



# **City and County of San Francisco**

## **2015-2019 Consolidated Plan**

**and**

## **2015-2016 Action Plan for Program Year July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016**



## Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
ES-05 Executive Summary - 24 CFR 91.200(c), 91.220(b) .....	3
The Process .....	5
PR-05 Lead & Responsible Agencies 24 CFR 91.200(b).....	5
PR-10 Consultation - 91.100, 91.200(b), 91.215(l).....	6
PR-15 Citizen Participation.....	25
Needs Assessment .....	28
NA-05 Overview .....	28
NA-10 Housing Needs Assessment - 24 CFR 91.205 (a,b,c) .....	29
NA-15 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Problems – 91.205 (b)(2) .....	42
NA-20 Disproportionately Greater Need: Severe Housing Problems – 91.205 (b)(2) .....	48
NA-25 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens – 91.205 (b)(2) .....	54
NA-30 Disproportionately Greater Need: Discussion – 91.205(b)(2) .....	56
NA-35 Public Housing – 91.205(b) .....	58
NA-40 Homeless Needs Assessment – 91.205(c).....	63
NA-45 Non-Homeless Special Needs Assessment - 91.205 (b,d).....	68
NA-50 Non-Housing Community Development Needs – 91.215 (f) .....	80
Housing Market Analysis.....	112
MA-05 Overview .....	112
MA-10 Number of Housing Units – 91.210(a)&(b)(2).....	114
MA-15 Housing Market Analysis: Cost of Housing - 91.210(a) .....	119
MA-20 Housing Market Analysis: Condition of Housing – 91.210(a).....	123
MA-25 Public and Assisted Housing – 91.210(b) .....	127
MA-30 Homeless Facilities and Services – 91.210(c) .....	133
MA-35 Special Needs Facilities and Services – 91.210(d).....	137
MA-40 Barriers to Affordable Housing – 91.210(e) .....	144
MA-45 Non-Housing Community Development Assets – 91.215 (f) .....	149
MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion .....	158
Strategic Plan .....	184
SP-05 Overview .....	184
SP-10 Geographic Priorities – 91.215 (a)(1).....	189
SP-25 Priority Needs - 91.215(a)(2).....	212
SP-30 Influence of Market Conditions – 91.215 (b).....	235
SP-35 Anticipated Resources - 91.215(a)(4), 91.220 (c)(1,2) .....	236
SP-40 Institutional Delivery Structure - 91.215(k) .....	245
SP-45 Goals Summary - 91.215(a)(4) .....	271
SP-50 Public Housing Accessibility and Involvement – 91.215(c).....	317
SP-55 Barriers to affordable housing – 91.215(h).....	322
SP-60 Homelessness Strategy – 91.215(d).....	329
SP-65 Lead based paint Hazards – 91.215(i) .....	334
SP-70 Anti-Poverty Strategy – 91.215(j) .....	336
SP-80 Monitoring – 91.230 .....	343
Action Plan .....	346
AP-15 Expected Resources – 91.220(c)(1,2) .....	346
AP-20 Annual Goals and Objectives.....	355

AP-35 Projects – 91.220(d).....	371
AP-38 Project Summary .....	372
AP-50 Geographic Distribution – 91.220(f).....	401
AP-55 Affordable Housing – 91.220(g).....	406
AP-60 Public Housing – 91.220(h).....	407
AP-65 Homeless and Other Special Needs Activities – 91.220(i).....	412
AP-70 HOPWA Goals– 91.220 (l)(3) .....	417
AP-75 Barriers to affordable housing – 91.220(j) .....	418
AP-85 Other Actions – 91.220(k).....	422
Program Specific Requirements.....	433
Appendix .....	443
Citizen Participation Comments Attachment	
Demographic Data by Neighborhood	
Citizen Participation Plan	
SF-424 Forms and Certifications	



# Executive Summary

## ES-05 Executive Summary - 24 CFR 91.200(c), 91.220(b)

### 1. Introduction

The Office of Community Planning and Development (CPD) of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requires that jurisdictions consolidate goals for all of its CPD programs into one strategic plan, called the Consolidated Plan. The four federal grant programs included in this Plan are 1) the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program, 2) the Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) program; 3) the HOME Investment Partnerships program (HOME) and 4) the Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS (HOPWA) program. A strategic plan must be submitted to HUD at least once every five years. This Consolidated Plan covers the time period of July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2020.

The Consolidated Plan serves the following purposes:

- A planning document for San Francisco's community development and affordable housing activities, which builds on a participatory process among citizens, organizations, businesses, and other stakeholders;
- A submission for federal funds under HUD's formula grant programs;
- A strategy to be followed in carrying out HUD programs; and
- A management tool for assessing performance and tracking results

Participation by the community and guidance by public employees enriched the planning process for the Consolidated Plan and allowed San Francisco to achieve a common vision and strategy for investments to support individuals, families and neighborhoods. The content of the Consolidated Plan is defined by a combination of federal regulation and what is most helpful for San Francisco's community development and affordable housing stakeholders. Therefore, this Consolidated Plan also includes strategies that are supported by resources other than the four federal funding sources. These additional strategies are included because they are directly related to the needs identified through the development of the Consolidated Plan.

### 2. Summary of the objectives and outcomes identified in the Plan Needs Assessment Overview

This five-year Consolidated Plan focuses on the following three overarching objectives:

1. Families and individuals are stably housed;
2. Communities have healthy physical, social and business infrastructure; and,
3. Families and individuals are resilient and economically self-sufficient.

### 3. Evaluation of past performance

In general, the community development and affordable housing activities that were implemented during the current Consolidated Plan time period served the identified needs. The five-year performance measures matrix and the one-year annual performance measures matrix in each of the City's Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Reports (CAPERs) show how the City performed against the goals that were set in the five-year strategic plan and the one-year action plan. The comparison of accomplishment data to goals indicate that the Consolidated Plan activities made a positive impact on the identified needs. However, due to the complexity and extent of the needs in the

City, the identified needs are still significant.

#### **4. Summary of citizen participation process and consultation process**

As part of the strategic planning process for the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan, MOHCD and OEWD conducted a thorough needs assessment, collecting data from a variety of city stakeholders. Two formal objectives of the planning process are to 1) promote citizen participation in the development of local priority needs and objectives; and 2) encourage consultation with public and private agencies to identify shared needs and solutions to persistent community problems.

In addition to providing forums for residents to comment on housing and community needs for the next five years, MOHCD and OEWD staff consulted with public and private agencies through the following methods:

- Interviewed staff from other City departments, including First 5 San Francisco; Department of Children, Youth and Their Families; Human Services Agency; Department of Public Health; Department on the Status of Women; Department of Aging and Adult Services; and Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs;
- Conducted 18 service provider focus groups;
- Conducted an on-line service providers' survey, which collected data from 287 respondents;
- Gathered City departments' funding data and analyzed City funding for services; and
- Reviewed relevant plans, reports and policy documents.

#### **5. Summary of public comments**

In addition to oral comments received during public hearings, MOHCD and OEWD received a total of four written public comments, two related to the Draft 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan and two related to the Draft 2015-2016 Action Plan. The first one is related to revising the Draft Consolidated Plan's background information and description of the Tenderloin neighborhood and revising the strategies to better meet the needs of small businesses in the Tenderloin. The second comment is related to revising the Draft Consolidated Plan so that it includes eviction and displacement as a problem and includes specific language for strategies that address this problem. The third written comment is by an applicant for funding describing the need for consideration of increased funding for two of its economic development programs. The final comment is related to the need for more emphasis on the "age-in-place" needs of low income seniors. Please see the Citizen Participation Comments Attachment for these four comments and MOHCD/OEWD's responses to these comments. Notes from all of the public hearings can also be found in the Citizen Participation Comments Attachment.

#### **6. Summary of comments or views not accepted and the reasons for not accepting them**

Not applicable

#### **7. Summary**

The needs assessment data is one category of information that was reviewed as part of the strategic planning process. Other components included developing a Theory of Change for MOHCD; leveraging the expertise of MOHCD staff and their understanding of city concerns, service delivery, and programmatic operations; and analyzing the funding available from MOHCD as well as other city agencies. All of this information was synthesized to inform the objectives, priority needs, goals and activities for the Consolidated Plan.

## The Process

### PR-05 Lead & Responsible Agencies 24 CFR 91.200(b)

#### 1. Describe agency/entity responsible for preparing the Consolidated Plan and those responsible for administration of each grant program and funding source

The following are the agencies/entities responsible for preparing the Consolidated Plan and those responsible for administration of each grant program and funding source.

**Table 1 – Responsible Agencies**

Agency Role	Name	Department/Agency
CDBG Administrator	SAN FRANCISCO	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
HOPWA Administrator	SAN FRANCISCO	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
HOME Administrator	SAN FRANCISCO	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
ESG Administrator	SAN FRANCISCO	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
HOPWA-C Administrator	SAN FRANCISCO	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

#### Narrative

In San Francisco, the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) is the lead agency responsible for the consolidated planning process and for submitting the Consolidated Plan, annual Action Plans and Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation Reports to HUD. MOHCD administers the CDBG housing, public facility, non-workforce development public service and organizational planning/capacity building activities; and all HOME, HOPWA and ESG activities. The Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) is responsible for economic development and workforce development activities of the CDBG program.

MOHCD serves as the lead agency for the HOPWA program for the San Francisco EMSA, which consists of San Francisco and San Mateo Counties.

#### Consolidated Plan Public Contact Information

Gloria Woo, Director of Compliance and Data Analysis  
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development  
1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
gloria.woo@sfgov.org  
415-701-5586

## **PR-10 Consultation - 91.100, 91.200(b), 91.215(I)**

### **1. Introduction**

As part of the strategic planning process for the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan, MOHCD and OEWD conducted a thorough needs assessment, collecting data from a variety of city stakeholders. Two formal objectives of the planning process are to 1) promote citizen participation in the development of local priority needs and objectives; and 2) encourage consultation with public and private agencies to identify shared needs and solutions to persistent community problems.

San Francisco's approach to community engagement was multi-layered to ensure that the various sectors were provided the opportunity to raise their concerns and provide valuable insight. In addition to providing forums for residents to comment on housing and community needs for the next five years, MOHCD and OEWD staff consulted with public and private agencies through the following methods:

- Interviewed staff from other City departments, including First 5 San Francisco; Department of Children, Youth and Their Families; Human Services Agency; Department of Public Health; Department on the Status of Women; Department of Aging and Adult Services; and Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs;
- Conducted 18 service provider focus groups;
- Conducted an on-line service providers' survey, which collected data from 287 respondents;
- Gathered City departments' funding data and analyzed City funding for services; and
- Reviewed relevant plans, reports and policy documents.

### **Provide a concise summary of the jurisdiction's activities to enhance coordination between public and assisted housing providers and private and governmental health, mental health and service agencies (91.215(I)).**

The City's senior advisor on health services convenes a monthly Health and Human Services Cluster meeting. Participating in this Cluster are the Directors of Public Health, Community Development, Human Services, Aging and Adult Services, Workforce Development, and Children, Youth and their Families. This monthly convening provides a regular forum to discuss issues of services coordination, policy, new initiatives, funding opportunities, and emerging needs. In addition, the Director of MOHCD meets on a weekly basis with the Director of Planning and the Director of Development for the Office of Economic and Workforce Development to discuss affordable and market-rate housing development issues citywide.

The City's HOPE SF initiative, focusing on the revitalization of four selected public housing sites at Hunters View, Alice Griffith, Sunnyside, and Potrero Terrace/Annex, brings together a bi-monthly Leadership Team consisting of deputy-level City staff representing health, human services, children and youth, workforce development, public housing, community development, affordable housing, and private philanthropy.

Affordable housing developers in San Francisco have formed a council that meets on a monthly basis to assist in the coordinated development of affordable housing throughout the City. Staff from MOHCD participates in these monthly meetings to provide a two-way channel of communication between these community based organizations and the City representatives who are responsible for overseeing City-financed affordable housing.

The City agencies also coordinate in the decision-making at the project level on affordable housing developments in the City, including at the level of individual project funding decisions. The Citywide Affordable Housing Loan makes funding recommendations to the Mayor for affordable housing development throughout the City or to the OCII Commission for affordable housing under their jurisdiction. Committee Members consist of the directors or the director's representative from the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development, Department of Public Health and Human Services Agency and the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure as successor to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (OCII). MOHCD also works closely with OCII, the Human Services Agency and the Department of Public Health to issue requests for proposals (RFPs) or notices of funding availability (NOFAs) on a regular basis to seek applications for particular types of developments. NOFAs are generally issued for projects to serve specific populations (family renters, single adults, seniors, people requiring supportive services, etc.), while RFPs are generally issued for specific development sites. Staff develops funding and general policy recommendations to the Loan Committee.

Staff from MOHCD, OCII, the Human Services Agency and Department of Public Health also meets on a bi-monthly basis to coordinate the development and operation of the City's permanent supportive housing pipeline and portfolio. Like the Health and Human Services Cluster meeting, this bi-monthly convening provides a regular forum to discuss issues of services coordination, policy, new initiatives, funding opportunities, and emerging needs specific for permanent supportive housing funded by these departments.

The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development also is a member of the Long Term Care Coordinating Council (LTCCC). This body is charged to: (1) advise, implement, and monitor community-based long term care planning in San Francisco; and (2) facilitate the improved coordination of home, community-based, and institutional services for older adults and adults with disabilities. It is the single body in San Francisco that evaluates all issues related to improving community-based long-term care and supportive services. The LTCCC has 41 membership slots. Membership categories were created to ensure representation from a variety of consumers, advocates, and service providers (non-profit and public). The Mayor appoints people to fill 32 slots, which represent non-profit service provider organizations, consumers, and advocates. The additional 9 slots represent City and County departments including: Human Services, Aging and Adult Services, Public Health (two slots), Mayor's Office on Disability, Mayor's Office of Housing, San Francisco Housing Authority, and the Municipal Railway, plus one non-voting slot to enable representation of the Mayor's Office. The LTCCC evaluates how service delivery systems interact to serve people, and recommends ways to improve service coordination and system interaction. Workgroups responsible for carrying out the activities in the plan provide periodic progress reports through presentations to the LTCCC.

### **Describe coordination with the Continuum of Care and efforts to address the needs of homeless persons (particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans, and unaccompanied youth) and persons at risk of homelessness**

The San Francisco Local Homeless Coordinating Board (Local Board) is the lead entity for the San Francisco Continuum of Care. The Local Board is staffed by the City's Human Services Agency (HSA). HSA staff has informed and updated the Local Board about the recent changes to the ESG program as a result of the HEARTH Act. The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), the lead agency for the City's ESG program, has been working closely with HSA staff and the Local Board to align

the city’s ESG program with the intent of the Act. MOHCD staff consulted with the Local Board during the creation of the Consolidated Plan to get its specific feedback on housing and homeless issues, the Local Board’s priorities, and how the City’s ESG programs and homeless housing programs can best align with the City’s continuum of care.

The Mayor has also recently created the San Francisco Inter-Agency Council on Homelessness (SFICH). Modeled after the U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness, the mission of the SFICH will be to coordinate the City and County’s response to homelessness, create consistent and transparent data metrics to share progress, and to maximize the effectiveness of federal, state and private contributions to end homelessness. The Council will be chaired by the Director of the Office of Housing Opportunities, Partnerships and Engagement, and will include the heads of the following agencies: Human Services Agency, Department of Public Health, MOHCD, Children, Youth and Families, police, Fire, Public Works, Recreation and Parks, Adult Probation, Juvenile Probation, District Attorney, Public Defender, City Treasurer, Sheriff, as well as other representatives from other entities such as the San Francisco Housing Authority, the San Francisco Unified School District, and the Medical Center Director of the San Francisco Veterans Affairs Office.

**Describe consultation with the Continuum(s) of Care that serves the jurisdiction's area in determining how to allocate ESG funds, develop performance standards and evaluate outcomes, and develop funding, policies and procedures for the administration of HMIS**

MOHCD staff meets regularly with HSA staff as HSA has developed its HMIS system to capture standards and outcomes of ESG grantees. MOHCD has been assigned the responsibility to train all ESG sub-recipients in the requirements of HMIS required data fields, and has developed coordinated data collection systems that align HMIS, MOHCD’s own internal contract monitoring system, and sub-recipient data management systems to ensure the capture of all relevant and required outcomes and outputs. MOHCD additionally met with the senior management of HSA during the creation of the Consolidated Plan to solicit input into MOHCD’s homeless and homeless prevention objectives and strategies, and convenes regular meetings of all HSA and MOHCD homeless prevention and rapid-rehousing providers in conjunction with HSA to coordinate strategies, review policy initiatives, review systems of service, and discuss funding allocations to coordinate ESG, McKinney, and City General Funds as they support these program areas. MOHCD will be sharing expenses for HMIS with HSA, based on the numbers of users established through the software agreement created between HSA and the HMIS software developer.

**2. Describe Agencies, groups, organizations and others who participated in the process and describe the jurisdictions consultations with housing, social service agencies and other entities**

**Table 2 – Agencies, groups, organizations who participated**

1	<b>Agency/Group/Organization</b>	San Francisco Immigrant Legal and Education Network
	<b>Agency/Group/Organization Type</b>	Services-Immigrant Legal
	<b>What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?</b>	Market Analysis Non-housing Community Development Needs
	<b>How was the</b>	2/19/14 Summary of Findings: Key needs for these

	<b>Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?</b>	immigrant clients include language access, housing, jobs and working conditions; most clients really need a case manager as well as a full representation attorney.
2	<b>Agency/Group/Organization</b>	Transitional Age Youth Advisory Board and Youth Commission
	<b>Agency/Group/Organization Type</b>	Services-TAY
	<b>What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?</b>	Market Analysis Non-housing Community Development Needs
	<b>How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?</b>	3/7/14 Summary of Findings: This is a specialized population which need specific services and support - re-entry, recent immigrants, LGBTQ, Trans-gender. Need more efforts in outreach to inform TAY groups of resources. Housing is major issue for this population. Need certificate/credential programs that help secure jobs & new opportunities. More leadership programs a w/focus on peer-led.
3	<b>Agency/Group/Organization</b>	HIV Prevention Planning Council
	<b>Agency/Group/Organization Type</b>	Services-Persons with HIV/AIDS
	<b>What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?</b>	Non-Homeless Special Needs Market Analysis Non-housing Community Development Needs
	<b>How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?</b>	3/13/14 Summary of Findings: Affordable housing with support services is needed, especially for substance users, incl. "wet" housing. LGBT specific shelters and LGBT sensitivity training for other providers. Rental subsidies and LGBT TAY housing and services.
4	<b>Agency/Group/Organization</b>	Housing Counseling Network
	<b>Agency/Group/Organization Type</b>	Services - Tenant Counseling/Eviction Prevention
	<b>What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?</b>	Housing Need Assessment Market Analysis Non-housing Community Development
	<b>How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?</b>	3/14/14 Summary of Findings: Tenants need counseling and representation earlier in the process in order to have better outcomes; more outreach and education is needed.

5	<b>Agency/Group/Organization</b>	Homeownership/Family Economic Success Coordinating Council
	<b>Agency/Group/Organization Type</b>	Housing Services-Financial Literacy and Homeownership Counseling
	<b>What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?</b>	Market Analysis Anti-poverty Strategy Non-housing Community Development Needs
	<b>How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?</b>	3/14/14 Summary of Findings: Needs affordable rental housing/homeownership opportunities and counseling that include financial education to prepare clients to be homeowner/renter-ready.
6	<b>Agency/Group/Organization</b>	HOPE SF Network
	<b>Agency/Group/Organization Type</b>	Services - Housing
	<b>What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?</b>	Public Housing Needs Market Analysis Non-housing Community Development Needs
	<b>How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?</b>	3/17/14 Summary of Findings: Key needs for residents are education (academic support, afterschool, adult education, and onsite child care), mental health and substance abuse, workforce, housing counseling, health and wellness
7	<b>Agency/Group/Organization</b>	SF Family Support Network
	<b>Agency/Group/Organization Type</b>	Services-Family Support
	<b>What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?</b>	Market Analysis Non-housing Community Development Needs
	<b>How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?</b>	3/17/14 Summary of Findings: Immediate need for affordable housing in safe areas that are located in SF near schools and child care services; accessible units go out of circulation quickly - should be saved for those that need the accessibility features; we need to have housing ladder to help families achieve sustainability and not have "golden ticket" mentality; need housing for immigrant families without documentation who have multiple barriers to employment, housing; need consolidated source of accurate information on housing



		opportunities.
8	<b>Agency/Group/Organization</b>	HIV Care Council
	<b>Agency/Group/Organization Type</b>	Services-Persons with HIV/AIDS
	<b>What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?</b>	Non-Homeless Special Needs HOPWA Strategy Market Analysis Non-housing Community Development Needs
	<b>How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?</b>	3/24/14 Summary of Findings: Need affordable housing, especially for HIV+ population
9	<b>Agency/Group/Organization</b>	Neighborhood Economic Development Partners
	<b>Agency/Group/Organization Type</b>	Services - Small Business Technical Assistance
	<b>What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?</b>	Economic Development
	<b>How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?</b>	3/25/14 Summary of Findings: Cultural awareness/isolation. Updating/modern tools to manage the business. Education regarding resources for small businesses. Proactive programs. Financing-(existing resources, understanding management of money, credit history). Education about what landlords want in a space and how to negotiate with them to get a fair lease. Business basics. Language capacity issues. Technical assistance for existing businesses. Develop a 1 year plan for clients. City permitting process is challenging in starting a business-food safety handling training in Spanish is needed. Legal issues etc. are difficult to understand
10	<b>Agency/Group/Organization</b>	Long Term Care Coordinating Council Housing and Services Workgroup
	<b>Agency/Group/Organization Type</b>	Housing Services - Housing Services-Elderly Persons Services-Persons with Disabilities Services-Long Term Care
	<b>What section of the Plan was addressed</b>	Housing Need Assessment

	<b>by Consultation?</b>	Non-Homeless Special Needs Non-housing Community Development Needs
	<b>How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?</b>	3/27/14 Summary of Findings: Need more deeply affordable units, like for SSI households; need affordable housing database or housing portal; there is a disconnect between accessible units available and disabled households that need it; should have set aside for BMR units for households with disabilities; consider local neighborhood preference; look at demographic data on senior tsunami; consider rent subsidies since can't build enough housing; reinstate a funding program to install accessibility features in rented and ownership housing occupied by low income households; figure out how to house those who have difficulty staying housed in supportive housing.
11	<b>Agency/Group/Organization</b>	Transitional Age Youth Executive Director Group
	<b>Agency/Group/Organization Type</b>	Services-TAY
	<b>What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?</b>	Market Analysis Non-housing Community Development Needs
	<b>How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?</b>	4/3/14 Summary of Findings: Specialized populations need services/support- re-entry, recent immigrants, LGBTQ, Trans-gender. Violence prevention and intervention/criminal justice system is very relevant to this population but isn't addressed in TAY Policy Report.
12	<b>Agency/Group/Organization</b>	Local Homeless Coordinating Board
	<b>Agency/Group/Organization Type</b>	Housing Services-homeless
	<b>What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?</b>	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth
	<b>How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?</b>	4/7/14 Summary of Findings: Group wants follow up on housing - tentatively scheduled for June; would like the Con Plan to incorporate the LHCB's own plan on supportive housing which is in development; want 300 units per year for homeless from here on out to match

		10 year plan goal of 3,000 units over 10 years; consider emergency needs of homeless people; want to see homeless pipeline
13	<b>Agency/Group/Organization</b>	Interfaith Council
	<b>Agency/Group/Organization Type</b>	Services-Faith Community
	<b>What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?</b>	Market Analysis Non-housing Community Development Needs
	<b>How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?</b>	4/10/14 Summary of Findings: Specialized populations need services/support- re-entry, recent immigrants, LGBTQ, Trans-gender. Violence prevention and intervention/criminal justice system is very relevant to this population but isn't addressed in TAY Policy Report.
14	<b>Agency/Group/Organization</b>	San Francisco Neighborhood Centers Together
	<b>Agency/Group/Organization Type</b>	Services-Community Centers
	<b>What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?</b>	Market Analysis Non-housing Community Development Needs
	<b>How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?</b>	4/11/14 Summary of Findings: Housing, particularly for young parents and transitional age youth, is very difficult to access; language access and cultural competency for immigrant populations; employment for immigrants and TAY; innovative solutions such as multigenerational housing/home care and co-housing
15	<b>Agency/Group/Organization</b>	Mayor's Disability Council
	<b>Agency/Group/Organization Type</b>	Services-Persons with Disabilities
	<b>What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?</b>	Housing Need Assessment Non-Homeless Special Needs Market Analysis Non-housing Community Development Needs
	<b>How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?</b>	4/18/14 Summary of Findings: Access and safety issues in affordable housing are particularly important; incorporate the specific recommendations for MOHCD from the Mayor's Disability Council which represent the top priorities
16	<b>Agency/Group/Organization</b>	Juvenile Justice & TAY Providers Association
	<b>Agency/Group/Organization Type</b>	Services-Juvenile Justice, TAY and Re-entry
	<b>What section of the Plan was addressed</b>	Market Analysis

	<b>by Consultation?</b>	Non-housing Community Development Needs
	<b>How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?</b>	4/22/14 Summary of Findings: High need population are re-entry and previously incarcerated. Housing services should follow a continuum, long term thinking. City departments and providers need better communication and platform for advocacy for TAY. Need better marketing/messaging, spaces to come together.
17	<b>Agency/Group/Organization</b>	Workforce Investment Citizens Advisory Committee
	<b>Agency/Group/Organization Type</b>	Services-Employment
	<b>What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?</b>	Market Analysis Non-housing Community Development Needs
	<b>How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?</b>	4/29/14 Summary of Findings: Need a continuum of services. WIA funding is restricted. CDBG should supplement what WIA cannot fund. Crucial gaps are education for employers so they can consider pipelines, more coordination so CBOs aren't working against what is coming down the pipeline. Coordination of funding opportunities. Address education, language, skill gaps and re-entry populations. More ESL, case management, knowledge of rights in the workplace.
18	<b>Agency/Group/Organization</b>	San Francisco Domestic Violence Consortium
	<b>Agency/Group/Organization Type</b>	Services-Victims of Domestic Violence
	<b>What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?</b>	Market Analysis Non-housing Community Development Needs
	<b>How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?</b>	5/8/14 Summary of Findings: Need subsidized or transitional housing for lengthier stays after the shelter and continued supportive services.
19	<b>Agency/Group/Organization</b>	First 5 San Francisco
	<b>Agency/Group/Organization Type</b>	Other government - Local
	<b>What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?</b>	Market Analysis Non-housing Community Development Needs
	<b>How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for</b>	MOHCD staff interviewed staff from other City departments to better coordinate services.

	<b>improved coordination?</b>	
20	<b>Agency/Group/Organization</b>	Department of Children, Youth and Their Families
	<b>Agency/Group/Organization Type</b>	Other government - Local
	<b>What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?</b>	Market Analysis Non-housing Community Development Needs
	<b>How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?</b>	MOHCD staff interviewed staff from other City departments to better coordinate services.
21	<b>Agency/Group/Organization</b>	Human Services Agency
	<b>Agency/Group/Organization Type</b>	Other government - Local
	<b>What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?</b>	Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth HOPWA Strategy Market Analysis Anti-poverty Strategy Non-housing Community Development Needs
	<b>How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?</b>	MOHCD staff interviewed staff from other City departments to better coordinate services.
22	<b>Agency/Group/Organization</b>	Department of Public Health
	<b>Agency/Group/Organization Type</b>	Other government - Local
	<b>What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?</b>	HOPWA Strategy Market Analysis Non-housing Community Development Needs
	<b>How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?</b>	MOHCD staff interviewed staff from other City departments to better coordinate services.

23	<b>Agency/Group/Organization</b>	Department on the Status of Women
	<b>Agency/Group/Organization Type</b>	Other government - Local
	<b>What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?</b>	Market Analysis Non-housing Community Development Needs
	<b>How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?</b>	MOHCD staff interviewed staff from other City departments to better coordinate services.
24	<b>Agency/Group/Organization</b>	Department of Aging and Adult Services
	<b>Agency/Group/Organization Type</b>	Other government - Local
	<b>What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?</b>	Market Analysis Non-housing Community Development Needs
	<b>How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?</b>	MOHCD staff interviewed staff from other City departments to better coordinate services.
25	<b>Agency/Group/Organization</b>	Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs
	<b>Agency/Group/Organization Type</b>	Other government - Local
	<b>What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?</b>	Market Analysis Non-housing Community Development Needs
	<b>How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?</b>	MOHCD staff interviewed staff from other City departments to better coordinate services.
26	<b>Agency/Group/Organization</b>	Service Provider Survey
	<b>Agency/Group/Organization Type</b>	Services - Housing Services-Children Services-Elderly Persons Services-Persons with Disabilities Services-Persons with HIV/AIDS Services-Victims of Domestic Violence Services-homeless Services-Health

		Services-Education Services-Employment Service-Fair Housing Services - Victims
	<b>What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?</b>	Housing Need Assessment Public Housing Needs Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs HOPWA Strategy Economic Development Market Analysis Non-housing Community Development Needs
	<b>How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?</b>	Through Survey Monkey, 279 service providers completed a survey which asked questions about client and neighborhood needs. Additionally, it allowed participants to prioritize funding based on unmet needs in their primary neighborhood service locations.

**Identify any Agency Types not consulted and provide rationale for not consulting**

MOHCD and OEWD staff consulted with all agency types that are involved in the housing and community development activities that are included in this Consolidated Plan.

**Other local/regional/state/federal planning efforts considered when preparing the Plan**

**Table 3 – Other local / regional / federal planning efforts**

<b>Name of Plan</b>	<b>Lead Organization</b>	<b>How do the goals of your Strategic Plan overlap with the goals of each plan?</b>
Continuum of Care	Human Services Agency (HSA)	The Local Homeless Board and this Consolidated plan identify similar strategies and needs for the targeted population.
HIV/AIDS Housing Plan	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	This plan and the Consolidated plan are coordinating similar goals and objectives.

<b>Name of Plan</b>	<b>Lead Organization</b>	<b>How do the goals of your Strategic Plan overlap with the goals of each plan?</b>
Child Services Allocation Plan 2013-2016	Department of Children Youth and their Families	To ensure that there wasn't a duplication of services and investment, this plan was considered and the Director of the Department was consulted.
Community Health Improvement Plan	Department of Public Health	Open spaces, health and general community development goals overlap with our Consolidated Plan efforts.
Department of Aging Area Plan 2012-2016	Department of Aging and Adult Services	Seniors as a target population and the effort to improve technology in the SF Housing Authority ties to our Consolidated plan.
HSA 2014 Federal Budget and Legislative Priorities	Human Services Agency (HSA)	Target populations, workforce development goals and homeless strategies were deemed as informative and related to our Consolidated Plan formation.
Five-Year Strategic Plan of the SF LHCB, 2008-2013	HSA/Local Homeless Coordinating Board (LHCB)	Focus on homeless prevention, emergency shelters and transitional housing, supportive housing, service connection and financial education overlap with Consolidated plan goals and objectives.
LHCB Strategic Plan Framework, 2014-2019	HSA/Local Homeless Coordinating Board (LHCB)	Focus on affordable housing, employment-readiness, emergency shelters and transitional housing, and homeless prevention overlap with Consolidated plan goals and objectives.
San Francisco's Ten-Year Plan to End Chronic Homelessness: Anniversary Report Covering 2004-2014	Human Services Agency (HSA)	Focus on expanding permanent supportive housing, homeless prevention and rapid re-housing efforts overlap with Consolidated plan goals and objectives.
2012-2014 Comprehensive HIV Health Services Plan	Department of Public Health: HIV Health Services	Focus on enhanced services for homeless and marginally housed persons with HIV overlap with Consolidated plan goals and objectives.
2014 Violence Against Women Community Needs Assessment	Department on the Status of Women	Similar emphasis on transitional housing resources that are gender-responsive to the needs of women survivors, and continued support of case management services for domestic violence survivors.
San Francisco Public Safety Realignment and Post Release Community Supervision 2012 Implementation Plan	Adult Probation Department	Supports goals for partnerships for services focusing on homeless or temporarily housed individuals and providing job readiness services.



Name of Plan	Lead Organization	How do the goals of your Strategic Plan overlap with the goals of each plan?
Reentry in San Francisco: Annual Report	Adult Probation Department	Supports overall focus on the needs of re-entry individuals.
Realignment in SF: Two Years in Review	Adult Probation Department	Supports recommendation to ensure fair housing access to permanent supportive rental housing.
San Francisco General Plan 2014 Housing Element	Planning Department	The Housing Element includes implementation strategies that preserve, develop and fund affordable housing for extremely low income, very low income and moderate income groups.

**Describe cooperation and coordination with other public entities, including the State and any adjacent units of general local government, in the implementation of the Consolidated Plan (91.215(I))**

MOHCD works closely with the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII), which is the Successor Agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, and the San Francisco Housing Authority on affordable housing activities.

In addition, the City and County of San Francisco works with the County of San Mateo on the use of HOPWA funds.

## **Narrative (optional):**

Key takeaways from the consultation and citizen participation processes are:

- Increasing affordable housing is consistently identified as the top priority across all stakeholder groups and data collection formats.
- Apart from housing concerns, residents and service providers largely agree on what they consider to be other pressing concerns confronting the city. Issues frequently identified by both groups include the following: providing mental health and substance use services, addressing homelessness, and supporting transitional age youth (TAY).
- Staff members of other city agencies were the only stakeholder group to emphasize the importance of capital support and facilities improvement.


### ***Residents' Perspectives***

As part of an on-line survey, San Francisco residents were asked to allocate \$100, in \$25 increments, to various city concerns. This hypothetical exercise allowed MOHCD and OEWD to understand the public's view of the relative priority of different issues. As conveyed in Exhibit 1, respondents identify increasing affordable housing, supporting TAY, and providing mental health and substance issues as top city priorities.

Responses to open-ended survey questions mirror many of the quantitative survey findings. When asked about neighborhood needs, respondents identified housing, safety, and homelessness most often. Notably, respondents referred to housing in multiple senses. Most frequently, residents described the importance of affordable housing (and the related issue of gentrification), but also wrote about the quality of housing and eviction prevention. Similarly, respondents described safety in multiple senses, included gang violence, gun violence, drugs, opportunities for greater police involvement, and improvements to the built environment (e.g., lighting and cameras) to promote safety.

It is important to note that the highest proportion (21%) of survey respondents lived in the 94117-Haight Ashbury zip code. The neighborhood with the second highest proportion of survey residents (14%) is 94110-Mission-Bernal. Consequently, aggregate-level analyses may reflect the priorities of these two neighborhoods rather than the needs of the city as a whole.

## Exhibit 1 – Residents’ Proposed Dollars to Each Service




### Service Providers’ Perspectives

#### Survey Results

Service providers were asked to complete a \$100 allocation exercise similar to that in the residents’ survey. Their responses echo many of the preferences identified in the residents’ survey. Respondents ranked supporting TAY, accessing mental health and substance use services, and addressing homelessness as the most pressing city concerns, as shown in Exhibit 2 below.

## Exhibit 2 – Providers’ Proposed Dollars to Each Service



Among the various ways that city needs were inquired about in the service providers’ survey, housing was consistently the most frequently cited concern. Open-ended responses offered slightly more detail on the types of housing assistance service providers had in mind. Respondents identified a need for more affordable housing, as well as a need for supportive housing and “wet” housing.

When asked about *client* needs (as opposed to *community* needs) service providers also referred to workforce development, youth development, addressing behavioral health and substance use, small

business development, and economic opportunities in addition to housing. The need to address safety concerns, including violence, and violence was identified as an important community need. Service providers most often associated violence with drugs, poverty, and gangs.

The three top services areas represented among respondents are children's services, homelessness, and economic development. Many of the service providers primarily serve the Tenderloin (16%) and Mission/Bernal Heights (13%) neighborhoods in the city. As with the limitation noted above with the residents' survey, this professional and geographic representation may influence aggregate-level analyses.

### **Focus Groups**

Focus groups constitute a valuable part of the needs assessment process because they provide greater depth and context on how stakeholders perceive city concerns. The focus groups identified three main need areas: housing, employment, and mental health in relation to safety.

#### Housing

As in other needs assessment data, focus group participants discussed the importance of housing services in San Francisco. More specifically, focus group members emphasized the importance of affordable housing, but also highlighted the value of transitional housing. Individuals further mentioned the housing needs of specific populations including TAY, seniors, individuals with disabilities, individuals who are HIV positive, and families. In addition to making housing more affordable, participants suggested the need for enhanced eviction preventions services in light of the growing number of Ellis Act evictions in the city.

Complementing these suggestions for enhanced housing services, focus group members emphasized the need to strengthen the overall housing system. Recommendations included the following: improving housing accessibility, promoting awareness of support services among potential beneficiaries, revising waitlist structures for greater equity, clarifying the eligibility process, or developing a comprehensive housing list or portal.

#### Employment

With respect to workforce needs, focus group members expressed a need for high-quality case management services to support securing employment. A few focus groups brought to light the importance of developing an integrated continuum of employment support instead of discrete services that may be disconnected from each other. Such a continuum could offer subsidized employment leading to employment experience, which would thereby improve job readiness, and increase the chances of obtaining a job and building a career. In addition to these concerns, some focus group participants emphasized the importance of increasing the availability of services that clear criminal records, which pose a significant impediment to securing employment.

#### Mental Health and Safety

In other needs assessment data, mental health concerns are most often framed in relation to substance use. In focus groups, participants connected mental health needs to traumatic life experiences of San Francisco residents. For instance, individuals who have witnessed or experienced violence are likely to suffer from post-traumatic stress syndrome. Focus group members recommended efforts to increase the capacity of service providers and case managers to provide trauma-informed support

## ***Agency Interviews***

As identified through other needs assessment data collection, city agency staff working across a variety of sectors also identified the need for more housing as a chief priority facing San Francisco. Interviewees spoke of housing in multiple senses including transitional housing, housing stability, emergency shelters, and eviction prevention.

Interviewees also mention capital needs and infrastructure maintenance almost as often as they cite housing concerns. The upkeep of facilities is essential to successful service delivery. Many interviewees indicated that most city agencies do not support these types of activities and underscored the importance of MOHCD's role with respect to capital needs and infrastructure.

Almost all individuals mentioned the value of coordinating services across city agencies to improve service connection and avoid duplication of efforts. Some interviewees further looked to MOHCD to play an oversight role among city agencies to foster greater coordination among departments.

## ***Conclusion***

The needs assessment information summarized here offers useful insights into how residents, service providers, and public sector staff understand San Francisco's needs. All stakeholders identified housing as the most important priority for the city. The majority of other concerns articulated related to the content of service delivery: TAY, homelessness, as well as mental health and substance use services. In contrast, staff members of other city agencies recognized the importance of financial and operational concerns by prioritizing capital and infrastructure needs.

It is important to note that the activities proposed in the Consolidated Plan may not exactly mirror the issues identified through the needs assessment process. The needs assessment data is one category of information that will be reviewed as part of the strategic planning. Other components include developing a Theory of Change for MOHCD; leveraging the expertise of MOHCD staff and their understanding of city concerns, service delivery, and programmatic operations; and analyzing the funding available from MOHCD as well as other city agencies. Synthesizing all this information will inform the goals, strategies, and objectives for the Consolidated Plan.

## **PR-15 Citizen Participation**

### **1. Summary of citizen participation process/Efforts made to broaden citizen participation Summarize citizen participation process and how it impacted goal-setting**

#### ***Public Input on Needs***

In preparation for the development of this Consolidated Plan, Citizen's Committee on Community Development, MOHCD and OEWD convened four public hearings in key neighborhoods to collect more detailed resident input on specific community needs. All locations were accessible to persons with disabilities, and translation services were made available to the public.

Notice of the hearings was published in the San Francisco Chronicle, in neighborhood-based newspapers, and on MOHCD's website. MOHCD also sent out a mass mailing of the public notice. The mailing list consisted of more than 900 non-profit organizations and neighborhood-based groups. The notice was translated into Chinese and Spanish and was distributed to public libraries and to other neighborhood organizations that serve low-income and hard-to-reach residents. Persons who did not want to speak at a public hearing were encouraged to provide written comments to MOHCD/OEWD.

No written comments were received by MOHCD/OEWD. Notes from the four public hearings can be found in the Citizen Participation Comments Attachment.

The Citizen's Committee on Community Development (CCCD) is a nine-member advisory body charged with promoting citizen participation for CDBG and ESG programs. Members are appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors, and represent a broad cross-section of communities served by the two programs. The CCCD holds public hearings, assists with the identification of community needs and the formulation of program priorities, and makes funding recommendations for the CDBG and ESG programs to the Mayor. The CCCD has regular monthly public meetings.

In addition to the public hearings, MOHD conducted an on-line survey of residents to assess their perspectives on the needs of their neighborhoods. The residents' survey had 285 respondents.

#### ***Public Input on the Draft 2015-2019 Five-Year Consolidated Plan***

The Draft 2015-2019 Five-Year Consolidated Plan was available to the public for review and comment between October 6, 2014 and November 4, 2014. The City published a notice in the San Francisco Chronicle on September 27, October 8 and October 17, 2014 informing the public of the availability of the draft document for review and comment. The public had access to review the document at the Main Branch of the Public Library and at the offices of MOHCD and OEWD. The document was also posted on the MOHCD and OEWD websites. The CCCD, MOHCD and OEWD held two public hearings on October 14 and October 21, 2014 to receive comments on the Draft 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan. Persons who cannot attend the public hearings or who do not want to speak at the public hearings are encouraged to provide written comments to MOHCD/OEWD.

Two written comments were received by MOHCD/OEWD. The first one is related to revising the Draft Consolidated Plan's background information and description of the Tenderloin neighborhood and revising the strategies to better meet the needs of small businesses in the Tenderloin. The second

comment is related to revising the Draft Consolidated Plan so that it includes eviction and displacement as a problem and includes specific language for strategies that address this problem. Please see the Citizen Participation Comments Attachment for these two comments and MOHCD/OEWD’s responses to these comments. Notes from the two public hearings can also be found in the Citizen Participation Comments Attachment.

**Public Input on the Draft 2015-2016 Action Plan**

The Draft 2015-2016 Action Plan was available to the public for review and comment between March 26, 2015 and April 24, 2015. The City published a notice in the San Francisco Examiner March 9, March 18 and April 1, 2015 informing the public of the availability of the draft document for review and comment. The public had access to review the document at the Main Branch of the Public Library and at the offices of MOHCD and OEWD. The document was also posted on the MOHCD and OEWD websites. The CCCD, MOHCD and OEWD held a public hearing on March 31, 2015 to receive comments on the Draft 2015-2016 Action Plan. Persons who cannot attend the public hearings or who do not want to speak at the public hearings are encouraged to provide written comments to MOHCD/OEWD.

Two written comment was received by MOHCD/OEWD. One comment is by an applicant for funding describing the need for consideration of increased funding for two of its economic development programs. The other comment requested MOHCD to revise the Consolidated Plan to include more emphasis on the “age-in-place” needs of low income seniors. Please see the Citizen Participation Comments Attachment for these two comment and MOHCD/OEWD’s responses to these comments. Notes from the March 31st public hearing can also be found in the Citizen Participation Comments Attachment.

**Citizen Participation Outreach**

**Table 4 – Citizen Participation Outreach**

Sort Order	Mode of Outreach	Target of Outreach	Summary of response/ attendance	Summary of Comments received	Summary of comments not accepted and reasons	URL (If applicable)
1	Community Needs Public Meeting 3/18/2014	Non-targeted/broad community  Residents of the Southeast sector	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment	n/a	n/a



Sort Order	Mode of Outreach	Target of Outreach	Summary of response/ attendance	Summary of Comments received	Summary of comments not accepted and reasons	URL (If applicable)
2	Community Needs Public Meeting 4/22/2014	Non-targeted/broad community  Residents of the South Central sector	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment	n/a	n/a
3	Community Needs Public Meeting 4/29/2014	Non-targeted/broad community  Residents of the Northeast sector	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment	n/a	n/a
4	Community Needs Public Meeting 5/13/2014	Non-targeted/broad community  Residents of the West Side	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment	n/a	n/a
5	Draft Con Plan Public Meeting 10/14/2014	Non-targeted/broad community	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment	n/a	n/a
6	Draft Con Plan Public Meeting 10/21/2014	Non-targeted/broad community	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment	n/a	n/a
7	Draft Action Plan Public Meeting 3/31/2015	Non-targeted/broad community	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment	n/a	n/a

# Needs Assessment

## NA-05 Overview

### Needs Assessment Overview

According to the San Francisco General Plan 2014 Housing Element, San Francisco continues to grow and has surpassed its population peak of the 1950s; by 2012, some 808,000 people called San Francisco home. A slight shift in the City's racial composition was noted in the U.S. Census Bureau's 2012 American Community Survey (ACS) estimate but San Francisco continues to be a culturally and racially diverse place. San Francisco households are generally better off and median incomes are rising; the 2012 ACS estimated San Francisco's median income at about \$73,802. San Francisco is also growing older. The median age of San Francisco residents has been rising since 2000, especially as the baby-boom generation ages. In 2012, the estimated median age was 38.5 years. Families with children constitute a small portion of San Francisco households. Under 12% of the City's total population is 14 years old and younger, giving San Francisco the distinction of having the fewest children per capita of all major U.S. cities.

Please refer to the Part I of the 2014 Housing Element for a description and analysis of San Francisco's population, employment and income trends.

## NA-10 Housing Needs Assessment - 24 CFR 91.205 (a,b,c)

### Summary of Housing Needs

#### *Permanent Affordable Housing Needs*

**Table 5 – Regional Housing Needs Assessment for San Francisco, 2014-2022**

Household Income Category	No. of Units	% of Total	Annual Production Goal
Very Low (0-50% AMI )	6,234	21.6%	831
Low (51 - 80% AMI )	4,639	16.1%	619
Moderate (81 - 120% AMI )	5,460	18.9%	728
Above Moderate (over 120% AMI )	12,536	43.4%	1,671
<b>TOTAL UNITS</b>	<b>28,869</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>3,849</b>

Source: ABAG, 2013; Regional Housing Need Allocation (2014-2022)

**Table 6 – New Affordable Housing Construction by Income Level, 2005-2013**

Household Income Category	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Very Low (0-50% AMI)	453	316	412	381	550	480	140	357	448	3,920
Low (51-80% AMI)	236	17	120	81	140	21	21	52	220	910
Moderate (81-120% AMI)	110	158	203	361	256	81	57	104	44	1,537
Total Affordable Units	799	491	735	823	946	582	218	513	712	6,367
As % of Total New Construction	42.7%	29.3%	33.5%	27.3%	28.1%	53.8%	62.6%	64.6%	30.6%	34.5%

Source: San Francisco Planning Department, 2014 Housing Element

Two governmental bodies, The State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), set San Francisco’s “fair share of the regional housing need” - the amount of new housing that should be built in order to house increasing numbers of residents. This Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) process also establishes the number of units that should be affordable to lower income households. The 2014 Housing Element suggested that the total number of housing units allocated to San Francisco by the RHNA process was not realistic. The goal for new housing production for very low to moderate income households outlined for the 2014-2022 planning period (16,333 units total or 2,178 per year) is nearly three times San Francisco’s average

production rate of 707 units per year (based on 2005-2013 data).<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, funds available for new affordable housing construction, rehabilitation and supportive service provision come primarily from Federal and State sources that, in the absence of major policy change, will not increase.

### **Cost Burden**

Since the need for low cost housing far exceeds its availability, many households are “cost burdened”, i.e. paying more than they can comfortably afford on housing and defined by HUD as paying more than 30% of household income toward housing expenses. Cost burden creates a trap that impedes financial growth when households are stretched thin financially and have few resources to invest in asset-building opportunities or professional development opportunities. Thus, poverty alleviation and economic development are especially challenging for cost-burdened communities.

Over 79% of San Francisco renter households who earn less than 50% of area median income are cost burdened (Table 11). The most recent data indicates that 93% of renters who are less than 50% of area median income are severely cost burdened (paying more than 50% of their income on rent) (Table 12). This data underscores the affordable housing crisis for San Francisco’s lowest income households, most especially the elderly whose incomes typically do not increase significantly each year. In order to make production of rental housing for the lowest income levels economically feasible, the City will continue to subsidize housing development chiefly for extremely low and very low-income renters.

### **Overcrowding**

Another consequence of high housing costs can be overcrowding when households double-up to reduce their housing costs to a manageable level. A household is considered overcrowded when there is more than one person per room in the dwelling unit.

The 2007-2011 CHAS data indicates that very low-income single-family renter households are the most overcrowded at 45% of total San Francisco households with that need (Table 13).


While the overall prevalence of overcrowded conditions is low citywide, certain communities have a high concentration of overcrowded housing- specifically the Chinatown, Tenderloin, South of Market, Mission, Outer Mission, Excelsior, Oceanview/Ingleside/Merced, Portola, Visitation Valley and part of the Bayview Hunters Point neighborhoods. Southeastern neighborhoods have a smaller total number of overcrowded households, but have a higher *proportion* of overcrowded households (Map 1). Corresponding to the demographic representation of these neighborhoods, certain ethnic groups are more likely to live in overcrowded conditions. White households are less likely to be overcrowded than other ethnicities, particularly Hispanic/Latino headed households and Asian headed households.

The neighborhoods that have the fewest households living in uncrowded conditions are Chinatown, Tenderloin, and part of Bayview/Hunters Point. The overcrowding situation in Chinatown is particularly severe, with 76% of households living in crowded conditions.

---

<sup>1</sup> City and County of San Francisco, San Francisco General Plan Housing Element, 2014

**Map 1 – Proportion of Households Living in Overcrowded Conditions**



***Substandard Housing - Lack of Kitchen and Plumbing Facilities***

A unit has complete kitchen facilities when it has all three of the following: (a) a sink with a faucet, (b) a stove or range, and (c) a refrigerator. All kitchen facilities must be located in the house, apartment, or mobile home, but they need not be in the same room.

Complete plumbing facilities include: (a) hot and cold running water, (b) a flush toilet, and (c) a bathtub or shower. All three facilities must be located inside the house, apartment, or mobile home, but not necessarily in the same room.

Citywide, only a small percentage of housing units lack kitchen facilities (4.2%) or plumbing facilities (2.3%). However, housing without kitchen or plumbing facilities are highly concentrated in three small neighborhoods: the Tenderloin, Chinatown, and the Financial District. These low-income neighborhoods have many of the City’s SRO buildings.

**Table 7 – Housing Needs Assessment Demographics**

Demographics	Base Year: 2000	Most Recent Year: 2011	% Change
Population	776,733	797,983	3%
Households	329,850	338,366	3%
Median Income	\$55,221.00	\$72,947.00	32%

Data Source: 2000 Census (Base Year), 2007-2011 ACS (Most Recent Year)

**Number of Households Table**

**Table 8 – Total Households Table**

	0-30% HAMFI	>30-50% HAMFI	>50-80% HAMFI	>80- 100% HAMFI	>100% HAMFI
Total Households *	70,835	39,965	51,455	30,270	145,840
Small Family Households *	13,180	11,755	14,810	9,225	54,930
Large Family Households *	2,275	3,185	4,015	2,210	6,330
Household contains at least one person 62-74 years of age	14,745	7,590	8,885	4,885	18,825
Household contains at least one person age 75 or older	15,815	7,220	6,225	2,665	7,615
Households with one or more children 6 years old or younger *	4,550	4,695	4,330	3,135	13,975
* the highest income category for these family types is >80% HAMFI					

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

**Housing Needs Summary Tables**

1. Housing Problems (Households with one of the listed needs)

**Table 9 – Housing Problems Table**

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30- 50% AMI	>50- 80% AMI	>80- 100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30- 50% AMI	>50- 80% AMI	>80- 100% AMI	Total
<b>NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS</b>										
Substandard Housing - Lacking complete plumbing or kitchen facilities	8,690	2,040	1,300	240	12,270	175	135	85	30	425

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
Severely Overcrowded - With >1.51 people per room (and complete kitchen and plumbing)	2,620	1,840	1,340	615	6,415	55	80	410	180	725
Overcrowded - With 1.01-1.5 people per room (and none of the above problems)	1,380	1,205	1,045	470	4,100	135	550	1,055	475	2,215
Housing cost burden greater than 50% of income (and none of the above problems)	24,840	8,270	2,955	470	36,535	6,345	4,360	5,170	2,430	18,305
Housing cost burden greater than 30% of income (and none of the above problems)	8,575	9,945	12,060	3,930	34,510	1,210	1,485	3,500	2,790	8,985
Zero/negative Income (and none of the above problems)	3,900	0	0	0	3,900	820	0	0	0	820

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

2. Housing Problems 2 (Households with one or more Severe Housing Problems: Lacks kitchen or complete plumbing, severe overcrowding, severe cost burden)

**Table 10 – Housing Problems 2**

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30- 50% AMI	>50- 80% AMI	>80- 100% AMI	Total	0- 30% AMI	>30- 50% AMI	>50- 80% AMI	>80- 100% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS										
Having 1 or more of four housing problems	37,530	13,355	6,640	1,790	59,315	6,715	5,120	6,720	3,110	21,665
Having none of four housing problems	17,765	14,915	26,580	17,020	76,280	4,105	6,575	11,515	8,345	30,540
Household has negative income, but none of the other housing problems	3,900	0	0	0	3,900	820	0	0	0	820

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

3. Cost Burden > 30%

**Table 11 – Cost Burden > 30%**

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30- 50% AMI	>50- 80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30- 50% AMI	>50- 80% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS								
Small Related	8,605	5,915	3,300	17,820	1,785	1,840	3,710	7,335
Large Related	1,350	1,140	440	2,930	360	890	1,500	2,750
Elderly	14,305	3,680	1,485	19,470	4,210	2,510	2,040	8,760
Other	18,330	9,765	10,635	38,730	1,480	1,100	2,295	4,875
Total need by income	42,590	20,500	15,860	78,950	7,835	6,340	9,545	23,720

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS



4. Cost Burden > 50%

**Table 12 – Cost Burden > 50%**

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total
<b>NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS</b>								
Small Related	5,850	2,105	635	8,590	1,645	1,425	2,055	5,125
Large Related	975	355	45	1,375	285	565	590	1,440
Elderly	8,300	1,360	325	9,985	3,260	1,770	1,210	6,240
Other	15,535	5,090	2,135	22,760	1,370	895	1,550	3,815
Total need by income	30,660	8,910	3,140	42,710	6,560	4,655	5,405	16,620

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

5. Crowding (More than one person per room)

**Table 13 – Crowding Information – 1/2**

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
<b>NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS</b>										
Single family households	4,255	2,680	1,790	725	9,450	165	370	765	355	1,655
Multiple, unrelated family households	355	690	410	65	1,520	30	220	685	315	1,250
Other, non-family households	720	495	455	290	1,960	0	40	10	0	50
Total need by income	5,330	3,865	2,655	1,080	12,930	195	630	1,460	670	2,955

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

**Table 14 – Crowding Information – 2/2**

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total
Households with Children Present	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Describe the number and type of single person households in need of housing assistance.**

As of 2012, single person households compose approximately 39% of San Francisco’s overall population (Table 15). Of this population group, the types of household in need of housing assistance are predominantly very low-income seniors, disabled or formerly homeless individuals living in single room occupancy units.

**Table 15 – San Francisco Household Sizes and Unit Sizes, 2012**

Household Size	% Total Households	Unit	% Total Housing Units
1-person	39.4%	Studio	13.8%
2-person	32.2%	1-bedroom	27.1%
3-person	12.8%	2-bedrooms	30.9%
4-person	9.3%	3-bedrooms	19.1%
5-person	3.3%	4-bedrooms	6.6%
6-person or more	3.1%	5-bedrooms or more	2.6%

Source: Census Bureau; San Francisco Planning Department, 2014 Housing Element

**Estimate the number and type of families in need of housing assistance who are disabled or victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking.**

It is estimated that 11% of all San Franciscans have a disability. Fifteen percent of people age 65 or older (7,149), and 33% of all younger adults with disabilities (13,280) in San Francisco are living in poverty<sup>2</sup>. Many rely on federal disability benefits (SSI) as their sole source of income. In addition, domestic violence was the most frequently cited cause of homelessness among survey respondents living in families (27%). San Francisco receives an average of 20 calls to 911 and almost 60 crisis line calls per day related to domestic violence (*Comprehensive Report on Family Violence in San Francisco, 2011*). San Francisco is also a national “hot spot” for human trafficking, including sex and labor trafficking, and one of the top 13 cities in the U.S. for child sex trafficking (FBI, 2009).<sup>3</sup> Although an exact percentage of families in need of housing assistance that fall into these categories is not available, the risk factors as described above would indicate that a high percentage of these families fall into these categories.

**What are the most common housing problems?**

The most common housing problems are the lack of available affordable housing and the severe cost burden impacting very-low and low-income households. In particular, San Francisco has seen a significant increase in evictions and displacement which has resulted in many low-income households struggling to remain in San Francisco. According to the recently released report by the San Francisco Anti-Displacement Coalition<sup>4</sup>, the number of eviction notices filed with the San Francisco Rent Board increased by 54.7% from 2010-11 to 2014-15, and is now higher than it has been in over a decade. In particular, the community has expressed concern over the rising numbers of Ellis Act evictions. The Ellis Act is a state law that permits a landlord to evict all tenants from a building, including a building that falls under the City’s rent control ordinance, if the landlord intends to stop renting the building and follow certain procedural requirements. In many cases landlords choose to convert these units to

<sup>2</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013 Five-Year Estimates

<sup>3</sup> ETR, Violence Against Women Community Needs Assessment, 2014

<sup>4</sup> San Francisco Anti-Displacement Coalition, San Francisco’s Eviction Crisis, 2015

homeownership units, allowing the units that formerly housed low-income renters to be sold to higher-income households. Although the City has supported efforts at the state level to modify this law to give San Francisco more flexibility about its application, to this date the law remains unchanged. Ellis Act filings with the Rent Board reached a peak at the end of 2013, declined briefly in 2014, and has now increased in 2015 leading to community concerns that the 2015 Ellis Act numbers may exceed the levels of 2013. According to the San Francisco Superior Court, the total number of unlawful detainer notices filed in 2013 was 3,423, indicating the high number of potential evictions in the City. Although various City departments have increased their investment in eviction prevention services, there are still a significant number of individuals who remain unrepresented in their eviction cases. Another group that experienced historic displacement and is still in need of affordable housing are low-income households displaced by San Francisco Redevelopment Agency action in the Western Addition and Hunters Point neighborhoods during the 1960s and 1970s. In 1967 the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency adopted a Certificate of Preference program for persons displaced by its Urban Renewal programs in the Western Addition. This preference gave displacees priority in renting or buying housing assisted by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency. The San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted Ordinance 232-08 that extended the program to all affordable housing administered by the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development.

### **Are any populations/household types more affected than others by these problems?**

The permanent affordable housing needs of some specific population groups are described below. These categories are not intended to be comprehensive, but rather to represent groups for whom the City will prioritize affordable housing over the next five years.

#### ***Very Low Income Seniors***

The 2010 Census counted 154,730, or 20% of San Francisco's population as 60 years or older. San Francisco's elderly population is expected to grow to 205,000 by 2020 and to 276,300 by 2030; this growth is consistent with national trends. The recent Census also estimated that 24% of all San Francisco households have one or more persons over 65 years old. About 37,500 elderly householders, representing about 25% of all elderly households in 2010, lived alone.

Advances in medical technology will likely increase the relative size of the senior population as life expectancies increase in the future. This segment of the population is more likely to be poor and in need of fully accessible housing to maintain their quality of life. There will also be a growing population of people with cognitive impairment and dementia in San Francisco between 2010 and 2020.<sup>5</sup> Due to a reduction in custodial care for older adults at hospitals and in nursing facilities, housing opportunities that include dementia care are a growing need.<sup>6</sup>

Over half (52%) of the City's seniors 65 and over are homeowners.<sup>7</sup> Many of these homeowners bought their home decades ago, and now own them outright. As a result, senior homeowners today are somewhat shielded from high housing costs. However, San Francisco baby boomers (adults born between 1936 and 1964) are less likely to own their homes than seniors age 65 or older. Furthermore,

---

<sup>5</sup>Alzheimer's/Dementia Expert Panel, 2009

<sup>6</sup> Dementia Care Revisions to Housing Element

<sup>7</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013 Five-Year Estimates

younger baby boomers are less likely than older baby boomers to own their homes. Both groups are dramatically less likely to own their homes than are baby boomers nationally or statewide.<sup>8</sup>

Since the city's historically high cost of houses has been prohibitive to many baby boomers, San Francisco is largely a city of renters when it comes to the baby boomer population<sup>9</sup> and there is a large unmet need for accessible, low-cost rental housing in the private market. As the generation of baby-boomer renters reaches retirement age, their incomes will decline, and the need for accessible low-cost rental housing and affordable senior housing will rise.

Senior citizens have different housing needs especially as they develop health problems or experience decreased mobility. The 2013 ACS estimated that 38% of persons 65 and over have mobility or self-care limitations. Older and disabled adults who require long-term care have a need for a broad range of on-site and off-site services including central dining, transportation services, limited or complete medical care, recreational and other services. For seniors living independently and aging in place, there is a need for small, safe, easily maintained, and affordable dwelling units. The median Social Security check in San Francisco is only \$943 per month<sup>10</sup>, while the average rent for a one-bedroom in San Francisco in 2014 was \$2,934<sup>11</sup>.

For seniors that wish to age in place, both senior services and housing rehabilitation programs are needed. Senior service needs include transportation to medical appointments and grocery shopping, in-home supportive services, and recreational programs. Housing programs include rehabilitation to provide more accessible accommodations in their homes.

### ***Persons with Disabilities***

It is estimated that 11% of the San Francisco population has a disability. A strong correlation between disability and poverty exists; people with disabilities not only have much higher unemployment than the general population, but those who work also earn less than their counterparts in the general population. Fifteen percent of people age 65 or older (7,149), and 33% of all younger adults with disabilities (13,280) in San Francisco are living in poverty<sup>12</sup>. Many rely on federal disability benefits (SSI) as their sole source of income. The maximum monthly payment for an aged or disabled SSI recipients is \$907 per month.

Housing options for people with disabilities range from acute care in an institution, to supportive housing, to living independently. Institutional living not only costs government many times more than other housing options, it also provides the most restricted and limited environment for people with disabilities. However, people with disabilities face numerous barriers, both physical and procedural, to securing an affordable and accessible home in the open market.

People with accessibility needs such as wheelchair accessible entrances, wide interior spaces for wheelchair circulation, accessible bathing facilities, adjustable heights for counters and cabinets, and other amenities needs face particular challenges obtaining appropriate housing. Over three-quarters of San Francisco's housing stock was built before 1950 without these accommodations in mind. Most

---

<sup>8</sup> San Francisco Department of Aging and Adult Services, Community Needs Assessment, 2006

<sup>9</sup> San Francisco Baby Boomers- A Breed Apart?, July 2008

<sup>10</sup> U.S. Social Security Administration, For seniors with cooking facilities, January 2009

<sup>11</sup> Seifel Consulting Briefing Book, State of the Housing Market Update 2014, May 2014

<sup>12</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013 Five-Year Estimates

housing is difficult to convert to accessible standards. Although disability rights laws require that a landlord allow accessibility modifications in rental units, the burden of paying for such modifications is on the tenants themselves, who as noted, are frequently living in poverty.<sup>13</sup>

The application process for housing can also discriminate against people with disabilities when landlords use a “First Come First Serve” basis. This process requires applicants to wait in line for hours at a time and people with disabilities often cannot withstand a long wait, especially as many are dependent on attendants to help them get ready in the morning and can’t physically be out of the house until after 9:00 a.m.<sup>14</sup> Nonprofit housing developers as well as private landlords vary greatly in how well they market open units, waitlists, or new buildings to people with disabilities.

### ***Transitional Age Youth***

The Mayor’s Task Force on Transitional Youth estimated that up to 10% of young adults ages 16-24, or 5,000 to 8,000 individuals, are disconnected from education, employment, and social support systems.<sup>15</sup> Transitional age youth stated in focus groups, that finding affordable and safe housing was a primary concern. It is estimated that approximately 5,700 San Francisco youth aged 16 to 24 are homeless or marginally housed<sup>16</sup>, while 1,902 homeless at the January 2013 Homeless Count were found to be under 25 years old<sup>17</sup>. Without stable housing, young people face significant challenges in achieving their education and employment goals. For many youth, having a place to live is also critical to reducing their involvement and exposure to street culture, including sex work, using or selling drugs and violence. These youth are most vulnerable to homelessness because they may be disconnected from services, their housing needs may differ from older homeless adults, and they may not identify themselves as “homeless” and therefore may not seek homeless services. Additionally there were only 314 housing units had been built or targeted for Transition Age Youth in 2007. This led to the development of the Housing for Transition Age Youth Work plan and Recommendations 2007-2012 by the Transition Age Youth Housing Working Group. This working group consisted of the City departments such as MOHCD, the Department of Public Health, Human Services Agency, and the Department of Children Youth and their Families, youth service providers, and housing providers. An assessment of existing transitional and supportive housing system serving Transition Age Youth is underway. It is intended to strengthen and refine the Transition Age Youth housing system. Initial findings indicate the need to have a housing and service system that is responsive to the needs of young people in order to be successful; clear and consistent communication must occur amongst the service and housing providers and the young people themselves, and that a spectrum of housing and service models are necessary to meet the range of needs of the most marginalized to the more independent young people.

---

<sup>13</sup> San Francisco Department of Aging and Adult Services, Community Needs Assessment, 2006

<sup>14</sup> Application Do’s and Don’ts For Housing Providers.

<sup>15</sup> City and County of San Francisco, Mayor’s Transitional Youth Task Force, *Disconnected Transitional Youth in San Francisco: A Roadmap to Improve the Life Chances of San Francisco’s Most Vulnerable Young Adults*, 2007.

<sup>16</sup> Larkin Street Youth Services, “Youth Homelessness in San Francisco” report, 2010

<sup>17</sup> City and County of San Francisco, San Francisco Homeless Point-in-Time Count & Survey, 2013

**Describe the characteristics and needs of Low-income individuals and families with children (especially extremely low-income) who are currently housed but are at imminent risk of either residing in shelters or becoming unsheltered 91.205(c)/91.305(c)). Also discuss the needs of formerly homeless families and individuals who are receiving rapid re-housing assistance and are nearing the termination of that assistance**

***Very Low-Income Families with Children***

Approximately 55,200 or 37% of family households in San Francisco include children. Many of these children are in low-income households in ethnic communities that tend to be poorer than the rest of the City. Specifically there is also a higher concentration of households with children under 18 years old in the southeast section of San Francisco, namely in the Bayview Hunters Point, Portola, Outer Mission, Excelsior, and the southern part of the Bernal Heights neighborhoods (Map 2). These neighborhoods are also where there is large minority population concentration (Map 6) and low-income concentration (Map 10). Roughly 12,800 households, have five persons or more. San Francisco has too few large affordable units to accommodate the needs of these families, and as a result, larger families are more likely to live in overcrowded conditions than smaller households.


Based on the current waiting list managed by the San Francisco Housing Authority, there is an estimated unfilled need for over 17,000 affordable housing units for low-income families. Two-thirds of these families require a two or three-bedroom unit due to their larger family sizes. Based on 2000 CHAS data, there is an estimated unfilled need of similar magnitude: 17,211. According to CHAS data, over a quarter (27%) of the families needing affordable and appropriate housing need a four-bedroom unit, or larger to avoid overcrowded conditions.

Homeless families with children under 18 are typically headed by a female head of household. According to survey respondents from the 2013 Point-in-Time Homeless Count, the primary reasons for the cause of the family's homelessness was domestic violence, job loss, drug or alcohol abuse, or eviction. Furthermore the number of homeless families increased since the 2011 Point-in-Time Homeless Count, increasing from 635 to 679.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> City and County of San Francisco, San Francisco Homeless Point-in-Time Count & Survey, 2013

**Map 2 – Proportion of Households with Youth Under 18 Years Old**



**If a jurisdiction provides estimates of the at-risk population(s), it should also include a description of the operational definition of the at-risk group and the methodology used to generate the estimates:**

San Francisco does not have an estimate of at-risk populations.

**Specify particular housing characteristics that have been linked with instability and an increased risk of homelessness**

The severe housing cost burden, especially for very low-income households at or below 30% AMI has the greatest risk factor for housing instability and increased risk of homelessness. Additionally the increase in evictions, especially Ellis Act evictions, is causing many low to moderate income households to be displaced or become homeless.

**Discussion**

See above.

## **NA-15 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Problems – 91.205 (b)(2)**

Assess the need of any racial or ethnic group that has disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.

(For this purpose, disproportionately greater need exists when the percentage of persons in a category of need who are members of a particular racial or ethnic group is at least 10 percentage points higher than the percentage of persons in category as a whole.

### **Introduction**

Analysis of the 2007-2011 CHAS data shows no particular racial or ethnic group having a disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.



**0%-30% of Area Median Income**

**Table 16 – Disproportionally Greater Need 0 - 30% AMI**


Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	54,030	12,085	4,725
White	19,615	4,035	1,740
Black / African American	7,150	1,720	295
Asian	17,610	4,790	2,110
American Indian, Alaska Native	255	15	0
Pacific Islander	225	80	15
Hispanic	7,525	1,170	360

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

\*The four housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities,
2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities,
3. More than one person per room,
4. Cost Burden greater than 30%

**Exhibit 3 – Housing Problems by Ethnicity - 0%-30% of Area Median Income**



### 30%-50% of Area Median Income

**Table 17 – Disproportionally Greater Need 30 - 50% AMI**


Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	29,905	10,065	0
White	12,375	3,505	0
Black / African American	2,655	1,425	0
Asian	8,490	3,565	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	55	15	0
Pacific Islander	150	25	0
Hispanic	5,470	1,350	0

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

\*The four housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities,
2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities,
3. More than one person per room,
4. Cost Burden greater than 30%

**Exhibit 4 – Housing Problems by Ethnicity - 30%-50% of Area Median Income**



**50%-80% of Area Median Income**

**Table 18 – Disproportionally Greater Need 50 - 80% AMI**


Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	28,920	22,535	0
White	14,080	9,960	0
Black / African American	1,400	1,685	0
Asian	8,265	6,805	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	40	110	0
Pacific Islander	75	180	0
Hispanic	4,335	3,230	0

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

\*The four housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities,
2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities,
3. More than one person per room,
4. Cost Burden greater than 30%

**Exhibit 5 – Housing Problems by Ethnicity - 50%-80% of Area Median Income**



**80%-100% of Area Median Income**

**Table 19 – Disproportionally Greater Need 80 - 100% AMI**


Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	11,625	18,645	0
White	5,870	9,435	0
Black / African American	195	1,085	0
Asian	3,750	5,300	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	25	60	0
Pacific Islander	55	120	0
Hispanic	1,575	2,100	0

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

\*The four housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities,
2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities,
3. More than one person per room,
4. Cost Burden greater than 30%

**Exhibit 6 – Housing Problems by Ethnicity - 80%-100% of Area Median Income**



## Discussion

Based on HUD's definition of disparate impact (percent of households with housing problems or \$0 or negative income > 10% than the jurisdiction as a whole for the income category), this data does not reveal disparate impacts on any particular racial or ethnic group. Please note that the margins of error make the statistics for some categories of households not as reliable as others (e.g. Pacific Islanders; American Indian, Alaska Native).

## **NA-20 Disproportionately Greater Need: Severe Housing Problems – 91.205 (b)(2)**

Assess the need of any racial or ethnic group that has disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.

(For this purpose, disproportionately greater need exists when the percentage of persons in a category of need who are members of a particular racial or ethnic group is at least 10 percentage points higher than the percentage of persons in category as a whole.

### **Introduction**

Analysis of the 2007-2011 CHAS data shows no particular racial or ethnic group having a disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.

**0%-30% of Area Median Income**

**Table 20 – Severe Housing Problems 0 - 30% AMI**


Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	44,245	21,870	4,725
White	16,820	6,830	1,740
Black / African American	5,425	3,445	295
Asian	13,775	8,625	2,110
American Indian, Alaska Native	200	75	0
Pacific Islander	180	125	15
Hispanic	6,360	2,335	360

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

\*The four severe housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities,
2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities,
3. More than 1.5 persons per room,
4. Cost Burden over 50%

**Exhibit 7 – Severe Housing Problems by Ethnicity - 0%-30% of Area Median Income**



### 30%-50% of Area Median Income

**Table 21 – Severe Housing Problems 30 - 50% AMI**


Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	18,475	21,495	0
White	7,460	8,420	0
Black / African American	1,310	2,775	0
Asian	5,850	6,205	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	15	55	0
Pacific Islander	40	135	0
Hispanic	3,295	3,525	0

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

\*The four severe housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities,
2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities,
3. More than 1.5 persons per room,
4. Cost Burden over 50%

**Exhibit 8 – Severe Housing Problems by Ethnicity - 30%-50% of Area Median Income**





## 50%-80% of Area Median Income

**Table 22 – Severe Housing Problems 50 - 80% AMI**


Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	13,360	38,095	0
White	5,180	18,860	0
Black / African American	630	2,450	0
Asian	4,790	10,280	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	30	120	0
Pacific Islander	10	245	0
Hispanic	2,435	5,130	0

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

\*The four severe housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities,
2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities,
3. More than 1.5 persons per room,
4. Cost Burden over 50%

**Exhibit 9 – Severe Housing Problems by Ethnicity - 50%-80% of Area Median Income**



**80%-100% of Area Median Income**

**Table 23 – Severe Housing Problems 80 - 100% AMI**


Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	4,905	25,365	0
White	2,025	13,275	0
Black / African American	75	1,205	0
Asian	2,035	7,010	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	0	80	0
Pacific Islander	0	170	0
Hispanic	695	2,980	0

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

\*The four severe housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4. Cost Burden over 50%

**Exhibit 10 – Severe Housing Problems by Ethnicity - 80%-100% of Area Median Income**



## Discussion

Based on HUD's definition of disparate impact (percent of households with severe housing problems or \$0 or negative income > 10% than the jurisdiction as a whole for the income category), this data does not reveal disparate impacts on any particular racial or ethnic group, with the exception of low-income American Indian, Alaska Native at 80-100% AMI. However, we would want to examine the housing problem data by race/ethnicity and income group more closely before taking any conclusions. Please note that the margins of error make the statistics for some categories of households not as reliable as others (e.g. Pacific Islanders; American Indian, Alaska Native).

## **NA-25 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens – 91.205 (b)(2)**

Assess the need of any racial or ethnic group that has disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.

(For this purpose, disproportionately greater need exists when the percentage of persons in a category of need who are members of a particular racial or ethnic group is at least 10 percentage points higher than the percentage of persons in category as a whole.

### **Introduction:**

Analysis of the 2007-2011 CHAS data shows no particular racial or ethnic group having a disproportionately greater housing cost burden need in comparison to the needs of that income category of need as a whole.


## Housing Cost Burden

**Table 24 – Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens AMI**

Housing Cost Burden	<=30%	30-50%	>50%	No / negative income (not computed)
Jurisdiction as a whole	74,400	50,345	62,325	5,460
White	110,545	33,270	30,530	1,900
Black / African American	10,205	4,955	5,760	320
Asian	52,570	19,045	18,600	2,580
American Indian, Alaska Native	525	220	179	0
Pacific Islander	545	330	210	15
Hispanic	18,810	8,825	9,030	445

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

**Exhibit 11 – Housing Cost Burden by Ethnicity**



### Discussion:

Analysis of the 2007-2011 CHAS data shows no particular racial or ethnic group having a disproportionately greater housing cost burden need in comparison to the needs of that income category of need as a whole. What the table does clearly indicate is that very low income households at or below 30% AMI of all ethnic groups are disproportionately impacted by housing cost burden than the rest of that racial or ethnic group as a whole.

## NA-30 Disproportionately Greater Need: Discussion – 91.205(b)(2)

**Are there any Income categories in which a racial or ethnic group has disproportionately greater need than the needs of that income category as a whole?**

All ethnic groups, white and non-white, at or below 50% of area median income have disproportionately greater need with severe housing problems, most notably housing cost burden. All ethnic groups at or below 50% AMI have a housing cost burden of greater than 70%.


**If they have needs not identified above, what are those needs?**

Not applicable.

**Are any of those racial or ethnic groups located in specific areas or neighborhoods in your community?**

The neighborhoods with the highest housing cost burden (see Map 3) correlate with the areas of minority concentration, namely in the Bayview, Tenderloin, South of Market, and parts of the Mission. See Map 6 for Areas of Minority Concentration.

**Map 3 – Proportion of Households Paying 50% or More of Income to Rent**



Map 3 illustrates the percentage of households that spend 50% or more of their income on rent at the census tract level. As the map demonstrates, there are many areas in San Francisco where 25%-50% of the population pays half or more of their income to rent. In the following neighborhoods, 25% or more of the population spends at least half of their income on rent:

- Oceanview/Merced/Ingleside (36%)
- Lakeshore (35%)
- Tenderloin (34%)
- Treasure Island (31%)
- Portola (31%)
- Excelsior (30%)
- Sunset/Parkside (27%)
- Chinatown (26%)
- Visitacion Valley (26%)
- Outer Mission (26%)
- Bayview Hunters Point (25%)
- Hayes Valley (25%)

Households that spend more than 50% of their income on their homes are classified by the National Low Income Housing Coalition as severely cost-burdened.

## NA-35 Public Housing – 91.205(b)

### Introduction

The San Francisco Housing Authority’s express mission is to “provide safe, sanitary, affordable, and decent housing to very low-income families, senior citizens and persons with disabilities.” Founded in 1938, it was the first established housing authority in California, and receives nearly all of its \$225+ million operating income from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and tenant-paid rents. The San Francisco Housing Authority (SFHA; Authority) is overseen by seven citizen commissioners, all of whom are appointed by the Mayor. Two of those commissioners must be current SFHA residents.

SFHA, the 17th largest housing authority in the country, administers both public housing and the Housing Choice Voucher program. Together, they serve over 31,000 San Francisco residents, with 12,691 residents living in 6,249 public housing units and 19,110 residents living in 8,016 privately owned housing units subsidized by Section 8 vouchers. The average annual household income for SFHA clients is \$14,590. Without public housing in San Francisco, virtually all SFHA clients would be forced to live outside the City or even face homelessness.

### Totals in Use

**Table 25 – Public Housing by Program Type**

	Program Type								
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers			Special Purpose Voucher		
				Total	Project-based	Tenant-based	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
# of units vouchers in use	0	952	5,534	7,445	914	6,331	200	0	0

\*includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)



## Characteristics of Residents

**Table 26 – Characteristics of Public Housing Residents by Program Type**

	Program Type							
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers			Special Purpose Voucher	
				Total	Project-based	Tenant-based	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program
Average Annual Income	0	10,161	13,355	17,192	15,435	17,591	12,607	0
Average length of stay	0	5	9	5	3	6	0	0
Average Household size	0	1	2	2	1	2	1	0
# Homeless at admission	0	10	66	17	3	11	3	0
# of Elderly Program Participants (>62)	0	205	2,052	3,113	475	2,601	37	0
# of Disabled Families	0	485	1,204	1,583	242	1,228	113	0
# of Families requesting accessibility features	0	952	5,534	7,445	914	6,331	200	0
# of HIV/AIDS program participants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
# of DV victims	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

## Race of Residents

**Table 27 – Race of Public Housing Residents by Program Type**

Race	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Program Type					
				Vouchers			Special Purpose Voucher		
				Total	Project-based	Tenant-based	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
White	0	475	1,538	2,341	258	1,983	100	0	0
Black/African American	0	371	2,352	2,148	199	1,857	92	0	0
Asian	0	65	1,386	2,781	426	2,351	4	0	0
American Indian/Alaska Native	0	32	71	136	25	109	2	0	0
Pacific Islander	0	9	187	39	6	31	2	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

\*includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

## Ethnicity of Residents

**Table 28 – Ethnicity of Public Housing Residents by Program Type**

Ethnicity	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Program Type					
				Vouchers			Special Purpose Voucher		
				Total	Project-based	Tenant-based	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
Hispanic	0	78	777	1,636	166	1,465	5	0	0
Not Hispanic	0	874	4,757	5,809	748	4,866	195	0	0

\*includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

**Section 504 Needs Assessment: Describe the needs of public housing tenants and applicants on the waiting list for accessible units:**

Approximately 2,000 of SFHA’s public housing units are designated as “senior/disabled”, roughly one-third of the portfolio. This high proportion requires accessible features in those units, though, given the age of the portfolio, appropriate accessibility improvements are not always present. Tenant needs include wheelchair accessibility, appropriate turning radii in elevators and bathrooms, bathroom grab bars, removable kitchen cabinetry, and accessible door and window handles, among other things.

**What are the number and type of families on the waiting lists for public housing and section 8 tenant-based rental assistance? Based on the information above, and any other information available to the jurisdiction, what are the most immediate needs of residents of public housing and Housing Choice voucher holders?**

The SFHA Housing Choice Voucher wait list is closed.

There are currently 7,426 households on the public housing wait list. In its lease-up of vacant units, SFHA prioritizes homeless households, households involuntarily displaced by government action, and veterans. The number of such waiting list households follows:

<b>With Homeless Preference(s):</b>	<b>1,396 households</b>
Homeless Adult in SF	157 households
Homeless Family in SF	417 households
Homeless Senior/Disabled in SF	822 households
<b>With Involuntarily Displaced Preference:</b>	<b>299 households</b>
<b>With Veteran Preference:</b>	<b>26 households</b>

The needs of the prioritized households on the SFHA wait list are self-explanatory. In addition, note that the average annual income of SFHA residents is less than \$15,000, a number that includes multi-person families. Since the 2014 median income of a household of 3 in San Francisco is \$87,400, SFHA residents and would-be residents are in particular need of extremely low-cost housing in order to survive.

**How do these needs compare to the housing needs of the population at large**

In comparison to the San Francisco population at large, SFHA wait list households are far poorer and thus in tremendous need for rental subsidy assistance. SFHA households also present the challenges of the poor, i.e., a strong likelihood of diminished educational achievement, less access to health care, higher incidents of trauma, employment retention problems, and family instability.

**Discussion**

Public housing is housing of last resort in San Francisco. Although the typical condition of an SFHA unit is poor or very poor, the waiting list remains as long as it is because people desperately need rental subsidies in order to survive.

In San Francisco, the FMRs for Housing Choice Vouchers are far less than market-rate rents, which is why most landlords will not rent to Section 8 voucher holders. Still, these vouchers are incredibly important, and at least allow some households to attain better housing than they would be able to rent on their own without the subsidies. An increase in the HCV FMRs for San Francisco would provide great assistance to tenants.

## NA-40 Homeless Needs Assessment – 91.205(c)

### Introduction:

Every two years, during the last ten days of January, San Francisco conducts a comprehensive count of its homeless population in order to gain a better assessment of the individuals who are currently experiencing homelessness.<sup>19</sup> All jurisdictions receiving federal funding to provide housing and services for homeless individuals and families are required by HUD to conduct a biennial Point-in-Time count of unsheltered and sheltered homeless persons. This count must include all unsheltered and sheltered homeless persons staying in emergency shelters and transitional housing programs on the date of the count. San Francisco has worked in conjunction with Applied Survey Research (ASR) to conduct the 2013 San Francisco Homeless Count and Survey. The San Francisco homeless count has two primary components: a Point-in-Time enumeration of unsheltered homeless individuals and families (those sleeping outdoors, on the streets, in parks, or vehicles, etc.) and Point-in-Time enumeration of homeless individuals and families who have temporary shelter (those staying in an emergency shelter, transitional housing, or using stabilization rooms).

The 2013 San Francisco Point-in-Time Count was a city-wide effort. With the support of 334 community volunteers, staff from various City departments and the San Francisco Police Department the entire city was canvassed between the hours of 8 p.m. and midnight on January 24, 2013. This resulted in a visual count of unsheltered homeless individuals and families residing on the streets, in vehicles, makeshift shelters, encampments and other places not meant for human habitation. Shelters and facilities reported the number of homeless individuals and families who occupied their facilities on the same evening of January 24 2013.

San Francisco conducted a supplemental count of unaccompanied children and youth under the age of 25 years old on the afternoon of January 24, 2013. This supplemental count was part of a nationwide effort, established and recommended by HUD, to understand the scope of youth homelessness. The youth count was conducted between the hours of 1 p.m. and 5 p.m. when unaccompanied children and youth were more likely to be visible. The count was conducted by trained currently homeless youth enumerators.

In the weeks following the street count, an in-depth survey was administered to 954 unsheltered and sheltered homeless individuals of all ages to gather more in-depth information about the characteristics and needs of the homeless population.

The data from this count provides information regarding the number, characteristics, and needs of homeless persons in San Francisco. The data focuses special attention on specific subpopulations, including chronically homeless, veterans, families, unaccompanied children under the age of 18, and unaccompanied youth, also known as transitional age youth (TAY) between the ages of 18-24.

---

<sup>19</sup> City and County of San Francisco, San Francisco Homeless Point-in-Time Count & Survey, 2013

## Homeless Needs Assessment

**Table 29 – Homeless Needs Assessment**

Population	Estimate the # of persons experiencing homelessness on a given night		Estimate the # experiencing homelessness each year	Estimate the # becoming homeless each year	Estimate the # exiting homelessness each year	Estimate the # of days persons experience homelessness
	Sheltered	Unsheltered				
Persons in Households with Adult(s) and Child(ren)	33	646	2,936	2,716	258	263
Persons in Households with Only Children	125	9	552	254	52	263
Persons in Households with Only Adults	4,517	2,038	1,904	876	181	263
Chronically Homeless Individuals	1,166	811	2,496	1,148	237	263
Chronically Homeless Families	2	31	132	61	13	263
Veterans	422	294	284	131	27	263
Unaccompanied Child	1,649	253	7,608	3,500	723	263
Persons with HIV	229	159	1,552	714	147	263

Data Source Comments: 2013 San Francisco Homeless Count and Survey

Indicate if the homeless population is: Has No Rural Homeless

**If data is not available for the categories "number of persons becoming and exiting homelessness each year," and "number of days that persons experience homelessness," describe these categories for each homeless population type (including chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth):**

For many individuals, the experience of homelessness is part of a long and recurring history of residential instability. Individuals may fall in and out of homelessness as they assemble different

subsistence strategies and housing opportunities. Almost half (48%) of survey respondents reported they were experiencing homelessness for the first time in 2013, a decrease from 53% in 2011.<sup>20</sup> Of those who were not experiencing homelessness for the first time, 41% reported they had experienced homelessness four or more times in the past three years. Of the 944 individuals who responded to the annual homeless survey, more than half (54%) of respondents reported they had been without housing for one year or more. The length of time survey respondents reported being homeless was similar to previous years. There were slight increases in the number of persons who reported they had been homeless for seven months or more, however. 14% of respondents reported being homeless between 7 to 11 months; 25% reported being homeless between 2 to 6 months; and 8% reported being homeless 30 days or fewer.

### Nature and Extent of Homelessness: (Optional)

**Table 30 – Homeless Needs Assessment 2**

<b>Race:</b>	<b>Sheltered:</b>	<b>Unsheltered (optional)</b>
White	781	1,251
Black or African American	646	1,036
Asian	135	216
American Indian or Alaska Native	not available	not available
Pacific Islander	included within Asian	included within Asian
<b>Ethnicity:</b>	<b>Sheltered:</b>	<b>Unsheltered (optional)</b>
Hispanic	700	1,122
Not Hispanic	993	3,193

Data Source Comments: 2013 San Francisco Homeless Count and Survey

### Estimate the number and type of families in need of housing assistance for families with children and the families of veterans.

Of the 7,350 homeless individuals identified from the 2013 Homeless Count, 679 of them were living in families defined as a household with at least one adult and one child under 18.<sup>21</sup> One in ten homeless individuals was living in a family with at least one child under the age of 18. While the number of persons in families increased, the percentage of those living on the street decreased from 15% in 2011 to 5% in 2013. Surveys were conducted with 75 individuals in homeless families. Seventy-two percent of survey respondents in families were female, much higher than survey respondent not in families (24% female). Thirty-two percent of respondents with families identified as Black/African American and 28% as White/Caucasian. The average age of family respondents was 36 years old, slightly lower than those living without children. More than two-third (67%) had been homeless for more than 6 months and 96% reported their school age children were in school.

<sup>20</sup> City and County of San Francisco, San Francisco Homeless Point-in-Time Count & Survey, 2013

<sup>21</sup> City and County of San Francisco, San Francisco Homeless Point-in-Time Count & Survey, 2013

The risk of homelessness is highest among families with children under the age of 5. Children in families experiencing homelessness have increased incidence of illness and are more likely to have emotional and behavioral problems than children with consistent living accommodations.

Domestic violence was the most frequently cited cause of homelessness among survey respondents living in families (27%). This was followed by job loss (22%), drug or alcohol abuse (18%) and eviction (15%). Personal relationships were also commonly cited causes of homelessness including 10% who reported a divorce, separation, or breakup and 7% who reported an argument with friends or family members who asked them to leave. Eighty percent of respondents in families reported usually sleeping in emergency shelters or transitional housing, as compared to 29% of homeless individuals not in families.

Eighty-five percent of family survey respondents reported they were receiving some form of public assistance. Of those who reported benefits, a large majority (81%) were receiving food stamps/WIC/Calfresh. More than half (53%) were receiving CalWORKs/TANF and 34% were on Medi-Cal/Medicare. Nineteen percent were receiving SSI/SSDI or Disability.

Eleven percent of survey respondents over the age of 18 years old were identified as veterans in 2013, compared to 17% in 2011 and the national average of 13%. Nearly all veteran respondents (99%) reported having served on active duty in the U.S. Armed Forces. Twenty-three percent reported they were called into active duty as a member of the National Guard or Reserves. Forty-one percent of veterans included in the Point-in-Time Count were sheltered in 2013, slightly lower than in 2011 (47%).

Less than 10% of veteran respondents were female and just 2% of homeless veterans were living in families with a child under the age of 18. Thirty-four percent of veterans identified as White/Caucasian, 29% as Black/African American and 11% as Hispanic/Latino. Sixty-five percent of homeless veterans were living in San Francisco at the time they most recently became homeless. The highest percentage (17%) of those who were not living in San Francisco at the time, reported moving to the City to access VA services or benefits.

In 2013, San Francisco veteran respondents reported fewer episodes of homelessness than non-veterans, yet a higher percentage reported having lived on the street for extended periods of time. Sixty-three percent of veterans reported having lived on the street for one year or more, compared to 53% of non-veterans.

The percentage of veterans reporting chronic depression decreased from 55% in 2011 to 36% in 2013. However, the percentage reporting PTSD increased from 35% in 2011 to 40% in 2013. Forty-two percent reported substance abuse; 40% reported suffering from PTSD; 36% from mental illness; 23% from chronic health problems; 19% from one or more physical disabilities; 8% from HIV/AIDS related illness; and 4% from a developmental disability.

The top three primary causes of homelessness reported by veterans were: job loss (28%), alcohol and drug use (20%), and an argument with a friend or family member who asked them to leave (18%). Nearly twice as many veterans (20%) reported alcohol or drug use as the primary cause of homelessness as compared to non-veterans (10%).



Eighty-three percent of veterans reported they were receiving some form of government assistance in 2013, similar to 2011 (80%). Of those who reported receiving services, the greatest percentage reported receiving VA Disability compensation (40%), followed by food stamps/WIC/CalFresh (34%).

### **Describe the Nature and Extent of Homelessness by Racial and Ethnic Group.**

Twenty-nine percent of survey respondents identified as White/Caucasian, followed by 26% who identified as Hispanic/Latino and 24% as Black/African American in 2013.<sup>22</sup> In comparison to the overall population of San Francisco, there were a disproportionate number of Hispanic/Latino and Black/African Americans experiencing homelessness. The overall San Francisco population was 16% Hispanic/Latino in 2013, but the percentage of homeless respondents identifying as Hispanic/Latino was 26%. Similarly, 6% of the overall population was Black-African American in 2013, while the percentage of homeless respondents was 24% Black/African-American. Five percent of survey respondents identified themselves as Asian/Pacific Islander, while 16% identified as other/multi-ethnic. The survey did not break out Pacific Islander or American Indian/Alaskan Native as a separate category.

### **Describe the Nature and Extent of Unsheltered and Sheltered Homelessness.**

Approximately 59% of all those individuals counted in the 2013 San Francisco Point-in-Time were unsheltered.<sup>23</sup> The number of unsheltered individuals was significantly affected by a targeted youth count that the City performed as recommended by HUD to gather further information on the number and characteristics of unaccompanied children under 18 and youth ages 18-24. Eighty-seven percent of youth under the age of 25 were unsheltered in 2013. Of the more than 3,000 individuals counted in the shelter count, 689 persons (23% were in non-traditional shelter settings. Four percent of the City's homeless population was housed in jails and hospitals. The number of homeless inmates reported in 2013 was 126, which was a 191 person decrease from the previous count in 2011.

### **Discussion:**

The relatively stable size of the general homeless population and new findings on the number of unaccompanied children and youth should not obscure the fact that many individual lives have been changed for the better through San Francisco's homeless initiatives. It is important to consider the results of the 2013 count within the context of local efforts to move individuals and families out of homelessness, through the provision of housing and support services. Since 2004, San Francisco has continued several ambitious initiatives to reduce the size of the homeless population, including the 5-Year Strategic Plan Toward Ending Homelessness in San Francisco and the 10-Year Plan to End Chronic Homelessness. The percentage of chronically homeless people in San Francisco decreased from 62% in 2009 to 31% of the homeless population in 2013.<sup>24</sup> Between 2009 and 2013, the number of chronically homeless in San Francisco declined by an estimated 51%. Over 18,000 homeless people have left the streets or shelter system for permanent housing since January 2004, with the assistance of the programs such as the City's Homeward Bound initiative.

---

<sup>22</sup> City and County of San Francisco, San Francisco Homeless Point-in-Time Count & Survey, 2013

<sup>23</sup> City and County of San Francisco, San Francisco Homeless Point-in-Time Count & Survey, 2013

<sup>24</sup> San Francisco Human Services Agency, San Francisco's Ten Year Plan to End Chronic Homelessness: Anniversary Report Covering 2004 to 2014

## NA-45 Non-Homeless Special Needs Assessment - 91.205 (b,d)

### Introduction:

Several notable trends have important implications for addressing the housing needs of individuals living with HIV and AIDS in San Francisco.

***Housing in San Francisco has become increasingly expensive, exceeding the values established by HUD's Fair Market Rents (FMR) and making it difficult for subsidy programs to be implemented effectively.*** Subsidy programs are designed to help lessen the financial burden of housing costs for beneficiaries. In order to enroll in subsidy programs, potential participants must find a housing unit with a rental price that cannot exceed HUD's FMR. San Francisco's current housing market makes it extremely difficult to find an apartment at or under HUD's fair market rent value. Large gaps exist between HUD's FMR and the realities of the city's housing market: the average cost of a San Francisco studio apartment is \$3,100<sup>25</sup>, while the FMR for a one bedroom apartment is \$1,635.<sup>26</sup> Additionally, accompanying the rising housing market is an increase in the number of no-fault evictions from rent-control apartments. Most noticeably, during the period from March 1, 2013, through February 28, 2014, the number of Ellis Act unit withdrawals increased from 116 to 216 notices while owner/relative move-in eviction notices increased from 185 to 273. Many individuals who previously relied on such apartments may be unable to afford and secure new housing in the city.

***There are significant numbers of individuals who are aging while living with HIV/AIDS.*** In San Francisco, 55% of men living with HIV/AIDS and 51% of women are over fifty years old, and 69% of HIV positive transgender individuals are more than forty years old.<sup>27</sup> Older HIV+ populations face health issues related to aging along with HIV disease. Much of the senior-specific housing (e.g. project-based Section 8 and federally funded senior projects) is targeted to those aged 62 and older. Older individuals with HIV may need more health-related support as they age, but may not qualify for currently available services.

***Many of those who are newly diagnosed with HIV are homeless.*** Among those individuals diagnosed with HIV infection from 2006-2012, between between 9 and 14% were homeless. Homeless persons newly diagnosed with HIV/AIDS are more likely, compared to the San Francisco HIV/AIDS population overall, to be women (including transgender women), African American, and injection drug users (IDU).<sup>28</sup> Services should be culturally competent to meet the needs of these individuals.

***As was the case when developing the 2007 plan, persons with HIV/AIDS are living longer and have more stable health status due to antiretroviral therapy.*** Among those who received a Stage 3 (AIDS) diagnosis between 2001-2012, 84% were alive five years later, compared to 79% who received the diagnosis between 1996-2000 and 40% who received the same diagnosis between 1990-1995.<sup>29</sup> As a result, facilities offering higher levels of care, such as RCFCIs, may experience a change in the type of demand for these services. RCFCIs may be needed for support during acute and temporary cases of illness, after which patients can return to independent living.

---

<sup>25</sup> Rent Jungle Website, March 2015

<sup>26</sup> HUD FMR Guidelines, 2015

<sup>27</sup> San Francisco Department of Public Health, HIV Semi-Annual Surveillance Report, December 2013

<sup>28</sup> San Francisco Department of Public Health, HIV/AIDS Epidemiology Annual Report, 2012

<sup>29</sup> San Francisco Department of Public Health, HIV/AIDS Epidemiology Annual Reports, 2005 and 2012

## HOPWA

**Table 31 – HOPWA Data**

<b>Current HOPWA formula use:</b>	
Cumulative cases of AIDS reported	33,444
Area incidence of AIDS	360
Rate per population	20
Number of new cases prior year (3 years of data)	1,376
Rate per population (3 years of data)	26
<b>Current HIV surveillance data:</b>	
Number of Persons living with HIV (PLWH)	17,373
Area Prevalence (PLWH per population)	968
Number of new HIV cases reported last year	0

Data Source: CDC HIV Surveillance

## HIV Housing Need (HOPWA Grantees Only)

**Table 32 – HIV Housing Need**

<b>Type of HOPWA Assistance</b>	<b>Estimates of Unmet Need</b>
Tenant based rental assistance	0
Short-term Rent, Mortgage, and Utility	10
Facility Based Housing (Permanent, short-term or transitional)	0

\*These numbers will overlap because people living with HIV/AIDS in San Francisco can benefit from a variety of housing types and assistance.

## Describe the characteristics of special needs populations in your community:

**Populations with Emerging Needs:** As a highly diverse and complex region with an expanding HIV caseload, the San Francisco EMA is home to many populations with emerging needs, including women, youth, and transgender people; members of distinct ethnic, cultural, and linguistic groups; homeless and formerly incarcerated persons; and members of diverse social and behavioral communities. These groups require specialized interventions to link and retain them in care; meet their service needs; and empower them to become effective self-care advocates. The challenge of effectively meeting the needs of emerging populations in the context of declining resources remains one of the most daunting issues facing the local system of care. The following six emerging populations that face evolving needs for specialized HIV care, each of which is described briefly below: 1) Persons with HIV 50 Years of Age and Older; 2) Transgender Persons; 3) Men of color who have sex with men; 4) Homeless individuals; 5) African Americans; and 6) Latinos. All of these groups have growing incidences of HIV infection resulting in increased costs to the local system of care.

**Emerging Population # 1: Persons With HIV 50 Years of Age and Older:** In part because it was one of the first regions hard hit by the HIV epidemic and in part because of its success in ensuring that a large proportion of persons with HIV have access to the high quality treatments and therapies, the HIV-infected population of the San Francisco EMA continues to age dramatically, at levels beyond which

could have been imagined in the first decade of the epidemic. As of December 31, 2010, more than two out of every five persons living with HIV and AIDS in the San Francisco EMA (42.6%) were 50 and older (9,787 persons).<sup>30</sup> At the same time, for the second year, persons 50 and older make up more than half of all persons living with AIDS in the EMA (6,039 out of 11,464 persons / 52.7%). An analysis conducted in late 2011 of the 8,252 persons age 50 and above living with HIV/AIDS as of December 31, 2010 in San Francisco County revealed many startling facts about this population, including the fact that there are 338 PLWHA age 70 and above in SF, including 38 persons ages 80 - 89 and 2 persons age 90 and above. The 50 and over population in San Francisco also contains a slightly higher percentage of African Americans than in the PLWHA population as a whole (15.5% vs. 13.2%), along with a higher proportion of non-MSM injection drug users (8.7% vs. 6.6).

**Emerging Population # 2: Transgender Persons:** Transgender persons are traditionally defined as those whose gender identity, expression, or behavior is not traditionally associated with their birth sex. Some transgender individuals experience gender identity as being incongruent with their anatomical sex and may seek some degree of gender confirmation surgery, take hormones, or undergo other cosmetic procedures. Others may pursue gender expression (whether masculine or feminine) through external self-presentation and behaviors. Key HIV risk behaviors among transgender persons include multiple sex partners, irregular condom use, and unsafe injection practices stemming both from drug use and from the injection of hormones and silicone. Because of the region's traditional openness to diverse lifestyles, many transgender individuals move to the San Francisco EMA seeking greater acceptance and an expanded sense of community. Although precise statistics are not available, the City estimates that at least 5,000 transgender persons call the Bay Area home.<sup>31</sup> What is not in question, however, is the epidemic's growing impact on these populations. As of December 31, 2010, at least 500 transgender persons were living with HIV and AIDS in San Francisco and Marin Counties (the County of San Mateo does not break out transgender HIV cases separately). The actual numbers, however, are probably much higher, with some studies indicating that HIV infection rates may be as high as 23.8% among this population, which in San Francisco would mean that at least 1,200 transgender persons may already be living with HIV. Examining the demographic breakdown of the PLWHA male-to-female (MTF) transgender population in San Francisco County as of 12/31/10 perhaps most striking is the cultural diversity of transgender PLWHA, with the largest infected ethnic groups being African Americans (35.4%) and Latinos (30.7%). Together these groups make up 66.1% of transgender PLWHA but only 30.4% of all PLWHA in the EMA. Reflecting the high risk of injection related infections among transgender persons, fully 45.4% of transgender PLWHA were infected through combined MSM / IDU behavior, versus 13.9% for the EMA as a whole.

**Emerging Population # 3: Men of Color Who Have Sex with Men (MSM):** MSM overall make up by far the most heavily HIV-impacted population in the San Francisco EMA, accounting for 86.0% of all persons living with HIV and AIDS as of December 31, 2010, including MSM who inject drugs (n=19,717).<sup>32</sup> At least 6,500 of these individuals – or approximately one-third of the HIV-infected MSM population of the EMA - are people of color, most of them African Americans and Latinos. However, in calendar year 2010, nearly half of all persons who tested positive for HIV (48.0%) were persons of color, an increase of 5.8%

---

<sup>30</sup> San Francisco HIV Health Services Planning Council & San Francisco Department of Public Health HIV Health Services, San Francisco EMA Comprehensive HIV Health Services Plan, 2012 – 2014

<sup>31</sup> San Francisco HIV Health Services Planning Council & San Francisco Department of Public Health HIV Health Services, San Francisco EMA Comprehensive HIV Health Services Plan, 2012 – 2014

<sup>32</sup> San Francisco HIV Health Services Planning Council & San Francisco Department of Public Health HIV Health Services, San Francisco EMA Comprehensive HIV Health Services Plan, 2012 – 2014

from 2006. Within Latino communities in San Francisco, MSM make up 87.3% of all persons living with HIV/AIDS, including 75.7% infected through MSM contact and 11.6% infected through MSM contact and injection drug use. Among Asian and Pacific Islander groups, the percentage is even higher, with MSM accounting for 87.7% of all persons living with HIV/AIDS, including 78.6% MSM only cases and 9.2% MSM/IDU cases. The percentage of MSM cases among African Americans in San Francisco is somewhat lower, largely due to the fact that a much higher proportion of African Americans living with HIV and AIDS are women.

**Emerging Population # 4: Homeless Individuals:** Homelessness is an ongoing crisis for the San Francisco EMA, contributing to high rates of HIV infection, and creating an intensive need for integrated, tailored services which bring homeless individuals into care, stabilize their life circumstances, and retain them in treatment. At least 1,605 HIV-infected homeless individuals are estimated to be living with HIV or AIDS in the San Francisco EMA each year (based on an overall 7% homelessness rate among PLWHA), and at least 42% of them are estimated to be out of care.<sup>33</sup> Among those individuals diagnosed with HIV infection from 2006-2012, between 9 and 14% were homeless. Homeless persons newly diagnosed with HIV/AIDS are more likely, compared to the San Francisco HIV/AIDS population overall, to be women (including transgender women), African American, and injection drug users (IDU). Services should be culturally competent to meet the needs of these individuals.

**Emerging Population # 5: African Americans:** The growing crisis of HIV among African Americans in the San Francisco EMA is a cause for significant concern. As of December 31, 2010, a total of 3,119 African Americans were estimated to be living with HIV/AIDS in the EMA, representing 13.6% of the region's HIV-infected population, despite the fact that only 4.3% of the EMA's population is African American.<sup>34</sup> At the same time, fully 18.4% of all those diagnosed with AIDS between January 1, 2008 and December 31, 2010 were African American – a percentage 35.3% higher than their representation in the overall PLWHA population. Women account for 18.1% of all African American PLWHA in the EMA, as compared to 6.2% for the EMA as a whole, while heterosexually transmitted cases account for 9.7% of African American PLWHA as compared to 3.6% for the entire EMA.

**Emerging Population # 6: Latinos:** In the San Francisco EMA, the Latino population makes up a growing percentage of the region's total HIV-infected population. While 16.8% of all PLWHA in the EMA as of December 31, 2010 were Latino/a, 10.7% of new AIDS cases diagnosed between January 1, 2008 and December 31, 2010 were among Latino/as, with a total of 3,854 Latino/a PLWHA estimated to be living in the EMA as of the end of 2010.<sup>35</sup> According to the most recent San Francisco HIV Epidemiology Report, Latinos represent 31% of young adult AIDS cases age 20-24 in the city and an alarming 44% of adolescent AIDS cases age 13-19 – a clear overrepresentation when compared to the 26% of the general adolescent population of San Francisco which is Latino/a.

---

<sup>33</sup> San Francisco HIV Health Services Planning Council & San Francisco Department of Public Health HIV Health Services, San Francisco EMA Comprehensive HIV Health Services Plan, 2012 – 2014

<sup>34</sup> San Francisco HIV Health Services Planning Council & San Francisco Department of Public Health HIV Health Services, San Francisco EMA Comprehensive HIV Health Services Plan, 2012 – 2014

<sup>35</sup> San Francisco HIV Health Services Planning Council & San Francisco Department of Public Health HIV Health Services, San Francisco EMA Comprehensive HIV Health Services Plan, 2012 – 2014

## **What are the housing and supportive service needs of these populations and how are these needs determined?**

In February 2014, the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), the Department of Public Health (DPH), and the Human Services Agency (HSA) launched a strategic planning process to create a revised HIV/AIDS housing plan for San Francisco, last updated in 2007. Together, members of MOHCD, DPH, and HSA along with LFA consulting staff formed a Steering Committee to oversee the strategy development process.

Community input was an integral part of the strategic planning. In May 2014, the Steering Committee invited representatives from various city agencies, the HIV Health Services Planning Council, the San Francisco HIV/AIDS Providers Network, community-based organizations serving PLWHA, and members of the Board of Supervisors to participate in a Stakeholder Council as part of the strategic planning process to develop the next iteration of the HIV/AIDS Housing Plan. The Stakeholder Council reflected a range of perspectives on HIV/AIDS housing, including housing providers, developers, and advocates for PLWHA among others. Throughout the Stakeholder Council process, 33 individuals representing 21 total agencies participated.

The Stakeholder Council met once a month from June to October 2014 for a total of five meetings. Learning for Action (LFA) provided support with facilitation, development of meeting materials, and documentation of the meetings. LFA also led data collection, analysis, and synthesis efforts in advance of Stakeholder Council meetings. During each Stakeholder Council Meeting, the Steering Committee and LFA presented the Stakeholder Council with relevant data and/or planning updates. The Stakeholder Council used this data and their professional experiences to inform their recommendations about the content for the HIV/AIDS housing plan.

The Steering Committee also convened two additional Work Groups to complement the Stakeholder Council: the Unmet Need Work Group and the Waitlist Work Group. These Work Groups were made up of Steering Committee members, select Stakeholder Council members, and other professionals with relevant expertise (e.g., public and social sector staff working in the housing and HIV/AIDS fields). Both Work Groups held two meetings each to explore issues related to unmet housing and waitlist needs in greater depth.

The report identified a number of areas of unmet housing needs for this population. It is well-known that the current supply of housing designated for PLWHA falls short of meeting demand. To assess the extent of this gap and to better understand the needs of specific sub-populations within the wider population of individuals living with HIV, the Steering Committee established a Work Group to examine unmet housing needs more closely. The Work Group included members from the Stakeholder Council along with staff from HSA, DPH, and community based organizations.

Mirroring the 2007 HIV/AIDS Housing Plan, the Work Group analyzed the needs of two main population categories: currently homeless HIV+ individuals and HIV+ individuals at-risk for becoming homeless. The Work Group's findings are summarized in tables in the 2014 HIV/AIDS Housing Plan. The tables list estimates for the number of HIV+ homeless individuals and HIV+ individuals at-risk for being homeless, as well as subpopulations within these two categories. Note, the subcategories are not mutually exclusive; for instance, an individual can be classified as both a senior *and* experiencing co-occurring disorders.

Some key insights emerging from the unmet needs analysis include the following:

- The high number of PLWHA at-risk for being homeless (12,344 or 77.6% of total PLWHA in San Francisco), based on being low income (at or below 50% AMI) and not receiving any housing support, is more than ten times the number of subsidies currently available, 998 (see Tables 35 and 36 below). This suggests the need for additional subsidies to support individuals with a high rent burden.
- Among HIV+ homeless individuals, the estimates are highest for subpopulations with co-occurring disorders, disabling HIV/AIDS, and chronic homelessness. Comparing and contrasting these subpopulations reveals that a higher proportion of individuals experience co-occurring disorders than either disabling HIV/AIDS or chronic homelessness. Close to half, 44.2%<sup>36</sup>, of all HIV+ homeless individuals also negotiate co-occurring disorders (defined as mental health and/or substance use addiction co-morbidities).
- Among HIV+ individuals at-risk for being homeless, estimates are highest for seniors and those not receiving care. Current and future support services should tailor their efforts to meet the needs of these subpopulations, and expanding the supportive housing services available would be one mean of doing so.

**Table 33 – Estimated Number of HIV+ Homeless Individuals**

<b>Population Segment</b>	<b>Estimate</b>
HIV+ and Homeless	1,764
<b>Subpopulations within HIV+ and Homeless</b>	<b>Estimate</b>
Adults in Families	64
Disabling HIV/AIDS	603
Co-Occurring Disorders (substance abuse or mental illness)	780
Chronically Homeless	547
Youth	297
Seniors	609

**Table 34 – Estimated Number of HIV+ Individuals At-Risk for Homelessness**

<b>Population Segment</b>	<b>Estimate</b>
At Risk (Low-income, earning at or below 50% AMI)	14,320
<b>Subpopulations within At-Risk</b>	
At Risk (Low-income less those receiving housing support)	12,344
Not in Care	4,452
Individuals Timing Out of Disability	401
Youth (25 years old or younger)	54
Seniors (55 years old or older)	5,486
Formerly Incarcerated	396
SRO	2,054

<sup>36</sup> Robertson et al. (2004). "HIV Seroprevalence Among Homeless and Marginally Housed Adults in San Francisco." *American Journal of Public Health*. Vol. 98 No 7.

### Current HIV/AIDS Housing Inventory

San Francisco provides targeted housing assistance at any point in time to 1,462 households impacted by HIV/AIDS. The term “targeted housing assistance” refers to housing either built or operated with support from HIV/AIDS-specific funding sources or tenant-based subsidy programs limited to PLWHA (i.e., being HIV positive is an eligibility requirement to qualify for the assistance). This number does not include other publicly financed housing services that may serve persons with HIV/AIDS who also meet other eligibility criteria.

This section details the following types of targeted housing assistance available to PLWHA in San Francisco:

- Subsidy programs;
- Supportive housing;
- RCFIs; and
- Other forms of non-permanent housing.

#### Subsidy Programs

As previously mentioned, subsidy programs assist individuals in meeting the full cost of his/her rent. With “tenant-based” subsidies, the tenant receives a subsidy that can be applied to a housing unit of his/her choice, typically in the private housing market. With “project-based” subsidies, the unit itself is subsidized and available to qualifying tenants, most often through non-profit owned housing with permanent affordability restrictions. “Deep” subsidies pay the difference between a percentage of the tenant’s income - regardless of the type or amount of income - and the contract rent. “Shallow” subsidies provide a fixed amount to make monthly housing expenses less burdensome to beneficiaries.

Existing subsidy programs comprise the most common way of providing housing to persons with HIV/AIDS in San Francisco. There are a total of 998 subsidy “slots” in San Francisco. Below, these slots are broken out by type and funding source.

**Table 35 – Deep Subsidies for Housing for PLWHA, by Funding Source and Number**

Funding Source	Number of Subsidies
HOPWA	240
General Fund	296
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>536</b>

**Table 36 – Shallow Subsidies for Housing for PLWHA, by Funding Source and Number**

Funding Source	Number of Subsidies
HOPWA	86
General Fund	376
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>462</b>

#### Supportive Housing

Supportive housing is implemented through a combination of different funding models:

- **Non-profit owned housing developed with HOPWA funding.** With scattered site housing, HOPWA funding provides initial capital for construction to create a dedicated unit that is set aside for a HOPWA eligible client. The supportive housing entity agrees to set aside this unit for 50-55 years.



These dedicated HOPWA units are part of larger developments with a mixture of funding sources and populations served. In the case of Derek Silva Community, the entire building is dedicated to PLWHA. HOPWA capital funds can also be used for rehabilitation of existing facilities. In many cases, rehabilitation extends the agency's set aside commitment. Since its inception, HOPWA resources have supported a total of 309 units non-profit housing reserved for PLWHA.

- **Master-leased housing in properties leased by the City & County of San Francisco from private owners.** Currently, supportive housing programs have been established in these properties that are funded through either DPH or HSA.
- **Set-asides units in nonprofit owned affordable housing that are funded by a specific City-funded source and reserved for the clients served by that funding source.** For example, the DAH Program provides operating support to units in exchange for reserving them for DAH-eligible clients.

### **Residential Care Facilities for the Chronically Ill (RCFCIs)**

RCFCIs are state-licensed facilities for individuals who require 24-hour support, including assistance with daily living activities such as bathing and dressing. At intake, residents must demonstrate medical necessity in order to be eligible for a RCFCI referral. While most RCFCI programs are considered to be permanent housing, some short-term transitional referrals are available. There are a total of 113 RCFCI slots in San Francisco.

### **Other Forms of Non-Permanent Housing**

Complementing the resources outlined above are transitional housing programs and emergency stabilization services. As the name implies, transitional housing services support individuals as they move from homelessness to permanent housing. Currently, the Brandy Moore House is the only HIV-specific transitional housing program in San Francisco. PLWHA may also meet other transitional housing programs provided in San Francisco. HSA is the main provider of transitional housing services in the city, with support available to families and single women, single adults (including veterans), and youth. A variety of agencies offer short-term emergency services to support individuals experiencing a housing crisis.

### **Discuss the size and characteristics of the population with HIV/AIDS and their families within the Eligible Metropolitan Statistical Area:**

More than a quarter century into the HIV epidemic, the three counties of the San Francisco EMA continue to be devastated by HIV – an ongoing crisis that has exacted an enormous human and financial toll on our region. According to the State of California, as of December 31, 2010, a total of 32,742 cumulative AIDS cases had been diagnosed in the EMA, representing more than one in five of all AIDS cases ever diagnosed in the state of California (n=159,329).<sup>37</sup> Over 21,626 persons have already died of AIDS in the EMA. As of December 31, 2010, a total of 11,464 persons were living with AIDS in the EMA's three counties while approximately the same number were believed to be living with HIV, for an estimated total of at least 22,928 persons living with HIV infection in the three-county region.<sup>38</sup> This

---

<sup>37</sup> State of California Department of Health Services, Office of AIDS, *California AIDS Surveillance Report: Cumulative Cases as of December 31, 2010*, Sacramento, CA, 2011.

<sup>38</sup> These and subsequent AIDS and HIV statistics in this section were derived from epidemiological data reports received from the Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo County health departments in September 2011. The numbers of PLWHA in the three counties are based on an assumption of a 1-to-1 ratio of PLWA to PLWHA, based on consensus estimates obtained in the City of San Francisco in August and September 2011, including a review of over 50 different sources of data. This method is used to account for those infected but not in care or unaware of their infection (therefore not recorded in the HIV reporting system).

represents an EMA-wide HIV infection incidence of 1,290.9 cases per 100,000 persons, meaning that approximately 1 in every 78 residents of the San Francisco EMA is now living with HIV. A total of 1,289 new cases of AIDS were diagnosed in the EMA over the three-year period between January 1, 2008 and December 31, 2010 alone, representing 11.2% of all persons living with AIDS as of that date. At the epicenter of this continuing crisis lies the City and County of San Francisco, the city hardest-hit during the initial years of the AIDS epidemic. Today, the City of San Francisco continues to have the nation's highest per capita prevalence of cumulative AIDS cases,<sup>39</sup> and AIDS is both the fourth leading cause of death among all male residents age 25-54 and the leading cause of death among Latinos in that age group.<sup>40</sup> The number of persons living with AIDS in San Francisco has increased by nearly 20% over the last decade alone - a percentage that does include more rapidly escalating non-AIDS HIV cases. Through December 31, 2010, a cumulative total of 28,761 cases of AIDS have been diagnosed in San Francisco, accounting for nearly 3% of all AIDS cases ever identified in the US as of the end of 2009 (n=1,089,714) and nearly 20% of all AIDS cases diagnosed in California (n=159,329), despite the fact that San Francisco County contains only 2% of the state's population.<sup>41</sup> As of the end of 2010, an estimated 19,390 San Franciscans were living with AIDS or HIV, representing 84.6 % of all persons living with HIV/AIDS in the EMA, for a staggering citywide prevalence of 2,408 cases of HIV per 100,000. This means that more than 1 in every 41 San Francisco residents is now living with HIV disease - an astonishing concentration of HIV infection in a city with a population of just over 800,000. As of December 2010, the incidence of persons living with AIDS per 100,000 in San Francisco County was over nearly ten times that of Los Angeles County (248.1 per 100,000) and more than four times<sup>42</sup> that of New York City (561.9 per 100,000). The following sections provide information on the specific demographics of the local HIV epidemic.

**Race / Ethnicity:** Reflecting the ethnic diversity of our EMA, the region's HIV/AIDS caseload is distributed among a wide range of ethnic groups. The majority of persons living with HIV and AIDS in the EMA are white (62.2%), while 13.6% of cases are among African Americans; 16.8% are among Latinos; and 5.2% are among Asian / Pacific Islanders. A total of 4,429 persons of color were living with AIDS in the San Francisco EMA as of December 31, 2009, representing 38.6% of all PLWA, while another 4,242 persons of color were estimated to be living with HIV as of the same date (37.0% of all PLWHA), for a total of 9,101 persons of color living with HIV/AIDS. However, the percentage of new AIDS cases among persons of color is increasing rapidly, particularly within Latino and Asian / Pacific Islander communities. While 38.6% of all people living with AIDS as of December 31, 2009 were persons of color, nearly half (49.7%) of new AIDS cases diagnosed between January 1, 2008 and December 31, 2010 were among persons of color (n=641). Latinos grew from 15.5% to 16.8% of all PLWHA living in the EMA between 12/31/08 and 12/31/10, while Asian / Pacific Islanders increased from 4.8% to 5.2% of cases over the same period. Additionally, among transgender persons, people of color make up 79.6% of all PLWHA, including a population that is 35.4% African American, 30.7% Latino, and 9.7% Asian / Pacific Islander. Transmission

---

<sup>39</sup> US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, "Diagnosis of HIV Infection and AIDS in the United States and Dependent Areas, 2009, *HIV/AIDS Surveillance Report*, Vol. 21, June 2011.

<sup>40</sup> San Francisco Department of Public Health, HIV Epidemiology Section, *HIV/AIDS Epidemiology Annual Report 2010*, San Francisco, CA, July 2011, [sfhiv.org/documents/AnnualReport2010.pdf](http://sfhiv.org/documents/AnnualReport2010.pdf)

<sup>41</sup> US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Op. Cit.

<sup>42</sup> Per capita PLWA rates for Los Angeles County, New York City, and the City and County of San Francisco derived by comparing reported people living with AIDS as of December 31, 2010 in the case of Los Angeles and San Francisco and December 31, 2009 in the case of New York City with new 2010 US Census Bureau populations for all three regions. LA County: 42,364 PLWHA as of 12/31/10 / 2010 Census Population: 9,818,605; New York City: 108,886 PLWHA as of 12/31/09 / 2010 Census Population: 19,378,102. Sources of AIDS data: County of Los Angeles Department of Health Services, Public Health, *HIV/AIDS Semi-Annual Surveillance Summary, Cases Reported as of December 31, 2010*, Los Angeles, CA, January 2011 and New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, *HIV Epidemiology & Field Services Semiannual Report*, New York, NY, December 17, 2010.

Categories: The most important distinguishing characteristic of the HIV epidemic in the San Francisco EMA involves the fact that HIV remains primarily a disease of men who have sex with men (MSM). In other regions of the US, the proportionate impact on MSM has declined over time as other populations such as injection drug users and heterosexuals have been increasingly affected by the epidemic.

While these groups have been impacted in our region as well, their representation as a proportion of total persons living with HIV and AIDS (PLWHA) has not been as high. Through December 31, 2010, fully 86.0% of the population of persons living with HIV/AIDS in our region were MSM (19,717), including 16,541 men infected with HIV through MSM contact only (72.0% of all PLWHA) and 3,176 MSM who also injected drugs (13.9% of all PLWHA). This represents an increase from the end of 2008, when the percentage stood at 82.3%. By comparison, only 33.0% of PLWHA in New York City as of December 31, 2009 were listed as infected through MSM contact.<sup>9</sup> Factors underlying this difference include the high proportion of gay and bisexual men living in the EMA and the large number of long-term HIV survivors in the region. Other significant local transmission categories include heterosexual injection drug users (7.3% of PLWHA) and non-IDU heterosexuals (3.6%). There are signs that this latter population may be increasingly, however, with 6.9% of new AIDS cases between 2008 and 2010 occurring among nondrug-using heterosexuals (n=89).

**Gender:** Reflecting the high prevalence of HIV/AIDS among men who have sex with men, the vast majority of those living with HIV and AIDS in the San Francisco EMA (91.6%) are men. 6.2% of all PLWHA in the region are women, 71.3% of whom are women of color. Among African Americans living with HIV/AIDS, fully 18.1% are women. The San Francisco EMA has by far the lowest percentage of women, infants, children, and youth (WICY) living with HIV/AIDS through 2008 of any EMA or TGA in the nation, with WICY populations making up only 7.95% of local PLWHA. By comparison, the next highest EMA - Denver, CO - has a WICY percentage of 11.49%. The proportion of women with AIDS in the EMA may also be increasing, with women making up 9.2% of new AIDS cases diagnosed between January 1, 2008 and December 31, 2010. Because of their high representation within the San Francisco population, transgender persons also make up a significant percentage of PLWHA, with at least 504 transgender individuals - the vast majority of them male-to-female transgender - estimated to be living with HIV or AIDS in the EMA as of December 31, 2010, a figure representing 2.2% of the region's PLWHA caseload.<sup>43</sup>

**Current Age:** An increasingly high proportion of persons living with HIV and AIDS in our region are age 50 and above.<sup>44</sup> This is attributable both to the long history of the HIV/AIDS epidemic in our EMA, resulting in a large proportion of long-term survivors, and the region's hard-fought success in bringing persons with HIV into care. Among the EMA's combined PLWHA population as of December 31, 2010, more than two out of every five people living with HIV/AIDS (42.7%) are age 50 or older, including 413 PLWHA age 70 and older. Persons 50 and older now make up the majority of persons living with AIDS in our EMA, constituting 52.7% of this population as of the end of 2010. Between December 2007 and December 2010 alone, the number of persons 50 and over living with AIDS increased by 10.9% within the EMA, while the overall number of PLWA increased by only 2%. This growing aging population creates dramatic challenges for the HIV service system, including the need to develop systems to coordinate and integrate HIV and geriatric care and to plan for long-term impacts of HIV drug therapies. The largest proportion of persons living with HIV and AIDS in the EMA are between the ages of 40 and 49, who

---

<sup>43</sup> Because transgender identity is not tracked in San Mateo County HIV surveillance data, the actual EMA-wide total of transgender PLWHA is believed to be much higher than these estimates.

<sup>44</sup> San Francisco HIV Health Services Planning Council & San Francisco Department of Public Health HIV Health Services, San Francisco EMA Comprehensive HIV Health Services Plan, 2012 – 2014

make up 37.3% of the combined PLWHA population, and 34.4% of new AIDS diagnoses between January 1, 2008 and December 31, 2010. A total of 316 young people between the ages of 13-24 are estimated to be living with HIV/AIDS in the EMA, constituting 1.3% of the PLWHA population. However, young people ages 13-24 make up 5.2% of all new AIDS cases diagnosed between January 1, 2008 and December 31, 2010, pointing to a growing HIV incidence within this population. Only 13 children age 12 and under are estimated to be living with HIV or AIDS in the EMA, and only 3 new AIDS cases were diagnosed among this group between January 1, 2008 and December 31, 2010.

***Disproportionate Impact:*** In terms of ethnic minority representation, both African American and Caucasian populations are disproportionately affected by HIV in relation to the overall EMA population, while Latino and Asian/Pacific Islander are underrepresented in relation to the general population.<sup>45</sup> Certainly the most dramatic overrepresentation occurs among African Americans. While only 4.3% of EMA residents are African American, they make up 13.6% of combined PLWHA populations in the San Francisco EMA are African American, meaning that more than three times the percentage of African Americans are infected with HIV as their proportion in the general population. And while 62.2% of all PLWHA are white, only 46.7% of EMA residents are white. By contrast, Asian/Pacific Islanders make up 26.7% of the EMA's total population but comprise 5.2% of PLWHA cases while Latinos constitute 16.8% of PLWHA but make up 19.3% of EMA residents. However, new HIV cases will soon create a disproportionate impact among Latinos as well, as 20.7% of newly diagnosed AIDS cases occurred among Latinos between January 1, 2008 and December 31, 2010.

Homeless and formerly incarcerated individuals are significantly overrepresented among persons living with HIV and AIDS in our region. While the combined annual EMA-Wide Homelessness Rate is estimated at 1,571 per 100,000, including an estimated 13,500 chronic homeless and another 13,140 individuals who become homeless at some point each year,<sup>46</sup> the combined annual EMA-Wide homelessness rate among persons living with HIV and AIDS is estimated at 7,999 per 100,000<sup>47</sup> - a rate more than four times the rate of homeless among the general population. Meanwhile, according to the California Department of Corrections, an average total of 5,134 persons are held in jail settings each day in the San Francisco EMA<sup>48</sup>, while a minimum of 65,000 annual bookings take place in the three-county region.<sup>49</sup> While available reports do not reveal how many of these arrested are among unduplicated persons, a conservative estimate based on prevailing recidivism rates would be 17,500 unduplicated individuals arrested and incarcerated each year in the EMA, for an estimated total of 50,000 individuals spending time in incarceration facilities over the past three years - a rate of 2,815 per 100,000. According to Ryan White service data for the Forensic AIDS Project – the local Center of Excellence serving incarcerated persons - a total of at least 646 individuals incarcerated in the San Francisco County jail were HIV-positive and receiving Ryan White services between July 1, 2008 and June 30, 2011 representing 7.9% of the city's total Ryan White caseload of 8,171 clients as of February 28, 2011, for a three-year incarceration rate of 7,906 per 100,000 – a rate more than three times that of the general population. The epidemic's most disproportionate impact remains among gay and bisexual men. Approximately

---

<sup>45</sup> San Francisco HIV Health Services Planning Council & San Francisco Department of Public Health HIV Health Services, San Francisco EMA Comprehensive HIV Health Services Plan, 2012 – 2014

<sup>46</sup> San Francisco HIV Health Services Planning Council & San Francisco Department of Public Health HIV Health Services, San Francisco EMA Comprehensive HIV Health Services Plan, 2012 – 2014

<sup>47</sup> San Francisco HIV Health Services Planning Council & San Francisco Department of Public Health HIV Health Services, San Francisco EMA Comprehensive HIV Health Services Plan, 2012 – 2014

<sup>48</sup> San Francisco HIV Health Services Planning Council & San Francisco Department of Public Health HIV Health Services, San Francisco EMA Comprehensive HIV Health Services Plan, 2012 – 2014

<sup>49</sup> San Francisco HIV Health Services Planning Council & San Francisco Department of Public Health HIV Health Services, San Francisco EMA Comprehensive HIV Health Services Plan, 2012 – 2014

63,577 gay-identified MSM live in the San Francisco EMA,<sup>50</sup> and an estimated 19,717 of them were HIV infected as of December 31, 2010. This means that a startling 31.0% of all gay-identified MSM in the San Francisco EMA may already be HIV-infected, setting the stage for a continuing health crisis that will impact the future of our region for decades to come. By contrast, less than 0.4% of heterosexual men are estimated to be HIV-infected in the San Francisco EMA.

### **Discussion:**

The two issues that arise most often when discussing the most pressing needs for persons living with HIV/AIDS are the aging population and the high housing costs. The current state of the rental market in San Francisco makes it virtually impossible for residents to use federal rental subsidies as they are unable to locate a rental unit at or below the HUD-determine Fair Market Rent. A number of individuals thus have to give up their subsidy after they have waited for months on the wait list because the market's true rental rates are double or triple the HUD-approved Fair Market Rent. Additionally, the aging nature of the population, while clearly a positive statement about the efficacy of current HIV treatment, means that individuals who are in receive a HOPWA-funded rental subsidy, or occupy a HOPWA-supported supportive housing unit or an RCFI is unlikely to leave that unit for many years. With shrinking HOPWA funds the number of new HOPWA beds is going to be small. This leaves newly-diagnosed people living with HIV/AIDS who have housing needs without access to these existing HOPWA resources.

---

<sup>50</sup> San Francisco HIV Health Services Planning Council & San Francisco Department of Public Health HIV Health Services, San Francisco EMA Comprehensive HIV Health Services Plan, 2012 – 2014

## NA-50 Non-Housing Community Development Needs – 91.215 (f)

### *Challenges Facing San Francisco*

As San Francisco emerges from its recent recession, the boom in commercial development and market-rate residential development has left the City's low- and moderate- income residents with few viable alternatives for housing and employment. Most especially, the lack of affordable housing is the number one issue for San Franciscans in every neighborhood, at virtually all income levels, and across all constituencies. San Francisco has identified eight overarching challenges that have a widespread effect on the well-being of its residents. Some are common to urban cities and counties. Some are especially significant for San Francisco. The eight challenges are:

- Lack of affordable housing (discussed in Housing Market Analysis);
- Concentration of low-income communities;
- Income disparity;
- Linguistic and cultural isolation;
- Educational disparity;
- Immigrant workforce;
- Digital divide; and
- Lack of asset building opportunities;

### **Concentration of Low-Income Communities**

The concentration of low-income communities in specific geographic neighborhoods places additional burdens on poor families that live within them, beyond what the families' own individual circumstances would dictate. In addition, this concentration can have wider effects on surrounding areas that limit overall economic potential and social cohesion. Children who live in extremely poor urban neighborhoods generally attend neighborhood schools where nearly all of the students are poor and at greater risk for failure. Schools in these areas are often unable to attract the best personnel. Concentration of low-income communities can also inhibit actions designed to increase low-income students' access to more economically integrated schools. Furthermore, residents of high-poverty areas experience negative health outcomes at much higher rates, owing partly to the stress of being poor and marginalized and partly to living in an environment with dilapidated housing and high crime. There may also be higher risk of exposure to other environmental hazards, such as lead-based paint and pollution. In general, high-poverty inner-city neighborhoods exhibit higher crime rates, especially for violent crime. In addition, lack of appreciation in housing values often precludes residents and their families from wealth accumulation enjoyed by comparable owners in other parts of the city.

In many instances, being poor in a poor area may place additional financial burdens on these families, including higher prices charged for basic goods and services because of lack of business competition, gaps in market information, and higher costs for doing business. Low levels of labor force participation in distressed neighborhoods may cut off individuals from the informal networks often relied upon to help workers find meaningful employment; employers may also have preconceptions of extremely poor neighborhoods that discourage them from hiring local residents.

Map 10 shows which census tracts have the highest concentrations of low-income communities. The southeast portion of the City remains an area of concentration, including Bayview/Hunters Point and Visitacion Valley, as does the central city area which encompasses the Tenderloin, Chinatown, and South

of Market. The adjacent Mission district is also an area of concentration; each of these six neighborhoods is designated as a Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area.

**Income Disparity**

Table 37 below shows household incomes by household type, tenure and ethnicity. In addition to the difference between median family income and median non-family income, disparities exist between home-owning households and renters, and amongst ethnic groups. This array of income, as well as household type, affects housing demand and affordability. For example, the median household income is not enough to afford the average 2012 rent for a two-bedroom apartment at \$1,799 a month. And while the median family income is somewhat higher than that of a non-family household, it is spread among more people in the household and would have to pay for larger housing to accommodate the larger average family household size. There is thus a need for larger units affordable to families and large households in San Francisco and an on-going need for affordable housing for the population in general.

**Table 37 – San Francisco Household Income by Household Type, Tenure and Race/Ethnicity, 2012**


<i>Characteristic</i>	<i>Median Income</i>	<i>Percentage of San Francisco Median Household Income (\$73,802)</i>
<b>Household Type</b>		
Family Household	\$85,778	116.2%
Non-Family Household	\$58,139	78.8%
<b>Tenure</b>		
Owner Occupied Households Median Income	\$110,922	150.3%
Renter Occupied Households Median Income	\$55,307	74.9%
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>		
White	\$89,068	120.7%
African American	\$30,491	41.3%
American Indian/Alaska Native	\$35,700	48.4%
Asian	\$63,686	86.3%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	\$46,224	62.6%
Other Race	\$50,290	68.1%
Two or More Race	\$65,181	88.3%
Hispanic or Latino	\$55,634	75.4%

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 2012 (5-year estimates)

San Francisco's demographic composition and changing economics affect the City's overall socio-economic profile in terms of its income distribution, income inequality, and racial and gender disparity in income.

San Francisco's middle class is shrinking, while those households at the low and high end of the income spectrum are growing. In 1990, middle income families comprised 45% of the City's population, while in 2012, they composed only 34%. During that same time period, the lower income households increased from 25% to 29%. While poverty in California statewide has remained flat, San Francisco's poverty rate has increased since 2007 from slightly above 10% to 15% as of 2012.

**Exhibit 12 – San Francisco Income Class Distribution, 1990-2012**




Sources: 1990 and 2000 Decennial Census, 2012 1-Year ACS




The number of San Francisco households earning less than \$25,000 a year increased from 2000 from below 65,000 to above 73,000. The number of households earning from between \$25,000 to \$50,000, from \$50,000 to 75,000, from \$75,000 to \$100,000 decreased in every category, while the percentage earning over \$100,000 increased significantly (Exhibit 13).

**Exhibit 13 – San Francisco Income Distribution, 1990-2010**



Income inequality within an area is most commonly measured by the Gini Coefficient, a number ranging from zero (complete equality) to one (total inequality). Gini coefficients were calculated using comparable 2007 and 2012 data for San Francisco and several peer cities, so that changes over time could be evaluated (Exhibit 14). San Francisco's Gini Coefficient has increased over every measured year, from 0.36 in 1990 to 0.523 in 2012.

**Exhibit 14 – Household Income Gini Coefficients for Select California Counties, 2007, 2012**



Race and gender are significant parts of the story of income inequality in San Francisco. Racial disparities in income are wider in San Francisco than they are nationally. Moreover, in contrast to national trends of converging income between whites and African-Americans and between whites and Asians, racial income disparities in San Francisco became wider during the 1990s and the gap continues to expand in the 2000s. Currently white households have an average median income of 120% of the City's overall median income, an increase of 5.5% from 2000, while African American households have a median income of 41% of the City's overall median income, a decrease of 12.4% from 2000. This seems to indicate an outflow of high- and middle- income African American households over the past 13 years. Given San Francisco's focus on advanced professional and technical service jobs, which generally require a four-year degree, disparities in educational attainment closely track disparities in income. According to the Census Bureau's 2013 1-Year American Community Survey, 67% of San Francisco whites have at least a bachelor's degree, but only 23% of African-Americans, 41% of Asians, and 31% of Latinos.

There are also significant income gaps between men and women in San Francisco. According to the 2012 5-year ACS report, women working full-time earn only 85% of what men earn on average.

San Francisco's changing job base has had major impacts on patterns of income inequality and disparity in the City. The loss of middle-income jobs has been associated with a diminishing middle class in San Francisco, as indicated by rising income inequality. The advanced professional and technical service jobs that have been growing in San Francisco disproportionately require a university degree. In this context, racial disparities in educational attainment translate into disparities in income and, as a later section in this chapter indicates, in asset poverty as well.

### **Linguistic and Cultural Isolation**

San Francisco has historically been a haven for immigrants. As of 2012, 38% of San Francisco's residents are immigrants, including and 176,000 adults that have been naturalized. According to a recent report by the Public Policy Institute of California, San Francisco has an estimated 30,000 undocumented immigrants, approximately 3% of the City's population, who are especially challenged in achieving self-sufficiency and accessing necessary social services, education, and health care by virtue of their undocumented status.

Language barriers impact immigrants' abilities to access necessities such as employment, healthcare, and police protection. Many adult immigrants and refugees are not necessarily literate in their own native languages, and struggle to master the complexities of English. In particular, sophisticated transactions such as legal issues or governmental forms may be confusing. Of all San Franciscans over the age of five, 45% speak a language other than English at home, with the largest language groups being Chinese, Spanish, Tagalog and Russian. Of the population that speaks an Asian Pacific Islander language at home, sixty percent are of limited English proficiency (LEP), meaning that they speak English less than "very well." At the individual level, about 23% of all San Franciscans in the 2008 survey indicated that they did not speak English "very well".

Fraudulent consultants, notaries public and attorneys often prey on immigrants selling them false promises of citizenship and work permits and exploiting their desire to become a part of American society. Immigrants face a maze of complex immigration laws that govern the most fundamental aspects of their lives. In order to navigate this maze, nonprofit legal service providers offer supportive services to these residents, including adjusting their immigration status, applying for citizenship, sponsoring a family member to join them in the United States, and accessing vital health, education, and social service programs for themselves and their children.

In 1989, San Francisco passed the "City and County of Refuge" Ordinance (also known as the Sanctuary Ordinance) which prohibits City employees from helping Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) with immigration investigations or arrests unless such help is required by federal or state law or a warrant. The Ordinance is rooted in the Sanctuary Movement of the 1980s, when churches across the country provided refuge to Central Americans fleeing civil wars in their countries. In providing such assistance, faith communities were responding to the difficulties immigrants faced in obtaining refugee status from the U.S. government. In February 2007, Mayor Gavin Newsom reaffirmed San Francisco's commitment to immigrant communities by issuing an Executive Order that called on City departments to develop protocol and training on the Sanctuary Ordinance. City residents can thereby continue to safely access City services. This protocol keeps families and workforce healthy by providing safe access to schools, clinics and other City services. Most recently the Mayor and Board of Supervisors set aside designated funding to provide legal services to undocumented unaccompanied minors and their families

to address the hundreds of children coming across the border to California seeking asylum to escape the unacceptable conditions in their home countries in Central America.

### Educational Disparity

Educational attainment (Table 38) in San Francisco is notably higher than other areas in the state and country. 51% of San Francisco residents have a Bachelor’s degree or higher as compared to 47% for the region, 30% for the state and 28% in the nation. Despite this high concentration of educated residents, a large share of the city’s residents – 14% – do not have a high school diploma or its equivalent. This is a full percent point higher than the region as a whole. While this statistic is not significantly different than the state or national averages, the knowledge-based economy in San Francisco and in the region indicates that these individuals will need specialized workforce services to help them be competitive in the labor market. As San Francisco’s Chief Economist, Ted Egan, noted “Living-wage job opportunities requiring short- or medium-term on-the-job training, a post-secondary vocational certificate, or Associates degree, are growing in San Francisco.”

### Immigrant Workforce

San Francisco and the Silicon Valley Region have a higher than average number of foreign-born individuals, 36% of the population (Table 38). This immigrant workforce is growing faster than the US-born workforce in San Francisco, at every level of income. Growth trends by income for immigrant and US-born workers are identical, with nearly all growth occurring at the upper and lower ends of the income spectrum. We will work to meet the needs of this growing group, both in terms of vocational skills and English language attainment. San Francisco is an international city, a hub of both tourism and industry. As such our San Francisco immigrant workforce is crucial to the health of the local and regional economies. As the human resources director of a large hotel chain said recently, “Someone who can communicate effectively in English will double their earning potential and have even greater value to us if he or she is bilingual.”

**Table 38 – Local, Regional, State and National Demographics**

Demographics	San Francisco City & County	Region*	California	United States
<b>Population (2012)</b>				
Total Population	825,863	3,402,678	38,041,430	313,914,040
Percent Change (2010-2012)	2.60%	2.86%	2.10%	1.70%
<b>Age (2011)</b>				
Under 18	13.50%	21.00%	24.60%	23.70%
18 to 64	72.70%	66.60%	63.70%	63.00%
65 and over	13.80%	12.40%	11.70%	13.30%
<b>Ethnicity &amp; Language (2007-2011)</b>				
Foreign-born	35.60%	35.98%	27.20%	12.80%
Language other than English spoken at home	45.30%	48.02%	43.20%	20.30%
<b>Educational Attainment (persons 25+ 2007-2011)</b>				
No high school diploma or GED	14.30%	13.28%	19.20%	14.60%
High school graduate/GED or higher	85.70%	86.72%	80.80%	85.40%
Bachelor's degree or higher	51.40%	46.58%	30.20%	28.20%

\* Region refers to San Francisco, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties.  
Source: US Census Bureau State & County QuickFacts

## **Digital Divide**

According to a recent study by the Public Policy Institute of California, 78% of San Francisco Bay Area adult residents have broadband access, an increase of 18 percentage points from 2008 (Public Policy Institute of California, 2012). However, statewide data indicate that there is disparity between groups; access to broadband and internet usage is highest among educated, U.S. born individuals, whites and blacks. While specific data could not be identified on digital literacy in the county, employers point out that all jobs, “high-tech” or not, require digital literacy.

A draft study released by the Mid-Pacific ICT Center and Centers of Excellence on March 18, 2013 found that over 85% of California employers surveyed agreed that digital literacy should be considered a basic skill. More than 76% also agree that non-technical skills (soft, workplace, or employability) are at least as important as technical skills (COE & MPICT, 2013). This was echoed recently by hospitality employers who said that technology and communication skills were critical to the success of their businesses. Not only are restaurants and hotels moving to computer-based tools for accomplishing their work, but they are introducing more computer-based training and application systems. A lack of digital literacy will be a barrier to applying to jobs, to doing the actual work, and to progressing in one’s field. As part of our strategy over the next five years, OEWD will integrate digital literacy into all of our programming, including access point services and sector bridge programs. In addition, we will work with employers to identify their sector’s workforce technology needs in order to proactively prepare the workforce of tomorrow

## **Lack of Asset Building Opportunities**

Poverty is frequently defined as a lack of income; however, by limiting our understanding of poverty to income alone, this definition omits a significant aspect of financial stability: asset wealth. Without savings, home equity, or equity in a retirement account or a business, an asset-poor household would face serious consequences if a sudden drop in income were to occur. Far more households are asset-poor compared to income-poor. The reason for the difference is that asset poverty accounts for a household’s total wealth, and not just the current income level.

In San Francisco, 24.7% of the city’s residents are asset poor and 35.6 are liquid asset poor<sup>51</sup>. This compares to 13.2% who are income poor, meaning below the federal poverty level, according to the 2012 ACS 5-Year report. A 13.2.% income poverty level means that more than one out of ten residents does not have enough money to afford basic living expenses. A 24.7% asset poverty percentage translates to one in three residents, if income stopped, does not have enough sufficient net worth to live for three months above the poverty level. The City’s liquid asset poverty rate of 35.6% means that more than one out of three individuals does not have enough liquid assets to live for three months above the poverty level. The race of the household also affects poverty rates because non-whites are twice as likely as whites to become asset poor.

Economic security is only achieved when families save and build assets. Yet low-income families often lack asset building opportunities that middle-income families take for granted. A 2005 Brookings Institute study showed that in San Francisco, an estimated 50,000 individuals, or roughly 20% of all adults, were unbanked. The study also indicated that half of Latino and African American adults were unbanked. Check cashing companies, pawnshops, and payday lenders are among the alternative financial services to the formal financial sector for lower-income households. Low- and moderate-

---

<sup>51</sup> Corporation for Enterprise Development Website, 2014.

income people see these banking alternatives as more convenient and accessible than conventional sources; unfortunately, they are associated with high fees and do not enable families to build long-term, sustainable asset wealth.

Across the nation, homeownership is a key wealth-building strategy for many families. Owning a home and building home equity presents benefits derived from the savings required of mortgage payments, the ability to borrow against the property, and potential capital appreciation. However, housing affordability remains a widespread problem. In San Francisco, only 37% are homeowners compared to 57% in California and 66% nationwide. For more information on high housing costs, refer to Section NA-10.

### ***Vulnerable Populations***

The City has identified vulnerable populations that are at special risk for being multiply affected by the social and economic problems that are facing San Francisco. The groups discussed in this section include:

- Immigrants;
- Seniors;
- Persons with disabilities;
- Persons with HIV/AIDS (see section NA-45);
- Disconnected transitional age youth;
- Survivors of domestic violence;
- Homeless and at risk of homelessness individuals and families (see section NA-40);
- Re-entry population;
- Veterans;
- Public housing residents (see section NA-35);
- Disconnected LGBT population;
- Disconnected African Americans; and,
- Disconnected Native Americans.

Services and strategies must accordingly be designed to address the unique needs and concerns of these populations in order to maximize their effectiveness. This section will describe in greater detail the characteristics, barriers and needs of these populations.

### **Immigrants**

Individuals with limited English skills or low educational attainment are especially at risk for unemployment or underemployment. Immigrants often fall within these categories, and San Francisco has historically been a haven for immigrants. According to the 2009 American Community Survey, San Francisco ranked fourth among the country's 25 largest cities by percentage of foreign born-residents in the nation. Currently, an estimated 36% of San Francisco's 837,442 residents are immigrants. San Francisco has an estimated 30,000 undocumented immigrants, who are especially vulnerable, subject to deportation and unable to access many employment opportunities due to their undocumented status.<sup>52</sup>

Language barriers impact immigrants' ability to access necessities such as employment, healthcare, and police protection. Of all San Franciscans over the age of five, 45% speak a language other than English at

---

<sup>52</sup> *Unauthorized Immigrants in California*, 2011, Public Policy Institute of America

home, with the largest language groups being Chinese, Spanish, Tagalog and Russian.<sup>53</sup> Twenty-three percent of the San Franciscan population are of limited English proficiency (LEP), meaning that they speak English less than “very well”<sup>54</sup>, with the percentage within the Asian population even higher at forty-five percent. Thirteen percent of San Francisco households are “linguistically isolated” with no one in the household over the age of 14 indicating that they speak English “well” or “very well”.

MOHCD's services to immigrants span all service modalities, including legal services, domestic violence, and financial literacy. MOHCD ensures that its programs are culturally and linguistically competent and reflect the diversity of the San Francisco community.


## Seniors

### Age Group Characteristics

Between 1990 and 2010, San Francisco’s total population grew from 723,959 to 805,235, an increase of 11%. During that time the number of seniors also increased by 11%. In San Francisco, the proportion of the population age 60 and over is 19%; in California, 16%. Both the number and share of San Francisco’s senior population are projected to increase over the next 10 years.

### Exhibit 15 – San Francisco Population Growth by Age Group, 1990-2020

Population Growth: San Francisco’s senior population grew by 18,000 from 2000 to 2010 with continued growth expected in the coming decade.




Source: US Census 1990, 2000, 2010; CA Department of Finance projections, 2007 & 2011

<sup>53</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2012 Five-Year Estimates

<sup>54</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2012 Five-Year Estimates

The accompanying chart (Exhibit 16) illustrates changes in San Francisco’s population by age. Since 1990 the city has lost many of its children, but it has gained many middle aged persons who are likely at the height of their earning power and apparently beyond their child-rearing years. San Francisco also appears to have more young adults without dependents, who possibly stay here for a limited period in their lives and careers before moving to more affordable communities. The drop in the number of persons age 65-79 corroborates that upon reaching retirement age, many San Franciscans also leave for more affordable communities. The increase in the number of persons over the age of 80 suggests that an earlier cohort, possibly a remnant of a different economic era, has remained here and aged.

**Exhibit 16 – Age Migration in San Francisco, 1990-2010**




Race and Ethnicity

San Francisco’s greatest asset is its diversity. As shown in the accompanying chart (Exhibit 17), whites made up 55% of the seniors in 1990, but declined by 2008 to 42%. Asian/Pacific Islanders increased from 27% to 40%. During that time, the number of white seniors decreased by over 9,000, while Asian/Pacific Islanders increased by almost 25,000. A significant portion of this growth is due to immigration: about 20,000 Asian and Pacific Islander seniors currently living in the city entered the United States after 1990. African Americans decreased slightly as a proportion of seniors, losing over 800 persons, while Latinos increased by over 3,500.



## Exhibit 17 – San Francisco Population 60+ by Race and Ethnicity, 1990-2010



Source: Census and 2010 ACS 3-year Estimates

Fifty four per cent, the majority of senior San Franciscans, speak a language other than English. This includes individuals who speak both English, still the majority language, and another language. Chinese is the second most common language, spoken by 26% of those 60+, with most speaking Cantonese and a minority speaking Mandarin. Spanish (9%), Tagalog (6%), and Russian (4%) are the other most common languages among the older population.

### Educational Attainment

As described earlier, San Francisco's population is one of the most highly educated in the country. As younger generations have aged, educational attainment among seniors in the city has risen: approximately 51% have at least some college, compared to 44% in 2000 and 34% in 1990. However, about one-fifth (21%) of San Francisco seniors have less than a 9<sup>th</sup> grade education, a higher share than the statewide rate of 14%. Seniors with lower levels of education may have greater trouble reading and writing, and when compounded by limited English proficiency, might not be able to read routine mail and notices. Knowing about available resources and navigating complex service systems may also be particularly challenging for these seniors. Moreover, more seniors are working than before, and they face significant disadvantages in seeking employment when younger applicants are highly educated.

### Income and poverty

Among San Francisco's roughly 155,000 seniors, approximately 19,000 (12%) were living below the federal poverty line and more than a quarter (27%) were living below 150% of the federal poverty line in 2006-2008. The federal poverty line for a single person age 65 or older is \$10,326 per year, or \$13,014 for a two-person household.<sup>55</sup> The Federal Poverty Guidelines (FPL), however, fail to take into account


<sup>55</sup> Definition from 2008. Data retrieved 6-17-2011 from Census.gov › People and Households › Poverty Main › Poverty Data › Poverty Thresholds › 2008, <http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/data/threshld/thresh08.html>

regional variations in cost of living. Many individuals with incomes above the poverty line continue to struggle to make ends meet in San Francisco.

The California Elder Economic Security Standard Index estimates how much is needed for a retired older adult to adequately meet his or her basic needs – without private or public assistance.<sup>56</sup> The chart (Exhibit 18) below shows that for an elder person in San Francisco, expenses for basic needs far outstrip the federal poverty guidelines. Expenses also exceed median Social Security (SS) payments and the maximum payments under the Supplemental Security Income (SSI) for older and disabled adults with little to no income. Based on the Elder Economic Security Standard Index, 61% of San Franciscans seniors -- more than 65,000 people over the age of 65 -- do not have enough income to meet their basic needs.

**Exhibit 18 – Economic Security Index for San Francisco Residents, 2009**

What it took to live in San Francisco in 2009 far outstripped both the federal poverty guidelines and government payments.



Source: San Francisco County, Elder Economic Security Index 2009

California supplements federal SSI payments, but over the past two years has reduced its payments multiple times, resulting in lower payments to recipients.<sup>57</sup> The combination of these cuts reduced an individual recipient’s 2010 income by more than \$900.<sup>58</sup> Even before cuts, many SSI recipients in San Francisco were struggling to pay for basic necessities. SSI reductions have a pronounced impact in San Francisco, as so many of its low income citizens rely on SSI.<sup>59</sup> The accompanying chart (Exhibit 19), which is drawn from a 2009 analysis of San Francisco’s public assistance, compares San Francisco’s SSI rate among low –income persons compared to the other large counties in the state.


<sup>56</sup> Basic costs include food, housing, medical care, transportation, and other necessary spending. For more information, see the Insight Center for Community Economic Development: <http://www.insightcced.org/communities/cfess/eesiDetail.html?ref=39>

<sup>57</sup> It is unlikely that benefits will be reduced further because doing so would result in California losing Medicaid funding.

<sup>58</sup> According to the Social Security Administration, “California SSI State Supplement Reductions”, the state’s monthly rate for an individual dropped by \$76 between May, 2009 and July, 2011.

<sup>59</sup> The reduction in SSI has also affected money coming into the county. According to Social Security records, county residents received \$2 million less per month in December of 2010 than in December 2008. Some of this reduction is because of cuts to SSI, and some because fewer San Franciscans were SSI recipients in 2010. SSI Recipients by State and County, [http://www.ssa.gov/policy/docs/statcomps/ssi\\_sc/](http://www.ssa.gov/policy/docs/statcomps/ssi_sc/)

**Exhibit 19 – IHSS Recipients Per 1,000 Income-Eligible Persons, 10 Largest California Counties, December 2009**




Source: State of California IHSS Management Statistics Summary; IPUMS, 2008 American Community Survey

Compared to the rest of the state, an unusual proportion of SSI recipients in San Francisco are seniors. The program has two categories of recipients: 1) Blind and Disabled; and 2) Aged. Statewide, 29% of SSI benefits fall into the category of Aged; in San Francisco, 55%. One possibility for the difference is that the city has many seniors who immigrated in mid-life and did not have the time to accrue full Social Security benefits, requiring them to rely on SSI. Seniors relying on SSI have heavy concentrations in the city’s Chinatown and Ocean/Merced/Ingleside neighborhoods.

Correlated with San Francisco’s high rate of SSI is its exceptionally high rate of In Home Supportive Services. San Francisco has more seniors and persons with disabilities who require assistance to remain in the community. The accompanying chart (Exhibit 20) compares San Francisco’s rate with that of other large California counties.

**Exhibit 20 – SSI Rate Per 1,000 Low-Income Persons, 10 Largest California Counties, December 2009**



Source: Social Security Administration, Supplemental Security Record, 100 percent data; IPUMS, 2008 American Community Survey

\*Low income = 100% of Federal Poverty Level


**Poverty and Race/Ethnicity**

More than 40,000 seniors (27%) live below 150% of the federal poverty line. The largest group of impoverished seniors is Asian/Pacific Islander, but as a share of their community, the seniors most likely to be low-income are African American. The shares of the population living below 150% of the Federal Poverty Line include<sup>60</sup>:

- 38% of African-American seniors
- 30% of Asian and Pacific Islander seniors
- 23% of Latino seniors
- 23% of white seniors

<sup>60</sup> Share of the American Indian / Native American and Other population in poverty is not listed because the population is too small for estimates based on ACS samples to be reliable.

**Exhibit 21 – San Francisco Senior Population Above and Below 150% Federal Poverty Level by Race and Ethnicity**



Source: ACS-3yr-2010

**Persons with Disabilities**

The ACS has changed how it asked about disability twice over the last ten years, making it problematic to compare how the population with disabilities has changed over time.<sup>61</sup> However, since 2005 the estimated number of San Franciscans reporting any disability has been fairly stable at approximately 90,000 people. According to the 2009 ACS estimates, San Francisco was home to almost 34,500 younger adults with at least one disability (6.4% of the population 18-59) and 54,100 seniors 60+ (35%).<sup>62</sup> Disabilities occur at a higher rate within the senior population, and disability rates generally increase with age. Types of disability differ by age. Among younger adults, cognitive and ambulatory difficulties are the most common. Among older adults, the most commonly reported functional limitation is difficulty with walking, followed by difficulty in living independently.

**Table 39 – Types of Disabilities for San Francisco Residents by Age Group, 2009<sup>63</sup>**

Difficulty with:	Walking		Independent Living		Self-Care		Remembering / Cognition		Hearing		Vision	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
18-59	16,678	3.1%	14,454	2.7%	6,871	1.3%	19,548	3.6%	5,891	1.1%	6,582	1.2%
60+	37,652	24.4%	33,712	21.9%	18,997	12.3%	17,888	11.6%	19,590	12.7%	11,331	7.4%

Source: ACS 2009 1-year Estimates, IPUMS

**Disability and Race**

For both younger persons and seniors, the disability rates are higher for African Americans (around 18% of younger adults and 50% of seniors). Whites are the largest group of individuals with disabilities among younger persons; among seniors, Asian/ Pacific Islanders.

<sup>61</sup> US Census, “New and Modified Content on the 2008 ACS Questionnaire: Results of Testing Prior to Implementation” [http://www.census.gov/acs/www/methodology/person\\_questions/#disable](http://www.census.gov/acs/www/methodology/person_questions/#disable)

<sup>62</sup> These numbers exclude the approximately 1,371 persons 18-59 and 3,476 persons 60+ with a disability living in institutional group quarters, i.e. nursing homes, assisted living facilities, jails or halfway houses.

<sup>63</sup> Note that individuals can have more than one type of disability.

**Table 40 – Disabled Non-Institutionalized Population in San Francisco by Age and Race, 2010**

	Younger Adults 18-59		Seniors 60+	
	Rate <sup>64</sup>	Number	Rate <sup>65</sup>	Number
White	5%	12,110	30%	18,661
Asian / PI	4%	7,135	34%	21,637
Black / Af. Am.	19%	5,829	44%	4,752
Latino	7%	5,721	37%	5,222
Other	n/a	634	n/a	197
<b>Total</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>31,429</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>50,469</b>

Source: ACS 2010 3-year Estimates, IPUMS

Many younger persons with disabilities live in the Tenderloin and South of Market. These two neighborhoods, characterized by Single Room Occupancy hotels, are close to accessible transportation, but also have some of the highest concentrations of predatory crime and drug abuse in the city (Fribourg, 2009).

Isolated and Homebound Seniors and Adults with Disabilities

Social isolation, having no close friends and few contacts with the outside world, is linked to poor health (Seeman, 2001). No reliable way exists to calculate the number of San Franciscans who are socially isolated or homebound. A variety of rough estimates and proxies are listed below.

*Living Alone:* In 2010 19% of the adult San Franciscans (133,000) lived alone, a larger share than in California or the US (10% and 13%, respectively). The rates of living alone increase with age (31% of those 65+ in San Francisco) and are higher still among older women (36% compared to 25% for men 65+). In all there are about 12,000 men and 22,000 women age 65+ living alone in San Francisco.

*Limited Social Contact:* According to a National Research Center 2008 phone survey of disabled and older San Franciscans, 9% of adults with disabilities and 7% of seniors had spent an hour or less socializing with friends or family over the past week. This share would indicate that between 8,000 and 11,000 adults with disabilities and older adults have limited social contact. A San Francisco Controller's Office 2011 phone survey found that 19% of San Franciscans over 60 needed assistance last year with socialization, (ETC Institute, 2011).

*Difficulty with Activities of Daily Living as a Proxy for Homebound:* Individuals who have trouble performing activities of daily living (ADLs) such as bathing, dressing, using the toilet, and eating, are more likely to be homebound. Applying national rates by age group to San Francisco population numbers results in estimates of the number of people with varying degrees of disability who may be homebound or “at risk” of being homebound or isolated (Kaye et. al. 2010).

Persons needing help with two or more ADLs:

- 8,000 San Franciscans, more than half of whom are 65+
- (3,380 adults under 65 and 4,531 adults 65+)

<sup>64</sup> Using a 90% confidence interval, disability rates for younger adults are within 2% for whites and Asian / Pacific Islanders, within 4% for Latinos, within 8% for blacks, and highly unreliable for other / Native Americans.

<sup>65</sup> Using a 90% confidence interval, disability rates for seniors are within 7% for whites and Asian / Pacific Islanders, within 17% for Latinos, within 20% for blacks, and highly unreliable for other / Native Americans.

Persons needing help with only one ADL:

- 14,000 San Franciscans, with a similar share 65+
- (6,173 adults under 65 and 7,744 adults 65+)

*In-Home Support Services as a Proxy for Homebound:* Aggregated data from In-Home Support Services (IHSS) may also help estimate the number of homebound or potentially homebound adults. If IHSS consumers generally have incomes below 150% of the poverty line, then they make up anywhere from a quarter to over a third of the population in those age brackets<sup>66</sup>:

- 11,108 consumers need help getting in or out of bed
- 8,683 consumers live alone
- 3,884 consumers are 85+

### **Disconnected Transitional Age Youth**

Transitional age youth (TAY) who are disconnected are those 16-24 year olds who need additional supports and opportunities to make a successful transition to adulthood.<sup>67</sup> TAY includes 16-24 year olds who:

- are academically off-track or have dropped out of high school;
- have had contact with public systems (e.g. foster care, juvenile justice, criminal justice, or special education);
- are homeless or marginally-housed;
- have a disability or other special need (including substance abuse);
- are young, unmarried parents;
- are undocumented;
- are immigrants and/or English Learners; and/or
- are Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer and Questioning (LGBTQQ).

Disconnected TAY face multiple challenges in making meaningful connections with education; entering the workforce; and creating strong, positive support networks. They often have limited educational achievement and may lack basic academic and work readiness skills needed to obtain and maintain employment. Disconnected youth may also face mental health problems, disabilities, or drug and alcohol abuse, homelessness, and isolation from positive communities. Current estimates indicate about 10% of 16-24 year olds in San Francisco, or roughly 8,000 of our young people, are at risk of not transitioning successfully into adulthood, or reaching adulthood at all. Indeed, 42% of San Francisco's homicide victims in 2012 were age 25 and younger. While many young people are disconnected altogether from services and supports, a significant number of youth and young adults are accessing public services. This link provides an opportunity to better connect them with the resources and supports they need to succeed.

### Disconnected Youth and Young Adults

According to the most current sources available:

---

<sup>66</sup> About 27% of those 60+ earn less than 150% of the Federal Poverty Rate as do 35% of those 85+.

<sup>67</sup> Policy Priorities for Transitional Age Youth: Vision & Goals 2014-2016, TAYSF: 2014.

- 1,902 young people under age 25 were identified as homeless in San Francisco during the 2013 Point-in-Time Count and Survey; 25% of these homeless youth identified as former foster youth; almost 30% identified as LGBTQ.
- 5,700 12-24 year olds are homeless/marginally-housed or at risk of becoming homeless each year.
- 6,000 16-24 year olds are without health insurance coverage.
- 7,700 18-24 year olds have not yet obtained a high school diploma.
- 9,000 18-24 years olds are neither working nor attending school.
- 700 students drop out of middle or high school each year, resulting in over \$122 million in lost earnings and societal costs.  
554 students in San Francisco Unified School District are currently off-track by one or more years and at risk of not graduating with their peers.

#### System-Involved Youth and Young Adults

- 435 youth aged 16 and older are currently in foster care placements; 247 of which are 18-21 year olds.
- More than 2,000 youth and young adults are currently involved in the juvenile and criminal justice systems.
- Each year, nearly 3,000 youth and young adults access public mental health and substance abuse services.
- Each month, approximately 1,400 18-24 year olds receive cash welfare benefits and nearly 4,000 18-24 year olds receive Food Stamps.

#### Cross-System Involvement

Disconnected TAY frequently are involved in multiple systems:

- 80% of young adults age 18-25 on Adult Probation lack a high school diploma or GED; 75% were unemployed at the time of arrest.
- Between 2005 and 2009, 15% of foster children had an episode of involvement with the Juvenile Probation Department; 7% of youth on probation had an episode of foster care.
- In 2011, approximately 8% of foster youth age 16 or older ran away from placement.
- 37% of foster care youth are currently in mental health services.

#### Transitional Age Youth Exiting Juvenile Justice Out of Home Placements

As of June 30, 2010, 39 San Francisco juvenile probationers were aged 18-25 and in out-of-home placement sites in San Francisco. Of these, 23 were African American, 13 were Hispanic, 2 were white, and one was Asian; 33 were male and 6 were female. The home community of 7 of these youth was Bayview Hunter's Point. The average length of stay in detention was 70.5 days, where 17 days was the minimum and 174 the maximum. The average length of stay in the out-of-home placement was 232, where the minimum was 5 days and the maximum was 982.

During FY2010, three youth were committed to CDCR's Division of Juvenile Justice (formerly CYA) facilities; all three are African American. In general, youth of color, and black youth in particular, are far more likely to become involved in the juvenile justice system than their white counterparts: black youth account for 17% of the nation's youth population, but for 28% of juvenile arrests, 37% of those in detention, 38% of those in secure placement, and 58% of youth committed to state adult prison (NCCD,



2007). Learning disabilities, physical disabilities, and mental health problems are common on young people involved in the juvenile justice system<sup>68</sup>.

School connectedness decreases young people's involvement in high-risk behaviors such as drug use, gang-involvement, running away from home, theft, assault, and handgun use<sup>69</sup>. Additionally, educational attainment marks an important point in an individual's personal growth and maturation, can have a "normalizing effect" on an individual's community involvement, and is generally linked to positive life outcomes<sup>70</sup>. Creating opportunities for young people leaving the juvenile justice system in San Francisco to engage in and complete high school, and communicating clear paths to post-secondary education, is one key means of mitigating long-term collateral consequences of a juvenile conviction.

Research suggests that being employed reduces adolescents' involvement in the juvenile justice system<sup>71</sup>, but 70% of court-involved youth released from residential facilities were either not in school or unemployed a year following their release<sup>72</sup>. Youth with a history of contact with the juvenile justice system are seven times more likely to be unemployed and welfare dependent in adulthood; these youth are also more likely to be arrested again later in life (Chung et al, 2005). Therefore, it is critical that young people exiting the juvenile justice system be provided with opportunities to develop skills and training that will lead to stable, meaningful employment.

An overwhelming number (75-93%) of children involved in the juvenile justice system have been sexually and/or physically abused, neglected, and/or exposed to traumatic events in the home or community<sup>73</sup>. In fact, being abused or neglected during childhood increases the likelihood of a juvenile arrest by 59%. These experiences can lead to a host of symptoms, such as depression, despondency, aggression, recklessness, or avoidance, and in some cases, to lasting mental health problems<sup>74</sup>.

### **Survivors of Domestic Violence**

San Francisco receives an average of 20 calls to 911 and almost 60 crisis line calls per day related to domestic violence<sup>75</sup>. San Francisco is also a national "hot spot" for human trafficking, including sex and labor trafficking, and one of the top 13 cities in the U.S. for child sex trafficking (FBI, 2009).<sup>76</sup>

There are three emergency shelters for victims of domestic violence and their children in San Francisco, with a combined total of approximately 75 beds. Specifically, the 3 emergency shelters provided 6,814 bed nights to women and their children escaping domestic violence; the 4 transitional and supportive housing agencies provided 15,029 bed nights to women seeking long-term stability; and the 2 crisis line providers fielded 18,261 calls for domestic violence and sexual assault victims.<sup>77</sup>

When surveyed about unmet needs, community providers and stakeholders identified LGBTQ survivors, Limited English Proficient (LEP) clients, immigrant populations, clients with mental health issues, and

---

<sup>68</sup> National Council on Disability, 2003

<sup>69</sup> Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2006

<sup>70</sup> Justice Policy Institute, 2007

<sup>71</sup> Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2006

<sup>72</sup> Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2002

<sup>73</sup> Justice Policy Institute, 2010

<sup>74</sup> National Child Traumatic Stress Network, 2004

<sup>75</sup> Comprehensive Report on Family Violence in San Francisco, 2011

<sup>76</sup> ETR, Violence Against Women Community Needs Assessment, 2014

<sup>77</sup> San Francisco Department on the Status of Women, Annual Report, 2012-13

youth as populations in need of additional services.<sup>78</sup> Service providers noted that the LGBTQ population has been slower than others to accept services and some survivors had expressed some concern about the possibility of being “outed” or running into former partners or even an abuser at some service agencies.

Also noted was the lack of elderly individuals seeking services, specifically elderly people of color and elderly LGBTQ individuals. Mentioned specifically to this community were feeling as though they somehow provoked their abuser and therefore feel like the abuse was justifiable; feelings of shame and secrecy around having been abused especially if the abuser is a family member; and, elderly individuals fearing Adult Protective Services and worry they will have their rights taken away if they report abuse.

Services for individuals with limited English proficiency are prioritized because these survivors are often unaware of their human and legal rights. Consequently, they remain silent about crimes perpetrated against them out of fear their immigration status will be revealed and they will face deportation. San Francisco is a Sanctuary City, which means that City and County employees cannot ask about an individual’s immigration status; they cannot disclose information regarding an individual’s immigration status; and, they cannot condition services based on an individual’s immigration status. As such, efforts to reach out to the communities remain especially important so that potential clients are aware that the abuse they have experienced is a crime and they have rights, regardless of their citizenship status.

Several staff noted the deaf community was largely absent from those populations requesting and utilizing services. Additionally, survey participants reported increase in the number of men and boys needing services but are reluctant to seek support for domestic abuse or sexual assault. In addition, youth in isolated neighborhoods such as Bayview and Hunter’s Point may also be difficult to reach and therefore considered by many staff as an underserved, priority population. Transportation issues were raised as a main barrier youth face in receiving services (e.g., it can take over an hour on public transportation to reach some service locations from isolated neighborhoods like Bayview and Hunter’s Point).

In addition to those services most utilized by survivors, survey respondents were asked to reflect on any additional services that might help support survivors’ current and emergent needs. Just about more than half of survey respondents perceived increased needs for additional housing services, mental health services, childcare, job placement/workforce development training, and financial assistance/support. In addition to these needs, interview and focus group participants also identified increased needs for mental health services for survivors and their families (augmenting and expanding existing services); legal services; enhanced housing services and workforce development training; human trafficking-related services; and coordinated responses to domestic violence for restorative justice.

### **Re-entry Population**

San Francisco’s Reentry Council defines “reentry” as a process that begins at the point of an individual’s arrest, continues throughout his/her incarceration and post-release supervision, and is complete once that person has made a peaceful, positive, and permanent reintegration into the community. Specific reentry goals vary from one individual to the next, but broadly defined they include living peacefully and

---

<sup>78</sup> ETR, Violence Against Women Community Needs Assessment, 2014

lawfully, achieving self-sufficiency, engaging in pro-social activities and relationships, maintaining or improving physical and behavioral health.

### Challenges to Successful Re-entry

Individuals leaving jail and prison often have a variety of complex and immediate needs, in addition to basic needs of stable housing and income. Many formerly incarcerated people face mental health needs or drug and alcohol addictions which require ongoing treatment and support. Other chronic health conditions such as hepatitis and HIV/AIDS, which impact formerly incarcerated people at higher rates than the general population, create special needs and challenges for individuals reentering communities. A large percentage of people leaving prison and jail have very low levels of education and work experience, making the need for basic skills and job training acute. A variety of policies governing eligibility for housing, employment, health care, and financial assistance pose additional challenges to people making the transition. Finally, many people who have been sentenced to jail or prison experience diminished supportive social and familial networks upon release, and must work to rebuild these relationships or form new ones.

### Adults Exiting San Francisco County Jail

At a recent point in time, the San Francisco jails held 1,653 people in custody; supervised 121 under alternative sentencing (including county parole, electronic monitoring, and SWAP); and accounted for another 1,671 people in Community Programs (including NoVA, domestic violence programs, Treatment on Demand, Women's Reentry Center, SF's Pretrial Homeless Release Project, Own Recognizance Project, Pretrial Diversion Program, and Supervised Pretrial Release Program). Inmates enrolled in the 5 Keys Charter School totaled 309.<sup>79</sup>

Nationally, more than half of people held in jail in 2002 reported having a preexisting criminal justice status; more than a third were already on probation. About half of all jail inmates had full-time employment at the time of their arrest<sup>80</sup>. Forty four percent of jail inmates had neither attained a GED nor completed high school. Sixty six percent and 67.8% of inmates reported regular alcohol and drug use, respectively, and for many individuals, jail detention provides the first exposure to substance abuse treatment programs (SAMSHA/CSET TIP). An estimated 64% of jail inmates had a recent history or symptoms of a mental health disorder, and these conditions were accompanied by high rates of unemployment, homelessness, substance abuse, and past physical or sexual abuse. Additionally, 32% of jail inmates with mental health problems had a history of violent offenses<sup>81</sup>.

Approximately 10% of San Francisco's jail population has a diagnosis of schizophrenia, bipolar or major depression. For some people, these conditions worsen during incarceration; for others, the jail setting provides their first contact with mental health professionals. Mentally ill offenders are at a much higher risk of recidivism than their counterparts; in Los Angeles County jails, for instance, the recidivism rate among mentally ill inmates is 90%<sup>82</sup>. Thus, jails often stand in for mental health crisis centers, and yet are ill equipped to serve the needs of this vulnerable population.

---

<sup>79</sup> Susan Fahey, Public Information Officer, SF Sheriff's Department, Phone, July 14, 2010

<sup>80</sup> Profile of Jail Inmates, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2002

<sup>81</sup> Mental Health Problems of Prison and Jail Inmates, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2006

<sup>82</sup> More Mentally Ill Persons are in Jails and Prisons than Hospital, Treatment Advocacy Center and National Sheriffs Association, Torrey Fuller et al, 2010

According to a 2009 point-in-time survey conducted by the San Francisco Human Services Agency, 394 people identified as homeless (out of a total estimated San Francisco homeless population of 4,550) were in jail. Just as the jail becomes a de facto intake facility for people experiencing a mental health crisis, jail functions as an emergency “shelter” for those who live on the street. People who were not homeless prior to their incarceration are also at risk of experiencing homelessness following a release from jail. Even a brief period of incarceration can cause an individual to lose employment, stable housing, and other critical supports.

As of August 20, 2010, San Francisco Adult Probation supervised 6,552 active probationers, 17% of whom are female.<sup>83</sup> Over half of San Francisco Adult Probationers are 35 or younger, with 1,396 probationers are ages 18-25. 381 people ages 56 to 65 are on probation, as are 42 individuals aged 66 or older. Of the 6,408 active probationers who had their race/ethnicity reported, a full 45% (2,838) of adult probationers are classified as black, 26% (1,652) are classified as white, and 20% (1,293) are classified as Hispanic. 4% (278) are classified as Asian; 3% (224) as Other; and 2% (123) Pacific Islander.

#### Adults Exiting CDCR Facilities

According to a report prepared for the Reentry Council by the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation Data Analysis Unit,<sup>84</sup> 1,449 people were paroled from CDCR institutions to San Francisco County in 2009, of which 1,294 were men and 155 were women; 888 were classified by CDCR as black, 343 as white, 125 as Hispanic, and 93 as other. Of these 1,449, 574 people were released to San Francisco County on their first parole; 648 were released following a parole violation; and 227 had been on parole and returned to custody with a new term. Of 534 people released from CDCR institutions to San Francisco in 2005, 301 (56.37%) were returned to custody within the first year; 384 (71.91%) had returned to custody within two years; and 409 (76.59%) had returned to custody within three years.<sup>85</sup> In 2009 1,660 people who were on parole in San Francisco were returned to custody with a new prison term.<sup>86</sup>

When a person paroles from a CDCR institution, s/he is provided with up to \$200 in cash “gate money” and a copy of his/her parole conditions. Some individuals have contact with family members or friends on the outside who are able to send “dress-outs” (clothing to wear out of the institution) prior to release and to offer the parolee a ride from custody. Parolees who do not have these contacts must purchase dress-outs from the prison and pay for bus fare to the county they parole, usually their county of last legal residence. Parolees must usually report to their assigned parole agent by the next business day following release.

Upon leaving prison, an individual on California parole in San Francisco may have an immediate need for stable housing, a source of income, treatment, healthcare, and education/training. Parole agents may be able to assist with meeting these needs, but may not be able to do more beyond requiring that the parolee attend a Parole and Community Team (PACT) meeting within the first week of release. Infectious diseases (such as HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and hepatitis B and C), serious mental illness, and co-occurring disorders impact members of the US prison population at higher rates than the general

---

<sup>83</sup> SF Adult Probation Department, Active Probationers Summary Report as of 8/20/10

<sup>84</sup> CDCR Adult Research, 2009

<sup>85</sup> CDCR Adult Research, 2009. This data include people released from prison on their first parole or on parole following a return to prison with a new court commitment; in other words, this data does not include people released from prison following a parole violation.

<sup>86</sup> (ACHAR12009)

population<sup>87</sup> which suggests that a significant number of people leaving prison will be returning to communities with medical conditions that require ongoing – and costly – treatment and care. Other factors which characterize the reentry population, such as homelessness, transience, low literacy, and high levels of risk-taking behavior, complicate service providers' abilities to effectively deliver treatment and services to these individuals<sup>88</sup>.

While the majority of people in prison reported being seen by a physician during the time spent in custody, barriers to securing health insurance upon release suggests that many of them will not receive regular medical care once on parole<sup>89</sup>. Inconsistent medical care and consequent poor health interferes with an individual's ability to maintain employment, care for one's children, keep appointments, and lead a productive life generally.

Two thirds of California inmates reported having a substance abuse problem, but according to a 2004 BJS survey, less than 22% of people with a history of substance abuse/dependence received in-prison treatment<sup>90</sup>. Of the 573 people expected to parole [for the first time] to San Francisco between July 1, 2010 and June 30, 2011, 13 will have participated in a substance abuse treatment program, and yet 1,728 people on parole in San Francisco have a documented substance abuse problem<sup>91</sup>. The link between substance abuse and the commission of crime is powerful: drug users are 16 times more likely than nonusers to report being arrested and booked for larceny or theft; 14 times more likely to be arrested and booked for driving under the influence, drunkenness, or liquor law violations; and 9 times more likely to be arrested and booked on an assault charge<sup>92</sup>.

Of the 573 people expected to parole [for the first time] to San Francisco between July 1, 2010 and June 30, 2011, 140 have been identified by CDCR as having a mental health diagnosis. According to a parolee demographics report on the Parolee Reentry Court Program section of the CDCR website, 309 people on parole in San Francisco have a mental health diagnosis, 299 of whom have a co-occurring substance abuse problem. More than half of California prison inmates reported having a recent mental health problem, but only half of those received treatment while in custody. Studies have found that pre-release assessments in combination with Parole Outpatient Clinics (POC), some of which offer a route to accessing county mental health Outpatient Clinics (POC), some of which offer a route to accessing county mental health services if the clinics themselves do not offer mental health services, reduce recidivism among parolees with mental health disorders (RAND, 2009). A comprehensive, continuous net of care should surround mentally ill people leaving prison. The key to ensuring continuity of care is effective and timely communication between CDCR mental health staff, individual parole agents, and local behavioral health services.

The rate of homelessness among parolees was estimated to be as high as 30 to 50 percent in cities like San Francisco and Los Angeles.<sup>93</sup> The Housing Choice Voucher Program (more commonly known as Section 8) and the San Francisco Housing Authority deny people with certain convictions from accessing these housing resources. These restrictions may severely limit the affordable housing options for people

---

<sup>87</sup> National Commission for Correctional Health Care, , The Health Status of Soon-to-be-Released Inmates: A Report to Congress, Vol. 1, 2002

<sup>88</sup> Davis, 2009.

<sup>89</sup> Davis, Lois, Understanding the Public Health Implications of Prisoner Reentry in California, Rand Corporation, 2009.

<sup>90</sup> Davis, 2009.

<sup>91</sup> EOP/CCMS – Drug by County, Division of Adult Parole Operations, California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, 2010.

<sup>92</sup> National Household Survey on Drug Abuse, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. 1997

<sup>93</sup> Petersilia, Joan, Understanding California Corrections, California Policy Research Center, University of California, 2006.

on parole in San Francisco. Parolees who are registered sex offenders living in San Francisco are likely homeless, given the lack of legal residential options available in San Francisco.

### Realignment

Over the last three years, the City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) has embraced the implementation of the Public Safety Realignment Act of 2011 (“Realignment,” also known as Assembly Bill 109 [AB109]), and related legislation. It has been widely observed that Realignment is the most significant change in California’s criminal justice policy in over 50 years. Realignment amended a broad array of statutes concerning where a defendant will serve his or her sentence and how a defendant is to be supervised upon release from custody.<sup>1</sup> In enacting Realignment, the Legislature declared, “Criminal Justice policies that rely on building and operating more prisons to address community safety concerns are not sustainable and will not result in improved public safety. California must reinvest its criminal justice resources to support community based corrections programs and evidence-based practices that will achieve improved public safety returns on this state’s substantial investment in its criminal justice system. Realigning low-level felony offenders who do not have prior convictions for serious, violent or sex offenses to locally run community based corrections programs, which are strengthened through community based punishment, evidence-based practices, improved supervision strategies, and enhanced secured capacity, will improve public safety outcomes among adult felons and facilitate their reintegration back into society.” [Cal. Pen. Code § 17.5(a)(3)-(5)]

### *Impacted Populations*

During the first month of Realignment—October 2011—San Francisco criminal justice agencies housed or supervised over 200 individuals on PRCS, PC § 1170(h) County Jail or Mandatory Supervision, or serving parole revocation sentences in County Jail. This monthly number continued to grow to a high of 261 in January 2012. In 2012, an average of 199 individuals started new AB109-related sentences every month. From January through August of 2013, the monthly average dropped to 160, consistent with reductions in the number of releases to PRCS, the number of new PC § 1170(h) sentences imposed, and the number of State Parole violators in County Jail. From the beginning of Realignment through August 2013, the overwhelming majority of individuals impacted by AB109 changes were State Parole violators, who made up over 75 percent of CCSF’s AB109 individuals. An average of 145 individuals began a State Parole violation sentence every month during this time period. In July 2013, State Parole violation hearings were transferred from the Board of Parole Hearings to Superior Courts in the counties in which the parolee was released, increasing the burden of proof for conviction, as well as the defense resources available to defendants. This development, along with Parole’s implementation of graduated sanctions, rewards, and responses and greater latitude by the supervising Parole Unit to make sanctioning decisions, has led to a dramatic drop in the number of individuals awaiting parole violation proceedings in County Jail. This drop became apparent in the jail population in September 2013, as those previously sentenced for parole violations completed their sentences and drastically fewer new sentences were imposed beginning in July. While this report shows only the first month in which the effect of these changes was fully realized, the trend has continued.

### *Population Projections and Actual Impacts*

At the outset of Realignment, the State projected the number of individuals that would be released from CDCR to PRCS in each county, in addition to the number of PC § 1170(h) sentences expected by month. The State made no projections regarding State Parole violators serving sentences in county jails. Cumulatively, since October 2011, San Francisco sentenced 466 individuals under PC § 1170(h) while the State projected 424 sentences, and received 614 PRCS clients while the State projected 498. The impact of Realignment on San Francisco, therefore, exceeded the State’s expectation by 17 percent, not

accounting for the impact of State Parole violators in County Jail, which has been the population with the largest impact on CCSF's criminal justice system under AB109. Of the 466 individuals sentenced under PC § 1170(h), 219 started a Mandatory Supervision sentence.

#### *Average Daily Population*

While the discussion above summarizes the number of individuals impacted by Realignment, a discussion of the impacts of Realignment on CCSF's criminal justice agencies requires accounting for the length of sentences these individuals serve. A calculation of each agency's Average Daily Population (ADP) takes into account the average number of individuals served over a period of time, given the number of individuals starting a sentence during that time period and the lengths of their sentences. Not surprisingly, the Adult Probation Department's ADP of AB109 individuals has increased steadily since October 2011, as new PRCS and Mandatory Supervision clients start sentences that range from several months to several years. The Sheriff's Department's ADP of AB109 individuals grew in the beginning of Realignment implementation and then leveled off, due to the fact that the largest AB109 population serving time in County Jail were parole violators, who serve no more than 90 days.<sup>3</sup> As discussed above, the number of parole violators in County Jail dropped dramatically in September, 2013, thus reducing the Sheriff's AB109 ADP to 63 in September 2013, compared to a high of 332 in February 2012. The AB109 ADP in the Adult Probation Department grew from 279 in the first year of Realignment to 522 in the reduced numbers of parole violators in County Jail beginning in September 2013, the AB109 annual ADP in County Jail is expected to drop significantly in the coming year. While the impact of AB109 on CCSF's criminal justice system has been significant, AB109 clients represent a fraction of the total population served by this system, as illustrated below. However, as indicated by the COMPAS risk and needs assessments conducted, the AB109 population is, on average, a higher risk and higher need population than the non-AB109 clients served in San Francisco.

#### *AB109 Clients' Risks and Needs*

San Francisco has a long-standing commitment to collaborative court models which provide alternatives to eligible individuals involved in the criminal justice system. Individuals sentenced to state prison in San Francisco tend to be those who have exhausted or are not eligible for these programs because they have been convicted of more serious crimes or have a longer criminal history than individuals who have historically been on probation or in County Jail. Thus, the AB109 population is a significantly higher-risk and higher-need population than the non-AB109 populations served. San Francisco's PRCS clients have had an average of eight prior felony convictions and a quarter of PRCS clients have had 11 or more prior felony convictions. Furthermore, while PRCS eligibility requires individuals' current offense to be a non-serious, non-violent, or non-sex offense, over two-thirds of PRCS clients have a serious, violent, or sex offense in their past.

APD Deputy Probation Officers conduct a COMPAS assessment with clients to determine their risk of recidivating and to identify their criminogenic needs. A vast majority of APD's clients have significant needs, with most assessed as having the following: vocational/education, substance abuse, cognitive behavioral, criminal opportunity, criminal personality, social environment, residential instability, and criminal thinking self-report.<sup>4</sup> A large proportion of AB109 clients have needs in every need category. APD has used this information to target AB109 funding to those services that meet the most prevalent needs, including vocational/education programs, substance abuse treatment, cognitive behavioral programming, mental health treatment, and housing, as discussed in more detail below.

In order to further analyze the needs and risk factors of AB109 clients, Dr. Steven Raphael, professor of Public Policy at University of California Berkeley's Goldman School of Public Policy and member of the

San Francisco Sentencing Commission, partnered with APD to conduct an analysis of re-arrest incidents for PRCS clients during their first year on PRCS. Based on preliminary findings of an analysis of arrest incidents for PRCS clients released through June 26, 2012, the following characteristics were most highly correlated with multiple arrests within a client's first year on PRCS:

- Failure to report to APD within two days of release from CDCR
- High COMPAS risk score
- Mental health designation by CDCR
- Self-reported as homeless at release from CDCR

While still in progress, this analysis serves as a logical basis for fine tuning, streamlining and expanding strategies and services that best address the risk factors identified. For example, placing clients who do not report within two days of their release from state prison on an intensive supervision caseload with comprehensive wraparound services; increasing access to behavioral health services; and expanding housing resources for PRCS clients are strategies strongly supported by this analysis. In the coming year, APD will explore these strategies in light of the final findings of this analysis.

### **Veterans**

According to the ACS 2012 5-Year Survey, there are 31,553 veterans in San Francisco. This represents 4.5% of the civilian population 18 years and over. Of this veteran population, 94% are men and 6% are women. The vast majority are seniors, with 29% being over 75 years old, while another 43% are between the ages of 55 to 64. Sixty-four percent are white, 14% are black, 16% are Asian, and 9% are Latino. The median income of veterans overall is \$40,643, which is only 55% of San Francisco's citywide household median income. Twenty-five percent do not have a degree higher than a high school diploma or equivalency. Ten percent are unemployed. 3,438 veterans were identified as having a service-connected disability rating.

The City's own needs assessments have identified significant needs for veterans. The 2013 Homeless Count identified 716 homeless veterans in San Francisco. This represented 11% of the total homeless population (down from 17% in the 2011 Homeless Count). The City's Human Services Agency has partnered with the US Department of Veterans Affairs to identify shelter users with a history of military service and support them to access federal veterans services. Thirty shelter beds are funded by the Department of Veterans Affairs and set-aside for this population. HSA continues to operate the County Veterans Services Office, assisting individuals with federal veterans benefits. San Francisco has significantly increased permanent supportive housing for veterans. Two new veteran specific developments been recently created. In 2013, the Veterans Commons building at 150 Otis opened to provide permanent housing for 75 veterans and the Veterans Residence in the Mission Neighborhood came online as permanent housing for 32 disabled veterans. Most significantly, in partnership with the Department of Veterans Affairs and San Francisco Housing Authority, San Francisco obtained 675 Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing vouchers for disabled and chronically homeless veterans and their families to use in the housing site of their choice. Since the utilization of these vouchers is a challenge, San Francisco formed the Homes for Heroes Team – a collaborative led by national leaders and City and County staff to increase housing placements for veterans via the 675 vouchers. Disabled veterans are also served by the San Francisco Season of Sharing Fund, which provides grants for back rent, security deposits, and other housing-related expenses.

### **Disconnected LGBT Individuals**

Lack of economic empowerment threatens the LGBT community's goals of independence and stability. Declining economic stability is pushing vulnerable segments of the LGBT community out of San Francisco and destroying the diversity and tolerance for which the city is known. The community is economically



diverse, and its income levels fall along the same spectrum as those of the heterosexual community. The economic development of the LGBT community is impeded by widespread societal homophobia, transphobia, and discrimination. Despite the lack of formal research, it is clear that the LGBT community faces unique economic challenges. Discrimination has an economic impact on the LGBT community because it erects barriers to finding and retaining employment and housing, and accessing health care and education. Isolation and the lack of support experienced by many LGBT persons exacerbate existing economic challenges. Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer and questioning (LGBTQQ) youth are vulnerable economically because they face societal discrimination alone; these youth often lack the family support that provides stability in the form of housing, sustenance, and spiritual grounding. LGBTQQ youth often become homeless when they come out to their families. The discrimination, homophobia, and transphobia in the home environment means many youth are thrown out of or forced to leave home. This lack of family support, financial and otherwise, makes LGBT youth particularly vulnerable.

LGBT immigrants find themselves in special circumstances that create serious economic difficulties; they face additional barriers because of a lack of documentation, safety, and family support. Immigrants often have difficulty obtaining social security numbers, drivers' licenses, and bank accounts. Immigrants may avoid reporting crimes to the police both because of a fear of discrimination and of problems with the Immigration and Naturalization Service. LGBT immigrants often live alone because they cannot bring families and relatives to the United States because they are legal strangers.

Discrimination in employment on the basis of sexual orientation, HIV status, and gender identity threatens the economic development of the LGBT community. Transgender persons are in a particularly precarious position in employment because of gender identity discrimination. San Francisco is one of the few municipalities that protects against gender identity discrimination. Transgender people are not protected in California as a whole or by the federal government. This lack of protection beyond the bounds of San Francisco's ordinance makes it imperative that transgender people find it economically feasible to remain living and working in the city. The national unemployment rate is at a current low of 4%<sup>5</sup>, but the unemployment rate of transsexuals is an astronomically high 70%.

Transgender people also face many obstacles to obtaining safe and affordable health services. Transgender people are often denied coverage for the costs of transitioning because insurance providers and employers, including the City and County of San Francisco, specifically and wrongly designate the treatment as elective. Without comprehensive coverage for these services, it is virtually impossible to proceed with the transitioning process. Transitioning generally costs between \$20,000 and \$75,000. This enormous individual financial investment puts treatment out of reach for most transgender people. Transgender coverage exclusion results not from fiscal necessity but from ignorance and bias.

In California, an estimated 2.3% of senior adults ages 50-70 identify as lesbian, gay, or bisexual in 2007<sup>94</sup> (A National Research Center phone survey of San Franciscans found that 14% of adults with disabilities and 10% of older adults describe themselves as lesbian, gay or bisexual. LGBT seniors and persons with disabilities face the same challenges but often with unique characteristics, including:

- Caregiving: A recent study reported a high incidence of caregiving among LGBT people compared to the general population, (one in four is a caregiver versus one in five). LGBT

---

<sup>94</sup> San Francisco Department of Aging and Adult Services, Area Plan, 2012-2016

boomers surveyed described their friendships as an important source of emotional support and were four times as likely to depend on a friend as a caregiver compared to the general population. They were also less likely to expect that they would rely on an adult child for care in the future (16% versus 7%).

- **Health:** According to the UCLA Center for Health Policy Research, California's aging gay and bisexual male population has higher rates of hypertension, diabetes, psychological distress symptoms, physical disability and fair/poor health status than heterosexual men with similar demographics.
- **Isolation and Discrimination:** Fear of discrimination and abuse places LGBT seniors at elevated risk for isolation, and research suggests that mainstream social services may not always provide culturally competent care].

Many LGBT seniors find that their sexual identity and experience of coping with discrimination has prepared them for aging by fostering personal resilience. Focus group participants were quick to highlight their history of fighting for their civil rights and acknowledged that for the LGBT movement to be its strongest, it should be intergenerational and should address racism other forms of within group discrimination and division.<sup>95</sup>

### **Disconnected African Americans**

In 2007, Mayor Gavin Newsom created the African American Out-Migration Task Force to address the shrinking number of African Americans in San Francisco. The Task Force determined<sup>96</sup> that the African American unemployment rate from 1990 to 2005 was consistently over twice that of non-African Americans, and that in 200, one quarter of African Americans lived in poverty, more than twice the proportion of non-African Americans. The Task Force found that only 35% of African Americans in San Francisco were homeowners, the lowest rate across the city; that African Americans composed nearly half of the residents living in public housing and one third of the total number of Section 8 household voucher holders. The report also found that per capita income for African Americans was 56% less than that of whites, and that African Americans in San Francisco are arrested at more than twice the rate of all other racial groups. Redevelopment in San Francisco that occurred primarily in the 1950's and '60s resulted in a significant number of African American households permanently leaving the City's Western Addition and Bayview Hunters Point neighborhoods, beginning an ongoing decline in the fabric of the African American community from which the City has not recovered. Currently African Americans comprise only 6% of the overall population of San Francisco according to the 2013 ACS data, a figure which has been steadily dropping since the high in 1970 of 13%.

### **Disconnected Native Americans**

Although the overall number of Native Americans living in San Francisco is small, comprising only .8% of the City's population according to 2013 ACS data, limited research has shown evidence of increased risk factors among this population. A 2005 study done by the Native American AIDS Project<sup>97</sup> showed that within the focus group of 50 individuals, 72% had been sexually assaulted at some point in their lives; 54% were homeless or marginally housed; 60% earned under \$10,000 per year. Because of the small number of Native Americans in San Francisco, virtually no services specifically tailored for their unique cultural needs currently exist.

---

<sup>95</sup> San Francisco Department of Aging and Adult Services, Area Plan, 2012-2016

<sup>96</sup> African American Out-Migration Task Force, Recommendations for the Retention and Attraction of African Americans in San Francisco, Powerpoint Presentation, 2008

<sup>97</sup> Native American AIDS Project, Native American Risk Assessment, 2006

## **Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Facilities:**

MOHCD has for many years served as the only City agency that consistently provides financial support for community facilities. No other City department, (and only a small number of private philanthropic organizations), provides support to the numerous nonprofits in the Northern California Bay Area. In a time where commercial real estate is perhaps the most expensive of any city in the U.S., the ability of social service providers to have a safe, secure, and permanent location from which to provide services has never been more important. Because of the scarcity of funding for this kind of support, and given the priority many non-profits and funds place on supporting programs rather than capital improvements, MOHCD is committed to continuing to use CDBG funds to fill this particular gap through its community facility capital improvements program. These funds have been used to cover the costs of tenant improvements that allow service providers to expand existing services, and to construct new facilities. In addition to protecting and expanding services, capital funds are used to ensure that these facilities are accessible to all and meet health and safety standards.

MOHCD has focused on supporting the following types of facilities: neighborhood and constituency-focused multi-service centers; family resource centers, senior centers; child care facilities; workforce service nodes; and youth centers. Special attention is given to those improvements that support ADA-mandated improvements and health and safety improvements. Other types of improvements have included HVAC, roofs, program space build-outs, elevators, ramps, boilers, and other essential capital improvements.

## **How were these needs determined?**

Each year the department has seen a wide range of organizations present their capital needs, and departmental resources are never sufficient to meet the community needs. MOHCD reviews the specific neighborhood needs based on existing and projected service demands, the condition of current facilities in that neighborhood, the capacity of each organization to manage a capital grant, the nature of the population served, and the ability of the organization to leverage matching resources to determine the priorities of each funding cycle.

MOHCD aligns its capital investments with the City's Capital Plan, which includes within its framework the needs of the City-owned properties that house services for low-and moderate-income San Francisco residents. The City also coordinates its activities with the San Francisco Community Investment Fund, a certified Community Development Entity, whose board consists of senior management of the City's chief investment entities such the City Administrator, the Director of the City's Capital Plan, the Director of the Office of Workforce and Economic Development, the Director of Public Finance, and the City's Chief Economist. The SF CIF applies for and administers the City's New Markets Tax Credits program, and MOHCD staff consults with SF CIF staff to determine need for capital support and opportunities for leverage. Additionally, MOHCD coordinates with the Department of Recreation and Parks to participate in opportunities to apply for State funding to support facilities and open space development. Finally, MOHCD provides resources for facilities to perform capital needs assessments and asset reserve analyses to better determine the reserve replacement needs and the aging of the building's capital assets.

### **Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Improvements:**

San Francisco prides itself on being a green city, and has therefore prioritized greening as a vital public improvement. The City has partnered with community based organizations that leverage community volunteers to provide trees and sidewalk gardens in distressed neighborhoods, working with local homeowners and institutions to ensure the long-term sustainability of the City's greening efforts. In addition, the City's new Housing Trust Fund provides additional resources for Mello-Roos-type infrastructure improvements to areas impacted by increased housing density. These improvements can include public park landscaping, furnishings and recreation equipment, pocket parks and parklets, murals, neighborhood gardens, and public right of way improvements including paving, furnishings and plantings.

### **How were these needs determined?**

The City consults with the director of the City's Capital Plan, with the Department of Public Works, with the members of the Board of Supervisors, and solicits input during its annual community needs assessment meetings held during the development of the City's annual Action Plan. In addition, the City consults with community based organizations that focus on neighborhood greening needs.

### **Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Services:**

The City's growing income equality between the poor and the rich has magnified the need for expansive services for the low-income community. Through this Consolidated Planning process the City has determined that its public services priorities for Community Development Block Grant dollars should be focused on homeless and eviction prevention services, access to rental and homeownership opportunities, foundational skills necessary as a precursor to employment, workforce development, financial literacy, service connection as a pathway to self-sufficiency, and the provision of legal services to move people towards income security.

By focusing on these areas, CDBG dollars can most effectively leverage the existing social service support structures that are currently supported by the City's General Fund. Examples of this include the City's funding of organizations that provide foundational skills necessary for individuals to attain the basic competencies that would later allow access to Workforce Investment Act-funded employment training programs. MOHCD also supports foundational skills programs for young people in the 18-24 year old range (transitional age youth) who often age out of high school focused programs without the appropriate support system or the acumen to access traditional adult-focused programs. MOHCD partners with the City's Treasurer and the Treasurer's Office of Financial Empowerment in its plan to create a network of Financial Empowerment Centers across the City, funded in part by CDBG, the Human Services Agency, Federal Treasury Funds, and other leveraged funding sources.

Access to housing and eviction prevention has become perhaps the most important of all services for this 2015-2019 plan. At every community meeting, in virtually every survey, and in every focus group, the lack of affordable housing opportunities in San Francisco was identified as the number one barrier to economic self-sufficiency for the City's low-income community. To that end MOHCD has begun to convene on a monthly basis all of the City's eviction prevention and tenant counseling organizations to better coordinate and align counseling services city-wide, and to ensure that the most vulnerable members of the City remain stably housed. The City has also supplemented CDBG funds with General

Funds to expand its access to housing work, specifically funding organizations that will work with individuals to help them navigate the city's affordable housing landscape, understand the application process, offer them rental readiness trainings, work with them on credit issues, offer translation and interpreting services, and help bridge the digital divide.

### **How were these needs determined?**

As part of the Consolidated Planning process, the City held neighborhood meetings, conducted focus groups, and distributed surveys to residents and service providers to solicit feedback on public service needs throughout the City. Priorities for needs are also re-examined on an annual basis through community needs assessments led by the City's Citizens' Committee on Community Development.

Residents and providers provide input on short-term and long-term needs based on neighborhoods and constituencies that are low-income, vulnerable, and disadvantaged. In addition, the City regularly conducts specific needs assessments focusing on specific constituencies. For example, the City conducts a comprehensive Three-Year Children's Community Needs Assessment that incorporates census and population survey data, neighborhood meetings attended by residents, surveys of community based organizations, conversations with policy and advisory bodies, focus groups involving parents and providers, and interviews with key City leaders. Similarly, the City's Department of Aging and Adults Services conducts a comprehensive needs assessment for seniors and people with disabilities, during which the department reviewed Census and ACS data, the California Health Interview Survey, consumer data from individuals receiving funding from the Office of Aging, City administrative data such as usage of Medi-Cal and Food Stamps, literature review, and community forums.

MOHCD additionally conducted a comprehensive survey of all City-funded social services by constituency, service provision type, neighborhood, and level of funding, and identified those areas where CDBG funding would be most highly leveraged. This analysis was supplemented by one-on-one interviews with the senior management of all key City service delivery departments, including the Human Services Agency, the Department of Public Health, and the Department of Children, Youth and their Families.

# Housing Market Analysis

## MA-05 Overview

### Housing Market Analysis Overview:

San Francisco competes with New York and Los Angeles for the unfortunate distinction of having the country's most expensive housing markets. The result for the City's low- and middle-income residents is often over-crowding, substandard conditions, and/or managing a heavy housing cost burden. In addition, high housing costs inhibit healthy, balanced economic growth regionally, as individuals and families seeking to live in the City and avoid long employment commutes are locked out of the local housing market.

### *Lack of Affordability: Rental Housing*

Low-income households face a significant gap between what they can afford and the price of available housing. According to HUD standards, renters earning 50% of AMI, or \$43,700 for a three-person household, should pay \$1,093 for a two-bedroom apartment, which is 30% of gross household income<sup>98</sup>. As of Q3 2014, the average San Francisco apartment rented for roughly three times that value.

The difference between an affordable rent and market-rate rent is commonly called the housing "affordability gap". The table below describes the average affordability gap for various income levels. The subsequent illustration graphically represents the affordability gap at 120% AMI.

**Table 41 – Rental Housing Affordability Gap in San Francisco by Income Level, 2014**

Number BRs	Fair Market Rent, 2014	30% AMI		50% AMI		80% AMI		120% AMI		150% AMI	
		Afford Rent	Gap	Afford Rent	Gap	Afford Rent	Gap	Afford Rent	Gap	Afford Rent	Gap
Studio	\$2,580	\$510	(\$2,070)	\$850	(\$1,730)	\$1,359	(\$1,221)	\$2,039	(\$541)	\$2,549	(\$31)
1BR	\$3,300	\$583	(\$2,717)	\$971	(\$2,329)	\$1,554	(\$1,746)	\$2,331	(\$969)	\$2,914	(\$386)
2BR	\$4,400	\$655	(\$3,745)	\$1,093	(\$3,307)	\$1,748	(\$2,652)	\$2,623	(\$1,777)	\$3,278	(\$1,122)
3BR	\$4,800	\$729	(\$4,071)	\$1,214	(\$3,586)	\$1,943	(\$2,857)	\$2,913	(\$1,887)	\$3,641	(\$1,159)
4BR	\$6,800	\$786	(\$6,014)	\$1,311	(\$5,489)	\$2,098	(\$4,702)	\$3,145	(\$3,655)	\$3,933	(\$2,867)

Source: San Francisco Rental List Price, Zillow, July 2014

<sup>98</sup> "2014 Maximum Income by Household Size, Unadjusted AMI for HUD Metro Fair Market Rent Area that contains San Francisco," and "2014 Maximum Monthly Rent by Unit Type derived from the Unadjusted AMI," both available online at the MOHCD website at: <http://sf-moh.org/index.aspx?page=24> (March 19, 2014).

**Lack of Affordability: Ownership Housing**

While rental apartments are unaffordable to low-income residents, homeownership opportunities are out of reach for the vast majority of San Francisco households, including low-income, moderate-income, and above moderate-income residents. Only households earning well above 150% AMI are able to afford a typical San Francisco home. The table and graph below describe the average homeownership affordability gap facing residents of various income levels. Per HUD standards, monthly mortgage and utility costs that total 35% of household income are considered affordable.

**Table 42 – Homeownership Affordability Gap in San Francisco by Income Level, 2014**

Income Levels <sup>99</sup>	2014	
	Affordable Sales Price <sup>100,101</sup>	Affordability Gap <sup>102</sup>
150% AMI	\$528,000	(\$445,000)
120% AMI	\$407,000	(\$566,000)
80% AMI	\$246,000	(\$727,000)
<b>Median Home Value<sup>103</sup></b>	<b>\$973,000</b>	

Sources: Mayor's Office of Housing, Federal Reserve Bank, San Francisco County Assessor's Office, California HCD, Zillow, Seifel Consulting Inc.

<sup>99</sup> Income categories are based on Maximum Income by Household Size published by HUD.

<sup>100</sup> Affordable sales prices and median sales prices are rounded to nearest \$1,000.

<sup>101</sup> Affordable sales price calculation assumes 33% of income is spent on housing, including taxes and insurance, a 10% downpayment, and 90% financing based on an annual average interest rate per the Federal Reserve Bank.

<sup>102</sup> Affordability gap equals affordable sales price minus median sales price for 2-bedroom unit.

<sup>103</sup> Zillow, San Francisco Metro Report, "Current Home Value", July 2014

## MA-10 Number of Housing Units – 91.210(a)&(b)(2)

### Introduction

Totaling about 376,083 units by the end of 2013<sup>104</sup>, San Francisco’s housing stock is roughly divided into low-, medium-, and higher-density structures. San Francisco’s housing stock is older than other West Coast cities, with almost 50% of San Francisco’s housing units constructed before World War II. San Francisco’s housing tends to be smaller in size, with about 72% of all units containing two bedrooms or less. San Francisco, like most large cities, is a city of renters who live in 63% of occupied housing units in the City.

### All residential properties by number of units

**Table 43 – Residential Properties by Unit Number**

Property Type	Number	%
1-unit detached structure	65,352	17%
1-unit, attached structure	56,770	15%
2-4 units	82,036	22%
5-19 units	75,549	20%
20 or more units	94,556	25%
Mobile Home, boat, RV, van, etc	656	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>374,919</b>	<b>100%</b>

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

### Unit Size by Tenure

**Table 44 – Unit Size by Tenure**

	Owners		Renters	
	Number	%	Number	%
No bedroom	1,657	1%	41,588	20%
1 bedroom	11,915	9%	78,983	37%
2 bedrooms	45,479	36%	59,567	28%
3 or more bedrooms	66,451	53%	32,726	15%
<b>Total</b>	<b>125,502</b>	<b>99%</b>	<b>212,864</b>	<b>100%</b>

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

<sup>104</sup> City and County of San Francisco, San Francisco General Plan Housing Element, 2014, page 21



**Table 45 – San Francisco Housing Characteristics, 2012**

Characteristic	All Units	Occupied	Rent	Own
	2012	2012	2012	2012
<b>TENURE STATUS</b>				
			63.1%	36.9%
<b>STRUCTURE TYPE</b>				
Single Family	32.4%	33.6%	14.1%	67.0%
2 - 4 Units	21.9%	21.7%	24.6%	16.8%
5 - 9 Units	9.9%	10.0%	13.9%	3.3%
10 - 19 Units	10.2%	10.2%	14.7%	2.4%
20+ Units	25.4%	24.3%	32.5%	10.3%
Other	2.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%
TOTAL	102%	100%	100%	100%
<b>UNIT SIZE</b>				
No Bedroom	13.8%	12.4%	18.8%	1.4%
1 Bedroom	27.1%	27.1%	37.1%	9.8%
2 Bedrooms	30.9%	31.1%	28.6%	35.3%
3 Bedrooms	19.1%	19.7%	10.8%	34.8%
4 Bedroom	6.6%	7.0%	3.0%	13.8%
5 or more Bedrooms	2.6%	2.8%	1.5%	4.9%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%
<b>AGE OF HOUSING BY YEAR BUILT</b>				
2010 or later	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%
2000-2009	6.3%	6.1%	5.5%	7.1%
1980 - 1999	9.6%	9.6%	9.6%	9.5%
1960 - 1979	15.2%	15.3%	18.5%	9.9%
1940 - 1959	20.0%	20.5%	18.5%	23.9%
1939 or earlier	48.8%	48.3%	47.7%	49.4%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%

Source: San Francisco Planning Department, 2014 Housing Element

**Describe the number and targeting (income level/type of family served) of units assisted with federal, state, and local programs.**

There are approximately 22,000 existing affordable housing units that have received local financial assistance from MOHCD or from the former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency. Those units also received a combination of federal or state assistance ranging from Low Income Housing Tax Credits, HUD Section 202/811 capital funding or funding from the California Department of Housing and Community Development. They targeted households earning 60% of area median income or below and served populations ranging from very low-income seniors, transition age youth, homeless adults to low-income families. There are also approximately 16,600 units assisted through the San Francisco Housing Authority's Section 8, public housing or HOPE VI programs. Of the public housing units, 3,340 units serve families in 19 developments; 2,043 units serve senior and disabled households in 23 developments, and 756 public housing and 393 other affordable units are in 6 HOPE VI developments.

**Provide an assessment of units expected to be lost from the affordable housing inventory for any reason, such as expiration of Section 8 contracts.**

There are 2,035 affordable housing units whose existing Federal rental or operating subsidy contract is scheduled to expire between 2015 and 2022.

**Table 46 – San Francisco Affordable Housing Units with Expiring Federal Rental or Operating Subsidy Between 2015 and 2022**

<i>Project</i>	<i>Owner [1]</i>	<i>First Expire [2]</i>	<i>Units [3]</i>	<i>Rent Assistance [4]</i>	<i>Risk Level [5]</i>
San Lorenzo Ruiz Center	NP	01/31/2015	145	202/8 NC	1-Very High
Autumn Glow Alzheimer's Residential	NP	01/31/2015	15	PRAC/811	4-Low
St. Peter's Place	NP	02/28/2015	19	PRAC/811	4-Low
Britton Courts	NP	03/31/2015	46	PD/8 Existing	4-Low
Menorah Park	NP	04/30/2015	151	202/8 NC	4-Low
Edith Witt Senior Community	LD	06/30/2015	95	PRAC/202	4-Low
Golden Gate Apartments	PM	07/31/2015	24	LMSA	4-Low
On Lok House	NP	10/31/2015	54	202/8 NC	4-Low
Eastern Park Apts	NP	11/30/2015	201	202/8 NC	2-High
Bernal Gateway Apartments	PM	12/31/2015	18	Pension Fund	4-Low
Heritage Homes	LD	12/31/2015	33	Pension Fund	4-Low
YWCA Apartments, Inc.	NP	12/31/2015	97	202/8 SR	4-Low
Sutter Apartments	PM	01/31/2016	67	Sec 8 NC	2-High
Buchanan Park Apartments	NP	03/31/2016	62	LMSA	4-Low
Eddy Street Apartments	NP	03/31/2017	20	PRAC/811	4-Low
Casa De La Raza	NP	07/31/2017	51	Sec 8 NC	2-High
Notre Dame Plaza	NP	07/31/2017	65	PRAC/202	4-Low
Alcantara Court	NP	05/31/2018	49	PRAC/202	4-Low
Leland Apartments	NP	06/30/2018	24	PRAC/811	4-Low
Western Park Apartments	NP	12/31/2018	114	LMSA	4-Low
Vista Del Monte	PM	01/31/2021	94	LMSA	4-Low
Page/Holloway Apartments	PM	02/03/2021	15	Sec 8 SR	3-Moderate
Thomas Paine Square	NP	05/31/2021	93	LMSA	3-Moderate
Fair Oaks Apartments	PM	07/20/2021	20	HFDA/8 SR	3-Moderate
Padre Apts	NP	07/30/2021	41	HFDA/8 SR	4-Low
Mission Capp Apartments	LD	8/16/21	48	LIHTC	4-Low
Cambridge Hotel	LD	12/31/21	60	LIHTC	4-Low
Coleridge Park Homes	LD	12/31/21	49	LIHTC	4-Low
Padre Palou Apartments	LD	6/30/22	17	LIHTC	4-Low
Steamboat Point Apartments	LD	8/27/22	108	LIHTC	4-Low
Connecticut Street Court	LD	9/30/22	10	LIHTC	4-Low
Jackie Robinson Gardens	LD	12/31/2022	130	LMSA	4-Low
Total Units			2,035		

Source: California Housing Partnership Corporation; San Francisco Planning Department 2014 Housing Element

#### **NOTES**

HUD Scale:

1-Very High	Section 8 expiring within 1 year or mortgage maturing within 1 year owner status and plans unknown
2-High	Section 8 expiring in 2-5 years or mortgage maturing within 2-5 years owner status and plans unknown
3-Mod	Section 8 expiring in 5-10 years or mortgage maturing within 5-10 year owner status and plans unknown
4-Low	
5-None	

### **Does the availability of housing units meet the needs of the population?**

Based on the relatively constant number of homeless persons in San Francisco, the high cost burden for very low-income San Franciscans and the overcrowded conditions, the availability of housing units is not meeting the needs of the population.

### **Describe the need for specific types of housing:**

San Francisco needs to preserve its existing housing stock that serves low-income households, most especially public housing and rent-controlled apartments.

## **Discussion**

### ***Public Housing***

#### **Background**

Established in 1938, the San Francisco Housing Authority (referred to as “the Authority” or SFHA) manages 6,139 units of public housing stock in 48 developments scattered throughout the city. It is the 17<sup>th</sup> largest public housing agencies in the nation and the first one established in California, serving over 31,000 public housing residents and Section 8 participants.

The mission of the San Francisco Housing Authority is to provide safe, sanitary, affordable, and decent housing to very low-income families, senior citizens and persons with disabilities. 2,043 units of the Authority’s public housing portfolio are designated specifically for senior or disabled households, and 3,340 units are designated for families. The Authority houses very low-income families, and without its assistance, many of San Francisco’s residents, who come from many different ethnic backgrounds and who create the city’s unique flavor, would be forced to live elsewhere.

On December 13, 2012, HUD notified SFHA that it has been declared “Troubled” – its lowest classification prior to placing an agency under federal receivership. SFHA has faced significant financial challenges in recent years due to the reduction of federal funding for public housing. In the previous two fiscal years, SFHA’s public housing program experienced a budget shortfall of \$4.0 million and \$2.6 million respectively. In the first five months of the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, the shortfall had already exceeded \$1.7 million.

#### **Physical Needs and Plans**

Some public housing properties are well maintained and in good condition; however, a large number suffer from deferred maintenance and require extensive capital improvements. According to the Housing Authority’s portfolio-wide physical needs assessment, there are \$270 million of immediate maintenance needs across all of its properties. In addition, as noted in the independent audit and

thorough stakeholder input, even before federal sequestration the Housing Authority struggled to provide efficient property management, as evidenced by high vacancy rates, lengthy and expensive unit turnover, and consistently poor response to maintenance requests.

The City of San Francisco is helping to address the physical deterioration of public housing and serve families living in severely dilapidated housing, HOPE SF will build upon the successes of HOPE VI in San Francisco and transform four of San Francisco's most distressed public housing into thriving, mixed income communities. Furthermore, the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development is spearheading the City's efforts to rehabilitate and convert 4,854 public housing units to private ownership and management under HUD's Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) program.

Since the HOPE SF rebuilding process will take years and the RAD conversions for approximately 2,400 existing public housing units will not be complete for at least three years, the City and SFHA will also take steps to address urgent infrastructure and rehabilitation needs at public housing sites. In prior years, MOH, SF Redevelopment Agency, and the SFPUC have partnered with the Housing Authority and invested in repairs that have the greatest effect on safety, security, and health issues impacting their residents' quality of life. Currently MOHCD is providing \$5,396,000 of its Housing Trust Fund and CDBG funds to SFHA to make immediate repairs to elevators in nine senior/disabled buildings, all of which are senior/disabled or high-rise buildings.

Through the HOPE SF and RAD conversions, with City continue its efforts and collaborations with other public and private entities. In part due to these partnerships, SFHA does not expect to lose any public housing units from the inventory.

### ***Rent-Controlled Apartments***

The San Francisco Rent Ordinance became effective June 13, 1979. The Ordinance applies to most rental units built before June 1979, and places limits on rent increases to about 2.2% annually, as well as limiting reasons for tenant evictions. Approximately 170,000 rental units are protected by rent control.

San Francisco's Condominium Conversion Ordinance restricts the number of rental units that can be converted to ownership properties to 200 per year. These controls remain an important feature of the City's ability to retain its rental housing stock for low-income renters, since most rental buildings in San Francisco have a higher market value when converted to single-family homes or condominiums than they do as apartments. Despite protections, the number of rent-controlled units continues to decline, particularly in smaller two-unit buildings that are not subject to condominium conversion controls.

Because many such sites are too small for traditional local financing models (less than 20 units) MOHCD has launched its Small Sites Program for acquisition and rehabilitation of buildings with 2-25 units, including existing group housing or cooperative housing buildings and mixed use buildings with 2-25 units. The program prioritizes buildings where Ellis Act eviction notices have been filed. It aims to maintain an average affordability of 80% of area median income so that existing households earning as low as 40% of AMI and up to 120% of AMI will not be displaced. It also requires affordability covenants be recorded on the properties in perpetuity in order to maintain the housing as affordable since it will no longer be subject to rent control if a government entity such as MOHCD is regulating the rents in the building.

## MA-15 Housing Market Analysis: Cost of Housing - 91.210(a)

### Introduction

San Francisco's housing prices are among the highest in the nation for both renters and homeowners. And despite price declines at year-end 2012, the median home value for a single family home in San Francisco in 2014 exceeded \$973,000, has risen by 15.6% since 2013 and is predicted to rise by another 4.8% within the next year.<sup>105</sup> The median sales price for San Francisco was over 1.4 times the cost of similar housing in the Bay Area and over four times the national average. It is estimated that only 16% of San Francisco's households can afford a median priced home in the City.

### Cost of Housing

**Table 47 – Cost of Housing**

	Base Year: 2000	Most Recent Year: 2011	% Change
Median Home Value	422,700	767,300	82%
Median Contract Rent	883	1,332	51%

Data Source: 2000 Census (Base Year), 2007-2011 ACS (Most Recent Year)

**Table 48 - Rent Paid**

Rent Paid	Number	%
Less than \$500	29,442	13.8%
\$500-999	45,349	21.3%
\$1,000-1,499	51,386	24.1%
\$1,500-1,999	43,180	20.3%
\$2,000 or more	43,507	20.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>212,864</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

### Housing Affordability

**Table 49 – Housing Affordability**

% Units affordable to Households earning	Renter	Owner
30% HAMFI	21,845	No Data
50% HAMFI	46,625	1,590
80% HAMFI	96,075	3,930
100% HAMFI	No Data	6,405
<b>Total</b>	<b>164,545</b>	<b>11,925</b>

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

<sup>105</sup> Zillow, <http://www.zillow.com/san-francisco-ca/home-values/>

**Table 50 – Housing Affordability 2**

Units affordable to Households earning	Renter		Owner	
	# of Units	% of Units	# of Units	% of Units
30% HAMFI	21,845	13.3%	No Data	n/a
50% HAMFI	46,625	28.3%	1,590	13.3%
80% HAMFI	96,075	58.4%	3,930	33.0%
100% HAMFI	No Data	n/a	6,405	53.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>164,545</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>11,925</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

## Monthly Rent

**Table 51 – Monthly Rent**

Monthly Rent (\$)	Efficiency (no bedroom)	1 Bedroom	2 Bedroom	3 Bedroom	4 Bedroom
Fair Market Rent	1,093	1,423	1,795	2,438	2,948
High HOME Rent	1,191	1,334	1,602	1,842	2,035
Low HOME Rent	971	1,040	1,252	1,450	1,620

Data Source: HUD FMR and HOME Rents

## Is there sufficient housing for households at all income levels?

There is insufficient housing for very-low income households as shown on previous Tables 49 and 50.

## How is affordability of housing likely to change considering changes to home values and/or rents?

Housing affordability will get worse should home values increase by another 82% and rents increase by another 51% between now and 2020.

**How do HOME rents / Fair Market Rent compare to Area Median Rent? How might this impact your strategy to produce or preserve affordable housing?**

**Table 52 – Area Median Rent Compared to Fair Market Rent and HOME Rents**

Monthly Rent (\$)	Efficiency (no bedroom)	1 Bedroom	2 Bedroom	3 Bedroom
Market Rent	\$2,341	\$2,934	\$4,214	\$4,018
Fair Market Rent	\$1,093	\$1,423	\$1,795	\$2,438
Ratio Market Rent to FMR	2.14	2.06	2.35	1.65
High HOME Rent	\$1,093	\$1,334	\$1,602	\$1,842
Ratio Market Rent to High HOME Rent	2.14	2.20	2.63	2.18
Low HOME Rent	\$980	\$1,050	\$1,262	\$1,460
Ratio Market Rent to Low HOME Rent	2.39	2.79	3.34	2.75

Source: HUD FMR and HOME Rents; Seifel Consulting

The area median rent is more than 1.5 times to up 3.3 times the Fair Market Rent or Low HOME Rents. The significant price differential only emphasizes the need to construct more affordable rental housing.

**Discussion**

***Rental Housing Market Trends***

San Francisco has one of the highest cost housing markets in the country. Because the City is only 7 miles square, and has scarce undeveloped land, housing is truly at a premium. Furthermore, cultural and culinary attractions, natural beauty, and jobs in highly skilled occupations have drawn a relatively large upper income population to the area. Yet, San Francisco is home to many low-income residents as well as upper-income professionals. In fact, over a quarter of San Francisco’s population is very low-income and earns less than half of the Area Median Income<sup>106</sup> (50% AMI is equivalent to \$34,000/year or \$2,833/month for a single individual). At this income level, market rate rents are out of reach with market rent for a 1 bedroom/ 1 bath apartment at \$2,934. According to HUD, an “affordable” rent should not exceed 30% of a household’s total income. Thus, the affordable rent for a single person earning \$34,000 50% AMI would be \$850, *less than 30%* of the actual market rate rent for a 1 bedroom apartment. Due to the City’s overall high housing costs, San Francisco is predominantly a city of renters- 63% of all households rent<sup>107</sup>. With the economic rebound from the recession, strong job market growth and correlating increase in the demand for housing, rental prices continue to rise.


<sup>106</sup> City and County of San Francisco, San Francisco General Plan Housing Element, 2014

<sup>107</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2012 Five-Year Estimates

## Ownership Housing Market Trends

San Francisco is consistently ranked as one of the most expensive for-sale housing markets in the country. In 2014, San Francisco has an estimated median sale price of \$973,000<sup>108</sup>. While the strength of San Francisco’s housing market is positive in many respects, it also means that few households can afford to buy (see “Lack of Affordability: Ownership Housing” table above). Only 23% of San Francisco households could afford to purchase a home at the median price. In contrast, nationally, 60% of households could afford a home in their area. Many homeowners in San Francisco bought their homes many years ago and could not afford to buy today. For that reason, neighborhoods with high homeownership rates are not necessarily high-income communities. Bayview, Excelsior, and Visitation Valley house many of San Francisco’s lowest-income communities, yet they also have some of the highest homeownership rates in the City. Conversely, some high-income communities such as the Marina and Russian Hill have low ownership rates (Map 4).

**Map 4 – Proportion of Owner Occupied Housing**



<sup>108</sup> Zillow, San Francisco Metro Report, “Current Home Value”, July 2014



## MA-20 Housing Market Analysis: Condition of Housing – 91.210(a)

### Introduction

The City and County of San Francisco housing stock contains a significant amount of units that with one or more conditions that threaten the vitality of its occupants. Renter-occupied households are more likely to live in substandard housing than owner-occupied counterparts. Moreover, 86% of housing units in San Francisco were built prior to 1980 – 71% were built prior to 1950 placing a large portion of aging units at risk for presenting lead-based paint hazards.

### Describe the jurisdiction's definition for "substandard condition" and "substandard condition but suitable for rehabilitation:"

The City and County of San Francisco housing code defines substandard conditions in housing as “any residential building or portion thereof,... in which there exists any condition that endangers the life, limb, health, property, safety or welfare of the public or the occupants thereof shall be deemed and hereby is declared to be a substandard building.” The City and County of San Francisco defines substandard residential buildings suitable for rehabilitation as those buildings that have the ability undergo rehabilitation and eliminate all conditions that endanger the safety and welfare of the public or the building’s occupants.

### Condition of Units

**Table 53 - Condition of Units**

Condition of Units	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Number	%	Number	%
With one selected Condition	48,356	39%	84,132	40%
With two selected Conditions	2,123	2%	11,765	6%
With three selected Conditions	376	0%	3,901	2%
With four selected Conditions	23	0%	617	0%
No selected Conditions	74,624	59%	112,449	53%
<b>Total</b>	<b>125,502</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>212,864</b>	<b>101%</b>

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

### Year Unit Built

**Table 54 – Year Unit Built**

Year Unit Built	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Number	%	Number	%
2000 or later	8,239	7%	11,485	5%
1980-1999	11,661	9%	20,692	10%
1950-1979	25,476	20%	60,118	28%
Before 1950	80,126	64%	120,569	57%
<b>Total</b>	<b>125,502</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>212,864</b>	<b>100%</b>

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

## Risk of Lead-Based Paint Hazard

**Table 55 – Risk of Lead-Based Paint**

Risk of Lead-Based Paint Hazard	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Number	%	Number	%
Total Number of Units Built Before 1980	105,602	84%	180,687	85%
Housing Units build before 1980 with children present	2,325	2%	3,210	2%

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS (Total Units) 2007-2011 CHAS (Units with Children present)

## Vacant Units

**Table 56 - Vacant Units**

	Suitable for Rehabilitation	Not Suitable for Rehabilitation	Total
Vacant Units	TBD	TBD	
Abandoned Vacant Units	TBD	TBD	
REO Properties	TBD	TBD	
Abandoned REO Properties	TBD	TBD	

### **Describe the need for owner and rental rehabilitation based on the condition of the jurisdiction's housing.**

San Francisco's historical architectural and aging housing landscape is susceptible to deteriorating housing conditions. Of the 338,366 housing units, the majority or 85% were built before 1980 and 59% were built before 1950. 45% or 151,293 of San Francisco housing units have one or more conditions that could classify them as substandard housing. The need to provide housing rehabilitation programs to address the substandard conditions of tenant- and owner-occupied housing is not only prevalent today, but will continue to be so for decades to come.

### **Estimate the number of housing units within the jurisdiction that are occupied by low or moderate income families that contain lead-based paint hazards. 91.205(e), 91.405**

While the exact number of housing units that are occupied by low or moderate income families that contain lead-based paint hazards is difficult to define, we can estimate that approximately 50% or 172,464 of households earn less than the area median income of \$73,802. Unable to afford the rising costs of housing, these households have a higher probability of living in more affordable neighborhoods that have a higher occurrence of substandard housing with lead-based paint hazards.

## Discussion

### ***Substandard Housing***

San Francisco has an older housing stock, with 48.8% of all units built before 1940<sup>109</sup>. This is the largest concentration of older housing stock in the State; only 10% of the occupied housing in California was built before 1940.

The exact number of substandard housing units or units needing rehabilitation is difficult to estimate. While the Census asks whether your dwelling has complete kitchen and plumbing facilities, it does not account for other more subtle housing problems, such as inadequate wiring, leaks, or heating. Three different measures are examined in this analysis: lack of kitchen or plumbing facilities, health and building code violations, and presence of lead-based paint.

### ***Health and Building Code Violations***

Health and Building Code violations are another proxy for substandard housing. The Department of Building Inspection tracks violations in the following areas:

- Building Section
- Fire Section
- Interior Surfaces
- Lead Section
- Other Section
- Plumbing and Electrical Section
- Sanitation Section
- Security Requirements
- Smoke Detection

Additionally, the Department of Health tracks violations in the following areas:


- Insanitary (e.g. Accumulation of filth, garbage, debris...)
- Housing (e.g. Standing water on disrepair roof, gutter)
- Food (e.g. Rodents/Roaches/Flies/Other Animals)
- Health Hazards (e.g. Asbestos)

The highest concentration of violations were, again, in those low-income, high density neighborhoods near downtown San Francisco, including Chinatown, Tenderloin, South of Market, the Financial District and part of Bayview/Hunters Point. Data also indicate a high rate of violations in the Inner Mission, Hayes Valley, Upper Market/Castro, Noe Valley and Inner Richmond neighborhoods (Map 6).

---

<sup>109</sup> City and County of San Francisco, San Francisco General Plan Housing Element, 2014

**Map 5 – Rate of Code Violations for Housing and Habitability**



***Buildings At-Risk from Seismic Activity***

Seismic retrofitting is a unique concern in many California cities, including San Francisco. In the early 1990s, there were approximately 400 unreinforced masonry residential hotels and apartment buildings (UMB), most of which are occupied by low-income households. Since then, the City has worked closely with building owners and invested in improvements to ensure they comply with seismic safety requirements. In addition to the unreinforced masonry buildings, much of San Francisco’s multi-unit housing stock built before 1978 is wood-framed construction with soft, weak, or open front wall lines that could cause the building to collapse in an earthquake. This is known as a “soft-story” condition. Like its unreinforced masonry ordinance, San Francisco also passed a mandatory retrofit ordinance requiring buildings with a “soft story” condition must seismically strength their properties by December 31, 2020.

## **MA-25 Public and Assisted Housing – 91.210(b)**

### **Introduction**

The San Francisco Housing Authority's express mission is to "provide safe, sanitary, affordable, and decent housing to very low-income families, senior citizens and persons with disabilities." Founded in 1938, it was the first established housing authority in California, and receives nearly all of its \$225+ million operating income from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and tenant-paid rents. The San Francisco Housing Authority (SFHA; Authority) is overseen by seven citizen commissioners, all of whom are appointed by the Mayor. Two of those commissioners must be current SFHA residents.

In 2012, HUD designated SFHA as a "Troubled" agency, the lowest designation prior to putting an agency under federal receivership (additional detail is provided below). The Authority's primary goal 2015-2020 is to implement its Public Housing Authority Recovery and Sustainability Agreement and Action Plan (PHARS), which it executed on July 1, 2013 with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and the City and County of San Francisco. Successful implementation of the PHARS will remove the Agency's "troubled" status and allow it to continue operation without the threat of receivership.

In addition, SFHA applied for the conversion of 4,585 public housing units under HUD's Rental Assistance Demonstration Program (RAD) in 2013. RAD is a program HUD launched in 2012 as a means of addressing the nation's \$26 billion deferred maintenance backlog and chronic underfunding for these repairs from Congress. SFHA's own capital needs exceed \$300 million. Through RAD, SFHA will transfer ownership of the units to nonprofit-led affordable housing development teams that can access, unlike SFHA, the tax credit equity and debt necessary to rehabilitate the buildings. SFHA expects this conversion and preservation effort to be complete by December 2016. Thereafter, it will function primarily as a Housing Choice Voucher agency, though still providing property management to its remaining public housing portfolio.

## Totals Number of Units

**Table 57 – Total Number of Units by Program Type**

	Program Type								
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers					
				Total	Project-based	Tenant-based	Special Purpose Voucher		
							Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
# of units vouchers available	0	952	6,249	8,016	884	7,132	1,363	0	90
# of accessible units									

\*includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

### Describe the supply of public housing developments:

As stated above, SFHA is currently in the process of converting 4,585 of its public housing units to nonprofit led affordable housing developers for the purposing of accessing resources necessary to rehabilitate and preserve them long-term. The RAD conversion list follows. The bulk of the public housing units remaining after the RAD conversion will be located at Sunnydale-Velasco (785 units), and Potreo Terrace/Potrero Annex (606 units). Note that both Sunnydale and Potrero are “HOPE SF” projects, described in greater detail below.

**Table 58 – Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) Conversion List**

Project Name	AMP	Neighborhood	Total PIC Units	Project type
<b>CHINATOWN</b>				
227 Bay	972	Chinatown	51	Senior
990 Pacific	976	Chinatown	92	Senior
Ping Yuen	972	Chinatown	234	Family
Ping Yuen North	976	Chinatown	200	Mixed
<i>Subtotal</i>			<b>577</b>	
<b>W ADDITION 1</b>				
Robert B. Pitts	988	Western Addition	203	Family
Westside Courts	969	Western Addition	136	Family
<i>Subtotal</i>			<b>339</b>	
<b>W ADDITION 2</b>				
939 Eddy	987	Western Addition	36	Senior
951 Eddy	987	Western Addition	24	Senior

Project Name	AMP	Neighborhood	Total PIC Units	Project type
1750 McAllister	985	Western Addition	97	Senior
Rosa Parks	978	Western Addition	198	Senior
<i>Subtotal</i>			<b>355</b>	
<b>TENDERLOIN/SOMA</b>				
666 Ellis	981	Tenderloin	100	Senior
430 Turk	987	Tenderloin	89	Senior
350 Ellis	981	Tenderloin	96	Senior
320 & 330 Clementina	983	SOMA	276	Senior
<i>Subtotal</i>			<b>561</b>	
<b>BERNAL HEIGHTS</b>				
Holly Courts	966	Bernal	118	Family
Alemanys	966	Bernal	158	Family
<i>Subtotal</i>			<b>276</b>	
<b>MISSION/CASTRO</b>				
25 Sanchez	986	Castro	90	Senior
462 Duboce	986	Castro	42	Senior
255 Woodside	979	Forest Hill	110	Senior
3850 18th St.	982	Mission	107	Senior
Mission Dolores	980	Mission	92	Senior
<i>Subtotal</i>			<b>441</b>	
<b>LOWER PAC HEIGHTS</b>				
1880 Pine	977	Lower Pac Heights	113	Senior
345 Arguello St.	986	Richmond	69	Senior
491 31st	986	Richmond	75	Senior
1760 Bush	977	Lower Pac Heights	108	Senior
Kennedy Towers	984	Lower Pac Heights	98	Senior
2698 California St	984	Lower Pac Heights	40	Senior
<i>Subtotal</i>			<b>503</b>	
<b>SOUTHEAST</b>				
Hunter's Point E/W	973	Southeast	213	Family
Westbrook Apartments	970	Southeast	226	Family
<i>Subtotal</i>			<b>439</b>	
<b>TOTAL PORTFOLIO</b>			<b>3,491</b>	

Project Name	AMP	Neighborhood	Total PIC Units	Project type
Hunters View 1	989	Southeast	54	Family
Hunters View 2A	974	Southeast	54	Family
Alice Griffith 1	975	Southeast	58	Family
Alice Griffith 2	975	Southeast	56	Family
Alice Griffith 3	975	Southeast	76	Family
Hunters View 2B	974	Southeast	39	Family
<b>TOTAL HOPE SF</b>			<b>337</b>	
Project Name	AMP	Neighborhood	Total PIC Units	Project type
Plaza East	963	Western Addition	193	Family
Bernal Dwellings	962	Bernal/ Mission	160	Family
Hayes Valley North	960	Western Addition	51	Family
Halley Valley South	961	Western Addition	66	Family
North Beach	990	North Beach	138	Family
Valencia Gardens	991	Mission	148	Family
<b>TOTAL HOPE VI</b>			<b>756</b>	
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>			<b>4,584</b>	

**Describe the number and physical condition of public housing units in the jurisdiction, including those that are participating in an approved Public Housing Agency Plan:**

As previously described, the physical condition of the SFHA portfolio demands that SFHA take advantage of HUD’s new Rental Assistance Demonstration program in order to access the resources necessary to preserve the housing, given the chronic underfunding of public housing agencies across the country by Congress. Units converted under RAD will permanently leave the public housing stock and will function as permanently affordable housing owned by private, tax credit limited partnerships.

In addition, SFHA and the City are collaborating on the best means to preserve the City’s largest public housing developments, Sunnydale and Potrero. These sites are included in the City’s ambitious HOPE SF



program, a broad-based, public-private partnership lead by the San Francisco Mayor's Office that brings together an array of stakeholders to engage with residents and provide resources that can interrupt the cycle of poverty for some of the most isolated and neglected communities within the City. The HOPE SF active public housing sites are:

- Hunters View (267 public housing units)
- Alice Griffith (256 public housing units)
- Potrero Terrace and Annex (606 public housing units)
- Sunnydale-Velasco (785 public housing units)

At its core, HOPE SF is an anti-poverty and housing development initiative that requires the complete demolition and rebuilding of the public housing in its portfolio. Through intensive community and economic development, combined with comprehensive resident service supports, HOPE SF seeks to reintegrate these long-isolated public housing communities with the City and to connect HOPE SF families with all the opportunities the City has to offer. The housing development-related work is carried out by the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), in coordination with the San Francisco Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII). Each site has a community building and service connection partnership through community-based organizations that provide activities and services on site.

The status of the individual HOPE SF sites follows:

#### **Hunters View**

The replacement of Hunters View's 267 public housing units is currently underway. The new mixed-income community will include 745 homes, comprised of 1:1 public housing replacement units, 86 new affordable units, and 392 market rate units, of which 22 will be BMR ownership units. While the Hunters View site has stunning views due to its very steep terrain, this site condition has made design and planning very difficult and the site's new infrastructure particularly expensive. The benefits of this investment are many, however. Hunters View's new streets will connect it with the broader Bayview neighborhood for the first time. Eased access to the Third Street Muni rail line, bus transit, and community services should enhance day-to-day life for all Hunters View residents.

#### **Alice Griffith**

Alice Griffith's revitalization will commence in January 2015. The development program includes the 1:1 replacement of 256 public housing units, 248 new affordable units, and 706 market-rate units, providing 1,210 new units overall. Like Hunters View, Alice Griffith's redevelopment benefits from the ability to temporarily relocate families on site while construction is underway, thus avoiding disruptive off-site relocation. And Alice Griffith enjoys the additional benefit of a \$30.5 million Choice Neighborhoods Initiative grant from HUD, awarded to help transform the housing and broader neighborhood and provide meaningful supportive services to residents.

#### **Potrero Terrace and Potrero Annex**

The steady growth of the Potrero Hill neighborhood's affluence and prosperity over the years has not improved conditions at Potrero Terrace and Potrero Annex. Crumbling infrastructure, disconnected streets, and the dilapidated housing stock at the sites have preserved conditions of poverty. The Potrero revitalization program anticipates 1,600 new units, including 606 public housing replacement units, an additional 385 new affordable housing units, and 609 new market rate or workforce housing units. The development will include new streets, new parks, and a new community facility as well as community-serving retail.

**Sunnydale-Velasco**

Sunnydale-Velasco’s 785 public housing units are spread over 50 hillside acres in an isolated corner of Visitacion Valley. The magnitude of the Sunnydale site amplifies its disconnectedness and infrastructure needs. The newly envisioned Sunnydale will include the replacement of its public housing units, 307 new affordable units, and 645 market rate units, together totaling 1,651 new units. New community facilities, parks, community gardens and an orchard, and new retail will enhance the housing revitalization plan.

In total, the City’s HOPE SF initiative will replace 1,828 public housing units, add 1,102 new affordable housing units serving low- and very-low income households, and provide 2,316 workforce units for sale and for rent. HOPE SF’s reimagining of the sites’ current conditions offers paths out of poverty and new opportunities for current and future generations of residents. While HOPE SF’s full build-out will take multiple phases and many years, the benefits of its success to the City as a whole should far exceed the investment.

**Public Housing Condition**

**Table 59 – Public Housing Condition**

Public Housing Development	Average Inspection Score
TBD	TBD

**Describe the restoration and revitalization needs of public housing units in the jurisdiction:**

See the information provided above regarding the Rental Assistance Demonstration and HOPE SF restoration and revitalization efforts currently underway.

**Describe the public housing agency's strategy for improving the living environment of low- and moderate-income families residing in public housing:**

See the information provided above regarding the Rental Assistance Demonstration and HOPE SF restoration and revitalization efforts currently underway. This work will have a truly transformative effect on the living environments of low- and moderate-income families now residing in public housing. In addition, at all RAD and HOPE SF sites, new developer-owners will provide new supportive services that will include case management and community building activities. Areas of emphasis will include health and wellness (including mental health), educational needs, and social interactions.

**Discussion:**

Please see above.

## MA-30 Homeless Facilities and Services – 91.210(c)

### Introduction

Homelessness locks people into an unhealthy crisis mode of existence, making it difficult for them to regain their health, effectively engage in mental health and substance abuse treatment, and address education and skill gaps that limit their ability to access decent employment. The result is often repeated cycling between shelters, emergency rooms, detoxification centers, and jails – using up precious public service dollars without producing positive outcomes. In order to break this damaging and costly cycle and to help people to end their homelessness, once and for all, the City needs an adequate supply of permanent affordable housing. Such housing provides people with an essential base of stability and security that facilitates their efforts to address the issues that undermine their ability to maintain housing, improve health and well-being, and maximize self-sufficiency and their ability to contribute to the community.

This housing must be deeply subsidized so that it is affordable to people who have extremely low incomes, 0-30% of the area median income (AMI). In addition, for many people who are homeless, in particular those who are repeatedly homeless and/or suffering from a disabling condition, the housing must be linked with services. This model is known as “permanent supportive housing” and it ensures that people have access to the full array of health, mental health, addiction, benefits, employment and other services they need to achieve long-term residential stability.

Permanent supportive housing is a nationally-recognized practice that has been shown to be effective: About three quarters of those who enter supportive housing stay for at least two years, and about half retain the housing for three to five years.<sup>110</sup> In addition, a study of two programs in San Francisco found that people in supportive housing have lower service costs, with a 57% reduction in emergency room visits and a 45% reduction in inpatient admissions.<sup>111</sup>

Strategies to enhance the City’s supply of affordable permanent housing and permanent supportive housing for homeless people must include: 1) development of new deeply subsidized units by both non-profit and for-profit developers; 2) enhancing access to existing housing through subsidies, master-leasing and making tenant selection criteria more flexible; and 3) preservation of existing units.

All permanent housing and permanent supportive housing units ideally will meet the following criteria: each unit has a place to sleep, a place to cook, a bathroom; residents have rights of tenancy; buildings and units are designed to ensure universal accessibility; buildings and units meet codes for safety; rental rates do not exceed 30% of the tenant’s income; for permanent supportive housing, the unit is linked to voluntary and flexible support services that meet the needs and preferences of the tenant so the tenant remains housed (in that or another unit).

---

<sup>110</sup> Wong Yi, Hadley TR, Culhane DP, Poulin SR, Davis MR, Cirksey BA, Brown JL. Predicting Staying or Leaving in Permanent Supportive Housing that Serves Homeless People with Serious Mental Illness. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research, Washington DC. March 2006. and Lipton, F.R., Siegel, C., Hannigan, A., et al. Tenure in supportive housing for homeless persons with severe mental illness. *Psychiatric Services* 51(4): 479-486, 2000.

<sup>111</sup> Martinez T and Burt M. Impact of Permanent Supportive Housing on the use of Acute Health Care Services by Homeless Adults. *Psychiatric Services*, Vol.57, No. 7, July 2006.

Not all current permanent housing and permanent supportive housing units meet the above criteria and to bring these units up to this standard would, in many cases, be cost prohibitive, spatially impossible or otherwise unfeasible. Yet those units provide needed and valuable housing resources to the people residing in those buildings. However at a minimum, all permanent housing and permanent supportive housing units should afford the resident the right to tenancy and comply with codes for safety. New and renovated permanent housing units should comply with all of the criteria.

### Facilities and Housing Targeted to Homeless Households

**Table 60 – Facilities and Housing Targeted to Homeless Households**

	Emergency Shelter Beds		Transitional Housing Beds	Permanent Supportive Housing Beds	
	Year Round Beds (Current & New)	Voucher / Seasonal / Overflow Beds	Current & New	Current & New	Under Development
Households with Adult(s) and Child(ren)	391		297	1,648	232
Households with Only Adults	1,268	60	278	5,312	75
Chronically Homeless Households				3,834	Included in all other homeless categories
Veterans	56		198	660	100
Unaccompanied Youth	60		35	79	54

### Describe mainstream services, such as health, mental health, and employment services to the extent those services are used to complement services targeted to homeless persons

Ending homelessness requires enhanced efforts to ensure that all homeless people are linked to the service system and are receiving the assistance they need to access and maintain housing. Some homeless people, including those who are chronically homeless, are reluctant to interact with the service system. This can be the result of previous negative experiences in requesting assistance; alienation from having lived on the margins of society for an extended period of time; or fear and paranoia, often symptoms of untreated mental illness or addiction. Mobile, multi-disciplinary outreach teams have proven to be effective at engaging this population. They bring basic services directly to clients in a non-threatening way, and over time encourage and assist in linking them with housing, treatment and other services. Similarly, community drop-in or Resource Centers offer a low demand environment, providing a place to get off the street and address basic needs. When clients are ready, drop-in centers can provide linkages to housing, treatment and other services. Resource Centers also play a critical safety net role in supporting those who are homeless on the streets, in shelters or in unsubsidized housing in private SRO hotels. Under the City CHANGES system of shelter reservations, Resource Centers are the primary access to the City’s single adult shelter system. In addition, they play the dual role of outreach/engagement and wraparound services provider within the very communities in which people reside, offering community space and support while affordable housing becomes available.

Outreach services, community drop-in/Resource Centers need to be expanded in order to better facilitate engagement of people who are chronically homeless or reluctant to access services and as important vehicles to promoting housing stability.

Wrap-Around Support Services: Most people who are homeless not only need housing but access to services to foster ongoing housing stability, improved health and maximum self-sufficiency. Depending on the individual, these services may be transitional, needed just long enough to help respond to the immediate crisis, or they may be needed on an ongoing, long-term basis. In all cases, the services should be: focused on and linked to either obtaining or maintaining housing; comprehensive so they address the full range of needs; individualized to meet the particular needs of each client; and integrated so that care is provided in a coordinated manner that facilitates maximum effectiveness. This is what is meant by “wraparound” care. Clients are provided all the services they need to support housing acquisition and ongoing retention through an integrated approach. This includes case management; health care; mental health services; substance abuse treatment; legal services; benefits advocacy; education, training and employment services; life skills and others.

Strategies to facilitate the provision of wrap-around care for people experiencing homelessness and to prevent recurrence of homelessness must include expanding the accessibility and availability of treatment and support services; enhancing cross-system and cross-agency service integration; improving homeless access to mainstream services and benefits; and ensuring that all service provision prioritizes housing acquisition and retention.

For some programs, non-clinical treatment services can be offered in temporarily subsidized, leased housing units, occupied by a single family or individual. The individual in the treatment program is offered housing for the duration of the program, and also offered the opportunity to convert his or her temporary occupancy to a tenancy through arrangement with the program organizer. Linkages to permanent housing are improved when the client is given the opportunity to “transition-in-place” from the treatment program into the housing by assuming the lease and rental obligation to the landlord post-treatment.

**List and describe services and facilities that meet the needs of homeless persons, particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth. If the services and facilities are listed on screen SP-40 Institutional Delivery Structure or screen MA-35 Special Needs Facilities and Services, describe how these facilities and services specifically address the needs of these populations.**

San Francisco has a broad network of homeless providers offering emergency shelter, transitional housing, employment services, legal services, food, veteran’s services, medical services, financial assistance, eviction prevention services, and assistance with alcohol and drug dependency.

The City supports a number of emergency shelters that serve homeless single youth and adults. Currently eight shelters offer a total of 305 beds for women and 829 beds for men, for a total of 1134 beds. In addition, the City supports family shelters at six locations for a total of 59 families as well as a number of one-night beds and sixty-day beds for families. The City also supports organizations that provide transitional housing to help homeless individuals move from the street to permanent housing. Clients using transitional housing may stay in the housing for six months to two years and receive

intensive services such as education, job training and placement, substance abuse counseling, parenting classes and child care services. They usually pay 30 percent of their income for services and housing.

Project Homeless Connect/Everyday Connect serves as a central site of referral for all homeless individuals and families. It works directly with those seeking services, as well as with case managers & staff from other agencies, to make connections to those often hard-to-access resources, services & goods that can provide additional or necessary ingredients for a successful move out of homelessness, transition into housing, or avoidance of housing loss. It connects individuals and families to comprehensive social & medical services & other supportive services. These services include: vision, hearing, dental, general medical, mental health, addiction treatment & recovery services, harm reduction programs, self-help programs, food, clothing, computer access & classes, transportation, employment services, Medi-Cal, SSI, SSDI, income assistance & other financial services.

Larkin Street Youth Services provides shelter and transitional housing specifically for unaccompanied children and youth, while Swords for Plowshares offers specific homeless services designed for veterans. The City also provides the Homeward Bound program, which is designed to help reunite homeless persons living in San Francisco with family and friends willing and able to offer ongoing support to end the cycle of homelessness. Through the Homeward Bound Program, the Human Services Agency can provide homeless individuals with a bus ticket home if the individual is homeless/low income and living in San Francisco; has family or friends at the destination that Homeward Bound staff can verify as willing and able to provide you a place to stay and ongoing support; is medically stable enough to travel unassisted to the destination; and is sober and able to abstain from alcohol or using other substances en route.

## MA-35 Special Needs Facilities and Services – 91.210(d)

### Introduction

With the adoption of the 10 Year Plan to End Chronic Homelessness in 2004, San Francisco launched an ambitious supportive housing development program to create 3,000 new units for the chronically homeless within a 10 year period. The focus on permanent supportive housing encompasses various special need populations with wrap around service supports to stabilize residents who have faced long-term homelessness. By December 2014, just over 3,000 units will have come on line which provide specialized housing and services to single person households, families, seniors, frail seniors, veterans, transition age youth, persons with HIV / AIDS, and people with serious mental illness. While San Francisco successfully met the target production goal of 3,000 units from this plan, there remains a significant need for permanent supportive housing across diverse populations. During the period of 2015-2020, San Francisco will build on successful models to continue creating new permanent supportive housing units.

### HOPWA Assistance Baseline Table

**Table 61 – HOPWA Assistance Baseline**

Type of HOPWA Assistance	Number of Units Designated or Available for People with HIV/AIDS and their families
TBRA	317
PH in facilities	175
STRMU	117
ST or TH facilities	43
PH placement	28

Data Source: HOPWA CAPER and HOPWA Beneficiary Verification Worksheet

**Including the elderly, frail elderly, persons with disabilities (mental, physical, developmental), persons with alcohol or other drug addictions, persons with HIV/AIDS and their families, public housing residents and any other categories the jurisdiction may specify, and describe their supportive housing needs**

***Elderly and Frail Elderly*** - Much of the elderly population in San Francisco need a range of community based services, i.e. social, physical, mental health, case management, chronic disease management, supportive housing, and other services that assist people to remain living in the community.

Community-based long term care services include: in-home supportive services; home health care; adult day services; paratransit services; home-delivered meals; supportive services in a hotel; care in residential care facilities, including board and care and assisted living; and other health and social services. Long term care and supportive services can be provided in home and community-based settings, as well as in institutional settings, depending on need and choice.

**Elderly with Dementia** – According to research conducted for San Francisco’s *20/20 Foresight Strategies in Excellence in Dementia Care Report*, San Francisco is facing a crisis in dementia care. In the Bay Area, one out of every two people 85+ has some type of dementia. Between now and 2020, San Francisco will experience a dramatic increase in the number of its citizens with Alzheimer’s disease and other dementing illnesses. Between 2010 and 2030, there will be a 49% increase in the number of people with Alzheimer’s related dementias (from 23,445 to 34,837). This does not include the increase in the number of people with other forms of dementia and mild cognitive impairment (MCI). Many of the San Francisco residents entering the world of cognitive impairment and dementia need supportive housing with access to treatment, care and services.

**Persons with Disabilities** – As described in Section NA-10, there is a significant need for affordable housing and permanent supportive housing for adults with disabilities. Since 2005 the estimated number of San Franciscans reporting any disability has been fairly stable at approximately 90,000 people. According to the 2009 ACS estimates, San Francisco was home to almost 34,500 younger adults with at least one disability (6.4% of the population 18-59) and 54,100 seniors 60+ (35%). Disabilities occur at a higher rate within the senior population, and disability rates generally increase with age. Types of disability differ by age. Among younger adults, cognitive and ambulatory difficulties are the most common. Among older adults, the most commonly reported functional limitation is difficulty with walking, followed by difficulty in living independently.

Disability affects people across the income spectrum, but those who are disabled are more than twice as likely as their non-disabled counterparts to live below the federal poverty line (23% vs. 10%). Those who have a disability are also less likely to have a college education than those without a disability (46% vs. 76%) and less likely to be employed (18% vs. 70%). They are more likely to be low-income, as more than half of San Franciscans with a disability earn less than \$25,000 a year, compared to only a third of those without a disability.

A disproportionate number of homeless persons in San Francisco are disabled. According to San Francisco’s 2011 homeless count, more than half of all homeless persons interviewed reported a disabling condition, including:

- 30% reporting a physical disability;
- 28%, a serious mental illness; and
- 5% HIV/AIDS.

Seniors and younger adults with disabilities who are homeless share many of the same needs and challenges. For example, tending to health care needs may become less of a priority when scrambling each day for shelter and food. It may be difficult to sequence the steps necessary to gain basic access to services when suffering from mental illness or dementia.

**Persons with HIV / AIDS and Families** – As described in Section NA-45, supportive housing for people living with HIV/AIDS includes non-profit owned housing developed with HOPWA funding; master-leased housing in properties leased by the City and County of San Francisco from private owners; and set-aside units in nonprofit owned affordable housing that are funded by a specific City-funded source and reserved for the clients served by that funding source. In non-profit owned housing, the dedicated HOPWA units are part of larger developments with a mixture of funding sources and populations served. In the case of Derek Silva Community, the entire building is dedicated to PLWHA. In master leased-housing, supportive housing programs have been established in these properties that are funded



through either DPH or HSA. In set-aside units, for example, the DAH Program provides operating support to units in exchange for reserving them for DAH-eligible clients.

RCFCIs are state-licensed facilities for individuals who require 24-hour support, including assistance with daily living activities such as bathing and dressing. At intake, residents must demonstrate medical necessity in order to be eligible for a RCFCI referral. While most RCFCI programs are considered to be permanent housing, some short-term transitional referrals are available.

**Transitional Age Youth** - Children and youth make up 25% of the homeless population in San Francisco. Each year, 5,700 12-24 year olds are homeless, marginally housed or at risk of homelessness. Young people in San Francisco face significant challenges accessing affordable and safe housing. They often do not know what is available; they also face prohibitive eligibility restrictions, long wait lists, and a lack of affordable options in safe neighborhoods.

### **Describe programs for ensuring that persons returning from mental and physical health institutions receive appropriate supportive housing**

To maximize the efficacy of its hospital discharge planning, the Department of Public Health funds a Medical Respite and Sobering Center in partnership with Community Awareness & Treatment Services. The Center provides approximately 60 respite beds (collocated with a 12-bed sobering center), and temporary housing with medically oriented support services for medically frail, homeless persons leaving San Francisco General Hospital or other clinics. The Center also includes a full-service kitchen that provides three hot meals per day and prepares special menus for any dietary needs of the clients. Medical respite episodes provide an important alternative to costly emergency care and also link individuals to longer-term residential options.

San Francisco's Diversion and Community Integration Program is an innovative model that brings together the City's resources and experts to divert individuals who are discharged from San Francisco's public skilled nursing facility (Laguna Honda), providing them the support and access to housing they need to live independently. The program is administered by a core group of City department and community-based experts who provide access to housing and services. In the roughly six years since the Diversion and Community Integration Program was created, it has managed the discharge and long-term care of over seven hundred fragile San Franciscans. Of these, 38% were provided with City-funded specialized housing. Program clients retained housing at a rate of 76%.<sup>112</sup>

### **Specify the activities that the jurisdiction plans to undertake during the next year to address the housing and supportive services needs identified in accordance with 91.215(e) with respect to persons who are not homeless but have other special needs. Link to one-year goals. 91.315(e)**

**TAY Housing Plan** – The San Francisco TAY Housing Plan has identified Transition Age Youth as a priority population in need of supportive housing. The plan calls for the development of multiple housing models for TAY, including TAY-only buildings, mixed buildings with other populations, scattered-site housing, shared apartment living, and transitional housing. Community-based service organizations

---

<sup>112</sup> San Francisco Human Services Agency, San Francisco's Ten Year Plan to End Chronic Homelessness: Anniversary Report Covering 2004 to 2014

provide direct services and supports to assist youth in accessing and maintaining housing, with the goal of helping TAY develop the skills necessary to maintain and/or successfully exit housing assistance. Over the next year, San Francisco will endeavor to bring 24 units for homeless TAY on line, and bring another 30 units for homeless TAY in predevelopment.

**Long Term Care Integration Strategic Plan** – With the development of California’s Coordinated Care Initiative (CCI), the state has begun the process of integrating health care and supportive social services while looking to reduce escalating health care costs. In preparation to meet this goal, the Long Term Care Coordinating Council, in collaboration with the Department of Aging and Adult Services, appointed the Long Term Care Integration Design group to explore the potential for long term care integration in San Francisco and to determine what is required to improve the provision of long term services and supports that will benefit older adults and adults with disabilities. Implementation of the LTCI Strategic Plan will result in improvements in San Francisco’s overall system for delivering long term support services for the benefit of all older adults and adults with disabilities in San Francisco. Critical objectives are to strengthen collaboration among county departments, including the Department of Aging and Adult Services, Human Service Agency, and the Dept. of Public Health, and among the three managed care plans, as well as improve access to long term services and supports for seniors and people with disabilities.

**2020 Foresight: Strategy for Excellence in Dementia Care** – was published in December 2009 with recommendations to address the growing crisis in dementia care and an economic analysis of that care. The goals and objectives are designed to improve outcomes for people with dementia through the identification of gaps and ways to address them by improving awareness, detection, and early Intervention.

**For entitlement/consortia grantees: Specify the activities that the jurisdiction plans to undertake during the next year to address the housing and supportive services needs identified in accordance with 91.215(e) with respect to persons who are not homeless but have other special needs. Link to one-year goals. (91.220(2))**

#### ***HIV/AIDS Housing 5-Year Plan***

##### **Goal 1: Maintain current supply of housing/facilities dedicated to supporting PLWHA**

- Strategy 1A: Focus HOPWA funds on operating and service costs
  - Objective 1Ai: Continued effective operation of all HOPWA-funded facilities
- Strategy 1B: The City (joint effort between MOHCD and other City agencies) will work with providers to identify alternative funding sources for capital improvements
  - Objective 1Bi: General Funds allocated to capital improvements as a result of joint advocacy efforts
  - Objective 1Bii: Increased number of providers, supported by technical assistance through MOHCD, have Capital Needs Assessments that can be used for capital campaigns or other private fundraising efforts
  - Objective 1Biii: Biannual assessment of usage of HIV/AIDS housing funds

##### **Goal 2: Increase supply of housing/facilities dedicated to supporting PLWHA**

- Strategy 2A: Expand available supportive housing through a master lease or scattered site models, or by subsidizing operating cost of units in new developments
  - Objective 2Ai: Clear understanding of the cost-effectiveness of various housing strategies, such as building permanent affordable housing compared to providing subsidies for existing housing
  - Objective 2Aii: Complete analysis to identify how much new housing is required to meet the needs of PLWHA
  - Objective 2Aiii: New resources secured to support increased housing/facilities (e.g. state programs, Prop 41)
  - Objective 2Aiv: At least one HIV/AIDS agency serves as an access point for HSA-funded housing programs
  
- Strategy 2B: Explore and conduct cost modeling for creative approaches to increasing housing supply
  - Objective 2Bi: Plan with recommendations about additional creative approaches to pursue (based on progress made on Strategy 2A) is produced by December 2016; plan should ensure that no proposed approaches contribute to unwanted displacement of PLWHA populations
  - Objective 2Bii: City and communities work together to link communities to existing rental subsidy programs based on needs they have identified (look at San Mateo County model for guidance)

**Goal 3: Increase resources available for subsidizing/making & keeping housing more affordable for PLWHA**

- Strategy 3A: Revisit the balance of deep vs. shallow rental subsidies (including eligibility criteria for both) to ensure maximum efficiency of these resources
  - Objective 3Ai: Explore the concept of replacing ‘shallow’ and ‘deep’ subsidies with a single category of long term, need-based subsidies that vary based on eligibility criteria
  - Objective 3Aii: Deep subsidies are maintained for current recipients
  - Objective 3Aiii: Shallow subsidies targeted at situations where it will prevent homelessness (can’t pay rent due to a short-term income loss, etc.)
  - Objective 3Aiv: Explore the possibility of offering flexible, long-term subsidies to people timing out of disability benefits
  - Objective 3Av: New resources identified for subsidies (e.g. federal funds, foundation grants, etc.)
  - Objective 3Avi: Examine how rental subsidies can be coordinated with affordable housing programs to ensure people don’t lose their affordable housing
  
- Strategy 3B: Expand emergency eviction prevention assistance programs (e.g., legal assistance, one-time back rent payment, one-time/short-term tenant-based shallow subsidies [e.g. RADCO, Glide], and/or temporary rent payment during residential and/or medical treatment)
  - Objective 3Bi: Data on potential and/or cost-effectiveness of subsidy for rapid re-housing
  - Objective 3Bii: Increased access to money management services/support
  
- Strategy 3C: Maximize leverage of other housing support resources (e.g. VA, HSA, etc.)

- Objective 3Ci: Increased capacity of case managers/intake personnel to identify and/or provide access to other housing support resources

**Goal 4: Expanded access to services for PLWHA that help increase housing stability**

- Strategy 4A: Increase access to mental health/substance abuse services in housing settings
  - Objective 4Ai: Increased availability of housing options with supportive services for individuals with mental health and/or addiction comorbidities
  - Objective 4Aii: Improve capacity/effectiveness of existing support services providers
  - Objective 4Aiii: Increased availability of roving mental health/substance abuse services for housing settings
- Strategy 4B: Increase access to aging services for PLWHA
  - Objective 4Bi: Increased collaboration/coordination with aging services providers (including DAAS)
- Strategy 4C: Increase access to other needed services for PLWHA (education, job training/placement, medical, etc.)
  - Objective 4Ci: Increased availability of roving support services
  - Objective 4Cii: Increased flexibility of services targeted at PLWHA
  - Objective 4Ciii: Increased Targeted Case Management available for youth LWHA

**Goal 5: Improved efficiency and quality of the housing and service delivery system**

- Strategy 5A: Increase mobility between levels of care to ensure optimum resource utilization
  - Objective 5Ai: Recommendations produced by December 2015 about redesign of RCFCLs to serve those for whom they are licensed (should address elderly populations)
  - Objective 5Aii: Transition and exits options for residents of RCFIs are financially feasible and include appropriate support services (e.g. needs-based rental subsidies and case management)
- Strategy 5B: Create and operationalize a coordinated intake & referral system and case management system for housing and related support services
  - Objective 5Bi: Improved consistency in status definitions for service eligibility across agencies and providers
  - Objective 5Bii: Improved functionality of the City's short-term rental subsidies (e.g. move-in grants)
- Strategy 5C: Improve and continually execute interdepartmental coordination with respect to advocacy for federal policy improvements on behalf of PLWHA
  - Objective 5Ci: Continue and/or solidify efforts to adjust FMR in San Francisco
  - Objective 5Cii: Re-allocation of funding formula for HOPWA to include high cost of housing in the formula; and maintain local control wherever possible
- Strategy 5D: Ensure services and resources are culturally competent for emerging populations
  - Objective 5Di: Resources are available for undocumented immigrants and/or asylum seekers
  - Objective 5Dii: Increased access to bilingual case managers

- Objective 5Diii: Increased capacity of providers to understand needs and cultural preferences of immigrants from different parts of the world
- Strategy 5E: Improve coordination between efforts within the City of San Francisco designed to support PLWHA
  - Objective 5Ei: public housing developments are accessible to PLWHA

## MA-40 Barriers to Affordable Housing – 91.210(e)

### Describe any Negative Effects of Public Policies on Affordable Housing and Residential Investment

#### *Barriers to Affordable Housing Production*

Developing housing in San Francisco is an expensive endeavor and a complex and lengthy process. Factors including high land and construction costs, scarce developable parcels, protracted entitlement and permitting processes, and organized opposition from neighbors pose real obstacles to developing market rate or affordable housing in San Francisco.

Barriers to construction of affordable housing include:

- Strong housing demand, leading to high land values and the ability of property owners to command high land sale prices and lack of available land
- High construction costs
- Lengthy permitting process, due in part to environmental review and resident concerns over growth

**High Land Costs and Lack of Available Land:** San Francisco is a peninsula of only 48.8 square miles. It has an established, relatively dense development pattern and is considered by many to be substantially built-out. While there are parcels of land still potentially available for development, San Francisco's tight land market increases pressures on land values. Both market-rate and affordable housing developers have reported to departments in San Francisco city government that acquiring land for housing San Francisco is a challenge. The heightened values of land make some of the land identified as a potential housing site infeasible for actual housing development, especially housing affordable to lower income households. San Francisco's finite supply of land, coupled with strong development pressure, means that land-owners can expect high prices for parcels they own, if they choose to sell for housing development at all.

**High Construction Costs:** In addition to high land costs, other direct costs of building new housing – the cost of labor, of construction materials and contractor fees – continue to escalate. Steep construction costs are generally seen as a major constraint on housing development and especially impacts affordability. In 2013, total development cost for an average two-bedroom condominium totaling 800 sq. ft. was about \$469,800 a unit or \$587 per square foot. Table 71 below breaks down these costs. Specific site conditions may also add to the cost of new housing construction. For example, building demolition may be required with the reuse of a site; toxic waste remediation needed to mitigate chemical contamination in some former industrial sites; or increased foundation costs in potentially seismically unstable soils.

**Table 62 – Estimated Multi-Family Housing Development Costs Per Unit, San Francisco, 2013**

<b>Cost Categories</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<b>% of Total Costs</b>
Land Cost	\$120,000	25.50%
Building Construction at \$300 per sq. ft.	\$240,000	51.10%
Permits, city fees and professional service fees at 20% of construction costs	\$48,000	10.20%
Subsidy to build below-market rate units (12% of total units) based on a \$200,000 per unit subsidy for a year, divided by the remaining 88 market-rate units	\$27,000	5.70%
Selling expenses	\$34,800	7.40%
<b>TOTAL DEVELOPMENT COST</b>	<b>\$469,800</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>Total Cost per Square Foot (Average Net Unit Size: 800 sq. ft.)</b>	<b>\$587.25</b>	

SOURCE: San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association (SPUR)

Note: San Francisco Housing Cost Calculation Per Unit for a 100-Unit Building. This is very simplified and does not include construction-financing expenses, contingencies or developer's profit, among other things. Calculations are based on a 100 unit building assuming 800 square feet per unit, which is approximately 640 square feet of usable space based on typical building efficiency.

**Governmental Constraints:** Housing production in San Francisco is affected by a number of governmental regulations, from local policies and codes to state and federal land use regulations and state environmental laws. These regulatory controls have been carefully crafted over time to balance citywide needs and address public concerns. These regulations were established to be consistent with the San Francisco's General Plan priorities to conserve and protect existing housing and neighborhood character. They also regulate new development to be compatible with and not detrimental to the area with respect to size, shape, traffic and its generated noise, open space and urban design requirements. The time required to administer and approve projects can add to the cost of housing production. But without these standards, an even greater check on new housing construction could result from public opposition to new development. Addressing these constraints must be balanced against other citywide needs and will also be tempered by public concerns. Most of San Francisco's existing regulations were established to be consistent with the San Francisco's General Plan priorities to conserve and protect existing housing and neighborhood character, regulating development to be compatible with neighborhood character, and not detrimental to the area with respect to size, shape, traffic and its generated noise, open space and urban design requirements. Impacts of local governmental regulations on residential development can be addressed by local housing policy.

**Overcoming Barriers**

Building anything new requires extensive local review and approval processes to ensure that the final structure is safe, respects the neighborhood context, serves community needs and meets environmental standards. From start to finish, the typical development process can take anywhere from three to five years.

Recognizing the need to increase efficiency and help developers better navigate approval processes, Mayor Lee issued Executive Directive 13-01 on December 18, 2013. It ordered all City departments that have the legal authority over the permitting or mapping of new or existing housing to prioritize in their administrative work plans the construction and development of all net new housing including

permanently affordable housing. Mayor Lee formed a Working Group of the City's Departments Heads, which will have three primary tasks:

- Make recommendations to the Mayor for City policies and administrative actions to preserve and promote rental housing in San Francisco;
- Require the Planning Commission to consider Discretionary Review hearings when a loss of housing is proposed; and,
- Create an advisory body to City departments when permitting authority to create a clearinghouse for code compliance checks for buildings that are being withdrawn from the rental market under the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance or a Notice of Intent to Withdraw units from the residential market.

The Working Group met over a two-month period and developed the following responses to each of the three Executive Directive tasks.

- **Tasks 1 and 2:** Thirteen short-term, administrative changes that will speed review of new housing permits; retain existing, habitable units; and encourage private parties to build more housing, consistent with San Francisco's General Plan.
- **Task 3:** Two short-term measures will ensure that the Rent Board will be able to inform tenants about their rights to habitable units and that the City is routinely checking on existing compliance as units transition under Rent Ordinance Sections 37.9(a)(8-10, 13).

#### **Task 1: Recommendations to the Mayor**

There are general process-improvement changes Planning and DBI could make to facilitate the production of affordable units and the retention of existing units. These changes include the following:

1. **Priority Processing.** Revise the Planning Director's Bulletin Number Two to prioritize 100% affordable housing projects, followed by projects with at least 20% on-site or 30% off-site affordable housing, as the Planning Department's highest priority. Market-rate housing projects will be prioritized based on how the Project intends to satisfy its inclusionary affordable housing obligation. Priority will be based on the project's proportion of affordable units produced – either on-site or off-site. The Planning Department will revise the Affidavit for Compliance with the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program to indicate that if an affordable housing project is seeking priority processing, the Affidavit for Compliance must be completed and submitted in conjunction with the filing of the Environmental Evaluation Application, entitlement, or Building Permit Application (whichever is filed first). Also, revise administrative policies for priority project review currently contained in DBI's Administrative Bulletin, AB-004, Priority Permit Processing Guidelines, in a similar fashion. Assist other City agencies in preparing administrative policies that prioritize affordable housing, if no such policies currently exist.
2. **Ombudsman for HOPE SF and Affordable Housing Projects.** Assign one primary staff person each in Planning and DBI to facilitate the entitlement and plan-check process for HOPE SF and affordable housing projects.
3. **Affordable Housing Policies and Procedures.** Establish inter-agency MOU's relating to the review and approval process for affordable housing projects, including internal agency policies and procedures to implement the goals and objectives of Mayor's ED 13-01.
4. **Encourage density.** Ask the Planning Commission to adopt a policy that encourages developers to maximize their permitted density when constructing major alterations or new construction projects.
5. **Training/Public Information.** Create informational bulletins and/or training sessions relating to the City's permitting process for housing projects.
6. **Justify Removal of Illegal Units.** If a property owner seeks to remove an illegal dwelling unit, require the submittal of findings that outline why they are removing, rather than legalizing, the dwelling-



unit. These findings would be considered by the Planning Commission at a Mandatory Discretionary Review Hearing (see Task 2).

7. Housing Element EIR. Prioritize and support the Housing Element EIR so that the Planning Department can rely on it for housing initiatives.
8. Concurrent Review. Ensure that City agencies (Planning, DPW, MoD, DBI, Fire) review applications simultaneously for housing projects, when appropriate. For 100% affordable housing projects, and projects with at least 20% on-site or 30% off-site affordable housing, require pre-application meetings with all relevant City agencies before permits are filed, and establish a requirement for concurrent review for all reviewing agencies. Concurrent review should occur when projects are well-defined and unlikely to substantially change in such a way that would compromise the efficiencies gained by concurrent review. The Departments may consider offering a fee waiver for pre-applications meetings for 100% affordable housing projects if approved by the Board of Supervisors.
9. Improve Tracking and Transparency of 100% Affordable Projects: Implement a system to identify pipeline projects that are 100% affordable and implement a publically-accessible tracking system with an up-to-date status of all such projects. When housing projects are approved, an on-line tracking system should indicate the number of affordable units and market rate units approved for construction, and confirm when CFCs/TCOs have been issued.
10. Agency Coordination on Affordable Housing Projects. Interagency coordination – including coordination of design review – is of paramount importance for affordable housing projects. Key projects such as Mother Brown’s Emergency Shelter require efficient, timely cooperation from not only the permitting agencies but also asset-holding agencies such as the School District and the Human Services Agency. Those responding to agency comments and corrections also must act within agency-set response timelines/deadlines.
11. Expedite Hiring of City Staff who Review Housing Permits. The City’s hiring process is lengthy. Permitting agencies can commit to quick filling of positions but need the assistance of other agencies such as the Department of Human Resources to hire in an efficient manner.
12. Accountability. Create performance standards for recommendations that will be implemented as a result of this Executive Directive.

## **Task 2: Discretionary Review for Loss of Housing Units**

1. DBI Housing Checklist. DBI will create a new housing checklist for building permit applications connected to buildings larger than two units. Should any of the following occur in the building, the permit may not be approved over-the-counter and shall instead be referred to the Planning Department to be processed as a Mandatory Discretionary Review:
  - i) The work will result in the removal or loss of a housing unit, legal or otherwise.
  - ii) The work will result in the permanent displacement of any tenant from their housing unit, legal or otherwise.
2. Mandatory Discretionary Review for the loss of Dwelling Units. For properties with more than two dwelling units, the Planning Department will initiate Discretionary Review for the loss of any dwelling units, legal or otherwise. For building permits to remove an unpermitted unit where there is a feasible path to legalize the unit, the Department will recommend that the current housing affordability crises creates an “exceptional and extraordinary” circumstance such that the Commission should deny the permit and preserve the unit. For building permits where there is no feasible path to legalize the unit, the Department will place the Discretionary Review on the consent calendar with a recommendation to approve the permit. The Planning Department will work with DBI and with the City Attorney’s Office (and other relevant agencies, including the Fire Department) to ensure this policy addresses possible life-safety issues on the properties.

**Task 3: Planning and Building Approvals & Notification**

1. The Department of Building Inspection and Planning Department will review the Notices received from the Rent Board under Task 3 and identify any properties subject to existing administrative code enforcement actions by either Department. The Departments will update the records on those existing violations and, where appropriate, initiate interdepartmental inspections in order to cure the violations.
2. The Rent Board will include information on applicable City Codes designed to ensure the habitability of residential units and each Departments' code enforcement process in the tenant information packet currently provided to tenants affected by a Notice of Intent to Withdraw units from the residential market under Rent Ordinance Section 37.9A.

The 2014 Housing Element also provides additional detail on policies and implementation actions to increase the supply of affordable housing.

## MA-45 Non-Housing Community Development Assets – 91.215 (f)

### Introduction

San Francisco's economy has rebounded strongly from the nationwide recession. As of August 2014, the city's unemployment rate (4.7 percent) was the third lowest among California's 58 counties.

Major sectors of San Francisco's economy – tech, hospitality, health care, and construction – are leading the way:

- An influx of technology firms has pushed the number of tech jobs in San Francisco to approximately 40,000, its highest mark ever. The strength of this sector is particularly significant because of its “multiplier effect” in the local economy, with research suggesting that as many as five local jobs are created for each tech job. In all, over 1,700 technology firms, including anchor companies such as Twitter, Yelp, Zynga, and Salesforce.com, call San Francisco home.
- The city's hospitality industry is stronger than ever: within the past year, the city's hotel industry saw its highest ever occupancy and room rates, while San Francisco International Airport welcomed over 44 million total passengers in 2013, making it the seventh busiest airport in the United States.
- The health care sector is projected to grow by 13% by 2020, solidifying its role as a vital San Francisco industry. This role will be further enhanced by the completion of major public and private hospital projects, including the recently completed rebuild of Laguna Honda Hospital, the current rebuild of San Francisco General Hospital, and California Pacific Medical Center's proposed construction of two San Francisco hospitals.
- Construction cranes dot the San Francisco skyline, reflecting a construction boom unseen in decades. According to the San Francisco Planning Department, the total cost of construction associated with building permits in 2011 was \$3.4 billion, exceeding the average of the previous nine years by a billion dollars. And the construction boom is projected to continue. For example, over 4,200 units of residential housing began construction in 2012, twenty times the number of housing units built in 2011.

## Economic Development Market Analysis

### Business Activity

**Table 63 – Business Activity**

Business by Sector	Number of Workers	Number of Jobs	Share of Workers %	Share of Jobs %	Jobs less workers %
Agriculture, Mining, Oil & Gas Extraction	2,074	330	1	0	-1
Arts, Entertainment, Accommodations	53,050	79,967	16	16	1
Construction	8,765	14,366	3	3	0
Education and Health Care Services	48,360	63,924	14	13	-1
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	29,710	54,675	9	11	2
Information	15,792	21,862	5	4	0
Manufacturing	15,919	9,035	5	2	-3
Other Services	31,420	43,491	9	9	0
Professional, Scientific, Management Services	61,310	98,922	18	20	2
Public Administration	4	1	0	0	0
Retail Trade	30,434	42,074	9	8	0
Transportation and Warehousing	8,198	6,350	2	1	-1
Wholesale Trade	11,486	13,502	3	3	-1
Total	316,522	448,499	--	--	--

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS (Workers), 2011 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (Jobs)

### Labor Force

**Table 64 – Labor Force**

Total Population in the Civilian Labor Force	483,835
Civilian Employed Population 16 years and over	447,467
Unemployment Rate	7.52
Unemployment Rate for Ages 16-24	23.17
Unemployment Rate for Ages 25-65	5.74

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

**Table 65 – Occupations by Sector**

Occupations by Sector	Number of People
Management, business and financial	163,032
Farming, fisheries and forestry occupations	18,845
Service	40,026
Sales and office	98,827

Occupations by Sector	Number of People
Construction, extraction, maintenance and repair	19,386
Production, transportation and material moving	12,711

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

## Travel Time

**Table 66 – Travel Time**

Travel Time	Number	Percentage
< 30 Minutes	206,256	51%
30-59 Minutes	159,355	39%
60 or More Minutes	40,828	10%
<b>Total</b>	<b>406,439</b>	<b>100%</b>

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

## Education:

Educational Attainment by Employment Status (Population 16 and Older)

**Table 67 – Educational Attainment by Employment Status**

Educational Attainment	In Labor Force		Not in Labor Force
	Civilian Employed	Unemployed	
Less than high school graduate	33,400	4,905	17,088
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	44,621	5,375	16,762
Some college or Associate's degree	73,472	7,088	21,504
Bachelor's degree or higher	238,044	11,706	32,624

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Educational Attainment by Age

**Table 68 – Educational Attainment by Age**

	Age				
	18–24 yrs	25–34 yrs	35–44 yrs	45–65 yrs	65+ yrs
Less than 9th grade	1,981	3,634	5,949	18,878	23,092
9th to 12th grade, no diploma	4,270	5,237	6,588	15,107	9,657
High school graduate, GED, or alternative	15,018	16,273	15,781	34,717	21,758
Some college, no degree	30,762	20,577	17,337	35,420	15,784
Associate's degree	2,899	7,196	7,481	14,144	4,970
Bachelor's degree	18,638	78,685	48,141	47,519	18,742

	Age				
	18–24 yrs	25–34 yrs	35–44 yrs	45–65 yrs	65+ yrs
Graduate or professional degree	1,079	35,851	32,902	39,348	15,274

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

## Educational Attainment – Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months

**Table 69 – Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months**

Educational Attainment	Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months
Less than high school graduate	19,374
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	26,895
Some college or Associate's degree	38,208
Bachelor's degree	60,495
Graduate or professional degree	83,112

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

### Based on the Business Activity table above, what are the major employment sectors within your jurisdiction?

San Francisco’s proven sector strategy for workforce development is rooted in detailed economic analysis and forecasting performed by both the San Francisco Office of Economic Analysis (OEA) and the California Employment Development Department (EDD).

Data published by OEA (December 2012) found that both the “creative” (e.g. IT services, internet media, software) and “experience” (e.g. restaurants, nightlife, accommodations) industries led the city’s economy out of recession. According to OEA data, creative industries grew at over 4% per year over the past business cycle (2004-2010), and San Francisco’s concentration is 70% more than the national average. Experience industries grew at 1.5% per year during that period and are 40% more concentrated than the U.S. average.

Private sector health care jobs grew more slowly than the creative and experience sectors, but still grew at 1% from 2004 to 2010 – and public and private health care represents a significant employment sector. Meanwhile, San Francisco’s construction sector, which saw a decline in employment over this time period due to the national collapse of the housing market, has rebounded since the end of the recession. According to the EDD, the number of construction industry jobs in San Francisco has increased by 12.1% from August 2013 to August 2014.

Growing jobs, increasing housing, and improving transportation will keep the City on a positive economic development trajectory. To keep up with our growing industries, Workforce has developed four workforce academies in construction, health care, hospitality, and technology to train and connect residents to jobs. We have also invested in efforts to grow jobs across every sector - in professional services, tech, biotech and cleantech, international trade and tourism, film and video production, advanced manufacturing, construction and health care - all parts of the City’s diverse economy.

## Describe the workforce and infrastructure needs of the business community:

### **Construction**

According to input from our construction industry advisory committee, employers continue to be challenged to recruit qualified, skilled workers with varying severity depending on the trade. This is supported by analysis done with Wanted Analytics which ranks the San Francisco Metro Statistical Area (San Francisco, Oakland and Fremont) as more difficult than the national average.

### **Health care**

Generally speaking (see Exhibit 22), health care employers do not report tremendous difficulty finding qualified applicants. However, according to employers we work with, they anticipate that nurses who chose not to retire during the recession will begin to leave the workforce. In addition, employers report that they experience difficulty keeping their employees current on new technology. There may be more opportunities for incumbent worker training in the upcoming years as technology changes and employees retire.

**Exhibit 22 – Hiring Scale for Health Care Occupations in the San Francisco MSA**



### **Hospitality**

According to a 2010 Sloan Center on Aging & Work study (Sloan Center on Aging & Work, 2010), Hospitality industry employers are concerned about their ability to recruit and retain qualified, skilled employees. Thirty eight percent of accommodation employers and 24.5% of all other tourism sector employers reported moderate or great talent recruitment and loss risks due to the low skills of new staff. 51.9% and 41% have moderate or great concerns about hiring skilled candidates. Our hospitality advisory board echoes this concern and points out the crucial need for customer service skills in the sector. They advise that these skills go beyond a superficial understanding of customer service to include job essential skills such as taking personal responsibility, cooperation and teamwork, interpersonal skills, creative thinking, critical thinking and problem solving.

Housekeeping is of particular interest to some local hotels, as this is demographically an aging workforce. We will continue to monitor this as the workforce system prepares to meet the needs of local employers while providing entry-level and career pathways to jobseekers.


## Tech

According to a recent MPICT study and input from our ICT industry advisory committee, 50% of employers state they have difficulty recruiting ICT workers with the appropriate skills and 11% state they have great difficulty (COE & MPICT, 2010). As Exhibit 23 shows, the MPICT report differentiated ICT and non-ICT firms and found that ICT firms reported a greater difficulty recruiting applicants than the non-ICT firms. In addition, the report found that “ICT firms and Bay Area firms report greater difficulty retaining ICT employees.” An additional finding from the study suggests that employers have a particular challenge around “finding competent and reasonably priced ICT consultants, temporary employees, and external services.”

Analysis done with Wanted Analytics supports this assessment, ranking the San Francisco Metro Statistical Area (San Francisco, Oakland and Fremont) as difficult on their hiring scale. The national average is 71 and the MSA is 80 showing that our local area employers have a greater difficulty sourcing qualified ICT workers than in other parts of the country.

Additionally, numerous Tech companies have reported challenges recruiting and retaining a diverse workforce. While 57 percent of occupations in the workforce are held by women, in computing occupations, that figure is only 25 percent (We Need More Women in Tech: The Data Prove It, The Atlantic, August 2013). Data show that blacks and Hispanics are also under-represented. For example, Blacks make up 2 percent and Hispanics 3 percent of Google’s Workforce (Google Statistics Show Silicon Valley Has a Diversity Problem, Washington Post, May 2014). Many tech companies have made formal commitments to increasing the diversity of their workplaces.

**Exhibit 23 – Difficulty in Recruiting Employment Applicants**



## Businesses

Doing business in San Francisco is difficult. Business owners who have been through the process of starting a business face uncertainty, frustration, and often times lost income. People do not have clarity about the interdependencies in the process, and offices and departments are not co-located to access information in a timely and efficient manner. There is no centralized way to capture conversations or instructions. Prospective business owners tend to turn first to family, friends, local community organizations, or others who have been through the process for advice. They sometimes ask multiple people the same questions and use the aggregate of those answers to determine how to proceed.



In the coming months, the City will launch a Business Portal that will be a vital building block for prospective business owners to access a library of permits, licenses and other regulatory documents needed to start a business in San Francisco. In addition to forms, the site will offer supplemental information and resources related to those documents, setting expectations around timelines and providing a clear map of the process. In the next couple of years, the City will build on the foundation already in place, and integrate more complex functionalities that will help streamline the business set-up process for both the user and city departments. Core to this new set of functionalities will be the ability to fill out and submit all necessary paperwork online and create an account system that will allow the user to save work and auto-fill repeated information.<sup>113</sup> In addition to streamlining online functionalities, the City is looking towards improved collaborations among local economic development organizations and community organizations with the Office of Economic and Workforce Development and the Office of Small Business.

**Describe any major changes that may have an economic impact, such as planned local or regional public or private sector investments or initiatives that have affected or may affect job and business growth opportunities during the planning period. Describe any needs for workforce development, business support or infrastructure these changes may create.**

### ***Transition to Gross Receipts***

In 2012, with the support of Mayor Ed Lee and all 11 Supervisors, San Francisco voters approved Proposition E, phasing out the City's Payroll Expense Tax and moving to a Gross Receipts Tax. The transition also includes changes to the business registration structure. This change in our method of taxation further advances the Economic Strategy's goals by supporting job creation. OEWD is working with the Treasure and Tax Collector's Office on outreach to San Francisco business to inform them of the changes and assist during the transition to the new tax structure.

### ***Housing***

A strong economy also depends on ensuring that people of all income levels can afford to live in the City. The City has set an aggressive goal to complete 30,000 new and rehabilitated homes by 2020, 30% of them permanently affordable and 50% affordable for our middle income residents. Seven months into the City's 2014 pledge, we have opened the doors to over 2543 new homes, with over 630 of those permanently affordable.

### ***Transportation***

San Francisco is also addressing our transportation challenges. We are working to improve road conditions, overcrowded transit, streets and cross walks that are unsafe for pedestrians, and congestion. An estimated 88,000 workers commute to San Francisco daily. Transportation is a key factor in affordability and that's why we are making critical investments.

- We completed 52 traffic calming projects in the neighborhoods.
- We're going to add 10 miles of new or improved bike lane miles this coming year, and 50 by 2018.

---

<sup>113</sup> CCSF Business Portal Research Report 02.26.20145 By Tomorrow Partners, <http://businessportal.sfgov.org/>

- We debuted our first year of BikeShare, to great success, with 2,800 San Francisco members and 25,000 short term memberships.
- And construction is well underway on the Central Subway, which will reduce travel times and increase ridership between Chinatown and South of Market when it opens in 2019.

With all the movement that takes place in the City, we are in the process of maximizing transportation connections to the local and regional workforce with major transportation projects including: Transbay Transit Center, Central Subway, Van Ness and Geary Bus Rapid Transit, the Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP), San Francisco Pedestrian Strategy and WalkFirst, Bay Area Bike Share, and SFMTA Bicycle Strategy. The Caltrain Downtown Extension (TTC/DTX), landing at the City's Transbay Transit Center, will transform regional transportation. By extending Caltrain that short 1.3 miles from Fourth and King to the new Transbay Transit Center, the City can better connect hundreds of thousands of regional residents with their jobs; and by building that tunnel for future high-speed rail service, the City can in the future connect millions of Californians with the Bay Area's epicenter in Downtown San Francisco and relieve the capacity of our airports.

### ***Infrastructure improvements recent and in the future***

We have taken great strides in improving telecommunications infrastructure across the City by expanding WiFi and fiber optics access including at all public housing facilities, 32 of our city's parks, Market Street, Treasure Island and the northern waterfront. San Francisco has laid more than 130 miles of fiber optics connecting more than 160 facilities.

Bay Area Bike Share was launched in August of 2013 with 350 bicycles at 35 stations in San Francisco. The number of daily trips continues to steadily increase and is approaching 130,000 total trips taken in San Francisco since the pilot's inception. Expansion of the program to 500 bikes at 50 stations is anticipated in 2015.

Through the Water System Improvement program, the most aged parts of our system have been replaced and seismic reliability has increased. We continue this investment in our residents, our businesses and our City through the Sewer System Improvement Program. With more than 60 percent of our City's sewers more than 70 years old, the SFPUC has outlined \$7.9 billion in capital needs for water and wastewater infrastructure over the next decade.

### **How do the skills and education of the current workforce correspond to employment opportunities in the jurisdiction?**

Educational attainment in San Francisco is notably higher than other areas in the state and country. 51% of San Francisco residents have a Bachelor's degree or higher as compared to 47% for the region, 30% for the state and 28% in the nation. Despite this high concentration of educated residents, a large share of the city's residents – 14% – do not have a high school diploma or its equivalent. This is a full percent point higher than the region as a whole. While this statistic is not significantly different than the state or national averages, the knowledge-based economy in San Francisco and in the region indicates that these individuals will need specialized workforce services to help them be competitive in the labor market. As San Francisco's Chief Economist, Ted Egan, noted "Living-wage job opportunities requiring short- or medium-term on-the-job training, a post-secondary vocational certificate, or Associates degree, are growing in San Francisco."

**Describe any current workforce training initiatives, including those supported by Workforce Investment Boards, community colleges and other organizations. Describe how these efforts will support the jurisdiction's Consolidated Plan.**

San Francisco has established “sector academies” that provide postsecondary training in the following fields: technology, health care, hospitality, and construction. These sector academies braid vocational training in a growing field with supportive services and, ultimately, employment services and post-placement support.

San Francisco’s sector academy approach also provides the opportunity for participants to sequence credentials within a field. For example, the health care academy offers training from personal care giver and certified home health aide to certified nursing assistant.

San Francisco will continue to match the most current Labor Market Information (LMI) data with realtime information on hiring trends from local and regional employers to inform its sector academy approach to workforce development, adjusting its training as needed based on employment projections and employer feedback. The WISF will not only evaluate the effectiveness of current efforts but will also determine if additional sector academies would be beneficial to its efforts.

**Does your jurisdiction participate in a Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS)?**

San Francisco does not participate in a Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy. OEWD has an economic development strategy.

**If so, what economic development initiatives are you undertaking that may be coordinated with the Consolidated Plan? If not, describe other local/regional plans or initiatives that impact economic growth.**

Not applicable.

**Discussion**

See above.

## **MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion**

### **Are there areas where households with multiple housing problems are concentrated? (include a definition of "concentration")**

Based on the various maps shown above, the neighborhood of Visitacion Valley has both an overcrowding and housing cost burden problem. Chinatown has both an overcrowding and substandard housing problems with a higher concentration of housing code violations than other neighborhoods.

### **Are there any areas in the jurisdiction where racial or ethnic minorities or low-income families are concentrated? (include a definition of "concentration")**


Although racial and ethnic groups are distributed throughout the City, certain neighborhoods have higher than average concentrations of minority households. HUD requires recipients of its funding to identify areas of minority concentration in the aggregate as well as by specific racial/ethnic group.

#### ***Areas of Minority Concentration***

San Francisco has defined an area of aggregate minority concentration as any census tract with a minority population that is 20 percentage points greater than that of the City's total minority percentage. According to the 2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, 58.28% of the City's population is identified as being composed of minorities, and therefore any census tract in which more than 78.28% of the population is classified as minority would qualify as an Area of Minority Concentration. Using this definition, the following neighborhoods in San Francisco have Areas of Minority Concentration (see Map 6):

- Bayview Hunters Point;
- Chinatown;
- Excelsior;
- Oceanview/Merced/Ingleside;
- Outer Mission;
- Portola;
- South of Market
- Sunset/Parkside;
- Tenderloin;
- Visitacion Valley; and
- Western Addition.

**Map 6 – Areas of Minority Concentration**



**Areas of Racial/Ethnic Group Concentration**


San Francisco defines an area of concentration for a specific racial/ethnic group as any census tract in which the population for that group is 20 percentage points greater than the Citywide percentage for that segment of the population.

**Areas of African American Concentration**

Based on the 2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, African Americans comprise 5.62% of San Francisco’s overall population. Therefore an Area of African American Concentration is a census tract in which more than 25.62% of the population is identified as African American. Using this definition, the following neighborhoods in San Francisco have Areas of African American Concentration (see Map 7):

- Bayview Hunters Point;
- Visitacion Valley; and
- Western Addition.

**Map 7 – Areas of African American Concentration**




Areas of Asian American Concentration

Based on the 2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Asian Americans comprise 33.01% of San Francisco’s overall population. Therefore an Area of Asian American Concentration is a census tract in which more than 53.01% of the population is identified as Asian American. Using this definition, the following neighborhoods in San Francisco have Areas of Asian American Concentration (see Map 8):

- Bayview Hunters Point;
- Chinatown;
- Excelsior;
- North Beach;
- Oceanview/Merced/Ingleside;
- Outer Mission;
- Outer Richmond;
- Portola;
- South of Market;
- Sunset/Parkside; and,
- Visitacion Valley.

**Map 8 – Areas of Asian American Concentration**




### Areas of Hispanic or Latino Concentration

Based on the 2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Hispanics or Latinos comprise 15.19% of San Francisco's overall population. Therefore an Area of Hispanic or Latino Concentration is a census tract in which more than 35.19% of the population is identified as Hispanic or Latino. Using this definition, the following neighborhoods in San Francisco have Areas of Hispanic or Latino Concentration (see Map 9):

- Bayview Hunters Point;
- Bernal Heights;
- Excelsior;
- Mission;
- Oceanview/Merced/Ingleside;
- Outer Mission; and
- Tenderloin.

**Map 9 – Areas of Hispanic or Latino Concentration**






### Areas of Low- and Moderate-Income Concentration

San Francisco uses HUD income data to calculate low- and moderate-income concentration. San Francisco’s definition of low- and moderate-income concentration is a census tract in which more than 51% of the population is low- and moderate-income. See Map 10 for areas of low- and moderate-income concentration in San Francisco, based on HUD income data.

**Map 10 –Areas of Low- and Moderate-Income Concentration**



## What are the characteristics of the market in these areas/neighborhoods?

### **Bayview Hunters Point**

#### **Demographics**

Approximately 37,363<sup>114</sup> people live in the Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood. Its population is younger than San Francisco's and more diverse. The Bayview has a higher proportion of children under 18 years old and a lower proportion of residents over 60 years old than Citywide averages. It has a higher proportion of Black and Latino residents than San Francisco overall; and while its proportion of White residents is smaller and there are fewer residents of Asian descent, the community as a whole is becoming more and more diverse. There are about 10,932 housing units in the area, 49% of which are owner-occupied.<sup>115</sup> The median household income is lower than the City's median income. See the Appendix for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

#### **Neighborhood Features**

Third Street in the Bayview Hunters Point is an industrial neighborhood located in the southeastern part of San Francisco that experienced disinvestment when businesses moved out of the area after the end of WWII and the closures of the shipyards. It is historically an African American district that in the past decade has become increasingly diverse, with an increasing percentage of Asian, Latino and Caucasian households. The community is proud of their heritage which is reflected in the commercial corridor with bright murals, painted by local artists, celebrating and commemorating African American culture and neighborhood diversity. Third Street is also home to a plethora of soul food cafes, decorative gardens and new residents attracted to recent developments located near Paul Avenue.

Third Street was a redevelopment area from 2006 until redevelopment ended statewide in 2011; the former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency made investments to create affordable housing and infrastructure and support the commercial district. The pending 720-acre redevelopment of the Hunters Point Shipyard will create 10,500 units housing and mixed-use development.

The T-Third Street line opened in 2007, bringing light rail service to Bayview. Third Street is served by numerous neighborhood groups and social service organizations that support the arts, safety, community gardens and small business development. In 2006 community partners, City agencies, and Bay Area LISC launched the Third Street Corridor Project to revitalize the commercial district and support local small businesses; that work continues today.

#### **Commercial District Health**

Third Street offers affordable dining choices and a handful of retail shops. Although capital investments and economic development activities in the neighborhood have contributed to slight improvements in the business climate along Third Street, Bayview residents remain marginalized, with high rates of unemployment and poverty. The two greatest challenges for the commercial district are the volume of commercial vacancies and the perception of the neighborhood as unsafe. Sales tax captured in the district has declined by 16% since 2006, compared with 17% growth Citywide. New businesses opened following the 2007 installation of the Third Street Light Rail, but many closed during the construction period due to diminished foot traffic. With strong neighborhood support and assistance from the City,

---

<sup>114</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013 Five-Year Estimates

<sup>115</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013 Five-Year Estimates

moderately-priced food establishments have been attracted to Third Street, but these businesses are struggling and require more assistance and foot traffic in order to thrive.

Public safety along Third Street is a primary concern for business owners and residents. The corridor has a high level of crime relative to the City overall. Hotspots of criminal activity occur at the intersections at Evans Ave and Oakdale Ave. Source: SFPD incidents data, November 2009-October 2012.

### **Opportunities**

Opportunities in the area exist in working with neighborhood entrepreneurs to open or expand businesses while engaging residents and “re-introducing” them to the area, as many are not aware of the new restaurants and recreational programming on Third Street. The success of the abutting neighborhood, “Dogpatch”, can also be capitalized on to draw visitors to unique restaurants along Third Street. All projects can also be leveraged to address public safety concerns; including beautification enhancements which can include pedestrian lighting and jobs for local residents through a safety and cleaning ambassador program. Given the relatively low cost of land in Bayview, development of affordable and workforce housing is a prime opportunity.

Bayview continues to be a high economic and workforce development priority for Mayor Lee and the City. With the loss of Redevelopment in California, San Francisco was faced with the depletion of funding for the on-going needs of the Bayview. The launch of Mayor’s Lee’s Invest in Neighborhoods (INN) Initiative helped to alleviate some of the impacts of the loss of Redevelopment, and since IIN’s deployment, Bayview has celebrated several successes. These successes include: the opening of over 10 community serving businesses/facilities along the Third Street Corridor; the deployment of over 40 neighborhood events centered in the Town Center of Third Street; and the investment of over \$1,000,000 into programs and projects that supported the continued revitalization of Third Street.

### **Bernal Heights**

#### **Demographics**

Approximately 26,052<sup>116</sup> people live in the Bernal Heights neighborhood. Its population is younger than San Francisco’s overall population. Bernal Heights has a higher proportion of children under 18 years old and a lower proportion of residents over 60 years old than Citywide averages. The largest racial group is White, which makes up 40% of the population. It has smaller proportions of Asians and Blacks than citywide. Latinos make up 30% of the population, twice that of the City overall. There are about 9,246 housing units in the neighborhood, 55% of which are owner-occupied<sup>117</sup>. The median household income is slightly lower than the City’s median household income. See the Appendix for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

#### **Neighborhood Features**

Mission Street, Cesar Chavez to Bosworth, is a thriving district south of the Mission neighborhood and on the western part of Bernal Heights. This active corridor features a mix of locally-owned bars, cafes, specialty shops, service providers, and anchored by Cole Hardware, Big Lots, Walgreens and Safeway. Although there are some destination businesses and well-regarded restaurants that attract visitors from around the City, it remains a district patronized primarily by local residents.

---

<sup>116</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013 Five-Year Estimates

<sup>117</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013 Five-Year Estimates

The neighborhood south of the intersection of Randall and Mission is known as College Hill. This section of Mission Street is known for its Central American food establishments and businesses predominantly owned by and serving Mexican and Central American families.

### **Commercial District Health**

This section of Mission Street features a healthy mix of neighborhood-serving retail, well established and locally-owned restaurants, green grocers, and ethnic shops and service providers. From 2006 to 2012 sales tax captured in the district grew by 23%, compared with 17% growth Citywide over the same period. The corridor is home to a high number of food and beverage stores and general merchandise.

Public safety along this stretch of Mission Street is a concern for business owners and residents. From 2009 to 2012 the area experienced a slightly higher amount of crime relative to other commercial districts around the City. Incidents were distributed throughout the district with the largest clusters at the intersections of Mission with Cesar Chavez, Valencia, Godeus, and Eugenia. (Source: SFPD incidents data, November 2009-October 2012) Merchants and advocates express concern about robberies and vandalism.

### **Opportunities**

Opportunity exists to develop capacity and relationships among the Mission Street/College Hill businesses, residents and agencies to improve the economic vitality of the area and contribute to maintaining the district's cultural diversity.

### **Chinatown**

#### **Demographics**

Approximately 14,905<sup>118</sup> people live in the Chinatown neighborhood. Its population is older than San Francisco's with a higher proportion of residents over 60 years old. The majority, or 82%, of Chinatown residents are of Asian descent and the neighborhood does not have the racial diversity of the City overall. There are about 6,855 housing units in the area, more than 90% of which are renter-occupied<sup>119</sup>. The median household income for the neighborhood is less than a third of the Citywide median and more than a quarter of residents live below the poverty level. See the Appendix for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

#### **Neighborhood Features**

Established in 1848, San Francisco's Chinatown is the oldest and second largest Chinese-American community in the United States (after New York City). Chinatown is the densest neighborhood in the city, and has retained its own customs, languages, places of worship, social clubs, and identity. The neighborhood continues to play an integral role in shaping the Chinese-American experience; serving as the gateway for immigrants to find work, learn English, receive social services, and participate in community activities.

Chinatown is multi-faceted: Stockton Street as Chinatown's marketplace serves the local community; Grant Avenue, with its various curio shops, is the top tourist destination; and Kearny is the

---

<sup>118</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013 Five-Year Estimates

<sup>119</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013 Five-Year Estimates

neighborhoods' vehicular gateway. The neighborhood offers affordable goods and services and a variety of authentic restaurants, herbal and curio shops, fish markets, and vegetable stands. The festivals, temples, renowned Dragon's Gate entrance, historical buildings, and alleyways are among Chinatown's strengths as a pedestrian accessible neighborhood. The neighborhood also features a large network of longstanding family associations, arts, culture and community-based organizations that offer a range of social services and resources to support and promote the history and culture of Chinatown.

### **Commercial District Health**

Located in downtown San Francisco, Chinatown covers 24 square blocks and overlaps with five different postal codes. Sales tax captured in the district grew by 21% between 2006 and 2012, compared with 17% growth Citywide over the same period. Chinatown has a very low vacancy rate (less than 4% as of spring 2013); several of the existing vacancies are larger commercial spaces.

Public safety in Chinatown is a concern for businesses and other community stakeholders. From 2009 to 2012 the neighborhood experienced an increase in the number of vehicle thefts/thefts from vehicles and slight decreases in assaults and robberies. Hotspots of criminal activity occur along Stockton Street and near the intersection of Broadway and Columbus. (Source: SFPD incidents data, November 2009-October 2012)

### **Opportunities**

Opportunities exist in leveraging the cultural events and programs that market local businesses by supporting local revitalization initiatives that have brought increased traffic to the local economy and highlighted the culture and arts in the community. A large component of the cultural experience in Chinatown is the storefronts that line the street. These businesses have been in operation for many years with little changes and can benefit from some assistance in refreshing their facades making them more attractive and inviting for customers. While several construction projects will improve the infrastructure and amenities of the neighborhood, businesses will need strategic advising to help them endure and grow as the Central Subway station, Portsmouth Square, Chinese Hospital, and Willie Woo Woo Wong playground undergo construction.

In 2012, Mayor Ed Lee announced the Invest in Neighborhoods (IIN) Initiative, a renewed effort among interagency and local stakeholders to strengthen and revitalize neighborhood commercial districts around San Francisco. Each participating district, of which Chinatown is one, has a comprehensive service plan tailored to respond to the community's unique opportunities and needs. As a part of the Chinatown IIN customized service plan, the following projects have been deployed by local stakeholders and the interagency team to date: a safety and cleaning program to help businesses impacted by key construction projects along Jackson, Washington, and Stockton streets; a marketing campaign aimed at local shoppers during the Lunar New Year that brought in more than \$120,000 to the local economy; an education and ADA compliance program to businesses interested in removing physical barriers from their sites; and neighborhood events that celebrate the community's arts and culture.

### **Excelsior and Outer Mission**

### **Demographics**

Approximately 62,660<sup>120</sup> people in the Excelsior and Outer Mission neighborhoods. It has a higher proportion of children under 18 years old and also a slightly higher proportion of residents over 60 years old than the city overall. Nearly half of the residents in the Excelsior and Outer Mission are Asian. It also has a higher proportion of Latino residents than San Francisco overall. There are about 16,846<sup>121</sup> housing units. A higher proportion, 65%, of households in the Excelsior and Outer Mission are owner-occupied households. The median household income of the Excelsior and Outer Mission is lower than the City's median income. See the Appendix for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

### **Neighborhood Features**

The Excelsior/Outer Mission neighborhood is an ethnically and economically diverse community situated between Balboa Park and McLaren Park. Residents and business owners are fond of the small town feel in this residential enclave of a bustling city. Streets such as Persia, Russia and Madrid are uniquely named after international cities and countries, reflecting the neighborhood's history as a magnet for international immigrants. The twelve-block commercial corridor of Mission Street, south of Interstate 280, is the economic center of the neighborhood.

The Excelsior/Outer Mission features strong neighborhood institutions and resident groups dedicated to improving the commercial district, including the Excelsior Action Group. A corridor manager, primarily funded by the City, works full time supporting local merchants and implementing neighborhood improvement projects. The neighborhood also has a strong community of nonprofit organizations that offer family services and arts and cultural programming. Recently, over a dozen community-based organizations, including the Excelsior Action Group, have united to form the Excelsior Planning Collaborative, which prioritizes community vitality and economic development among its aspirational values.

### **Commercial District Health**

Mission Street is a hub for its financial institutions, convenient and vibrant produce markets and authentic restaurants. Restaurants serve a range of international cuisine including Japanese, Thai, Chinese, Filipino, Mexican and Central American fare. Sales tax captured in the district has grown 15% since 2006, compared with 17% growth Citywide.

Public safety along Mission Street is a concern for merchants and residents. Hot spots of criminal activity exist on Mission Street at the intersections of Excelsior Street, Geneva Avenue and Russia Avenue. (Source: SFPD incidents data, November 2009-October 2012) The Excelsior is also one of the worst corridors in the City in terms of pedestrian safety. (WalkFirst, 2011) The corridor lacks pedestrian-level lighting and traffic calming infrastructure.

### **Opportunities**

Opportunities exist in attracting neighborhood serving businesses to the corridor that can fill existing vacancies. The corridor's retail opportunities include special food services; hobby, book and music stores; pet stores; sporting goods; and clothing and accessories.

---

<sup>120</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013 Five-Year Estimates

<sup>121</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013 Five-Year Estimates

## **Mission**

### **Demographics**

Approximately 54,611<sup>122</sup> people live in the Mission District. It is a young and diverse population. The proportion of White residents, currently about 40%, in the area is growing but the neighborhood remains part of the Latino heart of the City. There are about 22,468<sup>123</sup> housing units in the area, mostly in small multi-family structures of two to nine units. About 75% of households are renters. The median household income is lower than that of the City overall. See the Appendix for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

### **Neighborhood Features**

Lower 24th Street is located in the center of San Francisco's eclectic and predominantly Latino Mission District, running from Mission to Potrero streets. The corridor features a richness of culture and vibrancy unmatched anywhere else in the city. The corridor, with over 200 small businesses, is a bustling enclave for many Latino businesses including specialty food stores, restaurants, cafes, taquerias, Mexican bakeries, butchers, art galleries, and gift shops that serve the needs of local residents. The uniqueness of the area and multi-modal transportation options have proven attractive to new residents and new businesses, which are now calling Lower 24th home.

The district is an art and cultural mecca boasting the largest collection of murals in the city and hosting a multitude of events that enliven the neighborhood with history, spirituality, and community throughout the year. Lower 24th Street businesses, residents, arts organizations and long established non-profit agencies collaborate to organize events such as Carnaval, Cesar Chavez Parade and Festival, and Day of the Dead.

With easy access to 24th Street BART Station, Muni bus lines, and the 101 Freeway, this beautiful tree-lined thoroughfare provides neighborhood residents and visitors many choices for traveling within San Francisco and throughout the region.

### **Commercial District Health**

Lower 24th Street is a thriving and vibrant commercial district, with a low vacancy rate and a high level of foot traffic. Sales tax captured in the district has grown 57% since 2006, compared with 17% growth Citywide. The corridor features a high number of eating and drinking establishments, with opportunities for growth in general merchandise and financial institutions. The district also features the highest concentration of Latino owned businesses in the City.

Lower 24th Street has a high level of social capital, featuring an active Merchants & Neighbors Association (Calle 24) and many community-based arts, cultural, and social service organizations. There are opportunities to increase collaboration among merchants and arts and cultural organizations and among long-time businesses and those that are newer to the corridor.

Merchants and residents have expressed concern about public safety on Lower 24<sup>th</sup> Street. The neighborhood experienced a notable increase in assaults in 2010; that figure has since reduced. Trends

---

<sup>122</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013 Five-Year Estimates

<sup>123</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013 Five-Year Estimates

for other categories of offenses have remained relatively flat. Hot spots include the intersections at Mission, South Van Ness, and Harrison. (Source: SFPD incidents data, November 2009–October 2012)

### **Opportunities**

Opportunities along Lower 24<sup>th</sup> Street, now recognized as Calle 24 Latino Cultural District, exist in strengthening the businesses, institutions and cultural assets that have made the corridor what it is today. Beyond the establishments, the residents as well as the non-profit directors, business owners and property owners are an important component of maintaining the integrity of this corridor and have formed a council to work together in developing and implementing a vision for this Latino Cultural District. This has created an opportunity for the City to strengthen our partnership and support the neighborhood with services and funding that aligns with their process.

In 2012, Mayor Ed Lee announced the Invest in Neighborhoods (IIN) Initiative, which aims to strengthen small businesses, improve physical conditions, increase quality of life, and increase community capacity. Each participating district, of which Lower 24<sup>th</sup> Street is one, has a comprehensive service plan tailored to respond to the community's unique opportunities and needs. The Lower 24<sup>th</sup> Street IIN customized service plan primarily focuses on the preservation and strengthening of the corridor's existing businesses and cultural vitality. With these goals in mind we have developed programs to reduce business vulnerabilities and foster growth. In partnership with the community we've conducted extensive outreach to merchants and provided multi-lingual access to information and services. In response to what we've learned directly from businesses, we've customized services based on individual needs. These include business technical assistance that provides professional business consulting advice; lease strengthening workshops and counseling to businesses and cultural institutions; and the ADA Assessment Program which provides free Certified Access Specialist (CASp) inspections to protect businesses from ADA lawsuits. These business assistance programs are complemented by a number of community efforts to recognize and preserve the neighborhood's cultural assets and to maintain the diversity that has made this neighborhood so beloved by residents and visitors alike. In support of these efforts we have funded a public process to gather input on the mission, vision and goals of the Latino cultural district. The process will also help prioritize projects such as neighborhood branding, historic documentation, and cultural events. In the last five years previous to the IIN initiative, we partnered with the community partners to develop a community action plan that would guide economic revitalization of the corridor. Some of the major investments that resulted from that plan include sidewalk repairs, ADA accessible curbs, street repavement, pedestrian lighting and a street cleaning program.

### **North Beach**

#### **Demographics**

Approximately 12,451<sup>124</sup> people live in the North Beach neighborhood. It is a population that is older than San Francisco's overall and is less diverse. A higher share of its residents are over 60 years old and a lower share under 18 years old compared to San Francisco. 46% of residents in the North Beach are White and 38% are of Asian descent, with a lower share of Black, and Latino residents. There are about 6,551<sup>125</sup> housing units in the area. Renting households predominate, as 82% of the households are

---

<sup>124</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013 Five-Year Estimates

<sup>125</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013 Five-Year Estimates



renter-occupied. The median household income of the North Beach neighborhood is lower than the Citywide median. See the Appendix for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

### **Neighborhood Features**

North Beach, nestled within the scenic hills of northeast San Francisco, is one of the City's signature neighborhood commercial districts. The businesses of Columbus Avenue, Grant Avenue and around Washington Square serve local residents but also create a regional destination for the Bay Area and tourists from around the world. San Francisco's "Little Italy" is crowded with Italian restaurants, cafes, specialty food shops, and one of the only Italian pottery stores outside of Italy. Local clothing, craft, and artisan shops populate Grant Avenue, one of the oldest blocks in the City, and offer locals and visitors alike diverse choices for neighborhood dining and entertainment. City Lights Bookstore and Vesuvio Café, at the intersection of Columbus and Broadway, divided by Jack Kerouac Alley, stand as landmarks of the neighborhood's historic reputation as a center of Beat Generation culture in the middle part of the 20th century. North Beach features a strong and highly active merchants association and neighborhood groups committed to addressing and advocating for the needs of small businesses and the community.

### **Commercial District Health**

North Beach is a thriving commercial district with distinct character and a diverse mix of businesses. Sales tax captured in the district grew by 15% from 2006 to 2012, compared with 17% growth Citywide during that same period. The Central Subway construction remains an issue for some merchants and neighborhood stakeholders who express concerns about the negative impact on local businesses.

Public safety in North Beach is a concern for merchants and residents. From 2010 to 2012 the neighborhood experienced a dramatic decrease in the volume of reported assaults. From November 2011 to October 2012, hotspots of activity occurred on Grant Street north of Broadway. (Source: SFPD incidents data, November 2009-October 2012).

### **Opportunities**

Opportunities in the area exist in attracting neighborhood serving businesses such as grocery, hardware, and apparel. There is an opportunity site at the former Piazza Market on the corner of Columbus and Broadway and four vacant lots in the area. There is an opportunity to support and work with North Beach Business Association to educate businesses regarding ADA compliance, and to increase activation of public spaces, particularly on Columbus Avenue and Union Street.

### **Oceanview/Merced/Ingleside (OMI)**

#### **Demographics**

Approximately 27,930<sup>126</sup> people live in the OMI. Its population is younger than San Francisco's overall, with a higher proportion of children under 18 years old. Nearly 50% of the population is made up of Asian residents, and it has a higher proportion of Black and Latino residents than that found Citywide. There are about 7,792 housing units in the area, of which 67% are owner-occupied<sup>127</sup>. The median household income for the neighborhood is lower than the Citywide median income. See the Appendix for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

---

<sup>126</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013 Five-Year Estimates

<sup>127</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013 Five-Year Estimates

## **Neighborhood Features**

The OMI (Oceanview, Merced Heights and Ingleside neighborhoods) is located between City College of San Francisco and San Francisco State University in the southwestern part of San Francisco. It is a middle-class district of single-family, owner-occupied homes. Approximately 75% percent of the land area in the OMI is residential. While the population has been mostly African-American, in recent years the neighborhood has witnessed an influx of Asian-American and other ethnic groups, making it one of San Francisco's most diverse neighborhoods.

Ocean Avenue, the main street of the OMI, has over 160 storefronts and was recently transformed by Avalon Bay's 173 unit market rate housing with a new Whole Foods market on the ground floor. Pending development projects include the Municipal Transit Agency's redevelopment of the Phelan Bus Loop and City College's new Performing Arts Center.

In 2010, Ocean Avenue Association became a Community Benefit District (CBD) with a management focusing on cleaning and maintenance, safety, marketing, and streetscape improvements. The CBD also serves as an advocate for the 11-block district. Other nonprofit organizations in the area provide an array of programs supporting youth development, the arts and culture, education and advocacy for residents in the community.

The Broad Street commercial corridor, including Broad and Randolph streets, primarily serves the Ocean View neighborhood, the "O" in the three neighborhoods commonly referred to together as the "OMI": Ocean View, Merced Heights, and Ingleside. It is home to a long-standing African American community and growing Chinese and Latino communities.

Broad Street and Randolph connect through Orizaba forming a major road artery of the neighborhood. The area is mostly composed of single family residences with family serving businesses mostly at block corners along the corridor.

Ocean View public library anchors the social capital of the neighborhood, offering support and resources to the community. Several organizations have been active over the years in providing services to the corridor and advocating for improvement.

## **Commercial District Health**

Ocean Avenue has a relatively low commercial vacancy rate. Sales tax captured in the district has grown 32% since 2006, compared with 17% growth citywide. Between 2009 and 2012 vehicle theft/theft from vehicles increased by 66%, while robbery and assault incidents showed slight increases. Hot spots of criminal activity existed on Ocean Avenue at the intersections at Jules Ave and at Phelan Ave. (Source: SFPD incidents data, November 2009-October 2012) Community stakeholders report that prostitution is a major issue.

Broad Street is a small, mostly residential commercial district. Between 2006 and 2012 sales tax captured within the district grew by 5%, compared with 17% growth Citywide. The corridor features a high concentration of churches and social service agencies, a few small markets and liquor stores, and a small number of neighborhood-serving retail establishments. The corridor struggles with a high vacancy rate; many of the vacant retail spaces appear to require some capital investment in order to become leasable. Public safety, including pedestrian safety, along Broad Street is a concern for business owners and residents. Crimes appear in smaller, consistent clusters between 19th Avenue and Bright Street with

the largest clusters concentrated at Orizaba, Capitol and Plymouth Avenues. (Source: SFPD incidents data, November 2009-October 2012) Merchants and advocates express concern about robberies, vandalism, homicide, and speeding automobiles.

### **Opportunities**

Opportunities exist to enhance economic development and physical attributes of the Ocean Avenue commercial district through continued support of the CBD. Outreach efforts to promote available services including grants, loans, technical assistance and other programs would strengthen existing businesses and attract new tenants to the district. Lastly, property improvements would enrich the appearance of the neighborhood and increase its ability to support stronger, healthier businesses, adding to the diversity of shopping and dining options for the neighborhood. The corridor's growth opportunities include lawn and garden supplies, home furnishings, general merchandise, clothing, shoes, and jewelry, luggage and leather goods.

Opportunities exist to improve pedestrian safety, beautify the neighborhood, support existing businesses and build on the momentum of residents organizing to beautify the area around Broad and Randolph Streets.

### **Outer Richmond**

#### **Demographics**

Approximately 44,910<sup>128</sup> people live in the Outer Richmond. This population is slightly older than that of San Francisco's overall, although children under 18 form a bigger share than Citywide. The neighborhood has an almost equal share of White and Asian residents, 42% and 44% respectively; it has a smaller proportion of Blacks and Latinos than San Francisco overall. There are about 18,474<sup>129</sup> housing units in the area. Renting households predominate, with less than 40% home-owning households. The median household income for the neighborhood is the same as that of the City overall. See the Appendix for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

#### **Neighborhood Features**

The Outer Richmond district is one of the most diverse neighborhoods in San Francisco with Chinese, Russian, Korean, Japanese, Irish and Cambodian residents. Geary Boulevard, a major east-west commercial thoroughfare, is surrounded by a ring of parks including the Presidio, Ocean Beach, Lands End, and Golden Gate Park. The corridor is a bustling district that is known for its Korean and Chinese restaurants, Irish bars, Russian grocery stores, personal care services, chain stores, fast food, neighborhood serving shops, and financial institutions.

Geary Boulevard has several community-based organizations providing supportive services and enrichment activities for youth and families. An active merchants association exists with the potential to create a vibrant and sustainable CBD that will attract a mix of new businesses to the corridor.

#### **Commercial District Health**

Geary Boulevard is a thriving and vibrant commercial district, with a low vacancy rate and a high level of foot traffic. Sales tax captured in the district grew by 5% from 2006 to 2012, compared with 17% growth

---

<sup>128</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013 Five-Year Estimates

<sup>129</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013 Five-Year Estimates

Citywide over the same period. The corridor features a high number of eating and drinking establishments and personal care, and a low storefront vacancy rate.

From 2009 to 2012 Geary Boulevard experienced a lower volume of crime relative to other commercial districts around the City. From November 2011 to October 2012, hotspots of criminal activity occurred between 16th and 18th Avenues and at 21st Avenue. (Source: SFPD incidents data, November 2009-October 2012) Merchants and advocates express concern about vandalism and robberies.

### **Opportunities**

Opportunities exist to improve fill long time vacancies with neighborhood serving businesses, marketing the neighborhood, and support existing businesses. The corridor's retail opportunities include the development and activation of the Alexandria Theater site.

### **Portola**

#### **Demographics**

Approximately 14,861<sup>130</sup> people live in the Portola neighborhood. Although Portola has a higher proportion of children under 18 years old, its population is a little older than San Francisco's overall. The majority of Portola's residents are Asian; its proportion of Latino residents is also higher than Citywide. There are about 4,419 housing units in the area, of which 62% are owner-occupied<sup>131</sup>. The median household income for the Portola neighborhood is lower than the City's median income. See the Appendix for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

#### **Neighborhood Features**

Bordered by Silver Avenue, McLaren Park and the 101 Highway, the Portola District is a family-oriented, multi-cultural neighborhood. Comprised mainly of single-family homes, the Portola's residents represent a variety of ages, incomes, and cultural backgrounds, including new residents and others who have lived in the neighborhood for over 80 years. San Bruno Avenue is the thriving commercial main street of the Portola District. The street is a mix of neighborhood-serving retail, locally-owned restaurants, green grocers, and specialty food stores which have served the community for generations. It also features a high concentration of vibrant businesses owned by and serving Chinese Americans.

The Portola Neighborhood Association, comprised of local merchants, property owners, and residents, is committed to improving the commercial corridor and the neighborhood. Other nonprofit organizations in the area provide support services and activities targeting local youth, seniors and immigrants. In the last few years, San Bruno Avenue has undergone significant physical improvements including the undergrounding of utility lines, placement of new street lights, planting of trees and fortnight lilies, mural installations, and numerous storefront improvement projects.

#### **Commercial District Health**

San Bruno Avenue is a mix of neighborhood-serving retail, locally-owned restaurants, green grocers, and specialty food stores that have served the community for generations. Sales tax captured in the district has grown by 3% since 2006, compared with 17% growth Citywide.

---

<sup>130</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013 Five-Year Estimates

<sup>131</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013 Five-Year Estimates

Public safety along San Bruno Avenue in the Portola is a concern for both businesses and residents. Between 2010 and 2012 the neighborhood experienced an increase in vehicle thefts/theft from vehicles of 111%. Over that period, hot spots of criminal activity existed at Silver Ave, Felton Street and Bacon Street.

### **Opportunities**

Opportunities in the area exist in supporting existing local businesses to expand their customer base beyond the Portola Neighborhood. The success of attracting the first coffee shop in 20 years and the anticipated re-opening of long-time neighborhood restaurant, Breakfast at Tiffany's, will undoubtedly help in attracting more customers to the area. All projects can also be leveraged to address public safety concerns; specifically in the realm of pedestrian safety. The corridor's growth opportunities include apparel, shoe stores, and full service food establishments.

### **South of Market**

#### **Demographics**

Approximately 17,797<sup>132</sup> people live in San Francisco's South of Market Area, or SOMA. Its population is older than San Francisco's with a higher proportion of residents over 60 years old. It has a higher proportion of Black and Asian residents than San Francisco overall; and while its proportion of White and Latino residents is smaller than the City overall, the community as a whole is becoming more and more diverse. There are about 9,008<sup>133</sup> housing units in the area. About 77% of households are renters. The median household income is lower than that of the City overall. See the Appendix for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

#### **Neighborhood Features**

The neighborhood is a vast and diverse stretch of warehouses, auto repair shops, nightclubs, residential hotels, art spaces, loft apartments, furniture showrooms, condominiums, and technology companies. SOMA is home to many of San Francisco's museums, including SFMOMA, the Yerba Buena Center for the Arts, and the Museum of the African Diaspora. The Cartoon Art Museum, the children's Zeum, and the Contemporary Jewish Museum are also in the Yerba Buena area. The Center for the Arts, along with Yerba Buena Gardens, the Metreon, and many small theatre companies and venues, add to the cultural attraction of the SOMA.

Despite the Dot-Com crash of the early 2000s, major software and technology companies have headquarters here. The area is also home to the few Big-box stores in San Francisco.

#### **Commercial District Health**

Vacancy rates in Central Market are the highest citywide, approximately 25% for retail storefronts. Nevertheless, from 2006 to 2012 sales tax collected in the district grew by 24%, a greater increase than the City-wide rate (17%). While the variety and selection of retail and restaurants has increased over the past several years, the area still lacks sufficient neighborhood-serving establishments. Public safety is one of the most pressing issues for Central Market; the area has an extremely high volume of criminal activity. From November 2011 to October 2012, hotspots of criminal activity occurred along Sixth Street, Taylor Street, and at the intersection of Market and Seventh Street and Jones Street. Relative to other

---

<sup>132</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013 Five-Year Estimates

<sup>133</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013 Five-Year Estimates

commercial districts the neighborhood experiences higher concentrations of assault, robbery, and drug and alcohol violations. (Source: SFPD incidents data, November 2009-October 2012)

### **Opportunities**

The Central Market Economic Strategy was launched by the Mayor in 2011 and has led to a range of public and private investments aimed at creating a healthy, vibrant neighborhood in Central Market, the Tenderloin and Sixth Street. We now have a projected additional 13,000 jobs coming into the area as a result of the payroll tax exclusion, a substantially decreased storefront vacancy rate, and more than 5,500 units of housing in construction or approved in the immediate area. We know, however, from community engagement work in 2013 that neighborhood residents, business owners, community organizations and new stakeholders in the neighborhood still believe the area could be cleaner, safer, and healthier; there are also concerns about displacement. In 2014 we are updating the strategy to focus on 9 specific “action zones” within the larger area, and we are refocusing the mix of interventions and programs to address the current conditions in the neighborhood.

### **Sunset/Parkside**

#### **Demographics**

Approximately 78,132<sup>134</sup> people live in the Sunset/Parkside neighborhood. Its population is older than San Francisco’s overall, with a higher proportion of residents over 60 years old. The neighborhood, however, also has a slightly higher proportion of children under 18 years old. The neighborhood is predominantly Asian, 58%, and about a third White; there are very few black residents. Its Latino population is also smaller than the City overall. There are about 26,861 housing units in the area, of which 59% are owner-occupied<sup>135</sup>. The median household income in the Sunset/Parkside is about the same as Citywide median. See the Appendix for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

#### **Neighborhood Features**

The Sunset/Parkside neighborhood is a highly residential, middle class neighborhood that has become an ethnic enclave over the last several decades attracting young families and diverse populations, while retaining many long-time residents.

Outer Irving, between 19th and 27th Avenues, is a growing retail district. The food offerings are diverse and multi-ethnic, including Japanese, Middle Eastern, Indian, Thai, Korean, Irish, Mexican and Chinese restaurants. Irving Street is a destination for not only locals, but students and foodies on the hunt for good, cheap eats. Irving also has multiple financial institutions, boutiques, clothing stores, dry cleaners, pharmacies, and vibrant markets.

Noriega Street from 19th to 47th Avenue is a distinctive commercial corridor that meets the needs and is reflective of the diverse surrounding population. The section from 19th to 33rd features Chinese groceries, popular restaurants, bakeries, financial institutions and other neighborhood serving retail. The section from 45th to 47th is a favorite among surfers and beachgoers due to its proximity to Ocean Beach. These two blocks are an enclave of boutiques, with a popular custom board shop, bakery, produce market, pet supply store, pizza parlor, and taqueria. Noriega is developing into a destination for shopping and dining for young urban professionals with disposable income.

---

<sup>134</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013 Five-Year Estimates

<sup>135</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013 Five-Year Estimates

The Taraval commercial district—Taraval Street from 19th Avenue to 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue—features several nodes of active retail activity broken up by residential and office uses. The corridor features affordable and multi-ethnic cafés, locally serving restaurants and service businesses, light traffic and ample parking. Local hangouts include the Riptide bar and Bashful Bull Too. As of spring 2013, the Department of Public Works has begun the planning phase of a streetscape improvement project for Outer Taraval that may include sidewalk bulb-outs at key intersections, crosswalk enhancements, light fixture upgrades, new plantings, site furnishings, and possibly a gateway feature.

### **Commercial District Health**

Irving Street, sometimes referred to as “A San Francisco Secret” is a bustling commercial corridor with a variety of boutiques and ethnic restaurants. 2006-2012 sales tax captured shows the district has grown 20%, compared with 17% growth Citywide. The corridor features a high number of grocery and health and personal care establishments.

Noriega Street is a unique and diverse commercial district, with a low vacancy rate and a relatively high level of foot traffic. Between 2006 and 2012 sales tax captured in the district grew by 23%, compared with 17% growth Citywide during the same period. The corridor features a high number of specialty food and personal care establishments. Noriega Street experiences a low volume of criminal incidents compared with other commercial districts around the City. (Source: SFPD incidents data, November 2009-October 2012) Merchants and advocates express concern about prostitution and robberies.

Taraval Street is a large, multi-ethnic commercial corridor with approximately 205 businesses and high level of daytime foot traffic. 2006-2012 sales tax captured shows the district has grown 11%, compared with 17% growth Citywide. The corridor features a high number of lawn and garden equipment and supply stores and drinking establishments, with opportunities for growth in jewelry, luggage, leather goods, books, periodicals, and music stores. Parkside Taraval is one of the safest commercial districts in the City. Over the past year, reported incidents clustered between 18th and 24th Avenues and between 31st and 33rd Avenues. Merchants and advocates express concern about robberies and vandalism. (Source: SFPD incidents data, November 2009-October 2012)

### **Opportunities**

Opportunities exist on the Irving Street commercial corridor to increase collaboration among the diverse merchant population to support beautification efforts and engage in business retention strategies to strengthen the economic vitality of the corridor.

Opportunities also exist to increase community capacity and develop partnerships among merchants in upper and lower Noriega to support business growth and transform the corridor into a destination.

In addition, opportunities exist to develop partnerships for the Taraval commercial corridor, with a focus on beautification, increasing merchant communication and neighborhood promotional events.

### **Tenderloin/Central Market**

#### **Demographics**

Approximately 26,085<sup>136</sup> people live in San Francisco’s Tenderloin neighborhood. Its population is older than San Francisco’s overall, with a higher proportion of residents over 60 years old. The population is reflective of San Francisco’s overall population in that it is racially and ethnically diverse. In particular, the Tenderloin and adjacent neighborhoods have historically been home to large communities of people of Southeast Asian origin.

There are about 15,852 housing units in the area<sup>137</sup>. About 97% of households are renters. A large percentage of the housing stock in the neighborhood is affordable—developed as permanently affordable housing, or as residential hotels—providing a crucial resource for people who would otherwise be unable to secure housing in San Francisco. There is also a high concentration of residential hotels (also known as single-room occupancy hotels, or SROs). In many areas of the Tenderloin the average percentage of housing units by block group that are single room is over 50%, compared to a Citywide average of 10%. Many affordable housing and SRO units are subsidized by various Department of Public Health and Human Service Agency housing programs, which serve people who are recently homeless, people with behavioral health diagnoses, and other vulnerable populations.

The median household income for the neighborhood is about one third of the Citywide median and nearly 30% of residents live below the poverty level. See the Appendix for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

### **Neighborhood Features**

The Tenderloin is centrally located within the City and region, adjacent to other thriving and diverse neighborhoods and commercial districts (e.g., South of Market, Union Square, Civic Center). The neighborhood has historically been home to a variety of arts organizations, including small and large theaters, galleries, rehearsal spaces, and headquarters. Over the past two years, arts entities have increasingly expressed interest in relocating to the area. Dozens of nonprofit agencies, including several of the City’s leading service providers, are headquartered and/or have service sites within the district.

Market Street is the region’s most important transit corridor, served by BART, the MUNI metro subway, and multiple bus lines.

### **Commercial District Health**

In the last several decades Tenderloin and Central Market have struggled with high vacancy rates, a lack of private investment, physical blight, a lack of sufficient neighborhood-serving establishments, public safety issues, and a mix of social challenges. We know from community engagement work in 2013 that neighborhood residents, business owners, community organizations and new stakeholders in the neighborhood believe the area could be cleaner, safer, and healthier; there are also concerns about displacement. OEWD, in partnership with local housing organizations and neighborhood groups, also conducted a survey of residents in 2011. When asked what they liked most about the neighborhood, residents most frequently cited the location, accessibility, and local social services. Top concerns included homelessness, dirtiness of area, lack of public amenities, and that they feel unsafe in the neighborhood. When asked about their desired improvements for the neighborhood, residents asked for cleaner streets, safe public spaces, improved public safety, and more housing, both affordable and market rate.

---

<sup>136</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013 Five-Year Estimates

<sup>137</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013 Five-Year Estimates



Public safety is one of the most pressing issues. From November 2011 to October 2012, hotspots of criminal activity occurred along Sixth Street, Taylor Street, and at the intersection of Market and Seventh Street and Jones Street. Relative to other commercial districts the neighborhood experiences higher concentrations of assault, robbery, and drug and alcohol violations. (Source: SFPD incidents data, November 2009-October 2012).


A number of public, private and nonprofit entities are working to revitalize Central Market and Tenderloin. The area features three different Community Benefit Districts (CBDs) and a number of resident associations. The Central Market Partnership is a City-led effort to coordinate activities and spur private-sector efforts to improve the neighborhood.

Over the past five years Central Market has undergone extraordinary physical and economic changes that have attracted new residents, businesses, shoppers, and visitors to the area. Since the Central Market Economic Strategy was launched in late 2011, it has effectively helped coordinate public and private investment along Central Market. Seventeen tech companies, two co-working facilities and two venture capital firms have located in the area, bringing more than 12,000 new employees. More than 5,600 units of housing – 20% of which will be below market rate – are now under construction or approved for the area, and another 4,000 units are proposed. The storefront vacancy rate is down from 30% in 2010 to 16% today, and 13 new arts venues have opened with 4 more coming in 2015. Of those 13 new venues, 10 of them are relocations or expansions of arts venues from within the neighborhood or elsewhere in San Francisco.

### **Opportunities**

The Central Market Strategy has helped engage an extensive network of more than 25 city agencies and dozens of private and nonprofit stakeholders to work together to implement the goals set forth by the community. As a result, a number of new programs and investments are now being implemented both along Central Market and in the Tenderloin, such as a program to help existing businesses, arts groups and nonprofits stay and grow in the neighborhood; a major lighting improvement project by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission; and an expansion of the Tenderloin Safe Passage program, which ensures school children move between school and activities safely.

These developments have created more opportunities for the City to serve the neighborhood and an increased need for coordination of a growing number of stakeholders. Under the leadership of Mayor Lee, in 2014 the Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) and the Planning Department formed an Interagency Working Group to update and expand the Strategy with a focus on priority areas along Central Market, Sixth Street, and in the Tenderloin. The primary aim of the Strategy update is to harness the new investment along Central Market to create a diverse, healthy, mixed-income neighborhood that offers safety and well-being to all who live and work there. The Strategy will be released in May 2015.



In 2014, new developers, tech companies, small businesses and arts groups continued to move in, eager to contribute to and invest in the neighborhood – including the Tenderloin. An increasing number of improvement projects were also planned for the physical landscape. This confluence of energy, creativity and resources presented an opportunity to better coordinate and leverage the efforts of public and private actors to better serve the neighborhood.

The 2014 Central Market/Tenderloin Strategy update process documented the many public realm improvements planned or proposed for the area; engaged additional City agencies through the convening of a Central Market/Tenderloin Interagency Working Group; and conducted extensive community engagement including participation in numerous community planning processes, hosting or presenting at dozens of meetings, and conducting new focus groups and surveys. Appendix C further details these community engagement efforts.

This update process led to the inescapable conclusion that the area comprised of Central Market, Sixth Street and the Tenderloin should be treated as one distinct neighborhood, not three separate neighborhoods. These areas are interdependent, face similar challenges, and have long deserved a better quality of life for their residents. They have also become both a literal and symbolic center of a City struggling with a growing economic divide. Area residents and stakeholders have voiced a resounding commitment to ensuring that the area remains affordable and supportive of San Franciscans with substantial needs. And there is optimism that the area’s unique assets discussed above provide the opportunity to revitalize the neighborhood while ensuring low-income residents, including families and children and immigrant business owners, can benefit from cleaner and safer streets, quality businesses, recreation, and other opportunities alongside newcomers.

The update process has culminated in the creation of a new Strategy in 2015. To deepen and sustain the nascent revitalization on Market Street, this Strategy is expanded to include priority areas along Sixth Street and in the heart of the Tenderloin. The new Strategy captures important work underway as well as identifies new interventions that are planned or needed, as determined during the update process. It also creates a much-needed structure for implementation that allows work by the growing number of

diverse public and private stakeholders to proceed with increased coordination now and into the future. The goal is to harness the new investment in the area to create a diverse, healthy, mixed-income neighborhood that offers safety and well-being to all who live, work and visit the area.

For more information on the Central Market/Tenderloin Strategy, go to [investsf.org/neighborhoods/central-market](http://investsf.org/neighborhoods/central-market).

### **Visitacion Valley**

#### **Demographics**

Approximately 17,197<sup>138</sup> people live in Visitacion Valley. Despite a higher proportion of children in Visitacion Valley, median age for its population is older than San Francisco's. A majority of its population is Asian, and it has a higher proportion of Black and Latino residents than San Francisco overall. There are about 4,910 housing units in the area, of which 54% are owner-occupied<sup>139</sup>. The median household income for the neighborhood is significantly lower than that of the City overall. See the Appendix for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

#### **Neighborhood Features**

Visitacion Valley, tucked away in the southeastern section of San Francisco, features retail corridors along Leland Ave and Bayshore Boulevard. It is home to recent immigrants (predominantly Asian) and long-time San Francisco families alike. Local landmarks include Eichler homes, a Julia Morgan designed church, the Visitacion Valley Greenway, and the regional attractions of Candlestick Park and Cow Palace. With easy access to the 101 Freeway, T-Third Light Rail Line and Caltrain's Bayshore Station, residents and visitors have many choices for traveling within San Francisco and throughout the region.

#### **Commercial District Health**

Visitacion Valley has several challenges affecting the health of the commercial district; it has a high vacancy rate (23%) and low foot traffic. Sales tax captured has declined by 22% since 2006, compared with a citywide growth of 17%. While the area has undergone physical improvements to the public realm, those improvements alone have not succeeded in attracting more shoppers to the district. A study of existing sales tax compared with local demand indicates that local residents patronize businesses outside of the area. Businesses along the corridor include retail, food services, professional services and social assistance agencies.

From 2009 to 2012, robberies in the area increased by 31%, while assaults, burglaries and auto thefts have remained low. The greatest concentration of incidents in the district is in the area around Raymond Avenue.

#### **Opportunities**

Opportunities for growth exist in expanding marketing strategies for existing businesses and in attracting new businesses to fill vacant retail spaces. The expected redevelopment of the large vacant property located on Bayshore Boulevard (formerly occupied by a Schlage Lock factory) is anticipated to bring new residents and amenities to the area.

---

<sup>138</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013 Five-Year Estimates

<sup>139</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013 Five-Year Estimates

In 2012, Mayor Ed Lee announced the Invest in Neighborhoods (IIN) Initiative, which aims to strengthen small businesses, improve physical conditions, increase quality of life, and increase community capacity. Each participating district, of which Leland Avenue within Visitacion Valley is one, has a comprehensive service plan tailored to respond to the community's unique opportunities and needs. Businesses along the corridor include retail, food services, professional services and social assistance agencies. Opportunities for growth exist in strengthening the existing businesses and in attracting new businesses to fill vacant retail spaces.

In 2010 the corridor underwent a \$4.1 million streetscape improvement project, which included 63 newly planted trees, 30 accessible curb ramps, 15 corner bulb-outs and 45 pedestrian light fixtures. In addition, the street and sidewalks were repaved and now include decorative-stamped crosswalks to promote pedestrian safety, sidewalk furniture and public art. Despite the investment in physical improvements and community interventions commercial challenges have persisted within the area including declining sales tax revenue and a high vacancy rate. In 2012 the dissolution of the Redevelopment Agency resulted in loss of public funding for the redevelopment of the Schlage Lock an industrial site making the planned mixed-use development unfeasible. Even with this setback we have worked in close partnership to the mixed-use developer to secure and maximize public amenities while ensuring the project would be financially feasible. Since 2012 we led an extensive community planning/vision process which resulted in the adoption of a development agreement by the Board of Supervisors in 2014. We expect that the new residents and amenities to the area will contribute to the revitalization of Leland Avenue.

### **Western Addition**

#### **Demographics**

Approximately 20,521<sup>140</sup> people live in the Western Addition. This population is generally younger than San Francisco's population overall, with the 18 to 34 age group taking a large share. However, its proportion of residents over 60 years old is also higher than that of the City overall. More than 40% of the neighborhood is White, and Black residents comprise a higher share of the population than the City overall. The proportion of the Latino and Asian population in the neighborhood are smaller than the City's proportions. There are about 11,307<sup>141</sup> housing units in the neighborhood. A majority of households, 81%, in the Western Addition are renters. The median household income for the Western Addition is lower than the City's median income. See the Appendix for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

#### **Neighborhood Features**

The Fillmore is the commercial corridor serving the Western Addition neighborhood by the same name. During the middle part of the twentieth century, the demographics in the neighborhood shifted; as Jewish families moved out, and Japanese and Japanese-American families suffered internment, many African Americans who came to San Francisco for war industry jobs arrived in the Western Addition. The burgeoning African American community supported a slew of new jazz clubs and neighborhood businesses flourished; the district was dubbed 'the Harlem of the West'. Unfortunately during the

---

<sup>140</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013 Five-Year Estimates

<sup>141</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013 Five-Year Estimates

postwar period, Redevelopment in the Western Addition did severe damage to the community fabric, displacing residents and small businesses and disrupting the community network.

Today, the commercial district is a destination and boasts a growing food scene with new award-winning restaurants such as State Bird Provisions and 1300 on Fillmore.

### **Commercial District Health**

The Fillmore is a thriving and culturally rich commercial district, with a decreasing vacancy rate and a high level of foot traffic. From 2006 to 2012 sales tax captured in the district grew by 43%, compared with 17% growth Citywide. The corridor features a high number of eating and drinking establishments, with opportunities for growth in electronics and appliances and sporting goods.

Public safety along the Fillmore is a major concern for business owners and residents. The area experiences a high volume of crime relative to other commercial districts around the City. From November 2011 to October 2009 crimes occurred throughout the district, with the largest between Geary Boulevard and Eddy Street. (Source: SFPD incidents data, November 2009-October 2012) Merchants and advocates express concern about vehicle theft and break-ins, vandalism and robberies.

### **Opportunities**

Opportunities exist to build on community the active neighborhood association and other community-based and cultural organizations working to preserve the history of the neighborhood and contribute to the quality of life of the area. A recently formed Merchant Association will support businesses and attract new customers to the corridor.

### **Are there any community assets in these areas/neighborhoods?**

Yes, as described above, these neighborhoods have many community assets, including transit and bus services, commercial corridors, community centers and community organizations.

### **Are there other strategic opportunities in any of these areas?**

Yes, strategic opportunities in these neighborhoods are described above.

# Strategic Plan

## SP-05 Overview


### Strategic Plan Overview

San Francisco has determined that the optimum way to address the City's priority problem areas is to work towards a set of three interconnected, multidisciplinary objectives that cross program areas and utilize leveraged strategies both internally and across multiple city departments (see Exhibit 23 for Theory of Change diagram). Funding for these strategies will be coordinated across City departments, so that HUD funds can be maximized in those areas that are both of highest priority to MOHCD/OEWD and where HUD funds can provide the maximum benefit in terms of unmet need and resource scarcity. These three objectives are:

- Objective 1: Families and individuals are stably housed
- Objective 2: Communities have healthy physical, social, and business infrastructure
- Objective 3: Families and individuals are resilient and economically self-sufficient

Each of these three objectives is supported by a comprehensive set of goals and strategies that will guide MOHCD/OEWD through the next five years with specific activities that will enable the City to move its most vulnerable populations towards the three overarching objectives. Many of these goals and strategies will be leveraged to support multiple objectives and will address multiple problems.

**Exhibit 24 – MOHCD/OEWD Theory Change**



***Families and Individuals are Stably Housed***

The San Francisco Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) has undergone several significant changes in the past 5 years which affect the management and delivery of its housing programs and services.

First, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, along with all 400 redevelopment agencies in California, was dissolved on February 1, 2012, by order of the California Supreme Court in a decision issued on December 29, 2011 (California Redevelopment Association et al. v. Ana Matosantos). On June 27, 2012, the California Legislature passed and the Governor signed AB 1484, a bill making technical and substantive changes to AB 26, the dissolution bill that was found largely constitutional by the Supreme Court on December 29, 2011. Dissolution of redevelopment agencies in California eliminated a large source of funding for the development of affordable housing across the State. The impact was especially felt in San Francisco since the Redevelopment Agency historically devoted 50% of its tax increment financing to affordable housing. In response to the requirements of AB 26 and AB 1484, the City and County of San Francisco created the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII) as the Successor Agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency. Pursuant to state and local legislation, two bodies govern the Successor Agency, the Oversight Board of the Successor Agency and the Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure for the major development areas of Mission Bay, Transbay, and Hunters Point Shipyard. Also pursuant to state and local legislation, the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development was named as the successor-housing agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency. As the successor-housing agency, MOHCD has jurisdiction over all of the former Redevelopment Agency’s housing assets in existence as of February 1, 2012. The major development areas of Mission Bay, Transbay and Hunters Point Shipyard continue to have affordable

housing production requirements under their development agreements that were approved by the California Department of Finance as enforceable obligations of OCII. After those developments are completed they will be transferred to MOHCD as the successor-housing agency and then MOHCD will monitor compliance of those housing assets for the term of their affordability restrictions. Therefore, some of the goals and activities below speak to the continued integration of the Redevelopment Agency functions and infrastructure into MOHCD.

Second, the City and County of San Francisco has launched HOPE SF, which aims to move public housing away from the failed model of large, isolated islands of poverty and deteriorating housing and toward a new vision of high-quality mixed-income housing developments. HOPE SF's new model for revitalizing public housing draws on learning from more than 15 years of national HOPE VI experience, as well as on research by the Urban Institute, the Brookings Institute, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, and the Harlem Children's Zone. Then-Mayor Gavin Newsom and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors authorized \$95 million in local bond funding to launch HOPE SF, evidence of unprecedented City commitment to public housing. This amount exceeded the annual HOPE VI funding that year for the entire nation. HOPE SF will rebuild over 1,900 units in four public housing sites. Modern design principles will be used to transform more than 100 acres of dilapidated apartments into 2,400 additional homes, including both rental and for-sale units. The first HOPE SF site began construction in early 2010. This model will serve as a proving ground for various housing, community development, and economic and workforce development strategies being deployed elsewhere in the City.

In addition to HOPE SF, MOHCD is working closely with the San Francisco Housing Authority to rehabilitate and convert over 3,400 public housing units to private ownership and management under HUD's Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) program within the next 5 years. This effort will preserve an important housing safety net for some of San Francisco's poorest and most vulnerable residents.

The goals and activities enumerated in this strategic plan will be augmented by three cross-cutting strategies that will be executed by MOHCD over the 2015-2019 time period:

- Ensure exit plans/options for people leaving an intensive service setting
- Continue coordination with City agencies (including, but not limited to DPH, OCII, HAS, HOPE SF, HA) to leverage the resources of each and increase efficiency
- Strengthen systems to improve customer service, marketing, transparency, accountability, and data access
  - Create City Housing Policy Information Hub and pursue resources for enhanced website, including improvement to uniform application

### ***Communities Have Healthy Physical, Social, and Business Infrastructure***

Communities rely on strong infrastructures, which require investment in social capital within neighborhoods, safe and accessible buildings which offer valuable services to its residents, and vibrant commercial corridors with neighborhood-serving businesses that meet the needs of the local residents. To this end, San Francisco has chosen to invest in enhancing community facilities and public spaces, strengthening small businesses and commercial corridors, and increasing community cohesion through supporting community-based planning, leadership development, and community-led investment.



### ***Families and Individuals are Resilient and Economically Self-Sufficient***

For San Francisco’s low- and moderate-income residents to feel secure in their housing, advance towards their economic goals, and fully engage as resilient members of their community, each individual and their families need to be able to successfully move towards economic self-sufficiency. San Francisco uses as its basis for economic self-sufficiency the Family Economic Self-Sufficiency Standard (Self-Sufficiency Standard), which measures how much income is needed for a family of a certain composition living in a particular county to adequately meet its minimal basic needs. It is based on the costs families face on a daily basis – housing, food, childcare, out-of-pocket medical expenses, transportation, and other necessary spending – and provides a complete picture of what it takes for families to make ends meet. Calculated for 156 different family compositions in all 58 California Counties (and 35 other states), the Family Standard is based on credible, publicly available data sources, including:

- Housing costs: US Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Fair Market Rents and National Low-Income Housing Coalition (NLIHC)
- Childcare costs: California Department of Education (CDE)
- Food costs: US Department of Agriculture (USDA) low-cost food plan and ACCRA Cost of Living Index
- Health insurance costs: Medical Expenditure Panel Survey (MEPS)
- Transportation costs: U.S. Census and the National Association of Insurance Commissioners.

As stated by Diana Pearce in the Methodology Appendix for the Self Sufficiency Standard for California 2008, “Economic self-sufficiency cannot necessarily be achieved by wages alone. Public work supports (e.g., MediCal) are often necessary, even critical, for some families to meet the high costs of necessities in California, including housing, childcare, and health care. True self-sufficiency requires access to education, training, and jobs that provide skill development and career advancement over the long-term, rather than a specific job with a certain wage and benefits at one point in time. Being “self-sufficient”, however, does not imply that any family at any income should be completely self-reliant and independent of one another or the community-at-large. Indeed, it is through interdependence among families and community institutions (such as schools or religious institutions), as well as informal networks of friends, extended family, and neighbors that many families are able to meet both their non-economic and economic needs.” Research based on 2014 data by the Insight Center for Community Economic Development shows that of San Francisco’s households, 26.8.8% are living below the self-sufficiency standard. These households will not be able to move towards their goals of stable housing, healthy families, education and employment that moves them up the income ladder, without first knowing that they can meet their basic needs. San Francisco’s Consolidated Plan focuses on moving its residents towards self-sufficiency as the necessary first step towards success with all of their remaining goals.

**Table 70 – Self-Sufficiency and Poverty Characteristics for San Francisco, 2014**

County Characteristics	Households			Percentages		
	Below Poverty	Below SSS	Below SSS	Below Poverty	Below SSS	Below SSS
			Above Poverty			Above Poverty
<b>All</b>	23,187	67,934	44,747	9.10%	26.80%	17.70%
<b>With Children</b>	6,091	21,160	15,069	10.90%	38%	27.10%
<b>Without Children</b>	17,096	46,774	29,678	8.60%	23.60%	15.00%

Source: Insight Center for Community Economic Development, 2014

**Table 71 – Self-Sufficiency Standard for San Francisco Households with Two Adults, One Child 0-2 and One Child 13-18**

Self-Sufficiency Wage		Emergency Savings Fund	
Hourly Per Adult	\$17.91	Monthly Contribution	\$84
Monthly	\$6,303		
Annually	\$75,634		
Self-Sufficiency Standard			
Expense Type		Monthly Cost	
Housing		\$1,896	
Child Care		\$1,357	
Food		\$951	
Transportation		\$152	
Health Care		\$546	
Miscellaneous		\$490	
Taxes		\$1,127	
Earned Income Tax Credit		\$0	
Child Care Tax Credit		(\$50)	
Child Tax Credit		(\$167)	

## SP-10 Geographic Priorities – 91.215 (a)(1)

### Geographic Area

Table 72 – Geographic Priority Areas

<b>1</b>	<b>Area Name:</b>	Bayview Hunters Point
	<b>Area Type:</b>	Strategy area
	<b>Other Target Area Description:</b>	
	<b>HUD Approval Date:</b>	6/18/1996
	<b>% of Low/ Mod:</b>	
	<b>Revital Type:</b>	
	<b>Other Revital Description:</b>	
	<b>Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.</b>	MOHCD, along with the Department of Public Health and the Planning Department, has defined San Francisco neighborhoods by census tract boundaries (see Map 11). The Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood consists of the following census tracts: 230.01, 230.03, 231.02, 231.03, 232, 233, 234, 610, 612, 9806 and 9809.
	<b>Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.</b>	See MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion
	<b>How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?</b>	In 1993-94 San Francisco applied to HUD for consideration of six neighborhoods as federally designated Enterprise Communities. In order to be considered, all six neighborhoods developed ten-year strategic plans for community development. Of the six neighborhoods considered for recognition as Enterprise Communities, four were selected: Bayview Hunters Point; Visitacion Valley; South of Market and the Mission. The two neighborhoods not selected include Chinatown and the Tenderloin. The ten-year plans developed for the Enterprise Community application was sufficient for HUD to designate all six neighborhoods as Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas (NRSAs) in 1996.
<b>Identify the needs in this target area.</b>	<p>The following are the priority activities that will be carried out under the Consolidated Plan in the Bayview/Hunter's Point NRSA, organized by the Plan's Objectives and Priority Needs.</p> <p><b>Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed</b></p> <p>➤ Priority Need 1A: Develop and Maintain Affordable</p>	

		<p>Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Create new affordable rental units on Block 49</li> <li>▪ Create new affordable homeownership and rental units – Lennar/Shipyard</li> <li>▪ Create new affordable units on Alice Griffith and Hunters View sites through the HOPE SF initiative</li> <li>▪ Create new BMR units at Hunters View</li> <li>▪ Create new senior housing units at 5800 3<sup>rd</sup> Street</li> <li>▪ RAD – Complete rehab projects at Westbrook and Hunters Point East and West</li> <li>▪ HOPE SF - Continue efforts to revitalize Alice Griffith and Hunters View</li> </ul> <p>➤ Priority Need 1B: Make Housing Affordable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Continue administration of Certificate of Preference program providing displaced Bayview residents an opportunity to return to Bayview</li> <li>▪ Support expand rental readiness and homeownership opportunities to meet the increase in Bayview housing production</li> <li>▪ Collaborate with OCII to standardize marketing procedures</li> <li>▪ Support affirmative marketing to underrepresented communities for greater access to homeownership and rental opportunities citywide</li> </ul> <p>➤ Priority Need 1C: Prevent and Treat Homelessness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Maintain support to homeless shelters in the southeast sector of the city</li> <li>▪ HOPE SF to collaborate with tenant counseling and eviction prevention services to serve Alice Griffith and Hunters View residents</li> <li>▪ Provide outreach and counseling in targeted areas where residents are threatened with displacement and might be unaware of their rights and protections.</li> </ul> <p>➤ Priority Need 1D: Provide Supportive Housing Services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support RAD transition &amp; stabilization at Westbrook and Hunters Point East and West</li> <li>▪ Prepare Alice Griffith and Hunters View residents for the transition to nonprofit management</li> <li>▪ Increase service connection for Hunters View and Alice Griffith residents</li> </ul> <p><b>Objective 2: Communities Have Healthy Physical, Social, and Business Infrastructure</b></p>
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Priority Need 2A: Enhance Community Facilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support capital improvements to Bayview Opera House</li> <li>▪ Create construction of childcare centers at Hunters View and Alice Griffith</li> <li>▪ Support creation of senior center at 5800 3rd Street</li> <li>▪ Support Community Garden at Bret Harte School</li> <li>▪ Support Model Block greening program at 1100 block of Fitzgerald</li> <li>▪ Support public improvements in and around Hunters View and Alice Griffith</li> </ul> </li>   <li>➤ Priority Need 2B: Strengthen Small Businesses and Commercial Corridors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Target funding and resources on the improvement of safety.</li> <li>▪ Administer a safety and cleaning ambassador program along 3rd Street, with the highest concentration of service in the Town Center (this funding will have the opportunity to create up 8 full-time and 4 part-time positions that will target employing public housing residents)</li> <li>▪ Continue to deploy the SF Shines Façade and Tenant Improvement Program, but extend the program to allow for non-commercial properties along Third Street to be assisted (this will help to increase pedestrian level lighting and remove opportunities for tagging, loitering, and squatting along the corridor)</li> <li>▪ Undertake a community planning process to create a post-redevelopment economic action plan.</li> </ul> </li>   <li>➤ Priority Need 2C: Increase Community Cohesion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support creation of Community Action Grants program</li> <li>▪ Support convening of community providers focusing on collaboration, capacity building, and service to multicultural communities</li> <li>▪ Support community building activities at Hunters View and Alice Griffith</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Objective 3: Families and Individuals are Resilient and Economically Self-Sufficient</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Priority Need 3A: Promote Workforce Development</li> </ul>
--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Continue outreach to Bayview Hunters Point residents for job readiness and workforce development services</li> </ul> <p>➤ Priority Need 3B: Promote Economic Advancement Through Barrier Removal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Continue to fund service connection activities at Alice Griffith, Hunters View</li> <li>▪ Create service connection services at Westbrook and Hunters Point East and West</li> <li>▪ Collaborate with the Treasurer’s Office and the District 10 Financial Empowerment Program to expand financial literacy services in the Bayview</li> <li>▪ Support resident services at Hunters View and Alice Griffith specific to financial literacy and management</li> </ul>
	<b>What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?</b>	Opportunities for improvement are listed under each of the needs above.
	<b>Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?</b>	
<b>2</b>	<b>Area Name:</b>	Chinatown
	<b>Area Type:</b>	Strategy area
	<b>Other Target Area Description:</b>	
	<b>HUD Approval Date:</b>	6/18/1996
	<b>% of Low/ Mod:</b>	
	<b>Revital Type:</b>	
	<b>Other Revital Description:</b>	
	<b>Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.</b>	MOHCD, along with the Department of Public Health and the Planning Department, has defined San Francisco neighborhoods by census tract boundaries (see Map 11). The Chinatown neighborhood consists of the following census tracts: 107, 113, 118 and 611.
	<b>Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.</b>	See MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion
	<b>How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?</b>	In 1993-94 San Francisco applied to HUD for consideration of six neighborhoods as federally designated Enterprise Communities. In order to be considered, all six neighborhoods developed ten-year strategic plans for community development. Of the six neighborhoods considered for recognition as Enterprise Communities,

	<p>four were selected: Bayview Hunters Point; Visitacion Valley; South of Market and the Mission. The two neighborhoods not selected include Chinatown and the Tenderloin. The ten-year plans developed for the Enterprise Community application was sufficient for HUD to designate all six neighborhoods as Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas (NRSAs) in 1996.</p>
<p><b>Identify the needs in this target area.</b></p>	<p>The following are the priority activities that will be carried out under the Consolidated Plan in the Chinatown NRSA, organized by the Plan’s Objectives and Priority Needs.</p> <p><b>Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Priority Need 1A: Develop and Maintain Affordable Housing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Create new affordable rental units at Broadway and Sansome Streets</li> <li>▪ Create new affordable rental units at Broadway and Front Streets</li> <li>▪ Explore possibility of pursuing Choice Neighborhood Initiative Planning Grant with community based organizations</li> <li>▪ RAD – Complete public housing rehabilitation projects at 227 Bay Street, 990 Pacific Avenue and Ping Yuen</li> <li>▪ Complete seismic retrofit work at 665 Clay Street</li> <li>▪ Pursue, acquire, and rehabilitate small sites to stabilize the housing of low-income tenants through Small Sites Program</li> <li>▪ Do targeted outreach to property owners and renters about Lead and CalHOME rehab programs</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Priority Need 1B: Make Housing Affordable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provide housing counseling services and increased marketing for Chinatown residents pursuing homeownership opportunities</li> <li>▪ Support affirmative marketing to underrepresented communities for greater access to homeownership and rental opportunities citywide</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Priority Need 1C: Prevent and Treat Homelessness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provide outreach and counseling in targeted areas where residents are threatened with displacement and might be unaware of their rights and protections.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Priority Need 1D: Provide Supportive Housing Services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support RAD transition and stabilization services at Ping Yuen public housing developments</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Objective 2: Communities Have Healthy Physical, Social, and Business Infrastructure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Priority Need 2A: Enhance Community Facilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Continue to focus on improving facilities of community hubs</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Priority Need 2B: Strengthen Small Businesses and Commercial Corridors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Expand services to existing businesses to help them stay and grow in the Central Subway station and Portsmouth Square neighborhoods (as the Chinese Hospital and Willie Woo Woo Wong playground undergo construction)</li> <li>▪ Invest in the beautification and removal of physical barriers of the storefront businesses as a way to refresh their facades and provide a clean and safe environment for customers to frequent and shop.</li> <li>▪ Provide support to and invest in local revitalization initiatives such as Keep Chinatown Clean, Dancing on Waverly, and Shop Chinatown 888; these are projects that have brought increased traffic to the local economy and highlighted the culture and arts in the community</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Priority Need 2C: Increase Community Cohesion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Continue to support the functioning of the API Council</li> <li>▪ Support for convening and collaboration to nonprofit service providers targeting Chinatown residents to encourage service coordination and maximize shared learning</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Objective 3: Families and Individuals are Resilient and Economically Self-Sufficient</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Priority Need 3A: Promote Workforce Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Continue outreach to Chinatown residents for job readiness and workforce development services</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Priority Need 3B: Promote Economic Advancement Through Barrier Removal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Create service connection services at Ping Yuen</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	---



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Enhance service connection for seniors in Chinatown</li> <li>▪ Support programs focusing on building foundational skills for Chinatown residents, especially immigrants with limited English</li> <li>▪ Support programs that provide Chinatown residents with legal services, assistance and community education, focusing on workplace rights and application assistance for recent and/or limited English proficient immigrants.</li> <li>▪ Provide financial literacy services to Chinatown residents, especially recent or monolingual immigrants</li> </ul>
	<b>What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?</b>	Opportunities for improvement are listed under each of the needs above.
	<b>Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?</b>	
<b>3</b>	<b>Area Name:</b>	Mission
	<b>Area Type:</b>	Strategy area
	<b>Other Target Area Description:</b>	
	<b>HUD Approval Date:</b>	6/18/1996
	<b>% of Low/ Mod:</b>	
	<b>Revital Type:</b>	
	<b>Other Revital Description:</b>	
	<b>Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.</b>	MOHCD, along with the Department of Public Health and the Planning Department, has defined San Francisco neighborhoods by census tract boundaries (see Map 11). The Mission neighborhood consists of the following census tracts: 177, 201, 202, 207, 208, 209, 210, 228.01, 228.02, 228.03, 229.01, 229.02 and 229.03.
	<b>Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.</b>	See MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion
<b>How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?</b>	In 1993-94 San Francisco applied to HUD for consideration of six neighborhoods as federally designated Enterprise Communities. In order to be considered, all six neighborhoods developed ten-year strategic plans for community development. Of the six neighborhoods considered for recognition as Enterprise Communities, four were selected: Bayview Hunters Point; Visitacion Valley; South of Market and the Mission. The two	

	<p>neighborhoods not selected include Chinatown and the Tenderloin. The ten-year plans developed for the Enterprise Community application was sufficient for HUD to designate all six neighborhoods as Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas (NRSAs) in 1996.</p>
<p><b>Identify the needs in this target area.</b></p>	<p>The following are the priority activities that will be carried out under the Consolidated Plan in the Mission NRSA, organized by the Plan’s Objectives and Priority Needs.</p> <p><b>Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Priority Need 1A: Develop and Maintain Affordable Housing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Create new affordable rental units at 1950 Mission</li> <li>▪ Create new affordable rental units at 17th and Folsom Streets</li> <li>▪ Create new affordable rental units at 1294 Shotwell</li> <li>▪ Create new affordable rental units at 3001 24th Street</li> <li>▪ RAD – complete rehab projects at 255 Sanchez, 462 Duboce, 255 Woodside, 3850 18th Street, Mission Dolores</li> <li>▪ Pursue, acquire, and rehabilitate small sites to stabilize the housing of low-income tenants through Small Sites Program</li> <li>▪ Do targeted outreach to property owners and renters about Lead and CalHOME rehab programs</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Priority Need 1B: Make Housing Affordable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Maintain homeownership counseling services for Mission residents, especially new and limited English speaking immigrants</li> <li>▪ Support affirmative marketing to underrepresented communities for greater access to homeownership and rental opportunities citywide</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Priority Need 1C: Prevent and Treat Homelessness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support culturally and linguistically competent services to Mission residents at risk of eviction</li> <li>▪ Continue to support services for homeless populations living in the Mission</li> <li>▪ Provide outreach and counseling in targeted areas where residents are threatened with displacement and might be unaware of their rights and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<p>protections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Priority Need 1D: Provide Supportive Housing Services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Continue to support residential care facility for the chronically ill</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Objective 2: Communities Have Healthy Physical, Social, and Business Infrastructure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Priority Need 2A: Enhance Community Facilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Continue to support Mission-based community hubs with co-located services</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Priority Need 2B: Strengthen Small Businesses and Commercial Corridors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Continue focusing the mix the interventions and programs to address the current conditions of Lower 24th Street</li> <li>▪ Continue and expand services to existing businesses to help them stay and grow in the neighborhood</li> <li>▪ Support the institutions and existing cultural assets that attract visitors to experience the history and contribute to the economic strength of the corridor (examples of services may include leasing assistance and negotiations, development of marketing strategies, improved access to local resources and technical business assistance)</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Priority Need 2C: Increase Community Cohesion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support convening efforts, collaboration and service coordination for Mission organizations, especially around legal services for immigrants</li> <li>▪ Partner with City in Promise Neighborhood and Promise Zone Initiatives</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Objective 3: Families and Individuals are Resilient and Economically Self-Sufficient</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Priority Need 3A: Promote Workforce Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Continue outreach to Mission residents for job readiness and workforce development services</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Priority Need 3B: Promote Economic Advancement Through Barrier Removal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support culturally and linguistically competent services</li> <li>▪ Support programs focusing on building</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	--

		<p>foundational skills, especially those focused on recent and/or limited English speaking immigrants</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Continue to support coordinated legal services targeted to the needs of the immigrant community</li> <li>▪ Support culturally and linguistically competent services</li> </ul>
	<b>What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?</b>	Opportunities for improvement are listed under each of the needs above.
	<b>Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?</b>	
<b>4</b>	<b>Area Name:</b>	South of Market
	<b>Area Type:</b>	Strategy area
	<b>Other Target Area Description:</b>	
	<b>HUD Approval Date:</b>	6/18/1996
	<b>% of Low/ Mod:</b>	
	<b>Revital Type:</b>	
	<b>Other Revital Description:</b>	
	<b>Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.</b>	MOHCD, along with the Department of Public Health and the Planning Department, has defined San Francisco neighborhoods by census tract boundaries (see Map 11). The South of Market neighborhood consists of the following census tracts: 176.01, 178.01, 178.02 and 180.
	<b>Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.</b>	See MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion
	<b>How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?</b>	In 1993-94 San Francisco applied to HUD for consideration of six neighborhoods as federally designated Enterprise Communities. In order to be considered, all six neighborhoods developed ten-year strategic plans for community development. Of the six neighborhoods considered for recognition as Enterprise Communities, four were selected: Bayview Hunters Point; Visitacion Valley; South of Market and the Mission. The two neighborhoods not selected include Chinatown and the Tenderloin. The ten-year plans developed for the Enterprise Community application was sufficient for HUD to designate all six neighborhoods as Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas (NRSAs) in 1996.
<b>Identify the needs in this target area.</b>	The following are the priority activities that will be carried	

out under the Consolidated Plan in the South of Market NRSA, organized by the Plan's Objectives and Priority Needs.

**Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably House**

- Priority Need 1A: Develop and Maintain Affordable Housing
  - Create new affordable rental units at 1009 Howard St (aka 200 6th Street)
  - Create new affordable rental units at 1036 Mission
  - Create new affordable rental units at 5th and Howard St
  - Pursue new development opportunities to create new affordable rental units
  - RAD – complete rehab projects at 320 and 330 Clementina
  - Pursue, acquire, and rehabilitate small sites to stabilize the housing of low-income tenants through Small Sites Program
  - Do targeted outreach to property owners and renters about Lead and CalHOME rehab programs
  
- Priority Need 1B: Make Housing Affordable
  - Ensure outreach to current neighborhood residents to maximize access to BMR homeownership opportunities
  - Ensure outreach to current neighborhood residents to maximize access affordable rental opportunities (e.g. SOMA Fund)
  
- Priority Need 1C: Prevent and Treat Homelessness
  - Maintain support to homeless shelters in the SOMA
  - Support housing placement and case management in the South of Market
  - Provide outreach and counseling in targeted areas where residents are threatened with displacement and might be unaware of their rights and protections.

**Objective 2: Communities Have Healthy Physical, Social, and Business Infrastructure**

- Priority Need 2A: Enhance Community Facilities

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provide capital support for a permanent youth services facility</li> <li>▪ Explore providing capital support for a cultural facility</li> <li>▪ Support nonprofits affected by nonprofit displacement</li> <li>▪ Explore possibility of developing a multi-tenant office space</li> <li>▪ Explore possibility of partnering with City’s Recreation and Park Department to leverage public space improvement opportunities</li> <li>▪ Provide Complete Neighborhood infrastructure support to appropriate parts of SoMa affected by increased housing density</li> </ul> <p>➤ Priority Need 2B: Strengthen Small Businesses and Commercial Corridors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Strengthen business and neighborhood coordination through SoMa Strong collaboration</li> <li>▪ Update the strategy for the Sixth Street action zone (which will provide services [e.g. one on one assistance with leases, other types of technical assistance and financing] to existing businesses to help them stay and grow in the neighborhood as the economic landscape shifts)</li> <li>▪ Focus on business attraction efforts to bring in neighborhood-serving businesses that will provide affordable goods and services; use SF Shines façade and tenant improvement grants to help facilitate this</li> <li>▪ Complete streetscape and pedestrian improvement project that will make the street safer, more accessible, and more attractive</li> </ul> <p>➤ Priority Need 2C: Increase Community Cohesion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Continue to support Community Action Grants program</li> <li>▪ Support convening Community Council focusing on collaboration, capacity building, and service to multicultural communities</li> <li>▪ Support Youth Services Provider Coalition focusing on youth leadership, collaboration, capacity building, and service to multicultural communities</li> </ul> <p><b>Objective 3: Families and Individuals are Resilient and Economically Self-Sufficient</b></p>
--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Priority Need 3A: Promote Workforce Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Continue outreach to SOMA residents for job readiness and workforce development services</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Priority Need 3B: Promote Economic Advancement Through Barrier Removal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Create service connection for youth and families, especially focusing on school site programming and college preparatory programs</li> <li>▪ Expand outreach and services to SOMA residents</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
	<b>What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?</b>	Opportunities for improvement are listed under each of the needs above.
	<b>Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?</b>	
5	<b>Area Name:</b>	Tenderloin
	<b>Area Type:</b>	Strategy area
	<b>Other Target Area Description:</b>	
	<b>HUD Approval Date:</b>	6/18/1996
	<b>% of Low/ Mod:</b>	
	<b>Revital Type:</b>	
	<b>Other Revital Description:</b>	
	<b>Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.</b>	MOHCD, along with the Department of Public Health and the Planning Department, has defined San Francisco neighborhoods by census tract boundaries (see Map 11). The Tenderloin neighborhood consists of the following census tracts: 122.01, 122.02, 123.01, 123.02, 124.01, 124.02, 125.01 and 125.02.
	<b>Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.</b>	See MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion
<b>How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?</b>	In 1993-94 San Francisco applied to HUD for consideration of six neighborhoods as federally designated Enterprise Communities. In order to be considered, all six neighborhoods developed ten-year strategic plans for community development. Of the six neighborhoods considered for recognition as Enterprise Communities, four were selected: Bayview Hunters Point; Visitacion Valley; South of Market and the Mission. The two neighborhoods not selected include Chinatown and the Tenderloin. The ten-year plans developed for the Enterprise Community application was sufficient for HUD	

	to designate all six neighborhoods as Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas (NRSAs) in 1996.
<b>Identify the needs in this target area.</b>	<p>The following are the priority activities that will be carried out under the Consolidated Plan in the Tenderloin NRSA, organized by the Plan’s Objectives and Priority Needs.</p> <p><b>Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Priority Need 1A: Develop and Maintain Affordable Housing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Create new affordable rental units at Eddy and Taylor</li> <li>▪ RAD: complete rehab projects at 666 Ellis, 430 Turk and 350 Ellis</li> <li>▪ Rehabilitate and recapitalize O’Farrell Towers</li> <li>▪ Rehabilitate Yosemite Apartments</li> <li>▪ Do targeted outreach to property owners and renters about Lead and CalHOME rehab programs</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Priority Need 1B: Make Housing Affordable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support expanded rental readiness and homeownership opportunities</li> <li>▪ Support affirmative marketing to underrepresented communities for greater access to homeownership and rental opportunities citywide</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Priority Need 1C: Prevent and Treat Homelessness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Continue support to Tenderloin-based providers of eviction defense services</li> <li>▪ Maintain support to homeless shelters in the TL</li> <li>▪ Support case management, housing placement and foundational competencies in the Tenderloin</li> <li>▪ Provide outreach and counseling in targeted areas where residents are threatened with displacement and might be unaware of their rights and protections.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Objective 2: Communities Have Healthy Physical, Social, and Business Infrastructure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Priority Need 2A: Enhance Community Facilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provide support to the Tenderloin Museum</li> <li>▪ Support nonprofits affected by nonprofit displacement</li> <li>▪ Explore possibility of developing a multi-tenant office space</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support citywide efforts to revitalize Central Market/Tenderloin area</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Priority Need 2B: Strengthen Small Businesses and Commercial Corridors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Continue focus on updating the strategy for providing services to existing businesses to help them stay and grow in the neighborhood as the economic landscape shifts (e.g. one on one assistance with leases, other types of technical assistance and financing, or neighborhood-wide efforts such as the promotion of Little Saigon to new area employees)</li> <li>▪ Focus on business attraction efforts to bring in neighborhood-serving businesses that will provide affordable goods and services as well as complement new arts venues now in development (use SF Shines façade and tenant improvement grants to help facilitate this)</li> <li>▪ Partner with nonprofit community facilities to support their efforts to upgrade the exterior of their buildings and undertake efforts to bring positive activation to their storefronts and sidewalks</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Priority Need 2C: Increase Community Cohesion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support Youth Services Provider Coalition focusing on youth leadership, collaboration, capacity building, and service to multicultural communities</li> <li>▪ Increase support to South East Asian service providers</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Objective 3: Families and Individuals are Resilient and Economically Self-Sufficient</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Priority Need 3A: Promote Workforce Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Continue outreach to Tenderloin residents for job readiness and workforce development services</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Priority Need 3B: Promote Economic Advancement Through Barrier Removal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Explore provision of service connection and foundational competency trainings to residents of Single Room Occupancy hotels, especially those without an existing relationship with the CCSF</li> <li>▪ Continue to support foundational skills for</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	---


		<p>Tenderloin residents, especially the homeless population</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provide financial literacy services to Tenderloin residents, especially recent or monolingual immigrants</li> </ul>
	<b>What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?</b>	Opportunities for improvement are listed under each of the needs above.
	<b>Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?</b>	
<b>6</b>	<b>Area Name:</b>	Visitacion Valley
	<b>Area Type:</b>	Strategy area
	<b>Other Target Area Description:</b>	
	<b>HUD Approval Date:</b>	6/18/1996
	<b>% of Low/ Mod:</b>	
	<b>Revital Type:</b>	
	<b>Other Revital Description:</b>	
	<b>Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.</b>	MOHCD, along with the Department of Public Health and the Planning Department, has defined San Francisco neighborhoods by census tract boundaries (see Map 11). The Visitacion Valley neighborhood consists of the following census tracts: 264.01, 264.02, 264.03, 264.04 and 605.02.
	<b>Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.</b>	See MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion
	<b>How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?</b>	In 1993-94 San Francisco applied to HUD for consideration of six neighborhoods as federally designated Enterprise Communities. In order to be considered, all six neighborhoods developed ten-year strategic plans for community development. Of the six neighborhoods considered for recognition as Enterprise Communities, four were selected: Bayview Hunters Point; Visitacion Valley; South of Market and the Mission. The two neighborhoods not selected include Chinatown and the Tenderloin. The ten-year plans developed for the Enterprise Community application was sufficient for HUD to designate all six neighborhoods as Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas (NRSAs) in 1996.
<b>Identify the needs in this target area.</b>	The following are the priority activities that will be carried out under the Consolidated Plan in the Visitacion Valley NRSA, organized by the Plan's Objectives and Priority	

	<p>Needs.</p> <p><b>Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Priority Need 1A: Develop and Maintain Affordable Housing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Create new affordable units at Schlage Lock site</li> <li>▪ HOPE SF – continue efforts to revitalize and create new affordable units at Sunnydale</li> <li>▪ Pursue, acquire, and rehabilitate small sites to stabilize the housing of low-income tenants through Small Sites Program</li> <li>▪ Do targeted outreach to low-income homeowners in Vis Valley about Lead and CalHOME rehab programs</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Priority Need 1B: Make Housing Affordable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support homeownership opportunities to meet the increase in housing production in the City's southeast sector, including the promotion of DALP and the Mortgage Credit Certificate program</li> <li>▪ Support affirmative marketing to underrepresented communities for greater access to homeownership and rental opportunities citywide</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Priority Need 1C: Prevent and Treat Homelessness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Provide tenant counseling and eviction prevention services to Sunnydale residents, both on-lease and off lease.</li> <li>➤ Maintain support to homeless shelters in the southeast sector of the city</li> <li>➤ HOPE SF to collaborate with tenant counseling and eviction prevention services to serve Sunnydale residents</li> <li>➤ Provide outreach and counseling in targeted areas where residents are threatened with displacement and might be unaware of their rights and protections.</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ Priority Need 1D: Provide Supportive Housing Services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Prepare Sunnydale residents for the transition to nonprofit management</li> <li>➤ Increase service connection for Sunnydale residents</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Objective 2: Communities Have Healthy Physical, Social,</b></p>
--	--

	<p><b>and Business Infrastructure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Priority Need 2A: Enhance Community Facilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Provide capital investment to Visitacion Valley service hub at 50 Raymond</li> <li>➤ Provide capital investment to community services hub in Sunnydale</li> <li>➤ Partner with City departments to provide input into development plan for Schlage Lock Site</li> <li>➤ Coordinate capital and services planning processes across development plans for facilities</li> <li>➤ Support the development of community gardens in Sunnydale</li> </ul> </li>   <li>➤ Priority Need 2B: Strengthen Small Businesses and Commercial Corridors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ As a part of the Leland Avenue IIN customized service plan, continue strengthening the longtime existing business by providing individualized and comprehensive technical assistance,</li> <li>▪ As a part of the Leland Avenue IIN customized service plan, continue supporting neighborhood events to attract people to the corridor, building relationships with property owners to attract businesses and fill vacancies, physically improving business storefronts, and conducting business outreach and tailoring business services</li> </ul> </li>   <li>➤ Priority Need 2C: Increase Community Cohesion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Continue to support convening of community providers focusing on collaboration, capacity building, and service to multicultural communities in Visitacion Valley</li> <li>▪ Continue to support HOPE SF community building activities at Sunnydale</li> <li>▪ Continue to support CNI planning and implementation activities, peer leadership and Leadership Academies at Sunnydale</li> </ul> </li>   <p><b>Objective 3: Families and Individuals are Resilient and Economically Self-Sufficient</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Priority Need 3A: Promote Workforce Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Continue outreach to Visitacion Valley residents for job readiness and workforce development services</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </ul>
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Priority Need 3B: Promote Economic Advancement Through Barrier Removal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Continue to fund service connection activities at Sunnydale</li> <li>▪ Continue to provide support for culturally and linguistically competent services in Visitacion Valley</li> <li>▪ Support programs focusing on building foundational skills, especially for public housing residents and new and/or limited English speaking immigrants</li> <li>▪ Collaborate with the Treasurer's Office and the Financial Empowerment Initiative to expand financial literacy services in the southeast sector</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?</b></p>	<p>Opportunities for improvement are listed under each of the needs above.</p>
<p><b>Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?</b></p>	

**Map 11 – Map of San Francisco with Neighborhood Boundaries**



**General Allocation Priorities**

**Describe the basis for allocating investments geographically within the jurisdiction (or within the EMSA for HOPWA)**

Assistance will be directed in HUD-designated Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas (NRSAs), HUD-defined areas of low- and moderate-income concentration and minority concentration, and Invest in Neighborhoods Commercial Districts. HUD funds will be primarily directed in NRSAs and in areas of low- and moderate-income and minority concentration. See Map 12 for these geographic areas.

***Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas (NRSAs)***

In 1993-94 San Francisco applied to HUD for consideration of six neighborhoods as federally designated Enterprise Communities. In order to be considered, all six neighborhoods developed ten-year strategic plans for community development. Of the six neighborhoods considered for recognition as Enterprise Communities, four were selected: Bayview Hunters Point; Visitacion Valley; South of Market and the Mission. The two neighborhoods not selected include Chinatown and the Tenderloin. The ten-year plans

developed for the Enterprise Community application was sufficient for HUD to designate all six neighborhoods as Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas (NRSAs) in 1996.

MOHCD has made investments in each of these areas that correspond to the key principles of the original Enterprise Community Program, including 1) economic opportunity; 2) sustainable community development; 3) community based partnerships; and 4) strategic visions for change. The strategic plans for these neighborhoods provide substantive detail regarding community priorities such as economic development and job training; safe and affordable housing; public safety; neighborhood beautification; education; child care and public service support.

MOHCD respectfully requests renewal for all six of the current NRSA designations as provided for at 24 CFR 91.215 (e) (2) and CPD Notice 96.01.

MOHCD compliance with HUD criteria:

- **Boundaries:** MOHCD has provided census tract boundaries to specifically define each neighborhood according to year 2010 census data;
- **Demographic Criteria:** Each of the designated neighborhoods meets or exceeds the requirement that it be primarily residential and contain a percentage for low- and moderate-income residents that is equal to the “upper quartile percentage” (as computed by HUD pursuant to 24 CFR 570.208(a)(1)(ii) or 70%, whichever is less, but not less than 51%);
- **Consultation:** Strategic plans were developed for all six neighborhoods in consultation with the area’s key stakeholders, including residents, owners/operators of businesses and financial institutions, non-profit organizations, and community groups that are in or serve the neighborhood;
- **Assessment:** Each strategic plan includes an assessment of the economic situation in each area and economic development improvement opportunities and problems likely to be encountered;
- **Economic Empowerment:** MOHCD has a realistic development strategy and implementation plan to promote the area’s economic progress focusing on activities to create meaningful jobs for the unemployed and low- and moderate-income residents of the area as well as activities to promote the substantial revitalization of the neighborhood; and
- **Performance Measurement:** MOHCD has developed a program matrix that identifies reliable indicators including physical improvements, social initiatives and economic development activities, which are measurable over time.

In addition to the HUD guidelines, MOHCD has taken the additional step of reviewing each of the neighborhood strategic plans and is committed to achieving very specific outcomes over the next five years. The table above provides a supplemental snapshot of neighborhood assets, persistent needs and five-year opportunities for each neighborhood.

### ***Areas of Low- and Moderate-Income Concentration***

HUD calculates low- and moderate-income concentration by census block groups. See Map 12 for what HUD considers as areas of low- and moderate-income concentration in San Francisco.

### ***Areas of Minority Concentration***

Although racial and ethnic groups are distributed throughout the City, certain neighborhoods have higher than average concentrations of minority households. HUD requires recipients of its funding to identify areas of minority concentration in the aggregate as well as by specific racial/ethnic group.

San Francisco has defined an area of aggregate minority concentration as any census tract with a minority population that is 20 percentage points greater than that of the City's total minority percentage. According to the 2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, 58.2% of the City's population is identified as being composed of minorities, and therefore any census tract in which 78.2% of the population is classified as minority would qualify as an Area of Minority Concentration. See Map 12.

### ***Invest In Neighborhoods Commercial Districts***

Our neighborhood economic development strategy focuses on strengthening small businesses and key commercial neighborhood corridors that contribute to the local fabric of communities and are the backbone of our local economy. CDBG resources are a key component of this strategy, they fund our community based organizations (CBO's) to provide business technical assistance and support local commercial corridors. Our CBO's serve to provide services that are accessible at the neighborhood level and are culturally, ethnically and linguistically tailored for startup and existing businesses. While CDBG allows us to provide basic business assistance, we leverage these services by combining them with city programs that address the existing economic development needs in a strategic way. In 2012 as part of Mayor Ed Lee's 17 points jobs, he created the Invest In Neighborhoods (IIN) initiative, which has become our approach to neighborhood economic development. The basic principal of the initiative is to provide customized assistance that meets the specific needs of San Francisco's neighborhood commercial corridors. It aligns existing and new City resources and services to commercial corridors around the City in a way that is smart, efficient, and responsive to individual neighborhood needs and opportunities. Small businesses make an essential contribution to the culture and identity of San Francisco and in response the second point to the jobs plan created the Jobs Squad, which helps small businesses, navigate City processes, access vital City programs, and stay informed of issues that may affect them. This team of City staff conducts door-to-door outreach to small businesses around the City to connect them with help and information.

The purpose of the IIN initiative is to strengthen small businesses, improve physical conditions, increase quality of life, and build community capacity in 25 commercial districts throughout the city. While continuing to prioritize low- and moderate-income neighborhoods the goal is to establish more robust citywide programs and services to benefit small businesses, their owners, employees, and their neighborhoods across the city.

The initiative is managed by OEWD but represents an interagency approach under the Mayor's direction. IIN builds on the prior Administration's commercial corridor revitalization efforts, which targeted a smaller cohort of low- and moderate-income neighborhoods and did not leverage other City departments and resources as effectively. The initiative has also served to offset some of the neighborhood resources that were lost due to the dissolution of the SF Redevelopment Agency.




Invest in Neighborhoods provides a standard set of “baseline interventions” to all 25 corridors, and then targeted customized interventions to individual corridors based on an initial economic assessment and stakeholder input.

Among the baseline services all corridors receive include:

- An assigned staff person at City Hall, that oversees a plan for the area and manages provision of services
- A Jobs Squad member for business outreach and provides businesses with guidance on navigating City processes and referrals to city agencies and community partners
- Quarterly tracking and update of existing vacancies and access to StorfrontSF.com, a citywide, on-line vacancy-tracking database
- Access to a set of City-funded small business loan programs

Customized interventions for each corridor are then deployed based on their initial economic assessment. These interventions are selected from a broad-ranging suite of tools aimed at supporting small businesses and their surrounding commercial districts. OEWD utilizes CDBG along with General Fund dollars to provide these programs and services, and leverages them with resources and efforts from other City agencies and often private partners.

**Map 12 – NRSAs, Areas of Low- and Moderate-Income Concentration, Areas of Minority Concentration and Invest In Neighborhoods Commercial Districts**



## SP-25 Priority Needs - 91.215(a)(2)

### Priority Needs

**Table 73 – Priority Needs Summary**

<b>1</b>	<b>Priority Need Name</b>	Develop and Maintain Affordable Housing
	<b>Priority Level</b>	High
	<b>Population</b>	Extremely Low Low Moderate Middle Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse Veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families Victims of Domestic Violence Non-housing Community Development Other - Immigrants
	<b>Geographic Areas Affected</b>	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley
	<b>Associated Goals</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased Supply of Affordable Housing</li> <li>• Preserve and Maintain Affordable Housing Supply</li> </ul>
	<b>Description</b>	The development of new affordable housing and the preservation and maintenance of the existing affordable housing stock has never been more important as the demand for both rental and homeownership housing threatens to push low and moderate income households out of San Francisco. New housing must be built to address the growing population but also to replace San Francisco's aging housing

		supply. Preservation of existing housing stock through acquisition of smaller properties and taking them off the speculative market, addressing environmental concerns from housing such as lead-based paint, or rehabilitation of thousands of public housing units will preserve what historically has been considered the housing of “last resort” to San Francisco’s poorest residents.
	<b>Basis for Relative Priority</b>	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.
<b>2</b>	<b>Priority Need Name</b>	Make Housing Affordable
	<b>Priority Level</b>	High
	<b>Population</b>	Extremely Low Low Moderate Middle Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse Veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families Victims of Domestic Violence Non-housing Community Development Other - Immigrants
	<b>Geographic Areas Affected</b>	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley
	<b>Associated Goals</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased Affordability of Rental Housing</li> <li>• Increased Opportunities for Sustainable Homeownership</li> <li>• Increase Access to Rental &amp; Homeownership Housing</li> </ul>
	<b>Description</b>	As the cost to develop and operate housing in San Francisco increases and outpaces

		the income growth of low-income households, rental housing must be made affordable for these households through securing rental subsidies to supplement low-income tenant's ability to pay their rent. Affordable homeownership opportunities must also be provided to help increase financial mobility up the housing ladder by expanding down payment assistance programs or educating homebuyer/homeowners prior to or after purchasing a home. Strengthening the housing application system and community-based organization's capacity to assist clients finding housing must also expand access to rental and homeownership opportunities.
	<b>Basis for Relative Priority</b>	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.
<b>3</b>	<b>Priority Need Name</b>	Prevent and End Homelessness
	<b>Priority Level</b>	High
	<b>Population</b>	Extremely Low Low Moderate Middle Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse Veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families Victims of Domestic Violence Non-housing Community Development Other - Immigrants
	<b>Geographic Areas Affected</b>	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley

	<b>Associated Goals</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduced Rate of Evictions</li> <li>• Transitional Housing is Available for Those Who Need It</li> <li>• Homeless People Receive Basic Shelter and Support Services</li> </ul>
	<b>Description</b>	<p>Homelessness locks people into an unhealthy crisis mode of existence, making it difficult for them to regain their health, effectively engage in mental health and substance abuse treatment, and address education and skill gaps that limit their ability to access decent employment. In order to break this damaging and costly cycle and to help people to end their homelessness, the City needs an adequate supply of permanent affordable housing. The City also needs to prevent homelessness as the most cost-effective strategy. Homeless prevention programs focus primarily on eviction prevention, including tenant rights trainings, legal representation at eviction hearings, as well as rental vouchers and assistance with first and last month rent. Direct service programs support case management and related services to individuals and families in shelters and on the streets, focusing on those services which will maximize housing stability for those individuals and families.</p>
	<b>Basis for Relative Priority</b>	<p>Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.</p>
<b>4</b>	<b>Priority Need Name</b>	Provide Supportive Housing Services
	<b>Priority Level</b>	High
	<b>Population</b>	<p>Extremely Low          Low          Moderate          Middle          Families with Children          Elderly          Public Housing Residents          Chronic Homelessness          Individuals          Families with Children          Mentally Ill          Chronic Substance Abuse          Veterans          Persons with HIV/AIDS          Victims of Domestic Violence          Unaccompanied Youth          Elderly          Frail Elderly          Persons with Mental Disabilities          Persons with Physical Disabilities          Persons with Developmental Disabilities          Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions          Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families          Victims of Domestic Violence          Non-housing Community Development</p>

		Other - Immigrants
	<b>Geographic Areas Affected</b>	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley
	<b>Associated Goals</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased Access to Services for Public Housing Residents</li> <li>• Increased Access to Permanent Supportive Housing and Transitional Housing for PLWHA</li> </ul>
	<b>Description</b>	In order to assist public housing residents in the conversion of their housing through the Rental Assistance Demonstration program, they will need support services to help them understand what RAD is and how this significant change will affect them. Persons living with HIV/AIDs also face their own unique housing challenges and need access to supportive housing and support services, be it permanent supportive housing or transitional housing settings, rental subsidies, or a more efficient housing and service delivery system.
	<b>Basis for Relative Priority</b>	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.
<b>5</b>	<b>Priority Need Name</b>	Enhance Community Facilities and Spaces
	<b>Priority Level</b>	High
	<b>Population</b>	Extremely Low Low Moderate Middle Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse Veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families Victims of Domestic Violence

		Non-housing Community Development Other - Immigrants
	<b>Geographic Areas Affected</b>	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley
	<b>Associated Goals</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key Nonprofit Service Providers Have High Quality Facilities</li> <li>• Enhanced Public Spaces</li> </ul>
	<b>Description</b>	The ability of social service providers to have a safe, secure, and permanent location from which to provide services has never been more important. These funds have been used to cover the costs of tenant improvements that allow service providers to expand existing services, and to construct new facilities. In addition to protecting and expanding services, capital funds are used to ensure that these facilities are accessible to all and meet health and safety standards.
	<b>Basis for Relative Priority</b>	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.
<b>6</b>	<b>Priority Need Name</b>	Strengthen Small Businesses and Commercial Corridors
	<b>Priority Level</b>	High
	<b>Population</b>	Extremely Low Low Moderate Middle Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse Veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families Victims of Domestic Violence Non-housing Community Development

		Other - Immigrants
	<b>Geographic Areas Affected</b>	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley
	<b>Associated Goals</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thriving, Locally-Owned Small Businesses</li> <li>• Robust Commercial Corridors in Low-Income Neighborhoods</li> </ul>
	<b>Description</b>	San Francisco's use of Community Development Block Grants to support economic development activities falls into two general categories of programs and services: support for small businesses and entrepreneurs, and support for the commercial corridors in which these small businesses reside.
	<b>Basis for Relative Priority</b>	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.
<b>7</b>	<b>Priority Need Name</b>	Increase Community Cohesion
	<b>Priority Level</b>	High
	<b>Population</b>	Extremely Low Low Moderate Middle Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse Veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families Victims of Domestic Violence Non-housing Community Development Other - Immigrants
	<b>Geographic Areas</b>	Tenderloin Chinatown



	<b>Affected</b>	South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley
	<b>Associated Goals</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased Supports for Residents to Convene and Build Social Capital</li> <li>• Increased Capacity for Community-based Organizations</li> </ul>
	<b>Description</b>	Community cohesion and the building of social capital allows individuals to resolve collective problems more easily; permits communities to advance smoothly; and widening our awareness of the many ways in which individuals and families are linked. The networks that are brought together through community can also serve as conduits for the flow of helpful information that facilitates achieving goals. Neighborhood and community centers are seen as a crucial focal point to build social capital, so priority has been given to strengthen those organizations which serve as gathering places, information forums, and community organizing locations.
	<b>Basis for Relative Priority</b>	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.
8	<b>Priority Need Name</b>	Promote Workforce Development
	<b>Priority Level</b>	High
	<b>Population</b>	Extremely Low Low Moderate Middle Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse Veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families Victims of Domestic Violence Non-housing Community Development Other - Immigrants
	<b>Geographic</b>	Tenderloin

	<b>Areas Affected</b>	Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley
	<b>Associated Goals</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased Job Readiness</li> <li>• Increased Occupational Skills that Match Labor Market Needs</li> <li>• Access to Job Opportunities for Disadvantaged San Francisco Residents</li> </ul>
	<b>Description</b>	<p>Based on the local area population trends and specific industry analyses, implementing strategies and identifying opportunities that will promote entry into the workforce, pathways to a career, and self-sufficiency will continue to be our primary objective. An approach that focuses on building skills aligned with DOL’s competency model and ongoing employer engagement will be the anchor of all our programming. Based on our own best-practices and the evidence base in the field, we have identified the following program elements for success:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recruitment, screening, and intake processes to ensure a good match between the applicant, the program, and the target occupation.</li> <li>• Job readiness, basic skills, including digital literacy skills and hands-on technical skills training offered through the lens of specific industries and occupations.</li> <li>• Individualized services to support training completion, industry- and occupation-specific job search, and success on the job.</li> <li>• A strong link to local and regional employers that results in an evolving and responsive understanding of the target industries, occupations and connections to jobs that provide self-sufficiency pathways.</li> </ul>
	<b>Basis for Relative Priority</b>	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.
9	<b>Priority Need Name</b>	Promote Economic Advancement through Barrier Removal
	<b>Priority Level</b>	High
	<b>Population</b>	Extremely Low Low Moderate Middle Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse Veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth

	Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families Victims of Domestic Violence Non-housing Community Development Other - Immigrants
<b>Geographic Areas Affected</b>	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley
<b>Associated Goals</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved Service Connections</li> <li>• Improved Foundational Competencies and Access to Job Training and Employment Opportunities for Disconnected Populations</li> <li>• Increased Job Retention and Advancement Supports Through Legal and Other Related Services</li> <li>• Improved Financial Literacy and Management</li> </ul>
<b>Description</b>	MOHCD's economic advancement program brings together programs designed to provide foundational life skills and competencies, financial literacy and asset building, legal services and community education, social capital development, and strategic linkages and service connections through neighborhood and community centers to maximize individual and family economic self-sufficiency.
<b>Basis for Relative Priority</b>	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.

## Narrative (Optional)

### *Affordable Housing*

San Francisco is amongst the highest-cost housing markets in the nation and a large proportion of residents are rent burdened i.e. they must pay over 30% of their income on rent. Many of these households represent San Francisco's working families, so the lack of affordable housing can create problems for San Francisco employers attempting to attract and retain employees.

Market rents in San Francisco impose a particularly severe cost burden on low-income renters, especially seniors, low-income families, and persons with disabilities. Ninety-six percent of the households with a severe rent burden earn less than 50% of the area median income<sup>142</sup>. Thus, while the

---

<sup>142</sup> Source: 2000 Census. Severe rent burden is defined as paying more than 50% of income toward rent.

City holds an overarching objective to provide affordable rental housing to individuals and families with incomes up to 60% AMI, individuals and families at 50% AMI will be prioritized.

At the outset of the Consolidated Plan, the City is facing these challenges with the objective that families and individuals are stably housed. The following are the priority needs of the 2015 - 2019 Housing Strategic Plan in order to achieve the objective to stably house families and individuals. Some of these objectives reflect new priorities that are responsive to current opportunities and constraints. Together with affordable housing programs and goals in San Francisco's remaining redevelopment Project Areas, the City's innovative new programs will build on the success of prior Consolidated Plan housing activities and bring us closer to stably housing families and individuals.

Objective: Families and individuals are stably housed.

Priority Need 1A: Develop and Maintain Affordable Housing

Priority Need 1B: Make housing affordable

Priority Need 1C: Prevent and end homelessness

Priority Need 1D: Provide supportive housing services

The following paragraphs describe, in fuller detail, those new elements of the Housing Strategic Plan that reflect innovation and flexibility the current economic, housing, and policy context.

### **Priority Need 1A: Develop and Maintain Affordable Housing**

#### Goal 1Ai: Increased supply of affordable housing

San Francisco's homes are amongst the most expensive in the nation. Less than 23%<sup>143</sup> of San Franciscans can afford to buy a home without assistance and only 34%<sup>144</sup> of San Francisco residents are homeowners. Homeownership has many proven benefits at both the individual level and the neighborhood level. For children and families, homeownership improves stability by reducing the amount that families move from home to home. Changing schools negatively affects school performance not only for the child who moves, but for their classmates as well. Homeownership can also offer a sense of pride and security. On a neighborhood level, homeownership leads to improved property maintenance, reduced crime, and more political capital. Because only high income San Franciscans can afford homeownership without assistance, the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community and the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure as successor agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency will support low- and moderate-income renters who are ready to become homeowners and will help existing homeowners remain stably housed.

To address the City's housing shortage, and the pent-up demand and price escalation that have resulted from it, Mayor Lee set forth the following housing goals for 2020 in his State of the City address in January 2014:

- Construction of 30,000 new and rehabilitated homes throughout the City.
- At least one-third of those permanently affordable to low (<80% of median income) and moderate income (<120% of median income) families.
- The majority of those within financial reach of working, middle income San Franciscans (up to 150%

---

<sup>143</sup> Rosen Consulting Group

<sup>144</sup> Census Bureau

of median income).

The Mayor has laid out a seven-point plan to guide the City towards achievement of these ambitious targets:

1. Protect our residents from eviction and displacement, including Ellis Act reform.
2. Stabilize and protect at-risk rent-controlled units, through rehabilitation loans and a new program to permanently stabilize rent conditions in at-risk units.
3. Revitalize and rebuild our public housing, by continuing our HOPE SF commitments and improving thousands of other Housing Authority units.
4. Double our down payment loan programs, which helps recipients address the upfront hurdles of becoming a homeowner, and create more middle income homeownership opportunities, particularly on land under public control.
5. Build more affordable housing, faster, which will require more funding, as well as new tools that spread the burden of its construction from the City to our private partners.
6. Continue to build market rate units, especially rental units, to address the demand crisis that has built up from years of not enough housing.
7. Make construction of new housing easier – both in City departments, with more staff and less process; and in the neighborhoods, by giving those neighborhoods the infrastructure they need to thrive with growth.

The need for permanently affordable supportive housing is greater than the City's available supply of apartments for people needing on-site supports and services where they reside. "Supportive housing", as opposed to other types of affordable housing, includes on-site services such as case management. Supportive housing began as a model to reduce homelessness, and has become a model for serving many populations with specific needs. It is crucial for the City to continue to support and expand the supply of permanent supportive housing for San Francisco's low-income residents with specific needs, not only to prevent homelessness, but also to ensure a high quality of life for individuals who have disabilities, health-related issues, and other challenges.

MOHCD will continue to support development, maintenance, operating costs, and services to increase the supply of affordable homes for individuals who need housing with onsite supportive services to be healthy and thrive. These populations include but are not limited to people with HIV/AIDS, people with developmental disabilities, frail seniors, people with dementia, youth ages 18-24 with prior foster care involvement, and people suffering from severe mental illnesses.

Funds will be used to plan and develop new affordable units or to acquire and rehabilitate existing market rate units, restricting them for long-term affordability. These affordable units could include innovative housing models such as cooperative housing, manufactured housing or artist housing. The City will prioritize projects that can leverage other funding sources to ensure that City resources are efficiently allocated to financially feasible developments. MOHCD and OCII loans and/or grants will also be used to demonstrate local public investment as required by certain state, federal, and private sources.

San Francisco's Planning Commission began implementing inclusionary housing requirements when issuing planning approvals in the early 1990's. In 2002, this policy was codified into a citywide requirement for all new residential housing construction. Real-estate developers were required to sell or rent some units in any new development at a "below-market-rate" (BMR) price to households earning no more than the median income in the City. These lower income households then pay only 33% of their

total income for housing costs. Real estate developers could also pay an “in-lieu” fee instead of building affordable units. Fees were updated annually to reflect the difference between real development costs and affordable sales prices.

At present, the City manages re-sales of a portfolio of over 800 price-restricted Below Market Rate ownership units (BMR’s) for low- and moderate-income households. Eligibility to purchase these units is based on a family’s income. Prospective buyers must attend homebuyer counseling at a HUD and City approved counseling agency. The marketing of BMR units is done with City staff guidance to ensure access by traditionally underserved communities. In addition to the City’s inclusionary housing ordinance, there are other inclusionary policies that are required by certain Redevelopment Plans.

The City’s inclusionary housing ordinance and other Redevelopment Plan inclusionary requirements continue to generate new BMR units and in-lieu fees (fees paid by housing developers as an alternative to constructing new affordable housing units) for the production of affordable housing. The City will continue to work with developers to enable them to meet their obligations through payment of fees or production of housing units.

#### Goal 1Aii: Preserve and Maintain Affordable Housing Supply

Most housing stock in San Francisco is over 50 years old. As buildings age, they require maintenance and rehabilitation work, and owners of affordable housing often have difficulty obtaining the complete financing necessary from private sources. To maintain affordability for existing residents, affordable developments may require public funds to address substantial rehabilitation needs and/or to refinance their existing debt. MOHCD will provide financing for capital improvements to existing affordable housing to ensure that affordable housing in San Francisco is safe, healthy, and accessible.

Where lead poisoning threats occur, MOHCD will provide financing for remediation through the Lead Program (see Lead Program description below). Childhood lead poisoning can cause learning disabilities, concentration and behavior problems, loss of IQ, permanent neurological damage, and at high concentrations, seizures, coma and even death. Lead was added to paint prior to 1978 to make it more durable. All of San Francisco’s neighborhoods were fully developed by the end of World War II; a majority of its housing units were built prior to the 1978 ban on residential lead-based paint – 48.8% of the housing stock is pre-1940, which is considered the time frame when paint contained the greatest concentration of lead. There are approximately 22,000 housing units in San Francisco with lead-based paint hazards that are occupied by low-and moderate-income families. The Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development’s Lead Program seeks to protect children in San Francisco from lead by providing free lead inspections, risk assessments, project management, remediation, and clearance services to owners of properties occupied by low- and moderate-income renters in San Francisco and low-income property owners. Priority is given to housing occupied by families with children under 6 years old, particularly those with elevated blood lead levels.

The City provides low-interest, deferred payment loans to low- and moderate-income homeowners for rehabilitation, accessibility improvements, and code enforcement at their properties. Health and safety, code enforcement, and energy efficiency rehabilitation activities are prioritized for funding in the scope of work. As the City’s housing stock was predominantly built before 1979, lead hazard control is an essential part of rehabilitation and code enforcement. Similarly, energy efficiency upgrades, such as energy star appliances, energy efficient window replacements, and solar panel installations are prioritized for funding in all rehabilitation projects. To help more low-income homeowners age safely in

place, improved accessibility features will continue to be a priority. Targeted marketing and outreach will be done by the City for the rehabilitation programs, in collaboration with non-profit partners in neighborhoods with high concentrations of low-income homeowners, particularly those areas where high rates of foreclosure have led to a decrease in property values.

The acquisition of affordable housing units at-risk of converting to market rate due to real estate speculation, expiring HUD mortgages or other subsidies has been an important part of the City's efforts to increase the stock of affordable housing. Acquisition of "small sites", properties with 2-25 residential units and recording of affordability restrictions will preserve and maintain what may historically had been rent-controlled units for low-income households.

HOPE SF is an ambitious, large-scale effort to transform the San Francisco Housing Authority's ("SFHA"; "Housing Authority") most troubled and deteriorating housing stock. In partnership with multiple public and private entities, HOPE SF will revitalize entire neighborhoods with public, affordable, and market-rate homes, improved infrastructure, green design, and new commercial and retail opportunities. The new HOPE SF communities will include over 6,000 new residences in all, with each neighborhood demonstrating economic feasibility and environmental sustainability.

HOPE SF is not only concerned with rebuilding the physical form. Human capital development is an integral part of the HOPE SF program. HOPE SF calls for a comprehensive family strengthening strategy that includes an emphasis on education from cradle to college; intentional linkage to community and public services and opportunities for today's residents, and creation of vibrant community facilities (schools, parks, childcare sites) in the revitalized community of tomorrow. By supporting both neighborhood revitalization and human capital development, HOPE SF aims to create healthy, stable, and productive living environments for all residents, at all incomes, transforming communities that have been among San Francisco's most disadvantaged and challenged.

Over the next five years, the City will fund and oversee progress on the HOPE SF Initiative. HOPE SF will revitalize San Francisco's severely distressed public housing sites by creating thriving, mixed-income communities, without displacing current residents. HOPE SF will also create opportunities to transform residents' lives, not just their homes, by investing in the schools, services, safety and support needed for success.

In addition, SFHA applied for the conversion of 4,585 public housing units under HUD's Rental Assistance Demonstration Program (RAD) in 2013. RAD is a program HUD launched in 2012 as a means of addressing the nation's \$26 billion deferred maintenance backlog and chronic underfunding for these repairs from Congress. SFHA's own capital needs exceed \$300 million. Through RAD, SFHA will transfer ownership of the units to nonprofit-led affordable housing development teams that can access, unlike SFHA, the tax credit equity and debt necessary to rehabilitate the buildings. SFHA expects this conversion and preservation effort to be complete by December 2016. Thereafter, it will function primarily as a Housing Choice Voucher agency, though still providing property management to its remaining public housing portfolio.

### **Priority Need 1B: Make Housing Affordable**

#### Goal 1Bi: Increased affordability of rental housing

The City will leverage state, and federal capital, operating subsidies, rental subsidies, and services resources in order to create new supportive housing units.

In addition to services funding, the City will offer an operating/rent subsidy program to support the long-term operation of permanently supportive housing. Given extremely low rents, without additional funding supportive housing operating costs typically exceed revenues. The City will make the rental operation financially feasible using federal and state funding as well as funds from the Human Services Agency and Department of Public Health.

#### Goal 1Bii: Increased opportunities for sustainable homeownership

The City administers a variety of down payment and mortgage assistance programs that assist low- and moderate-income, first time homebuyers to purchase market rate homes and BMRs in San Francisco. The Downpayment Assistance Loan Program (DALP) is a local bond-capitalized fund that provides payment deferred, shared equity loans to low- and moderate-income first time homebuyers to assist them in the purchase of market priced homes. Similarly, the City provides shared equity, payment deferred loans to buyers through the Inclusionary program component of the BMR DALP program. Special forgivable down-payment assistance loans are also available for qualified teachers employed by the San Francisco Unified School District, qualified Police Officers in the San Francisco Police Department, and qualified First Responders such as fire fighters or paramedics. The City Second program also provides deferred payment loans to low- and moderate-income residents purchasing selected City-funded homeownership developments, where the City has the right of first refusal upon sale of the units. Mortgage Credit Certificates (MCCs) are available through the City to qualified first time homebuyers to provide additional tax credits to offset mortgage payments. All of the City's programs require possession of a first time homebuyer counseling certificate by a HUD and City approved agency.

Counseling of low income households that face the loss of their homes to foreclosure continues to be a core activity supported by the City. The City will continue to provide assistance to HUD-approved homeownership counseling agencies to help households obtain modifications to their mortgages, and/or provide counseling about other alternatives, such as short sales, negotiating deed in lieu of trust, debt restructuring and referral to legal assistance for those who have been victims of predatory lending practices. The City funds and will continue to fund this core activity in several languages throughout its diverse neighborhoods.

Through investment in community organizations providing legal assistance, counseling and re-housing assistance, the City will also mitigate the impact on renters of displacements by foreclosure of rental apartment buildings.

Homebuyer education is a crucial component of all of the first time homebuyer programs in the City. Several HUD approved non-profit counseling agencies are supported by the City to provide culturally sensitive homebuyer workshops and counseling in several languages for free throughout the City. All City supported agencies utilize the standard Neighborworks America approved curriculum for homebuyer education, and make up HomeownershipSF, a collaborative membership organization that is a Neighborworks affiliate. The homebuyer curriculum requires 6-8 hours of in-class education, and individual one-on-one counseling is encouraged before a certificate is issued. In addition to the ongoing workshops and counseling, the City-supported counseling agencies organize a yearly homeownership fair in the fall. The fair brings together counselors, lenders, and agencies dedicated to providing



opportunities for low-income first-time homebuyers. The homeownership fair is attended by an average of 3,000 people every year and targeted outreach is done to draw from the diverse San Francisco communities. The fair has workshops, in several languages, on credit repair, financing, special programs and other topics of interest to low-income, first-time homebuyers.

#### Goal 1Biii: Increase access to rental and homeownership housing

Average rental prices and sales prices in San Francisco are high, and it is difficult for low-income people to find housing within their budgets. A housing search for decent low-cost housing requires savvy, perseverance, good credit, and freedom from disabilities or any other issues that a landlord could perceive as undesirable in a tenant.

In comparison to renting, the complexities of home-purchase are even more opaque. Yet the City firmly believes that wealth, impeccable English language skills, and a legal education should not be prerequisites for homeownership. The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development will make efforts to reduce barriers to housing access so that low- and moderate-income individuals and families can find housing that fits their budgets.

MOHCD will fund a variety of housing counseling services for renters who have recently been evicted or are urgently in need of housing. Among low-income people, individuals with barriers to housing, such as those with disabilities or limited English fluency, will be prioritized. Housing counselors will help clients navigate the public housing system for placement on the waitlist and identify various affordable housing opportunities. Counseling agencies will also support seniors, younger adults with disabilities, and other clients with specific needs in finding service-enriched housing. Counseling on Fair Housing law will ensure renters know their rights regarding disability issues and reasonable accommodation/modification needs.

MOHCD will also increase housing access by giving a preference to low-income persons displaced by government action or Ellis Act evictions in the affordable and below market rate housing under MOHCD's purview that is not otherwise prohibited to giving preferences. Specifically households displaced by San Francisco Redevelopment Agency action in the 1960s and 1970s in the Western Addition and Hunters Point that hold a Certificate of Preference (COP), or households with a Ellis Act Housing Preference (EAHP) certificates will be given first and second preference in the affordable housing assisted by MOHCD or under MOHCD's purview. COP and EAHP certificate holders are given priority in the application screening process but must also meet the housing's resident selection criteria such as income qualifications. This preference does not include households headed by students.

San Francisco's robust network of affordable housing involves many active developers and management companies. Unfortunately, a system with many independent players can be time-consuming and confusing for potential tenants. Application processes differ and waitlists are maintained independently for each building. MOH/SFRA will help knit together this sometimes disjointed system to improve access to government supported housing by building an information network about affordable opportunities through the MOHCD website and online access to affordable homeownership and rental opportunities.

MOHCD's website will continue to serve as a hub of information regarding affordable housing resources. The websites will be enhanced for easy navigation and maintained with up-to-date information on programs and opportunities. It will continue to market its list of available Below Market Rate units for rent or for sale that were developed as a result of the San Francisco Inclusionary Zoning ordinance. In

addition, the MOH will create a new centralized web-based resource for information for both homeownership and rental opportunities.

### **Priority Need 1C: Prevent and End Homelessness**

Homelessness locks people into an unhealthy crisis mode of existence, making it difficult for them to regain their health, effectively engage in mental health and substance abuse treatment, and address education and skill gaps that limit their ability to access decent employment. In order to break this damaging and costly cycle and to help people to end their homelessness, the City needs an adequate supply of permanent affordable housing. The City also needs to prevent homelessness as the most cost-effective strategy. Homeless prevention programs focus primarily on eviction prevention, including tenant rights trainings, legal representation at eviction hearings, as well as rental vouchers and assistance with first and last month rent. Direct service programs support case management and related services to individuals and families in shelters and on the streets, focusing on those services which will maximize housing stability for those individuals and families.

#### Goal 1Ci: Reduced rate of evictions

Legal services and counseling will be provided to counsel individuals before a notice of unlawful detainer is filed, and full-scope representation will be offered to individuals who need legal services after having received notice.

#### Goal 1Cii: Transitional housing is available for those who need it

Operating support will be provided to transitional housing facilities as appropriate, with priority given to vulnerable populations such as survivors of domestic violence

#### Goal 1Ciii: Homeless people receive basic shelter and support services

Homeless individuals, particularly those in emergency shelters, will be provided supportive services focusing on providing foundational skills and transitioning them to more stable housing.

### **Priority Need 1D: Provide Supportive Housing Services**

#### Goal 1Di: Increased access to services for public housing residents

Although the City of San Francisco offers a rich array of services for low-income people, it can be challenging to navigate the network of providers and many different eligibility requirements. Despite the array of services already available to low-income San Franciscans, many of the residents HOPE SF neighborhoods lack the support and resources they need to connect with and successfully participate in these programs. Low educational attainment, safety concerns, inability to access capital, and the lack of a cohesive social fabric to support residents makes it difficult to even reach services designed to advance their goals.

HOPE SF has created a service connection model, which will be tailored to the needs of each community before, during, and following construction. Before construction, services will be focused on stabilizing families in crisis and involving all residents in site-planning, community-building activities and preparation for jobs. Later, job-training opportunities will prepare interested residents to work in development-related jobs. Residents will be prepared for, and supported through temporary onsite relocation. During construction, services will focus on preparing residents for life in the new community and will continue to ensure that everyone has access to any City resources, social services, education, and economic opportunities that they need to thrive.

Pre-development services will stabilize families in crisis and prepare all families for transition into a mixed-income community. Families in crisis, such as those struggling with mental health, addiction, or criminal justice issues, are often at risk for eviction. So too are residents who fail to pay rent. Using family-centered service plans, HOPE SF seeks to stabilize these families early, and provide supports throughout the development process.

Research and experience show that properly preparing residents, both old and new, is a critical component for the success of mixed-income developments. HOPE SF will invest in resident education for both old and new residents to make sure that “good neighbor” expectations are clear and conflicts are handled appropriately as they arise.

For public housing residents in RAD Program properties, once engaged and investments have been made in the Housing Development the consistent staff teams who participate in Community Engagement and Community Building work are available for ongoing resources and activities (Health and Wellness, Educational, Economic Mobility) to learn and expose the community to new choices. One-on-one support is available for residents regarding any needs but especially related to housing stabilization. Staff teams are made up of paraprofessional to professional providers who respond quickly to requests with follow up to ensure information / activities are helpful and accurate. Off-site services enhance these efforts. Important key element is for onsite providers to have a relationship with offsite city service providers.

Goal 1Dii: Increased access to permanent supportive housing and transitional housing for persons living with HIV/AIDS

Finally, the City will build capacity among housing and service organizations by funding partnerships between service providers and housing development corporations that develop and manage supportive housing for people with specific needs. Using HOPWA (Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS) funds, MOHCD will fund contractors to perform the following tasks for this population:

1. Manage a “deep” rental assistance program between HOPWA clients and private landlords to reach extremely low-income residents earning less than 30% of the Area Median Income. A “deep” rent subsidy covers the rent in excess of the tenant’s rent portion. The tenant’s rent portion is always a percentage of the tenant’s income (usually 30%). The allowed rent per unit cannot exceed the Fair Market Rent standard for San Francisco.
2. Manage a “shallow” rental assistance program serving slightly higher-income residents. A “shallow” rent is usually a fixed monthly amount that subsidizes the tenant’s rent to ensure housing stability. The tenant may pay more than 30% of income for rent. The allowed rent per unit cannot exceed the Fair Market Rent standard for San Francisco.
3. Study the impacts of a shallow rental assistance program.

Once supportive housing has been created, adequate oversight must occur to ensure that service provision and property management are high quality and serve the needs of tenants. In future years, capital improvements may be required to maintain the housing as permanently affordable and high quality.

- The City will conduct thorough annual monitoring of existing supportive housing developments, including a requirement for annual monitoring reports, annual site visits, and on-going assessments of the housing’s financial and operational health.
- The City will also provide financing for capital improvements to existing affordable housing stock

that are beyond the scope of existing reserves.

### ***Strong Communities***

#### **Community Facility Capital Improvements and Public Space Improvements**

MOHCD is the primary City agency that funds the rehabilitation or new construction of non-profit facilities that predominantly serve low-income families and individuals. The other sources of funds which non-profits typically access to finance the cost of construction or rehabilitation of facilities come primarily from private foundations. Because of the scarcity of funding for this kind of support, and given the priority many non-profits and funders place on supporting programs rather than capital improvements, MOHCD is committed to continuing to use CDBG funds to fill this particular gap through its community facility capital improvements program. These funds have been used to cover the cost of tenant improvements that allow service providers to expand existing services, and to construct new facilities. In addition to protecting and expanding services, capital funds are used to ensure that these facilities are accessible to all and meet health and safety standards. MOHCD has also been prioritizing the creation of capital needs assessment/asset reserve analyses for critical providers to understand their internal capital facility needs, the replacement reserve budgetary expectations, and the ability to match the aging of their assets to the structure of their operational budget.

As with community facilities, MOHCD is one of very few City agencies that can allocate funding for public space improvements, if the improvements will directly benefit low-income residents. To address this need, MOHCD created the public space improvement program. San Francisco prides itself on being a green city, and has therefore prioritized greening as a vital public improvement. The City has partnered with community based organizations that leverage community volunteers to provide trees and sidewalk gardens in distressed neighborhoods, working with local homeowners and institutions to ensure the long-term sustainability of the City's greening efforts. In addition, the City's new Housing Trust Fund provides additional resources for Mello-Roos-type infrastructure improvements to areas impacted by increased housing density. These improvements can include public park landscaping, furnishings and recreation equipment, pocket parks and parklets, murals, neighborhood gardens, and public right of way improvements including paving, furnishings and plantings (greening).

#### **Neighborhood Economic Development in San Francisco/Invest in Neighborhoods**

Our neighborhood economic development strategy focuses on strengthening small businesses and key commercial neighborhood corridors that contribute to the local fabric of communities and are the backbone of our local economy. CDBG resources are a key component of this strategy, they fund our community based organizations (CBO's) to provide business technical assistance and support local commercial corridors. Our CBO's serve to provide services that are accessible at the neighborhood level and are culturally, ethnically and linguistically tailored for startup and existing businesses. While CDBG allows us to provide basic business assistance, we leverage these services by combining them with city programs that address the existing economic development needs in a strategic way. In 2012 as part of Mayor Ed Lee's 17 points jobs, he created the Invest In Neighborhoods (IIN) initiative, which has become our approach to neighborhood economic development. The basic principal of the initiative is to provide customized assistance that meets the specific needs of San Francisco's neighborhood commercial corridors. It aligns existing and new City resources and services to commercial corridors around the City in a way that is smart, efficient, and responsive to individual neighborhood needs and opportunities. Small businesses make an essential contribution to the culture and identity of San Francisco and in response the second point to the jobs plan created the Jobs Squad, which helps small businesses, navigate City processes, access vital City programs, and stay informed of issues that may affect them.

This team of City staff conducts door-to-door outreach to small businesses around the City to connect them with help and information.

The purpose of the IIN initiative is to strengthen small businesses, improve physical conditions, increase quality of life, and build community capacity in 25 commercial districts throughout the city. While continuing to prioritize low- and moderate-income neighborhoods the goal is to establish more robust citywide programs and services to benefit small businesses, their owners, employees, and their neighborhoods across the city.

The initiative is managed by OEWD but represents an interagency approach under the Mayor's direction. IIN builds on the prior Administration's commercial corridor revitalization efforts, which targeted a smaller cohort of low- and moderate-income neighborhoods and did not leverage other City departments and resources as effectively. The initiative has also served to offset some of the neighborhood resources that were lost due to the dissolution of the SF Redevelopment Agency.

Invest in Neighborhoods provides a standard set of "baseline interventions" to all 25 corridors, and then targeted customized interventions to individual corridors based on an initial economic assessment and stakeholder input.

Among the baseline services all corridors receive include:

- An assigned staff person at City Hall, that oversees a plan for the area and manages provision of services
- A Jobs Squad member for business outreach and provides businesses with guidance on navigating City processes and referrals to city agencies and community partners
- Quarterly tracking and update of existing vacancies and access to StorfrontSF.com, a citywide, on-line vacancy-tracking database
- Access to a set of City-funded small business loan programs

Customized interventions for each corridor are then deployed based on their initial economic assessment. These interventions are selected from a broad-ranging suite of tools aimed at supporting small businesses and their surrounding commercial districts. OEWD utilizes CDBG along with General Fund dollars to provide these programs and services, and leverages them with resources and efforts from other City agencies and often private partners.

### **Organizational Capacity Building and Technical Assistance**

Nonprofits play a major role in City service delivery. The City and County of San Francisco contracts with nonprofits for a substantial percentage of its services. Currently, there are a total of 902 nonprofits registered with the City as receiving payments for goods or services for FY 2013-2014 and/or one or more of the prior two fiscal years (some contracts span multiple years). Total payments made to nonprofit organizations by the City and County of San Francisco ranged from approximately \$485.2 million in FY 2011-2012 to a projected \$519.6 million for FY 2013-2014. Of the 710 nonprofit organizations that are projected to receive funding from the City in FY 2013-2014, approximately 500 of them are projected to receive at least \$25,000 in City funds during this fiscal year. The City and County of San Francisco and the nonprofits that inhabit the city are mutually dependent upon one another. City contracts at times comprise substantial proportions of some nonprofits' revenue, while at the same time the City relies upon these organizations to deliver a broad range of culturally appropriate and accessible services to local residents.

Nonprofits offer competitive advantages with respect to service delivery. The City and County of San Francisco recognizes the ability and expertise of the nonprofit sector to deliver responsive and effective housing and social services to local residents, particularly those made vulnerable by poverty and other factors. Nonprofits are recognized for their ability to provide culturally competent and geographically accessible services. They provide greater flexibility than City agencies in program implementation, are able to leverage funding in innovative ways, can often scale up programming more quickly than the City, and can experiment and take risks to achieve social change that the City cannot.

However, San Francisco's nonprofit service providers are currently facing immense financial challenges. Currently many nonprofits are facing displacement based on the extraordinarily high commercial rents in all neighborhoods of the city, most especially along the public transit corridors which are most highly utilized by low-income residents.

Through this program resources are strategically leveraged to strengthen the capacity of grantee organizations and their staff, to foster increased cooperation, collaboration, efficiency and the sharing of best practices among groups of service providers, and to facilitate neighborhood and community planning by networks of service providers.

Through grants to technical assistance providers grantee organizations are able to access the expertise of consultants, attorneys, and experts in nonprofit management through workshops and trainings, direct technical assistance, consulting, and other formats. Access to this expertise is key to building the capacity of nonprofit staff, strengthening the systems and infrastructure of organizations, increasing compliance with federal and city mandates and ensuring that high-quality services are delivered to clients.

By funding collaboratives that bring together organizations that share common interests and needs, such as neighborhood centers or homeownership counseling programs, the program is able to foster increased cooperation, collaboration, efficiency and the sharing of best practices among groups of service providers. These funds are also highly leveraged, as they help establish structures through which the participating nonprofits build each other's own capacities and resources.

Finally, through facilitated neighborhood planning processes, planning grants also allow for nonprofits, city government, residents and key stakeholders within low-income neighborhoods to all work together to map the assets in a community, better coordinate the delivery of essential services, foster increased collaboration between all the organizations working within that community, and to build a sustainable infrastructure and institutional framework to ensure that high quality services will be delivered to its residents in the future.

### ***Economically Self-Sufficient Families and Individuals***

#### **Economic Advancement**

MOHCD's economic advancement program brings together programs designed to provide foundational life skills and competencies, financial literacy and asset building, legal services and community education, social capital development, and strategic linkages and service connections through neighborhood and community centers to maximize individual and family economic self-sufficiency.

Financial literacy and asset building is a crucial element of this program. Financial literacy is a bundle of skills that have to be learned continuously throughout one's life. As a person's overall money

management tasks become more and more complicated, we as consumers must understand not only how to do the basics, but also understand and master more complex financial transactions.

Legal problems faced by California's low-income community involve very basic issues of housing, family, safety, and employment— problems often caused by or exacerbated by the family's lack of resources. Legal service organizations receive daily requests for critical assistance, such as victims of domestic violence who need legal assistance to separate themselves from abusive partners; veterans who need legal assistance to obtain services and resources they have earned; and immigrants, who are particularly vulnerable and may need assistance to address unfair and deceptive business practices such as fraud in the purchase and sale of a used automobile, deceptive insurance sales, predatory fringe lending, or illegal debt collection practices.

MOHCD also supports programs that develop competencies which provide the foundation for success in school and at work. These foundational competencies are essential to occupational success and civic participation. They include academic competencies such as literacy and numeracy; workplace competencies such as teamwork, problem solving, and customer focus; and basic life skills, such as willingness to learn, professionalism, initiative, and dependability, and interpersonal skills.

Service connection is a strategy that leverages the strength of existing social service infrastructure and recognizes that many disenfranchised residents are still unable to access services, even if the services are geographically quite close. Because of language barriers, distrust, turf gang lines, disability issues, immigration status, and other barriers, specific service connection strategies need to be maximized at critical community hubs to ensure that the rich social service fabric created in San Francisco reaches those residents most in needs of those services.

Finally, social capital is also valued as leveraging the strengths within a community or neighborhood that accrue exponentially to each individual and family within that group. Meaningful economic advancement needs to include the development of social capital as an asset within the communities served. John Putnam has described social capital as "connections among individuals – social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them...Social capital calls attention to the fact that civic virtue is most powerful when embedded in a...network of reciprocal social relations. A society of many virtuous but isolated individuals is not necessarily rich in social capital." Putnam went on to say that social capital serves a number of specific functions, including allowing citizens to resolve collective problems more easily; greasing the wheels that allow communities to advance smoothly; and widening our awareness of the many ways in which our fates are linked. The networks that constitute social capital can also serve as conduits for the flow of helpful information that facilitates achieving goals. Neighborhood and community centers are seen as a crucial focal point to build social capital, so priority has been given to strengthen those organizations which serve as gathering places, information forums, and community organizing locations.

### **Workforce Development**

San Francisco will have a talented workforce that attracts, retains, and expands competitive industries and enhances the standard of living for all of the City's residents.

The mission of the Workforce Development Division of the Office of Economic and Workforce Development is to build public-private partnerships that create and guide a continuum of workforce services that improve the economic vitality for people and businesses.

Below are OEWDs goals:

1. Improve the responsiveness of the workforce system to meet the demands of sustainable and growing industries, providing employers with skilled workers and expanding employment opportunity for San Francisco residents.
2. Re-engage youth disconnected from the education system and labor market to achieve academic credentials, transition to post-secondary education, and/or secure living wage employment.
3. Increase access to workforce services for populations underserved by the workforce system.
4. Improve the quality of services available to businesses through the workforce system to promote hiring San Francisco job seekers.
5. Streamline and align policy and administration across multiple funding sources.
6. Strengthen policy and programmatic coordination between the workforce system and the city's educational institutions, specifically the San Francisco Unified School District and City College of San Francisco.
7. Work collaboratively across City departments to implement effective workforce strategies – such as subsidized employment and “earn while you learn” programming – tailored to the needs of targeted populations, including public housing residents, persons who are homeless, ex-offenders, transitional age youth (TAY), and English language learners.
8. Equipped with the most current labor market analysis, meet the workforce needs of growth sectors within the local and regional economy.
9. Support local government and private sector succession planning efforts through targeted skill building programs aligned with job vacancy projections.



## SP-30 Influence of Market Conditions – 91.215 (b)

### Influence of Market Conditions

**Table 74 – Influence of Market Conditions**

<b>Affordable Housing Type</b>	<b>Market Characteristics that will influence the use of funds available for housing type</b>
Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA)	High market-rate rents in most neighborhoods of San Francisco combined with Fair Market Rents that lag significantly behind actual rents will limit the ability of Housing Choice Voucher holders to successfully obtain rental housing.
TBRA for Non-Homeless Special Needs	Same as above.
New Unit Production	The recovery of the housing market combined with rising market-rate rents has spurred an increase in new housing unit production, especially market-rate rental and most recently a return of the condominium market. The City has set an aggressive target of constructing or rehabilitating 30,000 housing units by 2020, with at least one-third of those permanently affordable to low and moderate income families, and the majority of those within financial reach of working, middle income San Franciscans.
Rehabilitation	The City has an opportunity to take advantage of HUD’s new Rental Assistance Demonstration program in order to access the resources necessary to rehabilitate and preserve over 3,500 units of deteriorating public housing, given the chronic underfunding of public housing agencies across the country by Congress. Units converted under RAD will permanently leave the public housing stock and will function as permanently affordable housing owned by private tax credit limited partnerships.
Acquisition, including preservation	The strong market-rate rental housing market is causing rental property owners to put their rent-controlled buildings on the market, which investors and property “flippers” are quickly buying to renovate and sell for a substantial profit. Tenants in those rent-controlled apartments, who are more often than not elderly or low-income families are receiving Ellis Act eviction notices. These existing rent-controlled buildings who serve low-income households are more at-risk of being lost to profit-driven investors and developers, making preservation of these properties even more of a priority.

## SP-35 Anticipated Resources - 91.215(a)(4), 91.220(c)(1,2)

### Introduction

For the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan five-year time period, San Francisco anticipates the use of federal CDBG, HOME, ESG and HOPWA funds as well as local funds for the housing and community development activities described in this Plan. Local funding sources include General Fund, Housing Trust Fund and housing impact fees.

### Anticipated Resources

**Table 75 – Anticipated Resources**

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Remainder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
CDBG	public - federal	Acquisition Admin and Planning Economic Development Housing Public Improvements Public Services	16,489,944	2,462,600	653,347	19,605,891	60,000,000	Assumes approximately 5% reduction in entitlement funds each year and program income of \$500k each year.

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
HOME	public - federal	Acquisition Homebuyer assistance Homeowner rehab Multifamily rental new construction Multifamily rental rehab New construction for ownership TBRA	3,931,015	1,875,343	0	5,806,358	14,000,000	Assumes approximately 5% reduction in entitlement funds each year and program income of \$25k each year.

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
HOPWA	public - federal	Permanent housing in facilities Permanent housing placement Short term or transitional housing facilities STRMU Supportive services TBRA	7,461,390	100,772	0	7,562,162	27,000,000	Assumes approximately 5% reduction in entitlement funds each year and program income of \$100k each year.

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
ESG	public - federal	Conversion and rehab for transitional housing Financial Assistance Overnight shelter Rapid re-housing (rental assistance) Rental Assistance Services Transitional housing	1,482,125	0	0	1,482,125	5,000,000	Assumes approximately 5% reduction in entitlement funds each year and no program income.

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
General Fund	public - local	Acquisition Financial Assistance Homebuyer assistance Housing Multifamily rental new construction Multifamily rental rehab Public Services Rapid re-housing (rental assistance) Services Supportive services	10,000,000	0	0	10,000,000	40,000,000	Investments in Public Services and Housing from the City General Fund budget. Estimated at \$5,000,000 for services and \$5,000,000 for HOPE SF Housing each year.

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Remainder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
Housing Trust Fund	public - local	Acquisition Admin and Planning Homebuyer assistance Housing Multifamily rental new construction Multifamily rental rehab Public Improvements Rental Assistance	50,600,000	0	0	50,600,000	130,400,000	Local Housing Trust Fund (HTF). Total amount available in 2015-16 is \$50.6MM, of which \$25MM is borrowed and will be repaid from future HTF allocations. Outside of the borrowing, annual allocation increases \$2.8MM each year.

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
Other	public - local	Acquisition Admin and Planning Homebuyer assistance Housing Multifamily rental new construction Multifamily rental rehab	4,000,000	0	0	4,000,000	16,000,000	Annual program income from former Redevelopment Agency assets.
Other	public - local	Acquisition Admin and Planning Housing Multifamily rental new construction	100,000,000	0	0	100,000,000	30,000,000	Housing Impact Fees include Inclusionary In-Lieu fees, Jobs-Housing Linkage Fees, and Development Agreement Fees. Amount available in Year 1 includes anticipated unspent balances from prior years.



**Explain how federal funds will leverage those additional resources (private, state and local funds), including a description of how matching requirements will be satisfied**

San Francisco leverages local and state dollars to support its community development activities in various ways.

The City's Housing Trust Fund provides funding for affordable housing development, homeownership counseling, eviction prevention, access to rental housing, downpayment assistance, neighborhood infrastructure, and homeowner home rehabilitation.

The South of Market Community Stabilization Fund provides resources to assist vulnerable South of Market residents and support affordable housing, economic development and community cohesion through a residential impact fee imposed on residential developers in that specific neighborhood.

The City's General Fund supports additional projects at MOHCD, primarily focusing on legal services for immigrants and for residents facing eviction; revitalization efforts in public housing, including HOPE SF and the City's RAD public housing conversion projects; increased support for neighborhood-based services; increased support for immigrant communities seeking additional training in foundational life skills and transitions to self-sufficiency, and community planning efforts with residents in low-income communities.

In addition to CDBG workforce dollars, OEWD leverages WIA and local funds to execute local workforce development strategies. WIA funds a comprehensive range of workforce development activities to benefit job seekers, laid off workers, youth, incumbent workers, new entrants to the workforce, veterans, persons with disabilities, and employers. The purpose of these activities is to promote an increase in the employment, job retention, earnings, and occupational skills improvement by participants.

The ESG program requires a match in an amount that equals the amount of ESG funds provided by HUD. Matching contributions may be obtained from any source, including any federal resource other than the ESG program, as well as state, local and private sources. According to the ESG regulations, the City may comply with this requirement by providing the matching funds itself, or through matching funds provided by any ESG sub-recipient. San Francisco will comply with this requirement with non-ESG funds that will be provided by ESG sub-recipients to support the emergency shelter, rapid re-housing and/or homeless prevention activities that are supported by ESG funding.

HOME regulations require that participating jurisdictions match federal HOME funds that are used for housing development, rental assistance or down payment assistance with local sources at a rate of 25%. The City intends to satisfy this requirement by allocating sufficient funds from the Affordable Housing Fund for this purpose.

**If appropriate, describe publically owned land or property located within the jurisdiction that may be used to address the needs identified in the plan**

San Francisco currently leverages publicly owned land to strategically deliver essential services when possible. For example, a number of social service hubs are operated out of City-owned buildings that are master-leased to community based organizations. In addition, many youth services are located within

elementary, middle, or high schools within the public school system as part of San Francisco's "Beacon" program. Visitacion Valley, a HUD-approved NRSA, is an excellent example of this leveraging, as it has two different multi-tenant buildings owned by the City and leased to nonprofits to provide a range of childcare, youth, family resource, and senior services, in addition to a public-school base youth services Beacon Center.

In 2002, the City of San Francisco passed an ordinance requiring the transfer of underutilized or surplus property to the Mayor's Office of Housing for the development of affordable housing, particularly housing for the homeless.

Properties that are suitable for housing development are to be sold or leased to a non-profit for the development of affordable housing for the homeless and households earning less than 20 percent of Area Median Income or the property is sold and those proceeds are used to develop affordable housing for the homeless, or affordable housing for households earning less than 60 percent of AMI. Additionally MOHCD works with other agencies not subject to the Surplus Property Ordinance to acquire properties they deem surplus and develop the sites into affordable housing such as land from the San Francisco Unified School District, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, and the Port of San Francisco.

## **Discussion**

San Francisco will continue to leverage local, state, federal and private philanthropic dollars to maximize the effectiveness of HUD funds. The City strategically seek out other governmental funding opportunities such as Choice Neighborhood, Byrne, Promise Neighborhood, and other sources that support its integrated inter-departmental strategies of community revitalization. The City also utilizes its own property as appropriate to support the needs of the Consolidated Plan. In particular, the City has prioritized all appropriate surplus property to be dedicated first to affordable housing development, demonstrating the strong commitment the City has towards providing housing for its neediest residents.

## SP-40 Institutional Delivery Structure – 91.215(k)

Explain the institutional structure through which the jurisdiction will carry out its consolidated plan including private industry, non-profit organizations, and public institutions.

**Table 76 – Institutional Delivery Structure**

Responsible Entity	Responsible Entity Type	Role	Geographic Area Served
See narrative below.			

### ***Community Development Service Delivery System***

This section describes the institutional structure through which San Francisco implements its community development program. Essential partners are the private, non-profit and public sectors. They are integral parts of San Francisco’s community development planning and service delivery system. This section will discuss the role of each partner within the system, strengths and weaknesses of these roles, and strategies for strengthening the system.

#### **Private Sector**

City staff works regularly with local, private foundations and community development divisions of corporations and banks. These interactions are substantially consultative regarding non-profit funding applications. Typical consultations include 1) non-profit organization submits a proposal to a local business for funding, and the business consults with City staff regarding the merits of the proposal and capacity of the applicant organization; and 2) non-profit organizations makes an inquiry to City staff who discuss the proposal.

The City and the private sector engage in dialogue to better inform our mutual community investments. The City is working to strengthen its private sector communications to better leverage and coordinate resources.

#### **Non-profit Organizations**

Local non-profit organizations receive grants through a competitive process. Non-profits are the primary implementation arm of the City in program areas such as construction and rehabilitation of community centers and the provision of a variety of social services such as job training, legal services, health and domestic violence services, housing counseling, and economic development technical assistance to small and micro businesses.

Non-profit organizations provide an invaluable source of information regarding the changing needs, gaps in services and successes in our community development activities. These organizations often provide stability in neighborhoods that have few other resources for receiving information, assistance and services.

The large number of non-profit organizations serving low-income communities in San Francisco is both an asset and a challenge. With a long history of serving the community, the sheer number of non-profits leads to increased competition for limited resources. Conversely, the benefits of a rich variety of social service organizations often translates to more community-based and culturally competent services for

low-income residents. The City has already begun an initiative to engage non-profits in organizational and programmatic capacity building to strengthen the effective and efficient delivery of services.

### **Public Institutions**

It is the City's policy to coordinate community development activities among its agencies. Typically, these opportunities arise along with a common interest in a particular neighborhood, issue or population. The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (Successor to the Redevelopment Agency), Office of Economic and Workforce Development, Department of Children, Youth and Their Families, Human Services Agency, Department on the Status of Women, and the Department of Aging and Adult Services confer regularly with each other on subjects such as applicant capacity and community needs.

San Francisco uses the proposal review process as an opportunity to engage departments in a dialogue about the current developments and priorities in other City departments. This dialogue aids the City in being more strategic in the investment of CDBG dollars.

### **Organizational Relationship Between the City and the Public Housing Authority**

The nature of the City's working relationship with the San Francisco Housing Authority (SFHA) is largely one of information sharing for planning purposes. City departments work with the SFHA to identify needs of housing authority residents and have provided funding for capital needs on housing authority sites. In 2013 Mayor Ed Lee announced his intention to reform the governance and management of public housing in San Francisco. Mayor Lee directed the City Administrator and the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development Director to partner with HUD to develop a new vision for public housing based on HOPE SF. HUD has agreed to partner with San Francisco to create this new vision. The City issued a report on this effort in the summer of 2013, as published in "SFHA Re-Envisioning – Recommendations to Mayor Ed Lee on how to transform the San Francisco Housing Authority." MOHCD is now overseeing a three-year process to preserve and rehabilitate up to 41 public housing developments that will improve and upgrade public housing stock for residents.

### ***Workforce Development Service Delivery System***

The Workforce Investment San Francisco (WISF ) body establishes policies for workforce development in San Francisco and influences the design of the delivery system. Further, the WISF contributes expertise from industry and articulates the current workforce trends and needs of the local labor market. Most importantly, the WISF provides leadership in developing a strong and vital partnership between businesses, education, community-based organizations, and city agencies.

The mission of the WISF is to provide a forum where business, labor, education, government, community-based organizations and other stakeholders work together to increase their collective capacity to address the supply and demand challenges confronting the workforce.

Specifically the WISF is responsible for:

- Establishing the direction of workforce development in support of San Francisco's vision for economic competitiveness;
- Creating strategic workforce connections between industry, business, labor, educational institutions, and community based organizations to serve the needs of workers and employers in the region;
- Providing job seekers with education and training needs to achieve self-sufficiency; and,

- Creating a framework to merge public and private resources and expertise to create an integrated workforce development and business service system.

The WISF and Youth Council are staffed by the Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD), which is charged with coordinating and centralizing the youth and adult workforce systems in San Francisco. OEWD will provide staffing support for the quarterly meetings including taking minutes, scheduling of meetings, and ensuring compliance with regulations governing the WISF and Youth Council. The partnership with OEWD and the Mayor's Office ensures that the WISF provides city-wide leadership for workforce development, business attraction, and retention.

In the June, 2014, new local legislation was passed establishing a Committee on City Workforce Alignment ("Alignment Committee") comprised of City employees to coordinate Workforce Development Services across City departments in order to increase their effectiveness. The Alignment Committee will be comprised of one member designated by the Mayor, one member of the Board of Supervisors or a City employee designated by the Board, the Director of Workforce Development, and the department heads of the following City departments: Human Services Agency, Department of Children, Youth and Their Families, Public Utilities Commission, and Public Works.

Every five years, the Alignment is charged developing and submitting a Citywide Workforce Development Plan to the WISF for its review and comment. The plan will include an assessment of the City's anticipated workforce development needs and opportunities for the next five years and a strategy to meet the identified needs. The plan will also include goals and strategies for all Workforce Development Services in San Francisco and a projection of the funding needed to achieve the goals, consistent with the Strategic Plan for Economic Development approved by the Board of Supervisors and the Local Plan approved by WISF.

The new local legislation also establishes an eight (8) member committee to serve in an advisory capacity to the WISF and the Alignment Committee ("Workforce Community Advisory Committee"). The Workforce Community Advisory Committee shall advise the WISF on workforce development system priorities, client needs and services.

### ***Housing Development Delivery System***

This section examines the institutional structure by which the City creates and maintains affordable housing and delivers services linked with that housing. It includes a general review of the major components of both the housing development and services delivery systems.

#### **General Structure of the Housing Development System**

The three major components of the delivery system for the production of affordable housing in San Francisco are the public sector, the private sector, and the non-profit sector. Their primary roles and interrelationships are discussed below.

Key to this coordination is the ability to include multiple agencies in decision-making at the project level on affordable housing developments in the City. Coordination also exists at the level of individual project funding decisions. Members of the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development, Department of Public Health (DPH) and Human Services Agency (HSA) and the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure as successor to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (OCII) comprise the Citywide Affordable Housing Loan Committee. This committee makes funding recommendations to

the Mayor for affordable housing development throughout the City or to the OCII Commission for affordable housing under their jurisdiction. MOHCD works closely with OCII, HSA and DPH to issue requests for proposals (RFPs) or notices of funding availability (NOFAs) on a regular basis to seek applications for particular types of developments. NOFAs are generally issued for projects to serve specific populations (family renters, single adults, seniors, people requiring supportive services, etc.), while RFPs are generally issued for specific development sites. Staff develops funding and general policy recommendations to the Loan Committee.

## **The Roles of Local Government Entities in Affordable Housing Production**

### Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)

The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development is the City's primary affordable housing agency, operating out of the Mayor's Office. The responsibilities of MOHCD include:

- Administration of Community Development Block Grant activities with respect to housing. The staff of MOHCD administers the CDBG-funded site acquisition and rehabilitation loan programs; the monitoring of housing development and housing counseling subgrantees; and monitoring of ongoing compliance of developments funded with CDBG funds.
- Administration of the HOME Investment Partnerships Program including monitoring of ongoing compliance of developments funded with HOME funds.
- Administration of HUD special and competitive grants for housing including Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Grants.
- Successor Housing Agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency - With the passage of State Assembly Bill AB x1 26 in 2011, the Redevelopment Agency was dissolved as of February 1, 2012. The City and County of San Francisco created the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII) to be the successor agency of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency for the major development areas of Mission Bay, Transbay, and Hunters Point Shipyard, and named the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development to be the successor housing agency. As the successor housing agency, MOHCD has jurisdiction over all of the former Redevelopment Agency's housing assets in existence as of February 1, 2012. The major development areas of Mission Bay, Transbay and Hunters Point Shipyard continue to have affordable housing production requirements under their development agreements that were approved by the California Department of Finance as enforceable obligations of OCII. OCII does not have sufficient staff capacity to carry out all of its affordable housing production activities. Consequently OCII is entering into a memorandum of understanding with MOHCD for MOHCD to assist with the affordable housing development in the major approved development areas. After those developments are completed they will be transferred to MOHCD as the successor housing agency and then MOHCD will monitor compliance of those housing assets for the term of their affordability restrictions.
- Administration of the Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS (HOPWA) program for the three Bay Area counties.
- Administration of City-funded housing finance programs including Affordable Housing Fund consisting of fees generated by the Inclusionary Housing and Jobs-Housing Linkage programs; the Housing Trust Fund that was created with the voter-approved Proposition C in November 2012, and the Affordable Housing and Homeownership Bond Program. In certain cases, where another City department receives funds that are related to an affordable housing development, MOHCD may make funding recommendations to those department heads, and administers the funds if are approved.

- Administration of housing revenue bond financed programs including single-family and multifamily projects and of the mortgage credit certificate program.
- Providing technical assistance to sub-grantees and other housing developers in coordinating their applications for other sources of assistance such as state housing funds, low-income housing tax credits, HUD's Section 202, 811, 221(d)(4), and other programs.
- Monitoring of projects funded by City and mortgage revenue bond monies for ongoing compliance with legal and regulatory agreement requirements, including the resale of single-family units developed with bond funds or converted under the City's Condominium Conversion Ordinance.
- Advising and representing the Mayor with respect to housing policy issues including planning issues, code compliance and similar issues, and coordinating the efforts of other City departments in housing program initiatives.
- In coordination with the Planning Department, administering the inclusionary zoning requirements on projects approved for conditional use, and developing recommendations for ensuring the long-term affordability of those units.
- Establishing standards for affirmative marketing programs for all city assisted projects, including inclusionary housing units.

#### San Francisco Housing Authority

The Housing Authority is accountable to HUD, though it is subject to land use controls established by the Planning Code. The Authority derives a portion of its revenues from rents (residents pay 30% of their income for rent), but its budget and activity are substantially dependent on federal policy and programs.

The Housing Authority has established as its overall agency mission the provision of safe, decent, and sanitary housing for very low-income households. An additional objective is to expand opportunities for economic stability and essential human services for the residents of public housing. The SFHA operates the City's public housing and administers the Section 8 certificate, voucher, and project-based subsidy programs.

The Authority is governed by a seven-member commission appointed by the Mayor. The Commissioners are responsible for the policies and procedures of the Authority, as well as for the selection of the Authority's Executive Director.

The Authority serves over 31,000 San Francisco residents, with 12,691 residents living in 6,249 public housing units and 19,110 residents living in 8,016 privately owned housing units subsidized by Section 8 vouchers.

Currently the Authority is working with MOHCD and affordable housing developers to convert and rehabilitate over 3,400 units of public housing in 19 developments to HUD's Rental Assistance Demonstration Program.

#### Office of Economic and Workforce Development

The Office of Economic and Workforce Development administers programs to enhance the business climate and assist San Franciscans, business owners and job seekers. It also oversees the City's workforce development programs and is working with MOHCD on Section 3 hiring in MOHCD housing and capital projects.

### Planning Commission and Planning Department

The Planning Commission plays a central role in the development of housing policy through the Residence Element of the General Plan. The Planning Department provides yearly data and analysis of housing trends, which other agencies and the public rely on to help guide the development of housing programs. Since the mid-1970s, it has developed several types of zoning controls which attempt to directly or indirectly encourage the retention of existing affordable housing or the production of new affordable housing. Among the mechanisms implemented by Planning Department are Affordable Housing Special Use Districts, density bonuses for senior and disabled housing, floor area ratio and height exceptions for affordable housing in certain areas, jobs-housing linkage requirements, inclusionary zoning requirements, restrictions on condominium conversions, and restrictions on the conversion of residential units to commercial or hotel uses.

### Human Service Agency

The Human Services Agency (HSA) administers a number of programs that deliver housing-related services to affordable housing developments assisted by other City departments. HSA administers the federal Shelter Plus Care program, which provides rental assistance and services to households at risk of homelessness. HSA also administers the McKinney-Vento Supportive Housing Grants received by the City, including coordination of applications and services by the various nonprofit service providers. HSA also provides funding for the Local Operating Subsidy Program (LOSP), which provides operating subsidies to affordable housing developments that provide housing for chronically homeless single adults, seniors, families or transition-age youth that are referred by HSA.

### Department of Public Health

DPH administers public health programs through San Francisco General and Laguna Honda Hospitals, five district health centers, and mental health centers throughout the City. Community Mental Health Services (CMHS), a division of DPH, operates a number of programs for specific groups, including seniors, women and children, and persons with drug and alcohol dependency. These services can be linked with affordable housing developments assisted by other City departments. MOHCD's Lead Hazard reduction staff works closely with DPH. The Lead Hazard Reduction staff also works very closely with DPH personnel. DPH also provides funding for the Local Operating Subsidy Program for affordable housing developments that provide housing for chronically homeless households referred by DPH through its Direct Access to Housing program.

### Human Rights Commission

The City's Human Rights Commission supports and monitors Fair Housing Access laws and reports to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors with findings and policy recommendations on issues of accessibility and discriminatory barriers. The Commission protects persons from housing discrimination on the basis of medical disability, sexual orientation, family status, race, religion, or national origin. It also assists in resolving problems with SRO hotel management and advocates for the protection of disenfranchised groups. The Commission monitors fair housing practices at housing projects that receive public assistance and strives to correct policies and practices that could result in discriminatory practices.

### Rent Stabilization Board

The Rent Stabilization Board administers the City's rent control ordinance and hears arbitration appeals regarding rent disputes. The Board consists of five members appointed by the Mayor: two landlords, two tenants and one person who is neither. The Rent Board also monitors owner move-in evictions and Ellis Act evictions and advises the Mayor on rent control and eviction policies.



### Mayor's Office on Disability

The Mayor's Office on Disability (MOD) is the City's principal agency for ensuring access to City programs and facilities for people with disabilities. With respect to affordable housing development, MOD works closely with the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development to review its programs and projects and ensure that these projects provide not only the accessibility required by federal, state and local law, but also the greatest accessibility feasible.

### Department of Aging and Adult Services

The Department of Aging and Adult Services (DAAS) is a division of the Human Services Agency and coordinates programs addressing the needs of seniors. DAAS has established a network of Senior Central centers throughout the City, which disseminate information about programs and services for seniors.

### Department of Children, Youth and Their Families

The Department of Children, Youth and Families coordinates its family day care assistance program with the lead hazard reduction program operated by the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development.

### Department of Building Inspection

The Department of Building Inspection (DBI) is responsible for the permitting and inspection of new construction and alterations, the maintenance of building records, and the enforcement of residential energy conservation standards. DBI conducts plan checking and performs building, electrical, housing, and plumbing inspections.

## **The Roles of Non-Profit Entities in Affordable Housing Production**

For more than two decades, nonprofit organizations have been an essential element in the City's strategy for affordable housing production. Their roles include:

### Affordable Housing Production

The City's CDBG program provides administrative funding to a number of nonprofit corporations to acquire and rehabilitate existing buildings and to acquire sites for development of new housing for low-income households. Both subgrantee and other nonprofit corporations have also received loans or grants from the CDBG site acquisition and rehabilitation loan pools for these activities. A number of these nonprofits qualify as Community Housing Development Organizations under the HOME program.

### Housing Counseling and Technical Services

Several nonprofit organizations receive CDBG funds to provide housing counseling services and technical services to low-income households and to other non-profits. The housing counseling agencies receive housing discrimination complaints from the public and counsel individuals on their rights and remedies under state and federal laws, and work to prevent illegal lockouts, evictions and hotel conversions. These housing counseling agencies also provide homeownership counseling to potential low- and moderate-income homebuyers.

### Housing Services Providers

The trend toward linking affordable housing development with on-site supportive services has led to increased collaboration between housing developers, service providers and the City. Agencies such as Walden House, Conard House and Episcopal Community Services have become essential partners in the development of affordable housing.

### Community Lending

Three nonprofit lenders based in San Francisco, the Low Income Investment Fund, Local Initiatives Support Corporation, and the Northern California Community Loan Fund, play an important role in lending to affordable housing developers, particularly during the predevelopment stages of a project.

## **The Roles of Private Sector Entities in Affordable Housing Production**

### Lenders

Financial institutions participate in the affordable housing development process on many different levels. Thrift institutions have established the Savings Associations Mortgage Company (SAMCO) and commercial banks have established the California Community Reinvestment Corporation (CCRC) to provide long-term, fixed interest rate permanent financing for affordable housing. Each group understands the needs of non-profit developers, and would benefit from increased capitalization and more members. Some commercial banks are very active as construction lenders for affordable housing projects and engage in bridge loan lending on tax credit transactions.

### Legal Services

A number of local corporate law firms provide legal services for non-profit housing developers. Some of these services are provided at market rate; others are pro bono, representing a significant contribution to reduced project costs.

### For-Profit Developers

The very high cost of development in San Francisco has been a challenge for for-profit developers in affordable housing in recent years. Due to the large subsidies needed to build or rehabilitate affordable housing, the City has required most developers to agree to long-term affordability as a condition of receiving financing.

In specific niche areas, for-profit developers play a very important role. The City's inclusionary requirements for new construction of market rate housing ensure that most new market rate rental/condominium developers are participating actively in developing affordable housing through providing below market rate units within their market rate project, providing units on a different site, payment of a fee in-lieu of providing below market rate units on-site or off-site, or in certain neighborhoods in San Francisco acquiring land and transferring ownership of it to the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development for the development of affordable housing.

### Rental Property Owners

Most owners of residential rental properties have little experience in providing affordable housing. Certain groups of property owners, however, continue to play a role in maintaining the affordable housing stock. For-profit owners of HUD-assisted properties continue to make up a significant portion of the operators of this housing. To the extent that those owners do not seek to prepay mortgages and terminate Section 8 contracts, they will continue to provide (though not produce) affordable housing. Similarly, operators of board and care facilities provide a significant source of affordable housing.

### Tax Credit Investor

As limited partners in affordable housing developments sponsored by non-profit corporations, private investors provide one of the most important sources of equity for affordable housing. Continuation of the tax credit program at the federal and state levels provides an incentive for their participation.

### Architects, Engineers and Construction Contractors

The majority of these stakeholders in affordable housing development come from the private sector. In periods when market-rate development is strong, nonprofit developers experience increased costs due to the competitive demand for these services.

### ***Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS (HOPWA) Delivery System***

This section describes the institutional structure through which MOHCD administers the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) Program. Primary partners are the private, non-profit and public sectors which help to create capital projects, provide supportive services, rental assistance, and technical assistance. This section outlines the role of these primary partners and related issues.

#### **Private Sector**

Because federal regulations mandate that tenants in HOPWA assisted units be charged no more than 30% of their gross annual income, the rents at newly developed units are generally affordable for tenants. As a result, the income collected from these units is usually insufficient to leverage private conventional debt. In an attempt to mitigate this effect, and at the request of the HIV/AIDS community, San Francisco has focused its provision of newly developed HOPWA units in larger mixed-population affordable housing developments. By doing so, HOPWA units can take advantage of a development's overall income potential to secure conventional loans and benefit from private equity provided through the federal Low Income Housing Tax Credit Program.

The San Francisco HOPWA program's primary interface with the public sector occurs through its site tenant-based rental assistance programs. Clients of the rental assistance programs use certificates to locate and secure units, which exist on the private rental market. San Francisco continues to strategize ways to increase participation from the private sector in providing housing to persons with HIV/AIDS and to ensure that the clients can be competitive in the City's tight rental market. An example of these efforts is fostering good landlord-tenant relationships through the provision of supportive services and intervention.

#### **Non-profit Organizations**

MOHCD enters into legal agreements with non-profit housing developers, supportive service providers, and other housing related agencies to disburse HOPWA funds. New HOPWA projects are either solicited or unsolicited and proposed by non-profit housing developers or other community organizations. Typically, when HOPWA funds are available for new projects, MOHCD issues a Request for Proposals (RFP), which is widely advertised to local community organizations, including grassroots and faith-based organizations.

HIV housing program providers are typically community based and frequently collaborate with non-HIV service providers. Many of these providers receive City funding other than HOPWA funds to provide comprehensive health care, substance abuse and mental health treatment, case management, money management, nursing and attendant care, and food service to people living with HIV.

#### **Public Sector**

MOHCD participates in a monthly Pipeline meeting with other City staff that are collaboratively involved to address funding needs of all new and existing affordable housing projects, including those funded by HOPWA. MOHCD's primary partners in implementing the HOPWA program are the Department of Public Health (DPH), which administers the Ryan White Comprehensive AIDS Resource Emergency (CARE)

funds and the Human Services Agency (HSA), which administers the McKinney funds and now administers the HOWA Rental Subsidy Program.

In the beginning of the HOPWA program (1995), SFRA and DPH's HIV Health Services Branch collaborated on a 5 Year HIV/AIDS Housing Plan to set future funding directions for HIV housing. The plan was updated in 1998 and outlined needs which resulted in SFRA and DPH co-funding many HOPWA projects, frequently prioritizing HOPWA monies for capital and CARE monies for service funds (since CARE cannot be used for capital). Both HOPWA and CARE have funded rental assistance, initially co-funding several subsidy programs, and in more recent years, funding separate programs. In 2006, the City's Board of Supervisors established the HIV/AIDS Housing Work Group (with 24 members from various City agencies, SFRA, and community stakeholders) mandating that the group develop a Comprehensive HIV/AIDS Housing Plan for the City. This plan was published in May 2007 and identifies deficiencies in the current system and addresses them by developing specific, concrete goals and recommendations to address unmet housing needs among persons living with HIV/AIDS (including those at risk of homelessness). In 2014, MOHCD partnered again with DPH, HSA, and community-based HIV service organizations to create another 5-Year AIDS Housing Plan, which was issued in December, 2014.

HOPWA staff and DPH have taken additional housing advisory direction from the HIV Health Services' Planning Council. Many funding decisions that result from the Planning Council's recommendations have been handled between HOPWA staff and DPH; these include: HOPWA funds predominately funding the creation and maintenance of five licensed Residential Care Facilities; co-funding rental assistance programs; and DPH taking the lead on master leasing Single Room Occupancy hotels. Beginning in 1998, DPH created a separate Housing Division called Direct Access to Housing-Housing and Urban Health (DAH-HUH) to handle all DPH housing funding. The creation of DAH-HUH resulted in most of the HOPWA implementation being managed collaboratively with staff from this division.

HOPWA staff and DPH's DAH-HUH staff participate in numerous committee meetings focused on HIV housing and related services. These meetings have included the HIV Housing Access System Work Group, an advisory board that oversees and monitors the HIV Housing Wait List and the HOPWA "deep rent" program. San Francisco is current engaged in a comprehensive re-examination of the HIV/AIDS housing application and selection system, with MOHCD, DPH and HSA working together to create the most appropriate system to match the shifting needs of the epidemic.

Over the years as HOPWA funding has decreased, HOPWA funds have been committed to designated units in numerous capital projects in process and collaborated with HSA to provide supportive housing or General Fund monies for special needs services. HOPWA staff have also been a participant for several years in HSA's McKinney application process through participation on the priority panel for funding recommendations, and formulating options for renewal projects.

### ***Other Institutional Partners***

In addition to the partners listed above, other key partners collaborate to achieve the City's housing and community development goals.

#### **Mayor**

The Mayor is the elected chief executive officer of the City. The Mayor, through his various offices, carries out delivery of services and coordinates the activities of other City departments. The Mayor's Office prepares the City's annual proposed budget and makes recommendations to the Board of

Supervisors for allocation of General Fund and other monies to be used for housing, homeless programs and community development. The Mayor may also sponsor legislation setting policies and establishing programs in those areas. The Mayor appoints members of commissions that oversee many of the departments involved in service delivery, including the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, the Planning Commission, the Health Commission, the Human Services Commission, the Board of Commissioners of the Housing Authority, the Human Rights Commission, and the Citizen's Committee on Community Development.

### **Board of Supervisors**

The Board of Supervisors is the elected governing body of the City and County of San Francisco. It establishes, by ordinance and resolution, the policies that affect the delivery of affordable housing, homeless services and community development services in San Francisco. The Board also approves the lease or disposition of publicly owned land as sites for affordable housing development or community development facilities. The Board reviews and approves the zoning and conditional use actions of the Planning Commission. Actions of the Board are required to be approved by the Mayor, whose veto can be overridden by a vote of eight supervisors.

### **Assess of Strengths and Gaps in the Institutional Delivery System**

Overall, the City has well-established relationships within each institutional sector. These relationships provide a strong foundation for information and resource sharing, leveraging, collaborative planning and implementation. Our affordable housing development and homeless systems are interwoven, with close communication between departments allowing for strategic decision-making. We continue to explore all opportunities for partnership and collaboration. The City also strives for transparency between government and the community, inviting community stakeholders to participate in working groups, task forces, and citizen advisory committees.

In the area of workforce development, the City's strength is its successful sector strategy, a workforce development strategy that aligns the city's workforce programs around the needs of local and regional industry growth sectors, and through its "access points" strategy, creates training and employment pathways for disadvantaged San Franciscans.

San Francisco will expand the availability of and participation in "Earn and Learn" models such as apprenticeships, OJT, and other customized training where workers can build skills while working. Both research and practice strongly argue that deepening the deliberate connectivity of work and learning will increase the success both of learners of all ages and employers.

**Availability of services targeted to homeless persons and persons with HIV and mainstream services**

**Table 77 – Homeless Prevention Services Summary**

<b>Homelessness Prevention Services</b>	<b>Available in the Community</b>	<b>Targeted to Homeless</b>	<b>Targeted to People with HIV</b>
<b>Homelessness Prevention Services</b>			
Counseling/Advocacy	X	X	X
Legal Assistance	X	X	X
Mortgage Assistance	X		
Rental Assistance	X	X	X
Utilities Assistance	X	X	
<b>Street Outreach Services</b>			
Law Enforcement	X	X	
Mobile Clinics	X	X	X
Other Street Outreach Services	X	X	X
<b>Supportive Services</b>			
Alcohol & Drug Abuse	X	X	X
Child Care	X		
Education	X		
Employment and Employment Training	X	X	X
Healthcare	X	X	X
HIV/AIDS	X	X	X
Life Skills	X	X	X
Mental Health Counseling	X	X	X
Transportation	X	X	
<b>Other</b>			

**Describe the extent to which services targeted to homeless person and persons with HIV and mainstream services, such as health, mental health and employment services are made available to and used by homeless persons (particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families and unaccompanied youth) and persons with HIV within the jurisdiction:**

***Overview of the HIV/AIDS Local System of Care***

The San Francisco EMA has a long and distinguished history of responding to the HIV crisis with a comprehensive continuum of service programs that are impactful, innovative, competent, and cost effective. During the first decade of the AIDS epidemic, when San Francisco was one of the hardest-hit cities by the AIDS crisis, the region developed a comprehensive network of services that utilized case

management to link individuals to medical and supportive services. This system became known as the “San Francisco Model of Care” and had a lasting impact on the organization of HIV services in the US. Over the past decade and a half, the EMA has continued to evolve and grow to respond to changes in the epidemic and its affected populations, while incorporating new treatment developments. In the mid- 1990s, as the epidemic had an increasing effect on disenfranchised individuals, San Francisco developed the Integrated Services Program, a multidisciplinary model of HIV care in which services were merged, coordinated, and linked to stabilize and retain hard to- reach and severely affected individuals. This approach culminated in a significant intensification of the integrated services model in the form of the EMA’s seven Centers of Excellence –“one stop shop” programs similar to medical homes with wraparound services which work toward the goal of stabilizing the lives of multiply diagnosed and severe need populations through neighborhood-based, multi-service centers tailored to the needs of specific cultural, linguistic, and behavioral groups.

Throughout the San Francisco EMA, the emphasis on high-quality, client-centered, and culturally competent primary medical care services remains at the heart of the local care continuum, with medical case management offering individualized assessment, coordination, and linkage to a full range of social and supportive services. In addition to a number of major hospitals in the EMA, there are seven public clinics and six community clinics in San Francisco County; two public clinics in San Mateo County; and one public clinic in Marin County providing HIV/AIDS primary care. In Marin County, cases and services are focused around the major cities bordering the north-south-running Highway 101. San Mateo County has one HIV epicenter along its border with San Francisco and another at the opposite end of the county adjacent to East Palo Alto, with services spread between them.

In addition to medical care, the local continuum of care encompasses a range of linked programs that help people access and remain in treatment in the face of daunting life challenges. These services include case management, mental health and substance abuse treatment, dental care, treatment adherence support, direct emergency financial assistance, food, benefits counseling, and housing. The local continuum also includes access to critical services such as home health care and adult day health care to help persons living with HIV cope with more complex medical needs, while facilitating access to medical care through services such as transportation and childcare. A range of ancillary services such as money management support and legal assistance helps clients better manage the circumstances of their lives to consistently access treatment. Inpatient care is provided in a range of settings funded through non-Part A sources. A comprehensive matrix of HIV prevention, counseling, testing, early intervention, and care linkage services are supported through non-Part A funding streams, many directly linked to the San Francisco Centers of Excellence program.

The San Francisco EMA operates a wide range of outreach, care linkage, and treatment access activities to reach severe need populations, some of them supported through Minority AIDS Initiative (MAI) funding. Marin County, for example, has collocated testing, primary care, social services, and research programs in one central facility to provide easier access to service for residents, while the San Francisco HIV Prevention Section has funded a new full-time linkage specialist to concentrate on linking newly tested positive persons with counseling and care. San Mateo utilizes outreach workers who are integrated as part of the County’s STD / HIV Counseling and Testing Team, and who travel throughout the county providing outreach, testing, referrals, direct linkage to care, and contact to those who have fallen out of care. The emphasis of all of these programs is on ensuring that disenfranchised and underserved HIV-infected persons learn about their HIV status; become informed about the system of care; and receive the support they need to access services on a long-term basis. These programs are also

linked and integrated with our EMA's existing matrix of EIIHA services, designed to identify and bring into care as many new HIV-infected individuals as possible.

Additional Part A-funded components of the EMA's system of care increase clients' ability to access service and increase their self-efficacy with regard to remaining engaged in medical care and drug treatment. Substance abuse and mental health services, for example, improve clients' emotional and physical well-being, improve stability, and increase the probability of long-term treatment adherence. Benefits counseling maximizes access to health insurance and other income streams, while money management helps persons with HIV living on low incomes maintain housing and other essential services. Transportation via van service and bus and taxi tokens enables clients to access health care appointments. All of these services play an essential role in allowing people to access and remain in care over the long term.

### **The Centers of Excellence Program**

The San Francisco EMA's Centers of Excellence (CoE) network has successfully forged a new type of "safety net" for severe need and special populations based on the medical home model, one that encompasses a range of populations and neighborhoods and that is making a major contribution to the EMA's goal of reducing disparities and improving access to care for hard-hit and underserved communities. Through the CoE program, the Mission Center of Excellence, Native American Center of Excellence, and Southeast Partnership for Health provide culturally competent services for three key hard-hit populations of color in our region: Latinos/Hispanics, Native Americans, and African Americans, respectively. Meanwhile, the Women's Center of Excellence provides a unique range of services specifically tailored to the needs of HIV positive women, while the Tenderloin Area Center of Excellence offers services to homeless and marginally housed individuals, as well as active substance users, transgender persons, and - through a partnership with Asian & Pacific Islander Wellness Center - Asian/Pacific Islander communities. The services of the Forensic AIDS Project provide unique incarceration-based outreach, service, and post-release follow-up to persons in San Francisco County Jails. The transitional Case Management Program (TMP) funded by the California Department of Corrections supports inmates' transition from the prison system back into the community by linking them with medical and support. All CoEs also incorporate Prevention with Positives interventions (PWP) into their care services and all are fully linked to the regional HIV counseling and testing network. The Women's Center of Excellence, for example, incorporates an innovative PWP program for women and male-to female transgender people called the Sexual Health and Empowerment Program (SHE), an intervention incorporating formal risk assessments; one-on-one counseling with on-site Prevention Coordination; and ongoing risk-reduction groups and other services, including sexual and IDU harm reduction seminars, support, and referrals.

San Francisco's Centers of Excellence have already achieved significant success in enrolling greater numbers of persons of color with low incomes and severe needs in medical care services, with persons of color making up 71.0% of all Centers of Excellence clients versus 52.7% of the total Ryan White population. Even more striking has been the increase the CoEs have been able to achieve among African American clients, who now make up 30.6% of the CoE client population as compared to 19.3% of the Ryan White system as a whole.

### ***Overview of Homeless Framework for Care***

This strategic planning framework builds from the success, lessons learned, and guidance of *Toward*



*Ending Homelessness In San Francisco*<sup>145</sup>, the Five-Year Strategic Plan of the San Francisco Local Homeless Coordinating Board, 2008-2013 and *The San Francisco Plan To Abolish Chronic Homelessness, 2004-2014*<sup>146</sup>.

In 2008, the San Francisco Local Homeless Coordinating Board (LHCB) began implementing a five-year strategic plan, *Toward Ending Homelessness in San Francisco*. The purpose of the 2008 strategic plan was to provide one unified citywide plan to prevent and eradicate homelessness. That plan, adapted from a number of preexisting strategic plans, including *The San Francisco Plan To Abolish Chronic Homelessness, 2004-2014*, provided San Francisco with a roadmap to assist people who are homeless and those at risk for homelessness in our community, with the goal of ending homelessness.

The Local Homeless Coordinating Board (LHCB) is the lead entity for the San Francisco Continuum of Care (CoC). The LHCB works to ensure a unified homeless strategy that is supported by the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, City departments, nonprofit agencies, people who are homeless or formerly homeless and the community at large. All efforts are aimed at permanent solutions, and the range of services is designed to meet the unique and complex needs of individuals who are threatened with or currently experiencing homelessness.

A CoC is a group organized locally to carry out homeless planning and evaluation activities that is composed of a wide range of community stakeholders (e.g. homeless-service providers, faith-based organizations, school representatives, etc.) The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and other Federal agencies use the CoC structure to distribute funds.

In 2013, the Strategic Planning Committee of the LHCB convened to update and review its strategic plan to incorporate best practices, lessons learned, and new research into the community's plan to end homelessness. A focus of the Committee has been identifying measurable performance outcomes that will demonstrate that San Francisco is successfully responding to homelessness locally. With the assistance of key stakeholders and community members, the LHCB will use this plan to guide, monitor, and follow efforts towards ending homelessness in San Francisco.

The Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness, *Opening Doors*<sup>147</sup>, began implementation in 2010. The Federal Strategic Plan resulted from extensive research and review of national best practices, and will guide the allocation of Federal resources. Seeing many benefits to aligning local and Federal policy, the LHCB determined that this plan should use the structure of *Opening Doors*. In addition, the Strategic Planning Committee incorporated relevant *Opening Doors* strategies and action steps into this document, including a focus on chronically homeless persons, veterans, and families and youth.

The Plan's five high-level goals are to:

- Increase access to stable and affordable housing
- Increase economic security
- Improve health and stability
- Retool the homeless emergency response system

---

<sup>145</sup> San Francisco Local Homeless Coordinating Board, *Toward Ending Homelessness in San Francisco, 2008-2013*

<sup>146</sup> San Francisco Ten Year Planning Council, *The San Francisco Plan to Abolish Chronic Homelessness, 2004-2014*

<sup>147</sup> United States Interagency Council on Homelessness, *Opening Doors Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness, 2010*

- Improve leadership, collaboration, and civic engagement

**Goal: Increase Access to stable and affordable housing**

The City of San Francisco strives to increase the supply of subsidized permanent housing so that it is affordable to people who are experiencing homelessness, accessible, and offers services to achieve housing stability. At the conclusion of five years this strategic plan will result in more homeless people accessing housing that ends their homelessness.

*Indicators of Success*

- Create 200 new permanent supportive housing units to house chronically homeless individuals and families each year, while maintaining current permanent supportive housing units.
- Create access to 100 additional housing units affordable for people who are homeless each year, or who are exiting permanent supportive housing, while maintaining current affordable units.
- Improve the percentage of households successfully matched with correct housing type and level of service, from year to year, as indicated by length of stay and housing provider survey.
- Exit 75% of households from permanent supportive housing that are stabilized, interested in moving to other housing, and able to maintain housing without services, as indicated by housing provider survey.
- Reduce the number of homeless households that are barred from housing to 0.
- Ensure the number of evictions in Permanent Supportive Housing units is less than 10%.
- Reduce evictions from subsidized housing that lead to homelessness by 10%.

*STRATEGY #1: Increase Supply of housing available to homeless households*

**KEY ACTION STEPS**

- Expand the supply of permanent supportive housing, especially for chronically homeless people and other vulnerable populations. New housing should provide a range of choice, including different levels of service, geographic diversity, co-housing, and other options. Increase supply of affordable housing through new construction, expansion of master-leasing, and prioritization of housing subsidies.
- Develop innovative housing models, including especially congregate housing, to meet the needs of various homeless populations (e.g. long-term shelter stayers)
- Prioritize awards of Proposition C Funds for projects targeting homeless and those exiting from permanent supportive housing into affordable housing.
- Develop a sustainable regional network to improve new housing development and availability for homeless persons and those exiting PSH with 0-30% AMI, including participation of housing authorities from neighboring counties.
- Identify more coordinated, sustainable, dependable sources of supportive housing service funding. Improve leverage of existing funding.

*STRATEGY #2: Improve access to housing and housing services for homeless households*

**KEY ACTION STEPS**

- Implement a coordinated assessment system for all homeless housing to ensure most appropriate placement for each household and to streamline access to housing. Require that City-supported housing projects participate. Use coordinated assessment to understand

systemic gaps. Ensure that the system has access to housing that adopts the least restrictive tenant eligibility criteria based upon eviction, credit, and/or criminal histories.

- Expand access to affordable housing for homeless households by including additional units in the coordinated assessment system and increasing set-asides of mainstream housing resources, such as Housing Choice Vouchers, for homeless persons.
- Increase service-enriched housing by identifying funding and resources to support co-location of services with affordable housing.
- Build relationships with landlords and establish strategies to increase access to housing in San Francisco for homeless and at-risk households. Create renters' academies, personal finance courses, and other resources to maximize the success of new renters.
- Acknowledge and develop strategies to address the unique needs specific sub-population groups, including veterans, youth, and LGBT populations.

### *STRATEGY #3: prioritize housing resources*

#### KEY ACTION STEPS

- Use the coordinated assessment system to prioritize and target supportive housing for the households that require the associated level of support to end their homelessness.
- Evaluate all residents of city-funded supportive housing projects annually to determine housing stability and identify candidates for transition into more independent housing. Create incentives, including stipends, internships, and employment supports, to help people who have achieved stability in supportive housing to move into more independent housing in order to open units for others.
- Improve the link between eviction prevention services and placement in more intensive service environments, including guardianships and acute-level care to stabilize the most vulnerable households in permanent housing.
- Prevent homelessness by intervening to avoid evictions from permanent housing that lead to homelessness. Increase outreach and education about eviction-prevention resources, including financial assistance and tenant rights laws. Provide short-term rental support and wraparound services to address underlying issues threatening housing stability and to prevent eviction. Increase the provision of legal services for individuals and families at risk of eviction. Provide rehousing support.

#### **Goal: Increase economic security**

The City of San Francisco strives to increase the income of people who are experiencing homelessness by improving access to public benefits and employment opportunities. At the conclusion of five years this strategic plan will result in more homeless and formerly homeless people having income sufficient to maintain housing.

#### *Indicators of Success*

- Reduce the number of adults who become homeless again after being permanently housed by our CoC to less than 10%.
- Improve the percentage of homeless adults and formerly homeless adults in permanent supportive housing who are employed (including part-time, seasonal, and supported employment) to at least 20%.
- Reduce the percentage of homeless households with no income to less than 5%.
- Increase the percentage of disabled homeless adults who access SSI/SSDI, veteran benefits, or SDI to 80%.

### *STRATEGY #1: Increase Employment Opportunities*

#### KEY ACTION STEPS

- Develop easily-accessed employer incentives (like JobsNOW!) to encourage employment of homeless individuals.
- Collaborate with workforce development agencies to develop additional job support services, including skills training, stipends, childcare, and aftercare to encourage job retention, including through building linkages with the Department of Rehabilitation and the Department of Aging. Also work together to assist homeless persons with barriers to employment, such as criminal backgrounds.
- Connect veterans with veteran-specific employment training and access opportunities.
- Provide disabled clients with SSI and SSDI benefits in place with systematic and clear information about employment options while receiving disability benefits.
- Provide Care Not Cash recipients with employment incentives and assist with transition from CAAP to employment.

### *STRATEGY #2: Increase employment-readiness in homeless populations*

#### KEY ACTION STEPS

- Prioritize workforce development resources for those homeless individuals assessed as most likely to obtain and retain employment.
- Provide youth-specific education, training and job-placement resources, including compliance with the city's Homeless Education Plan.
- Expand funding and support for programs that target homeless and formerly homeless people, including programs that target the most in need, and may have lower job placement numbers than programs that take all unemployed applicants.

### *STRATEGY #3: Expand access to mainstream income benefits*

#### KEY ACTION STEPS

- Screen all homeless persons who access coordinated assessment or are clients of city-funded homeless programs for mainstream income benefits and provide support throughout the application process for each eligible benefit. Reevaluate benefits on an annual basis to determine if additional benefits are available.
- Invest in improving access for homeless veterans to veterans benefits.
- Increase connections to SSI and SSDI for homeless and formerly homeless housed San Franciscans.
- Improve linkages between homeless housing and CalWORKS and CAAP.
- Consider ways to streamline benefits applications or group multiple benefits in one application.

### **Goal: Improve Health and Stability**

The City of San Francisco aims to improve the health and housing stability of people experiencing homelessness in the city by ensuring that all individuals have access to an appropriate and effective level of care. At the conclusion of five years, this strategic plan will expand access to healthcare services for homeless people, improve health and stability outcomes, and reduce the burden on mainstream emergency medical services.

#### *Indicators of Success*

- Enroll 100% of eligible homeless individuals in MediCal, Covered CA, or Healthy SF.

- Ensure that 100% of residents in homeless housing programs have a “medical home” that provides integrated care for medical and behavioral health.
- Using housing as a health care intervention, improve the health outcomes of homeless individuals suffering from chronic health conditions by reducing hospitalizations of chronically homeless individuals by 10% every two years.
- Using housing as a health care intervention, reduce the number of emergency room and community paramedic encounters by homeless individuals by 10% every two years.
- Expand non-acute medical resources by increasing the number of medical respite beds by 10%.
- Reduce the number of homeless households and the number of households in permanent supportive housing experiencing hunger by 50%.

In addition to the strategies and action steps set forth below, the implementation of *San Francisco Community Health Improvement Plan*<sup>148</sup> will support the goals of this plan and improve our success.

#### *STRATEGY #1: Fully Integrate the Affordable Care Act*

##### KEY ACTION STEPS

- Ensure that all homeless residents have access to healthcare services by facilitating the enrollment of all eligible homeless individuals in California’s MediCal insurance program, and ensuring that non-MediCal eligible individuals are enrolled in Covered CA or Healthy San Francisco.
- Pursue new opportunities for alternative models of care under the Affordable Care Act, including pursuing waivers, Behavioral Health Homes, Targeted Case Management Services, Medicaid Rehabilitative Services, and Home and Community Based Services.
- Increase awareness among homeless housing and service providers about changes and opportunities under the Affordable Care Act. Provide adequate support and training throughout the transition and implementation.
- Ensure every resident in homeless housing has a designated medical home to coordinate medical, behavioral-health care services, and other needed health care, like dental care, with supportive services.
- Increase availability of medical services to ensure accessibility of medical care. The implementation of the *Health Care Services Master Plan Update*<sup>149</sup> will support this plan and increase our success.

#### *STRATEGY #2: Expand access to care at homeless programs*

##### KEY ACTION STEPS

- Develop strategies for providing enhanced care to aging and other vulnerable homeless populations, including dementia and Alzheimer’s patients, including creating resources like mobile medical teams able to provide care at housing sites without permanent medical facilities.
- Develop procedures for residents of homeless housing or shelter who are vulnerable (e.g. elders, people who are seriously mentally ill, etc.) and unable to maintain that housing or shelter to “step up” to a higher level of care, including through the coordinated assessment system.

---

<sup>148</sup> <http://www.sfdph.org/dph/comupg/knowlcol/chip/default.asp>

<sup>149</sup> <http://www.sfdph.org/dph/comupg/knowlcol/HCSMP/>

- Foster and expand partnerships between housing providers and health and behavioral health care providers in order to co-locate and/or coordinate health, behavioral health, safety and wellness services with housing.

*STRATEGY #3: Improve access to healthy, nutritious food*

**KEY ACTION STEPS**

- Increase use of CalFresh benefits by increasing enrollment and increasing the number of retailers that accept EBT and Restaurant Meal Vendors.
- Increase meals to school-aged children through school meal programs (including breakfast, after the bell, lunch, after school, and summer).
- Fund nonprofit meal/grocery programs to scale (including congregate meals for seniors/adults with disabilities, dining room, pantry, home-delivered meal and home-delivered grocery programs).
- Increase the number of housing units with kitchens.
- Create "Eat-SF" a local subsidy to supplement CalFresh, beginning with SSI recipients who are ineligible for CalFresh.

The implementation of the detailed recommendations in the *San Francisco Food Security Task Force, Assessment of Food Security in San Francisco*<sup>150</sup> will support the goals of this plan and improve our success.

**Goal: Retool the Homeless Emergency Response System**

The City of San Francisco strives to retool the city's homeless emergency response in order to reduce the number of households that experience homelessness, especially unsheltered homelessness.

*Indicators of Success*

- Reduce the unsheltered homeless population of San Francisco by 30% by January 2019.
- Divert 5% of shelter seekers to stable housing.
- Transition 50% of long-term shelter residents (defined as over three 90-day stays) to permanent housing units annually
- Serve an additional 500 adults through rapid rehousing.
- Increase percentage of people served by the coordinated assessment system that are successfully connected with prevention, rapid rehousing, or diversion resources, versus other resources, year to year.
- Reduce the number of people accessing shelter or homeless housing that come directly from the criminal justice system, foster care, and health care institutions by 75%.

*Priority #1: Prevent households from experiencing homelessness*

**KEY ACTION STEPS**

- Create and expand rapid rehousing and diversion programs for single adults and families, and make them available where people access the homeless system, including in shelters, coordinated assessment points, and Resource Centers. Improve program performance by

---

<sup>150</sup> <http://www.sfdph.org/dph/files/mtgsGrps/FoodSecTaskFrc/docs/FSTF-AssessmentOfFoodSecurityInSF-2013.pdf>

implementing *San Francisco Homelessness Prevention and Rental Assistance Programs Workgroup Summary Report*<sup>151</sup> recommendations.

*Priority #2: Improve discharge planning processes*

KEY ACTION STEPS

- Prevent homelessness by supporting the transition from incarceration, foster care, and hospitals into permanent housing that is not provided by the homeless system of care.
- Build partnerships across systems to support discharge planning.
- Build additional policies to support creating housing plans and discharge planning to promote housing. Ensure medically-vulnerable individuals are never discharged to the streets or to the homeless system of care.
- Increase the options for appropriate housing units for recently discharged people.

*Priority #3: Provide and improve interim housing and shelter*

Implementing the recommendations of the Shelter Access Workgroup<sup>152</sup> will support the goals of this plan and its success.

KEY ACTION STEPS

- Provide additional services in shelters that lead to accessing and maintaining permanent housing, including increasing housing placement and case management staff.

*Priority #4: Expand access and coordination of emergency Response system*

KEY ACTION STEPS

- Increase coordination and streamline efforts of city agencies and committees working to end homelessness.
- Increase street outreach.
- Provide broader outreach and access to services in the Southeast and other underserved neighborhoods. Increase housing and services in those neighborhoods.
- Build regional collaboration to better serve homeless people moving among Bay Area counties.
- Use the coordinated assessment system (referred to in the goal about increasing access to stable and affordable housing) to understand community need. Work to build linkages between coordinated assessment and other systems of care to improve assessment and access to resources.

**Goal: Improve Leadership, collaboration, and Civic Engagement**

- The key to ending homelessness in San Francisco is harnessing the will and the resources of all stakeholders towards one goal. Ending homelessness requires collaborative leadership at all levels of government and across all sectors.
- The City of San Francisco is committed to improving collaboration and increasing knowledge and implementation of successful interventions to prevent and end homelessness.
- At the conclusion of five years, this strategic plan will reduce homelessness in this community by:
  - Expanding and deepening collaboration between government agencies and private partners

---

<sup>151</sup> <http://www.sfgov3.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=3501>

<sup>152</sup> <http://www.sfdph.org/dph/files/mtgsGrps/FoodSecTaskFrc/docs/FSTF-AssessmentOfFoodSecurityInSF-2013.pdf>

- Broadening capacity of these organizations to prevent and end homelessness; and
- Increasing awareness of homelessness, related issues, and best practices.

#### *Indicators of Success*

- Reduce the number of people who are homeless by 10%, including reducing the number of chronically homeless persons by 30%, the number of veterans who are homeless by 30%, the number of homeless families by 20%, the number of homeless youth by 20%, and the number of homeless LGBT persons by 10%, annually.<sup>153</sup>
- Reduce the average length of time people are homeless in San Francisco by 10%, year to year.
- Improve the data quality in San Francisco’s HMIS by reducing the number of required missing or null values to less than 6%.
- Improve the data quality in San Francisco’s HMIS by increasing the bed coverage rate of all shelters, transitional housing, and permanent supportive housing programs in San Francisco to 95%.

#### *STRATEGY #1: Unify response to homelessness*

##### KEY ACTION STEPS

- By acceptance of this plan at the Board of Supervisors, the various City Departments, and the local non-profits addressing homelessness, have one unified city policy on how San Francisco will end homelessness.
- Improve coordination between LHCBS, the Mayor’s Office, the Board of Supervisors, the San Francisco Housing Authority, and City departments. Hold regular, director-level meetings of all city agencies that work with homeless persons or people at imminent risk of homelessness.
- Build partnerships with other systems of care that serve homeless people, especially school districts.
- Expand the decision-making authority of the LHCBS and consider expanding LHCBS membership or structure to include more participation from city agencies with a central role in San Francisco’s response to homelessness.

#### *STRATEGY #2: Increase collaboration and cooperation with private sector*

##### KEY ACTION STEPS

- Increase private investment in solutions to homelessness and build public/private partnerships.
- Increase engagement of neighborhood and community groups in responding to homelessness, and in improving factors that increase homelessness.
- Ensure that information on best practices, financing strategies, and other resources are readily available to homeless service providers, by supporting communication and technical assistance.

---

<sup>153</sup> Translated to real numbers, using the 2013 Point in Time Count, each year reduce:

- Number of homeless people by 735
- Number of chronically homeless people by 593
- Number of veterans by 215
- Number of individuals in homeless families by 136
- Number of homeless youth by 183
- Number of homeless LGBT by 213

These numbers may include people in more than one category, for example, an LGBT youth is reflected in both the youth count and the LGBT count.



*STRATEGY #3: Support community planning by improving data collection about homelessness*

**KEY ACTION STEPS**

- Publish a quarterly report regarding the performance of the homeless system of care at LHCB meetings, online, and with the Board of Supervisors. The report will use HMIS data to demonstrate improvement in the measures identified in this Plan over time.
- Align City-wide data collection efforts by coordinating at Department level.
- Provide additional training and monitoring to improve HMIS data quality and reduce the number of null or missing values.
- Improve HMIS system performance and utilization, and facilitate the exchange of data between other data systems.

**Describe the strengths and gaps of the service delivery system for special needs population and persons experiencing homelessness, including, but not limited to, the services listed above**

***Strengths of the HIV/AIDS Systems of Care***

The San Francisco EMA has a long and distinguished history of responding to the HIV crisis with a comprehensive continuum of service programs that are impactful, innovative, competent, and cost effective. During the first decade of the AIDS epidemic, when San Francisco was one of the hardest-hit cities by the AIDS crisis, the region developed a comprehensive network of services that utilized case management to link individuals to medical and supportive services. This system became known as the “San Francisco Model of Care” and had a lasting impact on the organization of HIV services in the US. Over the past decade and a half, the EMA has continued to evolve and grow to respond to changes in the epidemic and its affected populations, while incorporating new treatment developments. In the mid- 1990s, as the epidemic had an increasing effect on disenfranchised individuals, San Francisco developed the Integrated Services Program, a multidisciplinary model of HIV care in which services were merged, coordinated, and linked to stabilize and retain hard to- reach and severely affected individuals. This approach culminated in a significant intensification of the integrated services model in the form of the EMA’s seven Centers of Excellence –“one stop shop” programs similar to medical homes with wraparound services which work toward the goal of stabilizing the lives of multiply diagnosed and severe need populations through neighborhood-based, multi-service centers tailored to the needs of specific cultural, linguistic, and behavioral groups.

Throughout the San Francisco EMA, the emphasis on high-quality, client-centered, and culturally competent primary medical care services remains at the heart of the local care continuum, with medical case management offering individualized assessment, coordination, and linkage to a full range of social and supportive services.

***Gaps in HIV/AIDS Systems of Care***

From July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010, a total of 2,898 HIV-aware individuals in the San Francisco EMA were estimated to currently not be receiving HIV primary care, representing 14% of the region’s total estimated HIV-aware population. This is a significant reduction from the previous year’s estimate, in which 3,654 (18%) HIV-aware individuals were estimated to not be receiving HIV primary care, and a dramatic reduction from FY 2008-2009, when 5,205 (23%) were estimated to be out of care. These

reductions are reflective of our ongoing success in identifying, referring, and linking new HIV-positive persons to care. Between March 1, 2010 and February 28, 2011, at least 8,171 individuals were receiving Ryan White services in the EMA, representing an impressive 44.8% of the region's combined PLWHA population in care, and 35.6% of the PLWHA population.

Among all PLWHA populations, analysis reveals that unmet need from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010 was similar for males and females and across race/ethnicity and age categories, attesting to the expanding success of our programs in reaching diverse ethnic populations. Also, as is to be expected, the proportion of persons reporting an unmet need was significantly higher among those with non-AIDS HIV (19%) than among those diagnosed with AIDS (9%), reflecting the fact that the vast majority of persons diagnosed with AIDS is currently in care. However, in terms of age, PLWHA adults aged 30-39 were most likely to have unmet need for medical care than other age groups (19%), while significant unmet need also exists among persons 29 years and below. Persons aged 60 years or older were least likely to have unmet need (7%).

These findings point to the urgency of expanding outreach and service linkage programs related to young adult and recently diagnosed populations. In terms of youth, the San Francisco EMA service system has for many years been actively engaged in efforts to expand mobile and alternative approaches to HIV testing, and in systems such as the new LINCS Program that immediately link to care individuals who test positive in both public and private settings. The EMA has developed cooperative education and outreach programs in collaboration with regional prevention providers - programs that have consistently expanded the proportion of young people who enter the care system annually. At the same time, innovative approaches such as the Centers of Excellence model are specifically designed to expand awareness of and access to HIV services among young people within ethnic minority communities in San Francisco County, and to overcome barriers to care resulting from distrust of the medical system, fear of disclosure of HIV status, and fear of not receiving culturally appropriate services.

### ***Overcoming Gaps in HIV/AIDS Systems of Care***

The San Francisco EMA as a whole is continually seeking new approaches to fill identified gaps in care, particularly in regard to the growing number of multiply diagnosed and highly marginalized individuals who are infected with HIV in our region. This need is addressed both directly and indirectly throughout all facets of City's 2012-2014 Comprehensive HIV Health Services Plan. The City seeks to ensure a client-centered, coordinated, culturally competent continuum of essential services for all Ryan White-eligible persons with HIV, with a special focus emerging populations, persons experiencing health disparities, and persons with severe needs. This includes ensuring equity in service access and ensuring that all low-income persons with HIV in the region are able to access high-quality, culturally and linguistically competent care. Care gaps will also be addressed by increasing the number of HIV-infected individuals who are aware of their serostatus and are effectively engaged in care on a long-term basis. Care gaps will also be filled by enhancing and expanding inter-agency collaboration and service partnerships, including partnerships that expand the availability of multi-service, HIV specialist medical homes in the EMA. Finally, the City will be focusing specifically on the impacts of healthcare reform, and the need for pro-active research and service planning to ensure that no individual is lost to care in the transition to expanded Medicaid coverage and in the face of the healthcare system's increasing emphasis on client-level outcomes and population-based panel management approaches.

### ***Strengths and Gaps of the Homeless System***

Since January 2004, a total of 11,362 homeless persons have been placed in the City's permanent supportive housing programs. Of these, 10,091 were single adults and 1,271 were individuals in families. The permanent supportive housing operating by the City has been successful at stabilizing homeless persons once they move into housing. For example, across the single adult sites operated by the Human Services Agency, 94% of clients in housing at the start of FY12- 13 were still in supportive housing or other appropriate placement at the end of the year. Since January 2004, a total of 11,362 homeless persons have been placed in the City's permanent supportive housing programs. Of these, 10,091 were single adults and 1,271 were individuals in families. The permanent supportive housing operating by the City has been successful at stabilizing homeless persons once they move into housing. For example, across the single adult sites operated by the Human Services Agency, 94% of clients in housing at the start of FY12- 13 were still in supportive housing or other appropriate placement at the end of the year.

The Department of Public Health (DPH) Direct Access to Housing (DAH) Program sites are service enriched, striving to assist formerly homeless residents with co-occurring mental health issues, alcohol and substance abuse problems, and/or complex medical conditions. In its permanent supportive housing programs, the Human Services Agency also provides rich wraparound services. The Housing First Master Lease sites (including those funded by Care Not Cash) are served by the Behavioral Health Roving Team, working in collaboration with the Department of Public Health.

The San Francisco Homeless Outreach Team (SFHOT) was formed in May 2004 as part of a Mayor's Office, health, social services, and community initiative. Ten years later, SFHOT continues to evolve to meet various population needs. Over 3,000 chronically homeless severely disabled individuals have been care managed by SFHOT, with nearly 50% securing permanent housing. On July, 9, 2013, San Francisco Department of Public Health opened Tom Waddell Urban Health Clinic (TWUHC), a clinic serving homeless and marginally-housed persons as well as those living in supportive housing. This new clinic merged the primary care practices of Tom Waddell Health Center and Housing & Urban Health Center, and moved them to a newly refurbished, beautiful, and state-of-the-art clinic space on the ground floor of the Kelly Cullen Community (formerly the YMCA), located at 230 Golden Gate Avenue in the Tenderloin Neighborhood. TWUHC's multidisciplinary staff provides coordinated, Team-based, care for nearly 5,000 patients.

Through the Homeward Bound Program, the Human Services Agency provides transportation (typically a bus ticket) for homeless persons who:

- are homeless/low income and living in San Francisco; and
- have family or friends at the destination that Homeward Bound staff can verify as willing and able to provide a place to stay and ongoing support; and
- are medically stable enough to travel unassisted to the destination; and
- are sober and able to abstain from alcohol or using other substances en route.

Since its inception in 2005, Homeward Bound has served over 8,000 homeless persons.

**Provide a summary of the strategy for overcoming gaps in the institutional structure and service delivery system for carrying out a strategy to address priority needs**

The large number of non-profit organizations serving low-income communities in San Francisco is both an asset and a challenge. With a long history of serving the community, the sheer number of non-profits leads to increased competition for limited resources. Conversely, the benefits of a rich variety of social service organizations often translates to more community-based and culturally competent services for low-income residents. Lack of organizational capacity of non-profits is another gap in institutional structure. In response, the City is engaged in an ongoing effort to work with non-profits in organizational and programmatic capacity building to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of service delivery.

It is the City's policy to coordinate community development and housing activities among its departments. Because this work involves many City departments, coordination and information sharing across the various departments are challenges. City staff meets on a regular and as-needed basis with colleagues from other City departments to overcome gaps in institutional structure. For example, MOHCD leads a regular working group focused on the issues of nonprofit displacement with every other department with a significant investment in community-based organizations. Another example is the Alignment Committee, which was created in 2014 to undertake long and short-term planning for the City's workforce development programs, to set goals and priorities for these programs, to coordinate workforce development activities among City departments, and to monitor their effectiveness. In the coming months, the Alignment Committee will engage with stakeholders from throughout San Francisco to refine this plan into a comprehensive strategy for City workforce development services and investments. Among other stakeholders, the Alignment Committee will hear from jobseekers, employers, community based organizations, labor, and education and training partners.

In addition, staff of the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development and the Office of Economic and Workforce Development uses the Consolidated Plan/Action Plan development process as an opportunity to engage other departments in a dialogue about the current developments and priorities. This dialogue aids the City in being more strategic in the investment of Consolidated Plan dollars.

## SP-45 Goals Summary – 91.215(a)(4)

### Goals Summary Information

**Table 78 – Goals Summary**

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
1	Increased Supply of Affordable Housing	2015	2019	Affordable Housing Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Develop and Maintain Affordable Housing	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix
2	Preserve and Maintain Affordable Housing Supply	2015	2019	Affordable Housing Public Housing Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Develop and Maintain Affordable Housing	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
3	Increased Affordability of Rental Housing	2015	2019	Affordable Housing Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Make Housing Affordable	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix
4	Increased Opportunities for Sustainable Homeownership	2015	2019	Affordable Housing	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Make Housing Affordable	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
5	Increase Access to Rental and Homeownership Housing	2015	2019	Affordable Housing Public Housing Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Make Housing Affordable	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix
6	Reduced Rate of Evictions	2015	2019	Affordable Housing Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs Non-Housing Community Development	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Prevent and End Homelessness	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
7	Transitional Housing is Available for Those Who Need It	2015	2019	Affordable Housing Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Prevent and End Homelessness	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix
8	Homeless People Receive Basic Shelter and Support Services	2015	2019	Homeless Non-Housing Community Development	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Prevent and End Homelessness	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix



Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
9	Increased Access to Services for Public Housing Residents	2015	2019	Public Housing Non-Housing Community Development	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Provide Supportive Housing Services	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix
10	Increased Access to Permanent Supportive Housing and Transitional Housing for PLWHA	2015	2019	Affordable Housing Non-Homeless Special Needs	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Provide Supportive Housing Services	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
11	Key Nonprofit Service Providers Have High Quality Facilities	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Enhance Community Facilities and Spaces	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix
12	Enhanced Public Spaces	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Enhance Community Facilities and Spaces	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
13	Thriving, Locally-Owned Small Businesses	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Strengthen Small Businesses and Commercial Corridors	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix
14	Robust Commercial Corridors in Low-Income Neighborhoods	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Strengthen Small Businesses and Commercial Corridors	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
15	Increased Supports for Residents to Convene and Build Social Capital	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Increase Community Cohesion	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix
16	Increased Capacity for Community-Based Organizations	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Increase Community Cohesion	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
17	Increased Job Readiness	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Promote Workforce Development	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix
18	Increased Occupational Skills that Match Labor Market Needs	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Promote Workforce Development	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
19	Access to Job Opportunities for Disadvantaged San Francisco Residents	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Promote Workforce Development	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix
20	Improved Service Connections	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Promote Economic Advancement through Barrier Removal	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
21	Improved Foundational Competencies and Access to Job Training and Employment Opportunities for Disconnected Populations	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Promote Economic Advancement through Barrier Removal	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix
22	Increased Job Retention and Advancement Supports Through Legal and Other Related Services	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Promote Economic Advancement through Barrier Removal	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
23	Improved Financial Literacy and Management	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Promote Economic Advancement through Barrier Removal	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix

## Goal Descriptions

Table 79 – Goal Descriptions

1	<b>Goal Name</b>	Increased Supply of Affordable Housing
	<b>Goal Description</b>	New affordable and permanent supportive housing units will be developed.
2	<b>Goal Name</b>	Preserve and Maintain Affordable Housing Supply
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Existing affordable housing units will be preserved or maintained through remediating lead-based paint hazards, rehabilitating multiunit and single family homes; rehabilitation and conversion of public housing to nonprofit ownership and management under the RAD Program; and rebuilding dilapidated public housing under HOPE SF.
3	<b>Goal Name</b>	Increased Affordability of Rental Housing
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Pursue long-term rental support to provide deep affordability for permanent supportive housing.



4	<b>Goal Name</b>	Increased Opportunities for Sustainable Homeownership
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Programs to assist potential and existing homeowners will be expanded with education programs, down payment assistance and the continuation of successful homeownership programs.
5	<b>Goal Name</b>	Increase Access to Rental and Homeownership Housing
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Improve housing application system and the capacity of community-based organizations that assist clients find rental and homeownership opportunities.
6	<b>Goal Name</b>	Reduced Rate of Evictions
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Legal services and counseling will be provided to counsel individuals before a notice of unlawful detainer is filed, and full-scope representation will be offered to individuals who need legal services after having received notice.
7	<b>Goal Name</b>	Transitional Housing is Available for Those Who Need It
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Operating support will be provided to transitional housing facilities as appropriate, with priority given to vulnerable populations such as survivors of domestic violence.
8	<b>Goal Name</b>	Homeless People Receive Basic Shelter and Support
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Homeless individuals, particularly those in emergency shelters, will be provided supportive services focusing on providing foundational skills and transitioning them to more stable housing.
9	<b>Goal Name</b>	Increased Access to Services for Public Housing Residents
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Provide support services for public housing residents to assist them with transition of their public housing from housing authority control to nonprofit ownership and management under the RAD or HOPE SF programs.
10	<b>Goal Name</b>	Increased Access to Permanent Supportive Housing and Transitional Housing for PLWHA
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Operating support and program support will be provided to residential care facilities for the chronically ill serving PLWHA, and to transitional housing specifically targeting PLWHA.

11	<b>Goal Name</b>	Key Nonprofit Service Providers Have High Quality Facilities
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Capital funds will be made available for rehabilitation, tenant improvements, and new construction for community facilities, as well as providing service providers with capital needs assessments and asset reserve analyses to ensure long-term sustainability of these facilities.
12	<b>Goal Name</b>	Enhanced Public Spaces
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Funding will be made available to enhance public spaces, focusing on greening efforts in low-income communities and enhancements to neighborhoods impacted by increased housing density.
13	<b>Goal Name</b>	Thriving, Locally-Owned Small Businesses
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Community Development Block Grants will be utilized to provide a variety of support for small businesses and entrepreneurs in San Francisco. Central to this support is technical assistance for entrepreneurs who want to establish a new microenterprise or small business, and for owners who seek to strengthen or expand their existing small business.
14	<b>Goal Name</b>	Robust Commercial Corridors in Low-Income Neighborhoods
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Community Development Block Grants will be utilized to strengthen commercial corridors in low- and moderate-income areas. Activities fall in a variety of categories including business attraction, physical improvements to businesses and in neighborhoods, and capacity-building to help neighborhood stakeholders manage and improve commercial districts.
15	<b>Goal Name</b>	Increased Supports for Residents to Convene and Build Social Capital
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Community planning efforts will be supported that bring together residents to build social capital in low-income communities, including programming that allows residents to invest directly in community building grant opportunities.
16	<b>Goal Name</b>	Increased Capacity for Community-Based Organizations
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Community based organizations will be supported by strategic capacity building and technical assistance.
17	<b>Goal Name</b>	Increased Job Readiness
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Individuals will be provided with services that help build job search competencies.

18	<b>Goal Name</b>	Increased Occupational Skills that Match Labor Market Needs
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Individuals will be provided with job-driven, sector-specific occupational skills training.
19	<b>Goal Name</b>	Access to Job Opportunities for Disadvantaged San Francisco Residents
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Individuals will be provided with priority access to potential job opportunities.
20	<b>Goal Name</b>	Improved Service Connections
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Community centers that serve as neighborhood and constituency hubs will be enhanced through service connection resources that allow residents to better access the existing social service infrastructure citywide and in their neighborhoods
21	<b>Goal Name</b>	Improved Foundational Competencies and Access to Job Training and Employment Opportunities for Disconnected Populations
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Individuals will be provided with foundational competencies that will move them into the City's workforce development system and provide them skills towards achieving economic self-sufficiency
22	<b>Goal Name</b>	Increased Job Retention and Advancement Supports Through Legal and Other Related Services
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Individuals will be provided with legal services and other tools that will allow them to maintain their residency and employment and feel safe where they are living to ensure their ability to move towards self-sufficiency
23	<b>Goal Name</b>	Improved Financial Literacy and Management
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Individuals and families will be provided with financial literacy skills linked to key financial events in their lives that will promote asset building and increase housing stability

## 2015-2019 Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix

**Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix**

Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed											
Priority Need 1A: Develop and Maintain Affordable Housing											
Goal 1Ai. Increased supply of affordable housing											
Funding Amount	5-year \$ Amount	Year 1 \$ Amount		Year 2 \$ Amount		Year 3 \$ Amount		Year 4 \$ Amount		Year 5 \$ Amount	
CDBG	\$0	\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0	
HOME	\$11,887,150	\$5,787,150		\$0		\$0		\$2,500,000		\$3,600,000	
HOPWA											
ESG											
General Fund	\$0	\$0		\$0							
Housing Trust Fund	\$48,612,364	\$4,782,290		\$18,013,287		\$2,639,612		\$16,466,182		\$6,710,993	
Housing Impact Fees	\$131,983,782	\$63,587,850		\$40,081,514		\$19,860,388		\$7,033,818		\$1,420,212	
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$4,205,679	\$892,710		\$1,312,969		\$0		\$0		\$2,000,000	
Other	\$1,292,230	\$1,200,000		\$92,230		\$0		\$0		\$0	
OCII	\$187,115,000	\$107,350,000		\$3,015,000		\$26,485,000		\$44,235,000		\$6,030,000	
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$385,096,205</b>	<b>\$183,600,000</b>		<b>\$62,515,000</b>		<b>\$48,985,000</b>		<b>\$70,235,000</b>		<b>\$19,761,205</b>	
Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators	5-year Goal	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5	
		Goal	\$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt
Outcome Indicator 1Ai. Number of affordable housing units created	2,973	1,190	\$183,600,000	438	\$62,515,000	421	\$48,985,000	649	\$70,235,000	275	\$19,761,205
Performance Measures: Output Indicators	5-year Goal	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5	
		Goal	\$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt
Output Indicator: Number of Permanent Supportive Housing units built for TAY (Parcel U, 17th & Folsom)	47	12	\$2,600,000	-	\$1,500,000	35	\$5,500,000	-	\$0	-	\$0
Output Indicator: Number of Permanent Supportive Housing units built for seniors (24th St)	175		\$1,500,000	35	\$9,250,000	40	\$6,000,000	100	\$26,000,000	-	\$0

Output Indicator: Number of Permanent Supportive Housing units built for veterans (MBS3E)	50	50	\$24,000,000	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0
Output Indicator: Number of Permanent Supportive Housing units built for homeless families (20% set-aside for MBS6E, Parcel O, 1950 Mission, SWL 322-1, MBS6W)	215	110	\$21,200,000	41	\$10,353,000	29	\$7,497,000	20	\$4,447,000	15	\$3,353,000
Output Indicator: Number of affordable housing units built for low-income households at or below 60% AMI (non-homeless units for homeless family projects listed above, plus Alice Griffith Ph 1-3, HP Block 49, MBS7W, TB6, TB7)	1,486	818	\$134,300,000	162	\$41,412,000	117	\$29,988,000	329	\$39,788,000	60	\$16,408,205
Output Indicator: Number of BMR housing units developed (884 MOHCD inclusionary + 214 OCII inclusionary)	1,000	200		200		200		200		200	
Output Indicator: Number of workforce housing units developed beyond BMR	TBD										
<b>Goal 1Aii. Preserve and Maintain Affordable Housing Supply</b>											
<b>Funding Amount</b>	<b>5-year \$ Amount</b>	<b>Year 1 \$ Amount</b>	<b>Year 2 \$ Amount</b>	<b>Year 3 \$ Amount</b>	<b>Year 4 \$ Amount</b>	<b>Year 5 \$ Amount</b>					
CDBG	\$24,419,039	\$5,725,259	\$5,689,723	\$4,286,754	\$4,286,754	\$4,430,549					
HOME	\$10,800,000	\$2,500,000	\$3,600,000	\$1,100,000	\$3,600,000						
HOPWA	\$0										
ESG	\$0										
General Fund	\$8,527,531	\$92,716	\$3,356,667	\$1,692,716	\$1,692,716	\$1,692,716					
Housing Trust Fund	\$69,747,241	\$34,322,728	\$8,834,983	\$3,642,430	\$16,302,100	\$6,645,000					
Housing Impact Fees	\$76,916,044	\$29,392,694	\$29,889,010	\$7,324,040	\$1,992,900	\$8,317,400					
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$15,795,912	\$2,097,058	\$3,698,854	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$2,000,000					

Other	\$62,170,588	\$35,135,458		\$0		\$6,578,530		\$7,600,000		\$12,856,600	
OClI	\$19,547,988	\$2,500,000		\$17,047,988		\$0		\$0		\$0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$287,924,343</b>	<b>\$111,765,913</b>		<b>\$72,117,225</b>		<b>\$28,624,470</b>		<b>\$39,474,470</b>		<b>\$35,942,265</b>	
<b>Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	
		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Outcome Indicator: Number of affordable housing units preserved or maintained	3,041	2,317	\$109,891,443	263	\$70,242,755	126	\$26,750,000	110	\$37,600,000	225	\$34,067,795
<b>Performance Measures: Output Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	
		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Output Indicator: Number of units where lead hazards are addressed	100	60									
Output Indicator: Number of public housing units converted to private ownership under the Rental Assistance Demonstration program	2,066	2,066	\$42,685,563	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0
Output Indicator: Number of single family homes rehabilitated	125	23									
Output Indicator: Number of multifamily units rehabilitated	356	105	\$21,705,880	156	\$32,194,767	16	\$4,000,000	14	\$3,500,000	65	\$11,067,795
Output Indicator: Number of public housing units rebuilt under HOPE SF	536	63	\$45,500,000	107	\$38,047,988	110	\$22,750,000	96	\$34,100,000	160	\$23,000,000
<b>Priority Need 1B: Make Housing Affordable</b>											
<b>Goal 1Bi. Increased affordability of rental housing</b>											
<b>Funding Amount</b>	<b>5-year \$ Amount</b>	<b>Year 1 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 2 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 3 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 4 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 5 \$ Amount</b>	
CDBG											
HOME											
HOPWA											
ESG											
General Fund	\$10,322,919	\$1,385,119		\$542,052		\$2,027,343		\$5,640,083		\$728,322	
Housing Trust Fund											
Housing Impact Fees											

Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund											
Other											
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$10,322,919</b>	<b>\$1,385,119</b>		<b>\$542,052</b>		<b>\$2,027,343</b>		<b>\$5,640,083</b>		<b>\$728,322</b>	
<b>Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	
		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Outcome Indicator: Number of lower income households served with the assistance of rental subsidies (LOSP)	418	20	\$1,385,119	23	\$542,052	158	\$2,027,343	199	\$5,640,083	18	\$728,322
<b>Performance Measures: Output Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	
		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Output Indicator: Number of units supported with rental subsidies (Shelter plus Care or VASH)	75	0		0		0		75		0	
<b>Goal 1Bii. Increased opportunities for sustainable homeownership</b>											
<b>Funding Amount</b>	<b>5-year \$ Amount</b>	<b>Year 1 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 2 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 3 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 4 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 5 \$ Amount</b>	
CDBG	\$1,689,790	\$337,958		\$337,958		\$337,958		\$337,958		\$337,958	
HOME											
HOPWA											
ESG											
General Fund	\$640,210	\$128,042		\$128,042		\$128,042		\$128,042		\$128,042	
Housing Trust Fund	\$17,000,000	\$3,400,000		\$3,400,000		\$3,400,000		\$3,400,000		\$3,400,000	
Housing Impact Fees											
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund											
Other	\$1,775,187	\$783,187		\$248,000		\$248,000		\$248,000		\$248,000	
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$21,105,187</b>	<b>\$4,649,187</b>		<b>\$4,114,000</b>		<b>\$4,114,000</b>		<b>\$4,114,000</b>		<b>\$4,114,000</b>	
<b>Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	
		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Outcome Indicator 1Bii. Number of new homeowners created	900	180									
<b>Performance Measures: Output Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	
		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>

Output Indicator: Number of new COP holders	270	60		60		50		50		50	
Output Indicator: Number of new EAHF holders	250	50		50		50		50		50	
Output Indicator: Number of individuals receiving pre-purchase education and counseling	4,000	800		800		800		800		800	
Output Indicator: Number of individuals receiving post-purchase education and counseling	350	70		70		70		70		70	
Output Indicator: Number of households receiving downpayment assistance loans	500	100		100		100		100		100	
Output Indicator: Number of households receiving loans to purchase shares in co-ops	50	2		10		12		12		14	
Output Indicator: Number of new BMR owners	635	150		125		120		120		120	
Output Indicator: Number of MCCs issued	250	50		50		50		50		50	
Output Indicator: Number of individuals submitting an online application for BMR homeownership housing	4,000	100		975		975		975		975	
<b>Goal 1Biii. Increase access to rental and homeownership housing</b>											
<b>Funding Amount</b>	<b>5-year \$ Amount</b>	<b>Year 1 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 2 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 3 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 4 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 5 \$ Amount</b>	
CDBG	\$931,920	\$186,384		\$186,384		\$186,384		\$186,384		\$186,384	
HOME											
HOPWA	\$200,505	\$40,101		\$40,101		\$40,101		\$40,101		\$40,101	
ESG	\$166,665	\$33,333		\$33,333		\$33,333		\$33,333		\$33,333	
General Fund	\$89,245	\$17,849		\$17,849		\$17,849		\$17,849		\$17,849	
Housing Trust Fund	\$17,225,000	\$3,445,000		\$3,445,000		\$3,445,000		\$3,445,000		\$3,445,000	
Housing Impact Fees											



Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund											
Other	\$5,000,000	\$3,107,606		\$473,000		\$473,000		\$473,000		\$473,394	
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$23,613,335</b>	<b>\$6,830,273</b>		<b>\$4,195,667</b>		<b>\$4,195,667</b>		<b>\$4,195,667</b>		<b>\$4,196,061</b>	
<b>Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	
		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Outcome Indicator 1Biii. Number of households placed in BMR and affordable rental housing	1,000	233		190		190		190		197	
<b>Performance Measures: Output Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	
		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Output Indicator: Number of households submitting an online application for BMR rental housing	40,000	4,000		9000		9000		9000		9000	
Output Indicator: Number of households submitting an online application for affordable housing	10,000	2,000		2,000		2,000		2,000		2,000	
Output Indicator: Number of individuals receiving assistance in accessing housing, including preparing for successful rental application	12,500	2,500		2,500		2,500		2,500		2,500	
Output Indicator: Number of new and re-rental opportunities	500	100		100		100		100		100	
Output Indicator: Number of existing BMR rental units	1,228	828		100		100		100		100	
Output Indicator: Number of new COP holders	270	60		60		50		50		50	
Output Indicator: Number of new EAHP holders	250	50		50		50		50		50	
<b>Priority Need 1C: Prevent and End Homelessness</b>											
<b>Goal 1Ci. Reduced rate of evictions</b>											
<b>Funding Amount</b>	<b>5-year \$ Amount</b>	<b>Year 1 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 2 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 3 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 4 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 5 \$ Amount</b>	
CDBG	\$1,412,115	\$282,423		\$282,423		\$282,423		\$282,423		\$282,423	

HOME											
HOPWA											
ESG	\$2,436,370	\$487,274	\$487,274	\$487,274	\$487,274	\$487,274	\$487,274	\$487,274	\$487,274	\$487,274	\$487,274
General Fund	\$7,314,160	\$1,462,832	\$1,462,832	\$1,462,832	\$1,462,832	\$1,462,832	\$1,462,832	\$1,462,832	\$1,462,832	\$1,462,832	\$1,462,832
Housing Trust Fund	\$4,775,000	\$955,000	\$955,000	\$955,000	\$955,000	\$955,000	\$955,000	\$955,000	\$955,000	\$955,000	\$955,000
Housing Impact Fees											
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund											
Other											
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$15,937,645</b>	<b>\$3,187,529</b>	<b>\$3,187,529</b>	<b>\$3,187,529</b>	<b>\$3,187,529</b>	<b>\$3,187,529</b>	<b>\$3,187,529</b>	<b>\$3,187,529</b>	<b>\$3,187,529</b>	<b>\$3,187,529</b>	<b>\$3,187,529</b>
<b>Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	
		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Outcome Indicator 1Ci. Number of individuals whose evictions have been prevented	6,250	1,250		1,250		1,250		1,250		1,250	
<b>Performance Measures: Output Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	
		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Output Indicator: Number of individuals receiving legal representation	5,000	1,000		1,000		1,000		1,000		1,000	
Output Indicator: Number of individuals receiving tenant education and counseling	10,000	2,000		2,000		2,000		2,000		2,000	
Output Indicator: Number of individuals receiving short-term rental assistance	1,300	260		260		260		260		260	
Output Indicator: Number of individuals receiving financial assistance, including moving costs, security deposits, utilities, last month's rent	110	22		22		22		22		22	
<b>Goal 1Ci. Transitional housing is available for those who need it</b>											

Funding Amount	5-year \$ Amount	Year 1 \$ Amount		Year 2 \$ Amount		Year 3 \$ Amount		Year 4 \$ Amount		Year 5 \$ Amount	
CDBG											
HOME											
HOPWA											
ESG	\$275,000	\$55,000		\$55,000		\$55,000		\$55,000		\$55,000	
General Fund											
Housing Trust Fund											
Housing Impact Fees											
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund											
Other											
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$275,000</b>	<b>\$55,000</b>		<b>\$55,000</b>		<b>\$55,000</b>		<b>\$55,000</b>		<b>\$55,000</b>	
<b>Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	
		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Outcome Indicator 1Cii. Number of individuals and/or families moving to permanent housing	40	8		8		8		8		8	
<b>Performance Measures: Output Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	
		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Output Indicator: Number of individuals and/or families placed in transitional housing	75	15		15		15		15		15	
<b>Goal 1Ciii. Homeless people receive basic shelter and support services</b>											
Funding Amount	5-year \$ Amount	Year 1 \$ Amount		Year 2 \$ Amount		Year 3 \$ Amount		Year 4 \$ Amount		Year 5 \$ Amount	
CDBG	\$1,005,675	\$201,135		\$201,135		\$201,135		\$201,135		\$201,135	
HOME											
HOPWA											
ESG	\$3,921,460	\$784,292		\$784,292		\$784,292		\$784,292		\$784,292	
General Fund	\$53,690	\$10,738		\$10,738		\$10,738		\$10,738		\$10,738	
Housing Trust Fund											
Housing Impact Fees											
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund											

Other											
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$4,980,825</b>	<b>\$996,165</b>		<b>\$996,165</b>		<b>\$996,165</b>		<b>\$996,165</b>		<b>\$996,165</b>	
<b>Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	
		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Outcome Indicator 1Ciii. Number of individuals moved into more stable housing	1,100	220		220		220		220		220	
<b>Performance Measures: Output Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	
		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Output Indicator: Number of individuals receiving rapid-rehousing services, including case management, and housing placement	3,200	640		640		640		640		640	
Output Indicator: Number of individuals receiving short-term rental assistance	400	80		80		80		80		80	
Output Indicator: Number of individuals receiving financial assistance, including moving costs, security deposits, utilities, last month's rent	50	10		10		10		10		10	
Output Indicator: Number of individuals and families receiving shelter services	4,500	900		900		900		900		900	
Output Indicator: Number of units subsidized through LOSP	418	20		23		158		199		18	
<b>Priority Need 1D: Provide Supportive Housing Services</b>											
<b>Goal 1Di. Increased access to services for public housing residents</b>											
<b>Funding Amount</b>	<b>5-year \$ Amount</b>	<b>Year 1 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 2 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 3 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 4 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 5 \$ Amount</b>	
CDBG	\$3,359,830	\$671,966		\$671,966		\$671,966		\$671,966		\$671,966	
HOME											
HOPWA											
ESG											

General Fund	\$3,392,845	\$678,569		\$678,569		\$678,569		\$678,569		\$678,569	
Housing Trust Fund											
Housing Impact Fees											
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund											
Other											
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$6,752,675</b>	<b>\$1,350,535</b>		<b>\$1,350,535</b>		<b>\$1,350,535</b>		<b>\$1,350,535</b>		<b>\$1,350,535</b>	
<b>Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	
		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Outcome Indicator 1Di. Number of public housing residents that achieve 75% of their goals from their service plans	735	147		147		147		147		147	
<b>Performance Measures: Output Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	
		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Output Indicator: Number of residents engaged in case management across four HOPE SF sites	1,050	210		210		210		210		210	
Output Indicator: Number of resident service referrals across four HOPE SF sites	3,225	645		645		645		645		645	
<b>Goal 1Dii. Increased access to permanent supportive housing and transitional housing for PLWHA</b>											
<b>Funding Amount</b>	<b>5-year \$ Amount</b>	<b>Year 1 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 2 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 3 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 4 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 5 \$ Amount</b>	
CDBG											
HOME											
HOPWA	\$33,352,125	\$6,670,425		\$6,670,425		\$6,670,425		\$6,670,425		\$6,670,425	
ESG											
General Fund	\$6,569,385	\$1,313,877		\$1,313,877		\$1,313,877		\$1,313,877		\$1,313,877	
Housing Trust Fund											
Housing Impact Fees											
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund											
Other											

Total	\$39,921,510	\$7,984,302		\$7,984,302		\$7,984,302		\$7,984,302		\$7,984,302	
Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators	5-year Goal	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5	
		Goal	\$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt
Outcome Indicator 1Dii: Number of individuals more stably housed	2,500	500		500		500		500		500	
Performance Measures: Output Indicators	5-year Goal	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5	
		Goal	\$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt
Output indicator: Number of individuals housed in long-term residential care facilities	565	113		113		113		113		113	
Output indicator: Number of individuals housed in transitional facilities	395	79		79		79		79		79	
Output indicator : Number of individuals receiving short-term rental subsidies	135	90		45		0		0		0	
Output indicator : Number of individuals receiving long-term rental subsidies	1,200	240		240		240		240		240	
<b>Objective 2: Communities Have Healthy Physical, Social, and Business Infrastructure</b>											
<b>Priority Need 2A: Enhance Community Facilities and Spaces</b>											
<b>Goal 2Ai. Key nonprofit service providers have high quality facilities</b>											
Funding Amount	5-year \$ Amount	Year 1 \$ Amount		Year 2 \$ Amount		Year 3 \$ Amount		Year 4 \$ Amount		Year 5 \$ Amount	
CDBG	\$12,843,605	\$2,568,721		\$2,568,721		\$2,568,721		\$2,568,721		\$2,568,721	
HOME											
HOPWA											
ESG											
General Fund	\$2,585,650	\$1,637,130		\$537,130		\$137,130		\$137,130		\$137,130	
Housing Trust Fund											
Housing Impact Fees											
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund											
Other	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000									

Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators	5-year Goal	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5	
		Goal	\$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt
Outcome Indicator 2Ai. Number of individuals with increased access to community facilities and public spaces	60,000	12,000		12,000		12,000		12,000		12,000	
Outcome Indicator 2Ai(2). Improved capacity of nonprofit service providers to plan and secure resources for capital improvements	60	12		12		12		12		12	
Performance Measures: Output Indicators	5-year Goal	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5	
		Goal	\$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt
Output Indicator: Number of nonprofit service providers receiving capital improvements to their facilities	60	12		12		12		12		12	
Output Indicator: Number of nonprofit service providers receiving Capital Needs Assessments	60	12		12		12		12		12	
<b>Goal 2Aii. Enhanced public spaces</b>											
Funding Amount	5-year \$ Amount	Year 1 \$ Amount		Year 2 \$ Amount		Year 3 \$ Amount		Year 4 \$ Amount		Year 5 \$ Amount	
CDBG											
HOME											
HOPWA											
ESG											
General Fund											
Housing Trust Fund	\$7,700,000	\$1,700,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
Housing Impact Fees											
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund											
Other											
<b>Total</b>	<b>7,700,000</b>	<b>\$1,700,000</b>									
Performance Measures:	5-year Goal	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5	

Outcome Indicators		Goal	\$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt
Outcome Indicator 2Aiii. Number of individuals with increased access to community and public spaces	375,000	75,000		75,000		75,000		75,000		75,000	
Performance Measures: Output Indicators	5-year Goal	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5	
		Goal	\$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt
Output Indicator: Number of community and public spaces improved through capital investments	25	5		5		5		5		5	
<b>Priority Need 2B: Strengthen Small Businesses and Commercial Corridors</b>											
<b>Goal 2Bi. Thriving, locally-owned small businesses</b>											
Funding Amount	5-year \$ Amount	Year 1 \$ Amount		Year 2 \$ Amount		Year 3 \$ Amount		Year 4 \$ Amount		Year 5 \$ Amount	
CDBG	\$4,921,561	\$1,121,561		\$950,000		\$950,000		\$950,000		\$950,000	
HOME											
HOPWA											
ESG											
General Fund	\$1,825,000	\$365,000		\$365,000		\$365,000		\$365,000		\$365,000	
Housing Trust Fund											
Housing Impact Fees											
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund											
Other											
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$6,746,561</b>	<b>\$1,486,561</b>		<b>\$1,315,000</b>		<b>\$1,315,000</b>		<b>\$1,315,000</b>		<b>\$1,315,000</b>	
Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators	5-year Goal	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5	
		Goal	\$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt
Outcome Indicator 2Bi. Number of jobs created via business technical assistance	750	150		150		150		150		150	
Outcome Indicator 2Bi(2). Number of jobs created via loans funded	450	75		75		100		100		100	



Outcome Indicator 2Bi(3). Number of jobs retained via business technical assistance	1,125	225		225		225		225		225	
Outcome Indicator 2Bi(4). Number of jobs retained via loans funded	325	50		50		75		75		75	
Outcome Indicator 2Bi(5). Number of new businesses established via technical assistance provided	250	50		50		50		50		50	
Outcome Indicator 2Bi(6). Number of borrowers that graduate to conventional lending	50	10		10		10		10		10	
<b>Performance Measures: Output Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	
		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Output Indicator: # of startup businesses assisted	1,500	300		300		300		300		300	
Output Indicator: # of existing businesses assisted	2,000	400		400		400		400		400	
Output Indicator: # of partners that engage non- English speakers as clients	64	10		12		12		15		15	
Output Indicator: # of long-term businesses in neighborhood commercial corridors assisted	500	75		75		100		125		125	
Output Indicator: # of loans funded	625	125		125		125		125		125	
Output Indicator: total dollar amount value of loans issued	\$20,500,000	\$3,500,000		\$4,000,000		\$4,000,000		\$4,000,000		\$5,000,000	
Output Indicator: % of loan repaid	90%	90%		90%		90%		90%		90%	
Output Indicator: # of Section 108 funded projects	3	1		0		1		0		1	
<b>Goal 2Bi. Robust commercial corridors in low-income neighborhoods</b>											
<b>Funding Amount</b>	<b>5-year \$ Amount</b>	<b>Year 1 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 2 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 3 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 4 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 5 \$ Amount</b>	
CDBG	\$1,950,655	\$390,131		\$390,131		\$390,131		\$390,131		\$390,131	

HOME											
HOPWA											
ESG											
General Fund	\$9,500,000	\$2,576,000	\$1,731,000	\$1,731,000	\$1,731,000	\$1,731,000	\$1,731,000	\$1,731,000	\$1,731,000	\$1,731,000	\$1,731,000
Housing Trust Fund											
Housing Impact Fees											
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund											
Other											
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$11,450,655</b>	<b>\$2,966,131</b>	<b>\$2,121,131</b>	<b>\$2,121,131</b>	<b>\$2,121,131</b>	<b>\$2,121,131</b>	<b>\$2,121,131</b>	<b>\$2,121,131</b>	<b>\$2,121,131</b>	<b>\$2,121,131</b>	<b>\$2,121,131</b>
<b>Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	
		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Outcome Indicator 2Bii. Number of jobs created	145	25		25		30		30		35	
Outcome Indicator 2Bii(2). Number of jobs retained	200	40		40		40		40		40	
Outcome Indicator 2Bii(3). Number of existing leases strengthened and businesses stabilized	170	20		30		30		40		50	
<b>Performance Measures: Output Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	
		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Output Indicator: # of existing businesses assisted	575	100		100		125		125		125	
Output Indicator: # of openings and expansions assisted	57	10		10		10		12		15	
Output Indicator: # of organizations that achieved some development benchmark including formalization, 501(c)(3) status, new paid staff, sustainable funding source	27	5		5		5		5		7	
Output Indicator: # of façade improvement projects approved for grant funding	100	10		15		20		25		30	
Output Indicator: # of completed façade	36	6		6		8		8		8	

improvement projects											
Output Indicator: Total funds deployed for active and completed projects	\$2,500,000	\$500,000		\$500,000		\$500,000		\$500,000		\$500,000	
Output Indicator: # of ADA workshops provided	50	10		10		10		10		10	
Output Indicator: # of grants made to fund accessibility improvements	115	20		20		25		25		25	
Output Indicator: # of businesses assisted with ADA compliance	675	125		125		125		150		150	
Output Indicator: # of catalytic projects that achieve entitlement, groundbreaking, or grand opening	8	1		1		2		2		2	
Output Indicator: # of customized service plans developed or updated	115	20		20		25		25		25	
<b>Priority Need 2C: Increase Community Cohesion and Infrastructure</b>											
<b>Goal 2Ci. Increased supports for residents to convene and build social capital</b>											
<b>Funding Amount</b>	<b>5-year \$ Amount</b>	<b>Year 1 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 2 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 3 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 4 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 5 \$ Amount</b>	
CDBG											
HOME											
HOPWA											
ESG											
General Fund	\$7,000,000	\$1,400,000		\$1,400,000		\$1,400,000		\$1,400,000		\$1,400,000	
Housing Trust Fund											
Housing Impact Fees											
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund											
Other											
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$7,000,000</b>	<b>\$1,400,000</b>		<b>\$1,400,000</b>		<b>\$1,400,000</b>		<b>\$1,400,000</b>		<b>\$1,400,000</b>	
<b>Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	
		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>

Outcome Indicator 2Ci. Number of residents engaged in opportunities for neighborhood involvement	1,700	340		340		340		340		340	
<b>Performance Measures: Output Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	
		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Output Indicator: Number of planning processes completed	5	1		1		1		1		1	
Output Indicator: Number of residents participating in community building activities across four HOPE SF sites	1,630	326		326		326		326		326	
Output Indicator: Number of community based organizations receiving grants through community grantmaking process	70	14		14		14		14		14	
Output Indicator: Number of residents engaged in the community grantmaking process	75	15		15		15		15		15	
<b>Priority Need 2C: Increase Community Cohesion and Infrastructure</b>											
<b>Goal 2Cii. Increased capacity for community-based organizations</b>											
<b>Funding Amount</b>	<b>5-year \$ Amount</b>	<b>Year 1 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 2 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 3 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 4 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 5 \$ Amount</b>	
CDBG	\$835,000	\$167,000		\$167,000		\$167,000		\$167,000		\$167,000	
HOME											
HOPWA											
ESG											
General Fund	\$1,750,000	\$350,000		\$350,000		\$350,000		\$350,000		\$350,000	
Housing Trust Fund	\$1,800,000	\$360,000		\$360,000		\$360,000		\$360,000		\$360,000	
Housing Impact Fees											
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund											
Other											
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$4,385,000</b>	<b>\$877,000</b>		<b>\$877,000</b>		<b>\$877,000</b>		<b>\$877,000</b>		<b>\$877,000</b>	
<b>Performance Measures:</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	

<b>Outcome Indicators</b>		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Outcome indicator 2Cii: Number of community based organizations benefiting from technical assistance and capacity building	350	70		70		70		70		70	
<b>Performance Measures: Output Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	
		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Output Indicator: Number of community based organizations receiving technical assistance and capacity building	350	70		70		70		70		70	
<b>Goal 3Ai. Increased job readiness</b>											
<b>Funding Amount</b>	<b>5-year \$ Amount</b>	<b>Year 1 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 2 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 3 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 4 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 5 \$ Amount</b>	
CDBG	\$1,987,500	\$397,500		\$397,500		\$397,500		\$397,500		\$397,500	
HOME											
HOPWA											
ESG											
General Fund											
Housing Trust Fund											
Housing Impact Fees											
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund											
Other											
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,987,500</b>	<b>\$397,500</b>		<b>\$397,500</b>		<b>\$397,500</b>		<b>\$397,500</b>		<b>\$397,500</b>	
<b>Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	
		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Outcome Indicator 3Ai. Number of job readiness program participants who demonstrate proficiency in work readiness skills	3,000	600		600		600		600		600	
<b>Performance Measures: Output Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	
		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Number of participants who complete work	1,700	340		340		340		340		340	

readiness activities											
<b>Goal 3Aii. Increased occupational skills that match labor market needs</b>											
<b>Funding Amount</b>	<b>5-year \$ Amount</b>	<b>Year 1 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 2 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 3 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 4 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 5 \$ Amount</b>	
CDBG	\$2,965,000	\$575,000		\$575,000		\$575,000		\$575,000		\$665,000	
HOME											
HOPWA											
ESG											
General Fund											
Housing Trust Fund											
Housing Impact Fees											
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund											
Other											
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$2,965,000</b>	<b>\$575,000</b>		<b>\$575,000</b>		<b>\$575,000</b>		<b>\$575,000</b>		<b>\$665,000</b>	
<b>Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	
		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Outcome Indicator 3Aii. Number of participants who complete occupational training are employed for 90 days or more after placement	665	133		133		133		133		133	
<b>Performance Measures: Output Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	
		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Number of participants placed in training	975	195		195		195		195		195	
Number of participants that complete occupational training	875	175		175		175		175		175	
Number of participants attaining a state/industry recognized degree/certificate prior to program completion	875	175		175		175		175		175	
Number of participants with skills gains	875	175		175		175		175		175	

<b>Goal 3Aiii. Access to job opportunities for disadvantaged San Francisco residents</b>											
<b>Funding Amount</b>	<b>5-year \$ Amount</b>	<b>Year 1 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 2 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 3 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 4 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 5 \$ Amount</b>	
CDBG	\$2,585,000	\$517,000		\$517,000		\$517,000		\$517,000		\$517,000	
HOME											
HOPWA											
ESG											
General Fund											
Housing Trust Fund											
Housing Impact Fees											
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund											
Other											
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$2,585,000</b>	<b>\$517,000</b>		<b>\$517,000</b>		<b>\$517,000</b>		<b>\$517,000</b>		<b>\$517,000</b>	
<b>Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	
		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Outcome Indicator 3Aiii. Number of disadvantaged San Francisco residents secure local jobs	3,125	625		625		625		625		625	
<b>Performance Measures: Output Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	
		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Output Indicator: Local, state, and federal mandates for hiring are met	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
<b>Priority Need 3B: Promote Economic Advancement Through Barrier Removal</b>											
<b>Goal 3Bi. Improved service connections</b>											
<b>Funding Amount</b>	<b>5-year \$ Amount</b>	<b>Year 1 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 2 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 3 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 4 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 5 \$ Amount</b>	
CDBG	\$1,779,975	\$355,995		\$355,995		\$355,995		\$355,995		\$355,995	
HOME											
HOPWA											
ESG											
General Fund	\$4,297,855	\$859,571		\$859,571		\$859,571		\$859,571		\$859,571	
Housing Trust Fund											
Housing Impact Fees											

Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund											
Other	\$300,000	\$300,000									
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$6,377,830</b>	<b>\$1,515,566</b>		<b>\$1,215,566</b>		<b>\$1,215,566</b>		<b>\$1,215,566</b>		<b>\$1,215,566</b>	
<b>Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	
		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Outcome Indicator 3Bi. Number of individuals who achieve at least 75% of their service plan	1,400	280		280		280		280		280	
<b>Performance Measures: Output Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	
		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Output Indicator: Number of individuals connected to one or more service(s)	3,000	600		600		600		600		600	
Output Indicator: Number of individuals receiving case management as an element of service connection	2,500	500		500		500		500		500	
<b>Goal 3Bii. Improved foundational competencies and access to job training and employment opportunities for disconnected populations</b>											
<b>Funding Amount</b>	<b>5-year \$ Amount</b>	<b>Year 1 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 2 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 3 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 4 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 5 \$ Amount</b>	
CDBG	\$3,892,215	\$778,443		\$778,443		\$778,443		\$778,443		\$778,443	
HOME											
HOPWA											
ESG											
General Fund	\$593,260	\$118,652		\$118,652		\$118,652		\$118,652		\$118,652	
Housing Trust Fund											
Housing Impact Fees											
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund											
Other	\$300,000	\$300,000									
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$4,785,475</b>	<b>\$1,197,095</b>		<b>\$897,095</b>		<b>\$897,095</b>		<b>\$897,095</b>		<b>\$897,095</b>	
<b>Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	
		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>



Outcome Indicator 3Bii. Number of individuals with increased foundational competencies	1,250	250		250		250		250		250	
Outcome Indicator 3Bii(2). Number of individuals receiving high school diploma, GED, and/or enrolling in post-secondary education	100	20		20		20		20		20	
<b>Performance Measures: Output Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	
		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Output Indicator: Number of individuals trained in foundational competencies	2,500	500		500		500		500		500	
<b>Goal 3Biii. Increased job retention and advancement supports through legal and other related services</b>											
<b>Funding Amount</b>	<b>5-year \$ Amount</b>	<b>Year 1 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 2 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 3 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 4 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 5 \$ Amount</b>	
CDBG	\$3,607,945	\$721,589		\$721,589		\$721,589		\$721,589		\$721,589	
HOME											
HOPWA											
ESG											
General Fund	\$14,930,045	\$2,986,009		\$2,986,009		\$2,986,009		\$2,986,009		\$2,986,009	
Housing Trust Fund											
Housing Impact Fees											
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund											
Other											
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$18,537,990</b>	<b>\$3,707,598</b>		<b>\$3,707,598</b>		<b>\$3,707,598</b>		<b>\$3,707,598</b>		<b>\$3,707,598</b>	
<b>Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	
		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Outcome Indicator 3Biii. Number of individuals with increased knowledge of their rights as determined by pre- and post-assessments	4,000	800		800		800		800		800	

Outcome Indicator 3Biii(2). Number of individuals that with positive outcome indicators for their legal cases	1,375	275		275		275		275		275	
<b>Performance Measures: Output Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	
		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Output Indicator: Number of individuals receiving legal representation	7,000	1,400		1,400		1,400		1,400		1,400	
Output Indicator: Number of individuals receiving education about workers' rights	1,750	350		350		350		350		350	
<b>Goal 3Biv. Improved financial literacy and management</b>											
<b>Funding Amount</b>	<b>5-year \$ Amount</b>	<b>Year 1 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 2 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 3 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 4 \$ Amount</b>		<b>Year 5 \$ Amount</b>	
CDBG	\$1,732,510	\$346,502		\$346,502		\$346,502		\$346,502		\$346,502	
HOME											
HOPWA											
ESG											
General Fund	\$407,490	\$183,498		\$168,498		\$18,498		\$18,498		\$18,498	
Housing Trust Fund											
Housing Impact Fees											
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund											
Other	\$452,336	\$324,818		\$127,518							
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$2,592,336</b>	<b>\$854,818</b>		<b>\$642,518</b>		<b>\$365,000</b>		<b>\$365,000</b>		<b>\$365,000</b>	
<b>Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	
		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Outcome Indicator 3Biv. Number of individuals that increase their savings by 2% of net income	2,000	800		300		300		300		300	
Outcome Indicator 3Biv(2). Number of individuals that improve their credit score by at least 35 points	2,000	800		300		300		300		300	
<b>Performance Measures:</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>Year 1</b>		<b>Year 2</b>		<b>Year 3</b>		<b>Year 4</b>		<b>Year 5</b>	

<b>Output Indicators</b>		<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Output Indicator: Number of individuals opening up savings accounts and/or IDAs	970	250		180		180		180		180	
Output Indicator: Number of individuals receiving credit counseling and repair services	1,500	300		300		300		300		300	
Output Indicator: Number of individuals receiving financial counseling and education	4,400	2,000		600		600		600		600	

## Outline of Objectives, Priority Needs, Goals and Activities

### Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed

#### ➤ Priority Need 1A: Develop and Maintain Affordable Housing

- Goal 1Ai. Increased supply of affordable housing

##### Activities

- Affordable Housing and Permanent Supportive Housing (for Transitional Aged Youth/TAY, seniors, people with disabilities, mentally ill individuals, veterans, homeless families, etc.):
  - Continue to develop affordable housing; establish (annually) the proportion of housing development pool to be allocated to new development vs. rehabilitation
  - Increase options for homeless TAY and TAY aging out of foster care
  - Pursue new state funding sources (including Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities and Veterans Housing and Homeless Prevention Programs) & pursue cost cutting strategies in production (e.g. modular) & pursue entitlement process improvements that accelerate the development timeline
  - Manage transition of Redevelopment Agency (RA) housing to MOHCD (asset management, staff needs)
- BMR housing:
  - Address need for workforce housing beyond Below Market Rate (BMR) (e.g. expand BMR to include higher income threshold [adjust the 'dial'])
  - Explore finance mechanisms to create more workforce housing
  - Amend current planning policies to promote additional workforce production
  - Implement targeted state density bonus program
  - Pursue modifications to inclusionary program (adjust the 'dial')
  - Explore use of publicly owned land requiring higher workforce requirements
  - Pursue new financing sources for increased DALP
  - Acquire privately owned buildings to create new affordable units that are permanently reserved for mixed income
  - Implement workforce housing components of HOPE SF

- Goal 1Aii. Preserve and Maintain Affordable Housing Supply

##### Activities

- Lead Hazard Reduction Program
  - Establish plan for continued funding and renewed program direction to account for HUD funding ending in 2016
- Rental Assistance Demonstration program (RAD)
  - Complete conversion of 4,500 units of public housing to private ownership, accessing funding from HUD, traditional funding sources, and the City's GF
- Veterans
  - Pursue new state funding for veterans housing
- Single Family Housing
  - Support rehabilitation of single family housing
- Multi-family apartment buildings
  - Support predevelopment for preservation of existing affordable rental housing
- Public housing
  - Support revitalization of public housing under HOPE SF

➤ Priority Need 1B: Make Housing Affordable

• Goal 1Bi. Increased affordability of rental housing

Activities

- Pursue outside sources for long-term rental support to provide deep affordability (VASH, Shelter plus Care, Project-based Section 8, MHSA)
  - If no other sources exist for funding operations of permanent supportive housing for the homeless, fund with LOSP (General Fund)

• Goal 1Bii. Increased opportunities for sustainable homeownership

Activities

- Redevelopment Authority transition: Continue administration of housing lottery preference programs (and reduce implementation barriers)
- Improve and expand scope of homebuyer education and counseling to include post-purchase
- Downpayment Assistance Loan Program (DALP)
  - Pursue funding opportunities to increase income limit for DALP
  - Continue evaluating DALP
  - Expand services to community to ensure people are prepared
- Continue support for Co-op share loan program
- Continue support for BMR ownership opportunities, owners and improve monitoring of existing portfolio
- Continue Mortgage Credit Certificate program

• Goal 1Biii. Increase access to rental and homeownership housing

Activities

- Strengthen housing application systems through consistency and uniformity, including improvement to uniform application and marketing and eligibility requirements
- Develop and maintain Database of Affordable Housing Listings, Information and Application (DAHLIA)
- Provide additional support/capacity building to CBO's to help their clients find affordable rental housing
- Continue to support developers and property managers creating and maintaining BMR rental opportunities
- Continue administration of and reduce implementation barriers within the two housing lottery preference programs, the Certificate of Preference (COP) and the Ellis Act Housing Preference (EAHP)

➤ Priority Need 1C: Prevent and End Homelessness

• Goal 1Ci. Reduced rate of evictions

Activities

- Continue supporting representation of individuals
- Continue supporting tenant education (know your rights)
- Continue funding of RAPID re-housing (one-time relocation program; short-term)
- Build the organizational capacity of grantees/providers

• Goal 1Cii. Transitional housing is available for those who need it

#### Activities

- Maintain operating support and housing placement support for transitional housing
- Build the organizational capacity of grantees/providers

#### • Goal 1Ciii. Homeless people receive basic shelter and support services

#### Activities

- Continue to provide rapid re-housing services, short-term rental assistance and/or financial assistance for people in homeless shelters and domestic violence shelters
- Continue to provide operational support for individuals and families in domestic violence shelters
- Continue leveraging Local Operating Subsidy Program (LOSP) funds for permanent supportive housing
- Reduce operating costs of ESG by targeting on the service side, specifically to transition families/individuals to more stable housing situations
- Build the organizational capacity of grantees/providers

#### ➤ Priority Need 1D: Provide Supportive Housing Services

#### • Goal 1Di. Increased access to services for public housing residents

#### Activities

- Continue to support HOPE SF resident services
- Support RAD transition & stabilization
  - Incorporate \$500K expansion to RAD
- Pursue additional funding to stabilize tenants in RAD transformation process

#### • Goal 1Dii. Increased access to permanent supportive housing and transitional housing for PLWHA

#### Activities

- Maintain current supply of housing/facilities dedicated to supporting PLWHA
  - Focus HOPWA funds on operating and service costs
  - The City (joint effort between MOHCD and other City agencies) will work with providers to identify alternative funding sources for capital improvements
- Increase supply of housing/facilities dedicated to supporting PLWHA
  - Expand available supportive housing through a master lease or scattered site models, or by subsidizing operating cost of units in new developments
  - Explore and conduct cost modeling for creative approaches to increasing housing supply
- Increase resources available for subsidizing/making & keeping housing more affordable for PLWHA
  - Revisit the balance of deep vs. shallow rental subsidies (including eligibility criteria for both) to ensure maximum efficiency of these resources
  - Expand emergency eviction prevention assistance programs (e.g., legal assistance, one-time back rent payment, one-time/short-term tenant-based shallow subsidies [e.g. RADCO, Glide], and/or temporary rent payment during residential and/or medical treatment)
  - Maximize leverage of other housing support resources (e.g. VA, HSA, etc.)
- Expanded access to services for PLWHA that help increase housing stability
  - Increase access to mental health/substance abuse services in housing settings
  - Increase access to aging services for PLWHA
  - Increase access to other needed services for PLWHA (education, job training/placement, medical, etc.)

- Improved efficiency and quality of the housing and service delivery system
  - Increase mobility between levels of care to ensure optimum resource utilization
  - Create and operationalize a coordinated intake & referral system and case management system for housing and related support services
  - Improve and continually execute interdepartmental coordination with respect to advocacy for federal policy improvements on behalf of PLWHA
  - Ensure services and resources are culturally competent for emerging populations
  - Improve coordination between efforts within the City of San Francisco designed to support PLWHA

**Objective 2: Communities Have Healthy Physical, Social, and Business Infrastructure**

➤ Priority Need 2A: Enhance Community Facilities and Spaces

- Goal 2Ai. Key nonprofit service providers have high quality facilities

Activities

- Conduct an inventory of current nonprofit facilities in the form of a Capital Needs Assessment to help direct investments and support CBOs in better understanding their assets/facility needs
- Then make decisions on priority projects based on:
  - ✓ Neighborhood (NRSA) need with respect to community facilities
  - ✓ Facilities of entities that provide community linkages and/or leverage other services
  - ✓ Types of renovations needed; and
  - ✓ Whether the proposed project is a part of a long-term facility plan (responsive to a CAN)

- Goal 2Aii. Enhanced public spaces

Activities

- Fund the improvement of community spaces that are highly conducive to families convening
- Fund public space improvement projects that involve community members in their execution

➤ Priority Need 2B: Strengthen Small Businesses and Commercial Corridors

- Goal 2Bi. Thriving, locally-owned small businesses

Activities

- Continue to provide business technical assistance through community partners that is culturally, ethnically and linguistically tailored for startup and existing businesses
- Continue to increase efficiency of technical business assistance
- Continue supporting investments in small business lending
- Continue supporting section 108 for catalytic small business projects

- Goal 2Bii. Robust commercial corridors in low-income neighborhoods

Activities

- Continue to support local economic development efforts focused on revitalizing commercial corridors
- Increase investments in façade and other visible physical improvements
- Increase investments for the removal of business physical barriers as identified by the American’s with Disabilities Act
- Invest in catalytic community facilities

- Continue a geographically focused approach to deliver services in a way that leverages other city investments

➤ Priority Need 2C: Increase Community Cohesion

- Goal 2Ci. Increased supports for residents to convene and build social capital

Activities

- Develop and pilot a framework for comprehensive community/neighborhood planning opportunities; develop staff capacity (both number and expertise) for community planning as needed
- Continue to support neighborhood planning processes that bring together low-income, vulnerable, and disenfranchised populations to participate meaningfully in their communities
- Continue to support HOPE SF community building activities
- Continue to support neighborhood-based community action grant programs
- Leverage OEWD corridor priorities Continue to support neighborhood-based service coordination and collaboration

- Goal 2Cii. Increased capacity for community-based organizations

Activities

- Build the organizational capacity of grantees/providers

**Objective 3: Families and Individuals are Resilient and Economically Self-Sufficient**

➤ Priority Need 3A: Promote Workforce Development

- Goal 3Ai. Increased job readiness

Activities

- Maximize the job placement component for all CBO's offering job readiness activities; build their organizational capacity as needed

- Goal 3Aii. Increased occupational skills that match labor market needs

Activities

- Continue to provide industry-driven training programs that focus on occupational skill development (current industries with the greatest growth potential are: construction, health care, technology, and hospitality)
- Support the development and implementation of earn-and-learn training models, including apprenticeship, in high-growth industries

- Goal 3Aiii. Access to job opportunities for disadvantaged San Francisco residents

Activities

- Continue to provide monitoring and compliance of local, state, and federal laws (e.g. local hiring mandate, First Source, and Section 3) requiring companies to hire low and moderate income and/or San Francisco residents

➤ Priority Need 3B: Promote Economic Advancement Through Barrier Removal

- Goal 3Bi. Improved service connections

Activities

- Continue to fund service connection activities, which are largely concentrated at HOPE SF and RAD sites



- Explore what it would look like and require to incorporate community center portfolio into a service connection model
  - Extend eligibility for service connection grants to family resource centers in neighborhoods where they represent the best available service connection resource
  - Provide or expand case management as an element of service connection whenever possible
  - Build the organizational capacity of grantees/providers
- Goal 3Bii. Improved foundational competencies and access to job training and employment opportunities for disconnected populations
    - Activities
      - Expand programs that offer foundational competencies such as life skills, academic competencies and workplace competencies
      - Build the organizational capacity of grantees/providers
- Goal 3Biii. Increased job retention and advancement supports through legal and other related services
    - Activities
      - Maintain support for legal representation for employment discrimination, wage claims, wrongful termination, etc.
      - Continue to provide basic education to employees about their rights
      - Explore needs of vulnerable populations with respect to job retention and advancement and identify whether any population-specific interventions are required
      - Build the organizational capacity of grantees/providers
- Goal 3Biv. Improved financial literacy and management
    - Activities
      - Continue to support asset building (e.g. through savings products/IDAs)
      - Continue to support credit counseling & repair services
      - Continue to support financial counseling and education
      - Build the organizational capacity of grantees/providers

**Estimate the number of extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income families to whom the jurisdiction will provide affordable housing as defined by HOME 91.315(b)(2) - 91.315(b)(2):**

MOHCD estimates approximately 400 extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income families will be provided affordable housing rental housing during 2015-2019 time period using HOME funds and an additional approximately 2,500 affordable rental units will be built during this same time period using non-HOME sources.

## **SP-50 Public Housing Accessibility and Involvement – 91.215(c)**

### **Need to Increase the Number of Accessible Units (if Required by a Section 504 Voluntary Compliance Agreement)**

The RAD and the HOPE SF revitalization programs will meet or exceed the accessibility requirements of Section 504.

### **Activities to Increase Resident Involvements**

The RAD and HOPE SF revitalization programs will increase tenant engagement activities and tenant services substantially. A framework for the RAD tenant engagement work follows. At HOPE SF properties, this level of connection is exceeded, with deep case management services available to many residents, as further described below.

#### ***RAD Community Engagement***

##### **Establish trust; Map assets and identify needs; Begin community activities; Build resident base; Develop neighborhood partnerships**

Foundational and ongoing work with residents and community members of Housing Developments by all service providers or those who conduct work there.

##### **Community Building – Community organizing and events; Increased information and opportunities; Deeper resident and neighborhood partnerships; Implement peer leadership activities; Development of Health and Wellness, Educational, and Economic Mobility activities**

Deeper foundational and ongoing work that builds upon Community Engagement. As residents and community members become accustomed to providers then work can include recruiting peers and engaging them in leadership and skills building activities. This then establishes them as part of the team.

##### **Service Connection – Enhanced information and referral with follow up; Intentional Support for Housing Stabilization; Ongoing Health and Wellness, Educational, and Economic Mobility Activities**

Once engaged and investments have been made in the Housing Development the consistent staff teams who participate in Community Engagement and Community Building work are available for ongoing resources and activities (Health and Wellness, Educational, Economic Mobility) to learn and expose the community to new choices. One-on-one support is available for residents regarding any needs but especially related to housing stabilization. Staff teams are made up of paraprofessional to professional providers who respond quickly to requests with follow up to ensure information / activities are helpful and accurate. **Off-site services enhance these efforts.** Important key element is for onsite providers to have a relationship with offsite city service providers.

#### **Resident Engagement and RAD**

##### **➤ What is the goal?**

- To ease transition of residents to RAD
- To help residents understand what RAD is and how it will affect them
- To engage them in development of scope of work

- To engage them in development of documents and processes such as:
    - Grievances
    - House rules
    - Leases
    - Services
  - To introduce residents to new owners and management entities and personnel
  - To provide continuity and evolution of tenant associations
- **Why monthly meetings with residents at large are required?**
- Regular meetings message that development team is here to stay – trust building
  - Provide regular opportunity for asking questions, getting updates and providing feedback
  - Provide on-going opportunity for development teams and property management and residents to get to know each other
  - **Future meeting possibilities:**
    - January – March – there will be more specific topics to discuss and work on coming out of working groups – grievance procedures, house rules, new property management philosophies and procedures – rent payment – tenant associations
    - April and beyond – transition, new lease signing, etc.

All meetings include making FAQs available and appropriate translation. Teams always reiterate that there will be no permanent relocation due to RAD and that rents will be calculated in the same way that they are now. Other important message is that SFHA retains ownership of the land, which means that the buildings will be for people with low incomes forever.

**Below are the roles each partner is playing in the RAD Engagement process:**

SFHA: Identify existing resources for resident engagement that are effective and affordable. Establish partnerships with Developers, the City and Community Partners to communicate and engage with residents. Implement a Communication Plan including formal and informal communication milestones.

MOHCD: MOHCD coordinates the real estate transition from SFHA to developer team and will be a project lender. MOHCD will also coordinate the resident services model and its implementation at each site. Lastly MOHCD is leading the creation of clear and consistent dialogue, documentation and communication about RAD between all partners and residents.

Development Teams: Developer teams will implement the rehabilitation programs and own the buildings. They are committed to support resident involvement in all phases of the conversion and implementation.

Tenant Advocates: Tenant Advocates (Housing Rights Committee, National Housing Law Project, Bay Area Legal Aid) work with residents and stakeholders to promote greater understanding of resident rights

## **HOPE SF Community Engagement**

### **Resident Services and Community Building Overview**

Each of the four HOPE SF sites will continue to integrate intensive resident services and community building activities, executed by lead on-site service providers in collaboration with neighboring CBOs and city-wide programming. Services teams will focus their efforts towards preparing HOPE SF site residents for the transition to non-profit management, continuing to stabilize the tenant populations, and developing pathways towards economic mobility. They will achieve this through service connection and on-site programming in areas of economic mobility, public safety, health and wellness, and education.

In the next five years, all four HOPE SF sites will have completed construction of a subset of replacement and affordable housing units. Residents will continue to be included in community space planning efforts across all four sites, managed by the non-profit developers. The Mayor's Office will work with on-site service providers to coordinate the training and placement of residents in construction jobs occurring on site. All of the on-site service providers will be preparing residents for relocation and placement in the units. Residents will be included in a series of relocation planning meetings across the sites and will contribute to the development of the final relocation plans. Additionally, services and programming assisting with the transition to non-profit management will be ramped up, such as those related to financial literacy, workforce development, and tenant education. Community building activities -- such as senior, teen & family programming, community gardening, and community-wide celebrations -- will also continue to be executed at each of the four HOPE SF sites.

All four HOPE SF sites will be integrating learnings from the pilot Peer Health Leadership programs and will be furthering the delivery and evaluation of services and leadership development through this program over the next five years. Similarly, HOPE SF sites will continue to deepen their educational strategies which are executed in collaboration with the four on-site Educational Liaisons, 8 HOPE SF schools, and families at each of the sites. Undergirding the services components at the HOPE SF sites will be a cross-site safety plan that will improve the communication of violent crimes to lead and collaborative service providers. The safety plan will also provide a framework for post-incident support for families and residents impacted by the violence, inclusive of case management support and community building.

### **Lead HOPE SF Resident Services Agencies:**

<u>Site</u>	<u>Lead Service Provider</u>
Alice Griffith	Urban Strategies
Hunters View	Bayview YMCA
Potrero Terrace and Annex	Bridge Housing
Sunnydale	Mercy Housing

At Hunters View, the Bayview YMCA has worked to prepare residents for relocation. The YMCA has also focused on barrier removal, career development support, health and wellness activities, family support programming, educational activities, and employment soft and hard skills.

At Alice Griffith, the Urban Strategies team continues to link residents with senior programs, family support programming, youth programming, afterschool activities, health and wellness activities, and workforce development opportunities.

At Potrero Annex/Terrace, Bridge Housing continues to provide community building activities and foster individual participation in planning sessions. These activities included leadership development and safety workshops, healthy living and healthy generations groups, gardening/sustainability programs, social activities, and a service connection contract with the Potrero Hill Family support Center (Urban Services YMCA) in which they work with residents to assess, connect and support them in workforce and educational opportunities.

At Sunnydale, Mercy Housing, the Bayview YMCA, and TURF work collaboratively to provide outreach, family support, service connections, health and wellness, and educational activities and community convenings to Sunnydale residents.

Both Sunnydale and Potrero Annex and Terrace received HUD Choice Neighborhood Initiative Planning Grants to support the ongoing revitalization efforts throughout the upcoming year.

### **Choice Neighborhood Grants**

#### Planning Grants

Both Sunnydale and Potrero Annex and Terrace received HUD Choice Neighborhood Initiative Planning Grants in 2012 to support ongoing revitalization efforts. These planning efforts will be coming to a close in 2014. Both of these communities will utilize the momentum they gained throughout the planning process to continue to engage residents, city agencies, and other stakeholders in the implementation of the resulting plans. Sunnydale will begin 2015 with the development of implementation committees consisting of residents, city agencies, community organizations, and other stakeholders to collaborate on the execution of objectives in areas of housing development, health & wellness, safety, and economic stability.

The South Potrero Neighborhood Transformation Plan has supported the development of a coordinated blueprint for improving Potrero Annex and Terrace, and the surrounding neighborhood. Implementation of the Transformation Plan will begin in this five year period. At Potrero Terrace and Annex, the work will be focused on establishing quality services in the community, and connecting residents to the greater neighborhood and services.

#### Implementation Grants

Urban Strategies will be completing their cycle of the Choice Neighborhoods Implementation Grant at Alice Griffith in 2017. The team will continue to partner with residents, city agencies, community organizations, and other stakeholders as they complete their process. Workforce development programming will continue to ramp up as construction on-site will begin at Alice Griffith in early 2015. Additionally, key neighborhood revitalization and construction projects will continue to come online in the surrounding district which will provide opportunities for training and placement. Educational Liaison at Alice Griffith will continue to partner with the school district to execute plans addressing chronic absenteeism and parent engagement. Other city agencies will continue to execute their plans for improved transportation, parks, retail, and other commercial and recreational assets in the greater neighborhood.

## **Is the public housing agency designated as troubled under 24 CFR part 902?**

HUD designated SFHA as a “Troubled” agency on December 13, 2012.

### **Plan to remove the ‘troubled’ designation**

SFHA executed a Public Housing Authority Recovery and Sustainability Agreement and Action Plan (PHARS) with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and the City and County of San Francisco on July 1, 2013. The PHARS Agreement and Action Plan included several milestones for SFHA to achieve recovery and long-term sustainability over fiscal years 2014 and 2015 (10/1/13 – 9/30/14 and 10/1/14 – 9/30/15). Elements of the PHARS include:

- Assessment of existing staff assignments, policies and procedures, and development of improved policies and procedures
- Implementation of procedures to monitor independent audit findings
- Improved rent collection practices
- Improved unit turn-over rates and reduce vacancies
- Improved Commission oversight of SFHA finances and operations
- Development and implementation of a Waitlist Management Plan for both public housing and the Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) programs
- Development of a plan for housing quality standard (HQS) inspections for the (HCV) program
- Development of a plan for HCV re-certifications (etc.)

## SP-55 Barriers to affordable housing – 91.215(h)

### Barriers to Affordable Housing

Based on the Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing submitted to HUD, the following have been found to be barriers to affordable housing:

<b><i>Impediments to Affordable Housing Development</i></b>
City funding alone cannot cover costs for affordable housing development. Affordable housing developers depend on a variety of federal, state, and local funding sources. Unfortunately, Federal, State and local funding sources are vulnerable to the budgeting process and economic conditions.
Infrastructure costs sometimes pose an impediment to affordable development as in the case of HOPE SF developments where a large portion of development costs will be infrastructure costs such as new roads and sewers.
Most of the city is housed in smaller buildings (75% of the building stock is comprised of buildings with fewer than 20 units) Deterioration, TIC (Tenant in Common) conversions, condominium conversions, and demolitions all threaten to remove these units from the rental stock. However, Tax credit programs, the principle funding source for affordable housing rental development, have traditionally been difficult to use for scattered site developments.
<b><i>Impediments to Utilization of Assisted Housing Programs</i></b>
Affordable housing and public housing are predominantly located in low-income neighborhoods and neighborhoods with low-achieving schools.
A disproportionate number of voucher holders live in low-income neighborhoods like Bayview, SOMA, and the Western Addition.
Information about affordable housing is complex and non-centralized.
Applications can involve a large amount of paperwork and require households to provide records for income verification. In some cases, short application time frames and submittal requirements (e.g., by fax) create additional challenges. These requirements present obstacles for particular populations such as those with mental health issues or limited literacy.
Strict screening standards can have the effect of restricting access on the basis of race or disability status to the extent that screening criteria such as criminal history correlate with protected factors.
<b><i>Impediments to Healthy Living in Low-Cost Market Rate Housing and SROs</i></b>
Some renters in San Francisco, particularly recently arrived immigrants, people with limited English proficiency, low levels of education, or disabilities, are not aware of their rights to healthy, habitable housing under City Code.
Single Room Occupancy Hotels are amongst the oldest building in the City, and buildings continue to deteriorate.
Tenants who suffer from mental or psychiatric disabilities, or who have hoarding and cluttering behavior, can have difficulties vacating their room for building managers to do needed improvements.
Some buildings have elevators that break frequently and require special parts for repairs. Senior and disabled tenants in SRO buildings who need an elevator can become trapped in their units. Furthermore, a majority of SRO buildings lack elevators entirely.
Unlike nonprofit staff, who specialize in working with high-need populations, hotel staff in privately owned SROs seldom know how to approach persons with mental illness or in crisis.
<b><i>Impediments to Reducing Direct Discrimination</i></b>
Based upon reported incidents, alone, it is impossible to know the true prevalence of housing



discrimination because many people experiencing discrimination do not make a formal report.
<b>Impediments Facing Seniors and Adults with Disabilities</b>
5% of older adults and 9% of disabled adults need, but cannot access home repair and modifications programs
Because the Planning Department does not have a single, uniform procedure for reasonable accommodations requests, some persons in need of a reasonable accommodation may slip through the cracks. For instance, staff may not always recognize a “reasonable accommodations request” when it is not phrased in that terminology.
Accessibility issues in affordable housing could often be avoided if parties involved with affordable housing development and oversight—MOH, DPH, HSA, and developers, had improved communication and coordination with representatives from the disability community.
The application and wait-list process can make it difficult to “match” people with specific impairments to a suitable unit.
People with disabilities who need live-in care have exceptional difficulty accessing City-supported affordable housing if there are too few 2 bedroom units available, or because these units are financially out of reach
MOH does not collect complete data on the disability status of residents in City supported housing.
Security deposit assistance programs primarily focus on families at risk of homelessness.
<b><i>Impediments Due to Race/Ethnicity</i></b>
Low-income families often lack asset building opportunities. In San Francisco, an estimated 40,000 households (11%) are un-banked.
A large share of this most recent wave of foreclosures was precipitated by subprime and predatory lending that often targeted racial/ethnic and linguistic minorities
Foreclosure counselors in neighborhoods that are hard hit by foreclosures are having difficulty keeping up with the need for their assistance, and can no longer provide intensive one-on-one guidance.
The Office of the Assessor-Recorder has taken a leadership role in addressing foreclosures in San Francisco. However, the office has limited capacity to address a full range of policy and legislative issues related to the foreclosure crisis. In particular, little is known about the prevalence of foreclosures in rental buildings.
Criminal background checks, credit checks, and eviction history are commonly used to help judge applicant qualifications. However, these methods may result in disproportionate refusal of African American and Latino applicants.
Consistent underrepresentation of Latino and Hispanic households in City-supported rental housing
Applicants to BMR housing do not reflect the demographic mix of qualified San Francisco residents. Latino, African American and white applicants are under-represented relative to Asian applicants.
Multiple steps and requirements for BMR home purchase result in many drop-outs and disqualifications. Almost 10 applicants begin the process for every one that succeeds. As a general trend, Asian and white households appear to be more successful in making it through the process.
<b><i>Impediments Facing People with a Criminal Record</i></b>
Barriers to housing and work, in particular, hinder their ability to establish a healthy productive lifestyle. Housing discrimination on the basis of a criminal record is a Fair Housing issue as disproportionate numbers of African Americans, Latinos, and people with a disability have had criminal justice system involvement.
Housing managers are under pressure to fill units quickly so it is important that applicants have a timely opportunity to offer corrections, evidence of mitigating circumstances, evidence of rehabilitation, and requests for reasonable accommodation.

Most landlords are not adequately informed about laws regarding private criminal background checks and violate them unknowingly in an attempt to identify the best possible tenants
Some transitional housing programs bar those with a criminal background from enrollment.
For those who do not struggle with addiction or mental illness, the current stock of transitional housing is not a good fit, as most transitional housing includes a treatment regime. However, even those with an employment history and in-demand skills, when released without a home, need a transitional housing program to get back on their feet.
SFHA considers a wide range of criminal allegations and convictions, but does not call for blanket exclusions except those required by HUD for registered sex offenders and methamphetamine production. Some have voiced concern about the unpredictable nature of a broadly discretionary policy.
<b><i>Impediments Facing Immigrants and People with Limited English Proficiency</i></b>
City residents can safely access City-sponsored housing, regardless of their immigration status, but fear of deportation remains a significant barrier; many families and individuals opt for substandard or overcrowded conditions rather than become known to government staff or programs.
Housing-related transactions that might be easy for a high-school educated native-born American, such as filling out an application forms, can pose a substantial barrier to entry for anyone who cannot speak, write or read English.

## **Strategy to Remove or Ameliorate the Barriers to Affordable Housing**

### ***Addressing Barriers to Affordable Housing***

The City of San Francisco’s housing agencies work diligently to ensure that barriers to affordable housing are addressed. The Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development submitted its Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing (AI) to HUD to guide this work in the coming years. Numerous programs and policies implemented by the City of San Francisco aim to uphold fair housing rights. Below is a description of programs, policies, and directions the City will pursue to reduce barriers to housing access and barriers to affordable housing production.

### **Addressing Barriers to Housing Access**

#### Improve access to knowledge about rental housing

When certain groups have unequal access to information about their housing options, it can become a fair housing issue. MOHCD requires all affordable housing developers to adhere to strict affirmative marketing strategies to ensure that information about available units reaches the general public. The City and County of San Francisco requires its grantees to advertise the availability of housing units and services to individuals and families from all race/ethnic and economic backgrounds. MOHCD requires its partners to advertise in all forms of local media including community newspaper, radio and TV (when necessary). MOHCD will also post information on the availability of housing and services on its website. In site visits with the grantees, MOHCD monitors the grantee’s marketing efforts and discusses the organization’s method for reaching clients.

To further inform the public about affordable housing opportunities, the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development explains local policies and programs that address affordable housing through our website and Annual Housing Report. Together, the MOHCD website and Annual Housing Report

serve to orient the general public on basic issues such as the difference between public housing and other affordable housing.

Additionally, MOHCD publishes unit availability on its website and provides weekly email alerts to a list of service providers and community members. Email alerts list newly posted rental units in the Below Market Rate (BMR) rental and homeownership programs.

Finally, MOHCD funds community-based organizations to provide counseling for renters who are at risk of eviction, have recently been evicted, or are urgently in need of housing. Among low-income people, individuals with barriers to housing, such as those with disabilities or limited English fluency, are prioritized. Housing counselors help clients navigate public housing, affordable housing, and market rate housing (when appropriate) by guiding them to rental opportunities and assisting with the application process. Counseling agencies also support seniors, younger adults with disabilities, and other clients with specific needs in finding service-enriched housing.

#### Improve access to knowledge about homeownership opportunities

MOHCD supports community-based organizations in providing education and financial training programs that assist first time homebuyers to navigate the home purchase and financing opportunities available to them. Homebuyer education is a crucial component of all of the first time homebuyer programs in the City. Several HUD approved non-profit counseling agencies are supported by the City to provide culturally sensitive homebuyer workshops and counseling in several languages for free throughout the City. All City supported agencies utilize the standard Neighborworks America approved curriculum for homebuyer education, and make up HomeownershipSF, a collaborative membership organization that is a Neighborworks affiliate. The homebuyer curriculum requires 6-8 hours of in-class education, and individual one-on-one counseling is encouraged before a certificate is issued. In addition to the ongoing workshops and counseling, the City-supported counseling agencies organize a yearly homeownership fair in the fall. The fair brings together counselors, lenders, and agencies dedicated to providing opportunities for low-income first-time homebuyers. The homeownership fair is attended by an average of 3,000 people every year and targeted outreach is done to draw from the diverse San Francisco communities. The fair has workshops, in several languages, on credit income, first-time homebuyers.

#### Eliminate discriminatory practices

MOHCD requires MOHCD-funded affordable housing developers and management companies to comply with fair housing law and does not allow for discrimination against any protected class. MOHCD's loan documents include the following clause "Borrower agrees not to discriminate against or permit discrimination against any person or group of persons because of race, color, creed, national origin, ancestry, age, sex, sexual orientation, disability, gender identity, height, weight, source of income or acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS) or AIDS related condition (ARC) in the operation and use of the Project except to the extent permitted by law or required by any other funding source for the Project. Borrower agrees not to discriminate against or permit discrimination against Tenants using Section 8 certificates or vouchers or assistance through other rental subsidy programs"

In addition to working actively with MOHCD-funded affordable housing management to ensure compliance with fair housing requirements, MOHCD also funds community-based organizations to provide counseling on Fair Housing law to ensure renters across the City know their rights regarding discrimination issues, reasonable accommodation requests, and other fair housing issues.

## Addressing Barriers to Housing Production<sup>154</sup>

### Identify Sites Appropriate for Housing Development

San Francisco is relatively dense, and has limited opportunities for infill development. It is critical to identify and make available, through appropriate zoning, adequate sites to meet the City's housing needs—especially affordable housing. The San Francisco Planning Department has successfully developed neighborhood specific housing plans to accommodate the majority of new housing needs anticipated.

In an effort to identify *specific sites* for housing, as well as areas that can be zoned for housing development, all City agencies subject to the Surplus Property Ordinance annually report their surplus properties and those properties are evaluated with regard to their potential for affordable housing development. To the extent that land is not suitable for housing development, the City sells surplus property and uses the proceeds for affordable housing development.

In order to reduce the land required for non-housing functions, such as parking, the Planning Department will consider requiring parking lifts to be supplied in all new housing developments seeking approval for parking at a ratio of 1:1 or above. Also through area plans, especially in transit-rich neighborhoods, parking may be allowed at a ratio of less than 1:1 in order to encourage the use of public transit and maximize a site's use for housing.

### Encourage "Affordability by Design": Small Units & Rental Units

Using less expensive building materials and building less expensive construction types (e.g. wood frame midrise rather than steel frame high-rise) and creating smaller units can reduce development costs per/unit. High development costs are a major barrier to affordable housing development. The City encourages this type of affordability by design.

### *Secondary Units*

Secondary units (in-law or granny units) are smaller dwellings within a structure that contains a much larger unit, using a space that is surplus to the primary dwelling. Secondary units represent a simple and cost-effective method of expanding the housing supply. Such units can be developed to meet the needs of seniors, people with disabilities, and others who, because of modest incomes or lifestyles, prefer or need small units at relatively low rents. Within community planning processes, the City may explore where secondary units can occur without adversely affecting the neighborhood.

### *Smaller Units*

Density standards in San Francisco have traditionally encouraged larger units by setting the number of dwelling units in proportion to the size of the building lot. However, in some areas, the City may consider using the building envelope to regulate the maximum residential square footage. This will encourage smaller units in neighborhoods where building types are well suited for increased density.

---

<sup>154</sup> The following section on Addressing Barriers to Housing Production is cited from the June 2010 Draft Housing Element. The role of the Housing Element is to provide policy background for housing programs and decisions and broad directions towards meeting the City's housing goals. However, parameters specified in the Zoning Map and Planning Code can only be changed through a community process and related legislative process. Thus, not all strategies identified in the Housing Element are certain to be implemented. The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development will explore recommendations of the Housing Element as they pertain to findings from the 2011 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing (this report is currently in progress).

Moreover, the Planning Department allows a density bonus of twice the number of dwelling units when the housing is specifically designed for and occupied by senior citizens, physically or mentally disabled persons.

#### *Rental Units*

In recent years the production of new housing has yielded primarily ownership units, but low-income and middle-income residents are usually renters. The City encourages the continued development of rental housing, including market-rate rentals that can address moderate and middle income needs. Recent community planning efforts have explored incentives such as fee waivers and reductions in inclusionary housing requirements in return for the development of deed-restricted, long-term rental housing. The Planning Department will monitor the construction of middle income housing under new provisions included within the inclusionary requirements of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans and consider expanding those provisions Citywide if they are successful.

#### Identify and Implement Creative Financing Strategies

Due to the high cost of housing subsidies required to provide a unit to low and very low income households (subsidy of \$170,000-\$200,000 required per unit), financing is amongst the most challenging barriers to affordable housing production. In addition, several Federal and State programs that historically have supported affordable housing development are at risk. The current recession has impacted government coffers as well as financial institutions, reducing the capital available for development. For example, the Federal Low Income Housing Tax Credit program (LIHTC) has, in years past, financed about 90% of affordable housing. In this economic climate and with the elimination of redevelopment agencies and their required commitment of 20% of their tax increment to affordable housing, the City of San Francisco is seeking creative solutions to finance affordable housing production and preservation.

#### *Jobs-Housing Linkage Program*

New commercial and other non-residential development increase the City's employment base and thereby increase the demand for housing. The City's Jobs-Housing Linkage Program, which collects fees for affordable housing production from commercial developments, will continue to be enforced and monitored.

#### *Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credits*

Planning and OEWD will promote the use of the Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credits to help subsidize rental projects, and continue to provide information about such preservation incentives to repair, restore, or rehabilitate historic resources towards rental housing in lieu of demolition.

#### *Citywide Inclusionary Housing Program*

Planning and MOHCD will continue to implement the Citywide Inclusionary Housing Program, which requires the inclusion of permanently affordable units in housing developments of 10 or more units. MOHCD is also looking to expand the program to allow developers to target higher incomes than what is currently allowed under the Inclusionary Housing Program in exchange for more affordable housing units to be built.

#### *Tax Increment Financing*

Tax Increment dollars in the major development projects of Mission Bay, Hunters Point Shipyard and Transbay will continue to be set aside for affordable housing as required by the development

agreements for those major development projects and subject to the State Department of Finance's approval.

#### *Housing Trust Fund*

San Francisco voters approved Proposition C in November 2012, which amended the City's charter to enable creation of the Housing Trust Fund. It is a fund that shall exist for 30 years payable from set-asides from the City's general fund and other local sources. MOHCD is implementing housing programs or modifying existing programs to account for this new funding source and began using funds from the Housing Trust Fund in July 2013.

#### Reduce Regulatory Barriers

Public processing time, staffing, and fees related to City approval make up a considerable portion of affordable development costs. The City has implemented Priority Application Processing through coordination with the Planning Department, Department of Building Inspection, and Department of Public Works for 100% affordable projects. This expedites the review and development process and reduces overall development costs. Current City policy also allows affordable housing developers to pursue zoning accommodations through rezoning and application of a Special Use District. The Planning Department, in consultation with MOHCD and the development community, is exploring implementation of a San Francisco-specific density bonus program expanding upon the State Density Bonus law, which would enable a more expeditious land use entitlement process for projects that provide more affordable housing than required by local law by eliminating the need to use Special Use Districts to make certain zoning exceptions.

The City is also exploring mechanisms that maintain the strength of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and its use as a tool for environmental protection while eliminating aspects of its implementation that are not appropriate and unnecessarily delay proposed projects. For instance, the Planning Department will continue to prioritize projects that comply with CEQA requirements for infill exemptions by assigning planners immediately upon receipt of such applications. Other improvements to CEQA implementation are underway. For example, a recent Board of Supervisors report studied how to meaningfully measure traffic impacts in CEQA.

#### Address NIMBYISM

Neighborhood resistance to new development, especially affordable housing development, poses a significant barrier. However, NIMBYism can be reduced by engaging neighbors in a thorough and respectful planning process. In order to increase the supply and affordability of housing, the City has engaged in significant planning for housing through Area Plans and other processes that respect community voice and neighborhood character. In general, the Planning Department's review of projects and development of guidelines builds on community local controls, including Area plans, neighborhood specific guidelines, neighborhood Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CC&R's) and other resident-driven standards for development.

Public education about the desirability and necessity of affordable housing is also an ongoing effort. Planning, DBI and other agencies will continue to provide informational sessions at Planning Commission Department of Building Inspection Commission and other public hearings to educate citizens about affordable housing.

## **SP-60 Homelessness Strategy – 91.215(d)**

### **Describe how the jurisdiction's strategic plan goals contribute to: Reaching out to homeless persons (especially unsheltered persons) and assessing their individual needs**

The San Francisco Homeless Outreach Team (SFHOT) was formed in May 2004 as part of a Mayor's Office, health, social services, and community initiative. Ten years later, SFHOT continues to evolve to meet various population needs. Over 3,000 chronically homeless severely disabled individuals have been care managed by SFHOT, with nearly 50% securing permanent housing. SFHOT works collaboratively in small teams first to engage and stabilize chronically homeless individuals and next to help gain care for chronic conditions and find permanent housing via three lines of service, as follows:

**Stabilization Care:** This SFHOT service line provides short-term stabilization care management for high risk homeless individuals (homeless more than three years, experiencing complex medical, psychiatric, and substance abuse tri-morbidity, using a high number of urgent/emergent care services, and not able to navigate health and human services system on their own. Care Managers accept referrals from SFHOT First Responders and high user treatment programs. Within six to twelve months, the goals are to: (1) Stabilize individuals from the street into shelter/SRO, (2) Remove personal barriers to attaining permanent housing; e.g., attain benefits, primary care linkage, behavioral health care linkage, IDs, legal aid, etc., (3) Secure and place into permanent housing, (4) Assess and serve as care coordinators for SF Health Network members who are high risk / high cost individuals and are unable to engage into the system.

**First Responders and Street Medicine Staff:** This SFHOT service line provides outreach, engagement and warm-handoffs from the street to (or between) urgent/ emergent institutions. First Responders operate 24/7 and responds to requests from 311, Care Coordinators, Police, Fire, and Urgent/Emergent facilities (hospitals, SF Sobering Center, Psych Emergency Services, and Dore Psych Urgent Care) for street outreach/intervention and therapeutic transports. The goals are to, within two hours, respond and determine if the individual can be cleared for transport and provide warm-handoff to and/or from urgent/emergent facilities. In addition, the First Responders provide targeted search and outreach of HUMS (High Users of Multiple Systems) and other high-risk homeless individuals as identified by 311 (citizens) and health care coordinators and, once found, performs wellness checks and attempts to engage individuals into services and other resources as identified by community care plans. First Responders assess and refer the highest risk to the Care Management teams.

**San Francisco Public Library:** This SFHOT service line includes a Psychiatric Social Worker situated at the Civic Center Main Branch who conducts outreach and offers referrals to homeless, marginally housed and/or mentally ill patrons of the library. She also facilitates education sessions in group or individual settings for library staff, in order to improve understanding of behaviorally vulnerable patrons of the library. Her goal is to help library staff serve this group of patrons according to their needs, while helping to decrease the number and severity of incidents that require intervention from Library security staff. This social worker also supervises four 15-hours/week Health and Safety Associates (HaSAs) who are selected from a group of homeless library patrons being served by SF HOT's case management function. HaSAs assist the team by using their life experiences and learned engagement skills to reach out to other homeless patrons, in order to persuade them to accept case management and other services. In the

process, HaSAs gain employment and job-seeking skills, through their supervision by the Psychiatric Social Worker, as well as an associated DPH Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor.

### **Addressing the emergency and transitional housing needs of homeless persons**

The City's Ten Year Plan to End Chronic Homelessness directed the City to move its focus away from traditional emergency shelters and toward shelters with 24-hour crisis clinics, and sobering centers.

Since the Plan was published, the Department of Public Health has created the Dore Urgent Care Clinic, a medically-staffed 24/7 urgent care clinic designed to serve people in psychiatric crisis that is able to accommodate up to 12 clients at any one time. The department also funds the Dore Residence, a 14-bed intensive crisis residential treatment program, operated in a social rehabilitation model, that provides a 24-hour alternative to hospitalization and serves clients who need psychiatric crisis support. The average length of stay is 3-5 days. Many of the individuals served by the two programs are homeless.

The emergency shelter system for adults has had a reduction of 440 year-round beds between January 2005 (1,579 total beds) and the present (1,139 total beds in June 2014). While decreasing the number of emergency shelter beds, the City has enhanced the quality of emergency shelter and improved access for its clients. Between FY08-09 and FY13-14, the annual budget for emergency shelters increased by \$4.3 million. The additional money has been used to invest in added case management and sustain service levels.

The City continues to promote fair and efficient access to emergency shelter. It is supporting adding a new shelter in the Bayview, the neighborhood with the highest number of persons living on the street, according to the 2013 homeless count. HSA received a capital grant of nearly \$1 million from the state and plans to use local funding for shelter operations.

Another way that shelters have been made more accessible is that, as of February 2014, homeless persons can make 90-day shelter reservations by calling the City's 311 System. The new process makes it easier for seniors, persons with disabilities, and non-English speakers to access the emergency shelter system by eliminating the need to wait in line and instead using the 311 system's 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year translation capabilities. By making it as convenient as possible for homeless adults to access safe, clean emergency shelters when needed, more time is available them to seek employment, to engage with vital services, and to find permanent housing. Providing better access to the emergency shelter system enables the City to maximize the number of beds that are used every night, leaving fewer people on the street at night.

Although permanent housing is the primary goal for people who are homeless, interim housing is a necessity until the stock of housing affordable to people with extremely low incomes can accommodate the demand. Interim housing should be available to all those who do not have an immediate option for permanent housing, so that no one is forced to sleep on the streets. Interim housing should be safe and easily accessible and should be structured to provide services that assist people in accessing treatment in a transitional housing setting or permanent housing as quickly as possible.

In order to provide the interim housing needed in the City, existing shelters must be restructured so that they are not simply emergency facilities, but instead focus on providing services that link people with housing and services that promote ongoing stability. In addition, to ensure that people who are



homeless are willing to access these facilities, emphasis should continue to be placed on client safety and respectful treatment of clients by staff, including respect for cultural differences. The shelter system should provide specialized facilities or set-aside sections to meet the diversity of need, including safe havens, respite care beds, and places for senior citizens.

The City has placed a high priority on assisting people who are homeless to access permanent housing as quickly as possible, without requiring “housing readiness” or participation in services or transitional programs as a pre requisite. This strategy has been found to be effective with most populations, including people who are chronically homeless. However, for some people, access to treatment (either treatment in a clinical sense or mental health and/or substance abuse services) in a transitional housing setting can be beneficial; it provides a necessary steppingstone enhancing their ability to successfully access and maintain permanent housing. Particular sub-populations that have been found to benefit from treatment housing include: people suffering from a serious mental illness, people with chronic substance abuse problems, recently discharged offenders, people suffering from trauma (domestic violence, former sex workers, youth experiencing homelessness, veterans), and emancipated foster and homeless youth. For these populations, treatment housing provides a supportive, transitional environment that facilitates the stability necessary for future housing retention and provides treatment in a setting that offers immediate support against relapse and other potential set-backs. In order to be effective, treatment housing must offer culturally competent programs designed to meet the needs of the specific population being served.

Strategies necessary to effectively meet the need for treatment housing include: 1) evaluation of existing treatment/transitional housing in the City to determine which facilities to maintain and which to transform into permanent supportive housing; 2) appropriate assessment of the population that will benefit from treatment housing; 3) development of intensive case management and service packages for specific populations; and 4) creation of stronger linkages to facilitate movement between treatment programs and permanent housing.

**Helping homeless persons (especially chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth) make the transition to permanent housing and independent living, including shortening the period of time that individuals and families experience homelessness, facilitating access for homeless individuals and families to affordable housing units, and preventing individuals and families who were recently homeless from becoming homeless again.**

Many people who are homeless or at-risk, in particular those who are suffering from a disabling condition, are in touch with one or more of the City’s public institutions and systems of care, including hospitals, mental health programs, detoxification and treatment programs, foster care and the criminal justice system. As such, these institutions have an important role to play in identifying people who need assistance to maintain their housing or who are homeless and need help regaining it. Through comprehensive transition, or “discharge” planning, these individuals, upon release, can be linked with the housing, treatment and services they need to facilitate ongoing stability and prevent future homelessness.

Key aspects of effective discharge planning include: assessment of housing and service related needs at intake; development of comprehensive discharge plans and assignment of a discharge planner/case

manager to oversee plan implementation; provision of services that will promote long-term housing stability, while in custody/care; and expansion of housing options for people being discharged.

For people who are homeless involved with the criminal justice system whose crimes are non-violent petty misdemeanors, and for repeat, frequent users of the hospital system occasioned by lack of ongoing health care and homelessness, diversion strategies should be used that focus on addressing housing, treatment and service needs so as to prevent both recurring homelessness as well as repeat offenses and to support health outcomes.

“Respite” beds with appropriate medical care, medication and care supplies are needed by people who are homeless to recuperate post-hospitalization. These beds with care do not prevent homelessness nor end homelessness; but until sufficient permanent housing is available, they are necessary to support recovery. Coupled with other supportive services, they also can provide a link to other community services and housing opportunities.

In order to ensure the effectiveness of discharge planning efforts, data on the permanent housing outcomes of those discharged should be collected and included as part of ongoing evaluations of these public institutions.

**Help low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless, especially extremely low-income individuals and families who are likely to become homeless after being discharged from a publicly funded institution or system of care, or who are receiving assistance from public and private agencies that address housing, health, social services, employment, education or youth needs**

MOHCD’s homeless and homeless prevention programs align with the City’s 5-Year Homeless Strategic Framework to achieve the Framework’s following objective:

- Prevent homelessness by intervening to avoid evictions from permanent housing that lead to homelessness. Increase outreach and education about eviction-prevention resources, including financial assistance and tenant rights laws. Provide short-term rental support and wraparound services to address underlying issues threatening housing stability and to prevent eviction. Increase the provision of legal services for individuals and families at risk of eviction. Provide rehousing support.

Effective homelessness prevention requires early identification and assistance to help people avoid losing their housing in the first place. Public agencies, including social service agencies, health clinics, schools, the foster care system and city government offices, have an important role to play in this effort as they are often in contact with these households and can provide key information and referrals. San Francisco has a long history of public support for tenant’s rights and eviction prevention services which has led to model tenant protections and social support for tenants who are often at risk of eviction and displacement.

Strategies to facilitate the early identification and assistance needed to prevent homelessness include 1) expansion of resources available for rental assistance and for key services that address threats to housing stability; 2) facilitating access to eviction prevention services through education and outreach, expanded legal services and the establishment of specialized eviction prevention programs; and 3) development of standard “just-cause” eviction policies for city-funded programs.

To address the multi-various challenge of homelessness, the homelessness and homeless prevention program is grant-based and melds CDBG, ESG and Housing Trust Fund funding to support homeless prevention and eviction prevention programs, operating support for emergency and transitional shelters, direct services for homeless individuals and families, and supportive housing. This program coordinates closely with other City Departments, in particular the Human Services Agency, to align its strategies.

Through this program, MOHCD administers the HUD Emergency Solutions Grant program as authorized under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act. ESG grants support essential services related to emergency shelter or street outreach; ongoing operations of emergency shelters; and homeless prevention services for those individuals at imminent risk of homelessness.

MOHCD also utilizes Housing Trust Fund funds for tenant-based rental assistance for individuals and families. Finally, it utilizes CDBG funds to support programs preventing homelessness and providing direct services. Homeless prevention programs focus primarily on eviction prevention, including tenant rights trainings, legal representation at eviction hearings, as well as rental vouchers and assistance with first and last month rent. Direct service programs support case management and related services to individuals and families in shelters and on the streets, focusing on those services which will maximize housing stability for those individuals and families.

Ongoing housing stability also depends upon access to a stable and sufficient income stream. However, many homeless people have education deficits, limited job skills and/or gaps in their work history that make it difficult for them to obtain living wage employment. For these reasons, access to education, job training and employment services are vitally important. There are homeless-targeted training and employment services that offer these services in a way that is designed to meet the special needs of homeless people. While these programs are necessary and should be expanded, homeless people also need access to the mainstream workforce development system, which offers a wider range of resources. However, in order to be effective with this population, these mainstream programs must take steps to increase homeless families' and individuals' access and better accommodate their needs.

## **SP-65 Lead based paint Hazards – 91.215(i)**

### **Actions to address LBP hazards and increase access to housing without LBP hazards**

The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development is a multi-grant recipient of HUD's Office of Lead Hazard Control and Healthy Homes. Over the past 20 years, MOHCD has developed a highly collaborative infrastructure of City agencies and non-profit organizations to address childhood lead poisoning, lead hazards, and other health conditions stemming from poor quality housing in low-income communities. Collaborating agencies serve as referral partners to the lead program, which is a vital component of the day-to-day programmatic activities of MOHCD's Lead and Housing Rehabilitation Programs unit, which serves to improve low-income tenant- and owner-occupied housing.

To promote the occupancy of lead safe units by low-income families with children, the program will require property owners to execute a grant agreement, deed of trust, and declaration of restrictions that impose a five year restriction period; forbidding the property owner to evict current tenants; requiring property managers to maintain the property free of lead hazards; affirmatively marketing to low-income families with children under the age of six; and advertising and coordinating re-rentals through MOHCD. As a result of this enforcement tool, MOHCD maintains a registry of lead remediated housing units, which upon re-rental must be affirmatively marketed to low-income families with children under the age of six. These re-rentals must also be advertised and coordinated through MOHCD. In addition, MOHCD's monitoring and asset management team performs compliance monitoring requiring the owner to provide documentation of current tenants and property maintenance. MOHCD also requires CDBG funded housing, tenant rights, and other non-profit housing related agencies to provide lead poisoning prevention education to tenant families with young children, information on the Federal Lead Hazard Disclosure Law, and information on MOHCD's Lead Program.

### **How are the actions listed above related to the extent of lead poisoning and hazards?**

MOHCD response system is comprised of several City agencies and non-profit partners to address the problem of lead poisoning, prohibited nuisances code enforcement and dilapidated housing. Fundamental to the response system, the San Francisco Department of Public Health code enforcement has the legislative authority to cite property owners with a notice of violation whenever there is visibly deteriorated paint in the exterior or interior of a pre-1978 building where children under six may be exposed to the lead hazard. These violations become direct referrals to MOHCD, which provides lead grant assistance for the assessment and remediation services of lead hazards in low-income tenant- and owner-occupied housing.

In addition, MOHCD works with the Family Childcare Association, the Children's Council, the San Francisco Head Start Program, and other private preschools serving low-income families - to ensure families are educated on lead poisoning prevention and timely lead blood level testing of children under the age of six. As a result, low-income children attending targeted preschools are regularly tested for lead blood content as a commitment to a healthy educational start. Children with a detectable lead blood level are case managed by the San Francisco Department of Public Health.

**How are the actions listed above integrated into housing policies and procedures?**

Any housing built before 1978 that are or could be occupied by families and will be rehabilitated with MOHCD's financial assistance is required to be assessed for lead-based paint hazards. Should lead-based paint hazards be found then remediation becomes part of the rehabilitation scope of work.

## **SP-70 Anti-Poverty Strategy – 91.215(j)**

### **Jurisdiction Goals, Programs and Policies for reducing the number of Poverty-Level Families**

San Francisco is perceived as a wealthy area with an average household income of \$117,255. However, 13.8% of residents live below the poverty level. According to Chief Economist, Ted Egan, between 1990 and 2010, the population living in Extremely Low / Very Low income households (those earning less than 50% of Area Median Income) has grown the most. Growth has also been seen in households earning over 150% of area median income, and, to a lesser extent, in those earning 120-150% of AMI. The low income population (50-80% of AMI) has seen very slight growth, and the moderate income population (80-120%) experienced a decline in absolute numbers.

The cost of housing in San Francisco exacerbates the wealth disparity. Local housing costs not only exceed the national average but, thanks to a housing market crash that affected San Francisco less than other places, the city now has the most expensive housing in the region.

OEWD has implemented evidence-based sector academies and programs that provide access to employment opportunities for our priority populations, those most affected by wealth disparity. Our sectors – healthcare, construction, information and communications technology, and hospitality – were selected because of their high growth potential, entry-level employment opportunities, and more importantly, because of their pathways to self-sufficiency and economic security.

All San Franciscans deserve to live in safety and prosperity. But today, not all San Franciscans do. In truth, while we are one City, united in name and government, we remain separate communities. In neighborhoods with concentrated poverty, there is a San Francisco that is a community apart, separated by geography, violence, and decades of neglect. According to the U.S. Census Bureau's 2012 5-Year American Community Survey, 13.2% of San Francisco's residents live in poverty. This, in the context of a growing yet fragile city economy with a \$6 billion budget and for many people, unaffordable housing presents a unique opportunity for monumental change.

San Francisco's unequal income distribution and skyrocketing housing prices could jeopardize the City's future competitiveness and overall economic stability. The role of government is to intervene where the market fails society's most vulnerable populations, the City's poorest residents. At the neighborhood level, the City's policy levers include investing public funds to counteract policies at other levels of government that disadvantage a geographic area, promote localized economic development, create jobs, and increase the provision of goods and services. Because most nonprofits lack the economies of scale to construct infrastructure, and private actors have little incentive to invest in reweaving the frayed social fabric, government through a strategic public-private partnership is uniquely positioned to create the required innovative infrastructure to eradicate poverty. This infrastructure facilitates novel policy development, the formation of equitable redevelopment, enhanced service access and social capital in areas of concentrated poverty.

In April 2007, the Center for American Progress issued a report, *From Poverty to Prosperity: A National Strategy to Cut Poverty in Half*, which was the result of the Center convening a diverse group of national experts and leaders to examine the causes and consequences of poverty in America and to make recommendations for national action. In the report, the Center's Task Force on Poverty calls for a national goal of cutting poverty in half in the next 10 years and proposes a strategy to reach the goal.

In order to cut poverty in half over the next 10 years, the Task Force on Poverty recommended that strategies should be guided by four principles:

- **Promote Decent Work:** People should work and work should pay enough to ensure that workers and their families can avoid poverty, meet basic needs, and save for the future;
- **Provide Opportunity for All:** Children should grow up in conditions that maximize their opportunities for success; adults should have opportunities throughout their lives to connect to work, get more education, live in a good neighborhood, and move up in the workforce;
- **Ensure Economic Security:** People should not fall into poverty when they cannot work or work is unavailable, unstable, or pays so little that they cannot make ends meet; and
- **Help People Build Wealth:** Everyone should have the opportunity to build assets that allow them to weather periods of flux and volatility, and to have the resources that may be essential to advancement and upward mobility.

San Francisco’s anti-poverty strategy embodies all of these guiding principles. Creating opportunity for socially and economically isolated San Franciscans requires a multifaceted and comprehensive approach.

**Smart Government**

Smart government starts with inter-agency collaboration and community-based partnerships. Across the City, innovative strategies have been developed to provide unprecedented opportunities for our residents. From healthcare to housing, environment to employment, San Francisco is at the forefront of developing and implementing best practices to make our city better for everyone. However, many of the residents in our most disconnected neighborhoods lack the resources they need to connect to those programs and strategies. Low educational attainment, safety concerns, inability to access capital, and the lack of a cohesive social fabric to support residents makes it difficult to reach even the first rungs of these ladders. Working together in four priority areas – homelessness, asset building/homeownership, employment and youth/education – City departments are developing “on-ramps” that give residents the skills and resources they need to take advantage of the City’s innovations.

**Table 81 – “On-Ramp” Programs to Address City Goals**

<b>Policy area</b>	<b>Homelessness</b>	<b>Asset Building/Homeownership</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Youth/Education</b>
Goal	To end chronic homelessness	Asset building for low- and moderate-income residents	Living-wage jobs with opportunities for career advancement	All students graduate high school and have the ability to go to college
City strategy	<b>Housing First</b> is a successful program that places homeless individuals into permanent supportive housing with	<b>City’s First Time Homebuyers’ Program</b> helps low-income residents afford to own in San Francisco	<b>Four Sectors</b> have been identified by OEWD as having high growth potential for our city. Job training and development programs are	<b>SF Promise</b> guarantees college financial assistance for SF students who do well in school and graduate high school

Policy area	Homelessness	Asset Building/Homeownership	Employment	Youth/Education
	wrap around services		aligned around those sectors	
“On-Ramp”	<p><b>Project Homeless Connect</b> reaches out to homeless individuals every other month and provides a one-stop shop of health and human services for them</p>	<p><b>Bank on San Francisco</b> is an award winning national model program which allows families dependent on high-cost check-cashers to easily open a starter bank account with mainstream financial institutions</p> <p><b>Financial Empowerment Center Initiative</b> is an inter-departmental program to support centers that will conduct financial triage, set goals, and establishes action plans in 5 service areas: money management, improved credit, decreased debt, safe and affordable banking relationships, and build savings</p>	<p><b>Career Pathways that promote job mobility and advancement:</b> Creating career pathways that support the ability of residents and workers to attain the industry relevant/recognized skills employers are looking for is key to job mobility and advancement in the San Francisco labor market. Working in partnership with employers, the City will continue to implement industry-driven pathway approaches that cross learning at the K-12 and post-secondary levels.</p>	<p><b>Promise Neighborhood</b> is a federal Department of Education-supported program that brings together City departments and community-based organizations to transform a low-income, largely immigrant neighborhood by linking family economic security with student academic achievement. It creates a comprehensive, integrated framework of evidence-based services that responds to urgent needs and builds on the foundation of student, family, community, and school strengths and assets.</p> <p><b>The City’s Family Resource Center Initiative</b> brings national and local best practices in parent education and family support to high need communities. This inter-departmental program has tracks for parents of new</p>



Policy area	Homelessness	Asset Building/Homeownership	Employment	Youth/Education
				babies, preschoolers and young kids. It provides support for all parents so they can help each other in the knowledge that it “takes a village”.

An on-ramp is only as good as the system to which it connects. In some cases, those systems are not working as well as they could. City departments are working together with community-based organizations to determine situations where existing systems need to be tweaked or overhauled to achieve their intended effect. A critical part is changing the way the system works. If we want these efforts to result in lasting change, we must move beyond the coordination efforts often associated with an initiative to true integration and a new system that lasts beyond the efforts of any group of individuals driving the initiative. To do that will require some changes in the infrastructure that support the programs and services offered by the City.

**Community Voice**

Innovating means understanding problems and solutions at the ground level. The City must work alongside skilled and informed stakeholders that live in and know the neighborhoods and are able to work with us to pinpoint where systems are breaking down. These organized residents then hold everyone – the City, the nonprofit providers and their fellow residents themselves – accountable for measuring and achieving real results.

**Shared Data and Goals**

The first fundamental change is to create a mechanism to better share data across City agencies. Sharing data is critical as it allows us to identify specific families in multiple systems of care, who require multiple interventions. Understanding the complete needs of an individual and family helps City programs provide a more customized set of services to those families, ensure those services are coordinated, and identify where there are gaps in services that need to be addressed. Residents will be able to provide informed consent to participate in data sharing.

**Sector Based Approach to Workforce Development**

San Francisco has identified a sector, or industry-based approach to organize key aspects of its workforce development activities. Sector-based programs are skill-development that align training to meet the specific demands of growing or high demand industries. They incorporate case management, career counseling, and job search assistance for workers.

Sector strategies have emerged as a best practice within federal state and local policy. A recently published report by Public/Private Ventures, *Targeting Industries, Training Workers and Improving Opportunities*, through a longitudinal random assign study found that sector strategies have produced the following results:

- Participants in skills-training programs had decreases in poverty, from 64 percent to 35 percent.

- Participants in skills-training programs also accessed higher-quality jobs. The percentage of participants with health insurance available through their employers increased from 49 percent to 73 percent, while the percentage with paid sick leave increased from 35 percent to 58 percent.
- Many participants in skills-training programs obtained jobs in targeted sectors. Among advanced skills-training participants, these positions paid more than positions unrelated to training.
- Sectoral Employment Initiative participants believed the programs helped them achieve success in the labor market. Eighty-three percent of participants agreed that the training prepared them well for work in the targeted sector, and 78 percent said the program had improved their chances of getting a good job.
- Organizations using sectoral approaches other than or in addition to skills training demonstrated the potential to bring about systemic change. In very different contexts, through organizing and advocacy efforts or using leverage with industry contacts to negotiate with educational institutions, organizations either led or were involved in efforts that brought about significant changes to systems—changes that had the potential to benefit less-educated workers throughout the targeted sector.<sup>155</sup>

San Francisco’s proven sector strategy for workforce development is rooted in detailed economic analysis and forecasting performed by both the San Francisco Office of Economic Analysis (OEA) and the California Employment Development Department (EDD).

Since hitting the trough of the last business cycle in 2010, San Francisco has demonstrated its economic resiliency and recovery. In 2012, total employment in the City reached pre-recession levels<sup>156</sup>, and, since reaching this milestone, the unemployment rate has continued to steadily decline – standing at \_\_\_\_% as of the publishing of this report<sup>157</sup>.

The city is also out performing other large counties throughout the country. Between 2011-2012, San Francisco was the fastest growing large county in the United States as measured in annual private sector job growth. San Francisco’s recovery has also occurred across sectors with every sector in the city’s economy outpacing the US growth rate<sup>158</sup>.

The key characteristics of San Francisco’s Sector Based Approach include

- Identified four priority industries based upon employment growth, job accessibility to moderately skilled workers, career ladder opportunities, and providing self-sufficiency wages.
- Align skill development and occupational skills training to meet the workforce needs of these priority industries.
- Identify intermediaries who can engage industries serve as a bridge to social service providers that work intensively with disadvantaged participants.
- Integrate intensive case management into skill development and job training programs
- Implement and enforce policies that generate employment opportunities for San Francisco workers.

---

<sup>155</sup> Roder, Anne; Clymer, Carol; Wyckoff, Laura; *Targeting Industries, Training Workers and Improving Opportunities*; Public Private Ventures 2010

<sup>156</sup> Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2013

<sup>157</sup> California Employment Development Department, 2014

<sup>158</sup> Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2013

### ***Serious Collaboration***

The City will bring together public and philanthropic funding, tap into nonprofit expertise, and work with businesses and corporations to make sure that opportunity is accessible for all people in our communities and that every community can fully contribute its strengths and unique culture to our collective prosperity.

### **Economic Development**

For the first time since the closing of the Hunters Point Ship Yard real investment, nearly \$1 billion, is slated for the surrounding communities. From major public investment such as the redevelopment of public housing to significant private investment such as the development at the old Ship Yard and the Schlage Lock site, renewed activity in the southeast sector brings jobs, revitalizes buildings and neighborhoods and has the potential to transform communities.

One challenge is helping residents to get ready for such economic development. Many of the jobs that are available require different skill levels than most residents have. The City has been working with planning and contracting groups to try and forecast employment needs further out to give more time to prepare residents with the right skills. When there are many steps in the process, it is difficult to get the whole pipeline running smoothly. City departments, including MOHCD, OCII and OEWD, are working closely to develop training programs, provide life skills support, create job opportunities, and adjust employment systems that make this process more seamless.

### **Nonprofit Collaboration**

The City cannot do this work alone. There are hundreds of nonprofit organizations that provide critical services, reach out to residents and advocate for change. Without these organizations the social service delivery system simply will not work. However, through surveys and focus groups, we heard from residents that the quality of services was uneven. We also heard from nonprofits themselves that they lacked access to the kind of training and capacity building they believed they needed in order to reach their full potential. The City is working with community-based organizations (CBOs) through a number of capacity building City initiatives to develop new capacity building supports and deeper partnerships. This include the Capacity Building Project within the City's Controller's Office; MOHCD's capacity building programs; the Department of Children, Youth and their Family's capacity building programs; the Nonprofit Displacement Working Group; and the newly created Nonprofit Sector Initiative within the Office of Economic and Workforce Development.

### **Private Investment**

Reducing poverty is a major transformation that the public sector cannot do alone. There is an important role for philanthropy and the private sector to play in its implementation. The vast majority of new job creation will occur in the private sector.

The City sees foundations playing several roles:

- Providing expert advice
- Jointly funding critical enabling elements of the strategy
- Aligning other funding with the strategy
- Providing support for the strategy in the San Francisco public debate
- Helping identify and raise other philanthropic support

To that end, the City has newly created the position of Director of Strategic Partnerships within the Mayor's Office; this new position is focused on creating meaningful partnerships with private philanthropy to leverage private resources to support the City's work.

**How are the Jurisdiction poverty reducing goals, programs, and policies coordinated with this affordable housing plan**

All of San Francisco's anti-poverty efforts are dependent on availability of affordable housing to make the City's programs successful. Housing First to address homelessness must have housing units in which to place homeless households. First-time homebuyer programs must have homes affordable to those homebuyers to purchase, even with down payment or mortgage credit certificate assistance from the City. San Francisco's low-income labor force needs affordable housing near or within a reasonable commuting distance to be able participate in Four Sector employment programs offered by the City. Furthermore, safe, sanitary, stable and affordable living situations are critical to student success if they are involved in the SF Promise initiative or other education-focused systems. San Francisco knows it cannot thrive if it does not address the high housing cost and low housing supply challenges so MOHCD continues to work collaboratively with other City departments, nonprofit agencies, philanthropy and community stakeholders to interweave affordable housing in all of the various plans, programs or initiatives.

## **SP-80 Monitoring – 91.230**

**Describe the standards and procedures that the jurisdiction will use to monitor activities carried out in furtherance of the plan and will use to ensure long-term compliance with requirements of the programs involved, including minority business outreach and the comprehensive planning requirements**

### ***Monitoring for Community Development Activities***

#### **Managing Grants and Loans**

The Community Development Division of MOHCD will administer CDBG public facility, non-workforce development public service and organizational planning/capacity building activities; all ESG activities; and HOPWA rental assistance and supportive services programs. MOHCD's Housing Division will administer the housing activities of the CDBG and HOPWA programs; and all HOME activities. The Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) will administer CDBG economic development and workforce development activities.

Activities under the CDBG, ESG and HOPWA community development programs will be provided primarily through grant agreements with community-based non-profit organizations which provide a range of services, including legal, job training and placement, case management, information and referral, technical assistance to small businesses and micro-enterprises, homeless, homeless prevention and housing services.

MOHCD and OEWD will provide fiscal and programmatic monitoring of each project that receives CDBG, ESG and/or HOPWA funds. Monitoring will include both internal and on-site reviews. In addition, MOHCD will monitor construction projects for labor standards compliance related to the Davis-Bacon regulations. MOHCD will also monitor for access requirements related to Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act and the Americans With Disabilities Act. The City's Contract Monitoring Division will monitor for non-discrimination and Small Business Enterprise (SBE) requirements in contracting.

Since program year 2006-2007, MOHCD has been part of the steering committee for the City's Joint Fiscal and Compliance Monitoring Task Force, which serves to consolidate fiscal and compliance monitoring among various City departments. This consolidation effort increases communication among city departments, reduces multiple fiscal and compliance site visits to a single joint site visit or self-assessment, and decreases the administrative burden on both non-profit entities and City departments.

#### **For CDBG, ESG and HOPWA Grants**

Each agency receiving a CDBG, ESG and/or HOPWA grant will enter into a grant agreement that stipulates the conditions upon which the grant was awarded, the performance outputs and program outcomes to be met, and the budget. Regular program performance reports will be required of grant recipients, along with financial reports. Program site visits will be conducted to determine client eligibility, compliance with Federal and local requirements and program progress. Since most CDBG Public Services grants will qualify as limited clientele activities, recipient organizations will have to demonstrate that they are verifying income eligibility for their clients to MOHCD and OEWD grant coordinators/community builders at site visits.

For each grant, a MOHCD/OEWD grant coordinator/community builder will be responsible for providing technical assistance, reviewing progress reports, conducting on-site visits when appropriate, and evaluating performance outputs and program outcomes. The MOHCD/OEWD grant coordinator/community builder will also be responsible for reviewing monthly expenditure reports and monitoring for fiscal compliance with regulations and accounting policies.

#### For CDBG-Assisted Business Loans

Each loan recipient will be required to enter into an agreement that stipulates the loan conditions and repayment schedule. The borrower will be required to comply with a first source hiring agreement covering all jobs to be created as a condition of the loan.

#### Capacity Building for MOHCD/OEWD Staff and Delegate Agencies

MOHCD and OEWD will continue to invest in the training of its staff to build internal capacity so that MOHCD and OEWD can better assist its delegate agencies on both organizational and programmatic development. Organizational capacity building needs of delegate agencies include financial management, human resource management, technical assistance with compliance with federal and local regulations, Board of Directors development and program evaluation.

### ***Monitoring for Housing Activities***

#### **Single Family (Owner-Occupied) Properties**

MOHCD will continue to monitor single-family owner-occupied CDBG funded properties to ensure ongoing compliance with the program regulations and requirements. Monitoring activities will be carried out to ensure that owners of CDBG-assisted owner occupied properties continue to reside in the property; that they retain title to the property; and that property taxes are current.

#### **Multifamily Properties**

MOHCD will continue to monitor CDBG- and HOME-funded multifamily rental housing projects to ensure compliance with program requirements. Monitoring activities will include review of: (1) tenant income and rent schedules; (2) management and maintenance reports; and (3) income and expense statements, including financial statements and use of program income. MOHCD will continue to work with rental property owners and their property management agents to ensure ongoing compliance with tenant income and rent restrictions as well as HUD housing quality standards and local code.

The multi-family monitoring encompasses a wide range of housing types, including family and senior housing; housing for people with special needs; housing for people with AIDS/HIV; permanent housing for the homeless and those at risk of becoming homeless; and transitional housing for homeless families and individuals.

MOHCD will continue to inspect HOME- funded properties.

### ***Tracking Progress Towards the Consolidated Plan's Five-Year Targets***

MOHCD and OEWD consider monitoring their performance to be as important as identifying their goals. Their aim is to ensure that the City and its partners are marshaling its limited resources in an effective and coordinated way to create change in San Francisco's low-income communities. To be effective, MOHCD and OEWD have designed a performance measures matrix to ensure that community development and housing activities align with the Consolidated Plan's strategic goals. A five-year

performance measures matrix will be used to assess investment outcomes and outputs across the 2015-2019 timeframe of the Consolidated Plan. Performance under each measure will be tracked against a five-year goal and a one-year goal. Using the program matrix as a guide, MOHCD and OEWD will consistently measure performance towards program outcomes and provide ongoing feedback, adjustments, or sanction protocol as needed. This will ensure that the five-year Consolidated Plan will successfully serve as the roadmap to address its significant challenges through the implementation of its strategic goals and objectives.

## Action Plan

### AP-15 Expected Resources – 91.220(c)(1,2)

#### Introduction

For the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan five-year time period, San Francisco anticipates the use of federal CDBG, HOME, ESG and HOPWA funds as well as local funds for the housing and community development activities described in this Plan. Local funding sources include General Fund, Housing Trust Fund and housing impact fees.

#### Anticipated Resources

**Table 82 - Expected Resources – Priority Table**

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
CDBG	public - federal	Acquisition Admin and Planning Economic Development Housing Public Improvements Public Services	16,489,944	2,462,600	653,347	19,605,891	60,000,000	Assumes approximately 5% reduction in entitlement funds each year and program income of \$500k each year.



Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
HOME	public - federal	Acquisition Homebuyer assistance Homeowner rehab Multifamily rental new construction Multifamily rental rehab New construction for ownership TBRA	3,931,015	1,875,343	0	5,806,358	14,000,000	Assumes approximately 5% reduction in entitlement funds each year and program income of \$25k each year.

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
HOPWA	public - federal	Permanent housing in facilities Permanent housing placement Short term or transitional housing facilities STRMU Supportive services TBRA	7,461,390	100,772	0	7,562,162	27,000,000	Assumes approximately 5% reduction in entitlement funds each year and program income of \$100k each year.

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
ESG	public - federal	Conversion and rehab for transitional housing Financial Assistance Overnight shelter Rapid re-housing (rental assistance) Rental Assistance Services Transitional housing	1,482,125	0	0	1,482,125	5,000,000	Assumes approximately 5% reduction in entitlement funds each year and no program income.

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
General Fund	public - local	Acquisition Financial Assistance Homebuyer assistance Housing Multifamily rental new construction Multifamily rental rehab Public Services Rapid re-housing (rental assistance) Services Supportive services	10,000,000	0	0	10,000,000	40,000,000	Investments in Public Services and Housing from the City General Fund budget. Estimated at \$5,000,000 for services and \$5,000,000 for HOPE SF Housing each year.

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Remainder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
Housing Trust Fund	public - local	Acquisition Admin and Planning Homebuyer assistance Housing Multifamily rental new construction Multifamily rental rehab Public Improvements Rental Assistance	50,600,000	0	0	50,600,000	130,400,000	Local Housing Trust Fund (HTF). Total amount available in 2015-16 is \$50.6MM, of which \$25MM is borrowed and will be repaid from future HTF allocations. Outside of the borrowing, annual allocation increases \$2.8MM each year.

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
Other	public - local	Acquisition Admin and Planning Homebuyer assistance Housing Multifamily rental new construction Multifamily rental rehab	4,000,000	0	0	4,000,000	16,000,000	Annual program income from former Redevelopment Agency assets.
Other	public - local	Acquisition Admin and Planning Housing Multifamily rental new construction	100,000,000	0	0	100,000,000	30,000,000	Housing Impact Fees include Inclusionary In-Lieu fees, Jobs-Housing Linkage Fees, and Development Agreement Fees. Amount available in Year 1 includes anticipated unspent balances from prior years.

**Explain how federal funds will leverage those additional resources (private, state and local funds), including a description of how matching requirements will be satisfied**

San Francisco leverages local and state dollars to support its community development activities in various ways.

The City's Housing Trust Fund provides funding for affordable housing development, homeownership counseling, eviction prevention, access to rental housing, downpayment assistance, neighborhood infrastructure, and homeowner home rehabilitation.

The South of Market Community Stabilization Fund provides resources to assist vulnerable South of Market residents and support affordable housing, economic development and community cohesion through a residential impact fee imposed on residential developers in that specific neighborhood.

The City's General Fund supports additional projects at MOHCD, primarily focusing on legal services for immigrants and for residents facing eviction; revitalization efforts in public housing, including HOPE SF and the City's RAD public housing conversion projects; increased support for neighborhood-based services; increased support for immigrant communities seeking additional training in foundational life skills and transitions to self-sufficiency, and community planning efforts with residents in low-income communities.

In addition to CDBG workforce dollars, OEWD leverages WIA and local funds to execute local workforce development strategies. WIA funds a comprehensive range of workforce development activities to benefit job seekers, laid off workers, youth, incumbent workers, new entrants to the workforce, veterans, persons with disabilities, and employers. The purpose of these activities is to promote an increase in the employment, job retention, earnings, and occupational skills improvement by participants.

The ESG program requires a match in an amount that equals the amount of ESG funds provided by HUD. Matching contributions may be obtained from any source, including any federal resource other than the ESG program, as well as state, local and private sources. According to the ESG regulations, the City may comply with this requirement by providing the matching funds itself, or through matching funds provided by any ESG sub-recipient. San Francisco will comply with this requirement with non-ESG funds that will be provided by ESG sub-recipients to support the emergency shelter, rapid re-housing and/or homeless prevention activities that are supported by ESG funding.

HOME regulations require that participating jurisdictions match federal HOME funds that are used for housing development, rental assistance or down payment assistance with local sources at a rate of 25%. The City intends to satisfy this requirement by allocating sufficient funds from the Affordable Housing Fund for this purpose.

**If appropriate, describe publically owned land or property located within the jurisdiction that may be used to address the needs identified in the plan**

San Francisco currently leverages publicly owned land to strategically deliver essential services when possible. For example, a number of social service hubs are operated out of City-owned buildings that are master-leased to community based organizations. In addition, many youth services are located within

elementary, middle, or high schools within the public school system as part of San Francisco's "Beacon" program. Visitacion Valley, a HUD-approved NRSA, is an excellent example of this leveraging, as it has two different multi-tenant buildings owned by the City and leased to nonprofits to provide a range of childcare, youth, family resource, and senior services, in addition to a public-school base youth services Beacon Center.

In 2002, the City of San Francisco passed an ordinance requiring the transfer of underutilized or surplus property to the Mayor's Office of Housing for the development of affordable housing, particularly housing for the homeless.

Properties that are suitable for housing development are to be sold or leased to a non-profit for the development of affordable housing for the homeless and households earning less than 20 percent of Area Median Income or the property is sold and those proceeds are used to develop affordable housing for the homeless, or affordable housing for households earning less than 60 percent of AMI. Additionally MOHCD works with other agencies not subject to the Surplus Property Ordinance to acquire properties they deem surplus and develop the sites into affordable housing such as land from the San Francisco Unified School District, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, and the Port of San Francisco.

Under this year's Action Plan, MOHCD will issue between two to four Request for Proposals for developing four sites owned by MOHCD into affordable housing for low-income families or special need populations such as very low-income seniors or Transition-Age Youth. Specific sites to be made available for development through RFPs include a site at 1950 Mission Street that was purchased from the San Francisco Unified School District. Another site to be offered under a RFP is a site MOHCD purchased from the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission at 2070 Folsom Street.

## **Discussion**

San Francisco will continue to leverage local, state, federal and private philanthropic dollars to maximize the effectiveness of HUD funds. The City strategically seek out other governmental funding opportunities such as Choice Neighborhood, Byrne, Promise Neighborhood, and other sources that support its integrated inter-departmental strategies of community revitalization. The City also utilizes its own property as appropriate to support the needs of the Consolidated Plan. In particular, the City has prioritized all appropriate surplus property to be dedicated first to affordable housing development, demonstrating the strong commitment the City has towards providing housing for its neediest residents.



## Annual Goals and Objectives

### AP-20 Annual Goals and Objectives

#### Goals Summary Information

**Table 83 – Goals Summary**

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
1	Increased Supply of Affordable Housing	2015	2019	Affordable Housing Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Develop and Maintain Affordable Housing	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix
2	Preserve and Maintain Affordable Housing Supply	2015	2019	Affordable Housing Public Housing Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Develop and Maintain Affordable Housing	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
3	Increased Affordability of Rental Housing	2015	2019	Affordable Housing Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Make Housing Affordable	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix
4	Increased Opportunities for Sustainable Homeownership	2015	2019	Affordable Housing	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Make Housing Affordable	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
5	Increase Access to Rental and Homeownership Housing	2015	2019	Affordable Housing Public Housing Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Make Housing Affordable	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix
6	Reduced Rate of Evictions	2015	2019	Affordable Housing Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs Non-Housing Community Development	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Prevent and End Homelessness	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
7	Transitional Housing is Available for Those Who Need It	2015	2019	Affordable Housing Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Prevent and End Homelessness	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix
8	Homeless People Receive Basic Shelter and Support Services	2015	2019	Homeless Non-Housing Community Development	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Prevent and End Homelessness	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
9	Increased Access to Services for Public Housing Residents	2015	2019	Public Housing Non-Housing Community Development	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Provide Supportive Housing Services	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix
10	Increased Access to Permanent Supportive Housing and Transitional Housing for PLWHA	2015	2019	Affordable Housing Non-Homeless Special Needs	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Provide Supportive Housing Services	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
11	Key Nonprofit Service Providers Have High Quality Facilities	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Enhance Community Facilities and Spaces	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix
12	Enhanced Public Spaces	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Enhance Community Facilities and Spaces	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
13	Thriving, Locally-Owned Small Businesses	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Strengthen Small Businesses and Commercial Corridors	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix
14	Robust Commercial Corridors in Low-Income Neighborhoods	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Strengthen Small Businesses and Commercial Corridors	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
15	Increased Supports for Residents to Convene and Build Social Capital	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Increase Community Cohesion	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix
16	Increased Capacity for Community-Based Organizations	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Increase Community Cohesion	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix



Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
17	Increased Job Readiness	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Promote Workforce Development	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix
18	Increased Occupational Skills that Match Labor Market Needs	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Promote Workforce Development	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
19	Access to Job Opportunities for Disadvantaged San Francisco Residents	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Promote Workforce Development	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix
20	Improved Service Connections	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Promote Economic Advancement through Barrier Removal	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
21	Improved Foundational Competencies and Access to Job Training and Employment Opportunities for Disconnected Populations	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Promote Economic Advancement through Barrier Removal	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix
22	Increased Job Retention and Advancement Supports Through Legal and Other Related Services	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Promote Economic Advancement through Barrier Removal	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
23	Improved Financial Literacy and Management	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley	Promote Economic Advancement through Barrier Removal	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	See Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix

## Goal Descriptions

**Table 84 – Goal Descriptions**

1	<b>Goal Name</b>	Increased Supply of Affordable Housing
	<b>Goal Description</b>	New affordable and permanent supportive housing units will be developed.
2	<b>Goal Name</b>	Preserve and Maintain Affordable Housing Supply
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Existing affordable housing units will be preserved or maintained through remediating lead-based paint hazards, rehabilitating multiunit and single family homes; rehabilitation and conversion of public housing to nonprofit ownership and management under the RAD Program; and rebuilding dilapidated public housing under HOPE SF.
3	<b>Goal Name</b>	Increased Affordability of Rental Housing
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Pursue long-term rental support to provide deep affordability for permanent supportive housing.
4	<b>Goal Name</b>	Increased Opportunities for Sustainable Homeownership
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Programs to assist potential and existing homeowners will be expanded with education programs, down payment assistance and the continuation of successful homeownership programs.
5	<b>Goal Name</b>	Increase Access to Rental and Homeownership Housing
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Improve housing application system and the capacity of community-based organizations that assist clients find rental and homeownership opportunities.
6	<b>Goal Name</b>	Reduced Rate of Evictions
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Legal services and counseling will be provided to counsel individuals before a notice of unlawful detainer is filed, and full-scope representation will be offered to individuals who need legal services after having received notice.
7	<b>Goal Name</b>	Transitional Housing is Available for Those Who Need It
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Operating support will be provided to transitional housing facilities as appropriate, with priority given to vulnerable populations such as survivors of domestic violence.

8	<b>Goal Name</b>	Homeless People Receive Basic Shelter and Support
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Homeless individuals, particularly those in emergency shelters, will be provided supportive services focusing on providing foundational skills and transitioning them to more stable housing.
9	<b>Goal Name</b>	Increased Access to Services for Public Housing Residents
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Provide support services for public housing residents to assist them with transition of their public housing from housing authority control to nonprofit ownership and management under the RAD or HOPE SF programs.
10	<b>Goal Name</b>	Increased Access to Permanent Supportive Housing and Transitional Housing for PLWHA
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Operating support and program support will be provided to residential care facilities for the chronically ill serving PLWHA, and to transitional housing specifically targeting PLWHA.
11	<b>Goal Name</b>	Key Nonprofit Service Providers Have High Quality Facilities
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Capital funds will be made available for rehabilitation, tenant improvements, and new construction for community facilities, as well as providing service providers with capital needs assessments and asset reserve analyses to ensure long-term sustainability of these facilities.
12	<b>Goal Name</b>	Enhanced Public Spaces
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Funding will be made available to enhance public spaces, focusing on greening efforts in low-income communities and enhancements to neighborhoods impacted by increased housing density.
13	<b>Goal Name</b>	Thriving, Locally-Owned Small Businesses
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Community Development Block Grants will be utilized to provide a variety of support for small businesses and entrepreneurs in San Francisco. Central to this support is technical assistance for entrepreneurs who want to establish a new microenterprise or small business, and for owners who seek to strengthen or expand their existing small business.
14	<b>Goal Name</b>	Robust Commercial Corridors in Low-Income Neighborhoods
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Community Development Block Grants will be utilized to strengthen commercial corridors in low- and moderate-income areas. Activities fall in a variety of categories including business attraction, physical improvements to businesses and in neighborhoods, and capacity-building to help neighborhood stakeholders manage and improve commercial districts.

15	<b>Goal Name</b>	Increased Supports for Residents to Convene and Build Social Capital
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Community planning efforts will be supported that bring together residents to build social capital in low-income communities, including programming that allows residents to invest directly in community building grant opportunities.
16	<b>Goal Name</b>	Increased Capacity for Community-Based Organizations
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Community based organizations will be supported by strategic capacity building and technical assistance.
17	<b>Goal Name</b>	Increased Job Readiness
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Individuals will be provided with services that help build job search competencies.
18	<b>Goal Name</b>	Increased Occupational Skills that Match Labor Market Needs
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Individuals will be provided with job-driven, sector-specific occupational skills training.
19	<b>Goal Name</b>	Access to Job Opportunities for Disadvantaged San Francisco Residents
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Individuals will be provided with priority access to potential job opportunities.
20	<b>Goal Name</b>	Improved Service Connections
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Community centers that serve as neighborhood and constituency hubs will be enhanced through service connection resources that allow residents to better access the existing social service infrastructure citywide and in their neighborhoods
21	<b>Goal Name</b>	Improved Foundational Competencies and Access to Job Training and Employment Opportunities for Disconnected Populations
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Individuals will be provided with foundational competencies that will move them into the City's workforce development system and provide them skills towards achieving economic self-sufficiency

<b>22</b>	<b>Goal Name</b>	Increased Job Retention and Advancement Supports Through Legal and Other Related Services
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Individuals will be provided with legal services and other tools that will allow them to maintain their residency and employment and feel safe where they are living to ensure their ability to move towards self-sufficiency
<b>23</b>	<b>Goal Name</b>	Improved Financial Literacy and Management
	<b>Goal Description</b>	Individuals and families will be provided with financial literacy skills linked to key financial events in their lives that will promote asset building and increase housing stability



# Projects

## AP-35 Projects – 91.220(d)

### Introduction

San Francisco's 2015-2016 proposed projects are listed in AP-38 Project Summary.

### **Describe the reasons for allocation priorities and any obstacles to addressing underserved needs**

Allocation priorities are driven by the needs as determined by needs assessments, focus groups, resident surveys, input from community-based organizations, and analyses of existing investments by the City. MOHCD consults with the executive leadership of other City departments to coordinate funding and programmatic strategies to ensure maximum leverage. Given MOHCD's limited resources, priorities are given to those areas which maximize MOHCD's expertise in affordable housing and advancing economic opportunities.

Many of our residents are disenfranchised based on their limited income, disability status, cultural or language barriers, or other characteristics that make it difficult for them to adequately access services. San Francisco has identified eight overarching challenges that have a widespread effect on the well-being of its residents. Some are common to urban cities and counties. Some are especially significant for San Francisco. The eight challenges are:

- Lack of affordable housing (discussed in Housing Market Analysis);
- Concentration of low-income communities;
- Income disparity;
- Linguistic and cultural isolation;
- Education disparity;
- Immigrant workforce;
- Digital divide; and
- Lack of asset building opportunities.

## **AP-38 Project Summary**

### **Project Summary Information**

The proposed projects are listed by funding source (i.e., CDBG, ESG, HOPWA, HOME, General Fund, Housing Trust Fund, Other Funding Sources) and then by Consolidated Plan goals. Proposed projects that are funded by more than one funding source will be listed separately under each of the funding sources.

## 2015-2016 CDBG Projects

This list of CDBG-funded projects is organized by five-year objectives, priority needs and goals that are described in the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan. While a project may meet more than one goal, it is only listed under its primary goal.

### Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed

- Priority Need 1A: Develop and Maintain Affordable Housing
  - Goal 1Aii. Preserve and Maintain Affordable Housing Supply

Agency Name	Project Description	2015-2016 Funding Amount
Asian Neighborhood Design	Architectural/planning services for MOHCD funded housing projects	\$50,828
Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center	Residential building rehabilitation	\$27,750
Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center	Residential building rehabilitation	\$35,000
Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center	Residential building rehabilitation	\$35,000
Chinatown Community Development Center	Residential building rehabilitation	\$19,005
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	Housing development pool - CDBG (includes \$1,500,000 of CDBG program income in a revolving loan pool)	\$4,410,207
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	Lead hazard reduction program matching funds	\$450,000
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	Housing program delivery	\$675,000
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	Housing development grant funding pool	\$379,797
Rebuilding Together San Francisco	Critical home repairs for homeowners	\$30,000
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation	Preservation of existing housing portfolio/recapitalization	\$3,820
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation	Residential building rehabilitation at scattered sites	\$123,270
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$6,239,677</b>

➤ Priority Need 1B: Make Housing Affordable

- Goal 1Bii. Increased opportunities for sustainable homeownership

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>2015-2016 Funding Amount</b>
ASIAN, Inc.	Pre-purchase and foreclosure intervention counseling services	\$50,000
Consumer Credit Counseling Service of San Francisco	Pre-purchase homeownership counseling and information and referral services	\$50,000
Housing and Economic Rights Advocates	Foreclosure intervention services through legal counseling and representation	\$50,000
Mission Economic Development Agency	Pre- and post-purchase homebuyer education and counseling services, including foreclosure prevention	\$70,000
San Francisco Community Land Trust	Education and technical assistance for residents and boards of existing and proposed co-ops	\$36,000
San Francisco Housing Development Corporation	Pre- and post-purchase homebuyer education counseling and information and referral services	\$50,000
SF LGBT Community Center	Pre-purchase homebuyer education and counseling services	\$50,000
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$356,000</b>

- Goal 1Biii. Increase access to rental and homeownership housing

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>2015-2016 Funding Amount</b>
Homeless Prenatal Program, Inc.	Short-term financial assistance and workshops to help families obtain and retain safe housing	\$65,000
Independent Living Resource Center of SF	Rental housing counseling, financial management education and application assistance services for primarily disabled persons	\$35,000
San Francisco AIDS Foundation	Housing information and referral project	\$71,334
Self-Help for the Elderly	Tenant counseling, advocacy and eviction prevention assistance primarily for elderly renters	\$25,000
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$196,334</b>

➤ Priority Need 1C: Prevent and End Homelessness

- Goal 1Ci. Reduced rate of evictions

Agency Name	Project Description	2015-2016 Funding Amount
Chinatown Community Development Center	Tenant counseling primarily for monolingual Chinese households	\$50,000
Compass Family Services	Homeless and eviction prevention services and housing counseling for individuals and families	\$40,000
San Francisco Study Center - Housing Rights Committee of San Francisco	Tenant counseling, advocacy and education for renters to ensure housing stability and avoid eviction	\$60,000
Self-Help for the Elderly	Housing counseling and placement assistance	\$25,000
Tenderloin Housing Clinic, Inc.	Legal counseling and representation for tenants threatened with eviction	\$42,500
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$217,500</b>

- Goal 1Ciii. Homeless people receive basic shelter and support services

Agency Name	Project Description	2015-2016 Funding Amount
Central City Hospitality House	Shelter services primarily for single men	\$65,000
Community Awareness & Treatment Services	Shelter services primarily for women	\$50,000
Mission Neighborhood Health Center	Leadership development and case management services for homeless persons	\$46,873
YMCA of San Francisco (Bayview)	Respite services for homeless persons	\$50,000
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$211,873</b>

➤ Priority Need 1D: Provide Supportive Housing Services

- Goal 1Di. Increased access to services for public housing residents

Agency Name	Project Description	2015-2016 Funding Amount
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	HOPE SF program delivery	\$75,000
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$75,000</b>

**Objective 2: Communities Have Healthy Physical, Social, and Business Infrastructure**

➤ Priority Need 2A: Enhance Community Facilities and Spaces

- Goal 2Ai. Key nonprofit service providers have high quality facilities

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>2015-2016 Funding Amount</b>
Asian Neighborhood Design	Architectural/planning services for MOHCD funded capital projects	\$45,000
Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center	Renovation of HVAC, roof and ceiling, exterior weatherproofing, HVAC/water heater and doors at a multipurpose facility	\$99,015
Boys & Girls Clubs of San Francisco	Replace heating unit in a community youth facility	\$42,500
Brava! for Women in the Arts	Tenant improvements to interior programming and office space at a multipurpose facility	\$37,275
Chinese for Affirmative Action	Construction of a hydraulic elevator and data cable routing and installation at a multipurpose facility	\$200,000
Donaldina Cameron House	Renovation of kitchen in a multipurpose facility	\$168,362
Epiphany Center (DBA for Mount St. Joseph-St. Elizabeth)	Removal of ADA barriers and kitchen renovation in a child development and family support services facility	\$89,000
Friendship House Association of American Indians	Renovation of restroom space in a rehabilitation housing development facility	\$70,000
Justice & Diversity Center of the Bar Association of San Francisco	Replacement of roof of a facility offering homeless advocacy and legal support services	\$60,000
Maitri Compassionate Care	Renovation of roof, ADA barrier removal, fire and alarm system, electrical upgrades and façade at residential care facility serving persons with HIV/AIDS	\$139,768
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	Capital program delivery	\$327,512
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	Tenant improvements for nonprofit space in the Jessie Hotel (includes \$500,000 in CDBG program income)	\$946,949
Mission Neighborhood Centers	Tenant improvements to expand a planned childcare facility and to create office space for child care staff and space for family counseling	\$105,700
Portola Family Connections	Renovation of roof in a facility serving children and families	\$168,300

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>2015-2016 Funding Amount</b>
Richmond District Neighborhood Center	Construction of ADA ramp and renovation of sewer line at a multipurpose facility	\$82,509
San Francisco Housing Development Corporation	Tenant improvements for reconfiguration of office space and HVAC renovation in a facility that provides housing, financial counseling and supportive services	\$87,000
Wu Yee Children's Services	Rehabilitation of HVAC system in a facility that provides child development and family support services	\$64,473
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$2,733,363</b>

- Goal 2Aii. Enhanced public spaces

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>2015-2016 Funding Amount</b>
Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure	Capital improvements to Shoreview Park (funded from CDBG program income)	\$462,600
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$462,600</b>

➤ Priority Need 2B: Strengthen Small Businesses and Commercial Corridors

- Goal 2Bi. Thriving, locally-owned small businesses

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>2015-2016 Funding Amount</b>
La Cocina	Kitchen incubator and technical assistance for food based micro-entrepreneurs	\$50,000
Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights of the San Francisco Bay Area	Legal services for entrepreneurs	\$75,000
Mission Asset Fund	Building credit and access to capital for micro-entrepreneurs	\$50,000
Mission Economic Development Agency	Technical assistance for Mission Bernal commercial corridor businesses	\$25,000
Mission Economic Development Agency	Technical assistance for Mission Street (16th-25th) commercial corridor businesses	\$25,000
Mission Economic Development Agency	Technical assistance in English and Spanish for micro-entrepreneurs	\$75,000
Northeast Community Federal Credit Union	Business technical assistance on ADA Compliance	\$75,000
OEWD/Small Business Development Center	Technical assistance for small businesses	\$166,561

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>2015-2016 Funding Amount</b>
Office of Economic and Workforce Development	Section 108 repayment contingency	\$262,308
Pacific Community Ventures	Access to capital and technical assistance for small businesses	\$45,000
Renaissance Entrepreneurship Center	Technical assistance for micro-entrepreneurs	\$75,000
Renaissance Entrepreneurship Center	Technical assistance in English and Spanish to women entrepreneurs	\$40,000
Renaissance Entrepreneurship Center	Technical assistance BizFitSF for Leland Avenue commercial corridor small businesses	\$25,000
SF LGBT Community Center	Technical assistance, credit building microloans, workshops and mentorship	\$45,000
SFMade	Technical assistance for local manufacturers	\$65,000
South of Market Foundation	Technical assistance with focus on loan packaging	\$65,000
South of Market Foundation	Technical assistance for Central Market commercial corridor businesses	\$25,000
South of Market Foundation	Technical assistance for Tenderloin commercial corridor businesses	\$25,000
Southeast Asian Community Center	Technical assistance for Larkin Street/Little Saigon commercial corridor businesses	\$25,000
Southeast Asian Community Center	Technical assistance for Sunset District commercial corridor businesses	\$25,000
Southeast Asian Community Center	Technical assistance in English and Chinese for small businesses citywide	\$75,000
Wu Yee Children's Services	Technical assistance for child care businesses	\$45,000
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$1,383,869</b>

- Goal 2Bii. Robust commercial corridors in low-income neighborhoods

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>2015-2016 Funding Amount</b>
Bay Area Community Resource/Excelsior Action Group	Excelsior commercial corridor revitalization	\$70,000
Bay Area Community Resource/Portola Neighborhood Association	Portola San Bruno Avenue commercial corridor revitalization	\$70,000
North of Market Neighborhood Improvement Corp.	Tenderloin commercial corridor revitalization	\$45,000
Ocean Avenue Association	Ocean Avenue commercial corridor revitalization and technical assistance	\$30,000



<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>2015-2016 Funding Amount</b>
Renaissance Entrepreneurship Center	Technical assistance BizFitSF for Third Street commercial corridor small businesses	\$75,000
South of Market Foundation	Technical assistance and commercial corridor assistance for Fillmore/Western Addition commercial corridor	\$40,000
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$330,000</b>

➤ Priority Need 2C: Increase Community Cohesion

- Goal 2Cii. Increased capacity for community-based organizations

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>2015-2016 Funding Amount</b>
HomeownershipSF	Capacity building for a collaborative of five agencies that provide homeownership assistance	\$45,000
Northern California Community Loan Fund	Asset management planning for CDBG/HOPWA-eligible facilities	\$64,076
Prevent Child Abuse California	Organizational capacity building through participation in the Family Economic Success Certification Program, which offers training and peer support to nonprofit benefits providers	\$20,000
Richmond District Neighborhood Center	Organizational capacity building through participation in SF Neighborhood Centers Together, which offers training and peer support to Executive Directors	\$38,000
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$167,076</b>

**Objective 3: Families and Individuals are Resilient and Economically Self-Sufficient**

➤ Priority Need 3A: Promote Workforce Development

- Goal 3Ai. Increased job readiness

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>2015-2016 Funding Amount</b>
Central City Hospitality House	Neighborhood Access Point	\$100,000
Collective Impact (dba Mo' Magic)	Neighborhood Access Point and Young Adult WorkLink Services	\$70,000
Goodwill Industries of San Francisco, San Mateo & Marin Counties	Criminal justice and re-entry services in support of the One Stop system	\$125,000
Hearing and Speech Center of	Neighborhood Access Point and Young	\$42,500

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>2015-2016 Funding Amount</b>
Northern California	Adult WorkLink Services	
Positive Resource Center	Neighborhood Access Point	\$100,000
Vietnamese Youth Development Center	Young Adult Bridge services	\$60,000
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$497,500</b>

- Goal 3Aii. Increased occupational skills that match labor market needs

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>2015-2016 Funding Amount</b>
Bayview Hunter's Point Center for Arts & Technology	Young Adult Bridge services	\$75,000
Community Housing Partnership	Vocational skills training in the hospitality sector	\$75,000
Episcopal Community Services of SF	Vocational skills training in the hospitality sector	\$100,000
In-Home Supportive Services Consortium of San Francisco, Inc.	Vocational skills training in the health care sector	\$75,000
Mission Hiring Hall	Vocational skills training in the hospitality sector	\$150,000
Mission Language and Vocational School, Inc.	Vocational skills training in the health care sector	\$100,000
Office of Economic and Workforce Development	Workforce development services	\$90,000
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$665,000</b>

- Goal 3Aiii. Access to job opportunities for disadvantaged San Francisco residents

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>2015-2016 Funding Amount</b>
Community Center Pjt of SF (dba the San Francisco LGBT Community Center)	Neighborhood Access Point	\$120,000
Compass Family Services	Neighborhood Access Point	\$50,000
Mission Economic Development Agency	Neighborhood Access Point	\$152,000
Toolworks	Neighborhood Access Point	\$55,000
Upwardly Global	Neighborhood Access Point	\$75,000
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$452,000</b>

➤ Priority Need 3B: Promote Economic Advancement Through Barrier Removal

- Goal 3Bi. Improved service connections

Agency Name	Project Description	2015-2016 Funding Amount
APA Family Support Services/SCDC	Service connection in housing assistance, immigration and naturalization, employment, senior services, advocacy, information and referrals and outreach primarily for Samoan and Pacific Islander communities	\$50,000
Arab Cultural and Community Center	Culturally and linguistically specific resources that address safety, economic, housing and workplace needs for individual and families	\$50,000
Community Youth Center-San Francisco (CYC-SF)	Culturally competent and linguistically acceptable social services primarily for Asian residents in the Bayview, including access to employment, family support, childcare services, education, financial literacy, housing counseling and other supportive services	\$50,000
Filipino-American Development Foundation: Filipino Community Center	Bilingual and bicultural case management services primarily for the Filipino community	\$70,000
Hearing and Speech Center of Northern California	Increase the early identification of hearing loss, support participants in accepting this loss, and connect them to services that can provide treatment and help them to thrive	\$50,000
Lavender Youth Rec. & Info. Ct.(LYRIC)	Youth advocacy and case management services primarily for LGBTQQ transitional age youth between ages 18 and 24 to connect them to urgently needed resources, build their capacity to improve their lives and support them in moving toward self sufficiency	\$50,000
United Playaz	Case management and support services to direct youth away from influences that sustain at risk behavior and towards strengthening skills for self-sufficiency and becoming agents of change for their community	\$55,000
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$375,000</b>

- Goal 3Bii. Improved foundational competencies and access to job training and employment opportunities for disconnected populations

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>2015-2016 Funding Amount</b>
Booker T. Washington Community Service Center	Academic support, technology training, life skills and coaching for transitional age youth	\$40,000
Community Youth Center-San Francisco (CYC-SF)	Academic assistance, life skills building and support for at-risk, underserved young adults to enhance their educational/career outlook	\$50,000
Donaldina Cameron House	ESL and job readiness classes primarily for new immigrants	\$50,000
Episcopal Community Services of San Francisco	Foundational competencies programming, primarily for homeless adults	\$70,000
Homies Organizing the Mission to Empower Youth (HOMEY)	Foundational competencies programming, primarily for individuals re-entering from the correctional system	\$50,000
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	Program delivery for direct services	\$45,000
Mission Language and Vocational School, Inc.	Foundational academic competencies, primarily for adults in the Mission District	\$50,000
Mission Neighborhood Centers	Academic foundational competencies programming and GED preparation for transitional aged youth	\$55,000
Positive Resource Center	Employment and academic foundational competencies programming, primarily for people with HIV/AIDS or mental health disabilities	\$50,000
San Francisco Conservation Corps	Academic foundational competencies programming for transitional aged youth	\$50,000
Sunset District Comm. Develop. Corp.	Foundational competencies programming and intensive case management on youths at risk or involved with the juvenile justice system	\$50,000
The Arc San Francisco	Foundational competencies programming for adults with developmental disabilities	\$50,000
Together United Recommitted Forever (T.U.R.F.)	Foundational competencies programming and case management, primarily for transitional aged youth in Sunnydale	\$50,000
Urban Services YMCA	Foundational competencies programming primarily for transitional aged youth in the Excelsior	\$55,000

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>2015-2016 Funding Amount</b>
Vietnamese Youth Development Center	Academic foundational competencies programming, primarily for recent immigrants and transitional aged youth in the Tenderloin	\$50,000
YMCA of San Francisco (Bayview)	Foundational competencies programming and case management, primarily for transitional aged youth in Bayview	\$55,000
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$820,000</b>

- Goal 3Biii. Increased job retention and advancement supports through legal and other related services

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>2015-2016 Funding Amount</b>
AIDS Legal Referral Panel of the SF Bay Area	Legal services primarily for immigrants with HIV	\$82,000
Asian Americans Advancing Justice - Asian Law Caucus	Legal services primarily for recent immigrants	\$52,000
Bay Area Legal Aid	Legal representation and counseling regarding housing issues, economic self-sufficiency and issues faced by survivors of domestic violence	\$100,000
Central American Resource Center (CARECEN)	Legal services primarily for immigrants	\$80,000
Dolores Street Community Services	Legal services primarily for African immigrants	\$50,000
Instituto Laboral de la Raza	Legal services primarily for immigrant workers	\$60,000
La Raza Centro Legal	Legal services primarily for immigrants	\$50,000
La Raza Community Resource Center	Legal services primarily for immigrants	\$80,000
Nihonmachi Legal Outreach	Culturally and linguistically competent social and legal services primarily for the API community, including legal representation, counseling and referrals in a wide range of civil legal issues	\$75,000
Positive Resource Center	Legal representation and advocacy regarding SSI benefits	\$50,000
Swords to Plowshares Veterans Rights Organization	Legal services to secure VA benefits for homeless and low-income veterans	\$81,111
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$760,111</b>

- Goal 3Biv. Improved financial literacy and management

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>2015-2016 Funding Amount</b>
Consumer Credit Counseling Service of San Francisco	Provide high-volume, quality, one-on-one financial counseling services to low-income San Franciscans through targeted referral systems developed in partnership with the Office of Economic Empowerment and partner city agencies.	\$100,000
Mission Asset Fund	Financial education, coaching and access to loans for primarily immigrants	\$65,000
Mission Economic Development Agency	Financial education and coaching through workshops and individual counseling for primarily Spanish-speaking families	\$50,000
Mission SF Community Financial Center	Financial coaching and credit-building services to reduce and eliminate barriers to asset building	\$50,000
Northeast Community Federal Credit Union	Financial education and credit building/repair counseling services primarily for the unbanked population	\$50,000
San Francisco Housing Development Corporation	Financial education counseling and coaching services primarily for Bayview Hunters Point, Visitacion Valley, Potrero Hill and Western Additional residents	\$50,000
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$365,000</b>

#### General Administration

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>2015-2016 Funding Amount</b>
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	General CDBG administration and planning	\$3,297,988
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$3,297,988</b>

**TOTAL 2015-2016 CDBG:        \$19,605,891**

## 2015-2016 ESG Projects

This list of ESG-funded projects is organized by five-year objectives, priority needs and goals that are described in the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan. While a project may meet more than one goal, it is only listed under its primary goal.

### Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed

➤ Priority Need 1B: Make Housing Affordable

- Goal 1Biii. Increase access to rental and homeownership housing

Agency Name	Project Description	2015-2016 Funding Amount
Hamilton Family Center, Inc.	Rental assistance to assist families avoid eviction and become stably housed	\$33,333
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$33,333</b>

➤ Priority Need 1C: Prevent and End Homelessness

- Goal 1Ci. Reduced rate of evictions

Agency Name	Project Description	2015-2016 Funding Amount
AIDS Housing Alliance	Homeless prevention and rapid rehousing primarily for HIV+ persons	\$120,000
Catholic Charities CYO (AHHP)	Tenant based rental assistance for at-risk or homeless persons	\$190,000
Hamilton Family Center, Inc	Tenant based rental assistance and housing counseling for individuals and families	\$87,274
Justice & Diversity Center of the Bar Association of San Francisco	Eviction prevention legal services, including services focused on individuals with mental health disabilities	\$90,000
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$487,274</b>

- Goal 1Cii. Transitional housing is available for those who need it

Agency Name	Project Description	2015-2016 Funding Amount
Gum Moon Residence Hall	Shelter beds in a comprehensive transitional housing program primarily for Asian immigrant women who are survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault	\$55,000
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$55,000</b>

- Goal 1Ciii. Homeless people receive basic shelter and support services

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>2015-2016 Funding Amount</b>
Asian Women's Shelter	Shelter services primarily for Asian and Pacific Islander women who are victims of domestic violence	\$102,000
Compass Family Services	Shelter services for homeless families	\$87,000
Dolores Street Community Services	Shelter services primarily for homeless men	\$52,176
Episcopal Community Services of San Francisco	Shelter services for homeless persons	\$81,116
Friendship House Association of American Indians	Recovery services primarily for homeless Native Americans	\$55,000
Hamilton Family Center, Inc.	Shelter services for homeless families	\$50,000
Homeless Children's Network	Case management services for homeless families with children	\$50,000
La Casa de las Madres	Shelter services primarily for Spanish speaking women who are victims of domestic violence	\$150,000
Larkin Street Youth Services	Shelter services for homeless youth	\$112,000
Providence Foundation	Shelter services for homeless persons	\$45,000
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$784,292</b>

#### **General Administration**

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>2015-2016 Funding Amount</b>
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	HMIS	\$11,067
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	General ESG administration	\$111,159
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$122,226</b>

**TOTAL 2015-2016 ESG:            \$1,482,125**



## 2015-2016 HOPWA Projects

MOHCD serves as the lead agency for the HOPWA program for the San Francisco EMSA, which consists of San Francisco and San Mateo Counties.

### San Francisco HOPWA Recommendations

This list of HOPWA-funded projects is organized by five-year objectives, priority needs and goals that are described in the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan. While a recommended project may meet more than one goal, it is only listed under its primary goal.

#### Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed

- Priority Need 1B: Make Housing Affordable
  - Goal 1Biii. Increase access to rental and homeownership housing

Agency Name	Project Description	2015-2016 Funding Amount
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	Housing information and referral project	\$13,000
San Francisco AIDS Foundation	Housing information and referral project	\$35,000
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$48,000</b>

- Priority Need 1D: Provide Supportive Housing Services
  - Goal 1Dii. Increased access to permanent supportive housing and transitional housing for PLWHA

Agency Name	Project Description	2015-2016 Funding Amount
Black Coalition on AIDS	Transitional housing for persons with HIV/AIDS	\$50,000
Catholic Charities CYO	Partial rental subsidy program for people with HIV/AIDS	\$150,000
Catholic Charities CYO (Leland House)	RCF-CI (Residential Care Facility for the Chronically Ill) for people with HIV/AIDS	\$1,683,973
Catholic Charities CYO (Peter Claver)	RCF-CI (Residential Care Facility for the Chronically Ill) for people with HIV/AIDS	\$758,187
Dolores Street Community Services	RCF-CI (Residential Care Facility for the Chronically Ill) for people with HIV/AIDS	\$479,350
Larkin Street Youth Services	RCF-CI (Residential Care Facility for the Chronically Ill) for people with HIV/AIDS	\$348,144
Maitri Compassionate Care	RCF-CI (Residential Care Facility for the Chronically Ill) for people with HIV/AIDS	\$492,167
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	HOPWA capital pool (includes \$100,772 in HOPWA program income)	\$575,090
Mercy Housing CA XVII	Operating costs for a residence for persons with HIV/AIDS	\$50,000

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>2015-2016 Funding Amount</b>
San Francisco Human Services Agency	Rental assistance for persons with HIV/AIDS	\$1,795,681
San Francisco Human Services Agency	Housing advocacy for persons with HIV/AIDS	\$257,494
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$6,640,086</b>

**General Administration**

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>2015-2016 Funding Amount</b>
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	General HOPWA administration	\$203,731
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$203,731</b>

**TOTAL SAN FRANCISCO 2015-2016 HOPWA: \$6,891,817**

**San Mateo HOPWA Recommendations**

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>2015-2016 Funding Amount</b>
San Mateo: Mental Health Association of San Mateo	Housing information referrals and assistance with locating affordable/appropriate housing units for very low-income persons living with HIV/AIDS	\$14,955
San Mateo: Mental Health Association of San Mateo	Project sponsor administrative expenses	\$37,690
San Mateo: Mental Health Association of San Mateo	HUD-defined move-in costs (e.g., deposits) for very low-income persons living with HIV/AIDS	\$35,000
San Mateo: Mental Health Association of San Mateo	Short-term housing subsidies, including pre- and post-placement housing advocacy services for very low-income persons living with HIV/AIDS	\$488,480
San Mateo: San Mateo County STD/HIV Program	Comprehensive case management and community based services for very low-income persons with HIV/AIDS	\$94,220
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$670,345</b>

**TOTAL SAN MATEO 2015-2016 HOPWA: \$670,345**

**TOTAL 2015-2016 HOPWA : \$7,562,162**

## 2015-2016 HOME Projects

This list of HOME-funded projects is organized by five-year objectives, priority needs and goals that are described in the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan. While a recommended project may meet more than one goal, it is only listed under its primary goal.

### Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed

➤ Priority Need 1A: Develop and Maintain Affordable Housing

- Goal 1Ai. Increased supply of affordable housing

Agency Name	Project Description	2015-2016 Funding Amount
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	Housing development pool - HOME (includes \$1,875,343 in HOME program income)	\$5,413,258
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$5,413,258</b>

### General Administration

Agency Name	Project Description	2015-2016 Funding Amount
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	General HOME administration	\$393,100
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$393,100</b>

**TOTAL 2015-2016 HOME:      \$5,806,358**

## 2015-2016 General Fund Projects

This list of General Fund-supported projects is organized by five-year objectives, priority needs and goals that are described in the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan. While a project may meet more than one goal, it is only listed under its primary goal.

### Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed

➤ Priority Need 1A: Develop and Maintain Affordable Housing

- Goal 1Ai. Increased supply of affordable housing

Agency Name	Project Description	2015-2016 Funding Amount
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	Housing development pool	\$313,278
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$313,278</b>

➤ Priority Need 1B: Make Housing Affordable

- Goal 1Biii. Increase access to rental and homeownership housing

Agency Name	Project Description	2015-2016 Funding Amount
SF LGBT Community Center	LGBT access to housing	\$110,000
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$110,000</b>

➤ Priority Need 1C: Prevent and End Homelessness

- Goal 1Ci. Reduced rate of evictions

Agency Name	Project Description	2015-2016 Funding Amount
AIDS Housing Alliance	Eviction and homeless prevention primarily for LGBT and HIV+ persons	\$287,245
Bay Area Legal Aid	Housing counseling and eviction prevention primarily for residents of public and subsidized housing	\$53,428
Bay Area Legal Aid	Direct legal representation - eviction defense	\$350,000
Eviction Defense Collaborative, Inc.	Homeless and eviction prevention services, including legal representation, case management and rental assistance	\$80,702
Eviction Defense Collaborative, Inc.	Direct legal representation - eviction defense	\$400,000
Nihonmachi Legal Outreach	Housing counseling, legal assistance and	\$26,743

Agency Name	Project Description	2015-2016 Funding Amount
	access to housing for immigrant communities	
Nihonmachi Legal Outreach	Direct legal representation - eviction defense	\$250,000
San Francisco Study Center - Housing Rights Committee of San Francisco	Tenant counseling, advocacy and education for SF public housing residents to ensure housing stability and avoid eviction	\$80,000
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>\$1,528,118</b>

➤ Priority Need 1D: Provide Supportive Housing Services

- Goal 1Di. Increased access to services for public housing residents

Agency Name	Project Description	2015-2016 Funding Amount
APA Family Support Services/YMCA of San Francisco (Bayview)	Service connection for primarily public housing residents in Sunnydale-Velasco and greater Visitacion Valley	\$212,475
BRIDGE Regional Partners, Inc.	Community engagement and services for primarily public housing residents in Potrero Terraces and Annex and surrounding neighborhood	\$155,000
Potrero Hill Neighborhood House	Community outreach, engagement and service connection in Potrero Terraces and Annex and surrounding neighborhood	\$80,000
Together United Recommitted Forever (T.U.R.F.)	Community outreach, engagement and service connection for primarily public housing residents in Sunnydale-Velasco and greater Visitacion Valley	\$50,000
Urban Services YMCA	Service connection for primarily public housing residents in Potrero Terraces and Annex and surrounding neighborhood	\$120,000
YMCA of San Francisco (Bayview)	Community building and service connection for primarily public housing residents in Hunters View and greater Bayview/Hunters Point	\$658,060
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$1,275,535</b>

- Goal 1Dii. Increased access to permanent supportive housing and transitional housing for PLWHA

Agency Name	Project Description	2015-2016 Funding Amount
San Francisco Human Services Agency	Rental assistance for persons with HIV/AIDS	\$1,357,485
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$1,357,485</b>

**Objective 2: Communities Have Healthy Physical, Social, and Business Infrastructure**

➤ Priority Need 2A: Enhance Community Facilities and Spaces

- Goal 2Ai. Key nonprofit service providers have high quality facilities

Agency Name	Project Description	2015-2016 Funding Amount
Brava! for Women in the Arts	Tenant improvements to interior programming and office space at a multipurpose facility	\$219,186
San Francisco AIDS Foundation	Support funds to a health and wellness center aimed at ending HIV transmission primarily for gay and bisexual men	\$600,000
SF LGBT Community Center	Capital improvements and internal reconfiguration at a facility providing services to the LGBT community	\$680,814
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$1,500,000</b>

➤ Priority Need 2B: Strengthen Small Businesses and Commercial Corridors

- Goal 2Bii. Robust commercial corridors in low-income neighborhoods

Agency Name	Project Description	2015-2016 Funding Amount
Asian Neighborhood Design	Architectural services for Invest in Neighborhoods small businesses	\$60,131
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$60,131</b>

➤ Priority Need 2C: Increase Community Cohesion

- Goal 2Ci. Increased supports for residents to convene and build social capital

Agency Name	Project Description	2015-2016 Funding Amount
Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center	Public housing leadership development	\$125,000
Chinese Progressive Association	Sisterhood Farms community planning	\$5,000
Mercy Housing California	Community engagement and services for primarily public housing residents in	\$65,000

Agency Name	Project Description	2015-2016 Funding Amount
	Sunnydale-Velasco and greater Visitacion Valley	
San Francisco Parks Alliance	Implementation of the OMI Excelsior Community Action Grant program	\$88,587
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	Portola urban agriculture planning	\$50,000
Tenderloin Housing Clinic, Inc.	Leadership development for primarily Latinos in the Tenderloin	\$153,730
Tides Center/PODER	Upper Yard community planning	\$75,000
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$562,317</b>

- Goal 2Cii. Increased capacity for community-based organizations

Agency Name	Project Description	2015-2016 Funding Amount
Community Youth Center-San Francisco (CYC-SF)	Capacity building for the API Council, including nearly 80 organizations	\$51,243
Compasspoint Nonprofit Services	Technical assistance, consultation and workshop vouchers for CDBG-funded agencies	\$100,000
Earned Assets Resource Network/Office of the Treasurer	Staff training on financial education for CDBG grantees	\$14,000
Filipino American Development Foundation (FADF)/South of Market Community A	Capacity building for South of Market agencies	\$20,195
Homeless Children's Network	Capacity building for Tenderloin youth serving agencies, including development of youth leadership council	\$40,388
Northern California Community Loan Fund	Asset management planning for CDBG/HOPWA-eligible facilities	\$89,258
United Playaz	Capacity building for a youth development collaborative in the South of Market	\$40,388
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$355,472</b>

**Objective 3: Families and Individuals are Resilient and Economically Self-Sufficient**

➤ Priority Need 3A: Promote Workforce Development

- Goal 3Aiii. Access to job opportunities for disadvantaged San Francisco residents

Agency Name	Project Description	2015-2016 Funding Amount
Young Community Developers	Neighborhood Access Point and Young Adult WorkLink Services	\$65,000
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$65,000</b>

➤ Priority Need 3B: Promote Economic Advancement Through Barrier Removal

- Goal 3Bi. Improved service connections

Agency Name	Project Description	2015-2016 Funding Amount
APA Family Support Services/SCDC	Service connection for API community	\$20,000
Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center	Excelsior self-sufficiency center	\$90,000
Chinatown Community Development Center	Service connection for API community	\$50,000
Chinese for Affirmative Action	Integrated and wraparound services to achieve economic self sufficiency	\$380,000
Filipino American Development Foundation/Pin@y Educational Partnerships (PE	Opportunities to connect the worlds of history, art, and culture with direct community engagement and action for transitional aged youth	\$90,000
Filipino-American Development Foundation: Filipino Community Center	Basic needs assessments of individuals and the community to address barriers to sustainable housing opportunities, employment opportunities and community development	\$90,675
Urban Services YMCA	Service connection to Family Resource Center services such as case management, mental health, housing and basic needs assistance to address employment and financial needs and to cultivate self-sufficiency and success	\$151,458
Urban Services YMCA	Service connection for API community	\$125,000
Wu Yee Children's Services	Service connection for API community	\$105,000



<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>2015-2016 Funding Amount</b>
YMCA of San Francisco (Chinatown Branch)	Service connection to address gaps in employment and job placement, resource knowledge and social support services which lead to self sufficiency	\$38,433
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$1,140,566</b>

- Goal 3Bii. Improved foundational competencies and access to job training and employment opportunities for disconnected populations

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>2015-2016 Funding Amount</b>
Donaldina Cameron House	Bilingual services for API community	\$50,000
Good Samaritan Family Resource Center	Provide English as a Second Language and literacy instruction, primarily for primarily Spanish-speaking families	\$51,000
Gum Moon Residence Hall	Provide support groups and playgroups for grandparents who become caregivers	\$26,095
Gum Moon Residence Hall	ESL instruction and job readiness training primarily for low income immigrants in the Richmond and Sunset Districts	\$50,000
San Francisco Sheriff's Department 5 Keys Charter School	Bilingual services for API community	\$83,765
Southeast Asian Community Center	Bilingual services for API community	\$116,235
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$377,095</b>

- Goal 3Biii. Increased job retention and advancement supports through legal and other related services

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>2015-2016 Funding Amount</b>
AIDS Legal Referral Panel of the SF Bay Area	Legal services primarily for immigrants with HIV	\$50,000
Asian Americans Advancing Justice - Asian Law Caucus	Legal services primarily for individuals with mental health issues and facing deportation	\$121,167
Bay Area Legal Aid	Employment Legal Services for API domestic violence survivors	\$50,000
Central American Resource Center (CARECEN)	Unaccompanied minors legal services	\$1,063,800
Dolores Street Community Services	Legal services and education for recent immigrant populations	\$912,000

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>2015-2016 Funding Amount</b>
Dolores Street Community Services	Legal services and education for recent immigrant populations, primarily focused on those affected by deportation	\$219,000
La Raza Community Resource Center	Rapid response services for families at risk for deportation	\$51,765
Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights of the San Francisco Bay Area	Civil Counsel for immigration defense	\$100,000
Legal Services For Children	Legal services, primarily for immigrant youth	\$48,636
Mujeres Unidas y Activas	Domestic worker Bill of Rights	\$200,000
Nihonmachi Legal Outreach	Employment and immigration legal services for survivors of domestic violence	\$46,119
Nihonmachi Legal Outreach	Employment Legal Services for API domestic violence survivors	\$85,000
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$2,947,487</b>

- Goal 3Biv. Improved financial literacy and management

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>2015-2016 Funding Amount</b>
Consumer Credit Counseling Service of San Francisco	Provide high-volume, quality, one-on-one financial counseling services to low-income San Franciscans through targeted referral systems developed in partnership with the Office of Economic Empowerment and partner city agencies	\$165,000
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$165,000</b>

**TOTAL 2015-2016 GENERAL FUND:     \$11,757,484**

## 2015-2016 Housing Trust Fund Projects

This list of Housing Trust Fund-supported projects is organized by five-year objectives, priority needs and goals that are described in the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan. While a project may meet more than one goal, it is only listed under its primary goal.

### Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed

#### ➤ Priority Need 1A: Develop and Maintain Affordable Housing

- Goal 1Aii. Preserve and Maintain Affordable Housing Supply

Agency Name	Project Description	2015-2016 Funding Amount
Corporation for Supportive Housing	Training and technical assistance to supportive housing organizations	\$360,000
Rebuilding Together San Francisco	Critical home repairs for homeowners	\$45,000
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$405,000</b>

#### ➤ Priority Need 1B: Make Housing Affordable

- Goal 1Bii. Increased opportunities for sustainable homeownership

Agency Name	Project Description	2015-2016 Funding Amount
HomeownershipSF	Post-purchase counseling	\$175,000
San Francisco Community Land Trust	Post-purchase counseling	\$25,000
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$200,000</b>

- Goal 1Biii. Increase access to rental and homeownership housing

Agency Name	Project Description	2015-2016 Funding Amount
Hamilton Family Center, Inc	Rental assistance to assist families avoid eviction and become stably housed	\$50,000
Independent Living Resource Center of SF	Rental housing counseling, financial management education and application assistance services for primarily disabled persons	\$20,000
Mission Economic Development Agency	Comprehensive rental housing counseling/coaching, financial capability coaching, and access to bundled/integrated services	\$50,000

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>2015-2016 Funding Amount</b>
San Francisco Housing Development Corporation	Rental readiness and housing stabilization services	\$50,000
San Francisco Housing Development Corporation	Citywide access to housing	\$150,000
Self-Help for the Elderly	Tenant counseling, advocacy and eviction prevention assistance primarily for elderly renters	\$15,000
Veterans Equity Center	Tenant counseling, case management, application assistance and housing placement services	\$60,000
Veterans Equity Center	Citywide access to housing	\$50,000
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$445,000</b>

➤ Priority Need 1C: Prevent and End Homelessness

- Goal 1Ci. Reduced rate of evictions

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>2015-2016 Funding Amount</b>
AIDS Housing Alliance	Homeless prevention and rapid rehousing primarily for HIV+ persons	\$30,000
Bay Area Legal Aid	Housing counseling and eviction prevention primarily for residents of properties undergoing RAD transition	\$100,000
Causa Justa :: Just Cause	Housing counseling , advocacy and eviction prevention services	\$50,000
Eviction Defense Collaborative, Inc.	Homeless and eviction prevention services, including legal representation, case management and rental assistance	\$559,298
Legal Assistance to the Elderly	Legal services focused on housing, primarily for seniors and adults with disabilities	\$30,000
San Francisco Study Center - Housing Rights Committee of San Francisco	Tenant counseling, advocacy and education for public housing residents in RAD properties to ensure housing stability and avoid eviction	\$50,000
San Francisco Study Center - Housing Rights Committee of San Francisco	Tenant counseling, advocacy and education for renters to ensure housing stability and avoid eviction	\$50,000
San Francisco Study Center - Housing Rights Committee of San Francisco	Tenant counseling, advocacy and education for renters to ensure housing stability and avoid eviction	\$25,000

Agency Name	Project Description	2015-2016 Funding Amount
Self-Help for the Elderly	Housing counseling and placement assistance	\$15,000
Tenderloin Housing Clinic, Inc.	Legal counseling and representation for tenants threatened with eviction	\$45,000
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$954,298</b>

**TOTAL 2015-2016 HOUSING TRUST FUND:     \$2,004,298**

## 2015-2016 Projects Supported by Other Funding Sources

This list of projects that are supported by other funding sources is organized by five-year objectives, priority needs and goals that are described in the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan. While a project may meet more than one goal, it is only listed under its primary goal.

### Objective 2: Communities Have Healthy Physical, Social, and Business Infrastructure

- Priority Need 2A: Enhance Community Facilities and Spaces
  - Goal 2Ai. Key nonprofit service providers have high quality facilities

Agency Name	Project Description	2015-2016 Funding Amount
Brava! for Women in the Arts	Tenant improvements to interior programming and office space at a multipurpose facility	\$243,539
SF LGBT Community Center	Capital improvements and internal reconfiguration at a facility providing services to the LGBT community	\$756,461
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$1,000,000</b>

### Objective 3: Families and Individuals are Resilient and Economically Self-Sufficient

- Priority Need 3B: Promote Economic Advancement Through Barrier Removal
  - Goal 3Biv. Improved financial literacy and management

Agency Name	Project Description	2015-2016 Funding Amount
Consumer Credit Counseling Service of San Francisco	Provide high-volume, quality, one-on-one financial counseling services to low-income San Franciscans through targeted referral systems developed in partnership with the Office of Economic Empowerment and partner city agencies.	\$324,818
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$324,818</b>

**TOTAL 2015-2016 OTHER FUNDING SOURCES: \$1,324,818**

## AP-50 Geographic Distribution – 91.220(f)

### Description of the geographic areas of the entitlement (including areas of low-income and minority concentration) where assistance will be directed

Assistance will be directed in HUD-designated Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas (NRSAs), HUD-defined areas of low- and moderate-income concentration and minority concentration, and Invest in Neighborhoods Commercial Districts. HUD funds will be primarily directed in NRSAs and in areas of low- and moderate-income and minority concentration. See Map 13 for these geographic areas.

#### Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas (NRSAs)

In 1993-94 San Francisco applied to HUD for consideration of six neighborhoods as federally designated Enterprise Communities. In order to be considered, all six neighborhoods developed ten-year strategic plans for community development. Of the six neighborhoods considered for recognition as Enterprise Communities, four were selected: Bayview Hunters Point; Visitacion Valley; South of Market and the Mission. The two neighborhoods not selected include Chinatown and the Tenderloin. The ten-year plans developed for the Enterprise Community application was sufficient for HUD to designate all six neighborhoods as Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas (NRSAs) in 1996.

MOHCD has made investments in each of these areas that correspond to the key principles of the original Enterprise Community Program, including 1) economic opportunity; 2) sustainable community development; 3) community based partnerships; and 4) strategic visions for change. The strategic plans for these neighborhoods provide substantive detail regarding community priorities such as economic development and job training; safe and affordable housing; public safety; neighborhood beautification; education; child care and public service support.

MOHCD respectfully requests renewal for all six of the current NRSA designations as provided for at 24 CFR 91.215 (e) (2) and CPD Notice 96.01.

MOHCD compliance with HUD criteria:

- **Boundaries:** MOHCD has provided census tract boundaries to specifically define each neighborhood according to year 2010 census data;
- **Demographic Criteria:** Each of the designated neighborhoods meets or exceeds the requirement that it be primarily residential and contain a percentage for low- and moderate-income residents that is equal to the “upper quartile percentage” (as computed by HUD pursuant to 24 CFR 570.208(a)(1)(ii) or 70%, whichever is less, but not less than 51%);
- **Consultation:** Strategic plans were developed for all six neighborhoods in consultation with the area’s key stakeholders, including residents, owners/operators of businesses and financial institutions, non-profit organizations, and community groups that are in or serve the neighborhood;
- **Assessment:** Each strategic plan includes an assessment of the economic situation in each area and economic development improvement opportunities and problems likely to be encountered;
- **Economic Empowerment:** MOHCD has a realistic development strategy and implementation plan to promote the area’s economic progress focusing on activities to create meaningful jobs for the unemployed and low- and moderate-income residents of the area as well as activities to promote the substantial revitalization of the neighborhood; and

- **Performance Measurement:** MOHCD has developed a program matrix that identifies reliable indicators including physical improvements, social initiatives and economic development activities, which are measurable over time.

In addition to the HUD guidelines, MOHCD has taken the additional step of reviewing each of the neighborhood strategic plans and is committed to achieving very specific outcomes over the next five years. The table above provides a supplemental snapshot of neighborhood assets, persistent needs and five-year opportunities for each neighborhood.

#### Areas of Low- and Moderate-Income Concentration

HUD calculates low- and moderate-income concentration by census block groups. See Map 13 for what HUD considers as areas of low- and moderate-income concentration in San Francisco.

#### Areas of Minority Concentration

Although racial and ethnic groups are distributed throughout the City, certain neighborhoods have higher than average concentrations of minority households. HUD requires recipients of its funding to identify areas of minority concentration in the aggregate as well as by specific racial/ethnic group.

San Francisco has defined an area of aggregate minority concentration as any census tract with a minority population that is 20 percentage points greater than that of the City's total minority percentage. According to the 2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, 58.2% of the City's population is identified as being composed of minorities, and therefore any census tract in which 78.2% of the population is classified as minority would qualify as an Area of Minority Concentration. See Map 13.

#### Invest In Neighborhoods Commercial Districts

Our neighborhood economic development strategy focuses on strengthening small businesses and key commercial neighborhood corridors that contribute to the local fabric of communities and are the backbone of our local economy. CDBG resources are a key component of this strategy, they fund our community based organizations (CBO's) to provide business technical assistance and support local commercial corridors. Our CBO's serve to provide services that are accessible at the neighborhood level and are culturally, ethnically and linguistically tailored for startup and existing businesses. While CDBG allows us to provide basic business assistance, we leverage these services by combining them with city programs that address the existing economic development needs in a strategic way. In 2012 as part of Mayor Ed Lee's 17 points jobs, he created the Invest In Neighborhoods (IIN) initiative, which has become our approach to neighborhood economic development. The basic principal of the initiative is to provide customized assistance that meets the specific needs of San Francisco's neighborhood commercial corridors. It aligns existing and new City resources and services to commercial corridors around the City in a way that is smart, efficient, and responsive to individual neighborhood needs and opportunities. Small businesses make an essential contribution to the culture and identity of San Francisco and in response the second point to the jobs plan created the Jobs Squad, which helps small businesses, navigate City processes, access vital City programs, and stay informed of issues that may affect them. This team of City staff conducts door-to-door outreach to small businesses around the City to connect them with help and information.

The purpose of the IIN initiative is to strengthen small businesses, improve physical conditions, increase quality of life, and build community capacity in 25 commercial districts throughout the city. While continuing to prioritize low- and moderate-income neighborhoods the goal is to establish more robust



citywide programs and services to benefit small businesses, their owners, employees, and their neighborhoods across the city.

The initiative is managed by OEWD but represents an interagency approach under the Mayor's direction. IIN builds on the prior Administration's commercial corridor revitalization efforts, which targeted a smaller cohort of low- and moderate-income neighborhoods and did not leverage other City departments and resources as effectively. The initiative has also served to offset some of the neighborhood resources that were lost due to the dissolution of the SF Redevelopment Agency.


Invest in Neighborhoods provides a standard set of "baseline interventions" to all 25 corridors, and then targeted customized interventions to individual corridors based on an initial economic assessment and stakeholder input.

Among the baseline services all corridors receive include:

- An assigned staff person at City Hall, that oversees a plan for the area and manages provision of services
- A Jobs Squad member for business outreach and provides businesses with guidance on navigating City processes and referrals to city agencies and community partners
- Quarterly tracking and update of existing vacancies and access to StorfrontSF.com, a citywide, on-line vacancy-tracking database
- Access to a set of City-funded small business loan programs

Customized interventions for each corridor are then deployed based on their initial economic assessment. These interventions are selected from a broad-ranging suite of tools aimed at supporting small businesses and their surrounding commercial districts. OEWD utilizes CDBG along with General Fund dollars to provide these programs and services, and leverages them with resources and efforts from other City agencies and often private partners.

**Map 13 – NRSAs, Areas of Low- and Moderate-Income Concentration, Areas of Minority Concentration and Invest In Neighborhoods Commercial Districts**



## Geographic Distribution

**Table 85 - Geographic Distribution**

Target Area	Percentage of Funds

### **Rationale for the priorities for allocating investments geographically**

See discussion above. See the Appendix for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

### **Discussion**

## Affordable Housing

### AP-55 Affordable Housing – 91.220(g)

#### Introduction

**Table 86 – One Year Goals for Affordable Housing by Support Requirement**

One Year Goals for the Number of Households to be Supported	
Homeless	110
Non-Homeless	818
Special-Needs	62
Total	990

**Table 87 – One Year Goals for Affordable Housing by Support Type**

One Year Goals for the Number of Households Supported Through	
Rental Assistance	690
The Production of New Units	990
Rehab of Existing Units	105
Acquisition of Existing Units	40
Total	1,825

#### Discussion

Approximately 690 individuals and households will receive rental assistance in 2015-2016. MOHCD intends to provide tenant-based rental assistance to approximately 670 individuals and households through grants provided to community-based organizations offering tenant counseling and eviction prevention services. In addition, 20 formerly homeless households will be supported with project-based rental assistance.

Approximately 990 units will be produced with 110 units for homeless families, 62 units for special needs populations of transition-age youth or veterans, and 818 units produced for low-income families earning less than 60% of area median income. Additionally, the rehabilitation of 105 existing units will occur along with the acquisition of approximately 40 existing housing units for preservation as affordable housing through MOHCD's Small Sites Program.

## **AP-60 Public Housing – 91.220(h)**

### **Introduction**

MOHCD will continue to work closely with the San Francisco Housing Authority to address its dilapidated public housing either through demolition and rebuilding the most distressed public housing through the City's HOPE SF program, or rehabilitating the remaining public housing portfolio through the Federal Rental Assistance Demonstration program.

### **Actions planned during the next year to address the needs to public housing**

In the next year MOHCD and SFHA will convert approximately 1,400 public housing units to nonprofit ownership and management under the RAD program and initiate rehabilitation on those units by the end of 2015. Predevelopment work on an approximate 2,000 additional public housing units will also commence in the coming year with rehabilitation expected to start by Fall 2016. Under the HOPE SF program construction will begin on the next building in the 2<sup>nd</sup> phase of Hunters View as well as on the 3<sup>rd</sup> phase of Alice Griffith. Predevelopment work for infrastructure and the 1<sup>st</sup> vertical phases of Sunnydale and Potrero will also begin in the next year.

### **Actions to encourage public housing residents to become more involved in management and participate in homeownership**

The RAD and HOPE SF revitalization programs will increase tenant engagement activities and tenant services substantially. A framework for the RAD tenant engagement work follows. At HOPE SF properties, this level of connection is exceeded, with deep case management services available to many residents, as further described below.

#### ***RAD Community Engagement***

##### **Establish trust; Map assets and identify needs; Begin community activities; Build resident base; Develop neighborhood partnerships**

Foundational and ongoing work with residents and community members of Housing Developments by all service providers or those who conduct work there.

##### **Community Building – Community organizing and events; Increased information and opportunities; Deeper resident and neighborhood partnerships; Implement peer leadership activities; Development of Health and Wellness, Educational, and Economic Mobility activities**

Deeper foundational and ongoing work that builds upon Community Engagement. As residents and community members become accustomed to providers then work can include recruiting peers and engaging them in leadership and skills building activities. This then establishes them as part of the team.

##### **Service Connection – Enhanced information and referral with follow up; Intentional Support for Housing Stabilization; Ongoing Health and Wellness, Educational, and Economic Mobility Activities**

Once engaged and investments have been made in the Housing Development the consistent staff teams who participate in Community Engagement and Community Building work are available for ongoing

resources and activities (Health and Wellness, Educational, Economic Mobility) to learn and expose the community to new choices. One-on-one support is available for residents regarding any needs but especially related to housing stabilization. Staff teams are made up of paraprofessional to professional providers who respond quickly to requests with follow up to ensure information / activities are helpful and accurate. **Off-site services enhance these efforts.** Important key element is for onsite providers to have a relationship with offsite city service providers.

### **Resident Engagement and RAD**

#### ➤ **What is the goal?**

- To ease transition of residents to RAD
- To help residents understand what RAD is and how it will affect them
- To engage them in development of scope of work
- To engage them in development of documents and processes such as:
  - Grievances
  - House rules
  - Leases
  - Services
- To introduce residents to new owners and management entities and personnel
- To provide continuity and evolution of tenant associations

#### ➤ **Why monthly meetings with residents at large are required?**

- Regular meetings message that development team is here to stay – trust building
- Provide regular opportunity for asking questions, getting updates and providing feedback
- Provide on-going opportunity for development teams and property management and residents to get to know each other
- **Future meeting possibilities:**
  - January – March – there will be more specific topics to discuss and work on coming out of working groups – grievance procedures, house rules, new property management philosophies and procedures – rent payment – tenant associations
  - April and beyond – transition, new lease signing, etc.

All meetings include making FAQs available and appropriate translation. Teams always reiterate that there will be no permanent relocation due to RAD and that rents will be calculated in the same way that they are now. Other important message is that SFHA retains ownership of the land, which means that the buildings will be for people with low incomes forever.

### **Below are the roles each partner is playing in the RAD Engagement process:**

**SFHA:** Identify existing resources for resident engagement that are effective and affordable. Establish partnerships with Developers, the City and Community Partners to communicate and engage with residents. Implement a Communication Plan including formal and informal communication milestones.

**MOHCD:** MOHCD coordinates the real estate transition from SFHA to developer team and will be a project lender. MOHCD will also coordinate the resident services model and its implementation at each site. Lastly MOHCD is leading the creation of clear and consistent dialogue, documentation and communication about RAD between all partners and residents.

Development Teams: Developer teams will implement the rehabilitation programs and own the buildings. They are committed to support resident involvement in all phases of the conversion and implementation.

Tenant Advocates: Tenant Advocates (Housing Rights Committee, National Housing Law Project, Bay Area Legal Aid) work with residents and stakeholders to promote greater understanding of resident rights

### ***HOPE SF Community Engagement***

#### **Resident Services and Community Building Overview**

Each of the four HOPE SF sites will continue to integrate intensive resident services and community building activities, executed by lead on-site service providers in collaboration with neighboring CBOs and city-wide programming. Services teams will focus their efforts towards preparing HOPE SF site residents for the transition to non-profit management, continuing to stabilize the tenant populations, and developing pathways towards economic mobility. They will achieve this through service connection and on-site programming in areas of economic mobility, public safety, health and wellness, and education.

In the next five years, all four HOPE SF sites will have completed construction of a subset of replacement and affordable housing units. Residents will continue to be included in community space planning efforts across all four sites, managed by the non-profit developers. The Mayor's Office will work with on-site service providers to coordinate the training and placement of residents in construction jobs occurring on site. All of the on-site service providers will be preparing residents for relocation and placement in the units. Residents will be included in a series of relocation planning meetings across the sites and will contribute to the development of the final relocation plans. Additionally, services and programming assisting with the transition to non-profit management will be ramped up, such as those related to financial literacy, workforce development, and tenant education. Community building activities -- such as senior, teen & family programming, community gardening, and community-wide celebrations -- will also continue to be executed at each of the four HOPE SF sites.

All four HOPE SF sites will be integrating learnings from the pilot Peer Health Leadership programs and will be furthering the delivery and evaluation of services and leadership development through this program over the next five years. Similarly, HOPE SF sites will continue to deepen their educational strategies which are executed in collaboration with the four on-site Educational Liaisons, 8 HOPE SF schools, and families at each of the sites. Undergirding the services components at the HOPE SF sites will be a cross-site safety plan that will improve the communication of violent crimes to lead and collaborative service providers. The safety plan will also provide a framework for post-incident support for families and residents impacted by the violence, inclusive of case management support and community building.

#### **Lead HOPE SF Resident Services Agencies:**

<u>Site</u>	<u>Lead Service Provider</u>
Alice Griffith	Urban Strategies
Hunters View	Bayview YMCA
Potrero Terrace and Annex	Bridge Housing
Sunnydale	Mercy Housing

At Hunters View, the Bayview YMCA has worked to prepare residents for relocation. The YMCA has also focused on barrier removal, career development support, health and wellness activities, family support programming, educational activities, and employment soft and hard skills.

At Alice Griffith, the Urban Strategies team continues to link residents with senior programs, family support programming, youth programming, afterschool activities, health and wellness activities, and workforce development opportunities.

At Potrero Annex/Terrace, Bridge Housing continues to provide community building activities and foster individual participation in planning sessions. These activities included leadership development and safety workshops, healthy living and healthy generations groups, gardening/sustainability programs, social activities, and a service connection contract with the Potrero Hill Family support Center (Urban Services YMCA) in which they work with residents to assess, connect and support them in workforce and educational opportunities.

At Sunnydale, Mercy Housing, the Bayview YMCA, and TURF work collaboratively to provide outreach, family support, service connections, health and wellness, and educational activities and community convenings to Sunnydale residents.

Both Sunnydale and Potrero Annex and Terrace received HUD Choice Neighborhood Initiative Planning Grants to support the ongoing revitalization efforts throughout the upcoming year.

## **Choice Neighborhood Grants**

### Planning Grants

Both Sunnydale and Potrero Annex and Terrace received HUD Choice Neighborhood Initiative Planning Grants in 2012 to support ongoing revitalization efforts. These planning efforts will be coming to a close in 2014. Both of these communities will utilize the momentum they gained throughout the planning process to continue to engage residents, city agencies, and other stakeholders in the implementation of the resulting plans. Sunnydale will begin 2015 with the development of implementation committees consisting of residents, city agencies, community organizations, and other stakeholders to collaborate on the execution of objectives in areas of housing development, health & wellness, safety, and economic stability.

The South Potrero Neighborhood Transformation Plan has supported the development of a coordinated blueprint for improving Potrero Annex and Terrace, and the surrounding neighborhood. Implementation of the Transformation Plan will begin in this five year period. At Potrero Terrace and Annex, the work will be focused on establishing quality services in the community, and connecting residents to the greater neighborhood and services.

### Implementation Grants

Urban Strategies will be completing their cycle of the Choice Neighborhoods Implementation Grant at Alice Griffith in 2017. The team will continue to partner with residents, city agencies, community organizations, and other stakeholders as they complete their process. Workforce development programming will continue to ramp up as construction on-site will begin at Alice Griffith in early 2015. Additionally, key neighborhood revitalization and construction projects will continue to come online in the surrounding district which will provide opportunities for training and placement. Educational Liaison



at Alice Griffith will continue to partner with the school district to execute plans addressing chronic absenteeism and parent engagement. Other city agencies will continue to execute their plans for improved transportation, parks, retail, and other commercial and recreational assets in the greater neighborhood.

**If the PHA is designated as troubled, describe the manner in which financial assistance will be provided or other assistance**

HUD designated SFHA as a “Troubled” agency on December 13, 2012.

SFHA executed a Public Housing Authority Recovery and Sustainability Agreement and Action Plan (PHARS) with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and the City and County of San Francisco on July 1, 2013. The PHARS Agreement and Action Plan included several milestones for SFHA to achieve recovery and long-term sustainability over fiscal years 2014 and 2015 (10/1/13 – 9/30/14 and 10/1/14 – 9/30/15). Elements of the PHARS include:

- Assessment of existing staff assignments, policies and procedures, and development of improved policies and procedures
- Implementation of procedures to monitor independent audit findings
- Improved rent collection practices
- Improved unit turn-over rates and reduce vacancies
- Improved Commission oversight of SFHA finances and operations
- Development and implementation of a Waitlist Management Plan for both public housing and the Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) programs
- Development of a plan for housing quality standard (HQS) inspections for the (HCV) program
- Development of a plan for HCV re-certifications (etc.)

**Discussion**

MOHCD’s work with SFHA to address SFHA’s dilapidated housing stock either through the RAD or HOPE SF programs will preserve or rebuild some of the most important housing for San Francisco’s poorest residents. More importantly resident engagement under both programs will provide the public housing residents input on the rehabilitation or reconstruction and keep them informed of other important changes in their housing management.

## **AP-65 Homeless and Other Special Needs Activities – 91.220(i)**

### **Introduction**

**Describe the jurisdictions one-year goals and actions for reducing and ending homelessness including**

**Reaching out to homeless persons (especially unsheltered persons) and assessing their individual needs**

The San Francisco Homeless Outreach Team (SFHOT) was formed in May 2004 as part of a Mayor's Office, health, social services, and community initiative. Ten years later, SFHOT continues to evolve to meet various population needs. Over 3,000 chronically homeless severely disabled individuals have been care managed by SFHOT, with nearly 50% securing permanent housing. SFHOT works collaboratively in small teams first to engage and stabilize chronically homeless individuals and next to help gain care for chronic conditions and find permanent housing via three lines of service, as follows:

**Stabilization Care:** This SFHOT service line provides short-term stabilization care management for high risk homeless individuals (homeless more than three years, experiencing complex medical, psychiatric, and substance abuse tri-morbidity, using a high number of urgent/emergent care services, and not able to navigate health and human services system on their own. Care Managers accept referrals from SFHOT First Responders and high user treatment programs. Within six to twelve months, the goals are to: (1) Stabilize individuals from the street into shelter/SRO, (2) Remove personal barriers to attaining permanent housing; e.g., attain benefits, primary care linkage, behavioral health care linkage, IDs, legal aid, etc., (3) Secure and place into permanent housing, (4) Assess and serve as care coordinators for SF Health Network members who are high risk / high cost individuals and are unable to engage into the system.

**First Responders and Street Medicine Staff:** This SFHOT service line provides outreach, engagement and warm-handoffs from the street to (or between) urgent/ emergent institutions. First Responders operate 24/7 and responds to requests from 311, Care Coordinators, Police, Fire, and Urgent/Emergent facilities (hospitals, SF Sobering Center, Psych Emergency Services, and Dore Psych Urgent Care) for street\ outreach/intervention and therapeutic transports. The goals are to, within two hours, respond and determine if the individual can be cleared for transport and provide warm-handoff to and/or from urgent/emergent facilities. In addition, the First Responders provide targeted search and outreach of HUMS (High Users of Multiple Systems) and other high-risk homeless individuals as identified by 311 (citizens) and health care coordinators and, once found, performs wellness checks and attempts to engage individuals into services and other resources as identified by community care plans. First Responders assess and refer the highest risk to the Care Management teams.

**San Francisco Public Library:** This SFHOT service line includes a Psychiatric Social Worker situated at the Civic Center Main Branch who conducts outreach and offers referrals to homeless, marginally housed and/or mentally ill patrons of the library. She also facilitates education sessions in group or individual settings for library staff, in order to improve understanding of behaviorally vulnerable patrons of the library. Her goal is to help library staff serve this group of patrons according to their needs, while helping to decrease the number and severity of incidents that require intervention from Library security staff. This social worker also supervises four 15-hours/week Health and Safety Associates (HaSAs) who are

selected from a group of homeless library patrons being served by SF HOT's case management function. HaSAs assist the team by using their life experiences and learned engagement skills to reach out to other homeless patrons, in order to persuade them to accept case management and other services. In the process, HaSAs gain employment and job-seeking skills, through their supervision by the Psychiatric Social Worker, as well as an associated DPH Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor.

### **Addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons**

The City's Ten Year Plan to End Chronic Homelessness directed the City to move its focus away from traditional emergency shelters and toward shelters with 24-hour crisis clinics, and sobering centers.

Since the Plan was published, the Department of Public Health has created the Dore Urgent Care Clinic, a medically-staffed 24/7 urgent care clinic designed to serve people in psychiatric crisis that is able to accommodate up to 12 clients at any one time. The department also funds the Dore Residence, a 14-bed intensive crisis residential treatment program, operated in a social rehabilitation model, that provides a 24-hour alternative to hospitalization and serves clients who need psychiatric crisis support. The average length of stay is 3-5 days. Many of the individuals served by the two programs are homeless.

The emergency shelter system for adults has had a reduction of 440 year-round beds between January 2005 (1,579 total beds) and the present (1,139 total beds in June 2014). While decreasing the number of emergency shelter beds, the City has enhanced the quality of emergency shelter and improved access for its clients. Between FY08-09 and FY13-14, the annual budget for emergency shelters increased by \$4.3 million. The additional money has been used to invest in added case management and sustain service levels.

The City continues to promote fair and efficient access to emergency shelter. It is supporting adding a new shelter in the Bayview, the neighborhood with the highest number of persons living on the street, according to the 2013 homeless count. HSA received a capital grant of nearly \$1 million from the state and plans to use local funding for shelter operations.

Another way that shelters have been made more accessible is that, as of February 2014, homeless persons can make 90-day shelter reservations by calling the City's 311 System. The new process makes it easier for seniors, persons with disabilities, and non-English speakers to access the emergency shelter system by eliminating the need to wait in line and instead using the 311 system's 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year translation capabilities. By making it as convenient as possible for homeless adults to access safe, clean emergency shelters when needed, more time is available them to seek employment, to engage with vital services, and to find permanent housing. Providing better access to the emergency shelter system enables the City to maximize the number of beds that are used every night, leaving fewer people on the street at night.

Although permanent housing is the primary goal for people who are homeless, interim housing is a necessity until the stock of housing affordable to people with extremely low incomes can accommodate the demand. Interim housing should be available to all those who do not have an immediate option for permanent housing, so that no one is forced to sleep on the streets. Interim housing should be safe and easily accessible and should be structured to provide services that assist people in accessing treatment in a transitional housing setting or permanent housing as quickly as possible.

In order to provide the interim housing needed in the City, existing shelters must be restructured so that they are not simply emergency facilities, but instead focus on providing services that link people with housing and services that promote ongoing stability. In addition, to ensure that people who are homeless are willing to access these facilities, emphasis should continue to be placed on client safety and respectful treatment of clients by staff, including respect for cultural differences. The shelter system should provide specialized facilities or set-aside sections to meet the diversity of need, including safe havens, respite care beds, and places for senior citizens.

The City has placed a high priority on assisting people who are homeless to access permanent housing as quickly as possible, without requiring “housing readiness” or participation in services or transitional programs as a pre requisite. This strategy has been found to be effective with most populations, including people who are chronically homeless. However, for some people, access to treatment (either treatment in a clinical sense or mental health and/or substance abuse services) in a transitional housing setting can be beneficial; it provides a necessary steppingstone enhancing their ability to successfully access and maintain permanent housing. Particular sub-populations that have been found to benefit from treatment housing include: people suffering from a serious mental illness, people with chronic substance abuse problems, recently discharged offenders, people suffering from trauma (domestic violence, former sex workers, youth experiencing homelessness, veterans), and emancipated foster and homeless youth. For these populations, treatment housing provides a supportive, transitional environment that facilitates the stability necessary for future housing retention and provides treatment in a setting that offers immediate support against relapse and other potential set-backs. In order to be effective, treatment housing must offer culturally competent programs designed to meet the needs of the specific population being served.

Strategies necessary to effectively meet the need for treatment housing include: 1) evaluation of existing treatment/transitional housing in the City to determine which facilities to maintain and which to transform into permanent supportive housing; 2) appropriate assessment of the population that will benefit from treatment housing; 3) development of intensive case management and service packages for specific populations; and 4) creation of stronger linkages to facilitate movement between treatment programs and permanent housing.

**Helping homeless persons (especially chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth) make the transition to permanent housing and independent living, including shortening the period of time that individuals and families experience homelessness, facilitating access for homeless individuals and families to affordable housing units, and preventing individuals and families who were recently homeless from becoming homeless again**

Many people who are homeless or at-risk, in particular those who are suffering from a disabling condition, are in touch with one or more of the City’s public institutions and systems of care, including hospitals, mental health programs, detoxification and treatment programs, foster care and the criminal justice system. As such, these institutions have an important role to play in identifying people who need assistance to maintain their housing or who are homeless and need help regaining it. Through comprehensive transition, or “discharge” planning, these individuals, upon release, can be linked with the housing, treatment and services they need to facilitate ongoing stability and prevent future homelessness.

Key aspects of effective discharge planning include: assessment of housing and service related needs at intake; development of comprehensive discharge plans and assignment of a discharge planner/case manager to oversee plan implementation; provision of services that will promote long-term housing stability, while in custody/care; and expansion of housing options for people being discharged.

For people who are homeless involved with the criminal justice system whose crimes are non-violent petty misdemeanors, and for repeat, frequent users of the hospital system occasioned by lack of ongoing health care and homelessness, diversion strategies should be used that focus on addressing housing, treatment and service needs so as to prevent both recurring homelessness as well as repeat offenses and to support health outcomes.

“Respite” beds with appropriate medical care, medication and care supplies are needed by people who are homeless to recuperate post-hospitalization. These beds with care do not prevent homelessness nor end homelessness; but until sufficient permanent housing is available, they are necessary to support recovery. Coupled with other supportive services, they also can provide a link to other community services and housing opportunities.

In order to ensure the effectiveness of discharge planning efforts, data on the permanent housing outcomes of those discharged should be collected and included as part of ongoing evaluations of these public institutions.

**Helping low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless, especially extremely low-income individuals and families and those who are: being discharged from publicly funded institutions and systems of care (such as health care facilities, mental health facilities, foster care and other youth facilities, and corrections programs and institutions); or, receiving assistance from public or private agencies that address housing, health, social services, employment, education, or youth needs**

MOHCD’s homeless and homelessness prevention programs align with the City’s 5-Year Homeless Strategic Framework to achieve the Framework’s following objective:

- Prevent homelessness by intervening to avoid evictions from permanent housing that lead to homelessness. Increase outreach and education about eviction-prevention resources, including financial assistance and tenant rights laws. Provide short-term rental support and wraparound services to address underlying issues threatening housing stability and to prevent eviction. Increase the provision of legal services for individuals and families at risk of eviction. Provide rehousing support.

Effective homelessness prevention requires early identification and assistance to help people avoid losing their housing in the first place. Public agencies, including social service agencies, health clinics, schools, the foster care system and city government offices, have an important role to play in this effort as they are often in contact with these households and can provide key information and referrals. San Francisco has a long history of public support for tenant’s rights and eviction prevention services which has led to model tenant protections and social support for tenants who are often at risk of eviction and displacement.

Strategies to facilitate the early identification and assistance needed to prevent homelessness include 1) expansion of resources available for rental assistance and for key services that address threats to housing stability; 2) facilitating access to eviction prevention services through education and outreach, expanded legal services and the establishment of specialized eviction prevention programs; and 3) development of standard “just-cause” eviction policies for city-funded programs.

To address the multi-various challenge of homelessness, the homelessness and homeless prevention program is grant-based and melds CDBG, ESG and Housing Trust Fund funding to support homeless prevention and eviction prevention programs, operating support for emergency and transitional shelters, direct services for homeless individuals and families, and supportive housing. This program coordinates closely with other City Departments, in particular the Human Services Agency, to align its strategies.

Through this program, MOHCD administers the HUD Emergency Solutions Grant program as authorized under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act. ESG grants support essential services related to emergency shelter or street outreach; ongoing operations of emergency shelters; and homeless prevention services for those individuals at imminent risk of homelessness.

MOHCD also utilizes Housing Trust Fund funds for tenant-based rental assistance for individuals and families. Finally, it utilizes CDBG funds to support programs preventing homelessness and providing direct services. Homeless prevention programs focus primarily on eviction prevention, including tenant rights trainings, legal representation at eviction hearings, as well as rental vouchers and assistance with first and last month rent. Direct service programs support case management and related services to individuals and families in shelters and on the streets, focusing on those services which will maximize housing stability for those individuals and families.

Ongoing housing stability also depends upon access to a stable and sufficient income stream. However, many homeless people have education deficits, limited job skills and/or gaps in their work history that make it difficult for them to obtain living wage employment. For these reasons, access to education, job training and employment services are vitally important. There are homeless-targeted training and employment services that offer these services in a way that is designed to meet the special needs of homeless people. While these programs are necessary and should be expanded, homeless people also need access to the mainstream workforce development system, which offers a wider range of resources. However, in order to be effective with this population, these mainstream programs must take steps to increase homeless families’ and individuals’ access and better accommodate their needs.

## **Discussion**

See above.

## AP-70 HOPWA Goals– 91.220 (I)(3)

Table 88 – HOPWA Goals

One year goals for the number of households to be provided housing through the use of HOPWA for:	
Short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance to prevent homelessness of the individual or family	90
Tenant-based rental assistance	240
Units provided in permanent housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	181
Units provided in transitional short-term housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	11
Total	522

## AP-75 Barriers to affordable housing – 91.220(j)

### Introduction:

San Francisco continues to work to address how to remove barriers to the development of affordable housing be it through its land use policies or improving city procedures to expedite affordable housing production such as priority permit processing for affordable housing projects.

**Actions it planned to remove or ameliorate the negative effects of public policies that serve as barriers to affordable housing such as land use controls, tax policies affecting land, zoning ordinances, building codes, fees and charges, growth limitations, and policies affecting the return on residential investment**

### Addressing Barriers to Housing Production<sup>159</sup>

#### Identify Sites Appropriate for Housing Development

San Francisco is relatively dense, and has limited opportunities for infill development. It is critical to identify and make available, through appropriate zoning, adequate sites to meet the City's housing needs—especially affordable housing. The San Francisco Planning Department has successfully developed neighborhood specific housing plans to accommodate the majority of new housing needs anticipated.

In an effort to identify *specific sites* for housing, as well as areas that can be zoned for housing development, all City agencies subject to the Surplus Property Ordinance annually report their surplus properties and those properties are evaluated with regard to their potential for affordable housing development. To the extent that land is not suitable for housing development, the City sells surplus property and uses the proceeds for affordable housing development.

In order to reduce the land required for non-housing functions, such as parking, the Planning Department will consider requiring parking lifts to be supplied in all new housing developments seeking approval for parking at a ratio of 1:1 or above. Also through area plans, especially in transit-rich neighborhoods, parking may be allowed at a ratio of less than 1:1 in order to encourage the use of public transit and maximize a site's use for housing.

#### Encourage "Affordability by Design": Small Units & Rental Units

Using less expensive building materials and building less expensive construction types (e.g. wood frame midrise rather than steel frame high-rise) and creating smaller units can reduce development costs per/unit. High development costs are a major barrier to affordable housing development. The City encourages this type of affordability by design.

---

<sup>159</sup> The following section on Addressing Barriers to Housing Production is cited from the June 2010 Draft Housing Element. The role of the Housing Element is to provide policy background for housing programs and decisions and broad directions towards meeting the City's housing goals. However, parameters specified in the Zoning Map and Planning Code can only be changed through a community process and related legislative process. Thus, not all strategies identified in the Housing Element are certain to be implemented. The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development will explore recommendations of the Housing Element as they pertain to findings from the 2011 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing (this report is currently in progress).



### *Secondary Units*

Secondary units (in-law or granny units) are smaller dwellings within a structure that contains a much larger unit, using a space that is surplus to the primary dwelling. Secondary units represent a simple and cost-effective method of expanding the housing supply. Such units can be developed to meet the needs of seniors, people with disabilities, and others who, because of modest incomes or lifestyles, prefer or need small units at relatively low rents. Within community planning processes, the City may explore where secondary units can occur without adversely affecting the neighborhood.

### *Smaller Units*

Density standards in San Francisco have traditionally encouraged larger units by setting the number of dwelling units in proportion to the size of the building lot. However, in some areas, the City may consider using the building envelope to regulate the maximum residential square footage. This will encourage smaller units in neighborhoods where building types are well suited for increased density.

Moreover, the Planning Department allows a density bonus of twice the number of dwelling units when the housing is specifically designed for and occupied by senior citizens, physically or mentally disabled persons.

### *Rental Units*

In recent years the production of new housing has yielded primarily ownership units, but low-income and middle-income residents are usually renters. The City encourages the continued development of rental housing, including market-rate rentals that can address moderate and middle income needs. Recent community planning efforts have explored incentives such as fee waivers and reductions in inclusionary housing requirements in return for the development of deed-restricted, long-term rental housing. The Planning Department will monitor the construction of middle income housing under new provisions included within the inclusionary requirements of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans and consider expanding those provisions Citywide if they are successful.

### Identify and Implement Creative Financing Strategies

Due to the high cost of housing subsidies required to provide a unit to low and very low income households (subsidy of \$170,000-\$200,000 required per unit), financing is amongst the most challenging barriers to affordable housing production. In addition, several Federal and State programs that historically have supported affordable housing development are at risk. The current recession has impacted government coffers as well as financial institutions, reducing the capital available for development. For example, the Federal Low Income Housing Tax Credit program (LIHTC) has, in years past, financed about 90% of affordable housing. In this economic climate and with the elimination of redevelopment agencies and their required commitment of 20% of their tax increment to affordable housing, the City of San Francisco is seeking creative solutions to finance affordable housing production and preservation.

### *Jobs-Housing Linkage Program*

New commercial and other non-residential development increase the City's employment base and thereby increase the demand for housing. The City's Jobs-Housing Linkage Program, which collects fees for affordable housing production from commercial developments, will continue to be enforced and monitored.

### *Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credits*

Planning and OEWD will promote the use of the Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credits to help subsidize rental projects, and continue to provide information about such preservation incentives to repair, restore, or rehabilitate historic resources towards rental housing in lieu of demolition.

### *Citywide Inclusionary Housing Program*

Planning and MOHCD will continue to implement the Citywide Inclusionary Housing Program, which requires the inclusion of permanently affordable units in housing developments of 10 or more units. MOHCD is also looking to expand the program to allow developers to target higher incomes than what is currently allowed under the Inclusionary Housing Program in exchange for more affordable housing units to be built.

### *Tax Increment Financing*

Tax Increment dollars in the major development projects of Mission Bay, Hunters Point Shipyard and Transbay will continue to be set aside for affordable housing as required by the development agreements for those major development projects and subject to the State Department of Finance's approval.

### *Housing Trust Fund*

San Francisco voters approved Proposition C in November 2012, which amended the City's charter to enable creation of the Housing Trust Fund. It is a fund that shall exist for 30 years payable from set-asides from the City's general fund and other local sources. MOHCD is implementing housing programs or modifying existing programs to account for this new funding source and began using funds from the Housing Trust Fund in July 2013.

### Reduce Regulatory Barriers

Public processing time, staffing, and fees related to City approval make up a considerable portion of affordable development costs. The City has implemented Priority Application Processing through coordination with the Planning Department, Department of Building Inspection, and Department of Public Works for 100% affordable projects. This expedites the review and development process and reduces overall development costs. Current City policy also allows affordable housing developers to pursue zoning accommodations through rezoning and application of a Special Use District. The Planning Department, in consultation with MOHCD and the development community, is exploring implementation of a San Francisco-specific density bonus program expanding upon the State Density Bonus law, which would enable a more expeditious land use entitlement process for projects that provide more affordable housing than required by local law by eliminating the need to use Special Use Districts to make certain zoning exceptions.

The City is also exploring mechanisms that maintain the strength of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and its use as a tool for environmental protection while eliminating aspects of its implementation that are not appropriate and unnecessarily delay proposed projects. For instance, the Planning Department will continue to prioritize projects that comply with CEQA requirements for infill exemptions by assigning planners immediately upon receipt of such applications. Other improvements to CEQA implementation are underway. For example, a recent Board of Supervisors report studied how to meaningfully measure traffic impacts in CEQA.

### Address NIMBYISM

Neighborhood resistance to new development, especially affordable housing development, poses a significant barrier. However, NIMBYism can be reduced by engaging neighbors in a thorough and respectful planning process. In order to increase the supply and affordability of housing, the City has engaged in significant planning for housing through Area Plans and other processes that respect community voice and neighborhood character. In general, the Planning Department's review of projects and development of guidelines builds on community local controls, including Area plans, neighborhood specific guidelines, neighborhood Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CC&R's) and other resident-driven standards for development.

Public education about the desirability and necessity of affordable housing is also an ongoing effort. Planning, DBI and other agencies will continue to provide informational sessions at Planning Commission Department of Building Inspection Commission and other public hearings to educate citizens about affordable housing.

### **Discussion:**

As one of the most expensive cities in the United States to live, the need for affordable housing is more acute than elsewhere in the country. Consequently the need to remove barriers to the production or preservation of affordable housing has become an even more important priority for MOHCD. MOHCD is working closely with other City departments to revisit the City regulations that may serve one public purpose, such as increasing indoor air quality in residential buildings near major roadways, but is becoming a barrier to affordable housing production by increasing the development cost of affordable housing by requiring more expensive mechanical ventilation systems. MOHCD will also continue to work with other City departments to improve City process improvements that will help expedite the production of affordable housing be it with the Planning or Building Inspection departments.

## **AP-85 Other Actions – 91.220(k)**

### **Introduction:**

#### **Actions planned to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs**

Obstacles to meeting underserved needs for San Francisco are related to the extent of need in the City and the diversity of the population of the City. Major obstacles are limited funds, language barriers and gaps in institutional structure.

Due to high housing costs, economic conditions, poverty and unemployment, a significantly large number of low-income San Franciscans are not economically self-sufficient. The limited resources that are available to support programs and services that help individuals and families to become self-sufficient are inadequate. The situation is made worse by reductions in funding at the federal, state and local government levels at the same time as needs are increasing due to the weak economy. To minimize the impact of the City's limited resources, MOHCD and OEWD have increased our strategic coordination with other City departments in an effort to avoid duplication of services and to maximize the leveraging of federal, state and local dollars.

Another major set of obstacles are language barriers. San Francisco has historically been a haven for immigrants. Language barriers impact immigrants' abilities to access necessities such as employment, healthcare, and police protection. Many adult immigrants and refugees are not necessarily literate in their own native languages, and struggle to master the complexities of English. In particular, sophisticated transactions such as legal issues or governmental forms may be confusing. Of all San Franciscans over the age of five, 46% speak a language other than English at home, with the largest language groups being Chinese, Spanish, Tagalog and Russian. Fifty percent of the Asian population are of limited English proficiency (LEP), meaning that they speak English less than "very well." Thirty percent of Asian children are identified as LEP. Fourteen percent of San Francisco households are "linguistically isolated" with no one in the household over the age of 14 indicating that they speak English "well" or "very well". Among Asian households, that number increases to 35%. At the individual level, about 25% of all San Franciscans in the 2008 survey indicated that they did not speak English "very well", which is the third highest percentage in the state of California, and the 10<sup>th</sup> highest percentage of any county in the entire United States.

In response to this particular obstacle, San Francisco uses CDBG resources to provide language-appropriate services to linguistically and culturally isolated individuals and families, including translation services, legal services, vocational ESL instruction, information and referral, and case management. Services are provided through CDBG funding to neighborhood-based multi-service community centers.

Another action that will be taken will be granting those households displaced by Ellis Act evictions and former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency displacement first preference to any affordable housing under MOHCD's purview. These households were forcibly displaced from their homes so the San Francisco Board of Supervisors deemed them to have higher priority to be screened for eligibility for MOHCD's affordable housing stock. In order to qualify for this housing, these households must be certified by MOHCD that they meet specific displacement criteria, such as having lived in their residence for at least 10 years (or 5 years if they were seniors or disabled) prior to receiving an eviction notice under the State Ellis Act. MOHCD will also certify if a household was living in the Western Addition or

Hunters Point area during the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency's large-scale displacement of residents from those areas under its 1960s urban renewal policies. Should these households be certified that they were displaced by an Ellis Act eviction or by the Redevelopment Agency and given a certificate of preference, then these households would be prioritized for eligibility screening for MOHCD's affordable housing. These certificate of preference holders must meet the housing's eligibility criteria, such as income and household size, for the housing they applied to.

### **Actions planned to foster and maintain affordable housing**

The maintenance and preservation of existing affordable housing is a key housing activity for San Francisco given the age of its affordable housing stock. To this end San Francisco periodically issues Notice of Funding Availability for addressing the most pressing capital needs of existing affordable housing, especially those that impact the health and safety and ultimately the long-term livability of the properties.

### **Actions planned to reduce lead-based paint hazards**

The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development is a multi-grant recipient of HUD's Office of Lead Hazard Control and Healthy Homes. Over the past 20 years, MOHCD has developed a highly collaborative infrastructure of City agencies and non-profit organizations to address childhood lead poisoning, lead hazards, and other health conditions stemming from poor quality housing in low-income communities. Collaborating agencies serve as referral partners to the lead program, which is a vital component of the day-to-day programmatic activities of MOHCD's Lead and Housing Rehabilitation Programs unit, which serves to improve low-income tenant- and owner-occupied housing.

To promote the occupancy of lead safe units by low-income families with children, the program will require property owners to execute a grant agreement, deed of trust, and declaration of restrictions that impose a five year restriction period; forbidding the property owner to evict current tenants; requiring property managers to maintain the property free of lead hazards; affirmatively marketing to low-income families with children under the age of six; and advertising and coordinating re-rentals through our office. As a result of this enforcement tool, MOHCD maintains a registry of lead remediated housing units, which upon re-rental must be affirmatively marketed to low-income families with children under the age of six. These re-rentals must also be advertised and coordinated through MOHCD. In addition, MOHCD's monitoring and asset management team performs compliance monitoring requiring the owner to provide documentation of current tenants and property maintenance. MOHCD also requires CDBG funded housing, tenant rights, and other non-profit housing related agencies to provide lead poisoning prevention education to tenant families with young children, information on the Federal Lead Hazard Disclosure Law, and information on MOHCD's Lead Program.

MOHCD response system is comprised of several City agencies and non-profit partners to address the problem of lead poisoning, prohibited nuisances code enforcement and dilapidated housing. Fundamental to the response system, the San Francisco Department of Public Health code enforcement has the legislative authority to cite property owners with a notice of violation whenever there is visibly deteriorated paint in the exterior or interior of a pre-1978 building where children under six may be exposed to the lead hazard. These violations become direct referrals to MOHCD, which provides lead grant assistance for the assessment and remediation services of lead hazards in low-income tenant- and owner-occupied housing.

In addition, MOHCD works with the Family Childcare Association, the Children’s Council, the San Francisco Head Start Program, and other private preschools serving low-income families - to ensure families are educated on lead poisoning prevention and timely lead blood level testing of children under the age of six. As a result, low-income children attending targeted preschools are regularly tested for lead blood content as a commitment to a healthy educational start. Children with a detectable lead blood level are case managed by the San Francisco Department of Public Health.

### **Actions planned to reduce the number of poverty-level families**

San Francisco is perceived as a wealthy area with an average household income of \$117,255. However, 13.8% of residents live below the poverty level. According to Chief Economist, Ted Egan, between 1990 and 2010, the population living in Extremely Low / Very Low income households (those earning less than 50% of Area Median Income) has grown the most. Growth has also been seen in households earning over 150% of area median income, and, to a lesser extent, in those earning 120-150% of AMI. The low income population (50-80% of AMI) has seen very slight growth, and the moderate income population (80-120%) experienced a decline in absolute numbers.

The cost of housing in San Francisco exacerbates the wealth disparity. Local housing costs not only exceed the national average but, thanks to a housing market crash that affected San Francisco less than other places, the city now has the most expensive housing in the region.

OEWD has implemented evidence-based sector academies and programs that provide access to employment opportunities for our priority populations, those most affected by wealth disparity. Our sectors – healthcare, construction, information and communications technology, and hospitality – were selected because of their high growth potential, entry-level employment opportunities, and more importantly, because of their pathways to self-sufficiency and economic security.

All San Franciscans deserve to live in safety and prosperity. But today, not all San Franciscans do. In truth, while we are one City, united in name and government, we remain separate communities. In neighborhoods with concentrated poverty, there is a San Francisco that is a community apart, separated by geography, violence, and decades of neglect. According to the U.S. Census Bureau’s 2012 5-Year American Community Survey, 13.2%, of San Francisco’s residents live in poverty. This, in the context of a growing yet fragile city economy with a \$6 billion budget and for many people unaffordable housing presents a unique opportunity for monumental change.

San Francisco’s unequal income distribution and skyrocketing housing prices could jeopardize the City’s future competitiveness and overall economic stability. The role of government is to intervene where the market fails society’s most vulnerable populations, the City’s poorest residents. At the neighborhood level, the City’s policy levers include investing public funds to counteract policies at other levels of government that disadvantage a geographic area, promote localized economic development, create jobs, and increase the provision of goods and services. Because most nonprofits lack the economies of scale to construct infrastructure, and private actors have little incentive to invest in reweaving the frayed social fabric, government through a strategic public-private partnership is uniquely positioned to create the required innovative infrastructure to eradicate poverty. This infrastructure facilitates novel policy development, the formation of equitable redevelopment, enhanced service access and social capital in areas of concentrated poverty.

In April 2007, the Center for American Progress issued a report, *From Poverty to Prosperity: A National Strategy to Cut Poverty in Half*, which was the result of the Center convening a diverse group of national experts and leaders to examine the causes and consequences of poverty in America and to make recommendations for national action. In the report, the Center’s Task Force on Poverty calls for a national goal of cutting poverty in half in the next 10 years and proposes a strategy to reach the goal.

In order to cut poverty in half over the next 10 years, the Task Force on Poverty recommended that strategies should be guided by four principles:

- **Promote Decent Work:** People should work and work should pay enough to ensure that workers and their families can avoid poverty, meet basic needs, and save for the future;
- **Provide Opportunity for All:** Children should grow up in conditions that maximize their opportunities for success; adults should have opportunities throughout their lives to connect to work, get more education, live in a good neighborhood, and move up in the workforce;
- **Ensure Economic Security:** People should not fall into poverty when they cannot work or work is unavailable, unstable, or pays so little that they cannot make ends meet; and
- **Help People Build Wealth:** Everyone should have the opportunity to build assets that allow them to weather periods of flux and volatility, and to have the resources that may be essential to advancement and upward mobility.

San Francisco’s anti-poverty strategy embodies all of these guiding principles. Creating opportunity for socially and economically isolated San Franciscans requires a multifaceted and comprehensive approach.

### **Smart Government**

Smart government starts with inter-agency collaboration and community-based partnerships. Across the City, innovative strategies have been developed to provide unprecedented opportunities for our residents. From healthcare to housing, environment to employment, San Francisco is at the forefront of developing and implementing best practices to make our city better for everyone. However, many of the residents in our most disconnected neighborhoods lack the resources they need to connect to those programs and strategies. Low educational attainment, safety concerns, inability to access capital, and the lack of a cohesive social fabric to support residents makes it difficult to reach even the first rungs of these ladders. Working together in four priority areas – homelessness, asset building/homeownership, employment and youth/education – City departments are developing “on-ramps” that give residents the skills and resources they need to take advantage of the City’s innovations.

**Table 89 – “On-Ramp” Programs to Address City Goals**

Policy area	Homelessness	Asset Building/Homeownership	Employment	Youth/Education
Goal	To end chronic homelessness	Asset building for low- and moderate-income residents	Living-wage jobs with opportunities for career advancement	All students graduate high school and have the ability to go to college
City strategy	<b>Housing First</b> is a successful program that	<b>City’s First Time Homebuyers’ Program</b> helps low-income	<b>Four Sectors</b> have been identified by OEWD as having	<b>SF Promise</b> guarantees college financial assistance

Policy area	Homelessness	Asset Building/Homeownership	Employment	Youth/Education
	places homeless individuals into permanent supportive housing with wrap around services	residents afford to own in San Francisco	high growth potential for our city. Job training and development programs are aligned around those sectors	for SF students who do well in school and graduate high school
“On-Ramp”	<b>Project Homeless Connect</b> reaches out to homeless individuals every other month and provides a one-stop shop of health and human services for them	<b>Bank on San Francisco</b> is an award winning national model program which allows families dependent on high-cost check-cashers to easily open a starter bank account with mainstream financial institutions <b>Financial Empowerment Center Initiative</b> is an inter-departmental program to support centers that will conduct financial triage, set goals, and establishes action plans in 5 service areas: money management, improved credit, decreased debt, safe and affordable banking relationships, and build savings	<b>Career Pathways that promote job mobility and advancement:</b> Creating career pathways that support the ability of residents and workers to attain the industry relevant/recognized skills employers are looking for is key to job mobility and advancement in the San Francisco labor market. Working in partnership with employers, the City will continue to implement industry-driven pathway approaches that cross learning at the K-12 and post-secondary levels.	<b>Promise Neighborhood</b> is a federal Department of Education-supported program that brings together City departments and community-based organizations to transform a low-income, largely immigrant neighborhood by linking family economic security with student academic achievement. It creates a comprehensive, integrated framework of evidence-based services that responds to urgent needs and builds on the foundation of student, family, community, and school strengths and assets. <b>The City’s Family Resource Center Initiative</b> brings national and local best practices in parent education and family support



Policy area	Homelessness	Asset Building/Homeownership	Employment	Youth/Education
				to high need communities. This inter-departmental program has tracks for parents of new babies, preschoolers and young kids. It provides support for all parents so they can help each other in the knowledge that it “takes a village”.

An on-ramp is only as good as the system to which it connects. In some cases, those systems are not working as well as they could. City departments are working together with community-based organizations to determine situations where existing systems need to be tweaked or overhauled to achieve their intended effect. A critical part is changing the way the system works. If we want these efforts to result in lasting change, we must move beyond the coordination efforts often associated with an initiative to true integration and a new system that lasts beyond the efforts of any group of individuals driving the initiative. To do that will require some changes in the infrastructure that support the programs and services offered by the City.

**Community Voice**

Innovating means understanding problems and solutions at the ground level. The City must work alongside skilled and informed stakeholders that live in and know the neighborhoods and are able to work with us to pinpoint where systems are breaking down. These organized residents then hold everyone – the City, the nonprofit providers and their fellow residents themselves – accountable for measuring and achieving real results.

**Shared Data and Goals**

The first fundamental change is to create a mechanism to better share data across City agencies. Sharing data is critical as it allows us to identify specific families in multiple systems of care, who require multiple interventions. Understanding the complete needs of an individual and family helps City programs provide a more customized set of services to those families, ensure those services are coordinated, and identify where there are gaps in services that need to be addressed. Residents will be able to provide informed consent to participate in data sharing.

**Sector Based Approach to Workforce Development**

San Francisco has identified a sector, or industry-based approach to organize key aspects of its workforce development activities. Sector-based programs are skill-development that align training to meet the specific demands of growing or high demand industries. They incorporate case management, career counseling, and job search assistance for workers.

Sector strategies have emerged as a best practice within federal state and local policy. A recently published report by Public/Private Ventures, *Targeting Industries, Training Workers and Improving Opportunities*, through a longitudinal random assign study found that sector strategies have produced the following results:

- Participants in skills-training programs had decreases in poverty, from 64 percent to 35 percent.
- Participants in skills-training programs also accessed higher-quality jobs. The percentage of participants with health insurance available through their employers increased from 49 percent to 73 percent, while the percentage with paid sick leave increased from 35 percent to 58 percent.
- Many participants in skills-training programs obtained jobs in targeted sectors. Among advanced skills-training participants, these positions paid more than positions unrelated to training.
- Sectoral Employment Initiative participants believed the programs helped them achieve success in the labor market. Eighty-three percent of participants agreed that the training prepared them well for work in the targeted sector, and 78 percent said the program had improved their chances of getting a good job.
- Organizations using sectoral approaches other than or in addition to skills training demonstrated the potential to bring about systemic change. In very different contexts, through organizing and advocacy efforts or using leverage with industry contacts to negotiate with educational institutions, organizations either led or were involved in efforts that brought about significant changes to systems—changes that had the potential to benefit less-educated workers throughout the targeted sector.<sup>160</sup>

San Francisco’s proven sector strategy for workforce development is rooted in detailed economic analysis and forecasting performed by both the San Francisco Office of Economic Analysis (OEA) and the California Employment Development Department (EDD).

Since hitting the trough of the last business cycle in 2010, San Francisco has demonstrated its economic resiliency and recovery. In 2012, total employment in the City reached pre-recession levels<sup>161</sup>, and, since reaching this milestone, the unemployment rate has continued to steadily decline – standing at \_\_\_\_% as of the publishing of this report<sup>162</sup>.

The city is also out performing other large counties throughout the country. Between 2011-2012, San Francisco was the fastest growing large county in the United States as measured in annual private sector job growth. San Francisco’s recovery has also occurred across sectors with every sector in the city’s economy outpacing the US growth rate<sup>163</sup>.

The key characteristics of San Francisco’s Sector Based Approach include

- Identified four priority industries based upon employment growth, job accessibility to moderately skilled workers, career ladder opportunities, and providing self sufficiency wages.
- Align skill development and occupational skills training to meet the workforce needs of these priority industries.

---

<sup>160</sup> Roder, Anne; Clymer, Carol; Wyckoff, Laura; *Targeting Industries, Training Workers and Improving Opportunities*; Public Private Ventures 2010

<sup>161</sup> Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2013

<sup>162</sup> California Employment Development Department, 2014

<sup>163</sup> Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2013

- Identify intermediaries who can engage industries serve as a bridge to social service providers that work intensively with disadvantaged participants.
- Integrate intensive case management into skill development and job training programs
- Implement and enforce policies that generate employment opportunities for San Francisco workers.

### ***Serious Collaboration***

The City will bring together public and philanthropic funding, tap into nonprofit expertise, and work with businesses and corporations to make sure that opportunity is accessible for all people in our communities and that every community can fully contribute its strengths and unique culture to our collective prosperity.

### **Economic Development**

For the first time since the closing of the Hunters Point Ship Yard real investment, nearly \$1 billion, is slated for the surrounding communities. From major public investment such as the redevelopment of public housing to significant private investment such as the development at the old Ship Yard and the Schlage Lock site, renewed activity in the southeast sector brings jobs, revitalizes buildings and neighborhoods and has the potential to transform communities.

One challenge is helping residents to get ready for such economic development. Many of the jobs that are available require different skill levels than most residents have. The City has been working with planning and contracting groups to try and forecast employment needs further out to give more time to prepare residents with the right skills. When there are many steps in the process, it is difficult to get the whole pipeline running smoothly. City departments, including MOHCD, OCII and OEWD, are working closely to develop training programs, provide life skills support, create job opportunities, and adjust employment systems that make this process more seamless.

### **Nonprofit Collaboration**

The City cannot do this work alone. There are hundreds of nonprofit organizations that provide critical services, reach out to residents and advocate for change. Without these organizations the social service delivery system simply will not work. However, through surveys and focus groups, we heard from residents that the quality of services was uneven. We also heard from nonprofits themselves that they lacked access to the kind of training and capacity building they believed they needed in order to reach their full potential. The City is working with community-based organizations (CBOs) through a number of capacity building City initiatives to develop new capacity building supports and deeper partnerships. This include the Capacity Building Project within the City's Controller's Office; MOHCD's capacity building programs; the Department of Children, Youth and their Family's capacity building programs; the Nonprofit Displacement Working Group; and the newly created Nonprofit Sector Initiative within the Office of Economic and Workforce Development.

### **Private Investment**

Reducing poverty is a major transformation that the public sector cannot do alone. There is an important role for philanthropy and the private sector to play in its implementation. The vast majority of new job creation will occur in the private sector.

The City sees foundations playing several roles:

- Providing expert advice
- Jointly funding critical enabling elements of the strategy

- Aligning other funding with the strategy
- Providing support for the strategy in the San Francisco public debate
- Helping identify and raise other philanthropic support

To that end, the City has newly created the position of Director of Strategic Partnerships within the Mayor's Office; this new position is focused on creating meaningful partnerships with private philanthropy to leverage private resources to support the City's work.

### **Actions planned to develop institutional structure**

The large number of non-profit organizations serving low-income communities in San Francisco is both an asset and a challenge. With a long history of serving the community, the sheer number of non-profits leads to increased competition for limited resources. Conversely, the benefits of a rich variety of social service organizations often translates to more community-based and culturally competent services for low-income residents. Lack of organizational capacity of non-profits is another gap in institutional structure. In response, the City is engaged in an ongoing effort to work with non-profits in organizational and programmatic capacity building to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of service delivery.

It is the City's policy to coordinate community development and housing activities among its departments. Because this work involves many City departments, coordination and information sharing across the various departments are challenges. City staff meets on a regular and as-needed basis with colleagues from other City departments to overcome gaps in institutional structure. For example, MOHCD leads a regular working group focused on the issues of nonprofit displacement with every other department with a significant investment in community-based organizations. Another example is the Alignment Committee, which was created in 2014 to undertake long and short-term planning for the City's workforce development programs, to set goals and priorities for these programs, to coordinate workforce development activities among City departments, and to monitor their effectiveness. In the coming months, the Alignment Committee will engage with stakeholders from throughout San Francisco to refine this plan into a comprehensive strategy for City workforce development services and investments. Among other stakeholders, the Alignment Committee will hear from jobseekers, employers, community based organizations, labor, and education and training partners.

In addition, staff of the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development and the Office of Economic and Workforce Development uses the Consolidated Plan/Action Plan development process as an opportunity to engage other departments in a dialogue about the current developments and priorities. This dialogue aids the City in being more strategic in the investment of Consolidated Plan dollars.

### **Actions planned to enhance coordination between public and private housing and social service agencies**

The City's senior advisor on health services convenes a monthly Health and Human Services Cluster meeting. Participating in this Cluster are the Directors of Public Health, Community Development, Human Services, Aging and Adult Services, Workforce Development, and Children, Youth and their Families. This monthly convening provides a regular forum to discuss issues of services coordination, policy, new initiatives, funding opportunities, and emerging needs. In addition, the Director of MOHCD meets on a weekly basis with the Director of Planning and the Director of Development for the Office of

Economic and Workforce Development to discuss affordable and market-rate housing development issues citywide.

The City's HOPE SF initiative, focusing on the revitalization of four selected public housing sites at Hunters View, Alice Griffith, Sunnyside, and Potrero Terrace/Annex, brings together a bi-monthly Leadership Team consisting of deputy-level City staff representing health, human services, children and youth, workforce development, public housing, community development, affordable housing, and private philanthropy.

Affordable housing developers in San Francisco have formed a council that meets on a monthly basis to assist in the coordinated development of affordable housing throughout the City. Staff from MOHCD participates in these monthly meetings to provide a two-way channel of communication between these community based organizations and the City representatives who are responsible for overseeing City-financed affordable housing.

The City agencies also coordinate in the decision-making at the project level on affordable housing developments in the City, including at the level of individual project funding decisions. The Citywide Affordable Housing Loan makes funding recommendations to the Mayor for affordable housing development throughout the City or to the OCII Commission for affordable housing under their jurisdiction. Committee Members consist of the directors or the director's representative from the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development, Department of Public Health and Human Services Agency and the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure as successor to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (OCII). MOHCD also works closely with OCII, the Human Services Agency and the Department of Public Health to issue requests for proposals (RFPs) or notices of funding availability (NOFAs) on a regular basis to seek applications for particular types of developments. NOFAs are generally issued for projects to serve specific populations (family renters, single adults, seniors, people requiring supportive services, etc.), while RFPs are generally issued for specific development sites. Staff develops funding and general policy recommendations to the Loan Committee.

Staff from MOHCD, OCII, the Human Services Agency and Department of Public Health also meets on a bi-monthly basis to coordinate the development and operation of the City's permanent supportive housing pipeline and portfolio. Like the Health and Human Services Cluster meeting, this bi-monthly convening provides a regular forum to discuss issues of services coordination, policy, new initiatives, funding opportunities, and emerging needs specific for permanent supportive housing funded by these departments.

The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development also is a member of the Long Term Care Coordinating Council (LTCCC). This body is charged to: (1) advise, implement, and monitor community-based long term care planning in San Francisco; and (2) facilitate the improved coordination of home, community-based, and institutional services for older adults and adults with disabilities. It is the single body in San Francisco that evaluates all issues related to improving community-based long-term care and supportive services. The LTCCC has 41 membership slots. Membership categories were created to ensure representation from a variety of consumers, advocates, and service providers (non-profit and public). The Mayor appoints people to fill 32 slots, which represent non-profit service provider organizations, consumers, and advocates. The additional 9 slots represent City and County departments including: Human Services, Aging and Adult Services, Public Health (two slots), Mayor's Office on Disability, Mayor's Office of Housing, San Francisco Housing Authority, and the Municipal Railway, plus one non-voting slot to enable representation of the Mayor's Office. The LTCCC evaluates how service

delivery systems interact to serve people, and recommends ways to improve service coordination and system interaction. Workgroups responsible for carrying out the activities in the plan provide periodic progress reports through presentations to the LTCCC.

**Discussion:**

See above.

## Program Specific Requirements

### AP-90 Program Specific Requirements – 91.220(I)(1,2,4)

#### Introduction:

#### Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG) Reference 24 CFR 91.220(I)(1)

Projects planned with all CDBG funds expected to be available during the year are identified in the Projects Table. The following identifies program income that is available for use that is included in projects to be carried out.

1. The total amount of program income that will have been received before the start of the next program year and that has not yet been reprogrammed	2,462,600
2. The amount of proceeds from section 108 loan guarantees that will be used during the year to address the priority needs and specific objectives identified in the grantee's strategic plan.	0
3. The amount of surplus funds from urban renewal settlements	0
4. The amount of any grant funds returned to the line of credit for which the planned use has not been included in a prior statement or plan	0
5. The amount of income from float-funded activities	0
<b>Total Program Income:</b>	<b>2,462,600</b>

#### Other CDBG Requirements

1. The amount of urgent need activities	0
2. The estimated percentage of CDBG funds that will be used for activities that benefit persons of low and moderate income. Overall Benefit - A consecutive period of one, two or three years may be used to determine that a minimum overall benefit of 70% of CDBG funds is used to benefit persons of low and moderate income. Specify the years covered that include this Annual Action Plan.	99.00%

#### HOME Investment Partnership Program (HOME) Reference 24 CFR 91.220(I)(2)

1. A description of other forms of investment being used beyond those identified in Section 92.205 is as follows:

HOME funds are only being used for those eligible activities identified in 24 CFR 92.205. In addition to the HOME funds, MOHCD is also using local funds to supplement the HOME funds for HOME-eligible

activities, namely funds from San Francisco's Housing Trust Fund or from housing or job-linkage fees collected by the City and County of San Francisco.

2. A description of the guidelines that will be used for resale or recapture of HOME funds when used for homebuyer activities as required in 92.254, is as follows:

An account and a reuse account are established in the City and County of San Francisco's Financial Accounting Management Information System (FAMIS) accounting system. An exclusive account is set-up for the HOME ADDI program which is segregated from other funding sources.

The City and County of San Francisco's Financial Accounting Management Information System is used to track and report expenditures and income for each HOME ADDI loan to a program qualified borrower; including information related to the individual borrower detail such as borrower name and address.

All HOME ADDI loan repayments including loan principal and share of appreciation is deposited into the reuse account. Funds in the account and reuse account are expended in accordance with the HOME ADDI program guidelines.

3. A description of the guidelines for resale or recapture that ensures the affordability of units acquired with HOME funds? See 24 CFR 92.254(a)(4) are as follows:

MOHCD does not use HOME funds to acquire property that would be resold, such as single-family homes. MOHCD may use HOME funds to acquire multifamily properties. Any property receiving HOME funds will have a declaration of restrictions recorded against the property, which will specify the affordability requirements of the HOME funds. The declaration of restrictions and its affordability restrictions remain recorded on the property even if the HOME funds are repaid before the end of the declaration of restriction's term. Furthermore the HOME loan agreement includes the form of MOHCD's annual monitoring report that sub-recipients of HOME funds must submit to MOHCD on an annual basis. This report includes the rent schedule that MOHCD crosschecks against the HOME affordability restrictions.

4. Plans for using HOME funds to refinance existing debt secured by multifamily housing that is rehabilitated with HOME funds along with a description of the refinancing guidelines required that will be used under 24 CFR 92.206(b), are as follows:

If MOHCD loans HOME funds to multifamily projects that require refinancing and rehabilitation then MOHCD requires the project to meet its underwriting guidelines as well as extend the affordability term for an additional 55 years. Those guidelines include but are not limited to: the requirement that the rehabilitation must be a certain per unit threshold if any existing MOHCD financing is being requested to be refinanced; specify if the HOME funds will be used to maintain the number of existing affordable units or whether the funds will help create new HOME-assisted units; require that the underwriting must be done in conjunction with MOHCD's annual monitoring of the operations of the property to ensure the rehabilitation is not a result of poor ongoing maintenance of the property; demonstrate that the long term needs of the project can be met and including serving the targeted population over an extended affordability; state whether the HOME funds are being used in a NRSA; and explicitly inform the project sponsor that HOME funds cannot be used to refinancing other Federally-funded loans such as CDBG.



**Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG)**  
**Reference 91.220(l)(4)**

1. Include written standards for providing ESG assistance (may include as attachment)

The following standards have been developed by the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development in consultation with local Continuum of Care staff and with community-based organizations that serve individuals and families experiencing homelessness and those who are at imminent risk of experiencing homelessness.

These standards are intended to serve as broad standards through which San Francisco's various ESG sub-recipients may incorporate additional requirements, limits, etc. into their respective ESG programs to more effectively serve diverse populations who are experiencing homelessness or who are at risk of experiencing homelessness. It is anticipated that as San Francisco's highly coordinated Continuum of Care and its broader system of health and human service providers build a more integrated service delivery infrastructure, these ESG standards may also become more standardized and the delivery of ESG assistance more uniform. Currently however, ESG sub-recipients' programs reflect the diversity of the individuals and families experiencing homelessness or who are at risk of experiencing homelessness and thusly do not use a one-size-fits-all approach to address and prevent homelessness.

ESG sub-recipients include, but are not limited to: victim service providers, legal service providers, family shelter providers, youth shelter providers, etc. ESG sub-recipients have designed ESG programming that is responsive to the needs of their respective clientele and connects ESG program participants to the broader health and human service system, which includes mainstream benefits and services, and permanent supportive housing.

**Standard policies and procedures for evaluating individuals' and families' eligibility for assistance under ESG**

Individuals and families seeking assistance must receive at least an initial consultation and eligibility assessment with a case manager or other authorized representative who can determine eligibility and the appropriate type of assistance needed. ESG sub-recipients shall ensure that all program participants, at the time of intake, meet the definition of *homeless* or *at risk of homelessness* (including meeting the two threshold criteria – annual income below 30% area median income and lacking immediate resources to attain housing stability) and shall document accordingly, consistent with recordkeeping and reporting requirements at 24 CFR 576.500.

With regard to the need for Homelessness Prevention Assistance, there are many San Franciscans who are housed and have great need but would not experience homelessness if they did not receive assistance. To be eligible for Homelessness Prevention Assistance, programs must assess and document that the household would experience homelessness but for the ESG assistance. In other words, a household would require emergency shelter or would otherwise become literally homeless in the absence of ESG assistance. A household that is at risk of losing their present housing may be eligible if it can be documented that their loss of housing is imminent, they have no appropriate subsequent housing options, and they have no other financial resources and support networks to assist with maintaining current housing or obtaining other housing.

Additionally, ESG sub-recipients shall document the following prior to providing ESG Homelessness Prevention or Rapid Re-Housing Rental Assistance:

- Ensure rents do not exceed the lesser of current fair market rent (San Francisco, CA HUD Metro FMR Area) or the rent reasonableness standard at 24 CFR 982.507. If the gross rent for the unit exceeds either, ESG sub-recipients are prohibited from using ESG funds for any portion of the rent, even if the household is willing and/or able to pay the difference. The FMR and rent reasonableness standard requirement does not apply when a program participant receives only Financial Assistance or Services under Housing Stabilization and Relocation Services. This includes rental application fees, security deposits, an initial payment of last month's rent, utility payments/deposits, and/or moving costs, housing search and placement, housing stability case management, landlord-tenant mediation, legal services, and credit repair. (Note: last month's rent may not exceed the rent charged for any other month; security deposits may not exceed two months' rent.)
- Ensure units meet lead-based paint remediation and disclosure requirements, as well as ESG's minimum habitability standards at 24 CFR 576.403(a) and 576.403(c), respectively.
- See "standards for determining what percentage or amount of rent and utilities costs each program participant must pay while receiving homelessness prevention or rapid re-housing assistance" that are listed below for additional requirements.

ESG sub-recipients will either develop internal documentation forms or utilize standard forms distributed by MOHCD or HUD as available and appropriate.

#### **Standards for targeting and providing essential services related to street outreach**

San Francisco does not fund ESG Street Outreach. However, any agency seeking ESG funds for Street Outreach would be required to develop a written standard developed in consultation with the local Continuum of Care. The agency would be required to design an outreach plan that details targeting strategies for specific populations/subpopulations:

- A listing of the targeted population(s)/subpopulation(s), including recent data that estimates their numbers and location(s)
- Barriers to connecting targeted population(s)/subpopulation(s) to appropriate services, including service gaps
- Strategies to eliminating or mitigating these barriers
- A description of essential services that would be provided

#### **Policies and procedures for admission, diversion, referral and discharge by emergency shelters assisted under ESG, including standards regarding length of stay, if any, and safeguards to meet the safety and shelter needs of special populations, e.g., victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; and individuals and families who have the highest barriers to housing and are likely to be homeless the longest**

Admission to ESG Emergency Shelter facilities will be limited to those who meet the federal definition of *homeless* at 24 CFR 576.2. Upon initial contact at the point-of-entry, individuals and families will be screened by intake staff to determine appropriate response. Responses may range from immediate case management assistance in determining available and unutilized resources, to referrals for existing homelessness prevention and/or rapid re-housing programs.

If diversion is not possible and emergency shelter is appropriate, the maximum length of stay will be no longer than 6 months, unless ESG sub-recipient determines, on a case-by-case basis, that a longer stay is appropriate. No persons who are facing or suspect they may face a threat of violence will be discharged into an unsafe condition. Emergency shelter workers will work in collaboration with appropriate victim service providers to arrange safe accommodations for those who are or may be facing a threat of violence. Those who are in danger of a violent crime or feel they may be will be entered into a secure database system that is comparable to the Homeless Management Information Systems (HMIS). All other Emergency Shelter admissions will be entered into HMIS.

All persons discharged from Emergency Shelter facilities will have their exit status entered into either HMIS or a comparable database, and will be provided discharge paperwork as applicable or upon request.

Individuals and families who are determined to have the highest barriers to housing – due to a myriad of factors including discrimination, dual-diagnosis, chronic homelessness, etc. – will be prioritized for existing housing resources and paired with existing supportive services to increase the likelihood of staying successfully housed consistent with the local Continuum of Care’s Coordinated Assessment system and other local permanent supportive housing systems (e.g., serving veterans, families, transitional age youth, etc.)

**Policies and procedures for assessing, prioritizing, and reassessing individuals’ and families’ needs for essential services related to emergency shelter**

Persons seeking Essential Services related to Emergency Shelter will have access to case management, at a minimum. Other ESG-funded Essential Services that may be available in San Francisco include: child care, education services, employment assistance and job training, outpatient health services, legal services, life skills training, mental health services, substance abuse treatment services, transportation, and services for special populations. These types of essential services are typically funded by other local, state, and federal sources and provided by many health and human service providers. At a minimum, ESG-funded case management will be designed to connect program participants to other essential services, housing resources, and mainstream programs.

Continued assistance at re-assessment will vary according to intensity and duration of Essential Services.

**Policies and procedures for coordination among emergency shelter providers, essential services providers, homelessness prevention, and rapid re-housing assistance providers, other homeless assistance providers, and mainstream service and housing providers (see §576.400(b) and (c) for a list of programs with which ESG-funded activities must be coordinated and integrated to the maximum extent practicable).**

To the extent that the local Continuum of Care is designed to coordinate among these providers to more effectively and efficiently serve persons experiencing homelessness and those who are at risk of experiencing homelessness, ESG sub-recipients will be required to participate in the local Continuum of Care. To meet these goals, the local Continuum of Care requires that all ESG sub-recipients:

- Participate in the Coordinated Assessment system. It is expected that the Coordinated Assessment system will provide a standardized means for clients to access emergency shelter (including essential services), homelessness prevention and rapid re-housing programs, etc., including a common assessment tool for client information related to identification of needs, barriers, risk factors, etc. and a process for referral to other appropriate assistance, especially mainstream and housing resources.

- Ensure that ESG sub-recipient staff coordinate as needed regarding referrals and service delivery with staff from other agencies in order to ensure that services are not duplicated and clients can more easily access appropriate services.
- Ensure that ESG sub-recipient staff participate in any Continuum of Care trainings related to improving coordination among Continuum of Care members and to the implementation of the Coordinated Assessment system.

**Policies and procedures for determining and prioritizing which eligible families and individuals will receive homelessness prevention assistance and which eligible families and individuals will receive rapid re-housing assistance**

ESG Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing assistance (including Rental Assistance, Financial Assistance and other Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services) will be provided based on the chronological order in which eligible individuals and families seek assistance and on the extent of their need. Need is determined by the presence of risk factors, such as: unlawful detainer proceedings, veteran status, survivor of domestic violence status, families with dependent children, chronic homelessness, persons living with HIV/AIDS, etc.

Based upon San Francisco’s high rental costs and extremely low vacancy rates, it may be necessary for ESG program participants to secure housing outside of San Francisco if at the time of intake the participant is living in San Francisco.

The diverse composition of San Francisco’s ESG sub-recipient portfolio reflects the diverse groups who experience homelessness or at risk of experiencing homelessness. These groups include: families, transitional age youth, survivors of domestic violence, persons living with HIV/AIDS, etc. As a result, ESG sub-recipients collectively address the needs of these diverse groups. Internal policies and procedures for determining and prioritizing which individuals and families will receive assistance will vary according to the core competency of the ESG and the population served.

Homelessness Prevention program participants shall be recertified for continued eligibility every three months. Rapid Re-Housing program participants will be recertified annually.

**Standards for determining what percentage or amount of rent and utilities costs each program participant must pay while receiving homelessness prevention or rapid re-housing assistance**

Each ESG sub-recipient will be responsible for determining annual income as a basis of eligibility for services when applicable. As part of this income determination, the relevant staff person will ascertain the amount that the household is able to contribute toward Rental and other Financial Assistance, if any, depending on the ESG sub-recipient’s internal Rental/Financial Assistance program policy. ESG sub-recipients may provide shallow subsidies (payment of a portion of the rent), payment of 100 percent of the rent, a set dollar amount, or graduated or declining subsidies.

Regardless, when providing Rental Assistance, ESG sub-recipients shall document the following:

- Ensure that a written lease agreement is in place; (not required if only providing rental arrears assistance)
- Enter into a rental assistance agreement with the owner of the unit; (not required if only providing rental arrears assistance). This agreement must indicate the amount of the program participant’s contribution toward rent and utilities, as well as the duration of assistance.

- Rental assistance cannot be provided if program participant is also receiving rental assistance from another public source during the same period.
- ESG rental and other financial assistance may be administered by ESG sub-recipients as a grant or may be repaid by program participant. If repaid, funds shall be treated as program income pursuant to 24 CFR 85.25. Program income also includes any amount of a security or utility deposit returned to the ESG sub-recipient.
- See “standard policies and procedures for evaluating individuals’ and families’ eligibility for assistance under ESG” listed above for additional requirements.

As the overall goal the ESG program is to help individuals and families maintain housing independently, it is important that each ESG sub-recipient properly assess potential program participants to ensure that they are a good match for the program, and to refer them to more extensive supports as available if the individual or family is not likely to maintain housing independently.

**Standards for determining how long a particular program participant will be provided with rental assistance and whether and how the amount of that assistance will be adjusted over time**

Each ESG sub-recipient may set a maximum number of months that a program participant may receive rental assistance, or a maximum number of times that a program participant may receive rental assistance. The total period for which any program participant may receive ESG assistance shall not exceed 24 months in three years. However, no program participant may receive more than a cumulative total of 18 months of Rental Assistance, including up to 6 months of Rental Arrears.

Each ESG sub-recipient will conduct an initial screening to determine the number of months that a program participant will initially receive a commitment of Rental Assistance, including Rental Arrears. This initial commitment will be in writing and signed by an ESG sub-recipient representative and the program participant. Factors to take into consideration during the initial commitment are the program participant’s ability to pay rent in the immediate month and subsequent months such as anticipated change in income, time necessary to recover from unexpected expenses, etc.

- Conflicts of Interest
  - Organizational: ESG assistance may not be conditioned on an individual’s or family’s acceptance or occupancy of emergency shelter or housing owned by the City and County of San Francisco or the ESG sub-recipient offering the assistance. No ESG sub-recipient may, with respect to individuals or families occupying housing owned by the ESG sub-recipient, carry out the initial screening required under or administer Homelessness Prevention assistance.
  - Individual: No person who is an employee, agent, consultant, officer, or elected or appointed official of the City and County of San Francisco or the ESG sub-recipient who exercises or has exercised any functions or responsibilities with respect to activities assisted under the ESG program, or who is in a position to participate in a decision-making process or gain inside information with regard to activities assisted under the program, may obtain a financial interest or benefit from an assisted activity; have a financial interest in any contract, subcontract, or agreement with respect to an assisted activity; or have a financial interest in the proceeds derived from an assisted activity, either for him or herself or for those with whom he or she has family or business ties, during his or her tenure or during the one-year period following his or her tenure.

- ESG sub-recipient staff conducting the initial screening and authorizing assistance will be required to certify in a form that complies with these guidelines that a conflict of interest does not exist.

As the program participant is nearing the end of their initial commitment of assistance, the case manager may contact the program participant to assess their need for continued assistance – depending on the design of the ESG sub-recipient’s Rental Assistance program. If continued assistance is necessary and the potential assistance is within the period of recertification (i.e., every three months for Homelessness Prevention assistance and every twelve months for Rapid Re-Housing assistance), the ESG sub-recipient may provide more assistance. Otherwise, the ESG sub-recipient is required to recertify program participant eligibility, as well as perform the necessary requirements for the unit (e.g., habitability standards, rent reasonableness standard, FMR, lease agreement, etc.)

While providing Homelessness Prevention or Rapid Re- Housing assistance to a program participant, ESG sub-recipients shall:

- Require the program participant to have monthly contact, which may include phone/email, with a case manager to assist the program participant in ensuring long-term housing stability.
  - Note: ESG sub-recipients that are victim service providers are exempt from meeting with a case manager if the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 or the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act prohibits the ESG sub-recipient from making its shelter or housing conditional on the participant’s acceptance of services.
- Develop a plan to assist the program participant to retain permanent housing after the ESG assistance ends, taking into account all relevant considerations, such as the program participant’s current or expected income and expenses and other public or private assistance for which the program participant will be eligible and likely to receive.

**Standards for determining the type, amount, and duration of housing stabilization and/or relocation services to provide a program participant, including the limits, if any, on the homelessness prevention or rapid re-housing assistance that each program participant may receive, such as the maximum amount of assistance; maximum number of months the program participant may receive assistance; or the maximum number of times the program participant may receive assistance.**

Each ESG sub-recipient may set a maximum number of months that a program participant may receive Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing assistance, or a maximum number of times that a program participant may receive such assistance. The total period for which any program participant may receive ESG assistance shall not exceed 24 months in three years. However, no program participant may receive more than a cumulative total of 18 months of Rental Assistance, including up to 6 months of Rental Arrears.

Each ESG sub-recipient will conduct an initial screening to determine the number of months that a program participant will initially receive a commitment of ESG assistance, including Rental/Utility Payment Arrears. This initial commitment will be in writing and signed by an ESG sub-recipient representative and the program participant.

As the program participant is nearing the end of their initial commitment of ESG assistance, the case manager may contact the program participant to assess their need for continued assistance – depending on the design of the ESG sub-recipient’s ESG-funded program. If continued assistance is necessary and the potential assistance is within the period of recertification (i.e., every three months for Homelessness Prevention assistance and every twelve months for Rapid Re-Housing assistance), the ESG sub-recipient

may provide more assistance. Otherwise, if continued assistance is needed, the ESG sub-recipient is required to recertify program participant eligibility, as well as perform the necessary requirements for the unit (e.g., habitability standards, rent reasonableness standard, FMR, lease agreement, etc.)

While providing Homelessness Prevention or Rapid Re- Housing assistance to a program participant, ESG sub-recipients shall:

- Require the program participant to have monthly contact, which may include phone/email, with a case manager to assist the program participant in ensuring long-term housing stability.
  - Note: ESG sub-recipients that are victim service providers are exempt from meeting with a case manager if the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 or the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act prohibits the ESG sub-recipient from making its shelter or housing conditional on the participant's acceptance of services.
- Develop a plan to assist the program participant to retain permanent housing after the ESG assistance ends, taking into account all relevant considerations, such as the program participant's current or expected income and expenses and other public or private assistance for which the program participant will be eligible and likely to receive.

2. If the Continuum of Care has established centralized or coordinated assessment system that meets HUD requirements, describe that centralized or coordinated assessment system.

As described above under the Written Standards for Emergency Shelter Activities section, all City-funded shelters for single adults are accessed through HSA resource centers, and Connecting Point is a centralized intake system for homeless families seeking emergency shelter.

Also, as described under the Written Standards for Essential Services Related to Emergency Shelter section, the City's embedded information and referral specialists/case managers act as the coordinating entities within the City's shelter system. The City also centralized the behavior health services within the SF START structure so that one entity offers city-wide services throughout the broad spectrum of interlinked areas of mental health, substance abuse and related medical conditions that homeless individuals and families often exhibit.

3. Identify the process for making sub-awards and describe how the ESG allocation available to private nonprofit organizations (including community and faith-based organizations).

In San Francisco, MOHCD is the lead agency responsible for allocating four federal funding sources, Community Development Block Grant, Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG), HOME Investment Partnership and Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS funds for community development and housing activities. All of San Francisco's ESG-funded services are provided by private non-profit organizations. The process for making ESG funding allocations to non-profit organizations is outlined below:

- In partnership with the Citizen's Committee on Community Development (CCCD), MOHCD and the Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) conduct multiple public hearings to solicit citizen input on community needs for allocating funds from four federal sources, including ESG;
- MOHCD and OEWD issue Requests for Proposals and hold technical assistance workshops for interested non-profit organizations to provide information on the application and the review process;

- MOHCD and OEWD staff review all of the applications that are submitted by non-profit organizations and make funding recommendations to the CCCD;
  - CCCD makes funding recommendations to the Mayor for specific projects that will be implemented by non-profit organizations;
  - In partnership with the CCCD, MOHCD and OEWD conduct a public hearing to solicit input on the preliminary recommendations;
  - Funding recommendations for specific projects that will be implemented by non-profit organizations go through the San Francisco Board of Supervisors review process;
  - The Board of Supervisors and the Mayor approve the funding recommendations; and
  - MOHCD submits annual Action Plan application for HUD consideration.
4. If the jurisdiction is unable to meet the homeless participation requirement in 24 CFR 576.405(a), the jurisdiction must specify its plan for reaching out to and consulting with homeless or formerly homeless individuals in considering policies and funding decisions regarding facilities and services funded under ESG.

MOHCD staff currently coordinates with HSA staff and the Local Board to ensure that the perspective of homeless and formerly homeless individuals and families are integrated into the goals and objectives of the Consolidated Plan. MOHCD will be incorporating input from these individuals and families through hearings held in partnership with the Local Board, neighborhood hearings, focus groups with providers, and surveys conducted with both providers and residents.

5. Describe performance standards for evaluating ESG.

Consistent with consolidated planning regulations at 24 CFR 91.220(1)(4)(vi) and 91.320(k)(3)(v), San Francisco utilizes the following indicators as performance standards for evaluating ESG activities:

- Number of individuals/households served by homelessness prevention and rapid re-housing activities
- Number of individuals/households served by emergency shelter activities
- Number and percentage of individuals/households stably housed after 3 and 6 months from the time of initial homelessness and rapid re-housing assistance
- Number and percentage of individuals/households who avoided eviction
- Number and percentage of individuals/households who transitioned to permanent housing
- Number and percentage of individuals/households who completed 75% of goals of individualized service plan

**Discussion:**



# Appendix

**TENDERLOIN**  
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

CITY & COUNTY OF  
SAN FRANCISCO  
14 NOV -3 PM 4:02  
MAYOR'S OFFICE OF  
COMMUNITY INVESTMENT  
BY \_\_\_\_\_

25 TAYLOR STREET  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102  
TEDP@NOMNIC.ORG  
415.273.9275

November 3, 2014

MOHCD, Consolidated Planning Staff,  
1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor,  
San Francisco, CA 94103

Subject: City and County of San Francisco Draft Consolidated Plan

To Whom it May Concern,

Please accept the enclosed as the Tenderloin Economic Development Project's (TEDP) comments on the City and County of San Francisco's 2015-2019 Draft Consolidated Plan. TEDP's mission is to promote equitable development in the Tenderloin and our comments are related to revising certain portions of the Consolidated Plan's background information to achieve greater focus on the neighborhood and to address the needs of revise the Strategic Priorities to better meet the needs of small business in the Tenderloin.

We would be happy to discuss our comments with you in the future.

Sincerely,



Helen Bean  
Senior Advisor

**Tenderloin Economic Development Project  
Comments on City and County of San Francisco  
Draft 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan**

Pl 175 - Neighborhood Features –Tenderloin/Central Market

- The following text should be edited as follows:
  - Existing text: “Central Market is a vital segment of the urban core of the San Francisco Bay Area. The commercial district sits adjacent to a dense collection of established and emerging mixed-use neighborhoods: the Tenderloin, Civic Center, South of Market, and Union Square.
  - Proposed revised text: “Central Market is a vital segment of the urban core of the San Francisco Bay Area. The commercial district sits adjacent to one established neighborhood, the Tenderloin , and to an emerging neighborhood in the South of Market. It is also adjacent to the civic and retail centers of Civic Center and Union Square.”
  
- The Consolidated Plan should describe the Tenderloin in this section as a distinct neighborhood from Central Market.
  - This section of the Plan should include a basic demographic/economic/housing overview of the Tenderloin based on 2010 census.
  - The Plan should show how Tenderloin has one of San Francisco’s highest densities of permanent long-term, lower-income residents, with a major immigrant population. These residents need a stable neighborhood with neighborhood serving retail services that respond to their needs with businesses owned by them and serving them.
  - The Plan should quantify high crime/blight in Tenderloin based on City data – crimes and public work calls for service.
  - The Plan should describe and document the unheard of rapid rate of increases in commercial rents.

Commercial District Health

- The Plan should describe impact of rapid economic/market growth on small business – i.e. displacement due to rising rents.
- The Plan should describe how this trend is disproportionately affecting small, immigrant owned, businesses.
- Plan should acknowledge that Tenderloin has historically been the neighborhood where small immigrant owned businesses get their start. This role is now endangered due to changing economics of area.

Opportunities

- The Plan should include the following as opportunities:

- Strengthen business that serve the permanent residents of the Tenderloin
- Engage business owners as well as residents in positive activity. This must include stabilization and development of existing business in the Tenderloin in conjunction with attracting and promoting new business.
- Public/private partnerships should include but go beyond the arts and also include the public sector fostering private/private partnerships between the technology sectors and small business.

Strategic Priorities – Area 5 – Tenderloin

Priority Need 2B: Strengthen Small Businesses and Commercial Corridors

- The programs listed under Priority Need 2B should include the following:
  - Due to unprecedented increase in commercial rents in a low-income, culturally diverse, small business neighborhood, it is important to increase resources to organizations stabilizing businesses through community outreach and technical assistance. Time is of the essence in that many businesses are being displaced now.
  - Provide City incentives to property owners to lease to local small businesses and businesses that will meet Tenderloin neighborhood needs.
  - Work with stakeholders to create and implement an incentive and regulatory strategy to assure local serving businesses stay in or locate in the neighborhood.
  - Initiate and implement policies that target more of the direct benefits of the economic boom into the Tenderloin. For example, a dedicate a portion of property tax revenues from tech boom could be set aside to fund Tenderloin community organizations and technical assistance and establish a fund for improving Tenderloin businesses.
  - Strengthen retail and active uses on the ground floor of buildings in the Tenderloin to activate the street frontage and enhance safety in the neighborhood. Target these policies toward the Safe Passage route identified by the community.



**Public Comment Form for Draft 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan**

**Name:** Kate Sorensen, Causa Justa :: Just Cause

**Phone #** 510-763-5877 **Email address:** [kate@cjjc.org](mailto:kate@cjjc.org)

BY  
MAYOR'S OFFICE OF  
COMMUNITY INVESTMENT  
14 NOV -4 PM 12:25  
COUNTY OF  
ALameda

**Comments:**

**The needs assessment (Pages 1 – 141)** rarely includes eviction and displacement as a problem.

**The Assets (pages 147 – 155)** Please include: San Francisco has a long history of public support for tenant’s rights which has lead to model tenant protections and social support and the protection of community and cultural institutions.

**The Needs and Market Analysis Discussion (pages 156 – 178)** Headers called Opportunities embrace development without a plan to protect current long-term residents from displacement. New planning and neighborhood investment must include existing working class residents of color needs and concerns from the start rather than as an after thought.

**The Theory of Change (page 180)** 1<sup>st</sup> column, Target Populations needs to include: low-income residents facing displacement

**SP-10 Geographic Priorities – 91.215 (a)(1) -**

Under the header: Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed

Priority - Activities

On pages:186, 191, 195, 199, 203, 208,

Include this wording:

Outreach and counseling in targeted areas where residents are threatened with displacement and might be unaware of their rights and protections as San Francisco residents.

**SP-25 Priority Needs - 91.215(a)(2) - (pages 213 – 210)**

Add Immigrants to all populations

**Strategy to Remove or Ameliorate the Barriers to Affordable Housing**

**Addressing Barriers to Housing Access – (page 320)**

Add – “at risk of eviction” to the paragraph below:

Finally, MOHCD funds community-based organizations to provide counseling for renters who have recently been evicted or are urgently in need of housing. Among low-income people, individuals with barriers to housing, such as those with disabilities or limited English fluency, are prioritized. Housing counselors help clients navigate public housing, affordable housing, and market rate housing (when appropriate) by guiding them to rental opportunities and assisting with the application process.

Public Comment Form for Draft 2015-2016 Action Plan

Your Name (optional): Robert Hamaguchi  
Executive Director  
Japantown Task Force, Inc.  
Phone # (optional): 415-346-1239

Email address (optional): bobh@japantowntaskforce.org

April 2, 2015

MOHCD Staff  
1 South Van Ness Avenue 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94103

To Whom It May Concern:

Japantown Task Force, Inc., a program of the Japanese Community Youth Council ("JTF") was a respondent to the RFP for MOHCD CDBG program year 2015-16. Application was made for \$75,000 for Economic Development Program Area 3 – Neighborhood Commercial Corridor Revitalization, which specifically supports the Mayor's Invest in Neighborhoods Initiative ("IN Program"). The JTF was not recommended for a grant under this category.

Instead, JTF has been recommended for \$40,000 from General Funds for technical assistance to corridor businesses. There are no other Japantown organizations that have applied for this grant. For the last 5 years, JTF has been awarded funding under the similar RFP for MOHCD CDBG to provide technical assistance to small businesses in Japantown. It has met or exceeded all of its annual goals and the funding has been annually renewed.

The JTF has led the completion and eventual endorsement by the Planning Commission, Historic Preservation Commission, and the Board of Supervisors of the Japantown Cultural Heritage and Sustainability Strategy ("JCHESS") in Oct 2013. And, JTF has worked with the MOED to complete a Service Plan for the Mayor's Invest in Neighborhoods Initiative ("IN Program"). JTF has been reorganized to expand its mission to include the implementation of JCHESS and the IN Program.

Accordingly, JTF feels that these two programs deserve more consideration for increased funding.


Other Comments:

1. Japantown is not being recommended for any CDBG funding. Japantown has been identified as one of the targeted neighborhoods of the IN Program. The Japantown IN Program Service Plan needs local support for implementation. JTF is organized and has been supporting the implementation of the Service Plan. In 2014-15, JTF was awarded \$40,000 of the CDBG \$1,774,000 allocated for strengthening commercial corridor in low/moderate income neighborhoods. It is unfortunate that CDBG funding for 2015-16 has been reduced to \$1,121,000 for the same purposes and there is no support for Japantown.

CITY & COUNTY OF  
SAN FRANCISCO  
15 APR -6 PM 6:43  
MAYOR'S OFFICE OF  
COMMUNITY INVESTMENT  
BY \_\_\_\_\_

2. JTF has developed a 3-year operating plan/budgets, and guidelines for transparent operations, and reorganized to implement the JCHESS and the IN Program Service Plan. A 16-member board of directors is in place. A six-committee structure has been implemented and volunteers are in place or are being solicited. Accordingly, JTF has expanded to meet its larger mission and accordingly has greater needs.
3. JTF is a better fit for the RFP Program Area 3 (Commercial Core Revitalization) than Program Area 1b (Technical Assistance for Corridor Businesses). The Program Area 3 appears specifically designed to fund the IN Program. As articulated in the RFP description of Program Area 3, JTF is leveraging resources and formalizing collaborations with technical assistance partners, active in business attraction/retention/expansion/relocations, beautification and quality of life projects, and marketing and branding of the area. JTF is most certainly doing more than providing merely technical assistance.
4. The JCHESS and the IN Program were completed by JTF leadership. It is a good model neighborhood-serving organization to further cultural preservation and economic development. The services of JTF greatly reduce the burden on City agencies.
5. The JTF Small Business Assistance CDBG-funded program has served over 46 businesses since inception of the program in 2009. JTF has exceeded all its milestones and gained annual renewals of the program.
6. JTF has begun the expanding of its funding. PG&E and AT&T and the Japantown Merchants Assn have funded various JTF initiatives. Plans include additional funding from corporations and foundations and similar collaborations. Further, opportunities of fundraising from the formation of Community Benefit District and/or Community Land Trusts need time and funding to develop.
7. Business metrics (transient parking volumes, commercial vacancies, website traffic / Facebook followers, crime rates) all support Japantown is experiencing improvement in commercial activity. It would be great to get Taxable Sales data for 2013/14 for the Japantown area compared to 2012.
8. All under-served neighborhoods need a City-endorsed strategic plan like JCHESS, and an implementing organization with appropriate start-up funding from the City.
9. JTF initiatives that will be delayed or stopped entirely if there is not more funding obtained include formation of a community benefit district, a visitor/tourist center, community land trust property search, JEDM monthly meetings, community clean ups / power washing before festivals.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Robert Hamaguchi

# COMMUNITY DESIGN CENTER

5 THOMAS MELLON CIRCLE, SUITE 128 • SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94134 • T:415.586.1235 • F:415.586.0935 • hn3782@earthlink.net

April 20, 2015

MOHCD, Action Plan Staff  
Citizens Committee on Community Development  
1 South Van Ness Ave, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94103

15 APR 24 PM 1:51  
MAYOR'S OFFICE OF  
COMMUNITY INVESTMENT  
BY \_\_\_\_\_

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft 2015-2016 Action Plan and Preliminary Funding Recommendations for CDBG.

Briefly the Action Plan is both ambitious and comprehensive. I would like to see more attention accorded the "Age-in Place," needs of low income seniors, if they so desire.

Most of my comments are directed to the Draft Preliminary Funding Recommendations for 2015-2016: the Community Design Center has not been included in the Draft Preliminary Funding Recommendations for 2015-2016.

We believe it is in the City's interest to refund CDC to provide support for community organizations improving neighborhood facilities in low income neighborhoods. Our services help ensure effective and cost efficient programs to help communities in San Francisco.

The allocation of city funds to community groups to make improvements often overshadows the process of actually making the improvements. Successfully executing improvement projects is often more challenging and problematic than obtaining the necessary funding. Getting the project completed is largely taken for granted.

Owner Representative Services specifically address the needs of community groups that arise after they become responsible for undertaking the improvements. Many community organizations with limited construction budgets, over-extended staff, unfamiliar with the legal and governmental requirements involved in construction, need help to complete their projects successfully.

Often when support is not available, even small projects languish, problems develop and delays fester. Work gets bogged down with relatively simple challenges and that could be avoided with our support.

We usually prioritize projects that require specialist or engineers or involve unanticipated situation, delays, or lack of time and staff.



# COMMUNITY DESIGN CENTER

---

5 THOMAS MELLON CIRCLE, SUITE 128 ♦ SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94134 ♦ T:415.586.1235 ♦ F:415.586.0935 ♦ hn3782@earthlink.net

We believe that with the current funding limitations, cutbacks in staffing the expansion of ADA & HUD concerns, our services will be more necessary and cost effective than ever.

CDBG funding plays an important part in our ability to support the implementation efforts for community organizations.

Please reconsider your recommendation and include CDBG funding for the Community Design Center for the 2015-2016.

Sincerely,



Charles B. Turner Jr  
Executive Director

CC: Citizens Committee on Community Development

## **MOHCD/OEWD Responses to Public Comments**

### ***Response to Tenderloin Economic Development Project Comment***

In response to the comment from the Tenderloin Economic Development Project requesting revisions to the Consolidated Plan's background information and description of the Tenderloin neighborhood and revisions to the strategies to better meet the needs of small businesses in the Tenderloin, OEWD has incorporated the suggestions in the Central Market/Tenderloin Strategy, which includes a great deal of additional data, community feedback, and programmatic interventions aimed at improving the lives of low-income residents and business owners in the Tenderloin.

### ***Response to Causa Justa Comment***

In response to the request from Causa Justa to incorporate comments emphasizing the importance of addressing eviction and displacement as a significant issue to be addressed, MOHCD has highlighted the need for expanded services for individuals facing eviction and displacement in appropriate sections of the Consolidated Plan.

### ***Response to Japantown Task Force Comment***

OEWD responded to the Japantown Task Force's comment describing the need for consideration of increased funding for two of its economic development programs. The following is the response:

Thank you for your comments to the 2015-16 Action Plan. The 2015-2016 application process was extremely competitive and requests exceeded the amount of funding available for the CDBG program. The Office of Economic and Workforce Development reviewed and considered all economic development proposals submitted. The review included support for priorities identified in the RFP, HUD eligible projects, organizational capacity, performance history, leveraging of funds, and other key qualitative and performance issues. Unfortunately, limited funds resulted in only a fraction of the many quality proposals put forth for a positive recommendation. Thank you for your interest and ongoing contribution to serve and strengthen San Francisco's most vulnerable neighborhood and communities.

### ***Response to Community Design Center Comment***

In response to Community Design Center comment describing the need for more attention accorded to the "age-in-place" needs of low income seniors, MOHCD revised the appropriate Consolidated Plan sections to highlight these needs.

## Notes from Public Meetings

### Community Needs Public Meeting #1 Southeast Quadrant - March 18, 2014

#### NEIGHBORHOOD STRENGTHS

- Re-entry programs
- Beautiful city
- BVHP Transportation
- Grade schools
- Pharmacies/Amenities
- Strong youth development programs
- Housing more affordable
- Business development on 3rd street
- Grocery outlet is coming
- Sunday meters
- ESL → Citizenship classes
- After school programs
- Nonprofit housing developers engaged and in touch with the community
- Access to land for community
- Trees
- Safe places for children
- Willingness to support other agencies
- Community cleanups
- Desire to increase communication
- Seniors ( San Bruno corridor) evicted on restricted income
- Active email list set-up by residents. Good communication tool. Resident to resident
- Seniors and long term residents know neighbors
- High rate of homeownership, library, classes offered
- Tree planting as community building activity
- Seniors is important, they can't afford housing, become evicted, no more section 8, only sro available but sometimes not even qualifies for that;
- Good place for seniors though
- Good email list set up by residents, strong way of communicating, messages are sure to reach folks (resident to resident)
- Seniors who lived here a long time and contribute a lot to the neighborhood; at risk of being priced out of their homes
- High rate of homeowners, long term homeowners
- Great new library; have free yoga every Sunday; new programs, classes happening all the time
- Have a lot of community building happening
- Generations of people live here
- Long term residencies have created resiliency, a notable quality
- Neighbors are friendly/neighborly, tree planting program as a community building activity
- The presents of re-entry programs.
- It is a beautiful City (the resources just need to be)

- Transportation in the Bayview is good
- There are a number of schools in the Bayview
- It has the best weather.
- More internships and opportunities for youth (other than Bay Area counties)
- Housing is more affordable than other parts of the City.
- More independent stores and restaurants (particularly Mom and Pop)

### **NEIGHBORHOOD GAPS**

- Communication
- Needs of re-entry population
- Workforce development
- Housing
- Record expungement
- Help for tenants
- Local hiring can be strengthened
- Rent to own programs
- Job training opportunities
- Transparency of nonprofit providers
- Local GED with childcare
- Keeping community centers in public use
- Healthy food access + affordable
- Playgrounds unsafe
- Financial wellness workshops
- Affordable housing for childcare in home
- Jobs for youth
- Onsite educational services
- GED assistance
- Artificial gang territory
- Lack of community policing
- Healthcare
- Safer and cleaner neighborhoods
- Space for microbusinesses
- Lack of sense of community
- People need to think out of the box
- PTSD and other misdiagnosed illnesses
- Outreach and networking of nonprofits
- Van service to downtown
- Access to healthy food
- Empty storefronts on Leland Avenue- problematic building owners not wanting to lease to storefronts
- High rents in San Francisco
- Working class families need services too even if they are homeowners due to perception they don't need services
- Safety- use of community safety ambassadors seems to give sense of safety
- Grocery store and café' is needed
- Community center is gone ( was gem despite its issues)

- Empty storefronts
- Rent too high
- Gap in affordable housing for blue collar workers; working class people need services too
- Average income is \$20K
- Safety; if there's an safety ambassador around, there seems to be more people coming out of their homes
- Even if they are homeowners, due to perception, they don't need services
- There is a lack of communication particularly with respect to APA population.
- There is a high concentration of re-entry population (as a result AB109 released)
- There needs to be more local hiring (one thing the formula retail is good for)
- There needs to be more transparency with respect to funding opportunities
- There needs to be better outreach
- Need GED local programs
- Need childcare
- Need healthy grocery stores. Nearest Safeway is on 16<sup>th</sup> street.
- The playgrounds are not managed and they are not safe.
- Need for financial wellness workshops.
- Sunday meters break up the fellowship associated with worship services
- Need for rent to own opportunities

<p><b>Community Needs Public Meeting #2</b>  <b>South Central Quadrant - April 22, 2014</b></p>
---

**NEIGHBORHOOD STRENGTHS**

- Development-business and housing
  - Family networks
  - Community Organizations and rich service environment
  - Resources for families and individuals
  - Educational resources
  - Strong advocates
  - Community partners
  - Residents care
  - Opportunities for small business
  - Transportation- (BART, Balboa Park/16<sup>th</sup> Mission)
  - Presidio Trust- BVHP community sense
  - The progress of the communities we serve, economic, business, housing, public housing before and after the transformations of public housing (Hope VI)
  - How families have been able to stick together and stay as much as they have due to familial networks
  - Community organizations help people stay in the neighborhood and have sense of community
- Amount of resources, youth services, family services

- , rich network
- Educational resources
- Advocacy from community based organizations;
- Network of organizations helps each organization do its work better; community partnerships
- Residents care
- Development of SOMA ( \$\$→biz) ↑tax revenue
- Mission District: language/art/culture
- Diversity across city supported (DV survivors support)
- Affordable housing opportunities
- Neighborhood well served by transit in Vis Valley
- Live in Oceanview so close to BART & Muni
- 16<sup>th</sup> & Mission BART is convenient
- Presidio – pretty amazing as a place of privilege; as a person who works get subsidized housing through the Presidio Trust; a lot of traffic increased
- SOMA – becoming quickly developed with construction of housing & commercialized brings \$\$ to the local businesses and tax revenue to SF
- Bayview is a vibrant community with engagement on the street with families caring for each other
- Mission – very cultural and a lot of Spanish-speaking businesses that serve Central Legal’s clients
- San Francisco – diversity in the city so can often find supports and safety in the neighborhoods for DV survivors
- SF – a lot of great parks and public spaces
- It’s the people of SF that makes it interesting and attractive versus just the built environment

### **NEIGHBORHOOD GAPS**

- Support for undocumented families/individuals
- Technology youth/adults
- Asset building
- Childcare
- Government agencies lack of communication + coordination
- Struggling school
- Low income employment opportunities
- Lack of constructive solutions to problems
- Behind the curve
- Residents left out of housing development decisions until it’s too late
- Job training and experience opportunities
- Mistrust of City and City Partners
- Technology/resources
- Lack of a housing ladder
- Housing barriers for the homeless + low income people
- Section 8 waitlist too long
- Accessible resources for non-documented
- More affordable housing for low income + mod folks
- Access to capital
- Transportation costs high
- Childcare-too expensive or full

- Healthcare
- Affordable commercial space
- Gentrification and out migration of Africans+ brown folks
- Criminal Justice System
- Jobs (creation, local neighborhood)- inequity, lack of middle means –tech influx goods \$ ↑lack of mobility
- Commercial corridors undeveloped (Broad-Randolph)
- Certain of walkability, no lights
- Commutes ↑for lower-income workers
- Jobs – a lot of immigrants, low income and elderly in Vis Valley so need job created
- Jobs – are skewed toward those that are educated like tech jobs or low-wage jobs unless you have an education; techies taking over the Mission District and prices are going up to serve the techies in the neighborhood; demographics in the Mission has changed to younger population
- Loss of middle class in SF – part of mission of ArtSeed is to connect residents of PacHeights with the Bayview; success is through chance encounters when meeting in public spaces; a lot of kids that work with cannot go to art exhibit in presidio is because don't feel comfortable in Presidio if live in Bayview
- Need opportunity to bridge the divide with positive encounters like Mission residents saying hi to tech workers waiting for Google shuttle
- In Oceanview there are business that are closed on Broad and Randolph; Balboa Car Barn and around Balboa Park needs to be developed into housing and other uses
- Clients for Central Legal facing issues of not having enough affordable housing but work in SF so need to commute in San Francisco
- Isn't there an incentive for property owners to donate property for affordable housing? Strategy to work with nonprofits and persons who may want to donate property as a "legacy"
- San Francisco has the lowest unemployment rate in the West but there are disparities between socio-economic classes; role of gov't is to even out the benefits and what private capital invests in – tax and redistribute those taxes OR push private capital to invest in certain communities
- What's going on with all of the private development and the \$\$ being invested in SF?
- Google Impact Challenge – offering \$400-500K grants for nonprofits that'll make an impact; need to be a techie to get social networks to get your vote
- People feel more comfortable giving to those who don't need it – tend to reach out to those who already have \$\$ because don't trust low income people or small nonprofits with large sums of \$\$ - Arts Commission was able to give grants to smaller nonprofits as well as providing mentorship to the nonprofits
- Where work at Union Square felt embarrassed that people on drugs knocking down tourists; high concentration of services around Union Square deters tourists
- From experience of Mission Promise Initiative, while we have lots of resource on the community services level, government agencies don't always collaborate well with others. Lack of communication between government agencies, people working in silos; tough to do strategic initiative across many governmental partners
- Employment opportunities for low income individuals; to be able to support their families;
- Feels like it is less and less clear as a resident how to do things for problems; evictions, gentrification, tech, there aren't a lot of construction solutions happening; how to turn energy into constructive solutions
- Development process and financial institutions from 20 years ago is having impact now – so we aren't with the curve; if we were more part of the process from the beginning, we could have

more impact; none of this happened overnight. For example, if you aren't on public assistance, you get displaced; due to gentrification; having a participatory, transparent process from a long time ago; people aren't on the ground when things are happening;

- Gap between lowest income and market rate that isn't addressed; for example, for a nonprofit employed person; mid-range, widening gap
- A lot of companies won't even consider people who don't have college education; would be great to have employers consider people with skills although no degree;
- Sometimes there is a mistrust with who the City is partnering with – for example, Twitter space market hall rents too high for La Cocina supported businesses;
- Lack of a housing ladder
- Lack of accessibility for housing ; we develop affordability housing list; list of SF affordable housing is very short and waiting list of years; criminal background checks bar people; all different kinds of barriers; example, family waiting for 16 years for S. 8 voucher; took their name out in protest; even if they do have these vouchers, nowhere to go with them;
- Accessibility for undocumented families; we are supposed to be a sanctuary city but nowhere for people to go to get housing;
- Can't afford to live on a min wage job; feel it as an entrepreneur, there is no one to hire on a minimum wage
- Lack of access to capital – need employees to scale
- Transit and transportation costs
- Childcare needs and education piece - all programs are full or expensive
- Lack of opportunities for small businesses for low or moderate income people
- Lack of access to health care
- Lack of affordable commercial spaces
- Employment ladder – what people need at different times; there could be more of a continuum between agencies and employment opportunities;
- Coordination aspect between City departments could be much better
- Gentrification, education and out migration of certain communities like African American, Latino
- Criminal justice system
- Technology needs to be included in the 5 Year Plan; technology will be the glue
- Need additional resources for undocumented tenants
- Reality of tracking in education, housing and jobs – hard to break out

### **Community Needs Public Meeting #3 Northeast Quadrant - April 29, 2014**

#### **NEIGHBORHOOD STRENGTHS**

- There is funding available
- There is a place to voice our concerns
- People are coming together to preserve affordable housing
- Funding for economic development
- Awareness across different collaborations
- Resources
- Housing for everyone! diverse housing
- ID user resources



- Many different resources
- Security is better, cleaner near public transit
- Architecture-Tenderloin
- Ethnic diversity-Treasure Island
- Workforce system-SF
- Active community/services for under represented
- Public transportation, clean accessibility
- Community center-Portola district
- Well used gym-TI
- Housing Rights Committee
- There is funding available
- Opportunities to participate
- Communities want action and access to housing that is affordable. Important to preserve longevity of various populations.
- Economic Development funds available as part of broader effort because economic development helps transform communities
- Awareness issues across the city, collaboration on issues that affect the entire City
- Many more resources available in SF in comparison to other areas
- Housing development houses everyone across the spectrum of people in SF
- IDU user and legal exchange is working
- Compared to other cities more resources and better at getting the word out, consolidated resources
- Community sense in SOMA, people know each other and say hi when they pass by – would like to find housing around that area, it is close to everything
- SOMA: cleaner & safer & good public transportation
- -TL: Preservation of Architecture
- Treasure Island: ethnic diversity; Youth engagement – basketball e.g.
- Sunset: workforce service systems – not just listings; have supports avail in multiple languages
- Receptive to community voices, services are going to the underrepresented
- Duboce Triangle: good transportation, accessible community services
- Portola: Community Center

### **NEIGHBORHOOD GAPS**

- Need to compile resources
- Affordable housing
- Better community outreach for input and outcomes
- Under-funded agencies that serve diverse populations
- More resources for asset building
- Minimum income too high in housing
- Need for city navigators-benefits; healthcare; housing; services-highly trained person
- Accountability of business in our communities
- Nonprofit rent increases
- New business not hiring locally
- Services not written in business contracts like inclusionary housing
- More low income housing
- Increase in noise

- “affirmative action”
- Huge need continues
- Commercial corridors = vague
- “Public space” need/healthy neighborhood
- Build economic development
- Cost of living + doing business
- How do we define “affordable”
- Gentrification
- More housing
- Accessibility for undocumented families resources
- Translation of city resources for seniors and people with disabilities
- Ellis Act Evictions
- Shrinking funding for HIV/AIDS
- More mental health services
- Culturally sensitive staffing at nonprofits and government agencies
- Language resources for all languages or at least languages in community
- Housing application assistance and qualification
- Afterschool program for youth
- Senior programs
- New buildings don’t appear to be rent controlled by rent control rules
- Consider a housing tax to help create more housing
- BMR units need to be in main project or located close by in some neighborhood
- More healthcare for seniors especially
- More bike lanes- that promote healthy communities
- Shelter-not safe for certain populations, e.g. LGBT-funds should be allocated to create a safe place
- Lease-to own program.
- Mental health services-especially for those in crisis
- Freeway repairs
- Open space development-e.g. adding additional bathroom in park
- Affordable housing
- Community collaboration
- Better access to housing/cultural emphasis on completing applications
- Environmental control
- Ladder system to move formerly homeless through to permanent supportive housing services to residents to teach basic skills
- Unsolicited services forced on residents
- More coordination between city, property managers and SFHA staffs on housing issues
- No uniform policy with respect to BMR program
- BMR owners don’t seem to be respectful of people going into set aside units
- Work for people with disabilities particularly HIV
- Landlord not respecting reasonable accommodation request more training for landlords/owners of certain buildings.
- Housing issues are a high need in the City
- Help to connect to affordable housing/new place to live
- Getting communities involved in this process of giving input – this can be replicated more often

– greater community outreach and offer education to communities on how to become engaged in decisions for their neighborhoods

- Staff has so much to do, not enough case managers to help people access housing that is affordable – agencies need more resources to do the work to preserve the diversity of the city
- Need more resources for asset building and support for small business and entrepreneurs in SF
- Cost of living and cost of doing business in the City is too high, for ex. SRO residents paying \$1k per month is too high
- Change in demographics – African American population decline
- More housing
- Better wages for people doing the work
- Accessibility for undocumented families & resources for immigrants
- Gentrification and how it effects housing and families
- Application process for housing is too short, people aren't plugged in or find out early enough
- More resources for seniors and people with disabilities – people are being discriminated against if they are on SSI
- Ellis Act displacement
- For those living with HIV/AIDS, funding is shrinking and are having to get funding from other services
- Gap in homeless connect, users and still using, need mental health services in senior communities and in general
- Both government and nonprofit, culturally responsive staffing – need someone who can communicate with various communities or won't be effect at assisting them, including language accessibility
- Cultural accessibility
- Need for assistance with housing applications, especially seniors and in the appropriate language
- More education workshops explaining how to fill out housing applications and to understand whether they would even qualify for what is available
- Help to buy houses
- Lower the minimum income requirements to access housing
- City should invest in “Navigators” to help people navigate the system and get access to services, benefits, etc.
- Local hire initiatives for big businesses that are moving into the City, accountability because they do impact the City, not just voluntary on the part of the business – City requires services in their contract for development, like we do with affordable housing (Inclusionary)
- Smaller businesses should be hiring locally too, tech companies are getting help from the City on taxes
- TL: add more bathrooms, use GA recipients to monitor; more open spaces
- TL: too many pigeons
- TL: create “step up” housing – questions whether perm housing should go directly to people coming out of homelessness (go to SRO instead). Noted the DISH buildings (DPH-DAH) as a good example.
- Treasure Island – potholes coming off freeway
- Objection to unsolicited services from social workers – services should be voluntary
- Duboce Triangle: more affordable housing particularly for homeless; Ellis Act eviction prevention; community collaboration

- Better access to affordable housing – culturally-sensitive supports during the application process
- Bad experience with housing: HIV+, has Section 8, living at Mercy building in TL. Applied, got in lottery & got BMR unit at Trinity. Prepared to move, then day-of, he was told that there was a problem. Went to Housing Rights Commission to make complaint, then 60 day wait... was able to stay at Mercy unit, but felt pressure the whole time. Did move, eventually. Need better coordination on lease-up process.
- Other examples: Trinity, Ava buildings. Concern about the lack of consistency in lease-up processes. Need for more respect of prospective tenants.
- Need disabled services; moved-in to a unit in an SRO building with policy that limited overnight stays; also was on 6<sup>th</sup> floor, had trouble with a neighbor that would knock on door, manager not helpful in resolving. Request training for LL's to be more aware of needs of tenants that live in SROs.
- Portola: afterschool program for youth, seniors; make services available to Spanish speakers (is more avail for Chinese-speakers)
- Mission: affordable housing for teachers and low income residents

<p><b>Community Needs Community Meeting #4</b>  <b>Westside Quadrant – May 13, 2014</b></p>
---

**NEIGHBORHOOD STRENGTHS**

- Diverse economics
- Places to eat
- Familiarity of neighbors
- Good transportation, 38 is crowded
- Lives in Hayes Valley and appreciates the subsidized housing and likes the mix and appreciates that
- Likes the smallness of the City- world class UCSF, SF State, USF, City College
- Proximity to the GG park, ocean, accessible to downtown SF
- Western Addition- love the area because Safeway, Walgreens and community festivals, close hospital, good programs such as Village Project, CPMC being built which will provide jobs
- Richmond- excellent transportation, Clement community festivals, diversity, proximity to open space- GGP and Presidio, appreciates the lack of development on those open spaces,
- Sunset- close to dentist, produce market, in a walking group, close to beach, sunset beacon has community events

**NEIGHBORHOOD GAPS**

- 38 bus line is overcrowded
- Low income housing, low income housing, low income housing. Has counted the new developments and the prices are too much. Losing the culture of the neighborhoods, specifically Mission. Hates the term 'market rate' it's not what is needed in the City. The City is out of balance, it can't be just for rich people.
- Huge homeless problem in SF. They aren't having their needs met. The growing litter, graffiti and dumping.
- Immigrant seniors, the children are not able to speak and read English. The parents are in need of translation services and interpretation. Would like to see more after school programs like

tutorials for general pop and immigrant community. How to get online and get information. Help new immigrants get online, Skype, etc. Computer literacy.

- Would like to see some of the meters removed. On Saturday and Sunday people get tickets and cant rest. If there will be construction there should be notice weeks in advance or at least a day. People are getting their cars towed.
- Housing specialist for Compass family specialist – affordable housing, info about Sunset. Low income housing is mostly downtown and Western Addition. Hasn't found a way to access low income housing in Sunset and Richmond.
- The institutions nearby who do rental protection- people are getting evicted. Housing rights agencies have been evicted. These services should be everywhere not just in one part of the City. Lack of affordable indoor space other than library. Not enough recycling containers on corners, only garbage cans.
- Create housing opportunities for folks with behavioral and disabled and with other issues. Make it easier to align services with needs. Lack of knowledge about data changes ex. 911 and cell phone
- Need more jobs and opportunities for people. Vouchers have become worthless in Section 8. Need more legal help for evictees.
- Concerned about privatization of public services. Taxes are going toward the spaces but you have to pay. Growing removal of open spaces and very unhappy about this.

## Draft Consolidated Plan Community Meeting #1 October 14, 2014

Daisy – TAY SF

- There is a lot of abandoned housing. Is it cheaper to develop those sites?

Teresa

- Why is it a full time student can't apply to BMR housing?
  - Answer – It's not a MOHCD rule, it's the regulations associated with the federal funding which subsidizes MOHCD to build the building has that as a rule.

Diana- Opportunity fund

- Will funding area 2B remain the same?
  - Answer – yes.

Willie Warren

- Feels that 1A and 1B are being accomplished
- There are families who are vehicular housed. There are also populations that are coming out of rehab or realignment who are looking for housing.
- Will there be an increase in agencies to ensure cultural sensitivity.

Community Living Campaign

- There is a higher proportion of elderly in the city, check the data. Speaker read a statement that highlights that there are more than 65,000 elderly living in SF who are 65 or older.
- In terms of workforce strategies, workforce development is lacking for seniors.

LGBTQ Center

- Why are LGBTQ not listed as a priority population
  - Answer- we have moved away from having a population based focus. Our model is based on service areas.

Small Business Representative

- Hope that MOHCD listens to community and consider how the Department can grow support for services for small businesses and microenterprises.

Representative who sits on Disability Council/Co-chair HIV Council

- There is a problem with not calling out populations; it may lead to them being brushed under the rug.
- There should be a provision for elder/senior housing

Floyd

- If programs would like to 'think outside of the box' will MOHCD be supportive of those proposals? Want to me innovative and wants to know if there is room for service providers to try new models.
  - Answer- Should be based on evidence based practices, however, we must all take into consideration how willing are we to be disruptive to the current/historical portfolio?

MOHCD is willing to support collaborating differently and relooking/rethinking.

Willie Warren

- Size of public housing units are smaller. Is square footage the same?

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Draft Consolidated Plan Community Meeting #2</b> <b>October 21, 2014</b></p>
--

Bill, ALRP

- Thank for the data portal effort.
- Needs funds for assistance with disability compliant – units. (1Bii)
- Glad there will be multiyear grants
- When will the proposals be?
  - Answer- December 17.
- It's nice that needs align with previous con-plan because needs don't usually go away. Really glad that there isn't a major shift/flavor of the month.
- If CDBG faces loss in federal funding support, CBOs are willing to meet with Mayor to identify resources to back fill.
- Wants HESPA expanded, only received half of requests.
- Useful- cost benefit analysis of operating subsidy vs. current bang for buck
- Objective 1 – need support for case management to assist and track documents Objective 3 – Is that credit counseling lending circles?
- Where does immigrant legal funding fit
  - Answer- (3b)

Jenny, Chinese for Affirmative Action

- Asked MOHCD to speak on foundational competencies and how that leads to Workforce Development.
- Asked if MOHCD engaged City College in the Con Plan process

RAD question

- Where has this been successful? Non-profit housing developers/managers?
  - Many nonprofits have done this for a long time. However, the RAD model SF is using is new so there isn't a precedent. MOHCD feels positive in this model.
- Does mixed income mean losing low income?
  - Answer – no low income will be lost. It is 1:1

Western Addition Resident

- Are the African American populations being reached out to? They should be represented at this meeting.

**Draft Action Plan Community Meeting  
March 31, 2015**

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Testifier(s)</b>	<b>Comment summary</b>
Rebuilding Together San Francisco	Karen Nemsick accompanied by staff and program beneficiary	Rebuilding Together works to achieve affordable housing by addressing deferred maintenance, which puts occupants of owner-occupied homes at risk of losing their home. Beneficiary, 83 years of age, experienced many falls but, with the help of Rebuilding Together, intends to live longer with a higher quality of life.
Renaissance Enterprise Center	Sharon Miller accompanied by staff and program beneficiaries	Renaissance creates jobs and economic security. Revived Women’s Initiative. Program beneficiary lost financial district job and had very difficult time finding a new job, but Renaissance helped her start-up a women’s sports apparel business. Another beneficiary, a nurse practitioner, took advantage of Renaissance’s business planning resources that helped her start-up her own trauma-healing practice – she learned her strengths before walking into the unknown. Another beneficiary, a pickle entrepreneur, gained knowledge and accessed mentors and an SBA loan and now sees her business’ path of growth – she saved many months, if not years, in creating her growth plan.
San Francisco Safe House	Jessica Li	Safe House provides transitional housing for homeless sex workers. There are less than 15 such programs nationwide. Program provides financial literacy, job training, case management, health services, etc. While permanent housing is essential, transitional housing is still necessary and should be prioritized.
Japantown Taskforce	Alice Kawahatsu	Once 36 blocks connected to Western Addition, Japantown is now only 4 blocks. The Taskforce was created seven years ago to help businesses survive and to focus on serving seniors by bringing community together to develop a plan to achieve community and economic development, and safety for seniors. The Taskforce requested \$75,000 but only \$40,000 is being recommended for funding. Funding applicants should be provided clear information as to whether they qualify. The Taskforce is appreciative of the recommended grant award, but it needs \$300,000. The Taskforce has plans to make Peace Plaza a historical landmark and a venue for more community events.
SF Made	Ferron Salniker	Expressed thanks for continued support. SF Made works with 500 members and provides education, advising, assistance finding commercial space, access to capital, and access to market opportunities – to create and retains jobs. SF Made exceeded its contract goal of creating 200 jobs and retaining 400 jobs. Cited manufacturing examples that pay higher than minimum wage, including Magnolia Brewing and MacRoskey



Agency	Testifier(s)	Comment summary
		Mattress.
Renaissance Bayview	Karwana Dyson accompanied by staff and program beneficiaries	Renaissance Bayview serves the dynamic Bayview and Visitacion Valley. Entrepreneurship is hard work and Renaissance Bayview provides comprehensive business support services to thereby empower people with great ideas to create sustainable businesses. Entrepreneurship is powerful and is a path out of poverty. Program beneficiary, a graphic designer, described how she grew as a business owner since connecting with Renaissance Bayview. She stated that had it not been for these services, her business would not exist – anyone can start a business but it takes know-how to stand.
Good Samaritan Family Resource Center (FRC)	Jaime Aragón	Good Samaritan FRC helps immigrants find success. Neighborhoods served include Mission, Tenderloin, and Excelsior. A core service is English-as-a-second-language (ESL) classes – a vital service for newcomers. This program is responsive to those Good Samaritans FRC serves by providing child care services to enable parents to participate in these classes (60 participants per class – mostly persons with dependent children). Lack of child care services is a major barrier to access this program. English language proficiency benefits everyone, not only those who learn proficiency.
Community Reformer (?); Community Assistance Service Enterprise (CASE)	Ace “on the Case” Washington	Informally retired from activism: communicating, documenting, and taking pictures. In the middle of going straight to HUD Secretary Castro regarding the Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) program. Mr. Washington stated that San Francisco is the most corrupt city in the US. Concerned with African American outmigration and support for Fillmore District businesses.
Women’s Audio Mission (WAM)	Lopa Pal	WAM is run entirely by women and girls. WAM was faced with displacement in 2014 and, with help from the City, found a needle in the haystack to purchase a facility in Mid-Market. WAM indicated that the mayor’s office had issued a press release announcing the City’s support of WAM in purchasing its new facility and referenced continued support. WAM needs \$200,000 to make their space a reality. WAM trains and connects 1,000 women and girls to lucrative opportunities so that they thrive in San Francisco. WAM asked that the City continue to support them so that San Francisco continues to be a place where artistry and technology intersect.
Community Design Center	Chuck Turner	Community Design Center is a nonprofit design firm that provides services to project owner representatives, especially smaller groups with limited capacity, to help implement projects. While building or correcting projects is still difficult as a result of lots of red tape, Community Design Center helps with efficiencies by assisting with bidding for obtaining A&E/design/planning services, as well as documentation for

Agency	Testifier(s)	Comment summary
		HUD and other funders. Projects are backed up and Community Design Center could help move them forward.
Community Youth Center / Bayview Youth Advocates (CYC/BYA)	Eddy Zheng	CYC/BYA expresses thanks for four years of support. CYC/BYA is one of the few that provides culturally appropriate services to monolingual Chinese speakers, of which more than 30 percent of them live in the southeast of San Francisco. Other than public safety, housing is very important, which is why CYC/BYA helps its clients fill-out housing forms. Financial support for CYC/BYA is important for employee retention, as employees of community-based organizations often have to choose between feeding their family and doing community work.
Gum Moon	Susan Chen and Montira Warran	Gum Moon expressed thanks for the past several years of support. This funding will enable them to continue to provide transitional shelter and supportive services to survivors of domestic violence, as well as support groups for grandparents who are caregivers to their grandchildren.
LYRIC	Alan Gutierrez and Reeshae McCray	LYRIC serves transgender and gender-nonconforming youth. In 2015, there have been 10 murders of transgender women of color in the US. In the last one and a half years, LYRIC helped place 21 youth in Human Services Agency (HSA) permanent supportive housing. Reeshae shared experience as a former sex worker, former foster child, and current student. Reeshae connected with LYRIC in 2013 and has since accessed permanent supportive housing.
San Francisco Conservation Corps	Samantha Sassi	Expressed thanks for transitional age youth charter school and high school diploma program. (High school diploma programs does not have same (unfortunate) stigma that is associated with GED program, which results in greater earning potential.) San Francisco Conservation Corps also provides job training and placement; and identifies and accesses career pathways.
Friendship House Association of American Indians	Pa-Pai X. Thomas	Expressed thanks. Friendship House is a 90-day (up to six months) residential program that also provides GED and job training. Capital improvement funds are much needed and increase energy efficiency.
Homeless Advocacy Project of the Justice & Diversity Center of the Bar Association of	Teresa Friend	Expressed thanks for funding its eviction defense work that prioritizes tenants with serious mental illnesses. This work is as critical as ever. Also capital improvement project funding for its Tenderloin site (new roof).

Agency	Testifier(s)	Comment summary
San Francisco		
Chinese Newcomers Service Center	Rita Mah	Chinese Newcomers asked that the City reconsider its recommendation to not fund its information and referral program, an essential service. Those they serve are neither youth nor seniors, but rather the middle-aged population that lacks skills and basic literacy. This population cannot fill basic forms in either English or Chinese – they do not have time to go to school because they must support their families, so they get low-skill jobs. Chinese Newcomers essentially triage the needs of people in their community and are creative in finding their clients work.
Veterans Equity Center / BiSHoP	Juslyn Manalo accompanied by staff	Organization provides case management and outreach to access affordable housing opportunities, particularly in neighborhoods that do not know of these opportunities. Project is part of a larger strategy of strengthening community in San Francisco. Housing program staff expressed thanks for enabling her to help others navigate affordable housing – more than simply providing assistance filling out forms, she provides assistance throughout the entire process (particularly with the expansion of the BMR program). Project targets teachers and eviction prevention; rooted in SOMA and Filipino community – now citywide expansion. Case management in Spanish will now be possible at BiSHoP with this funding.
Mission Economic Development Agency	Gabriel Medina	Expressed thanks and outlined programs, including homeownership (30 homeowners), business and workforce development (250 new hires) programs. Cited recent study that found 8,000 displaced Latinos and affordability crisis, including a 91 percent decline in Latino participation in the BMR program. Asked that its 24 <sup>th</sup> St. activity not be cut.
Mission Language and Vocation School (MLVS)	Rosario Anaya accompanied by staff and a beneficiary	MLVS works to address barriers to employment with its medical assistance, culinary, and other vocational academies. Expressed thanks for continued support for medical assistance and foundational competencies projects. MLVS indicated that it trusts that the City’s General Fund will fund its programs historically funded with these funds. Beneficiary expressed thanks and asked for continued support.
Filipino Community Center	Terrence Valen	Celebrating its 10-year anniversary. Filipino Community Center serves hundred and reaches thousands, especially immigrant and transitional age youth populations with culturally appropriate services; e.g., through certified Tagalog interpreters, information and referral, health care, service connection, legal services, etc.

## Appendix

### Demographic Data by Neighborhood

Neighborhood	Homeownership Affordability Gap				Severe Housing Problems				Excessive Rent Burden				Severe Overcrowding			
	Median Income	Median Home Price	Annual Income Required to Afford Monthly Mortgage Payment	Annual Income Affordability Gap	Total Households (2011)	Households with Severe Housing Problems	% of Neighborhood	% of City	Renter Occupied Households	Renter Households paying 50% or more	% of Neighborhood	% of City	Total Households	Households with more than 1.51 occupant per room	% of Neighborhood	% of City
<b>Bayview Hunters Point*</b>	\$53,852	\$555,001	\$132,556	(\$78,703)	10,415	3,765	36.15%	4.16%	5,526	1,393	25.21%	2.91%	10,932	422	3.86%	3.66%
Bernal Heights	\$87,638	\$940,000	\$224,509	(\$136,871)	9,145	2,255	24.66%	2.49%	4,170	821	19.69%	1.72%	9,246	156	1.69%	1.35%
Castro/Upper Market	\$137,775	\$1,349,000	\$322,194	(\$184,419)	10,910	1,525	13.98%	1.69%	6,244	947	15.17%	1.98%	10,828	50	0.46%	0.43%
<b>Chinatown*</b>	\$28,167	\$832,500	\$198,833	(\$170,666)	7,175	4,093	57.05%	4.52%	6,343	1,679	26.47%	3.51%	6,855	1,453	21.20%	12.61%
Excelsior	\$66,882	\$638,000	\$152,379	(\$85,497)	10,275	3,365	32.75%	3.72%	3,802	1,156	30.41%	2.42%	10,532	405	3.85%	3.51%
Financial District	\$159,625	\$1,175,000	\$280,636	(\$121,010)	8,300	2,280	27.47%	2.52%	5,808	1,200	20.66%	2.51%	9,009	316	3.51%	2.74%
Glen Park	\$144,284	\$1,200,000	\$286,607	(\$142,322)	3,790	650	17.15%	0.72%	1,494	269	18.01%	0.56%	3,725	4	0.11%	0.03%
Golden Gate Park	\$0	N/A			25	0	0.00%	0.00%	35	0	0.00%	0.00%	35	0	0.00%	0.00%
Haight Ashbury	\$138,118	\$1,295,000	\$309,296	(\$171,178)	8,275	1,425	17.22%	1.58%	6,153	947	15.39%	1.98%	8,273	0	0.00%	0.00%
Hayes Valley	\$96,875	\$980,582	\$234,201	(\$137,326)	8,510	2,455	28.85%	2.71%	7,100	1,750	24.65%	3.66%	8,594	120	1.40%	1.04%
Inner Richmond	\$99,266	\$1,300,000	\$310,491	(\$211,224)	8,975	2,410	26.85%	2.66%	6,433	1,279	19.88%	2.67%	9,204	226	2.46%	1.96%
Inner Sunset	\$123,864	\$1,274,500	\$304,400	(\$180,537)	11,895	2,345	19.71%	2.59%	7,075	1,491	21.07%	3.12%	11,811	64	0.54%	0.56%
Japantown	\$50,833	\$887,500	\$211,970	(\$161,136)	2,400	615	25.63%	0.68%	2,076	485	23.36%	1.01%	2,319	143	6.17%	1.24%
Lakeshore	\$62,251	\$855,000	\$204,207	(\$141,956)	5,140	1,920	37.35%	2.12%	4,696	1,647	35.07%	3.44%	4,884	14	0.29%	0.12%
Lincoln Park	\$87,500	N/A			75	10	13.33%	0.01%	46	0	0.00%	0.00%	89	0	0.00%	0.00%
Lone Mountain/USF	\$105,689	\$1,007,500	\$240,630	(\$134,941)	6,065	1,305	21.52%	1.44%	4,662	1,022	21.92%	2.14%	6,222	24	0.39%	0.21%
Marina	\$179,369	\$1,670,000	\$398,861	(\$219,492)	13,220	2,580	19.52%	2.85%	9,970	1,502	15.07%	3.14%	13,783	141	1.02%	1.22%
McLaren Park	\$20,625	N/A			235	60	25.53%	0.07%	175	37	21.14%	0.08%	246	0	0.00%	0.00%
<b>Mission*</b>	\$66,649	\$1,052,500	\$251,378	(\$184,728)	22,620	6,610	29.22%	7.31%	17,322	3,181	18.36%	6.65%	23,069	1,499	6.50%	13.01%
Mission Bay	\$95,777	\$1,017,500	\$243,019	(\$147,242)	3,565	705	19.78%	0.78%	3,008	444	14.76%	0.93%	4,444	179	4.03%	1.55%
Nob Hill	\$78,612	\$900,000	\$214,955	(\$136,343)	14,480	4,309	29.76%	4.76%	13,146	2,744	20.76%	5.74%	15,057	851	5.65%	7.39%
Noe Valley	\$156,101	\$1,500,000	\$358,258	(\$202,157)	11,000	1,760	16.00%	1.95%	5,290	855	16.16%	1.79%	10,737	72	0.67%	0.62%
North Beach	\$68,727	\$989,000	\$236,212	(\$167,484)	6,535	2,040	31.22%	2.25%	5,395	1,062	19.68%	2.22%	6,551	199	3.04%	1.73%
Oceanview/Merced/Ingleside	\$75,620	\$535,000	\$127,779	(\$52,159)	7,545	2,500	33.13%	2.76%	2,546	927	36.41%	1.94%	7,792	276	3.54%	2.40%
Outer Mission	\$85,756	\$724,000	\$172,919	(\$87,163)	6,030	1,905	31.59%	2.11%	2,043	521	25.50%	1.09%	6,314	222	3.52%	1.93%
Outer Richmond	\$91,347	\$980,000	\$234,062	(\$142,715)	18,615	3,915	21.03%	4.33%	11,493	2,668	23.21%	5.58%	18,474	320	1.73%	2.78%
Pacific Heights	\$168,140	\$1,310,500	\$312,998	(\$144,858)	13,245	2,720	20.54%	3.01%	9,932	1,618	16.29%	3.38%	13,507	203	1.50%	1.76%
Portola	\$67,360	\$651,500	\$155,604	(\$88,244)	4,245	1,265	29.80%	1.40%	1,691	520	30.75%	1.09%	4,419	140	3.17%	1.21%
Potrero Hill	\$149,137	\$965,000	\$230,480	(\$81,343)	5,690	920	16.17%	1.02%	3,070	418	13.62%	0.87%	5,835	120	2.06%	1.04%
Presidio	\$171,284	N/A			1,130	265	23.45%	0.29%	1,098	163	14.85%	0.34%	1,132	0	0.00%	0.00%
Presidio Heights	\$155,028	\$1,365,500	\$326,135	(\$171,107)	4,765	905	18.99%	1.00%	3,036	619	20.39%	1.29%	4,828	23	0.48%	0.20%
Russian Hill	\$104,654	\$1,350,000	\$322,433	(\$217,779)	9,795	2,180	22.26%	2.41%	7,810	1,289	16.50%	2.69%	10,043	295	2.94%	2.56%
Seacliff	\$207,397	\$1,625,000	\$388,113	(\$180,716)	8,885	195	22.03%	0.22%	171	22	12.87%	0.05%	917	0	0.00%	0.00%
<b>South of Market*</b>	\$59,301	\$762,500	\$182,115	(\$122,814)	8,280	2,950	35.63%	3.26%	6,969	1,511	21.68%	3.16%	9,008	659	7.32%	5.72%
Sunset/Parkside	\$93,529	\$885,000	\$211,372	(\$117,844)	26,405	5,990	22.69%	6.62%	10,977	2,928	26.67%	6.12%	26,861	463	1.72%	4.02%
<b>Tenderloin*</b>	\$30,716	\$652,000	\$155,723	(\$125,007)	15,415	8,820	57.22%	9.75%	15,426	5,263	34.12%	11.00%	15,852	2,032	12.82%	17.63%
Treasure Island	\$23,305	N/A			615	210	34.15%	0.23%	618	192	31.07%	0.40%	618	0	0.00%	0.00%
Twin Peaks	\$109,341	\$945,000	\$225,703	(\$116,362)	3,410	450	13.20%	0.50%	1,984	287	14.47%	0.60%	3,448	0	0.00%	0.00%
<b>Visitacion Valley*</b>	\$49,438	\$633,500	\$151,304	(\$101,867)	4,865	1,820	37.41%	2.01%	2,249	593	26.37%	1.24%	4,910	145	2.95%	1.26%
West of Twin Peaks	\$148,175	\$1,215,285	\$290,257	(\$142,083)	13,510	2,255	16.69%	2.49%	2,709	373	13.77%	0.78%	13,634	14	0.10%	0.12%
Western Addition	\$57,655	\$720,000	\$171,964	(\$114,309)	10,865	2,725	25.08%	3.01%	9,159	2,016	22.01%	4.21%	11,307	273	2.41%	2.37%
<b>San Francisco Totals</b>	<b>\$91,394</b>	<b>\$1,000,000</b>	<b>\$238,839</b>	<b>(\$147,445)</b>	<b>338,335</b>	<b>90,472</b>	<b>26.74%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>218,950</b>	<b>47,839</b>	<b>21.85%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>345,344</b>	<b>11,523</b>	<b>3.34%</b>	<b>100%</b>

\*NRSA

## Appendix

### Demographic Data by Neighborhood

Neighborhood	Eviction Notices					Foreclosures and Troubled Mortgagees							
	Renter Occupied Households	Fault Eviction Notices	No Fault Eviction Notices	Total Eviction Notices	Eviction Notices per 1000 Renter Households	Total Owner Households with a Mortgage	Notices of Default	Foreclosures	Notice of Default Rate	Foreclosure Rate	Owner Occupied Housing with a Troubled Mortgage	% of Neighborhood	% of City
<b>Bayview Hunters Point*</b>	5,526	50	10	60	11	3,954	70	16	1.77%	0.40%	571	14.44%	19.03%
Bernal Heights	4,170	19	27	46	12	4,141	23	3	0.56%	0.07%	112	2.70%	3.73%
Castro/Upper Market	6,244	77	26	103	17	3,871	12	3	0.31%	0.08%	69	1.78%	2.30%
<b>Chinatown*</b>	6,343	27	4	31	5	132	3	2	2.27%	1.52%	3	2.27%	0.10%
Excelsior	3,802	43	33	76	20	4,673	36	14	0.77%	0.30%	335	7.17%	11.16%
Financial District	5,808	9	0	9	2	2,756	17	10	0.62%	0.36%	37	1.34%	1.23%
Glen Park	1,494		6	6	5	1,375	13	2	0.95%	0.15%	43	3.13%	1.43%
Golden Gate Park	35	2	0	2	58	0	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%
Haight Ashbury	6,153	22	15	37	7	1,852	9	2	0.49%	0.11%	29	1.57%	0.97%
Hayes Valley	7,100	52	9	61	9	1,233	10	0	0.81%	0.00%	24	1.95%	0.80%
Inner Richmond	6,433	20	22	42	7	1,714	9	1	0.53%	0.06%	27	1.58%	0.90%
Inner Sunset	7,075	25	15	40	6	3,156	12	2	0.38%	0.06%	52	1.65%	1.73%
Japantown	2,076	5	1	6	3	135	2	0	1.48%	0.00%	5	3.70%	0.17%
Lakeshore	4,696	85	0	85	19	162	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	7	4.32%	0.23%
Lincoln Park	46	3	0	3	66	28	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%
Lone Mountain/USF	4,662	19	18	37	8	1,200	4	0	0.33%	0.00%	22	1.83%	0.73%
Marina	9,970	51	10	61	7	2,500	12	3	0.48%	0.12%	24	0.96%	0.80%
McLaren Park	175	2	0	2	12	67	1	0	1.49%	0.00%	5	7.46%	0.17%
<b>Mission*</b>	17,322	148	62	210	13	4,692	25	3	0.54%	0.07%	91	1.94%	3.03%
Mission Bay	3,008		1	1	1	1,293	13	0	1.01%	0.00%	17	1.31%	0.57%
Nob Hill	13,146	75	20	95	8	1,174	15	12	1.28%	1.02%	23	1.96%	0.77%
Noe Valley	5,290	30	24	54	11	4,249	10	3	0.24%	0.07%	64	1.51%	2.13%
North Beach	5,395	48	4	52	10	820	4	0	0.49%	0.00%	12	1.46%	0.40%
Oceanview/Merced/Ingleside	2,546	23	22	45	18	3,754	37	11	0.99%	0.29%	278	7.41%	9.26%
Outer Mission	2,043	19	20	39	20	3,115	16	4	0.51%	0.13%	171	5.49%	5.70%
Outer Richmond	11,493	64	53	117	11	4,166	20	0	0.48%	0.00%	76	1.82%	2.53%
Pacific Heights	9,932	61	16	77	8	2,437	9	1	0.37%	0.04%	35	1.44%	1.17%
Portola	1,691	19	12	31	19	1,553	15	4	0.97%	0.26%	111	7.15%	3.70%
Potrero Hill	3,070	8	20	28	10	2,321	12	1	0.50%	0.04%	49	2.11%	1.63%
Presidio	1,098	0	0	0	0	11	1	0	9.09%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%
Presidio Heights	3,036	12	5	17	6	1,095	4	0	0.37%	0.00%	11	1.00%	0.37%
Russian Hill	7,810	48	15	63	9	1,196	11	4	0.92%	0.33%	28	2.34%	0.93%
Seacliff	171	3	2	5	30	510	2	0	0.39%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%
<b>South of Market*</b>	6,969	61	6	67	10	1,821	17	8	0.93%	0.44%	37	2.03%	1.23%
Sunset/Parkside	10,977	58	70	128	12	9,498	31	13	0.33%	0.14%	213	2.24%	7.10%
<b>Tenderloin*</b>	15,426	108	1	109	8	378	12	0	3.17%	0.00%	19	5.03%	0.63%
Treasure Island	618		0		0	0	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%
Twin Peaks	1,984	7	2	9	5	908	4	0	0.44%	0.00%	16	1.76%	0.53%
<b>Visitacion Valley*</b>	2,249	29	6	35	16	1,612	17	5	1.05%	0.31%	183	11.35%	6.10%
West of Twin Peaks	2,709	16	13	29	11	7,850	34	9	0.43%	0.11%	159	2.03%	5.30%
Western Addition	9,159	43	7	50	6	1,514	9	0	0.59%	0.00%	43	2.84%	1.43%
<b>San Francisco Totals</b>	<b>218,950</b>	<b>1,391</b>	<b>577</b>	<b>1,968</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>88,916</b>	<b>551</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>0.62%</b>	<b>0.15%</b>	<b>3,001</b>	<b>3.38%</b>	<b>100%</b>

\*NRSA

## Demographic Data by Neighborhood

Neighborhood	Personal and Property Crime						Perceived Safety			Likelihood of Leaving San Francisco				Emergency Preparedness		Voter Turnout			Block Parties & Street Fairs	
	Total Population	Personal Crimes (2014)	Personal Crime Rate (per 1,000 residents)	Total Households	Property Crimes	Property Crime Rate (per 1,000 households)	Feels Unsafe (During the Night)	Neither Safe nor Unsafe (During the Night)	Feels Safe (During Night)	Very Likely	Somewhat Likely	Not to Likely	Not Likely at All	Set aside 72 hours of food, water, and medicine	Made a family communication plan	Registered Voters	Ballots Cast (2012 Presidential Election)	Neighborhood Turnout	Permitted Events	% of City
<b>Bayview Hunters Point*</b>	37,363	1,426	38.17	10,932	1,691	154.68	21%	27%	52%	2%	11%	30%	56%	48%	25%	19,559	11,976	61%	6	3.73%
Bernal Heights	26,052	423	16.24	9,246	1,071	115.83	4%	10%	86%	3%	20%	20%	57%	65%	42%	15,635	12,204	78%	13	8.07%
Castro/Upper Market	19,775	518	26.19	10,828	1,449	133.82	2%	4%	93%	5%	17%	18%	60%	52%	33%	16,880	13,781	82%	8	4.97%
<b>Chinatown*</b>	14,905	345	23.15	6,855	851	124.14	0%	11%	89%	4%	13%	25%	57%	39%	51%	4,328	2,326	54%	3	1.86%
Excelsior	39,437	492	12.48	10,532	864	82.04	6%	22%	72%	7%	14%	28%	52%	52%	26%	17,941	11,958	67%	4	2.48%
Financial District/South Beach	16,091	845	52.51	9,009	5,856	650.02	0%	3%	97%	6%	15%	22%	57%	34%	19%	11,389	8,270	73%	4	2.48%
Glen Park	7,895	51	6.46	3,725	344	92.35	0%	12%	88%	7%	2%	35%	56%	71%	33%	6,256	5,205	83%	4	2.48%
Golden Gate Park	39	72	N/A	35	785	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,783	1,297	73%	0	0.00%
Haight Ashbury	17,715	198	11.18	8,273	837	101.17	3%	6%	90%	4%	8%	31%	57%	40%	32%	14,284	11,306	79%	7	4.35%
Hayes Valley	17,787	333	18.72	8,594	1,578	183.62	3%	15%	82%	9%	15%	30%	46%	41%	35%	13,269	9,950	75%	2	1.24%
Inner Richmond	21,861	123	5.63	9,204	551	59.87	1%	10%	89%	11%	17%	31%	41%	47%	35%	13,792	10,183	74%	4	2.48%
Inner Sunset	27,710	117	4.22	11,811	757	64.09	1%	4%	95%	5%	11%	30%	55%	52%	26%	16,962	13,300	78%	11	8.83%
Japantown	3,939	93	23.61	2,319	493	212.59	0%	0%	100%	16%	22%	28%	35%	30%	12%	2,115	1,565	74%	5	3.11%
Lakeshore	13,189	142	10.77	4,884	693	141.89	7%	7%	85%	8%	26%	24%	42%	55%	23%	6,876	4,763	69%	0	0.00%
Lincoln Park	324	0	0.00	89	10	112.36	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,875	1,336	71%	0	0.00%
Lone Mountain/USF	15,608	136	8.71	6,222	841	135.17	0%	3%	97%	7%	27%	19%	47%	48%	32%	10,509	7,876	75%	5	3.11%
Marina	23,793	204	8.57	13,783	1,581	114.71	1%	9%	90%	8%	23%	24%	45%	40%	32%	15,878	12,385	78%	5	3.11%
McLaren Park	662	32	48.34	246	64	260.16	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2,877	1,653	57%	0	0.00%
<b>Mission*</b>	56,873	2,299	40.42	22,468	4,548	202.42	6%	22%	72%	11%	17%	28%	43%	43%	28%	34,717	24,912	72%	13	8.07%
Mission Bay	9,251	137	14.81	4,444	633	142.44	3%	2%	95%	7%	25%	27%	42%	48%	43%	5,146	3,815	74%	0	0.00%
Nob Hill	25,816	480	18.59	15,057	1,811	120.28	1%	11%	88%	9%	12%	30%	50%	51%	23%	15,203	10,718	70%	1	0.62%
Noe Valley	21,564	118	5.47	10,737	610	56.81	0%	4%	96%	9%	13%	38%	40%	46%	31%	17,076	14,093	83%	12	7.45%
North Beach	12,451	385	30.92	6,551	1,500	228.97	0%	9%	91%	1%	10%	22%	67%	49%	34%	6,800	4,984	73%	3	1.86%
Oceanview/Merced/Ingleside	27,930	305	10.92	7,792	463	59.42	6%	21%	72%	3%	16%	25%	56%	51%	26%	13,313	8,581	64%	0	0.00%
Outer Mission	23,223	349	15.03	6,314	587	92.97	7%	20%	73%	5%	12%	29%	53%	59%	44%	11,375	7,470	66%	4	2.48%
Outer Richmond	44,910	248	5.52	18,474	917	49.64	1%	7%	91%	2%	14%	29%	55%	51%	31%	24,952	18,033	72%	4	2.48%
Pacific Heights	23,299	187	8.03	13,507	1,263	93.51	2%	1%	98%	5%	12%	38%	45%	53%	38%	16,776	13,321	79%	0	0.00%
Portola	14,861	231	15.54	4,419	458	103.64	20%	26%	54%	2%	25%	33%	40%	49%	31%	7,872	5,147	65%	2	1.24%
Potrero Hill	12,746	211	16.55	6,436	1,194	185.52	10%	20%	71%	9%	12%	30%	49%	47%	36%	9,071	7,059	78%	3	1.86%
Presidio	2,918	2	0.69	1,132	30	26.50	0%	0%	100%	28%	31%	22%	19%	84%	43%	2,557	1,870	73%	0	0.00%
Presidio Heights	10,251	60	5.85	4,828	325	67.32	0%	4%	96%	8%	10%	30%	51%	44%	31%	6,846	5,467	80%	2	1.24%
Russian Hill	18,949	173	9.13	10,043	1,263	125.76	1%	5%	95%	5%	20%	30%	45%	56%	33%	12,927	9,717	75%	1	0.62%
Seacliff	2,459	4	1.63	917	32	34.90	0%	0%	100%	0%	24%	13%	63%	72%	37%	1,492	1,207	81%	2	1.24%
<b>South of Market*</b>	17,797	1,713	96.25	9,008	6,691	742.78	16%	28%	56%	16%	18%	22%	44%	48%	28%	11,944	7,499	63%	1	0.62%
Sunset/Parkside	78,132	367	4.70	26,861	1,344	50.04	3%	11%	86%	6%	12%	22%	61%	48%	28%	44,620	31,445	70%	11	6.83%
<b>Tenderloin*</b>	26,085	2,632	100.90	15,852	3,308	208.68	12%	26%	62%	6%	16%	23%	55%	54%	33%	15,062	8,611	57%	2	1.24%
Treasure Island	2,654	32	12.06	618	144	233.01	0%	0%	100%	0%	10%	17%	73%	53%	28%	1,159	645	56%	0	0.00%
Twin Peaks	7,092	42	5.92	3,448	209	60.61	0%	9%	91%	6%	14%	18%	62%	51%	26%	5,396	4,458	83%	1	0.62%
<b>Visitacion Valley*</b>	17,197	397	23.09	4,910	401	81.67	14%	26%	60%	1%	17%	33%	49%	43%	27%	5,760	3,218	56%	4	2.48%
West of Twin Peaks	36,377	227	6.24	13,634	1,091	80.02	1%	5%	94%	5%	12%	16%	67%	61%	35%	26,351	21,180	80%	13	8.07%
Western Addition	20,521	550	26.80	11,307	2,308	204.12	4%	12%	84%	12%	7%	19%	62%	36%	33%	14,218	10,091	71%	1	0.62%
<b>San Francisco Totals</b>	<b>817,501</b>	<b>16,699</b>	<b>20.43</b>	<b>345,344</b>	<b>51,446</b>	<b>148.97</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>502,841</b>	<b>364,875</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>100%</b>

\*NRSA

## Demographic Data by Neighborhood

Neighborhood	Low/Mod Population				Educational Disparity				Poverty				Median Income		Unemployment			
	Total Population (Low/Mod)	Low/Mod Population	% of Neighborhood	% of City	Total Population 25+	Population 25+ with No Diploma	% of Neighborhood	% of City	Total Population 3+	Persons Livening in Poverty	% of Neighborhood	% of City	Median Income	% of City Median	Civilian labor force	Unemployed	% of Neighborhood	% of City
<b>Bayview Hunters Point*</b>	34,460	24,230	70.31%	6.07%	24,247	6,785	27.98%	7.79%	35,551	6,578	18.50%	8.11%	\$53,852	58.92%	19,255	3,037	15.77%	7.38%
Bernal Heights	24,880	11,935	47.97%	2.99%	19,349	2,335	12.07%	2.68%	24,853	2,392	9.62%	2.95%	\$87,638	95.89%	16,518	1,604	9.71%	3.90%
Castro/Upper Market	19,795	7,915	39.98%	1.98%	17,791	507	2.85%	.58%	19,260	1,248	6.48%	1.54%	\$137,775	150.75%	14,964	938	6.27%	2.28%
<b>Chinatown*</b>	15,325	13,505	88.12%	3.38%	11,725	6,228	53.12%	7.15%	14,718	3,809	25.88%	4.70%	\$28,167	30.82%	7,463	1,016	13.61%	2.47%
Excelsior	37,865	21,025	55.53%	5.26%	29,030	7,650	26.35%	8.78%	37,984	3,095	8.15%	3.82%	\$66,882	73.18%	21,904	2,416	11.03%	5.87%
Financial District	12,640	4,290	33.94%	1.07%	13,404	602	4.49%	.69%	15,130	1,287	8.51%	1.59%	\$159,625	174.66%	10,558	671	6.36%	1.63%
Glen Park	8,235	3,065	37.22%	.77%	6,406	319	4.98%	.37%	7,579	529	6.98%	.65%	\$144,284	157.87%	4,736	361	7.62%	.88%
Golden Gate Park	30	20	66.67%	.01%	39	0	.00%	.00%	39	0	.00%	.00%	\$0	.00%	39	0	.00%	.00%
Haight Ashbury	17,180	7,410	43.13%	1.86%	14,536	281	1.93%	.32%	17,192	1,222	7.11%	1.51%	\$138,118	151.12%	13,780	819	5.94%	1.99%
Hayes Valley	16,085	9,760	60.68%	2.44%	15,082	876	5.81%	1.01%	17,213	2,220	12.90%	2.74%	\$96,875	106.00%	13,513	909	6.73%	2.21%
Inner Richmond	20,745	10,615	51.17%	2.66%	17,388	2,194	12.62%	2.52%	21,295	2,112	9.92%	2.60%	\$99,266	108.61%	13,405	941	7.02%	2.29%
Inner Sunset	26,580	10,930	41.12%	2.74%	21,852	1,204	5.51%	1.38%	26,147	1,757	6.72%	2.17%	\$123,864	135.53%	17,033	813	4.77%	1.98%
Japantown	3,725	2,390	64.16%	.60%	3,568	439	12.30%	.50%	3,776	728	19.28%	.90%	\$50,833	55.62%	1,703	92	5.40%	.22%
Lakeshore	11,960	8,005	66.93%	2.00%	7,077	556	7.86%	.64%	11,013	957	8.69%	1.18%	\$62,251	68.11%	6,858	873	12.73%	2.12%
Lincoln Park	215	50	23.26%	.01%	308	31	10.06%	.04%	176	4	2.27%	.00%	\$87,500	95.74%	120	8	6.67%	.02%
Lone Mountain/USF	12,935	5,820	44.99%	1.46%	10,883	635	5.83%	.73%	12,799	1,034	8.08%	1.27%	\$105,689	115.64%	9,498	649	6.83%	1.58%
Marina	21,985	6,440	29.29%	1.61%	20,455	559	2.73%	.64%	22,985	1,060	4.61%	1.31%	\$179,369	196.26%	17,163	1,188	6.92%	2.89%
McLaren Park	745	560	75.17%	.14%	433	123	28.41%	.14%	638	278	43.57%	.34%	\$20,625	22.57%	288	59	20.49%	.14%
<b>Mission*</b>	55,595	36,550	65.74%	9.15%	45,113	7,677	17.02%	8.81%	54,844	7,657	13.96%	9.44%	\$66,649	72.93%	38,468	2,894	7.52%	7.03%
Mission Bay	6,035	2,670	44.24%	.67%	7,653	396	5.17%	.45%	8,728	452	5.18%	.56%	\$95,777	104.80%	6,639	369	5.56%	.90%
Nob Hill	23,850	15,700	65.83%	3.93%	21,282	2,164	10.17%	2.48%	24,910	3,090	12.40%	3.81%	\$78,612	86.01%	17,169	1,047	6.10%	2.54%
Noe Valley	22,290	7,680	34.45%	1.92%	17,744	630	3.55%	.72%	20,789	990	4.76%	1.22%	\$156,101	170.80%	14,890	911	6.12%	2.21%
North Beach	11,820	7,055	59.69%	1.77%	10,541	1,525	14.47%	1.75%	12,203	1,519	12.45%	1.87%	\$68,727	75.20%	8,143	617	7.58%	1.50%
Oceanview/Merced/Ingleside	24,515	13,055	53.25%	3.27%	19,793	4,436	22.41%	5.09%	27,193	2,943	10.82%	3.63%	\$75,620	82.74%	15,611	1,981	12.69%	4.81%
Outer Mission	21,580	10,335	47.89%	2.59%	16,992	3,660	21.54%	4.20%	22,244	1,776	7.98%	2.19%	\$85,756	93.83%	13,120	1,045	7.96%	2.54%
Outer Richmond	45,395	21,450	47.25%	5.37%	35,152	4,313	12.27%	4.95%	43,590	2,752	6.31%	3.39%	\$91,347	99.95%	26,756	1,915	7.16%	4.65%
Pacific Heights	22,740	7,385	32.48%	1.85%	20,095	537	2.67%	.62%	22,012	1,303	5.92%	1.61%	\$168,140	183.97%	15,864	718	4.53%	1.74%
Portola	14,460	7,660	52.97%	1.92%	10,855	3,543	32.64%	4.07%	14,488	1,412	9.75%	1.74%	\$67,360	73.70%	7,964	851	10.69%	2.07%
Potrero Hill	12,275	4,670	38.04%	1.17%	10,534	428	4.06%	.49%	12,151	840	6.91%	1.04%	\$149,137	163.18%	9,160	707	7.72%	1.72%
Presidio	2,865	1,155	40.31%	.29%	2,107	0	.00%	.00%	2,734	99	3.62%	.12%	\$171,284	187.41%	1,894	28	1.48%	.07%
Presidio Heights	9,175	2,720	29.65%	.68%	7,764	338	4.35%	.39%	9,738	432	4.44%	.53%	\$155,028	169.63%	5,909	602	10.19%	1.46%
Russian Hill	18,650	9,425	50.54%	2.36%	15,733	1,750	11.12%	2.01%	18,340	1,420	7.74%	1.75%	\$104,654	114.51%	13,001	640	4.92%	1.56%
Seacliff	2,380	380	15.97%	.10%	1,738	25	1.44%	.03%	2,370	122	5.15%	.15%	\$207,397	226.93%	1,069	30	2.81%	.07%
<b>South of Market*</b>	13,910	9,170	65.92%	2.30%	14,992	2,899	19.34%	3.33%	16,681	3,978	23.85%	4.90%	\$59,301	64.88%	9,292	885	9.52%	2.15%
Sunset/Parkside	76,460	34,240	44.78%	8.57%	58,636	9,063	15.46%	10.41%	75,725	4,887	6.45%	6.02%	\$93,529	102.34%	44,265	3,679	8.31%	8.94%
<b>Tenderloin*</b>	23,910	21,290	89.04%	5.33%	21,110	5,292	25.07%	6.08%	24,941	7,252	29.08%	8.94%	\$30,716	33.61%	13,224	1,569	11.86%	3.81%
Treasure Island	2,035	1,465	71.99%	.37%	1,504	170	11.30%	.20%	2,374	731	30.79%	.90%	\$23,305	25.50%	1,380	170	12.32%	.41%
Twin Peaks	6,210	2,100	33.82%	.53%	6,225	335	5.38%	.38%	6,486	514	7.92%	.63%	\$109,341	119.64%	4,178	297	7.11%	.72%
<b>Visitacion Valley*</b>	17,725	12,675	71.51%	3.17%	11,759	3,291	27.99%	3.78%	16,641	2,449	14.72%	3.02%	\$49,438	54.09%	9,239	1,516	16.41%	3.68%
West of Twin Peaks	36,105	10,880	30.13%	2.72%	27,812	1,604	5.77%	1.84%	35,287	1,480	4.19%	1.82%	\$148,175	162.13%	20,409	1,353	6.63%	3.29%
Western Addition	19,045	11,745	61.67%	2.94%	16,704	1,699	10.17%	1.95%	20,094	2,715	13.51%	3.35%	\$57,655	63.08%	11,551	930	8.05%	2.26%
<b>San Francisco Totals</b>	<b>774,410</b>	<b>399,420</b>	<b>51.58%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>635,411</b>	<b>87,099</b>	<b>13.71%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>782,911</b>	<b>81,123</b>	<b>10.36%</b>	<b>100%</b>			<b>497,993</b>	<b>41,148</b>		<b>100%</b>

\*NRSAs

## Demographic Data by Neighborhood

Neighborhood	Total Population	Immigrants				Seniors 60+			Persons with a Disability				Veterans				People Living with HIV/AIDS		
		Total Population 5+	Population that Speaks English less than "very well"	% of Neighborhood	% of City	Total Population 60+	% of Neighborhood	% of City	Total Civilian Population	Total Population with a Disability	% of Neighborhood	% of City	Civilian Population 18 Years and Over	Number of Veterans	% of Neighborhood	% of City	Number of PLWHA	% of Neighborhood	% of City
<b>Bayview Hunters Point*</b>	37,363	34,356	10,170	29.60%	5.77%	5,806	15.54%	3.58%	37,335	4,205	11.26%	4.87%	27,923	1,126	4.03%	1.91%	314	.84%	2.60%
Bernal Heights	26,052	24,525	4,618	18.83%	2.62%	3,737	14.34%	2.31%	25,956	1,738	6.70%	2.01%	21,358	890	4.17%	1.51%	352	1.35%	2.91%
Castro/Upper Market	19,775	19,248	537	2.79%	.30%	3,272	16.55%	2.02%	19,714	1,715	8.70%	1.99%	18,442	1,068	5.79%	1.81%	1,944	9.83%	16.08%
<b>Chinatown*</b>	14,905	14,649	9,802	66.91%	5.56%	5,147	34.53%	3.18%	14,885	2,813	18.90%	3.26%	13,232	224	1.69%	.38%	50	.34%	.41%
Excelsior	39,437	37,368	15,547	41.61%	8.82%	8,172	20.72%	5.04%	39,126	4,155	10.62%	4.81%	32,477	970	2.99%	1.65%	203	.51%	1.68%
Financial District	16,091	15,225	2,237	14.69%	1.27%	2,453	15.24%	1.51%	16,007	1,522	9.51%	1.76%	14,518	635	4.37%	1.08%	219	1.36%	1.81%
Glen Park	7,895	7,466	476	6.38%	.27%	1,884	23.86%	1.16%	7,895	640	8.11%	.74%	6,679	435	6.51%	.74%	158	2.00%	1.31%
Golden Gate Park	39	39	0	.00%	.00%	0	.00%	.00%	39	0	.00%	.00%	39	0	.00%	.00%	0	.00%	.00%
Haight Ashbury	17,715	17,034	536	3.15%	.30%	1,792	10.12%	1.11%	17,685	1,044	5.90%	1.21%	16,119	536	3.33%	50.00%	452	2.55%	3.74%
Hayes Valley	17,787	17,349	1,637	9.44%	.93%	1,930	10.85%	1.19%	17,603	1,740	9.88%	2.02%	16,421	536	3.26%	.91%	884	4.97%	7.31%
Inner Richmond	21,861	20,856	4,870	23.35%	2.76%	4,703	21.51%	2.90%	21,785	2,371	10.88%	2.75%	19,163	916	4.78%	.91%	68	.31%	.56%
Inner Sunset	27,710	26,392	3,539	13.41%	2.01%	5,480	19.78%	3.38%	27,650	1,781	6.44%	2.06%	24,266	829	3.42%	1.55%	158	.57%	1.31%
Japantown	3,939	3,748	856	22.84%	.49%	1,544	39.20%	.95%	3,896	889	22.82%	1.03%	3,677	231	6.28%	1.41%	43	1.09%	.36%
Lakeshore	13,189	12,886	2,312	17.94%	1.31%	2,122	16.09%	1.31%	13,163	1,364	10.36%	1.58%	12,087	494	4.09%	.39%	71	.54%	.59%
Lincoln Park	324	320	43	13.44%	.02%	179	55.25%	.11%	176	9	5.11%	.01%	317	72	22.71%	.84%	0	.00%	.00%
Lone Mountain/USF	15,608	15,003	1,376	9.17%	.78%	2,218	14.21%	1.37%	15,355	1,586	10.33%	1.84%	14,123	436	3.09%	.12%	149	.95%	1.23%
Marina	23,793	22,720	807	3.55%	.46%	3,833	16.11%	2.37%	23,747	1,337	5.63%	1.55%	21,307	1,145	5.37%	.74%	49	.21%	.41%
McLaren Park	662	638	245	38.40%	.14%	138	20.85%	.09%	662	106	16.01%	.12%	584	0	.00%	1.94%	0	.00%	.00%
<b>Mission*</b>	56,873	54,304	13,323	24.53%	7.56%	7,302	12.84%	4.51%	56,526	5,864	10.37%	6.79%	49,846	1,425	2.86%	.00%	1,285	2.26%	10.63%
Mission Bay	9,251	8,911	1,957	21.96%	1.11%	670	7.24%	.41%	9,251	439	4.75%	.51%	8,469	161	1.90%	2.42%	87	.94%	.72%
Nob Hill	25,816	25,420	5,036	19.81%	2.86%	5,275	20.43%	3.26%	25,691	2,487	9.68%	2.88%	24,246	970	4.00%	.27%	490	1.90%	4.05%
Noe Valley	21,564	20,365	909	4.46%	.52%	3,629	16.83%	2.24%	21,556	1,445	6.70%	1.67%	18,717	819	4.38%	1.65%	560	2.60%	4.63%
North Beach	12,451	12,135	3,285	27.07%	1.86%	3,092	24.83%	1.91%	12,451	1,422	11.42%	1.65%	11,528	442	3.83%	1.39%	57	.46%	.47%
Oceanview/Merced/Ingleside	27,930	26,809	9,916	36.99%	5.62%	5,583	19.99%	3.45%	27,830	3,292	11.83%	3.81%	23,211	814	3.51%	.75%	146	.52%	1.21%
Outer Mission	23,223	21,724	8,260	38.02%	4.68%	5,113	22.02%	3.16%	23,205	2,378	10.25%	2.75%	19,232	721	3.75%	1.38%	103	.44%	.85%
Outer Richmond	44,910	42,821	11,411	26.65%	6.47%	10,097	22.48%	6.23%	44,834	4,697	10.48%	5.44%	38,362	1,267	3.30%	1.22%	150	.33%	1.24%
Pacific Heights	23,299	22,203	1,281	5.77%	.73%	5,036	21.61%	3.11%	23,009	1,712	7.44%	1.98%	21,147	1,190	5.63%	2.15%	186	.80%	1.54%
Portola	14,861	14,294	5,550	38.83%	3.15%	3,394	22.84%	2.10%	14,844	1,437	9.68%	1.66%	12,006	471	3.92%	2.02%	84	.57%	.69%
Potrero Hill	12,746	11,917	684	5.74%	.39%	1,570	12.32%	.97%	12,701	829	6.53%	.96%	10,965	242	2.21%	.80%	225	1.77%	1.86%
Presidio	2,918	2,584	48	1.86%	.03%	143	4.90%	.09%	2,918	79	2.71%	.09%	2,220	107	4.82%	.41%	0	.00%	.00%
Presidio Heights	10,251	9,596	872	9.09%	.49%	2,353	22.95%	1.45%	10,224	1,176	11.50%	1.36%	8,629	380	4.40%	.18%	59	.58%	.49%
Russian Hill	18,949	18,157	2,794	15.39%	1.58%	3,863	20.39%	2.38%	18,949	1,238	6.53%	1.43%	17,489	663	3.79%	.64%	123	.65%	1.02%
Seacliff	2,459	2,253	114	5.06%	.06%	619	25.17%	.38%	2,459	190	7.73%	.22%	1,774	126	7.10%	1.12%	0	.00%	.00%
<b>South of Market*</b>	17,797	17,245	4,479	25.97%	2.54%	4,421	24.84%	2.73%	17,065	4,172	24.45%	4.83%	16,331	653	4.00%	.21%	624	3.51%	5.16%
Sunset/Parkside	78,132	74,675	22,367	29.95%	12.68%	18,534	23.72%	11.44%	77,851	7,651	9.83%	8.86%	65,897	2,705	4.10%	1.11%	249	.32%	2.06%
<b>Tenderloin*</b>	26,085	25,217	8,163	32.37%	4.63%	6,416	24.60%	3.96%	25,950	7,065	27.23%	8.18%	24,050	1,747	7.26%	4.59%	1,205	4.62%	9.97%
Treasure Island	2,654	2,605	376	14.43%	.21%	120	4.52%	.07%	2,623	450	17.16%	.52%	2,258	36	1.59%	2.96%	30	1.13%	.25%
Twin Peaks	7,092	6,916	670	9.69%	.38%	1,936	27.30%	1.20%	6,626	1,132	17.08%	1.31%	6,365	487	7.65%	.06%	410	5.78%	3.39%
<b>Visitacion Valley*</b>	17,197	16,231	7,015	43.22%	3.98%	3,660	21.28%	2.26%	17,153	1,898	11.07%	2.20%	13,677	419	3.06%	.83%	115	.67%	.95%
West of Twin Peaks	36,377	34,558	4,520	13.08%	2.56%	9,335	25.66%	5.76%	36,344	2,851	7.84%	3.30%	29,782	2,033	6.83%	.71%	301	.83%	2.49%
Western Addition	20,521	20,126	3,698	18.37%	2.10%	5,428	26.45%	3.35%	20,364	3,425	16.82%	3.97%	18,731	1,057	5.64%	3.45%	487	2.37%	4.03%
<b>San Francisco Totals</b>	<b>817,501</b>	<b>780,888</b>	<b>176,336</b>	<b>22.58%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>161,999</b>	<b>19.82%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>813,103</b>	<b>86,344</b>	<b>10.62%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>707,664</b>	<b>29,478</b>	<b>4.17%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>12,090</b>	<b>1.48%</b>	<b>100%</b>

\*NRSA



## Demographic Data by Neighborhood

Neighborhood	Black or African Americans			Public Housing Residents				American Indian			Re-Entry Population			Disconnected TAY			
	Total Black or African American	% of Neighborhood	% of City	Total Renter Households	Public Housing Units	% of Neighborhood	% of City	American Indian and Alaska Native	% of Neighborhood	% of City	Re-Entry Population	% of Neighborhood	% of City	Population 15 to 24	Disconnected Transition Age Youth (TAY)	% of Neighborhood	% of City
<b>Bayview Hunters Point*</b>	12,369	33.10%	26.94%	5,526	968	17.52%	15.48%	329	.88%	9.59%	307	.82%	14.64%	5,232	595	11.37%	20.42%
Bernal Heights	884	3.39%	1.93%	4,170	280	6.71%	4.48%	92	.35%	2.68%	81	.31%	3.86%	2,669	106	3.97%	3.64%
Castro/Upper Market	504	2.55%	1.10%	6,244	219	3.51%	3.50%	109	.55%	3.18%	25	.13%	1.19%	823	5	0.61%	.17%
<b>Chinatown*</b>	261	1.75%	.57%	6,343	520	8.20%	8.32%	47	.32%	1.37%	21	.14%	1.00%	2,060	49	2.38%	1.68%
Excelsior	722	1.83%	1.57%	3,802	0	.00%	.00%	117	.30%	3.41%	115	.29%	5.48%	4,626	260	5.62%	8.92%
Financial District	361	2.24%	.79%	5,808	0	.00%	.00%	57	.35%	1.66%	0	.00%	.00%	1,218	15	1.23%	.51%
Glen Park	492	6.23%	1.07%	1,494	0	.00%	.00%	36	.46%	1.05%	17	.22%	.81%	467	18	3.85%	.62%
Golden Gate Park	0	.00%	.00%	35	0	.00%	.00%	0	.00%	.00%	0	.00%	.00%	0	0	0.00%	.00%
Haight Ashbury	530	2.99%	1.15%	6,153	0	.00%	.00%	8	.05%	.23%	19	.11%	.91%	1,826	17	0.93%	.58%
Hayes Valley	2,531	14.23%	5.51%	7,100	159	2.24%	2.54%	149	.84%	4.34%	100	.56%	4.77%	1,625	44	2.71%	1.51%
Inner Richmond	368	1.68%	.80%	6,433	69	1.07%	1.10%	70	.32%	2.04%	10	.05%	.48%	2,243	30	1.34%	1.03%
Inner Sunset	401	1.45%	.87%	7,075	0	.00%	.00%	102	.37%	2.97%	24	.09%	1.14%	2,847	22	0.77%	.75%
Japantown	315	8.00%	.69%	2,076	136	6.55%	2.18%	0	.00%	.00%	10	.25%	.48%	109	7	6.42%	.24%
Lakeshore	778	5.90%	1.69%	4,696	0	.00%	.00%	123	.93%	3.59%	20	.15%	.95%	5,248	24	0.46%	.82%
Lincoln Park	30	9.26%	.07%	46	0	.00%	.00%	0	.00%	.00%	0	.00%	.00%	9	0	0.00%	.00%
Lone Mountain/USF	816	5.23%	1.78%	4,662	0	.00%	.00%	40	.26%	1.17%	24	.15%	1.14%	3,528	18	0.51%	.62%
Marina	169	.71%	.37%	9,970	0	.00%	.00%	37	.16%	1.08%	12	.05%	.57%	1,113	7	0.63%	.24%
McLaren Park	118	17.82%	.26%	175	0	.00%	.00%	0	.00%	.00%	1	.15%	.05%	165	6	3.64%	.21%
<b>Mission*</b>	1,844	3.24%	4.02%	16,895	394	2.33%	6.30%	411	.72%	11.98%	179	.33%	8.54%	5,754	296	5.38%	10.16%
Mission Bay	263	2.84%	.57%	3,008	0	.00%	.00%	0	.00%	.00%	6	.06%	.29%	897	15	1.67%	.51%
Nob Hill	606	2.35%	1.32%	13,146	0	.00%	.00%	79	.31%	2.30%	35	.14%	1.67%	3,306	32	0.97%	1.10%
Noe Valley	575	2.67%	1.25%	5,290	0	.00%	.00%	43	.20%	1.25%	30	.14%	1.43%	1,372	30	2.19%	1.03%
North Beach	137	1.10%	.30%	5,395	189	3.50%	3.02%	13	.10%	.38%	13	.10%	.62%	1,097	36	3.28%	1.24%
Oceanview/Merced/Ingleside	3,504	12.55%	7.63%	2,546	17	.67%	.27%	124	.44%	3.62%	78	.28%	3.72%	4,178	138	3.30%	4.74%
Outer Mission	226	.97%	.49%	2,043	0	.00%	.00%	168	.72%	4.90%	46	.20%	2.19%	2,645	101	3.82%	3.47%
Outer Richmond	535	1.19%	1.17%	11,493	75	.65%	1.20%	128	.29%	3.73%	63	.14%	3.00%	4,334	85	1.96%	2.92%
Pacific Heights	566	2.43%	1.23%	9,932	359	3.61%	5.74%	18	.08%	.52%	20	.09%	.95%	1,326	7	0.53%	.24%
Portola	808	5.44%	1.76%	1,691	0	.00%	.00%	41	.28%	1.20%	48	.32%	2.29%	1,689	89	5.27%	3.05%
Potrero Hill	623	4.89%	1.36%	3,497	628	17.96%	10.04%	331	2.60%	9.65%	52	.35%	2.48%	686	73	7.77%	2.51%
Presidio	29	.99%	.06%	1,098	0	.00%	.00%	24	.82%	.70%	0	.00%	.00%	113	3	2.65%	.10%
Presidio Heights	223	2.18%	.49%	3,036	0	.00%	.00%	0	.00%	.00%	9	.09%	.43%	1,116	10	0.90%	.34%
Russian Hill	164	.87%	.36%	7,810	0	.00%	.00%	0	.00%	.00%	13	.07%	.62%	1,911	16	0.84%	.55%
Seacliff	0	.00%	.00%	171	0	.00%	.00%	0	.00%	.00%	1	.04%	.05%	183	1	0.55%	.03%
<b>South of Market*</b>	2,124	11.93%	4.63%	6,969	276	3.96%	4.41%	123	.69%	3.59%	74	.42%	3.53%	1,569	59	3.76%	2.02%
Sunset/Parkside	530	.68%	1.15%	10,977	24	.22%	.38%	66	.08%	1.92%	98	.13%	4.67%	9,364	154	1.64%	5.28%
<b>Tenderloin*</b>	2,689	10.31%	5.86%	15,426	285	1.85%	4.56%	242	.93%	7.06%	343	1.31%	16.36%	3,220	123	3.82%	4.22%
Treasure Island	609	22.95%	1.33%	618	0	.00%	.00%	26	.98%	.76%	18	.68%	.86%	868	49	5.65%	1.68%
Twin Peaks	389	5.49%	.85%	1,984	110	5.54%	1.76%	54	.76%	1.57%	6	.08%	.29%	295	36	12.20%	1.24%
<b>Visitacion Valley*</b>	2,714	15.78%	5.91%	2,249	785	34.90%	12.56%	137	.80%	3.99%	74	.43%	3.53%	2,760	180	6.52%	6.18%
West of Twin Peaks	973	2.67%	2.12%	2,709	0	.00%	.00%	7	.02%	.20%	33	.09%	1.57%	3,025	55	1.82%	1.89%
Western Addition	4,129	20.12%	8.99%	9,159	759	8.29%	12.14%	79	.38%	2.30%	72	.35%	3.43%	2,319	103	4.44%	3.53%
<b>San Francisco Totals</b>	<b>45,909</b>	<b>5.62%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>218,950</b>	<b>6,252</b>	<b>0.02855</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3,430</b>	<b>.42%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2,097</b>	<b>.26%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>89,835</b>	<b>2,914</b>	<b>3.24%</b>	<b>100%</b>

\*NRSA

# Demographic Data by Neighborhood: Measure Operationalization and Data Sources

Measure	Operationalization	Data Source
Homeownership Affordability Gap	Difference between the neighborhood median income and income needed to afford monthly payments for a neighborhood median priced 1-,2-, 3-bedroom home.	San Francisco Office the Assessor. (2014). <i>Home Sales Prices for the City and County of San Francisco</i> . Unpublished raw data. U.S. Census Bureau. (2014). <i>Family Income in the Past 12 Months (In 2013 Inflation-Adjusted Dollars) (B19101)</i> . 2013 ACS 5-Year Estimates.
Severe Housing Problems	A household that has 1 or more of the following problems: lacks complete kitchen facilities; 2) lacks complete plumbing facilities; 3) household is severely overcrowded; and 4) household is severely cost burdened.	U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2014). <i>Consolidated Planning/CHAS Data</i> . 2007-11 ACS 5-Year Average.
Excessive Rent Burdened	Renter-occupied households paying 50% percent or more of income for rent.	U.S. Census Bureau. (2014). <i>Gross Rent as a Percentage of Household Income in the Past 12 Months (B25070)</i> . 2013 ACS 5-Year Estimates.
Severe Overcrowding	Renter and owner-occupied households with more than 1.51 occupants per room.	U.S. Census Bureau. (2014). <i>Tenure By Occupants Per Room (B25014)</i> . 2013 ACS 5-Year Estimates.
Evictions Notices	Evictions notices per 1,000 renter households by neighborhood	San Francisco Rent Board. (2015). <i>Eviction Notice and Estoppels 2009-2014</i> . Unpublished raw data.
Default & Foreclosure Rate	Default notices and foreclosures per 1000 owner-occupied households with a mortgage by neighborhood	San Francisco Office the Assessor. (2014). <i>Notice of Defaults, Trustee Sales, and Trustee Deeds</i> . Unpublished raw data.
Borrowers with At Risk Mortgages	Owner-occupied borrowers with loan-to-value ratio greater than 90%, with a home value less than \$1.5 M, and are less than \$1M underwater.	Corelogic. (2015). <i>Mortgage Data</i> . Unpublished data provided by the Office of the Controller, City and County of San Francisco.
Rate of Personal Crime	Number of assaults, robberies, and sex offences in 2014 per 1,000 residents.	DataSF. (2014). <i>Incidents derived from SFPD Crime Incident Reporting System</i> .
Property Crime Rate	Number of arsons, burglaries, thefts, and vehicle thefts per 1,000 households.	DataSF. (2014). <i>Incidents derived from SFPD Crime Incident Reporting System</i> .
Social Capital (Perceived Safety)	Number of survey respondents that feel safe walking alone in their neighborhood during the night.	Office of the Controller, City and County of San Francisco. (2013). <i>City Survey 2013 Final Report</i> . Unpublished raw data.
Social Capital (Likelihood of Leaving San Francisco)	Number of survey respondents that are likely to leave san Francisco within the next three years.	Office of the Controller, City and County of San Francisco. (2013). <i>City Survey 2013 Final Report</i> . Unpublished raw data.
Social Capital (Emergency Preparedness)	Number of survey respondents that have set aside 72 hours of food, water and medicine or have made a family communication plan	Office of the Controller, City and County of San Francisco. (2013). <i>City Survey 2013 Final Report</i> . Unpublished raw data.
Civic Participation	Voter turnout for the 2012 Presidential Election	San Francisco Department of Elections. (2012). <i>Final Certified Statement of Votes, November 5, 2012 Election</i> .
Neighborhood and Community Events	Number of Block Parties, Street Fairs, and Farmer's Markets.	San Francisco Municipal Transit Agency. (2014). <i>Temporary Street Closures</i> . Unpublished raw data.
Low/Mod Population	Number of individuals earning below 80% of Area Median Income (AMI).	U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2014). <i>American Community Survey 5-Year 2006-2010 Low and Moderate Income Summary Data</i> .

# Demographic Data by Neighborhood: Measure Operationalization and Data Sources

Measure	Operationalization	Data Source
Educational Disparity	Population 25 years and over with no high school diploma.	U.S. Census Bureau. (2014). <i>Educational Attainment for the Population 25 Years and Over (B15003)</i> . 2013 ACS 5-Year Estimates.
Person Living in Poverty	Population with poverty status in the past 12 months.	U.S. Census Bureau. (2014). <i>Poverty Status in the Past 12 Months by School Enrollment by Level of School for the Population 3 Years and Over (B14006)</i> . 2013 ACS 5-Year Estimates.
Unemployment	Number of unemployed persons 16 years and over in civilian labor force.	U.S. Census Bureau. (2014). <i>Employment Status for the Population 16 Years and Over (B23025)</i> . 2013 ACS 5-Year Estimates.
Median Family Income	Median family income calculated for each neighborhood.	U.S. Census Bureau. (2014). <i>Family Income in the Past 12 Months (In 2013 Inflation-Adjusted Dollars) (B19101)</i> . 2013 ACS 5-Year Estimates.
Immigrants	Population 5 years and over that speaks English less than very well.	U.S. Census Bureau. (2014). <i>Language Spoken at Home by Ability to Speak English for the Population 5 Years and Over (Table B16001)</i> . 2013 ACS 5-Year Estimates.
Disconnected Transitional Age Youth	Composite measure of the number of SFUSD student academically off-track for high school graduation and the number of Juvenile Probation Department referrals.	San Francisco Unified San Francisco Unified School District. (2014). <i>San Francisco Unified School District Students Academically Off-Track Students for the 2013-14 School Year</i> . Unpublished raw data. San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department. (2014). <i>Unduplicated Count of Juvenile Probation Referrals In San Francisco</i> . Juvenile Probation Department Annual Report, 2013.
Seniors	Population 60 years and older.	U.S. Census Bureau. (2014). <i>Sex by Age (Table B01001)</i> . 2013 ACS 5-Year Estimates.
Persons with a Disability	Civilian noninstitutionalized population with a disability.	U.S. Census Bureau. (2014). <i>Disability Characteristics (Table S1810)</i> . 2013 ACS 5-Year Estimates.
Re-Entry Population	San Francisco Adult Probation Department Active Clients with validated neighborhood address.	San Francisco Adult Probation Department. (2014). <i>Active Adult Probation Clients by Neighborhood as of February 14, 2014</i> . Unpublished raw data.
Veterans	Population with veteran status.	U.S. Census Bureau. (2014). <i>Veteran Status (Table 2101)</i> . 2013 ACS 5-Year Estimates. 2013 ACS 5-Year Estimates., 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey.
People Living with HIV/AIDS	Number of living HIV cases in San Francisco by neighborhood as of December 31, 2013.	San Francisco Department of Public Health. (2014). <i>San Francisco in HIV Epidemiology Annual Report 2013</i> . Unpublished raw data.
Black or African American	Population that is Black or African American	U.S. Census Bureau. (2014). <i>Hispanic or Latino Origin by Race (B03002)</i> . 2013 ACS 5-Year Estimates.
American Indian and Alaskan Native	Population that is American Indian or Alaskan Native.	U.S. Census Bureau. (2014). <i>Hispanic or Latino Origin by Race (B03002)</i> . 2013 ACS 5-Year Estimates.
Public Housing Residents	Public housing units.	San Francisco Housing Authority. (2015). Unpublished raw data.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	1
I. BACKGROUND .....	2
II. PUBLIC INPUT ON REVISED CITIZEN PARTICIPATION PLAN .....	4
III. PURPOSE.....	5
IV. CONSOLIDATED PLAN AND ACTION PLAN.....	6
A. Consultation With Other Community Development and Housing Agencies.....	6
B. Public Hearings and Notification of Hearings.....	6
C. Public Review of Draft Consolidated Plan/Action Plan.....	7
V. AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSOLIDATED PLAN/ACTION PLAN .....	9
A. Substantial Amendments .....	9
B. Public Review Process for Substantial Amendments .....	9
VI. CONSOLIDATED ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND EVALUATION PREPOT.....	10
VII. AMENDMENTS TO THE CITIZEN PARTICIPATION PLAN .....	11
A. Substantial Amendments .....	11
B. Public Review Process for Substantial Amendments .....	11
VIII. AVAILABILITY OF DOCUMENTS TO THE PUBLIC.....	12
IX. ACCESS TO RECORDS .....	12
X. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO ORGANIZATIONS REQUESTING CDBG, ESG, HOME OR HOPWA FUNDING .....	13
XI. COMPLAINTS.....	14

## I. BACKGROUND

On January 5, 1995, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) issued a final rule that consolidates into a single submission the planning and application aspects of the following four HUD community development formula grant programs: Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG), Home Investment Partnerships (HOME), and Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS (HOPWA). The rule also consolidates the reporting requirements for these programs.

In San Francisco, the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) is the lead agency responsible for the consolidated planning process and for submitting the Consolidated Plan, annual Action Plans and Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation Reports to HUD. MOHCD administers the CDBG housing, public facility, non-workforce development public service and organizational planning/capacity building activities; and all HOME, HOPWA and ESG activities. The Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) is responsible for economic development and workforce development activities of the CDBG program.

MOHCD serves as the lead agency for the HOPWA program for the San Francisco EMSA, which consists of San Francisco and San Mateo Counties.

The Citizen's Committee on Community Development (CCCD) is a nine-member advisory body charged with promoting citizen participation for CDBG, ESG, HOME and HOPWA programs. Members are appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors, and represent a broad cross-section of communities served by the four programs. The CCCD holds public hearings, assists with the identification of community needs and the formulation of program priorities, and makes funding recommendations for the CDBG, ESG, HOME and HOPWA programs to the Mayor. The CCCD has regular monthly public meetings.

The regulations implementing the consolidated submission requires the City and County of San Francisco to adopt a citizen participation plan for the consolidated planning, application and reporting processes. The City and County of San Francisco is making revisions to our current Citizen Participation Plan. The revisions are related to the following changes to San Francisco's organizational structure:

- The former two offices of the Mayor's Office of Community Development and Mayor's Office of Housing have been merged into the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development;
- The Office of Economic and Workforce Development now administers economic development and workforce development activities of the CDBG program;
- The former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (SFRA) was the lead agency for the HOPWA program that served the San Francisco, San Mateo and Marin Counties. Pursuant to the passage of Assembly Bill No. 1X 26 (Chapter 5, Statutes of 2011-12, First Extraordinary Session) (AB 26), the State of California suspended most new activities of redevelopment agencies and dissolved all redevelopment agencies in the

State as of October 1, 2011. Subsequently, the date for dissolution was extended to January 31, 2012. As of February 1, 2012, the City and County of San Francisco is the successor agency to the SFRA. MOHCD is the successor housing agency and thus, the lead agency for the HOPWA program; and,

- As of program year 2014-2015, the San Francisco EMSA for the HOPWA program includes San Francisco and San Mateo Counties. Prior to 2014-2015, the San Francisco EMSA included the three counties of San Francisco, San Mateo and Marin.

## **II. PUBLIC INPUT ON REVISED CITIZEN PARTICIPATION PLAN**

The revisions to the Citizen Participation Plan described above are not substantive changes and do not constitute a Substantial Amendment as defined in Section VII of this plan. Public input on the revisions was not solicited.

### **III. PURPOSE**

The Citizen Participation Plan sets forth policies and procedures that the CCCD) MOHCD and OEWD have adopted to encourage citizen involvement regarding the use of four federal funding sources: CDBG, ESG, HOME and HOPWA. The Citizen Participation Plan specifically promotes citizen participation in the following activities:

- Development of the Consolidated Plan, a five-year strategic plan that serves as a planning document for San Francisco's community development and affordable housing activities and a strategy for San Francisco's use of the four federal funding sources;
- Development of each annual Action Plan, which identifies the proposed projects that will be funded during the upcoming fiscal year with the four funding sources;
- Consideration of substantial amendments to a Consolidated Plan and/or annual Action Plan;
- Review of each annual Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report, which describes San Francisco's implementation of activities funded by the four Federal programs; and,
- Consideration of substantial amendments to the Citizen Participation Plan

The intent of the Citizen Participation Plan is to encourage those least likely to participate in the process, especially low-income persons living in distressed neighborhoods, in public and assisted housing developments, and in areas where CDBG, ESG, HOME and HOPWA funds are proposed to be used. This plan describes actions the City will take to encourage participation of all citizens, with special outreach to communities of color, limited English proficient residents, and persons with disabilities.



## **IV. CONSOLIDATED PLAN AND ACTION PLAN**

As required by federal regulations, San Francisco submits a Consolidated Plan every five years and an Action Plan every year to HUD. The Consolidated Plan is a long-range plan that identifies community development and housing needs of low-income San Franciscans, establishes priorities, and describes objectives, priority needs, goals and activities to address the identified needs. The Action Plan is a document that lists specific projects that will receive CDBG, ESG, HOME, and/or HOPWA funding in the upcoming program year.

Both documents are submitted to HUD for its review and approval, and serve as applications for federal funding under the four programs, as well as planning documents. The Action Plan also serves as an implementation plan to be followed for carrying out community development and housing activities funded by the CDBG, ESG, HOME and HOPWA programs.

The process for the development of a Consolidated Plan/Action Plan is as follows:

### **A. Consultation With Other Community Development and Housing Agencies**

In developing a Consolidated Plan, MOHCD and OEWD will consult with and review reports and policy documents of public and private agencies to identify shared needs and solutions to persistent community problems. Consultation may take place through individual contacts with representatives of other City departments and community-based organizations or group meetings and focus groups. During development of an Action Plan, consultation with other agencies will be conducted primarily for coordination of resources for community development and housing activities.

### **B. Public Hearings and Notification of Hearings**

During the initial development of each Action Plan and/or Consolidated Plan, the CCCD will convene at least one public hearing to solicit input on community development and housing needs.

The CCCD will convene another public hearing after the annual Draft Action Plan, which will include preliminary funding recommendations, is made available to the public. The list of preliminary funding recommendations is a list of projects that are proposed to receive CDBG, ESG, HOME and/or HOPWA funding. The purpose of this hearing is to solicit comments from the public on the proposed uses of funds.

Prior to the submission of the Action Plan to HUD, the City and County of San Francisco's legislative process requires the Board of Supervisors to authorize the budget within the Action Plan, which is primarily the list of proposed projects. Therefore, another opportunity for the public to comment on the list of proposed projects to be included in the Action Plan is during the Board of Supervisors' legislative process.

All public hearings will be held on dates and times to encourage citizen participation, and at facilities that are wheelchair accessible and convenient for residents. MOHCD and OEWD will make special efforts to solicit input from communities of color, persons with limited English proficiency (LEP), persons with disabilities, and low-income persons residing in distressed neighborhoods and in public and assisted housing developments.

With advance notice, MOHCD and OEWD will accommodate the needs of LEP residents with translation services. If requested in advance, accommodations will also be extended for persons with disabilities. Notices announcing public hearings will include a TDD number for persons with hearing and speech impairments to use.

The public will be informed of hearings through the following methods:

1. Notices of public hearings will be published in the local newspaper that is currently designated by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors for public notices. Notices will also be published in neighborhood newspapers and ethnic group-specific publications that are used by the Board of Supervisors for outreach;
2. Notices will be posted on the MOHCD and OEWD websites;
3. Notices will be mass mailed to non-profit organizations on MOHCD's mailing list.

The publication of notices in newspapers, web postings, and mass mailings will take place approximately two weeks prior to the date of a public hearing. Notices will encourage persons who cannot attend a hearing to submit written comments to MOHCD.

A summary of oral and written comments will be included with the final submission of the Consolidated Plan and/or annual Action Plan.

### **C. Public Review of Draft Consolidated Plan/Action Plan**

Prior to the submission of the Consolidated Plan and Action Plan to HUD, MOHCD will publish a notice in the local newspaper that is currently designated by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors for public notices, which summarizes the content of the document, and informs the public of locations where a copy of the draft document may be reviewed. For each Action Plan, the notice will also include a summary of the amount of assistance expected to be received from HUD, the range of activities to be funded, and the amount of funding expected to directly benefit low- and moderate-income persons. Notices will also be posted on the MOHCD and OEWD websites and published in neighborhood and ethnic group-specific newspapers that are used by the Board of Supervisors for outreach.

The City and County of San Francisco does not expect any displacement of persons to occur as a result of CDBG, ESG, HOME, or HOPWA-funded activities. However, in the rare event that displacement does occur, MOHCD and OEWD will develop strategies to minimize displacement and to assist any persons displaced. Information related to any displacement will be included in the notice and in the Draft Action Plan.

After public notice of approximately 7-10 days, the Draft Consolidated Plan and/or annual Action Plan will be available for public review and comment electronically on the MOHCD and OEWD websites, at the offices of MOHCD and OEWD, and at the Main Branch of the San Francisco Public Library. Interested persons will have 30 days to provide written comments on the Consolidated Plan and/or Action Plan. Interested parties may also provide oral comments at the CCCD meeting that is conducted within the 30-day review period.

A summary of all comments received within the 30-day period will be included in the final Consolidated Plan/Action Plan that is submitted to HUD.

The list of proposed funding recommendations associated with the annual Action Plan requires Board of Supervisors approval, in order for San Francisco to have an authorized Action Plan submission to HUD. The public has a final opportunity to comment on the list of proposed projects to be included in the Action Plan during the Board of Supervisors' budget approval process.

## **V. AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSOLIDATED PLAN/ACTION PLAN**

Consolidated Plans and/or annual Action Plans may be revised during the program year. Certain changes will be minor in nature, and will not require public notification or citizen participation prior to the implementation of such changes. Other changes, defined as substantial, will require public notification and public review.

### **A. Substantial Amendments**

The following changes shall be considered substantial amendments to the Consolidated Plan and/or Action Plan:

1. A cumulative change in the use of CDBG funds from one activity to another activity in excess of 10% of the total CDBG grant allocation for the program year. Examples of activities are planning/administration, public services, economic development, capital projects, and housing.
2. A change in the method of distribution of CDBG funds to sub-recipients for an amount that is more than 10% of the total CDBG grant allocation for the program year. The primary method of distribution of CDBG funds is through a competitive selection process, which is generally a Request For Proposals (RFP), a Request For Qualifications (RFQ), or a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) process.

### **B. Public Review Process for Substantial Amendments**

In cases of substantial amendments to the Consolidated Plan and/or Action Plan, the public notification/review process is as follows:

1. MOHCD will publish a notice in the local newspaper that is currently designated by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors for public notices, which will inform the public of proposed changes, and locations where a copy of the draft amendment may be reviewed. Notices will also be posted on the MOHCD website and published in neighborhood newspapers and ethnic group-specific publications that are used by the Board of Supervisors for outreach.
2. After public notice of approximately 7-10 days, the draft amendment will be available for public review and comment electronically on MOHCD's website, at the offices of MOHCD, and at the Main Branch of the San Francisco Public Library. Interested persons will have 30 days to provide written comments on the proposed amendment. Interested parties may also provide oral comments at a CCCD meeting that is conducted within the 30-day period.
3. A summary of all comments received within the 30-day period will be included in the substantial amendment to the Consolidated Plan/Action Plan that is finally submitted to HUD.

## **VI. CONSOLIDATED ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND EVALUATION PREPORT**

On an annual basis, MOHCD must prepare a Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) that is submitted to HUD 90 days after the end of the program year. San Francisco's program year is from July 1 to June 30. The CAPER represents the annual report of San Francisco's implementation of the CDBG, ESG, HOME and HOPWA programs.

Prior to the submission of the CAPER to HUD, MOCD will publish a notice in the local newspaper that is currently designated by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors for public notices, which will inform the public of the availability of the Draft CAPER for review and comment, and of the locations where a copy of the draft document may be reviewed. Notices will also be posted on the MOHCD and OEWD websites and published in neighborhood and ethnic group-specific newspapers that are used by the Board of Supervisors for outreach.

After public notice of approximately 7-10 days, copies of the Draft CAPER will be available for public review and comment electronically on the MOHCD and OEWD websites, at the offices of MOCD and OEWD, and at the Main Branch of the San Francisco Public Library. Interested persons will have 15 days to provide written comments on the Draft CAPER. Interested parties may also provide oral comments at the CCCD meeting that is within or closest to the 15-day review period.

A summary of all comments received within the 15-day period will be included in the CAPER that is finally submitted to HUD.

## **VII. AMENDMENTS TO THE CITIZEN PARTICIPATION PLAN**

This Citizen Participation Plan may be revised for reasons including to meet changing Federal guidelines or to enhance citizen participation. Certain changes will be minor in nature, and will not require public notification or citizen participation prior to the implementation of such changes. However, other changes defined as substantial, will require public notification and public review.

### **A. Substantial Amendments**

The Citizen Participation Plan provides a list of circumstances that constitute a substantial amendment to a Consolidated Plan and/or annual Action Plan and require a public review process. A change to this list shall be considered a substantial amendment to the Citizen Participation Plan.

### **B. Public Review Process for Substantial Amendments**

Whenever there is a substantial amendment to the Citizen Participation Plan, the public notification/review process will be as follows:

1. MOHCD will publish a notice in the local newspaper that is currently designated by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors for public notices, which will inform the public of proposed changes, and locations where a copy of the draft amendment can be reviewed. Notices will also be posted on the MOHCD website and published in neighborhood and ethnic group-specific newspapers that are used by the Board of Supervisors for outreach.
2. After public notice of approximately 7-10 days, the draft amendment will be available for public review and comment electronically on MOHCD's website, at the offices of MOHCD, and at the Main Branch of the San Francisco Public Library. Interested persons will have 15 days to provide written comments on the proposed amendment. Interested parties may also provide oral comments at the CCCD meeting that is within or closest to the 15-day review period.
3. A summary of all comments received within the 15-day period will be included in the substantial amendment to the Citizen Participation Plan that is submitted to HUD.

## **VIII. AVAILABILITY OF DOCUMENTS TO THE PUBLIC**

It is the policy of MOHCD and OEWD to make available to all interested parties and organizations the following documents:

- The current Consolidated Plan;
- The current annual Action Plan;
- Substantial amendments to the current Consolidated Plan and/or Action Plan, if any;
- The most recent CAPER; and,
- The current Citizen Participation Plan and any substantial amendments.

These documents are available electronically on the MOHCD and OEWD websites, at the office of MOHCD and OEWD, and at the Main Branch of the San Francisco Public Library. Upon request, MOHCD will make documents available in a form that is accessible to persons with disabilities. MOHCD may be contacted at 415-701-5500 or 415-701-5503 (TDD).

## **IX. ACCESS TO RECORDS**

Persons, agencies and other interested parties may access information and records related to San Francisco's Consolidated Plan, Action Plans, CAPERs and the City's use of CDBG, ESG, HOME, and HOPWA funding during the preceding five years. Interested parties will be afforded reasonable and timely access to records in accordance with applicable public records access regulations.

## **X. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO ORGANIZATIONS REQUESTING CDBG, ESG, HOME OR HOPWA FUNDING**

MOHCD and OEWD sponsor technical assistance workshops during their Request For Proposals (RFP) processes for non-profit organizations that are interested in submitting proposals for CDBG, ESG, HOME and/or HOPWA funding. The purpose of these workshops is to provide interested parties with information and technical guidance on the application process. These workshops are scheduled at times and locations to maximize community participation. Workshops are held at locations that are accessible to persons with disabilities.

MOHCD and OEWD staff are available year-round to provide information and guidance to organizations interested in implementing programs with CDBG, ESG, HOME, or HOPWA funds.

RFP technical assistance, as described above, will be offered to eligible organizations that serve low-income individuals and families. Technical assistance does not guarantee an award of funds.



## **XI. COMPLAINTS**

MOHCD and OEWD will review and assess all written complaints and comments concerning CDBG, ESG, HOME and HOPWA-funded activities, the Consolidated Plan, the Action Plan, and the CAPER. Complaints and comments that are assessed as citizen feedback or input will be considered and summarized in the Consolidated Plan, Action Plan or CAPER, as appropriate. For complaints that require a formal response by MOHCD or OEWD, the appropriate department will provide a written response within 15 working days of receipt of the complaint. If a response cannot be prepared within the 15-day timeframe, the person that submitted the complaint will be notified of the approximate date a response will be provided.

For general concerns and concerns related to CDBG housing, public facility, non-workforce development public service and organizational planning/capacity building activities; and all ESG, HOME and HOPWA activities, please write to the Director of the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD).

For concerns related to CDBG economic development and workforce development activities, please write to the Director of the Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD).

The address for MOHCD and OEWD Workforce Development Division is as follows:  
1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103.

The address for OEWD Economic Development Division is as follows:  
City Hall, Room 448, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102

**Application for Federal Assistance SF-424**

* 1. Type of Submission: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preapplication <input type="checkbox"/> Application <input type="checkbox"/> Changed/Corrected Application	* 2. Type of Application: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New <input type="checkbox"/> Continuation <input type="checkbox"/> Revision	* If Revision, select appropriate letter(s): _____ * Other (Specify): _____
--	--	--

* 3. Date Received: 05/15/2015	4. Applicant Identifier: 2015-2016 CDBG
-----------------------------------	--

5a. Federal Entity Identifier: _____	5b. Federal Award Identifier: _____
---	--

**State Use Only:**

6. Date Received by State: _____	7. State Application Identifier: _____
----------------------------------	--

**8. APPLICANT INFORMATION:**

\* a. Legal Name: City and County of San Francisco

* b. Employer/Taxpayer Identification Number (EIN/TIN): 94-6000417	* c. Organizational DUNS: 0703842550000
---	--

**d. Address:**

\* Street1: 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor  
Street2: \_\_\_\_\_  
\* City: San Francisco  
County/Parish: \_\_\_\_\_  
\* State: CA: California  
Province: \_\_\_\_\_  
\* Country: USA: UNITED STATES  
\* Zip / Postal Code: 94103-5416

**e. Organizational Unit:**

Department Name: Mayor's Office	Division Name: Housing & Community Development
------------------------------------	---

**f. Name and contact information of person to be contacted on matters involving this application:**

Prefix: Mr. \* First Name: Olson  
Middle Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
\* Last Name: Lee  
Suffix: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: Director

Organizational Affiliation:  
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

\* Telephone Number: 415-701-5509 Fax Number: 415-701-5501

\* Email: olson.m.lee@sfgov.org

**Application for Federal Assistance SF-424**

**\* 9. Type of Applicant 1: Select Applicant Type:**

C: City or Township Government

Type of Applicant 2: Select Applicant Type:

Type of Applicant 3: Select Applicant Type:

\* Other (specify):

**\* 10. Name of Federal Agency:**

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

**11. Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number:**

14-218

CFDA Title:

Community Development Block Grant

**\* 12. Funding Opportunity Number:**

n/a

\* Title:

n/a

**13. Competition Identification Number:**

Title:

**14. Areas Affected by Project (Cities, Counties, States, etc.):**

Add Attachment

Delete Attachment

View Attachment

**\* 15. Descriptive Title of Applicant's Project:**

2015-2016 Community Development Block Grant Program for the City and County of San Francisco - services for the low- and moderate-income community

Attach supporting documents as specified in agency instructions.

Add Attachments

Delete Attachments

View Attachments

**Application for Federal Assistance SF-424**

**16. Congressional Districts Of:**

\* a. Applicant

\* b. Program/Project

Attach an additional list of Program/Project Congressional Districts if needed.

**17. Proposed Project:**

\* a. Start Date:

\* b. End Date:

**18. Estimated Funding (\$):**

* a. Federal	<input type="text" value="16,489,944.00"/>
* b. Applicant	<input type="text"/>
* c. State	<input type="text"/>
* d. Local	<input type="text"/>
* e. Other	<input type="text" value="653,347.00"/>
* f. Program Income	<input type="text" value="2,462,600.00"/>
* g. TOTAL	<input type="text" value="19,605,891.00"/>

**\* 19. Is Application Subject to Review By State Under Executive Order 12372 Process?**

- a. This application was made available to the State under the Executive Order 12372 Process for review on
- b. Program is subject to E.O. 12372 but has not been selected by the State for review.
- c. Program is not covered by E.O. 12372.

**\* 20. Is the Applicant Delinquent On Any Federal Debt? (If "Yes," provide explanation in attachment.)**

- Yes
- No

If "Yes", provide explanation and attach

**21. \*By signing this application, I certify (1) to the statements contained in the list of certifications\*\* and (2) that the statements herein are true, complete and accurate to the best of my knowledge. I also provide the required assurances\*\* and agree to comply with any resulting terms if I accept an award. I am aware that any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statements or claims may subject me to criminal, civil, or administrative penalties. (U.S. Code, Title 218, Section 1001)**

\*\* I AGREE

\*\* The list of certifications and assurances, or an internet site where you may obtain this list, is contained in the announcement or agency specific instructions.

**Authorized Representative:**

Prefix:  \* First Name:   
Middle Name:   
\* Last Name:   
Suffix:

\* Title:

\* Telephone Number:  Fax Number:

\* Email:

\* Signature of Authorized Representative: 

\* Date Signed:



**Application for Federal Assistance SF-424**

* 1. Type of Submission: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preapplication <input type="checkbox"/> Application <input type="checkbox"/> Changed/Corrected Application	* 2. Type of Application: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New <input type="checkbox"/> Continuation <input type="checkbox"/> Revision	* If Revision, select appropriate letter(s): _____ * Other (Specify): _____
--	--	--

* 3. Date Received: 05/15/2015	4. Applicant Identifier: 2015-2016 ESG
-----------------------------------	---

5a. Federal Entity Identifier: _____	5b. Federal Award Identifier: _____
---	--

**State Use Only:**

6. Date Received by State: _____	7. State Application Identifier: _____
----------------------------------	--

**8. APPLICANT INFORMATION:**

\* a. Legal Name: City and County of San Francisco

* b. Employer/Taxpayer Identification Number (EIN/TIN): 94-6000417	* c. Organizational DUNS: 0703842550000
---	--

**d. Address:**

\* Street1: 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor  
Street2: \_\_\_\_\_  
\* City: San Francisco  
County/Parish: \_\_\_\_\_  
\* State: CA: California  
Province: \_\_\_\_\_  
\* Country: USA: UNITED STATES  
\* Zip / Postal Code: 94103-5416

**e. Organizational Unit:**

Department Name: Mayor's Office	Division Name: Housing & Community Development
------------------------------------	---

**f. Name and contact information of person to be contacted on matters involving this application:**

Prefix: Mr. \* First Name: Olson  
Middle Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
\* Last Name: Lee  
Suffix: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: Director

Organizational Affiliation:  
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

\* Telephone Number: 415-701-5509 Fax Number: 415-701-5501

\* Email: olson.m.lee@sfgov.org

**Application for Federal Assistance SF-424**

**\* 9. Type of Applicant 1: Select Applicant Type:**

C: City or Township Government

Type of Applicant 2: Select Applicant Type:

Type of Applicant 3: Select Applicant Type:

\* Other (specify):

**\* 10. Name of Federal Agency:**

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

**11. Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number:**

14-231

CFDA Title:

Emergency Solutions Grant

**\* 12. Funding Opportunity Number:**

n/a

\* Title:

n/a

**13. Competition Identification Number:**

Title:

**14. Areas Affected by Project (Cities, Counties, States, etc.):**

Add Attachment

Delete Attachment

View Attachment

**\* 15. Descriptive Title of Applicant's Project:**

2015-2016 Emergency Solutions Grant Program for the City and County of San Francisco - services for persons and families who are homeless or at-risk of homelessness

Attach supporting documents as specified in agency instructions.

Add Attachments

Delete Attachments

View Attachments

**Application for Federal Assistance SF-424**

**16. Congressional Districts Of:**

\* a. Applicant

\* b. Program/Project

Attach an additional list of Program/Project Congressional Districts if needed.

Add Attachment

Delete Attachment

View Attachment

**17. Proposed Project:**

\* a. Start Date:

\* b. End Date:

**18. Estimated Funding (\$):**

* a. Federal	<input type="text" value="1,482,125.00"/>
* b. Applicant	<input type="text"/>
* c. State	<input type="text"/>
* d. Local	<input type="text"/>
* e. Other	<input type="text"/>
* f. Program Income	<input type="text"/>
* g. TOTAL	<input type="text" value="1,482,125.00"/>

**\* 19. Is Application Subject to Review By State Under Executive Order 12372 Process?**

- a. This application was made available to the State under the Executive Order 12372 Process for review on
- b. Program is subject to E.O. 12372 but has not been selected by the State for review.
- c. Program is not covered by E.O. 12372.

**\* 20. Is the Applicant Delinquent On Any Federal Debt? (If "Yes," provide explanation in attachment.)**

Yes  No

If "Yes", provide explanation and attach

Add Attachment

Delete Attachment

View Attachment

**21. \*By signing this application, I certify (1) to the statements contained in the list of certifications\*\* and (2) that the statements herein are true, complete and accurate to the best of my knowledge. I also provide the required assurances\*\* and agree to comply with any resulting terms if I accept an award. I am aware that any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statements or claims may subject me to criminal, civil, or administrative penalties. (U.S. Code, Title 218, Section 1001)**

\*\* I AGREE

\*\* The list of certifications and assurances, or an internet site where you may obtain this list, is contained in the announcement or agency specific instructions.

**Authorized Representative:**

Prefix:  \* First Name:   
Middle Name:   
\* Last Name:   
Suffix:

\* Title:

\* Telephone Number:  Fax Number:

\* Email:

\* Signature of Authorized Representative: 

\* Date Signed:





Application for Federal Assistance SF-424								
<b>* 1. Type of Submission:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preapplication <input type="checkbox"/> Application <input type="checkbox"/> Changed/Corrected Application			<b>* 2. Type of Application:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New <input type="checkbox"/> Continuation <input type="checkbox"/> Revision			<b>* If Revision, select appropriate letter(s):</b> _____ <b>* Other (Specify):</b> _____		
<b>* 3. Date Received:</b> 05/15/2015		<b>4. Applicant Identifier:</b> 2015-2016 HOME						
<b>5a. Federal Entity Identifier:</b> _____			<b>5b. Federal Award Identifier:</b> _____					
<b>State Use Only:</b>								
<b>6. Date Received by State:</b> _____		<b>7. State Application Identifier:</b> _____						
<b>8. APPLICANT INFORMATION:</b>								
<b>* a. Legal Name:</b> City and County of San Francisco								
<b>* b. Employer/Taxpayer Identification Number (EIN/TIN):</b> 94-6000417			<b>* c. Organizational DUNS:</b> 0703842550000					
<b>d. Address:</b>								
<b>* Street1:</b> 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor								
<b>Street2:</b> _____								
<b>* City:</b> San Francisco								
<b>County/Parish:</b> _____								
<b>* State:</b> CA: California								
<b>Province:</b> _____								
<b>* Country:</b> USA: UNITED STATES								
<b>* Zip / Postal Code:</b> 94103-5416								
<b>e. Organizational Unit:</b>								
<b>Department Name:</b> Mayor's Office			<b>Division Name:</b> Housing & CommunityDevelopment					
<b>f. Name and contact information of person to be contacted on matters involving this application:</b>								
<b>Prefix:</b> Mr.		<b>* First Name:</b> Olson						
<b>Middle Name:</b> _____								
<b>* Last Name:</b> Lee								
<b>Suffix:</b> _____								
<b>Title:</b> Director								
<b>Organizational Affiliation:</b> Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development								
<b>* Telephone Number:</b> 415-701-5509			<b>Fax Number:</b> 415-701-5501					
<b>* Email:</b> olson.m.lee@sfgov.org								

**Application for Federal Assistance SF-424**

**\* 9. Type of Applicant 1: Select Applicant Type:**

C: City or Township Government

Type of Applicant 2: Select Applicant Type:

Type of Applicant 3: Select Applicant Type:

\* Other (specify):

**\* 10. Name of Federal Agency:**

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

**11. Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number:**

14-239

CFDA Title:

Home Investment Partnership

**\* 12. Funding Opportunity Number:**

n/a

\* Title:

n/a

**13. Competition Identification Number:**

Title:

**14. Areas Affected by Project (Cities, Counties, States, etc.):**

Add Attachment

Delete Attachment

View Attachment

**\* 15. Descriptive Title of Applicant's Project:**

2015-2016 Home Investment Partnership Program for the City and County of San Francisco - affordable housing development program to assist low- and moderate-income individuals and families

Attach supporting documents as specified in agency instructions.

Add Attachments

Delete Attachments

View Attachments

**Application for Federal Assistance SF-424**

**16. Congressional Districts Of:**

\* a. Applicant

\* b. Program/Project

Attach an additional list of Program/Project Congressional Districts if needed.

Add Attachment

Delete Attachment

View Attachment

**17. Proposed Project:**

\* a. Start Date:

\* b. End Date:

**18. Estimated Funding (\$):**

* a. Federal	<input type="text" value="3,931,015.00"/>
* b. Applicant	<input type="text"/>
* c. State	<input type="text"/>
* d. Local	<input type="text"/>
* e. Other	<input type="text"/>
* f. Program Income	<input type="text" value="1,875,343.00"/>
* g. TOTAL	<input type="text" value="5,806,358.00"/>

**\* 19. Is Application Subject to Review By State Under Executive Order 12372 Process?**

- a. This application was made available to the State under the Executive Order 12372 Process for review on
- b. Program is subject to E.O. 12372 but has not been selected by the State for review.
- c. Program is not covered by E.O. 12372.

**\* 20. Is the Applicant Delinquent On Any Federal Debt? (If "Yes," provide explanation in attachment.)**

Yes  No

If "Yes", provide explanation and attach

Add Attachment

Delete Attachment

View Attachment

**21. \*By signing this application, I certify (1) to the statements contained in the list of certifications\*\* and (2) that the statements herein are true, complete and accurate to the best of my knowledge. I also provide the required assurances\*\* and agree to comply with any resulting terms if I accept an award. I am aware that any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statements or claims may subject me to criminal, civil, or administrative penalties. (U.S. Code, Title 218, Section 1001)**

\*\* I AGREE

\*\* The list of certifications and assurances, or an internet site where you may obtain this list, is contained in the announcement or agency specific instructions.

**Authorized Representative:**

Prefix:  \* First Name:   
Middle Name:   
\* Last Name:   
Suffix:

\* Title:

\* Telephone Number:  Fax Number:

\* Email:

\* Signature of Authorized Representative: 

\* Date Signed:



**Application for Federal Assistance SF-424**

* 1. Type of Submission: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preapplication <input type="checkbox"/> Application <input type="checkbox"/> Changed/Corrected Application	* 2. Type of Application: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New <input type="checkbox"/> Continuation <input type="checkbox"/> Revision	* If Revision, select appropriate letter(s): <input type="text"/> * Other (Specify): <input type="text"/>
--	--	--

* 3. Date Received: <input type="text" value="05/15/2015"/>	4. Applicant Identifier: <input type="text" value="2015-2016 HOPWA"/>
--	--

5a. Federal Entity Identifier: <input type="text"/>	5b. Federal Award Identifier: <input type="text"/>
--	---

**State Use Only:**

6. Date Received by State: <input type="text"/>	7. State Application Identifier: <input type="text"/>
---	---

**8. APPLICANT INFORMATION:**

\* a. Legal Name:

* b. Employer/Taxpayer Identification Number (EIN/TIN): <input type="text" value="94-6000417"/>	* c. Organizational DUNS: <input type="text" value="0703842550000"/>
--	---

**d. Address:**

\* Street1:   
Street2:   
\* City:   
County/Parish:   
\* State:   
Province:   
\* Country:   
\* Zip / Postal Code:

**e. Organizational Unit:**

Department Name: <input type="text" value="Mayor's Office"/>	Division Name: <input type="text" value="Housing &amp; CommunityDevelopment"/>
---	---

**f. Name and contact information of person to be contacted on matters involving this application:**

Prefix:  \* First Name:   
Middle Name:   
\* Last Name:   
Suffix:

Title:

Organizational Affiliation:

\* Telephone Number:  Fax Number:

\* Email:

**Application for Federal Assistance SF-424**

**\* 9. Type of Applicant 1: Select Applicant Type:**

C: City or Township Government

Type of Applicant 2: Select Applicant Type:

Type of Applicant 3: Select Applicant Type:

\* Other (specify):

**\* 10. Name of Federal Agency:**

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

**11. Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number:**

14-241

CFDA Title:

Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS

**\* 12. Funding Opportunity Number:**

n/a

\* Title:

n/a

**13. Competition Identification Number:**

Title:

**14. Areas Affected by Project (Cities, Counties, States, etc.):**

Add Attachment

Delete Attachment

View Attachment

**\* 15. Descriptive Title of Applicant's Project:**

2015-2016 Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS Program for the San Francisco EMSA - housing and supportive services for people with HIV/AIDS

Attach supporting documents as specified in agency instructions.

Add Attachments

Delete Attachments

View Attachments

**Application for Federal Assistance SF-424**

**16. Congressional Districts Of:**

\* a. Applicant

\* b. Program/Project

Attach an additional list of Program/Project Congressional Districts if needed.

Add Attachment

Delete Attachment

View Attachment

**17. Proposed Project:**

\* a. Start Date:

\* b. End Date:

**18. Estimated Funding (\$):**

* a. Federal	<input type="text" value="7,461,390.00"/>
* b. Applicant	<input type="text"/>
* c. State	<input type="text"/>
* d. Local	<input type="text"/>
* e. Other	<input type="text"/>
* f. Program Income	<input type="text" value="100,772.00"/>
* g. TOTAL	<input type="text" value="7,562,162.00"/>

**\* 19. Is Application Subject to Review By State Under Executive Order 12372 Process?**

- a. This application was made available to the State under the Executive Order 12372 Process for review on
- b. Program is subject to E.O. 12372 but has not been selected by the State for review.
- c. Program is not covered by E.O. 12372.

**\* 20. Is the Applicant Delinquent On Any Federal Debt? (If "Yes," provide explanation in attachment.)**

Yes  No

If "Yes", provide explanation and attach

Add Attachment

Delete Attachment

View Attachment

**21. \*By signing this application, I certify (1) to the statements contained in the list of certifications\*\* and (2) that the statements herein are true, complete and accurate to the best of my knowledge. I also provide the required assurances\*\* and agree to comply with any resulting terms if I accept an award. I am aware that any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statements or claims may subject me to criminal, civil, or administrative penalties. (U.S. Code, Title 218, Section 1001)**

\*\* I AGREE

\*\* The list of certifications and assurances, or an internet site where you may obtain this list, is contained in the announcement or agency specific instructions.

**Authorized Representative:**

Prefix:  \* First Name:   
Middle Name:   
\* Last Name:   
Suffix:

\* Title:

\* Telephone Number:  Fax Number:

\* Email:

\* Signature of Authorized Representative: 

\* Date Signed:





## CERTIFICATIONS

In accordance with the applicable statutes and the regulations governing the consolidated plan regulations, the jurisdiction certifies that:

**Affirmatively Further Fair Housing** -- The jurisdiction will affirmatively further fair housing, which means it will conduct an analysis of impediments to fair housing choice within the jurisdiction, take appropriate actions to overcome the effects of any impediments identified through that analysis, and maintain records reflecting that analysis and actions in this regard.

**Anti-displacement and Relocation Plan** -- It will comply with the acquisition and relocation requirements of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended, and implementing regulations at 49 CFR 24; and it has in effect and is following a residential antidisplacement and relocation assistance plan required under section 104(d) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, in connection with any activity assisted with funding under the CDBG or HOME programs.


**Anti-Lobbying** -- To the best of the jurisdiction's knowledge and belief:

1. No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of it, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the awarding of any Federal contract, the making of any Federal grant, the making of any Federal loan, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement;
2. If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement, it will complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying," in accordance with its instructions; and
3. It will require that the language of paragraph 1 and 2 of this anti-lobbying certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subcontracts, subgrants, and contracts under grants, loans, and cooperative agreements) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

**Authority of Jurisdiction** -- The consolidated plan is authorized under State and local law (as applicable) and the jurisdiction possesses the legal authority to carry out the programs for which it is seeking funding, in accordance with applicable HUD regulations.

**Consistency with plan** -- The housing activities to be undertaken with CDBG, HOME, ESG, and HOPWA funds are consistent with the strategic plan.

**Section 3** -- It will comply with section 3 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, and implementing regulations at 24 CFR Part 135.

  
Signature/Authorized Official

5/8/2015  
Date

## Specific CDBG Certifications

The Entitlement Community certifies that:

**Citizen Participation** -- It is in full compliance and following a detailed citizen participation plan that satisfies the requirements of 24 CFR 91.105.

**Community Development Plan** -- Its consolidated housing and community development plan identifies community development and housing needs and specifies both short-term and long-term community development objectives that provide decent housing, expand economic opportunities primarily for persons of low and moderate income. (See CFR 24 570.2 and CFR 24 part 570)

**Following a Plan** -- It is following a current consolidated plan (or Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy) that has been approved by HUD.

**Use of Funds** -- It has complied with the following criteria:

1. Maximum Feasible Priority. With respect to activities expected to be assisted with CDBG funds, it certifies that it has developed its Action Plan so as to give maximum feasible priority to activities which benefit low and moderate income families or aid in the prevention or elimination of slums or blight. The Action Plan may also include activities which the grantee certifies are designed to meet other community development needs having a particular urgency because existing conditions pose a serious and immediate threat to the health or welfare of the community, and other financial resources are not available);
2. Overall Benefit. The aggregate use of CDBG funds including section 108 guaranteed loans during program year(s) 2015 , \_\_\_\_\_ (a period specified by the grantee consisting of one, two, or three specific consecutive program years), shall principally benefit persons of low and moderate income in a manner that ensures that at least 70 percent of the amount is expended for activities that benefit such persons during the designated period;
3. Special Assessments. It will not attempt to recover any capital costs of public improvements assisted with CDBG funds including Section 108 loan guaranteed funds by assessing any amount against properties owned and occupied by persons of low and moderate income, including any fee charged or assessment made as a condition of obtaining access to such public improvements.

However, if CDBG funds are used to pay the proportion of a fee or assessment that relates to the capital costs of public improvements (assisted in part with CDBG funds) financed from other revenue sources, an assessment or charge may be made against the property with respect to the public improvements financed by a source other than CDBG funds.

The jurisdiction will not attempt to recover any capital costs of public improvements assisted with CDBG funds, including Section 108, unless CDBG funds are used to pay the proportion of fee or assessment attributable to the capital costs of public improvements financed from other revenue sources. In this case, an assessment or charge may be made against the property with respect to the public improvements financed by a source other than CDBG funds. Also, in the case of properties owned and occupied by moderate-income (not low-income) families, an assessment or charge may be made against the property for public improvements financed by a source other than CDBG funds if the jurisdiction certifies that it lacks CDBG funds to cover the assessment.

**Excessive Force** -- It has adopted and is enforcing:

1. A policy prohibiting the use of excessive force by law enforcement agencies within its

jurisdiction against any individuals engaged in non-violent civil rights demonstrations; and

2. A policy of enforcing applicable State and local laws against physically barring entrance to or exit from a facility or location which is the subject of such non-violent civil rights demonstrations within its jurisdiction;

**Compliance With Anti-discrimination laws** -- The grant will be conducted and administered in conformity with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 USC 2000d), the Fair Housing Act (42 USC 3601-3619), and implementing regulations.

**Lead-Based Paint** -- Its activities concerning lead-based paint will comply with the requirements of 24 CFR Part 35, subparts A, B, J, K and R;

**Compliance with Laws** -- It will comply with applicable laws.

  
Signature/Authorized Official

5/8/2015  
Date

Mayor  
Title

**OPTIONAL CERTIFICATION  
CDBG**

Submit the following certification only when one or more of the activities in the action plan are designed to meet other community development needs having a particular urgency as specified in 24 CFR 570.208(c):

The grantee hereby certifies that the Annual Plan includes one or more specifically identified CDBG-assisted activities which are designed to meet other community development needs having a particular urgency because existing conditions pose a serious and immediate threat to the health or welfare of the community and other financial resources are not available to meet such needs.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature/Authorized Official

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Title

### Specific HOME Certifications


The HOME participating jurisdiction certifies that:

**Tenant Based Rental Assistance** -- If the participating jurisdiction intends to provide tenant-based rental assistance:

The use of HOME funds for tenant-based rental assistance is an essential element of the participating jurisdiction's consolidated plan for expanding the supply, affordability, and availability of decent, safe, sanitary, and affordable housing.

**Eligible Activities and Costs** -- it is using and will use HOME funds for eligible activities and costs, as described in 24 CFR § 92.205 through 92.209 and that it is not using and will not use HOME funds for prohibited activities, as described in § 92.214.

**Appropriate Financial Assistance** -- before committing any funds to a project, it will evaluate the project in accordance with the guidelines that it adopts for this purpose and will not invest any more HOME funds in combination with other Federal assistance than is necessary to provide affordable housing;

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature/Authorized Official

5/8/2015  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Mayor  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Title

## ESG Certifications

The Emergency Solutions Grants Program Recipient certifies that:

**Major rehabilitation/conversion** – If an emergency shelter’s rehabilitation costs exceed 75 percent of the value of the building before rehabilitation, the jurisdiction will maintain the building as a shelter for homeless individuals and families for a minimum of 10 years after the date the building is first occupied by a homeless individual or family after the completed rehabilitation. If the cost to convert a building into an emergency shelter exceeds 75 percent of the value of the building after conversion, the jurisdiction will maintain the building as a shelter for homeless individuals and families for a minimum of 10 years after the date the building is first occupied by a homeless individual or family after the completed conversion. In all other cases where ESG funds are used for renovation, the jurisdiction will maintain the building as a shelter for homeless individuals and families for a minimum of 3 years after the date the building is first occupied by a homeless individual or family after the completed renovation.

**Essential Services and Operating Costs** – In the case of assistance involving shelter operations or essential services related to street outreach or emergency shelter, the jurisdiction will provide services or shelter to homeless individuals and families for the period during which the ESG assistance is provided, without regard to a particular site or structure, so long the jurisdiction serves the same type of persons (e.g., families with children, unaccompanied youth, disabled individuals, or victims of domestic violence) or persons in the same geographic area.

**Renovation** – Any renovation carried out with ESG assistance shall be sufficient to ensure that the building involved is safe and sanitary.

**Supportive Services** – The jurisdiction will assist homeless individuals in obtaining permanent housing, appropriate supportive services ( including medical and mental health treatment, victim services, counseling, supervision, and other services essential for achieving independent living), and other Federal State, local, and private assistance available for such individuals.

**Matching Funds** – The jurisdiction will obtain matching amounts required under 24 CFR 576.201.


**Confidentiality** – The jurisdiction has established and is implementing procedures to ensure the confidentiality of records pertaining to any individual provided family violence prevention or treatment services under any project assisted under the ESG program, including protection against the release of the address or location of any family violence shelter project, except with the written authorization of the person responsible for the operation of that shelter.

**Homeless Persons Involvement** – To the maximum extent practicable, the jurisdiction will involve, through employment, volunteer services, or otherwise, homeless individuals and families in constructing, renovating, maintaining, and operating facilities assisted under the ESG program, in providing services assisted under the ESG program, and in providing services for occupants of facilities assisted under the program.

**Consolidated Plan** – All activities the jurisdiction undertakes with assistance under ESG are consistent with the jurisdiction’s consolidated plan.

**Discharge Policy** – The jurisdiction will establish and implement, to the maximum extent practicable and where appropriate policies and protocols for the discharge of persons from

publicly funded institutions or systems of care (such as health care facilities, mental health facilities, foster care or other youth facilities, or correction programs and institutions) in order to prevent this discharge from immediately resulting in homelessness for these persons.



Signature/Authorized Official

5/8/2015

Date

Mayor

Title



### HOPWA Certifications

The HOPWA grantee certifies that:

**Activities** -- Activities funded under the program will meet urgent needs that are not being met by available public and private sources.

**Building** -- Any building or structure assisted under that program shall be operated for the purpose specified in the plan:

1. For at least 10 years in the case of assistance involving new construction, substantial rehabilitation, or acquisition of a facility,
2. For at least 3 years in the case of assistance involving non-substantial rehabilitation or repair of a building or structure.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature/Authorized Official

5/8/2015  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Mayor  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Title

## APPENDIX TO CERTIFICATIONS

### INSTRUCTIONS CONCERNING LOBBYING:

#### A. Lobbying Certification

This certification is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was made or entered into. Submission of this certification is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1352, title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required certification shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each such failure.

