



City and County of San Francisco

Amended 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan and 2020-2021 Action Plan

February 2021

**Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
Office of Economic and Workforce Development
Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing**
One South Van Ness Avenue, Fifth Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
Phone: 415-701-5500; TDD: 415-701-5503
Website: www.sfmohcd.org

Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)

Overview of Plans - Context for this Document

MOHCD Strategic Plan

Overarching department goals

MOHCD Annual Report

Progress to Strategic Plan goals; includes legislatively-mandated reporting

HUD-Required Plans

Consolidated Plan

Housing and community development goals

Annual Action Plan

Summary of activities and resources for Consolidated Plan goals

CAPER

(Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report) - Progress to Consolidated Plan goals

Analysis of Impediments

(to Fair Housing Choice) - Analysis of conditions that affect the location, availability and accessibility of housing

Additional MOHCD Plans

HIV Housing Plan

Goals for addressing the housing needs of HIV+ households

Racial Equity Action Plan

Vision and activities for achieving racial equity in department policies and practices

Digital Equity Plan

Goals for improving digital access and literacy

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	4
ES-05 Executive Summary – 24 CFR 91.200(c), 91.220(b)	4
The Process	7
PR-05 Lead & Responsible Agencies – 24 CFR 91.200(b)	7
PR-10 Consultation – 91.100, 91.200(b), 91.215(l).....	8
PR-15 Citizen Participation – 91.105, 91.115, 91.200(c) and 91.300(c).....	18
Needs Assessment	35
NA-05 Overview	35
NA-10 Housing Needs Assessment – 24 CFR 91.205 (a,b,c)	38
NA-15 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Problems – 91.205 (b)(2)	51
NA-20 Disproportionately Greater Need: Severe Housing Problems – 91.205 (b)(2)	56
NA-25 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens – 91.205 (b)(2)	62
NA-30 Disproportionately Greater Need: Discussion – 91.205(b)(2)	64
NA-35 Public Housing – 91.205(b)	66
NA-40 Homeless Needs Assessment – 91.205(c).....	70
NA-45 Non-Homeless Special Needs Assessment – 91.205 (b,d)	76
NA-50 Non-Housing Community Development Needs – 91.215 (f)	88
Housing Market Analysis.....	101
MA-05 Overview	101
MA-10 Number of Housing Units – 91.210(a)&(b)(2)	103
MA-15 Housing Market Analysis: Cost of Housing – 91.210(a)	107
MA-20 Housing Market Analysis: Condition of Housing – 91.210(a).....	111
MA-25 Public and Assisted Housing – 91.210(b)	114
MA-30 Homeless Facilities and Services – 91.210(c)	120
MA-35 Special Needs Facilities and Services – 91.210(d)	125
MA-40 Barriers to Affordable Housing – 91.210(e)	128
MA-45 Non-Housing Community Development Assets – 91.215 (f)	130
MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion	142
MA-60 Broadband Needs of Housing occupied by Low- and Moderate-Income Households – 91.210(a)(4), 91.310(a)(2)	177

MA-65 Hazard Mitigation – 91.210(a)(5), 91.310(a)(3)	178
Strategic Plan	184
SP-05 Overview	184
SP-10 Geographic Priorities – 91.215 (a)(1).....	239
SP-25 Priority Needs - 91.215(a)(2).....	271
SP-30 Influence of Market Conditions – 91.215 (b)	293
SP-35 Anticipated Resources – 91.215(a)(4), 91.220(c)(1,2)	294
SP-40 Institutional Delivery Structure – 91.215(k).....	301
SP-45 Goals Summary – 91.215(a)(4).....	328
SP-50 Public Housing Accessibility and Involvement – 91.215(c)	356
SP-55 Barriers to affordable housing – 91.215(h).....	362
SP-60 Homelessness Strategy – 91.215(d).....	369
SP-65 Lead based paint Hazards – 91.215(i)	375
SP-70 Anti-Poverty Strategy – 91.215(j)	376
SP-80 Monitoring – 91.230	385
Action Plan	388
Expected Resources	388
AP-15 Expected Resources – 91.220(c)(1,2)	388
Annual Goals and Objectives	389
AP-20 Annual Goals and Objectives	389
Projects	390
AP-35 Projects – 91.220(d).....	390
AP-50 Geographic Distribution – 91.220(f).....	410
Affordable Housing	414
AP-55 Affordable Housing – 91.220(g).....	414
AP-60 Public Housing – 91.220(h).....	415
AP-65 Homeless and Other Special Needs Activities – 91.220(i).....	417
AP-70 HOPWA Goals– 91.220 (l)(3)	423
AP-75 Barriers to affordable housing – 91.220(j)	424
AP-85 Other Actions – 91.220(k).....	429
Program Specific Requirements.....	442
AP-90 Program Specific Requirements – 91.220(l)(1,2,4).....	442

Glossary of Terms.....	454
Acronyms and Abbreviations	456
Appendix	460
Appendix A: Citizen Participation Comments Attachment	
Appendix B: Integrated Needs Analysis	
Appendix C: Citizen Participation Plan	
Appendix D: 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 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, 2020 through June 30, 2025.

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 City & County of San Francisco (City) staff 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.

Please note that community engagement and strategy development for this Consolidated Plan were substantially completed before the COVID-19 pandemic started and before the Congress passed the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act, under which HUD provided additional funds to San Francisco under the CDBG, ESG and HOPWA programs. Therefore, strategies to support residents during the COVID-19 pandemic are not included in this Consolidated Plan. This 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan and 2020-2021 Action Plan includes proposed uses for the 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG, HOME and HOPWA entitlement grants.

City staff is currently working to prioritize needs related to the pandemic and plans to update this document by submitting an Amendment to the Consolidated Plan to HUD, which will include proposed uses for the additional CDBG, ESG and HOPWA funding received under the CARES Act. The Draft Amendment to the Consolidated Plan will be available for public review and comment for five days before it is submitted to HUD.

Please note that in September 2020, the City amended this document to include the use of HUD CARES Act funds.

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

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

1. Families and individuals are stably housed;
2. Families and individuals are resilient and economically self-sufficient;
3. Communities have healthy physical, social and business infrastructure;
4. Communities at risk of displacement are stabilized; and
5. The City works to eliminate the causes of racial disparities.

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

The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) contracted with Resource Development Associates (RDA) to develop an outreach and engagement strategy and an integrated needs analysis. The outreach and engagement strategy included community forums and online surveys for all San Francisco resident and stakeholders; focus groups for targeted groups and community advocates; and interviews with staff of other City departments. This outreach and engagement and consultation process was used to inform both the needs analysis and the development of strategies for the 2020–2024 Consolidated Plan, Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice and the HIV Housing Plan.

5. Summary of public comments

In support of the development of its 2020–2025 Consolidated Plan, Analysis of Impediments, and HIV Housing Plan, City staff completed a year-long, city-wide outreach and engagement process with stakeholders and residents of San Francisco. During this process, MOHCD, Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD), and Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH) outreached to a wide range of community stakeholders and residents for their perspectives, needs, feedback and input, specifically targeting the City's populations that need the most support. This process served as a framework to identify housing and community development priorities, which in turn will drive the goals and strategies outlined in the final plans. Ultimately, MOHCD will use the community's input and priorities to inform decision-making for funding community services.

MOHCD, OEWD and HSH received public input throughout the entire Consolidated Planning process. Below is a summary of public input opportunities for different phases of the planning process:

- Need assessment phase
 - 10 community forums, 40 focus groups and two surveys
 - Report back meeting
- Strategy development phase
 - Public review and comment period

- Proposed strategies meeting
 - Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area (NRSA) strategies meetings
- Funding recommendations phase
 - Public hearing on preliminary funding recommendations
- Consolidated Plan/Action Plan development phase
 - Public review and comment period

Please see the Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A for notes from all public hearings, public comments received and MOHCD/OEWD/HSR's responses to these comments.

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

Not applicable

7. Summary

As part of the strategic planning process, the needs assessment data was reviewed. Other strategic planning components included developing a Theory of Change (ToC) 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. 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	Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing
HOPWA-C Administrator	SAN FRANCISCO	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Narrative

In San Francisco, 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 all HOME and HOPWA activities as well as the CDBG housing, public facility, non-workforce development public service and organizational planning/capacity building activities. OEWD is responsible for economic development and workforce development activities of the CDBG program. HSH administers ESG activities and oversees the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) reporting.

MOHCD serves as the lead agency for the HOPWA program for the San Francisco Eligible Metropolitan Statistical Area (EMSA), which consists of San Francisco and San Mateo Counties.

Consolidated Plan Public Contact Information

Gloria Woo, Director of Data, Evaluation and Compliance
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(l)

1. Introduction

MOHCD contracted with RDA to develop an outreach and engagement strategy and an integrated needs analysis. The outreach and engagement strategy included community forums and online surveys for all San Francisco residents and stakeholders; focus groups for targeted groups and community advocates; and interviews with staff of other City departments. This outreach and engagement and consultation process was used to inform both the needs analysis and the development of strategies for the 2020–2024 Consolidated Plan, Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice and the HIV Housing Plan.

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(l)).

The Director of MOHCD meets weekly to discuss affordable and market-rate housing development issues citywide with the Director of Planning, the Director of Building Inspection, the Mayor’s Director of Housing Delivery, the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure’s (OCII) Executive Director and the Director of Development for OEWD.

MOHCD is a housing delivery agency, working with the Mayor’s Director of Housing Delivery and the Housing Delivery Team and other housing delivery agencies (OEWD, OCII, Treasure Island Development Authority and the Port of San Francisco) to streamline the production of housing development in San Francisco. The Housing Delivery Team meets with housing coordinators, designated representatives of each City department involved in housing production, to coordinate and expedite each department’s efforts to approve and permit new housing development. The Director of Housing Delivery, in collaboration with the housing delivery agencies, identifies and implements major process improvements, such as common master schedule review, permit tracking, electronic plan review and staffing planning.

The City agencies also coordinate in 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 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. Committee members consist of the directors or the director’s representative from MOHCD, HSH, and OCII as successor to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (SFRA). MOHCD works closely with OCII and HSH to issue requests for proposals (RFPs) or notices of funding availability (NOFAs) on a regular basis for particular types of developments. NOFAs are generally issued for projects that 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 for the Loan Committee.

The directors of MOHCD, OCII and HSH meet monthly to discuss permanent supportive housing issues. Staff from MOHCD, OCII, and HSH also meet monthly to coordinate the development and operation of the City’s permanent supportive housing pipeline and portfolio. These monthly convenings provide 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.

MOHCD also coordinates with other City agencies around other affordable housing initiatives such as the City's Public Lands Initiative led by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), as the owner of much of the public land in San Francisco that can be developed for affordable housing. MOHCD participates in monthly meetings or calls with SFMTA along with staff from the Planning Department to coordinate the development of Public Land as affordable housing.

MOHCD takes a coordinating role in bringing transit funding from the State to housing projects. To that end MOHCD meets regularly with SFMTA, the Department of Public Works (DPW), the regional transportation agency Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART), and other agencies responsible for implementing transit improvements that support residents of affordable housing.

MOHCD is also a member of San Francisco's Long-Term Care Coordinating Council (LTCCC). LTCCC advises the Mayor and City on policy, planning and service delivery issues for older adults and people with disabilities to promote an integrated and accessible long-term care system. LTCCC has 40 membership slots that represent a variety of consumers, advocates and service providers (non-profit and public) and meets bi-monthly. LTCCC active workgroups include Palliative Care Workgroup, Social Engagement Workgroup and Behavioral Health Workgroup.

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.

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 (LHCB) is the Continuum of Care (CoC) governing body for the San Francisco CoC. LHCB is staffed by HSH, the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) lead and CoC Collaborative applicant in San Francisco. Through the provision of coordinated, compassionate and high-quality services, HSH strives to make homelessness in San Francisco rare, brief and one time.

Through Executive Order, HSH was created and launched on July 1, 2016 to combine key homeless serving programs and contracts from the Department of Public Health (DPH), the Human Services Agency (HSA), MOHCD, and the Department of Children, Youth and Their Families (DCYF). This consolidated department has a singular focus on preventing and ending homelessness for people in San Francisco. HSH staff has informed and updated the LHCB about the recent changes to the ESG program as a result of the HEARTH Act. HSH, the lead agency for the City's ESG program, has been working closely with the LHCB to align the city's ESG program with the intent of the Act. MOHCD and HSH staff consulted with the LHCB during the creation of the Consolidated Plan to get its specific feedback on housing and homeless issues, the LHCB's priorities, and how the City's ESG programs and homeless housing programs can align with the City's CoC.

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

HSH has developed its HMIS system to capture standards and outcomes of ESG grantees. In previous years when MOHCD was the lead agency for the ESG program, MOHCD helped design the in-person and video training programs for ESG sub-recipients about the requirements of HMIS required data fields, and developed coordinated data collection systems that align HMIS, HSH contracting systems, MOHCD's internal contract monitoring system and sub-recipient data management systems to ensure the capture of all relevant and required outcomes and outputs. Additionally, MOHCD met with the senior management of HSH during the creation of the Consolidated Plan to solicit input into homeless and homeless prevention objectives and strategies, and convened regular meetings of all HSH and MOHCD homeless prevention and rapid-rehousing providers in conjunction with HSH 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. Locally, San Francisco refers to our HMIS system as the ONE System. All agencies with access to the ONE System are expected to participate in monthly agency lead meetings and comply with the San Francisco Continuous Data Quality Improvement plan as documented by the San Francisco user agreement. HSH will continue to manage all ESG programs in the ONE System.

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

How were the Agencies/Groups/Organizations consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultations or areas for improved coordination?

MOHCD conducted focus group meetings with the organizations listed in Table 2 to gain their perspectives on housing and service needs, barriers to housing access and choice, neighborhood change, and discrimination and fair housing.

Table 2 – Agencies, groups, organizations

1	Agency/Group/Organization	API Council
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services – Broadband Internet Service Providers Services – Children Services – Education Services – Elderly Persons Services – Employment Services – Fair Housing Services – Health Services – Homeless Services – Housing Services – Narrowing the Digital Divide Services – Persons with Disabilities Services – Persons with HIV/AIDS Services – Victims Services – Victims of Domestic Violence
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Market Analysis Non-Housing Community Development
2	Agency/Group/Organization	Arab Resource and Organizing Center
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services – Broadband Internet Service Providers Services – Children Services – Education Services – Elderly Persons Services – Employment Services – Fair Housing Services – Health Services – Homeless Services – Housing Services – Narrowing the Digital Divide Services – Persons with Disabilities Services – Persons with HIV/AIDS Services – Victims Services – Victims of Domestic Violence
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Market Analysis Non-Housing Community Development
3	Agency/Group/Organization	Council of Community Housing Organizations
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Market Analysis Non-Housing Community Development

4	Agency/Group/Organization	Eviction Prevention & Tenant Empowerment Working Group
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services – Housing
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Market Analysis Non-Housing Community Development
5	Agency/Group/Organization	HIV Housing Providers
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services – Housing Services – Persons with HIV/AIDS
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Non-Homeless Special Needs Market Analysis Non-Housing Community Development
6	Agency/Group/Organization	Housing Action Coalition
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Market Analysis Non-Housing Community Development
7	Agency/Group/Organization	Human Services Network
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services – Housing Services – Children Services – Education Services – Elderly Persons Services – Employment Services – Fair Housing Services – Health Services – Homeless Services – Persons with Disabilities Services – Persons with HIV/AIDS Services – Victims Services – Victims of Domestic Violence
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Market Analysis Non-Housing Community Development
8	Agency/Group/Organization	Local Homeless Coordinating Board
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services – Homeless
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs – Chronically Homeless Homeless Needs – Families with Children Homelessness Needs – Unaccompanied Youth Homelessness Needs – Veterans Market Analysis Non-Housing Community Development

9	Agency/Group/Organization	Long Term Care Coordinating Council
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services – Elderly Persons Services – Persons with Disabilities
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Market Analysis Non-Housing Community Development
10	Agency/Group/Organization	Mayor's Disability Council
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services – Persons with Disabilities
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Market Analysis Non-Housing Community Development
11	Agency/Group/Organization	San Francisco Immigrant Legal and Education Network
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services – Immigrants
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Market Analysis Non-Housing Community Development
12	Agency/Group/Organization	San Francisco Latino Parity & Equity Coalition
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services – Broadband Internet Service Providers Services – Children Services – Education Services – Elderly Persons Services – Employment Services – Fair Housing Services – Health Services – Homeless Services – Housing Services – Narrowing the Digital Divide Services – Persons with Disabilities Services – Persons with HIV/AIDS Services – Victims Services – Victims of Domestic Violence
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Market Analysis Non-Housing Community Development
13	Agency/Group/Organization	Senior Disability Action
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services – Elderly Persons Services – Persons with Disabilities
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Market Analysis Non-Housing Community Development

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

MOHCD, OEWD and DSHS 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/state/federal planning efforts

Name of Plan	Lead Organization	How do the goals of your Strategic Plan overlap with the goals of each plan?
Continuum of Care: Local Homeless Coordinating Board Strategic Plan Framework, 2014–2019	HSH/LHCB	This plan focuses on homelessness, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals.
HSH Strategic Framework and Youth Addendum	HSH	This plan focuses on homelessness, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals.
Larkin Street Youth Services Report on Youth Homelessness, 2018	HSH	This plan focuses on homelessness, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals.
Youth Homelessness Demonstration Project Plan	HSH	This plan focuses on homelessness, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals.
2013–2018 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice	MOHCD	This plan focuses on fair housing, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals.
2015–2019 Consolidated Plan	MOHCD	The 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan was reviewed during the development of the 2020–2024 Consolidated Plan.
Annual Progress Report, 2016/2017	MOHCD	This is MOHCD’s 2016–2017 Annual Report, which is aligned with Consolidated Plan goals.
Examining Housing Equity for African Americans in San Francisco	MOHCD	This plan focuses on housing equity, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals.
Five-Year Strategic Plan	MOHCD	This is MOHCD’s strategic plan, which is aligned with Consolidated Plan goals.
HIV Housing Five-Year Plan, 2016–2020	MOHCD	This plan focuses on housing for the HIV community, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals.
Economic Strategic Plan 2014 Update	OEWD	This plan focuses on economic development strategies, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.

Name of Plan	Lead Organization	How do the goals of your Strategic Plan overlap with the goals of each plan?
Workforce Alignment 2016 Update	OEWD	This plan focuses on workforce development strategies, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.
Department of Aging and Adult Services (DAAS) Dignity Fund Community Needs Assessment (DFCNA), 2018	DAAS	This plan focuses on the needs of seniors and persons with disabilities, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.
Community Needs Assessment, 2016	DCYF	This plan focuses on the needs of children, youth and their families, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.
Service Allocation Plan, 2018–2023	DCYF	This plan focuses on the needs of children, youth and their families, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.
2017–2021 Integrated HIV Prevention and Care Plan	DPH	This plan focuses on HIV prevention and care, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals.
AOT Annual Report, 2017	DPH	This plan includes healthcare for the HIV community, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals.
Community Health Needs Assessment	DPH	This plan includes healthcare for the HIV community, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals.
Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) 3-year integrated Plan, 2017–2020	DPH	This plan includes healthcare for the HIV community, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals.
MHSA Annual Update, 2018/2019	DPH	This plan includes healthcare for the HIV community, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals.
MHSA Community Program Planning Report, 2017	DPH	This plan includes healthcare for the HIV community, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals.
Whole Person Care DHCS application, 2016	DPH	This plan includes healthcare for the HIV community, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals.

Name of Plan	Lead Organization	How do the goals of your Strategic Plan overlap with the goals of each plan?
Whole Person Care Update, 2018	DPH	This plan includes healthcare for the HIV community, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals.
Housing Authority Annual Administrative Plan	San Francisco Housing Authority (SFHA)	This plan focuses on public housing, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals.
Our Children Our Families (OCOF) Five-Year Plan, Year One Report 2016	OCOF Commission	This plan focuses on the needs of children, youth and their families, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.
2009 Report of the SF Mayor's Task Force on African-American Out-Migration	SF Mayor's Task Force on African-American Out-Migration	This plan focuses on the needs of the African American community, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.
Annual Eviction Reports	SF Planning Department	This report focuses on eviction prevention, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals.
Central SOMA Plan	SF Planning Department	This plan focuses on the needs of the South of Market neighborhood, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.
Central Waterfront/Dogpatch Public Realm	SF Planning Department	This plan focuses on the needs of the Central Waterfront/Dogpatch neighborhood, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.
Citywide Planning Division Five-Year Work Program, 2014–2019	SF Planning Department	This plan focuses on citywide needs, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.
Civic Center Public Realm Plan	SF Planning Department	This plan focuses on the needs of the Civic Center/Tenderloin neighborhood, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.
General Plan 2014 Housing Element	SF Planning Department	This plan focuses on housing needs, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.
Housing Balance Reports	SF Planning Department	This plan focuses on housing needs, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.
Housing for Families with Children (Family Friend Housing White Paper)	SF Planning Department	This plan focuses on housing needs, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.

Name of Plan	Lead Organization	How do the goals of your Strategic Plan overlap with the goals of each plan?
Hub Area Plan update	SF Planning Department	This plan focuses on the needs of the Market and Octavia Area, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.
Mission Action Plan 2020	SF Planning Department	This plan focuses on the needs of the Mission District, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.
Southeast Framework	SF Planning Department	This plan focuses on the needs of the Southeast sector of the City, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.
Sustainable Chinatown	SF Planning Department	This plan focuses on the needs of Chinatown, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.
San Francisco Right to Civil Counsel Pilot Program Documentation Report	Stanford Law School John and Terry Levin Center for Public Service and Public Interest	This report focuses on eviction prevention, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals.
Assessment of Housing Needs and Barriers Experienced by Black, Latino/a and Pacific Islander Communities, Seniors, Persons with Disabilities, and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer (LGBTQ+) households	Homeownership SF	This plan focuses on housing needs, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.
AIDS Housing Needs Assessment, 2014	Alameda County	This plan focuses on housing for the HIV community, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals.
Standards of Care	LA County Commission on HIV	This plan includes healthcare for the HIV community, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals.

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(l))

MOHCD works closely with OCII, which is the successor agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, and the SFHA 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.

PR-15 Citizen Participation – 91.105, 91.115, 91.200(c) and 91.300(c)

1. Summary of citizen participation process/Efforts made to broaden citizen participation

Summarize citizen participation process and how it impacted goal-setting

In support of the development of its 2020–2024 Consolidated Plan, Analysis of Impediments, and HIV Housing Plan, MOHCD and OEWD engaged in a year-long, city-wide outreach and engagement process with stakeholders and residents of San Francisco. During this process, MOHCD and OEWD outreached to a wide range of community stakeholders and residents for their perspectives, needs, feedback and input, specifically targeting the City’s populations that need the most support. This process served as a framework to identify housing and community development priorities, which in turn will drive the goals and strategies outlined in the final plans. Ultimately, MOHCD will use the community’s input and priorities to inform decision-making for funding community services.

Community Outreach and Engagement

Community input is a critical part of the strategic planning process, providing crucial data to ensure funded programs and services address the highest priority needs of populations that need the most support as well as the City holistically. During this process, public input was obtained through community meetings (neighborhood forums and population-specific focus groups) and web surveys.

Outreach and Engagement Participant Demographics

MOHCD’s community outreach process engaged a total of 3,883 participants across community forums, focus groups and web surveys. While all survey participants provided demographic information, this information was more difficult to capture during in-person events. About twice as many women as men participated, with this ratio remaining consistent across engagement events. Participants represented a diversity of sexual orientation and racial/ethnic identities, with about one third identifying as LGBTQ+ and two thirds identifying with a race or ethnicity other than white. Tables 4–6 below summarize gender identity, sexual orientation, and race/ethnicity for all community participants who completed a demographic form, either in person or online. Although most participants did provide this information, the values in the tables below may under-represent actual participation totals.

Community participation by race/ethnicity as represented in Table 6 below largely reflects San Francisco’s population as a whole. In San Francisco, 41% of the population identifies as White, 34% as Asian, 15% as Latino/a or Hispanic, 5% as Black or African American, 4% as multiracial, and 1% as Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander and American Indian or Alaska Native.¹ Groups with disproportionately high engagement across community meetings include Black, African American or African participants, who represented 14% of all participants, and American Indian or Alaska Native participants, who represented 5% of all participants.

¹ American Community Survey, 2017

Table 4 – Self-Reported Gender Identity Across Community Outreach Efforts

Gender Identity	n	%
Female	1,732	60%
Male	955	33%
I prefer not to answer	74	3%
Genderqueer/ Gender Non-binary	73	3%
Trans Female	17	<1%
Other	14	<1%
Trans Male	10	<1%
Total Participants Self-Reporting Gender Identity	2,875	100%

Table 5 – Self-Reported Sexual Orientation Across Community Outreach Efforts

Sexual Orientation	n	%
Straight/Heterosexual	1,656	60%
Prefer not to answer	372	14%
Gay/Lesbian/Same Gender Loving	372	14%
Bisexual	238	9%
Other	81	3%
Questioning/Unsure	26	<1%
Total Participants Self-Reporting Sexual Orientation	2,745	100%

Table 6 – Self-Reported Race/Ethnicity Across Community Outreach Efforts

Race/Ethnicity	n	%
Asian	1,061	33%
White	1,005	31%
Black, African American or African	455	14%
Latino/a or Hispanic	420	13%
American Indian or Alaska Native	172	5%
Middle Eastern or North African	63	2%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	40	1%
Total Participants Self-Reporting Race/Ethnicity	3,216	100%

Community Forums and Focus Groups

MOHCD facilitated 10 neighborhood-based public forums and 40 population-specific focus groups. Representatives from across the housing spectrum participated in the forums and focus groups, including individuals experiencing homelessness, residents of public and subsidized housing, housing and social service providers, HIV/AIDS housing advocates, homeowners, new San Francisco residents, recent immigrants, and life-long residents of the City. MOHCD facilitated sessions with cultural groups including African American, Cambodian, Samoan, Vietnamese, LGBTQ+, and people living with HIV/AIDS (PLWHA) community members. Participants responded to a series of structured questions on a range of relevant domains including housing and service needs, barriers to housing access and choice,

neighborhood change, and discrimination and fair housing. The following tables list the events held during this process, and the numbers of attendees participating in each.

Table 7 – Townhall-Style Community Forums, December 2018–February 2019

Community Forums	District(s)	Attendees ²
Bayview Hunters Point	D10	70
Castro	D7 & D8	29
Chinatown	D2 & D3	165
Excelsior and OMI	D11	79
Mission	D9	54
South of Market	D6	51
Sunset	D1 & D4	55
Tenderloin	D6	85
Visitacion Valley	D10	30
Western Addition	D5	38
Total Participants		656

² These numbers may under-represent actual attendance because some participants did not provide demographic information.

Table 8 – Community Focus Groups, January 2019–March 2019

Focus Groups	Attendees
African American Community	35
Cambodian Community	19
Council of Community Housing Orgs.	14
Eviction Prevention & Tenant Empowerment Working Group	22
HIV Community	50
HIV Housing Providers	21
Homeowners	8
HOPE SF Hunters View Housing Community	21
HOPE SF Potrero Hill Housing Community	58
HOPE SF Sunnysdale Housing Community	13
Housing Action Coalition	3
Human Service Network	7
Latino/a Service Providers & Advocates	19
LGBTQ+ Community	20
Local Homeless Coordinating Board	13
Long Term Care Coordinating Council	50
Mayor's Disability Council	20
RAD – 1760 Bush	20
RAD – 1880 Pine	11
RAD – 18th St	13
RAD – 25 Sanchez	11
RAD – 2698 California	21
RAD – 345 Arguello	31
RAD – 462 Duboce	5
RAD – 491 31st	18
RAD – Clementina Towers	15
RAD – Bernal Dwellings Housing Community	9
RAD – Hayes Valley North & South	17
RAD – JFK	28
RAD – Mission Dolores	7
RAD – Robert B. Pitts	20
RAD – Westside Courts	15
RAD – Woodside	9
Samoan Community	12
San Francisco Immigrant Legal & Education Network	20
Senior Disability Action	40
Transgender Community	6
Vietnamese Community	18
Total Participants	739

A total of 1,395 individuals took part in the community meetings that were held across San Francisco between November 2018 and March 2019. Participants were asked to complete forms identifying a number of demographic characteristics, including gender, race or ethnicity, and sexual orientation, but not all participants opted to complete this form. Notably, among those who did complete the form, most identified as female, straight/heterosexual, and Asian. The following tables display demographic characteristics of participants that elected to complete the form.

Table 9 - Forum and Focus Group Participant Demographics

Gender – Forums	#	%
Female	300	68%
Male	128	29%
I prefer not to answer	5	1%
Genderqueer/ Non-binary	4	1%
Other	2	<1%
Total	439	100%

Gender – Focus Groups	#	%
Female	138	62%
Male	81	36%
Other	2	<1%
Trans Male	2	<1%
Trans Female	1	<1%
Total	224	100%

Orientation – Forums	#	%
Straight/Heterosexual	261	67%
I prefer not to answer	46	12%
Gay/Lesbian/Same-Gender	36	9%
Bisexual	33	9%
Other	12	3%
Total	388	100%

Orientation – Focus Groups	#	%
Straight/Heterosexual	158	77%
I prefer not to answer	22	11%
Gay/Lesbian/Same-Gender	10	5%
Bisexual	9	4%
Other	5	2%
Grand Total	204	100%

Race/Ethnicity – Forums	#	%
Asian	214	51%
Latino/a or Hispanic	64	15%
Black or African	61	15%
White	61	15%
American Indian or Alaska Native	13	3%
Middle Eastern or North African	5	1%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	2	0%
Total	420	100%

Race/Ethnicity – Focus Grps	#	%
Asian	97	38%
Black or African	60	24%
White	52	20%
Latino/a or Hispanic	23	9%
American Indian or Alaska Native	14	5%
Middle Eastern or North African	7	3%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	2	1%
Total	255	100%

Community Surveys

MOHCD developed two community surveys to capture residents' housing and non-housing service needs as well as their experiences with MOHCD and OEWD programs, if applicable.

Planning Survey

This survey asked respondents what they need to get and stay in housing, which non-housing services are most important for them and their family, how they prefer to access services, their opinions of MOHCD, and other quality of life questions.

This survey also included a demographic component where respondents indicated their age, race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, HIV/AIDS status, housing status, disability status, income level, educational attainment, and language preference.

Planning Responses
2,488 total responses

Program Evaluation Survey

After completing the Planning Survey, participants had the opportunity to complete the MOHCD and OEWD Program Evaluation survey, which asked about utilization of programs and services. Respondents were asked about their utilization of economic and workforce development programs, housing placement programs, housing services, and community services and then asked to rate and describe their overall experience with these programs and services. This survey was thus able to collect and compare specific utilization data from a range of MOHCD and OEWD programs and funded services and nuance these data with participants' numerical rankings and qualitative assessments.

Program Evaluation Responses
1,813 total responses

Survey Respondent Demographics

Survey respondents that completed the planning survey were invited to take the program evaluation survey, and, as a result, most program evaluation survey respondents were counted in the planning survey demographic results. Residents from across 40 different San Francisco neighborhoods completed the planning survey, with responses from residents of the Chinatown, Mission, Tenderloin, South of Market, Sunset/Parkside, and Bayview Hunters Point each representing 5% or more of the total survey share. Respondents indicated a diversity of gender, sexual orientation, and racial identities. A slight majority of respondents identified as straight/heterosexual (58%) and as female (60%). Fifteen percent (15%) of respondents self-identified as gay/lesbian/same gender loving, 14% preferred not to answer, and 9% identified as bisexual. Thirty-five percent (35%) of respondents self-identified as white, 30% as Asian, 13% as Black/African American or African, 13% as Latino/a or Hispanic, 6% as American Indian or Alaska Native, 2% as Middle Eastern or North African, and 1% as Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander.

The following tables display planning survey response counts by self-reported neighborhood of residence, sexual orientation, gender identity, and race.

Table 10 – Planning Survey Responses by Neighborhood of Residence

Neighborhood	#	%
Chinatown	248	12%
Mission	232	11%
Tenderloin	176	8%
South of Market	136	6%
Sunset/Parkside	126	6%
Bayview Hunters Point	121	6%
Castro/Upper Market	79	4%
Western Addition	76	4%
Excelsior	68	3%
Outer Richmond	66	3%
Bernal Heights	57	3%
Haight Ashbury	57	3%
Oceanview/Merced/Ingleside	50	2%
North Beach	49	2%
Hayes Valley	47	2%
Outer Mission	44	2%
Inner Sunset	44	2%
Mission Bay	43	2%
Financial District	38	2%
Inner Richmond	38	2%
Potrero Hill	35	2%
Glen Park	32	1%
Portola	31	1%
Visitacion Valley	29	1%
Pacific Heights	25	1%
Twin Peaks	21	1%
Nob Hill	21	1%
Noe Valley	20	1%
Marina	19	1%
Russian Hill	18	1%
Japantown	17	1%
West of Twin Peaks	15	1%
Lakeshore	13	1%
Golden Gate Park	12	1%
Treasure Island	8	0%
Lone Mountain/USF	7	0%
Presidio	6	0%
Presidio Heights	5	0%
Lincoln Park	4	0%
McLaren Park	3	0%
Seacliff	3	0%
Total Participants Self-Reporting Neighborhood	2,139	100%

Figure 1 – Self-Reported Sexual Orientation, Planning Survey Respondents




Figure 2 – Self-Reported Gender Identity, Planning Survey Respondents





Figure 3 – Self-Reported Race/Ethnicity, Planning Survey Respondents



Document Review

MOHCD's outreach and engagement efforts are embedded within a network of ongoing planning processes led by partner agencies seeking to identify and respond to community needs. To capture results from these outreach processes and supplement MOHCD's engagement efforts, RDA conducted a review of over 50 planning documents from partner City agencies, cross-sector partnerships and initiatives, and advocacy groups in order to understand previous and current research, findings, and demographics of populations engaged. As detailed in Appendix B, approximately half (23) of the documents noted community participation in these planning processes, with outreach and engagement strategies including focus groups, public forums, community meetings, formal public comment, and online forums. For each document that included community participation, RDA recorded community input related to each of the identified research questions. Appendix B provides further information about the planning documents and the outreach methods that contributed to these documents.

Secondary Data

The integrated needs analysis pulls in high-level secondary data from the 2017 American Community Survey (ACS) to contextualize data and/or findings where appropriate. The ACS is a nationwide survey that collects and produces information on social, economic, housing, and demographic characteristics about our nation's population every year. Some figures use analysis of ACS data conducted by third parties and these instances are noted in footnotes throughout the document.

Additional Public Meetings

Report Back Meeting

On June 20, 2019, MOHCD and OEWD held a public meeting to provide all residents and stakeholders with a summary of key findings from the community engagement process. The written summary is in Appendix A – Citizen Participation Comments Attachment. Approximately 40 individuals attended the meeting and 13 individuals provided comments on the summary of key findings. A summary of the comments received during the public hearing can also be found in Appendix A. People who could not attend the public hearing or who did not want to speak at the public hearing were encouraged to provide written comments to MOHCD/OEWD. No written comments were received.

Proposed Strategies Meeting

The proposed strategies document for the 2020–2024 Consolidated Plan was available in seven languages for public review and comment from July 29, 2019 to August 19, 2019. The public had access to review the document at the offices of MOHCD and OEWD. The document was also posted on the MOHCD and OEWD websites. MOHCD and OEWD held a public hearing on August 5, 2019 to receive comments on the proposed strategies. Persons who could not attend the public hearing or who did not want to speak at the public hearing were encouraged to provide written comments to MOHCD/OEWD. Approximately 35 individuals attended the August 5th public meeting and 13 individuals provided comments on the proposed strategies. In addition, a total of 50 written comments were received by 11 individuals. A summary of all of the comments received and MOHCD/OEWD's responses to the comments can be found in Appendix A – Citizen Participation Comments Attachment.

Strategies for Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area (NRSA) Meetings

In October and November of 2019, a series of six public meetings were held by MOHCD and OEWD in each of the six NRSAs to discuss neighborhood-specific strategies. The following is a list of the six neighborhoods with dates of the meetings:

- Chinatown: October 7, 2019

- Bayview Hunters Point: October 10, 2019
- Mission: October 16, 2019
- South of Market: October 17, 2019
- Tenderloin: October 18, 2019
- Visitacion Valley: November 7, 2019

Notes from each of these meeting can be found in Appendix A – Citizen Participation Comments Attachment.

Public Hearing on Preliminary Funding Recommendations for 2020–2021 CDBG, ESG, HOME and HOPWA Programs

The proposed funding recommendations for the 2020–2021 CDBG, ESG, HOME and HOPWA Programs were available in English for public review and comment from January 22, 2020 to March 2, 2020. The public had access to review the recommendations at the offices of MOHCD and OEWD. The recommendations were also posted on the MOHCD and OEWD websites. MOHCD, OEWD and HSH held a public hearing on February 4, 2020 to receive comments on the proposed funding recommendations for these four federal programs, as well as the recommendations for other MOHCD funding sources, including local general funds and housing trust funds. Persons who could not attend the public hearing or who did not want to speak at the public hearing were encouraged to provide written comments to MOHCD/OEWD/HSR. Approximately 144 individuals attended the February 4th public meeting and 31 individuals provided comments on the proposed funding recommendations. In addition, a total of 62 written comments by 59 individuals were received. A summary of all of the comments received and MOHCD/OEWD/HSR's responses to the comments can be found in Appendix A – Citizen Participation Comments Attachment.

Public Input on the Draft 2020–2024 Five-Year Consolidated Plan and the Draft 2020–2021 Action Plan

The Draft 2020–2024 Five-Year Consolidated Plan and Draft 2020–2021 Action Plan was available to the public for review and comment between May 7, 2020 and June 5, 2020. The document was posted on the MOHCD, OEWD and HSH websites. Due to the current shelter in place order, hard copies were not available. Residents and stakeholders were encouraged to provide written feedback to MOHCD/OEWD/HSR. Three individuals provided comments on the draft documents. A summary of the comments received and MOHCD/OEWD/HSR responses are included in the Citizen Participation Comments Attachment.

Please note that community engagement and strategy development for this Consolidated Plan were substantially completed before the COVID-19 pandemic started and before the Congress passed the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act, under which HUD provided additional funds to San Francisco under the CDBG, ESG and HOPWA programs. Therefore, strategies to support residents during the COVID-19 pandemic are not included in this Consolidated Plan. This 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan and 2020-2021 Action Plan includes proposed uses for the 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG, HOME and HOPWA entitlement grants.

City staff is currently working to prioritize needs related to the pandemic and plans to update this document by submitting an Amendment to the 2020-2021 Action Plan to HUD, which will include proposed uses for the additional CDBG, ESG and HOPWA funding received under the CARES Act. The Draft Amendment to the 2020-2021 Action Plan will be available for public review and comment for five days before it is submitted to HUD.

Public Input on Amendment to 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan and 2020-2021 Action Plan

The following two draft documents were made available for public review and comment from June 8, 2020 to June 12, 2020.

1. An Amendment to San Francisco's 2020-2021 Action Plan that described the proposed uses of the supplemental funding provided by HUD to San Francisco under the first round of CARES Act funding, which included funds under the CDBG, ESG, and HOPWA programs.
2. An Amendment to San Francisco's Citizen Participation Plan that allowed the City to implement an expedited public participation process in accordance with HUD guidelines.

These documents were posted on the MOHCD, HSH and HSA websites. Due to the current shelter in place order, hard copies were not available. Residents and stakeholders were encouraged to provide written feedback to MOHCD/HSH/HSA. Two individuals provided comments on the draft documents. A summary of the comments received and responses are included in the Citizen Participation Comments Attachment.

A second draft Amendment to San Francisco's 2020-2021 Action Plan was made available for public review and comment from August 3, 2020 to August 7, 2020. This second Amendment included the proposed uses of the second round of ESG funding as well as the proposed revised uses of the first round of ESG funding under the CARES Act. This document was posted on the MOHCD, HSH and HSA websites. Due to the current shelter in place order, hard copies were not available. Residents and stakeholders were encouraged to provide written feedback to MOHCD/HSH/HSA. 11 individuals provided comments on the draft document. A summary of the comments received and responses are included in the Citizen Participation Comments Attachment.

Citizen Participation Outreach

Table 11 – 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 Forum in the Castro on 12/3/2018	Non-targeted/ broad community outreach in Districts 7 and 8	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
2	Community Forum in the Sunset on 12/10/2018	Non-targeted/ broad community outreach in Districts 1 and 4	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	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)
3	Community Forum in the Excelsior/ OMI on 1/16/2019	Non-targeted/ broad community outreach in District 11	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
4	Community Forum on the Tenderloin on 1/22/2019	Non-targeted/ broad community outreach in Tenderloin/ District 6	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
5	Community Forum in the Western Addition on 1/31/2019	Non-targeted/ broad community outreach in District 5	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
6	Community Forum in the South of Market on 2/5/2019	Non-targeted/ broad community outreach in South of Market/ District 6	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
7	Community Forum in the Mission on 2/13/2019	Non-targeted/ broad community outreach in District 9	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
8	Community Forum in Chinatown on 2/19/2019	Non-targeted/ broad community outreach in Districts 2 and 3	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	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)
9	Community Forum in Bayview Hunters Point on 2/20/2019	Non-targeted/ broad community outreach in BVHP/ District 10	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
10	Community Forum in Visitacion Valley on 2/26/2019	Non-targeted/ broad community outreach in Visitacion Valley/ District 10	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
11	Focus Group with African American Community on 3/11/2019	African American residents, advocates, service providers and stakeholders	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
12	Focus Group with Cambodian Community on 3/20/2019	Cambodian residents, advocates, service providers and stakeholders	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
13	Focus Group with HIV+ Community on 2/20/2019	HIV+ clients of SF AIDS Foundation	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
14	Focus Group with BMR Homeowners on 3/27/2019	BMR homeowners	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	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)
15	Focus Group with HOPE SF Hunters View Community on 1/28/2019	Hunters View residents	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
16	Focus Group with HOPE SF Potrero Hill Community on 3/19/2019	Potrero Terrace and Annex residents	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
17	Focus Group with HOPE SF Sunnydale Community on 2/21/2019	Sunnydale residents	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
18	Focus Group with LGBTQ+ Community on 3/20/2019	LGBTQ+ residents, advocates, services providers and stakeholders	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
19	16 Focus Groups in 16 RAD Developments in the Month of March 2019	Residents of 16 RAD developments	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
20	Focus Group with Samoan Community on 3/26/2019	Samoan residents, advocates, service providers and stakeholders	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	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)
21	Focus Group with Transgender Community on 3/21/2019	Transgender residents, advocates, service providers and stakeholders	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
22	Focus Group with Vietnamese Community on 3/19/2019	Vietnamese residents, advocates, service providers and stakeholders	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
23	Online and Paper Survey on Housing and Community Development Needs	Non-targeted/ broad community outreach	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
24	Report Back on Needs Analysis Meeting on 6/20/2019	Non-targeted/ broad community outreach	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
25	Proposed Strategies Public Review and Comment Period and Meeting on 8/5/2019	Non-targeted/ broad community outreach	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
26	Chinatown NRSA Strategies Meeting on 10/7/2019	Chinatown residents, advocates, service providers and stakeholders	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	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)
27	Bayview Hunters Point NRSA Strategies Meeting on 10/10/2019	Bayview Hunters Point residents, advocates, service providers and stakeholders	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
28	Mission NRSA Strategies Meeting on 10/16/2019	Mission residents, advocates, service providers and stakeholders	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
29	South of Market NRSA Strategies Meeting on 10/17/2019	South of Market residents, advocates, service providers and stakeholders	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
30	Tenderloin NRSA Strategies Meeting on 10/18/2019	Tenderloin residents, advocates, service providers and stakeholders	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
31	Visitation Valley NRSA Strategies Meeting on 11/7/2019	Visitation Valley residents, advocates, service providers and stakeholders	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	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)
32	Preliminary Funding Recommendations for 2020–2021 CDBG, ESG, HOME and HOPWA Programs Public Review and Comment Period from 1/22–3/2/2020 and Meeting on 2/4/2020	Non-targeted/ broad community outreach	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
33	Public Review and Comment Period for the Draft 2020–2024 Consolidated Plan and 2020–2021 Action Plan from 5/4–6/2/2020	Non-targeted/ broad community outreach	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a

Needs Assessment

NA-05 Overview

Needs Assessment Overview

MOHCD contracted with RDA to develop an integrated needs analysis for the 2020–2024 Consolidated Plan, Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing, and HIV Housing Plan as well as other ongoing efforts led by the Planning Department. This needs analysis includes findings from the community outreach events organized by MOHCD as well as RDA’s review of approximately 50 community needs assessments, consolidated plans, and other relevant departmental reports from city and county agencies in San Francisco and the Bay Area. Finally, this analysis pulls in secondary data from the 2017 ACS where appropriate to contextualize data and/or findings.

As an assessment of community needs, this analysis presents findings in terms of what services San Franciscans indicate that they most need. While residents discussed challenges, the community engagement and document review also reflect that residents who are connected to services generally have positive experiences and view the programs favorably.

The needs analysis organizes findings around the following domains: housing services, social and supportive services, economic self-sufficiency, service access, community empowerment and engagement, coordination of services, and housing barriers. These “buckets” of community needs were selected because they reflect the ways in which data were collected as well as how community members naturally discussed their service needs and concerns.

To support MOHCD’s prioritization of populations that need the most support across the housing spectrum, RDA analyzed 37 survey reports under different population-specific filters in order to capture the unique needs of prioritized population groups. RDA examined survey results for all subgroups under each of the following filters to inform the analysis and synthesis presented in this needs assessment: race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender identity, age (seniors and TAY), HIV status, disability status, and housing status (homeless). Population-specific needs that emerged from this analytical process are documented in the appropriate section in the document.

Summary of Findings

Cross-cutting Community Needs and Concerns

1. Among the concerns identified during community engagement, San Francisco stakeholders are most frequently concerned about displacement, increasing housing prices, the overall cleanliness and safety of their neighborhoods, and transit accessibility.
2. Participants in MOHCD’s community engagement identified that services to support self-sufficiency and stability are as important as the need for housing itself.
3. Many stakeholders expressed a prominent need for culturally inclusive and culturally-specific services.
4. Participants expressed a need for greater awareness of, navigation of, and access to available services, including both housing and other supportive services.
5. Stakeholders expressed a desire for more inclusive and relaxed standards around affordable housing eligibility.

6. Many community members voiced the need for more opportunities to provide input on the City's housing eligibility policies as well as participate in the development of affordable housing programs.
7. Stakeholders asked for more streamlined services, improved inter-agency collaboration, and stronger cross-agency communication to support the delivery of both housing and supportive services.

Housing Services

1. Community engagement participants emphasized the need for affordable housing environments at the most vulnerable end of the housing spectrum: shelters and transitional housing for persons experiencing homelessness, accessible housing for seniors and individuals with disabilities, and affordable housing for the lowest-income households.
2. While affordable housing was the most frequently mentioned housing services need, the recognition of the intersection of health and housing was a common thread throughout the discussions, as participants emphasized the need for safe and healthy living environments.
3. Community members expressed the need for stronger eviction and tenant supports and protections, including tenant education as well as City policies to prevent unlawful eviction.

Social and Supportive Services

1. Community members need affordable, targeted support for trauma, PTSD, substance use disorders, and other mental health conditions.
2. Compared to housing needs, social and supportive service needs are more intensive and vary by population.

Economic Self-Sufficiency

1. Participants expressed an overwhelming need for paid job training programs that provide pathways to living-wage, sustainable employment.
2. There is a large need for financial literacy and planning programs as well as financial services, specifically savings and credit counseling services.
3. Residents want San Francisco employers to hire more local residents.

Knowledge of and Access to Services

1. Participants indicated limited knowledge about availability of and eligibility for housing and social services, as well as a need for assistance navigating those services.
2. In addition to needing greater knowledge of eligibility requirements, stakeholders conveyed that eligibility requirements can be a barrier to accessing services.
3. Participants expressed a need for inclusive language support services, in order to promote both knowledge of services and service access, especially for health and housing.
4. Residents experience several barriers to transportation in San Francisco, including long wait times, safety, and cost of transportation, which impede their access to jobs, medical appointments, and other services.

Community Empowerment and Engagement

1. Community stakeholders want better relationships and accountability with MOHCD.
2. Participants articulated a wide need for culturally-competent and inclusive outreach and community engagement strategies that promote community-building and link residents to services.

Coordination of Services

1. Stakeholders asked for more streamlined services, improved inter-agency collaboration, and stronger cross-agency communication to support the delivery of both housing and supportive services.
2. Community members that participated in forums and focus groups asked for more financial and capacity-building support for nonprofit organizations and other service providers, including changes to contracting rules.

Housing Access, Perceptions, and Barriers

1. Participants named displacement and increasing housing prices as the top concerns impacting housing access and the ability to remain in housing.
2. Both renters and homeowners express low overall housing choice because they feel “locked in.”
3. Participants highlighted barriers to homeownership centering around both housing prices and financing options.
4. Neighborhood forum participants shared the qualities that they believe make a neighborhood desirable, identifying the following characteristics:
 - a. Public transit
 - b. Green space
 - c. Safety
 - d. Community
 - e. Commercial options
 - f. Schools
 - g. Walkability
 - h. Access to services
 - i. Cleanliness
5. Participants in community engagement shared multiple experiences of housing discrimination, but overall, their responses reveal that there is not one specific, overt type of discrimination. Their responses indicate a more pervasive and entrenched systemic discrimination that affects people of color and African American communities in particular.

A more detailed description of these findings can be found in Appendix C – Integrated Needs Analysis.

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

Summary of Housing Needs

Permanent Affordable Housing Needs

Table 12 – 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
TOTAL UNITS	28,869	100.0%	3,849

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

Table 13 – New Affordable Housing Construction by Income Level, 2014–2018

Household Income Category	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Total
Very Low (0–50% AMI)	149	213	248	686	40	1,336
Low (51–80% AMI)	477	66	364	558	401	1,866
Moderate (81–120% AMI)	131	250	190	222	204	997
Total Affordable	757	529	802	1,466	645	4,199
Total All New Units	3,654	3,095	4,895	4,511	2,690	18,845
Affordable % of All New Units	21%	17%	16%	32%	24%	22%

Source: San Francisco Planning Department, 2018 Housing Inventory

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).³ Based on housing production data from 2014–2018, San Francisco did not meet any of its annual production goals for any income category.

³ City and County of San Francisco, San Francisco General Plan Housing Element, 2014

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.

San Francisco renter households who earn less than 30% of area median income are cost burdened, with the elderly renters most impacted (Figure 4). The most recent data indicates that 76% of renters who are at less than 50% of area median income are severely cost burdened (paying more than 50% of their income on rent) (Figure 6). 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.

Figure 4 – Cost Burden for Renters >30%




Figure 5 – Cost Burden for Owners >30%




Figure 6– Cost Burden for Renters >50%





Figure 7 – Cost Burden for Owners >50%



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 2011–2015 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data indicates that very low-income single-family renter households are the most overcrowded at 50% of total San Francisco households with that need (Figure 8).

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, Excelsior, 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/Latinx-headed households and Asian-headed households.

The neighborhoods that have the most households living in crowded conditions are Chinatown, Tenderloin, and part of Bayview Hunters Point. The overcrowding situation in Chinatown is particularly severe, with 42% of households living in crowded conditions.

Figure 8– Overcrowding for Renters






Figure 9– Overcrowding for Owners



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 Single-Room Occupancy (SRO) buildings. And extremely low-income renters are disproportionately impacted (67%) by having one or more housing problems.

Figure 10 – Severe Housing Problems for Renters




Table 14 – Housing Needs Assessment Demographics

Demographics	Base Year: 2009	Most Recent Year: 2015	% Change
Population	805,235	840,765	4%
Households	324,185	353,285	9%
Median Income	\$70,040.00	\$81,294.00	16%

Data Source: 2005–2009 ACS (Base Year), 2011–2015 ACS (Most Recent Year)

Number of Households Table

Table 15 – Housing Urban Development Area Median Family Income (HAMFI) by Households

	0–30% HAMFI	>30– 50% HAMFI	>50– 80% HAMFI	>80– 100% HAMFI	>100% HAMFI
Total Households	79,400	40,450	52,270	30,170	150,995
Small Family Households	15,205	11,885	15,770	9,855	57,555
Large Family Households	2,325	3,320	3,995	2,090	6,475
Household contains at least one person 62–74 years of age	17,930	9,705	11,420	5,345	20,390
Household contains at least one person age 75 or older	17,550	6,850	6,410	2,870	7,285
Households with one or more children 6 years old or younger	5,150	3,945	4,540	2,950	14,765

Data Source: 2011–2015 CHAS

Housing Needs Summary Tables

Table 16 – Housing Problems (Households with one of the listed needs)

	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										
Substandard Housing – Lacking complete plumbing or kitchen facilities	10,325	1,940	1,420	540	14,225	145	155	210	55	565
Severely Overcrowded – With >1.51 people per room (and complete kitchen and plumbing)	3,230	1,825	1,365	620	7,040	60	270	380	195	905
Overcrowded – With 1.01–1.5 people per room (and none of the above problems)	2,130	1,310	1,265	425	5,130	240	505	940	690	2,375
Housing cost burden greater than 50% of income (and none of the above problems)	26,475	7,430	2,500	425	36,830	6,975	4,285	3,985	1,620	16,865
Housing cost burden greater than 30% of income (and none of the above problems)	8,695	9,290	11,710	3,760	33,455	1,775	1,915	4,545	3,165	11,400

	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
Zero/negative Income (and none of the above problems)	4,035	0	0	0	4,035	795	0	0	0	795

Data Source: 2011–2015 CHAS

Table 17 – Housing Problems 2 (Households with one or more Severe Housing Problems: Lacks kitchen or complete plumbing, severe overcrowding, severe cost burden)

	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	42,160	12,505	6,550	2,010	63,225	7,425	5,215	5,510	2,560	20,710
Having none of four housing problems	19,925	15,470	26,470	15,950	77,815	5,060	7,260	13,740	9,650	35,710
Household has negative income, but none of the other housing problems	4,035	0	0	0	4,035	795	0	0	0	795

Data Source: 2011–2015 CHAS

Table 18 – 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	9,760	5,100	3,320	18,180	1,910	2,445	3,840	8,195
Large Related	1,200	1,090	335	2,625	400	785	1,320	2,505
Elderly	15,450	4,005	1,830	21,285	5,290	2,510	2,540	10,340
Other	20,355	8,945	9,575	38,875	1,490	1,125	1,550	4,165
Total need by income	46,765	19,140	15,060	80,965	9,090	6,865	9,250	25,205

Data Source: 2011–2015 CHAS

Table 19 – 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
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS								
Small Related	6,605	1,825	550	8,980	1,725	1,700	1,445	4,870
Large Related	815	310	0	1,125	345	390	400	1,135
Elderly	9,530	1,575	505	11,610	3,780	1,750	1,315	6,845
Other	16,940	4,335	1,725	23,000	1,350	750	985	3,085
Total need by income	33,890	8,045	2,780	44,715	7,200	4,590	4,145	15,935

Data Source: 2011–2015 CHAS

Table 20 – Crowding (More than one person per room)

	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										
Single family households	5,095	2,655	1,930	605	10,285	290	345	605	585	1,825
Multiple, unrelated family households	525	795	445	220	1,985	30	360	705	330	1,425
Other, non-family households	1,105	365	530	285	2,285	0	80	10	0	90
Total need by income	6,725	3,815	2,905	1,110	14,555	320	785	1,320	915	3,340

Data Source: 2011–2015 CHAS

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 21). Of this population group, the types of households in need of housing assistance are predominantly very low-income seniors, disabled or formerly homeless individuals living in SRO units.

Table 21 – 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 10.3% of all San Franciscans have a disability. Of this disabled population, 35.5% are people aged 65 or older and 6.6% are younger adults⁴. Many rely on federal disability benefits (SSI) as their sole source of income, which is only \$943.72 per month for an elderly or single disabled person in California. Comparatively the average monthly rent for a two-bedroom apartment in San Francisco as of 2018 was \$4,650 per month.⁵ In addition, domestic violence was attributed to be the cause of homelessness among 22% of survey respondents living in families during the bi-annual homeless Point-in-Time (PIT) Count,⁶ with one in four domestic violence survivors being turned away from shelters due to lack of space.⁷ 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, the growing affordability gap between incomes earned and rental and ownership housing costs has made housing extremely unaffordable for many San Franciscans. Since the economic recovery started in 2011, the median rent and home prices in San Francisco have skyrocketed, making housing only affordable to higher income households. The *Housing Affordability Strategy* recently published by the San Francisco Planning Department states that a household would need to earn about \$169,000 per year to afford the median

⁴ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2018 Five-Year Estimates

⁵ San Francisco Planning Department, 2018 San Francisco Housing Inventory, 2019.

⁶ Applied Survey Research, San Francisco Homeless Count and Survey, 2019.

⁷ Department on the Status of Women, Family Violence in San Francisco FY 2017, January 2019.

rent in 2019, while a homebuyer would need to earn over \$307,000 per year to afford the median home price of \$1,387,278.⁸

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 with the 2018 ACS estimating the population to be about 21.7% of San Francisco's population. San Francisco's elderly population is expected to grow to 23% by 2020 and 26% by 2030. Older adults in San Francisco also tend to be low income: approximately 22% live just above the Federal poverty line while 16% of San Francisco seniors live below the Federal poverty line. Additionally, San Francisco's older adult population is also predominantly female, persons of color, immigrants, speak a primary language other than English, and the lowest income seniors are concentrated in particular neighborhoods such as Chinatown, South of Market and the Tenderloin.⁹

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 1 out of 10 San Francisco residents has a disability and 1 out of 4 persons with a disability lives in poverty. Employed adults with disabilities are more than twice as likely as employed adults Citywide to experience poverty.¹⁰ Many rely on federal disability benefits (SSI) as their sole source of income. The maximum monthly payment for an aged or disabled SSI recipient in 2019 was \$943 per month while the average rent for a studio is \$1,300 per month.

Housing options for people with disabilities range from acute care in an institution, to supportive housing, to living independently. Institutional living provides the most restricted and limited environment for people with disabilities yet costs the government many times more than other housing options. 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 face challenges obtaining housing with appropriate amenities, such as wheelchair-accessible entrances, wide interior spaces for wheelchair circulation, accessible bathing facilities, and counters and cabinets with adjustable heights. Approximately 58% of San Francisco's housing stock was built before 1950, without these accommodations in mind. Most housing is difficult to convert to accessible standards. Although disability rights laws require that a landlord allow accessibility

⁸ San Francisco Housing Affordability Strategies, 2020

⁹ San Francisco Department of Aging and Adult Services, DAAS Community Needs Assessment, 2016.

¹⁰ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

modifications in rental units, the burden of paying for such modifications is on the tenants themselves, who are frequently living in poverty.

Transitional Age Youth

Disconnected transitional age youth (TAY) are defined by San Francisco's legislation as young people aged 18–24 who are homeless or in danger of homelessness; have dropped out of high school; have a disability or other special needs, including substance abuse; are low-income parents; are undocumented; are new immigrants and/or English learners; are LGBTQ+; and/or are transitioning from the foster care, juvenile justice, criminal justice or special education system. According to the 2019 PIT homeless count, 14% of the homeless counted were unaccompanied children or TAY, and of those 95% of the unaccompanied youth were aged 18–24. Furthermore 76% of the unaccompanied children and 83% of TAY were found to be unsheltered, living on the streets, in tents, cars or abandoned buildings.¹¹

Within the youth population in San Francisco there are also subpopulations with their own unique needs. San Francisco has historically been a sanctuary for LGBTQ+ youth. Of the youth survey respondents for the 2019 PIT count, 46% of the respondents identified to be LGBTQ+ compared to 23% of the adult population. Also, one in five youth exiting the foster care system experience homelessness within four years of exiting foster care.

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


According to 2018 ACS data, approximately 69,700 or 19% of family households in San Francisco have children. There are higher concentrations of households with children under 18 years old in the southeast section of San Francisco – Bayview Hunters Point, Portola, Outer Mission, Excelsior, and Visitation Valley (Map 2). These are neighborhoods with large minority population concentrations (Map 5) and low-income concentrations (Map 9). Roughly 18,000 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 than smaller households to live in overcrowded conditions.

Homeless families with children under 18 are typically headed by a female head of household. According to survey respondents from the 2019 PIT Homeless Count, the primary reasons for the cause of the family's homelessness was job loss, eviction, and rent increases. Furthermore, the number of homeless families slightly increased, from 190 to 208, since the 2017 PIT Homeless Count.¹²

¹¹ Department of Homeless and Supportive Housing, San Francisco Youth Homeless Count and Survey, 2019

¹² Department of Homeless and Supportive Housing, San Francisco Homeless Point-in-Time Count & Survey, 2019

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 is the greatest risk factor for housing instability and increased risk of homelessness, especially for very low-income households at or below 30% AMI. 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.

Introduction

The four housing problems are: (1) housing lacks complete kitchen facilities, (2) housing lacks complete plumbing facilities, (3) there is more than one person per room, and (4) cost burden is greater than 30%. Analysis of the 2011–2015 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 22 – 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	60,055	14,515	4,830
White	20,580	4,335	1,750
Black/African American	6,395	2,370	575
Asian	20,530	5,715	1,950
American Indian, Alaska Native	320	35	4
Pacific Islander	400	125	40
Hispanic	9,735	1,645	370

Data Source: 2011–2015 CHAS

Figure 11 – Housing Problems by Ethnicity – 0–30% of AMI (Table 22)




30%-50% of Area Median Income

Table 23 – 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	28,920	11,530	0
White	11,995	4,030	0
Black/African American	1,470	1,095	0
Asian	9,075	4,125	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	20	20	0
Pacific Islander	45	4	0
Hispanic	5,515	2,005	0

Data Source: 2011–2015 CHAS

Figure 12 – Housing Problems by Ethnicity – 30–50% of AMI (Table 23)




50%-80% of Area Median Income

Table 24 – 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	28,315	23,955	0
White	13,080	10,585	0
Black/African American	1,195	1,690	0
Asian	8,310	7,435	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	15	40	0
Pacific Islander	160	160	0
Hispanic	4,775	3,275	0

Data Source: 2011–2015 CHAS

Figure 13 – Housing Problems by Ethnicity – 50–80% of AMI (Table 24)




80%-100% of Area Median Income

Table 25 – 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	11,495	18,675	0
White	5,795	9,795	0
Black/African American	330	820	0
Asian	3,545	5,220	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	45	55	0
Pacific Islander	0	29	0
Hispanic	1,480	2,085	0

Data Source: 2011–2015 CHAS

Figure 14 – Housing Problems by Ethnicity – 80–100% of AMI (Table 25)



Discussion

Based on HUD’s definition of disparate impact (percentage of households with housing problems or no/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.

Introduction

The four severe housing problems are: (1) housing lacks complete kitchen facilities, (2) housing lacks complete plumbing facilities, (3) there is more than one person per room, and (4) cost burden is greater than 50%. Analysis of the 2011–2015 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 26 – 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	49,585	24,985	4,830
White	17,460	7,465	1,750
Black/African American	4,895	3,870	575
Asian	16,725	9,525	1,950
American Indian, Alaska Native	295	60	4
Pacific Islander	235	285	40
Hispanic	8,075	3,305	370

Data Source: 2011–2015 CHAS

Figure 15 – Severe Housing Problems by Ethnicity – 0–30% of AMI (Table 26)




30%-50% of Area Median Income

Table 27 – 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	17,720	22,730	0
White	6,990	9,035	0
Black/African American	690	1,875	0
Asian	6,105	7,095	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	10	30	0
Pacific Islander	34	14	0
Hispanic	3,450	4,070	0

Data Source: 2011–2015 CHAS

Figure 16 – Severe Housing Problems by Ethnicity – 30–50% of AM (Table 27)




50%-80% of Area Median Income

Table 28 – 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	12,060	40,210	0
White	4,540	19,115	0
Black/African American	380	2,505	0
Asian	4,105	11,640	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	0	55	0
Pacific Islander	120	200	0
Hispanic	2,780	5,275	0

Data Source: 2011–2015 CHAS

Figure 17 – Severe Housing Problems by Ethnicity – 50–80% of AMI (Table 28)




80%-100% of Area Median Income

Table 29 – 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	4,570	25,600	0
White	1,920	13,670	0
Black/African American	120	1,025	0
Asian	1,765	7,000	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	0	100	0
Pacific Islander	0	29	0
Hispanic	565	3,005	0

Data Source: 2011–2015 CHAS

Figure 18 – Severe Housing Problems by Ethnicity – 80–100% of AMI (Table 29)



Discussion

Based on HUD's definition of disparate impact (percent of households with severe housing problems or no/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.

Introduction

Analysis of the 2011–2015 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 30 – Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens AMI

Housing Cost Burden	<=30%	30–50%	>50%	No/negative income (not computed)
Jurisdiction as a whole	215,305	67,325	64,780	5,885
White	118,155	31,170	28,085	1,925
Black/African American	9,115	4,360	4,645	675
Asian	59,060	19,890	19,815	2,530
American Indian, Alaska Native	310	110	255	4
Pacific Islander	510	245	290	40
Hispanic	21,905	9,725	9,545	560

Data Source: 2011–2015 CHAS

Figure 19 – Housing Cost Burden by Ethnicity (Table 30)



Discussion

Analysis of the 2011–2015 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 or the jurisdiction as a whole. What the table does clearly indicate is that, when compared to the rest of that racial or ethnic group as a whole, very low-income households at or below 30% AMI of all ethnic groups are disproportionately impacted by the housing cost burden.

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, the Bayview, Lakeshore, Tenderloin and Chinatown. See Map 5 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:

- Bayview Hunters Point
- Chinatown
- Excelsior
- Lakeshore
- Oceanview/Merced/Ingleside
- Outer Mission
- Outer Richmond
- Portola
- Sunset/Parkside
- Tenderloin
- Visitacion Valley

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 SFHA'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 \$65+ million operating income from HUD and tenant-paid rents. The SFHA is overseen by seven citizen commissioners, all of whom are appointed by the Mayor. Two of those commissioners must be current SFHA residents. Starting in 2020, the Mayor will appoint four members directly, at least one of whom must be an SFHA resident. Three members will be recommended by motion at the sole discretion of the Board of Supervisors; of the Board's three appointment recommendations, at least one must be an SFHA resident 62 years of age or older.

SFHA administers both public housing and the Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program. In 2019, there were 1,911 public housing units and 12,165 HCV vouchers (both tenant and project based) under SFHA management. The average annual household income for SFHA clients is \$14,590. Without public housing and HCV vouchers, virtually all SFHA clients would be forced to live outside the City or even face homelessness.

Totals in Use

Table 31 – Public Housing by Program Type

Program Type							
	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers				
			Total	Project-based	Tenant-based	Special Purpose Voucher	
						Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program
# of units vouchers in use	585	1,911	12,165	5,365	6,215	865	99

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Table 32 – Characteristics of Public Housing Residents 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
Average Annual Income	0	10,284	20,390	19,443	17,507	21,560	17,459	0
Average length of stay	0	7	11.8	10	5	15	9	13
Average Household size	0	1	2.5	2	2	2	1	3
# Homeless at admission	0	23	6	64	47	17	6	0
# of Elderly Program Participants (>62)	0	74	203	6,424	3,196	3,228	346	3
# of Disabled Families	0	78	366	8,417	4,543	3,874	616	18
# of Families requesting accessibility features	0	N/A	171	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
# of HIV/AIDS program participants	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
# of DV victims	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Ethnicity of Residents

Table 33 – Ethnicity of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Ethnicity	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Program Type					
				Vouchers					
				Total	Project-based	Tenant-based	Special Purpose Voucher		
							Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
Hispanic	0	35	244	1,672	988	579	84	21	6
Not Hispanic	0	224	806	12,079	5,385	5,783	828	83	69

*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 3,200 or roughly one-third of the portfolio of SFHA’s former public housing units are designated as “senior/disabled.” This high proportion requires accessible features in those units, though, given the age of the portfolio, appropriate accessibility improvements are not always installed. 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 HCV wait list is closed.

There are currently 15,157 households on the public housing wait list. The Preference categories have changed since 2010 and the SFHA no longer has a “homeless” preference that is not connected to a referral from a City and County of San Francisco Agency.

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 2019 median income of a household of 3 in San Francisco is \$110,850, 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

Compared 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 more 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

In the fall of 2018, SFHA was discovered to have a shortfall of up to \$30 million in the HCV program. HUD determined in March 2019 that SFHA was in substantial default of its obligations under the housing voucher and public housing programs. According to HUD's March 2019 default notice, HUD had the authority to place the Housing Authority in receivership, taking possession of all or part of the Housing Authority. Instead, SFHA is remedying the default through contracting out its HCV and public housing property management programs, and having the City assume oversight of the SFHA's essential functions.

In 2020 and 2021, SFHA will convert its 1,911 remaining units of public housing to the HCV program via HUD's disposition programs: the Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) program and the Section 18 Demo/Dispo program. Given SFHA's financial difficulties, HUD has approved the early conversion of these units to HCV in order to stabilize the agency's finances and operations.

NA-40 Homeless Needs Assessment – 91.205(c)

Introduction

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 (PIT) 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.

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.¹³ San Francisco worked in conjunction with Applied Survey Research to conduct the 2019 San Francisco Homeless Count and Survey. The San Francisco homeless count has two primary components: a PIT enumeration of unsheltered homeless individuals and families (those sleeping outdoors, on the streets, in parks, or vehicles, etc.) and PIT enumeration of homeless individuals and families who have temporary shelter (those staying in an emergency shelter, transitional housing, or using stabilization rooms).

The 2019 San Francisco PIT Count was a city-wide effort. With the support of over 400 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, 2019. 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.

San Francisco conducted a supplemental count of unaccompanied children and youth under the age of 25 years old concurrently. This supplemental count was part of a nationwide effort, established and recommended by HUD, to understand the scope of youth homelessness. The count was conducted by trained currently homeless youth enumerators.

In the weeks following the street count, an in-depth survey was administered to 1,000 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 and focuses special attention on specific subpopulations, including chronically homeless, veterans, families, unaccompanied children under the age of 18, and unaccompanied youth, also known as TAY, between the ages of 18–24.

¹³ City and County of San Francisco, San Francisco Homeless Point-in-Time Count & Survey, 2013

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. Thirty-one percent of survey respondents reported they were experiencing homelessness for the first time in 2019, a decrease from 53% in 2011.¹⁴ The length of time survey respondents reported being homeless was similar to previous years.

Nature and Extent of Homelessness: (Optional)

Table 34 – Homeless Needs Assessment

Race:	Sheltered:	Unsheltered (optional)
White	703	1608
Black or African American	1125	1853
Asian	72	283
American Indian or Alaska Native	154	247
Pacific Islander	108	92
Multiple Races	693	1097
Ethnicity:	Sheltered:	Unsheltered (optional)
Hispanic	2284	4427
Not Hispanic	571	953

Data Source: 2019 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 8,035 homeless individuals identified from the 2019 Homeless Count, 631 of them were living in families defined as a household with at least one adult and one child under 18.¹⁵ Forty-three individuals in homeless families with children participated in the San Francisco Survey.¹⁶ Seventy-two percent of survey respondents in families were female.

One-third of respondents in families with children reported experiencing homelessness for the first time, compared to 31% of all other respondents. Sixty percent reported experiencing homelessness for a year or more. Respondents in families with children were largely long-term San Francisco residents; 86% reported living in San Francisco at the time they most recently became homeless and 50% reported

¹⁴ City and County of San Francisco, San Francisco Homeless Point-in-Time Count & Survey, 2019

¹⁵ City and County of San Francisco, San Francisco Homeless Point-in-Time Count & Survey, 2019

¹⁶ City and County of San Francisco, San Francisco Homeless Point-in-Time Count & Survey, 2019

having lived in the city for at least ten years. Prior to experiencing homelessness, 33% reported they were living in a home owned or rented by themselves or a partner.

Seventy-two percent of family survey respondents reported they were receiving some form of public assistance. Of those who reported benefits, a large majority were receiving food stamps/WIC/CalFresh. More than half were receiving CalWORKs/TANF.

In 2019, there were an estimated 608 veterans experiencing homelessness in San Francisco, compared to 684 in 2017 (an 11% reduction). Of veterans surveyed during the PIT Count, 81% were unsheltered. Seventy-nine percent of veteran survey respondents identified as male, 16% as female, 5% as transgender, and 1% as gender non-conforming. Twenty percent of veterans identified as Hispanic or Latino/a, 33% as Black or African American, 31% as White, and 23% as Multi-racial.

At the time they most recently became homeless, 67% of veteran survey respondents reported living in San Francisco (compared to 70% of non-veteran respondents), 27% reported living in another county within California and 6% reported living in another state. Of those who did not live in San Francisco at the time they became homeless, 11% reported coming to San Francisco to access VA services. Thirty-six percent (36%) of veteran respondents reported living in a home owned or rented by themselves or a partner prior to becoming homeless, compared to 29% of non-veterans. Veterans reported being in a hospital or treatment center prior to becoming homeless at twice the rate of non-veterans (8% and 4%, respectively).

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

When asked about their racial identity, greater differences between those experiencing homelessness and the general population emerged. A much higher proportion of survey respondents identified as Black or African American (37% compared to 6%), and a lower percentage identified as Asian (5% compared to 34%). The majority of survey respondents identified as either Black or African American (37%), White (29%), or Multi-racial (22%).

Describe the Nature and Extent of Unsheltered and Sheltered Homelessness.

The total number of unsheltered persons counted was 5,180. Of the 2,855 individuals included in the shelter count, 84% (2,412 people) were in emergency shelter programs while 16% (443 persons) were residing in transitional housing and safe haven programs on the night of the count.

Discussion:

San Francisco is experiencing a homelessness crisis. Data indicates that there are more homeless people in the city than we have seen since 2002; conditions have become exceedingly difficult for unhoused San Franciscans who are getting older and sicker over time. This crisis impacts housed people as well, reducing the overall quality of life in the City. This section describes some of the conditions driving this crisis, efforts to serve the homeless population in San Francisco, and plans to expand and improve the City's response.

San Francisco and the Bay Area are in the midst of an unprecedented housing affordability crisis that impedes efforts to address homelessness. Both home prices and rents have outpaced inflation over the past decade. Greater demand for housing has also created a decline in overall housing affordability. Though housing production for low-income households in 2017–2018 outpaced the 10-year historic average, overall housing production has failed to keep pace with employment growth or the rising number of high-income households. The City’s existing stock of an estimated 160,000 rent-controlled units have historically helped to keep housing options affordable. However, new move-ins over the past five years have reflected higher income households compared to historic trends; only 40% of new move-ins earned less than 80% of AMI, compared to more than 60% of new move-ins ten or more years ago. Low-income residents are hardest hit by housing availability and affordability, and are much less likely to have alternate housing options if forced to move out of their current residence. Thirty five percent of the 2018 SF Planning Department Housing Survey respondents earning 30% or less of AMI indicated that they would have no housing options if forced to move out; in contrast, only 12% of those earning between 120–200% of AMI reported having no options. Research from Zillow Economic Research demonstrates the relationship between rent affordability and homelessness. A recent study indicates that communities experience a sharp increase in homelessness when median rent accounts for 32% or more of median income. San Francisco remains well above this threshold for rent affordability, with median rent accounting for 39% of median income on average through 2017 and 2018. Housing market trends, along with other factors, led to increases in homelessness during the past ten years. These were driving factors in the City’s creation of a new department dedicated to addressing homelessness.

HSH strives to make homelessness in San Francisco rare, brief, and one-time. HSH provides services, shelter and housing to over 11,000 homeless and formerly homeless individuals each day. In October 2017, HSH published a strategic framework available at <http://hsh.sfgov.org/researchreports/framework/>.

The framework enumerates the following goals:

- Improve the City’s response to street homelessness by December 2018
- End large, long-term encampments by December 2018
- Ensure no families with children are unsheltered by December 2018
- Design and implement coordinated systems for adults, families, and youth by June 2019
- Implement performance accountability across all programs and systems by June 2021
- Reduce adult chronic homelessness 50% by December 2022
- Reduce youth homelessness 50% by December 2022
- End family homelessness by December 2022

In addition to achieving the first four goals in its strategic framework by June 2019, HSH accomplished the following from July 2016–December 2018:

- Helped over 5,500 people exit homelessness through housing, rent subsidies, and reunification programs
- Provided prevention and diversion services to over 4,000 households
- Sheltered over 15,000 people
- Conducted outreach to over 19,000 people
- Maintained housing for over 9,500 people living in permanent supportive housing
- Opened 675 Temporary Shelter beds, including five Navigation Centers
- Added 550 units of Permanent Supportive Housing

- Launched the Moving On Initiative, helping over 200 supportive housing tenants move to other housing
- Added over 500 new Rapid Re-Housing and Rent Subsidy slots
- Added 500 Problem Solving slots to help prevent and quickly end homelessness
- Opened five “Access Points” that have assessed over 4,700 adults and 1,600 families for homeless services
- Implemented a Coordinated Entry System to prioritize people for housing and other services
- Launched the ONE System, a “by-name” expanded homelessness management information system
- Reduced TAY homelessness 22% from 2015–2019
- Reduced student homelessness 23% in the SFUSD from 2014–2018
- Reduced veteran homelessness 11% since 2017

Despite reductions in some subpopulations, this crisis continues to grow in San Francisco and the conditions on our streets are unacceptable for both housed and unhoused residents. There is a significant increase in adult homelessness and chronic homelessness in the City. Compounding this challenge is the fact that the homeless population is getting sicker: in 2017, 55% of survey respondents reported having one or more disabling conditions; this increased to 69% in 2019. Although the City has significantly reduced large, long-term tent encampments, the 2019 PIT Count shows an increase in the number of people sleeping unsheltered, with two-thirds of this growth attributable to people sleeping in vehicles. With this updated information on current homeless population trends, HSH plans to respond with additional resources and new interventions targeted to vehicle encampments, chronic adult homelessness and prevention and diversion efforts.

From the 2017 to 2019 PIT Counts, HSH added nearly 400 units of Permanent Supportive Housing, including 69 for families, 61 for TAY, and 260 for adults. This expansion in inventory has allowed for an increase in the number of people that exit homelessness each year: in 2018, HSH helped more people exit homelessness than ever before in San Francisco. There are over 1,500 new units of Permanent Supportive Housing in the pipeline; these units will help increase the number of people we can assist. HSH is also expanding Rapid Re-Housing for adults, youth and families and is exploring new strategies to grow the Homeward Bound program.

HSH helps over 2,000 people exit homelessness each year but estimates that over 7,000 individuals enter homelessness annually. In other words, for every person HSH helps find housing, there are more than three newly homeless individuals. This issue is one of the biggest challenges to solving San Francisco’s homelessness crisis. To address the rate at which people are becoming homeless, Mayor Breed proposed a \$5.2M investment in homelessness prevention and diversion (also known as Problem Solving) in the FY19–20 budget.

Core to HSH’s strategic framework is the prioritization of housing resources for the populations most in need. During the past five years, the City’s Permanent Supportive Housing increases proportionally focused on TAY and families with children. With additional supportive housing in the pipeline targeted to single adults, HSH plans to reverse this trend. More than 1,200 units for single adults are in the pipeline, with almost half of these new units expected to open by June 2021. In addition, San Francisco’s Coordinated Entry system for single adults launched in August 2018 and began placing individuals in housing programs beginning November 2018. HSH designed this process to ensure that the highest need

populations are prioritized for services, in effect targeted housing resources to chronically homeless individuals. More information about Coordinated Entry can be found in HSH's strategic framework.

Unsheltered or street homelessness continues to be a significant crisis in San Francisco that requires immediate response in order to meet the health, welfare, and safety needs of people on the streets as well as their housed neighbors. Though HSH has opened 675 new shelter beds for families and adults since mid-2016, the unsheltered population observed during the 2019 PIT Count was 19% greater than in 2017. The demand for adult shelter beds remains high, with 1,190 individuals on the adult shelter waitlist on the week of the 2019 PIT Count. HSH is committed to expanding its resources to respond to this deficit and expects to open at least 700 additional temporary shelter beds by 2020. On January 16, 2018, the City launched the Healthy Streets Operations Center (HSOC), a multi-departmental effort to address increasing public concern about street homelessness and, in particular, a rise in large-scale encampments in 2016–2017. HSOC co-located staff from HSH, the San Francisco Police Department, San Francisco Public Works, the San Francisco Department of Emergency Management, the San Francisco DPH, and other departments to employ an Incident Command System approach for issues regarding street safety and cleanliness, encampments, medical and behavioral health issues of individuals on the street, and referral needs to homelessness services. Over the course of 2018, homeless-related requests for services via SF311 declined by 33%, with average call response times declining 27%. HSOC has also effectively maintained the progress of HSH's Encampment Resolution Team in eliminating all large-scale encampments, identified as sites occupied by six or more tents or improvised structures and in place for 30 days or longer. Though tent encampments continue to remain a priority for HSH to monitor, HSOC and HSH have begun to identify an increase in persons sleeping in vehicles in certain regions of the City. This increase is reflected in the recent PIT Count data; approximately two-thirds of the increase in the unsheltered count can be attributed to the increase in people enumerated as sleeping in vehicles. A count conducted by HSOC on April 24, 2019 identified 578 passenger vehicles and RVs or vans that appeared to be inhabited. To address the growing population of people living in their vehicles, HSH has expanded the focus of the Encampment Resolution Team to now include encampments of inhabited vehicles. The City is also piloting a program to allow for safe overnight parking and will soon open a Vehicle Triage Center.

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

Introduction:

Seniors

The number and diversity of the elderly population of the United States continues to grow and as housing cost burdens continue to increase, the inequities become more evident. The number and the age range of the elderly population is predicted to continue rising as Baby Boomers age, with households age 80 and over accounting for 12% of the American population by 2038.¹⁷ Furthermore, the Harvard study estimates the elderly population will become more ethnically diverse with Hispanics growing from 7% of the elderly population in 2018 to 12% by 2038, as well as Asian elderly growing in number while the number of white households decreases from 78% to 70% during that same time period. Because Hispanic and Asian households are more likely to live in multigenerational households, the housing needs of this growing elderly population may need to change to accommodate their households' composition. Income inequities between higher-income seniors and low-income seniors is also increasing. Wealthier seniors are able to invest in stocks and benefit from a healthy stock market; conversely, low-income seniors reliant on Social Security payments as their primary source of income have not seen payment growth commensurate with the cost-of-living increase. Racial disparities for homeownership amongst seniors, one of the primary means to grow wealth in the United States, has also grown. In 2018 the black-white homeownership gap grew to a 30-year high of 19.4% according to the Harvard analysis of ACS data.

Persons with Disabilities

Along with seniors, access to affordable and accessible housing for persons with disabilities is one of the highest needs, especially since many persons with disabilities are low-income or live on fixed incomes. Additionally, persons with disabilities may live alone and need support and opportunities for interaction to prevent isolation.

Veterans

Veterans often struggle returning to civilian life after military service. A 2017 needs assessment of more than 700 San Francisco veterans found a number of challenges for veterans in the City ranging from finding meaningful employment at wages above the poverty line, finding housing in San Francisco that is affordable for their wages, encountering unstable housing situations but not meeting HUD's definition of homeless, physical and psychological health issues, and barriers to access to services, especially for those veterans with non-honorable discharge status.¹⁸

Re-Entry Populations

Finding affordable housing in San Francisco is very difficult for low-income households, and even more so for persons exiting the justice system with a criminal record. Landlords often require criminal background checks as part of the housing application process. Furthermore, criminal records are often barriers to employment, which in turn makes securing and maintaining housing difficult. Barriers to employment and housing often lead to homelessness. The National Alliance to End Homelessness

¹⁷ Housing American's Older Adults 2019, Joint Center for Housing Studies of Harvard University, 2019

¹⁸ The State of the American Veterans: A San Francisco Veterans Study, University of Southern California School of Social Work, 2017

estimates one in five persons returning to their communities from prison become homeless upon reentry, with estimates as high as 30–50% in major urban areas.

Transitional Age Youth

TAY emancipating from foster care are one-fourth more likely to become homeless. Youth experiencing homelessness identified their top 10 needs in the following order: food, clothing, shelter/housing, dental care, health care, personal hygiene, employment, education, transportation, and eye care.¹⁹ An assessment of San Francisco TAY found a need for coordinated youth referral process, including a centralized and up-to-date inventory of TAY housing sites, increased communication among TAY referral agencies and stakeholders, additional options to improve entry processes, the need for high quality youth-specific services, and physical design and location of housing sites responsive to TAY needs.²⁰

Persons Living with HIV/AIDS

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 \$3,688²¹ while the FMR for a one-bedroom apartment is \$2,720.²²

There are significant numbers of individuals who are aging while living with HIV/AIDS. In San Francisco, 67% of people living with HIV are over 50 years old²³ and face health issues related to aging 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 2009–2016, between 12–13% were homeless.²⁴ Compared to the San Francisco HIV/AIDS population overall, homeless persons newly diagnosed with HIV/AIDS are more likely to be women (including transgender women), African American, and injection drug users.²⁵ Services should be culturally competent to meet the needs of these individuals.

¹⁹ San Francisco Coordinated Community Plan to Prevent and End Youth Homelessness, SF Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, January 2018

²⁰ Providing Stability and Support: An Assessment of San Francisco's TAY Housing and Services System, Corporation for Supportive Housing, November 2015.

²¹ Rent Café Website, February 2020

²² HUD FMR Guidelines, 2020

²³ San Francisco Department of Public Health, HIV Semi-Annual Surveillance Report, December 2019

²⁴ SF EMA HIV Community Planning Council 2017 Summit Report

²⁵ San Francisco Department of Public Health, HIV/AIDS Epidemiology Annual Report, 2018

As was the case when developing the 2014 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 2012–2019, 97% were alive five years later, compared to 84% who received the diagnosis between 2001–2012 and 79% who received the same diagnosis between 1996–2000.²⁶ As a result, facilities offering higher levels of care, such as Residential Care Facilities for the Chronically Ill (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.

HOPWA

Table 35 – HOPWA Data

Current HOPWA formula use:	
Cumulative cases of AIDS reported	30,167
Area incidence of AIDS	360
Rate per population	20
Number of new cases prior year (3 years of data)	105
Rate per population (3 years of data)	26
Current HIV surveillance data:	
Number of PLWHA	15,908
Area Prevalence (PLWHA per population)	848.6
Number of new HIV cases reported last year	163

Data Source: December 2019 SFDPH HIV Semi-Annual Surveillance Report

HIV Housing Need (HOPWA Grantees Only)

Table 36 – HIV Housing Need (See table below)

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

Table 37 – Indicators for Calculating Unmet HIV/AIDS Housing Need among San Francisco PLWHA

Indicator	Definition
A.1 # Homeless or Unstably Housed PLWHA	Living in an SRO, on the street, in a shelter, or in a car
A.2 # Severely rent-burdened PLWHA	Paying at least 50% of income toward rent. May include some SRO residents also captured within A.1
A. Estimated need for HIV/AIDS housing resources	A.1 + A.2

²⁶ San Francisco Department of Public Health, HIV/AIDS Epidemiology Annual Report, 2018

B.1	# Dedicated subsidies	Includes full/standard subsidies and shallow/partial subsidies
B.2	# Dedicated permanent units	Includes all permanent capital units, including transitional housing units and units in permanent residential care facilities for PLWHA
B.3	Annual turnover availability rate	The portion of units and subsidies that become available each year to new tenants. Rising rents mean that as subsidies are vacated, only a portion of them can be re-allocated to new tenants.
B.	Total units and subsidies available annually	(B.1 + B.2) x B.3
C.	Annual Unmet HIV/AIDS Housing Need	A - B

This plan attempts to describe the level of need among those PLWHA who are most significantly impacted by the cost of housing. Specifically, this plan describes housing assistance “need” to include households or individuals who are either a) *unstably housed or experiencing homelessness* (lacking a fixed, regular, or adequate nighttime residence) or b) *severely rent-burdened* (paying at least 50% of their income toward housing costs).

Including both PLWHA households that are *severely rent-burdened* and those that are either *unstably housed or experiencing homelessness*, this plan estimates that a total of **2,560** households are in need of housing assistance resources of some form.

Table 38 – Households in Need of HIV/AIDS Housing Resources

Category	Households
Severely Rent-Burdened	170
Unstably Housed or Homeless	2,390
TOTAL	2,560

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 Eligible Metropolitan Statistical Area (EMSA) 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 face evolving needs for specialized HIV care: 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) Latino/as. All of these groups have growing incidences of HIV infection resulting in increased costs to the local system of care. Each population is described briefly below.

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 high quality treatments and therapies, the HIV-infected population of the San Francisco EMA continues to age dramatically at levels unimaginable during the

first decade of the epidemic. As of December 31, 2018, more than three out of every five persons living with HIV and AIDS in the San Francisco EMA were 50 and older (10,671 persons, 67%).²⁷ 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 2,631 PLWHA age 65 and above in San Francisco.

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.

During the 2009–2018 time period, 113 trans women newly diagnosed with HIV comprised 3% of all persons diagnosed with HIV in San Francisco. Compared to all persons diagnosed with HIV in this time period, trans women were more likely to be non-white, persons who inject drugs (PWID), and younger; 44% of newly diagnosed trans women were 18–29 years old. As of December 31, 2018, 31% of the 396 trans women living with HIV in San Francisco were African American and 36% were Latina. Forty three percent of trans women living with HIV were PWID. Similar to trans women newly diagnosed with HIV in 2009–2018, trans women living with HIV were more likely to be non-white, PWID, and younger ages when compared to all persons living with HIV in San Francisco.⁷

Emerging Population # 3: Men of Color Who Have Sex with Men. Men who have sex with men (MSM) overall make up by far the most heavily HIV-impacted population in the San Francisco EMA, accounting for the largest number of newly diagnosed with HIV and AIDS as of December 31, 2018. Among MSM newly diagnosed with HIV from 2009–2018, Whites accounted for the largest number of diagnoses in San Francisco. The number of MSM newly diagnosed with HIV from 2009–2018 declined in White and Latino/a persons. Annual number of Latino MSM diagnosed exceeded the number of White MSM in 2018. The annual number of Asian/Pacific Islander MSM diagnosed increased from 36 in 2009 to a high of 46 in 2012 and then decreased to 15 in 2018. Among MSM, Whites made up 31%, African Americans 17%, Latino/a persons 38% and Asian/Pacific Islanders 10% of new diagnoses in 2018.²⁸

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 that bring homeless individuals into care, stabilize their life circumstances, and retain them in treatment. Among homeless persons newly diagnosed with HIV from 2009–2018, the number of diagnoses peaked at 67 in 2010, and in 2018 the number was 40. The proportion of new diagnoses among homeless individuals fluctuated but showed an overall increasing trend in the more recent years:

²⁷ HIV Epidemiology Report December 2018

²⁸ HIV Epidemiology Report December 2018

11% in 2016, 13% in 2017, and 20% in 2018 – the highest during the 2009–2018 time period. Compared to all persons diagnosed with HIV in 2009–2018, persons who were homeless at time of HIV diagnosis were more likely to be women or trans women, African American, PWID, and men who have sex with men and who also inject drugs (MSM-PWID).

A total of 7,849 PLWHA had residential housing status or address information collected or updated in 2018. Eight percent of PLWHA with housing status or address in 2018 were homeless or lived in a Single-Room Occupancy (SRO) facility during 2018. Among persons who were homeless or lived in a SRO facility during 2018, there were higher proportions of women, trans women, African Americans, Latino/a persons, PWID, MSM-PWID, and persons in younger age groups (25-29 years, 30–39 years, 40-49 years), compared to all PLWHA.⁸

Emerging Population # 5: African Americans: The growing crisis of HIV among African Americans in the San Francisco EMA is a cause for significant concern. New diagnoses increased among African American and Latino/a persons. For the first time, the number and proportion of new HIV diagnoses among Latino/as exceeded the number among whites. African American men and women had the highest HIV diagnosis rates by race, with rates per 100,000 population of 145 and 35, respectively, followed by Latino/a men and women. Three-year survival following an AIDS diagnosis was lowest among African Americans (82%) compared to other races; and PWID (79%) compared to other transmission categories.

29

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

In February 2014, MOHCD, DPH and HSA launched a strategic planning process to create a revised HIV/AIDS housing plan for San Francisco, last updated in 2019. Together, members of MOHCD, DPH, and HSA along with Learning For Action consulting staff formed a steering committee to oversee the strategy development process.

Community input was an integral part of the strategic planning. Throughout 2019, the steering committee invited representatives from various city agencies, the San Francisco HIV/AIDS Providers Network, community-based organizations serving PLWHA, and leaders from several City and County of San Francisco departments 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.

The stakeholder council met once a month from June 2019 to April 2020 for a total of eleven meetings. RDA led data collection, analysis, and synthesis efforts throughout several stakeholder council meetings. The stakeholder council used this data and their professional experiences to inform their recommendations about the content for the HIV/AIDS housing plan.

²⁹ HIV Epidemiology Report December 2018

The needs analysis report identified a number of areas of unmet housing needs for PLWHA. 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 workgroup to examine unmet housing needs more closely. The workgroup included members from the stakeholder council along with staff from HSA, DPH, and community-based organizations.

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

- The proportion of all people newly diagnosed with HIV who are homeless has steadily increased from 10% in 2006 to 14% in 2017 (HIV Epidemiology Section, Population Health Division, San Francisco DPH, 2018).
- The risk of HIV infection due to homelessness can be exacerbated in particular subpopulations of people experiencing homelessness. For example, youth who have unstable housing are known to be more likely to engage in high-risk substance use.³⁰
- Homelessness has been associated with a greater likelihood of experiencing transphobic victimization (emotional, physical, and sexual abuse due to being transgender) and engaging in sexual risk taking among race minority women and the lack of access to basic living necessities has been found to impact black trans women's linkage to healthcare and HIV prevention knowledge.³¹
- As a result of increased risk of HIV due to the factors described above, persons experiencing homelessness are disproportionately affected by HIV. An estimated 3.3% of homeless population are living with HIV compared to 1.8% of stably-housed populations.³²

Current HIV/AIDS Housing Inventory

In San Francisco, HIV/AIDS housing resources are limited by the available funding. Each year, a portion of these resources become available to new households due to attrition or death. Because the cost of housing is rising, not all housing resources that turn over will become available to new households. This plan estimates that there are 28 units or subsidies that will become available each year to new HIV/AIDS households, assuming constant funding for HIV/AIDS housing resources.

PLWHA may qualify for and receive any type of housing assistance resource in San Francisco, but there are dedicated permanent units and subsidies for PLWHA. The funding for permanent housing units dedicated for PLWHA primarily comes from the HOPWA Program. Housing assistance subsidy programs for PLWHA may either be funded through HOPWA, Section 8, or the City's General Fund. The City currently provides dedicated housing resources for up to 1,198 households affected by HIV/AIDS, described in the sections below.

³⁰ Pilarinos, A., Kennedy, M. C., McNeil, R., Dong, H., Kerr, T., & DeBeck, K. (2017).

<https://harmreductionjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12954-017-0150-5>

³¹ Sevelius, J. M., Patouhas, E., Keatley, J. G., & Johnson, M. O. (2014). Barriers and facilitators to engagement and retention in care among transgender women living with human immunodeficiency virus. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine: A Publication of the Society of Behavioral Medicine*, 47(1), 5–16. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12160-013-9565-8>

³² Thakrar, K., Morgan, J. R., Gaeta, J. M., Hohl, C., & Drainoni, M. L. (2016). Homelessness, HIV, and Incomplete Viral Suppression. *J Health Care Poor Underserved*, 27(1), 145–156. <https://doi.org/10.1353/hpu.2016.0020>

Subsidy Programs

Housing subsidy programs assist individuals in meeting the full cost of rent. Subsidies may be either *tenant-based* (the subsidy follows the individual to a unit of their choosing, mostly in the private market) or *project-based* (the subsidy is for the unit itself, mostly in the non-profit housing market). Additionally, subsidies may be either *full or standard* (derived from the difference between the tenant's monthly income and the monthly rent), or *shallow or partial* (fixed, moderate monthly amounts). MOHCD administers HIV/AIDS subsidies directly to residents, and also funds local AIDS service organizations—the San Francisco AIDS Foundation (SFAF) and Catholic Charities (CC)—to administer them. In addition to the 624 existing subsidies in 2019, at the time of writing in December 2019, the Q Foundation was approved to administer 130 new subsidies beginning in 2020. Those additional subsidies are counted in the total below, although details on the type and amounts were not yet available. The City currently provides 754 rental subsidies to PLWHA, which is 24% fewer than the 998 available five years ago.

Table 39 – Subsidies

Subsidy Type	Agency	Quantity
Full or standard	MOHCD (<i>full</i>)	186
	SFAF (<i>standard</i>)	244
SUBTOTAL		330
Shallow or partial	SFAF (partial)	15
	SFAF (shallow)	90
	CC (shallow)	89
SUBTOTAL		194
New Q Foundation subsidies		130
TOTAL SUBSIDIES		754

Funding for all HIV/AIDS subsidies remained relatively flat over the previous five years, but the cost for rental housing in San Francisco consistently rose; and, as subsidies “turned over” through attrition, new subsidy amounts needed to increase. As a result, the total number of subsidies available steadily declined during this period.

To demonstrate how rising costs affect the number of subsidies available, the following charts illustrate that costs for SFAF subsidies increased each year between FY 14/15 and FY 19/20, and, as a result, the number of subsidies available for new households decreased.³³ These trends indicate that planning for future housing assistance for PLWHA in San Francisco should account for continued attrition as housing costs continue to rise.

³³ Data were collected in October of 2019, so estimates for FY 19/20 are incomplete.

Figure 20 – SFAF Subsidy Costs by Type, FY 14/15 to FY 19/20





Figure 21 – SFAF Subsidies by Type, FY 14/15 to FY 19/20



Permanent Capital Units

Targeted, permanent units are available to PLWHA in San Francisco through independent living associations, behavioral health and substance abuse treatment, permanent supportive family housing units (PSH), transitional housing (TH), and Residential Care Facilities for the Chronically Ill (RCFCIs). Most permanent units for PLWHA in San Francisco are managed by non-profit providers in mixed-population sites or developments that braid HOPWA funds with other sources. Typically, HOPWA funding provides for both the capital construction costs as well as the dedication costs to a set aside a units for qualifying PLWHA. There are 444 permanent units dedicated for PLWHA in San Francisco, indicating a 96% retention or replacement rate of the 464 units that were available five years ago.

- *ILAs* are privately-owned homes or complexes that provide housing for adults with disabling health conditions, serving residents that do not need medication oversight, are able to function without supervision, and live independently.
- *BSLP treatment* units are 11 units at 1761 Page St. managed by Baker Places/PRC. These units offer tenants a co-op style living community with behavioral health and mental health treatment support services.
- *PSH* units are long-term housing provided to PLWHA-affected families or households. These units are managed by non-profit providers and include onsite services such as case management, referrals to external services, and support groups. PSH programs may be open to any age, dedicated for transition-age youth (TAY), or dedicated for older adults.
- *TH* services support individuals as they move from homelessness to permanent housing. Residents of TH facilities receive case management and referral services for short or moderate stays, typically lasting 6–12 months.

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.

Table 40 – Dedicated Permanent HIV/AIDS Units, 2019

Unit Type	Quantity
Independent living associations	304
Behavioral health and substance abuse treatment	11
Permanent supportive housing	5
Transitional housing	11
RCFCI	113
TOTAL	444

Turnover Rate for HIV/AIDS Housing Resources

MOHCD manages and tracks data on 630 of these 1,198 units and subsidies; those data reflect that 46 new HIV/AIDS housing placements occurred between August 2016 and August 2019. This suggests an annual turnover of 2.4% annually. Extrapolating this rate to the 1,198 HIV/AIDS units and subsidies in the full inventory, this plan assumes that 29 existing units or subsidies will be vacated each year.

However, not all units or subsidies that are vacated will turn over to new households. The inventory of units and subsidies declined from 1,462 to 1,198 (18%) over the last five years, or 3.6% annually. Funding for HIV/AIDS housing has remained relatively flat during this period, but the cost of housing increased dramatically, which decreases the total slots that can be turned over to new households. As a result, this plan assumes 3.6% annual attrition, resulting in an estimated 28 new households that can receive a dedicated unit or subsidy each year.

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 440 non-profit housing units 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.

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. HSH 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

San Francisco living HIV cases were more likely to be men and white, and men who have sex with men (MSM), including MSM who also inject drugs (MSM-PWID), compared to PLWHA in California and the United States. Newly diagnosed people with HIV in San Francisco were more likely to be men, Latino or Asian/Pacific Islander compared to persons newly diagnosed with HIV nationally. Newly diagnosed people with HIV in San Francisco were more likely to be PWID (MSM and non-MSM) compared to persons newly diagnosed with HIV in California and the United States. Newly diagnosed persons in San Francisco in 2018 had a greater proportion of African Americans, Latino/a, and non-MSM PWID compared to all San Franciscans living with HIV.

The number of San Francisco residents at time of diagnosis with HIV stage 3 (AIDS) reached a peak in 1992 and has declined in all subsequent years. Beginning in 1995, the number of deaths among people ever classified as stage 3 has decreased dramatically due to antiretroviral therapies (ART). After 1999 the number of new stage 3 diagnoses and the number of deaths continued to decline but at a slower rate than from 1995 to 1998. There were 9,167 San Francisco residents at time of diagnosis living with HIV ever classified as stage 3 by the end of 2018.

The number of new HIV diagnoses declined from 534 in 2006 to 197 in 2018. The number of deaths each year fluctuated but remained relatively stable from 2008 to 2017. The number of PLWHA increased each year until deaths in PLWHA began to exceed new diagnoses in 2016. The provisional number of PLWHA at the end of 2018 is 15,990; this will be revised when death reporting for 2018 is complete.

The majority of persons newly diagnosed with HIV between 2009 and 2018 were men and MSM. From 2012 to 2018, there have been increases in proportions of African Americans and Latino/as and declines in proportions of whites. From 2017 to 2018, the racial/ethnic group accounting for the largest proportion of annual diagnosed persons shifted from white to Latino/a. Over time, most new diagnoses are among people aged 30–39 years. While the numbers are small, the proportion of women diagnosed trended upward in 2015 through 2018, compared to 2012 to 2014. No children (<13 years) were diagnosed with HIV during 2009 to 2018.

Gender, racial/ethnic and risk distributions of PLWHA remained mostly stable between 2014 and 2018; cases were predominately men, white, and MSM (including MSM-PWID). Persons living with HIV aged 40–49 years declined from 27% in 2014 to 20% in 2018. Persons living with HIV continued to shift into older age groups with the largest proportion among persons aged 50–59 years (36%) and a steady increase observed among persons aged 60–69 years (17% to 23% from 2014 to 2018).

As of December 31, 2018, 15,990 San Francisco residents at diagnosis were alive and 9,673 (60%) of these residents were still living in the city based on their most recent available address. The total number of PLWHA with a current address of San Francisco is 12,749.³⁴

White MSM (non-PWID) comprised half of men living with HIV in San Francisco. Among African American men, there was a higher proportion of PWID and MSM-PWID. White and African American men had similar age distributions at the end of 2018, while Latino/a, Asian/ Pacific Islander, Native American, and multi-racial men were younger than whites and African Americans. Injection drug use was the predominant transmission category for white, African American, and multi-racial women while heterosexual sex was the predominant transmission category for Latina and Asian/Pacific Islander and Native American women combined. Latino/as and African Americans each accounted for 36% and 31%, respectively, of trans women living with HIV.³⁵

Discussion

When discussing the most pressing needs for persons living with HIV/AIDS, two issues that often arise 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-determined 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 receive a HOPWA-funded rental subsidy, or who occupy a HOPWA-supported supportive housing unit or an RCFCI, are unlikely to leave that unit for many years. With shrinking HOPWA funds the number of new HOPWA beds will be small. This leaves newly-diagnosed people living with HIV/AIDS who have housing needs without access to these existing HOPWA resources.

HOPWA Assistance Baseline Table

Table 41 – HOPWA Assistance Baseline

Type of HOWA Assistance	Number of Units Designated or Available for People with HIV/AIDS and their families
Tenant based rental assistance	187
Permanent Housing in facilities	175
Short-term Rent, Mortgage, and Utility	117
Short term or Transitional facilities	43
Permanent Housing placement	28

Data Source: HOPWA CAPER and HOPWA Beneficiary Verification Worksheet

³⁴ HIV Epidemiology Report December 2018

³⁵ HIV Epidemiology Report December 2018

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

Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Facilities

Conversations with San Francisco residents and stakeholders reflected the following needs for public and community facilities:

Free and/or Low-cost Exercise and Recreational Facilities

San Franciscans articulated the need to expand publicly-accessible exercise and recreational facilities and improve access to existing affordable options, such as community gyms, public pools, and recreation centers. Community members suggested that the City could expand free or discounted access days. Survey respondents reported they want more indoor recreational space in their neighborhoods.

- *Families and Youth.* Notably, residents and stakeholders across the City reflected the need for more affordable family-friendly options for recreational and exercise facilities.

Community Centers and Gathering Spaces

Throughout data collection, San Franciscans identified a priority need for dedicated community spaces where residents can gather, organize, host forums and meetings, and participate in cultural events. As an example, community members voiced that there were not enough public community spaces to host events such as the City-sponsored community outreach meetings facilitated for this Consolidated Plan. City stakeholders expressed the need for MOHCD to continue supporting, building, and expanding neighborhood centers, family friendly spaces, population-specific or constituency-focused community centers, and other multi-service community centers.

- *Seniors and Persons with Disabilities.* Additionally, stakeholders identified the need for the City to ensure these community spaces are accessible to seniors and persons with disabilities and to ensure that existing community spaces meet all health, access, and safety standards. Residents shared that these community centers and hubs can reduce isolation.

Facilities to Address the Ongoing Crisis for Persons Experiencing Homelessness

Expanded facilities for persons experiencing homelessness, such as more shelter beds, more transitional/interim housing facilities, and more hygiene facilities (showers and laundry), arose as a particularly important need among residents and stakeholders. Community members reflected the need to expand and enhance these types of facilities for persons experiencing homelessness because, while the City continues to address this ongoing crisis, existing options are insufficient for the need, frequently overcrowded, frequently perceived as unsafe, and not always accessible to persons with disabilities. The need for safer shelters was mentioned in eight of the 10 forums and in most focus groups. In addition to safety, participants named shelter overcrowding as a top concern.

- *LGBTQ+.* Conversations with the LGBTQ+ community highlighted the need for safe and accessible facilities that are inclusive and welcoming to LGBTQ+ residents who are experiencing homelessness. In particular, these residents noted the need to ensure shelters and transitional facilities are safe for individuals who are transgender.

How were these needs determined?

Community input is a critical part of the strategic planning process, providing crucial data to ensure funded programs and services address the highest priority needs of vulnerable populations as well as the City holistically. During this planning process, public input was obtained through public neighborhood forums, population-specific focus groups, web surveys, and a review of prior City plans and documents.

As described in the Citizen Participation section, MOHCD engaged in a year-long, community-wide outreach and engagement process with stakeholders and residents of San Francisco. During this process, MOHCD facilitated 10 neighborhood-based public forums and 40 population-specific focus groups, specifically targeting the City's most vulnerable populations. Representatives from across the housing spectrum participated in the forums and focus groups, including individuals experiencing homelessness, residents of public and subsidized housing, housing and social service providers, HIV/AIDS housing advocates, homeowners, new San Francisco residents, recent immigrants, and life-long residents of the City. MOHCD facilitated the 40 focus groups with culturally-specific populations.

MOHCD also developed and deployed a community needs survey that generated thousands of responses from community members and stakeholders across the City. This survey asked residents about their needs for housing, public facilities, public improvements, and public services. Findings from the community meetings and surveys were triangulated with the qualitative data collected through community engagement and directly inform the needs described in this section.

MOHCD's community outreach process engaged a total of 3,614 participants across community forums, focus groups, and surveys.

These outreach and engagement efforts are embedded within a network of ongoing planning processes led by partner agencies seeking to identify and respond to community needs. Over 50 documents from partner City agencies, cross-sector partnerships and initiatives and advocacy groups were reviewed in order to understand previous and current needs of San Francisco populations. This analysis was supplemented by one-on-one interviews with the senior management of all key City service delivery departments, including HSH, DPH, DCYF, the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD), the Office of Transgender Initiatives, and the Department on the Status of Women (DOSW).

Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Improvements

Conversations with San Francisco residents and stakeholders reflected the following needs for public improvements:

Clean, Sanitary, and Safe Public Spaces

San Franciscans frequently cited concerns over the cleanliness of public spaces, noting that these issues disproportionately affect lower-income neighborhoods and areas of the City with higher concentrations of vulnerable populations, public drug use or drinking, and persons experiencing homelessness. Stakeholders described public health hazards on the streets, including litter, human waste, broken glass, and hypodermic needles. Residents noted the need for improved City responses to these health and safety concerns. In fact, overall cleanliness and safety of their neighborhoods was one of the most

frequent topics shared across all data collection. Survey respondents frequently reported the need for better sidewalks and safer crosswalks.

In the DPH's Community Health Needs Assessment, residents voiced a desire for a cleaner and safer city—some did not feel safe to exercise in their neighborhood—and suggested more green spaces, community gardens, public parks, and clean public restrooms.³⁶ Participants in data collection for the Consolidated Plan cited needs for more community-based neighborhood clean-up efforts, better street lighting, and better outdoor lighting in general.

Residents identified several potential strategies to improve the health and safety of public spaces, including installation of additional trash receptacles, increased monitoring and clean-up of human waste, and increased monitoring and clean-up of needles and broken glass. As noted above in the section on public facility needs, residents noted that improved access to hygiene, showers, and laundry facilities for persons experiencing homelessness would improve overall cleanliness and safety of public spaces.

- *Families and Youth.* During community conversations on the OCOF Initiative, families particularly expressed the importance of maintaining a clean, safe environment in their neighborhoods. Families stressed the critical need for safer green spaces and neighborhoods free of drugs, crime, and violence, so that youth and families can thrive.
- *Black/African Americans.* Members of this community reflected the need for further clean-up efforts in their neighborhoods and renovated parks and public spaces.

Greener Public Spaces

San Franciscans shared appreciation for the City's parks and open spaces and affirming the City's priority around the improvement, greening, and beautification of public spaces and open spaces. However, residents and community members also identified that many public spaces still need improvement and updating to become more green and child friendly, particularly within lower-income neighborhoods and privately-owned, publicly-operated spaces (POPOs). Survey respondents indicated that they would like to see more parks and open spaces and street beautification projects.

Safe, Reliable, and Accessible Public Transportation

San Francisco residents shared that they experience challenges with public transportation, including long wait times, safety, and cost of transportation, which impede their access to jobs, medical appointments, and other public services. When asked to discuss transit accessibility, stakeholders commonly mentioned extended and inconsistent wait times, particularly given many people's need to transfer and take multiple bus or MUNI lines, which impacts participants' access to their destinations. Many participants also noted the prohibitive cost of public transportation. Stakeholders need reliable transportation with lines that connect easily, including the potential of express services/shuttles downtown and to BART. Participants also raised the possibility of the City contracting with rideshare providers to facilitate access for populations with special needs.

In the OCOF Five-Year Plan, Year One Report (2016), residents expressed concerns that transportation access is not equitable across the city, and is less reliable and has fewer stops in certain neighborhoods

³⁶ Department of Public Health, Community Health Needs Assessment, pg 39

(e.g., Bayview, Nob Hill, Potrero Hill, Visitacion Valley, Excelsior, Missouri, Watchman Way, Turner Terrace). Along these lines, several participants noted that affordable housing developments may not be close to transit hubs. Families living on Treasure Island explained that the bus routes to pre-designated middle schools limit choices for their children. Likewise, they felt without transportation it is difficult for their children to participate in school events, afterschool programs and extracurricular activities, such as sport teams.

- *Seniors and Persons with Disabilities.* Many participants emphasized transportation accessibility challenges for seniors and persons with disabilities, including bus stops that require walking up steep hills, challenges with Paratransit, unreliable or non-functioning station elevators and escalators, and inconsistent availability of seats for older adults and people with disabilities. The DAAS DFCNA also highlighted residents' concerns with existing assisted transportation services, including a lack of reliability, long wait times and no-shows from Paratransit, inflexible routes, and expensive fares, even for individuals receiving subsidized rides. Also, some seniors shared a need for assisted transportation services that support them in getting from their residence or pick-up location to the transportation vehicle.³⁷
- *Families and Youth.* Many OCOF participants on the southeast side of the city expressed concerns about the quality, reliability, and safety of public transportation. This plan described that parents from this quadrant would allow their children to attend afterschool programs if they could count on safe, reliable transportation home.
- *Black/African Americans.* Members of this community noted that they need to rely on safer public transit options to take them to and from work, school, and other activities.
- *Residents of Public Housing.* Public Housing residents noted the need for more robust, reliable, and safe public transportation options.

How were these needs determined?

Community input is a critical part of the strategic planning process, providing crucial data to ensure funded programs and services address the highest priority needs of vulnerable populations as well as the City holistically. During this planning process, public input was obtained through public neighborhood forums, population-specific focus groups, web surveys, and a review of prior City plans and documents.

As described in the Citizen Participation section, MOHCD engaged in a year-long, community-wide outreach and engagement process with stakeholders and residents of San Francisco. During this process, MOHCD facilitated 10 neighborhood-based public forums and 40 population-specific focus groups, specifically targeting the City's most vulnerable populations. Representatives from across the housing spectrum participated in the forums and focus groups, including individuals experiencing homelessness, residents of public and subsidized housing, housing and social service providers, HIV/AIDS housing advocates, homeowners, new San Francisco residents, recent immigrants, and life-long residents of the City. MOHCD facilitated the 40 focus groups with culturally-specific populations.

MOHCD also developed and deployed a community needs survey that generated thousands of responses from community members and stakeholders across the City. This survey asked residents

³⁷ Department of Aging and Adult Services, 2018 Dignity Fund Community Needs Assessment

about their needs for housing, public facilities, public improvements, and public services. Findings from the community meetings and surveys were triangulated with the qualitative data collected through community engagement and directly inform the needs described in this section.

MOHCD's community outreach process engaged a total of 3,614 participants across community forums, focus groups, and surveys.

These outreach and engagement efforts are embedded within a network of ongoing planning processes led by partner agencies seeking to identify and respond to community needs. Over 50 documents from partner City agencies, cross-sector partnerships and initiatives, and advocacy groups were reviewed in order to understand previous and current needs of San Francisco populations. This analysis was supplemented by one-on-one interviews with the senior management of all key City service delivery departments, including the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Services, the DPH, and the DCYF, SFUSD, the Office of Transgender Initiatives, and DOSW.

Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Services

Conversations with San Francisco residents and stakeholders reflected the following needs for public services, categorized into housing services, social and supportive service programs, and education and economic self-sufficiency services.

Housing Services

The following highlights the top needs for housing services that participants named across all community engagement and surveys. The sections that follow describe findings synthesized from the ways community members described and contextualized these needs.

The following are the most frequently mentioned housing service needs:

- Housing navigation and application assistance
- More housing protections
- Eviction prevention support
- Tenant education
- Landlord negotiation assistance
- Relocation assistance

Housing Navigation and Other Services for Persons Experiencing Homelessness

San Franciscans identified a need for a wide range of services that support persons experiencing homelessness, including additional housing navigation services to connect individuals with housing opportunities; case management to identify service needs, connect individuals to needed services, and support them in overcoming barriers to self-sufficiency; counseling services to support residents in applying for and enrolling in public benefits; and financial assistance for staying housed, such as rental subsidies. Across neighborhoods and demographic groups, residents described these services and supports as critical and in high demand to ensure individuals experiencing or at-risk of imminent homelessness receive the support they need to obtain or remain stably housed. Participants in data collection for this planning process repeatedly described the challenges navigating the City's housing and homeless services. Although the need for housing navigation services arose in nearly all

conversations with community members, this need was elevated particularly for Black/African Americans, Cambodians, and Vietnamese groups.

Tenants' Rights Education and Eviction Prevention Services

In light of entrenched challenges with housing affordability, the lack of affordable housing options, and growing income inequality across the entire Bay Area, San Franciscans shared an ongoing need for tenant education and eviction prevention services to ensure renters are able to understand their rights, access legal services to prevent unlawful evictions, and ultimately remain housed in San Francisco.

San Francisco residents emphasized the need to enhance the enforcement of eviction prevention policies that protect tenants from illegal evictions and displacement. Across all populations that participated in focus groups for the Consolidated Plan, and in nearly all public forums, residents expressed persistent fears of eviction and landlord harassment, noting concerns that the processes to enforce existing policies do not sufficiently prevent fair housing violations before they occur and do not sufficiently protect low- and middle-income renters from displacement. For example, community members shared that they frequently avoid requesting improvements to their units—including those to which they are legally entitled—because they are afraid of being perceived as a “bad tenant,” and, as a result, afraid that landlords will either directly (harassment, threats of eviction) or indirectly (being targeted for a no-fault eviction) retaliate against them.

Conversations with community members revealed that many San Francisco tenants need more outreach to understand when and where to access information about their rights, need preventative services before any fair housing violations occur, and also need free or low-cost legal services when facing landlord conflicts.

- *Seniors.* Seniors and older adults who participated in data collection for the DAAS DFCNA discussed frustration, confusion, and need for more education around their legal rights related to evictions and mistreatment from property managers.³⁸

Landlord Education & Section 8 Recruitment Services

San Francisco residents frequently reflected that existing policies and strategies to protect tenants do not sufficiently protect vulnerable communities from fair housing violations, illegal evictions, and displacement. Stakeholders suggested that the City review and enhance tenant protections and enforcement strategies, but also provide greater outreach and education services to landlords in order to prevent predatory practices from happening in the first place.

- *Public Housing Residents (Including Residents Eligible for Public Housing or Approved for a Section 8 Voucher).* Residents understand that HUD-approved Fair Market Rents for Section 8 programs are misaligned with the realities of the rental housing market in San Francisco, making it difficult to recruit and retain landlords who are willing to participate. Still, residents prioritized a City-wide need to increase the number of landlords willing to participate in HCV programs. They suggested strategies to increase landlord recruitment and retention, including conducting targeted landlord outreach, education, and technical support; providing liaison services for tenants and landlords (e.g., a voucher manager to help resolve disputes or complaints); allocating funds to support needed improvements and repairs that ensure habitability

³⁸ Department of Aging and Adult Services, 2018 Dignity Fund Community Needs Assessment

standards; providing additional incentives or tax credits for landlords; guaranteeing rent payments during periods of vacancy; providing up-front advance rent payments; and expanding rules for Section 8 vouchers to include alternative housing options such as co-operative or other shared living arrangements.

Social and Supportive Service Programs

The following highlights the top social and supportive service needs that participants named across all community engagement events and surveys. The following sections synthesize the ways community members described and contextualized these needs. Discussions among residents frequently centered on needs for job training, behavioral health supports, language access and cultural literacy among services, financial planning and education, and access to affordable community services such as childcare.

The following are the most frequently mentioned social service needs:

- Benefits assistance (CalWorks, SNAP, Medi-Cal, etc.)
- Better access to healthcare
- Access to healthy food
- Mental health and substance use support
- Language support
- Knowledge of available services
- Support for seniors and people with disabilities
- Affordable childcare
- Case management

Benefits Assistance, Service Navigation, and Case Management

Participants across community engagement events and survey respondents frequently described needs for assistance navigating and applying for public benefits (e.g. CalFresh, SSDI, etc.), social service navigation, case management, and coordinated and streamlined service delivery. Stakeholders asked for more streamlined services, improved inter-agency collaboration, and stronger cross-agency communication to support the delivery of both housing and supportive services across San Francisco. Moreover, data collection activities emphasized knowledge gaps between populations as far as service availability and eligibility.

Along these lines, the Homeownership SF assessment, which included focus groups with older adults, adults with disabilities, LGBTQ+ households, persons living with HIV, and Asian/Pacific Islander communities, found that housing instability has impacted their health and/or ability to find stable employment. Participants frequently shared that the act of navigating complicated bureaucracies left them feeling hopeless, and restricted their ability to engage in activities or programming to achieve a greater level of self-sufficiency.³⁹

In the DAAS DFCNA, residents expressed frustration about navigating what they perceive as a large, decentralized, and often complicated service system. They discussed the time it takes to navigate the system and to determine what services are available, where they are located, and whether they meet

³⁹ Homeownership SF report: Results from 2017-2018 Focus Groups. Assessment of Housing Needs and Barriers experienced by Black, Latino/a and Pacific Islander Communities, LGBT households, Seniors, and Persons with Disabilities

eligibility requirements. As an example of the complications associated with navigating the system, many consumers from different groups cited an extensive amount of paperwork, which is often redundant across different services or programs.

In particular, needs for culturally, linguistically, and technologically accessible social service navigation support emerged for the following resident groups:

- *Residents of Public Housing.* More than other groups, residents of public housing (e.g. RAD, HOPE SF) expressed a need for increased awareness of available social services.
- *Cambodians, Latino/a, and Asian/Pacific Islander Communities (especially Samoans).* Focus groups with these populations emphasize needs for greater awareness of housing and social services.
- *Seniors and Persons with Disabilities.* A need for supportive services for seniors and people with disabilities was mentioned in seven of the 10 community forums and nearly all focus groups, especially case management. This also arose in the DAAS DFCNA.
- *LGBTQ+.* Participants in focus groups with the LGBTQ+ community discussed a need for cultural competence among service providers and a desire for LGBTQ+ specific case management and support services.
- *Persons Living with HIV.* Over half (50.3%) of HIV+ survey respondents listed benefits navigation as their most needed service. Conversations with members of this community focused on the value of appointment reminders, medication adherence support, and onsite supportive services that vary with degrees of support needed (e.g., appointment escort, drop-in counseling, and transportation to appointments).
- *Persons Experiencing Homelessness.* Nearly two-thirds (64.3%) of homeless survey respondents listed benefits navigation and application support (SSDI, Section 8, etc.) as the non-housing service they need most. These residents expressed the need for case management twice as frequently as other groups.
- *TAY.* Nearly half (47.6%) of TAY survey respondents list benefits support (SSDI, Section 8, etc.) as the non-housing service that they most need.

Behavioral Health Services

Residents frequently discussed the need to expand behavioral health services including both mental health and substance use services. Although participants in some forums and focus groups mentioned specific needs such as methadone clinics, or particular clinical approaches like trauma-informed care, for the most part participants described a need to increase behavioral health services in general, noting the public visibility of mental health and/or substance use crises. Culturally-specific and population-specific needs arose for the following groups:

- *Persons Experiencing Homelessness.* Participants specifically called for accessible and culturally competent mental health services to address the trauma of homelessness. The DCYF Community Needs Assessment also pointed to a need for social-emotional support for youth and families who lack basic housing and/or are facing homelessness.⁴⁰
- *Public Housing Residents.* Residents of public housing mentioned the need for additional behavioral health services twice as frequently as other groups that participated in data collection for this Consolidated Plan.

⁴⁰ DCYF Community Needs Assessment

- *LGBTQ+*. Participants described the need for mental health and substance abuse services that are inclusive for the specific needs of LGBTQ+ residents. Nearly a third (27%) of LGBTQ+ survey respondents reported mental health and/or substance use help as their top need.
- *Persons Living with HIV*. Participants described the need for behavioral health services that are culturally relevant for and tailored to the specific needs of residents living with HIV.
- *Black/African Americans, American Indian/Alaska Natives, and Multi-racial Residents*. These specific populations listed mental health and/or substance use help as a top need in their survey responses.
- *Persons with Disabilities*. Nearly a third (28.9%) of survey respondents identifying as having a disability indicated that one of the most important services to them (or their family) is access to mental health and/or substance use help.

Affordable Childcare and After-School Services

Affordable childcare facilities, programs, and services remain a top priority for City residents. This includes afterschool programs and on-site childcare and aftercare, with an emphasis on accessible programs for lower-income families who need childcare in order to access critical public services such as those listed in this section, e.g. benefits enrollment, job training, etc.

Improved Cultural Inclusivity and Accessibility for Public Services

San Franciscans consistently articulated the need to expand and improve access to existing public services for various culturally-specific resident populations, as well as ensure these services are accessible for community members who are monolingual speakers of threshold languages other than English. Among those discussed during data collection, stakeholders identified the need to translate materials for housing services, health services, emergency services, and services that help residents enroll in public benefits and entitlements. The most common response to questions about language translation needs was that all housing and social service materials need to account for the linguistic diversity of residents and be culturally inclusive. The need for language support more generally was an overarching theme across the community meetings. Residents expressed an interest in innovative strategies for integrating language services, such as maximizing “the effectiveness of reaching non-English speakers by collaborating with housing advocacy and community groups that already conduct trainings and disseminate fair housing information to specific populations.”⁴¹

In terms of cultural inclusivity, participants noted that diverse program staff are important to successfully delivering services, stating that trust is more easily built when service providers share a marginalized identity with program participants. Additionally, the Homeownership SF report found that residents with limited access to technology need additional methods of accessing information about public services and programs.

- *Seniors and Persons with Disabilities*. Across many public forums and focus groups, residents raised the need for information about public services to be written in plain language, and for events to include simultaneous translation into American Sign Language. The Homeownership SF

⁴¹ Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), 2013-2018 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice

report found that residents with limited technological skills or internet access emphasized a need for centralized information about housing programs and public services.⁴²

- *Vietnamese and Cambodians.* In particular, residents reflected a greater need for language support among Vietnamese and Cambodian populations for navigating and applying for public services and resources, including translation of written materials as well as real time translation services.
- *Families with Mixed Immigration Statuses.* Residents identified the need to ensure services, e.g. family unification, are both inclusive and feel safe for families affected by federal immigration policies, that are awaiting immigration decisions, or that include undocumented relatives.

Education and Economic Self-sufficiency Services

The following highlights the top economic self-sufficiency needs that participants named across all community engagement events and surveys. The following sections synthesize the ways community members described and contextualized these needs.

The following are the top education and economic self-sufficiency service needs:

- Job training
- Financial planning and education
- Learning new job skills
- Access to ESL classes
- GED and high school diploma programs
- Financing and credit services
- Tech access/tech education
- Permanent job/career opportunities
- Employment coaching
- “Working class” jobs
- Jobs for seniors and persons with disabilities

Workforce Readiness, Job Training, and Placement Services

Residents and stakeholders frequently expressed the need to develop workforce readiness, increase job training opportunities, and expand pathways to sustainable employment through placement services. Community members expressed an overwhelming need for paid job training programs that provide pathways to living-wage, sustainable employment. Across forums and focus groups, participants emphasized that while there are current job training opportunities, these opportunities may not be paid and/or may not link to long-term employment. Community members shared specific suggestions for the types of job training programs and workforce readiness services that would most benefit them, including paid apprenticeship programs; community “Jobs Markets” based on the Farmers Market model; City-sponsored ESL, vocational, and technology education programs; subsidies for the “start-up costs” associated with obtaining employment; community benefit agreements with tech companies; and a practice test for City jobs to allow those with additional barriers to learn more about what to expect from the real exam.

⁴² Homeownership SF report: Results from 2017-2018 Focus Groups. Assessment of Housing Needs and Barriers experienced by Black, Latino/a and Pacific Islander Communities, LGBT households, Seniors, and Persons with Disabilities

Residents said that San Francisco employers can do better at hiring locally, and there was general consensus that policies needed to better incentivize local hiring for permanent, living-wage jobs that lead to careers for residents in need of work. Community members expressed frustration that employers who use City and community resources too often hire employees from outside the region. For example, community members indicated that incentivizing high-paying employers to move to San Francisco does not benefit the residents who most need living-wage jobs, although they may hire locally for high-wage positions in specific industries.

In addition, residents noted the employment service needs for several specific populations, including:

- *Youth and TAY.* Residents expressed a need for more services focused on youth, such as City-sponsored all-ages internship programs, leadership development programs, summer and after-school job programs, as well as City-sponsored work permits for youth who are undocumented. Over 40% of TAY survey respondents list employment as a top need.
- *Recent Immigrants.* Populations of recent immigrants noted the need for culturally literate job retraining programs.
- *Persons Living with HIV.* Residents and advocates for this community noted that obtaining employment is a frequent challenge, and described a need for additional job training and placement support services.
- *Persons Experiencing Homelessness.* After case management, homeless survey respondents listed employment support and training as their top service need.
- *Asian and Middle Eastern/North African.* Survey respondents from these groups listed proximity to employment as one of their top needs.
- *Seniors and Persons with Disabilities.* In the DAAS DFCNA, older adults and persons with disabilities reflected the need for employment opportunities, noting that employers often overlook them as potential candidates.

Financial Education, Empowerment, and Planning Services

San Franciscans also articulated a need for financial literacy programs that promote economic mobility for City residents. Across forums and focus groups, participants raised two distinct needs related to financial empowerment: 1) financial planning and education services; and 2) banking and credit services. The need for financial planning services arose frequently during discussions of barriers to homeownership. In addition to significant income barriers, participants felt they lacked the financial planning tools and financial literacy to even start considering the process of homeownership. Residents and advocates both articulated the need for available checking, savings, and credit services to this population in order for them to achieve greater self-sufficiency. Overall, community members stressed the important role that financial empowerment services and programs play in promoting sustainable economic mobility for City residents and called out this need as a resource barrier for already vulnerable populations.

- *Recent Immigrants.* In particular, participants raised a need for culturally-competent financial literacy programs for recently-arrived immigrants, including those that regularly send money to relatives in their countries of origin.
- *Residents of Public Housing.* Banking and credit counseling services emerged as a priority need among residents of public housing.
- *Persons Experiencing Homelessness.* Banking and credit counseling services also emerged as a priority among those experiencing homelessness.
- *Youth and TAY.* In the community input sessions, six groups discussed the needs of 14- to 24-year-olds and prioritized the need for youth to develop life skills and independence, with a

particular emphasis on financial literacy (e.g., banking, building credit, taxes, and savings). In the DCYF Community Needs Assessment, service provider grantees emphasized the need for developing financial literacy, including debt and debt management, information about student loans, credit building, access to banking, and avoiding check cashers and predatory lenders.⁴³

- *Black/African American and Latino/a.* Survey respondents from these communities listed financial literacy and budgeting as a top need.

Education Services

San Franciscans noted several educational service needs, including access to GED programs, English language learning programs, and access to affordable higher education more broadly. In particular, the following communities named a specific need for educational services:

- *American Indian, Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian, and other Pacific Islander.* Survey respondents from these populations survey respondents listed access to GED or high school diploma programs as a top need.
- *Chinese and Vietnamese.* Survey respondents from these populations listed access to ESL classes as a top need.

How were these needs determined?

Community input is a critical part of the strategic planning process, providing crucial data to ensure funded programs and services address the highest priority needs of vulnerable populations as well as the City holistically. During this planning process, public input was obtained through public neighborhood forums, population-specific focus groups, web surveys, and a review of prior City plans and documents.

As described in the Citizen Participation section, MOHCD engaged in a year-long, community-wide outreach and engagement process with stakeholders and residents of San Francisco. During this process, MOHCD facilitated 10 neighborhood-based public forums and 40 population-specific focus groups, specifically targeting the City's most vulnerable populations. Representatives from across the housing spectrum participated in the forums and focus groups, including individuals experiencing homelessness, residents of public and subsidized housing, housing and social service providers, HIV/AIDS housing advocates, homeowners, new San Francisco residents, recent immigrants, and life-long residents of the City. MOHCD facilitated the 40 focus groups with culturally-specific populations.

MOHCD also developed and deployed a community needs survey that generated thousands of responses from community members and stakeholders across the City. This survey asked residents about their needs for housing, public facilities, public improvements, and public services. Findings from the community meetings and surveys were triangulated with the qualitative data collected through community engagement and directly inform the needs described in this section.

MOHCD's community outreach process engaged a total of 3,614 participants across community forums, focus groups, and surveys.

⁴³ Department of Children Youth and Families, 2016 DCYF Community Needs Assessment

These outreach and engagement efforts are embedded within a network of ongoing planning processes led by partner agencies seeking to identify and respond to community needs. Over 50 documents from partner City agencies, cross-sector partnerships and initiatives, and advocacy groups were reviewed in order to understand previous and current needs of San Francisco populations. This analysis was supplemented by one-on-one interviews with the senior management of all key City service delivery departments, including the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Services, the DPH, and the DCYF, SFUSD, the Office of Transgender Initiatives, and the DOSW.

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 \$55,450 for a three-person household, should pay \$1,386 for a two-bedroom apartment, which is 30% of gross household income.⁴⁴ In 2018 the average San Francisco apartment rented for more than three times that value or \$4,650 per month.⁴⁵

The difference between an affordable rent and market-rate rent is commonly called the housing "affordability gap." The table below describes the affordability gap for various income levels in 2019. The table illustrates an affordability gap even exists for households paying rents at 120% AMI.

Table 42 – Rental Housing Affordability Gap in San Francisco, 2019

Number BRs	Market Rent, June 2019	Afford- able Rent 30% AMI	Gap	Afford- able Rent 50% AMI	Gap	Afford- able Rent 80% AMI	Gap	Afford- able Rent 100% AMI	Gap	Afford- able Rent 120% AMI	Gap
1BR	\$3,700	\$739	(\$2,961)	\$971	(\$2,329)	\$1,970	(\$1,730)	\$2,463	(\$1,237)	\$2,955	(\$745)
2BR	\$4,720	\$831	(\$3,889)	\$1,093	(\$3,307)	\$2,218	(\$2,502)	\$2,771	(\$1,949)	\$3,325	(\$1,395)

Source: Zumper National Rent Report, "June 2019 and 2019 Maximum Monthly Rent by Unit Type derived from the Unadjusted AMI," available online at the MOHCD website

⁴⁴ "2019 Maximum Income by Household Size, Unadjusted AMI for HUD Metro Fair Market Rent Area that contains San Francisco," and "2019 Maximum Monthly Rent by Unit Type derived from the Unadjusted AMI," both available online at the MOHCD website at: <https://sfmohcd.org/ami-levels> (May 3, 2019).

⁴⁵ SF Planning Department, 2018 Housing Inventory, 2019.

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 43 – Homeownership Affordability Gap in San Francisco by Income Level, 2019

Income Levels ⁴⁶	2019	
	Affordable Sales Price ^{47,48}	Affordability Gap ⁴⁹
130% AMI	\$605,000	(\$705,000)
105% AMI	\$463,000	(\$847,000)
80% AMI	\$320,000	(\$990,000)
Median Home Value^[5]	\$1,310,000	

Sources: Sample 2019 Purchase Price Limits for BMR Inclusionary Housing Program published by SF MOHCD on 5/3/2019, and Zillow

⁴⁶ Income categories are based on SF MOHCD's income table named "[2019 Maximum Income by Household Size derived from the Unadjusted Area Median Income \(AMI\) for HUD Metro Fair Market Rent \(HMFA\) that contains San Francisco.](#)" Households earning up to 100% of AMI are eligible to apply for low-income BMR Ownership Units with an affordable purchase price set at 80% of AMI or less. Households earning from 95% to 120% of AMI eligible to apply for moderate-income BMR Ownership Units with an affordable purchase price set at 105% of AMI or less. Households earning from 120% to 150% of AMI are eligible to apply for middle-income BMR Ownership Units with an affordable purchase price set at 130% of AMI or less.

⁴⁷ Affordable sales prices and median sales prices are rounded to nearest \$1,000.

⁴⁸ 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.

⁴⁹ Affordability gap equals affordable sales price minus median sales price for 2-bedroom unit.

^[5] Zillow, San Francisco Home Prices & Values at <https://www.zillow.com/san-francisco-ca/home-values>, May 2019.

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

Introduction

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 71% of all units containing two bedrooms or less. San Francisco, like most large cities, is a city of renters who live in 64% of occupied housing units in the City.

All residential properties by number of units

Table 44 – Residential Properties by Unit Number

Property Type	Number	%
1 unit detached structure	74,360	19%
1 unit, attached structure	47,855	12%
2–4 units	81,990	21%
5–19 units	78,315	20%
20 or more units	100,255	26%
Mobile Home, boat, RV, van, etc	900	0%
Total	383,675	100%

Data Source: 2011-2015 ACS

Unit Size by Tenure

Table 45 – Unit Size by Tenure

	Owners		Renters	
	Number	%	Number	%
No bedroom	1,715	1%	43,525	19%
1 bedroom	12,925	10%	82,860	37%
2 bedrooms	44,565	35%	64,315	29%
3 or more bedrooms	69,490	54%	33,890	15%
Total	128,695	100%	224,590	100%

Data Source: 2011-2015 ACS

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

There are approximately 25,000 existing affordable housing units that have received local financial assistance from MOHCD or from the former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency or are monitored by MOHCD for long-term affordability. 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, TAY, homeless adults to low-income families. In 2019, there were 1,911 public housing units and 12,165 HCV vouchers (both tenant and project based) under SFHA management. The average annual household income for SFHA clients is \$14,590. Without public housing and HCV vouchers, virtually all SFHA clients would be forced to live outside the City or even face homelessness.

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 2,042 affordable housing units whose existing Federal rental or operating subsidy contract is scheduled to expire between 2019 and 2024.

Table 46 – San Francisco Affordable Housing Units with Expiring Federal Rental or Operating Subsidy Between 2019 and 2024

Property Name	HUD Contract Overall Expiration Date	HUD Tracts Status (as of 8/30/19)	Assisted Units Count	HUD Program Type	Property Owner Type	Risk Level
Friendship Village One	5/31/19	Expired	68	S8 Loan Mgmt	Non-Profit	Expired
Ammel Park Coop	6/30/19	Expired	95	S8 Loan Mgmt	Non-Profit	Expired
Armstrong Place Senior Housing	8/31/19	Active	71	PRAC 202/811	Limited Dividend	Low
Presentation Senior Housing	9/30/19	Active	92	PRAC 202/811	Non-Profit	Low
La Playa	12/31/19	Active	13	PRAC 202/811	Non-Profit	Low
Octavia Court	12/31/19	Active	14	PRAC 202/811	Non-Profit	Low
Vera Haile Sr. Housing	12/31/19	Active	86	PRAC 202/811	Profit Motivated	Low
Arc Mercy Community	12/31/19	Active	15	PRAC 202/811	Profit Motivated	Low
San Lorenzo Ruiz Center	1/31/20	Active	145	Sec. 202	Non-Profit	Very High
Autumn Glow Alzheimer's Residential	1/31/20	Active	15	PRAC 202/811	Non-Profit	Low
St. Peter's Place	2/29/20	Active	19	PRAC 202/811	Non-Profit	Low
Eddy Street Apartments	3/31/20	Active	20	PRAC 202/811	Non-Profit	Low
John W. King Senior Community	3/31/20	Active	90	PRAC 202/811	Non-Profit	Low
Bill Sorro Community	3/31/20	Active	14	PRAC 202/811	Profit Motivated	Low
Crocker Amazon Senior Apartments	4/30/20	Active	36	PRAC 202/811	Non-Profit	Low

Alcantara Court	5/31/20	Active	49	PRAC 202/811	Non-Profit	Low
Bayview Senior Housing	5/31/20	Active	53	PRAC 202/811	Non-Profit	Low
Leland Apartments	6/30/20	Active	24	PRAC 202/811	Non-Profit	Low
Edith Witt Senior Community	6/30/20	Active	95	PRAC 202/811	Profit Motivated	Low
Notre Dame Plaza	7/31/20	Active	65	PRAC 202/811	Non-Profit	Low
Providence Senior Housing	7/31/20	Active	49	PRAC 202/811	Non-Profit	Low
Buena Vista Terrace	7/31/20	Active	39	PRAC 202/811	Non-Profit	Low
Willie B. Kennedy Apartments	7/31/20	Active	97	PRAC 202/811	Profit Motivated	Low
Eugene Coleman Com. House	8/31/20	Active	85	PRAC 202/811	Non-Profit	Low
YWCA APARTMENTS, INC.	12/31/20	Active	97	Sec. 202	Non-Profit	Very High
VISTA DEL MONTE	1/31/21	Active	94	S8 Loan Mgmt	Profit Motivated	High
Page/Holloway Apartments	2/3/21	Active	15	Other S8 Rehab	Profit Motivated	High
Thomas Paine Square	5/31/21	Active	93	S8 Loan Mgmt	Non-Profit	High
Fair Oaks Apartments	7/20/21	Active	20	S8 State Agency	Profit Motivated	High
Padre Apts	7/30/21	Active	41	S8 State Agency	Non-Profit	Low
Casa De La Raza	7/31/22	Active	51	Other S8 New	Non-Profit	High
JACKIE ROBINSON GARDENS	12/31/22	Active	130	S8 Loan Mgmt	Limited Dividend	High
Friendship Village Two	5/31/24	Active	90	S8 Loan Mgmt	Non-Profit	Moderate
Mariposa Gardens Apartments	9/18/24	Active	62	Other S8 New	Limited Dividend	Low

Source: HUD Section 8 Contracts database

NOTES

HUD Scale:

- Very High Section 8 expiring within 1 year or mortgage maturing within 1 year owner status and plans unknown
- High Section 8 expiring in 2–5 years or mortgage maturing within 2–5 years owner status and plans unknown
- Mod Section 8 expiring in 5–10 years or mortgage maturing within 5–10 year owner status and plans unknown
- Low Section 8 expiring in 5 years or mortgage maturing within 5 years; has long-term affordability restrictions with MOHCD or State
- Expired Section 8 contract already expired but may be in the process of contract renewal at the time of data pulled from HUD database

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

SFHA administers both public housing and the HCV program. In 2019, there were 1,911 public housing units and 12,165 HCV vouchers (both tenant and project based) under SFHA management. The average annual household income for SFHA clients is \$14,590. Without public housing and HCV vouchers, virtually all SFHA clients would be forced to live outside the City or even face homelessness.

Please see Section MA-25 for a more detailed description of the state of San Francisco's public housing.

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. Despite price declines in the middle of 2019, the median home value for a single-family home in San Francisco in 2019 exceeded \$1.4 million, has risen by 55.7% since 2015 and is predicted to rise by another 5.7% within the next year.⁵⁰ The median sales price for San Francisco was over 1.7 times the cost of similar housing in the Bay Area and over five times the national average.⁵¹

Cost of Housing

Table 47 – Cost of Housing

	Base Year: 2009	Most Recent Year: 2015	% Change
Median Home Value	781,500	799,600	2%
Median Contract Rent	1,220	1,498	23%

Data Source: 2005–2009 ACS (Base Year), 2011–2015 ACS (Most Recent Year)

Table 48 - Rent Paid

Rent Paid	Number	%
Less than \$500	30,330	13.5%
\$500-999	38,010	16.9%
\$1,000-1,499	47,025	20.9%
\$1,500-1,999	43,150	19.2%
\$2,000 or more	66,070	29.4%
Total	224,585	100.0%

Data Source: 2011–2015 ACS

Housing Affordability

Table 49 – Housing Affordability

% Units affordable to Households earning	Renter	Owner
30% HAMFI	24,770	No Data
50% HAMFI	50,640	1,885
80% HAMFI	100,070	4,820
100% HAMFI	No Data	9,735
Total	175,480	16,440

Data Source: 2011–2015 CHAS

⁵⁰ Zillow, <http://www.zillow.com/san-francisco-ca/home-values/>

⁵¹ Bay Area Market Reports, <https://www.bayareamarketreports.com/trend/san-francisco-home-prices-market-trends-news>

Monthly Rent

Table 50 – Monthly Rent

Monthly Rent (\$)	Efficiency (no bedroom)	1 Bedroom	2 Bedroom	3 Bedroom	4 Bedroom
Fair Market Rent	1,822	2,255	2,809	3,663	3,912
High HOME Rent	1,818	1,949	2,341	2,695	2,986
Low HOME Rent	1,411	1,511	1,813	2,095	2,337

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.

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 and rents increase between now and 2024.

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 51 – Area Median Rent Compared to Fair Market Rent and HOME Rents

Monthly Rent (\$)	Efficiency (no bedroom)	1 Bedroom	2 Bedroom	3 Bedroom	4 Bedroom
Market Rent	2,990	3,640	4,710	5,600	6,850
Fair Market Rent	1,822	2,255	2,809	3,663	3,912
Ratio Market Rent to FMR	1.64	1.61	1.68	1.53	1.75
High HOME Rent	1,818	1,949	2,341	2,695	2,986
Ratio Market Rent to High HOME Rent	1.64	1.87	2.01	2.08	2.29
Low HOME Rent	1,411	1,511	1,813	2,095	2,337
Ratio Market Rent to Low HOME Rent	2.12	2.41	2.60	2.67	2.93

Data Source: HUD FMR; 2019 HOME Rents; Zillow

The area median rent is more than 1.5 times to up 2.9 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. According to the CHAS data, at least a third of San Francisco's population is very low-income and earns less than half of the Area Median Income (HUD 50% unadjusted AMI in 2019 is equivalent to \$43,100/year or \$3,592/month for a single individual). At this income level, market rate rents are out of reach with market rent for a studio or efficiency apartment at \$2,990. 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 \$43,100 50% AMI would be \$1,078, *less than 36%* of the actual market rate rent for a studio apartment. Due to the City's overall high housing costs, San Francisco is predominantly a city of renters – 65% of all households rent.⁵² With strong job market growth and correlating increase in the demand for housing, rental prices continue to rise.


Ownership Housing Market Trends

San Francisco is consistently ranked as one of the most expensive for-sale housing markets in the country. In 2019, San Francisco had an estimated median sale price of \$1,310,000⁵³. 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 "San Francisco Homeownership Affordability Gap" table above). 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 Portola 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 Nob Hill have low ownership rates (Map 4).

⁵² San Francisco Planning Department, Housing Needs and Trends Report, July 2018

⁵³ Zillow, San Francisco Home Prices & Values at <https://www.zillow.com/san-francisco-ca/home-values>, May 2019

Map 4 – Proportion of Owner-Occupied Housing



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

Introduction

The City and County of San Francisco housing stock contains 42% of the units possess one of 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, 83% of housing units in San Francisco were built prior to 1980 – 58% were built prior to 1950 with 5% of units built before 1980 with children present, therefore having a number of aging units at risk for presenting lead-based paint hazards that can harm children.

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 52 - Condition of Units

Condition of Units	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Number	%	Number	%
With one selected Condition	44,380	34%	84,345	38%
With two selected Conditions	2,490	2%	13,750	6%
With three selected Conditions	220	0%	4,755	2%
With four selected Conditions	10	0%	560	0%
No selected Conditions	81,600	63%	121,175	54%
Total	128,700	99%	224,585	100%

Data Source: 2011-2015 ACS

Year Unit Built

Table 53 – Year Unit Built

Year Unit Built	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Number	%	Number	%
2000 or later	10,480	8%	16,325	7%
1980-1999	11,985	9%	22,465	10%
1950–1979	24,985	19%	62,100	28%
Before 1950	81,235	63%	123,695	55%
Total	128,685	99%	224,585	100%

Data Source: 2011–2015 CHAS

Risk of Lead-Based Paint Hazard

Table 54 – Risk of Lead-Based Paint

Risk of Lead-Based Paint Hazard	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Number	%	Number	%
Total Number of Units Built Before 1980	106,220	83%	185,795	83%
Housing Units build before 1980 with children present	5,940	5%	2,735	1%

Data Source: 2011-2015 ACS (Total Units) 2011–2015 CHAS (Units with Children present)

Need for Owner and Rental Rehabilitation

San Francisco’s historical architectural and aging housing landscape is susceptible to deteriorating housing conditions. Of the 353,270 housing units, the majority or 92% were built before 1980 and 58% were built before 1950. Forty-two percent or 149,940 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.

Estimated Number of Housing Units Occupied by Low or Moderate Income Families with LBP Hazards

The use of lead-based paint was banned in 1978. If 5% of the housing built prior to 1980 also has a child present, then one can estimate that 5% of San Francisco’s housing would also have lead-based paint hazards.

Discussion

Substandard Housing

San Francisco has an older housing stock, with 58% of all units built before 1950. This is the largest concentration of older housing stock in the State.

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 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:

- Unsanitary (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)

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 SFHA'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 \$65+ million operating income from HUD and tenant-paid rents. The SFHA 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. From 2015-2020, SFHA implemented its Public Housing Authority Recovery and Sustainability Agreement and Action Plan (PHARS), which it executed on July 1, 2013 with HUD and the City and County of San Francisco.

As part of the PHARS, in 2015 and 2016 SFHA converted 4,585 public housing units under HUD's RAD program. RAD is a program HUD launched in 2012 to address the nation's \$26 billion deferred maintenance backlog and chronic underfunding for these repairs from Congress. SFHA's own capital needs exceeded \$300 million. Through RAD, SFHA transferred ownership of the units to nonprofit-led affordable housing development teams that, unlike SFHA, could access the tax credit equity and debt necessary to rehabilitate the buildings. The conversion and preservation effort leveraged over \$2 billion in financing, including \$130 million from the City and County, and resulted in over \$800 million in rehabilitation of units, common spaces, and building systems.

In 2020 and 2021, SFHA will convert its 1,911 remaining units of public housing to the HCV program via HUD's disposition programs: RAD and the Section 18 Demo/Dispo program. Given SFHA's financial difficulties, HUD has approved the early conversion of these units to HCV in order to stabilize the agency's finances and operations.

Total Number of Units

Table 55 – Totals Number of Units by Program Type

Program Type							
	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers				
			Total	Project-based	Tenant-based	Special Purpose Voucher	
						Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program
# of units vouchers in use	585	1,911	12,165	5,365	6,215	865	99

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Describe the supply of public housing developments:

After the 2015–2016 RAD conversion of 3,480 public housing units, only 1,911 public housing units remain in SFHA’s portfolio. The bulk of these are located at Sunnydale-Velasco (665 units, reduced from original total of 785 units), and Potrero Terrace/Potrero Annex (514, down from original total of 606 units). Note that both Sunnydale and Potrero are “HOPE SF” projects, described in greater detail below.

An additional 584 units of public housing in HOPE VI “mixed finance” projects are also being converted under RAD. Between 1993 and 1997, HUD funded the redevelopment of six SFHA projects through HOPE VI. Private housing providers redeveloped and operated the 1,149 housing units (756 of which were public housing replacement units) on the six sites, including two Hayes Valley sites. The Housing Authority formed limited partnerships with four of the housing providers for Bernal Dwellings, Hayes Valley North and South, and Plaza East, in which the limited partnerships entered into long-term ground leases for the sites; and entered into long-term ground leases with the non-profit housing providers for North Beach and Valencia Gardens.

Table 56 – San Francisco HOPE VI projects

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
TOTAL HOPE VI			756	

As of December 2019, two of the six original projects – Bernal Dwellings and Valencia Gardens -- had converted their public housing units to HCV under RAD. Two more are scheduled to convert in 2020, and two more in 2021. No residents will be displaced by these conversions.

Lastly, 70 units of scattered site public housing located in five small projects across San Francisco will undergo conversion from public housing to HCV under the Section 18 Demo/Disposition program. No residents will be displaced by the conversion.

Table 57 – Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) Conversion List

Project Name	AMP	Neighborhood	Total PIC Units	Project type
CHINATOWN				
227 Bay	972	Chinatown	50	Senior
990 Pacific	976	Chinatown	92	Senior
Ping Yuen	972	Chinatown	234	Family
Ping Yuen North	976	Chinatown	200	Mixed
<i>Subtotal</i>			576	
W ADDITION 1				
Robert B. Pitts	988	Western Addition	200	Family
Westside Courts	969	Western Addition	135	Family
<i>Subtotal</i>			335	
W ADDITION 2				
939 Eddy	987	Western Addition	36	Senior
951 Eddy	987	Western Addition	24	Senior
1750 McAllister	985	Western Addition	97	Senior
Rosa Parks	978	Western Addition	200	Senior
<i>Subtotal</i>			353	
TENDERLOIN/SOMA				
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>			561	
BERNAL HEIGHTS				
Holly Courts	966	Bernal	118	Family
Alemanay	966	Bernal	150	Family
<i>Subtotal</i>			268	

Project Name	AMP	Neighborhood	Total PIC Units	Project type
MISSION/CASTRO				
25 Sanchez	986	Castro	89	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>			441	
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>			503	
SOUTHEAST				
Hunter's Point E/W	973	Southeast	213	Family
Westbrook Apartments	970	Southeast	226	Family
<i>Subtotal</i>			439	
TOTAL PORTFOLIO			3,480	

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:

Under HUD's RAD program, the City and private developers leveraged outside funds to finance over \$800 million in rehabilitation and improvements on 3,480 public housing units. A backlog of capital improvements and maintenance had accumulated, given the chronic underfunding of public housing agencies across the country by Congress. Units converted under RAD have left the public housing stock and function as permanently affordable housing owned by private, tax credit limited partnerships.

With the exception of RAD conversions of 546 HOPE VI units and the Section 18 disposition of 70 scattered site units, disposition of the remaining public housing units under SFHA's jurisdiction will take place through the HOPE SF program, begun by SFHA in collaboration with the City in 2005. HOPE SF is the nation's first large-scale community development and reparations initiative aimed at creating vibrant, inclusive, mixed-income neighborhoods without mass displacement of original low-income communities of color. 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 MOHCD in coordination with OCII. Each site has a community building and service connection partnership through community-based organizations that provide activities and services on site.

Through HOPE SF, four public housing sites comprising 1,917 public housing units will be redeveloped through mixed use residential development; at the end of revitalization approximately 5,260 total units will have been built. HOPE SF projects consist of infrastructure development, public housing replacement, other affordable housing development, and market rate housing. For-profit developers are constructing the market rate housing, and non-profit developers are constructing the replacement public housing and other affordable housing. Once completed, the public housing and affordable housing will be operated by non-profit housing providers, who will enter into long-term ground leases with the Housing Authority for use of the sites.

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)

The status of the individual HOPE SF sites follows:

Hunters View

The replacement of Hunters View's 267 public housing units is currently underway. All original households have been rehoused in replacement units; an additional 53 replacement units will be completed in 2023. The new mixed-income community will include 745 homes, comprised of 1:1 public housing replacement units, 86 new affordable units, and up to 392 market rate 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 began in January 2015, and all public housing households have been rehoused in brand new units. An additional 30 public housing replacement units that satisfy the replacement requirements will be constructed in 2022. The overall 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 benefited from the ability to temporarily relocate families on site while construction was underway, thus avoiding disruptive off-site relocation. Alice Griffith enjoyed 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. The first 72 public housing replacement units were completed in 2019. As of January 2020, another 167 units are in predevelopment. The entire project is expected to be complete in 2030.

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. The first 53 public housing replacement units were completed in 2019. As of January 2020, over 310 units are in predevelopment or construction. The entire project is expected to be complete in 2030.

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 58 – Public Housing Condition

Public Housing Development	Average Inspection Score
n/a	n/a

Because SFHA is considered a RAD agency, REAC scores are no longer calculated for SFHA's remaining public housing.

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

See the information provided above regarding the RAD 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 RAD, Section 18 and HOPE SF restoration and revitalization efforts currently underway. This work has had truly transformative effect on the living environments of low- and moderate-income families residing in public housing.

In addition, at all RAD and HOPE SF sites, new developer-owners 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.⁵⁴ 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.⁵⁵

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).

⁵⁴ 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.

⁵⁵ 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. 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 the criteria.

Facilities and Housing Targeted to Homeless Households

Table 59 – 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	2,000	232
Households with Only Adults	1,900	200	278	6,000	75
Chronically Homeless Households				6,000	307
Veterans	56		198	960	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, Access Points, 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, Access Points, and 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 offer 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 dedicated to women and 829 beds for men in the San Francisco Adult Shelter System. Adult Shelter System provides short-term emergency shelter for adults experiencing homelessness in San Francisco. The current adult shelter system has 1,203 shelter beds

for adults over the age of 18. To access shelter, please create a profile by visiting any of the shelter reservation sites below. More information on the 90-day shelter bed reservation system is available in [English](#) and in [Spanish](#). Lists of adult shelters and resource centers are also available in both [English](#) and [Spanish](#). Further since 2016, San Francisco has implemented a substantial increase in shelter beds at Navigation Centers and SAFE Centers that serve people of any gender. San Francisco's first Navigation Center opened in March 2015 and was a successful pilot serving San Francisco's highly vulnerable and long-term unhoused neighbors who are often fearful of accessing traditional shelter and services. HSH subsequently opened 8 Navigation Centers and currently has 6 in operation. For more information, [click here](#).

San Francisco's Navigation Center model is being replicated nationally and, here in San Francisco, building upon this best practice, SAFE Navigation Centers were established.

The SAFE Navigation Center Model

An evolution of Navigation Centers, SAFE Navigation Centers are low-threshold, high-service temporary shelter programs for adults experiencing homelessness in San Francisco. SAFE Navigation Centers are one part of the Homelessness Response System and are an attractive service for people living unsheltered or in encampments.

SAFE Navigation Centers are essential to reducing unsheltered homelessness and connecting guests to services and housing assistance. SAFE Navigation Centers build off the best aspects of Navigation Centers while making them more scalable, sustainable, and effective. The City is looking to expand SAFE Navigation Centers in neighborhoods across the city to respond to the homelessness crisis and has reviewed over 100 potential sites. For information on proposed Navigation Centers, visit: <http://hsh.sfgov.org/overview/notices/>

Seasonal Shelter Programs

The City supports family shelters at seven locations for a total of 75 families as well as a number of one-night beds and sixty-day beds for families.

The Interfaith Winter Shelter Program will run from Sunday, November 24, 2019 through Saturday, March 28, 2020. Spaces are reserved on a first come, first served basis each Sunday. The reservation ticket will allow the guest a seven-night stay. Two meals will be served to shelter guests each night.

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 childcare 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 and 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 HSA 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 the end of the 10-year plan period, just over 3,000 units came on line which provided specialized housing and services to single person households, families, seniors, frail seniors, veterans, TAY, 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 2020–2024, San Francisco will continue to build on successful models to continue creating new permanent supportive housing units.

HOPWA Assistance Baseline Table

Table 60 – 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	93
Tenant-based rental assistance	187
Units provided in permanent housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	232
Units provided in transitional short-term housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	28
Total	540

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.

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

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; 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.

PLWHA who are residing in units leased by private owners are assisted with a monthly subsidy through the Tenant Based Rental Assistance program that allows them to pay no more than 30% of their monthly income towards rent payment.

RCFCIs are state-licensed facilities owned by non-profits for individuals who require 24-hour support, including assistance with daily living activities such as bathing and dressing, medication management, meals on site, case management. 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 20% of the homeless population in San Francisco. It is estimated that about 2,000 youth are homeless, marginally housed or at risk of homelessness in San Francisco on any given night. 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 DPH funds a Medical Respite and Sobering Center in partnership with Community Awareness & Treatment Services. The Center provides approximately 75 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.

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)

San Francisco Coordinated Community Plan to Prevent and Youth Homelessness – The San Francisco Coordinated Community Plan to Prevent and Youth Homelessness lays out goals, objectives and action steps to address youth homelessness in San Francisco. Specifically, MOHCD will work to produce low-barrier non-time limited supportive housing units within its housing pipeline.

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 Housing 5-Year Plan Goals

- Goal 1: Maintain current supply of housing/facilities dedicated to supporting PLWHA
- Goal 2: Increase supply of housing/facilities dedicated to supporting PLWHA
- Goal 3: Increase resources available for subsidizing/making & keeping housing more affordable for PLWHA
- Goal 4: Expand access to services for PLWHA that help increase housing stability
- Goal 5: Improv efficiency and quality of the housing and service delivery system

MA-40 Barriers to Affordable Housing – 91.210(e)

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. The 2020 University of California Berkeley study of hard construction costs in California found that construction costs in the state had risen by 25% and by 119% in the Bay Area between 2008 and 2018, Bay Area construction costs are the most expensive in the state, and affordable housing construction costs are more expensive than comparable market rate or mixed-income developments.⁵⁶ Contributors to these high costs include the higher cost of living in the Bay Area, which exacerbate the need for higher labor costs.

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

⁵⁶ Turner Center for Housing Innovation, The Hard Costs of Construction: Recent Trends in Labor and Materials Costs for Apartment Buildings in California, March 2020.

concerns. For example, affordable housing is subject to some form of prevailing wage requirements if it is funded by low income housing tax credits or federal funding. According to the Turner Center construction cost study, projects with prevailing wage requirements cost an average of \$30 more per square foot than projects without wage requirements. Furthermore San Francisco imposes additional hiring and procurement requirements such as first source hiring, local business and small business enterprise requirements that increase development costs due to additional compliance work required of developers and contractors. Such policies may also reduce the pool of contractors willing to bid on San Francisco projects, and consequently the cost benefit of competitive bidding. The time required to administer and approve projects in San Francisco may also add to the cost of housing production. It was found that it takes an average of 3.8 years to get a project permitted in San Francisco, due in part to the public input process for securing land use entitlements. The Turner Center's research found that the uncertainty of project timelines and risk made subcontractors hesitant to bid on San Francisco projects, again reducing the pool of contractors and price competition.

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 expedite housing production to address the need for housing for all income levels, Mayor Lee committed the City delivering at least 5,000 units of new or rehabilitated housing every year for the foreseeable future and consequently issued Executive Directive 17-02 on September 27, 2017. This Directive supplements 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. Directive 17-02 aims to deliver faster approvals for housing development projects at both the entitlement stage and the post-entitlement permitting stage. It directed City permitting and housing delivery agencies to work together to implement specific:

- approval deadlines for entitlement and permitting of housing development projects to ensure that enough units are approved each year;
- accountability measures to ensure deadlines are being observed;
- key process improvements during project entitlements and post-entitlement permitting; and,
- identification of staffing and resources measures that will help departments meet the requirements of the Directive.

MA-45 Non-Housing Community Development Assets – 91.215 (f)

Introduction

According to the San Francisco Office of Economic Analysis (2020), the San Francisco economy remains healthy (2020, p. 15).⁵⁷ The average unemployment rate for the last two years remained at an all-time low of approximately 2.3%. The September 2019 unemployment rate of 1.8% was the lowest level ever recorded in San Francisco, and is far below what most economists consider full employment. Since 2010, the City has added, on average, about 24,000 jobs per year, with almost every major sector contributing to this growth.

Per the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and California Employment Development Department (December 2019), San Francisco has added 203,000 jobs (36.4% increase) since 2010⁵⁸, though only 135,000 more San Franciscans have jobs since 2010 (30.3% increase)⁵⁹; therefore, jobs in San Francisco are growing faster than job growth for San Francisco residents.

Economic development is booming, and major sectors in San Francisco remain construction; leisure and hospitality; information and communication technology; health care; and professional, scientific, and business services. Information and communication technology remain the largest industry in San Francisco.

From the San Francisco Office of Economic Analysis (2020, p. 15): “the technology sector plays a vital role in the City’s economy, contributing to about 40% of job growth in 2018. Since 2010, the technology sector has played an outsized role in the City’s economy, contributing to about 36% of job growth. Technology employment in the San Francisco Metro Division (San Francisco and San Mateo) experienced a significant slowdown in 2016 and early 2017, but has since recovered and on average, posted 9.6% growth in the first nine months of 2019. Given its importance in the local economy, any slowdown in the technology sector would create a particular risk for San Francisco’s economy.”

Nonetheless, the San Francisco economy demonstrates strong, sustained economic growth from the nationwide recession that impacted the nation about ten years ago.

⁵⁷ San Francisco Controller, Office of Economic Analysis. (3 January 2020). *Five Year Financial Plan Update: FY 2020-21 through FY 2023-24*. Author.

⁵⁸ Source: US Bureau of Labor Statistics Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages (www.bls.gov/cew)

⁵⁹ Source: California Employment Development Department (www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov)

Economic Development Market Analysis

Business Activity

Table 61 – 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	2,456	203	1	0	-1
Arts, Entertainment, Accommodations	60,929	96,937	15	16	1
Construction	12,069	18,194	3	3	0
Education and Health Care Services	66,748	88,029	17	14	-2
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	30,452	54,499	8	9	1
Information	27,934	35,800	7	6	-1
Manufacturing	18,031	9,916	4	2	-3
Other Services	19,324	29,695	5	5	0
Professional, Scientific, Management Services	83,449	146,753	21	24	3
Public Administration	0	0	0	0	0
Retail Trade	32,481	47,619	8	8	0
Transportation and Warehousing	8,770	7,482	2	1	-1
Wholesale Trade	12,496	17,118	3	3	0
Total	375,139	552,245	--	--	--

Data Source: 2011-2015 ACS (Workers), 2015 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (Jobs)

Labor Force

Table 62 – Labor Force

Total Population in the Civilian Labor Force	513,140
Civilian Employed Population 16 years and over	478,375
Unemployment Rate	6.78
Unemployment Rate for Ages 16-24	25.16
Unemployment Rate for Ages 25-65	5.08

Data Source: 2011-2015 ACS

Table 63 – Occupations by Sector

Occupations by Sector	Number of People
Management, business and financial	187,820
Farming, fisheries and forestry occupations	19,700
Service	43,695
Sales and office	98,250
Construction, extraction, maintenance and repair	16,750

Occupations by Sector	Number of People
Production, transportation and material moving	12,315

Data Source: 2011-2015 ACS

Travel Time

Table 64 – Travel Time

Travel Time	Number	Percentage
< 30 Minutes	204,295	47%
30–59 Minutes	174,140	40%
60 or More Minutes	57,510	13%
Total	435,945	100%

Data Source: 2011-2015 ACS

Education

Table 65 – Educational Attainment by Employment Status (Population 16 and Older)

Educational Attainment	In Labor Force		Not in Labor Force
	Civilian Employed	Unemployed	
Less than high school graduate	30,945	4,095	17,745
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	42,900	4,560	15,905
Some college or Associate's degree	79,620	7,135	23,475
Bachelor's degree or higher	268,410	11,695	33,715

Data Source: 2011-2015 ACS

Table 66 - Educational Attainment by Age

	Age				
	18–24 yrs	25–34 yrs	35–44 yrs	45–65 yrs	65+ yrs
Less than 9th grade	865	3,975	5,675	20,815	23,175
9th to 12th grade, no diploma	3,180	4,405	5,195	12,715	9,615
High school graduate, GED, or alternative	12,420	13,855	13,885	35,650	20,555
Some college, no degree	29,220	24,525	17,900	38,075	18,075
Associate's degree	3,040	7,945	7,155	14,780	6,645
Bachelor's degree	18,195	90,465	47,825	54,650	22,250
Graduate or professional degree	1,380	42,360	38,670	40,085	18,865

Data Source: 2011-2015 ACS

Table 67 – Educational Attainment – Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months

Educational Attainment	Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months
Less than high school graduate	20,548
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	26,553
Some college or Associate's degree	36,804
Bachelor's degree	66,370
Graduate or professional degree	87,750

Data Source: 2011-2015 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) and which is grounded in data from the ACS and Bureau of Labor Statistics.

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

In 2020, construction cranes continue to 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 2015 was \$3.4 billion, exceeding the average of the previous nine years by a billion dollars. And the construction boom is projected to continue.

The San Francisco CityBuild Academy aims to meet the demands of the construction industry by providing comprehensive pre-apprenticeship and construction administration training to San Francisco residents. CityBuild began in 2006 as an effort to coordinate City-wide construction training and employment programs and is administered by OEWD in partnership with City College of San Francisco, various community non-profit organizations, labor unions, and industry employers.

Health Care

The health care sector grew 16.2% from 2010 – 2020, and it is projected to grow 8.2% by 2025, solidifying its role as a vital San Francisco industry⁶⁰. This role will be further enhanced by the

⁶⁰ Economic Modeling Specialists International. (February 2020). *Industry Snapshot: Healthcare*, EMSI Q1 2020 Data Set.

completion of major public and private hospital projects, including the recently completed rebuild of Laguna Honda Hospital, two California Pacific Medical Center's San Francisco hospitals, and the ongoing rebuild of San Francisco General Hospital and other publicly-funded clinics.

The health care industry and health care occupations have been identified both nationally and locally as a priority for workforce investment due to stable and/or increasing demand for new workers, replacement of retirees, and skills development in response to new technologies and treatment options, as well as evolving service delivery options (including local and federal health care initiatives, such as the Affordable Care Act). Because the health care sector encompasses occupations in such a wide variety of settings and requires various levels of education and skill, it presents excellent opportunities for a broad spectrum of local job-seekers.

The San Francisco health care sector represents an opportunity for middle-skill jobs, demonstrating higher than average entry- and middle-skill wages above the self-sufficiency wage rate⁶¹. Employment is certification-based, and there are clear pathways from entry-level to advanced middle-skill employment. This provides an opportunity for low-income and disconnected workers to enter a career pathway without advanced degrees.

The San Francisco HealthCare Academy responds to this opportunity by engaging with industry partners to identify key needs of the industry, including skill requirements, vetting and approving a programmatic framework, review of training curriculum, identifying partnership opportunities, and providing programmatic oversight of any workforce programs related to the health care sector.

Generally speaking, 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.

Hospitality

Despite growing employment opportunities and career pathways, the hospitality industry continues to face serious workforce challenges related to staff attraction and retention. In particular, hospitality struggles to retain entry-level staff and younger demographic workers. According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Leisure and Hospitality occupations experienced a 76.7% total annual separation rate for employees in 2018. This figure is staggering, especially when juxtaposed with the total rate of U.S. employee separations at 44.3 %.⁶² While the cyclical nature of hospitality industry allows workers to enter the market and either move up through the sector to on to another, this trend necessitates investment from workforce entities and employers to ensure a continuous pool of job-ready candidates. The issue of staff attraction and retention affects a diversity of employers within the hospitality sector. In 2016, The National Restaurant Association calculated that the employee turnover rate for the industry was 61%, with that figure nearly doubling for front-line positions (hosts, servers, support

⁶¹ JPMorgan Chase & Co. (May 2015). *Strengthening the Bay Area: Building a Middle-Skill Workforce to Sustain Economic Growth and Expand Opportunity*.

⁶² <https://www.bls.gov/news.release/jolts.t16.htm>

staff).⁶³ Hoteliers are also struggling to replace staff that are exiting the industry. Nationally, hoteliers are experiencing an approximate employee separation rate of 73.8%, though locally, this can largely be attributed to large scale retirements.⁶⁴ In conversations with San Francisco stakeholders, including the SF Hotel Council and Local 2, OEWD has been advised that a large proportion of union hotel employees are expected to retire within the next few years. In fact, in 2019, the Hotel Council reported a decline in San Francisco hotel workers who reside in the city, with 47% of employees commuting in from places like San Mateo, Contra Costa, and Alameda counties. This figure depicts a 7% decrease in SF residency for hotel workers since 2016, and underlines the importance of local workforce training.⁶⁵ As commuting and transportation challenges continue to face this workforce, it can be expected that the separation rate will also continue to increase.

Despite the apparent high volume of employees exiting entry-level hospitality positions (either attributed to retirement, career advancement, or sector changes) the number of hospitality opportunities only continues to grow locally. These vacancies create opportunities for San Francisco residents to enter the sector, or even the workforce, and build careers. Hospitality employers need strong candidate pools for the constant opportunities related to culinary work, either in restaurants or hotels, housekeepers, and other hotel positions. It is critical that OEWD continue to offer trainings to help San Francisco workers competitively access the myriad of employment opportunities within hospitality.

Tech

Fueled by unparalleled tech sector growth, the Bay Area accounted for nearly \$1 trillion in economic productivity in 2018.¹ The Bay Area's tech economy is unlike any other in the United States, local companies compete for talent on a global level which means that city and county governments in the region face the challenge of creating pathways to well-paid careers for their residents. With San Francisco having record low unemployment rates (hovering in the 2% range), San Francisco's current job seekers typically have little to no experience in the tech sector and have lower educational attainment levels than their counterparts working in tech; hence the need of the City to invest in Tech training to address the tech talent opportunity gap in the Bay Area.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics projects that nationwide employment in software development will grow by 24% between 2016–2026, much faster than the average growth across all sectors.² This projection likely underestimates future growth in high tech for the San Francisco Bay Area, where the local high technology sector both drives national and international technological innovation and local economic growth. Amidst the historic growth in the sector, the pipeline for tech careers has not kept up with the demand and hiring qualified tech workers has continued to be a challenge for local tech employers. Across the U.S. and specifically the San Francisco Metro Statistical Area, tech growth has consistently outpaced almost all other industries and occupations, growing 6.7% annually.³ Additionally, it is the general consensus that large racial and gender disparities exist across industries, occupations, and pipeline stages of the high tech sector. African American and Latino/a employees are significantly underrepresented within technical occupations, such as computer programmers and software

⁶³ <https://upserve.com/restaurant-insider/3-common-reasons-restaurant-employee-turnover/>

⁶⁴ <https://business.dailypay.com/blog/staff-turnover-rates-hotel-motel-hospitality-industry>

⁶⁵ <https://www.bizjournals.com/sanfrancisco/news/2019/08/20/tourism-hotels-economic-impact-hotel-council-sf.html>

developers, and decision-making roles, such as managers and executives. Women, and especially women of color, are likewise inadequately represented. To further exacerbate this divide is the high tech industry's reliance on talent from top-tiered universities. As a result, the San Francisco Metro Statistical Area has a high tech workforce that is less diverse across racial and gender lines than any other major tech hub in the country.

TechSF strategically funds organizations that train those under-represented in tech populations. With a majority of TechSF participants being under the federal poverty line upon enrollment and then exiting programs into employment opportunities that provide economic self-sufficiency, the initiative has proven to be one mechanism that provides upward mobility for San Franciscans. Without programs like TechSF, the region's companies have less diverse talent to select from and local job seekers have less access to tech training and careers in technology.

1. According to Bureau of Economic Analysis figures, the combined 2018 GDP of the San Francisco–Oakland–Berkeley and San Jose–Sunnyvale–Santa Clara metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs) was approximately \$880 billion.
2. Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, *Occupational Outlook, Software Developers*, Bureau of Labor Statistics, (Apr 12, 2019), <https://www.bls.gov/ooh/computer-and-information-technology/software-developers.htm>.
3. LinkedIn Economic Graph, LinkedIn, *LinkedIn's U.S. Workforce Report for June 2019*, LinkedIn Economic Graph, (June 7, 2019), <https://economicgraph.linkedin.com/resources/linkedin-workforce-report-june-2019>

Businesses

The City of San Francisco has experienced major changes since the great recession. Real estate is at an all-time high, the tech boom has transformed the local economy, and unemployment is at its lowest point since the year 2000; unfortunately, economic forces have also threaten the existence of many small businesses operating in the City, as many business owners cannot afford the rising cost of rent, cost of labor, and raw material. Moreover, Small businesses face technical, financial, regulatory and market driven challenges that stagnate business growth, or worse, force micro-enterprises out of business. Socially and economically disadvantaged businesses are particularly vulnerable.

Technical challenges include an inappropriate level of understanding and/or improper execution of key business functions (i.e. marketing, financial management, and operations). It also includes inadequate strategy, informal organization management, and a tendency towards minimal utilization of available technologies. As a result, small enterprises find it difficult to compete against large competitors, who have the knowledge, resources, and capacity to fulfill these technical requirements.

In addition to technical knowhow, business owners need adequate resources to operate profitable businesses; resources include, but are not limited to: capital, information, and networks. Access to capital has long been considered pivotal to the success of a small business; while this continues to be the case, informed and responsible borrowing is equally important. Therefore, business owner need help navigating an assortment of lending products, pairing the lending product to its proper use, and understanding the cash flow implications of borrowing. Lastly, in addition to lenders, business owners need access to networks that can support the stabilization and growth of their small business. Networks include: business professionals, support organizations, and strategic partners.

OEWD operates a suite of financial, technical, and other forms of assistance for local small businesses at all stages of the business lifecycle. Aspiring business owners can mitigate the risk associated with business start-up by working with business experts that can help entrepreneurs develop business plans, capitalize their business adequately, and navigate the local licenses and permits process. Similarly, existing business owners can adapt to the ever-changing business environment and operate sustainable and expanding businesses by working with marketing, financial management, exporting, procurement, and human resources (HR) experts. Finally, proactive steps and proper guidance can help businesses reduce the risk of displacement, ensure business compliance, and help reduce barriers for struggling low-income, minority, and women-owned businesses. Consequently, it is critical that OEWD continue to fund organizations that provide technical assistance for small business owners; without these services business start-ups would fail to launch, and small business growth would stagnate.

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.

Housing

A strong economy also depends on ensuring that people of all income levels can afford to live in the City. 2013-2017 ACS data shows over 41,000 owner households are cost burdened spending more than 30% of income. Of these, over 18,000 are severely cost burdened spending more than 50% of income on housing costs. The City's most recent budget makes significant new investments in creating more housing and supporting low- and middle-income residents who are struggling to afford the high cost of housing in San Francisco. Over \$180 million in new funding will go to the creation of new affordable housing, preservation of existing affordable units, and prevention of eviction and displacement. When taken together with a proposed \$600 million Affordable Housing Bond and the Mayor's housing investments in FY 2018-19, these investments result the identification of over \$1 billion in total discretionary funding for affordable housing.

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.

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.

Transportation improvement projects have/will have varying effects on the hundreds of businesses adjacent to them. In 2017, OEWD provided financial, marketing, and business development support for businesses affected by the Central Subway construction project. Building on lessons learned from Central Subway construction mitigation efforts, OEWD in collaboration with SFMTA launched a \$5 million financing program earlier this year with the goal to address current and future major construction impacts to small businesses.

Infrastructure Improvements Recent and in the Future

A place of unique neighborhoods, progressive values, and innovative industry, San Francisco is growing. The city's creative culture and dynamic economy continue to draw new residents; as of 2015 the population was 864,816, up 11% from 2000. Plan Bay Area, developed by ABAG, projects San Francisco to grow by 90,000 housing units and 190,000 jobs by 2040. As the city's density increases, having sufficient infrastructure to support all residents in all neighborhoods becomes more challenging but also more important.

The Proposed City and County of San Francisco Capital Plan for Fiscal Years (FY) 2018-2027 offers a guiding document for City infrastructure investments, which assesses the City's capital needs, identifies the level of investment required to meet those needs, and provides a constrained plan of finance for the next 10 years.

The Proposed Plan continues the City's commitment to plan and finance projects that will strengthen the integrity of San Francisco's infrastructure. The Plan recommends a record level of \$35 billion in investments over the next decade that will improve San Francisco's resilience through critical seismic repairs and strengthening; transportation and utility system improvements; safer streets for pedestrians, bicyclists, and drivers; and more affordable housing.

Real estate developments along the city's waterfront, the creation of new neighborhoods, and preparing existing neighborhoods for anticipated growth will increase the City's infrastructure portfolio along with its tax base. Eastern Neighborhoods, Mission Bay, Candlestick Point, and Hunters Point Shipyards are just a few of the high-growth areas changing the face of San Francisco. Many of these developments and projects have distinctive funding mechanisms, including dedicated development fees and developer agreements that target improvements in areas of especially high growth. These projects seek to create well-planned, safe places to live, travel, work, and play.

Construction Mitigation

City Infrastructure Improvements have the potential to contribute to long-term economic benefits, but in the short term these projects may have negative impacts on businesses by discouraging and adversely influencing customer behaviors and patterns. Small, brick and mortar businesses are particularly vulnerable as they tend to be ill-equipped to respond to business disruption.

To limit the negative impact construction projects have on surrounding businesses, OEWD has developed a suite of construction mitigation measures; including, interdepartmental coordination, business outreach, corridor specific marketing, and small business technical assistance. Small businesses can take advantage of business training, one-on-one consulting, small business financing, and ADA compliance assistance.

With major capital projects underway and still more on the horizon, there are opportunities for engaging the services of the OEWD earlier in the construction process to enable small businesses to take sufficient precautionary measure in terms of planning and protect them from major financial harm.

How do the skills and education of the current workforce correspond to employment opportunities in the jurisdiction?

Twice as many San Francisco residents hold a bachelor's degree or higher compared to the general U.S. population. Due to the City's historically low unemployment rate of 1.9%⁶⁶, local industries' high-demand for middle skill and thought workers⁶⁷, and the higher-than-average availability of degree-holders, residents with advanced education credentials gain access to the majority of well-paying jobs, especially in the information and communication technology and professional and business services sectors.

This educated worker supply creates a local economy which demands workers with the highest degree available, and in which San Franciscans with lower educational attainment cannot adequately compete, thereby creating inflation of degree requirements for entry-level jobs and a growing opportunity gap for people without postsecondary educational attainment⁶⁸.

Additionally, the federal poverty rate—defined as earnings less than or equal to \$12,100 for an individual or \$25,100 for families—for San Francisco working age adults without a college degree is between 11% and 20.2%, compared to 5.2% for those who hold bachelor's degrees and higher⁶⁹. The Insight Center for Community Economic Development assessed the San Francisco Self-Sufficiency Standard—a measure of the required earned income to cover basic necessities without public assistance—for single adults to be \$55,860 and for a two-adult, two-child household to be \$77,600 to \$149,200 depending on children's age⁷⁰. The ACS (2016) demonstrates that San Francisco bachelor's degree holders earn a median income of \$76,065 per year, while residents with lower educational attainment earn a median income of less than \$41,100⁷¹. Therefore, many residents who earn above the federal poverty rate still have difficulty surviving in the Bay Area, and this need is more pronounced among people without postsecondary educational attainment.

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

⁶⁶ California Employment Development Division. (January 2020). *Monthly Labor Force Data for Counties, December 2019*. <https://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/data/unemployment-and-labor-force.html>

⁶⁷ San Francisco Office of Economic and Workforce Development. (2018). *San Francisco County Highest Ranked Occupations, 2017-2019*. EMSI Economic Modeling.

⁶⁸ JPMorgan Chase & Co. (May 2015). *Strengthening the Bay Area: Building a Middle-Skill Workforce to Sustain Economic Growth and Expand Opportunity*.

⁶⁹ U.S. Census. (2016). *San Francisco County Educational Attainment, American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates, 2016*.

⁷⁰ Pearce, D. (2018). California self-sufficiency standard, 2018. *Insight Center for Community Economic Development*. <https://insightcced.org/2018-family-needs-calculator/>

⁷¹ U.S. Census. (2016). *San Francisco County median earnings in the past 12 months (in 2016 Inflation-Adjusted Dollars) by sex by educational attainment for the population 25 years and over, American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates, 2016*.

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.” In response, the public workforce system has responded by creating programming for middle skill jobs which do not require advanced education and incumbent worker training.

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.

In 2014, 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 real-time 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.

We also are currently studying/tracking the financial services sector as viable sector for training investment.

Does your jurisdiction participate in a Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS)?

Yes. The City and County of San Francisco participates in [ABAG](#), which encompasses its eight-county Economic Development District (EDD). City and County ABAG representatives participated in ABAG’s Economic Strategy Committee during production of the ABAG’s 2019 [Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy for the San Francisco Bay Area](#).

The CEDS vision is: A dynamic and resilient economy, spurred by a culture of innovation and inclusion, providing opportunities, shared prosperity, and a sustainable quality of life for all residents and workers. The vision statement is the distillation of conversations among business, workforce, local government and community stakeholders, reflecting the region’s aspirations for the economy and its participants over the next 10 to 20 years.

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.

Prior to CEDS publication, the City and County of San Francisco Board of Supervisors unanimously approved [a resolution](#) adopting the Vision, Goals and Objectives of The Bay Area Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy and establishing the eight-county Bay Area Regional Economic Development District (Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, and Solano counties). The Vision, Goals and Objectives follow, and align with a broad range of San Francisco initiatives across the four Goals areas of business climate, workforce, housing and work places, and infrastructure.

Additionally, in January 2020 the City and County of San Francisco Board of Supervisors unanimously approved [a resolution](#) instructing the San Francisco Planning Department to apply on behalf of the City to realign the City's designations for its Priority Development Areas, Priority Conservation Areas, and Priority Production Areas. This realignment makes qualifying projects in these designated areas eligible for regional capital and planning funds, including grants and technical assistance.

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 2017 ACS 5-Year Estimates, 59.16% of the City's population is identified as being composed of minorities, and therefore any census tract in which more than 79.16% 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 5):

- Bayview Hunters Point;
- Chinatown;
- Excelsior;
- Oceanview/Merced/Ingleside;
- Outer Mission;
- Portola;
- Tenderloin; and
- Visitacion Valley.

Map 5 – 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 2017 ACS 5-Year Estimates, African Americans comprise 5.09% of San Francisco's overall population. Therefore, an Area of African American Concentration is a census tract in which more than 25.09% 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 6):

- Bayview Hunters Point; and
- Western Addition.

Map 6 – Areas of African American Concentration




Areas of Asian American Concentration

Based on the 2017 ACS 5-Year Estimates, Asian Americans comprise 33.87% of San Francisco's overall population. Therefore, an Area of Asian American Concentration is a census tract in which more than 53.87% 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 7):

- Bayview Hunters Point;
- Chinatown;
- Excelsior;
- North Beach;
- Oceanview/Merced/Ingleside;
- Outer Mission;
- Outer Richmond;
- Portola;
- South of Market;
- Sunset/Parkside; and,
- Visitacion Valley.

Map 7 – Areas of Asian American Concentration




Areas of Hispanic or Latino/a Concentration

Based on the 2017 ACS 5-Year Estimates, Hispanics or Latino/as comprise 15.27% of San Francisco's overall population. Therefore, an Area of Hispanic or Latino/a Concentration is a census tract in which more than 35.27% of the population is identified as Hispanic or Latino/a. Using this definition, the following neighborhoods in San Francisco have Areas of Hispanic or Latino/a Concentration (see Map 8):

- Bayview Hunters Point;
- Bernal Heights;
- Excelsior; and
- Mission.


Map 8 – Areas of Hispanic or Latino/a 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. The following neighborhoods in San Francisco have areas of low- and moderate-income concentration, based on HUD income data (see Map 9): Bayview Hunters Point; Bernal Heights; Chinatown; Haight Ashbury; Hayes Valley; Excelsior; Inner Richmond; Inner Sunset; Japantown; Lakeshore; Mission; Nob Hill; North Beach; Oceanview/Merced/Ingleside; Outer Mission; Outer Richmond; Portola; Potrero Hill; Russian Hill; South of Market; Sunset/Parkside; Tenderloin; Treasure Island; Twin Peaks; Visitacion Valley; West of Twin Peaks; and Western Addition.

Map 9 – Areas of Low- and Moderate-Income Concentration



What are the characteristics of the market in these areas/neighborhoods?

Bayview Hunters Point

Demographics

Approximately 37,600⁷² people live in the Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood. Its population is more diverse than San Francisco's. 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, Latino/a, and Asian residents than San Francisco overall; and while its proportion of White residents is smaller, the community as a whole is becoming more and more diverse. There are about 12,040 housing units in the area, 52% of which are owner-occupied.⁷³ The median household income is lower than the City's median income. See the San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf 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/a 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.

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. The December 2013 IIN Business Inventory Report indicated that Third Street's vacancy rate was 24.1%, or 42 vacancies out of 174 storefront, there were slight improvements year by year. The December 2019 IIN Business Inventory Report a high vacancy rate of 21.3%, or 37 vacancies out of 174 storefronts. 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, 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 for Bayview business owners and residents. While the area has a high level of crime relative to the City overall, improvements to safety have been achieved. Over the past 3 years, incidences of violent crimes have decreased by 11% and incidents of property crimes have decreased by 10%. (Source: SFPD incidents data, November 2017-October 2020).

⁷² U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

⁷³ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

Opportunities

Bayview continues to be a high economic and workforce development priority for the City. Invest in Neighborhoods (IIN), a division within OEWD, deploys focused investments and resources in the Bayview and 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.

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.

Bernal Heights

Demographics

Approximately 26,140⁷⁴ people live in the Bernal Heights neighborhood. 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 57% of the population. It has a smaller proportion of Asians than citywide. Latino/as make up 29% of the population, which is almost twice that of the City overall. The proportion of Blacks is the same as the City’s. There are about 9,770 housing units in the neighborhood, 57% of which are owner-occupied⁷⁵. The median household income is higher than the City’s median household income. See the San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at

https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf 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.

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.

⁷⁴ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

⁷⁵ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

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. The corridor is home to a high number of food and beverage stores and general merchandise. The December 2013 IIN Business Inventory Report indicated that Mission-Bernal's vacancy rate was 12.1% , or 27 vacancies out of 223 storefront. The December 2019 IIN Business Inventory Report recorded a vacancy rate of 12.4%, or 37 vacancies out of 174 storefronts.

Opportunities

The Invest in Neighborhoods (IIN) division of OEWD aims to strengthen small businesses, improve physical conditions, increase quality of life, and increase community capacity. IIN, in collaboration with community stakeholders, provide small business technical assistance such as lease negotiations, legal assistance, and small business financing to respond to the community's unique opportunities and needs. The strategy 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 while leveraging 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 14,820⁷⁶ people live in the Chinatown neighborhood. Its population is significantly older than San Francisco's with a higher proportion of residents over 60 years old. The majority, or 81%, of Chinatown residents are of Asian descent and the neighborhood does not have the racial diversity of the City overall. There are about 7,430 housing units in the area, 93% of which are renter-occupied⁷⁷. The median household income for the neighborhood is less than a fourth of the Citywide median and more than a quarter of residents live below the poverty level. See the San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf 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.

⁷⁶ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

⁷⁷ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

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 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, with over 32,600 residents, 22,700 housing units and 4,000 small businesses within one-quarter mile radius. Since 2012, Invest In Neighborhoods (IIN) has leveraged City programs and resources to respond to the specific needs and opportunities in Chinatown. Through building rapport and relationships with business owners/operators, local stakeholders and community partners, our goal is to support district's economic vitality, strengthen neighborhood serving businesses, increase physical and cultural attractions, and enhance business development in this historic, unique neighborhood.

However, after the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake and the 2001 dotcom bubble Chinatown's economic climate was shocked and faced a huge loss of tourists for food and retail industry and competition with new Chinese hubs in the Bay Area. This continuing challenge for Chinatown is a decreasing number of visitors, particularly at night and with slowing business to restaurants and merchants. Even though the December 2013 IIN Business Inventory Report indicated that Chinatown has a very low vacancy rate (6.0%, or 50 vacancies out of 827 storefront), the situation is getting worse and worse year by year. The December 2019 IIN Business Inventory Report recorded a record high vacancy rate of 12.6%, or 124 vacancies out of 986 storefronts.

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) Over the past 3 years, incidences of violent and property crimes have fluctuated. Overall, incidences of violent crimes have decreased by 5% and incidences of property crimes have decreased by 12% in the area. (SFPD CompStat Reports January 2017-2020)

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.

Since 2012, Invest in Neighborhoods (IIN), a division of OEWD, has implemented strategic activities based on 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 inter-agency 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 Years; 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.

Under the direction of Mayor London N. Breed, IIN and Chinatown stakeholders see addressing these challenges as a top priority. In response, IIN is providing focused and customized assistance for Chinatown include customer attraction and business retention programs, year-round celebratory events and multi-marketing campaigns in an effort to help new and existing businesses grow and stay in San Francisco. The plan also includes the implementation of new programs to improve physical conditions and to increase quality of life in the Chinatown neighborhood. The collective investments along with our community-based partners provide grassroots support and resources to ensure this unique neighborhood remain diverse and cultural vibrant for residents and visitors. In FY19-20, IIN continues to support and fund 11 programs with 9 Chinatown-based organizations for a total of a \$710,000 investment. IIN also propose 3 new programs to promote public safety and increase customer retention.

Excelsior and Outer Mission

Demographics

Approximately 63,610⁷⁸ 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. Its proportion of Latino/a residents is approximately double that of San Francisco's overall proportion. There are about 18,320⁷⁹ 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 San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf 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

⁷⁸ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

⁷⁹ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

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

Measuring 2.2 miles long, the Excelsior and Outer Mission Neighborhood Commercial District is the longest in the City. The Corridor is within a strategic location of San Francisco, relatively close to two Bart Stations (Balboa and Glen Park) and a mid-point between downtown jobs and the Peninsula.

The Excelsior and Outer Mission is a thriving neighborhood. It's an ethnically and economically diverse community and a hub for restaurants, produce markets, and financial institutions.

Diverse small businesses serve the population of the Excelsior, including Chinese bakeries, Central American cafés and pupuserias, and community organizations like the Filipino Community Center and the Islamic Center.

Overall, sales tax revenue in the Excelsior corridor increased by 9% from \$652,157.31 in 2012 to \$769,078.44 in 2017. The largest increase was in the business category of Food and Drugs going from \$206,725.23 in 2012 to realizing annual increases to \$338,767.37 in 2017.

Opportunities

Since 2017, the Invest in Neighborhoods (IIN) division of OEWD, in partnership with the Excelsior Action Group, a local non-profit partner, assisted over 40 businesses in the Excelsior and Outer Mission with everything from business planning, marketing support, lease negotiations, permitting, access to loans, and compliance issues. We have also activated 18 new storefronts in partnership with the Excelsior Action Group since 2017.

As of 2019 (Q4), there were 335 businesses in the Excelsior, with a total of 46 vacancies. This is a 13.73% vacancy rate, which has stayed relatively stable over the past 3 years. Generally, a rate of between 5% and 10% is seen as low enough to support a vibrant corridor, but not so low as to preclude business turnover.

In addition to a high vacancy rate, the Excelsior and Outer Mission experiences other challenges related to cleaning, safety, walkability, and a lack of affordable and quality housing and commercial storefront options.

In 2018, an Excelsior and Outer Mission Neighborhood Strategy was completed. The Strategy, the result of a two-year community consultation process, outlined actions to enhance the neighborhood's commercial Corridor: Mission Street and Geneva Avenue. The Strategy provides recommendations related to improving the public realm, creating business and entrepreneurial opportunities, expanding and protecting housing supply, and enhancing mobility options.

Furthermore, the Corridor is a city approved Opportunity Zone tract, one of two Neighborhood Corridors with this designation in San Francisco, meaning that investors who allocate funds into these zones would be allowed to defer or eliminate federal taxes on capital gains. This means that investments

related to residential and commercial projects might be focused in the Excelsior, over other areas of the city.

Hayes Valley

Demographics

Approximately 18,250⁸⁰ people in Hayes Valley. It has a lower proportion of children under 18 years old and of residents over 60 years old than the city overall. The population is predominately White, 67%. The Asian population is 14%; the Black population is 9%; and, the Latino/a population is 11%. There are about 9,650⁸¹ housing units, of which 81% is renter occupied. The median household income of Hayes Valley is higher than the City's median income. See the San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

Neighborhood Features

Hayes Valley is located next to the Western Addition neighborhood. Victorian, Queen Anne, and Edwardian townhouses are mixed with high-end boutiques, restaurants, and public housing complexes. Octavia Boulevard, which replaced the demolished Central Freeway, leads to a community park at the center of the neighborhood, the Hayes Green. The neighborhood is served by five MUNI bus lines. Hayes Valley is in close proximity to anchor institutions such as City Hall, San Francisco Symphony, and San Francisco Opera House.

Commercial District Health

Hayes Valley's current commercial district was boosted in part by the destruction caused by the 1989 earthquake to the Central Freeway, which had entrance ramps on Franklin and Gough streets. The freeway was an eyesore and created noise pollution that kept businesses and foot traffic away. Not long after that part of the freeway came down, the community began to transform, and commerce moved in.

The corridor features a wide variety of high-end boutiques, restaurants, art galleries, bars, wine shops, bakeries, and coffee shops.

Opportunities

The Invest in Neighborhoods (IIN) division of OEWD aims to strengthen small businesses, improve physical conditions, increase quality of life, and increase community capacity. IIN, in collaboration with community stakeholders, provide small business technical assistance such as lease negotiations, legal assistance, and small business financing to respond to the community's unique opportunities and needs. The strategy 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 while leveraging opportunities.

⁸⁰ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

⁸¹ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

Inner Richmond

Demographics

Approximately 22,500⁸² people live in the Inner Richmond neighborhood. It has a slightly lower proportion of children under 18 years old and a slightly higher proportion of residents over 60 years old than the city overall. The population is predominately White, 54%, and Asian, 36%. Its proportion of Latino/a population at 9% and Black population at 2% are lower than the City overall. There are about 9,960⁸³ housing units, of which 68% is renter occupied. The median household income of the Inner Richmond neighborhood is slightly lower than the City's median income. See the San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

Neighborhood Features

The Inner Richmond is well positioned between the Presidio and Golden Gate Park with 13 major bus lines running through the neighborhood. It's in close proximity to hospitals, Kaiser and St. Mary's Dignity Health, as well as the University of San Francisco. The Inner Richmond is one of the safest areas in the City.

Commercial District Health

The Inner Richmond's primary commercial corridors are Geary Boulevard and Clement Street. The corridors offer a diverse selection of cuisine including Chinese, Cambodian, Korean, Burmese, and Russian reflecting its diverse population. Many of the commercial uses are located on the ground floor of buildings with residential units above. The corridors provide neighborhood-serving goods and services, as well as restaurants and services that serve a more regional customer base.

Opportunities

The Invest in Neighborhoods (IIN) division of OEWD aims to strengthen small businesses, improve physical conditions, increase quality of life, and increase community capacity. IIN, in collaboration with community stakeholders, provide small business technical assistance such as lease negotiations, legal assistance, and small business financing to respond to the community's unique opportunities and needs. The strategy 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 while leveraging opportunities.

Japantown

Demographics

Approximately 3,650⁸⁴ people live in Japantown. It has a significantly lower proportion of children under 18 years old and a significantly higher proportion of residents over 60 years old than the city overall. The population is predominately White, 57%, and Asian, 35%. Its proportion of Latino/a population at 9%

⁸² U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

⁸³ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

⁸⁴ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

and Black population at 3% are lower than the City overall. There are about 2,500⁸⁵ housing units, of which 86% is renter occupied. The median household income of Japantown is lower than the City's median income. See the San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

Neighborhood Features

Japantown has been the primary hub for the city and the region's Japanese American community for over a century, which always maintained a diverse mix of residents and businesses. The population of residents of Japanese ancestry is relatively low (5%), meaning that many Japanese Americans and others who see Japantown as their cultural center reside outside of the neighborhood. Nonetheless, its institutions and businesses make Japantown a regional as well as local community center.

Japantown contains over 200 institutional uses, including community centers, schools, civic organizations, business associations, and religious institutions. These uses are largely interspersed throughout the community. Other areas of interest include the pedestrian-only part of Buchanan Street between Post and Sutter Streets, and Peace Plaza, a Recreation and Parks Department open space located between Post and Geary between two of the Japan Center mall buildings. These organizations and institutions provide a range of services and benefits to the local community, as well as to Japanese Americans from around the region. These services are offered by way of many community activities, educational and youth programs, teaching and performing of traditional arts and crafts, and senior programs, among others.

Commercial District Health

Japantown contains over 700 businesses utilizing over 2 million square feet of space. More visible are the customer-oriented businesses that are south of Bush Street, along Geary, Post, Fillmore, and Buchanan Streets. These are typically retail in nature, including many restaurants. Many of the commercial uses are located on the ground floor of buildings with residential units above. The relatively few large-scale, commercial buildings were constructed during the urban renewal era between Post Street and Geary Boulevard to form Japan Center.

Japantown has nearly 250 customer-oriented businesses. These businesses are clustered around the Japan Center, Peace Plaza, and the Buchanan Mall, as well as elsewhere along Post Street and Fillmore Street. These businesses rely on their geographical concentration to maintain Japantown's unique cultural draw. Additionally, Japantown Garage parking has been quite consistent with serving on averaging between 500,000-550,000 vehicles per year.

While some visitors may come for annual events such as the Cherry Blossom Festival and stay to dine and shop for gifts and clothing, others come regularly to buy groceries, attend classes or meetings, or utilize community services. The December 2013 IIN Business Inventory Report indicated that Japantown's vacancy rate was 3.3%, or 5 vacancies out of 153 storefront, which increased significantly year by year. The December 2019 IIN Business Inventory Report recorded a vacancy rate of 10.1%, or 16 vacancies out of 153 storefronts.

Public safety is a concern for business owners and residents.

⁸⁵ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

Opportunities

The Invest in Neighborhoods (IIN) division of OEWD aims to strengthen small businesses, improve physical conditions, increase quality of life, and increase community capacity. IIN, in collaboration with community stakeholders, provide small business technical assistance such as lease negotiations, legal assistance, and small business financing to respond to the community's unique opportunities and needs. The strategy 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 while leveraging opportunities.

In Japantown, many retail operations cater to Japanese-American and Japanese clientele. The mix of retail and cultural institutions also serves local residents well, providing goods, support services, and a sense of community for an ethnically and income-diverse population. There has been a substantial effort to ensure that new businesses are culturally relevant and sustainable.

Mission

Demographics

Approximately 58,640⁸⁶ people live in the Mission District. It is a young and diverse population. It has a lower proportion of residents 60 years and older than the City overall. The proportion of White residents has grown to 57%, but the neighborhood remains part of the Latino/a heart of the City, with Latino/as making up 39% of the neighborhood. There are about 25,860⁸⁷ 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 San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

Neighborhood Features

The Mission District is located in the center of San Francisco's eclectic and predominantly Latino/a Lower 24th Street and Mission Street commercial corridors. Lower 24th Street 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/a 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.

Mission Street includes a diverse business mix that provides neighborhood-serving goods and services, as well as restaurants and services that serve a more regional customer base. Ground floor storefronts on Mission Street are occupied by a mix of traditional retail (i.e., stores that sell products to the general public); services (including personal, financial, and medical services); and eating and drinking places. The upper floors include a range of office uses (including medical, professional, and tech firms) and some residential uses. In comparison to Valencia Street, which is characterized by a concentration of high-end

⁸⁶ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

⁸⁷ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

stores and restaurants, Mission Street has a variety of businesses serving low- and moderate-income households as well as higher-income households. Typically, grocery stores and other types of local-serving retail draw local customers during the day, while bars, restaurants and nightclubs bring in a younger, more affluent clientele at night, from the neighborhood and beyond. Medical and social service providers also attract clients from outside the neighborhood, as well as serving local residents.

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. Mission District 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 16th and 24th Street BART Stations, 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

The 24th Street Latino/a Cultural District and Mission Street commercial districts are thriving and vibrant corridors, with over 700 ground floor businesses and a moderate vacancy rate of 14% and a high level of foot traffic. The corridors feature 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/a owned businesses in the City.

Unlike other corridors in the Mission, Mission Street's retail mix also includes formula retail businesses. Formula retail stores and other chains occupy seven percent of ground floor storefronts on the corridor. These include restaurants, cell phone stores, and drugstores. While these retailers are sometimes perceived as diminishing neighborhood character, they may also provide affordable products to local residents as well as employment opportunities for low- and moderate-income workers. Total estimated retail and restaurant sales on the corridor increased by 30 percent between 2007 and 2016, from \$190 million to \$247 million (after adjusting for inflation).

In recent years the Mission District has attracted more white, affluent, and highly educated residents, leading to concerns about gentrification and displacement. At the same time, the two corridors are increasingly emerging as regional destinations for restaurants, entertainment, and nightlife.

Opportunities

Opportunities in the Mission District exist in strengthening the businesses, institutions and cultural assets that have made the corridors what they are 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/a Cultural District. The Mission District has a high level of social capital, featuring an active community organization that includes many community-based arts, cultural, and social service organizations. 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.

The Invest in Neighborhoods (IIN) division of OEWD aims to strengthen small businesses, improve physical conditions, increase quality of life, and increase community capacity. IIN, in collaboration with community stakeholders, created a comprehensive service plans tailored to respond to the community's

unique opportunities and needs. The strategy 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. These include business technical assistance that provides professional business consulting advice; lease strengthening workshops and counseling to businesses and cultural institutions. 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/a Cultural District. Some of the major investments that resulted from that plan include sidewalk repairs, ADA accessible curbs, façade improvements, pedestrian lighting, and a street cleaning program.

North Beach

Demographics

Approximately 12,600⁸⁸ 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. 51% of residents in the North Beach are White and 40% are of Asian descent, with a lower share of Black, and Latino/a residents. There are about 7,250⁸⁹ housing units in the area. Renting households predominate, as 80% of the households are renter-occupied. The median household income of the North Beach neighborhood is lower than the Citywide median. See the San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf 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, although vacancy rates are higher than the citywide average at 18.7% in 2019. The Central Subway

⁸⁸ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

⁸⁹ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

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. Public safety in North Beach is a concern for merchants and residents. Over the past 3 years, incidences of violent crimes have increased by 15%, however, incidents of property crimes have decreased by 2%. (Source: SFPD incidents data, November 2017-October 2020).

Opportunities

The Invest in Neighborhoods (IIN) division of OEWD aims to strengthen small businesses, improve physical conditions, increase quality of life, and increase community capacity. IIN, in collaboration with community stakeholders, provide small business technical assistance such as lease negotiations, legal assistance, and small business financing to respond to the community's unique opportunities and needs. The strategy 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 while leveraging opportunities.

Oceanview/Merced/Ingleside (OMI)

Demographics

Approximately 28,010⁹⁰ people live in the OMI. Its population has a higher proportion of children under 18 years old than the City overall. 54% of the population is made up of Asian residents, and it has a higher proportion of Black and Latino/a residents than that found Citywide. There are about 8,330 housing units in the area, of which 65% are owner-occupied⁹¹. The median household income for the neighborhood is lower than the Citywide median income. See the San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at

https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

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.

⁹⁰ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

⁹¹ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

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/a 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

The December 2013 IIN Business Inventory Report indicated that Ocean Avenue's vacancy rate was 12.8%, or 19 vacancies out of 149 storefront, the vacancy rate gradually increased year by year. The December 2019 IIN Business Inventory Report recorded a vacancy rate of 15.5%, or 25 vacancies out of 161 storefronts

Broad Street is a small, mostly residential commercial district with a total of 50 storefronts and moderate vacancy rate of 18% in 2019. 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 vacant retail spaces that appear to require a high capital investment in order to become leasable.

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 44,870⁹² people live in the Outer Richmond. This population is slightly older than that of San Francisco's overall, with residents 60 years and older forming a bigger share than Citywide. The neighborhood has an almost equal share of White and Asian residents, 44% and 46% respectively; it has a smaller proportion of Blacks and Latino/as than San Francisco overall. There are about 20,140⁹³ housing units in the area. Renting households predominate, with less than 40% home-owning households. The median household income for the neighborhood is lower than that of the City overall. See the San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf 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 of 8.5% in 2019 and a high level of foot traffic. The corridor features a high number of eating and drinking establishments and personal care. The December 2013 IIN Business Inventory Report indicated that Geary Boulevard's vacancy rate was 6.9% or 16 vacancies out of 232 storefronts, which fluctuated year by year. The December 2019 IIN Business Inventory Report recorded a vacancy rate of 8.5%, or 20 vacancies out of 236 storefronts.

Over the past 3 years, incidences of violent crimes have increased by 8% and incidents of property crimes have increased by 31%. (Source: SFPD incidents data, November 2017-October 2020). Merchants and advocates express concern about vandalism and robberies.

Opportunities

The Invest in Neighborhoods (IIN) division of OEWD aims to strengthen small businesses, improve physical conditions, increase quality of life, and increase community capacity. IIN, in collaboration with community stakeholders, provide small business technical assistance such as lease negotiations, legal assistance, and small business financing to respond to the community's unique opportunities and needs. The strategy primarily focuses on the preservation and strengthening of the corridor's existing

⁹² U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

⁹³ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

businesses and cultural vitality. With these goals in mind we have developed programs to reduce business vulnerabilities and foster growth while leveraging 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 16,410⁹⁴ 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/a residents is also higher than Citywide. There are about 4,990 housing units in the area, of which 65% are owner-occupied⁹⁵. The median household income for the Portola neighborhood is lower than the City's median income. See the San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf 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, façade renovation of the 1927 Art Deco style Avenue Theater, 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. According to the Invest In Neighborhoods Storefront Vacancy Survey for San Bruno Ave., vacancy rates declined 4.9 % between 2013 and 2016, and then rose 3.1% between 2016 and 2018. The December 2019 IIN Business Inventory Report recorded a vacancy rate of 9.9%, or 16 vacancies out of 162 storefronts.

⁹⁴ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

⁹⁵ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

Public safety along San Bruno Avenue in the Portola is a concern for both businesses and residents. Between 2018 and 2019, there was 24% increase in assault crimes and a 21% increase in larceny crimes.

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, as well as Churn Urban Creamery ice cream shop 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.

Potrero Hill

Demographics

Approximately 13,770⁹⁶ people live in the Potrero Hill neighborhood. This neighborhood has a higher proportion of children under 18 years old and a lower proportion of residents 60 years and older than San Francisco overall. The population is predominately White, 64%. The Asian population is 16%; the Latino/a population is 14%; and the Black population is 6%. There are about 6,510 housing units in the area, of which 52% are renter-occupied⁹⁷. The median household income for the Potrero Hill neighborhood is significantly higher than the City's median income. See the San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at

https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

Neighborhood Features

Potrero Hill is a residential neighborhood in San Francisco. It is known for its views of the San Francisco Bay and city skyline, its proximity to many destination spots, its sunny weather, and having two freeways and a Caltrain station. Potrero Hill is also in close proximity to the Mission Bay Biotechnology hub, Interstate 280 and Highway 101.

Commercial District Health

Potrero Hill's 18th Street corridor features diverse restaurant options. The corridor is also home to wide variety of retail stores, galleries, bars, music venues, and coffee shops. Additionally, Potrero Hill has many anchor companies and institutions such as The Anchor Brewing Company, California Culinary Academy, Whole Foods, the SF Public Library, and various schools.

Opportunities

The Invest in Neighborhoods (IIN) division of OEWD aims to strengthen small businesses, improve physical conditions, increase quality of life, and increase community capacity. IIN, in collaboration with community stakeholders, provide small business technical assistance such as lease negotiations, legal assistance, and small business financing to respond to the community's unique opportunities and needs. The strategy primarily focuses on the preservation and strengthening of the corridor's existing

⁹⁶ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

⁹⁷ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

businesses and cultural vitality. With these goals in mind we have developed programs to reduce business vulnerabilities and foster growth.

South of Market

Demographics

Approximately 19,180⁹⁸ 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/a residents is smaller than the City overall, the community as a whole is becoming more and more diverse. There are about 12,110⁹⁹ housing units in the area. About 82% of households are renters. The median household income is less than half of the City's median household income. See the San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf 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. SOMA is also home to two of the San Francisco's Cultural Districts, SoMa Pilipinas, established in 2016, and LGBTQ+ and Leather Cultural District, established in 2018. SoMa Pilipinas seeks to increase the visibility and celebrate the contributions of the Filipino community with history in SOMA spanning 100 years. LGBTQ+ and Leather Cultural District commemorating the history and culture of the leather subculture active in the area for approximately half a century.

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 2011 to 2019, 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 2019)

⁹⁸ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

⁹⁹ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

Opportunities

The Central Market Strategy which will be updated in 2021, 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. Additionally, public and private entities have funded Urban Alchemy, a non-profit that deploys ambassadors to bring safety through de-escalation to the neighborhood.

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 previous leadership of Mayor Lee, in 2014, 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 was 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.

In the face of major new streetscape developments slated to begin in the next 12 months, the time is ripe to protect 2014 investments in the Tenderloin/Central Market community and strengthen small business corridors in the Tenderloin and Central Market neighborhood. We currently have the partnerships and social innovations in place to create a well-balanced community but lack the resources to effectively bring them to scale.

The City has been updating aging infrastructure and making improvements to transportation and sewage systems across the City. The Mid-Market & Tenderloin communities have several construction projects (Better Market Street Project, 6th Street Project, Better Taylor Street Project and the Bart Market Street Canopies and Escalators Modernization Project) scheduled to begin in the next two years that will impact small businesses. Depending upon the scale of the construction, this can have disastrous impacts on the short- and long-term economic development of an area.

Sunset/Parkside

Demographics

Approximately 81,050¹⁰⁰ 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, 57%, and 35% White; there are very few black residents. Its Latino/a population is also smaller than the City overall. There are about 29,310 housing units in the area, of which 60% are owner-occupied¹⁰¹. The median household income in the Sunset/Parkside is about the same as Citywide median. See the San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

¹⁰⁰ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

¹⁰¹ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

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.

The Taraval commercial district—Taraval Street from 19th Avenue to 48th 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. Recent, streetscape improvements for Outer Taraval 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” or “San Francisco’s second Chinatown” is a bustling commercial corridor with a variety of boutiques and ethnic restaurants and a 10.5% vacancy rate in 2019. The corridor features a high number of grocery and health and personal care establishments. Irving St from 40th Ave to 48th Ave has seen an increase in businesses opening from 2016–2020 mostly around food, beverages and art.

Noriega Street is a unique and diverse commercial district, with a low vacancy rate of 6.0% in 2019 and a relatively high level of foot traffic. 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. 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 and an 8.9% vacancy rate in 2019. 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. The strength of their merchant association has drawn significant city investment into their existing and new small businesses. The People of Parkside Sunset won best Merchant Association of the Year from the Council of District Merchants in 2019.

Sunset/Parkside is one of the safest areas in the City. Over the past 3 years, incidences of violent crimes have decreased by 24%, however, incidents of property crimes have slightly increased by 1%. (Source: SFPD incidents data, November 2017-October 2020)

Opportunities

The Invest in Neighborhoods (IIN) division of OEWD aims to strengthen small businesses, improve physical conditions, increase quality of life, and increase community capacity. IIN, in collaboration with community stakeholders, provide small business technical assistance such as lease negotiations, legal assistance, and small business financing to respond to the community's unique opportunities and needs. The strategy 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 while leveraging 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 28,220¹⁰² 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 19,210 housing units in the neighborhood¹⁰³. 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 DPH and Human Service Agency housing programs, which serve people who are recently homeless, people with behavioral health diagnoses, and other vulnerable populations.

¹⁰² U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

¹⁰³ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

The median household income for the neighborhood is less than one third of the Citywide median and 30% of residents live below the poverty level. See the San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf 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. MOHCD conducted a survey of residents in 2019. When asked what they liked most about the neighborhood shopping area, residents most frequently cited the location and accessibility. Top concerns included crime and safety issues, blight, and lack of parking.

Public safety is one of the most pressing issues. While Tenderloin and Central Market crimes are marginally increasing, the neighborhood maintains a disproportionately high rate of crime in comparison to most San Francisco neighborhoods. Relative to other commercial districts the neighborhood experiences higher concentrations of assault, robbery, and drug and alcohol violations. (Source: SFPD incidents data, 2012-2019).

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 Mid-Market Business Association is a community-led effort to coordinate activities and spur private-sector efforts to improve the neighborhood.

Over the past nine 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. Currently under construction or approved for the area are 3,264 housing units with approximately 786 which will be below market rate. The storefront vacancy rate has gone down from 30% in 2010 to 12.2 percent in 2018. 17 new arts venues have opened with 10 of them being relocations or expansions of arts venues from within the neighborhood or elsewhere in San Francisco.

Opportunities


The Central Market Strategy which will be updated in 2021, 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. Additionally, public and private entities have funded Urban Alchemy, a non-profit that deploys ambassadors to bring safety through de-escalation to the neighborhood.

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 previous leadership of Mayor Lee, in 2014, 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 was 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.

In the face of major new streetscape developments slated to begin in the next 12 months, the time is ripe to protect 2014 investments in the Tenderloin/Central Market community and strengthen small business corridors in the Tenderloin and Central Market neighborhood. We currently have the partnerships and social innovations in place to create a well-balanced community but lack the resources to effectively bring them to scale.

The City has been updating aging infrastructure and making improvements to transportation and sewage systems across the City. The Mid-Market & Tenderloin communities have several construction projects (Better Market Street Project, 6th Street Project, Better Taylor Street Project and the Bart Market Street Canopies and Escalators Modernization Project) scheduled to begin in the next two years that will impact small businesses. Depending upon the scale of the construction, this can have disastrous impacts on the short- and long-term economic development of an area.

Map 10 – Central Market/Tenderloin Action Zones 2014–2015



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.

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.

Treasure Island

Demographics

Approximately 3,090¹⁰⁴ people live on Treasure Island. Its population is younger than San Francisco's overall, with a proportion of residents between the ages of 18-34 years that is almost double that of San Francisco's, and a significantly lower proportion of residents ages 35-59 years and 60 years and older. More than 30% of the neighborhood is White. Black residents comprise a higher share of the population, 20%, than the City overall. Latino/a residents also comprise a higher share of the population than the City overall. The proportion of Asian population in the neighborhood is smaller than the City's proportion. There are about 770¹⁰⁵ housing units in the neighborhood, all of which are renter occupied. The median household income for Treasure Island is significantly lower than the City's median income. See the San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

Neighborhood Features

Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island are in the San Francisco Bay, about halfway between the San Francisco mainland and Oakland. The Islands are the site of the former Naval Station Treasure Island (NSTI), which is owned by the U.S. Navy. NSTI was closed on September 30, 1997, as part of the Base Realignment and Closure Program. The Islands also include a U.S. Coast Guard Station and Sector Facility, a U.S. Department of Labor Job Corps campus, and Federal Highway Administration land occupied by the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge and tunnel structures.

Treasure and Yerba Buena Islands are home to approximately 1,800 San Francisco residents. All housing on the Islands is rental housing, and there are no homeowner opportunities at this time. The Housing and Urban Design element of the TI/YBI Development Plan contemplates future rental and homeownership opportunities.

The Villages at Treasure Island is market rate rental housing and includes a community of town homes and flats surrounded by open space and large front yards. Most homes include large, private patios and enclosed rear yards. Spacious and fully-featured two, three, and four bedroom floor plans offer large kitchens, ample living and dining rooms, over-sized wardrobe closets and storage space. Market-rate housing on the Islands is managed by the John Stewart Company.

The on-Island residential community also includes participants in supportive-housing programs overseen by One Treasure Island. One Treasure Island is a collaborative of 20 community agencies originally formed in 1994 to develop the formerly-homeless housing and support component of the Reuse Plan for Treasure Island. One Treasure Island initiates community-building efforts to help develop this newly

¹⁰⁴ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

¹⁰⁵ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

forming San Francisco neighborhood and also provides an organized way for member agencies and others to participate. Part of this effort includes developing and/or coordinating access to support services for residents such as a food pantry, recreation activities, health services, and children and youth programs.

Opportunities

The Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island Project facilitates the City's long-term goal of implementing the creation of a new City neighborhood on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island that provides extensive public benefits to the City such as significant amounts of new affordable housing, increased public access and open space, transportation improvements, extensive infrastructure improvements, and recreational and entertainment opportunities, while creating jobs and a vibrant, sustainable community. In particular, the Project provides an innovative transportation program designed to maximize transit usage and opportunities for walking and biking, with a dense mixed-use urban core in close proximity to transit, and provides a model for sustainable development. The Project provides for the creation of approximately 300-acres of public open spaces, including neighborhood parks, sports fields, shoreline parks, wetlands, and urban farm and large areas for passive recreation and native habitat.

The Project provides a new, high-density, mixed-use community with a variety of housing types, a retail core, open space and recreation opportunities, on-site infrastructure, and public and community facilities and services. In all, there will be up to approximately 8,000 residential units; up to approximately 140,000 square feet (sq. ft.) of new commercial and retail space; approximately 100,000 sq. ft. of new office space; up to 500 hotel rooms; approximately 300 acres of parks and open space; bicycle, transit, and pedestrian facilities; a ferry terminal and intermodal transit hub; and new and/or upgraded public services and utilities, including a new or upgraded wastewater treatment plant.

Three historic buildings on Treasure Island would be adapted to house up to 311,000 sq. ft. of commercial space. There is an opportunity to adaptively reuse nine historic buildings and four garages on Yerba Buena Island. The Navy will remediate hazardous materials to standards consistent with applicable Federal laws governing base closure prior to transfer. Geotechnical improvements will be made to stabilize Treasure Island and the causeway that connects it to Yerba Buena Island. Build out will be implemented in phases, anticipated to occur from approximately 2016 through 2034, depending on market conditions.

Visitacion Valley

Demographics

Approximately 18,570¹⁰⁶ 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/a residents than San Francisco overall. There are about 5,280 housing units in the neighborhood, of which 53% are owner-occupied¹⁰⁷. The median household income for the neighborhood is significantly lower than that of the City overall. See the San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at

¹⁰⁶ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

¹⁰⁷ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf 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 including low foot traffic; it has a total of 77 storefronts with the City's highest commercial vacancy rate of 24.7% in 2019. Businesses along the corridor include retail, food services, professional services and social assistance agencies.

Opportunities

The Invest in Neighborhoods (IIN) division OEWD aims to strengthen small businesses, improve physical conditions, increase quality of life, and increase community capacity. IIN, in collaboration with community stakeholders, provide small business technical assistance such as lease negotiations, legal assistance, and small business financing to respond to the community's unique opportunities and needs. The strategy primarily focuses on filling commercial vacancies and strengthening of the corridor's existing businesses. With these goals in mind we have developed programs to reduce business vulnerabilities and foster growth while leveraging opportunities.

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.

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.

Western Addition

Demographics

Approximately 22,220¹⁰⁸ people live in the Western Addition. This population is slightly older than San Francisco's population overall, with a higher proportion of residents 60 years and older than the City.

¹⁰⁸ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

More than 40% of the neighborhood is White, and Black residents comprise a higher share of the population, 21%, than the City overall. The proportion of the Latino/a and Asian population in the neighborhood are smaller than the City's proportions. There are about 12,540¹⁰⁹ housing units in the neighborhood. A majority of households, 79%, in the Western Addition are renters. The median household income for the Western Addition is lower than the City's median income. See the San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf 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 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 home to a growing food scene with new award-winning restaurants such as State Bird Provisions and 1300 on Fillmore.

Commercial District Health

Over the past few years, the Fillmore/Western Addition has been unable to continue with the vibrancy it once had and struggles to keep small businesses open. The Fillmore was hit with many closures of small businesses due to high rents on commercial property, lack of foot traffic, and other city fees attached to running a small business in San Francisco. The December 2013 IIN Business Inventory Report indicated that Geary Boulevard's vacancy rate was 12%, or 12 vacancies out of 100 storefronts, which continued to rise year by year. The December 2019 IIN Business Inventory Report recorded a commercial vacancy rate of 14.6%, or 18 vacancies out of 123 storefronts.

Public safety along the Fillmore is a primary concern for business owners and residents. The area experiences a high volume of crime relative to other commercial districts around the City. The 2018 crime rate in Fillmore, CA, was 134 (City-Data.com crime index), which was 2.1 times smaller than the U.S. average. It was higher than in 50.6% of U.S. cities. The 2018 Fillmore crime rate rose by 23% compared to 2017. The number of homicides stood at 1 - an increase of 1 compared to 2017. In the last five years, Fillmore has seen a rise in violent crime and a decrease in property crime. Merchants and residents express concern about vehicle theft and break-ins, vandalism, and robberies.

Opportunities

The Invest in Neighborhoods (IIN) division of OEWD aims to strengthen small businesses, improve physical conditions, increase quality of life, and increase community capacity. IIN, in collaboration with community stakeholders, provide small business technical assistance such as lease negotiations, legal assistance, and small business financing to respond to the community's unique opportunities and needs. The strategy primarily focuses on the preservation and strengthening of the corridor's existing

¹⁰⁹ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

businesses and cultural vitality. With these goals in mind we have developed programs to reduce business vulnerabilities and foster growth while leveraging opportunities.

Opportunities exist to build on the community the active neighborhood associations 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. With the two Merchants Associations in the area, they will be able to support existing 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.

MA-60 Broadband Needs of Housing occupied by Low- and Moderate-Income Households – 91.210(a)(4), 91.310(a)(2)

Describe the need for broadband wiring and connections for households, including low- and moderate-income households and neighborhoods.

Low-income households in San Francisco are disproportionately impacted by the digital divide. According to the City's 2018 Digital Divide survey, only 59% of low-income residents have high-speed home Internet access, compared to 87% of the city's residents overall. Neighborhoods with the lowest Internet adoption numbers are predominantly low-income communities. For instance, according to the US Census Bureau's ACS, roughly half of households in census blocks containing historical public housing communities such as Hunters View and Sunnysdale lack broadband access. As digitalization accelerates in education, jobs, and even health care in San Francisco, it becomes increasingly important for the City to ensure all residents have adequate access.

Describe the need for increased competition by having more than one broadband Internet service provider serve the jurisdiction.

Multiple studies, including the City's own survey, have found affordability to be the most common barrier to broadband adoption for non-subscribers. Although some ISPs offer discount Internet programs for low-income individuals, these programs offer service at speeds lower than the FCC's broadband standard and have restrictive eligibility criteria, including past debt or other services purchased from the company in the past. In San Francisco, as in many major US cities, low-income neighborhoods have fewer Internet service options, meaning fewer affordable choices.

The City's award-winning Fiber to Housing program aims to address this problem by setting inside wiring standards in affordable housing to enable high-speed Internet and accommodate multiple providers, and then leveraging the City's own fiber-optic facilities to incentivize private ISPs to provide free or low-cost high-speed service to housing sites. Through a partnership with local Internet provider Monkeybrains, this program has thus far connected nearly 3,000 households in 23 housing sites with free fiber Internet connectivity far exceeding FCC's speed standard.

MA-65 Hazard Mitigation – 91.210(a)(5), 91.310(a)(3)

Describe the jurisdiction's increased natural hazard risks associated with climate change.

The following sections provide an overview of climate change and how it influences hazards in San Francisco today and into the future. For more detail, please see Chapter 4 of the San Francisco [Hazards and Climate Resilience Plan](#).

What is Climate Change?

Carbon dioxide is a naturally occurring gas produced by decay, fermentation, and combustion, and absorbed by plants through photosynthesis. Carbon dioxide is one of many greenhouse gases, which are chemical compounds that allows sunlight to reach the earth's surface in one form (as visible light), but absorbs reradiated energy (in the form of heat) from the earth and inhibits it from escaping the atmosphere.¹¹⁰ Beginning in the 20th century, industrial emissions, energy production, transportation, agricultural production, as well as deforestation of the plants that absorb carbon dioxide has increased the concentration of these greenhouse gases in our atmosphere. As these greenhouse gases trap heat, global temperatures increase, and weather becomes more variable and extreme.¹¹¹

Climate change is already happening. The National Ocean and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) identifies 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018 as the four hottest years in recorded history.¹¹² These extreme temperatures have a significant and cascading impact on global weather patterns. High temperatures melt polar ice caps and contribute to the thermal expansion of the oceans which cause global sea levels to rise. Warm ocean temperatures also increase evaporation, and this increased concentration of water vapor in the atmosphere changes rainfall patterns as storms and droughts both become more extreme.

Climate change results in three important changes to the global climate system:

- Increasing temperatures
- Rising sea levels
- Changing precipitation patterns

While climate change may be global in scope, its impacts are local. The following sections discuss the implications that climate change has for hazards in San Francisco today and into the future

Increasing Temperatures

As a result of climate change, San Francisco is already experiencing an increase in temperatures. From 1950 through 2005, the Bay Area saw an average annual maximum temperature increase of 1.7° F.¹¹³ San Francisco reached an all-time high temperature of 106° F on September 1, 2017.¹¹⁴ Climate scientists project 15-40 extreme heat days per year by mid-century, and upwards of 90 extreme heat

¹¹⁰ <https://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/monitoring-references/faq/greenhouse-gases.php>

¹¹¹ San Francisco Climate and Health Adaptation Framework

¹¹² <https://www.noaa.gov/news/2018-was-4th-hottest-year-on-record-for-globe>

¹¹³ California National Resources Agency. California's Fourth Climate Change Assessment: San Francisco Bay Area Region Report. Retrieved from: <http://www.climateassessment.ca.gov/regions/docs/20180827-SanFranciscoBayArea.pdf> (Accessed: 9/10/2018)

¹¹⁴ <http://sanfrancisco.cbslocal.com/2017/09/01/excessive-heat-warning-declared-for-entire-bay-area/>

days per year by end-of-century. Heat waves are similarly projected to increase in both frequency and severity.

Implications for Future Hazards

Higher temperatures influence several hazards, including:

- San Francisco will experience more extreme heat days and heatwaves will be longer. San Franciscans are particularly vulnerable to extreme heat
- Drought and wildfires may become more frequent and severe. Higher temperatures increase evaporation, which dries out soils and vegetation, increasing the severity of drought and making the region more prone to wildland-urban-interface fires.¹¹⁵ In addition, more wildfires can increase the occurrence of poor air quality events

Rising Sea Levels

Rising sea levels will have implications for flooding and liquefaction risks. Sea levels in the Bay Area have already risen by as much as 8 inches in the last 100 years.¹¹⁶ Some areas of the city developed on bay fill zones also face the prospect of subsidence increasing the relative impact of SLR. According to Guidance from the State, San Francisco may see 11-24 inches of sea level rise by 2050 and 30–83 inches by 2100. For an in-depth treatment of SLR Projections and detailed mapping, please see the San Francisco Sea Level Rise Vulnerability & Consequences Assessment,¹¹⁷ which uses 10 scenarios that represent a range of SLR projections.

Implications for Future Hazards

Without action, a variety of hazards will increase as seas rise, including:

- Low-lying areas that are not currently exposed to tides will experience inundation during high tides in the long-term.¹¹⁸
- Coastal flooding will become more frequent as Bay and sea levels occur more often. Coastal flooding will be more extensive and longer-lasting, especially during storm events.¹¹⁹
- Stormwater flooding will increase as high bay levels can impede drainage of stormwater runoff.¹²⁰
- Higher sea levels will also increase the elevation of the groundwater table, increasing the susceptibility of some soils to liquefaction during an earthquake.¹²¹

¹¹⁵ Ekstrom, Julia A., and Susanne C. Moser. 2012. Climate Change Impacts, Vulnerabilities, and Adaptation in the San Francisco Bay Area: A Synthesis of PIER Program Reports and Other Relevant Research. California Energy Commission. Publication number: CEC-500-2012-071.

¹¹⁶ California National Resources Agency. California's Fourth Climate Change Assessment: San Francisco Bay Area Region Report. Retrieved from: <http://www.climateassessment.ca.gov/regions/docs/20180827-SanFranciscoBayArea.pdf> (Accessed: 9/10/2018)

¹¹⁷ City and County of San Francisco, (Publication forthcoming). "Draft Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Consequences Assessment".

¹¹⁸ City and County of San Francisco, 2016. "Sea Level Rise Action Plan."

¹¹⁹ Ibid

¹²⁰ Ibid

¹²¹ Adapting to Rising Tides, "Climate Impacts and Scenarios."
<http://www.adaptingtorisingtides.org/portfolio/climate-impacts-and-scenarios/>

Changing Precipitation Patterns

San Francisco precipitation levels have historically fluctuated between wet and dry extremes. Climate change will amplify this trend. As a result, San Francisco is projected to experience an increase in both flooding and drought. Projections point to a trend towards more intense/frequent storms during the wet-season in the coming decades.

Implications for Future Hazards

Changing precipitation patterns may influence several hazards, including:

- Concentrated precipitation in extreme events may increase stormwater flooding, especially along San Francisco's underground creeks and in San Francisco's natural drainage basins.
- Concentrated precipitation in extreme events may also increase the risk of landslides. An increase in wildland-urban-interface fires also increases landslide risks.
- In dry years, when coastal high-pressure systems do not dissipate during winter months, California may be subject to frequent and severe droughts. In addition, a reduced snowpack in the Sierras can exacerbate drought and compromise water supply.

Table 68 – Summary of Climate Change Implications for Hazards

Climate Change:	Increasing Temperatures	Rising Sea Levels	Changing Precipitation Patterns
Implications for Hazards:	More extreme heat days, making heatwaves more frequent and longer-lasting. Drought and wildland-urban-interface fires may become more frequent and severe.	More frequent, extensive and longer-lasting coastal flooding , especially during storm events. Stormwater flooding may increase as high bay levels can impede drainage of stormwater runoff. Higher groundwater table may increase the susceptibility of some soils to liquefaction during an earthquake.	Concentrated precipitation in discrete storm events may increase stormwater flooding . Droughts may be more frequent and severe. Reduced snowpack in the Sierras may also exacerbate drought .

Describe the vulnerability to these risks of housing occupied by low- and moderate-income households based on an analysis of data, findings, and methods.

The following section describes the vulnerabilities of housing occupied by low- and moderate-income households to climate hazards. More information can be found in the Housing Vulnerability and Consequence Profile, which can be found in Appendix A of the San Francisco [Hazards and Climate Resilience Plan](#).


Flooding

Single family homes have low exposure to all types of flooding, but around 800 homes are in the 100-year stormwater flood zone. Around 12,000 multifamily units are exposed in both the stormwater

flooding and 24" sea level rise zones. The proportion of affordable housing exposed to all types of flooding is higher than rates for other housing types. The 66" sea level rise zone contains over 4,000 affordable units.

Most homes are not built to withstand any amount of flooding, as current construction materials, siting and design standards do not consider potential exposure to either water or salt. San Francisco does not have an adopted FEMA flood plain with building code requirements but both coastal floodplains (through FEMA) and urban flood zones (through SFPUC) are under development.

Map 11 – Subsidized Affordable Housing and Flood Hazard



Extreme Heat and Poor Air Quality

Older and un-weatherized buildings or those without air conditioning can lead to unhealthy conditions for occupants, particularly the elderly, children, and those with illnesses that make them more sensitive to heat. Given the usually mild conditions in San Francisco, most housing does not have air conditioning.

Older housing without adequate HVAC puts residents at higher risk of heat and air quality health impacts from wildfire smoke. This has a particular impact on sensitive populations, such as children, the elderly, those who are pregnant, and those with medical conditions. This can be particularly acute in Single Room Occupancy buildings (SROs), as well as Skilled Nursing Facilities.

Vulnerabilities for Low- and Moderate-Income Households

Low- and moderate-income residents are particularly vulnerable to housing damage because they are more likely to rent, more likely to spend a high percentage of their income on housing and may not have the financial resources to find replacement housing, repair damage, or invest in weatherization and retrofits. Structural racism and enduring impacts of exclusionary zoning make these vulnerabilities even more acute for communities of color who face displacement pressure under normal conditions. Climate change impacts could worsen these pressures. Below is more detail on specific housing challenges faced by low- and moderate-income San Francisco households and how that influences their vulnerability to climate hazards.

Rent Controlled Housing

As of 2015, an estimated 68,000 low income renters and 24,000 moderate income renters lived in rent-controlled units and many were paying rents significantly below market. If tenants are forced to relocate after a disaster it could be difficult to find homes at an affordable price,

Cost burdened Renters

2013-2017 ACS data shows over 87,000 renters in San Francisco who are cost burdened, spending more than 30% of income on rent. Of these, over 42,000 are severely cost burdened or paying more than 50% of income on rent. Many of these households are already taxed financially and dislocation from their housing could make it difficult to remain in the city during recovery. Communities of color, including African Americans and Latino/as along with seniors and people with disabilities are face higher rates of severe rent burden.

Cost Burdened Owners

2013-2017 ACS data shows over 41,000 owner households are cost burdened spending more than 30% of income. Of these, over 18,000 are severely cost burdened spending more than 50% of income on housing costs. While homeowners have more security of tenure and are likely to have more wealth in home equity, lower income homeowners who are the majority of owners with severe cost burdens, are likely to be least equipped to recover from a disaster with less savings and less capacity to navigate bureaucracy to access recovery funds.

Overcrowding

2013-2017 ACS data shows 6% of all households or 22,000 households are overcrowded, meaning there are more than one person per habitable room and more than half of these households are severely overcrowded with more than 1.5 people per room. Overcrowding is problem overwhelmingly faced by families with children and is mostly a problem for low income households. It is also more pronounced among people of color especially Asians and Latino/as. Many families with children who are overcrowding will struggle to find housing that can accommodate their families should they be displaced due to disaster.

Subsidized affordable housing

There are approximately 33,000 housing units in San Francisco that have been built or preserved with public subsidy to be affordable to people with low- and moderate-incomes.

Some buildings that serve low income tenants may have maintenance and modernization needs that could affect recovery or resiliency after a disaster. Because affordable housing financing depends on many sources, re-financing for repair or rebuilding could be more complex than average for a multifamily building. Some publicly funded developments also house people with physical, mental, and developmental disabilities who need special attention in the event of evacuation.

SROs

There are approximately 19,000 single room occupancy (SRO) units in hundreds of buildings around the city. These small units tend to be more affordable than other housing and disproportionately serve lower income people including many seniors, people with disabilities, people of color, and immigrant families. Most SROs were built in the nine years following the 1906 earthquake and many are nearly 100 years old. As a result, many buildings may have significant maintenance needs, need adaptations for changing weather, and could need significant repairs following a disaster. Over 12,000 SRO units are privately owned while more 6,500 are nonprofit owned (and are included in the 33,000 affordable units described above).

Skilled Nursing Facilities (SNFs)

SNFS are often located in residential buildings and serve medically-vulnerable residents who need daily care. Any impacts to residential buildings that include SNFs would have severe impacts on residents who are unable to evacuate and need consistent access to medical care.

Strategic Plan

SP-05 Overview

Strategic Plan Overview

Based on the key findings from the community engagement process and on MOHCD's role within the City structure, MOHCD has determined that the optimum way to address the City's priority needs is to work towards a set of five interconnected, multidisciplinary objectives that cross program areas and utilize leveraged strategies both internally and across multiple city departments (see Figure 22 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/HSR and where HUD funds can provide the maximum benefit in terms of unmet need and resource scarcity. These five objectives are:

- Objective 1: Families and individuals are stably housed
- Objective 2: Families and individuals are resilient and economically self-sufficient
- Objective 3: Communities have healthy physical, social, and business infrastructure
- Objective 4: Communities at risk of displacement are stabilized
- Objective 5: City works to eliminate the causes of racial disparities

Each of these three objectives is supported by a comprehensive set of goals and activities that will guide MOHCD/OEWD/HSR through the next five years with specific activities that will enable the City to move its most vulnerable populations towards the five overarching objectives. Many of these goals and activities will be leveraged to support multiple objectives and will address multiple needs.


MOHCD has also identified five target populations based on the findings from the community engagement process and on MOHCD's role within the City structure. The five target populations are:

- Extremely and very low-income households
- Households with barriers to access to opportunities
- Households at risk of displacement
- Households experiencing a legacy of exclusion
- Households destabilized by system trauma

Figure 22 – MOHCD Theory Change

MOHCD Theory of Change

(includes OEWD/HSB Consolidated Plan work)



Objectives

Families and Individuals are Stably Housed

MOHCD has undergone several significant changes in the past five 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 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, MOHCD 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 SFHA to rehabilitate and convert over 3,400 public housing units to private ownership and management under HUD's RAD (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.

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: 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 20148 data by the Insight Center for Community Economic Development shows that of San Francisco’s households, 28% 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 69 – Self-Sufficiency Standard for San Francisco Households with Two Adults, One Pre-Schooler and One Child 13–18

Self-Sufficiency Wage		Emergency Savings Fund	
Hourly Per Adult	\$24.79	Monthly Contribution	\$186
Monthly	\$8,725		
Annually	\$104,702		
Self-Sufficiency Standard			
Expense Type		Monthly Cost	
Housing		\$3,099	
Childcare		\$1,718	
Food		\$1,121	
Transportation		\$188	
Health Care		\$618	
Miscellaneous		\$675	
Taxes		\$1,739	
Earned Income Tax Credit		\$0	
Childcare Tax Credit		(\$100)	
Child Tax Credit		(\$333)	

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.

Communities at Risk of Displacement Are Stabilized

To address these issues of displacement, the City is committed to a set of values and programs, including the following:

- Strengthen Tenant Protections and Housing Stabilization Programs
 - Implement, evaluate, fully fund, and explore stable funding sources for the San Francisco Tenant Right to Counsel (TRC), which provides legal representation to tenants facing eviction.
 - Expand and explore stable funding sources for tenants' rights education and counseling programs, and mediation programs
 - Expand and explore stable funding sources for rent subsidy programs to assist specific underserved populations and rent-burdened households
 - Enhance mediation process for minor lease violations and explore changes to the eviction notification process.
- Preserve Existing Housing Serving Low-Income Households
 - Expand affordable housing nonprofit capacity to purchase multifamily residential buildings, expand existing funding, and identify potential fixed funding sources for the Small Site Program.
 - Better understand the number of unauthorized units (UDUs) and explore small low-interest loan and grant program opportunities to legalize UDUs.
 - Expand acquisition and master lease status, address maintenance issues, enhance tenant protections, and adjust sale notification report requirements of Single Room Occupancy (SRO) Hotels
- Maximize Housing Production that Supports Community Stability
 - Explore revisions to the HOME-SF program to ensure it maximizes the production of housing, particularly permanently affordable units.
 - Incentivize affordable Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) construction through financial incentives, technical assistance, and ongoing property management support targeting senior, low-income, and single-family homeowners.
 - Expand housing development options to support intergenerational and growing household needs, including multifamily housing and density adjustments.
 - Continue efforts to maximize State and Federal funding for affordable housing production.
- Support Arts and Cultural Stabilization
 - Continue to build upon existing funding opportunities, technical assistance, and partnerships to build capacity and mitigate displacement of artists and arts organizations.
 - Expand preservation and support for existing arts and culture spaces.
- Encourage City and Community Partnerships to Sustain Neighborhood Cultural Heritage
 - Support the Cultural Districts Initiative's efforts to sustain the neighborhood's rich art, culture, traditions, ways of life, history, and overall community ecosystem.

- Coordinate and streamline City resources and partnership opportunities to implement the strategies identified in each Cultural District report.
- Support Small Businesses and Neighborhood Commercial Districts
 - Identify potential funding sources to expand support for small business grants, loans, and neighborhood economic stabilization
 - Retain Legacy Businesses with targeted support through the nomination and application process
 - Continue to preserve and incentivize the creation of Production, Distribution, and Repair (PDR) spaces and explore an in-lieu fee option.
 - Streamline the City permit process for businesses.
- Expand Workforce Development Programs
 - Continue to prioritize employment and training resources for those communities with large barriers to employment.
 - Expand training and employment opportunities in emerging and growing industries such as Cannabis and Commercial Driving, particularly through the apprenticeship model, and programs such as CityDrive, Advanced Manufacturing training pilot, and Opportunities for All.
 - Expand career pathway opportunities in non-construction industries such as healthcare, technology, and hospitality for disadvantaged community members, leveraging City's increased investment in the First Source Hiring Program.

City Works to Eliminate the Causes of Racial Disparities

MOHCD is committed to the principles of racial equity and the elimination of racial disparities. Our department recognizes the oppressive history of racial injustice, especially in housing and community services, the structural inequities that remain today, and the trauma those inequities perpetuate. We achieve racial equity when race no longer determines one's socioeconomic outcomes.

Our vision is that through our policies, programs and practices, MOHCD works in partnership with the City's communities, organizations and people that have been most harmed by racial inequity to shape where they live and work, create thriving neighborhoods, celebrate diverse cultures and build intergenerational wealth. We intend to ensure that all levels of MOHCD staff reflect the people we serve.

Target Populations

Extremely and Very Low-Income Households

Extremely low-income households are defined as households whose incomes are below 30% of the Area Median (AMI) Income. Very low-income households are those whose incomes are below 50% of AMI. The AMI for San Francisco for FY 2019 is \$136,800.

According to an MOHCD analysis of 2017 ACS (ACS) data, roughly one-third of all San Franciscans qualify as low or extremely low income. By volume, these persons are largely White (28%), Chinese (24%), and Latino/a (22%). However, all three have unemployment rates comparable to the city average, and therefore, comprise a significant portion (74%) of San Francisco's working poor.

African Americans and American Indians, on the other hand, represent a much smaller portion of San Francisco's low and extremely low-income population due to smaller overall numbers (5% and 0.2% of the population, respectively). However, these two groups are more likely to be low or extremely low income; 63% of American Indians and 59% of African Americans are low or extremely low income, compared to 50% of Latino/as, 37% of Chinese, and 23% of White residents. They are also much more likely to be unemployed than any other group; they are twice and eight times more likely to be unemployed, respectively.

Households with Barriers to Access to Opportunities

Primary barriers to opportunities include limited English proficiency, low digital access or literacy, low educational attainment, criminal record, and immigration status.

Households at Risk of Displacement

San Francisco's increasing income inequality and housing and business costs have been linked to changes in the city's socio-economic composition and displacement of communities of color and the businesses and organizations that serve them and low-income households. Displacement can surface as residential, commercial, or psychological and can be direct and indirect, physical or economic and exclusionary. Residential and commercial displacement is the process by which a household or commercial tenant is forced to move from its residence or place of business. Psychological displacement is both the fear of loss and the sentiment that what was once home is no longer a welcoming space. There are countless impacts of displacement on a household, community, neighborhood, and city. A stable community is one that provides existing residents and businesses the choice to stay in the neighborhood rather than be forcibly displaced as change and pressures occur. Vulnerable populations tend to be most at risk of displacement.

Vulnerable groups include people of color (Black, Latinx/Hispanic, Asian, Native American/American Indian, and Pacific Islander), people living with disabilities, low-income households, people experiencing homelessness, seniors, youth, immigrants, LGBTQ+, refugees, linguistically isolated households, small businesses, veterans, and non-profit organizations.

Pressures from displacement cause vulnerable populations to move within San Francisco or leave it entirely. These vulnerable households may be pushed from their neighborhood into higher poverty, lower-resourced neighborhoods. Low-income households experienced the highest percentage of out-migration (four percent) of any other income category between 2006 and 2015. In 2017, in San Francisco, Black residents made up 5.3 percent of the city's population, when these residents had previously made up 11 percent of the city's total population in 1990. In the time span of 25 years, the proportion of the Black population in San Francisco was reduced by half, a far more rapid decline than the rest of the Bay Area. Displacement of low-income households to other lower-income neighborhoods intensifies poverty conditions, creates new patterns of segregation and reduces access to opportunities. The movement into other housing also may increase the transportation or/and housing cost burden on the migrating household, especially if the housing lost is rent controlled or more affordable than any current options.

In addition to residential displacement, businesses, non-profit organizations (NPOs) and service providers are similarly struggling to stay in San Francisco. Business closures and location changes have increased significantly in the last 20 years. Though it is difficult to quantify commercial displacement, a significant number of commercial corridors have higher and longer periods of vacancy. The high cost of

opening and operating a business, higher rent speculation, and online retail sales, among other factors may lead to empty storefronts and underutilized retail spaces throughout the city.

In 2016, a survey of NPOs showed that those with at least one location in San Francisco are more likely to be very concerned about the real estate market having a negative impact on their futures.⁹ The implications not only include NPOs losing their space, but also constituents, who are often from vulnerable populations, losing valuable services and gathering space. Non-profits in the survey with at least one location in San Francisco are more likely to have to decide about relocation compared to NPOs in other Bay Area cities.

The City is tracking displacement through eviction notices, among other data sources. Though eviction notices do not capture the full extent of displacement, they provide a proxy for eviction rates in the city. As home rental prices escalated between 2010 and 2016, certain types of eviction notices also increased and then flattened in 2017 correlating with a stabilization of rents. For example, the number of capital improvement evictions have increased since rental prices escalated in the city. Similarly, utility pass through, operating and maintenance, and capital improvement petitions filed by landlords increased from 2016. Capital improvement petitions were most frequent in the Tenderloin and Inner Richmond.

Although the total number of eviction notices have generally decreased over time since the 1990s, the types of eviction notices filed with the Rent Board follow different trends.¹¹ In the past ten years, neighborhoods with predominantly low-income households (such as the Outer Sunset, South of Market, Excelsior, and Mission) have had a higher proportion of no-fault eviction notices (Ellis Act, Owner Move-In, Relative Move-In, and Capital Improvements eviction notices, among others). Between January 2016 and July 2019, predominantly low-income census tracts received the highest number of overall eviction notices: the Ingleside, Richmond, Outer Mission, Visitacion Valley, and Mission Districts experienced the highest number of no-fault eviction notices; Ingleside, Northeast, Downtown, and Mission Planning Districts experienced the highest number of at-fault evictions during that time period.

Households Experiencing a Legacy of Exclusion

MOHCD has defined households experiencing a legacy of exclusion as households with Black/African American and Native Americans-descendants of American slavery and survivors of Native American genocide. At MOHCD we recognize the oppressive and exploitative history of racial injustice, as well as the present-day structural inequities that exist in the United States, San Francisco and the greater Bay Area.

For over 500 years, starting with the European colonialization of Native American lands and people, cultural, institutional and personal racism have worked to oppress all people of color in this country and especially our Black/African American and Native American populations. In many cases, local, state and federal governments and institutions have been leaders and partners in discriminatory policies and practices designed to disenfranchise these populations, robbing them of their humanity and real opportunities to build wealth and community stability. In spite of these historic and persistent racial inequities, these groups built and sustained vibrant and beautiful cultures and have remained significant contributors across all areas of society. Their resilience is remarkable and deserving of our admiration.

Households Destabilized by Systemic Trauma

MOHCD defines trauma as lasting adverse effects on the individual's functioning and mental, physical, social, emotional, or spiritual well-being resulting from an event, series of events, or set of circumstances that an individual may experience as physically or emotionally harmful or life-threatening.

MOHCD recognizes that many institutional systems and practices cause trauma such as institutional racism; exclusionary policies in housing, employment, education and health; discrimination due to gender, sex, or age; intergenerational poverty, and biased criminal justice. MOHCD understands that households destabilized by this systemic trauma need significant support and investment to be able to function or survive.

Target Sub-Populations

MOHCD has identified sub-populations that fall under one or more of the target population.

Culturally Specific Groups

Black and African American

According to the Census Bureau's ACS 2017 five-year estimates, there are approximately 44,000 Black and African American residents in San Francisco, comprising 5% of the City's total population. The neighborhoods with the highest proportion of Black and African American population are Bayview Hunter's Point (26%), Western Addition (18%), Treasure Island (17%), Ocean/Merced/Ingleside (12%), and South of Market (10%).

The proportion of Blacks and African Americans 25 years and older in San Francisco with no high school diploma is 11%, compared to a Citywide proportion of 12%. The median household income for Black and African American households is \$30,325, which is 31% of the City's overall median household income of \$96,265. 32% of Black and African American San Franciscans live below the poverty level, compared to 12% of all San Franciscans. The poverty level is defined as an annual income of approximately \$25,000 for family of four. The unemployment rate of Black and African American residents 16 years and older is 15%, compared to a 5% rate for all San Francisco residents.

Specific target populations were invited to participate in focus groups during data collection for this Consolidated Plan. Analysis of population-specific input reflects specific needs for public facilities, improvements, and services. Below are the top needs identified by Black and African American community members during focus groups, forums, and surveys.

Black and African American community members, as well as advocates and leaders, highlighted that historical and existing racial disparities not only affect long-term economic opportunities for this community, but also access to public services, programs, and resources. Consequently, there is a need for culturally relevant services focused on self-sufficiency and independence (such as housing navigation or access to public benefits), economic empowerment (home ownership, land ownership, business ownership), behavioral health services, as well as healing or reparative services that incorporate approaches informed by an understanding of intergenerational trauma and racial disparities. Participants also commented on the need for safer open spaces for families and safer transportation options for getting to school or work. The needs most frequently discussed by this community include:

- Targeted Outreach
- Housing Navigation and Other Services for Persons Experiencing Homelessness
- Behavioral Health Services
- Financial Education, Empowerment, and Planning Services
- Trauma-Informed Healing or Reparative Services

The survey data shows that the following needs were the most cited by Black and African American community members:

- Housing – More affordable housing
- Employment – Higher Income
- Financial – Rental subsidy, housing voucher, or other reduced-cost housing
- Wellness – Access to healthy food
- Employment – Learning new skills
- Financial – Down payment help
- Benefits – Help with CalWorks, SNAP, MediCare, MediCal, General Assistance, etc.

Latino/a

According to the Census Bureau's ACS 2017 five-year estimates, there are approximately 132,000 Latino/a residents in San Francisco, comprising 15% of the City's total population. The neighborhoods with the highest proportion of Latino/a population are Mission (38%), Treasure Island (34%), Excelsior (32%), Bernal Heights (29%), Visitacion Valley (28%), and Outer Mission (27%).

171,041 or 21% of San Francisco's population five years and older speak English less than very well. Of the limited English proficient San Franciscans, 20% or 34,760 speak Spanish.

The proportion of Latino/as 25 years and older in San Francisco with no high school diploma is 23%, almost double the Citywide proportion of 12%. The median household income for Latino/a households is \$67,282, which is 70% of the City's overall median household income of \$96,265. 14% of Latino/a San Franciscans live below the poverty level, compared to 12% of all San Franciscans. The poverty level is defined as an annual income of approximately \$25,000 for family of four. The unemployment rate of Latino/a residents 16 years and older is 6%, compared to a 5% rate for all San Francisco residents.

Specific target populations were invited to participate in focus groups during data collection for this Consolidated Plan. Analysis of population-specific input reflects specific needs for public facilities, improvements, and services. Below are the top needs identified by the Latino/a community during focus groups, forums, and surveys:

- Benefits Assistance, Service Navigation, and Case Management
- Financial Education, Empowerment, and Planning Services

The survey data shows that the following needs were the most cited by Latino/a community members:

- Housing – More affordable housing
- Employment – Higher Income
- Financial – Rental subsidy, housing voucher, or other reduced-cost housing
- Benefits – Help with CalWorks, SNAP, MediCare, MediCal, General Assistance, etc.
- Wellness – Access to healthy food
- Financial – Down payment help

Middle Eastern and North African

Specific target populations were invited to participate in focus groups during data collection for this Consolidated Plan. Analysis of population-specific input reflects specific needs for public facilities, improvements, and services. Workforce Readiness, Job Training, and Placement Services are the top

needs identified by the Middle Eastern and North African community during focus groups, forums, and surveys.

The survey data shows that the following needs were the most cited by Middle Eastern and North African community members:

- Housing – More affordable housing
- Financial – Rental subsidy, housing voucher, or other reduced-cost housing
- Health – Better access to healthcare
- Employment – Higher Income
- Wellness – Access to healthy food
- Wellness – Access to recreation
- Legal – Worker/employment rights

Native American and Indigenous

According to the Census Bureau's ACS 2017 five-year estimates, there are approximately 1,400 Native American and Indigenous residents in San Francisco, comprising 0.2% of the City's total population. The neighborhoods with the highest proportion of Native American and Indigenous population are Mission, Excelsior, Sunset/Parkside, and Tenderloin.

The proportion of the Native American and Indigenous community members 25 years and older in San Francisco with no high school diploma is 19%, compared to a Citywide proportion of 12%. The median household income for Native American and Indigenous households is \$52,276, which is 54% of the City's overall median household income of \$96,265. 14% of Native American and Indigenous San Franciscans live below the poverty level, compared to 12% of all San Franciscans. The poverty level is defined as an annual income of approximately \$25,000 for family of four. The unemployment rate of Native American and Indigenous residents 16 years and older is 10%, double the 5% rate for all San Francisco residents.

Specific target populations were invited to participate in focus groups during data collection for this Consolidated Plan. Analysis of population-specific input reflects specific needs for public facilities, improvements, and services. Behavioral Health Services and Education Services (GED/HS programs) are the top needs identified by the Native American and Indigenous community during focus groups, forums, and surveys.

The survey data shows that the following needs were the most cited by Native American and Indigenous community members:

- Housing – More affordable housing
- Employment – Higher Income
- Financial – Rental subsidy, housing voucher, or other reduced-cost housing
- Wellness – Access to healthy food
- Employment – Learning new skills
- Benefits – Help with CalWorks, SNAP, MediCare, MediCal, General Assistance, etc.
- Employment – Getting a job
- Health – Better access to healthcare

Samoan

Specific target populations were invited to participate in focus groups during data collection for this Consolidated Plan. Analysis of population-specific input reflects specific needs for public facilities, improvements, and services. Below are the top needs identified by the Samoan community during focus groups, forums, and surveys.

The survey data shows that the following needs were the most cited by Samoan community members:

- Housing – More affordable housing
- Childcare – After-school programs
- Benefits – Help with CalWorks, SNAP, MediCare, MediCal, General Assistance, etc.
- Financial – Rental subsidy, housing voucher, or other reduced-cost housing
- Education – GED and high school diploma programs
- Employment – Learning new skills

Southeast Asian (Primarily Cambodian, Laotian, Vietnamese)

Specific target populations were invited to participate in focus groups during data collection for this Consolidated Plan. Analysis of population-specific input reflects specific needs for public facilities, improvements, and services. Below are the top needs identified by the Southeast Asian community during focus groups, forums, and surveys.

- *Cambodians*
 - Targeted Outreach
 - Housing Navigation and Other Services for Persons Experiencing Homelessness
 - Benefits Assistance, Service Navigation, and Case Management
 - Improved Cultural Inclusivity and Accessibility for Public Services
- *Vietnamese*
 - Targeted Outreach
 - Housing Navigation and Other Services for Persons Experiencing Homelessness
 - Improved Cultural Inclusivity and Accessibility for Public Services
 - Education Services (GED/HS programs)

The survey data shows that the following needs were the most cited by Southeast Asian community members:

- Housing – More affordable housing
- Employment – Learning new skills
- Employment – Higher Income
- Benefits – Help with CalWorks, SNAP, MediCare, MediCal, General Assistance, etc.
- Health – Better access to healthcare
- Employment – Getting a job

Very Low-Income Households that are Not Homeless

This target population are very low income households that may be living in housing but whose housing may be precarious due to possibility of unaffordable rent increases. These households may include very low-income families or individuals working low-wage jobs or receiving public assistance.

Very Low-Income Homeowners

San Francisco has a 37.6% homeownership rate compared to the national rate of 64.3%. Homeownership is concentrated in the west and southern and southeastern parts of the city. The southern neighborhoods are also areas of low-income concentration. Although homeownership provides some level of financial security due to the equity homeowners may have in their homes, elderly homeowners may be on fixed incomes and therefore may not have the cash available to perform extensive home repairs without taking equity out of their homes. Home improvements often needed for elderly homeowners are improvements to make their homes more accessible as they age in their homes.

Persons Experiencing Homelessness

See Homeless Needs Assessment section of this document. For details about persons experiencing homelessness, see the 2019 San Francisco Homeless Count Report at http://hsh.sfgov.org/wp-content/uploads/2019HIRDReport_SanFrancisco_FinalDraft.pdf

Specific target populations were invited to participate in focus groups during data collection for this Consolidated Plan. Analysis of population-specific input reflects specific needs for public facilities, improvements, and services. Below are the top needs identified by the homeless community during focus groups, forums, and surveys:

- Benefits Assistance, Service Navigation, and Case Management
- Behavioral Health Services
- Workforce Readiness, Job Training, and Placement Services
- Financial Education, Empowerment, and Planning Services

The survey data shows that the following needs were the most cited by homeless community members:

- Housing – More affordable housing
- Financial – Rental subsidy, housing voucher, or other reduced-cost housing
- Employment – Higher Income
- Benefits – Help with CalWorks, SNAP, MediCare, MediCal, General Assistance, etc.
- Employment – Getting a job
- Wellness – Access to healthy food

Households with Low Educational Attainment

The self-sufficiency standards for San Francisco households are some of the highest in the country. As a result, it is becoming increasingly difficult for many San Francisco residents to earn a livable wage if they do not have a college degree (Citywide Workforce Services Alignment Plan, 2017).

Among San Franciscans 25 years and older, nearly 83,000 or 12% do not have a high school diploma credential but no college degree. They are predominantly from communities of color. Racial groups with a proportion of community members without a high school diploma that's higher than the citywide proportion are Latino/a (23%), Asian (21%) and American Indian and Alaska Native (19%).

These residents are in need of academic skills that can help bridge the gap between their current educational attainment and entry into post-secondary institutions or industry-aligned job training and apprenticeship programs.

The survey data shows that the following needs were the most cited by respondents without a high school diploma:

- Housing – More affordable housing
- Health – Better access to healthcare
- Employment – Getting a job
- Financial – Rental subsidy, housing voucher, or other reduced-cost housing
- Childcare – After-school programs
- Employment – Learning new skills
- Benefits – Help with CalWorks, SNAP, MediCare, MediCal, General Assistance, etc.

Limited English Proficient Households

In San Francisco, language access is highly correlated with educational attainment and household income. Most San Franciscans with a high school degree or less are either naturalized citizens or citizens of another country (Citywide Workforce Services Alignment Plan, 2017). Many do not speak English or do not speak English well enough to access workforce, educational and other community opportunities (including critical services).

171,041 or 21% of San Francisco’s population five years and older speak English less than very well. Of this population who speak English less than “very well”:

- 96,338 (57%) speak Chinese (including Mandarin and Cantonese)
- 34,760 (20%) speak Spanish
- 8,989 (5%) speak Tagalog
- 6,593 (4%) speak Russian, Polish, or other Slavic language
- 6,049 (4%) speak Vietnamese

The survey data shows that the following needs were the most cited by respondents who preferred a language other than English:

- Housing – More affordable housing
- Health – Better access to healthcare
- Employment – Getting a job
- Employment – Higher Income
- Financial – Rental subsidy, housing voucher, or other reduced-cost housing
- Benefits – Help with CalWorks, SNAP, MediCare, MediCal, General Assistance, etc.

Immigrants, including Undocumented Immigrants and Refugees

The San Francisco Immigrant Legal & Education Network

The San Francisco Immigrant Legal & Education Network (SFILEN) is a collaboration of thirteen multiracial, multilingual community-based organizations that provide critical legal services and outreach to San Francisco immigrants. SFILEN clients face barriers in accessing social services, have fear of local law enforcement, and are being detained and deported in record numbers. SFILEN staff has direct experience supporting low-income, underserved immigrants with culturally and linguistically appropriate services to address the barriers facing San Francisco’s immigrant communities.

The San Francisco Immigrant Integration Project (2014)

SFILEN conducted a two-year community research effort, the San Francisco Immigrant Integration Project (“Integration Project”). The goal of the Integration Project was to engage a broad range of stakeholders on immigrant integration issues, to document the unique needs of the immigrant community, and to propose relevant policies and practices for meaningful integration.

Based on figures from the ACS, San Francisco’s adult foreign-born population (18 years and older) comprises nearly 40% of the city. While San Francisco is often perceived as an immigrant friendly and welcoming sanctuary city, participants in the integration project have stated otherwise. Many are immigrants struggling to find a job and affordable housing in an expensive city. The warm welcome of San Francisco is sharply contrasted with the lack of access to city resources and limited meaningful engagement from city stakeholders.

This project documents how San Francisco immigrant communities struggle to gain access to services and what they do in the face of these service gaps. This project also provides recommendations for San Francisco to improve immigrant integration through an emphasis on effective and accessible city services, the removal of cultural and linguistic barriers, and the participation of all stakeholders.

The Integration Project consisted of three community-based phases: (1) collaborative, multilingual planning and research, including a preliminary interview process with select community members; (2) community-based research with focus groups and administration of a multilingual survey to San Francisco immigrants; and (3) a community engagement process to present the project’s findings and begin to frame future policy or advocacy recommendations for SFILEN.

SFILEN staff and community leaders surveyed 625 San Francisco immigrants with 609 valid, complete surveys. The Integration Project was distributed in the community for six weeks and the survey was available in Spanish, Chinese, San Francisco Immigrant Legal & Education Network 3 Tagalog, Arabic, Tigrinya, and English. All participants were San Francisco residents, 18 years or older, and “immigrant” was defined as those born outside of the United States. Most survey participants were clients of SFILEN’s legal services, constituent members of SFILEN organizations, or other immigrant residents that came in contact with SFILEN service providers. The staff at the University of San Francisco’s Leo T. McCarthy Center for Public Service and the Common Good was instrumental in the survey design, processing and disaggregation of quantitative data from the surveys.

In addition to the survey, SFILEN staff and community leaders conducted more than 30 one-on-one interviews, nine in-language focus groups, and brought together more than 150 community members for convenings to share the results. In total, SFILEN engaged more than 800 San Francisco community members and immigrants.

Key Findings

1. **Common Dreams:** Nearly 63% of survey participants indicated that they came to the U.S. for “a better life.” Focus group participants further explained that they had hope for better employment and educational opportunities, to reunite with family members, or to escape political turmoil in their home countries.
2. **Access to Services:** Despite feeling welcome in San Francisco (63% of respondents said they felt adjusted to U.S. culture), most immigrants still face barriers to critical services and programs. All survey participants indicated they had unmet needs when it comes to accessing basic support.

3. **Key Challenges:** The San Francisco immigrant community has the most difficulty with employment and housing. San Francisco immigrants are unemployed and underemployed with 45% indicating they are out of work and 21% working only part time. They indicated that employment services are inaccessible due to language barriers or being difficult to locate. Additionally, 45% of participants indicated that their housing needs are not being met and 58% have difficulty accessing housing services.
4. **Immigrant Access to Healthcare:** A majority of immigrants indicated that their health care needs are being met, but there is still some confusion and misinformation about eligibility for local health care programs. Nearly 70% of all immigrants indicated they have been able to access health services. But many immigrants indicated that they were not entirely clear about the requirements for health care programs, including some people fearing that their information would be turned over to immigration officials.
5. **Undocumented Immigrants:** Approximately 20% of survey respondents indicated they are undocumented while 7% declined to state their immigrant status. San Francisco's undocumented immigrant community faces additional barriers when it comes to accessing city services. Undocumented immigrants have difficulty accessing most programs because of a lack of documentation/ identification and limited funds. Additionally, fear of law enforcement is a daily challenge for most immigrant communities, but particularly Latino/a immigrants who witness increased police presence in their neighborhoods. They also witness growing collaboration between police officers and immigration authorities.
6. **Civic Participation:** Most immigrants, 60% of survey participants, indicated that they wish civic participation was a bigger part of their lives. They wish to participate in voting, community education events, attend city hearings, and community rallies more to be a part of improving their own communities.
7. **Support systems:** Immigrant communities utilize creative, community-based support systems because they lack access to or do not trust city agencies. Immigrant communities are using mutual aid programs, cooperative models, and informal networks between friends to try to fill service gaps.

Recommendations

1. **Redefine immigrant integration** to move beyond welcoming messages and cultural celebrations. What is most meaningful to new immigrants is access to critical services (such as housing, employment, and health care) that are needed for a good quality of life.
2. **Expand community education and outreach.** Immigrants in San Francisco have trouble accessing services due to lack of information or misinformation. They are also unaware of pro-immigrant policies and programs that they could benefit from. Targeted education and outreach conducted by community members with existing relationships and linguistic and cultural competency/humility can fill the gap.
3. **Promote best practices and innovative strategies** to increase access to services. San Francisco stakeholders can implement a number of initiatives to increase access for immigrants such as workforce training initiatives for low-skilled workers, expanding worker protection laws, and

creating a centralized housing database. Best practices account for linguistic, cultural, and educational barriers that immigrant communities most often face.

4. Build bridges with the receiving community. The existing neighborhoods and residents of a demographically changing city have a stake in this as well. With better immigrant integration, our local schools, local economy, and neighborhood relationships all improve. Greater interactions, relationship-building, and mutual support between immigrants and receiving communities should be promoted and supported by city officials.
5. Support community-based research. The Integration Project was the first of its kind to document the experiences of a significant number of undocumented and underserved immigrants. Because it was a community-driven process, immigrants felt comfortable being candid and direct about their experiences accessing services in San Francisco. The project opened up many new research inquiries that require follow up to properly assess how all communities can thrive in San Francisco.

For more details, please see The San Francisco Immigrant Integration Project Findings from Community-Based Research Conducted by the San Francisco Immigrant Legal & Education Network (SFILEN) at <https://sfilen.org/publication/>

Households with Low Digital Access/Literacy

In addition to spoken and written language, digital literacy is now increasingly necessary to navigate the modern employment landscape, as well as to make connections to fellow San Franciscans.

Low-income residents face a shortage of no cost tech support services to help with issues like malware removal, addressing online scams, and diagnosing hardware and software issues; non-English digital literacy trainings, particularly in Cantonese and Spanish; smartphone trainings; opportunities to learn basic digital skills, such as online safety and online banking and bill pay; and opportunities to learn intermediate and advanced digital skills, such as computer programming, particularly for non-youth audiences (Digital Divide Survey, 2018).

The most significant gaps in technology usage, access and skills exist among four demographic groups: low-income residents and families; limited English proficient residents; adults with disabilities; and older adults. A concentrated need exists among the following low-income neighborhoods: Bayview Hunters Point; Chinatown; Mission; Ocean/Merced/Ingleside; Excelsior; Tenderloin and Mid-Market; and Visitacion Valley and Sunnydale.

The Consolidated Plan survey data shows that the following needs were the most cited by respondents in households with no access to the internet:

- Health – Better access to healthcare
- Housing – More affordable housing
- Benefits – Help with CalWorks, SNAP, MediCare, MediCal, General Assistance, etc.
- Better safety
- Wellness – Access to healthy food
- Housing – More protections to stay in housing

Public Housing, RAD and HOPE SF residents

Residents of HOPE SF and RAD converted public housing developments, as well as Single Room Occupancy (SRO) housing developments, experience similar but also unique needs compared to other low-income households throughout the city.

Many do not speak English as their primary language, and need assistance and services offered in multiple languages or through interpretation and translation services. They require assistance accessing healthy foods, and a majority report feeling socially isolated.

Many have difficulty coping with stress, anxiety, or depression, and many report feeling unsafe within their homes, buildings and/or neighborhoods. Families and households need housing stabilization services to ensure timely rent payment, compliance with house and lease rules, and ongoing housing stability.

For seniors and persons with disabilities in these units, it can be a challenge, physically and psychologically, to leave home and access services. They require case management and care coordination, community engagement, and transportation options to help them identify and address barriers to self-sufficiency.

Given the myriad economic, social, mental health, mobility and language needs within these developments, it is essential for service providers to adopt place-based activities that build community cohesion and develop skills for coping with daily stresses. In many cases, residents will express their needs but not show an interest in receiving services that might be available to them. Case management is required to help residents feel safe enough to request and follow through with the services they may need. Case managers must listen carefully to successfully address the unique needs of each property and the residents who live there.

Specific target populations were invited to participate in focus groups during data collection for this Consolidated Plan. Analysis of population-specific input reflects specific needs for public facilities, improvements, and services. Below are the top needs identified by residents of public and subsidized housing during focus groups, forums, and surveys.

Residents of public and subsidized housing conveyed the most needs for public services of all groups across the City. The needs most frequently discussed by this community include:

- Landlord Education & Section 8 Recruitment Services
- Benefits Assistance, Service Navigation, and Case Management
- Behavioral Health Services
- Financial Education, Empowerment, and Planning Services
- Accessible and Safe Public Transportation
- Access to Healthy Food and Grocery Stores
- Physical Health and Wellness Facilities and Services

This community was the only group that self-identified challenges around food security, and the need for food access was among the top needs mentioned in these conversations.

The survey data shows that the following needs were the most cited by respondents who indicated that they rent from the SFHA:

- Housing – More affordable housing
- Housing – More protections to stay in housing
- Financial – Rental subsidy, housing voucher, or other reduced-cost housing
- Housing – Accessible or adaptable unit for persons with disabilities
- Benefits – Help with CalWorks, SNAP, MediCare, MediCal, General Assistance, etc.
- Health – Mental health/substance use help
- Wellness – Access to healthy food
- Employment – Getting a job

Disconnected Transitional Age Youth (TAY)

In San Francisco, and across the nation, many young people age 18–24 are disconnected from the supports and services they need to ensure a successful transition into stable and self-sufficient adulthood. Most of these disconnected TAY have to overcome challenging backgrounds, often including significant trauma, and are at an elevated risk for unemployment, poverty, involvement with the criminal justice system, and homelessness.¹²² San Francisco’s Children and Families First Legislation defines “disconnected TAY” as young people age 18–24 who:¹²³

- are homeless or in danger of homelessness;
- have dropped out of high school;
- have a disability or other special needs, including substance abuse;
- are low-income parents;
- are undocumented;
- are new immigrants and/or English learners;
- are LGBTQ+; and/or
- are transitioning from the foster care, juvenile justice, criminal justice or special education system.

In 2014, the City and County of San Francisco renamed the Children’s Fund to the Children and Youth Fund, expanding its use to include services for TAY. As part of this expansion, the Department of Children, Youth, and Their Families (DCYF) began administering funds for TAY services. In 2016, DCYF awarded its first rounds of pilot grants designated for TAY-serving organizations throughout San Francisco.

In “Valuing Individuality while Building Community”, the March 2018 Final Evaluation Report on San Francisco Department of Children, Youth, and Their Families’ Grants for Disconnected Transitional Age Youth, the document presents findings that draw on the following data sources:

- A TAY survey completed by 144 program participants, administered by grantees throughout the fiscal year 2016–17;¹²⁴
- A survey of all DCYF-funded TAY grantees (23 respondents total), administered in October 2017;

¹²² Disconnected Transitional Youth In San Francisco; Mayor’s Transitional Youth Task Force, 2007

¹²³ Charter Section 16.108 of the Children and Families First Legislation

¹²⁴ Note: Data from the TAY survey are available at
<http://dcyf.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=5171>

- Three focus groups conducted with a total of 17 participants representing 15 funded organizations in November 2017; and
- Year-end reports and associated data for 13 TAY grants (10 innovation and 3 collaboratives) submitted to DCYF through its Contract Management System (CMS), capturing data for fiscal year 2016–17.¹²⁵

While San Francisco’s disconnected TAY face a number of shared challenges, the population includes a number of distinct subgroups including former foster youth, justice-involved TAY, and young parents—each with their own unique experiences and needs. We first describe the common challenges that disproportionately affect the population as a whole. We then explore these dynamics for several of the subgroups within San Francisco’s TAY population. Data sources for this section include the TAY survey, grantee survey, and grantee focus groups.

Common Challenges and Needs

Disconnected TAY face a number of common challenges that impact their ability to engage in programming and maintain participation. According to grantees, the most widespread challenges for this population include being homeless or at risk of homelessness, the need to prioritize basic needs over program participation, trauma exposure and social anxiety, and substance abuse and mental health challenges.

Finding secure housing and help with transportation rose to the top as services that about one-fifth of TAY participants (19 percent and 18 percent, respectively) reported not being able to get through the program in which they participated. Among grantees, 39 percent offer services to help participants find secure housing, and about half (52 percent) provide help with transportation. Although almost all grantees (91 percent) reported providing help with finding a job, this was among the top three unmet needs reported by TAY participants, indicating a need for additional supports and/or employment opportunities—the latter being largely outside the scope of what grantees are able to offer. The next most common unmet needs were help with paying the rent and counseling or mental health services, which are both provided by a relatively small share of grantees (17 percent and 22 percent, respectively). While referrals may help meet some of this need, the high cost of living and lack of mental health services for TAY in San Francisco create additional challenges in these areas.

In terms of other commonly-reported needs, smaller percentages of TAY participants (8 percent each) also reported needing help with getting food and with getting medical services (each offered by 39 percent of grantees) and help with managing money (offered by 52 percent of grantees). Smaller shares of TAY participants reported needing support with getting into school, legal issues, reconnecting with family, childcare, and substance abuse treatment.

Some needs are not so easily met by grantees, and speak to structural and systemic constraints that providers and TAY across the city face. These include, most notably, housing, as well as mental health services and substance abuse treatment. As discussed below, grantees shared how these needs can have a significant impact on young people’s ability to remain stable and engage in programming.

¹²⁵ Note: Contract Management System data available at <http://dcyf.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=5171>

All grantees highlighted homelessness and a lack of stable housing as particular challenges for TAY. Most grantees discussed the extremely high cost of housing in the Bay Area as a tremendous challenge.

Some grantees noted that turbulence at home can also impact young people's housing stability. Providers also noted the need for more emergency and short-term shelter options for TAY who are homeless or at risk of homelessness. One grantee highlighted a shortage of TAY-specific beds in emergency shelters throughout San Francisco, sharing that, "for every five young people who experience homelessness, there are two beds. We have one of the worst unsheltered rates in the nation."

Both grantees and service participants highlighted mental health services and substance abuse treatment as significant needs. More than three-quarters of TAY participants (77 percent) reported needing help for emotional or mental health problems during the past year. Grantees agreed that there is a significant need for additional mental health support for TAY in San Francisco. Providers discussed the struggle many young people face when trying to deal with both substance abuse and what one called "untreated mental illness."

While none of these grantees were funded to provide mental health services, many still had to address this need as part of their work with disconnected young people. Grantees shared that, while they are able to offer TAY some mental health resources and referrals to outside agencies, their capacity in this area is often limited.

TAY Subgroups

While San Francisco's disconnected TAY share some common characteristics as discussed above, there are also a number of distinct and often intersecting subgroups, each with its own unique needs and assets. In fact, intersectionality among San Francisco's TAY seems to be the norm. The intersectional nature of many young people's identities is particularly important to note, because while TAY may engage with services that are designed for a specific facet of their identity, they often have additional needs that impact their ability to engage and sustain participation. The remainder of this section explores several subgroups of San Francisco's disconnected TAY that rose to the top throughout this evaluation.

Grantees explained that **former foster youth** can be "invisible" because they may not disclose their involvement in the foster care system. One quarter (26 percent) of grantees identified current or former foster care participants as a target population, yet some held that these participants are often more willing to share information about other characteristics or needs when engaging in services. Another mentioned that some former foster youth prefer to identify with the present rather than the past. One provider recalled only learning about a participant's time in foster care through internal program records. Not knowing this important information about participants' history makes it challenging for providers to develop a full understanding of their past experiences and thus design an approach to best meet their needs.

While grantees may be meeting the needs of **TAY with disabilities and special needs**, data on this topic is limited. About one fourth of funded agencies (26 percent) reported TAY with disabilities or special needs as a target population for their services. This evaluation did not collect additional information from grantees about the extent to which they are able to accommodate these needs. Additional research would be necessary to develop a deeper understanding of what those needs are and how grantees are responding to them.

Grantees agreed that community is especially important for **young people who identify as LGBTQ+**. One-third of grantees (30 percent) identified LGBTQ+ TAY as a target population, and they shared that many of these young people do not have family support and need to build a “family” of choice among their peers. According to providers who work with this population, these social connections are a key reason why some LGBTQ+ young people remain engaged in programming. Knowing that many LGBTQ+ TAY participate and stay involved in programming as a way to be of service to their peers and community can help inform a tailored approach to engaging and retaining these young people. Such an approach should include mechanisms to support community building, engage current participants to reach out to others, and keep former participants connected.

Providers noted that **justice-involved young people** may view their programming as an extension of “the system,” and experience referrals as punitive rather than positive. For these reasons, engaging justice-involved young people in programming can be challenging, although one-third (30 percent) of grantees identified this group as a target population. Recidivism is a significant risk for justice system-involved youth,¹²⁶ and grantees stressed the importance of meeting these young people where they are and providing additional supports when necessary. One provider that works with this population with the goal of “having people not recidivate” noted that they “encourage participants to be connected to our program at whatever level feels comfortable [for them].” At another agency, providers advocate for these participants when needed; one grantee reported that “We’re... showing up to people’s court cases, standing up in court to say, ‘I’m here on behalf of so and so.’” Multigenerational justice system involvement appears to have a significant impact on TAY as well. Forty-two percent of TAY participants reported having a parent who has been incarcerated, and those young people were more likely to report having been detained or incarcerated themselves. Parental incarceration can also affect TAY economically and disrupt supportive adult relationships, which grantees identified as being key to TAY stability and success.

TAY parents have responsibilities that their non-parenting peers do not face—most significantly, caring for their children. About the same percentage of participants who identified as parents (11 percent) reported “being a better parent” as one of their goals when deciding to enroll in the funded program (8 percent). One-third of grantees (30 percent) identified low-income parents as a target TAY population. Those who serve TAY parents noted that many of these young people were not interested in parenting programs designed for the general adult population, suggesting a need for parenting programs and other related services that are tailored to this age group.

Grantees also noted that a lack of childcare can prevent TAY parents from engaging and persisting with services. Specifically, grantees identified a need for drop-in childcare, in addition to full- and part-time scheduled childcare, allowing for more wraparound support for parenting TAY.

Many grantees identified **TAY who are “truly disconnected”** (i.e., not working, in school, or connected to any programs) as particularly difficult to reach even though they may be most in need of services. Grantees noted that many of these young people, especially those who do not live or congregate in the locations where other TAY are typically reached, are unaware of available programs and services. Grantees noted, however, that reaching young people in their mid-teens who are at least marginally connected to systems or services can help prevent true disconnection.

¹²⁶ <https://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/fact-sheet-reducing-recidivism-justiceinvolved-youth>

Couch-surfing youth who are not connected to systems or services TAY face unique challenges accessing supports in part because they and others may not consider themselves to be homeless and are often unaware of services designed for homeless young people on the streets. Although they are unstably housed, couch-surfing youth may not identify as truly homeless, and as a result may not seek programs and services that they could benefit from. San Francisco's 2017 Point In Time (PIT) Homeless Count¹²⁷ highlights the "hidden nature" of youth homelessness, and notes how that impacts their disconnection from services: "Young people experiencing homelessness have a harder time accessing services... due to the stigma of their housing situation, lack of knowledge of available resources, and a dearth of services targeted to young people."

The current political climate has led to an increased sense of fear and vulnerability among undocumented individuals, including **undocumented TAY**. Grantees explained that, in some cases, undocumented TAY choose to remain completely disconnected for fear of being reported and/or detained, which can make them difficult to find and serve. According to providers, word-of-mouth referrals, one of the most successful means of reaching TAY in general, are also the most effective way to connect undocumented TAY with services.

TAY who are undocumented share a unique set of challenges, particularly related to employment. Some grantees shared that TAY without documentation that allows them to work may not be eligible for certain aspects of workforce development programs, including some internships and job placements. Grantees added that constraints within the immigration system often leave TAY waiting for several years to obtain needed legal documentation.

Displaced young people. The housing crisis in San Francisco and the rest of the Bay Area has led to increased youth displacement. According to data submitted by grantees, almost half (47 percent) of TAY participants who are enrolled in high school attend high school outside of San Francisco, indicating that they likely also live outside of the city limits. Grantees reported that some youth commute long distances to remain engaged in services located in San Francisco, as even the cost of living continues to rise in formerly affordable surrounding areas. One grantee noted that not all disconnected TAY who leave San Francisco do so by choice, and may have strong connections to communities that draw them back. This person explained, "San Francisco ships a lot of kids for foster care and transitional housing out of County to the East Bay and out of state. Youth commute from the East Bay back to San Francisco where their community is."

TAY from San Francisco. Some grantees reported that TAY who are originally from San Francisco can be among the most challenging to reach and engage in services. They shared that long-term, multigenerational socioeconomic stress has impacted communities throughout San Francisco, leaving many of these young people with a sense of immobility. One provider noted that "those who have lived in San Francisco the longest are hard to reach," adding that "TAY who have lived in disadvantaged communities in San Francisco just don't see the motivation anymore." By hiring community members to serve as outreach and program staff, some grantees were able to more effectively engage San Francisco-born TAY.

¹²⁷ <http://hsh.sfgov.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/2017-SF-Point-in-Time-CountGeneral-FINAL-6.21.17.pdf>

Grantees highlighted the individuality of each disconnected young person, noting that the strengths and challenges they bring impact the way they experience services from outreach to completion. TAY come to services with different levels of socio-emotional development, soft skills, education, and work experience. They also come with a range of previous experiences, often including significant exposure to trauma. Grantees repeatedly highlighted the need to meet TAY where they are, and tailor services, timelines, and anticipated outcomes to each individual served.

Specific target populations were invited to participate in focus groups during data collection for this Consolidated Plan. Analysis of population-specific input reflects specific needs for public facilities, improvements, and services. Below are the top needs identified by the TAY community during focus groups, forums, and surveys:

- Benefits Assistance, Service Navigation, and Case Management
- Workforce Readiness, Job Training, and Placement Services
- Financial Education, Empowerment, and Planning Services

The survey data shows that the following needs were the most cited by respondents between the ages of 18-24:

- Employment – Higher Income
- Housing – More affordable housing
- Benefits – Help with CalWorks, SNAP, MediCare, MediCal, General Assistance, etc.
- Financial – Rental subsidy, housing voucher, or other reduced-cost housing
- Health – Better access to healthcare
- Employment – Getting a job
- Employment – Learning new skills

Persons Living with HIV/AIDS (PLWHA)

See Non-homeless Special Needs Assessment section of this document for a description of the PLWHA community.

Specific target populations were invited to participate in focus groups during data collection for this Consolidated Plan. Analysis of population-specific input reflects specific needs for public facilities, improvements, and services. Below are the top needs identified by the HIV community during focus groups, forums, and surveys.

Focus groups with persons living with HIV and HIV service providers highlighted the need for services that address the health, mental health, housing, and employment needs that many low-income individuals living with HIV encounter. Members of this community indicated needs for case management services, with discussions focusing on the value of appointment reminders, support for medication adherence, and onsite supportive services that vary with degrees of support needed (e.g., appointment escort, drop in counseling, and transportation to appointments). Job training and culturally relevant mental health support also emerged as top needs.

- Benefits Assistance, Service Navigation, and Case Management
- Behavioral Health Services
- Workforce Readiness, Job Training, and Placement Services
- Recent Immigrants
- Workforce Readiness, Job Training, and Placement Services

- Financial Education, Empowerment, and Planning Services

The survey data shows that the following needs were the most cited by respondents who indicated that they are living with HIV/AIDS:

- Housing – More affordable housing
- Benefits – Help with CalWorks, SNAP, MediCare, MediCal, General Assistance, etc.
- Financial – Rental subsidy, housing voucher, or other reduced-cost housing
- Health – Mental health/substance use help
- Wellness – Access to healthy food
- Housing – More protections to allow me to stay in my housing
- Legal – Eviction prevention

Seniors and Persons with Disabilities

San Francisco is home to 169,189 adults ages 60 or over and 33,463 adults ages 18–59 living with a disability. In 2016, older adults comprised 20% of the City’s population, a number that will rise to 26% by 2030.¹²⁸ Older adults and adults with disabilities are important, vibrant members of the San Francisco community who face a unique set of challenges. As these groups of individuals grow in number, the need to provide programs and services to support them also increases. In recognition of the challenges facing these groups, voters passed legislation to both define and support the needs of older adults and adults with disabilities. On November 8, 2016, voters approved Proposition I¹²⁹ to amend the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco to establish the Dignity Fund, a guaranteed funding stream to provide these needed services and supports for older adults and adults with disabilities, to be administered by DAAS.

SF DAAS services aim to maximize self-sufficiency, safety, health, and independence so older adults and adults with disabilities may live in the community for as long as possible while maintaining the highest quality of life. An Oversight and Advisory Committee (OAC) comprised of representatives from the Aging and Adult Services Commission, the SF DAAS Advisory Council, the Long Term Coordinating Council, and at-large mayoral appointments ensures responsible and equitable allocation of the Fund.

Proposition I also outlined a planning process to begin in FY17–18 and repeat every fourth fiscal year. The DAAS DFCNA represents the start of this planning process. The findings from each DFCNA will inform the Service Allocation Plan (SAP) developed in the subsequent year.

This DFCNA integrated findings from two concurrent efforts – Community Research and an Equity Analysis – to identify consumer needs, system-level strengths and gaps, and underserved community members. The Community Research component collected new data from a wide breadth of community members and service providers. Community forums in each supervisorial district and 29 focus groups with a variety of demographic groups reached 744 consumers and service providers, while online, paper, and phone surveys reached 1,127 consumers and 298 service providers. The Equity Analysis leveraged

¹²⁸ San Francisco HSA Planning Unit. 2016. Assessment of the Needs of San Francisco Seniors and Adults with Disabilities. Accessed on February 2018 from <https://www.sfhhsa.org/about/reports-publications/olderadults-and-people-disabilities/2016-seniors-and-adults-disabilities>.

¹²⁹ For original text of the amendment, see:
<http://69.89.31.206/~sfcommun/sfdignityfund/wpcontent/uploads/2016/11/Leg-Final.pdf>

existing data sources, such as the Census and SF DAAS administrative data, to calculate SF DAAS service participation rates for consumers with the presence of an equity factor and across districts and income levels, as well as financial benefits across districts.

Key Findings

Over the past several years, SF DAAS has invested extensive time and funding into improving its capacity to serve and support older adults and adults with disabilities so they can maintain independence and contribute to their neighborhoods and communities. Findings suggest that SF DAAS' efforts to support older adults and adults with disabilities and allow them to continue contributing to their communities have been largely successful. Connected consumers rated programs and services favorably and shared many stories of positive experiences. Findings also indicate that there continue to be opportunities to improve outreach and service efforts to meet the needs of older adults and adults with disabilities. The Community Research efforts also highlighted the structural problems that persist throughout San Francisco and often amplify the challenges in providing social services to large groups of individuals who are struggling to meet their basic needs. Key findings include:

1. The majority of service-connected consumers have positive service experiences and enjoy their participation. Consumers who participate in existing programs view them favorably. Those programs and services that promote meaningful community and social connection are an important and beneficial resource that enhance consumers' quality of life.
2. Consumers and service providers described several barriers and challenges to accessing services that can limit engagement in services and programs that support older adults and adults with disabilities. They identified a need for more information about and increased visibility of existing programs and services that support older adults and adults with disabilities. They also described barriers such as navigation challenges and confusion around eligibility. Adults with disabilities called out an increased navigation challenge because the name of SF DAAS does not specifically call out adults with disabilities as a population served.
3. San Francisco residents display limited awareness of the challenges facing older adults and adults with disabilities, which compounds existing barriers to service engagement for these groups. Consumers and service providers voiced concern that younger adults and those without a disability lack awareness of the challenges facing older adults and adults with disabilities. They expressed interest in promoting awareness of these challenges among the broader San Francisco community.
4. There are opportunities to enhance existing collaboration efforts and establish new partnerships throughout the community, both across agencies and within community groups. Community members and providers identified important opportunities to continue or begin collaboration efforts between agencies in San Francisco. Consumers also expressed appreciation for collaboration efforts that involve other community members, not just those who are not adults with disabilities or older adults. They expressed interest in being integrated into their community through programs and services.

For more details, please see March 2018 DFCNA here:

<https://www.sfhhsa.org/sites/default/files/Dignity%20Fund%20Community%20Needs%20Assessment%20FINAL%20Draft%20Report%20%284.6.18%29.pdf>

Specific target populations were invited to participate in focus groups during data collection for this Consolidated Plan. Analysis of population-specific input reflects specific needs for public facilities, improvements, and services.

People with Disabilities

Below are the top needs identified by the persons with disabilities community during focus groups, forums, and surveys:

- Community Centers and Gathering Spaces
- Safe, Reliable, and Accessible Public Transportation
- Targeted Outreach
- Benefits Assistance, Service Navigation, and Case Management
- Behavioral Health Services
- Improved Cultural Inclusivity and Accessibility for Public Services
- Workforce Readiness, Job Training, and Placement Services

The survey data shows that the following needs were the most cited by respondents that indicated that they have a disability:

- Housing – More affordable housing
- Financial – Rental subsidy, housing voucher, or other reduced-cost housing
- Benefits – Help with CalWorks, SNAP, MediCare, MediCal, General Assistance, etc.
- Wellness – Access to healthy food
- Employment – Higher Income
- Health – Better access to healthcare
- Housing – More protections to stay in housing
- Health - Mental health/substance use help

Seniors

Below are the top needs identified by the HIV community during focus groups, forums, and surveys:

- Community Centers and Gathering Spaces
- Safe, Reliable, and Accessible Public Transportation
- Targeted Outreach
- Landlord Education & Section 8 Recruitment Services
- Benefits Assistance, Service Navigation, and Case Management
- Improved Cultural Inclusivity and Accessibility for Public Services
- Workforce Readiness, Job Training, and Placement Services

The survey data shows that the following needs were the most cited by respondents that are 63 years and older:

- Housing – More affordable housing
- Benefits – Help with CalWorks, SNAP, MediCare, MediCal, General Assistance, etc.
- Financial – Rental subsidy, housing voucher, or other reduced-cost housing
- Wellness – Access to healthy food
- Health – Better access to healthcare
- Employment – Higher Income

LGBTQ+

The 2017 San Francisco Bay Area LGBTQ+ Community Needs Assessment was commissioned by Horizons Foundation (Horizons) and conducted by Learning for Action. This report, based on the findings from a survey of over 1,400 LGBTQ+ community members and nearly two dozen interviews with field experts, describes the needs and experiences of diverse LGBTQ+ community members across the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area in the topics of: basic needs and safety, including economic and housing security; medical and mental health care; drug and alcohol recovery; housing; legal assistance; community connection and social life; and civic engagement.

The needs assessment surfaced the following key findings:

LGBTQ+ community members seek economic stability, safety, and equal rights. When asked to share their biggest overall concerns right now as a member of the LGBTQ+ community, survey respondents most commonly named: the high cost of living and limited affordable housing opportunities in the Bay Area, being targets of violence and discrimination, and fears of losing rights and access to services, including health care, in the current national political climate. Service priorities include: employment opportunity programs; affordable and secure housing, particularly for LGBTQ+ older adults; and increased access to high-quality and LGBTQ+-competent health care.

There is continued need for funding and services to focus on community safety and economic safety net direct service provision for LGBTQ+ community members in the Bay Area. LGBTQ+ community members across all Bay Area counties, income and education levels, racial identities, sexual orientations, gender identities, and ages report feeling unsafe in living their daily lives; have had trouble meeting basic needs such as housing, food, and medicine in the past 12 months; and have had unmet need for critical services such as health care, legal, and housing services or have had negative experiences getting such services in the past three years.

- More than one-third (36%) of respondents report feeling “unsafe more often than safe” or “unsafe most or all of the time” in at least one facet of their lives.
- More than one in five (21%) have had trouble meeting at least one basic need (for shelter, food, medicine, transportation, or gas, electric, or water in their home) because of economic hardship in the 12 months prior to answering the survey.
- About one in three (34%) respondents was not able to access at least one service they needed in the past three years, such as health care, mental or behavioral health care, or legal or housing services.

Within this picture of need throughout the LGBTQ+ community, an intersectional analysis shows that some community members are systematically more affected by a lack of safety, economic security, and access to needed services. Analysis of LGBTQ+ community members who experience precarity or need in two or more areas of safety, economic security, and access to services reveal that a nearly identical list of factors substantially increases risk of high need in each domain.

1. LGBTQ+ community members are more likely to feel unsafe in at least two facets of life (such as in their neighborhood, at work or school, on public transit, or interacting with law enforcement);

AND

2. LGBTQ+ community members are more likely to have had at least two unmet basic needs in the past year;

AND

3. LGBTQ+ community members are more likely to not have been able to access at least two types of services they needed in the past three years;

IF THEY:

- Have an income of less than \$60,000 per year;
- Do not have a Bachelor's degree or higher educational attainment;
- Are people of color;
- Are bisexual;
- Are transgender or genderqueer/non-binary (compared to cisgender LGBTQ community members)
- Are younger than 25;
- Have a disability;
- Ever lived in foster care; or
- Live in Alameda (1 only), Contra Costa, Napa, Santa Clara (3 only), and Solano (1 and 2) Counties.

There is a role for funders, movement leaders, and organizations to adopt an intersectional lens and to actively oppose racism, classism, transphobia, biphobia, sexism, xenophobia, ableism, ageism, and other roots of disparities within the LGBTQ+ community's experiences to ensure that being bisexual, or transgender, or a person of color, or disabled, or young, or any other core aspects of identity do not make community members systematically more vulnerable, excluded, or poorly served.

Field experts also call for other ways to address these disparities and strengthen the LGBTQ+ community and the network of organizations serving this community in the Bay Area:

- Movement leaders must work to heal the pain of class, race, and gender identity divisions within the LGBTQ+ community, build relationships across identity groups, and honor the rich diversity of the community in order for the movement to advance.
- Expand and support programming that: builds community; fosters connection among and outside of the LGBTQ+ community; provides opportunities for community members to support each other; encourages inter-generational connections; and celebrates culture.
- Increase understanding and data about transgender and non-binary identities and people through research, funder and organizational education, and public campaigns
- Support intersectional movement building across and beyond the nine counties through investments in collaboration and partnership structures
- Expand funder support of differentiated and grassroots strategies that allow smaller and more specialized organizations and programs to provide critical and nuanced support to those whose needs are not well addressed by one-size-fits-all approaches within larger LGBTQ+ organizations.
- Prioritize the following policy and advocacy efforts for the Bay Area LGBTQ+ community:
 - Ensure that hard-won legal protections for the LGBTQ+ community remain in place
 - Justice system reform, including reforming prison, jail, and policing policies and practices
 - Protect queer and trans immigrant communities that are currently being targeted for deportation
 - Protect and advocate for queer- and trans-friendly health care policies and research

For more details, please see the Horizons Foundation 2018 San Francisco Bay Area LGBTQ+ Community Needs Assessment at <https://www.horizonsfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/SF-Bay-Area-LGBTQ-Needs-Assessment-Report-2018-.pdf>

Specific target populations were invited to participate in focus groups during data collection for this Consolidated Plan. Analysis of population-specific input reflects specific needs for public facilities, improvements, and services. Below are the top needs identified by the LGBTQ+ community during focus groups, forums, and surveys:

- Homeless Shelters
- Benefits Assistance, Service Navigation, and Case Management
- Behavioral Health Services

The survey data shows that the following needs were the most cited by respondents that identified as lesbian, gay or bisexual:

- Housing – More affordable housing
- Financial – Rental subsidy, housing voucher, or other reduced-cost housing
- Benefits – Help with CalWorks, SNAP, MediCare, MediCal, General Assistance, etc.
- Employment – Higher Income
- Wellness – Access to healthy food
- Health – Mental health/substance use help
- Legal – Eviction prevention

The survey data shows that the following needs were the most cited by respondents that identified as transgender or gender non-conforming:

- Benefits – Help with CalWorks, SNAP, MediCare, MediCal, General Assistance, etc.
- Housing – More affordable housing
- Health – Better access to healthcare
- Health – Mental health/substance use help
- Financial – Rental subsidy, housing voucher, or other reduced-cost housing
- Employment – Higher Income
- Wellness – Access to healthy food
- Employment – Learning new skills
- Financial – Down payment help

Small Businesses with Cultural Competency/Humility

With the great level of diversity of race, ethnicity, culture and language, the City and County of San Francisco has a history of commitment culturally and linguistically appropriate for its diverse population. According to the 2017 ACS 5-Year Estimates, 59.16% of the City's population is identified as being composed of minorities. The Invest in Neighborhoods (IIN) division of OEWD is committed to creating inclusive economic development programs that meet the dynamic needs of San Francisco's small business community.

Culturally and linguistically appropriate services are increasingly recognized as foundational requirements for a successful economic development strategy. The primary focus of IIN's Economic Development strategy is to provide technical assistance to low-moderate income micro entrepreneurs,

to small businesses that employ or will employ low-moderate income jobs, and entrepreneurs that face particular challenges (LGBTQ+ entrepreneurs facing homophobia, as well as immigrants and monolingual Chinese and Spanish speakers) in addition to more universal needs for technical assistance, financing and professional development. IIN works with community-based organizations with existing relationships and linguistic and cultural competency/humility to fill the gap in customized business technical assistance for immigrant and low-to-moderate small business owners.

Opportunity Neighborhood Residents

OEWD provides more than \$12 million in grant awards through its Invest In Neighborhoods (IIN) division to strengthen neighborhood commercial districts by implementing neighborhood improvement projects and providing a variety of technical services related to neighborhood economic development citywide. IIN works closely with merchant associations, commercial corridor representatives, local businesses, and other community stakeholders to develop and deploy small business services and reach targeted communities.

IIN's Opportunity Neighborhood's program targets neighborhoods that have experienced historic divestment and have an economic development strategy that promotes diversity, equity and inclusion. These neighborhoods have an assigned project manager that works closely with community stakeholders and other city departments to strategically disburse investments including funds and services and support an economic development strategy. IIN promotes, funds, and is actively involved in neighborhood-based planning efforts to create a healthy commercial corridor which reflects the unique characteristics and needs of the surrounding community.

The opportunity neighborhoods include:

- Bayview
- Central Market/Tenderloin
- Chinatown
- Excelsior
- Lower Fillmore
- Mission (24th and Mission Streets)

Veterans

According to the ACS 2017 5-Year estimates, there are 24,582 veterans in San Francisco. This represents 3.3% of the civilian population 18 years and over. Of this veteran population, 92.5% are men and 7.5% are women. The vast majority are seniors, with 30% being over 75 years old, while another 40% are between the ages of 55 to 74. Sixty-one percent are white, 13% are black, 18% are Asian, and 10% are Latino/a. The median income of veterans overall is \$43,811, compared to \$45,675 for San Francisco's overall civilian population 25 years and older. Nearly 7% are unemployed. 6,825, or 28% of veterans were identified as having a disability.

According to the March 2018 San Francisco DAAS DFCNA , older adult veterans represent a key demographic slice of San Francisco, with the majority having called the City home for at least 30 years. These veterans often present with both overlapping and unique needs compared to their peers, including high rates of chronic health issues, Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), and other emotional and physical challenges.

Veterans make up almost 12% of the older adult population (65+) currently residing in San Francisco. To understand their experience using community support services, DAAS sought feedback from 164 veterans through surveys, focus groups, and community forums, and found that veterans experienced many of the same challenges as their peers when it came to aging in place in the Bay Area, as well as additional obstacles that may affect their daily well-being.

Among survey respondents, nearly half of older adult veterans reported experiencing long-term/chronic health issues, while one in three reported having a disability requiring accommodation. Veterans also reported experiencing frequent concerns about meeting their healthcare and medication needs.

In focus groups, veterans shared stories about the impact of invisible disabilities on their daily lives. For example, PTSD can create barriers to essential City services like public transportation. Many veterans reported intense discomfort and fear of riding public transportation due to the potential triggering effect of being in crowded, enclosed spaces. One participant who experiences PTSD shared that riding public transportation “is really dangerous because it’s all you can do to not seriously react [in] situations when high school kids on the bus route are acting up.” He and other participants went on to emphasize a desire for the expansion and improvement of SF DAAS-funded assisted transportation services as a means to improve their transportation safety.

Female veterans described challenges as a gender minority in many programs and facilities aimed at veterans. Focus group attendees explained that, “women veterans are a little different and it can be difficult being one or two women in the room or building.” To address this challenge, participants suggested women’s activity/support groups that meet consistently and reliably.

Veterans face unique challenges and barriers in accessing services. Older adults and adults with disabilities who are veterans make up an important part of the DAAS Dignity Fund target population. Across community research, veterans highlighted gaps in accessing healthcare and medication services to help support them in living with chronic health issues. In addition, veterans may have disabilities requiring specific accommodations, housing support, and transportation services related to previous combat experience, such as PTSD. Further exploration is warranted to better understand the needs of older adults and adults with disabilities who are also veterans.

Survivors of Domestic Violence

Highlights of the Fiscal Year 2017 Report on Family Violence in San Francisco that was issued in January 2019 by the San Francisco DOSW indicate that community-based organizations play an important role in supporting victims of domestic violence. In FY 2017, there were three times as many people served in community-based organizations for domestic violence than people who called 911.

Demographic factors impact an individual’s vulnerability to domestic violence.

- Women are more likely than men to experience multiple forms of intimate partner violence across their lifespans and within individual violent relationships.
- People of color are disproportionately victimized in every victim age bracket. In cases where the victim was under the age of 18, 47% were Latino/a, and in cases where the victim was over 60, 37% were black.
- Lesbian, gay, and bisexual high school students were three and a half times more likely to experience sexual dating violence than their heterosexual peers and more than twice as likely to experience physical dating violence.

Guns pose a lethal threat in domestic violence cases. Domestic violence calls to 911 have increased 69% since 2014, and half of all San Francisco domestic violence homicides since 2014 involved guns.

Households Experiencing Violence

Family violence and street violence not only hurt those directly involved, but also negatively affect the greater San Francisco community.

Re-entry Population

Populations Impacted by Realignment

Along with the overall number of individuals involved in the criminal justice system in San Francisco, the number of individuals sentenced, supervised, or jailed in San Francisco due to Realignment has been steadily declining since its implementation in October 2011. Because the population in state prison that is eligible for release to Post Release Community Supervision (PRCS) was largely fixed at the start of Realignment implementation and most individuals sentenced to non-violent, non-serious, non-sex offense charges are now sentenced to County Jail under PC § 1170(h), it was expected that there would be a large number of releases to PRCS at the beginning of Realignment implementation and that the number would then decline over time. This trend is clear in the average number of PRCS releases per month over the three years of Realignment: 37 in the first year, 16 in the second, and 12 in the third. However, while it was expected that the number of individuals sentenced under PC § 1170(h) would increase as the PRCS numbers declined, San Francisco has also experienced a steady decline in PC § 1170(h) sentences from an average of 19 per month in the first year of Realignment to 15 in the second and 13 in the third. This reflects an overall drop in felony sentencing in the County since 2008: the average felony arraignments per month has decreased 50 percent since 2008, including an 11 percent decrease since the onset of Realignment.¹³⁰

From the beginning of Realignment implementation, the overwhelming majority of individuals impacted by AB109 changes were state parole violators, although these numbers have also been declining steadily over the last three years. An average of 156 individuals began a state parole violation sentence per month during the first year of Realignment, 131 per month in the second, and 109 per month in the third. In July 2013, state parole violation hearings were transferred from the State's 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, contributed to the overall downward trend in the number of individuals awaiting parole violation proceedings in County Jail.

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.

¹³⁰ San Francisco Superior Court

Not surprisingly, the Adult Probation Department's ADP of AB109 individuals increased in the first two years of Realignment, as new PRCS and Mandatory Supervision clients started sentences that range from several months to several years. In the third year of Realignment, the AB109 ADP in the Adult Probation Department leveled off, as many completed their supervision terms and fewer individuals began new PRCS or Mandatory Supervision sentences, as discussed above. The total AB109 ADP in the Adult Probation Department grew from 284 in the first year of Realignment to 523 in the second and remained constant at 524 in the third.

The Sheriff's Department's ADP of AB109 individuals remained relatively stable for the first two years of Realignment and then declined in year three, due to the overall decrease in the number of individuals serving state parole violation sentences. The Sheriff's Department's AB109 ADP dropped slightly from 262 in year one to 234 in year two and then dropped more dramatically in year three to 140. As is clear in the chart below, the composition of the Sheriff's Department ADP of AB109 individuals has changed as the proportion of state parole violators has decreased and the proportion of those sentenced under PC § 1170(h) has increased.

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. However, as indicated by the COMPAS risk and needs assessments conducted, and discussed below, 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. These characteristics of the San Francisco PRCS population have been unchanged since the onset of Realignment.

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 (80 percent) of APD's clients have significant needs, with most assessed as having one or more of the following: vocational/education, substance abuse, cognitive behavioral, criminal personality, criminal opportunity, social environment, residential instability, and criminal thinking self-report. A large proportion of AB109 clients have needs in every 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 2014 APD partnered with George Mason University's Center for Advancing Correctional Excellence! (ACE!) to conduct an analysis of the County's reentry service delivery system. ACE! examined the

criminogenic needs of APD's clients as well as the services provided by APD-funded and community-based reentry service providers. Service providers completed online assessments and met with ACE! researchers to discuss strategies for adjusting services and programs to better align with evidence-based practices.

ACE! is also using its Risk Need Responsivity (RNR) tool to conduct an analysis that will identify any gaps between APD's clients' needs and the reentry services provided in the County. APD will then adjust its reentry services funding strategies accordingly. This project is one of the County's continuous quality improvement efforts, to ensure that resources are targeted to the most critical needs of clients and that the services offered are high quality and adhere to best practices.

In the coming year, San Francisco will continue to set up performance measurement systems for its reentry service providers. This, along with the Risk Need Responsivity project begun in 2014 with George Mason University's Center for Advancing Correctional Excellence!, will allow the County to assess the efficacy and outcomes of its programs and strategies, as well as use data and information to adjust programs, target them to those clients most likely to benefit, and identify CCSF's gaps between available services and clients' needs.

A continuing focus on research and evaluation in 2015 will allow San Francisco criminal justice partners to further refine and tailor their Realignment strategies to be more effective, cost-efficient, and evidence-based.

Racial Disparities Persist Amid Large Drug Arrest Decline

Amid drastic changes in San Francisco's drug enforcement and statewide drug policy reforms, disproportionate arrests among African American residents continue. This section excerpts key findings from a recent study by CJCJ's Senior Research Fellow, Mike Males, and San Jose State University Human Rights Institute Professor, William Armaline. The study, *San Francisco's Drug Arrests Drop 90% through 2016; Disproportionate Arrests of African Americans Persist*, details drug arrest patterns by race since the 1980s and provides comprehensive insight on the City's fluctuating trends. Some figures differ slightly from those in the original report due to updated information from the Department of Justice and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention through 2016.

- **Even as San Francisco's population grew by 150,000, the city's drug arrests plummeted by 92 percent since 1988-89, the peak years for drug arrests.**

Despite population growth in San Francisco, drug arrests declined sharply through 2015 and 2016. The decline has been especially steep during the last seven years as statewide criminal justice reforms reclassified several drug offenses from felonies to misdemeanors and marijuana was decriminalized, then legalized. Drug law reforms, policing changes, and other, unknown factors have reduced drug felony arrest drastically in San Francisco (down 92% for African Americans and 85% for other races from their 2008 peak compared to 2016).

- **Felony drug arrest rates were 10 times higher for African Americans in San Francisco than residents of other races in 2016.**

Racial disparities in 2016 have narrowed from the peak year, 2008, when African Americans in San Francisco were 19.2 times more likely than San Franciscans of other races, and 4.5 times more likely than African Americans elsewhere in California, to be arrested for a drug felony. In 2016, African Americans in San Francisco experienced felony drug arrest rates 10 times higher than San Franciscans of other races, and 2.4 times higher than African Americans elsewhere in California.

- **Misdemeanor drug arrests fell by 85 percent in San Francisco from 2008-2009 to 2015-2016.**

While some of the decline in felony arrests can be attributed to the reclassification of many felony drug offenses as misdemeanors due to recent reforms, misdemeanor drug arrests also fell by 85 percent in San Francisco from 2008-2009 to 2015-2016, both two-year periods.

- **Steep declines in juvenile drug arrests have accompanied continuing reductions in youth crime, drug overdose deaths, and violence.**

Arrest rates of youth in San Francisco for felonies have declined by 94 percent in recent years, including a decline of 98 percent among African American youth. Notably, only one African American female youth was arrested in San Francisco for a drug felony in 2016 after years of deeply disproportionate drug arrest rates (CJCJ, 2015). Additionally, marijuana arrests among teenagers have declined by 80 percent since 2010. Declines in juvenile drug arrests have accompanied large, continuing declines in juvenile crime, violent deaths, traffic deaths, school dropout, teen pregnancy, and related problems among youth through 2016 (CDC, 2018).

- **Racial patterns in drug arrests still do not match racial patterns in drug use.**

Of the 839 people who died from using illicit drugs in San Francisco during the five year, 2012-2016 period, 57 percent were non-Latino/a white residents, 25 percent were African American, 10 percent were Latino/a, and 8 percent were Asian. In contrast, 42 percent of the city's 5,691 drug felony arrests during this period were African Americans (other races are not detailed by San Francisco police).

While San Francisco's major decline in drug arrests show improvement, steep racial disparities in drug arrests must be addressed by law enforcement and policy leaders in order to better serve the city's diverse communities. By investigating racial disparities and uniting local policies with fair practices, San Francisco can invest in the safety and health of its residents.

Adult Probation Department (APD) Re-entry Community

The most pressing needs of the APD re-entry community, as expressed by the Community Assessment and Services Center lead provider (UCSF Citywide Forensics) are housing, mental health treatment and substance use treatment.

Based on the APD March 2018 Strategic Plan, the following are strategies for the department to meet the needs of the APD re-entry community:

- Provide Services that Break the Cycle of Crime
 - Increase public safety through effective engagement with individuals on community supervision.
 - Connect clients, including TAY, with specialized programming and social services to increase well-being and likelihood for long-term success.
- Support Victims of Crime
 - Help victims of crime recover from financial and emotional hardships
- Enhance Services Provided at a One-Stop Center
 - Provide effective case management services that support each client to achieve individualized success at a one-stop re-entry center.
 - Through partnerships, deliver timely and effective mental health and substance use treatment services that address identified behavioral health needs.

- Strengthen Collaboration Across Agencies and Community-based Organizations to Better Address Offender Needs
 - Partner to implement a new pre-booking diversion program for low level drug offenders that serves as an alternative to arrest or jail time, better meets clients' needs, and reduces criminal behavior.
- Improve Data Collection and Reporting
 - Develop a robust case management system that: 1) enhances the ability to collect, analyze, and report data; and 2) allows for a data-informed approach to services designed to reduce recidivism and increase client well-being.

Key Demographics of Juvenile Justice-Involved Youth¹³¹

The United States has seen a marked decline in juvenile offenses since 2000. Overall, there were 36% fewer juvenile arrests nationally in 2014 compared to 2000.¹³² This trend of decreasing juvenile arrests persists at the state level as well with California seeing an impressive nearly 64% fewer arrests statewide in 2014 compared to 2000¹³³. San Francisco is no exception to this national and statewide trend. Locally, San Francisco saw nearly 70% fewer juvenile arrests in 2014 compared to 2000. This profound shift away from arrest as a solution to delinquent behavior is the result of the tremendous work San Francisco has done to reduce reliance on the juvenile justice system and incarceration.

This reduction in juvenile arrests has been driven in large part by the decrease in arrests for more serious, felony offenses. There were 60% fewer boys arrested in San Francisco in 2014 (717 male arrests) than there were in 2006 (1773 male arrests), the year with the highest number of total arrests in the last twelve years. Even more impressively there were 69% fewer arrests of young women in 2014 (210 female arrests) than in 2006 (673 female arrests).

While this total reduction in system involvement is encouraging, San Francisco has become increasingly aware that the reduction in arrests and referrals to the Juvenile Probation Department (JPD) has not benefitted all San Francisco youth equally. In fact, in 2014 African-American youth in San Francisco made up eight percent of the general youth population, but accounted for over half of all referrals to JPD. This extraordinary disproportionality has persisted in San Francisco for over ten years. Though African-American children have comprised no more than 12% of San Francisco's youth population since 2005, they have consistently accounted for a disproportionate representation of young people in the juvenile justice system: over 44% of young people in the juvenile justice system are African-American, increasing to nearly 53% in 2014.

This disproportionality in the juvenile justice system persists for other groups of young people as well. Within San Francisco, both African American and Hispanic/Latinx youth experience higher rates of poverty, lower rates of academic achievement, and higher rates of involvement with the juvenile justice system than other racial/ethnic groups in the city.¹³⁴ Because of an inconsistent measurement of

¹³¹ City and County of San Francisco's Comprehensive Multi-agency Local Action Plan: Strategies for San Francisco Juvenile Justice, March 2017

¹³² UCR, 2015, Arrests by Age

¹³³ California Criminal Justice Statistics Center. State of California, Attorney General, Criminal Justice Statistic Center. Retrieved February 6, 2017, from <https://oag.ca.gov/crime/cjsc/stats/arrests>

¹³⁴ Not controlling for offense or other factors. Mission Analytics. (2015). Analysis of Racial and Ethnic Disparities in SF Juvenile Justice. Mission Analytics

Asian/Pacific Islander youth in Census population surveys, this population of young people is not included. However, it is important to note that San Francisco's Asian/Pacific Islander (API) youth are consistently disproportionately represented in the juvenile justice system as well. In 2014, API youth made up six percent of the system-involved population while Asian/Pacific Islander San Franciscans of all ages routinely make up under one percent of our city's population.

Disproportionate contact persists at the neighborhood level as well. The young people in Bayview-Hunters Point only make up 9.3% of San Francisco's youth population but they accounted for 17% of all referrals to JPD¹³⁵. Similarly, though young people in Visitacion Valley only make up 3.6% of San Francisco's youth population they made up 8% of JPD's referrals¹³⁶.

Across the nation, we have seen that LGBTQ/GNCT (lesbian, gay, bisexual, questioning/gender non-conforming, trans) youth¹³⁷, homeless youth¹³⁸, youth in foster care¹³⁹, and children with a system-involved or incarcerated family member¹⁴⁰ are disproportionately represented and/or disparately impacted by involvement in the juvenile justice system. Unfortunately, there is no reason to assume that this is different in San Francisco. In an evaluation commissioned by the San Francisco Human Rights Commission to determine violence prevention needs for San Francisco's LGBTQ+ community, nearly half of participants were under 25, more than half identified as trans, and nearly two-thirds had ever experienced homelessness.¹⁴¹ The city's Homeless PIT Count in 2015 found 853 unaccompanied youth or TAY under 25 living on the street or in shelters¹⁴². In early 2016, there were 924 San Francisco children in foster care¹⁴³. A 2015 survey of incarcerated adults in the San Francisco County jail system found that 59% are parents to a total of approximately 1,110 children in San Francisco. While we only have data on the presence of these populations of young people locally, the national data paired with the qualitative evidence gathered from interviews and focus groups bears out the concern of disproportionate representation in and disparate impact of system involvement on these young people. Many system partners are also concerned about gang-involved youth in San Francisco whose interactions with law enforcement and the juvenile justice system are seen as much more likely and normalized. Additionally, while we know that the implications of justice system-involvement can be negative for all youth, justice system partners acknowledge that there is special attention to be paid to

¹³⁵ American Community Survey, 5-Year Estimates 2011-2015; San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department. (2015).

¹³⁶ Ibid

¹³⁷ Sherman, F. and Black, A. (2015) Gender Injustice: System-Level Juvenile Justice Reforms for Girls. The National Crittenton Foundation, National Women's Law Center

¹³⁸ Applied Survey Research. (2015) San Francisco Homeless Point-In-Time Count & Survey Comprehensive Report.

¹³⁹ Huang, H., Ryan, J., & Herz, D. (2012) The Journey of Dually-Involved Youth: The Description and Prediction of Rereporting and Recidivism. Children and Youth Services Review.

¹⁴⁰ Hairston, C. (2007) Focus on Children with Incarcerated Parents: An Overview of the Research Literature. Annie E. Casey Foundation.

¹⁴¹ San Francisco Human Rights Commission, The SF LGBTQ Center, Learning for Action. (January 2015). San Francisco Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer & Intersex Violence Prevention Needs Assessment. San Francisco, CA.

¹⁴² Applied Survey Research. (2015) San Francisco Homeless Point-In-Time Count & Survey Comprehensive Report

¹⁴³ Webster, D., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Dawson, W., Magruder, J., Exel, M., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Putnam-Hornstein, E., King, B., Rezvani, G., Wagstaff, K., Sandoval, A., Yee, H., Xiong, B., Benton, C., Tobler, A., & Romero, R. (2016). CCWIP Reports. Retrieved from http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare

the disparate impact of involvement on the aforementioned young people as well as on undocumented youth, youth 13 and younger, and girls.

*Community Needs Assessment for Juvenile Justice-Involved Youth*¹⁴⁴

To fulfill the planning requirements of the Children and Youth Fund, DCYF engages young people, parents, and service providers in a Community Needs Assessment (CNA) every five years. The results of the CNA inform the development of a citywide action plan (the Services Allocation Plan) and strategic funding priorities. In developing its CNA, DCYF, in collaboration with the OCOF Council, Office of Early Childcare and Education (OECE), and San Francisco Board of Supervisors, held a series of Community Input Sessions across all 11 supervisorial districts in San Francisco with 362 participants. Additionally, DCYF compiled a vast literature review and conducted a series of expert interviews and focus groups. As a part of the data collection process, on March 23, 2016 DCYF held an All-Grantee meeting to gather feedback on the needs of children, youth, and their families in San Francisco from over 200 service providers who work directly with the young people of San Francisco and their families. Information relevant to the juvenile justice system involved population is included in the present report.

The following findings reflect information gathered through the following sources: interviews with the Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council members, violence prevention and intervention grantee input sessions, focus groups in Juvenile Justice Center, and other targeted information gathering. Information was coded and categorized into ten discrete topic areas, represented here by each heading. In each of the following sections is an explanation of the topic area as well as suggestions that arose in the information gathering process. While the following findings discuss San Francisco's justice-involved youth population broadly, stakeholders, young people, and research recognize that we must strategically target specific special populations of young people who are system-involved, which are described above.

Policy Review

Throughout all of the information gathering processes, system stakeholders, youth, and community members identified policies and/or practices that were outdated, out of sync with the City's vision, and needed to change. This included the VPI Joint Funders, a collaborative body made up of DCYF, DPH, and JPD, who stressed the immediate need to address the implications of AB 403, referred to as Continuum of Care Reform. AB 403 is a state effort that draws together a series of existing and new reforms to child welfare services and reduces reliance on congregate care while increasing reliance on short-term, therapeutic interventions for young people separated from their biological parents, particularly as applicable to young people committed to out-of-home placements. Additionally, stakeholders identified the need to organize a policy working group and/or seek other opportunities to revise and/or eliminate functions, operations, practices, and policies that promote inefficiency, unnecessary delays, inequity, or contribute to racial and ethnic disparity.

Trained and Supported Workforce

Stakeholders, system partners, and youth alike offered suggestions focused on ensuring that there is a well-trained and well-supported workforce for all partners who work with youth in the juvenile justice system.

¹⁴⁴ City and County of San Francisco's Comprehensive Multi-agency Local Action Plan: Strategies for San Francisco Juvenile Justice, March 2017

Young people felt a bias in the systems they interacted with, especially with police, juvenile probation, and in school (especially teachers). Additionally, youth suggested that law enforcement can and should make stronger connections to the communities they serve.

Similarly, service providers felt that departments and agencies working with system-involved youth should be providing developmentally appropriate services, have culturally and linguistically appropriate staff and use trauma-informed, harm reduction, and restorative justice approaches.

Collaboration and Communication

All system partners cited the need for City departments and agencies to work together in service of San Francisco's most vulnerable young people. Many people mentioned that San Francisco ought to capitalize on this moment in the city when leadership is progressive, respects and likes each other, and shares a vision for system-involved youth.

Some specific suggestions were to ensure that all agencies and organizations that touch system-involved youth maintain an ongoing dialogue, are transparent with one another, and commit to collaborations that best support young people and their families.

Alternatives to Formal Involvement and Incarceration

Often identified and discussed throughout our information gathering was the need to ensure that there are multiple opportunities for youth to exit the detention center and/or formal system involvement where and when appropriate and to keep youth from deeper involvement in the justice system. Many stakeholders and youth identified this particularly in terms of a continuum of additional community supervision services that include, but are not limited to: diversion, home detention, electronic monitoring, and reporting centers as well as restorative justice opportunities.

Some system partners cited the need for more diversion opportunities at time of arrest so a young person never has to go through formal processing or involvement with JPD where possible and when appropriate. Many others recognized that while San Francisco has what resembles a continuum of alternatives, many resources, such as the evening reporting center, are vastly underutilized.

Academic and Alternative Education Opportunity

Many young people in San Francisco's juvenile justice system are completely disconnected from a traditional school setting, and stakeholders discussed the need for multiple alternatives for appropriate education and workforce opportunities for system-involved youth and stressed the overall need to be more creative.

All of the young people discussed their connection or lack thereof to school. Young people acknowledged that school inside juvenile hall was too easy and did not match their experience in district schools. Similarly, many young people expressed the desire for extra support in school and recognized that incentives were helpful in encouraging attendance. The JPD Directors and VPI Joint Funders echoed this and called out the need for effective academic supports for young people in the hall. The VPI Joint Funders also identified the need for more workforce development opportunities.

Whole Family Engagement

All system partners recognize that the juvenile justice system has traditionally focused on each individual young person and that it is integral to consider youth in the context of their family and community. Many young people mentioned feeling isolated from friends and family while incarcerated

or in out-of-home placements. Partners stressed that including and engaging families in every step of the juvenile justice process is imperative to a young person's successful transition out of the system. Ensuring that families have access to the services and resources they need will help ensure that the caring adults in a system-involved young person's life are equipped to provide appropriate care.

One focus group emphasized the need for more family-oriented programs to help keep families together, noting that problems often start in the home and that building support systems can strengthen individuals and their families.

Basic Needs/Access to Service and Transportation

All sources cited the inextricable connection between access to basic services and the success of youth in the juvenile justice system.

Service providers observed that youth are often compelled to prioritize meeting their immediate and basic needs over participating in services. They also cited trauma, social anxiety, substance use and mental health issues, and delayed socio-emotional development as common barriers to engagement in supportive services. Additional challenges to young people's engagement in services include a distrust of institutions, language and literacy barriers, scheduling, parenting responsibilities, and concerns about losing eligibility for other benefits. Service providers specifically reported that lack of safe transportation to and from programs is a significant barrier for youth from high crime neighborhoods.

Affordable housing and housing support was one of the most pressing needs cited by sources. Community input session participants acknowledged that while the City has increased efforts to address housing needs, disconnected youth and their families have particular needs for intentional services for the whole family (as discussed above).

Service Connection & Coordination

The need for intentional, continuous, and coordinated services for youth throughout the juvenile justice process was a continuous thread throughout all information gathering. Many system partners identified that services started in custody ought to continue out of custody.

Youth also identified a need for better outreach to improve awareness about available programs for career development and job-training opportunities, especially those who are not in school and system-involved.

Quite a few young people mentioned that being in custody provides time to reflect and get the help they need, but that once released help and support becomes inconsistent. Additionally, many expressed that the help and support available does not always fit what they want or need. Many young people expressed immense anxiety and apprehension about getting out, mostly centered around a sense of dread and fear of failure, as well as apprehension around social circles and friend groups.

Quality Programming

The majority of stakeholders discussed the type, quality and accountability of programming available to young people in the juvenile justice system.

Young people and partners alike expressed the need for quality programming that offers enrichment (arts and music), life skills, anger management, conflict resolution, education about the dangers of social media, and exposure to a greater diversity of environments. JPD Directors called out a need for robust

workforce development opportunities for justice-involved young people. Young people also expressed interest in pathways to upward mobility and mentorship with adults in their communities who have successfully transitioned out of public housing, off public assistance, and into gainful employment and independent living.

Similarly, young people and service providers stressed the need to develop life skills and independence, with a particular emphasis on financial literacy (e.g., banking, building credit, taxes, and savings).

Youth highlighted the particular challenge immigrants in the city face in obtaining employment because of the lack of language-appropriate, culturally competent job training programs. Additionally, they mentioned that programs are held only during the workweek and are located in parts of the city that are difficult for them to access.

There is a continued demand for more safe spaces and culturally competent and culturally specific community programs, where family-community connections can be developed and strengthened. Youth expressed concerns about crime and violence in their communities, indicating a need for better security in their neighborhoods. They felt that existing parks and recreation centers need to be renovated and maintained, and that housing projects should have their own centers for youth and separate spaces for teens to recreate in a healthy, safe environment.

Youth Culture and Perspective

Most young people felt that their involvement with the justice system was unsurprising and expected. However, every young person at some point throughout each focus group session mentioned wanting to grow, learn, or do something different with their lives.

Many participants in the young women's focus group lead independent lives filled with responsibility on the outside but feel like they are treated like children while incarcerated, highlighting a perceived incongruence between needs of young people and services the system provides. When asked where they saw themselves in a year, youth in detention responded with a range of responses from "Opening my eyes" (being alive) to "Going to college" or "Working with animals."

Outline of Objectives, Priority Needs, Goals and Activities

OBJECTIVE 1: FAMILIES AND INDIVIDUALS ARE STABLY HOUSED

Priority Need 1A: Develop and maintain accessible and affordable housing

Goal 1Ai: Create more affordable housing

Activities:

- Explore new finance mechanisms to create more affordable housing
- Acquire privately owned buildings to create new permanently affordable units
- Encourage geographic diversity in location of affordable housing, especially in high opportunity neighborhoods through MOHCD's funding opportunities
- Improve coordination with the Planning Department, Department of Building Inspection, Mayor's Office on Disability, DPW, and SFMTA related to housing and permitting processes to expedite housing production in accordance with Mayor's Executive Directive 17-02
- Continue to implement affordable housing components of HOPE SF
- Monitor the development of below market rate units in projects with Development Agreements or subject to the Inclusionary Housing Program
- Review and evaluate applicant and occupant data from the Inclusionary Housing Program and MOHCD-sponsored affordable housing on an ongoing basis to inform housing policies and procedures
- Explore increasing the number of MOHCD-required mobility/communication accessible units in MOHCD-supported housing
- Explore creative approaches to increasing housing supply
- Increase housing dedicated to supporting HIV+ households
 - Improve Plus Housing program access to HOPWA units
- Increase housing opportunities for people who are homeless or formerly homeless
- Increase housing opportunities for vulnerable populations, including seniors, persons with disabilities, TAY, and veterans
- Support City-funded nonprofit-operated shared housing programs that leverage existing housing to provide affordable housing opportunities for vulnerable populations, such as seniors and systems-involved youth

Goal 1Aii: Preserve affordable housing

Activities:

- Purchase housing at risk of losing affordability
- Rehabilitate existing housing to preserve its affordability
- Negotiate extension of affordability restrictions for existing affordable housing
- Explore ways to leverage capital to preserve affordable housing, including sources from other City departments
- Continue to leverage RAD to rehabilitate and preserve federally-subsidized housing
- Continue to support lead hazard reduction programs
- Continue to support home modification programs that benefit low-income homeowners, increasing safety, accessibility and health outcomes, as well as access to solar power
- Explore ways to assist homeowners with deferred property maintenance

- Continue to monitor homeowners and building owners for compliance with programmatic requirements
- Improve coordination among City agencies and non-profits providing post-purchase/preservation services
- Improve coordination with HUD and private property owners to engage in preservation of privately owned, federally supported existing affordable housing

Goal 1Aiii: Improve data and analytics on affordable housing inventory and placements

Activities:

- Create more robust tools to track housing portfolio, pipeline and placement of applicants for MOHCD-sponsored housing
- Continue to develop and refine DAHLIA (Database of Affordable Housing Listings, Information and Application) and Salesforce capacity to track demand for affordable housing, including enhanced web analytics
- Partner with other DAHLIA jurisdictions on aggregated data sharing, to better understand demand pressures on San Francisco

Priority Need 1B: Make housing more affordable

Goal 1Bi: Reduce development costs to help leverage local housing resources and serve lower income households

Activities:

- Pursue alternative construction types and methods to reduce development costs such as modular construction
- Leverage free or low-cost land such as public land for development
- Pursue new local and state sources of funding
- Work with state and federal agencies to acquire land with priority for affordable housing, including housing for people who are homeless
- Work with City agencies to identify local fees and processes that could be reduced or waived to limit the overall cost of affordable housing

Goal 1Bii: Increase affordability of rental housing

Activities:

- Continue to support long-term rental subsidies and explore subsidy expansion target populations to stabilize their housing
 - Advocate for and pursue State and Federal rental subsidy sources, such as CoC, HOPWA, Section 202 and Section 811
- Continue to administer the Local Operating Subsidy Program
- Expand AMI range for select projects, which will fund more housing for lower-income households
- Pilot new tenant and building based rent subsidy programs for underserved populations
- Identify additional capital subsidies and tenant-based rent subsidies for HIV+ households, homeless households and other vulnerable populations

Goal 1Biii: Increase opportunities for sustainable homeownership

Activities:

- Continue to support, and take steps to improve the quality and standardization of, homebuyer education and post-purchase education and counseling
- Continue to provide Inclusionary ownership opportunities for low- and moderate-income households
- With the Planning Department, explore allowing Inclusionary owners to purchase a second unit (and sell the prior) to improve mobility for growing or shrinking ownership households
 - Explore allowing Inclusionary owners to purchase a second unit (and sell the prior)
- Evaluate Inclusionary, City Second, and Limited Equity Program re-sale pricing to ensure future affordability
- Explore more options to help homeowners with unaffordable HOA dues and rehab costs
- Continue to pursue funding opportunities for DALP for higher income households, including first responders and educators
- Explore strategies to increase lender participation in homeownership programs
- Explore strategies to increase realtor participation in homeownership programs, especially realtors serving target populations
- Continue to streamline MOHCD real estate transaction practices through the DAHLIA system

Goal 1Biv: Increase access to rental and homeownership housing

Activities:

- Continue to support rental housing counseling services to help residents navigate and have equitable access to the City's affordable housing programs
 - Increase language access and cultural competency/cultural humility for housing counseling services
 - Include housing counseling for HIV+ persons to support navigation and placement challenges
 - Include housing counseling for formerly homeless households and other populations at risk of displacement to support navigation and placement challenges
 - Provide additional support/capacity building to service providers to meet increasing demand
- Continue to develop and maintain DAHLIA
 - Add additional functionality, and additional programs and resources, including programs and resources for extremely low-income people
 - Continue to provide housing listings and applications in Chinese, Spanish and Filipino
 - Expand outreach to include community centers, including workforce access points, public libraries, etc.
- Increase awareness about available housing resources
 - More outreach to smaller groups, especially select demographics
- Continue to support developers and property managers to create and maintain Inclusionary rental opportunities
- Evaluate housing lottery preference programs to ensure they meet their intended goals
- Continue to monitor lottery/lease up to ensure that housing programs reach the intended beneficiaries

- Ensure units that are accessible and intended for persons with mobility and communication disabilities go to people who need them
- Implement Right to Return Legislation allowing preference and priority for former residents of HOPE SF sites in HOPE SF replacement units

Priority Need 1C: Prevent and reduce homelessness

Goal 1Ci: Improve systems to help each person find the right path to permanent housing

Activities:

- Implement coordinated systems for adults, families with children, and youth
- Implement performance accountability across all programs and systems

Goal 1Cii: Reduce homelessness for adults, youth and families

Activities:

- Develop homelessness prevention and problem solving (diversion) activities targeting people with a history of homelessness and people being discharged into homelessness from mainstream institutions such as hospitals, jails, prisons, and health and behavioral health setting
- Develop new permanent supportive housing units for adults, youth and families

Goal 1Ciii: Ensure no families with children are unsheltered

Activities:

- Identify unsheltered families through targeted outreach
- Offer all unsheltered families shelter placement
- Increase access to family-serving shelter beds

Goal 1Civ: Improve the City's response to street homelessness and end large, long-term encampments

Activities:

- Continue to provide street outreach to provide care, and connection to housing, shelter and other services for people experiencing homelessness
- Conduct quarterly counts of tents and vehicle encampments
- Provide targeted outreach to large encampments
- Place people into low-barrier shelters
- Conduct assessments and housing prioritization using mobile outreach teams

Goal 1Cv: Further align MOHCD's work with HSH

Activities:

- Strengthen planning and coordination between MOHCD and HSH to maximize resources and funding to better serve households experiencing housing instability
- Improve processes to support coordinated entry and increase the production and lease-up of permanent housing
- Improved coordination of the placement of HOPWA, RAD, PBV, and other supportive housing units

- Create linkage between DAHLIA and Coordinated Entry
- Coordinate HSH homelessness prevention and problem-solving activities with MOHCD eviction prevention and housing stabilization activities to support a comprehensive strategy to divert or prevent households from experiencing homelessness

Goal 1Cvi: Expand services to prevent homelessness and stabilize housing for formerly homeless households and those at risk of homelessness

Activities:

- Provide on-site services with clinical support within supportive housing buildings
- Partner to provide targeted services to clients at risk of homelessness to access the homelessness response system
- Prioritize homelessness prevention and problem-solving resources for households with a history of homelessness or shelter use
- Create shallow subsidies that would add another layer to the housing safety net, easing the transition from housing instability and relieving some of the demand on housing programs with deeper subsidies

Priority Need 1D: Provide services to maintain housing stability

Goal 1Di: Reduce rate of evictions

Activities:

- Under Tenant Right to Counsel initiative, expand support for full scope legal representation for residents facing eviction
- Continue to support tenant counseling, outreach and education; mediation; housing stability case management, and direct financial assistance (one-time assistance and flexible tenant-based subsidies) activities
- Standardize renter education curriculums delivered by City-funded housing counseling programs
- Expand longer-term rental subsidy programs
- Continue to engage community stakeholders around eviction prevention strategies to maximize effectiveness

Goal 1Dii: Increase access to services for residents of public and publicly subsidized housing, RAD projects, HOPWA subsidized housing, and single room occupancy hotels

Activities:

- Continue to support and develop a more comprehensive continuum of services including enhanced information and referral, service connection to identify and meet short-term client goals, case management to address more complex and/or longer-term needs, and case coordination to coordinate services for a client between multiple providers and systems
- Work with City departments to explore improving housing stability through mental health and substance abuse services
- Explore expansion of services to residents of single room occupancy hotels
- Combine service connection and skill development strategies to provide more comprehensive services that increase clients' economic self-sufficiency

- Locate key services, such as tenant counseling and eviction prevention, legal services, financial education and counseling, on-site at HOPE SF and RAD projects
- Continue to support community building and resident leadership development programs
- Provide housing retention services, as needed, for current HOPWA units and those in development

Goal 1Diii: Provide support for other affordable housing residents to ensure success in their housing placement

Activities:

- Create welcome packet to be distributed to new affordable housing residents, and explore connecting social services to residents
- Facilitate connection to mediation services when needed
- Require notification of services to tenants when evicting tenants from MOHCD-sponsored affordable housing

Goal 1Div: Increase collaboration between healthcare and housing systems by increasing mobility between levels of care (high to low acuity) in residential settings for HIV+ households

Activities:

- Ensure assessment of tenant ability to live independently in order to move to more appropriate housing

OBJECTIVE 2: FAMILIES AND INDIVIDUALS ARE RESILIENT AND ECONOMICALLY SELF-SUFFICIENT

Priority Need 2A: Promote workforce development

Goal 2Ai: Provide access to employment opportunities across multiple sectors for unemployed and underemployed populations

Activities:

- Provide workforce services to unemployed and underemployed residents to prepare them for future employment opportunities
- MOHCD and OEWD work collaboratively to provide jobs for residents in their neighborhoods
 - Expand Local Hire targeting so residents of the property get priority for construction jobs and explore Local Hire for property management jobs
 - Encourage developers to expand employment opportunities within their developments
 - Provide links to neighborhood job opportunities on DAHLIA
 - Advertise job listing sign-up on MOHCD website

Priority Need 2B: Increase opportunities through improved language access and core skills development

Goal 2Bi: Improve access to MOHCD programs and services through translation of paper and digital resources

Activities:

- Improve language access for all MOHCD programs and services, community workshops and meetings
- Develop and maintain a detailed resource guide that lists programs and services by language that services are provided in
- Explore making DAHLIA accessible to more populations through translation into additional languages

Goal 2Bii: Provide skill development and training resources

Activities:

- Continue to support and refine skills development programs in areas including life skills and personal effectiveness, educational skills (including GED and diploma programs), English as a Second Language training, and workplace readiness skills
- Support programs that create clear pathways to more advanced training opportunities, including post-secondary educational programs, more advanced ESL programming at San Francisco City College, and sector-specific job training programs through OEWD and other entities
- Combine service connection and skill development strategies to provide more comprehensive services

Goal 2Biii: Improve financial literacy and personal finance management

Activities:

- Continue to support financial counseling and education, asset and credit building, debt reduction, access to banking, and credit counseling and repair services
- Increase investment in more intensive services that build the financial capability of clients, and ongoing one-on-one coaching services that produce long-term economic improvements
- Encourage co-location of financial services at housing sites and at community-based organizations

Goal 2Biv: Improve digital literacy

Activities:

- Provide training in basic, intermediate and advanced digital skills, through workshops and drop-in hours, and new innovative delivery models at community-based digital literacy programs
- Support programs that refurbish and distribute computers and other digital devices for low-income households
- Work with neighborhood hubs, including libraries and community centers to leverage their computer facilities to expand Internet access and digital literacy for beneficiaries of MOHCD-funded services
- Support programs that provide Internet access and assist with digital literacy for affordable housing residents and sites, especially at HOPE SF, RAD, and SRO housing
- Build technology capacity of community-based organizations (CBOs), empowering CBO staff to lead digital literacy trainings and services

Priority Need 2C: Provide equitable access to civil legal services for immigration and other critical issues

Goal 2Ci: Increase access to civil legal services

Activities:

- Continue to provide support for immigration-related legal services
- Continue to support and develop more targeted funding and service strategies for areas of civil law including employment, family, consumer, benefits and non-eviction related housing issues

Priority Need 2D: Help households connect to services

Goal 2Di: Increase access to community-based services

Activities:

- Continue to support and develop a more comprehensive continuum of services including enhanced information and referral, service connection to identify and meet short-term client goals, case management to address more complex and/or longer term needs, and case coordination to coordinate services for a client between multiple providers and systems
- Combine service connection and skill development strategies to provide more comprehensive services
- Support innovative community outreach strategies

OBJECTIVE 3: COMMUNITIES HAVE HEALTHY PHYSICAL, SOCIAL AND BUSINESS INFRASTRUCTURE

Priority Need 3A: Enhance community facilities and spaces

Goal 3Ai: Ensure nonprofit service providers have high quality, stable facilities

Activities:

- Continue to provide support for capital improvements for community facilities providing essential public services
- Facilitate the development of capital needs assessments for community facilities to ensure long-term sustainability
- Provide support to meet design needs related to maximizing the utility of facilities
- Provide support for organizations to acquire and/or identify lease opportunities to remain in and better serve their communities

Goal 3Aii: Enhance public spaces

Activities:

- Create and improve community amenities designed to serve low-income residents

Priority Need 3B: Strengthen small businesses and commercial corridors

Goal 3Bi: Encourage the development and sustainability of thriving locally owned 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

Goal 3Bii: Support the development and sustainability of 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 tenant improvements
- Increase investments in accessibility and compliance projects
- Continue a geographically-focused approach to deliver services in a way that leverages other City investments

Priority Need 3C: Support community-driven comprehensive strategies

Goal 3Ci: Support neighborhood-based planning efforts

Activities:

- Provide infrastructure for communities to launch, lead, and determine their own cultural stabilization strategies with extensive support from City Agencies through the Cultural District Program
- Continue to support neighborhood planning processes that bring together low-income, and disenfranchised populations at risk of displacement to meaningfully participate in their communities' planning processes
- Support neighborhood residents and leaders to learn about City processes, programs and initiatives
- Strengthen economic development strategies and activities within community-driven plans

Goal 3Cii: Support locally-based community building

Activities:

- Continue to support networks of community-based organizations and other key community stakeholders that provide increased service coordination and collaboration for both neighborhoods and specific populations
- Continue to support neighborhood-based community action grant programs

Priority Need 3D: Support capacity needs of community-based organizations and MOHCD professional partners

Goal 3Di: Increase capacity of community-based organizations

Activities:

- Build organizational capacity of MOHCD grantees/providers through outreach, relationship building and recruitment, organizational assessments, trainings and coaching, cohort-based and project-based work, subject matter experts, and other technical assistance methodologies
- Prioritize strengthening the following community-based organizations and developers
 - Black-led, Native American-led, Mayan-led, Southeast Asian-led, Transgender-led and volunteer-led organizations
 - Organizations under fiscal sponsorship
 - Organizations serving a majority of clients from our six NRSAs (Bayview Hunters Point, Chinatown, Mission, South of Market, Tenderloin and Visitacion Valley)

OBJECTIVE 4: COMMUNITIES AT RISK OF DISPLACEMENT ARE STABILIZED

Priority Need 4A: Address inequitable impacts of economic growth through anti-displacement measures for residents and businesses

Goal 4Ai: Implement policies and programs that prioritize current residents

Activities:

- Continue to administer housing lottery preference programs
- As MOHCD evaluates and updates policies and procedures for affordable housing to meet current needs, recommend parallel changes/updates to the Inclusionary Planning Code and non-profit developer loan agreements
- Implement right-to-return policy for re-leasing of buildings where tenants were displaced
- Implement the City's first right to purchase laws for acquiring buildings at risk of being unaffordable
- Support "Mixed Status Families" at risk of losing their housing subsidies due to immigration status

Goal 4Aii: Encourage commercial tenants to locate on ground-floor spaces of MOHCD's affordable housing developments

Activities:

- Work with OEWD to financially support commercial tenant improvements (build outs) for ground-floor spaces
- Work with OEWD to market commercial space opportunities to local non-profits

Goal 4Aiii: Reduce displacement of residents and businesses

Activities:

- Provide flexible tenant-based rental subsidies to reduce household rent burdens to more sustainable (less than 70% of income toward rent) or affordable (30% of income toward rent) levels
- Leverage programs that help households understand and assert tenants' rights, including Tenant Right to Counsel; tenant counseling, education, and outreach; and tenant-landlord and tenant-tenant alternative dispute resolution (mediation)
- Create and implement policies to mitigate negative impacts of rent increases

- Expand programs designed to retain homeowners in communities experiencing a legacy of exclusion
- Coordinate with other departments to ensure the long-term sustainability of neighborhood-based organizations
- Leverage place-based strategies such as legislated cultural districts and the Central SOMA Plan to shape and exercise control over their physical, social, economic and cultural environment
- Increase access to resources for small businesses in low-income neighborhoods that want to stay in San Francisco
- Expand programs to offer capital funding for tenant improvements to launch new commercial locations

Priority Need 4B: Ensure economic growth offers benefits to existing communities

Goal 4Bi: Require local hiring to the greatest extent possible in MOHCD's projects and programs

Activities:

- Coordinate with OEWD for job readiness and job placement on affordable housing projects
- Continue to support job readiness and placement for RAD and HOPE SF projects

Goal 4Bii: Ensure adequate City services in neighborhoods where MOHCD's affordable housing is located

Activities:

- Work with City partners such as San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) on access to and quality of low-cost transportation
- Work with key City departments to identify needs and opportunities for service implementation and coordination
- Participate in interdepartmental meetings for the development of strategies that result in improved service delivery in neighborhoods where MOHCD's affordable housing is located

Goal 4Biii: Implement programs that provide direct benefits resulting from neighborhood-based economic growth to local communities

Activities:

- Target amenities development to communities impacted by increased housing density
- Coordinate Cultural District programming with other community development initiatives
- Increased partnerships between City Departments and Cultural District community groups to better coordinate resources and develop policy solutions
- Continue to identify ways in which existing businesses and residents can access increased employment and access to capital
- Collaborate with other City departments to identify additional ways to support local micro enterprise and entrepreneurs
- Coordinate with OEWD for new retail and community supported businesses retained or created in MOHCD-supported affordable housing sites

OBJECTIVE 5: THE CITY WORKS TO ELIMINATE THE CAUSES OF RACIAL DISPARITIES

Priority Need 5A: Ensure racially equitable access to programs and services, in coordination with other City departments

Goal 5Ai: Develop specific funding, policies and practices to ensure equitable access to MOHCD and OEWD programs

Activities:

- Review and evaluate outreach practices with a racial equity lens
- Improve outreach to historically underserved neighborhoods and communities
- Leverage culturally-competent outreach to increase awareness about available housing and service resources
- While housing and community development policies and programs are informed by a host of stakeholders and regulations, including the Mayor, elected officials, and federal and state funding requirements, MOHCD, in its outreach and engagement practices, shall provide voice to communities most impacted by racial inequity and support their agency in both shaping and achieving housing and community development goals.
- Continue standardization of housing and program eligibility criteria, and other policies, with a racial equity lens
- Evaluate and improve MOHCD programs and services to ensure equitable access
- Analyze gaps in placement success for different demographics, and determine required interventions to create equitable access to affordable housing resources
- Explore options for extending the benefits of the Certificate of Preference program
- MOHCD shall prioritize communities most impacted by racial inequities in its contracts, grants, community development services and affordable housing opportunities, and will develop and expand programs that focus on serving these communities
- Explore and implement racial equity performance measures into procurement processes, including MOHCD and OEWD RFQ/RFP selection criteria
- Partner with the Human Right Commission's Office of Racial Equity to implement racial equity policies
- Implement department-wide trauma-informed trainings and systems to support improved customer service and self-care
- Develop a resource guide that is organized by target populations
- In order to inform decisions, guide resource allocation, and evaluate the effectiveness of its programs, MOHCD shall employ robust, inclusive, disaggregated and equitable data collection and analysis strategies

Priority Need 5B: Instill racial equity and trauma-informed values and practices in the work of MOHCD and its partners

Goal 5Bi: Incorporate cultural competency/humility, trauma-informed systems, and other equity training and resources for MOHCD's partners

Activities:

- Create a comprehensive action plan for incorporating Racial Equity into MOHCD programs and operations

- Explore further development and implementation of trainings for grantees, developers, and housing placement and property management partners, including trainings on implicit bias, cultural competence/cultural humility, trauma informed systems and racial equity
- Education for housing and service providers for HIV+ persons to increase cultural competency/humility and reduce stigma
- In order to consistently focus on addressing racial inequities, MOHCD shall integrate a racial equity framework into all facets of its culture, practices, and work plans, and work to ensure that all staff feel that their contributions are integral to MOHCD's mission, that their identities and experiences are celebrated, and that their voices are heard and considered

Goal 5Bii: Incorporate racial equity principles in MOHCD's hiring and promotion practices

Activities:

- Review MOHCD hiring and promotion practices and implement changes to better support a diverse and inclusive work environment
- MOHCD shall develop and implement staff recruitment and retention strategies such that MOHCD staff, at all levels, is diverse and representative of the communities we serve

Goal 5Biii: Implement racial equity and trauma-informed values and approaches throughout MOHCD

Activities:

- Develop and implement a racial equity plan for MOHCD
- Conduct a complete racial equity analysis of MOHCD's internal policies
- Communicate values to external community and stakeholders
- Continue to convene the Racial Equity Work Group to create and implement MOHCD's racial equity plan
- Create a trauma-informed working group to support implementation of healing practices
- In order to advance this Racial Equity Plan, MOHCD shall ensure that the racial equity initiative is sustainably resourced and appropriately staffed

SP-10 Geographic Priorities – 91.215 (a)(1)

Geographic Area

Table 70 – Geographic Priority Areas

1	Area Name:	Bayview Hunters Point
	Area Type:	Strategy area
	Other Target Area Description:	
	HUD Approval Date:	6/18/1996
	% of Low/ Mod:	
	Revital Type:	
	Other Revital Description:	
	Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.	MOHCD, along with the DPH and the Planning Department, has defined San Francisco neighborhoods by census tract boundaries (see Map 12). 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.
	Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.	See MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion
	How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?	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.
	Identify the needs in this target area.	<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>Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 1A: Develop and maintain accessible and affordable housing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to implement affordable housing components of HOPE SF at Hunters View and Alice Griffith ▪ Complete 28 new affordable housing projects currently in the development pipeline for the

		<p>neighborhood, which will add 1,513 of affordable housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 1B: Make housing more affordable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Robustly fund Homeownership counseling programs based in the neighborhood ▪ Robustly fund home modification programs that focus on helping low-income homeowners (a significant population in Bayview Hunters Point) modify and be able to stay in their homes ▪ Robustly fund Rental Housing Counseling programs based in the neighborhood ➤ Priority Need 1C: Prevent and reduce homelessness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduce the inflow of households entering the homeless response system by engaging in diversion or funding prevention services ▪ Maintain support to homeless outreach, shelters and social services for people actively experiencing homelessness in the southeast sector ▪ Increase the outflow from the homeless response system by supporting the development of affordable housing and rental assistance ➤ Priority Need 1D: Provide services to maintain housing stability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide robust support for RAD Family Services projects at Hunters Point East, Hunters Point West, and Westbrook housing developments ▪ Provide robust support for HOPE SF Housing Retention and Case Management services ▪ Locate other key services, such as tenant counseling and eviction prevention, legal services, financial education and counseling, on-site at HOPE SF and RAD projects ▪ Continue to support community building and resident leadership development programs ▪ Support Tenant Right to Counsel providers based in the neighborhood, to ensure that residents have access to full scope legal representation when facing eviction <p>Objective 2: Families and Individuals are Resilient and Economically Self-Sufficient</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 2A: Promote workforce development
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide a full range of employment and training services through The Bayview-Hunters Point Job Center, including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Job readiness workshops, job search assistance, career planning and connections to employment. ○ Certifications and license(s) attainment assistance to enhance employment. ○ Outreach, hiring and training of residents for HOPE SF housing sites in BVHP. ○ Open computer lab with staff assistance available. ○ Targeted outreach to neighborhood seniors and older adults for employment assistance. ▪ Support Bayview-Hunters Point organizations for youth workforce services. This includes sector services, youth development for the workforce, barrier removal services and paid internship opportunities. <p>➤ Priority Need 2B: Increase opportunities through improved language access and core skills development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support skills development programs in areas including life skills and personal effectiveness, educational skills (including GED and diploma programs), English as a Second Language training, and workplace readiness skills ▪ Support programs that create clear pathways to more advanced training opportunities, including post-secondary educational programs, more advanced ESL programming at San Francisco City College, and sector-specific job training programs through OEWD and other entities ▪ Ensure that skill development programs based in Bayview Hunters Point are funded, and that these programs are accessible to RAD and HOPE SF residents, ▪ Support financial counseling and education, including intensive one-on-one financial coaching; ensure that these services are located in Bayview Hunters Point including on-site at HOPE SF and RAD housing sites ▪ Support digital literacy programs, including programs that provide Internet access and
--	--	---

		<p>assist with digital literacy for affordable housing residents and sites, especially at HOPE SF and RAD housing sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 2C: Provide equitable access to civil legal services for immigration and other critical issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure that a comprehensive civil legal services provider is located in Bayview Hunters Point, and that residents have access to legal counseling and representation in a wide range of crucial legal areas ➤ Priority Need 2D: Help households connect to services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support a comprehensive continuum of services including enhanced information and referral, service connection to identify and meet short-term client goals, case management to address more complex and/or longer term needs, and case coordination to coordinate services for a client between multiple providers and systems. Ensure that these services are located in the Bayview. <p>Objective 3: Communities Have Healthy Physical, Social and Business Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 3A: Enhance community facilities and spaces <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure nonprofit service providers have high quality, stable facilities ▪ Enhance public spaces ➤ Priority Need 3B: Strengthen small businesses and commercial corridors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to provide business technical assistance through community partners ▪ Support economic revitalization and façade improvement efforts along the Third Street Commercial Corridor- Evans to Jamestown Avenues ▪ Lead 6 month community engagement process to develop and prioritize goals in the Cultural District strategy ➤ Priority Need 3C: Support community-driven comprehensive strategies
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Through the African American Arts and Cultural District in Bayview Hunters Point, provide infrastructure for the community to launch, lead, and determine its own cultural stabilization strategies, with extensive support from City Agencies ▪ Support neighborhood planning processes focused on Bayview Hunters Point, including supporting convening of nonprofits services in Southeast San Francisco, and collaboratives of organizations led by underrepresented populations (including African-American led organizations) <p>➤ Priority Need 3D: Support capacity needs of community-based organizations and MOHCD professional partners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Build organizational capacity of MOHCD's Bayview Hunters Point grantees/providers through outreach, relationship building and recruitment, organizational assessments, trainings and coaching, cohort-based and project-based work, subject matter experts, and other technical assistance methodologies <p>Objective 4: Communities At Risk of Displacement are Stabilized</p> <p>➤ Priority Need 4A: Address inequitable impacts of economic growth through anti-displacement measures for residents and businesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Leverage African-American Arts & Cultural District to support anti-displacement policies ▪ Play a key role in strategy and program development, coordinating resources for small businesses and property owners, supporting inter-agency and community collaborations, and facilitate community engagement for the Bayview/Third Street Corridor merchants <p>➤ Priority Need 4B: Ensure economic growth offers benefits to existing communities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Coordinate with OEWD for job readiness and job placement on affordable housing projects ▪ Continue to support job readiness and placement for RAD and HOPE SF projects ▪ Coordinate Cultural District programming with other community development initiatives to
--	--	---

		provide maximum economic benefit to neighborhood residents
	What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?	Opportunities for improvement are listed under each of the needs above.
	Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?	
2	Area Name:	Chinatown
	Area Type:	Strategy area
	Other Target Area Description:	
	HUD Approval Date:	6/18/1996
	% of Low/ Mod:	
	Revital Type:	
	Other Revital Description:	
	Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.	MOHCD, along with the DPH and the Planning Department, has defined San Francisco neighborhoods by census tract boundaries (see Map 12). The Chinatown neighborhood consists of the following census tracts: 107, 113, 118 and 611.
	Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.	See MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion
	How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?	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.
	Identify the needs in this target area.	<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>Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 1A: Develop and maintain accessible and affordable housing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Complete Ping Yuen North RAD rehabilitation project, providing 199 affordable units ▪ Complete 772 Pacific Avenue project, providing an estimated 49 affordable units ➤ Priority Need 1B: Make housing more affordable

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Robustly fund Homeownership counseling programs that can serve neighborhood residents, including monolingual Chinese speakers ▪ Robustly fund Rental Housing Counseling programs based in the neighborhood, and ones that can serve neighborhood residents, including monolingual Chinese speakers <p>➤ Priority Need 1C: Prevent and reduce homelessness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduce the inflow of households entering the homeless response system by engaging in diversion or funding prevention services ▪ Maintain support to homeless outreach, shelters and social services for people actively experiencing homelessness in the northwest sector ▪ Increase the outflow from the homeless response system by supporting the development of affordable housing and rental assistance <p>➤ Priority Need 1D: Provide services to maintain housing stability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide robust support for RAD Family Services projects at Ping Yuen and Ping Yuen North ▪ Ensure that other key services, such as tenant counseling and eviction prevention, legal services, financial education and counseling, are accessible to residents of these RAD projects ▪ Continue to support community building and resident leadership development programs ▪ Support Tenant Right to Counsel providers based in the neighborhood, to ensure that residents have access to full scope legal representation when facing eviction ▪ Support tenant counseling and education organizations based in the neighborhood <p>Objective 2: Families and Individuals are Resilient and Economically Self-Sufficient</p> <p>➤ Priority Need 2A: Promote workforce development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide employment and training services to local residents through the Chinatown Job Center, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Job readiness workshops, job search assistance, career planning and
--	--	--

		<p>connections to employment opportunities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Services in English, Spanish, Cantonese, and Mandarin. ○ Career pathways programs for older adults ○ Additional targeted outreach in two public housing sites in Chinatown. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sector trainings in both Health Care and Hospitality, to provide residents with skills and training to enter these industries. ▪ Additional Workforce partners specialize in providing general workforce services to newly arrived immigrants to help them successfully integrate in the workforce. <p>➤ Priority Need 2B: Increase opportunities through improved language access and core skills development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support skills development programs in areas including life skills and personal effectiveness, educational skills (including GED and diploma programs), English as a Second Language training, and workplace readiness skills, and that these are accessible to recent immigrants, LEP and monolingual residents ▪ Support programs that create clear pathways to more advanced training opportunities, including post-secondary educational programs, more advanced ESL programming at San Francisco City College, and sector-specific job training programs through OEWD and other entities ▪ Ensure that skill development programs based in Chinatown are supported, and that these programs are accessible to RAD residents ▪ Support financial counseling and education, including intensive one-on-one financial coaching; ensure that financial counseling services are available in Chinatown ▪ Support digital literacy programs, including programs that provide Internet access and assist with digital literacy for affordable housing residents and sites, especially at RAD housing sites
--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 2C: Provide equitable access to civil legal services for immigration and other critical issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure that civil legal services providers are located in Chinatown, and that residents have access to legal counseling and representation in a wide range of crucial legal areas, and in the necessary languages ➤ Priority Need 2D: Help households connect to services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support a comprehensive continuum of services including enhanced information and referral, service connection to identify and meet short-term client goals, case management to address more complex and/or longer term needs, and case coordination to coordinate services for a client between multiple providers and systems; ensure that these services are available in needed languages, and that appropriate translation services are accessible; ensure that services are based in Chinatown. <p>Objective 3: Communities Have Healthy Physical, Social and Business Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 3A: Enhance community facilities and spaces <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure Chinatown nonprofit service providers have high quality, stable facilities ▪ Enhance public spaces ➤ Priority Need 3B: Strengthen small businesses and commercial corridors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Expand services to existing businesses to help them stay and grow in the Central Subway Station and Grant Avenue area ▪ Provide support to and invest in local revitalization and marketing initiatives ➤ Priority Need 3C: Support community-driven comprehensive strategies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support work of the API Council to convene and coordinate efforts of organizations that serve Chinatown and other API communities ▪ Support work of the API Council to convene and coordinate efforts of organizations that serve Chinatown and other API communities
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 3D: Support capacity needs of community-based organizations and MOHCD professional partners <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Build organizational capacity of MOHCD's Chinatown grantees/providers through outreach, relationship building and recruitment, organizational assessments, trainings and coaching, cohort-based and project-based work, subject matter experts, and other technical assistance methodologies <p>Objective 4: Communities At Risk of Displacement are Stabilized</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 4A: Address inequitable impacts of economic growth through anti-displacement measures for residents and businesses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ OEWD Corridor Manager will provide business engagement and vacancy tracking ➤ Priority Need 4B: Ensure economic growth offers benefits to existing communities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Coordinate with OEWD for job readiness and job placement on affordable housing projects ▪ Continue to support job readiness and placement for <u>RAD</u> projects ▪ Economic Development activities focusing on vacancy activation, including short-term "pop up" businesses and improvements to attract long-term tenants
	What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?	Opportunities for improvement are listed under each of the needs above.
	Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?	
3	Area Name:	Mission
	Area Type:	Strategy area
	Other Target Area Description:	
	HUD Approval Date:	6/18/1996
	% of Low/ Mod:	
	Revital Type:	
	Other Revital Description:	
	Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.	MOHCD, along with the DPH and the Planning Department, has defined San Francisco neighborhoods by census tract boundaries (see Map 12). The Mission NRSA neighborhood consists of the following census tracts: 177, 201, 202, 208, 209, 228.01, 228.02, 228.03, 229.01, 229.02 and 229.03.

<p>Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.</p>	<p>See MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion</p>
<p>How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>Identify the needs in this target area.</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>Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 1A: Develop and maintain accessible and affordable housing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 34 new affordable housing projects currently in development in the neighborhood, which will add 1,429 units of affordable housing ▪ This includes primarily new construction, along with small sites acquisition, rehabilitation, and inclusionary housing ➤ Priority Need 1B: Make housing more affordable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Robustly fund Homeownership counseling programs based in the neighborhood ▪ Robustly fund Rental Housing Counseling programs based in the neighborhood ▪ Continue and complete Bernal Dwellings RAD rehabilitation project, providing affordable 160 units ➤ Priority Need 1C: Prevent and reduce homelessness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduce the inflow of households entering the homeless response system by engaging in diversion or funding prevention services ▪ Maintain support to homeless outreach, shelters and social services for people actively experiencing homelessness in the Mission ▪ Increase the outflow from the homeless response system by supporting the

		<p>development of affordable housing and rental assistance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 1D: Provide services to maintain housing stability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support Tenant Right to Counsel providers based in the neighborhood, to ensure that residents have access to full scope legal representation when facing eviction ▪ Support tenant counseling and education organizations based in the neighborhood <p>Objective 2: Families and Individuals are Resilient and Economically Self-Sufficient</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 2A: Promote workforce development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide employment and training services to local residents, through the Mission Job Center, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Job readiness workshops, job search assistance, career planning and connections to employment opportunities. ○ Services in English and Spanish. ○ Career pathways programs for public housing residents, and targeted outreach in five public housing sites in the Mission. ○ Training for tech careers and office administration. ▪ Additional Mission-based Workforce partners specialize in providing workforce and training services in hospitality and healthcare. ➤ Priority Need 2B: Increase opportunities through improved language access and core skills development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support skills development programs in areas including life skills and personal effectiveness, educational skills (including GED and diploma programs), English as a Second Language training, and workplace readiness skills ▪ Support programs that create clear pathways to more advanced training opportunities, including post-secondary educational programs, more advanced ESL programming at San Francisco City College, and sector-specific job training programs through OEWD and other entities
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure that skill development programs based in the Mission are funded, and that these programs are accessible to RAD residents ▪ Support financial counseling and education, including intensive one-on-one financial coaching; ensure that these services are located in the Mission ▪ Support digital literacy programs, including programs that provide Internet access and assist with digital literacy for affordable housing residents and sites, especially at RAD housing sites in the Mission <p>➤ Priority Need 2C: Provide equitable access to civil legal services for immigration and other critical issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure that civil legal services providers are located in the Mission, and that residents have access to legal counseling and representation in a wide range of crucial legal areas, and in the necessary languages ▪ Due to large number of immigrant families, ensure that legal services are available to them in the neighborhood, and in the necessary languages <p>➤ Priority Need 2D: Help households connect to services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support a comprehensive continuum of services including enhanced information and referral, service connection to identify and meet short-term client goals, case management to address more complex and/or longer term needs, and case coordination to coordinate services for a client between multiple providers and systems; ensure that these services are available in needed languages (including Spanish as well as Mayan and other indigenous languages), that appropriate translation services are accessible, and that providers are located in the Mission <p>Objective 3: Communities Have Healthy Physical, Social and Business Infrastructure</p> <p>➤ Priority Need 3A: Enhance community facilities and spaces</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure Mission nonprofit service providers have high quality, stable facilities
--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Enhance public spaces <p>➤ Priority Need 3B: Strengthen small businesses and commercial corridors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide small businesses with individualized technical assistance through community partners ▪ Support neighborhood events to attract people to the corridor, fill vacancies, improve business storefronts, and conduct business outreach and tailored business services <p>➤ Priority Need 3C: Support community-driven comprehensive strategies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Leverage Mission 2020 and Mission Promise Zone planning processes ▪ Strengthen economic development strategies and activities in community-driven plans <p>➤ Priority Need 3D: Support capacity needs of community-based organizations and MOHCD professional partners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Build organizational capacity of MOHCD's Mission neighborhood grantees/providers through outreach, relationship building and recruitment, organizational assessments, trainings and coaching, cohort-based and project-based work, subject matter experts, and other technical assistance methodologies <p>Objective 4: Communities at Risk of Displacement are Stabilized</p> <p>➤ Priority Need 4A: Address inequitable impacts of economic growth through anti-displacement measures for residents and businesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Leverage Calle 24 Latino/a Cultural District to support anti-displacement policies ▪ Look to the Mission Action Plan as a guide for implementing strategies that reduce displacement and seek stabilization <p>➤ Priority Need 4B: Ensure economic growth offers benefits to existing communities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Calle 24 Latino/a Cultural District will be an economically vibrant community that is inclusive of diverse income households and businesses that together compassionately embrace the unique Latino/a heritage and
--	--	---

		<p>cultures of 24th Street and that celebrate Latino/a cultural events, foods, businesses, activities, art and music.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Coordinate with OEWD for job readiness and job placement on affordable housing projects ▪ Continue to support job readiness and placement for RAD projects
	What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?	Opportunities for improvement are listed under each of the needs above.
	Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?	
4	Area Name:	South of Market
	Area Type:	Strategy area
	Other Target Area Description:	
	HUD Approval Date:	6/18/1996
	% of Low/ Mod:	
	Revital Type:	
	Other Revital Description:	
	Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.	MOHCD, along with the DPH and the Planning Department, has defined San Francisco neighborhoods by census tract boundaries (see Map 12). The South of Market neighborhood consists of the following census tracts: 176.01, 178.01, 178.02 and 180.
	Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.	See MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion
	How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?	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.
	Identify the needs in this target area.	<p>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.</p> <p>Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 1A: Develop and maintain accessible and affordable housing

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Complete 31 new affordable housing projects currently in development in the neighborhood, which will add 1,170 units of affordable housing ▪ Includes new construction, rehabilitation, and inclusionary units ▪ Includes both rental and homeownership opportunities <p>➤ Priority Need 1B: Make housing more affordable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Robustly fund Homeownership counseling programs based in the neighborhood ▪ Robustly fund Rental Housing Counseling programs based in the neighborhood <p>➤ Priority Need 1C: Prevent and reduce homelessness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduce the inflow of households entering the homeless response system by engaging in diversion or funding prevention services ▪ Maintain support to homeless outreach, shelters and social services for people actively experiencing homelessness in SOMA ▪ Increase the outflow from the homeless response system by supporting the development of affordable housing and rental assistance <p>➤ Priority Need 1D: Provide services to maintain housing stability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support Tenant Right to Counsel providers based in the neighborhood, to ensure that residents have access to full scope legal representation when facing eviction ▪ Support tenant counseling and education organizations based in the neighborhood <p>Objective 2: Families and Individuals are Resilient and Economically Self-Sufficient</p> <p>➤ Priority Need 2A: Promote workforce development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide employment and training services to local residents through the SOMA Job Center, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Job readiness workshops, job search assistance, career planning and connections to employment opportunities. ○ Access to paid training and on the job training opportunities.
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Partnerships with other city/state agencies that offer public assistance, disability and unemployment services. ▪ Additional SOMA-based Workforce partners specialize in providing workforce and training services to veterans and those with developmental disabilities. <p>➤ Priority Need 2B: Increase opportunities through improved language access and core skills development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support skills development programs in areas including life skills and personal effectiveness, educational skills (including GED and diploma programs), English as a Second Language training, and workplace readiness skills ▪ Support programs that create clear pathways to more advanced training opportunities, including post-secondary educational programs, more advanced ESL programming at San Francisco City College, and sector-specific job training programs through OEWD and other entities ▪ Ensure that skill development programs based in SOMA are funded <p>➤ Priority Need 2C: Provide equitable access to civil legal services for immigration and other critical issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure that civil legal services providers are located in SOMA, and that residents have access to legal counseling and representation in a wide range of crucial legal areas, and in the necessary languages <p>➤ Priority Need 2D: Help households connect to services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support a comprehensive continuum of services including enhanced information and referral, service connection to identify and meet short-term client goals, case management to address more complex and/or longer term needs, and case coordination to coordinate services for a client between multiple providers and systems; ensure that these services are available in needed languages, and that appropriate translation
--	--	---

	<p>services are accessible; ensure that these providers are located in SOMA</p> <p>Objective 3: Communities Have Healthy Physical, Social and Business Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 3A: Enhance community facilities and spaces <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure SOMA nonprofit service providers have high quality, stable facilities ▪ Enhance public spaces ➤ Priority Need 3B: Strengthen small businesses and commercial corridors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide business retention & attraction services for neighborhood-serving businesses on the Sixth Street action zone ▪ Complete 6th Street Pedestrian Safety Project, to make street safer, more accessible, and more attractive; provide construction mitigation support ▪ Foster events and activations to strengthen foot traffic and build community ➤ Priority Need 3C: Support community-driven comprehensive strategies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Implement & refresh Mayor's Central Market/Tenderloin Strategy, which includes SOMA ▪ Support Cultural District planning and strategies ▪ Support block specific groups and strategies, such as on Stevenson and Jessie Street ➤ Priority Need 3D: Support capacity needs of community-based organizations and MOHCD professional partners <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Build organizational capacity of MOHCD's SOMA neighborhood grantees/providers through outreach, relationship building and recruitment, organizational assessments, trainings and coaching, cohort-based and project-based work, subject matter experts, and other technical assistance methodologies <p>Objective 4: Communities At Risk of Displacement are Stabilized</p>
--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 4A: Address inequitable impacts of economic growth through anti-displacement measures for residents and businesses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Leverage two cultural districts in this neighborhood: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SoMa Pilipinas – Filipino Cultural District, whose mission is to prevent the displacement of the Filipino community, protect its historic and cultural assets, help develop and sustain its legacy institutions and support its anchor community organizations, while improving the living conditions of the whole community. ○ Leather and LGBTQ+ Cultural District, whose mission is to preserve, advance, and promote San Francisco’s Leather and LGBTQ+ Cultural District as a local, national, and international resource, and as a culturally and commercially enriched neighborhood and district. ➤ Priority Need 4B: Ensure economic growth offers benefits to existing communities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Leverage Central SOMA cultural preservation and community services for current residents ▪ Coordinate with OEWD for job readiness and job placement on affordable housing projects ▪ Continue to support job readiness and placement for RAD projects
	What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?	Opportunities for improvement are listed under each of the needs above.
	Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?	
5	Area Name:	Tenderloin
	Area Type:	Strategy area
	Other Target Area Description:	
	HUD Approval Date:	6/18/1996
	% of Low/ Mod:	
	Revital Type:	
	Other Revital Description:	
	Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.	MOHCD, along with the DPH and the Planning Department, has defined San Francisco neighborhoods by census tract boundaries (see Map 12). 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.

<p>Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.</p>	<p>See MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion</p>
<p>How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>Identify the needs in this target area.</p>	<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>Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 1A: Develop and maintain accessible and affordable housing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Complete 22 new affordable housing projects currently in development in the neighborhood, which will add 1,265 units of affordable housing ▪ Includes new construction, rehabilitation, and inclusionary units ▪ Includes both rental and homeownership opportunities ➤ Priority Need 1B: Make housing more affordable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Robustly fund Homeownership counseling programs based in the neighborhood ▪ Robustly fund Rental Housing Counseling programs based in the neighborhood ➤ Priority Need 1C: Prevent and reduce homelessness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduce the inflow of households entering the homeless response system by engaging in diversion or funding prevention services ▪ Maintain support to homeless outreach, shelters and social services for people actively experiencing homelessness in the Tenderloin ▪ Increase the outflow from the homeless response system by supporting the

		<p>development of affordable housing and rental assistance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 1D: Provide services to maintain housing stability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support Tenant Right to Counsel providers based in the neighborhood, to ensure that residents have access to full scope legal representation when facing eviction ▪ Support tenant counseling and education organizations based in the neighborhood <p>Objective 2: Families and Individuals are Resilient and Economically Self-Sufficient</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 2A: Promote workforce development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide employment and training services to local residents through the Tenderloin Job Center, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Job readiness workshops, job search assistance, career planning and connections to employment opportunities. ○ Services/information in English, Spanish and Vietnamese. ○ Assistance with employment barrier removal such as basic computer, substance abuse and temporary housing. ▪ Additional Tenderloin-based Workforce partners specialize in providing workforce and training services to the Vietnamese community, to residents wanting tech training/employment and working the hotel lobby/hospitality industry. ➤ Priority Need 2B: Increase opportunities through improved language access and core skills development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support skills development programs in areas including life skills and personal effectiveness, educational skills (including GED and diploma programs), English as a Second Language training, and workplace readiness skills ▪ Support programs that create clear pathways to more advanced training opportunities, including post-secondary educational programs, more advanced ESL programming at San Francisco City College, and sector-specific
--	--	--

		<p>job training programs through OEWD and other entities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure that skill development programs based in the Tenderloin are funded <p>➤ Priority Need 2C: Provide equitable access to civil legal services for immigration and other critical issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure that civil legal services providers are located in the Tenderloin, and that residents have access to legal counseling and representation in a wide range of crucial legal areas, and in the necessary languages <p>➤ Priority Need 2D: Help households connect to services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support a comprehensive continuum of services including enhanced information and referral, service connection to identify and meet short-term client goals, case management to address more complex and/or longer term needs, and case coordination to coordinate services for a client between multiple providers and systems; ensure that these services are available in needed languages, and that appropriate translation services are accessible; ensure that these providers are located in the Tenderloin <p>Objective 3: Communities Have Healthy Physical, Social and Business Infrastructure</p> <p>➤ Priority Need 3A: Enhance community facilities and spaces</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure Tenderloin nonprofit service providers have high quality, stable facilities ▪ Enhance public spaces <p>➤ Priority Need 3B: Strengthen small businesses and commercial corridors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to increase efficiency of technical business assistance ▪ Continue business attraction efforts that provide affordable goods and services; use SF Shines façade and tenant improvement grants to help facilitate this. ▪ Support efforts to upgrade the exterior of commercial buildings and undertake efforts to
--	--	--

	<p>bring positive activation to storefronts and sidewalks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 3C: Support community-driven comprehensive strategies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participation on block groups, such as Golden Gate Safety Group, to support small businesses and residents and address safety and security concerns ➤ Priority Need 3D: Support capacity needs of community-based organizations and MOHCD professional partners <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Build organizational capacity of MOHCD's Tenderloin neighborhood grantees/providers through outreach, relationship building and recruitment, organizational assessments, trainings and coaching, cohort-based and project-based work, subject matter experts, and other technical assistance methodologies <p>Objective 4: Communities At Risk of Displacement are Stabilized</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 4A: Address inequitable impacts of economic growth through anti-displacement measures for residents and businesses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Leverage Compton's Transgender Cultural District to address displacement of this community ▪ The mission of the district is to create an urban environment that fosters the rich history, culture, legacy, and empowerment of transgender people and its deep roots in the southeastern Tenderloin neighborhood. ▪ The transgender district aims to stabilize and economically empower the transgender community through ownership of homes, businesses, historic and cultural sites, and safe community spaces. ➤ Priority Need 4B: Ensure economic growth offers benefits to existing communities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Coordinate with OEWD for job readiness and job placement on affordable housing projects ▪ Continue to support job readiness and placement for RAD projects
What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?	Opportunities for improvement are listed under each of the needs above.

	Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?	
6	Area Name:	Visitacion Valley
	Area Type:	Strategy area
	Other Target Area Description:	
	HUD Approval Date:	6/18/1996
	% of Low/ Mod:	
	Revital Type:	
	Other Revital Description:	
	Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.	MOHCD, along with the DPH and the Planning Department, has defined San Francisco neighborhoods by census tract boundaries (see Map 12). The Visitacion Valley neighborhood consists of the following census tracts: 264.01, 264.02, 264.03, 264.04 and 605.02.
	Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.	See MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion
	How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?	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.
	Identify the needs in this target area.	<p>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 Needs.</p> <p>Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 1A: Develop and maintain accessible and affordable housing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue phased construction and development of Sunnydale HOPE SF mixed-income housing ▪ 775 public housing replacement units will be constructed within 12 buildings on site, along with 196 affordable units (set at 60% AMI, selected through lottery process) ▪ Each building will be 75% replacement units and 25% affordable units


		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Parcel Q, the first development, is in lease up currently with 55 units ▪ Block 6 will start construction in December 2019, with 167 units ▪ Block 3, with about 150 units of affordable housing, and the Community Center will both start construction in 2023 <p>➤ Priority Need 1C: Prevent and reduce homelessness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduce the inflow of households entering the homeless response system by engaging in diversion or funding prevention services ▪ Maintain support to homeless outreach, shelters and social services for people actively experiencing homelessness in Visitacion Valley ▪ Increase the outflow from the homeless response system by supporting the development of affordable housing and rental assistance <p>➤ Priority Need 1D: Provide services to maintain housing stability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support Tenant Right to Counsel providers based in the neighborhood, to ensure that residents have access to full scope legal representation when facing eviction ▪ Support tenant counseling and education organizations based in the neighborhood <p>Objective 2: Families and Individuals are Resilient and Economically Self-Sufficient</p> <p>➤ Priority Need 2A: Promote workforce development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide employment and training services to local residents through the Visitacion Valley Job Center, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Job readiness workshops, job search assistance, career planning, public computer access, and connections to employment opportunities. ○ Services/information in English, Spanish and Chinese. ○ Assistance with employment opportunities at San Francisco Airport. ○ Assistance with driving opportunities with San Francisco Muni. ▪ OEWD partners with Visitacion Valley based partners who prioritize providing workforce
--	--	---

		<p>and training services to residents under the HOPE SF program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 2B: Increase opportunities through improved language access and core skills development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support skills development programs in areas including life skills and personal effectiveness, educational skills (including GED and diploma programs), English as a Second Language training, and workplace readiness skills ▪ Support programs that create clear pathways to more advanced training opportunities, including post-secondary educational programs, more advanced ESL programming at San Francisco City College, and sector-specific job training programs through OEWD and other entities ▪ Ensure that skill development programs are based in Visitacion Valley, and can provide services to diverse population (including services in English, Spanish and Chinese) ➤ Priority Need 2C: Provide equitable access to civil legal services for immigration and other critical issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure that civil legal services providers have regular presence in Visitacion Valley, and that residents have access to legal counseling and representation in a wide range of crucial legal areas, and in the necessary languages ➤ Priority Need 2D: Help households connect to services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support a comprehensive continuum of services including enhanced information and referral, service connection to identify and meet short-term client goals, case management to address more complex and/or longer term needs, and case coordination to coordinate services for a client between multiple providers and systems; ensure that these services are available in needed languages, and that appropriate translation services are accessible; ensure that these providers are located in Visitacion Valley
--	--	---

	<p>Objective 3: Communities Have Healthy Physical, Social and Business Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 3A: Enhance community facilities and spaces <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure Visitacion Valley nonprofit service providers have high quality, stable facilities ▪ Enhance public spaces ➤ Priority Need 3B: Strengthen small businesses and commercial corridors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to provide small businesses with individualized technical assistance through community partners ▪ Continue supporting neighborhood events to attract people to the Leland Street corridor, fill vacancies, improve business storefronts, and conduct business outreach and tailored business services ➤ Priority Need 3D: Support capacity needs of community-based organizations and MOHCD professional partners <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Build organizational capacity of MOHCD's Visitacion Valley neighborhood grantees/providers through outreach, relationship building and recruitment, organizational assessments, trainings and coaching, cohort-based and project-based work, subject matter experts, and other technical assistance methodologies <p>Objective 4: Communities At Risk of Displacement are Stabilized</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 4A: Address inequitable impacts of economic growth through anti-displacement measures for residents and businesses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Leverage Cultural Districts to support anti-displacement policies ▪ Increase access to resources for small businesses in low-income neighborhoods that want to stay in San Francisco ▪ Provide technical assistance and access to resources to existing business to support their stabilization and growth within the neighborhood. ➤ Priority Need 4B: Ensure economic growth offers benefits to existing communities
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordinate with HOPE SF and OEWD for job readiness and job placement on affordable housing projects, particularly on the Sunnydale HOPE SF site Continue to support job readiness and placement for HOPE SF and RAD projects
What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?	Opportunities for improvement are listed under each of the needs above.
Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?	

Map 12 – 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 areas of minority concentration; and City designated Invest in Neighborhoods Commercial Districts, Community Benefit Districts, Opportunity Neighborhoods, and Cultural 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; childcare and public service support.

MOHCD respectfully requests renewal for all six of the current NRSA designations as provided for at 24 CFR 91.215(g) and CPD Notice CPD-16-16.

MOHCD compliance with HUD criteria:

- **Boundaries:** MOHCD has provided census tract boundaries to specifically define each neighborhood according to year 2010 census tract boundaries (see Map 12);
- **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)) of 65%;
- **Consultation:** Strategic plans were developed for all six neighborhoods in consultation with the area’s key stakeholders, including residents, non-profit organizations, and community groups that are in or serve the neighborhood (see PR-15 Citizen Participation section);
- **Assessment:** See MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion section for a neighborhood profile of each of the six neighborhoods;
- **Housing and Economic Opportunities:** MOHCD, OEWD and HSH have developed realistic housing and community and economic development strategies with each neighborhood’s residents and stakeholders to promote the substantial revitalization of each of the neighborhoods. See SP-10 Geographic Priorities for the six neighborhood strategies;

- **Performance Measurement:** MOHCD, OEWD and HSH have developed a program matrix that identifies reliable indicators of success, which are measurable over time (see SP-45 Goals Summary section); and,
- **Leverage:** Federal funds will be leveraged with state and local funds (see SP-35 Anticipated Resources section).

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 2017 ACS 5-Year Estimates, 59.16% of the City's population is identified as being composed of minorities, and therefore any census tract in which 79.16% of the population is classified as minority would qualify as an Area of Minority Concentration. See Map 13.

Invest In Neighborhoods Commercial Districts

Invest In Neighborhoods (IIN) is a division within OEWD that implements programs focused on neighborhood commercial district planning, management, safety, and vibrancy. The strategies deployed are intended to advance opportunities for all. The division implements programs and services with the support of community partners to increase quality of life and economic opportunities within neighborhoods and commercial corridors. IIN seeks to advance economic opportunities in the City's neighborhoods using strategies centered on diversity, equity, and inclusion to ensure increased quality of life and prosperity for all residents.

The division's guiding objectives are to build community capacity, fortify neighborhoods and their economies, improve physical conditions and strengthen small businesses. Some of the services offered support small business assistance, safety and cleanliness, physical improvements to buildings or spaces, positive activation of public spaces and engagement of residents along targeted corridors throughout the city. IIN programs and services are intended to maximize impact within five strategic areas: small businesses, storefronts and buildings, commercial corridors, public spaces and neighborhoods. A comprehensive approach to stabilization of neighborhoods and commercial districts is best aligned with our neighborhood strategic area of impact.

Services provided under the impact area for neighborhoods are streamlined under three programs: Community Benefit Districts, Opportunity Neighborhoods and Cultural Districts.

Community Benefit Districts

The Community Benefit District (CBD) Program provides technical assistance for management plan and engineer's report development, district establishment, and operational support to improve the overall quality of life in targeted commercial districts and mixed-use neighborhoods through partnerships between the City and local communities.

OEWD oversees 18 local community benefit districts in the City. Each CBD is managed by a non-profit agency. Community Benefit Districts are required to complete an annual report that outlines the year's achievements and financials including income, expense, asset, liabilities, new assets, and carry over which are reviewed by OEWD and heard by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors' Government Audit and Oversight Committee. OEWD's annual report shares the Department's accomplishments and financials from that fiscal year.

Some CBDs tailor services specific to the neighborhood's needs. For example, the Tenderloin CBD manages the Safe Passage Program, which is a coalition of Corner Captains who are trained to respond to different emergencies in the neighborhood and maintain a daily positive presence for children and youth walking on the sidewalks. The Lower Polk CBD hosts a Tenant-Landlord Clinic designed to help prevent homelessness by keeping people housed in their current homes.

Opportunity Neighborhoods

The Opportunity Neighborhood's program targets neighborhoods that have experienced historic divestment and have an economic development strategy that promotes diversity, equity and inclusion. These neighborhoods have an assigned project manager that works closely with community stakeholders and other city departments to strategically disburse investments including funds and services and support an economic development strategy.

The opportunity neighborhoods include:


- Bayview
- Central Market/Tenderloin
- Chinatown
- Excelsior
- Lower Fillmore
- Mission (24th and Mission Streets)

Cultural Districts

OEWD is a key partner to MOHCD in the implementation of the Cultural District program whose focus is on advancing equitable and shared prosperity for San Franciscans by growing sustainable jobs, supporting businesses of all sizes, creating great places to live and work, and helping everyone achieve economic self-sufficiency. Staff supports and leverages economic resources to ensure that there is alignment and a comprehensive approach to each district's economic development strategies. In addition, our division coordinates with our neighborhood project managers where the districts overlap with our programs.

Customized economic interventions for each neighborhood 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



SP-25 Priority Needs - 91.215(a)(2)

Priority Needs

Table 71 – Priority Needs Summary

1	Priority Need Name	Develop and maintain accessible housing and affordable housing
	Priority Level	High
	Population	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
	Geographic Areas Affected	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley
	Associated Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create more affordable housing • Preserve affordable housing • Improve data and analytics on affordable housing inventory and placements
	Description	The development of new affordable housing and the preservation and maintenance of the existing affordable housing stock have 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 for 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.
	Basis for Relative Priority	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.
2	Priority Need Name	Make housing more affordable
	Priority Level	High
	Population	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
	Geographic Areas Affected	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley
	Associated Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce development costs to help leverage local housing resources and serve lower income households

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase affordability of rental housing • Increase opportunities for sustainable homeownership • Increase access to rental and homeownership housing
	Description	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 tenants' 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 homebuyers/homeowners prior to or after purchasing a home. Strengthening the housing application system and community-based organizations' capacity to assist clients finding housing must also expand access to rental and homeownership opportunities. MOHCD will work closely with both homeownership and rental housing counseling agencies to better coordinate services, reach vulnerable populations and strive for equity in access, and use data-driven methods to improve effectiveness and impact.
	Basis for Relative Priority	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.
3	Priority Need Name	Prevent and reduce homelessness
	Priority Level	High
	Population	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
	Geographic Areas Affected	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitation Valley
	Associated Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve systems to help each person find the right path to permanent housing • Reduce homelessness for adults, youth and families • Ensure no families with children are unsheltered • Improve the City's response to street homelessness and end large, long-term encampments • Better align MOHCD's work with HSH • Expand services to prevent homelessness and stabilize housing for formerly homeless households and those at risk of homelessness
	Description	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.
	Basis for Relative Priority	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.
	4 Priority Need Name	Provide services to maintain housing stability
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Low Moderate Middle Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill

	<p>Chronic Substance Abuse</p> <p>Veterans</p> <p>Persons with HIV/AIDS</p> <p>Victims of Domestic Violence</p> <p>Unaccompanied Youth</p> <p>Elderly</p> <p>Frail Elderly</p> <p>Persons with Mental Disabilities</p> <p>Persons with Physical Disabilities</p> <p>Persons with Developmental Disabilities</p> <p>Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions</p> <p>Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families</p> <p>Victims of Domestic Violence</p> <p>Non-housing Community Development</p> <p>Other - Immigrants</p>
Geographic Areas Affected	<p>Tenderloin</p> <p>Chinatown</p> <p>South of Market</p> <p>Mission</p> <p>Bayview Hunters Point</p> <p>Visitacion Valley</p>
Associated Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce rate of evictions • Increased access to services for residents of public and publicly subsidized housing, RAD projects, HOPWA subsidized housing, and single room occupancy hotels • Provide support for other affordable housing residents to ensure success in their housing placement • Increased mobility between levels of housing for HIV+ households
Description	<p>Under the <u>Tenant Right to Counsel</u> initiative, MOHCD is expanding support for full scope legal representation for residents facing eviction, which is a highly effective and efficient strategy for reducing the rate of evictions and keeping vulnerable residents in their current homes. We will also continue to support other proven strategies, including tenant counseling, outreach and education; mediation; housing stability case management, and direct financial assistance (one-time assistance and flexible tenant-based subsidies) activities, and we will expand longer-term rental subsidy programs. MOHCD will continue to engage community stakeholders around eviction prevention strategies to maximize effectiveness.</p> <p>Residents of publically subsidized housing will need support services to help them remain stably housed including through any transition periods such as related to the RAD project. In order to assist public housing residents in the conversion of their housing through the RAD program, they will need support services to help them understand what RAD is and how this significant change will affect them.</p> <p>Persons living with HIV/AIDs also face their own unique housing challenges and need access to supportive housing and support services, be it permanent</p>

		supportive housing or transitional housing settings, rental subsidies, or a more efficient housing and service delivery system.
	Basis for Relative Priority	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.
5	Priority Need Name	Promote workforce development
	Priority Level	High
	Population	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
	Geographic Areas Affected	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitation Valley
	Associated Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide access to employment opportunities across multiple sectors for unemployed and underemployed populations
	Description	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

		<p>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"> • Recruitment, screening, and intake processes to ensure a good match between the applicant, the program, and the target occupation. • Job readiness, basic skills, including digital literacy skills and hands-on technical skills training offered through the lens of specific industries and occupations. • Individualized services to support training completion, industry- and occupation-specific job search, and success on the job. • 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.
	Basis for Relative Priority	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.
6	Priority Need Name	Increase opportunities through improved language access and core skills development
	Priority Level	High
	Population	<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 Other - Immigrants</p>
	Geographic Areas Affected	<p>Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market</p>

		Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley
	Associated Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve access to MOHCD programs and services through translation of paper and digital resources • Provide skill development and training resources • Improve financial literacy and personal finance management • Improve digital literacy
	Description	<p>MOHCD's skill development programming supports community-based services in areas including life skills and personal effectiveness, educational skills (including GED and diploma programs), English as a Second Language training, and workplace readiness skills. There is an emphasis on supporting programs that create clear pathways to more advanced training opportunities, including post-secondary educational programs, more advanced ESL programming at San Francisco City College, and sector-specific job training programs through OEWD and other entities.</p> <p>Through MOHCD's Financial Capability portfolio we support financial counseling and education, asset and credit building, debt reduction, access to banking, and credit counseling and repair services. This includes an increased investment in more intensive services that build the financial capability of clients, and ongoing one-on-one coaching services that produce long-term economic improvements. We encourage co-location of financial services at housing sites and at community-based organizations.</p> <p>An important new point of emphasis is supporting programs to improve digital literacy and access to technology, reflecting the growing importance of technology and digital skills in education, employment, and economic self-sufficiency and the specific needs of very low and low income families in keeping up the pace.</p>
	Basis for Relative Priority	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.
7	Priority Need Name	Provide equitable access to civil legal services for immigration and other critical issues
	Priority Level	High
	Population	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
	Geographic Areas Affected	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitation Valley
	Associated Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve access to civil legal services
	Description	It is estimated nationally that 71% of low-income households experienced at least one civil legal problem in 2017, and that those in need were unable to obtain adequate legal assistance 86% of the time. The unmet need is particularly high for undocumented and recent immigrants, seniors, survivors of domestic violence, families with minor children, and adults with disabilities. The law pervades all aspects of life: family, community, work, health, finance, safety, and beyond. Most San Franciscans “go it alone” without the assistance of a legal professional in urgent, complex and high-stakes civil legal matters. When access to the civil legal services needed to address their most fundamental rights is limited, this only reinforces existing disparities. Through the Access to Civil Justice portfolio, MOHCD supports access to high quality legal representation and counseling in the core areas of immigration, employment, consumer, benefits advocacy, housing, and family law. We also support a community legal navigator program to help social service providers identify and make appropriate referrals for clients with legal needs.
	Basis for Relative Priority	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.
8	Priority Need Name	Help households connect to services
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Low Moderate Middle

		<p>Families with Children</p> <p>Elderly</p> <p>Public Housing Residents</p> <p>Chronic Homelessness</p> <p>Individuals</p> <p>Families with Children</p> <p>Mentally Ill</p> <p>Chronic Substance Abuse</p> <p>Veterans</p> <p>Persons with HIV/AIDS</p> <p>Victims of Domestic Violence</p> <p>Unaccompanied Youth</p> <p>Elderly</p> <p>Frail Elderly</p> <p>Persons with Mental Disabilities</p> <p>Persons with Physical Disabilities</p> <p>Persons with Developmental Disabilities</p> <p>Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions</p> <p>Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families</p> <p>Victims of Domestic Violence</p> <p>Non-housing Community Development</p> <p>Other - Immigrants</p>
	Geographic Areas Affected	<p>Tenderloin</p> <p>Chinatown</p> <p>South of Market</p> <p>Mission</p> <p>Bayview Hunters Point</p> <p>Visitacion Valley</p>
	Associated Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase access to community-based services
	Description	<p>When MOHCD engaged residents and stakeholders of low-income communities to inform the development of our 2020–2025 Consolidated Plan, they highly prioritized the need for better and more efficient service connection, as well as case management and case coordination services that help them navigate the array of services available, create linkages across service providers, and create individual service plans through which they can create and achieve clear goals. MOHCD will support a wide range of both community- based and housing place-based projects that are able to provide culturally and linguistically appropriate services to San Francisco’s diverse communities, and ensure that families and individuals from these communities are able to effectively access needed resources and navigate the social service environment.</p>
	Basis for Relative Priority	<p>Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.</p>
9	Priority Need Name	Enhance community facilities and spaces
	Priority Level	High

	Population	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
	Geographic Areas Affected	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitation Valley
	Associated Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure nonprofit service providers have high quality, stable facilities • Enhance public spaces
	Description	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,

		<p>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.</p> <p>MOHCD has focused on supporting the following types of facilities: neighborhood and constituency-focused multi-service centers; family resource centers, senior centers; childcare 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.</p> <p>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.</p>
	Basis for Relative Priority	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.
10	Priority Need Name	Strengthen small businesses and commercial corridors
	Priority Level	High
	Population	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
	Geographic Areas Affected	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley
	Associated Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage the development and sustainability of thriving locally owned businesses Support the development and sustainability of robust commercial corridors in low-income neighborhoods
	Description	San Francisco's use of CDBG funds 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.
	Basis for Relative Priority	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.
11	Priority Need Name	Support community-driven comprehensive strategies
	Priority Level	High
	Population	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

	<p>Persons with Developmental Disabilities</p> <p>Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions</p> <p>Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families</p> <p>Victims of Domestic Violence</p> <p>Non-housing Community Development</p> <p>Other - Immigrants</p>
Geographic Areas Affected	<p>Tenderloin</p> <p>Chinatown</p> <p>South of Market</p> <p>Mission</p> <p>Bayview Hunters Point</p> <p>Visitation Valley</p>
Associated Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support neighborhood-based planning efforts • Support locally-based community building
Description	<p>This strategy supports San Franciscans to come together to proactively build their communities. Whether bound by a shared identity, geography or values, people should have the resources necessary to engage with one another, with local government, institutions and businesses, and with their public spaces. This strategy aims to remove barriers to convening and collaboration so communities can transform themselves in new and positive ways.</p> <p>To make it easier for low-income, vulnerable and disenfranchised populations to participate in civic and community opportunities, we seek to fund:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Neighborhood and community planning processes that bring together these populations to meaningfully participate in their communities. 2. Neighborhood-based community action grant programs. 3. Networks of community-based organizations that provide increased service coordination and collaboration for both neighborhoods and specific populations. <p>This strategy supports the formation and ongoing development of collaboratives working together to accomplish one or more of the following community benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify community needs and gaps in services • Share resources (including small grants for community-led projects) • Develop approaches and solutions to critical community issues, such as the need to heal recurring trauma experienced by residents • Advocate for policies and practices that benefit their community • Develop community leaders and authentic voices • Improve communication between residents and institutions <p>Small business and financing programs, in combination with other economic development tools, are specifically designed to support community-driven comprehensive strategies. First, OEWD makes use of a City-wide business needs assessments to better understand the needs and service gaps in the small business community, in particular, the needs in opportunity neighborhoods. Second, OEWD works closely with merchant associations, commercial corridor</p>

		representatives, local businesses, and other community stakeholders to develop and deploy small business services and reach targeted communities. Finally, Invest in Neighborhoods, a division of OEWD, promotes, funds, and is actively involved in neighborhood-based planning efforts.
	Basis for Relative Priority	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.
12	Priority Need Name	Support capacity needs of community-based organizations and MOHCD professional partners
	Priority Level	High
	Population	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
	Geographic Areas Affected	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley
	Associated Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase capacity of community-based organizations
	Description	Capacity building is an investment in the effectiveness and future sustainability of a nonprofit organization. Many nonprofits serving vulnerable populations do

		<p>not have the resources to maximize their impact on the residents they serve. MOHCD recognizes the gaps in funding and resources that exist for many nonprofits, including its own grantees. We also recognize how practices within our sector perpetuate a cycle in which funders continually under-resource the nonprofits they support. These funds are one strategy to provide less restricted support to nonprofits so they can build systems and the increased capacity to execute their missions into the future. Distinct capacity building projects, such as improving fundraising and communication strategies, offering training and skill-building for staff and leadership, developing a leadership succession plan, or building financial adaptability, all build the capacity of nonprofits to effectively execute their mission in the future. Common capacity building interventions include connecting organizations and their staff to information, peer learning or convening (e.g. cohorts), education and training (e.g. workshops or webinars), and consulting or coaching. MOHCD will also fund organizational assessments to identify capacity challenges and/or areas for improvement, and to plan appropriate interventions. We encourage our nonprofit grantees to identify the areas of their operations where these funds would be most impactful.</p>
	Basis for Relative Priority	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.
13	Priority Need Name	Address inequitable impacts of economic growth through anti-displacement measures for residents and businesses
	Priority Level	High
	Population	<p>Extremely Low</p> <p>Low</p> <p>Moderate</p> <p>Middle</p> <p>Families with Children</p> <p>Elderly</p> <p>Public Housing Residents</p> <p>Chronic Homelessness</p> <p>Individuals</p> <p>Families with Children</p> <p>Mentally Ill</p> <p>Chronic Substance Abuse</p> <p>Veterans</p> <p>Persons with HIV/AIDS</p> <p>Victims of Domestic Violence</p> <p>Unaccompanied Youth</p> <p>Elderly</p> <p>Frail Elderly</p> <p>Persons with Mental Disabilities</p> <p>Persons with Physical Disabilities</p> <p>Persons with Developmental Disabilities</p> <p>Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions</p> <p>Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families</p> <p>Victims of Domestic Violence</p>

		Non-housing Community Development Other - Immigrants
	Geographic Areas Affected	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley
	Associated Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement policies and programs that prioritize current residents • Encourage commercial tenants to locate on ground-floor spaces of MOHCD's affordable housing developments • Reduce displacement of residents and businesses
	Description	<p>One of the crucial elements of our anti-displacement strategy for current San Francisco residents is implementation of the <u>Tenant Right to Counsel</u> initiative, through which we have vastly expanded support for full scope legal representation for residents facing eviction. This is proven to be a highly effective and efficient strategy for keeping vulnerable residents in their current homes, reducing homelessness and displacement. We will also continue to support other proven strategies, including tenant counseling, outreach and education; mediation; housing stability case management, and direct financial assistance (one-time assistance and flexible tenant-based subsidies) activities, and we will expand longer-term rental subsidy programs. MOHCD will continue to engage community stakeholders around eviction prevention strategies to maximize effectiveness and minimize displacement.</p> <p>The most recent report by the City's Budget and Legislative Analyst's Office on the topic showed the closure of small businesses in San Francisco has reached record numbers with almost 4,000 small businesses closing in 2014, compared to 693 small businesses closed in 1994. The report draws connections to San Francisco's skyrocketing rents and the high level of commercial evictions. In response, OEWD has deployed a range of services to small businesses including but not limited to small business consulting, lease negotiation assistance, small business loans, legacy business registry, façade improvement assistance, commercial corridor management, relocation and broker services, business permit assistance, and coordination with city agencies.</p> <p>With aging buildings and rising HOA costs, low to moderate income first time homeowners need access to support for sustainable homeownership. Resources and information on topics such as refinancing mortgages, taxes and insurance, HOA membership, and home repair and maintenance are essential.</p>
	Basis for Relative Priority	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.
14	Priority Need Name	Ensure economic growth offers benefits to existing communities
	Priority Level	High

	Population	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
	Geographic Areas Affected	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley
	Associated Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require local hiring to the greatest extent possible in MOHCD's projects and programs • Ensure adequate City services in neighborhoods where MOHCD's affordable housing is located • Implement programs that provide direct benefits resulting from neighborhood-based economic growth to local communities
	Description	Provide resources and coordination to ensure that the social services safety net, economic self-sufficiency projects, health and wellness programs and housing stability services are located and serving those communities and neighborhoods most in need. OEWD seeks to help all San Franciscans benefit equitably from the prosperity of our city. As San Francisco experiences long periods of economic growth, low unemployment rates and increased investments in City services, OEWD remains

		<p>committed to realizing equitable outcomes for the communities and industries that we serve.</p> <p>OEWD recognizes the deep and pervasive impacts that past and present structural and institutional inequities have created in many of our communities, and in particular, our communities of color. We've seen that the unprecedented economic opportunities realized in San Francisco have not been accessible to all. Many OEWD services are designed to reach those who have been traditionally excluded from that prosperity.</p>
	Basis for Relative Priority	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.
15	Priority Need Name	Ensure racially equitable access to programs and services, in coordination with other City departments
	Priority Level	High
	Population	<p>Extremely Low</p> <p>Low</p> <p>Moderate</p> <p>Middle</p> <p>Families with Children</p> <p>Elderly</p> <p>Public Housing Residents</p> <p>Chronic Homelessness</p> <p>Individuals</p> <p>Families with Children</p> <p>Mentally Ill</p> <p>Chronic Substance Abuse</p> <p>Veterans</p> <p>Persons with HIV/AIDS</p> <p>Victims of Domestic Violence</p> <p>Unaccompanied Youth</p> <p>Elderly</p> <p>Frail Elderly</p> <p>Persons with Mental Disabilities</p> <p>Persons with Physical Disabilities</p> <p>Persons with Developmental Disabilities</p> <p>Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions</p> <p>Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families</p> <p>Victims of Domestic Violence</p> <p>Non-housing Community Development</p> <p>Other - Immigrants</p>
	Geographic Areas Affected	<p>Tenderloin</p> <p>Chinatown</p> <p>South of Market</p> <p>Mission</p> <p>Bayview Hunters Point</p> <p>Visitacion Valley</p>

	Associated Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop specific funding, policies and practices to ensure equitable access to MOHCD and OEWD programs
	Description	<p>MOHCD is in the middle of a multi-year process that began in December of 2016. MOHCD staff were invited to participate in a regional training cohort put together by the national racial equity organization, the Government Alliance on Race and Equity (GARE). The GARE work informed the City's racial equity initiative. As part of both the first and second GARE cohorts, MOHCD created its own internal Racial Equity Working Group, consisting of staff and managers across all of its program divisions, in the fall of 2017. In April of 2018, MOHCD began a series of monthly all-staff racial equity meetings to lay out the framework for racial equity across the entire department. MOHCD engaged a consultant specializing in racial equity as its lead consultant to guide our racial equity work, and began working with her in February, 2019. MOHCD has now created a draft racial equity action plan which will be finalized in Spring 2020 and will serve as the department road map over the next three years.</p> <p>In terms of MOHCD's work with the community, MOHCD is committed to ensuring racially equitable access to programs and services, in coordination with other City departments; incorporating racial equity principles into its own hiring and promotion practices, and implement racial equity and trauma-informed values and approaches throughout MOHCD.</p> <p>A few of the key elements of MOHCD's plans include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improving outreach to historically underserved neighborhoods and communities; Providing voice to communities most impacted by racial inequity and support their agency in both shaping and achieving housing and community development goals; Analyzing gaps in placement success for different demographics, and determine required interventions to create equitable access to affordable housing resources; Prioritizing communities most impacted by racial inequities in its contracts, grants, community development services and affordable housing opportunities, and will develop and expand programs that focus on serving these communities; In order to inform decisions, guide resource allocation, and evaluate the effectiveness of its programs, MOHCD shall employ robust, inclusive, disaggregated and equitable data collection and analysis strategies.
	Basis for Relative Priority	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.
	16 Priority Need Name	Instill racial equity and trauma-informed values and practices in the work of MOHCD and its partners
	Priority Level	High
	Population	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 Other – Black/African Americans Other – Native Americans
	Geographic Areas Affected	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitation Valley
	Associated Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate cultural competency/humility, trauma-informed systems, and other equity training and resources for MOHCD's partners • Incorporate racial equity principles in MOHCD's hiring and promotion practices • Implement racial equity and trauma-informed values and approaches throughout MOHCD
	Description	MOHCD is in the middle of a multi-year process that began in December of 2016. MOHCD staff were invited to participate in a regional training cohort put together by the national racial equity organization, the Government Alliance on Race and Equity (GARE). The GARE work informed the City's racial equity initiative. As part of both the first and second GARE cohorts, MOHCD created its own internal Racial Equity Working Group, consisting of staff and managers across all of its program divisions, in the fall of 2017. In April of 2018, MOHCD began a series of monthly all-staff racial equity meetings to lay out the framework for racial equity across the entire department. MOHCD engaged a

	<p>consultant specializing in racial equity as its lead consultant to guide our racial equity work, and began working with her in February, 2019. MOHCD has now created a draft racial equity action plan which will be finalized in Spring 2020 and will serve as the department road map over the next three years.</p> <p>In terms of MOHCD's work with the community, MOHCD is committed to ensuring racially equitable access to programs and services, in coordination with other City departments; incorporating racial equity principles into its own hiring and promotion practices, and implement racial equity and trauma-informed values and approaches throughout MOHCD.</p> <p>A few of the key elements of MOHCD's plans include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving outreach to historically underserved neighborhoods and communities; • Providing voice to communities most impacted by racial inequity and support their agency in both shaping and achieving housing and community development goals; • Analyzing gaps in placement success for different demographics, and determine required interventions to create equitable access to affordable housing resources; • Prioritizing communities most impacted by racial inequities in its contracts, grants, community development services and affordable housing opportunities, and will develop and expand programs that focus on serving these communities; • In order to inform decisions, guide resource allocation, and evaluate the effectiveness of its programs, MOHCD shall employ robust, inclusive, disaggregated and equitable data collection and analysis strategies.
Basis for Relative Priority	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.

SP-30 Influence of Market Conditions – 91.215 (b)

Influence of Market Conditions

Table 72 – Influence of Market Conditions

Affordable Housing Type	Market Characteristics that will influence the use of funds available for housing type
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 HCV holders to successfully obtain rental housing.
TBRA for Non-Homeless Special Needs	Same as above.
New Unit Production	The strong job market in the burgeoning high tech industry combined with rising market-rate rents and some of the highest homeownership prices in the country has spurred an increase in new housing unit production, especially market-rate rentals and condominiums. The City continues to work toward its 2014 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 utilized and continues to take advantage of various HUD tools including the RAD program and Section 18 Disposition Program in order to access the resources necessary to rehabilitate and preserve and in some cases place deteriorating public housing, given the chronic underfunding of public housing agencies across the country by Congress. Units converted under RAD or replaced under Section 18 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 2020–2024 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.

The Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (CARES Act), Public Law 116-136, was created on March 27, 2020, to respond to the growing effects of this historic public health crisis. The CARES Act authorized the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to provide supplemental Community Development Block Grant (CDBG-CV), Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG-CV), and Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS (HOPWA-CV) funding to entitlement communities such as the City and County of San Francisco.

Anticipated Resources

Table 73 – Anticipated Resources

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	\$18,649,794	\$6,550,000	\$446,805	\$25,646,599	\$74,400,000	Assumes flat funding and no additional program income in future years.

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	\$5,402,373	\$2,400,748	\$0	\$7,803,121	\$21,600,000	Assumes flat funding and no additional program income in future years.
HOPWA	public - federal	Permanent housing in facilities Permanent housing placement Short term or transitional housing facilities STRMU Supportive services TBRA	\$7,067,229	\$1,200,000	\$2,000,000	\$10,267,229	\$27,161,177	Assumes HOPWA Modernization Projection Scenario 2 for San Francisco and no additional program income in future years.
ESG	public - federal	Financial Assistance Overnight shelter Rapid re-housing (rental assistance) Rental Assistance Services Transitional housing	\$1,595,423	\$0	\$0	\$1,595,423	\$6,000,000	Assumes flat funding and no additional program income in future years.

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-CV (Round 1)	public - federal	Overnight shelter Public Services Rental Assistance Other	\$10,972,734	\$0	\$0	\$10,972,734	\$0	CDBG-CV funds to be used to prevent, prepare for and respond to the Coronavirus
ESG-CV (Round 1)	public - federal	Overnight shelter Public Services Other	\$5,501,459	\$0	\$0	\$5,501,459	\$0	ESG-CV funds to be used to prevent, prepare for and respond to the Coronavirus
ESG-CV (Round 2)	public - federal	Overnight shelter Public Services Other	\$43,605,003	\$0	\$0	\$43,605,003	\$0	ESG-CV funds to be used to prevent, prepare for and respond to the Coronavirus
HOPWA-CV (Round 1)	public - federal	Housing Public Services Rental Assistance Transitional housing Other	\$1,028,483	\$0	\$0	\$1,028,483	\$0	HOPWA-CV funds to be used to prevent, prepare for and respond to the Coronavirus

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	Approximately \$34M grants to CBOs for services predominantly serving low and moderate income residents. Balance is affordable housing loans for acquisition/preservation and new construction.	\$124,400,000	\$0	\$0	\$124,400,000	\$176,000,000	Assumes reduced ERAF in FY21-22 and no ERAF thereafter.
Housing Trust Fund	public - local	Affordable housing related services and loans	\$39,600,000	\$0	\$0	\$39,600,000	\$186,400,000	Full HTF allocation, including portion spent on administration.
LMI Housing Asset Fund	public - local	Affordable housing related and loans	\$4,000,000	\$0	\$10,000,000	\$14,000,000	\$16,000,000	Assumes flat revenue rate each year.
Housing Impact Fees	public - local	Affordable housing related loans	\$91,371,000	\$0	\$161,760,000	\$253,131,000	\$318,100,000	Housing impact fees based on projections tied to actual projects which have been assessed fees.

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: \$		
GO Bond	public - local	Affordable housing related capital expenditures	\$161,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$161,000,000	\$426,000,000	\$600M 2019 Affordable Housing GO Bond less \$13M in cost of issuance.
OCII	public - local	Affordable housing related capital expenditures	\$58,180,000	\$0	\$0	\$58,180,000	\$696,435,000	Based on OCII housing pipeline budgeting worksheet

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 affordable housing and community development activities in various ways.

The City's General Fund supports additional services coordinated through 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; and digital equity programming, including digital skills training and broadband adoption. The City's Capital Budget supports the expansion and maintenance of the facilities necessary for Fiber to Housing. In addition, General Fund is used to fund affordable housing loans for acquisition/preservation and new construction

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.

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 by using General Fund to support HSH's emergency shelter programs that are supported with 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.

OEWD leverages General Funds to enhance small business technical assistance and financing programs. Additionally, General Funds are used to support façade & tenant improvements, activate public spaces, and drive commercial district programming, all of which have a direct impact and benefits for commercial corridors and businesses. Finally, OEWD leverages General Funds to provide ADA

compliance assistance, support Legacy Businesses, and make mini-grants available for women-owned businesses.

Invest in Neighborhoods receives funds from the Small Business Administration (SBA) and the Governor's Office of Business and Economic Development to fund the San Francisco Small Business Development Center, a program developed to help existing and aspiring entrepreneurs start and expand businesses.

San Francisco expects to leverage HUD CARES Act funding with local General Fund, local philanthropic funds, and federal funds from FEMA.

If appropriate, describe publicly 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 SFUSD, 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 74 – 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. MOHCD, OCII (Successor to the Redevelopment Agency), OEWD, DCYF, HSA, DOSW, and DAAS 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

In past decades, the nature of the City's working relationship with the SFHA (SFHA) was largely one of resource sharing and planning. MOHCD supported the SFHA by providing grants and loans to support capital improvements in light of SFHA's limited funding, and contributed over \$100M in City funds to support the conversion of 3,480 public housing units under the federal RAD program. In addition, MOHCD and SFHA have collaborated on utilization of SFHA's project-based and tenant based vouchers for special populations and in supportive housing environments. Lastly, SFHA and MOHCD have collaborated closely on the HOPE SF program.

In 2019, the City's role in SFHA's programmatic and financial functions changed dramatically. By a letter from HUD to the Authority dated March 7, 2019, HUD determined that SFHA was in default under its Housing Choice Voucher Consolidated Annual Contributions Contract ("HCV ACC") and its Low Rent Public Housing Consolidated Annual Contributions Contract ("LRPH ACC"). After a determination of default, HUD has the authority to take possession of all or a part of the Authority or require the Authority to make other arrangements consistent with HUD requirements that are in the best interests of the public housing residents and families assisted by HUD.

Under the Default Letter, HUD determined that it is in the best interests of public housing residents and assisted families to allow SFHA the opportunity to cure the Default as follows: (i) the City's assumption of responsibility of the programmatic and financial functions under the HCV ACC and LRPH ACC, including financial management, program management, wait list and admissions, inspections, eligibility determinations, and lease and grievance procedures, and (ii) outsourcing programmatic and financial administration of the HCV program and LRPH program, including continued outsourcing of Authority's financial management.

The City approved a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between SFHA and the City in December 2019, and reviewed by HUD, outlining the preliminary terms of the City's assumption of Housing Authority functions as shown below:

Labor Relations: SFHA gave notice to its existing employees on the reduction in Housing Authority staffing, resulting from the City's assumption of and contracting out of SFHA functions, as required by HUD. SFHA developed severance packages for employees who were impacted and is partnering with the City to assist with finding City jobs for these employees when possible.

Restructuring of the Housing Authority: The MOU provided a preliminary restructuring plan that included:

- Appointment of City staff to provide executive management oversight of Housing Authority functions;
- Plan to contract out the Housing Authority's public housing and HCV programs; and
- Development of a specific timeline to integrate the Housing Authority's systems, processes, and the policies with the City for financial oversight, information technology, human resources, real estate, purchasing, and legal oversight. The MOU further provided for the parties (HUD, Housing Authority, City) to commit to the capital funding necessary to redevelop the public housing under HOPE SF; and to continue to convert the public housing units to project based vouchers.

Shortfall Funding: HUD maintains a fund to annually augment local housing authorities' budgets that have a shortfall in their housing voucher programs. HUD provided \$10 million in shortfall funding to the Housing Authority in 2018. According to the MOU, the Housing Authority will apply for HUD's shortfall funding annually, or as frequently as needed.

Executive Management and Shared Services:

- The City will provide executive management staff to the Housing Authority, including a chief executive officer reporting to the Mayor or the Mayor's designee.
- The Housing Authority will integrate with City services over time, including information technology, human resources, purchasing, real estate, financial systems, and other services. The timing and process of integration will be developed in consultation with MOHCD, Controller, and General Services Agency. Administration and Oversight
- The annual Housing Authority budget will be submitted to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors, who may accept or reject the budget. The budget submission will be consistent with City procedures and HUD timelines and requirements.
- Administration of the HCV program and public housing will be contracted to third parties, as required by HUD and discussed above. The Housing Authority will work with the City to procure third-party contractors, but the contracting process must conform to HUD requirements. Contracts for property transactions will be subject to third-party appraisal with the exception of properties conveyed for development of affordable housing.
- Financial management of the Housing Authority will be contracted to a third party with expertise and experience in HUD financial Introduction Budget and Legislative Analyst's Office 10 reporting and requirements. Currently, the Housing Authority contracts with BDO USA LLP for financial management and reporting.
- Issuance of debt by the Housing Authority must be approved by the Authority and the Board of Supervisors.
- Any material amendment to the MOU is subject to prior approval by the Board of Supervisors. Housing Authority Commission
- The Housing Authority Commission is authorized by state law to have seven members, appointed by the Mayor, two of whom must be Housing Authority residents. Under the proposed MOU, the Mayor would appoint four members directly, and three members recommended by motion at the sole discretion of the Board of Supervisors. Of the Mayor's four appointments, at least one must be a Housing Authority resident. Of the Board's three appointments, at least one must be a Housing Authority resident 62 years of age or older.

Non-Housing Assets

- The Housing Authority will (a) inventory non-housing assets, including the building at 1815 Egbert Street, vehicles, and other assets; (b) identify which assets are needed for ongoing

operations; and (c) plan disposition of surplus assets in accordance with HUD requirements. Loans made by the City to the Housing Authority will be repaid from surplus funds from the disposition of assets, subject to HUD requirements.

Workforce Development Service Delivery System

The Citizens' Committee on Community Development (CCCC) and the Workforce Investment Board of San Francisco (WISF) establish policies for workforce development in San Francisco and influence the design of the delivery system. Where the CCCC contributes workforce development expertise from community members and advocacy groups, the WISF contributes expertise from industry and articulates the current workforce trends and needs of the local labor market.

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. The WISF provides leadership in developing a strong and vital partnership between businesses, education, community-based organizations, and city agencies.

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 is staffed by 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. 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 to coordinate and align workforce development services, establishing the Committee on City Workforce Alignment ("Alignment Committee") comprised of department heads across City departments and the Workforce Community Advisory Committee (WCAC), comprised of leadership from community-based organizations with deep specialization in community development.

The Alignment Committee includes one member designated by the Mayor, one member of the Board of Supervisors or a City employee designated by the Board, and the department heads of the following City departments: OEWD; HSA; DCYF; Public Utilities Commission; Public Works, Department of Human Resources, and Human Rights Commission. The Director of Workforce Development and Director of the Human Rights Commission co-chair Alignment Committee.

The Alignment Committee and WCAC are charged with developing and submitting a Citywide Workforce Development Plan to the WISF for its review and comment, which was submitted and approved in late

2017. The five-year plan includes an assessment of the City's anticipated workforce development needs and opportunities and a strategy to meet the identified needs, which influences the City and County of San Francisco's CDBG decision-making around resource allocation. 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 Alignment Committee and WCAC legislation sunset in 2019, and all members agreed to continue the work under good faith effort until the legislation is reauthorized.

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 MOHCD, HSH and OCII (as successor to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency) 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 its jurisdiction. MOHCD works closely with OCII, and HSH to issue requests for qualifications (RFQs) 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 RFQs are generally issued for specific development sites. Staff develops funding and general policy recommendations to the Loan Committee.

Roles of Local Government Entities in Affordable Housing Production

MOHCD

MOHCD is the City's primary affordable housing agency, operating out of the Mayor's Office. The responsibilities of MOHCD include:

- Administration of CDBG 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 Program including monitoring of ongoing compliance of developments funded with HOME funds.
- 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 OCII to be the successor agency of the San

San Francisco Redevelopment Agency for the major development areas of Mission Bay, Transbay, and Hunters Point Shipyard, and named MOHCD 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. 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 HOPWA program for the San Francisco and San Mateo counties. Marin County is now no longer part of this shared program and receives funding separately.
- 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 general obligation bonds for affordable housing passed by voters in 2015 and 2016. 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.

SFHA

SFHA'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 \$65+ million operating income from HUD and tenant-paid rents. SFHA is overseen by seven citizen commissioners, all of whom are appointed by the Mayor. Two of those commissioners must be current SFHA residents. Starting in 2020, the Mayor will appoint four members directly, and three members recommended by motion at the sole discretion of the Board of Supervisors. Of the Mayor's four appointments, at least one must be a Housing Authority resident. Of the Board's three appointment recommendations, at least one must be a Housing Authority

resident 62 years of age or older. The Commission is responsible for the policies and procedures of the Authority, as well as for the selection of the Authority's Executive Director.

SFHA administers both public housing and the HCV program. In 2019, there were 1,911 public housing units and 12,165 HCV vouchers (both tenant and project based) under SFHA management. The average annual household income for SFHA clients is \$14,590. Without public housing and HCV vouchers, virtually all SFHA clients would be forced to live outside the City or even face homelessness. 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.

In the fall of 2018, SFHA was discovered to have a shortfall of up to \$30 million in the HCV program. HUD determined in March 2019 that SFHA was in substantial default of its obligations under the housing voucher and public housing programs. According to HUD's March 2019 default notice, HUD had the authority to place the Housing Authority in receivership, taking possession of all or part of the Housing Authority. Instead, SFHA is remedying the default through contracting out its HCV and public housing property management programs, and having the City assume oversight of the SFHA's essential functions.

In 2020 and 2021, SFHA will convert its 1,911 remaining units of public housing to the HCV program via HUD's disposition programs: the RAD (RAD) program and the Section 18 Demo/Dispo program. Conversion of these units will be made possible in part by affordable housing funds administered by MOHCD. Given SFHA's financial difficulties, HUD has approved the early conversion of these units to HCV in order to stabilize the agency's finances and operations.

OEWD

OEWD 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 Housing 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 and area plans 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 affordable housing, floor area ratio and height exceptions for affordable housing in certain plan 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.

HSH

HSH is the lead entity for the San Francisco Homeless Response System and the lead for the San Francisco HMIS, CoC. Through the provision of coordinated, compassionate, and high-quality services, HSH strives to make homelessness in San Francisco rare, brief, and one time. HSH launched on July 1, 2016. The department combines key homeless serving programs and contracts from DPH, HSA, MOHCD and the DCYF. This consolidated department has a singular focus on preventing and ending homelessness for people in San Francisco.

HSA

San Francisco HSA is San Francisco's home for help with food, health insurance, supportive care, financial assistance, childcare, and more. The HSA provides specialty programs for veterans, families, and people with HIV/AIDS and serves as a thought leader on poverty and solutions.

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.

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 MOHCD 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. MOD also provides building permit plan check review and construction period inspections for all affordable housing funded by MOHCD or OCII.

DAAS

DAAS is a division of the HSA 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.

DCYF

DCYF coordinates programs addressing the needs of children and youth, including disconnected TAY. DCYF has established a network Beacon Centers throughout the City which partner with local schools, transforming them into safe spaces where children, youth, parents and community members

can engage in positive, educational, enriching and healthy activities during extended hours, youth in the community will benefit.

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.

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 sub-grantee 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 Services

Numerous nonprofit organizations receive CDBG funds to provide housing counseling 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. In 2018 the City approved a ballot measure mandating that the City provide full-scope legal representation to all individuals who received an unlawful detainer notice. This has resulted in expanded resources given to legal service organizations providing full-scope eviction defense, and has significantly increased the number of households who are able to remain in their housing following the receipt of an unlawful detainer notice.

These housing counseling agencies also provide homeownership counseling to potential low-and moderate-income homebuyers, as well as assistance in applying for affordable rental housing.

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. Supportive service agencies such as Conard House and Episcopal Community Services have become essential partners in the development of affordable housing, including serving as co-owner with an experienced affordable housing developer so that the service agency becomes the long-term owner of the property over time and build its housing asset portfolio.

Community Lending

Four nonprofit lenders and intermediaries based in San Francisco, the Low Income Investment Fund, Local Initiatives Support Corporation, and Community Vision (formerly Northern California Community Loan Fund), and the San Francisco Accelerator Fund play an important role in lending to affordable housing developers, particularly during the acquisition and predevelopment stages of a project.

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 MOHCD 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.

HOPWA Delivery System

This section describes the institutional structure through which MOHCD administers the 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 DPH, which administers the Ryan White Comprehensive AIDS Resource Emergency (CARE) funds and HSH, which administers McKinney funds.

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. In 2018, MOHCD again partnered with City agencies and community organizations to create its next five-year plan, which will be issued in the summer/fall of 2020.

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 for the Chronically Ill (RCFCIs); co-funding rental assistance programs; and DPH taking the lead on master leasing Single Room Occupancy hotels. MOHCD is currently engaged a consultant to draft a white paper to examine the current status of these RCFCIs to ensure their sustainability and determine their best use based on the evolving nature of the HIV epidemic.

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 her 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 OCII, 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 75 – Homeless Prevention Services Summary

Homelessness Prevention Services	Available in the Community	Targeted to Homeless	Targeted to People with HIV
Homelessness Prevention Services			
Counseling/Advocacy	X	X	X
Legal Assistance	X	X	X
Mortgage Assistance	X		
Rental Assistance	X	X	X
Utilities Assistance	X	X	
Street Outreach Services			
Law Enforcement	X	X	
Mobile Clinics	X	X	X
Other Street Outreach Services	X	X	X
Supportive Services			
Alcohol & Drug Abuse	X	X	X
Childcare	X	X	
Education	X	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	
Other			
Other			

Describe how the service delivery system including, but not limited to, the services listed above meet the needs of homeless persons (particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth)

Overview of Homeless Framework for Care

According to the 2017 PIT Count, 1,363 unaccompanied and transitional-age youth (TAY) comprised 18% of the total homeless population in San Francisco, and 20% of homeless adults. This is a 28% decline from the 2013 count, but still indicates that nearly one in five adults experiencing homelessness in San Francisco are under 25.

Because young people experience homelessness in ways that differ from adults and often do not access services designed for adults, accurate enumeration of youth is especially challenging. Since 2013, San Francisco has conducted a supplemental youth count to ensure full representation of youth. The transitional-age (18-24) population is diverse and faces many and varied challenges. LGBTQ+ youth represent nearly half (49%) of the population of homeless youth in San Francisco. Black (26%) and Multi-Racial (35%) youth are significantly over-represented in the population of homeless youth compared to the estimated population of all people between the ages of 15 and 24 (7.4% and 6.5% respectively). Youth that identify as belonging to minority racial groups and as LGBTQ+ make up a significant portion of the San Francisco youth population experiencing homelessness, and these young people face increased economic, housing, and social and structural barriers.

More than half of youth experiencing homelessness (56%) say they became homeless while living in San Francisco. This is somewhat lower than 69% for the overall homeless population. Some youth arrive after becoming homeless, seeking a place to live safely, and others are mobile, coming into and leaving the City frequently. About 27% have been in foster care. While their circumstances vary, these youth share a transitional stage of life—their needs often differ from those of families and adults that experience homelessness and require different responses.

San Francisco's youth providers and HSH work closely together and offer a range of approaches that includes drop-in centers, Street Outreach, Temporary Shelter (both emergency shelter and transitional housing), Rapid Rehousing and Permanent Supportive Housing specifically targeted to the needs of youth. Most of the youth system's resources, however, have traditionally been focused on transitional programs. While this is aligned with the life stage and needs of some youth, it leaves gaps for youth with higher needs and those with less severe needs. Because transitional programs are often long and intensive, a more limited number of youth can be served.

The current set of youth resources has not had a comprehensive, coordinated method for access, and youth report that they often have to go many places to seek help or cannot get the help they need. A portion of the adult system also serves TAY, though that percent is estimated at significantly less than 10% of the available shelter and housing resources, despite the estimated size of the youth population.

In 2017, San Francisco was awarded a two-year demonstration grant from HUD, known as the Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program (YHDP), to plan for a systemic approach to meet the needs of homeless youth. This grant provided resources to analyze the current system, identify gaps, and develop a detailed plan with articulated vision and goals. Providers, advocates, and a wide range of youth participated in framing the challenges and shaping the plan, leading to a shared vision for a future state:

With shared responsibility in San Francisco, our vision is a city where no youth experience homelessness. To that end we will prevent and end youth homelessness using a coordinated community response that offers low-barrier, flexible housing models and uniquely tailored services ensuring that homelessness is rare, brief, and one-time, while empowering youth to define and achieve their own self-sufficiency through immediate and equal access to the continuum of resources, support, and care.

The YHDP process catalyzed significant movement on youth homelessness, including creating the Youth Policy and Advisory Council (YPAC) of youth 24 and under, bringing new funding and capacity to providers serving youth experiencing homelessness and forming a Youth Homelessness Oversight and Action Council (YHOAC) consisting of providers, public funders, and youth.

It also laid the groundwork for the development of Coordinated Entry for Youth, a system change to ensure that youth are able to access resources in a clear and consistent way through youth-oriented Access Points. All youth will be offered Problem Solving services to attempt immediate resolution of a housing crisis, and those who are assessed as highest need will be prioritized for quick enrollment in youth-targeted housing resources.

Accelerated progress toward this goal is already being made. Between FY17-18 and FY18-19 resources for addressing youth homelessness have more than doubled. Rising Up, a new public private partnership, launched in October 2018, will raise \$30 million from combined federal, state, local, and private sources to fund at least 500 rapid rehousing slots linked to jobs/vocational training and education, and problem solving for 450 youth. The Federal YHDP grant will also fund additional capacity, including contributing to the Rising Up expansion of Rapid Rehousing, creating 10 new units of Permanent Supportive Housing (in addition to 40 already in the pipeline) and supporting the creation of 10-15 Host Homes. Host Homes will provide a new housing intervention in San Francisco, utilizing existing housing stock and community activation to house more of our City's youth. This pilot provides a non-institutional, community-based housing option for LGBTQ+ youth and youth of color and will increase the limited supply of housing for pregnant and parenting youth. HSH is planning to open a TAY Navigation center which will provide safety, stability, and an entry point into permanent housing for youth living outside.

In addition to expanding capacity, changes and improvements in the system include launching Coordinated Entry for youth and implementing youth-specific data collection in the ONE System to strengthen the ability to coordinate care and track outcomes. Strengthening the system will include continuing work on equity and intersectionality throughout the system, working with other City departments to effectively and creatively use existing resources, and centering the voices of the youth experiencing homelessness. Youth will have access to a range of services that are critical to ending their homelessness, including family reunification and permanent connections, education, employment, and behavioral health services.

To make the system more responsive with all resources, HSH will work to lower access barriers and build in greater flexibility in TAY program models, allowing youth to move across housing programs as their

needs change. In addition, as high-priority youth 18 and over are also eligible for housing from the adult system, HSH and its partners will work to analyze barriers to youth access or stabilization in this portfolio by improving integration and responsiveness between the youth, family, and adult systems. The City's Moving On Initiative (MOI) will provide youth in permanent supportive housing with opportunities to transition to more independent housing situations with continuing subsidy support.

NEXT STEPS

Key next steps include:

1. Continue to collaborate with youth in all decision-making and in oversight of the system as it develops.
2. Complete the launch of Rising Up, including raising \$30 million in combined public and private resources; with \$10 million in public and millions of dollars in private funding committed as of the writing of this report. The resources will rehouse at least 500 youth with Rapid Rehousing and job/vocational training and education, and provide Problem Solving to at least 450 youth over the next three years.
3. Complete planning and launch Coordinated Entry for youth to identify, assess, and prioritize the needs of youth experiencing homelessness, including establishing youth-focused access points, by Spring of 2019.
4. Implement problem-solving strategies, including family reunification, to prevent at-risk and homeless youth from needing to enter the Homelessness Response System through immediate resolution of their housing crisis whenever possible.
5. Finalize the selection of a site and open a youth-targeted Navigation Center, offering 50 - 75 additional beds for prioritized unsheltered youth, by end of 2019.
6. Ensure all housing and service options are low-barrier, coordinated, equally accessible and have a Housing First orientation with high-quality, client-centered services.
7. Create movement through the system, including the ability to support youth transitioning out of time-limited programs into long-term independent housing.
8. Set goals for equity and inclusion that address intersections of identity and center the voices of youth experiencing disproportionate barriers by developing interventions to assist them in accessing responsive services.
9. Strengthen collaboration with the HSA and Adult and Juvenile Probation Departments to work towards the goal of preventing homelessness for all youth as they exit foster care and justice systems. Additionally, work with the DPH and DCYF to fully integrate education, employment, and behavioral health services more seamlessly with programs serving youth experiencing homelessness.
10. Based on an analysis of current barriers, work to better integrate the Adult and Youth systems, and ensure that age- appropriate services and program models are offered as needed in Adult-targeted programs to ensure TAY are welcomed and well-served.

11. With full implementation of the ONE System, improve youth-specific data collection and ability to analyze outcomes for all programs and communities, including improved analysis for evidence of racial disparities in access, services, or results, and especially any impact of the intersectionality of race, sexual orientation, and gender identity on outcomes for youth.

REDUCE HOMELESSNESS AMONG YOUTH BY 50% BY 2023

Modeling developed by HSH indicates that homelessness among youth can be reduced by half by the beginning of 2023. This will require the implementation of critical system changes, such as coordinated entry, greater flexibility across programs, and the addition of significant new resources for Rapid Rehousing, Problem Solving, and other housing models. HSH has adopted this as its Strategic Framework goal for youth.

This strategic planning framework builds from the success, lessons learned, and guidance of *Toward Ending Homelessness In San Francisco*¹⁴⁵, 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*.¹⁴⁶

In 2008, the San Francisco 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 LHCB is the lead entity for the San Francisco 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.). HUD 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.

¹⁴⁵ San Francisco Local Homeless Coordinating Board, *Toward Ending Homelessness in San Francisco, 2008-2013*

¹⁴⁶ San Francisco Ten Year Planning Council, *The San Francisco Plan to Abolish Chronic Homelessness, 2004-2014*

The Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness, *Opening Doors*¹⁴⁷, 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 LHC 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
- 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 placement 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

¹⁴⁷ United States Interagency Council on Homelessness, *Opening Doors Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness*, 2010

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 HCVs, 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 LGBTQ+ populations. HSH will evaluate disparities due to race and use data and best practices when developing these strategies.

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*¹⁴⁸ 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.

¹⁴⁸ <http://www.sfdph.org/dph/comupg/knowlcol/chip/default.asp>

- 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* ¹⁴⁹ 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.
- 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* ¹⁵⁰ 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.

¹⁴⁹ <http://www.sfdph.org/dph/comupg/knowncol/HCSMP/>

¹⁵⁰ <http://www.sfdph.org/dph/files/mtgsGrps/FoodSecTaskFrc/docs/FSTF-AssessmentOfFoodSecurityInSF-2013.pdf>

Indicators of Success

- Reduce the unsheltered homeless population of San Francisco by 30% by January 2022
- 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 implementing *San Francisco Homelessness Prevention and Rental Assistance Programs Workgroup Summary Report*¹⁵¹ 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

Open 1,000 shelter beds in the 2016–2023 period.

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.

¹⁵¹ <http://www.sfgov3.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=3501>

- 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
 - 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 LGBTQ+ persons by 10%, annually.¹⁵²
- 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

¹⁵² 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.

- 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 LHCB, the Mayor's Office, the Board of Supervisors, the SFHA, 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 LHCB and consider expanding LHCB 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.

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

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.

Gaps in HIV/AIDS Systems of Care

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 LINC 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.

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 participates with OEWD and the Arts Commission in a regular working group focused on the issues of nonprofit displacement through a number of OEWD-funded initiatives to stabilize nonprofits.

In the June, 2014, new local legislation was passed to coordinate and align workforce development services, establishing the Committee on City Workforce Alignment ("Alignment Committee") comprised of department heads across City departments and the Workforce Community Advisory Committee (WCAC), comprised of leadership from community-based organizations with deep specialization in community development.

The Alignment Committee includes one member designated by the Mayor, one member of the Board of Supervisors or a City employee designated by the Board, and the department heads of the following City departments: OEWD; HSA; DCYF; Public Utilities Commission; Public Works, Department of Human Resources, and Human Rights Commission. The Director of Workforce Development and Director of the Human Rights Commission co-chair the Alignment Committee.

The Alignment Committee and WCAC are charged with developing and submitting a Citywide Workforce Development Plan to the WISF for its review and comment, which was submitted and approved in late 2017. The five-year plan includes an assessment of the City's anticipated workforce development needs and opportunities and a strategy to meet the identified needs, which influences the City and County of San Francisco's CDBG decision-making around resource allocation. 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 Alignment Committee and WCAC legislation sunset in 2019, and all members agreed to continue the work under good faith effort until the legislation is reauthorized.

In addition, staff of MOHCD and OEWD 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 76– 2020-2024 Five-Year Funding and Indicators of Success Table

Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed												
Priority Need 1A: Develop and maintain accessible and affordable housing												
Goal 1Ai: Create more affordable housing												
Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2024-2025) \$ Amount	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
HOME	\$7,566,299	\$150,000	\$5,966,299	\$150,000	\$1,150,000	\$150,000						
General Fund	\$47,561,458	\$47,561,458							\$32,561,458			
Housing Trust Fund	\$57,000,000		\$5,000,000	\$9,000,000	\$20,000,000	\$23,000,000						
Housing Impact Fees	\$281,315,065	\$45,990,000	\$71,825,065	\$129,500,000	\$34,000,000					\$12,000,000		
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$27,005,680	\$200,000	\$10,805,680	\$15,000,000	\$1,000,000		\$200,000					
OCII	\$572,615,000	\$47,680,000	\$101,360,000	\$274,830,000	\$148,745,000		\$47,680,000					
Other	\$592,487,415	\$169,677,971	\$35,133,701	\$239,786,601	\$62,500,000	\$85,389,142	\$16,545,729		\$4,438,542	\$25,000,000		
Total	\$1,585,550,917	\$311,259,429	\$230,090,745	\$668,266,601	\$267,395,000	\$108,539,142	\$64,425,729	\$0	\$37,000,000	\$37,000,000	\$0	\$0
Indicators of Success	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
# of new HOPE SF units developed	389	64		158		167	64					
# of HIV+ dedicated housing units developed	0											
# of Plus Housing applicant placements	25	5	5	5	5	5						

# of dedicated housing units for families developed	4,421	1,300	814	1,535	351	421			130	273		
# of dedicated housing units for seniors developed	765			480	285							
# of mobility/ADA units developed	31			14	17							
Goal 1Aii: Preserve affordable housing												
Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2024-2025) \$ Amount	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
CDBG	\$8,104,310	\$2,548,910			\$5,555,400							
General Fund	\$41,642,348	\$37,956,000	\$2,232,250	\$472,781	\$484,601	\$496,716	\$191,845		\$24,231		\$15,883	\$51,997
Housing Trust Fund	\$56,517,010	\$11,079,000	\$35,359,602	\$3,688,062	\$3,192,763	\$3,197,583	\$55,998	\$6,400,000	\$7,073		\$4,636	\$15,178
Housing Impact Fees	\$4,035,570	\$840,180	\$2,536,560	\$658,830								
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$12,363,305	\$12,363,305										
Other	\$65,550,000	\$2,500,000	\$44,589,000	\$18,461,000								
Total	\$188,212,543	\$67,287,395	\$84,717,412	\$23,280,673	\$9,232,764	\$3,694,298	\$247,842	\$6,400,000	\$31,304	\$0	\$20,519	\$67,175
Indicators of Success	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
# of Small Sites units preserved/made permanently affordable	535	171	171	175	9	9						
# of units made code compliant (for example, seismic, fire) or received health and safety improvements	169	113			56		88					

# of low-income homeowners who have assessments completed and home modifications installed that increase safety, accessibility and health outcomes	25	5	5	5	5	5	2					1
# of low-income homeowners who have solar assessments completed and solar modifications installed	40	8	8	8	8	8	3					1
Decrease in number of out of compliance (with Planning or MOHCD program requirements) homeowners and property owners	150	30	30	30	30	30						
# of HOPE SF public housing units replaced or # of HOPE VI units rehabilitated	277	121	126		30		53					
# of RAD-like conversion units rehabilitated	154	154										
Goal 1Aiii: Improve data and analytics on affordable housing inventory and placements												
Funding Source												
No funding to sub-recipients												
Indicators of Success												
No Indicators of Success												
Priority Need 1B: Make housing more affordable												
Goal 1Bi: Reduce development costs to help leverage local housing resources and serve lower income households												
Funding Source												
No funding to sub-recipients												

Indicators of Success												
No Indicators of Success												
Goal 1Bii: Increase affordability of rental housing												
Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2024-2025) \$ Amount	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
HOPWA	\$1,305,080	\$261,016	\$261,016	\$261,016	\$261,016	\$261,016	\$6,525		\$45,678	\$91,356	\$32,627	
General Fund	\$118,345,699	\$13,532,934	\$22,334,605	\$22,793,754	\$27,831,745	\$31,852,662	\$113,999	\$77,999	\$73,043	\$125,999	\$485,214	
Other	\$6,800,000	\$3,800,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000		\$275,887	\$174,734	\$231,428	\$330,547	\$1,154,442	\$42,000
Total	\$126,450,779	\$17,593,950	\$23,595,621	\$24,054,770	\$29,092,761	\$32,113,678	\$396,412	\$252,733	\$350,148	\$547,902	\$1,672,283	\$42,000
Indicators of Success	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
# of residents receiving rental subsidies	1,100	220	220	220	220	220	16	10	14	22	68	2
# of housing subsidies and vouchers for HIV+ households	935	187	187	187	187	187						
# of new LOSP units funded	14,922	2,713	2,871	2,903	3,200	3,235						
Goal 1Biii: Increase opportunities for sustainable homeownership												
Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2024-2025) \$ Amount	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
CDBG	\$1,672,600	\$334,520	\$334,520	\$334,520	\$334,520	\$334,520	\$50,582	\$16,072	\$42,162	\$36,893	\$12,951	\$10,246
General Fund	\$5,101,162	\$970,480	\$994,742	\$1,019,611	\$1,045,101	\$1,071,228	\$146,743	\$46,627	\$122,317	\$107,031	\$37,574	\$29,723
Total	\$6,773,762	\$1,305,000	\$1,329,262	\$1,354,131	\$1,379,621	\$1,405,748	\$197,325	\$62,699	\$164,479	\$143,924	\$50,525	\$39,969
Indicators of Success	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal	Year 1 Bayview	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley

							Hunters Point					
# of residents receiving homeownership education and counseling	16,000	3,200	3,200	3,200	3,200	3,200	484	154	403	353	124	98
# of residents receiving homeownership counseling services who successfully become homeowners	1,725	345	345	345	345	345	52	17	43	38	13	11
# of homeowners who receive post-purchase education and counseling	1,250	250	250	250	250	250	38	12	32	28	10	8
# of homeowners who receive legal representation to avoid foreclosure	100	20	20	20	20	20	3	1	3	2	1	1
# of higher-income households, including first responders and educators, who receive DALP	150	30	30	30	30	30						
# of homebuyers served from previously underserved select demographic populations	75	5	10	15	20	25	1		1	1		
Goal 1Biv: Increase access to rental and homeownership housing												
Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2024-2025) \$ Amount	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
General Fund	\$4,592,054	\$873,624	\$895,465	\$917,851	\$940,797	\$964,317	\$172,245	\$31,847	\$137,385	\$112,012	\$126,571	\$25,040
Housing Trust Fund	\$7,024,431	\$1,336,376	\$1,369,785	\$1,404,030	\$1,439,131	\$1,475,109	\$199,906	\$40,044	\$157,681	\$101,600	\$97,972	\$33,051
Total	\$11,616,485	\$2,210,000	\$2,265,250	\$2,321,881	\$2,379,928	\$2,439,426	\$372,151	\$71,891	\$295,066	\$213,612	\$224,543	\$58,091

Indicators of Success	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
# of residents receiving rental housing education and counseling	18,000	3,600	3,600	3,600	3,600	3,600	606	117	481	348	366	95
# of residents submitting at least one application for a rental housing opportunity	1,000,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	33,679	6,506	26,703	19,331	20,321	5,257
# of residents who successfully move into MOHCD-sponsored affordable housing	3,750	750	750	750	750	750						
# of new DAHLIA accounts created	150,000	20,000	25,000	30,000	35,000	40,000						
# of leasing agents, lenders and housing counselors who receive training on MOHCD housing programs	1,175	235	235	235	235	235						
# of housing education opportunities for HIV+ persons	25	5	5	5	5	5						
# of HIV+ residents receiving rental housing counseling services who successfully move into MOHCD-sponsored affordable housing	25	5	5	5	5	5						
# of households receiving rental housing at HOPE SF sites via the HOPE SF Right to Return legislation	125	25	25	25	25	25						
Priority Need 1C: Prevent and reduce homelessness												

Goal 1Ci: Improve systems to help each person find the right path to permanent housing												
Funding Source												
See Goal 1CVi for funding												
Indicators of Success	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
% of successful exits from Coordinated Entry	85%	75%	75%	80%	80%	85%						
Goal 1Cii: Reduce homelessness for adults, youth and families												
Funding Source												
See Goal 1Ai for funding for PSH units												
Indicators of Success	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
# of permanent supportive housing units for adults developed	414	29	276		25	84						
# of permanent supportive housing units for youth developed	42		32	10								
# of permanent supportive housing units for families developed	335	110	20	205								
Ratio of homeless families to 6 months average housing placement rate	1	8	5	1	1	1						
# of chronic homeless adults	7,288	2,050	2,050	1,069	1,069	1,050						
# of homeless youth	3,846	900	900	682	682	682						
Goal 1Ciii: Ensure no families with children are unsheltered												

Funding Source												
See Goal 1Cvi for Funding												
Indicators of Success	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
# of unsheltered families	0	0	0	0	0	0						
Goal 1Civ: Improve the City’s response to street homelessness and end large, long-term encampments												
Funding Source												
See Goal 1Cvi for funding												
Indicators of Success	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
# of large, long-term encampments	0	0	0	0	0	0						
Goal 1Cv: Further align MOHCD’s work with HSH												
Funding Source												
No funding to sub-recipients												
Indicators of Success	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
# of MOHCD placements to HOPWA units	25	5	5	5	5	5						
Goal 1Cvi: Expand services to prevent homelessness and stabilize housing for formerly homeless households and those at risk of homelessness												
Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2024-2025) \$ Amount	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
ESG	\$6,934,855	\$1,386,971	\$1,386,971	\$1,386,971	\$1,386,971	\$1,386,971						
General Fund	\$1,200,000,000	\$240,000,000	\$240,000,000	\$240,000,000	\$240,000,000	\$240,000,000						

Total	\$1,206,934,855	\$241,386,971	\$241,386,971	\$241,386,971	\$241,386,971	\$241,386,971	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Indicators of Success	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
# of households who reached a problem solving resolution or were diverted from homelessness	15,000	2,000	2,500	3,000	3,500	4,000						
Priority Need 1D: Provide services to maintain housing stability												
Goal 1Di: Reduce rate of evictions												
Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2024-2025) \$ Amount	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
CDBG	\$18,523,090	\$3,704,618	\$3,704,618	\$3,704,618	\$3,704,618	\$3,704,618	\$232,407	\$145,373	\$409,799	\$566,637	\$687,327	\$101,608
General Fund	\$18,700,362	\$3,557,685	\$3,646,627	\$3,737,793	\$3,831,238	\$3,927,019	\$282,042	\$178,111	\$461,393	\$606,180	\$812,361	\$101,608
Housing Trust Fund	\$25,550,004	\$4,860,808	\$4,982,328	\$5,106,886	\$5,234,559	\$5,365,423	\$317,534	\$198,621	\$559,902	\$774,187	\$939,083	\$138,826
Total	\$62,773,456	\$12,123,111	\$12,333,573	\$12,549,297	\$12,770,415	\$12,997,060	\$831,983	\$522,105	\$1,431,094	\$1,947,004	\$2,438,771	\$342,042
Indicators of Success	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
# of tenants facing eviction who receive full legal representation	9,800	1,800	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	124	78	212	289	362	51
# of tenants facing eviction able to stay in their current unit	4,900	900	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	62	39	106	145	181	25
# of tenants receiving emergency rental assistance to stabilize their housing	3,650	730	730	730	730	730	50	31	86	117	147	21

# of tenants receiving Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) services	3,000	600	600	600	600	600	41	26	71	96	121	17
# of residents receiving tenants' rights counseling/education	4,500	900	900	900	900	900	62	39	106	145	181	25
Goal 1Dii: Increase access to services for residents of public and publicly subsidized housing, RAD projects, HOPWA subsidized housing, and single room occupancy hotels												
Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2024-2025) \$ Amount	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
CDBG	\$4,615,235	\$923,047	\$923,047	\$923,047	\$923,047	\$923,047	\$140,952	\$133,555				\$241,075
General Fund	\$18,915,208	\$3,598,559	\$3,688,523	\$3,780,736	\$3,875,254	\$3,972,136	\$934,617	\$866,301	\$150,000			\$939,848
Housing Trust Fund	\$788,450	\$150,000	\$153,750	\$157,594	\$161,534	\$165,572	\$22,905	\$13,903				\$39,176
Total	\$24,318,893	\$4,671,606	\$4,765,320	\$4,861,377	\$4,959,835	\$5,060,755	\$1,098,474	\$1,013,759	\$150,000	\$0	\$0	\$1,220,099
Indicators of Success	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
# of HOPE SF and RAD residents participating in community building activities that increase cohesion and trust, provide leadership opportunities, and lead to healthier outcomes for residents	20,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	2,000	250	250			500
# of resident leaders who successfully support or lead the implementation of programming at their site	200	40	40	40	40	40	20	10	5			5

# of clients receiving information and referral, service connection and case coordination services	6,500	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300	500	100	100			200
# of clients engaged in case management, including development of Individual Service Plan	1,500	300	300	300	300	300	100	25	25			50
# of clients who complete at least 50% of the goals from their Individual Service Plan	750	150	150	150	150	150	50	15	15			15
# of clients receiving housing retention services residing in new and existing HOPWA units	935	187	187	187	187	187						
Goal 1Diii: Provide support for other affordable housing residents to ensure success in their housing placement												
Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2024-2025) \$ Amount	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
HOPWA	\$250,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000						
Total	\$250,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Indicators of Success	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
# of welcome packets received by new tenants in MOHCD-sponsored affordable housing projects	2,850	100	500	750	750	750						

# of MOHCD affordable housing tenants at risk of eviction that receive notification of eviction support services	8,280	1,024	1,548	1,748	1,930	2,030						
Goal 1Div: Increase collaboration between healthcare and housing systems by increasing mobility between levels of care (high to low acuity) in residential settings for HIV+ households												
Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2024-2025) \$ Amount	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
HOPWA	\$12,521,680	\$2,504,336	\$2,504,336	\$2,504,336	\$2,504,336	\$2,504,336			\$362,377	\$54,413	\$383,163	\$1,158,166
General Fund	\$7,622,530	\$1,586,608	\$1,453,558	\$1,489,897	\$1,527,144	\$1,565,323			\$229,582	\$34,473	\$242,751	\$733,750
Total	\$20,144,210	\$4,090,944	\$3,957,894	\$3,994,233	\$4,031,480	\$4,069,659	\$0	\$0	\$591,959	\$88,886	\$625,914	\$1,891,916
Indicators of Success	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
# of acuity-based assessments for housing placements	25	5	5	5	5	5						
Objective 2: Families and Individuals are Resilient and Economically Self-Sufficient												
Priority Need 2A: Promote workforce development												
Goal 2Ai: Provide access to employment opportunities across multiple sectors for unemployed and underemployed populations												
Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2024-2025) \$ Amount	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
CDBG	\$7,325,145	\$1,465,029	\$1,465,029	\$1,465,029	\$1,465,029	\$1,465,029	\$200,000		\$50,000	\$200,000	\$450,000	\$33,000
Total	\$7,325,145	\$1,465,029	\$1,465,029	\$1,465,029	\$1,465,029	\$1,465,029	\$200,000	\$0	\$50,000	\$200,000	\$450,000	\$33,000
Indicators of Success	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal	Year 1 Bayview	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley

							Hunters Point					
# of unemployed and underemployed residents that successfully enroll into workforce services in aim of securing employment	3,475	695	695	695	695	695	130		25	107	228	22
Priority Need 2B: Increase opportunities through improved language access and core skills development												
Goal 2Bi: Improve access to MOHCD programs and services through translation of paper and digital resources												
Funding Source												
No funding to sub-recipients												
Indicators of Success												
No Indicators of Success												
Goal 2Bii: Provide skill development and training resources												
Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2024-2025) \$ Amount	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
CDBG	\$1,790,000	\$358,000	\$358,000	\$358,000	\$358,000	\$358,000	\$24,825	\$26,102	\$33,428	\$19,690	\$43,086	\$18,871
General Fund	\$17,968,760	\$3,418,500	\$3,503,963	\$3,591,562	\$3,681,351	\$3,773,384	\$285,827	\$297,696	\$419,165	\$206,306	\$442,529	\$193,838
Total	\$19,758,760	\$3,776,500	\$3,861,963	\$3,949,562	\$4,039,351	\$4,131,384	\$310,652	\$323,798	\$452,593	\$225,996	\$485,615	\$212,709
Indicators of Success	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
# of clients who receive training in life skills/personal effectiveness, educational skills, ESL, and workplace readiness	19,000	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800	313	326	455	227	489	214

# of clients who achieve a high school diploma or GED or enroll in post-secondary education programs	875	175	175	175	175	175	14	15	21	10	23	10
# of clients who enroll in a sector-specific job training program	1,750	350	350	350	350	350	29	30	42	21	45	20
Goal 2Biii: Improve financial literacy and personal finance management												
Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2024-2025) \$ Amount	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
CDBG	\$260,000	\$52,000	\$52,000	\$52,000	\$52,000	\$52,000	\$8,025	\$4,758	\$7,686	\$5,225	\$2,581	\$5,241
General Fund	\$2,565,089	\$488,000	\$500,200	\$512,705	\$525,523	\$538,661	\$75,314	\$44,650	\$72,133	\$49,031	\$24,224	\$49,186
Total	\$2,825,089	\$540,000	\$552,200	\$564,705	\$577,523	\$590,661	\$83,339	\$49,408	\$79,819	\$54,256	\$26,805	\$54,427
Indicators of Success	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
# of clients receiving financial counseling	10,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	309	183	296	201	99	202
# of clients who increase savings by at least one week of income	2,075	415	415	415	415	415	64	38	61	42	21	42
# of clients who decrease debt by at least 10%	1,125	225	225	225	225	225	35	21	33	23	11	23
# of clients who increase their credit score by at least 35 points	1,250	250	250	250	250	250	39	23	37	25	12	25
# of clients who open safe and affordable bank accounts	1,000	200	200	200	200	200	31	18	30	20	10	20

# of programs being implemented on-site at RAD and HOPE SF housing developments	30	6	6	6	6	6	3	1	1			1
Goal 2Biv: Improve digital literacy												
Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2024-2025) \$ Amount	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
General Fund	\$1,839,716	\$350,000	\$358,750	\$367,719	\$376,912	\$386,335	\$58,333	\$58,333	\$58,333	\$23,333	\$58,333	\$58,333
Total	\$1,839,716	\$350,000	\$358,750	\$367,719	\$376,912	\$386,335	\$58,333	\$58,333	\$58,333	\$23,333	\$58,333	\$58,333
Indicators of Success	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
# of clients who receive free or low-cost digital devices	1,500	300	300	300	300	300	50	50	50	20	50	50
# of clients who receive training in digital skills, including basic digital literacy, online safety, privacy, information literacy, and advanced education or employment related skills	2,500	500	500	500	500	500	75	75	75	40	70	75
# of clients in affordable housing with increased access to high-speed internet	15,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	500	500	500	200	500	500
Priority Need 2C: Provide equitable access to civil legal services for immigration and other critical issues												
Goal 2Ci: Increase access to civil legal services												
General Fund	\$60,966,799	\$11,598,742	\$11,888,711	\$12,185,928	\$12,490,577	\$12,802,841	\$1,516,523	\$339,846	\$2,834,253	\$359,079	\$1,829,811	\$889,199
Housing Trust Fund	\$3,416,613	\$650,000	\$666,250	\$682,906	\$699,979	\$717,478	\$74,279	\$18,043	\$155,478	\$18,978	\$99,170	\$49,439

Total	\$64,383,412	\$12,248,742	\$12,554,961	\$12,868,834	\$13,190,556	\$13,520,319	\$1,590,802	\$357,889	\$2,989,731	\$378,057	\$1,928,981	\$938,638
Indicators of Success	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
# of clients receiving a limited legal service	21,000	4,200	4,200	4,200	4,200	4,200	545	123	1,025	130	661	322
# of clients receiving an extended legal service	12,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	325	73	610	77	394	192
# of clients who have their civil legal issue successfully resolved	10,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	260	58	488	62	315	153
Priority Need 2D: Help households connect to services												
Goal 2Di: Increase access to community-based services												
Funding Source	Expected 5- year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020- 2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021- 2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022- 2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023- 2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2024- 2025) \$ Amount	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
CDBG	\$1,790,000	\$358,000	\$358,000	\$358,000	\$358,000	\$358,000	\$24,825	\$26,102	\$33,428	\$19,690	\$43,086	\$18,871
General Fund	\$17,968,760	\$3,418,500	\$3,503,963	\$3,591,562	\$3,681,351	\$3,773,384	\$285,827	\$297,696	\$419,165	\$206,306	\$442,529	\$193,838
Total	\$19,758,760	\$3,776,500	\$3,861,963	\$3,949,562	\$4,039,351	\$4,131,384	\$310,652	\$323,798	\$452,593	\$225,996	\$485,615	\$212,709
Indicators of Success	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
# of clients receiving information and referral, service connection and case coordination services	20,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	329	343	479	239	514	225
# of clients engaged in case management, including development of Individual Service Plan	7,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	123	129	180	90	193	84

# of clients who complete at least 50% of the goals from their Individual Service Plan	5,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	82	86	120	60	129	56
Objective 3: Communities Have Healthy Physical, Social, and Business Infrastructure												
Priority Need 3A: Enhance community facilities and spaces												
Goal 3Ai: Ensure nonprofit service providers have high quality, stable facilities												
Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2024-2025) \$ Amount	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
CDBG	\$6,409,560	\$196,780	\$1,553,195	\$1,553,195	\$1,553,195	\$1,553,195						
HOPWA	\$4,400,992	\$3,200,992	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000						
Total	\$10,810,552	\$3,397,772	\$1,853,195	\$1,853,195	\$1,853,195	\$1,853,195	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Indicators of Success	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
# of facilities receiving capital improvements	48		12	12	12	12						
# of facilities receiving capital needs assessments	5	1	1	1	1	1						
Goal 3Aii: Enhance public spaces												
Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2024-2025) \$ Amount	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
Housing Trust Fund	\$2,000,000		\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total	\$2,000,000	\$0	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Indicators of Success	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal	Year 1 Bayview	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley

							Hunters Point					
# of communities facing increased housing density receiving community amenities	16		4	4	4	4						
Priority Need 3B: Strengthen small businesses and commercial corridors												
Goal 3Bi: Encourage the development and sustainability of thriving locally owned businesses												
Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2024-2025) \$ Amount	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
CDBG	\$4,606,228	\$1,088,869	\$879,340	\$879,340	\$879,340	\$879,340						
Total	\$4,606,228	\$1,088,869	\$879,340	\$879,340	\$879,340	\$879,340	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Indicators of Success	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
# of startup businesses assisted	676	160	129	129	129	129	22	30	43	34	20	10
# of existing businesses assisted	2,074	490	396	396	396	396	67	90	130	75	50	10
# of businesses engaged in a language other than English	210	50	40	40	40	40	6	90	30	5	10	5
Total dollar amount value of loans accessed	\$14,806,004	\$3,500,000	\$2,826,501	\$2,826,501	\$2,826,501	\$2,826,501	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$50,000
# of loans funded	231	55	44	44	44	44	4	4	30	10	10	5
Total dollar amount value of equity invested	\$7,403,004	\$1,750,000	\$1,413,251	\$1,413,251	\$1,413,251	\$1,413,251	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$50,000
# of jobs retained via business technical assistance	1,482	350	283	283	283	283	20	20	45	20	25	5

# of jobs created via business technical assistance	1,482	350	283	283	283	283	20	20	45	20	25	5
# of new businesses established via technical assistance provided	210	50	40	40	40	40	7	10	20	5	5	2
# of leases strengthened and businesses stabilized	189	45	36	36	36	36	1	5	5	5	5	2
Goal 3Bii: Support the development and sustainability of robust commercial corridors in low-income neighborhoods												
Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2024-2025) \$ Amount	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
CDBG	\$1,812,974	\$428,570	\$346,101	\$346,101	\$346,101	\$346,101						
Total	\$1,812,974	\$428,570	\$346,101	\$346,101	\$346,101	\$346,101	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Indicators of Success	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
# of SF Shines façade applications completed	26	6	5	5	5	5	1	1	1	1	3	1
# tenant improvements completed	26	6	5	5	5	5	1	1	1	1	3	1
# of jobs created via business technical assistance	319	75	61	61	61	61	13	5	10	11	14	5
# of training workshops offered via business technical assistance	1,268	300	242	242	242	242	5	4	5	7	9	4
Priority Need 3C: Support community-driven comprehensive strategies												
Goal 3Ci: Support neighborhood-based planning efforts												
Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2024-2025) \$ Amount	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley

CDBG	\$761,452	\$180,000	\$145,363	\$145,363	\$145,363	\$145,363						
General Fund	\$3,750,000	\$750,000	\$750,000	\$750,000	\$750,000	\$750,000	\$200,000					\$175,000
Other	\$6,100,000	\$1,220,000	\$1,220,000	\$1,220,000	\$1,220,000	\$1,220,000	\$230,000		\$230,000	\$530,000	\$230,000	
Total	\$10,611,452	\$2,150,000	\$2,115,363	\$2,115,363	\$2,115,363	\$2,115,363	\$430,000	\$0	\$230,000	\$530,000	\$230,000	\$175,000
Indicators of Success	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
# of community-generated planning processes that lead to measurable benefits for the neighborhood	43	8	9	6	10	10	2		4	7	2	
# of nonprofit organizations that will produce cultural events, arts, cultural activities, and public place keeping projects	115	23	23	23	23	23	4		2	7	1	2
# of businesses assisted as part of a community-driven comprehensive strategy (Cultural Districts, neighborhood strategy)	147	35	28	28	28	28						8
# of jobs created via business technical assistance as part of a community-driven comprehensive strategy	126	30	24	24	24	24						8
# of jobs retained via business technical assistance as part of a community-driven comprehensive strategy	126	30	24	24	24	24						8
Goal 3Cii: Support locally-based community building												

Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2024-2025) \$ Amount	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
General Fund	\$6,065,803	\$1,154,000	\$1,182,850	\$1,212,421	\$1,242,732	\$1,273,800	\$131,250	\$29,678	\$149,267	\$164,800	\$97,000	\$4,200
Other	\$15,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$230,000	\$0	\$460,000	\$460,000	\$230,000	\$0
Total	\$21,065,803	\$4,154,000	\$4,182,850	\$4,212,421	\$4,242,732	\$4,273,800	\$361,250	\$29,678	\$609,267	\$624,800	\$327,000	\$4,200
Indicators of Success	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
# of community-driven reports completed	50	10	10	10	10	10	1		1	2	1	
Priority Need 3D: Support capacity needs of community-based organizations and professional partners												
Goal 3Di: Increase capacity of community-based organizations												
Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2024-2025) \$ Amount	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
General Fund	\$5,129,577	\$975,886	\$1,000,283	\$1,025,290	\$1,050,922	\$1,077,196	\$121,985	\$121,985	\$182,979	\$121,985	\$121,985	\$60,993
Total	\$5,129,577	\$975,886	\$1,000,283	\$1,025,290	\$1,050,922	\$1,077,196	\$121,985	\$121,985	\$182,979	\$121,985	\$121,985	\$60,993
Indicators of Success	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
# of organizations receiving capacity building and technical assistance	400	80	80	80	80	80	10	10	15	10	10	5
# of organizations who successfully achieved at least one of their capacity building goals, as measured by pre- and post-assessment	75	15	15	15	15	15	2	2	3	2	2	1

Objective 4: Communities At Risk of Displacement Are Stabilized												
Priority Need 4A: Address inequitable impacts of economic growth through anti-displacement measures for residents and businesses												
Goal 4Ai: Implement policies and programs that prioritize current residents												
Funding Source												
No funding to sub-recipients												
Indicators of Success	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
# of residents who access affordable housing through lottery preference programs	1,250	250	250	250	250	250						
# of “Mixed Status Families” stabilized via support services and subsidies	715	130	140	145	150	150						
Goal 4Aii: Encourage commercial tenants to locate on ground-floor spaces of MOHCD’s affordable housing developments												
Funding Source												
No funding to sub-recipients												
Indicators of Success												
No Indicators of Success												
Goal 4Aiii: Reduce displacement of residents and businesses												
Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2024-2025) \$ Amount	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
CDBG	\$423,028	\$100,000	\$80,757	\$80,757	\$80,757	\$80,757						
General Fund	\$4,932,674	\$975,000	\$980,625	\$986,391	\$992,300	\$998,358	\$381,250	\$625	\$7,500	\$7,500	\$11,250	\$8,125
Other	\$1,500,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000				\$300,000		
Total	\$6,855,702	\$1,375,000	\$1,361,382	\$1,367,148	\$1,373,057	\$1,379,115	\$381,250	\$625	\$7,500	\$307,500	\$11,250	\$8,125

Indicators of Success	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
# of tenants receiving emergency rental assistance to stabilize their housing (also in 1Di)	3,650	730	730	730	730	730	202		4	163	6	4
# of tenants facing eviction able to stay in their current unit (also in 1Di)	4,900	900	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	250		5	201	7	5
# of households receiving tenant education and counseling	4,500	900	900	900	900	900	250		5	201	7	5
# of households receiving full-scope eviction defense	9,800	1,800	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	499	1	10	403	15	11
# of households receiving other eviction defense services	5,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	277		5	224	8	6
# of households whose housing crisis was resolved with emergency rental assistance	3,650	730	730	730	730	730	202		4	163	6	4
# of existing businesses assisted	189	45	36	36	36	36						
# of eligible Legacy Businesses assisted	42	10	8	8	8	8						
# existing leases strengthened and businesses stabilized	105	25	20	20	20	20						

# of activities or projects completed that sustained a neighborhood's art, culture, tradition, way of life, history or overall ecosystem	165	31	32	34	34	34	4	6	11	3		
Priority Need 4B: Ensure economic growth offers benefits to existing communitiesmeasures for residents and businesses												
Goal 4Bi: Require local hiring to the greatest extent possible in MOHCD's projects and programs												
Funding Source												
No funding to sub-recipients												
Indicators of Success	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
# of participants who receive job readiness services in HOPE SF and RAD sites	250	50	50	50	50	50	15		10			15
# of participants who are placed in jobs at HOPE SF and RAD sites	125	25	25	25	25	25	8		5			8
Goal 4Bii: Ensure adequate City services in neighborhoods where MOHCD's affordable housing is located												
Funding Source												
No funding to sub-recipients												
Indicators of Success												
No Indicators of Success												
Goal 4Biii: Implement programs that provide direct benefits resulting from neighborhood-based economic growth to local communities												
Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2024-2025) \$ Amount	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
General Fund	\$2,500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$100,000					\$100,000
Other	\$1,500,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000				\$300,000		

Total	\$4,000,000	\$800,000	\$800,000	\$800,000	\$800,000	\$800,000	\$100,000	\$0	\$0	\$300,000	\$0	\$100,000
Indicators of Success	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
# of outreach and community input activities provided by City Departments to communities	70	14	14	14	14	14	3		4	7	2	1
# of plans developed to address stabilization and economic growth needs in communities and neighborhoods	24	5	5	2	6	6	2		4	5	2	
Objective 5: The City Works to Eliminate the Causes of Racial Disparities												
Priority Need 5A: Ensure racially equitable access to programs and services, in coordination with other City departments												
Goal 5Ai: Develop specific funding, policies and practices to ensure equitable access to MOHCD and OEWD programs												
Funding Source												
No funding to sub-recipients												
Indicators of Success	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
# of City staff who attend GARE training workshops	35	7	7	7	7	7						
# of staff trained in trauma informed systems and self-care activities	150	50	50	50								
Execution of racial equity analysis in MOHCD RFQ/RFP selection criteria	1	1										

Creation of MOHCD community outreach strategies that address racial disparities, historically underserved populations, cultural competency, and cultural humility	5	1	1	1	1	1						
Priority Need 5B: Instill racial equity and trauma-informed values and practices in the work of MOHCD and its partners												
Goal 5Bi: Incorporate cultural competency, trauma-informed systems, and other equity training and resources for MOHCD’s partners												
Funding Source												
No funding to sub-recipients												
Indicators of Success	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
# of partner staff trained in implicit bias, cultural competency, trauma informed systems and equity trainings	50	10	10	10	10	10						
# of HIV-specific education seminars and trainings	5	1	1	1	1	1						
# of trainings for community partners hosted by MOHCD and OEWD	5	1	1	1	1	1						
Goal 5Bii: Incorporate racial equity principles in MOHCD’s hiring and promotion practices												
Funding Source												
No funding to sub-recipients												

Indicators of Success	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
Execute MOHCD Racial Equity plan	3	1	1	1								
Goal 5Bii: Incorporate racial equity principles in MOHCD’s hiring and promotion practices												
Funding Source												
No funding to sub-recipients												
Indicators of Success	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
Execute MOHCD Racial Equity plan	3	1	1	1								
Implement changes to MOHCD internal policies	5	1	1	1	1	1						
Inclusion of Trauma Champions, Catalysts, and Leaders in MOHCD’s Racial Equity Working group	15	3	3	3	3	3						

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)

MOHCD estimates approximately 160 extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income families will be provided affordable housing rental housing during 2020–2024 time period using HOME funds and an additional approximately 5,800 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)

Under the RAD conversion and the HOPE SF revitalization programs, all former public housing units will meet or exceed the accessibility requirements of Section 504, providing a minimum of 5% mobility units and 4% vision- and hearing-impaired units.

Activities to Increase Resident Involvements

The RAD and HOPE SF revitalization programs 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 that are made available via referral 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
- To build systems to support housing stability

➤ **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
- To ensure ongoing communication between tenants, property management, and services

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.

All four HOPE SF sites 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. On-site service providers will be preparing residents for relocation and placement in the units. 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.

Table 77 – Lead HOPE SF Resident Services Agencies

<u>Site</u>	<u>Lead Service Provider</u>
Alice Griffith	Bayview Senior Services
Hunters View	Bayview YMCA
Potrero Terrace and Annex	Bridge Housing and Shanti Project
Sunnydale	Mercy Housing

At Hunters View, the Bayview Y has worked to prepare residents to keep their housing stable. The Bayview Y 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 Bayview Senior Services team, in conjunction with the Bayview Y, 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, gardening/sustainability programs, and social activities. Shanti Project is continuing to provide housing stabilization services on site to residents and working with households affected by Accelerated Conversion to ensure successful conversion.

At Sunnydale, Mercy Housing and the Bayview Y work collaboratively to provide outreach, family support, service connections, health and wellness, and educational activities and community convenings to Sunnydale residents.

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 and completed planning in 2014. Both of these communities continue to engage residents, city agencies, and other stakeholders in the implementation of the resulting plans.

The South Potrero Neighborhood Transformation Plan supported the development of a coordinated blueprint for improving Potrero Annex and Terrace, and the surrounding neighborhood. At Potrero Terrace and Annex, the work has been focused on establishing quality services in the community, and connecting residents to the greater neighborhood and services.

Implementation Grants

Urban Strategies completed their cycle of the Choice Neighborhoods Implementation Grant at Alice Griffith in 2017 in partnership with residents, city agencies, community organizations, and other stakeholders. Additionally, key neighborhood revitalization and construction projects continue to come online in the surrounding district which will provide opportunities for training and placement.

The Sunnydale team is exploring the feasibility of a 2021 Implementation Grant application.

Is the public housing agency designated as troubled under 24 CFR part 902?

By a letter from HUD to the Authority dated March 7, 2019, HUD determined that the SFHA was in default under its HCV Consolidated Annual Contributions Contract ("HCV ACC") and its Low Rent Public Housing Consolidated Annual Contributions Contract ("LRPH ACC"). After a determination of default, HUD has the authority to take possession of all or a part of the Authority or require the Authority to make other arrangements consistent with HUD requirements that are in the best interests of the public housing residents and families assisted by HUD.

Plan to remove the 'troubled' designation

Under the Default Letter, HUD determined that it is in the best interests of the Authority's public housing residents and assisted families to allow the Authority the opportunity to cure the SFHA Default as follows: (i) the City's assumption of responsibility of the programmatic and financial functions under the HCV ACC and LRPH ACC, including financial management, program management, wait list and admissions, inspections, eligibility determinations, and lease and grievance procedures, and (ii) outsourcing programmatic and financial administration of the HCV program and LRPH program, including continued outsourcing of Authority's financial management.

The City approved a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between SFHA and the City in December 2019, and reviewed by HUD, outlining the preliminary terms of the City's assumption of Housing Authority functions as shown below:

Labor Relations

SFHA gave notice to its existing employees on the reduction in Housing Authority staffing, resulting from the City's assumption of and contracting out of SFHA functions, as required by HUD. SFHA developed severance packages for employees who were impacted and is partnering with the City to assist with finding City jobs for these employees when possible.

Restructuring of the Housing Authority

The MOU provided a preliminary restructuring plan that included:

- Appointment of City staff to provide executive management oversight of Housing Authority functions;
- Plan to contract out the Housing Authority's public housing and HCV programs; and
- Development of a specific timeline to integrate the Housing Authority's systems, processes, and the policies with the City for financial oversight, information technology, human resources, real estate, purchasing, and legal oversight. The MOU further provided for the parties (HUD, Housing Authority, City) to commit to the capital funding necessary to redevelop the public housing under HOPE SF; and to continue to convert the public housing units to project based vouchers.

Shortfall Funding

HUD maintains a fund to annually augment local housing authorities' budgets that have a shortfall in their housing voucher programs. HUD provided \$10 million in shortfall funding to the Housing Authority in 2018. According to the MOU, the Housing Authority will apply for HUD's shortfall funding annually, or as frequently as needed.

Executive Management and Shared Services

- The City will provide executive management staff to the Housing Authority, including a chief executive officer reporting to the Mayor or the Mayor's designee.
- The Housing Authority will integrate with City services over time, including information technology, human resources, purchasing, real estate, financial systems, and other services. The timing and process of integration will be developed in consultation with MOHCD, Controller, and General Services Agency. Administration and Oversight
- The annual Housing Authority budget will be submitted to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors, who may accept or reject the budget. The budget submission will be consistent with City procedures and HUD timelines and requirements.
- Administration of the HCV program and public housing will be contracted to third parties, as required by HUD and discussed above. The Housing Authority will work with the City to procure third-party contractors, but the contracting process must conform to HUD requirements. Contracts for property transactions will be subject to third-party appraisal with the exception of properties conveyed for development of affordable housing.
- Financial management of the Housing Authority will be contracted to a third party with expertise and experience in HUD financial Introduction Budget and Legislative Analyst's Office 10 reporting and requirements. Currently, the Housing Authority contracts with BDO USA LLP for financial management and reporting.

- Issuance of debt by the Housing Authority must be approved by the Authority and the Board of Supervisors.
- Any material amendment to the MOU is subject to prior approval by the Board of Supervisors. Housing Authority Commission
- The Housing Authority Commission is authorized by state law to have seven members, appointed by the Mayor, two of whom must be Housing Authority residents. Under the proposed MOU, the Mayor would appoint four members directly, and three members recommended by motion at the sole discretion of the Board of Supervisors. Of the Mayor's four appointments, at least one must be a Housing Authority resident. Of the Board's three appointments, at least one must be a Housing Authority resident 62 years of age or older.

Non-Housing Assets

- The Housing Authority will (a) inventory non-housing assets, including the building at 1815 Egbert Street, vehicles, and other assets; (b) identify which assets are needed for ongoing operations; and (c) plan disposition of surplus assets in accordance with HUD requirements. Loans made by the City to the Housing Authority will be repaid from surplus funds from the disposition of assets, subject to HUD requirements.

SP-55 Barriers to affordable housing – 91.215(h)

Barriers to Affordable Housing

Based on the 2011 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing submitted to HUD, the following have been found to be barriers to affordable housing:

Impediments to Affordable Housing Development
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.
Impediments to Utilization of Assisted Housing Programs
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.
Impediments to Healthy Living in Low-Cost Market Rate Housing and SROs
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.
Impediments to Reducing Direct Discrimination

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.
Impediments Facing Seniors and Adults with Disabilities
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.
Impediments Due to Race/Ethnicity
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/a applicants.
Consistent underrepresentation of Latino/a and Hispanic households in City-supported rental housing
Applicants to BMR housing do not reflect the demographic mix of qualified San Francisco residents. Latino/a, 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.
Impediments Facing People with a Criminal Record
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, Latino/as, 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.
Impediments Facing Immigrants and People with Limited English Proficiency
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

The City of San Francisco's housing agencies work diligently to ensure that barriers to affordable housing are addressed. MOHCD 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, MOHCD 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 Production¹⁵³

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

¹⁵³ 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).

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 DPW 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

Street Outreach is a Core Component of the Homeless Response System in the HSH Strategic Framework. Coordinated Entry replaces single program waitlists and entry procedures that encourage people to get on as many lists as possible and then wait for assistance. A person experiencing homelessness or at risk of homelessness may go to an Access Point, such as a Resource Center. They may also be approached by a Street Outreach worker and be immediately assessed, using the standard assessment for all programs. Problem Solving assistance is offered to all, especially those newly homeless or at-risk. If homelessness can be prevented by returning to a safe place, that will be facilitated. If not, clients will be offered Temporary Shelter.

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

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 capability. 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.

Further since 2016, San Francisco has created and rapidly expanded the SAFE Center and Navigation Center portfolio in San Francisco.

The Navigation Center Model

San Francisco's first Navigation Center opened in March 2015 and was a successful pilot serving San Francisco's highly vulnerable and long-term unhoused neighbors who are often fearful of accessing traditional shelter and services. HSH subsequently opened 8 Navigation Centers and currently has 6 in operation. For more information, [click here](#).

San Francisco's Navigation Center model is being replicated nationally and, here in San Francisco, we are building on this best practice by developing SAFE Navigation Centers.

The SAFE Navigation Center Model

An evolution of Navigation Centers, SAFE Navigation Centers are low-threshold, high-service temporary shelter programs for adults experiencing homelessness in San Francisco. SAFE Navigation Centers are one part of the Homelessness Response System and are an attractive service for people living unsheltered or in encampments.

SAFE Navigation Centers are essential to reducing unsheltered homelessness and connecting guests to services and housing assistance. SAFE Navigation Centers build off of the best aspects of Navigation Centers while making them more scalable, sustainable, and effective. The City is looking to expand SAFE Navigation Centers in neighborhoods across the city to respond to the homelessness crisis and has

reviewed over 100 potential sites. For information on proposed Navigation Centers, visit: <http://hsh.sfgov.org/overview/notices/>

Effective

From the launch of Navigation Centers in 2015 through the end of 2018, 46% of Navigation Center exits were either to permanent housing or reunifications with family or friends through the Homeward Bound program. Over 5,000 clients have been served at Navigation Centers from 2015 to November 2019.

Access-Controlled

Navigation Centers and SAFE Navigation Centers do not accept walk-ins. All individuals and couples who enter have been selected by the SF Homeless Outreach Team or a centralized referral system. Because Navigation Centers operate 24x7, there are no lines outside in the evening, and guests are not exited onto the street in the morning.

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 prerequisite. 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

The HSH Strategic Framework endorses Problem Solving as a Core Component of the Homeless Response System. Problem Solving provides opportunities to prevent people from entering the Homelessness Response System and to redirect people who can resolve their homelessness without the need for ongoing support. It may offer a range of one-time assistance, including eviction prevention, legal services, relocation programs (Homeward Bound), family reunification, mediation, move in assistance, and flexible grants to address issues related to housing and employment

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 myriad challenges of homelessness, homeless response services and prevention program is grant-based and aligns 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 HSA and DPH, to align its strategies.

Through this program, MOHCD administers the ESG 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, individuals experiencing homelessness many times 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 City's 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. 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. DPH collaborates 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 DPH.

How are the actions listed above related to the extent of lead poisoning and hazards?

Fundamental to the response system, the DPH code enforcement unit 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 remediation services of lead hazards as part of its single-family home rehab loan program.

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.

In addition, MOHCD requires 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 Home Rehab program.

SP-70 Anti-Poverty Strategy – 91.215(j)

Jurisdiction Goals, Programs and Policies for reducing the number of Poverty-Level Families

Coordinated Entry

In August 2016, Mayor Edwin M. Lee launched HSH to fundamentally change the way the City and County of San Francisco addresses homelessness. HSH—relying on guidance from people experiencing homelessness, service providers, and other stakeholders in San Francisco—developed a Five-Year Strategic Framework outlining specific goals for HSH’s vision to make homelessness a rare, brief, and one-time event with the overall aim of significant, sustained reductions in homelessness. To accomplish this goal, HSH will coordinate alignment of all programs into a Homelessness Response System (HRS) that treats homelessness as an emergency to be responded to quickly and effectively. Please note that the Homelessness Response System covers the entire geographic region defined as the San Francisco CoC.

Coordinated Entry (CE) is a key component of this response system. CE is a consistent, community wide intake process to match people experiencing homelessness to available community resources that are the best fit for their situation. CE includes a clear set of entry points, a standardized method to assess and prioritize people needing assistance, and a streamlined process for rapidly connecting people to a housing solution. All homeless individuals and families in San Francisco will complete a standardized assessment process that considers the household’s situation and identifies the best type of housing intervention to address their needs. Permanent housing programs—including permanent supportive housing (PSH) and rapid rehousing (RRH)—will fill spaces in their programs from a community pool of eligible households generated from the standard assessment process. CE will also fully integrate into the Online Navigation and Entry (ONE) System—San Francisco’s implementation of the Homeless Management and Information System (HMIS). The assessment will build upon the standard intake and be entered directly into ONE and referrals to transitional and permanent housing will be made through the ONE System. This coordinated process will dramatically reduce the burden placed on people experiencing homelessness by removing the necessity to seek assistance from every provider separately and instead streamline access to all the resources in our Homelessness Response System.

HSH has launched Adult Coordinated Entry, Family Coordinated Entry and Coordinated Entry for Youth and their Community Access Points.

Healthy Retail SF

The grassroots activism to provide healthy food options in the Bayview District and the Tenderloin has led to institutional change within city government. In 2013, Supervisor Eric Mar introduced legislation that created Healthy Retail SF, which is led by OEWD’s Invest in Neighborhoods division, in conjunction with the DPH. San Francisco has about 1,150 food retail stores, about 1,000 are corner stores. This program supports these mom-and-pop businesses while providing healthy and affordable food access, especially to underserved neighborhoods.

In certain parts of the City, there is a lack of quality full-service neighborhood markets with fresh produce, and an overabundance of corner stores selling alcohol, tobacco, and highly processed foods that are high in salt, fat, and sugar and low in nutrients. In communities that lack supermarkets, families depend on corner stores for food purchases, and the choices at those stores are often limited to packaged food and very little, if any, fresh produce. For example, a 2011 assessment of 19 corner stores

in the City's Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood found that 20% of the stores stocked a variety of fresh fruits and vegetables, only 11% stocked whole grain bread, and only 37% stocked low-fat milk. The presence of a large number of stores selling low quality foods in a community can undermine public efforts to promote health and send a message that normalizes the use of unhealthy products in that neighborhood, placing these communities at greater risk for obesity and chronic disease. A high number of convenience stores per capita is associated with higher rates of mortality, diabetes, and obesity. Proximity to convenience stores within a neighborhood is associated with higher rates of obesity and diabetes. The impact of convenience stores on health is even greater in low-income neighborhoods.

Healthy Retail SF created an expert healthy retail advisory group, designed program structures and tools, and implements neighborhood wide outreach meetings with store owners. Each participating store receives an assessment and tailored 13-page Individualized Development Plan (IDP) that outlines activities, timelines, persons responsible and budget in three areas: business operations, physical changes to the store, and community engagement and marketing. Community Food Advocates called Food Guardians and Food Justice Leaders are a critical element of the model.

Healthy Retail SF provides funds for participating businesses to make improvements based on their IDP. Improvements include installation of equipment, community engagement and marketing support, technical assistance with sustainable business practices, and store space redesign. Participating businesses commit 35% of its selling area to fresh produce, whole grains, lean proteins, and low-fat dairy products, while limiting the sale of tobacco and alcohol to 20% of the selling space.

Homeowner Emergency Loan Program (HELP)

The purpose of the MOHCD HELP program is to assist San Francisco homeowners in need of a one-time emergency financial assistance loan due to an unforeseen financial hardship.

HELP Funds may be used for:

- Past due mortgage Payments
- Past due HOA monthly dues
- Past due property taxes
- Special assessments (e.g. renovation costs passed down to residents)
- BMR homeowners in need of financial assistance to complete necessary repairs in order to sell property

HOPE SF

HOPE SF is an ambitious cross-sector initiative to transform San Francisco's most distressed public housing sites into vibrant and healthy communities.

It began with a study. In 2005, the HSA released an analysis of at-risk families known as the "Seven Street Corners Study." The study came out of an effort to create a consolidated youth database with data from the child welfare and juvenile justice systems. When the data was walking distance of just seven street corners in the city — street corners that overlapped with obsolete public housing sites where families were living geographically, socially, and economically cut off from San Francisco's robust resources.

In response, Mayor Gavin Newsom set a bold vision of rebuilding dilapidated public housing developments into thriving mixed-income communities that integrated holistic family services, high quality schools, new businesses, public transportation, and green buildings. HOPE SF drew on more than

15 years of learning from HUD's HOPE VI housing revitalization program. However, unlike the HUD projects in which only a small percentage of residents returned to redeveloped housing sites, San Francisco committed to the principle that families would not be displaced.

In 2007, the mayor and Board of Supervisors secured \$95 million in local bond funding, an amount that eclipsed the nationwide HOPE VI funding for that year, to launch HOPE SF. From the beginning, the initiative brought together expertise from the public, nonprofit, and philanthropic sectors, working together to improve the lives of public housing residents and break the cycle of poverty.

Today, the City and County of San Francisco, the San Francisco Foundation, and Enterprise Community Partners collaborate on HOPE SF with the involvement of many organizations and longtime residents.

HOPE SF will rebuild four housing developments in three southeastern San Francisco neighborhoods: Hunters View and Alice Griffith in the Bayview, Potrero Terrace and Annex in Potrero Hill, and Sunnydale-Velasco in Visitacion Valley. Located in isolated and mostly undeveloped areas, these sites were originally built to temporarily house shipyard workers during and after World War II.

By tripling density, HOPE SF will replace 1,900 public housing units one-for-one and add low-income and market-rate units, ultimately building more than 5,300 homes at multiple levels of affordability. Construction is phased so that residents can remain on site and take part in the transformation of their communities.

Alice Griffith

Originally built in 1962 adjacent to the now-demolished Candlestick Park, Alice Griffith received a \$30.5 million HUD Choice Neighborhood Award in 2012 and is part of the Hunters Point Shipyard/Candlestick Point Neighborhood Development plan. In 2019, all original residents had been rehoused, achieving nearly 90% retention. Two more affordable projects, including 30 public housing replacement units, will be constructed in 2024-2025. Five Point, the Master developer, is responsible for developing market rate, inclusionary and workforce units. When completed, there will be expanded transit, retail and office space, a research and development campus, and over 300 acres of open space. The proposed total number of units will be 1,150.

Hunters View

Hunters View, originally built in 1956, was the first HOPE SF site to undergo revitalization. Perched on a grassy hill above the old naval shipyard, it has spectacular views of the San Francisco Bay. Of the original families, 70% were retained through the transition between public housing and mixed-income development. Amenities include open spaces, a community center, a childcare facility, a wellness center, a sound studio, and playgrounds. The Phase 3 — affordable and the first two phases of market-rate homes will break ground in 2020. The proposed total number of units will be 600.

Potrero Terrace and Annex

Home to nearly 1,300 people, Potrero Terrace and Potrero Annex — together known as Potrero — are two of the oldest public housing developments in San Francisco. Located at the southeastern edge of the Potrero Hill neighborhood, they were hastily constructed in 1941 and 1955. HOPE SF will rebuild both sections of the 38-acre site into a unified mixed-income development with buildings of varying heights and a park. Phase 1 — construction of the first 72 units was completed in February 2019. The proposed total number of units will be 1,400-1,600.

Sunnydale/Velasco

Sunnydale, San Francisco's largest public housing community, is undergoing a transformation into a mixed-income development of new affordable and market rate housing, street and utility infrastructure, and open spaces. Located at the foot of McLaren Park, the 50-acre site will also include an exciting neighborhood hub and the city's first recreation center in decades, a Boys & Girls Club, and early childhood education centers. The proposed total number of units will be 1,400-1,770.

Opportunities for All

Opportunities for All is a mayoral initiative to address economic inequality by ensuring that all young people can be a part of San Francisco's thriving economy. The initiative serves thousands of high school-aged youth who are ready and interested in working, as well as provides opportunities for youth who might need additional support, as part of Mayor Breed's efforts to provide paid internships for youth in San Francisco.

Opportunities for All connects young people to employment, training and post-secondary opportunities. Youth work an average of four weeks and earn \$15 per hour for up to 20 hours a week, receive mentorship, and visit local businesses to help them identify careers of interest and begin to plan for their future. Opportunities for All builds on existing work-based learning programs and funding. Across the globe, work-based programs are celebrated for preparing young people for work, keeping them engaged in school and promoting self-efficacy.

Opportunities for All works with the SFUSD, OEWD and DCYF to align efforts and recruit youth participants. This initiative also develops a framework where non-profit service providers and employers have shared understanding and language around work expectations for youth, track youth progress, and provide tools that help youth plan for their future.

Our Children Our Families Initiative

In November 2014, San Francisco voters approved Proposition C, the Children and Families First Initiative, which created the OCOF Council with the purpose of aligning strategies across City agencies, the School District, and community partners to improve the lives of children, youth, and their families. Prop C outlines OCOF's mandates in addition to extending the Public Education Enrichment Fund and the Children's Fund for another 25 years respectively.

OCOF Council knows that the challenges facing our children, youth and families; safety, housing stability, economic security, health, education, and employment, are interconnected and cannot be addressed in isolation. In order to achieve the impact we seek, we must work in partnership across all sectors. Our strategies involve a collective impact approach, where we work together in three key areas: data and research, training and capacity building and service delivery system improvement. These strategies will serve as a roadmap for our collaboration across the City, District and Community.

Data and Research

Data and research is at the heart of OCOF's work. We aim to use data to inform all decision making for OCOF's work but also to encourage and promote the use of data across all child and family serving systems.

Focus Areas:

- Convene a Data and Research Advisory Group: The purpose of this group will be to serve as an advisory body to OCOF around measuring the outcomes in the framework, as well as identifying data and research projects that align with OCOF outcomes.
- Monitoring outcomes measures: Develop a plan for monitoring the measures in the Outcomes Framework and informing policy and practice change.
- Support use of shared data for policy and program development: OCOF will use targeted data sharing across the city, school district and community to improve research, policy and/or practice. Work with various experts and stakeholders to develop policies and protocols that facilitate data sharing, as well as identifying existing shared data projects across the city that align and advance OCOF outcomes.

Training and Capacity Building

Strengthening the existing workforce and developing a strong pipeline of new employees across San Francisco through curriculum designed to build capacity and skills of the workforce to understand the impact of trauma on the lives of children, youth and families and develop the skills to build resilience and connection is critical to impacting the outcomes we seek to improve.

Focus Areas:

- Develop curriculum and pilot implementation plans: Develop implementation plans for 5 Training and Capacity Building pillars with a primary focus on a Healing City and a Welcoming City.
- Establish an evaluation plan for each pilot: Along with each pilot plan, the development of an evaluation plan will be necessary to demonstrate the challenges and successes for each pilot. This will inform the scaling and sustainability of the pilot.

Service Delivery System Improvement

Service delivery system improvement is at the heart of much of OCOF's mission. The activities for this strategy will focus on changes to systems in addition to service delivery and programs.

Focus Areas:

- Advance strategies that support service navigation: The goals of the service navigation focus area are to identify gaps and redundancies in services and to help families and service providers easily access available services from all agencies. Within this focus area, there are two components: a service inventory for system navigators and a family friendly service navigating website – www.sffamilies.org.
- Coordinating budgets to achieve shared outcomes: The goal of ultimately coordinating budgets across systems is so that efforts are coordinated to generate additional funding and blended resources are integrated into budget planning. An integral part of achieving coordinated budgets will be the Citywide Spending Analysis, which will determine where resources are spent on child and family serving programs. This will include a landscape of services that link the identified spending categories to specific services.
- Identify and support family friendly City policies and protocols: The goal of advancing protocols and policies that designate San Francisco a "Family Friendly City" is so that families are put at the center of decision making across the city, school district and community.
- Improve Citywide service coordination: The goal of this focus area is to identify gaps and redundancies across various collective impact efforts working with vulnerable children, youth and families in order to improve connections and eliminate duplication of efforts. OCOF will lead

and participate in efforts that bring together key decision makers to develop strategies to address service overlap and gaps related to service coordination within San Francisco.

San Francisco Financial Justice Project

The [San Francisco Financial Justice Project](#) is the nation's first effort embedded in government to assess and reform fines and fees that have a disproportionate and adverse impact on low-income residents and communities of color. Since its inception in 2016, the Project has worked with partners to eliminate or adjust dozens of fines and fees, and to lift millions of dollars in debt off of tens of thousands of low-income people. Housed in the Office of the San Francisco Treasurer, the Financial Justice Project has two main goals: First, to listen to community groups and local residents to identify fine and fee pain points. Second, to identify and implement doable solutions for government and the courts. Over the last three years, The Financial Justice Project has worked with dozens of community partners, city departments and the courts to enact a range of reforms. Read more [here](#) about The Financial Justice Project's reforms; and [here](#) is a list of fine and fee discounts for low-income San Franciscans.

Sector Based Approach to Workforce Development

The Workforce Development Division of OEED connects job seekers in San Francisco with employment opportunities in growing industries such as Technology, Health Care, Hospitality and Construction. We provide industry aligned job training and access to job search assistance at community-based neighborhood access points throughout the City, to help provide employers with skilled workers. See

Construction Training Programs

CityBuild Academy (CBA)

CityBuild Academy aims to meet the demands of the construction industry by providing comprehensive pre-apprenticeship and construction administration training to San Francisco residents. CityBuild began in 2006 as an effort to coordinate City-wide construction training and employment programs and is administered by OEWD in partnership with City College of San Francisco, various community non-profit organizations, labor unions, and industry employers.

Construction Administration & Professional Service Academy (CAPSA)

The Construction Administration and Professional Service Academy (CAPSA) is a semester-long program offered at the City College of San Francisco, Mission Campus. The program prepares San Francisco residents for entry-level careers as professional construction office administrators.

CityBuild Women's Mentorship Program

The CityBuild Women's Mentorship Program is a volunteer program that connects women construction leaders with experienced professionals and student-mentors who offer a myriad of valuable resources: professional guidance; peer support; life-skills coaching; networking opportunities; and access to community resources.

Health Care Training Program

Launched in January 2010, the HealthCare Academy falls under OEWD's sector strategy and is designed to improve the responsiveness of the workforce system to meet the demands of the growing industry. Through a dual customer approach, the HealthCare Academy provides employers with skilled workers while expanding employment opportunities for local residents.

The health care industry and health care occupations have been identified both nationally and locally as a priority for workforce investment due to stable and/or increasing demand for new workers, replacement of retirees, and skills development in response to new technologies and treatment options, as well as evolving service delivery options (including local and federal health care initiatives, such as the Affordable Care Act). Because the health care sector encompasses occupations in such a wide variety of settings and requires various levels of education and skill, it presents excellent opportunities for a broad spectrum of local jobseekers.

The HealthCare Academy engages with industry partners to identify key needs of the industry, including skill requirements, vetting and approving a programmatic framework, review of training curriculum, identifying partnership opportunities, and providing programmatic oversight of any workforce programs related to the health care sector. Collaborative partners include the San Francisco Hospital Council, the DPH (and affiliated hospitals), SEIU-UHW West, UC Berkely's Center for the Public Health Practice, California Health Workforce Initiative, and industry employers: California Pacific Medical Center, Dignity Health, Kaiser Permanente, San Francisco Community Clinics Consortium, Chinese Hospital and Homebridge.

Hospitality Training Program

The Hospitality Initiative, launched in 2011, was designed to effectively coordinate training and employment resources that support the growth of a diverse and well-qualified hospitality sector workforce in San Francisco. In support of this goal are the following objectives: To prepare San Francisco residents for training and employment opportunities in the hospitality sector; to fulfill hiring needs of hospitality sector employers with qualified candidates that are job ready, possess the skills and abilities to perform job duties, and hold knowledge and passion for the industry; to educate workforce system service providers and jobseekers about the hospitality industry and to provide them with relevant and current information on connecting to jobs, careers, and/or relevant training.

Industry partnerships play a critical role in establishing sector programming. Collaborative partners include San Francisco Hotel Council (and affiliated members), Golden Gate Restaurant Association (and affiliated members), San Francisco Travel, Moscone Center, City College of San Francisco, SFUSD, Unite Here Local 2, and community based organizations and industry employers.

Technology Training Program

Launched in 2012, TechSF is an initiative of OEWD designed to provide education, training and employment assistance to locals who are interested in landing a job within San Francisco's tech sector. TechSF is committed to:

- Providing tech training, free of charge, to San Francisco residents who are interested in landing a job in a tech occupation;
- Partnering with educators, training organizations and employers to ensure our participants have opportunities to skill up and land in a job;
- Ensuring our trainings meet local employer demand; and
- Ensuring our participants are trained not only in in-demand technical skills, but also receive career readiness supports.

TechSF aims to ensure that a highly-skilled and diverse talent pool connects to, and thrive in, opportunities in tech while meeting industry talent needs. Careers in tech are not solely isolated to the tech sector. TechSF believes that the skills learned in TechSF training programs can open doors to working in a tech job in many different industries.

TechSF provides opportunities for anyone interested in a career in technology. From the exploratory tech learner to the well-versed programmer who is looking to gain a competitive edge, TechSF has opportunities to step outside your comfort zone.

The TechSF Apprenticeship Accelerator offers job seekers the unique opportunity to acquire essential experience and training to get established in a career in tech.

TechSF provides the opportunity to connect directly with Tech Sector employers through exposure and networking events.

Smart Money Coaching Program

The Smart Money Coaching program by the Office of Financial Empowerment provides free, confidential, one-on-one, personalized financial guidance. A certified financial coach helps households to address financial challenges and goals, including reducing debt, establishing and improving credit score, opening a safe and affordable bank account, and increasing savings. Smart Money Coaching has locations throughout San Francisco and is available to anyone living, working or receiving services in San Francisco. This initiative is funded through MOHCD, HSA, DAAS, and the Treasurer's Office. These services are available at over twenty sites on a regular basis, including HOPE SF and RAD housing sites, the San Francisco Main Library, and at nonprofit partners of MOHCD and other city departments.

Tenant Right to Counsel: San Francisco's Eviction Defense System

San Francisco voters passed the "No Eviction Without Representation Act of 2018," then-known as Proposition F, on June 5, 2018. This local law went into effect on July 11, 2019. It establishes a policy that all residential tenants facing eviction have a right to legal representation, known as a tenant right to counsel. The ballot initiative that brought about the local law did not create a revenue source to fund the Tenant Right to Counsel (TRC) program. However, through the City's budget process, the Mayor and Board of Supervisors have significantly increased funding for the TRC program since its passage. MOHCD allocated \$9.6 million in Fiscal Year 2019-2020 (July 1, 2019-June 30, 2020) to the TRC program.

Legal representation is provided by a network of nine City-funded legal services organizations (with a combined 47 attorneys supported by social workers & paralegals) and is subject to availability. During the first six months of implementation (July-December 2019), the TRC program provided the mandated full-scope legal representation to approximately two-thirds of all tenant households who availed themselves of assistance. The remaining one-third received limited legal services, including *pro per* assistance with completing the prescribed court form that must be filed at the court within five calendar days of being served with the eviction lawsuit in order to assert their defense, and limited-scope representation during the mandatory, pre-trial settlement conference.

The TRC program is providing full-scope legal representation to an unprecedented number of tenants facing eviction. Program-level data and other relevant studies suggest that full-scope legal representation get far superior results for clients than limited legal services. In San Francisco, approximately 67% of clients receiving full-scope legal representation stay in their homes, as compared to less than 40% of clients receiving limited-scope legal representation.

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 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. OEWD will administer CDBG economic development and workforce development activities. HSH will administer the ESG program.

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, HSH 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, through a work order with MOHCD, the City's Office of Labor Standards and Enforcement will monitor construction projects for labor standards compliance related to the Davis-Bacon regulations. The City's Contract Monitoring Division will monitor for non-discrimination and Small Business Enterprise (SBE) requirements in contracting. MOHCD will monitor for access requirements related to Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act and the Americans With Disabilities Act.

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/HSH/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/HSH/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/HSH Staff and Delegate Agencies

MOHCD, OEWD and HSH will continue to invest in the training of its staff to build internal capacity so that MOHCD, OEWD and HSH 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. HSH will train MOHCD, OEWD and all stakeholders on Housing First and coordinated entry. Service coordination cross CCSF departments, nonprofits, community-based organizations, etc. is essential in maximizing resources and funding to have make progress in reducing and ending homelessness.

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, HSH and OEWD consider monitoring performance to be as important as identifying their goals. The 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, HSH and OEWD have designed a funding and indicators of success table to ensure that community development and housing activities align with the Consolidated Plan's strategic goals. A five-year indicators of success table will be used to assess investment outcomes and outputs across the 2020–2024 timeframe of the Consolidated Plan. Performance under each indicator will be tracked against a five-year goal and a one-year goal. Using the indicators table as a guide, MOHCD, HSH 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 Expected Resources

AP-15 Expected Resources – 91.220(c)(1,2)

Introduction

See SP-35 section.

Anticipated Resources

See SP-35 section.

Explain how federal funds will leverage those additional resources (private, state and local funds), including a description of how matching requirements will be satisfied

See SP-35 section.

If appropriate, describe publically owned land or property located within the jurisdiction that may be used to address the needs identified in the plan

See SP-35 section.

Discussion

See SP-35 section.

Annual Goals and Objectives

AP-20 Annual Goals and Objectives

Goals Summary Information

See SP-45 section, Table 76 – 2020-2024 Five-Year Funding and Indicators of Success Table

Projects

AP-35 Projects – 91.220(d)

Introduction

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.

2020–2021 CDBG Projects

This list of CDBG-funded projects is organized by five-year objectives, priority needs and goals that are described in the 2020–2024 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 Accessible and Affordable Housing

- Goal 1Ai. Create more affordable housing

Agency Name	Project Description	CDBG Funding Amount
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	Housing development pool – Multi-family (includes \$5,000,000 in CDBG program income)	\$10,803,410
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	Housing program delivery	\$675,000
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	Housing development pool – Single-family (includes \$500,000 in CDBG program income)	\$500,000
Subtotal		\$11,978,410

Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed

➤ Priority Need 1B: Make Housing More Affordable

- Goal 1Biii. Increase opportunities for sustainable homeownership

Agency Name	Project Description	CDBG Funding Amount
Mission Economic Development Agency	Pre-purchase homeownership counseling and information and referral services	\$150,000
Mission Economic Development Agency	Post-purchase homeownership counseling and information and referral services	\$34,520
San Francisco Housing Development Corporation	Pre-purchase homeownership counseling and information and referral services	\$150,000
Subtotal		\$334,520

Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed

➤ Priority Need 1D: Provide Services to Maintain Housing Stability

- Goal 1Di. Reduce rate of evictions

Agency Name	Project Description	CDBG Funding Amount
Causa Justa :: Just Cause	Tenant counseling and education services	\$558,450
Eviction Defense Collaborative, Inc.	Legal advice and representation for all San Franciscans facing eviction	\$1,581,337
San Francisco Study Center, Incorporated, fiscal sponsor of	Tenant counseling and education services	\$569,500

Agency Name	Project Description	CDBG Funding Amount
the Housing Rights Committee of San Francisco		
Tenderloin Housing Clinic, Inc.	Legal advice and representation for all San Franciscans facing eviction	\$995,331
	Subtotal	\$3,704,618

Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed

➤ **Priority Need 1D: Provide Services to Maintain Housing Stability**

- **Goal 1Dii. Increase access to services for residents of public and publicly subsidized housing, RAD projects, HOPWA subsidized housing, and single room occupancy hotels**

Agency Name	Project Description	CDBG Funding Amount
Bayview Hunters Point Multipurpose Senior Services, Inc.	Housing retention and case management services at HOPE SF sites	\$202,000
Chinatown Community Development Center, Inc.	Service connection for residents of single room occupancy hotels	\$148,750
Gum Moon Residence Hall	Service connection and skill-building for residents of single room occupancy hotel	\$80,000
Mercy Housing California	Activities and field trips for Sunnydale youth	\$48,000
Young Community Developers, Inc.	College preparation and academic skill-building for Alice Griffith youth	\$50,000
Young Men's Christian Association of San Francisco (Bayview Branch)	Service connection and case management for residents of Hunters View and Sunnydale	\$346,297
Young Men's Christian Association of San Francisco (Chinatown Branch)	Service connection for residents of single room occupancy hotels	\$48,000
	Subtotal	\$923,047

Objective 2: Families and Individuals are Resilient and Economically Self-Sufficient

➤ **Priority Need 2A: Promote Workforce Development**

- **Goal 2Ai. Provide access to employment opportunities across multiple sectors for unemployed and underemployed populations**

Agency Name	Project Description	CDBG Funding Amount
America Works of California, Inc.	Reentry-focused Specialized Access Point	\$150,000
Central City Hospitality House	Neighborhood Access Point	\$200,000
Central City Hospitality House	Job Readiness Services	\$100,000
Community Housing Partnership	Job Readiness Services	\$75,000
Community Housing Partnership	Occupational Skills Training for the Hospitality Sector	\$56,250

Agency Name	Project Description	CDBG Funding Amount
Compass Family Services	Job Readiness Services	\$75,000
Episcopal Community Services of San Francisco	Occupational Skills Training for the Hospitality Sector	\$56,250
Five Keys Schools and Programs	Job Readiness Services	\$70,000
Homebridge, Inc.	Occupational Skills Training for the Health Care Sector	\$60,000
Office of Economic and Workforce Development	Workforce development program delivery	\$90,000
PRC	Disability-focused Specialized Access Point	\$100,000
San Francisco Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender Community Center	Job Readiness Services	\$110,000
The Arc San Francisco	Disability-focused Specialized Access Point	\$75,000
Upwardly Global	Immigrant-focused Specialized Access Point	\$7,500
Young Community Developers, Inc.	Neighborhood Access Point	\$330,029
	Subtotal	\$1,555,029

Objective 2: Families and Individuals are Resilient and Economically Self-Sufficient

➤ **Priority Need 2B: Increase opportunities through improved language access and core skills development**

• **Goal 2Bii. Provide skill development and training resources**

Agency Name	Project Description	CDBG Funding Amount
Episcopal Community Services of San Francisco	Skills training, service connection, short-term case management, and case coordination for homeless residents	\$64,000
Good Samaritan Family Resource Center of San Francisco	ESL training, early childhood education, and family support for Latino immigrants	\$52,000
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	Program delivery for direct services	\$45,000
Mission Neighborhood Centers, Inc.	Educational support for TAY and adult residents in southeast San Francisco	\$52,000
Wu Yee Children's Services	Service connection for low-income monolingual immigrant Chinese families	\$96,000
Young Men's Christian Association of San Francisco (Chinatown Branch)	Service connection for Chinese immigrants	\$212,000
Young Men's Christian Association of San Francisco (Urban Services Branch)	Service connection and case management for API residents of District 11 and citywide	\$240,000
	Subtotal	\$761,000

Objective 2: Families and Individuals are Resilient and Economically Self-Sufficient➤ **Priority Need 2B: Increase opportunities through improved language access and core skills development**

- **Goal 2Biii. Improve financial literacy and personal finance management**

Agency Name	Project Description	CDBG Funding Amount
Mission Economic Development Agency	Financial capability services for low-income, Latinx and immigrant families	\$52,000
	Subtotal	\$52,000

Objective 3: Communities Have Healthy Physical, Social and Business Infrastructure➤ **Priority Need 3A: Enhance community facilities and spaces**

- **Goal 3Ai. Ensure nonprofit service providers have high quality, stable facilities**

Agency Name	Project Description	CDBG Funding Amount
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	Capital grant pool	\$196,780
	Subtotal	\$196,780

Objective 3: Communities Have Healthy Physical, Social and Business Infrastructure➤ **Priority Need 3B: Strengthen Small Businesses and Commercial Corridors**

- **Goal 3Bi. Encourage the development and sustainability of thriving locally-owned businesses**

Agency Name	Project Description	CDBG Funding Amount
ASIAN, Inc.	Technical assistance for multilingual small businesses and microenterprises	\$38,869
Children's Council of San Francisco	Home-based training for Spanish-speaking childcare entrepreneurs	\$55,000
La Cocina, Inc.	Kitchen incubator and technical assistance for food-based microentrepreneurs	\$70,000
Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights of the San Francisco Bay Area	Legal services for entrepreneurs	\$100,000
Main Street Launch	Workshops for African American business owners in Bayview	\$15,000
Main Street Launch	Workshops for African American business owners in Lower Fillmore	\$15,000
Main Street Launch	Revolving Loan Fund and Emerging Business Loan Fund	\$39,869
Mission Asset Fund	Small business loans and financial coaching	\$70,000
Mission Economic Development Agency	Technical assistance for Mission Street (16th-25th) commercial corridor businesses	\$30,000
Mission Economic Development Agency	Technical assistance for Bernal Heights commercial corridor businesses	\$20,000

Agency Name	Project Description	CDBG Funding Amount
Mission Economic Development Agency	Technical assistance in English and Spanish for microentrepreneurs	\$75,000
Office of Economic and Workforce Development	San Francisco Revolving Loan Fund	\$700,000
Renaissance Entrepreneurship Center	Technical assistance for microentrepreneurs	\$75,000
Renaissance Entrepreneurship Center	Technical assistance in English and Spanish to women entrepreneurs	\$40,000
Renaissance Entrepreneurship Center	Technical assistance to entrepreneurs in Bayview Hunters Point	\$40,000
Renaissance Entrepreneurship Center	Technical assistance to businesses on Bayview Third Street corridor	\$20,000
San Francisco Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender Community Center	Technical assistance, credit-building microloans, workshops and mentorship	\$70,000
San Francisco Small Business Development Center	Technical assistance for small businesses	\$200,000
Self-Help for the Elderly	Neighborhood commercial revitalization services	\$15,000
SFMade, Inc.	Technical assistance for local manufacturers	\$65,000
Southeast Asian Community Center	Technical assistance for Sunset commercial corridor businesses	\$20,000
Southeast Asian Community Center	Technical assistance in English and Chinese for small businesses citywide	\$75,000
Southeast Asian Community Center	Technical assistance in English and Chinese for small businesses in Visitacion Valley	\$15,000
Southeast Asian Community Center	Technical assistance for Tenderloin, Central Market and SoMa commercial corridor businesses	\$20,000
Start Small Think Big Inc	Technical assistance for small businesses	\$55,000
Wu Yee Children's Services	Technical assistance for childcare businesses	\$100,000
	Subtotal	\$2,038,738

Objective 3: Communities Have Healthy Physical, Social and Business Infrastructure

➤ Priority Need 3B: Strengthen Small Businesses and Commercial Corridors

- Goal 3Bii. Support the development and sustainability of robust commercial corridors in low-income neighborhoods

Agency Name	Project Description	CDBG Funding Amount
Bay Area Community Resources, Inc., fiscal sponsor of Portola Neighborhood Association	Portola San Bruno Avenue commercial corridor revitalization	\$70,000

Agency Name	Project Description	CDBG Funding Amount
Excelsior Action Group	Excelsior Small Business Resiliency Project	\$46,561
Kultivate Labs	SoMa Mission Street commercial corridor beautification	\$31,785
Mission Economic Development Agency	Excelsior/Outer Mission commercial corridor revitalization	\$20,000
Mission Economic Development Agency	Mission Street commercial corridor revitalization	\$15,000
North of Market Neighborhood Improvement Corporation	Tenderloin commercial corridor revitalization	\$80,000
North of Market Neighborhood Improvement Corporation	Technical assistance to the Tenderloin Merchant Association	\$20,000
North of Market/Tenderloin Community Benefit Corporation	Tenderloin commercial corridor beautification	\$31,785
Ocean Avenue Association	Ocean Avenue commercial corridor revitalization and technical assistance	\$40,000
Renaissance Entrepreneurship Center	Technical assistance to Lower Fillmore commercial corridor small businesses	\$20,000
	Subtotal	\$375,131

Administration Costs

Agency Name	Project Description	CDBG Funding Amount
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	General CDBG administration and planning	\$3,727,326
	Subtotal	\$3,727,326

TOTAL 2020-2021 CDBG: \$25,646,599

2020–2021 ESG Projects

This list of ESG-funded projects is organized by five-year objectives, priority needs and goals that are described in the 2020–2024 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 1C: Prevent and Reduce Homelessness

• Goal 1Cii. Reduce homelessness for adults, youth and families

Agency Name	Project Description	ESG Funding Amount
Catholic Charities CYO of the Archdiocese of San Francisco	Homelessness prevention services	\$212,943
Central City Hospitality House	Emergency shelter essential services	\$73,000
Community Awareness & Treatment Services, Inc.	Emergency shelter essential services	\$55,000
Compass Family Services	Emergency shelter essential services	\$96,000
Compass Family Services	Homelessness prevention services	\$53,944
Dolores Street Community Services, Inc.	Emergency shelter essential services	\$55,000
Episcopal Community Services of San Francisco	Emergency shelter operations	\$89,000
Episcopal Community Services of San Francisco	Rapid rehousing services	\$53,943
Hamilton Families	Emergency shelter essential services	\$55,000
Hamilton Families	Rapid rehousing services	\$191,943
Homeless Children's Network	Emergency shelter essential services	\$55,000
La Casa de las Madres	Emergency shelter essential services	\$165,000
Larkin Street Youth Services	Emergency shelter essential services	\$112,000
Mission Area Health Associates, dba Mission Neighborhood Health Center	Homelessness prevention services	\$55,943
Providence Foundation of San Francisco	Emergency shelter essential services	\$50,000
The San Francisco Particular Council of the Society of St.	Emergency shelter operations	\$50,000

Agency Name	Project Description	ESG Funding Amount
Vincent de Paul, dba St. Vincent de Paul Society of San Francisco		
	Subtotal	\$1,423,716

Administration Costs

Agency Name	Project Description	ESG Funding Amount
Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing	General ESG administration	\$81,171
Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing	HMIS	\$60,622
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	General ESG administration	\$29,914
	Subtotal	\$171,707

TOTAL 2020-2021 ESG: \$1,595,423

2020–2021 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 2020–2024 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 More Affordable

- Goal 1Bii. Increase affordability of rental housing

Agency Name	Project Description	CDBG Funding Amount
Catholic Charities CYO of the Archdiocese of San Francisco	Services Associated with HIV/AIDS Long-Term Rental Subsidy Program	\$261,016
	Subtotal	\$261,016

Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed

➤ Priority Need 1D: Provide Services to Maintain Housing Stability

- Goal 1Dii. Increase access to services for residents of public and publicly subsidized housing, RAD projects, HOPWA subsidized housing, and single room occupancy hotels

Agency Name	Project Description	HOPWA Funding Amount
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	Housing information and referral project	\$48,000
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	Long term rental subsidy and housing advocacy program for persons with HIV/AIDS	\$3,153,166
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	Operating costs for a residence for persons with HIV/AIDS	\$50,000
Rafiki Coalition for Health and Wellness	Transitional housing for persons with HIV/AIDS	\$50,000
	Subtotal	\$3,301,166

Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed

➤ Priority Need 1D: Provide Services to Maintain Housing Stability

- Goal 1Div. Increase collaboration between healthcare and housing systems by increasing mobility between levels of care (high to low acuity) in residential settings for HIV+ households

Agency Name	Project Description	HOPWA Funding Amount
Catholic Charities CYO of the Archdiocese of San Francisco	RCF-CI (Residential Care Facility for the Chronically Ill) for people with HIV/AIDS	\$326,488

Agency Name	Project Description	HOPWA Funding Amount
Catholic Charities CYO of the Archdiocese of San Francisco	RCF-CI (Residential Care Facility for the Chronically Ill) for people with HIV/AIDS	\$758,187
Catholic Charities CYO of the Archdiocese of San Francisco	Partial rental subsidy program for people with HIV/AIDS (includes \$100,000 in HOPWA reprogrammed funds)	\$100,000
Dolores Street Community Services, Inc.	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	Capital pool - HOPWA (includes \$1,200,000 in HOPWA program income and \$1,900,000 in HOPWA reprogrammed funds)	\$3,200,992
	Subtotal	\$5,705,328

Administration Costs

Agency Name	Project Description	HOPWA Funding Amount
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	General HOPWA administration	\$187,654
	Subtotal	\$187,654

TOTAL 2020-2021 SAN FRANCISCO HOPWA: \$9,455,164

San Mateo HOPWA Projects

Agency Name	Project Description	HOPWA Funding Amount
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	\$28,350
San Mateo: Mental Health Association of San Mateo	Project sponsor administrative expenses	\$ 43,679
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	\$25,000
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	\$ 565,654
San Mateo: San Mateo County STD/HIV Program	Comprehensive case management and community-based services for very low-income persons with HIV/AIDS	\$149,382
	Subtotal	\$812,065

TOTAL 2020-2021 SAN MATEO HOPWA: \$812,065

TOTAL 2020-2021 HOPWA: \$10,267,229

2020–2021 HOME Projects

This list of HOME-funded projects is organized by five-year objectives, priority needs and goals that are described in the 2020–2024 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 Accessible and Affordable Housing

• Goal 1Ai. Create more affordable housing

Agency Name	Project Description	HOME Funding Amount
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	Housing development pool – HOME (includes \$2,400,748 in HOME program income)	\$7,113,853
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	Housing development grants for CHDOs	\$150,000
	Subtotal	\$7,263,853

General Administration

Agency Name	Project Description	HOME Funding Amount
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	General HOME administration	\$539,268
	Subtotal	\$539,268

TOTAL 2020-2021 HOME: \$7,803,121

2020–2021 CDBG-CV (CARES Act) Projects (Round 1)

This list of CDBG CARES Act-funded projects is organized by five-year objectives, priority needs and goals that are described in the 2020–2024 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 More Affordable

- Goal 1Bii. Increase affordability of rental housing

Agency Name	Project Description	CDBG Funding Amount
Catholic Charities CYO of the Archdiocese of San Francisco	Rental assistance program related to COVID-19 response and recovery	\$375,000
Eviction Defense Collaborative, Inc.	Rental assistance program related to COVID-19 response and recovery	\$1,875,000
Q Foundation (dba AIDS Housing Alliance)	Rental assistance program related to COVID-19 response and recovery	\$375,000
Young Community Developers, Inc.	Rental assistance program related to COVID-19 response and recovery	\$375,000
	Subtotal	\$3,000,000

Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed

➤ Priority Need 1C: Prevent and Reduce Homelessness

- Goal 1Cii. Reduce homelessness for adults, youth and families

Agency Name	Project Description	CDBG Funding Amount
San Francisco Human Services Agency	Staffing and basic supplies costs at up to 22 non-congregate shelters for COVID-19 response	\$7,972,734
	Subtotal	\$7,972,734

TOTAL CDBG-CV Round 1: \$10,972,734

2020–2021 ESG-CV (CARES Act) Projects (Rounds 1 and 2)

This list of ESG CARES Act-funded projects is organized by five-year objectives, priority needs and goals that are described in the 2020–2024 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 1C: Prevent and Reduce Homelessness

- Goal 1Cii. Reduce homelessness for adults, youth and families

Agency Name	Project Description	ESG Funding Amount
Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing	Essential services and operations at Safe Sleeping Villages and other emergency shelter sites. 335 clients for 30 days. Average Safe Sleeping cost is approximately \$266 per bed per night	\$2,676,459
Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing	COVID-related PPE and supplies and materials for HSH facility team operating shelters and for nonprofit shelter and homeless services providers	\$75,000
Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing	Essential Services and Operations for Shelter in Place (SIP) Hotels. 359 clients for 30 days. Average SIP Hotel costs is approximately \$255 per bed per night	\$2,750,000
	Subtotal	\$5,501,459

TOTAL ESG-CV Round 1: \$5,501,459

Agency Name	Project Description	ESG Funding Amount
Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing	Essential Services and Operations for Shelter in Place (SIP) Hotels. Estimated 468 clients. Average SIP Hotel costs is approximately \$255 per bed per night.	\$43,605,003
	Subtotal	\$43,605,003

TOTAL ESG-CV Round 2: \$43,605,003

2020–2021 HOPWA-CV (CARES Act) Projects (Round 1)

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-CV Projects

This list of HOPWA CARES Act-funded projects is organized by five-year objectives, priority needs and goals that are described in the 2020–2024 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 More Affordable**

- **Goal 1Bii. Increase affordability of rental housing**

Agency Name	Project Description	HOPWA-CV Funding Amount
Catholic Charities CYO of the Archdiocese of San Francisco	Increased rental subsidies; prevention and education in alignment with the City's COVID-19 prevention efforts; case management and assistance in accessing essential services and supplies such as food, water, medications, medical care, and information; meals, groceries, and delivery of food; and, personal protective equipment for clients of a long-term rental subsidy program that serves people living with HIV/AIDS	\$200,000
	Subtotal	\$200,000

Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed

➤ **Priority Need 1D: Provide Services to Maintain Housing Stability**

- **Goal 1Dii. Increase access to services for residents of public and publicly subsidized housing, RAD projects, HOPWA subsidized housing, and single room occupancy hotels**

Agency Name	Project Description	HOPWA-CV Funding Amount
Mercy Housing California XVII, A California Limited Partnership	Prevention and education in alignment with the City's COVID-19 prevention efforts; case management and assistance in accessing essential services and supplies such as food, water, medications, medical care, and information; rental subsidies; meals, groceries, and delivery of food; and, personal protective equipment for residents of a transitional housing facility for persons with HIV/AIDS	\$60,304

Agency Name	Project Description	HOPWA-CV Funding Amount
Rafiki Coalition for Health and Wellness	Prevention and education in alignment with the City's COVID-19 prevention efforts; case management and assistance in accessing essential services and supplies such as food, water, medications, medical care, and information; rental subsidies; meals, groceries, and delivery of food; and, personal protective equipment for residents of a transitional housing facility for persons with HIV/AIDS	\$110,000
Subtotal		\$170,304

Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed

➤ **Priority Need 1D: Provide Services to Maintain Housing Stability**

- **Goal 1Div. Increase collaboration between healthcare and housing systems by increasing mobility between levels of care (high to low acuity) in residential settings for HIV+ households**

Agency Name	Project Description	HOPWA-CV Funding Amount
Catholic Charities CYO of the Archdiocese of San Francisco	Prevention and education in alignment with the City's COVID-19 prevention efforts; case management and assistance in accessing essential services and supplies such as food, water, medications, medical care, and information; rental subsidies; meals, groceries, and delivery of food; and, personal protective equipment for residents of a residential care facility for persons with HIV/AIDS	\$130,000
Catholic Charities CYO of the Archdiocese of San Francisco	Prevention and education in alignment with the City's COVID-19 prevention efforts; case management and assistance in accessing essential services and supplies such as food, water, medications, medical care, and information; rental subsidies; meals, groceries, and delivery of food; and, personal protective equipment for residents of a residential care facility for persons with HIV/AIDS	\$110,000
Dolores Street Community Services, Inc.	Prevention and education in alignment with the City's COVID-19 prevention efforts; case management and assistance in accessing essential services and supplies such as food, water, medications, medical care, and information; rental subsidies;	\$100,000

Agency Name	Project Description	HOPWA-CV Funding Amount
	meals, groceries, and delivery of food; and, personal protective equipment for residents of a residential care facility for persons with HIV/AIDS	
Larkin Street Youth Services	Prevention and education in alignment with the City's COVID-19 prevention efforts; case management and assistance in accessing essential services and supplies such as food, water, medications, medical care, and information; rental subsidies; meals, groceries, and delivery of food; and, personal protective equipment for residents of a residential care facility for persons with HIV/AIDS	\$110,000
Maitri Compassionate Care	Prevention and education in alignment with the City's COVID-19 prevention efforts; case management and assistance in accessing essential services and supplies such as food, water, medications, medical care, and information; rental subsidies; meals, groceries, and delivery of food; and, personal protective equipment for residents of a residential care facility for persons with HIV/AIDS	\$90,000
	Subtotal	\$540,000

TOTAL SAN FRANCISCO HOPWA-CV: \$910,304

San Mateo HOPWA Projects

Agency Name	Project Description	HOPWA-CV Funding Amount
San Mateo HOPWA Program	Increased Rent Subsidies and Emergency Financial Assistance Fund provides emergency assistance to clients for expenses such as: utility bills, minor home repairs, assistance in purchasing furniture and equipment, etc.	\$118,179
	Subtotal	\$118,179

TOTAL SAN MATEO CARES Act HOPWA-CV: \$118,179

TOTAL HOPWA-CV: \$1,028,483

2020–2021 Projects Supported by Other Funding Sources

Please note that as of June 15, 2020, projects to be funded by non-federal funding sources have not yet been finalized.

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. Through a comprehensive needs assessment process, San Francisco has identified a number of cross-cutting community needs and concerns that span neighborhoods and constituencies. These include:

- Among the concerns identified during community engagement, San Francisco stakeholders are most frequently concerned about displacement, increasing housing prices, the overall cleanliness and safety of their neighborhoods, and transit accessibility.
- Participants in MOHCD's community engagement identified that services to support self-sufficiency and stability are as important as the need for housing itself.
- Many stakeholders expressed a prominent need for culturally inclusive and culturally-specific services.
- Participants expressed a need for greater awareness of, navigation of, and access to available services, including both housing and other supportive services.
- Stakeholders expressed a desire for more inclusive and relaxed standards around affordable housing eligibility.
- Many community members voiced the need for more opportunities to provide input on the City's housing eligibility policies as well as participate in the development of affordable housing programs.
- Stakeholders asked for more streamlined services, improved inter-agency collaboration, and stronger cross-agency communication to support the delivery of both housing and supportive services.

San Francisco proposes to allocate HUD CARES Act funding to meet the most urgent needs related to preventing and responding to the coronavirus, which include rental assistance; non-congregate shelters; essential services and shelter for unsheltered individuals; and essential services for persons living with HIV/AIDS.

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 areas of minority concentration; and City designated Invest in Neighborhoods Commercial Districts, Community Benefit Districts, Opportunity Neighborhoods, and Cultural Districts. HUD funds will be primarily directed in NRSAs and in areas of low- and moderate-income and minority concentration. See Map 14 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; childcare and public service support.

MOHCD is requesting renewal for all six of the current NRSA designations in San Francisco's 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan, as provided for at 24 CFR 91.215(g) and CPD Notice CPD-16-16.

Areas of Low- and Moderate-Income Concentration

HUD calculates low- and moderate-income concentration by census block groups. See Map 14 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 2017 ACS 5-Year Estimates, 59.16% of the City's population is identified as

being composed of minorities, and therefore any census tract in which 79.16% of the population is classified as minority would qualify as an Area of Minority Concentration. See Map 14.

Invest In Neighborhoods Commercial Districts

Invest In Neighborhoods (IIN) is a division within OEWD that implements programs focused on neighborhood commercial district planning, management, safety, and vibrancy. The strategies deployed are intended to advance opportunities for all. The division implements programs and services with the support of community partners to increase quality of life and economic opportunities within neighborhoods and commercial corridors. IIN seeks to advance economic opportunities in the City's neighborhoods using strategies centered on diversity, equity, and inclusion to ensure increased quality of life and prosperity for all residents.

The division's guiding objectives are to build community capacity, fortify neighborhoods and their economies, improve physical conditions and strengthen small businesses. Some of the services offered support small business assistance, safety and cleanliness, physical improvements to buildings or spaces, positive activation of public spaces and engagement of residents along targeted corridors throughout the city. IIN programs and services are intended to maximize impact within five strategic areas: small businesses, storefronts and buildings, commercial corridors, public spaces and neighborhoods. A comprehensive approach to stabilization of neighborhoods and commercial districts is best aligned with our neighborhood strategic area of impact.

Services provided under the impact area for neighborhoods are streamlined under three programs: Community Benefit Districts, Opportunity Neighborhoods and Cultural Districts.

Community Benefit Districts

The Community Benefit District (CBD) Program provides technical assistance for management plan and engineer's report development, district establishment, and operational support to improve the overall quality of life in targeted commercial districts and mixed-use neighborhoods through partnerships between the City and local communities.

OEWD oversees 18 local community benefit districts in the City. Each CBD is managed by a non-profit agency. Community Benefit Districts are required to complete an annual report that outlines the year's achievements and financials including income, expense, asset, liabilities, new assets, and carry over which are reviewed by OEWD and heard by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors' Government Audit and Oversight Committee. OEWD's annual report shares the Department's accomplishments and financials from that fiscal year.

Some CBDs tailor services specific to the neighborhood's needs. For example, the Tenderloin CBD manages the Safe Passage Program, which is a coalition of Corner Captains who are trained to respond to different emergencies in the neighborhood and maintain a daily positive presence for children and youth walking on the sidewalks. The Lower Polk CBD hosts a Tenant-Landlord Clinic designed to help prevent homelessness by keeping people housed in their current homes.

Opportunity Neighborhoods

The Opportunity Neighborhood's program targets neighborhoods that have experienced historic divestment and have an economic development strategy that promotes diversity, equity and inclusion. These neighborhoods have an assigned project manager that works closely with community stakeholders and other city departments to strategically disburse investments including funds and services and support an economic development strategy.

The opportunity neighborhoods include:


- Bayview
- Central Market/Tenderloin
- Chinatown
- Excelsior
- Lower Fillmore
- Mission (24th and Mission Streets)

Cultural Districts

OEWD is a key partner to MOHCD in the implementation of the Cultural District program whose focus is on advancing equitable and shared prosperity for San Franciscans by growing sustainable jobs, supporting businesses of all sizes, creating great places to live and work, and helping everyone achieve economic self-sufficiency. Staff supports and leverages economic resources to ensure that there is alignment and a comprehensive approach to each district's economic development strategies. In addition, our division coordinates with our neighborhood project managers where the districts overlap with our programs.

Customized economic interventions for each neighborhood 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 14 – NRSAs, Areas of Low- and Moderate-Income Concentration, Areas of Minority Concentration and Invest In Neighborhoods Commercial Districts



Geographic Distribution

Table 78 – Geographic Distribution

Target Area	Percentage of Funds
Tenderloin	10
Chinatown	10
South of Market	10
Mission	10
Bayview Hunters Point	10
Visitation Valley	10

Rationale for the priorities for allocating investments geographically

See discussion above.

Discussion

See discussion above.

Affordable Housing

AP-55 Affordable Housing – 91.220(g)

Introduction

Approximately 2,713 individuals and households will receive rental assistance in 2020–2021 through the City’s Local Operating Subsidy Program. MOHCD intends to provide tenant-based rental assistance to approximately 220 individuals and households through grants provided to community-based organizations offering tenant counseling and eviction prevention services.

Approximately 1,173 units will be produced with 139 units for homeless families, 33 units for special needs populations of seniors, and 1,001 units produced for low-income families earning less than 80% of area median income. Additionally, the rehabilitation of 267 existing units will occur along with the acquisition of approximately 171 existing housing units for preservation as affordable housing through MOHCD’s Small Sites Program.

Table 79 – One Year Goals for Affordable Housing by Support Requirement

One Year Goals for the Number of Households to be Supported	
Homeless	139
Non-Homeless	1,439
Special-Needs	33
Total	1,611

Table 80 – One Year Goals for Affordable Housing by Support Type

One Year Goals for the Number of Households Supported Through	
Rental Assistance	2,933
The Production of New Units	1,173
Rehab of Existing Units	267
Acquisition of Existing Units	171
Total	4,544

Discussion

See discussion above.

AP-60 Public Housing – 91.220(h)

Introduction

MOHCD will continue to work closely with the SFHA to support the disposition and conversion of all remaining public housing in San Francisco either through rehabilitation or new construction. San Francisco has utilized the RAD program and the Section 18 Disposition program to repair, preserve and reposition these important resources. The City's HOPE SF program rebuilds and revitalizes four large public housing communities.

Actions planned during the next year to address the needs to public housing

By mid-2021, the SFHA's remaining 1,911 units of public housing will be converted to HCV (HCV) units in order to facilitate the preservation, rehabilitation and rebuilding of these valuable units. In 2020, two HOPE VI projects will convert under RAD. In 2021, 167 units of public housing replacement and new affordable units at Sunnydale HOPE SF will complete construction; 157 units of public housing replacement at Potrero HOPE SF will be under development; and 115 units of public housing replacement and new tax credit affordable will be under construction at Hunters View. Also, in 2021, 70 scattered site public housing units will convert to HCV and undergo substantial rehabilitation using funds leveraged under HCV.

Actions to encourage public housing residents to become more involved in management and participate in homeownership

Because public housing is being phased out by mid-2021, and the public housing staff are either being phased out or transferred to other SFHA divisions, there are little to no opportunities for resident placement in management jobs. However, in the new HOPE SF developments, MOHCD and OEWD track the new owners' adherence with workforce requirements including construction placement and other employment opportunities for residents. SFHA continues to administer its homeownership program for HCV households, which allows households to accrue funds toward a downpayment using the HCV subsidy funds.

If the PHA is designated as troubled, describe the manner in which financial assistance will be provided or other assistance

In the fall of 2018, SFHA was discovered to have a shortfall of up to \$30 million in the HCV program. HUD determined in March 2019 that SFHA was in substantial default of its obligations under the housing voucher and public housing programs. According to HUD's March 2019 default notice, HUD had the authority to place the Housing Authority in receivership, taking possession of all or part of the Housing Authority. Instead, SFHA is remedying the default through contracting out its HCV and public housing property management programs, and having the City assume oversight of the SFHA's essential functions.

In 2020 and 2021, SFHA will convert its 1,911 remaining units of public housing to the HCV program via HUD's disposition programs: the Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) program and the Section 18 Demo/Dispo program. Given SFHA's financial difficulties, HUD has approved the early conversion of these units to HCV in order to stabilize the agency's finances and operations.

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

Street Outreach is a Core Component of the Homeless Response System in the HSH Strategic Framework. Coordinated Entry replaces single program waitlists and entry procedures that encourage people to get on as many lists as possible and then wait for assistance. A person experiencing homelessness or at risk of homelessness may go to an Access Point, such as a Resource Center. They may also be approached by a Street Outreach worker and be immediately assessed, using the standard assessment for all programs. Problem Solving assistance is offered to all, especially those newly homeless or at-risk. If homelessness can be prevented by returning to a safe place, that will be facilitated. If not, clients will be offered Temporary Shelter.

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

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 capability. 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.

Further since 2016, San Francisco has created and rapidly expanded the SAFE Center and Navigation Center portfolio in San Francisco.

The Navigation Center Model

San Francisco's first Navigation Center opened in March 2015 and was a successful pilot serving San Francisco's highly vulnerable and long-term unhoused neighbors who are often fearful of accessing traditional shelter and services. HSH subsequently opened 8 Navigation Centers and currently has 6 in operation. For more information, [click here](#).

San Francisco's Navigation Center model is being replicated nationally and, here in San Francisco, we are building on this best practice by developing SAFE Navigation Centers.

The SAFE Navigation Center Model

An evolution of Navigation Centers, SAFE Navigation Centers are low-threshold, high-service temporary shelter programs for adults experiencing homelessness in San Francisco. SAFE Navigation Centers are one part of the Homelessness Response System and are an attractive service for people living unsheltered or in encampments.

SAFE Navigation Centers are essential to reducing unsheltered homelessness and connecting guests to services and housing assistance. SAFE Navigation Centers build off of the best aspects of Navigation

Centers while making them more scalable, sustainable, and effective. The City is looking to expand SAFE Navigation Centers in neighborhoods across the city to respond to the homelessness crisis and has reviewed over 100 potential sites. For information on proposed Navigation Centers, visit: <http://hsh.sfgov.org/overview/notices/>

Effective

From the launch of Navigation Centers in 2015 through the end of 2018, 46% of Navigation Center exits were either to permanent housing or reunifications with family or friends through the Homeward Bound program. Over 5,000 clients have been served at Navigation Centers from 2015 to November 2019.

Access-Controlled

Navigation Centers and SAFE Navigation Centers do not accept walk-ins. All individuals and couples who enter have been selected by the SF Homeless Outreach Team or a centralized referral system. Because Navigation Centers operate 24x7, there are no lines outside in the evening, and guests are not exited onto the street in the morning.

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 prerequisite. 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 on-going 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

The HSH Strategic Framework endorses Problem Solving as a Core Component of the Homeless Response System. Problem Solving provides opportunities to prevent people from entering the Homelessness Response System and to redirect people who can resolve their homelessness without the need for ongoing support. It may offer a range of one-time assistance, including eviction prevention, legal services, relocation programs (Homeward Bound), family reunification, mediation, move in assistance, and flexible grants to address issues related to housing and employment.

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 myriad challenges of homelessness, homeless response services and prevention program is grant-based and aligns 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 HSA and DPH, to align its strategies.

Through this program, MOHCD administers the ESG 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, individuals experiencing homelessness many times 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 81 – 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	93
Tenant-based rental assistance	187
Units provided in permanent housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	232
Units provided in transitional short-term housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	28
Total	540

AP-75 Barriers to affordable housing – 91.220(j)

Introduction:

The City of San Francisco's housing agencies work diligently to ensure that barriers to affordable housing are addressed. MOHCD 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.

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 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, MOHCD 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 Production¹⁵⁴

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

¹⁵⁴ 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).

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.

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 DPW 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 HSH 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, 43% speak a language other than English at home, with the largest language groups being Chinese, Spanish, and Filipino. Fifty-seven percent of the population that speak an Asian language at home are of limited English proficiency (LEP), meaning that they speak English less than "very well." Thirty percent of Asian children are identified as LEP. Twelve percent of San Francisco households are "linguistically isolated" as of 2015 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 21% of all San Franciscans in the 2018 ACS five-year survey indicated that they did not speak English "very well."

In response to this particular obstacle, San Francisco uses CDBG and general fund 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 these funds to neighborhood-based multi-service community centers.

Another action that will be taken will be granting those households displaced by Ellis Act evictions, owner move-in evictions, fire damage, 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 City's 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. 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. DPH collaborates 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 DPH.

Fundamental to the response system, the DPH code enforcement unit 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 remediation services of lead hazards as part of its single-family home rehab loan program.

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.

In addition, MOHCD requires 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 Home Rehab program.

Actions planned to reduce the number of poverty-level families

Coordinated Entry

In August 2016, Mayor Edwin M. Lee launched HSH to fundamentally change the way the City and County of San Francisco addresses homelessness. HSH—relying on guidance from people experiencing homelessness, service providers, and other stakeholders in San Francisco—developed a Five-Year Strategic Framework outlining specific goals for HSH’s vision to make homelessness a rare, brief, and one-time event with the overall aim of significant, sustained reductions in homelessness. To accomplish this goal, HSH will coordinate alignment of all programs into a Homelessness Response System (HRS) that treats homelessness as an emergency to be responded to quickly and effectively. Please note that the Homelessness Response System covers the entire geographic region defined as the San Francisco CoC.

Coordinated Entry (CE) is a key component of this response system. CE is a consistent, community wide intake process to match people experiencing homelessness to available community resources that are the best fit for their situation. CE includes a clear set of entry points, a standardized method to assess and prioritize people needing assistance, and a streamlined process for rapidly connecting people to a housing solution. All homeless individuals and families in San Francisco will complete a standardized assessment process that considers the household’s situation and identifies the best type of housing intervention to address their needs. Permanent housing programs—including permanent supportive housing (PSH) and rapid rehousing (RRH)—will fill spaces in their programs from a community pool of eligible households generated from the standard assessment process. CE will also fully integrate into the Online Navigation and Entry (ONE) System—San Francisco’s implementation of the Homeless Management and Information System (HMIS). The assessment will build upon the standard intake and be entered directly into ONE and referrals to transitional and permanent housing will be made through the ONE System. This coordinated process will dramatically reduce the burden placed on people experiencing homelessness by removing the necessity to seek assistance from every provider separately and instead streamline access to all the resources in our Homelessness Response System.

HSH has launched Adult Coordinated Entry, Family Coordinated Entry and Coordinated Entry for Youth and their Community Access Points.

Healthy Retail SF

The grassroots activism to provide healthy food options in the Bayview District and the Tenderloin has led to institutional change within city government. In 2013, Supervisor Eric Mar introduced legislation that created Healthy Retail SF, which is led by OEWD’s Invest in Neighborhoods division, in conjunction with the DPH. San Francisco has about 1,150 food retail stores, about 1,000 are corner stores. This program supports these mom-and-pop businesses while providing healthy and affordable food access, especially to underserved neighborhoods.

In certain parts of the City, there is a lack of quality full-service neighborhood markets with fresh produce, and an overabundance of corner stores selling alcohol, tobacco, and highly processed foods that are high in salt, fat, and sugar and low in nutrients. In communities that lack supermarkets, families depend on corner stores for food purchases, and the choices at those stores are often limited to packaged food and very little, if any, fresh produce. For example, a 2011 assessment of 19 corner stores in the City’s Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood found that 20% of the stores stocked a variety of fresh fruits and vegetables, only 11% stocked whole grain bread, and only 37% stocked low-fat milk. The presence of a large number of stores selling low quality foods in a community can undermine public

efforts to promote health and send a message that normalizes the use of unhealthy products in that neighborhood, placing these communities at greater risk for obesity and chronic disease. A high number of convenience stores per capita is associated with higher rates of mortality, diabetes, and obesity. Proximity to convenience stores within a neighborhood is associated with higher rates of obesity and diabetes. The impact of convenience stores on health is even greater in low-income neighborhoods.

Healthy Retail SF created an expert healthy retail advisory group, designed program structures and tools, and implements neighborhood wide outreach meetings with store owners. Each participating store receives an assessment and tailored 13-page Individualized Development Plan (IDP) that outlines activities, timelines, persons responsible and budget in three areas: business operations, physical changes to the store, and community engagement and marketing. Community Food Advocates called Food Guardians and Food Justice Leaders are a critical element of the model.

Healthy Retail SF provides funds for participating businesses to make improvements based on their IDP. Improvements include installation of equipment, community engagement and marketing support, technical assistance with sustainable business practices, and store space redesign. Participating businesses commit 35% of its selling area to fresh produce, whole grains, lean proteins, and low-fat dairy products, while limiting the sale of tobacco and alcohol to 20% of the selling space.

Homeowner Emergency Loan Program (HELP)

The purpose of the MOHCD HELP program is to assist San Francisco homeowners in need of a one-time emergency financial assistance loan due to an unforeseen financial hardship.

HELP Funds may be used for:

- Past due mortgage Payments
- Past due HOA monthly dues
- Past due property taxes
- Special assessments (e.g. renovation costs passed down to residents)
- BMR homeowners in need of financial assistance to complete necessary repairs in order to sell property

HOPE SF

HOPE SF is an ambitious cross-sector initiative to transform San Francisco's most distressed public housing sites into vibrant and healthy communities.

It began with a study. In 2005, the HSA released an analysis of at-risk families known as the "Seven Street Corners Study." The study came out of an effort to create a consolidated youth database with data from the child welfare and juvenile justice systems. When the data was walking distance of just seven street corners in the city — street corners that overlapped with obsolete public housing sites where families were living geographically, socially, and economically cut off from San Francisco's robust resources.

In response, Mayor Gavin Newsom set a bold vision of rebuilding dilapidated public housing developments into thriving mixed-income communities that integrated holistic family services, high quality schools, new businesses, public transportation, and green buildings. HOPE SF drew on more than 15 years of learning from HUD's HOPE VI housing revitalization program. However, unlike the HUD projects in which only a small percentage of residents returned to redeveloped housing sites, San Francisco committed to the principle that families would not be displaced.

In 2007, the mayor and Board of Supervisors secured \$95 million in local bond funding, an amount that eclipsed the nationwide HOPE VI funding for that year, to launch HOPE SF. From the beginning, the initiative brought together expertise from the public, nonprofit, and philanthropic sectors, working together to improve the lives of public housing residents and break the cycle of poverty.

Today, the City and County of San Francisco, the San Francisco Foundation, and Enterprise Community Partners collaborate on HOPE SF with the involvement of many organizations and longtime residents.

HOPE SF will rebuild four housing developments in three southeastern San Francisco neighborhoods: Hunters View and Alice Griffith in the Bayview, Potrero Terrace and Annex in Potrero Hill, and Sunnydale-Velasco in Visitacion Valley. Located in isolated and mostly undeveloped areas, these sites were originally built to temporarily house shipyard workers during and after World War II.

By tripling density, HOPE SF will replace 1,900 public housing units one-for-one and add low-income and market-rate units, ultimately building more than 5,300 homes at multiple levels of affordability. Construction is phased so that residents can remain on site and take part in the transformation of their communities.

Alice Griffith

Originally built in 1962 adjacent to the now-demolished Candlestick Park, Alice Griffith received a \$30.5 million HUD Choice Neighborhood Award in 2012 and is part of the Hunters Point Shipyard/Candlestick Point Neighborhood Development plan. In 2019, all original residents had been rehoused, achieving nearly 90% retention. Two more affordable projects, including 30 public housing replacement units, will be constructed in 2024-2025. Five Point, the Master developer, is responsible for developing market rate, inclusionary and workforce units. When completed, there will be expanded transit, retail and office space, a research and development campus, and over 300 acres of open space. The proposed total number of units will be 1,150.

Hunters View

Hunters View, originally built in 1956, was the first HOPE SF site to undergo revitalization. Perched on a grassy hill above the old naval shipyard, it has spectacular views of the San Francisco Bay. Of the original families, 70% were retained through the transition between public housing and mixed-income development. Amenities include open spaces, a community center, a childcare facility, a wellness center, a sound studio, and playgrounds. The Phase 3 — affordable and the first two phases of market-rate homes will break ground in 2020. The proposed total number of units will be 600.

Potrero Terrace and Annex

Home to nearly 1,300 people, Potrero Terrace and Potrero Annex — together known as Potrero — are two of the oldest public housing developments in San Francisco. Located at the southeastern edge of the Potrero Hill neighborhood, they were hastily constructed in 1941 and 1955. HOPE SF will rebuild both sections of the 38-acre site into a unified mixed-income development with buildings of varying heights and a park. Phase 1 — construction of the first 72 units was completed in February 2019. The proposed total number of units will be 1,400-1,600.

Sunnydale/Velasco

Sunnydale, San Francisco's largest public housing community, is undergoing a transformation into a mixed-income development of new affordable and market rate housing, street and utility infrastructure,

and open spaces. Located at the foot of McLaren Park, the 50-acre site will also include an exciting neighborhood hub and the city's first recreation center in decades, a Boys & Girls Club, and early childhood education centers. The proposed total number of units will be 1,400-1,770.

Opportunities for All

Opportunities for All is a mayoral initiative to address economic inequality by ensuring that all young people can be a part of San Francisco's thriving economy. The initiative serves thousands of high school-aged youth who are ready and interested in working, as well as provides opportunities for youth who might need additional support, as part of Mayor Breed's efforts to provide paid internships for youth in San Francisco.

Opportunities for All connects young people to employment, training and post-secondary opportunities. Youth work an average of four weeks and earn \$15 per hour for up to 20 hours a week, receive mentorship, and visit local businesses to help them identify careers of interest and begin to plan for their future. Opportunities for All builds on existing work-based learning programs and funding. Across the globe, work-based programs are celebrated for preparing young people for work, keeping them engaged in school and promoting self-efficacy.

Opportunities for All works with the SFUSD, OEWD and DCYF to align efforts and recruit youth participants. This initiative also develops a framework where non-profit service providers and employers have shared understanding and language around work expectations for youth, track youth progress, and provide tools that help youth plan for their future.

Our Children Our Families Initiative

In November 2014, San Francisco voters approved Proposition C, the Children and Families First Initiative, which created the OCOF Council with the purpose of aligning strategies across City agencies, the School District, and community partners to improve the lives of children, youth, and their families. Prop C outlines OCOF's mandates in addition to extending the Public Education Enrichment Fund and the Children's Fund for another 25 years respectively.

OCOF Council knows that the challenges facing our children, youth and families; safety, housing stability, economic security, health, education, and employment, are interconnected and cannot be addressed in isolation. In order to achieve the impact we seek, we must work in partnership across all sectors. Our strategies involve a collective impact approach, where we work together in three key areas: data and research, training and capacity building and service delivery system improvement. These strategies will serve as a roadmap for our collaboration across the City, District and Community.

Data and Research

Data and research is at the heart of OCOF's work. We aim to use data to inform all decision making for OCOF's work but also to encourage and promote the use of data across all child and family serving systems.

Focus Areas:

- Convene a Data and Research Advisory Group: The purpose of this group will be to serve as an advisory body to OCOF around measuring the outcomes in the framework, as well as identifying data and research projects that align with OCOF outcomes.
- Monitoring outcomes measures: Develop a plan for monitoring the measures in the Outcomes Framework and informing policy and practice change.

- Support use of shared data for policy and program development: OCOF will use targeted data sharing across the city, school district and community to improve research, policy and/or practice. Work with various experts and stakeholders to develop policies and protocols that facilitate data sharing, as well as identifying existing shared data projects across the city that align and advance OCOF outcomes.

Training and Capacity Building

Strengthening the existing workforce and developing a strong pipeline of new employees across San Francisco through curriculum designed to build capacity and skills of the workforce to understand the impact of trauma on the lives of children, youth and families and develop the skills to build resilience and connection is critical to impacting the outcomes we seek to improve.

Focus Areas:

- Develop curriculum and pilot implementation plans: Develop implementation plans for 5 Training and Capacity Building pillars with a primary focus on a Healing City and a Welcoming City.
- Establish an evaluation plan for each pilot: Along with each pilot plan, the development of an evaluation plan will be necessary to demonstrate the challenges and successes for each pilot. This will inform the scaling and sustainability of the pilot.

Service Delivery System Improvement

Service delivery system improvement is at the heart of much of OCOF's mission. The activities for this strategy will focus on changes to systems in addition to service delivery and programs.

Focus Areas:

- Advance strategies that support service navigation: The goals of the service navigation focus area are to identify gaps and redundancies in services and to help families and service providers easily access available services from all agencies. Within this focus area, there are two components: a service inventory for system navigators and a family friendly service navigating website – www.sffamilies.org.
- Coordinating budgets to achieve shared outcomes: The goal of ultimately coordinating budgets across systems is so that efforts are coordinated to generate additional funding and blended resources are integrated into budget planning. An integral part of achieving coordinated budgets will be the Citywide Spending Analysis, which will determine where resources are spent on child and family serving programs. This will include a landscape of services that link the identified spending categories to specific services.
- Identify and support family friendly City policies and protocols: The goal of advancing protocols and policies that designate San Francisco a "Family Friendly City" is so that families are put at the center of decision making across the city, school district and community.
- Improve Citywide service coordination: The goal of this focus area is to identify gaps and redundancies across various collective impact efforts working with vulnerable children, youth and families in order to improve connections and eliminate duplication of efforts. OCOF will lead and participate in efforts that bring together key decision makers to develop strategies to address service overlap and gaps related to service coordination within San Francisco.

San Francisco Financial Justice Project

The [San Francisco Financial Justice Project](#) is the nation's first effort embedded in government to assess and reform fines and fees that have a disproportionate and adverse impact on low-income residents and communities of color. Since its inception in 2016, the Project has worked with partners to eliminate or adjust dozens of fines and fees, and to lift millions of dollars in debt off of tens of thousands of low-income people. Housed in the Office of the San Francisco Treasurer, the Financial Justice Project has two main goals: First, to listen to community groups and local residents to identify fine and fee pain points. Second, to identify and implement doable solutions for government and the courts. Over the last three years, The Financial Justice Project has worked with dozens of community partners, city departments and the courts to enact a range of reforms. Read more [here](#) about The Financial Justice Project's reforms; and [here](#) is a list of fine and fee discounts for low-income San Franciscans.

Sector Based Approach to Workforce Development

The Workforce Development Division of OEED connects job seekers in San Francisco with employment opportunities in growing industries such as Technology, Health Care, Hospitality and Construction. We provide industry aligned job training and access to job search assistance at community-based neighborhood access points throughout the City, to help provide employers with skilled workers. See

Construction Training Programs

The CityBuild Academy (CBA)

CityBuild Academy aims to meet the demands of the construction industry by providing comprehensive pre-apprenticeship and construction administration training to San Francisco residents. CityBuild began in 2006 as an effort to coordinate City-wide construction training and employment programs and is administered by OEWD in partnership with City College of San Francisco, various community non-profit organizations, labor unions, and industry employers.

Construction Administration & Professional Service Academy (CAPSA)

The Construction Administration and Professional Service Academy (CAPSA) is a semester-long program offered at the City College of San Francisco, Mission Campus. The program prepares San Francisco residents for entry-level careers as professional construction office administrators.

CityBuild Women's Mentorship Program

The CityBuild Women's Mentorship Program is a volunteer program that connects women construction leaders with experienced professionals and student-mentors who offer a myriad of valuable resources: professional guidance; peer support; life-skills coaching; networking opportunities; and access to community resources.

Health Care Training Program

Launched in January 2010, the HealthCare Academy falls under OEWD's sector strategy and is designed to improve the responsiveness of the workforce system to meet the demands of the growing industry. Through a dual customer approach, the HealthCare Academy provides employers with skilled workers while expanding employment opportunities for local residents.

The health care industry and health care occupations have been identified both nationally and locally as a priority for workforce investment due to stable and/or increasing demand for new workers, replacement of retirees, and skills development in response to new technologies and treatment options, as well as evolving service delivery options (including local and federal health care initiatives, such as the

Affordable Care Act). Because the health care sector encompasses occupations in such a wide variety of settings and requires various levels of education and skill, it presents excellent opportunities for a broad spectrum of local jobseekers.

The HealthCare Academy engages with industry partners to identify key needs of the industry, including skill requirements, vetting and approving a programmatic framework, review of training curriculum, identifying partnership opportunities, and providing programmatic oversight of any workforce programs related to the health care sector. Collaborative partners include the San Francisco Hospital Council, the DPH (and affiliated hospitals), SEIU-UHW West, UC Berkely's Center for the Public Health Practice, California Health Workforce Initiative, and industry employers: California Pacific Medical Center, Dignity Health, Kaiser Permanente, San Francisco Community Clinics Consortium, Chinese Hospital and Homebridge.

Hospitality Training Program

The Hospitality Initiative, launched in 2011, was designed to effectively coordinate training and employment resources that support the growth of a diverse and well-qualified hospitality sector workforce in San Francisco. In support of this goal are the following objectives: To prepare San Francisco residents for training and employment opportunities in the hospitality sector; to fulfill hiring needs of hospitality sector employers with qualified candidates that are job ready, possess the skills and abilities to perform job duties, and hold knowledge and passion for the industry; to educate workforce system service providers and jobseekers about the hospitality industry and to provide them with relevant and current information on connecting to jobs, careers, and/or relevant training.

Industry partnerships play a critical role in establishing sector programming. Collaborative partners include San Francisco Hotel Council (and affiliated members), Golden Gate Restaurant Association (and affiliated members), San Francisco Travel, Moscone Center, City College of San Francisco, SFUSD, Unite Here Local 2, and community based organizations and industry employers.

Technology Training Program

Launched in 2012, TechSF is an initiative of OEWD designed to provide education, training and employment assistance to locals who are interested in landing a job within San Francisco's tech sector. TechSF is committed to:

- Providing tech training, free of charge, to San Francisco residents who are interested in landing a job in a tech occupation;
- Partnering with educators, training organizations and employers to ensure our participants have opportunities to skill up and land in a job;
- Ensuring our trainings meet local employer demand; and
- Ensuring our participants are trained not only in in-demand technical skills, but also receive career readiness supports.

TechSF aims to ensure that a highly-skilled and diverse talent pool connects to, and thrives in, opportunities in tech while meeting industry talent needs. Careers in tech are not solely isolated to the tech sector. TechSF believes that the skills learned in TechSF training programs can open doors to working in a tech job in many different industries.

TechSF provides opportunities for anyone interested in a career in technology. From the exploratory tech learner to the well-versed programmer who is looking to gain a competitive edge, TechSF has opportunities to step outside your comfort zone.

The TechSF Apprenticeship Accelerator offers job seekers the unique opportunity to acquire essential experience and training to get established in a career in tech.

TechSF provides the opportunity to connect directly with Tech Sector employers through exposure and networking events.

Smart Money Coaching Program

The Smart Money Coaching program by the Office of Financial Empowerment provides free, confidential, one-on-one, personalized financial guidance. A certified financial coach helps households to address financial challenges and goals, including reducing debt, establishing and improving credit score, opening a safe and affordable bank account, and increasing savings. Smart Money Coaching has locations throughout San Francisco and is available to anyone living, working or receiving services in San Francisco. This initiative is funded through MOHCD, HSA, DAAS, and the Treasurer's Office. These services are available at over twenty sites on a regular basis, including HOPE SF and RAD housing sites, the San Francisco Main Library, and at nonprofit partners of MOHCD and other city departments.

Tenant Right to Counsel: San Francisco's Eviction Defense System

San Francisco voters passed the "No Eviction Without Representation Act of 2018," then-known as Proposition F, on June 5, 2018. This local law went into effect on July 11, 2019. It establishes a policy that all residential tenants facing eviction have a right to legal representation, known as a tenant right to counsel. The ballot initiative that brought about the local law did not create a revenue source to fund the Tenant Right to Counsel (TRC) program. However, through the City's budget process, the Mayor and Board of Supervisors have significantly increased funding for the TRC program since its passage. MOHCD allocated \$9.6 million in Fiscal Year 2019-2020 (July 1, 2019-June 30, 2020) to the TRC program.

Legal representation is provided by a network of nine City-funded legal services organizations (with a combined 47 attorneys supported by social workers & paralegals) and is subject to availability. During the first six months of implementation (July-December 2019), the TRC program provided the mandated full-scope legal representation to approximately two-thirds of all tenant households who availed themselves of assistance. The remaining one-third received limited legal services, including *pro per* assistance with completing the prescribed court form that must be filed at the court within five calendar days of being served with the eviction lawsuit in order to assert their defense, and limited-scope representation during the mandatory, pre-trial settlement conference.

The TRC program is providing full-scope legal representation to an unprecedented number of tenants facing eviction. Program-level data and other relevant studies suggest that full-scope legal representation get far superior results for clients than limited legal services. In San Francisco, approximately 67% of clients receiving full-scope legal representation stay in their homes, as compared to less than 40% of clients receiving limited-scope legal representation.

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 participates with OEWD and the Arts Commission in a regular working group focused on the issues of nonprofit displacement through a number of OEWD-funded initiatives to stabilize nonprofits.

In the June, 2014, new local legislation was passed to coordinate and align workforce development services, establishing the Committee on City Workforce Alignment ("Alignment Committee") comprised of department heads across City departments and the Workforce Community Advisory Committee (WCAC), comprised of leadership from community-based organizations with deep specialization in community development.

The Alignment Committee includes one member designated by the Mayor, one member of the Board of Supervisors or a City employee designated by the Board, and the department heads of the following City departments: OEWD; HSA; DCYF; Public Utilities Commission; Public Works, Department of Human Resources, and Human Rights Commission. The Director of Workforce Development and Director of the Human Rights Commission co-chair the Alignment Committee.

The Alignment Committee and WCAC are charged with developing and submitting a Citywide Workforce Development Plan to the WISF for its review and comment, which was submitted and approved in late 2017. The five-year plan includes an assessment of the City's anticipated workforce development needs and opportunities and a strategy to meet the identified needs, which influences the City and County of San Francisco's CDBG decision-making around resource allocation. 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 Alignment Committee and WCAC legislation sunset in 2019, and all members agreed to continue the work under good faith effort until the legislation is reauthorized.

In addition, staff of MOHCD and OEWD 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 Director of MOHCD meets weekly to discuss affordable and market-rate housing development issues citywide with the Director of Planning, the Director of Building Inspection, the Mayor's Director of Housing Delivery, the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure's (OCII) Executive Director and the Director of Development for OEWD.

MOHCD is a housing delivery agency, working with the Mayor's Director of Housing Delivery and the Housing Delivery Team and other housing delivery agencies (OEWD, OCII, Treasure Island Development Authority and the Port of San Francisco) to streamline the production of housing development in San Francisco. The Housing Delivery Team meets with housing coordinators, designated representatives of each City department involved in housing production, to coordinate and expedite each department's efforts to approve and permit new housing development. The Director of Housing Delivery, in collaboration with the housing delivery agencies, identifies and implements major process improvements, such as common master schedule review, permit tracking, electronic plan review and staffing planning.

The City agencies also coordinate in 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 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. Committee members consist of the directors or the director's representative from MOHCD, HSH, and OCII as successor to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (SFRA). MOHCD works closely with OCII and HSH to issue requests for proposals (RFPs) or notices of funding availability (NOFAs) on a regular basis for particular types of developments. NOFAs are generally issued for projects that 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 for the Loan Committee.

The directors of MOHCD, OCII and HSH meet monthly to discuss permanent supportive housing issues. Staff from MOHCD, OCII, and HSH also meet monthly to coordinate the development and operation of the City's permanent supportive housing pipeline and portfolio. These monthly convenings provide 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.

MOHCD also coordinates with other City agencies around other affordable housing initiatives such as the City's Public Lands Initiative led by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), as the owner of much of the public land in San Francisco that can be developed for affordable housing. MOHCD participates in monthly meetings or calls with SFMTA along with staff from the Planning Department to coordinate the development of Public Land as affordable housing.

MOHCD takes a coordinating role in bringing transit funding from the State to housing projects. To that end MOHCD meets regularly with SFMTA, the Department of Public Works (DPW), the regional transportation agency Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART), and other agencies responsible for implementing transit improvements that support residents of affordable housing.

MOHCD is also a member of San Francisco's Long-Term Care Coordinating Council (LTCCC). LTCCC advises the Mayor and City on policy, planning and service delivery issues for older adults and people with disabilities to promote an integrated and accessible long-term care system. LTCCC has 40 membership slots that represent a variety of consumers, advocates and service providers (non-profit and public) and meets bi-monthly. LTCCC active workgroups include Palliative Care Workgroup, Social Engagement Workgroup and Behavioral Health Workgroup.

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.

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	6,550,000
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
Total Program Income:	6,550,000

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 System Project (FSP) 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 to 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 MOHCD in consultation with local CoC 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 CoC 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 CoC. 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 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 CoC's Coordinated Assessment system and other local permanent supportive housing systems (e.g., serving veterans, families, TAY, 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: childcare, 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 CoC 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 CoC. To meet these goals, the local CoC 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 CoC trainings related to improving

coordination among CoC 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, TAY, 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 CoC has established centralized or coordinated assessment system that meets HUD requirements, describe that centralized or coordinated assessment system.

COVERAGE: CE system covers entire CoC (SF city/county) through accessible access points and outreach teams. Numerous dedicated access points for families and adult individuals exist to facilitate targeted services. 5 youth-dedicated access points opened in 2019 with strategic placement in underserved areas and locations where youth frequent. Targeted services for youth LGBTQ+ are also available. Those presenting at an access point for a different subpopulation receive an immediate referral to one that will better assist them.

LEAST LIKELY TO APPLY: Access to CE through 311 hotline and in ADA-compliant sites, centrally located and in underserved neighborhoods, reach the linguistically/culturally isolated. Multilingual mobile outreach teams target those unlikely to seek services for assessments on streets and in shelters, hospitals, and jails. In May 2019, the Homeless Outreach Team made 1,095 outreach attempts, had 830 successful engagements, made 1,264 referrals, and linked 423 individuals to services. Partnerships with schools, criminal justice, healthcare ensure referrals across systems. To ensure most hard to reach adults are located, CE team conducted an "assessment blitz" from August through October 2018.

PRIORITIZATION: Most vulnerable prioritized through initial assessment for eligibility/safety and offered flexible problem-solving interventions like reunification, eviction prevention, and connection to mainstream services/benefits. Further assessment uses SF CoC-specific tools weighing factors like current living situation, length/episodes of homelessness, use of crisis services, trauma, other vulnerabilities. Dynamic housing list identifies those with highest needs and prioritizes them for most intensive and immediate housing and services. As described above under the Written Standards for Emergency Shelter Activities section, all City-funded shelters for single adults are accessed through HSH Access Points.

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,

CDBG, ESG, HOME and HOPWA funds for community development and housing activities.

In accordance to HUD and CCSF procurement processes, ESG subaward allocations are selected by solicitation through competitive bids from eligible entities. HSH issues a request for qualifications (RFQs) to invite applications from qualified applicants to provide ESG eligible activities in outreach, shelter, prevention, rapid rehousing and data collection.

HSH completes the Minimum Qualification and Evaluation Panel review of applications submitted by providers seeking to become qualified to provide eligible activities of the ESG Program. The ESG Program interim rules require coordination and collaboration between Continuums of Care (CoC) and ESG recipients in order to ensure recipients effectively strategize about the systems of assistance needed to address homelessness and how their respective funding streams can support provision of that assistance. As such, HSH is required to take into consideration existing ESG services in the Homelessness Response System (HRS) as part of the coordination and collaboration requirement.

Panelists reviewed each application, RFQ materials, and rating guide, and assigned a rating to each application per service component. Based on the review from the Minimum Qualification and Evaluation Panel, funding recommendations are made to either award grants or augment existing grants. 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.

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 HSH staff and the LHCB 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 LHCB, neighborhood hearings, focus groups with providers, and surveys conducted with both providers and residents.

5. Describe performance standards for evaluating ESG.

Consistent with 24 CFR 91.220(1)(4)(vi) and 91.320(k)(3)(v), San Francisco utilizes the following outputs to monitor 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

Per HUD, ESG activities and performance indicators should complement the activities of the Continuum of Care Program and supports Housing First which are evidence-based practices that support the following tenets:

1. Targeting those who need the assistance most;
2. Reducing the number of people living on the streets or emergency shelters;
3. Shortening the time people spend homeless; and
4. Reducing each program participant's housing barriers or housing stability risks.

Performance targets will be developed for each ESG program component and put in place for the 2020 funding cycle. These performance standards will closely align to System Performance Standards required for Continuum of Care programs.

The CoC System Performance Measures measure these seven performance standards:

1. Length of homelessness: measures the change in the average and median length of time persons are homeless when in emergency shelter and transitional housing programs
2. Returns to homelessness: measures clients who exited emergency shelter, transitional housing, street outreach, and permanent housing programs to permanent housing destinations, measures how many of them returned to homelessness for up to 2 years' post-exit
3. Number of people served: specifically, this measure is related to the Point in Time, but also pulled from HMIS and this will consistently be a measure of data collected for all ESG programs
4. Employment and Income (maintaining and increasing income): This includes six tables capturing employment and non-employment income changes for those maintaining in programs and for those exiting programs
5. Number of persons becoming homeless for the first time: measures number of persons entering the homeless system through emergency shelter and transitional housing programs for the first time in the HMIS database
6. Homeless Prevention Measures (TBD)
7. Successful placements (percent of those exiting to permanent housing destinations): This one measures positive movement out of the homeless system and is divided into three tables, (1) Street Outreach, (2) movement into Permanent Housing situations from emergency shelter, transitional housing and rapid rehousing and (3) retention or exits to permanent housing situations

Discussion:

Identify the method for selecting HOPWA project sponsors.

The method for selecting HOPWA project sponsors is outlined below:

In partnership with the Citizens' Committee on Community Development (CCCD), MOHCD, OEWD and HSH conduct multiple public hearings to solicit citizen input on community needs for allocating funds from four federal sources, including HOPWA;

- MOHCD issue a Request for Proposals and hold technical assistance workshops for interested non-profit organizations to provide information on the application and the review process;

- MOHCD 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, OEWD and HSH 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.

For the CARES Act HOPWA program, MOHCD requested each current HOPWA grantee to talk with all of its participants being served through the HOPWA program to assess how they had been adversely impacted by COVID-19 and what resources could be helpful and supportive during this crisis. Through several meetings by phone and by video conference each grantee communicated to MOHCD the needs that HOPWA participants requested due to COVID-19. CARES Act HOPWA funds will be provided to eight existing HOPWA-funded projects for prevention and education in alignment with the City's COVID-19 prevention efforts, case management and assistance in accessing essential services and supplies, rental subsidies, meals, and personal protective equipment for people living with HIV/AIDS.

Glossary of Terms

Terms:

ADA (Americans with Disability Act) – a civil rights law enacted in 1990 that prohibits discrimination based on disability

AMI (Area Median Income) – the midpoint household income for a given metropolitan area (half of households earn more and half earn less). AMIs are published for household sizes from one to nine persons.

Certificate of Preference – a housing lottery preference granted to persons displaced by specific actions of the former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency in the 1960s through 1980s

Coordinated Entry – a centralized assessment and prioritization system for the placement of homelessness resources

Cultural Districts – a City program with designated community-defined areas intended to celebrate and strengthen the unique cultural identities of San Francisco and to coordinate resources to assist in stabilizing communities facing, or at risk of, displacement

DAHLIA (Database of Affordable Housing Listings, Information and Application) – an online tool to help households find and apply for affordable housing

DALP (Down Payment Assistance Loan Program) – a down payment loan program that helps households bid on a property within the open market

Development Agreements – contracts entered into by the City and County of San Francisco and a developer that define a development project's rules, regulations, commitments, and policies for a specific period of time

GARE: Government Alliance on Race and Equity (GARE) is a national network of government working to achieve racial equity and advance opportunities for all

HOA (Home Owners Association) – an organization of homeowners of a housing development, the purpose of which is to preserve, maintain, and enhance homes and their value

HOPE SF – An initiative that seeks to transform four of San Francisco's most distressed public housing sites (Hunters View, Alice Griffith, Sunnyside-Velasco and Potrero Terrace and Annex) into vibrant, thriving communities through holistic revitalization

HOPWA (Housing Opportunity for People With AIDS) – a federal program that helps people living with HIV/AIDS to obtain and maintain their housing through rental subsidies and other housing supports

Inclusionary (Housing Program) – a City program that requires market-rate housing developers to provide affordable housing units, as required by Section 415 of the San Francisco Planning Code

Legacy Business – a business that has operated in San Francisco for 30 or more years, with no break in San Francisco operations exceeding two years. The business has contributed to the neighborhood's history and/or the identity of a particular neighborhood or community.

Local Hire – a San Francisco policy that promotes the hiring of local residents for locally-sponsored construction projects

Local Operating Subsidy Program – a San Francisco subsidy program designed to address gaps between the amount of rent formerly homeless residents can pay and the cost to operate housing for homeless persons

Mortgage Credit Certificate Program – a program of the California Housing Finance Agency that allows low to moderate income first-time homebuyers to convert a portion of their annual mortgage interest payment into a tax credit

PBV (Project-based Voucher) – a rental subsidy from the Housing Authority attached to a particular unit, not to a tenant

Plus Housing – the primary MOHCD program that places housing units and subsidies with HIV+ households

RAD (Rental Assistance Demonstration) – an initiative that rehabilitates and transitions public housing properties to Section 8 project based voucher properties with long term affordability

RFQ (Request for Qualifications)/RFP (Request for Proposal) – two standard types of public sector methods used to solicit vendors or agencies to bid on services or provide a proposal for services

SRO (Single Room Occupancy) – a type of housing unit typically where certain facilities such as bathroom and kitchen are shared among a number of units

Technical Assistance: Support activity that improves the overall economic viability of a business

Tenant Improvement – changes made to the interior of a commercial or industrial property by its owner to accommodate the needs of a tenant such as floor and wall coverings, ceilings, partitions, air conditioning, fire protection, and security.

Tenant Right to Counsel – an initiative approved by voters that provides full legal representation to households facing eviction

Acronyms and Abbreviations

By full name:

American Community Survey (ACS)

Area Median Income (AMI)

Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG)

Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART)

Catholic Charities (CC)

City & County of San Francisco (City)

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)

Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS)

Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Reports (CAPERs)

Continuum of Care (CoC)

Department of Aging and Adult Services (DAAS)

Department of Children, Youth and Their Families (DCYF)

Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH)

Department of Public Health (DPH)

Department of Public Works (DPW)

Department on the Status of Women (DOSW)

Dignity Fund Community Needs Assessment (DFCNA)

Eligible Metropolitan Area (EMA)

Eligible Metropolitan Statistical Area (EMSA)

Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG)

Healthy Streets Operations Center (HSOC)

HOME Investment Partnerships program (HOME)

Homeless Management Information System (HMIS)

Housing Choice Voucher (HCV)

Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS (HOPWA)

Housing Urban Development Area Median Family Income (HAMFI)

Human Services Agency (HSA)

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer or questioning, intersex, allies (LGBTQ+)

Long-Term Care Coordinating Council (LTCCC)

Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)
Men who have sex with men (MSM)
Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area (NRSA)
Notice of funding availability (NOFA)
Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII)
Office of Community Planning and Development (OCPD)
Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD)
Our Children Our Families (OCOF)
People living with HIV/AIDS (PLWHA)
Persons who inject drugs (PWID)
Point-in-Time (PIT)
Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)
Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD)
Request for Proposals (RFP)
Residential Care Facilities for the Chronically Ill (RCFCI)
Resource Development Associates (RDA)
San Francisco AIDS Foundation (SFAF)
San Francisco Continuum of Care (CoC)
San Francisco Homeless Outreach Team (SFHOT)
San Francisco Housing Authority (SFHA; Authority)
San Francisco Local Homeless Coordinating Board (LHCB)
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA)
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (SFRA)
San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD)
Single-Room Occupancy (SRO)
State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)
Theory of Change (ToC)
Transitional Age Youth (TAY)
Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA)
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS)
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)

By acronym or abbreviation:

(ABAG)	Association of Bay Area Governments
(ACS)	American Community Survey
(AMI)	Area Median Income
(BART)	Bay Area Rapid Transit
(CAPER)	Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report
(CC)	Catholic Charities
(CDBG)	Community Development Block Grant
(CHAS)	Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy
(City)	The City & County of San Francisco
(CoC)	Continuum of Care
(CPD)	Office of Community Planning and Development
(DAAS)	Department of Aging and Adult Services
(DAH)	Direct Access to Housing Program
(DFCNA)	Dignity Fund Community Needs Assessment
(DCYF)	Department of Children, Youth and Families
(DPH)	Department of Public Health
(DOSW)	Department on the Status of Women
(DPW)	Department of Public Works
(EMA)	Eligible Metropolitan Area
(EMSA)	Eligible Metropolitan Statistical Area
(ESG)	Emergency Solutions Grant
(HAMFI)	Housing Urban Development Area Median Family Income
(HCV)	Housing Choice Voucher
(HHS)	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
(HMIS)	Homeless Management Information System
(HOME)	HOME Investment Partnerships program
(HOPWA)	Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS
(HSA)	Human Services Agency
(HSOC)	Healthy Streets Operations Center
(HUD)	U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
(LHCB)	San Francisco Local Homeless Coordinating Board

(LGBTQ+)	Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer or questioning, intersex, allies
(LTCCC)	Long-Term Care Coordinating Council
(MOHCD)	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
(MSM)	Men who have sex with men
(NOFA)	Notice of funding availability
(NRSA)	Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area
(OCII)	Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure
(OCOF)	Our Children Our Families
OCPD	Office of Community Planning and Development
(OEWD)	Office of Economic and Workforce Development
(PIT)	Point-in-Time
(PLWHA)	People living with HIV/AIDS
(PWID)	Persons who inject drugs
(RAD)	Rental Assistance Demonstration
(RCFCIs)	Residential Care Facilities for the Chronically Ill
(RDA)	Resource Development Associates
(RFP)	Request for Proposal
(RHNA)	Regional Housing Needs Allocation
(SFAF)	San Francisco AIDS Foundation
(SFHA)	San Francisco Housing Authority
(SFHOT)	San Francisco Homeless Outreach Team
(SFILEN)	San Francisco Immigrant Legal & Education Network
(SFMTA)	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
(SFRA)	San Francisco Redevelopment Agency
(SFUSD)	San Francisco Unified School District
(SRO)	Single-Room Occupancy
(TAY)	Transitional Age Youth
(TIDA)	Treasure Island Development Authority
(ToC)	Theory of Change

Appendix



MOHCD Five Year Planning Process: Integrated Needs Analysis

Introduction to this Document

In support of the development of its 2020-2025 Consolidated Plan, Analysis of Impediments, and HIV Housing Plan, the City and County of San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) engaged in a year-long, city-wide outreach and engagement process with stakeholders and residents of San Francisco. During this process, MOHCD outreached to a wide range of community stakeholders and residents for their perspectives, needs, feedback, and input, specifically targeting the City's most vulnerable populations. This process served as a framework to identify housing and community development priorities, which, in turn, will drive the goals and strategies outlined in the final plans. Ultimately, MOHCD will use the community's input and priorities to inform decision-making for funding community services.

MOHCD contracted with Resource Development Associates (RDA) to develop an integrated needs analysis for these three plans and as well as other ongoing efforts led by the Planning Department. This needs analysis includes findings from the community outreach events organized by MOHCD as well as RDA's review of approximately 50 community needs assessments, consolidated plans, and other relevant departmental reports from city and county agencies in San Francisco and the Bay Area. Finally, this document pulls in secondary data from the 2017 American Community Survey (ACS) where appropriate to contextualize data and/or findings.

As an assessment of community needs, this document presents findings in terms of what services San Franciscans indicate that they most need. While residents discussed challenges, the community engagement and document review also reflect that residents who are connected to services generally have positive experiences and view the programs favorably.

This document organizes findings around the following domains: housing services, social and supportive services, economic self-sufficiency, service access, community empowerment and engagement, coordination of services, and housing barriers. These "buckets" of community needs were selected because they reflect the ways in which data were collected as well as how community members naturally discussed their service needs and concerns.

To support MOHCD's prioritization of vulnerable populations across the housing spectrum, RDA analyzed 37 survey reports under different population-specific filters in order to capture the unique needs of prioritized population groups. RDA examined survey results for all subgroups under each of the following filters to inform the analysis and synthesis presented in this report: race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender identity, age (seniors and TAY), HIV status, disability status, and housing status (homeless). Population-specific needs that emerged from this analytical process are documented in the appropriate section in the document.



Methodology and Data Sources

As stated above, this needs analysis integrates findings from community outreach and engagement efforts, an extensive document review, and secondary data from the 2017 ACS. A description of the community outreach and engagement process, including participant demographics, a description of the document review, and a brief overview of secondary data are below. A detailed review of the methodology RDA used to code qualitative data from community meetings is included in Appendix A. Survey data was quantitative and analyzed using summary output reports.

Community Outreach and Engagement

Community input is a critical part of the strategic planning process, providing crucial data to ensure funded programs and services address the highest priority needs of vulnerable populations as well as the City holistically. During this process, public input was obtained through community meetings (neighborhood forums and population-specific focus groups) and web surveys.

Outreach and Engagement Participant Demographics

MOHCD's community outreach process engaged a total of 3,614 participants across community forums, focus groups, and web surveys. About twice as many women as men participated, with this ratio remaining consistent across engagement events. Participants represented a diversity of sexual orientation and racial/ethnic identities, with about one third identifying as LGBTQ+ and two thirds identifying with a race or ethnicity other than white. Tables 1-3 below summarize gender identity, sexual orientation, and race/ethnicity for all community participants who completed a demographic form, either in person or online. All survey participants provided demographic information, but this information was more difficult to capture during in-person events. Although most participants did provide this information, the values in the tables below may under-represent actual participation totals.

Community participation by race/ethnicity as represented in Table 3 below largely reflects San Francisco's population as a whole. In San Francisco, 41% of the population identifies as white, 34% as Asian, 15% as Latino/a or Hispanic, 5% as Black or African American, 4% as multiracial, and 1% as Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander and American Indian or Alaska Native.¹ Groups with disproportionately high engagement across community meetings include Black, African American or African participants, who represented 14% of all participants, and American Indian or Alaska Native participants, who represented 5% of all participants.

¹ American Community Survey, 2017



Table 1: Self-Reported Gender Identity Across Community Outreach Efforts

Gender Identity	n	%
Female	1,732	60%
Male	955	33%
I prefer not to answer	74	3%
Genderqueer/ Gender Non-binary	73	3%
Trans Female	17	<1%
Other	14	<1%
Trans Male	10	<1%
Total Participants Self-Reporting Gender Identity	2,875	100%

Table 2: Self-Reported Sexual Orientation Across Community Outreach Efforts

Sexual Orientation	n	%
Straight/Heterosexual	1,656	60%
Prefer not to answer	372	14%
Gay/Lesbian/Same Gender Loving	372	14%
Bisexual	238	9%
Other	81	3%
Questioning/Unsure	26	<1%
Total Participants Self-Reporting Sexual Orientation	2,745	100%

Table 3: Self-Reported Race/Ethnicity Across Community Outreach Efforts

Race/Ethnicity	n	%
Asian	1,061	33%
White	1,005	31%
Black, African American or African	455	14%
Latino/a or Hispanic	420	13%
American Indian or Alaska Native	172	5%
Middle Eastern or North African	63	2%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	40	1%
Total Participants Self-Reporting Race/Ethnicity	3,216	100%

1. Community Forums and Focus Groups

MOHCD facilitated 10 neighborhood-based public forums and at least 40 population-specific focus groups. Representatives from across the housing spectrum participated in the forums and focus groups, including individuals experiencing homelessness, residents of public and subsidized housing, housing and social service providers, HIV/AIDS housing advocates, homeowners, new San Francisco residents, recent immigrants, and life-long residents of the City. MOHCD facilitated sessions with cultural groups including African American, Cambodian, Samoan, Vietnamese, LGBTQ, and PLWHA community members. Participants responded to a series of structured questions on a range of relevant domains including



City and County of San Francisco, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
2020-2025 Consolidated Plan & HIV Housing Plan: Community Engagement Key Findings

housing and service needs, barriers to housing access and choice, neighborhood change, and discrimination and fair housing. The following tables list the events held during this process, and the numbers of attendees participating in each.

Table 4: Townhall-Style Community Forums, December 2018 – February 2019

Community Forums	District(s)	Attendees ²
Bayview Hunters Point	D10	70
Castro	D7 & D8	29
Chinatown	D2 & D3	165
Excelsior and OMI	D11	79
Mission	D9	54
South of Market	D6	51
Sunset	D1 & D4	55
Tenderloin	D6	85
Visitacion Valley	D10	30
Western Addition	D5	38
Total Participants		656

² These numbers may under-represent actual attendance because some participants did not provide demographic information.



Table 5: Community Focus Groups, December 2018 – February 2019

Focus Groups	Attendees
African American Community	35
Cambodian Community	19
Council of Community Housing Orgs.	14
Eviction Prevention & Tenant Empowerment Working Group	22
HIV Community	50
HIV Housing Providers	21
Homeowners	8
HOPE SF Hunters View Housing Community	21
HOPE SF Potrero Hill Housing Community	58
HOPE SF Sunnydale Housing Community	13
Housing Action Coalition	3
Human Service Network	7
Latino Service Providers & Advocates	19
LGBTQ Community	20
Local Homeless Coordinating Board	13
Long Term Care Coordinating Council	50
Mayor's Disability Council	20
RAD - 1760 Bush	20
RAD - 1880 Pine	11
RAD - 18th St	13
RAD - 25 Sanchez	11
RAD - 2698 California	21
RAD - 345 Arguello	31
RAD - 462 Duboce	5
RAD - 491 31st	18
RAD - Clementina Towers	15
RAD - Bernal Dwellings Housing Community	9
RAD - Hayes Valley North & South	17
RAD - JFK	28
RAD - Mission Dolores	7
RAD - Robert B. Pitts	20
RAD - Westside Courts	15
RAD - Woodside	9
Samoan Community	12
San Francisco Immigrant Legal & Education Network	20
Senior Disability Action	40
Transgender Community	6
Vietnamese Community	18
Total Participants	739



Forum and Focus Group Participant Demographics

A total of 1,395 individuals took part in the community meetings, which were held across San Francisco between November 2018 and March 2019. Participants were asked to complete forms identifying a number of demographic characteristics, including as gender, race or ethnicity, and sexual orientation, but not all participants opted to complete this form. Notably, among those who did complete the form, most identified as female, straight/heterosexual, and Asian. The following tables display demographic characteristics of participants that elected to complete the form.

Gender – Forums	#	%
Female	300	68%
Male	128	29%
I prefer not to answer	5	1%
Genderqueer/ Non-binary	4	1%
Other	2	<1%
Total	439	100%

Gender – Focus Groups	#	%
Female	138	62%
Male	81	36%
Other	2	<1%
Trans Male	2	<1%
Trans Female	1	<1%
Total	224	100%

Orientation - Forums	#	%
Straight/Heterosexual	261	67%
I prefer not to answer	46	12%
Gay/Lesbian/Same-Gender	36	9%
Bisexual	33	9%
Other	12	3%
Total	388	100%

Orientation – Focus Groups	#	%
Straight/Heterosexual	158	77%
I prefer not to answer	22	11%
Gay/Lesbian/Same-Gender	10	5%
Bisexual	9	4%
Other	5	2%
Grand Total	204	100%

Race/Ethnicity – Forums	#	%
Asian	214	51%
Latino/a or Hispanic	64	15%
Black or African	61	15%
White	61	15%
American Indian or Alaska Native	13	3%
Middle Eastern or N. African	5	1%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	2	0%
Total	420	100%

Race/Ethnicity – Focus Grps	#	%
Asian	97	38%
Black or African	60	24%
White	52	20%
Latino/a or Hispanic	23	9%
American Indian or Alaska Native	14	5%
Middle Eastern or N. African	7	3%
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	2	1%
Total	255	100%



2. Community Surveys

MOHCD developed two community surveys to capture residents' housing and non-housing service needs as well as their housing experiences more generally.

Planning Survey

This survey asked respondents what they need to get and stay in housing, which non-housing services are most important for them and their family, how they prefer to access services, their opinions of MOHCD, and other quality of life questions. This survey also included a demographic component where respondents indicated their age, race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, HIV/AIDS status, housing status, disability status, income level, educational attainment, and language preference.

Planning Responses

2,219 total responses
24 responses/day (average)

Program Evaluation Survey

After completing the Planning Survey, participants had the opportunity to complete the MOHCD Program Evaluation survey, which asked about utilization of programs and services. Respondents were asked about their utilization of economic and workforce development programs, housing placement programs, housing services, and community services and then asked to rate and describe their overall experience with these programs and services. This survey was thus able to collect and compare specific utilization data from a range of City and community programs and services and nuance these data with participants' numerical rankings and qualitative assessments.

Program Evaluation Responses

1,537 total responses
14 responses/day (average)

Survey Respondent Demographics

Survey respondents that completed the planning survey were invited to take the program evaluation survey, and, as a result, most program evaluation survey respondents were counted in the planning survey demographic results. Residents from across 40 different San Francisco neighborhoods completed the planning survey, with responses from residents of the Mission, Tenderloin, Chinatown, South of Market, Sunset/Parkside, and Bayview Hunters Point each representing 5% or more of the total survey share. Respondents indicated a diversity of gender, sexual orientation, and racial identities. A slight majority of respondents identified as straight/heterosexual (58%) and as female (60%). Fifteen percent (15%) of respondents self-identified as gay/lesbian/same gender loving, 14% preferred not to answer, and 9% identified as bisexual. Thirty-five percent (35%) of respondents self-identified as white, 30% as Asian, 13% as Black/African American or African, 13% as Latino/a or Hispanic, 6% as American Indian or Alaska Native, 2% as Middle Eastern or North African, and 1% as Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander.

The following tables display planning survey response counts by self-reported neighborhood of residence, sexual orientation, gender identity, and race.



Table 6: Planning Survey Responses by Neighborhood of Residence

Neighborhood	#	%
Mission	232	12%
Tenderloin	175	9%
Chinatown	139	7%
South of Market	135	7%
Sunset/Parkside	126	6%
Bayview Hunters Point	121	6%
Castro/Upper Market	79	4%
Western Addition	76	4%
Excelsior	68	3%
Outer Richmond	65	3%
Bernal Heights	57	3%
Haight Ashbury	57	3%
Oceanview/Merced/Ingleside	50	3%
Hayes Valley	47	2%
Outer Mission	44	2%
Inner Sunset	43	2%
Mission Bay	43	2%
North Beach	41	2%
Financial District	38	2%
Inner Richmond	36	2%
Potrero Hill	35	2%
Glen Park	31	2%
Portola	31	2%
Visitation Valley	29	1%
Pacific Heights	23	1%
Twin Peaks	21	1%
Nob Hill	21	1%
Noe Valley	20	1%
Marina	19	1%
Russian Hill	18	1%
Japantown	16	1%
West of Twin Peaks	15	1%
Lakeshore	13	1%
Golden Gate Park	10	1%
Treasure Island	8	0%
Lone Mountain/USF	7	0%
Presidio	6	0%
Presidio Heights	5	0%
Lincoln Park	4	0%
McLaren Park	3	0%
Seacliff	3	0%
Total Participants Self-Reporting Neighborhood	2,219	100%



Figure 1: Self-Reported Sexual Orientation, Planning Survey Respondents




Figure 2: Self-Reported Gender Identity, Planning Survey Respondents





Figure 3: Self-Reported Race/Ethnicity, Planning Survey Respondents³





Document Review

MOHCD's outreach and engagement efforts are embedded within a network of ongoing planning processes led by partner agencies seeking to identify and respond to community needs. To capture results from these outreach processes and supplement MOHCD's engagement efforts, RDA conducted a review of over 50 planning documents from partner City agencies, cross-sector partnerships and initiatives, and advocacy groups in order to understand previous and current research, findings, and demographics of populations engaged. As detailed in Appendix B., approximately half (23) of the documents noted community participation in these planning processes, with outreach and engagement strategies including focus groups, public forums, community meetings, formal public comment, and online forums. For each document that included community participation, RDA recorded community input related to each of the identified research questions. Appendix B provides further information about the planning documents and the outreach methods that contributed to these documents.

Secondary Data

This document pulls in high-level secondary data from the 2017 ACS to contextualize data and/or findings where appropriate. The ACS is a nationwide survey that collects and produces information on social, economic, housing, and demographic characteristics about our nation's population every year. Some figures use analysis of ACS data conducted by third parties and these instances are noted in footnotes throughout the document.



Summary of Findings

Cross-cutting Community Needs and Concerns

1. Among the concerns identified during community engagement, San Francisco stakeholders are most frequently concerned about displacement, increasing housing prices, the overall cleanliness and safety of their neighborhoods, and transit accessibility.
2. Participants in MOHCD's community engagement identified that services to support self-sufficiency and stability are as important as the need for housing itself.
3. Many stakeholders expressed a prominent need for culturally inclusive and culturally-specific services.
4. Participants expressed a need for greater awareness of, navigation of, and access to available services, including both housing and other supportive services.
5. Stakeholders expressed a desire for more inclusive and relaxed standards around affordable housing eligibility.
6. Many community members voiced the need for more opportunities to provide input on the City's housing eligibility policies as well as participate in the development of affordable housing programs.
7. Stakeholders asked for more streamlined services, improved interagency collaboration, and stronger cross-agency communication to support the delivery of both housing and supportive services.

Housing Services

1. Community engagement participants emphasized the need for affordable housing environments at the most vulnerable end of the housing spectrum: shelters and transitional housing for persons experiencing homelessness, accessible housing for seniors and individuals with disabilities, and affordable housing for the lowest-income households.
2. While affordable housing was the most frequently mentioned housing services need, the recognition of the intersection of health and housing was a common thread throughout the discussions, as participants emphasized the need for safe and healthy living environments.
3. Community members expressed the need for stronger eviction and tenant supports and protections, including tenant education as well as City policies to prevent unlawful eviction.

Social and Supportive Services

1. Community members need affordable, targeted support for trauma, PTSD, substance use disorders, and other mental health conditions.
2. Compared to housing needs, social and supportive service needs are more intensive and vary by population.

Economic Self-Sufficiency

1. Participants expressed an overwhelming need for paid job training programs that provide pathways to living-wage, sustainable employment.



2. There is a large need for financial literacy and planning programs as well as financial services, specifically savings and credit counseling services.
3. Residents want San Francisco employers to hire more local residents.

Knowledge of and Access to Services

1. Participants indicated limited knowledge about availability of and eligibility for housing and social services, as well as a need for assistance navigating those services.
2. In addition to needing greater knowledge of eligibility requirements, stakeholders conveyed that eligibility requirements can be a barrier to accessing services.
3. Participants expressed a need for inclusive language support services, in order to promote both knowledge of services and service access, especially for health and housing.
4. Residents experience several barriers to transportation in San Francisco, including long wait times, safety, and cost of transportation, which impede their access to jobs, medical appointments, and other services.

Community Empowerment and Engagement

1. Vulnerable community stakeholders want better relationships and accountability with MOHCD.
2. Participants articulated a wide need for culturally-competent and inclusive outreach and community engagement strategies that promote community-building and link residents to services.

Coordination of Services

1. Stakeholders asked for more streamlined services, improved interagency collaboration, and stronger cross-agency communication to support the delivery of both housing and supportive services.
2. Community members that participated in forums and focus groups asked for more financial and capacity-building support for nonprofit organizations and other service providers, including changes to contracting rules.

Housing Access, Perceptions, and Barriers

1. Participants named displacement and increasing housing prices as the top concerns impacting housing access and the ability to remain in housing.
2. Both renters and homeowners express low overall housing choice because they feel “locked in.”
3. Participants highlighted barriers to homeownership centering around both housing prices and financing options.
4. Neighborhood forum participants shared the qualities that they believe make a neighborhood desirable, identifying the following characteristics:
5. Participants in community engagement shared multiple experiences of housing discrimination, but overall, their responses reveal that there is not one specific, overt type of discrimination. Their responses indicate a more pervasive and entrenched systemic discrimination that affects people of color and African American communities in particular.



Key Findings

Cross-cutting Community Needs and Concerns

- 1. Among the concerns identified during community engagement, San Francisco stakeholders are most frequently concerned about displacement, increasing housing prices, the overall cleanliness and safety of their neighborhoods, and transit accessibility.**

When asked to describe significant changes in their neighborhood in the past five years, participants in community forums and focus groups emphasized that the rising cost of housing, combined with limited income and insufficient employment and wage opportunities, severely impacts their sense of security and choice related to their living situation. Community engagement activities for other City and County planning processes elicited similar concerns. The recognition of the intersection of health and housing was a common thread throughout the discussions. Across forums and focus groups, as well as other City community engagement processes, participants articulated healthy housing needs with urgency, citing concerns related to “toxic” SRO and Section 8 environments, food deserts, street sanitation, and community violence. Residents experience barriers to transportation, including long wait times, safety, and cost of transportation, which impede access to jobs, medical appointments, and other services.

- 2. Participants in MOHCD's community engagement identified that services to support self-sufficiency and stability are as important as the need for housing itself.**

It is not a surprise, given the current housing challenges across the entire Bay Area and in San Francisco specifically, that participants in all community forums and in all focus groups (except for the one designated for homeowners) discussed strong needs for more affordable housing options. Similarly, during the prior planning process covering fiscal years 2015-2019, MOHCD identified “increasing affordable housing” as the top priority across all stakeholder groups and data collection formats.³ At the same time, discussions among residents frequently centered on needs for job training, behavioral health supports, language access, financial planning and education, and access to affordable community services such as childcare.

- 3. Many stakeholders expressed a prominent need for culturally inclusive and culturally-specific services.**

Focus groups and forums revealed that while there are many consistent service needs across San Franciscans, there are distinct housing and service needs for vulnerable groups including seniors and persons with disabilities, LGBTQ+ individuals, immigrant communities, and communities of color.

- 4. Participants expressed a need for greater awareness of, navigation of, and access to available services, including both housing and other supportive services.**

³ Increasing affordable housing was consistently identified as the top priority across all stakeholder groups and data collection formats. (pg 20)



Participants across community engagements spoke about a need for service navigation, case management, and coordinated and streamlined service delivery. This need was discussed in relation to housing services as well as broader social and supportive services.

5. Stakeholders expressed a desire for more inclusive and relaxed standards around affordable housing eligibility.

When speaking about affordable housing, many participants expressed that the income requirements are too low, preventing families that also need affordable and subsidized housing from being eligible. In addition, many stakeholders highlighted that immigration status can serve as a barrier to eligibility for these housing opportunities as well as other services.

6. Many community members voiced the need for more opportunities to provide input on the City's housing eligibility policies as well as participate in the development of affordable housing programs.

In particular, many participants expressed a desire for the City to conduct more community outreach and to provide information about and seek input on available services and pending policy developments related to affordable housing.

7. Stakeholders asked for more streamlined services, improved interagency collaboration, and stronger cross-agency communication to support the delivery of both housing and supportive services.

Forum and focus group participants generally agreed that increasing interagency collaboration and streamlining services would decrease barriers to access and facilitate service navigation. Participants would like to see centralized resources such as DAHLIA duplicated across other services as well as increased warm hand-offs between agencies and uniform information across service providers.



Housing Services

1. **Community engagement participants emphasized the need for affordable housing environments at the most vulnerable end of the housing spectrum: shelters and transitional housing for persons experiencing homelessness, accessible housing for seniors and individuals with disabilities, and affordable housing for the lowest-income households.**

Focus groups and forums revealed heightened housing and service needs for vulnerable groups including seniors and persons with disabilities, LGBTQ+ individuals, persons living with HIV, immigrant communities, and communities of color. In community forums, focus groups, and in other City and County planning processes, participants frequently discussed needs for low-income housing, housing for seniors, additional public shelters, and safe places to go and stay.⁴

- Focus groups with the **LGBTQ+ community** highlighted concerns for LGBTQ+ individuals experiencing homelessness. The most frequently discussed need was for safe shelters and transitional housing, with an emphasis on safe environments for transgender individuals.
- A need for housing for **seniors and persons with disabilities** was mentioned in nine out of 10 community forums and multiple focus groups. The most commonly specified needs were for affordable, accessible, and supportive housing that allows them to live as independently as possible and/or age in place. For these populations, supportive services are necessary in order to maintain housing. In the DAAS Community Needs Assessment, this need was amplified in African American and Hispanic/Latino focus groups and community forums.⁵
- **Persons living with HIV/AIDS (PLWHA)** and PLWHA providers pointed out several characteristics that can improve the housing environments for persons living with HIV, including safety, quiet, personal outdoor space, having a liaison between building management and tenants, and management being respectful and knowledgeable about HIV. MOHCD and OEWD also noted that the high number of PLWHA at-risk for experiencing homelessness – 12,344 individuals or 77.6% of San Francisco's PLWHA population – is more than ten times the number of subsidies currently available.⁶ The Alameda County AIDS Housing Needs Assessment points to an acute need for increased medical respite. Thousands of persons experiencing homelessness are released from area hospitals onto the streets, exacerbating their health conditions and making re-admittance

The table below highlights the top fifteen housing and housing service needs that participants named across all community engagement events and also across all survey responses.

Affordable housing
Rental assistance/reduced-cost housing
Housing navigation and application assistance
Safe shelter, transitional, and permanent housing environments
More housing protections
Senior and accessible housing
Eviction prevention support
Housing subsidies
Tenant education
Supportive housing
Down-payment assistance
Housing close to employment
Landlord negotiation assistance
Relocation assistance
Mortgage, HOA dues or foreclosure assistance

This section contains qualitative findings synthesized from the ways community members described and contextualized their needs.

⁴ Department of Public Health, Community Health Needs Assessment, pg 39

⁵ Department of Aging and Adult Services, Dignity Fund Community Needs Assessment

⁶ "At-risk" is based on being low income (at or below 50% AMI) and not receiving any housing support; OEWD 2017-18 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) report



and mortality more likely; still, the City and County only provides 18 medical respite beds for the entire community.⁷

- Community members in seven of the 10 forums raised a need for more youth services. In terms of housing, they recommended affordable housing assistance for **transitional age youth (TAY)**, particularly for homeless TAY and TAY who are in school. In a survey of 229 unaccompanied homeless youth conducted by Applied Survey Research (ASR), forty-three percent (43%) of youth reported that they did not expect to have stable housing within the 12 months following the survey. When asked about barriers to permanent housing, 54% reported that they could not afford rent, followed by 36% who reported not enough income or no job. Twenty-seven percent (27%) reported not enough housing was available, followed by 17% who could not afford moving costs, and 15% who felt the housing process was too difficult.⁸
- Several focus group participants noted the need for emergency/transitional **housing for families**, including accessible housing for families with children who have disabilities.

2. While affordable housing was the most frequently mentioned housing services need, the recognition of the intersection of health and housing was a common thread throughout the discussions, as participants emphasized the need for safe and healthy living environments.

Across forums and focus groups, participants articulated healthy housing needs with urgency, citing concerns related to “toxic” SRO and Section 8 environments, food deserts, street sanitation, and community violence. The need for safer shelters was mentioned in eight of the 10 forums and in most focus groups. In addition to safety, participants named shelter overcrowding as a top concern. Nearly 60% of survey respondents reported a serious health or accessibility concern about where they live. Survey respondents indicated that they would like to see better sidewalks and safer crosswalks, more parks and open spaces, street beautification projects, and increased indoor recreational space in their neighborhoods, among other public space improvements.

Similarly, during community conversations on the “Our Children, Our Families Initiative,” families particularly expressed the importance of maintaining a clean, safe environment in their neighborhoods. Families stressed the critical need for more accessible, affordable, safe and stable housing with safe green spaces and access to healthy food and grocery stores; families additionally expressed a desire for neighborhoods free of drugs, crime and violence for children, youth and families to thrive. City and County plans recommend monitoring fair housing conditions that meet Health Department health and safety codes, including basics such as kitchen and bathroom.⁹ In the Department of Public Health’s Community Health Needs Assessment, residents voiced a desire for a cleaner and safer city—some did not feel safe to exercise in their neighborhood—and suggested more green spaces, community gardens, public parks, and clean public restrooms.¹⁰

⁷ Alameda County AIDS Housing Needs Assessment

⁸ 2017 San Francisco Unique Youth Survey & Count Report

⁹ Department of Children Youth and Families, Our Children, Our Families (OCOF) Five-Year Plan, Year One Report 2016

¹⁰ Department of Public Health, Community Health Needs Assessment, pg 39



The Planning Department notes that families with children are consistently the majority of overcrowded homes in San Francisco. Since 2005, overcrowded households that are families with children comprised about 26,000 of the households in San Francisco or 50% of the total households in the City that are overcrowded.¹¹ In the 2014 Housing Element, the Planning Department particularly identifies Asian-American and Hispanic/Latino households comprise disproportionate numbers of overcrowded households (14%). These households are likely to be larger and have lower incomes, and, in order to afford the cost of housing, many low-income families crowd into smaller units.¹²

3. Community members expressed the need for stronger eviction and tenant supports and protections, including tenant education as well as City policies to prevent unlawful eviction.

In most forums and in all focus groups (but the one designated for homeowners), participants expressed the fear of eviction and a desire for greater protections. For example, in several forums and focus groups, participants observed that community members may hesitate to ask for improvements to their units because they fear the consequences of being seen as a “bad tenant.” Participants identified a need to know where they can go to access information about tenants’ rights, emphasizing a desire for preventive services prior to fair housing violations or unlawful eviction proceedings (e.g., information about what repairs and amenities tenants are entitled to under law). Participants also need assistance available on-demand, and tenant-focused legal services in escalated situations such as landlord harassment.

Community input in the previous Analysis of Impediments reflects that many individuals and landlords remain uninformed about their tenant/landlord rights and fair housing rights and obligations. Stakeholders expressed the need for additional community-based services in this arena, particularly for legal services to prevent eviction.¹³

- In particular, **seniors and older adults** discussed frustration and confusion around their legal rights related to evictions and mistreatment from property managers.¹⁴

In addition to tenant-focused education and services, participants want the City to develop policies and landlord education programs to prevent the types of predatory practices that may lead to displacement. Participants were also asked for suggestions for increasing the number of landlords who accept Section 8 vouchers for their units. Their suggestions included: education and technical support to landlords; liaisons between tenants and landlords (e.g., a voucher manager to help resolve disputes/complaints, required payee services for tenants); funding for habitability standards improvements, repairs, and damages; incentives/tax credits for landlords; payment for vacant units in project-based sites; pre-payment of rent by the City; and permitting Section 8 vouchers for non-traditional housing such as co-ops.

¹¹ Planning Department, Housing for Families with Children (Family Friend Housing White Paper)

¹² Planning Department, San Francisco General Plan 2014 Housing Element

¹³ Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), 2013-2018 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice

¹⁴ Department of Aging and Adult Services, 2018 Dignity Fund Community Needs Assessment



Social and Supportive Services

1. Community members need affordable, targeted support for trauma, PTSD, substance use disorders, and other mental health conditions.

Mental health (MH) and substance use (SU) services together were the most frequently mentioned social and supportive service need across all community meetings. Although participants in some groups mentioned specific needs such as methadone clinics, or particular clinical approaches like trauma-informed care, participants for the most part described a need for general mental health services. Similarly, the previous Consolidated Plan community engagement process found that residents and service providers largely converged on other pressing concerns including: providing mental health and substance use services, addressing homelessness, and supporting transitional age youth (TAY).¹⁵

- Nearly a third (28.9%) of survey **respondents identifying as having a disability** indicated that one of the most important services to them or their family is access to mental health and/or substance use help.
- Nearly a third (27%) of **LGBTQ+** survey respondents reported mental health and/or substance use help as their top need.
- **American Indian or Alaska Native** survey respondents, **Black, African American or African** respondents, and **multiracial** respondents listed mental health and/or substance use help as a top need.

Residents specifically called for accessible and culturally competent mental health services to address the trauma of homelessness. The DCYF Community Needs Assessment also pointed to a need for social-emotional support for those who lack basic housing and/or are facing homelessness.¹⁶ Along these lines, the Homeownership SF assessment, which included focus groups with older adults, adults with disabilities, LGBTQ+ households, persons living HIV, and Asian/Pacific Islander communities, found that multiple housing barriers result in a mental and physical toll on participants. This report noted:

"Many participants mentioned experiencing depression, anxiety and trauma due to housing instability, which was then compounded by institutional barriers they faced during their housing search. Participants commonly cited that the inability to find affordable housing has impacted their health and/or ability to find stable employment. Participants frequently shared that the act of navigating complicated bureaucracies left

The table below highlights the top fifteen social and supportive service needs that participants named across all community engagement events and also across all survey responses.

Benefits assistance (CalWorks, SNAP, Medi-Cal, etc.)
Better access to healthcare
Access to healthy food
Mental health and substance use support
Language support
Knowledge of available services
Support for seniors and people with disabilities
Affordable childcare
Case management
Legal services – consumer/civil rights
Legal services – worker/employment rights
Legal services – immigration support
Access to recreation
Nutrition programs
Neighborhood clean-up and safety programs

This section contains qualitative findings synthesized from the ways community members ***described*** and ***contextualized*** their needs.

¹⁵ Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), 2015-2020 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan

¹⁶ DCYF Community Needs Assessment



them feeling hopeless, and restricted their ability to engage in activities or programming to achieve a greater level of self-sufficiency.”¹⁷

2. Compared to housing needs, social and supportive service needs are more intensive and vary by population.

Across all community meetings, participants expressed a need for any type of social or supportive service roughly 860 times. Participants expressed any type of housing-related need 530 times. In addition to being expressed more frequently, social and supportive service needs also varied more by population.

- Nearly half (47.6%) of **TAY** survey respondents list benefits support (SSDI, Section 8, etc.) as the non-housing service that they most need.
- Nearly two-thirds (64.3%) of survey respondents indicate they are experiencing **homelessness** list benefits support (SSDI, Section 8, etc.) as the non-housing service they need most.
- Over half (50.3%) of survey respondents who indicated they are **HIV+** list benefits support (SSDI, Section 8, etc.) as the non-housing service they need most.
- **Participants experiencing homelessness** voiced a need for case management twice as frequently as other groups. The next top needs were for employment support and training, financial assistance including rental assistance and subsidies, and supportive housing.
- A need for supportive services for **seniors and people with disabilities** was mentioned in seven of the 10 community forums and nearly all focus groups. Commonly mentioned needs were related to case management and reducing isolation – including senior centers/hubs, outreach, and transportation.
- Focus groups with **residents in public and subsidized housing** conveyed the highest number of needs out of all forums and focus groups. In these focus groups, the most commonly mentioned need was for mental health services, followed by needs for accessible transportation, employment, and food access. Mental health and substance use services were mentioned by residents of public housing twice as frequently as all other groups. This group was the only forum or focus group in which food access was one of the five most frequently mentioned needs. Other top needs among participants included employment training, financial planning and education services, health and wellness services, senior and disability support, and overall knowledge of available services.
- In seven out of 10 forums, participants spoke about an overall need for social services and assistance for **immigrant communities**. This need was frequently discussed in the Mission and SOMA forums and in focus groups with cultural groups and housing advocates. Several participants also spoke to challenges faced by mixed-status families (e.g., family unification being affected by current immigration policies).
- Participants in focus groups with the **LGBTQ+ community** discussed a need for cultural competence among service providers and a desire for LGBTQ+ specific services, mental health support, and case management.

¹⁷ Homeownership SF report: Results from 2017-2018 Focus Groups. Assessment of Housing Needs and Barriers experienced by Black, Latino and Pacific Islander Communities, LGBT households, Seniors, and Persons with Disabilities



City and County of San Francisco, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
2020-2025 Consolidated Plan & HIV Housing Plan: Community Engagement Key Findings

- Focus group participants with **Black/African American community** members highlighted that racial disparities affect economic opportunities and service access. Consequently, there is a need for culturally relevant services focused on economic empowerment (home ownership, land ownership, business ownership), as well as healing services that address intergenerational trauma. Participants also commented on the need for safe open spaces for families and safety in getting to school/work. Bayview-Hunters Point forum participants shared a need for supportive services specific to the reentry population.
- Focus groups with **persons living with HIV/AIDS** and HIV service providers highlighted the need for services that address the health, mental health, housing, and employment needs that many low-income individuals living with HIV encounter. Financial support was the top need mentioned in HIV-specific focus groups, followed by case management, with discussions focusing on the value of appointment reminders, medication adherence support, and onsite supportive services that vary with degrees of support needed (e.g., appointment escort, drop in counseling, and transportation to appointments). Job training and culturally relevant mental health support also emerged as top needs. The Alameda County AIDS needs assessment observed that, in that County, substance abuse interventions and resources are hard to access, fragmented and not aligned with emerging and best practices for persons experiencing homelessness.¹⁸
- Forum and focus group participants identified a desire for more **services focused on TAY/youth**, including recreation (e.g., afterschool programs, outdoor recreation spaces); leadership development for youth and transition-age youth; and employment support (e.g., summer and afterschool jobs or internships). TAY expressed interest in pathways to upward mobility and mentorship with adults in their communities who have successfully transitioned out of public housing, off public assistance, and into gainful employment and independent living.
- Families living on Treasure Island explained they have limited access to resources, such as children, youth and family programs, transportation, health supports and school choice.¹⁹

¹⁸ Alameda County AIDS Housing Needs Assessment

¹⁹ Department of Children Youth and Families, Our Children, Our Families (OCOF) Five-Year Plan, Year One Report 2016



Economic Self-Sufficiency

1. Participants expressed an overwhelming need for paid job training programs that provide pathways to living-wage, sustainable employment.

Participants mentioned a need for any type of job training 87 times across forums and focus groups, making job training the most frequently raised of *all* needs. This came up in every neighborhood forum and each type of focus group, with the exception of homeowners. Participants emphasized that while there are current job training opportunities, they may not be paid and/or may not link to long-term employment. Community members shared specific suggestions for the types of job training programs and workforce readiness services that would most benefit them:

- Paid apprenticeship programs
- Community “Jobs Market,” based on the Farmers Market model
- City-sponsored English learning, vocational, and technology education programs
- City-sponsored all-ages internship program
- Employment opportunities for youth/TAY
- City-sponsored work permits for youth who are undocumented
- Subsidies for the “start-up costs” of obtaining employment
- Job retraining programs with cultural competency component for recent immigrants
- Community benefit agreements with tech companies
- A practice test for City jobs to allow those with additional barriers to learn more about what to expect from the real exam

Specific populations further nuanced their needs for job training and employment:

- **Asian** survey respondents and **Middle Eastern or North African** respondents listed proximity to employment as a top need.
- **Asian** survey respondents listed access to ESL classes as a top need.
- **American Indian or Alaska Native** and **Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander** survey respondents listed access to GED or high school diploma programs as a top need related to economic self-sufficiency.
- Over 40% of **TAY** survey respondents list employment as a top need related to economic self-sufficiency.

2. There is a large need for financial literacy and planning programs as well as financial services, specifically savings and credit counseling services.

The table below highlights the top fifteen economic self-sufficiency needs that participants named across all community engagement events and also across all survey responses.

Job training
Getting a job
Financial planning and education
Learning new job skills
Access to ESL classes
GED and high school diploma programs
Local hiring
Financing and credit services
Tech access/tech education
Permanent job/career opportunities
Employment coaching
“Working class” jobs
Employer programs
Senior/disability employment
Affordable higher education opportunities

This section contains qualitative findings synthesized from the ways community members described and contextualized their needs.



Across forums and focus groups, participants raised two distinct needs related to financial empowerment: 1) financial planning and education services, and 2) banking and credit services. The former was often mentioned during discussions of barriers to homeownership. In addition to significant income barriers, participants felt they lacked the financial planning tools and financial literacy to even start considering the process of homeownership. Participants also raised a need for culturally-competent financial literacy programs for immigrant families that regularly send money back to their home countries.

The latter emerged as a need primarily in focus groups, particularly among residents of public housing and those experiencing homelessness. Both these participants, as well as housing advocates, articulated that there needs to be checking, savings, and credit services availability to this population in order for them to achieve greater self-sufficiency. Overall, community members stressed the important role that financial services and programs play in promoting sustainable economic mobility for City residents and called out this need as a resource barrier for already vulnerable populations.

In the community input sessions, six groups discussed the needs of 14- to 24-year-olds and prioritized the need for youth to develop life skills and independence, with a particular emphasis on financial literacy (e.g., banking, building credit, taxes, and savings). Service providers at the All-Grantee meeting also emphasized the need for developing financial literacy, including debt and debt management, information about student loans, credit building, access to banking, and avoiding check cashers and predatory lenders.²⁰

- Compared to male respondents, **female survey respondents** indicated a higher need for financial budgeting/planning as well as debt management.
- **Black, African American or African** survey respondents and **Latino/a/x or Hispanic** respondents listed financial literacy and budgeting as a top need.

3. Residents want San Francisco employers to hire more local residents.

Employment, with an emphasis on local hiring, was a consistent need across focus groups and forums. Participants in SOMA, Excelsior, and the Tenderloin in particular expressed that policies needed to better incentivize local hiring for permanent, living-wage jobs that lead to careers for residents in need of work. Participants expressed frustration that employers who use City and community resources too often hire employees from outside the region.

Participants carry a nuanced understanding of the impact of hiring practices on very low-income residents. They indicated that incentivizing high-paying employers, who may hire locally for high-wage positions in specific industries, to move to San Francisco does not benefit the residents who most need living-wage jobs.

²⁰ Department of Children Youth and Families, 2016 DCYF Community Needs Assessment



Knowledge of and Access to Services

1. Participants indicated limited knowledge about availability of and eligibility for housing and social services, as well as a need for assistance navigating those services.

Community engagement participants were asked to list the ways in which they find out about available services in San Francisco. While a majority of survey respondents indicated that they are most likely to find out about available services from an internet search, a majority of forum and focus group participants indicated that they find out about services through word of mouth from friends, family members, and/or neighbors. Other methods were flyers, social media, the internet, case managers, and news media. Similarly, focus groups conducted for the Homeownership SF project found that many participants rely on word of mouth and personal networks in order to identify housing opportunities. The report summarized:

*"Participants are and have been utilizing a broad number of city-funded services in their housing search and housing retention efforts. While some work individually with housing counselors or social workers, others use the affordable housing lists available through Episcopal Community Services, and visit community drop-in center such as Glide, for help with their search. Some have applied for units on DAHLIA, and regularly check with Mercy Housing, Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation, Chinatown Community Development Center, and other non-profit housing developers for new opportunities. While many mentioned utilizing websites, such as Craigslist.org or Apartments.com, to look for shared or market-rate housing, many still look for signs on buildings, rely on word of mouth, and ask around their personal network of friends, family, coworkers and community members for leads."*²¹

Forum and focus group conversations emphasized knowledge gaps between populations as far as service availability and eligibility.

- More than other groups, **residents of public housing** (e.g. RAD, HOPE SF) expressed a need for increased awareness of available social services in San Francisco.
- **Cambodian, Latino, and Samoan focus groups** emphasize a need for greater awareness of housing and social services.
- The need for housing navigation services arose across the majority of forums and focus groups, particularly among **racial and cultural groups (e.g. African American, Cambodian, and Vietnamese community focus groups)**. Participants repeatedly described the difficulty of navigating the City's housing process. Participants recognized that DAHLIA is intended to streamline and facilitate this process, though some (e.g. Chinatown forum participants and members of the housing advocates focus group) cautioned that the website was not accessible to those with low technological literacy and those with no or low Internet access.
- Within the Department of Adult and Aging Services (DAAS) Needs Assessment, knowledge surrounding eligibility was the most frequently identified barrier to housing for **older adults**.

²¹ Homeownership SF report: Results from 2017-2018 Focus Groups. Assessment of Housing Needs and Barriers experienced by Black, Latino and Pacific Islander Communities, LGBT households, Seniors, and Persons with Disabilities



Consumers and providers called for greater outreach and awareness efforts to increase consumers' understanding of available SF DAAS services.²²

- The Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH) focuses on the distinct needs reflected by **adults, families with children, and youth that are homeless**. In their 5-year Strategic Framework, HSH notes that pathways from homelessness to housing are unclear and inconsistent. Due to lack of data sharing and no clear resource allocation process, there is little systematic decision making about the most appropriate support for each client. Further, those seeking assistance may not be provided information about what they are eligible for and when they might receive it.
- Through focus groups with older adults, adults with disabilities, LGBTQ+ households, persons living with HIV, and Asian/Pacific Islander communities, the Homeownership SF report found that navigating the housing process posed strong barriers, including uncertainty about how to find housing to apply for and complicated documentation requirements. Many participants, especially seniors and people with disabilities, were unaware of DAHLIA and the preferences and priorities for inclusionary housing. Participants expressed confusion about which housing opportunities are available, who is eligible, and how to apply, emphasizing a need for centralized access to information about housing programs and opportunities.²³

2. In addition to needing greater knowledge of eligibility requirements, stakeholders conveyed that eligibility requirements can be a barrier to accessing services.

When speaking about affordable housing, many focus group and forum participants expressed that the income requirements are too low, preventing families that also need affordable and subsidized housing from being eligible. In contrast, several participants in focus groups conducted by Homeownership SF maintained that the eligibility cutoff for inclusionary housing is too high.²⁴ Parents and community members maintained during their input into the Our Children, Our Families Council that beyond being too expensive, there are “too many requirements to find housing.”²⁵

- Immigration status was mentioned as a barrier to obtaining housing or other services. Specifically, participants noted that for **individuals/families that are undocumented**, it is more difficult to find housing, and there are rental assistance programs and emergency assistance/funds for which they are not eligible.
- The Homeownership SF study reported that many **seniors, retirees, families, and people with disabilities** are living on a fixed income below \$15,000 per year, and would need to double or triple their income to qualify for inclusionary and other affordable housing opportunities.²⁶

²² Department of Aging and Adult Services, 2018 Dignity Fund Community Needs Assessment

²³ Homeownership SF report: Results from 2017-2018 Focus Groups. Assessment of Housing Needs and Barriers experienced by Black, Latino and Pacific Islander Communities, LGBT households, Seniors, and Persons with Disabilities

²⁴ Ibid

²⁵ Department of Children Youth and Families, Our Children, Our Families (OCOF) Five-Year Plan, Year One Report 2016

²⁶ Homeownership SF report: Results from 2017-2018 Focus Groups. Assessment of Housing Needs and Barriers experienced by Black, Latino and Pacific Islander Communities, LGBT households, Seniors, and Persons with Disabilities




3. Participants expressed a need for inclusive language support services, in order to promote both knowledge of services and service access, especially for health and housing.

Participants discussed the types of language accessibility services they need, both in response to questions about language services and in more general discussion. Participants noted language translation needs for housing materials, health services, emergency services, and public benefit applications. The most common response to questions about language translation needs was that all housing and social service materials need to account for the linguistic diversity of residents and be culturally inclusive. The need for language support more generally was an overarching theme across the community meetings: outside of their responses to questions about specific translation needs, participants voiced a need for language support 78 times. The previous Analysis of Impediments noted that older adults particularly experience barriers related to language access. Approximately 401% of San Francisco residents over 60 are LEP (speaking English “less than very well”) compared with the 23% of the total City population.²⁷

- The need for language support was highlighted in **Vietnamese and Cambodian** communities, particularly around service navigation and help with filling out applications.
- **Asian** survey respondents listed access to ESL classes as a top need.
- In several forums and focus groups, participants also raised a need for accessible information for **seniors and persons with disabilities**, such as materials in plain language, American Sign Language, and in languages other than English. Members of the senior and older adult communities also demonstrated a need for technology access and education.

The figure below describes the proportion of San Francisco’s population, by race/ethnicity and primary language, that speaks English less than “very well.”²⁸ Overall, this population represents 21% of San

Figure 4: Population 5 Years and Older Who Speak English Less than “Very Well”



²⁷ Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), 2013-2018 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice

²⁸ American Community Survey, 2017



San Francisco's residents. The data shown in the figure echo stakeholders' needs, particularly in the Chinese and Vietnamese communities, for ESL classes.

4. Residents experience several barriers to transportation in San Francisco, including long wait times, safety, and cost of transportation, which impede their access to jobs, medical appointments, and other services.

When asked to discuss transit accessibility, stakeholders commonly mentioned extended and inconsistent wait times, particularly given many people's need to transfer and take multiple bus or MUNI lines, which impacts participants' access to their destinations. Many participants also noted the prohibitive cost of public transportation. Stakeholders need reliable transportation with lines that connect easily, including the potential of express services/shuttles downtown and to BART. Participants also raised the possibility of the City contracting with rideshare providers to facilitate access for populations with special needs.

- Participants felt that transportation access is not equitable across the city, less reliable and with fewer bus stops in **certain neighborhoods** (e.g., Bayview, Nob Hill, Potrero Hill, Visitacion Valley, Excelsior, Missouri, Watchman Way, Turner Terrace). Along these lines, several participants noted that affordable housing developments may not be close to transit hubs.
- Many participants emphasized accessibility barriers for **seniors and persons with disabilities**, including bus stops that require walking up steep hills, challenges with Paratransit, unreliable or non-functioning station elevators and escalators, and inconsistently availability seats for older adults and people with disabilities.

Several other City and County planning processes highlighted residents' concerns with existing assisted transportation services, including that they were unreliable (e.g., long wait times and no-shows from Paratransit); inflexible, and expensive, even for individuals receiving subsidized rides.²⁹

- Some middle-income **older adults** with need for mobility accommodations expressed concern that their assisted transportation options were further limited by eligibility requirements. In addition, many older adults and adults with disabilities expressed concern over assisted transportation service providers that do not support getting from the residence to the vehicle.³⁰
- The expansion of proof-of-payment fare enforcement on MUNI has fostered widespread fear of racial discrimination and profiling among working-class **African American, Latino, and Asian and Pacific Islander residents** in east and southeast San Francisco – the same neighborhoods where families spend 21-24% of their total household income on transportation.³¹
- Families living on Treasure Island explained that the bus routes to pre-designated middle schools limit choices for their children. Likewise, they felt without transportation it is difficult for their children to participate in school events, afterschool programs and extracurricular activities, such as sport teams.³²

²⁹ Department of Aging and Adult Services, 2018 Dignity Fund Community Needs Assessment

³⁰ Ibid

³¹ Department of Childen Youth and Families, 2016 DCYF Community Needs Assessment

³² OCOF FIVE-YEAR PLAN, YEAR ONE REPORT 2016



Community Empowerment and Engagement

1. Vulnerable community stakeholders want better relationships and accountability with MOHCD.

Overall, community members were very appreciative to have the opportunity to participate in the forums and focus groups and share their perspectives and suggestions. Participants expressed that they would like MOHCD to continue to hold community meetings like the forums to be able to keep a pulse on community needs, particularly the needs of vulnerable populations. Participants emphasized that, in order to rectify historical inequities, there must be accountability measures in place to which the City can be responsive. Participants would like to see a more robust and transparent accountability system by which City-funded services are evaluated in terms of population-specific outcomes. As one participant said,

"Accountability is an essential part of equity."

Along these lines, participants in focus groups for the Homeownership SF project reported "a perception of discrimination at the City level, noting that the systems and policies in place effectively maintain the status quo. Some commented that while City leaders and officials say they are concerned about the displacement of underrepresented groups, they have not implemented effective policy to ensure those groups have access."³³

2. Participants articulated a wide need for culturally-competent and inclusive outreach and community engagement strategies that promote community-building and link residents to services.

Culturally-competent and inclusive community outreach was the most frequently mentioned need related to community engagement. Community members acknowledge that there are current outreach efforts marketing City-sponsored housing and supportive services, but these efforts are not reaching certain communities. Participants felt strongly that using culturally-competent outreach strategies will yield increased awareness of and engagement in services. Similarly, survey respondents indicated that increasing the number of cultural events available to community members would increase their sense of community.

The table below highlights the top fifteen community engagement needs that participants named across all community engagement events and also across all survey responses.

Culturally competency and inclusivity (e.g. cultural events, cultural-based outreach)
Community events (e.g. block parties, holiday events, sports events, farmers markets)
Community space (e.g. recreational space, green space, art space)
Nonprofit support and capacity
Parking
Community planning
Support for small businesses
Volunteer opportunities
Community meetings and outreach
Accountability
Community engagement and communication efforts
Targeted marketing of services
Community-based neighborhood clean-up efforts
Senior services
Better street and outdoor lighting

This section contains qualitative findings synthesized from the ways community members described and contextualized their needs.

³³ Homeownership SF report: Results from 2017-2018 Focus Groups. Assessment of Housing Needs and Barriers experienced by Black, Latino and Pacific Islander Communities, LGBT households, Seniors, and Persons with Disabilities



City and County of San Francisco, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
2020-2025 Consolidated Plan & HIV Housing Plan: Community Engagement Key Findings

- This need was mentioned most frequently in the **LGBTQ+, older adult, and African American** community focus groups. Participants in the **Cambodian, Samoan, and Vietnamese** focus groups raised this need as well.

Participants emphasized the importance of diversity among program staff when it comes to successful service delivery, stating that trust is more easily built when service providers share a marginalized identity with clients (e.g. LGBTQ+). Participants would like to see a greater bilingual and bicultural presence among the City and nonprofit workforce, more intentional outreach to people with disabilities, and an investment in culturally-appropriate warm hand-offs (e.g. peer-led outreach and hand-offs).

Plans including the DAAS Needs Assessment and the MHSA Community Program Planning Report (2017) recorded interest from consumers in seeing innovative strategies for increasing service awareness and engagement. One frequently cited example was the use of peer service navigators or ambassadors, who can listen to individual consumers' needs and connect them to appropriate resources.³⁴

³⁴ DAAS Dignity fund community needs assessment 2018; MHSA Community Program Planning Report (2017)



Coordination of Services

1. Stakeholders asked for more streamlined services, improved interagency collaboration, and stronger cross-agency communication to support the delivery of both housing and supportive services.

Forum and focus group participants generally agreed that increasing interagency collaboration and streamlining services would decrease barriers to access and facilitate service navigation. Multiple participants mentioned DAHLIA as an example of a centralized resource for a particular type of service, but cautioned that the website was not accessible to those with low technological literacy and those with no or low Internet access. Participants would like to see this type of centralized resource duplicated across other services as well as increased warm hand-offs between agencies and uniform information across service providers.

Several other community planning documents recorded frustrations and concerns from stakeholders in navigating what they perceive as a large and often complicated service system. For example, in the DAAS needs assessment, consumers discussed the time it takes to navigate the system and to determine what services are available, where they are located, and whether they meet eligibility requirements. As an example of the complications associated with navigating the system, many consumers from different groups cited an extensive amount of paperwork, which is often redundant across different services or programs.³⁵ Planning documents similarly discussed fragmentation among the many county-wide providers who care for persons experiencing homelessness. Participants in the Homeownership SF focus groups shared stories about being referred from one agency to another, only to find they are ineligible for housing services from the referred agency. Additionally, they expressed frustration toward working with multiple agencies and providers in order to determine eligibility and availability of services.³⁶ Participants observed limited citywide coordination and information, expressing that the San Francisco can improve by centralizing the range of housing resources, as well as the outreach, information and services that connect individuals to housing resources.³⁷

The Alameda County AIDS Housing Needs Assessment observed that persons experiencing homelessness interact with hospitals, social service agencies, HMO payers, nursing, criminal justice system, city outreach staff, outpatient clinics, free clinics, shelters and service providers, without sufficient coordination or adequate resource-sharing.³⁸ Similarly, in their feedback about the MHSA Community Program Planning Report, community members maintaining that the City's Family Resource Centers are not connected to SF BHS and MHSA programming in a meaningful way, and suggested that a partnership between BHS and these centers could improve access to mental/behavioral health services.³⁹

³⁵ Department of Aging and Adult Services, 2018 Dignity Fund Community Needs Assessment

³⁶ Homeownership SF report: Results from 2017-2018 Focus Groups. Assessment of Housing Needs and Barriers experienced by Black, Latino and Pacific Islander Communities, LGBT households, Seniors, and Persons with Disabilities

³⁷ Ibid

³⁸ Alameda County, Alameda County AIDS Housing Needs Assessment

³⁹ Department of Public Health, MHSA Community Program Planning Report (2017)



Documents cited the importance of building capacity to collaborate as a whole community, aligning San Francisco's many touch-points into a single eco-system of supports for target populations, and the need and opportunity to pool and leverage resources to advance shared outcomes.⁴⁰ Community members expressed an interest in innovative strategies for integrating language services. For instance, a respondent to the AI request for public input pointed out that "the City could maximize the effectiveness of reaching non-English speakers by collaborating with housing advocacy and community groups that already conduct trainings and disseminate fair housing information to specific populations."⁴¹

2. Community members that participated in forums and focus groups asked for more financial and capacity-building support for nonprofit organizations and other service providers, including changes to contracting rules.

Stakeholders including service providers and their clients shared that the economic landscape in San Francisco provides challenges for case management, continuity of care, client-provider relationships, and general service delivery. Nonprofit organizations have difficulty hiring and retaining high-qualified candidates due to their inability to pay competitive salaries and provide needed employee benefits that ameliorate stress and trauma from ongoing front-line work. As a result, staff turnover impacts client engagement and successful completion of programs.

Additionally, nonprofits are being pushed out due to rising rents that are becoming increasingly unaffordable. Participants noted that when a nonprofit that was previously a centralized location for community meetings and outreach is displaced due to rising rents, this affects community engagement and service delivery to the community. Service providers echoed this, adding that the City will only give money for direct services and not to subsidize rent and utility costs (specifying that maintenance and building improvement cannot be built into contracts) but stressed that nonprofits cannot provide services without appropriate space. Providers emphasized that available funding for nonprofit displacement needs to be better-funded and preventative in focus. Community members would also like to see nonprofit capacity-building that allows service providers to track and maintain outcome metrics and engage in a higher degree of robust data collection and data transparency overall.

⁴⁰ Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, 2014-2019 Local Homeless Coordinating Board Strategic Plan Framework, 2014-2019

⁴¹ Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), 2013-2018 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice



Housing Access, Perceptions, and Barriers

Housing concerns

1. Participants named displacement and increasing housing prices as the top concerns impacting housing access and the ability to remain in housing.

Participants in MOHCD community engagement tied fears of displacement to their experiences of gentrification and the effects of the presence of tech companies. For example, in several forums and focus groups, participants observed the closing of local businesses, spoke about feeling less of a sense of community than in previous years, and noted instances where SROs are now used for tech company employees or tourists.

Top Housing Concerns
Displacement
Increasing housing prices
Gentrification
Presence of tech companies/workers
Vacant buildings
Lack of housing
Homelessness
Short-term rental market
Cost of living
Income inequality
Overcrowding

Discussions about displacement in several community forums and focus groups raised concerns about the decreasing sense of community as a result of changes in their neighborhoods. As discussed below in relation to residents' perceptions of desirable neighborhoods, having a strong community was one of the top qualities of a desirable neighborhood. The impact of the housing market on residents' community connectedness emerged in other City planning processes as well. While some community members had an opportunity to be relocated to public housing outside of the city, the location and availability of services and resources were a concern. Participants stressed the need to define and build communities, especially for the homeless and people in transitional housing. The older population was cited as being especially vulnerable.⁴²

The 2013-2018 Analysis of Impediments found that market rate asking prices in empty rental housing in San Francisco are generally unaffordable to extremely low-, very low-, and low-income households regardless of household size. Other City and County planning processes heard similar concerns from residents. During 11 public meetings with 127 San Francisco residents across a variety of backgrounds and neighborhoods, the San Francisco Department of Public Health identified the cost of housing as a prominent concern during the meetings.⁴³

- As part of 20 focus groups conducted by the Our Children Our Families Council, Both **Latino and African American** community members expressed a sentiment of "stop kicking/pushing us out of

⁴² Department of Public Health, Community Health Needs Assessment, p. 39


⁴³ Ibid



the City of San Francisco.” African American parents in the Bayview voiced their frustration at witnessing the transformation of their neighborhoods with the growing presence of tech companies, yet their children are not benefiting from the internships and jobs with these companies.⁴⁴

The figures below provide additional context around concerns related to displacement and evictions across San Francisco and which neighborhoods are disproportionately affected.

Figure 5: Displacement Typologies in the Bay Area




⁴⁴ Department of Children Youth and Families, Our Children, Our Families (OCOF) Five-Year Plan, Year One Report 2016

⁴⁵ Urban Displacement Project, UC Berkeley



Figure 6: Eviction Density in San Francisco⁴⁷



Housing choice

2. Both renters and homeowners express low overall housing choice because they feel “locked in.”

Neighborhood forum participants were asked to describe the level of housing choice they felt they have and to list factors that they believe affect their housing choice. Forum participants listed over 20 factors (see below).⁴⁶ The top five most frequently raised factors were cost, rent control, limited housing/housing competition, racism, and proximity to schools. Participants shared a nuanced understanding of rent control in particular.

Many participants expressed feeling “locked in” to a housing unit due to rent control policies and the reality of generational homeownership. In the case of generational homeowners, they expressed that they felt like any opportunity to sell was not matched by the opportunity to buy a home somewhere else in San Francisco. The majority of survey respondents (64.5%) reported feeling that they have little-to-no choice in where they live due to cost of housing, limited housing stock, rent control, family size, and/or proximity to their job, family, or school. Similarly, in focus groups for the Homeownership SF project, many participants agreed that when applications open for multi-family housing, they are priced as high as inclusionary housing, and many applications are for waitlist slots; this leaves many feeling discouraged.⁴⁷

⁴⁶ Chinatown forum notes did not include responses to housing choice questions.

⁴⁷ Homeownership SF report: Results from 2017-2018 Focus Groups. Assessment of Housing Needs and Barriers experienced by Black, Latino and Pacific Islander Communities, LGBT households, Seniors, and Persons with Disabilities



City and County of San Francisco, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
2020-2025 Consolidated Plan & HIV Housing Plan: Community Engagement Key Findings

- HUD data on housing problems confirm that San Francisco's high-cost housing market has the effect of disproportionately limiting housing choices for **people and households of color**. HUD data examine "housing problems" that result from a market where much of the housing stock is unaffordable, and find that Hispanic households, black households, and Asian households are all more likely to have housing problems than white households.⁴⁸
- For **seniors with disabilities**, the availability of senior-specific housing designed to accommodate the needs and preferences of older adults, is a significant factor in determining location of residence.⁴⁹ **Seniors and people with disabilities** living in SROs cited difficulties finding a permanent housing option. They described feeling stuck in a perpetual state of housing insecurity because they do not foresee their income changing.⁵⁰

Figure 7: Responses to "What makes you feel like you have a choice or don't have a choice in where you live?"

Factor Affecting Housing Choice	MOHCD Community Forums - Factors Affecting Housing Choice										Total
	Mission/ District 9	Excelsior & OMI/ District 11	Bayview Hunters Point/ District 10	Castro/ Districts 7 & 8	South of Market/ District 6	Visitacion Valley/ District 10	Tenderloin / District 6	Western Addition/ District 5	Sunset/ Districts 1 & 4	Chinatown/ Districts 2 & 3	
Cost/Affordability										Chinatown forum notes did not include responses to housing choice questions.	8
Rent Control											4
Limited Housing/Housing Competition											4
Racism											3
Proximity to School											3
Generational Homeowner											2
Job Availability											2
Safety Concerns											2
Commuting Distance											1
Credit Rating											1
Dependent on Roommates											1
Lack of Childcare											1
Need ADA Accessibility											1
NIMBY Community											1
Property Taxes											1
Loss of Community/ Displacement											2
Criminal Record											1
Exploitative Financial Products											1
Few Lottery Opportunities											1
Limited Section 8											1
Requirements for Affordable Housing											1
Total Barriers	7	6	5	5	5	5	4	3	2		

⁴⁸ Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), 2013-2018 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice. HUD defines a "housing problem" as any one of the following conditions: spending more than 30 percent of household income on housing, living in an overcrowded situation, or living in a housing unit that lacks complete kitchen or plumbing facilities.

⁴⁹ Ibid

⁵⁰ Homeownership SF report: Results from 2017-2018 Focus Groups. Assessment of Housing Needs and Barriers experienced by Black, Latino and Pacific Islander Communities, LGBT households, Seniors, and Persons with Disabilities



Barriers to
homeownership

3. Participants highlighted barriers to homeownership centering around both housing prices and financing options.

In 2010, only 39 percent of households in San Francisco owned the homes in which they lived. In comparison, approximately 58 percent of households in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area own their homes. At nearly 79 percent, Ingleside had the highest homeownership rate. Other outlying neighborhoods— including Excelsior, Twin Peaks, and the Sunset—mirrored this trend, all with homeownership rates of 60 percent or greater. By contrast, only ten percent of Downtown households were homeowners, while neighborhoods surrounding the downtown core—including North Beach, the Western Addition, and the Marina—all featured homeownership rates below 30 percent.⁵¹ In the 2013-2018 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing choice, MOHCD found that market-rate ownership housing remains out of reach for most low-income households in San Francisco. As of September 2010, the maximum price that a low-income household could afford for a single-family home was \$354,500. Of the homes sold that month, only nine percent fell below this price point. In addition to housing affordability, credit accessibility and uncertainty in the job market were cited as challenges for potential homebuyers.

Neighborhood forum and community focus group participants were asked to describe the barriers that prevent them from buying a home in San Francisco. Across forums and focus groups, participants listed the following barriers: credit score, income, limited housing stock, cost, down payment, HOA dues, financing, lack of financial literacy, housing lottery system, loan qualification, Tenancy in Common, competitive market, and rental history.

- **RAD and HOPE SF focus group participants** mentioned homeownership barriers with the greatest frequency, followed by participants of cultural focus groups. These groups mentioned barriers to homeownership at a rate more than twice that of the average across all focus groups.
- **SOMA forum participants** listed the greatest number of homeownership barriers, with Chinatown, Bayview-Hunters Point, and Visitacion Valley residents reporting the fewest.
- MOHCD's assessment examining housing equity for **African Americans** highlighted issues of access and opportunity for homeownership for Black San Francisco residents. The report demonstrated progress toward transforming the conditions in public housing and substantial Black representation in MOHCD programming, but found gaps in Black representation in MOHCD programming for Inclusionary/BMR Homeownership Units and Down Payment Assistance Loans.⁵²

Neighborhood
desirability

4. Neighborhood forum participants shared the qualities that they believe make a neighborhood desirable, identifying the following characteristics:

Participants were asked to list which San Francisco neighborhoods they would consider "desirable" and "undesirable." The results of these discussions are shown in the table below and

⁵¹ Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), 2013-2018 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice

⁵² Examining Housing Equity for African Americans In San Francisco: Prepared for the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development Tia Hicks, Community Development Intern



illustrated in **Error! Reference source not found.**⁵³ Green-colored boxes indicate that participants of a given forum listed a neighborhood as “desirable.” Red-colored boxes indicate that participants of a given forum listed a neighborhood as “undesirable.” Yellow-colored boxes indicate that participants listed a neighborhood as both “desirable” and “undesirable.” The neighborhoods with a majority “desirable” vote (with five or more forums indicating they are desirable communities) are the Mission, Haight Ashbury, Inner Sunset, North Beach, and Inner Richmond.

Desirable Neighborhood Characteristics	Frequency (among forums)
Public transit	10/10
Green space	9/10
Safety	8/10
Community	7/10
Commercial options	7/10
Schools	7/10
Walkability	7/10
Access to services	5/10
Cleanliness	5/10
Views	4/10
Air quality	3/10
Low traffic	3/10
Community engagement	2/10
Weather	2/10
Jobs	2/10
Police relationships	1/10

The neighborhoods with a majority “undesirable” vote (with at least three or more forums listing them as undesirable) are the Tenderloin, Outer Sunset, Bayview-Hunters Point, and South of Market. Tenderloin had the most undesirable votes, with nearly 67% of respondents stating the neighborhood to be undesirable. It should be noted the only desirable rankings for both the Tenderloin and Bayview-Hunters Point are from their own residents.

⁵³ Visitation Valley forum notes did not include responses to neighborhood desirability questions.



City and County of San Francisco, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
2020-2025 Consolidated Plan & HIV Housing Plan: Community Engagement Key Findings

Figure 8: If money were no object, where would you choose to live (top 3 desirable places) and where would you choose to not live (top 3 least desirable places)?

Ranked Neighborhood	Castro/ District 8 and District 7	Sunset/ District 4 and District 1	Excelsior & OMI/ District 11	Tenderloin / District 6	Western Addition/ District 5	South of Market/ District 6	Mission/ District 9	Chinatown / Districts 2 & 3	Bayview Hunters Point/ District 10	Visitacion Valley/ District 10	Total (Yes)	Total (No)
Mission											7	1
Haight Ashbury											6	0
Inner Richmond											5	0
Inner Sunset											5	1
North Beach											5	1
Seacliff											5	0
Glen Park											4	0
Outer Sunset											4	5
Castro											3	0
Duboce Triangle											3	0
Twin Peaks											3	1
Western Addition											3	2
Excelsior											2	2
Laurel Heights											2	0
Marina											2	2
Nob Hill											2	0
Outer Richmond											2	3
Pacific Heights											2	3
Potrero Hill											2	2
Presidio											2	1
Silver Terrace											2	1
South of Market											2	4
St. Francis Woods											2	0
Bayview											1	5
Bernal Heights											1	0
Dolores Park											1	0
Embarcadero											1	0
Lone Mountain											1	0
Noe Valley											1	0
Oceanview/Ingleside											1	0
Outer Mission											1	0
Tenderloin											1	7
Visitacion Valley											1	3
West Portal											1	0
Candlestick Point											0	1
Chinatown											0	1
Dogpatch											0	4
Financial District											0	1
Ingleside											0	1
McLaren Park											0	1
Mount Davidson											0	1
Parkmerced											0	3
Russian Hill											0	1
Treasure Island											0	2

Visitacion Valley forum notes did not include responses to neighborhood desirability



Fair housing and
discrimination

5. Participants in community engagement shared multiple experiences of housing discrimination, but overall, their responses reveal that there is not one specific, overt type of discrimination. Their responses indicate a more pervasive and entrenched systemic discrimination that affects people of color and African American communities in particular.

While the forums and focus groups participants did not tend to speak about fair housing violations, a number of participants did perceive bias or discrimination on the part of landlords (e.g., strict, sometimes unlawful renting criteria). One-quarter of survey respondents said that they have experienced housing discrimination in San Francisco. Among survey respondents who reported making a fair housing complaint, 44% said that they were harassed or experienced retaliation for making the complaint. This speaks to participants' common desire for greater tenant education and protections, described earlier. The following illustrate the specific forms of discrimination experienced by forum and focus group participants:

Age-based discrimination

- Some individuals in forums and focus groups commented that they perceived ageism on the part of some landlords and are afraid to ask for modifications to units for fear of eviction or displacement.
- "[There is an] ageist perspective." – Castro forum participant
- "[Need to] prevent SROs from kicking out the elderly to make more money." –Long-term Care Coordinating Council focus group participant
- In the DAAS Community Needs Assessment, adults with disabilities shared stories of property managers failing to make reasonable accommodations to make housing compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).⁵⁴

LGBTQ discrimination

- "There are many forms of discrimination. There are issues of internalized transphobia." – Transgender focus group participant
- "There are barriers steering LGBT applicants away from housing opportunities." – LGBT focus group participant

Race-based discrimination

- "There are racial inequities throughout the housing system." – Bayview-Hunters Point forum participant
- "Redlining? Yes. This neighborhood." – Western Addition forum participant

Disability discrimination

- "There is discrimination against people with disabilities, especially mental health disabilities." – Long-term Care Coordinating Council focus group participant

⁵⁴ Department of Aging and Adult Services, Dignity Fund Community Needs Assessment



City and County of San Francisco, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
2020-2025 Consolidated Plan & HIV Housing Plan: Community Engagement Key Findings

- “Yes, because of my disability. I didn’t file because I knew I had been violated and had rights.” – Tenderloin forum participant

Section 8 discrimination

- “There is no housing stock that would [take] Section 8. I can’t find owners that would deal with this type of client.” – Homeless focus group participant

Language discrimination

- “I asked that the housing application be translated into Spanish and they said no, it would be too much money.” – Tenderloin forum participant

Employment discrimination

- “Employment discrimination is subtle and pervasive. The City needs to come up with ways to improve access to jobs.” – Tenderloin forum participant

Discrimination based on family size

- “[People need to] end discrimination against larger families.” – Mission forum participant

The above findings are reflected in other City and County reports as well:

- According to the responses of four community-based organizations reported in the Budget and Legislative Analyst’s Report regarding Tenant Displacement in San Francisco, **people living below federal poverty guidelines, minorities, the elderly, and people with disabilities** are disproportionately being evicted.⁵⁵
- In their 2012 Eviction report, San Francisco’s Eviction Defense Collaborative (EDC) found that while **African Americans** make up 6% of the City’s population, African Americans represented 29% of all those evicted in that year.⁵⁶
- During 11 public meetings with 127 San Francisco residents across a variety of backgrounds and neighborhoods, some felt discriminated against (sex offenders, people with dependencies) in the housing market.⁵⁷
- Discrimination was one of the most common concerns and challenges mentioned in focus groups for the Homeownership SF project. Participants reported that discrimination relating to race, ethnicity, age, LGBTQ+ status, immigration status, criminal record, or class status has been a barrier to housing access in the past and currently.⁵⁸

⁵⁵ Stanford Law School, Tenant Right To Counsel Analyses

⁵⁶ EDC 2012 Eviction Report, p. 4 (quoting US Census data).

⁵⁷ Department of Public Health, Community Health Needs Assessment, p. 39

⁵⁸ Homeownership SF report: Results from 2017-2018 Focus Groups. Assessment of Housing Needs and Barriers experienced by Black, Latino and Pacific Islander Communities, LGBT households, Seniors, and Persons with Disabilities



City and County of San Francisco, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
2020-2025 Consolidated Plan & HIV Housing Plan: Community Engagement Key Findings

Violations of San Francisco Police Code 33 consistently emerged as the most commonly violated ordinance. From 2007 to 2010, 57 percent of complaints and technical assistance requests fell within this category.^{59 60}

- Fair housing violations surrounding **disability** were by far the most common basis for complaint or technical assistance request, consistent with the FHEO and State DFEH data.
- **Race, family status, and age** surfaced as other common bases, again showing general consistency with federal and state fair housing data.⁶¹

Among survey respondents, certain population reported experiencing housing discrimination in San Francisco at rates double that of the general population, as represented in survey responses.

- Over half (52%) of survey respondents who identified as **transgender** indicated that they have experienced housing discrimination in San Francisco. This is double the rate of the general population of all survey respondents.
- Over half (52%) of survey respondents who indicated they were experiencing **homelessness** reported that they have experienced housing discrimination in San Francisco. This is double the rate of the general population of all survey respondents.

⁵⁹ Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), 2013-2018 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice

⁶⁰ Prohibits discrimination based on race, color, ancestry, national origin, place of birth, sex, age religion, creed, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity, weight, source of income, and height.

⁶¹ Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), 2013-2018 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice



Appendix A: Qualitative Data Analysis Methodology

Summary

The project research team took an adapted grounded theory approach to qualitative data analysis using the ATLAS.ti software program. Grounded theory is a well-established method of data collection that combines inductive and deductive coding of data to ensure that participants' concerns drive findings while also allowing researchers to answer specific questions.⁶² The "open" coding process is inductive, intended to allow themes to emerge from participants without being predetermined by the research questions. The "closed" coding process is deductive and seeks to answer specific questions. However, because the questions posed to participants in community sessions were quite structured by design and necessity—precluding a fully inductive analytical process—the research team adapted the grounded theory approach, utilizing an open coding scheme as much as possible within the forum and focus group format in order to adapt the question that grounded theory seeks to answer—What did people say?—to: What did people say about housing needs? What did people say about non-housing needs? etc.

Using this approach in ATLAS.ti, the research team developed the following code "families" for each forum and focus group (some of these families relied on open coding more than others, as some were targeted questions for which MOHCD asked participants to generate a list):

- City-Community Relationship
- Collaboration
- Neighborhood Desirability
- Discrimination
- Housing Barriers
- Housing Choice
- Housing Services (needs and concerns)
- Language Accessibility
- Neighborhood Change
- Non-housing Services (needs and concerns)
- Community Engagement

The research team then used ATLAS.ti's frequency codes function to assess the frequency with which individual codes and code families occurred both in individual forums and focus groups as well as among larger populations (e.g. members of the LGBTQ population). By running the codes function by document group (i.e. forum or focus group), the research team derived findings based on the frequency of a code overall as well as the distribution of a code across populations.

⁶² Charmaz, K. 2003. Grounded Theory. The SAGE Encyclopedia of Social Science Research Methods. 2003. SAGE Publications.



Qualitative Coding Scheme

The following is a summary of the five-step process utilized for the above methodologic process:

Step 1: All forum and focus groups transcripts were read and coded thematically to identify concepts based on common themes across respondents. Each coded passage received a prefix code that identified whether the quotation indicated a general need, general concern, or addressed a specific question “type” posed by facilitators (e.g. experiences of discrimination, housing barriers, etc.). The data analysts kept running lists of codes generated to facilitate consistent use of coding schemes across transcripts. During this step, each transcript was simultaneously labeled and assigned to a primary document group that referenced the neighborhood community or specific focus group population.

Step 2: Once a comprehensive list of initial codes was generated, the codes were organized into “families” or groupings of similar codes. For example, codes related to financial literacy needs and codes related to mental health services needs were grouped into a family of non-housing service needs.

Based on this scheme, if a participant in the SOMA forum discussed the need of individuals who are undocumented to obtain immigration-related legal services, the passage would receive the following codes:

- the prefix and substantive code pairing, “need-legal-services;”
- the prefix and substantive code pairing, “need-immigration-assistance;”
- the substantive family code, “non-housing services;”

And be grouped into the following primary document group:

- SOMA neighborhood forum

Step 3: Once transcript coding was completed, focus groups with similar participant populations were assigned secondary document groups that allowed the data analysts to report out on the needs and concerns of these community members both by specific focus group and in terms of the larger population they belong to. For example, transcripts from focus groups with residents of public and subsidized housing were each assigned to their own primary document group and all assigned to the secondary document group “Public Housing.”

Step 4: RDA then used ATLAS.ti’s frequency codes function to assess the frequency with which individual codes and code families occurred both in individual forums and focus groups, among larger populations, and between forums and focus groups. By running the frequency function for each individual code and code family both by primary and secondary document groups, the research team could derive findings.

Step 5: The project team used ATLAS.ti’s quotation reports function to generate full quotation reports for certain codes. These quotation reports, taken together with the frequency counts, allowed us to generate nuanced findings informed by quantitative distribution but grounded in participants’ own words.



Appendix B: Document Review Methodology

Table 7: 48 Documents reviewed, 23 instances of recorded Community Participation

	Document Name	Recorded Community Participation
Alameda County	1. AIDS Housing Needs Assessment 2014	✓
DAAS	2. DAAS Dignity Fund Community Needs Assessment 2018	✓
DCYF	3. Community Needs Assessment 2016	✓
	4. Services Allocation Plan 2018-2023	
	5. 2017–2021 Integrated HIV Prevention and Care Plan	✓
	6. 2017–2021 Integrated HIV Prevention and Care Plan	
	7. AOT Annual Report 2017	✓
	8. Community Health Needs Assessment	✓
DPH	9. MHSA 3-year integrated plan 2017-2020	✓
	10. MHSA Annual Update 18/19	✓
	11. MHSA Community Program Planning Report 2017	✓
	12. Whole Person Care DHCS application (2016)	
	13. Whole Person Care Update 2018	
Housing Authority	14. Housing Authority Annual Administrative Plan	✓
	15. HSH Strategic Framework	✓
HSH	16. Larkin St Youth Services Report on Youth Homelessness 2018	
	17. Local Homeless Coordinating Board Strategic Plan Framework, 2014-2019	
	18. Youth Homelessness Demonstration Project Plan	
	19. 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan	✓
MOHCD	20. Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice	✓
	21. Annual Progress Report 16/17	
	22. Examining Housing Equity for African Americans in San Francisco	
	23. Five-Year Strategic Plan 2016-2020	
	24. HIV Housing Five-Year Plan 2016-2020	✓
OCOF	25. OCOF Five-Year Plan, Year One Report 2016	✓
OEWD	26. Economic Strategic Plan 2014 Update	✓
	27. Workforce Alignment 2016 Update	
Other	28. 2009 Report of the SF Mayor's Task Force on African-American Out-Migration	✓
	29. Annual Eviction Reports	
	30. Central SOMA Plan	✓
	31. Central Waterfront/Dogpatch Public Realm	✓
	32. Citywide Planning Division Five-Year Work Program 2014-2019	
Planning	33. Civic Center Public Realm Plan	✓
	34. General Plan 2014 Housing Element	✓
	35. Housing Balance Reports	
	36. Housing for Families with Children (Family Friend Housing White Paper)	
	37. Hub Area Plan update	✓



City and County of San Francisco, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
2020-2025 Consolidated Plan & HIV Housing Plan: Community Engagement Key Findings

	Document Name	Recorded Community Participation
	38. Mission Action Plan 2020	✓
	39. Southeast Framework	
	40. Sustainable Chinatown	
Other	41. Tenant Right To Counsel Analyses	
	42. Standards of Care, LA County Commission on HIV	
	43. Housing Standards of Care	
	44. Assessment of Housing Needs and Barriers Experienced by Black, Latino and Pacific Islander Communities, LGBT households, Seniors, and Persons with Disabilities	✓
Cannot identify/still in production	45. Black San Francisco Existing Conditions Study	
	46. Latino Needs Assessment	
	47. Racial and Ethnic Equity Action Plan	
	48. SPARC report of housing disparities (Future Publication)	
	49. Tenderloin Community Data Project	
	50. Google Civic Bridge Project	

Table 8: 23 Instances of recorded Community Participation

Agency	Document Name	Description of CP methods and outreach
Alameda County	1. AIDS Housing Needs Assessment 2014	Consumer, provider, and developer focus groups; online surveys for providers, consumers, and developers. Targeted outreach to low-income consumers.
DAAS	2. DAAS Dignity Fund Community Needs Assessment 2018	Focus groups, public forums, and surveys. Targeted outreach to vulnerable populations.
DCYF	3. Community Needs Assessment 2016	Surveys, interviews, focus groups, and public forums. Targeted outreach to vulnerable populations.
	4. OCOF Five-Year Plan, Year One Report 2016	District-level public forums and community meetings. Targeted outreach to vulnerable populations.
DPH	5. AOT Annual Report 2017	Surveys and interviews
	6. Community Health Needs Assessment	Public forums, focus groups, and community meetings. Targeted outreach and translation for v-pops.
	7. MHSA 3-year integrated plan 2017-2020	Interviews and community engagement
	8. MHSA Annual Update 18/19	Public meetings, focus groups, interviews
	9. MHSA Community Program Planning Report 2017	Community engagement meetings, surveys



City and County of San Francisco, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
2020-2025 Consolidated Plan & HIV Housing Plan: Community Engagement Key Findings

Agency	Document Name	Description of CP methods and outreach
	10. 2017–2021 Integrated HIV Prevention and Care Plan	Public input sessions, focus groups with providers, focus groups with consumers, planning council meetings, and work group meetings. Targeted outreach to v-pops. - Participation results minimally documented
Housing Authority	11. Housing Authority Annual Administrative Plan	Public comment
Homeownership SF	12. Assessment of Housing Needs and Barriers experienced by Black, Latino and Pacific Islander Communities, LGBT households, Seniors, and Persons with Disabilities	Three focus groups that are underrepresented in the application pool for inclusionary housing
HSH	13. HSH Strategic Framework	Client and provider focus groups and surveys. - Participation results minimally documented
	14. San Francisco Coordinated Community Plan to Prevent and End Youth Homelessness	Public meetings, leadership meetings, advisory council meetings, community planning sessions.
MOHCD	15. Consolidated Plan	Steering committee meetings, focus groups, public forums, online participatory exercises and feedback.
	16. Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice	Outreach not clearly recorded. - Only formal public comment included
	17. HIV Housing Five-Year Plan 2016-2020	Steering committee meetings with providers, developers, and advocates.
	18. 2009 Report of the SF Mayor's Task Force on African-American Out-Migration	Interviews: target population, qualitative data review
OEWD	19. Economic Strategic Plan 2014 Update	Outreach to sector-specific stakeholders. - Description/notes not available
	20. State of the Retail Sector	Limited interviews with merchants and property owners in the Mission only.



City and County of San Francisco, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
2020-2025 Consolidated Plan & HIV Housing Plan: Community Engagement Key Findings

Agency	Document Name	Description of CP methods and outreach
	21. WIOA Local Plan 2017-2020	Survey and presentations at standing meetings.
Planning	22. Central SOMA Plan	Extensive process including public hearings, CBO meetings, public meetings, walking tours, popup event, and surveys.
	23. Central Waterfront/Dogpatch Public Realm	26 presentations at public meetings, - Community prioritization sessions, - Public workshop,
	24. Civic Center Public Realm Plan	Community workshops, open house. - Topics provided but no summary of feedback
	25. General Plan 2014 Housing Element	- Only formal written comments included
	26. Hub Area Plan update	public workshops
	27. Mission Action Plan 2020	Extensive community-driven process including public forums and community meetings

Notes from Community Forums, December 2018 – February 2019

1. Bayview Hunters Point Community Forum
2. Castro Community Forum
3. Chinatown Community Forum
4. Excelsior and OMI Community Forum
5. Mission Community Forum
6. South of Market Community Forum
7. Sunset Community Forum
8. Tenderloin Community Forum
9. Visitacion Valley Community Forum
10. Western Addition Community Forum

Notes from Focus Groups, December 2018 – March 2019

1. African American Community
2. Arab Community
3. Cambodian Community
4. Council of Community Housing Organizations
5. Eviction Prevention & Tenant Empowerment Working Group
6. HIV Community
7. HIV Housing Providers
8. Homeowners
9. HOPE SF Hunters View Housing Community
10. HOPE SF Potrero Hill Housing Community
11. HOPE SF Sunnydale Housing Community
12. Housing Action Coalition
13. Human Service Network
14. Latino Services Providers & Advocates
15. LGBTQ+ Community
16. Local Homeless Coordinating Board
17. Long Term Care Coordinating Council
18. Mayor's Disability Council
19. RAD – 1760 Bush Street Community
20. RAD – 1880 Pine Street Community
21. RAD – 18th Street Community
22. RAD – 25 Sanchez Street Community
23. RAD – 2698 California Street Community
24. RAD – 345 Arguello Street Community
25. RAD – 462 Duboce Street Community
26. RAD – 491 31st Avenue Community
27. RAD – 711 Pacific Community
28. RAD – Clementina Towers Community
29. RAD – Bernal Dwellings Housing Community
30. RAD – Hayes Valley North & South Community
31. RAD – JFK Community
32. RAD – Mission Dolores Community
33. RAD – Robert B. Pitts Community
34. RAD – Westside Courts Community
35. RAD – Woodside Community

36. Samoan Community
37. San Francisco Immigrant Legal & Education Network
38. Senior Disability Action
39. Transgender Community
40. Veterans' Comments
41. Vietnamese Community

Report Back

1. Summary of Key Findings from Community Engagement
 - a. English
 - b. Chinese
 - c. Filipino
 - d. Russian
 - e. Samoan
 - f. Spanish
 - g. Vietnamese
2. Summary of Written Comments Received and MOHCD/OEWD/HSR Responses
3. Notes from June 20, 2019 Meeting

Proposed Strategies

1. Proposed Strategies Documents
 - a. English
 - b. Chinese
 - c. Filipino
 - d. Russian
 - e. Samoan
 - f. Spanish
 - g. Vietnamese
2. Summary of Written Comments Received and MOHCD/OEWD/HSR Responses
3. Notes from August 5, 2019 Meeting

Notes from NRSA Strategies Meetings, October-November 2019

1. Bayview Hunters Point NRSA Strategies Meeting
2. Chinatown NRSA Strategies Meeting
3. Mission NRSA Strategies Meeting
4. South of Market NRSA Strategies Meeting
5. Tenderloin NRSA Strategies Meeting
6. Visitacion Valley NRSA Strategies Meeting

Preliminary Funding Recommendations for 2020-2021 CDBG, ESG, HOME and HOPWA Programs

1. Summary of Written Comments Received
2. Notes from February 4, 2020 Meeting

Draft 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan and 2020-2021 Action Plan

1. Summary of Written Comments Received and MOHCD/OEWD/HSR Responses

Draft Amendments to 2020-2021 Action Plan for CARES Act Funding

1. Summary of Comments Received on First Draft Amendment and Responses
2. Summary of Comments Received on Second Draft Amendment and Responses

Community Forum Notes
December 2018 – February 2019

1. Bayview Hunters Point Community Forum
2. Castro Community Forum
3. Chinatown Community Forum
4. Excelsior and OMI Community Forum
5. Mission Community Forum
6. South of Market Community Forum
7. Sunset Community Forum
8. Tenderloin Community Forum
9. Visitacion Valley Community Forum
10. Western Addition Community Forum

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 20, 2019
Dr. George W. Davis Senior Center (Bayview Hunters Point/District 10)

Table of Contents

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups.....	1
Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups.....	6
Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups	11
Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups	15

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups

Session #1

1. What's important to you that brought you here tonight?

- Familiarize with process
- Shrinkage of affordable housing (less)
- Affordable housing income bands too restrictive, does not serve low-income or moderate
- Challenges of using COP. Looking for more information/resources
- To hear & listen

Station 1 – Neighborhood Change and Choice

2. Based on the maps and your personal experience, what are the most important or noteworthy changes in this neighborhood in the past 5 years?

- Shrinking number of African Americans
- Homeownership prices have increased
- Do not see diversity within our community- socially
- African American culture not visible in fullness anymore/ fewer churches
- Reduced sense of community
- Cost of housing increased

3. What do you think has caused or contributed to those changes in your neighborhood?

- Increased cost of living
- Increase in homelessness
 - No mental health support
 - No housing
- Lack of accountability for sites serving homeless
 - Drug example
- Increase resources to ensure empathy possible
 - See that people just doing their jobs – cycling

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 20, 2019
Dr. George W. Davis Senior Center (Bayview Hunters Point/District 10)

- Anxiety because people don't know where they will live/ get second chance job opportunities / options not affordable

4. If money were not object, where would you choose to live (top 3 desirable places) and where would you choose to not live (top 3 least desirable places)?

- Most desirable places to live per map – Bayview (11), Portola (2), Brisbane, Dogpatch (3), Potrero Hill (2), Mission (3), Twin Peaks, St. Francis Woods (3), Haight-Ashbury, Buena Vista Heights, Seacliff (2), Outer Richmond, Inner Richmond (2), Marina (2), Hayes Valley, Duboce Triangle (2), South of Market, Marin County (3), Healdsburg, Brisbane, Woodside (2)
- Least desirable places to live per map – Outer Richmond (4), Outer Sunset (2), Excelsior, Crocker Amazon, Visitacion Valley, Bayview (2), Bayshore, South of Market (2), Western Addition, Marina, City of Richmond, East Palo Alto (2), East Oakland (3)

5. What makes a neighborhood a desirable place to live?

- Views
- Family
- Weather
- Home
- Transportation
- History
- Character
- Jobs – new ones!
- Education
- Safety
- Parks
- Shopping
- Access to travel
- Good services – gas stations
- Healthy, quality foods (rest & grocery)
- Business opportunities
- Entertainment
- Churches
- Community Fairs/ Activities

6. Do you feel like you have a choice in where you live? And where do you live now (zip code)?

No choice		A lot of choice	
x	x	x	
94124	94124	94124	

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 20, 2019
Dr. George W. Davis Senior Center (Bayview Hunters Point/District 10)

7. What makes you feel like you have a choice or don't have a choice?

- No longer feel like we belong
- Effect of system
- Effect of gang injunctions/ records
- Cost
- Exploitive financial products

Station 2 – Access to Opportunity

8. What are the most pressing challenges to getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood?

- Education in SF because less favored by recruiters
- Insufficient educational showing/ testing for college

9. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or a keep a job?

- Community building/ capacity to leverage

10. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in accessing public transportation?

- [no answers given]

11. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in accessing public transportation?

- [no answers given]

12. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in living in or creating more healthy neighborhoods?

- [no answers given]

13. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in live in or create healthy neighborhoods?

- [no answers given]

Station 3: Fair Housing Violations

14. Have you or a member of your household experienced a violation of your fair housing protections?

- [no answers given]

15. What did you do/Who did you go to for support? How helpful was it?

- [no answers given]

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 20, 2019
Dr. George W. Davis Senior Center (Bayview Hunters Point/District 10)

Session #2

1. What's important to you that brought you here tonight?

- Future of Bayview
- Affordable housing for African Americans
- Hearing the policies about fair housing
- Feeling disconnected & trying to decide whether to stay or leave
- Challenges for families to get housing with children
- Cost of housing/ occupancy STD's
- Learn about housing issues here

Station 1 – Neighborhood Change and Choice

2. Based on the maps and your personal experience, what are the most important or noteworthy changes in this neighborhood in the past 5 years?

- African Americans leaving – elders pass & families move
- A lot of development – for newcomers
- Types of businesses have changed, catering to newcomers
 - Though most avoid 3rd street
- Fewer familiar faces/ names changing without regard to history
- Few legacy residents shop on 3rd/ Fight for what should be on 3rd street

3. What do you think has caused or contributed to those changes in your neighborhood?

- Lack of appropriate law enforcement
- Lack of response by city for public SVC's
- Media coverage – bias
- Impact of development of nearby areas (Dogpatch/ UCSF)
- Dot Com Boom
- Availability of land in southeast sector
 - Increase of density in Bayview
- Mental illness
- Lack of funding for youth, homeless, mental health programs
- Cost of rent
- Impact of policies (Health Dept., Planning, etc.)
- Poorly performing schools
 - Families moving away

4. If money were not object, where would you choose to live (top 3 desirable places) and where would you choose to not live (top 3 least desirable places)?

- [no answers given]

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 20, 2019
Dr. George W. Davis Senior Center (Bayview Hunters Point/District 10)

5. What makes a neighborhood a desirable place to live?

- Amenities – groceries, community centers, churches
- Sense of community
- Weather
- Transportation
- Walkability
- View
- Feel connected
- Institutions
- Parks & Open Space
- QUALITY food sources

6. Do you feel like you have a choice in where you live? And where do you live now (zip code)?

No choice						A lot of choice	
x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
94110	94110	94110	945019	94110	94124	94124	

7. What makes you feel like you have a choice or don't have a choice?

- Discrimination – racism
- Access to capital
 - Ability to qualify
- Family property ownership

Station 2 – Access to Opportunity

8. What are the most pressing challenges to getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood?

- [no answers given]

9. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or a keep a job?

- [no answers given]

10. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in accessing public transportation?

- [no answers given]

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 20, 2019
Dr. George W. Davis Senior Center (Bayview Hunters Point/District 10)

- 11. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in accessing public transportation?**
 - [no answers given]
- 12. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in living in or creating more healthy neighborhoods?**
 - [no answers given]
- 13. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in live in or create healthy neighborhoods?**
 - [no answers given]

Station 3: Fair Housing Violations

- 14. Have you or a member of your household experienced a violation of your fair housing protections?**
 - [no answers given]
- 15. What did you do/Who did you go to for support? How helpful was it?**
 - [no answers given]

Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

- 1. What is important to you that brought you here tonight?**
 - People origin/ current situation
 - Know more what people think about Bayview Plans
 - Increase services, Asian population help
 - Place to live/housing – upgrade and make room for others that are coming in
 - Developer – Help community better
 - Have providers, but don't have people to be heard
 - Homelessness/services
 - Seniors need to be in their home- hope to developed
 - Close down business to build homes, but still empty spaces.
- 2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?**
 - Mental Health
 - Job services – living wage jobs for both young adults and adults
 - Senior services – good access here, couldn't hurt to have more
 - Financial
 - More shelters
 - Homeless – jobs, started doing community work

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 20, 2019
Dr. George W. Davis Senior Center (Bayview Hunters Point/District 10)

3. How would you find out about these services?

- Community centers
- YMCA → the same information/resources
- Churches

- Children centers can come in to do homework watch TV/ After school program
- More programs before / After school
- Services – health, housing, seniors
- Outreach – radio, workshop

4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?

- Outreach- word of mouth
- Access services/ information
- Reference
- Outside the network
- Mass produce information/ centralized information
- More tabling/ Basic info flyering
- Transportation
- Language

5. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?

- Familiar places
- 1 Stop Shop information
- Multilingual
- Language
- Safety
- Fear
- Educate people about community
- Community Building Program
- Improving service
- Unpaid job program – difficult
- Paid job training/ internship
-

6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?

- Homelessness – where to find resources/ services local senior housing
- Local senior housing
- Multilingual services to find housing
- SBO connection?

7. What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?

- Veterans

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 20, 2019
Dr. George W. Davis Senior Center (Bayview Hunters Point/District 10)

- Locked up/second chances – Employers
- Job programs – language translations /EAS
- Service local neighborhood
- Additional case management/ support
- Skills-training

8. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?

- [no answers given]

9. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?

- Specific employment pathways
- GED Completion
- City college
- Partnership
- Platform/ Job fairs
- Hire Bayview residents/ local hiring
- Employer accounting how many people they hire from job fairs

10. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?

- [no answers given]

11. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?

- [no answers given]

12. What do you like most and least about your neighborhood shopping area?

- [no answers given]

13. What are things that would build your sense of community?

- [no answers given]

Session #2

1. What is important to you that brought you here tonight?

- Any family in need – asking
- Toxic contamination in the Bayview
- Killing of young men of color
- Gentrification – people of color in Bayview Housing
- Territorial Block by block
- Don't know how to write
- No skills
- Financial services

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 20, 2019
Dr. George W. Davis Senior Center (Bayview Hunters Point/District 10)

- Getting people to utilize, do not trust institution
- 2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?**
- Finding employment/ Job services
 - Positive Community Affairs
 - Child Care
 - Safety
 - Activities for the youth/ Positive apartments, affordable, trips
 - Mental Health, Substance abuse
 - Community Support
 - Longevity Jobs
 - Outsiders reap the benefits
 - No fruits or fruits/vegetables/ affordable/ accessible
 - Facilities in neighborhood that delivers outside the community
 - Housing, homelessness shelter/ multi-floors
 - Inadequate shelter
- 3. How would you find out about these services?**
- City department has to communicate better with each other
 - Share network
 - Information out
 - Offer places they can go outside neighborhood
 - Better communication/ Follow-up
 - Training
 - Positive Community Affairs
 - Cultural Sensitivity
- 4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?**
- Financing to help residence
 - Racism
 - Rudeness / other race
 - Transportation
 - Mental Health
- 5. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?**
- T-Train – more than one train / can run more frequently to Bayview
 - Living wage jobs
 - Local hiring
 - Loss of basic institutions, pharmacy, banks
 - Better awareness from police
- 6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?**

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 20, 2019
Dr. George W. Davis Senior Center (Bayview Hunters Point/District 10)

- [no answers given]
- 7. What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?**
- More access to free education
 - On the job training
 - Pay fees
 - Entrepreneurship opportunities
 - Incarcerated jobs/ hard to find/Re-enter job market
 - Professional development
 - Mentorship
 - NEW Business person mentored by seasoned business person
 - Creative job hubs/ Incubators
- 8. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?**
- [no answers given]
- 9. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?**
- Access to education
 - Job training
 - Practice test for City jobs
 - Credit for experiences in place of Degrees
 - Minimum qualifications
 - Wages for housework/ Expand
 - Pay foster parents double, but not pay parents
 - Local hiring
- 10. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?**
- Affordable housing – REAL affordable housing!
 - Substantial living
 - System/ Rent control accountability basic standard of living
 - Strong department of DBI
 - Policing is very threatening – problem with law enforcement need attention – police accountability
 - Wealth education/ management
 - Financial literacy
 - Community involvement
 - Health First – good food, restaurants
 - Water contamination in Bayview/ Toxic
 - Liquor store closing early
- 11. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
- City department denying problems

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 20, 2019
Dr. George W. Davis Senior Center (Bayview Hunters Point/District 10)

- Health/Contamination sponsorship of the poison approved building in the toxic land, refuse to do EIR.

12. What do you like most and least about your neighborhood shopping area?

- [no answers given]

13. What are things that would build your sense of community?

- [no answers given]

Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

1. What is important to you that brought you here tonight?

- Small, inadequate housing, negatively impacting health, wants to stay in the community
- Need immediate housing, SRO (too small) wants housing in Bayview community
- In desperate need of housing, doesn't want to stay in a shelter
- Information about homeownership, or about MOHCD rental program (wants to stay/live in Bayview/Dogpatch)
- Needs adequate housing, is on multiple housing lists, in immediate need, elderly/ senior, health issues, the City system is like a run-around, paying more than 70% of income on rent.
- Son was on housing list, couldn't renew, needs housing
- Works for City, sees inadequate conditions like mold, and other unhealthy environmental issues, people need affordable housing, SRO's aren't suitable for families.

2. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?

- Housing authority list is too long, some people get housed faster than others (out of order), system needs to be improved
- Supports for women of color to get housing, issues with criminal records of family members
- Racial inequities throughout the housing system
- SRO environment is toxic, deaths in the building, drug users etc. → needs access to better housing, has been on Section 8 list for 5 years.
- Credit, good jobs, (not just SSI) are needed to get housing.
- SSI & disabled don't make enough to stay in housing and even SRO's

3. In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?

- Housing authority renewal issues → if someone leaves the household, can all the others stay? Changes in household should not disqualify for housing.
- Section 8 list is full, I need housing now
- Vouchers here (Section 8) you cannot stay in San Francisco
- People who grew up in San Francisco, people of color, do not get enough housing opportunity

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 20, 2019
Dr. George W. Davis Senior Center (Bayview Hunters Point/District 10)

- 4. Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities.**
 - Farther up 3rd street, the housing has onsite gyms, big part of good health (mental & physical), clean environment
 - You have to spend time going to multiple locations, you need access to online & telephone
 - We need more 3 & 4 bedroom housing for young people to grow into and build a family, with playgrounds.
 - People live stressful lives, overcrowded, family housing
 - Build family housing
 - Challenges for formerly incarcerated to access housing in the system
- 5. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified would you prefer?**
 - Email, text, phone call.
 - Mail
 - Newspaper → Examiner
 - Flyers (on street poles) (Posted in businesses)
 - Community facilities (like YMCA's etc.)
 - DAHLIA (this is good, email alerts)
 - Hard copies take too long in the mail
 - For homeownership, there might be a fear of applying, fear of unknown, think you will not get it.
 - How do you know if something is a scam? \$0 down, etc. offers online
 - If you come to meetings & show up, you aren't guaranteed any housing. That should change.
- 6. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?**
 - [no answers given]
- 7. What are the kinds of things that help people move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?**
 - [no answers given]
- 8. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
 - Clean up the streets, there is trash everywhere
 - Add containers on the streets for recycling
 - Places for trash that are not dumping grounds
 - Clean up human waste on streets, access to public bathrooms. Streets are filthy.
 - Facilities for people to shower (public access)
 - Outdoor exercise activities
 - Spaces for youth, speakers for them etc.
 - Spaces for food donation, giveaway
- 9. What are things that would build your sense of community?**

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 20, 2019
Dr. George W. Davis Senior Center (Bayview Hunters Point/District 10)

- Gentrification concerns, high income vs. low income
 - Include all people, not just some
- Art programs (inclusive)
- Adopt-a-neighbor

Session #2

1. What is important to you that brought you here tonight?

- Family has been in Bayview & Fillmore, homeless & drug-use is up. People need help; also TAY (18-24) transitioning out of systems have challenges; older adults who lost housing have troubles; people coming out of services (rehab for drug/alcohol) have trouble accessing services after.
- Problems with landlord, medical costs are half my check, so it's hard to pay other bills, need affordable housing (family, members with disabilities)
- Have section 8 voucher that landlords will not accept.
- Need for shelter beds in the Bayview
 - 1,200 homeless in District 10
 - 125 (2) shelter beds in District 10
 - Is active church
 - There is a Nav. Center (Bayshore)
- Needs for homeless seniors, come here to Dr. Davis

2. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?

- More money (rental subsidy)
- LIHTC rents are too high, SSI benefits is not enough money.
- People stay where they can stay, they don't go anywhere;; need more shelter beds & housing for low-income in the Bayview (homeless, undocumented)
- Affordable housing is not low-income housing
- Medical costs, dialysis vs. bills/rent) are unsustainable
- Mental health supports
- Medical program to check on people (once a week, make sure they) are taking meds.

3. In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?

- Funding commitments from City change
- If you do not have certain amount of years as homeless, then you cannot qualify for housing.
 - Need to prove sleep in car, street, etc. but not shelter
- System relies on individual interviewers (subjective)
- Seniors have trouble navigating the housing system
 - The seniors have children in home who's drug etc. can jeopardize their housing
 - Need a lawyer to navigate housing authority

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 20, 2019
Dr. George W. Davis Senior Center (Bayview Hunters Point/District 10)

- Seniors → DAHLIA is good, but seniors do not have access to internet or people to do the applications for them.
 - Seniors → need supportive housing, are frail, the independent housing isn't good enough for them, (health declines and they die)
- 4. Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities.**
- Case management for vulnerable populations in the housing system
 - Seems like certain groups get favored under the new, changing priorities (vets, mental health etc.)
 - Preferences means everyone fights over limited housing
 - Case management for homeless, not just in housing system.
 - Mother Brown's should be expanded, help keep up with their paperwork.
 - DAHLIA should have housing for families (2,3, 4 bedrooms, not 1, or studios)
- 5. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified would you prefer?**
- Email (gets DAHLIA alerts)
 - but chances are so low
 - Text (youth and others)
 - Phone call (seniors)
 - Word of mouth, from trusted person
- 6. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?**
- Homeownership is expensive for everyone, but if you aren't even stable, it is very out of reach.
 - First time home buyers programs are ok but do not work in San Francisco.
- 7. What are the kinds of things that help people move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?**
- [no answers given]
- 8. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
- Existing parks are good, but could be more family friendly, beautify (help homeless & move them away from parks with services)
 - Parks should look clean and be nice
 - Parks should serve people in the community
 - Parks with open public restrooms
- 9. What are things that would build your sense of community?**
- Community hire
 - When new businesses come in, they do not have employees from the community with skills for these jobs
 - When seniors and children feel safe to walk the streets, that is when the community thrives

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 20, 2019
Dr. George W. Davis Senior Center (Bayview Hunters Point/District 10)

- The people who live here (generational, legacy) get to stay here → community thrives

Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups

Notes for the Long Range Housing Planning break-out groups will be synthesized and posted on the Planning Department's website after all of the forums have taken place.

**A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 3, 2018
Eureka Valley Recreation Center (District 7 and District 8)**

Table of Contents

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups.....	1
Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups.....	4
Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups	8
Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups	11

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups

Sessions #1 and #2

Neighborhood Change and Choice

1. What is the most important or noteworthy change in this neighborhood in the last 5 years?

- Long-time residents moved away (3 dots)
- Fewer families with children live here
- Far fewer LGBT people live here (3)
- Many more strollers (1)
- Local businesses are closing
- Way many vacant storefronts
- Far less LGBTQ people in the area, soon there will be Pride flags hanging, but no LGBTQ people working under them
- Increased rents (4)
- More evictions (2)
- Harder for long-term HIV survivors to afford to live here (2)
- More seniors, few younger families (D7)
- More Asian-American (D7)
- Less seniors are living in the Castro as they don't own many buildings. So younger "Tech" industry workers take up the vacant spaces, further increasing the rent.
- Loss of creative people who are priced-out

2. What has caused changes in your neighborhood?

- Housing costs have gone up (5)
- Homeowners more reluctant to rent out homes/units (1)
- "Upgrading residential properties(2)
- Immigration patterns/development of more middle/upper class in Asia
- Lack of new housing
- The "Tech" industry has allowed far more youth to relocate to the neighborhood
- Increased rent, not enough housing to allow low-income citizens to live in the area (1)

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 3, 2018
Eureka Valley Recreation Center (District 7 and District 8)

- Priced out of option to renew lease; rising rental rates (2)
- Short term rentals (1)
- High retail costs (rental of space) (1)
- Evictions (2)
- Loss of units from people passing from HIV/AIDS (2)
- Lack of housing for people with HIV/AIDS – losing housing because they don't have ability to pay
- City paying companies/organizations to do things that aren't necessary. No oversight. Not housing people

3. Where would you choose to live and where would you choose not to live?

- Most desirable places to live per maps – Castro (6), Duboce Triangle (2), Mission, Glen Park, St Francis Woods, West Portal, Inner Sunset (2), Seacliff, Presidio, Lone Mountain (2), Haight Ashbury, Marina, Nob Hill, South of Market (2), Marin County (2), Walnut Creek, Lafayette, Danville, Oakland (2), South San Francisco, Palo Alto
- Least desirable places to live per maps – Outer Sunset (2), Outer Richmond, Pacific Heights, Marina, Tenderloin (4), South of Market (3), Dogpatch (4), Bayview (4), Parkmerced (3), Daly City, South San Francisco, San Mateo, San Jose, Pinole, Pittsburg

4. What attributes/characteristics/features make a neighborhood a desirable place to live?

- Access to parks (3)
- Access to good public transit (5)
- Gay people/Queer people (3)
- Safe walkability (4)
- Access to local businesses
- Biodiversity of plants, animal, people (3)
- X Affordability! (3)
- Community/queers
- Libraries (1)
- Ethnic racial diversity
- Walkability (1)
- Stores/restaurants/bars (1)

5. Do you feel like you have a choice in where you live?

No notes – see flipchart

6. What makes you feel like you have a choice or don't have a choice?

- I'm queer and my family is multiply marginalized – safer in #s (1)
- Can't afford market rates, need to keep rent control (1)
- Money (3)
- I cannot afford to live in the area I want because I do not make enough money (3)
- If we had access to affordable higher education in order to produce enough income to live in this place and work in this place, I think we would have more choice.
- Moving would mean giving up the benefit of rent control (1)
- Older building not ADA-accessible. Seniors can't move

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 3, 2018
Eureka Valley Recreation Center (District 7 and District 8)

Access to Opportunity

- 7. What are the most pressing challenges to getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood?**
 - Access to mass transit to South Bay where tech jobs are
 - Transit to my job in Bayview terrible (especially after 7 pm)
 - Parking
- 8. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or keep a job?**
 - Easy to drive to work
 - Incentive for a more diverse population which lead to wider perspectives, more challenges met
- 9. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in accessing public transportation?**
 - Terrible sidewalks
 - Needing to transfer makes transit way more complex, so all of area off BART MUNI train lines (such as my neighborhood Chinatown) require transfer, waiting, missed connection
- 10. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in accessing public transportation?**
 - Lots of lines converge here
 - Buses come more often
- 11. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in living in or creating more healthy neighborhoods?**
 - Trash, rubbish and filth on the sidewalks, FREE NEEDLES
 - Mediocre transit/poor transit to some areas
 - Crime
 - Accessibility for elderly/disabled people
- 12. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood to live in or create healthy neighborhoods?**
 - Parks
 - Not filth in streets/sidewalks
 - More incentive for community involvement towards improvement

Fair Housing Violations

- 13. Have you or a member of your household experienced a violation of your fair housing protections?**
 - YES – 3 green dots (Very Helpful)
 - NO – 1 green dot (Very Helpful) and 1 red dot (Not Helpful)
- 14. What did you do/Who did you go for support?**
 - California Department of Fair Employment and Housing
 - Human Rights Commission

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 3, 2018
Eureka Valley Recreation Center (District 7 and District 8)

- Bay Area Legal Aid
- SF Tenant's Union (2 Yellow dots – Somewhat Helpful) and 1 green dot (Very Helpful)

15. How helpful was it?

See answers of Question 14

16. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

No flipchart for this question

Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

1. Let's list the non-housing needs that are most important for you and/or your family.

- Childcare
 - Culturally competent (same sex parenting)
- Food
 - Income challenged
 - Lower income limits
- Access to info for non-English speakers
- Advertising resources we have now to navigate application processes
- Awareness about resources
- Quality healthcare
- Staff/language diversity

2. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?

- Sharing relatable experiences
- Physical outreach
- Multi-cultural marketing material
- Art + Culture engagement
- Website, but make easy to navigate (ask the community)
- Doctor's office for social worker
 - Online too impersonal
 - More personal referral
- Family + friends even more important to communities of color
- One stop shop

3. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services that would meet those needs?

- Stigma (social)
- Language barriers
- Transportation:
 - Great to group things

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 3, 2018
Eureka Valley Recreation Center (District 7 and District 8)

- Frequency, convenience
 - Physical/mental challenge
 - Lack of cultural competence
- 4. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?**
- More queer pol staff/diversity
 - After hours times for people who work days
 - (including now to publish this)
 - Application process simplified + provide next steps, what to expect, etc.
 - Glossary of terms
- 5. What are the biggest challenges getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood? What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or keep a job?**
- Challenges:
- Age discrimination
 - Transportation
 - Lack of opportunities
 - Lack of training/experience
 - Small businesses squeezed by economic factors
 - Undocumented
- Helps:
- Community resources with jobs listing
 - Opportunities in your neighborhood
 - Employers – offered training
 - Focus on mental health awareness
- 6. If you (or someone you know) needed help advancing your career, what services and supports would you look for?**
- One-stop career center
 - Online certification/accreditation (CDC sessions should be open to public)
 - CBO-based employment services
 - Jobs clubs
 - Temporary employment agencies
 - Internship programs for university students (paid)
- 7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?**
- Increase hoop access points
 - Create one for LGBT community, Polly Amory, Leather, etc., cultural districts
 - D.O.R. collaboration with C.B.O. (Federal money)
 - Equal opportunity for underserved communities
- 8. What do you like most and least about your local commercial corridor?**

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 3, 2018
Eureka Valley Recreation Center (District 7 and District 8)

Most:

- LGBT-owned
- All in walking distance
- Convenience

Least:

- 2-3 business only
- Too much bar scene, not safe for youth
- Expensive restaurant
- Needs more small businesses
- Needs more diverse businesses

9. What are things that would build your sense of community?

- Block events to encourage communities
- Something to bring people together from different background
- Bring together younger generation
- Encourage sex positivity

**10. Which programs or services need to be offered in a language other than English?
(Phone translation is a barrier)**

- Everything
- Safe injection facilities
- Needle exchange
- STIs/STDs treatment
- Health services (preventive)

11. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- Ageist perspective
- Gender ID issues
- Sex positivity
 - bath houses in San Francisco
 - support for healthy options
- Asset building – build financial security

Session #2

1. Let's list the non-housing needs that are most important for you and/or your family.

- Cleaner city – sidewalks, people on streets + more...
- Reduce barriers to services – what's keeping you from making the next step?
- Creating spaces for community – too many barriers to use
- General safety

2. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?

"Where would you go?"

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 3, 2018
Eureka Valley Recreation Center (District 7 and District 8)

- Internet – but for most in need don't have that
 - Library use/resource
 - Navigation centers
- 3. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services that would meet those needs?**
- Mental stability/ability to get through the process
 - Have a representative go to them and see what they need
 - Being home-bound limits access
 - Each provider has to have their own outreach efforts – too decentralized
 - No investment in helping community
 - Understand what's out there
- 4. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?**
- Coordinated database of services
 - Provider portal of broadcast services – calendar, flyer, etc.
- 5. What are the biggest challenges getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood? What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or keep a job?**
- Challenges:
- Trauma makes work place hard
 - Education lack
 - Mental health services
 - How to balance mind/body/soul
- Help:
- Practice skills, self-soothing
- 6. If you (or someone you know) needed help advancing your career, what services and supports would you look for?**
- Training for new skill (EDD) – post disability
 - (how to) integrate wellness into your life
 - Paid well ness benefits
 - Child care
 - transportation
- 7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?**
- “What's a good job?”
 - Paying SF rent
 - It's not \$15/hour
 - What is the continuum of job experience/career building
 - Continue to support free city course
 - Subsidize childcare + transportation
 - Requirements on computer (especially tech companies, etc)

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 3, 2018
Eureka Valley Recreation Center (District 7 and District 8)

8. What do you like most and least about your local commercial corridor?

Most

- new business energy
- wider Castro sidewalk

Least

- eliminating people who have been there a long time
- missing daily clean teams
- not affordable eating places
- increasing policing
- vacant storefronts

9. What are things that would build your sense of community?

- Neighborhood watch – helps get to know neighbors
- More Sunday streets/Block parties
 - Including safe events for younger people
 - More housing
- Teach about wellness
- Neighborhood groups talking about eviction prevention, neighbor support

10. Which programs or services need to be offered in a language other than English?

- All
- Eviction prevention
- Workforce development
- Mental health
- Not just language, but also cultural competency

11. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- What have you experienced been with accessing MOHCD services?
- Eviction record impact – makes things worse
- Credit matters also impact situations

Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

1. Let's list the types of housing-related needs that are most important for you and/or your family.

- Evictions
 - rent-related
 - Speculation-driven
 - Ellis Act, OMI
 - Prevention services needed: back rent, legal services, credit repair, lack of info re: eviction process + rights

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 3, 2018
Eureka Valley Recreation Center (District 7 and District 8)

- Relocation Assistance
- Homelessness
- Vacant buildings that need rehab.
- New projects needed in Fillmore

2. In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?

- City spends too much \$ on problems, not solutions.
- “There are no housing services!”
- “Too much overhead, too little services”

More notice for community meeting needed

3. What supports do you or your family need in order to be able to *get* an apartment?

- No vacancy control
- Waiting lists are all closed
- At-risk OMI tenants need immediate assistance
- Up front housing costs - \$ for deposits, 1st month rent, relocation assistance

4. What services do you need to *stay* in your apartment?

- Legal representation- “adequate attorneys”
- More notice for OMI & Ellis evictions
- Where to find new housing – affordable immediate, temporary housing
- Earlier intervention with legal services

5. In your experience, what supports or services do specific groups need to be able to rent apartments?

- Assistance clearing eviction and back-rent record

6. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified you prefer?

- Flyer, especially for seniors/disabled
- Email

7. Aside from the high cost, what are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?

- How to prevent eviction?
- At-risk tenants should automatically be put on lists
- Help finding affordable housing with no waiting lists

8. What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?

9. What are things that would build your sense of community?

10. Which programs or services need to be offered in a language other than English?

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 3, 2018
Eureka Valley Recreation Center (District 7 and District 8)

11. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

Session #2

- 1. Let's list the types of housing-related needs that are most important for you and/or your family.**
 - Stabilizing rents of non-rent controlled units
 - Knowing legal rights + resources for tenants
 - Help overcoming barriers, e.g. legal
 - Affordability – paying monthly
- 2. In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?**
 - Tenants union is accessible, info hard to get appt. for seniors
 - Info re tenants' rights not so accessible
 - Rent Board info + services fairly accessible
 - Lack of info re/ housing services + programs
 - Better outreach + marketing
- 3. What supports do you or your family need in order to be able to *get* an apartment?**
 - Higher income, lower rent
 - Financial education re credit score + impact on housing
- 4. What services do you need to *stay* in your apartment?**
 - Financial education e.g. money management
 - Legal services, free or low cost
 - Better + more info regarding these services. E.g. Housing fairs, "Project Homeless Connect" model
- 5. In your experience, what supports or services do specific groups need to be able to rent apartments?**
 - Housing "buddy" or "ambassador"
 - Seniors with low-tech experience or not tech. access
 - Translation for non-English speakers
 - Incentives for owners to not raise rents to market upon vacancy (rent stab. Housing)
- 6. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified you prefer?**
 - Social media
 - Public radio
 - Email blasts
 - Flyers, notices in shops
 - Text messages

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 3, 2018
Eureka Valley Recreation Center (District 7 and District 8)

- 7. Aside from the high cost, what are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?**
 - Lottery – neighborhood preference is barrier
 - HOA dues too high!
 - Incentives/assistance to new owners/existing tenants to help maintain tenancy when building is sold
 - Allowing TIC ownership for larger building
- 8. What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?**
 - Ask homeless people what they need
 - Lack of beds in shelters
 - More navigation centers as entry point to permanent housing
 - Job resources/placement to increase income for permanent housing
- 9. What are things that would build your sense of community?**
 - Stability – housing. Places to cook and eat. Community kitchens
 - Community forums
 - Farmers' markets
 - Neighborhood events
 - Neighborhood blogs/info
- 10. Which programs or services need to be offered in a language other than English?**
 - All
 - Based on demographics + need
- 11. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?**
 - Concern re: people displaced by fire

Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups

Notes for the Long Range Housing Planning break-out groups will be synthesized and posted on the Planning Department's website after all of the forums have taken place.

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 19, 2019
Chinatown YMCA (Chinatown/District 3 and District 2)

Table of Contents

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups.....	1
Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups.....	5
Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups	8
Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups	10

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups

Session #1

1. What's important to you that brought you here tonight?

- Stay in rent-control apt
- 3rd eviction
- Cheap landlord
- Lack of property maintenance

Station 1 – Neighborhood Change and Choice

2. Based on the maps and your personal experience, what are the most important or noteworthy changes in this neighborhood in the past 5 years?

- Not enough infrastructure
- Park issues- more traffic
- Not enough housing (more TICS)
- Small dwellings but unaffordable
- Evictions-unlawful detainer
- No interaction with landlord

3. What do you think has caused or contributed to those changes in your neighborhood?

- Developments
- Real Estate

4. If money were not object, where would you choose to live (top 3 desirable places) and where would you choose to not live (top 3 least desirable places)?

- Most desirable places to live per map - North Beach, Haight Ashbury, Western Addition, Laurel Heights
- Least desirable places to live per map – Visitacion Valley, South San Francisco, Excelsior, Mount Davidson, Outer Sunset, Tenderloin

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 19, 2019
Chinatown YMCA (Chinatown/District 3 and District 2)

5. What makes a neighborhood a desirable place to live?

- Green Space
- Transportation
- Farmer's market/ hospitals/ food/ coffee
- safety

6. Do you feel like you have a choice in where you live? And where do you live now (zip code)?

- No choice: 94108, 94115
- A lot of choice: 94115

7. What makes you feel like you have a choice or don't have a choice?

-

Station 2 – Access to Opportunity

8. What are the most pressing challenges to getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood?

-
-

9. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or a keep a job?

-
-

10. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in accessing public transportation?

-
-

11. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in accessing public transportation?

-
-

12. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in living in or creating more healthy neighborhoods?

- Challenges: Small room (district 3)

13. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in live in or create healthy neighborhoods?

- Assets: Convenient to stores, people/ community

Station 3: Fair Housing Violations

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 19, 2019
Chinatown YMCA (Chinatown/District 3 and District 2)

14. Have you or a member of your household experienced a violation of your fair housing protections?

- Yes: 2
- No: 0

15. What did you do/Who did you go to for support? How helpful was it?

•

Session #2

1. What's important to you that brought you here tonight?

- Families with children
- Not all housing opportunities in DHALIA, especially senior housing
- No neighborhood preference in Chinatown
- Hard to get selected by lottery
- More housing for disable people
- No access to fill out paper applications
- More senior housing
- Need more info about subletting rent a room for small landlords
- Income restrictions/ language discrimination

Station 1 – Neighborhood Change and Choice

2. Based on the maps and your personal experience, what are the most important or noteworthy changes in this neighborhood in the past 5 years?

- Higher rent for both business and housing
- Cannot afford affordable housing rent is too high
- More tech people live in SRO's
- SRO's are only marketed in English, targeted to certain groups of people

3. What do you think has caused or contributed to those changes in your neighborhood?

- Too little housing in certain neighborhood marketing in English

4. If money were not object, where would you choose to live (top 3 desirable places) and where would you choose to not live (top 3 least desirable places)?

•

5. What makes a neighborhood a desirable place to live?

•

6. Do you feel like you have a choice in where you live? And where do you live now (zip code)?

- No choice: 94108 = 9 people, 94112= 1 person, 94133= 1 person, 94111, 94104

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 19, 2019
Chinatown YMCA (Chinatown/District 3 and District 2)

7. What makes you feel like you have a choice or don't have a choice?

-

Station 2 – Access to Opportunity

8. What are the most pressing challenges to getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood?

-

9. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or a keep a job?

-

10. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in accessing public transportation?

-

11. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in accessing public transportation?

-

12. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in living in or creating more healthy neighborhoods?

-

13. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in live in or create healthy neighborhoods?

-

Station 3: Fair Housing Violations

14. Have you or a member of your household experienced a violation of your fair housing protections?

- Yes: 4 people
- No: 0 people

15. What did you do/Who did you go to for support? How helpful was it?

- Do: Contact MOHCD – No help
- Where went for help? Private attorney, Tenderloin neighborhood

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 19, 2019
Chinatown YMCA (Chinatown/District 3 and District 2)

Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

- 1. What is important to you that brought you here tonight?**
 -
- 2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?**
 - Job programs- to support & raise their families immigration policies- get access & info & legal services
 - More public services & community organizations funding for training specifically social workers
 - More info. To run for public office I.E. education commissioner
 - Funding for TAY programs- workforce training & school/education
 - Language, vocational training & English courses
 - Case Management for TAY youth 18-24 non-school age
 - Vocational training for special needs individuals
 - Funding for community building
- 3. How would you find out about these services?**
 - Local newspaper- Tsing Tao
 - Radio
 - YMCA/senior centers will language capacity
 - CCDC
- 4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?**
 - Language barriers-YMCA/ senior Center needs
 - Job training/ programs- insufficient, minimum funding, needs language capacity, needs bilingual
 - Staff, lower English proficiency
 - Neighborhood needs a building or community facilities
- 5. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?**
 -
- 6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?**
 -
- 7. What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?**
 - MOHCD look at neighborhood & community holistically to determine needs
 - API counseling
 - Provide stability for nonprofits; assistance for staff to retain housing in the City
 - Needs assistance for small business; businesses are closing and many store fronts are vacant
 - Homeless population- MOHCD needs a plan to assist the homeless population

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 19, 2019
Chinatown YMCA (Chinatown/District 3 and District 2)

- Childcare- parents work night shift; no childcare available at night times
 - Sanitary concerns- City provide more facilities
- 8. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?**
-
- 9. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?**
-
- 10. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?**
-
- 11. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
- Provide more bathroom facilities to eliminate public urination and waste
 - More shelters to decrease overcrowding
 - More street lights/ lighting in alley ways
 - Fund more nonprofits and community agencies
 - Chinatown & funding to clean up and repair Stockton tunnel
 - Keep households in their homes; provide funding for nonprofits for homeowner assistance and other programs
- 12. What do you like most and least about your neighborhood shopping area?**
-
- 13. What are things that would build your sense of community?**
-

Session #2

- 1. What is important to you that brought you here tonight?**
- Housing affordability
 - Housing rental assistance
- 2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?**
- Needs more languages assistance; find non-profits & community agencies to support language capacity
 - Need rental assistance programs; funding for rental assistance programs
 - Housing expenses are higher than income; wants more funding for renter assistance
 - Self-help for the elderly is very important to the community. It has a long history & provides many programs/ for seniors, the organizations is very good
 - The City needs to provide more funding to this organizations; it provides info and resources. Community will support organizations

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 19, 2019
Chinatown YMCA (Chinatown/District 3 and District 2)

- Rental housing increase to 4% (ccdc)
- 3. How would you find out about these services?**
- Community centers nonprofits to disperse information & resources to the public
 - Flyers in multiple languages is important. Flyers at public spaces, non-profits organizations
 - Public libraries- for internet access but availability is limited
 - Broadcast on Chinese radio
 - Newspaper- Tsing Tao
 - Senior housing information online is brief, needs more information
- 4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?**
-
- 5. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?**
- Improve 911 – services took 30 minutes.
 - Improve sanitary conditions; add waste/recycling bins in front of business
 - Accessibility in SROS –elevators
 - Improve communication/ marketing- radio, newspapers, flyers, non-profit organization; enlist the help of non-profits & community centers; enlist the help on small neighborhood businesses to check on community members during disasters, etc.
 - Make sure community use 311 to report non-emergency
 - Childcare for SRO occupants
 - Support youth in community; encourage youth to connect with seniors
 - Meal programs
 - Make signs to discourage throwing trash, spitting in street
- 6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?**
-
- 7. What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?**
-
- 8. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?**
-
- 9. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?**
-
- 10. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?**
-
- 11. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
-

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 19, 2019
Chinatown YMCA (Chinatown/District 3 and District 2)

12. What do you like most and least about your neighborhood shopping area?

-

13. What are things that would build your sense of community?

-

Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

1. What is important to you that brought you here tonight?

- Applicants fee for lottery. We pointed that for City sponsored projects, no fee
- 415 701-5500
- Fund nonprofits to help with application work
- DHALIA doesn't give feedback about application
- Many and empty properties not rented out
- Education about new immigration laws that affect affordable housing

2. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?

-

3. In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?

-

4. Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities.

-

5. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified would you prefer?

-

6. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?

-

7. What are the kinds of things that help people move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?

-

8. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?

-

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 19, 2019
Chinatown YMCA (Chinatown/District 3 and District 2)

9. What are things that would build your sense of community?

-

Session #2

1. What is important to you that brought you here tonight?

- Allow TIC
- Eviction prevention
- Down payment assistance
- Housing too small
- More affordable senior housing
- Help paying rental subsidies for affordable housing
- Affordable housing for 62*65 year olds low income
- More housing
- Family housing
- Support organizations like self-help elderly
- More rental subsidies
- Update technology to be more responsive to applicants
- Elevators in older building especially SRO's
- Single parent household
- Make it clear that you don't need ssn to live in housing

2. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?

- Rent for seniors keep rising
- Need more indoor community center in Chinatown
- Space for seniors and children
- Preference for affordable lottery for 1st time applicants for families with children
- More housing subsidies like section 8 and get more landlords to accept section 8
- List of properties/ landlords that accept section 8
- Increase funds for senior services
- Well-funded small sites program. Affordable housing preservation should be priority

3. In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?

-

4. Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities.

-

5. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified would you prefer?

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 19, 2019
Chinatown YMCA (Chinatown/District 3 and District 2)

-
- 6. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?
 -
- 7. What are the kinds of things that help people move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?
 -
- 8. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?
 -
- 9. What are things that would build your sense of community?
 -

Written Statement Received:

My name is Chang Jok Lee, I'm the president of the Ping Yuen Residents Improvement Association. Our mission is to strive for better living conditions for nearly 1,000 residents that are residing at Ping Yuen and North Ping Yuen. Since the establishment in 1968, the leadership has continuously working with our security measure. One successful example of getting security improvement was back 1978 where we organized the first Public Housing rent strike in the city after a brutal rape and murder of a young girl at North Ping Yuen. Nowadays Ping infrastructure upgrades because of resident's support and collaboration during the Rental Assistance Demonstration conversation and renovation. With all the additional resident services funding, we are able to focus on breaking through isolation by connecting residents through community building work. Residents feel closer to their neighbors and start building a sense of belonging to the community. This is not something we can achieve in a blink of an eye. It takes time, resources and a lot of work. The work must continue, so residents feel welcome to their community to increase their interests in participating in the service programs. When they build the sense of community ownership, they will become more socialize and active which will help improved their health and wellness overall. Thus, I strongly urge the MOHCD to allocate more funding for community building, so that we can continue the work on building a healthier and solidarity community.

Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups

Notes for the Long Range Housing Planning break-out groups will be synthesized and posted on the Planning Department's website after all of the forums have taken place.

**A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)**

Table of Contents

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups.....	1
Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups.....	9
Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups	14
Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups	20

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups

Session #1

Station 1 – Neighborhood Change and Choice

1. Based on the maps and your personal experience, what are the most important or noteworthy changes in this neighborhood in the past 5 years?

- Lots of new development, restaurants, apartments
- + Vacancies – including brand new retail
- + Stalled constructions
 - Mission and Prussia, cable car
- Too long to get a permit
- Upsizing existing housing – move SF
- Less owner occupied
- Prices increase to rent and buy
- Safeway services not keeping up
- Trash problem not effective
- Boarded up store fronts around Randolph
- Families leaving
- Street dumping
- Lots of business turnover
- Takes long time to open a new business
- Locals can't economically support new business
- Less variety of commercial options especially basics
- New shops taking business away from existing
- Less info-sharing amongst community groups

2. What do you think has caused or contributed to those changes in your neighborhood?

- Incomes higher
- Profit-driven development needs certain return on investment
- Lack of city commitment to AH for existing residents

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development

Wednesday, January 16, 2019

Balboa High School (District 11)

- Chains (ex: CVS)
 - Housing as investment / global re: market drives up prices
 - Lack of legislative protection
 - City not investing in creating working class jobs (+ converse) investing too much in high wage jobs
- 3. If money were not object, where would you choose to live (top 3 desirable places) and where would you choose to not live (top 3 least desirable places)? And why?**
- Most desirable places to live per map – Excelsior (14), Outer Mission (5), Oceanview/Ingleside (14), Parkmerced, St Francis Woods, Bernal Heights, Mission (9), Noe Valley, Haight Ashbury, Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset (2), Seacliff, Inner Richmond, Western Addition, Tenderloin, Bayview, Berkeley, Palo Alto
 - Least desirable places to live per map – Parkmerced, Ingleside, Visitacion Valley, Excelsior, Marina (2), Pacific Heights (2), Presidio, Western Addition, Tenderloin (3), Chinatown, South of Market (3), Dogpatch, Bayview (12), Treasure Island, Oakland
- 4. What makes a neighborhood a desirable place to live?**
- + (Positive)
 - Public transit access
 - Good schools
 - Cultural corridors – ex: Calle 24, SOMA Pilipinas
 - Family-friendly – walkable
 - - (Negative)
 - Crime
 - Cars (speeding cars)
 - Inaccessible to transit
 - Trash
 - Lack of long term residents / speculators
 - Lack of walkable services
- 5. Do you feel like you have a choice in where you live? And where do you live now (zip code)?**
- No notes; see flipchart for graph.
- 6. What makes you feel like you have a choice or don't have a choice?**
- Money
 - School location
 - Competition for resources
 - Lack of affordable housing even that is called “affordable,” lack of different income levels served

Station 2 – Access to Opportunity

- 7. What are the most pressing challenges to getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood?**

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

- Challenges
 - Fair pay and benefits
 - Lack of resources / variety of retail
- 8. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or a keep a job?**
- Assets
 - Public transit (Bart and Muni)
 - Colleges
- 9. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in accessing public transportation?**
- Challenges
 - Depends – Ingleside on Hill
 - Cost
 - Safety (ped safety)
 - Frequency of bus
 - Reliability of bus schedule
 - Slow speed for long distance
 - Lines to wait
 - Limited ADA
- 10. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in accessing public transportation?**
- Assets
 - No answer
- 11. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in living in or creating more healthy neighborhoods?**
- Challenges
 - Knowing where to get help
- 12. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in live in or create healthy neighborhoods?**
- Assets
 - No answer

Station 3: Fair Housing Violations

- 13. Have you or a member of your household experienced a violation of your fair housing protections?**
- 14. What did you do/Who did you go to for support? How helpful was it?**

Other Question

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

15. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

Session #2

Station 1 – Neighborhood Change and Choice

1. Based on the maps and your personal experience, what are the most important or noteworthy changes in this neighborhood in the past 5 years?

- Asian and Latino pop grown
- Increasingly unaffordable to working class
- Increased rents, more Tech employees
- Displacement
- Speculation
- More density / more people per house

2. What do you think has caused or contributed to those changes in your neighborhood?

- Not enough resources
- Wages level while housing increases
- Very high income pop
- Not strong enough tenant protections vs harassment
- Increased rent leads to homelessness

3. If money were not object, where would you choose to live (top 3 desirable places) and where would you choose to not live (top 3 least desirable places)?

- See map
- + (Positive)
 - Raising family / community
 - Safe
 - Schools
 - Everything here / long residents
 - Work
 - Transit
 - Affluent community
 - Health care
 - Grew up here
 - Nature and green connections
 - Friendly people
- - (negative)
 - Affluence
 - Ped safety

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

- Air pollution
- Earthquake safety of soil
- Danger
- Access – bad reputation

4. What makes a neighborhood a desirable place to live?

- No notes

5. Do you feel like you have a choice in where you live? And where do you live now (zip code)?

- No notes; see flipchart for graph.

6. What makes you feel like you have a choice or don't have a choice?

- Have a choice
 - Parental help
- Don't have a choice
 - Money
 - Can't afford – prices and income
 - Race
 - Lots of requirements for A.H.

Station 2 – Access to Opportunity

7. What are the most pressing challenges to getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood?

- Transit slow on some lines
- Language access
- Immigration status
- Lack of training to advance to higher-paying jobs

8. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or a keep a job?

- Transit in some areas

9. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in accessing public transportation?

- Not going downtown
- Frequency
- Reliability
- Crowding
- Pedestrian or bike safety
- Lack of place to sit and wait or bus shelter
- 14R stops at 7pm

10. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in accessing public transportation?

- Towards downtown

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

11. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in living in or creating more healthy neighborhoods?

- Noise pollution
- Trash (especially on Mission)
- Human waste / feces

12. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in live in or create healthy neighborhoods?

- Local produce markets
- Parks access

Station 3: Fair Housing Violations

13. Have you or a member of your household experienced a violation of your fair housing protections?

14. What did you do/Who did you go to for support? How helpful was it?

Other Question

15. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- Many people don't know where to go
- HRC – needs evidence so that is a challenge
- Lack of follow-thru office filing
- APS – limits on penalties

Submitted Written Responses

Station 1 – Neighborhood Change and Choice

1. Based on the maps and your personal experience, what are the most important or noteworthy changes in this neighborhood in the past 5 years?

- More homeless people in the neighborhood. Especially since the Superbowl was in S.F. and many homeless were pushed out of downtown area.
- New buildings
- JHSF
- Real estate interest in D11 as last bastion of affordability in SF

2. What do you think has caused or contributed to those changes in your neighborhood?

- See above.
- Real estate pressures.

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

- 3. If money were not object, where would you choose to live (top 3 desirable places) and where would you choose to not live (top 3 least desirable places)? And why?**
- Aside from the obvious wealthy classic S.F. neighborhoods, I think SF needs to develop neighborhoods that are balanced and diverse for a range of incomes. Neighborhoods like along Irving St. have a healthy commercial corridor, access to park/open space and transit, yet it feels like a neighborhood. It's what makes Noe Valley, the Castro, Glen Park work and attractive as places to live.
 - SF
 - NYC
 - Hong Kong
 - Texas
 - North
- 4. What makes a neighborhood a desirable place to live?**
- Comfortable adequate housing for mixed incomes. Not too dense or overcrowded, with a safe and clean environment.
 - Parks and green space
- 5. Do you feel like you have a choice in where you live? And where do you live now (zip code)?**
- Yes – 94112
 - No – pushed out of west side due to student institutional growth taking housing up!
- 6. What makes you feel like you have a choice or don't have a choice?**
- More affordable home ownership opportunities within the community.
 - Don't have choices; rent vs. buy; need alternatives for affordable housing creation.

Station 2 – Access to Opportunity

- 7. What are the most pressing challenges to getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood?**
- Educational opportunities
 - Long term jobs – Ex: Lowe's eliminates local hires. People did not want to pay wage increases. Long term viability. Jobs.
- 8. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or a keep a job?**
- CCSF public services
- 9. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in accessing public transportation?**
- Public transit in S.F. works generally well for distance, but is not good within neighborhoods. Many people, families with children, people with disabilities, find it difficult to travel by public transit all the time.
 - Linkage across city
 - Lack of equity in investment
 - Lack of long term transit planning

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

- Overcrowding of systems
- Improve access from t to too

10. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in accessing public transportation?

- Not much is being done to address the concerns I've cited above. Smaller public transit vehicles that help you get up and down from the hills within neighborhoods would encourage more people to travel by public transit.
- Balboa Park station as a hub and central major North to South and East to West transit hub.

11. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in living in or creating more healthy neighborhoods?

- Lack of appropriate public transit. Unfriendly and poorly designed public spaces/commercial corridors.
- Retail lacking empty storefronts
- Lack of teen and youth centers, play and evening spaces safe!
- Public plazas meeting large groups in building

12. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in live in or create healthy neighborhoods?

- Libraries – access to arts within the community. Public open spaces and parks. More greening in neighborhood.
- Excelsior planning group
- Improves parks/schools/pools
- Libraries needed more of

Station 3: Fair Housing Violations

13. Have you or a member of your household experienced a violation of your fair housing protections?

- No.
- Yes, displaced by SFSU/CSU growth and enrollment increases, gentrification. Parkmerced Apts. Stonestown Apts.

14. What did you do/Who did you go to for support? How helpful was it?

- N/A
- Fair housing complaint was not helpful, not investigated
- Focus of developer to rent to students over families, protected class in SF

Other Question

15. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- Housing density and building height in particular. I don't think that more than 4 or 5 stories are appropriate within our outer neighborhoods. People have chosen to live there because of the qualities of the neighborhoods.
- Focus on transit long range planning in D11
- Balboa Park station as intermodal hub, linking J-K-T-M lines.

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

- Geneva Harney Line as LRV vehicle link to Balboa Park Station
- Access to HSR at Bayshore
- Overcrowded transit/schools/pools
- Infrastructure needs not being addressed in district equitable vs. downtown!!!!

Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

1. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?

- Jobs
 - Job training support
 - ESL Classes – more opportunities and community support
 - Jobs for mono lingual
 - Providing monetary support while learning
 - Age 16-24 and seniors
 - Opportunities for seniors
- Education
 - Computer skills
 - Financial literacy
 - Consumer protection
- Senior centers
 - Nutrition - transportation
 - Education - connecting to Department of Aging services
 - Physical center - larger

2. How would you find out about these services?

- Google
- Word of mouth
- Multi-lingual websites
- Nextdoor.com
- Newspaper
- Library
- Sunday street fair and other events
- Organization networks

3. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?

- Issues with paratransit
- Language barriers
- Capacity to address crisis cases
- Technology barriers
- Internet

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

- Access to library (hours)
 - Fear (sfrebuildingtogether)
- 4. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?**
- Having Saturday hours (funding)
 - Programs working with each other
 - Data
 - Library longer hours (funding)
- 5. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?**
- Legal services
 - Immigration
 - Tenant rights
 - Assisted living facilities
 - Gathering spaces for community (free / low cost)
- 6. What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?**
- Community Connector Program
 - Ongoing coaching for those who get a job
 - Language accessible
 - Mentoring
 - Programs for all ages
 - Volunteer opportunities
 - Barrier removal funds (example: clipper card)
- 7. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?**
- 8. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?**
- 9. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?**
- 10. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
- 11. What do you like most and least about your neighborhood shopping area?**
- 12. What are things that would build your sense of community?**

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

13. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

Session #2

1. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?

- Transportation
 - Public
- Early childhood education (affordable)
- Financial services for new families (young)
- Implementation of Prop C (Both)
- Small business services
- Access city services
- Disaster preparedness
- Access to learning new technology

2. How would you find out about these services?

- Creating community engaging strategy
- Personal networks
- Web access
- Google
- Calling the Mayor's office

3. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?

- Business hours accessible for working families
- Transportation
- Trust
- Language barriers
- Unfamiliar with online information
- Broken communication with city and community

4. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?

- Community engaging strategies / outreach
- Improve connection / relationship with city
- Let the community know about services

5. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?

- Housing the homeless
- Advocacy from city
- Accountability to voter initiative

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

- Case management services
 - Mental health services
 - Better access to support groups
 - Public gathering spaces
- 6. What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?**
- Supported employment
 - Transportation
 - Expressway to get to downtown faster
 - Continue with free city college
 - Flexible schedules / family-friendly environment
 - Centers to deal with stress
- 7. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?**
- Word of mouth
 - 311
- 8. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?**
- Utilizing vacant spaces for employment training
 - Mentorship
 - Hiring people from the community
 - Community training / leadership development
- 9. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?**
- Financial literacy – in schools
 - Credit education / understanding
 - Knowledge on how to use credit
 - Protecting community from financial predators
 - Student debt counseling
- 10. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
- 11. What do you like most and least about your neighborhood shopping area?**
- 12. What are things that would build your sense of community?**
- 13. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?**

Submitted Written Responses

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

- 1. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?**
 - Financial education assistance. Particularly for youth and families.
 - Transit
 - Schools
 - Pools
 - Parks
- 2. How would you find out about these services?**
 - City websites
- 3. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?**
 - Lack of large scale public transit improvements (links, loops, connections)
 -
- 4. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?**
 - Transit linkages outside downtown
 - Improve connectivity between areas
- 5. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?**
 - Libraries with enough seating and space
 - Parks with wildlife protection
 - Transit that gets to all major points in City. East-West. North-South.
 - Public pools large enough for populations proposed
- 6. What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?**
 - \$ Pay
- 7. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?**
 - City websites
 - Local community boards/meetings and organizations
- 8. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?**
 - More outreach in district at major intersections; not just online
- 9. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?**
 - More financial planning and counseling opportunities for all ages. Especially youth and seniors.
 - Rental income from ADU unit
 - Too many hurdles
- 10. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
 - More open spaces – green spaces with art.
 - Public plaza

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

- Green spaces
- Spaces for kids/teens age groups and seniors
- Benches seating improves sidewalks!

11. What do you like most and least about your neighborhood shopping area?

- The lack of diverse retail. Not easy to shop along the Mission and Geneva corridors. Not much there. Too many of the same things. Parking is difficult too.
- Dirty. Lack trees
- Empty retail spaces.

12. What are things that would build your sense of community?

- Clean and safe commercial corridor with a good variety of businesses and pedestrian friendly activities for a range of age groups and families.
- Larger public community meeting space
- Arts/culture/film center in Excelsior for 500+ people

13. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- Transit lacking equity
- Need to link and connect systems. Treat Balboa Park station as major transit hub.

Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?

- Housing for households earning <25% AMI
- More units with 3+ bedrooms
- Stronger protections for tenants (harassment)
- Relocation assistance
- More 100% A.H. for people in certain neighborhoods
- Solutions to habitability (mold) problems
- Housing in this neighborhood to protect against displacement
- Housing for households up to 120% AMI
- Anti-gentrification policy + program
- Access to higher paying jobs
- Language services / translation
- Access + eviction program to affordable housing for families with children and the elderly
- Help with BMR application process
- More monitoring or BMR program
- End to discrimination against families
- End to discrimination against special needs households
- More housing for seniors, immediately

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

- 2. In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?**
 - Speculation / eviction protections
 - DAHLIA doesn't provide enough listings for HHS with AMIs under 25%
 - New Section 8-style voucher program for HHS who have been displaced
 - More training on BMR process + more clarity
 - Improvements to BMR program
 - More supervision + monitoring
 - Language capability
 - End to discrimination
 - Limited information for housing seekers
 - People don't know about DAHLIA
 - Inclusionary model doesn't work because of limited supply
 - More housing that isn't linked to market rate
 - Eviction is not a solution to substandard housing
- 3. Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities.**
 - Seniors (ADA)
 - Persons with disability (ADA)
 - Battered / domestic violence
 - Support to stay in homes
 - Seniors: moratorium on eviction
 - Victims of predatory lending (owners)
 - Renters: limits on rent increases, harassment
 - Single moms who don't qualify for BMRs
 - People with below credit scores
 - Single people
 - Purchase by affordable housing companies not speculators
- 4. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified would you prefer?**
 - Community outreach / face to face
 - Language-competent CBOs
 - Strategies that don't rely on internet access
 - Hire neighborhood residents to help get the word out about opportunities
 - TV ads
 - Text alerts
- 5. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?**

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

6. **What are the kinds of things that help people move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?**
7. **What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
8. **What are things that would build your sense of community?**
9. **Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?**

Session #2

1. **What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?**
 - Stable employment to afford housing
 - Rental assistance – short term and long term
 - Eviction defense and prevention support
 - Relocation help
 - Affordable child care
 - Better transportation (public transit)
 - Accommodations for disabled and seniors
 - Better / more realistic definitions of “low income”
 - More targeting to lower income HHS
 - More funds and commitment to housing for existing residents
 - Rental support and subsidy for families who are undocumented
2. **In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?**
 - More support for families with a disabled member
 - Better coordination of social workers with housing opportunities
 - More training on DAHLIA
 - More services for HHS who aren’t homeless yet are at risk
 - Deeper affordability
 - Not enough opportunities in DAHLIA
 - Not enough affordable housing
 - More community facilities / central location for services
 - Multi-language access to programs and to housing opportunities
3. **Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities.**
 - People with disabilities and seniors need stable, affordable housing, not SROs
 - Undocumented people inhabiting illegal units
 - Opportunities to legalize units

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

- Eliminating barriers for undocumented people
 - Help with security deposits / 1st and last month's rent
 - Deeper affordability
 - Safety accommodations for senior renters – no fear of retaliation
 - Protections for seniors
 - Housing for people earning minimum wage
 - Support for seniors to stay in their homes safely – renters and owners (repairs) (budgeting)
 - Preserve housing occupied by seniors
- 4. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified would you prefer?**
- Newspapers
 - Emails
 - CBOs, churches, schools
 - Language – culture-specific CBOs (e.g., Chinese in this area)
 - All
- 5. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?**
- Down payment assistance for co-ops and other “in between” housing (e.g., limited equity co-ops)
 - More creative approaches
 - Limited monthly maintenance / HOA fees
 - Assistance with these fees
 - Help with improving credit scores
- 6. What are the kinds of things that help people move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?**
- More funding for services to prevent homelessness and more locations
 - Stable jobs
 - Local hire programs with better monitoring
 - Vocational training that prepares for high-paying jobs
 - Paid training opportunities
 - Mental health care
 - Financial counseling especially for DV victims
 - On-site supports for TAY and others in housing
 - Holistic, wrap around supports for families and individuals – long term
 - Program policies that create barriers and limit opportunity; inflexible income limits, requirements for
 - Transition supports for people leaving homelessness
 - Family shelters that are safe and comfortable
- 7. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
- More non-commercial community space

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

- More open space
- Larger public libraries and pools
- More cultural activities for Chinese residents
- Free or low cost community meeting spaces

8. What are things that would build your sense of community?

9. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

Submitted Written Responses

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?

- Retired homeowner on a fixed income struggling with property tax increases. On social security it is difficult to pay almost \$10,000 in property taxes.
- Income, rent from ADUs on property
- Better transit options
- Access to good public infrastructure/jobs
- I really need house myself or can let me buy cheap house
- Current market is inaccessible for my family (2 SFUSD teachers with 2 children, 5yo and 7yo) both for homebuying and renting. There may be programs that may help us access affordable housing options but finding them seems overly complicated and not broadcasted enough.
- For my students living in District 11, they are concerned about the same thing, feel that info about services and programs isn't reaching them and their families or is overly complicated to access.
- How can you partner more closely with community agencies, schools, neighborhood organizations, etc. to make sure info about services, support programs, community meetings, etc. is readily available, so residents feel more that reaching them is priority #1.
- Public schools could be a great way to reach people, but partnership is needed to ensure that materials and channels of communication are appropriate / fine tuned to reach students and their families.

2. In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?

- No. Nothing is being done to address this situation.
- No. Have to go downtown to get services. Many not locally focused enough for those working 9-5 jobs. Need weekend and evening hours.

3. Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities.

- While housing is in short supply – even more unavailable are programs to assist people to become homeowners. Workforce housing to accommodate people we want to keep in our neighborhoods like teachers and other working middle income earners.
- Flexibility in ownership. Ex: Senior wants increased income but not manage sub-rental

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

- Residents in the neighborhood have senior household members. When the young people are out for work, no one watches seniors. We hope that there will have more senior daycare centers in the neighborhood helping us taking care of seniors. This way, seniors can have places to do activities and won't be lost, and then the young people can pick up them after work.
- 4. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified would you prefer?**
- Email/flyers
 - Meetings in districts
- 5. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?**
- In District 11 in particular, not enough housing is being built that can be purchased. We need more opportunities for people to be able to invest in their futures.
 - \$ - downpayments
 - Base # for affordable
 - Buy-in or purchase
- 6. What are the kinds of things that help people move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?**
- Rent control that is too strict.
 - More counseling is needed to address the root causes that create homeless populations and shelter populations.
- 7. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
- More open/green space along the commercial corridors of Mission Street and Geneva Avenue.
 - Don't have community large gathering space along corridor
 - Plazas and parks along Mission
 - Meeting at Balboa H.S.
- 8. What are things that would build your sense of community?**
- A more livable commercial corridor that is safe, clean and has a range of businesses and services
 - Public city feature to excelsior
 - Plaza central meeting space
- 9. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?**
- Transportation large scale changes and improvements
 - Public infrastructure
 - Pools – no deep public pools large enough
 - Libraries too small
 - Gas/water/electric

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups

Notes for the Long Range Housing Planning break-out groups will be synthesized and posted on the Planning Department's website after all of the forums have taken place.

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 13, 2019
St. John Episcopal Church (Mission District 9)

Table of Contents

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups.....	1
Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups.....	6
Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups	11
Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups	13

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups

Session #1

1. What's important to you that brought you here tonight?

- Racism
- Transphobia
- Stigma with Section 8, difficult to use
- More info on tenant rights
- Living conditions in SRO
- Have organizations supporting low-income people
- Definition of affordable not necessarily affordable
- Clarify concept of affordable - affordable to whom?
- Make more affordable
- Displacement
- Access when hard to prove income and immigration status

Station 1 – Neighborhood Change and Choice

2. Based on the maps and your personal experience, what are the most important or noteworthy changes in this neighborhood in the past 5 years?

- Gentrification
- More coffee and laptops
- More Caucasians fewer Latinos
- More expensive buildings and restaurants
- Rich vs everybody
- More buildings on Market pushing others out
- Favorite stores closed
- Higher rents for housing in business
- Fewer families, more young people, less connection to community

3. What do you think has caused or contributed to those changes in your neighborhood?

- Corporations moving in and building new

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 13, 2019
St. John Episcopal Church (Mission District 9)

- Vacancy decontrol
- Groups like Core(?) magazine leaving
- Big companies - they discriminate versus Latinos
- Proposed monster in the mission
- People think it's safer
- No Burger King
- Change in city philosophy to bigger economic star at expense of cultural id
- Greed, trickles down across neighborhood
- Disinvestment / no investment in mission for 10 years

4. If money were not object, where would you choose to live (top 3 desirable places) and where would you choose to not live (top 3 least desirable places)?

- Most desirable places to live per map – Mission (17), Dolores Park (3), Eureka Valley (3), Twin Peaks (4), Glen Park (2), Excelsior, Visitacion Valley, Outer Sunset, Inner Sunset (2), Haight Ashbury (2), Duboce Triangle, Hayes Valley (3), South of Market (3), North Beach (3), Pacific Heights (2)
- Least desirable places to live per map – Outer Richmond (3), Outer Sunset (6), Inner Sunset, Lakeside, Parkmerced, Daly City, Bayview (6), Silver Terrace, Mission, Dolores Park, South of Market (3), Tenderloin (7), North Beach, Russian Hill, Pacific Heights (3), Marina (3)

5. What makes a neighborhood a desirable place to live?

- Transportation
- Parks
- Safety
- Safe spaces for LGBTQ elderly
- Affordable food
- Cultural activities
- Schools for Hispanics
- Rehab centers
- Hospitals
- Churches, police, fire
- Organizations that help families
- Housing for all income levels

6. Do you feel like you have a choice in where you live? And where do you live now (zip code)?

No choice

X
94110
94109
94103

X
94110
94103

X
94801
94601
94103

A lot of choice

7. What makes you feel like you have a choice or don't have a choice?

- High rents

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 13, 2019
St. John Episcopal Church (Mission District 9)

- No place to shower or cook
- Can go to school or work more
- Willing to live farther / travel to work / friends, etc.
- Not adequate representation
- Choice in East Bay but not in San Francisco
- Get less space for your dollar
- Few Lottery opportunities / competition
- Section 8 not accepted everywhere
- Obstacles - Mission fees, difficult to apply via Lottery

8. What are the most pressing challenges to getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood?

9. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or a keep a job?

Challenges

- Commute
- Transit access in some parts of neighborhood
- Highest rents
- Language barrier
- Documentation status

Assets

- Transit access
- Best salaries

Station 2 – Access to Opportunity

[questions 10-13 not asked]

Station 3: Fair Housing Violations

14. Have you or a member of your household experienced a violation of your Fair Housing protections?

- Yes – 8
- Difficult to know
- No - 0

15. What did you do / who did you go to for support? How helpful was it?

- Hud - 3
- Tenants Union
- Causa Justa

Session #2

1) What is important to you that brought you here tonight?

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 13, 2019
St. John Episcopal Church (Mission District 9)

- New buildings - the Monster in the Mission
- Want more small sites and preservation for San Francisco Community Land Trust

Station 1 – Neighborhood Change and Choice

2) Based on the maps in your personal experience, what are the most important or noteworthy changes in this neighborhood in the past 5 years?

- More vacant ground floors
- Racial demographic change
- Traffic
- “Feces crescent”
- More homeless visible, compression due to development
- Less neighborhood services - example Valencia
- Less cohesive, less friendly, harder to talk with strangers
- Less MUNI, more ride service
- More doubling up, living in cars, visible homeless
- Higher incomes and services available
- Loss of long-term businesses available to lower-income

3) What do you think has caused or contributed to those changes in your neighborhood?

- Luxury condos
- Capitalism
- More tech workers - higher incomes, speed of change increased
- Economic tsunami
- Lack of building new affordable housing
- Lack of upkeep of current housing stock
- Lack of city investment besides / services - not equitable investment in district 6, district 9, district 10 eastside

4) If money were no object, where would you choose to live (top 3 most desirable places) and where would you choose to not live (top three least desirable places)?

5) What makes a neighborhood a desirable place to live?

- Transit
- Life services, walking distance, flat journey
- Community feeling
- Not fecal present
- Cultural diversity
- Near ocean or open space big parks
- Garden ability, light

6) Do you feel like you have a choice in where you live now? What is your zip code?

No choice

A lot of choice

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 13, 2019
St. John Episcopal Church (Mission District 9)

X	X	X
94110	94110	94102
	94103	94122

7) What makes you feel like you have a choice or don't have a choice?

- Ability to sell versus opportunity to buy again
- Housing is stable
- Good relationship with landlord
- Money
- If move, would need to leave Bay Area
- Hostility to people with long-term connections to neighborhood

Station 2 – Access to Opportunity

8) What are the most pressing challenges to getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood?

9) What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or a keep a job?

Challenges

- MUNI less reliable
- Turnover of businesses
- Affordability, effect of part time jobs

Assets

- Bike access
- BART
- Walkability
- Mix of jobs at different income levels

10) What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in accessing public transportation?

11) What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in accessing public transportation?

Challenges

- TNC / rideshare congestion
- No direct to Caltrain
- Mission red lanes fewer stops, hard for business
- Rideshare makes less bikeable

Assets

- BART
- Bikes / flat
- # 33 bus
- # 22 bus

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 13, 2019
St. John Episcopal Church (Mission District 9)

12) What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in living in or creating more healthy neighborhoods?

13) What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in live in or create healthy neighborhoods?

Challenges

- Dangers from rideshare drivers
- Random violence at 16th and mission
- Cleanliness of streets – “fecal crescent”
- Needles

Assets

- Noise low in sunset
- Groceries
- Walkability
- Navigation center at 20th and South Van Ness

Station 3: Fair Housing Violations

14) Have you or a member of your household ever experienced a violation of your Fair Housing protections?

- Yes - 2
- No - 4

15) What did you do / where did you go for support? How helpful was it?

- HRC referral
- Legal Services referral
- Larkin Street Youth
- SF Bar Association
- Balance, EDC, Tenants Union

Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

1) What's important to you that brought you here tonight?

- Current legislation
- Jobs
- Community engagement should be core to the plan

2) Other than housing services, what are the services that are according to you and or your family?

- Healthcare
- Outreach to tenants where they are informing of Rights and support
- Welfare
- Immigration Services

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 13, 2019
St. John Episcopal Church (Mission District 9)

- Community Education
- Programs for youth
- Eviction prevention
- Legal Services
- Advertising in passive spaces regarding services and opportunities
- Get dollars or job for seniors
- Connect these services to housing needs (for example downtown streets)

3) How would you find out about these services?

- Bus ad
- Flyers
- Library
- Resource fairs trusted community organizations
- Schools
- City-run social media
- Word of mouth
- Phone calls

4) What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?

- Your age if senior
- Scheduling / hours of availability
- Language access
- Transportation
- Technological barriers
- Not knowing that service exists
- Childcare
- Eligibility
- Fear based on immigration status

5) If there are services that you use and think need to be improved need to be improved?

- More outreach
- Proximity to where you live
- Improve compliance with language access ordinance
- Expand number of languages in which services are available
- Fund services and organizing - these are complementary
- Fund training for most vulnerable populations (job language career coaching)
- How to get people without right-to-work status a job

6) What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?

- Childcare
- Legal services for labor rights - need more attorneys
- Orientation to the universe of all the different types of housing assistance
- Need additional follow-through tech assistance after initial housing applications

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 13, 2019
St. John Episcopal Church (Mission District 9)

7) What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?

- Training, mentorship (paid)
- Immediate, temporary job - especially for formerly incarcerated
- Connection between community and jobs
- Relationships with employers for mentorship
- Include domestic workers
- Fair enforcement of labor law
- Protection for undocumented workers, especially when they are advocating for their rights

8) How would you find out about services that those need?

- Receipt from the store which is hiring
- Community organizations
- Trusted organizations
- Friends - they text you / word-of-mouth
- Flyer in laundromat

9) What, if any, suggestions do you have for the city to improve access to good jobs?

- Clarification about what the good jobs are - how do you know
- Connect trusted organizations - "need a job, ask me how" sticker
- Phone number
- Campaign / promote jobs - similar to how politicians campaign for jobs
- Where are the access points?
- Engage community organizers to spread the word
- Raise minimum wage
- Make existing job a good job example of domestic workers
- Planning for jobs city invest in sector jobs
- Job fairs like farmers markets - regular and open

10) What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and or to be able to build wealth?

- Money
- Lower rent
- Financial literacy, build credit
- Public bank local investments, especially for retirement accounts
- Connect financial literacy to job access

11) What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?

- Use public spaces for affordable housing
- Landbank
- For example, Balboa Reservoir should have been 100% of affordable not market rate
- Maker spaces

12) What do you like most and least about your neighborhood shopping area?

- Need more grocery stores

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 13, 2019
St. John Episcopal Church (Mission District 9)

- Diverse mom and pop shops
- Need more affordable fast food
- Need locally owned stores so well stays in community
- Affordable places flip to become expensive boutiques

13) What are things that would build your sense of community?

- no answers-

Session #2

1) What's important to you that brought you here tonight?

- I usually come
- Learning
- I'm part of this community
- We want more info about housing
- Hearing what is going on
- We want to express ourselves
- Become informed

2) Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and or your family?

- Health services
- Recreation centers for kids
- Services for homeless
- Educational services for kids

3) How would you find out about the services?

- Women's collective
- Online but hard to find
- Rumor / Word of mouth

4) What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?

- Transportation - especially for elders or disabled - come on site
- Low income makes it hard
- Discrimination
- Not knowing enough about what agencies do what
- Distance / Location

5) If there are services that you use and you think need to be improved how do they need to be improved?

- More organized and unified
- Get information out through churches / schools
- Paratransit is terrible - lots of complaints

6) What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 13, 2019
St. John Episcopal Church (Mission District 9)

- Express lane - don't want to wait
- People to visit socially isolated / elderly - especially assisted living
- Funds for educating house workers / house cleaners, capacity building

7) What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?

- Training - paid
- Child care. Want to get paid enough to afford childcare
- Benefits
- Respect for house cleaners

8) How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?

- Need resources / funding for training- for example CPR training, especially for child care providers

9) What, if any, suggestions do you have for the city to improve access to good jobs?

- Good pay
- Trainings for employee rights and how to negotiate

10) What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and or to be able to build wealth?

- Work and good pay
- Resources for work - knowledge about where the work is
- Save money - balance between wants and needs
- Financial education and budgeting
- How to save
- Banks with low or no fees
- Be independent
- Consumer advocates

11) What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?

- Community gathering places
- Homeless leave trash around
- Graffiti
- Security
- Clean streets
- Earthquake safety / preparedness
- Light and air access

12) What do you like most and least about your neighborhood shopping area?

Most

- Culture
- Food
- Transportation
- Hospital

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 13, 2019
St. John Episcopal Church (Mission District 9)

- Everything is closed
- Least
- Need social security number to work
 - Paint / business facade improvement and interior improvement - low interest loans

13) What are things that would build your sense of community?

- Information fair in Spanish
- Flyers
- Neighborhood directories of services available
- Lawyers - free and good

Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

1) What's important to you that brought you here tonight?

- Housing - learn more about
- Addressing homelessness
- Affordability and access to housing - how much housing gets built for families
- How much do we need to make to qualify for affordable housing

2) What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?

- Expansion of BMR and ease of applications - increase percentage of condos in program
- 20 - 50% AMI - large families needing housing
- Ellis acted out - not on lease - what are options?
- More resources for those facing evictions

3) In your opinion, do you feel that existing Housing Services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?

- Similar services for homeless for the housing insecure - expand definition of homeless
- Telephone access services, services more available

4) Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities

- Families are invisible children under school age, 0 through 5 - this demographic not getting attention
- Do people know about the housing available, ie. homeless men in their 40s - 50s

5) If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified would you prefer?

- Sign up for email notification
- Phone call
- La Colectiva de Mujeres - learn about housing at meetings
- More public campaigns - BART, buses, other public areas

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 13, 2019
St. John Episcopal Church (Mission District 9)

- Receive phone call to know where to apply
- Guest speakers at community colleges, immigrant groups, smart money network

6) If home ownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?

- Price of houses
- Down payment assistance - hard to compete with DALP
- Maybe city could provide low-interest loans
- Need incentives for sellers
- Credit scoring
- Not enough inventory
- Association dues for condos - capped for inclusionary buyers
- What are demographics for BMRs?

7) What are the kinds of things that help people move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?

- Would like to have knowledge of opportunities to pass on to those less fortunate. Is there availability?
- Child care for parents in temporary housing
- Security deposit - move-in costs
- Long waitlist out of shelters and into housing
- SROs should not be considered permanent for family - should be considered navigation center
- Latino families are sent to 3rd street - would like to stay in the mission

8) What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?

- More green space
- Pool facilities
- Good neighbors
- Need permanent housing - living in school that turns into shelter at night
- Franklin Park - needs better clean up, too much trash
- More public seating at muni stops

9) What are things that would build your sense of community?

- More space
- More spacious bedrooms
- More cross-cultural experiences with the goal of helping each other

Session #2

1) What's important to you that brought you here tonight?

- Housing counselor works with people in the mission
- SFMTA
- Section 8 discrimination
- Increase subsidies for seniors

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 13, 2019
St. John Episcopal Church (Mission District 9)

- Native San Franciscan forced out
- Immigrants having hard time with housing and are afraid
- Student housing - need more
- Housing Advocate concerned about access to housing - should have more homeless preference
- Displaced by fire, has DTHP certificate, now over income, still can't afford
- Commission over instead of MOHCD
- Prioritize small site acquisition for Community Land Trust over new construction
- Local preference 40% percent to 60%

2) What do you and your family to get or stay in housing?

- Discrimination - needing papers for all members of household
- Lenders more flexible where good credit but not willing to lend - discrimination?
- Master list of homeowners willing to rent to Section 8
- Need help navigating the process of finding housing, applying for housing - a housing helper
- Too many different agencies - bureaucracy
- Not enough housing below 30% AMI
- Need more immediate housing now - simplify process
- Increased wages
- Cap on rent

3) In your opinion, do you feel that existing Housing Services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?

- Have owners commit to renting to people with Section 8 vouchers
- Lottery system doesn't take into account people who really need housing
- Existing preferences to housing are inadequate
- Educating owners about Section 8, ending stigma
- Get the word out more about housing

4) Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay and housing? Groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities

- Need more housing for persons with disabilities and seniors and more long-term subsidies for those groups
- Get folks out of SROs and into more acceptable housing
- Have housing available to undocumented immigrants
- Lots of obstacles - husband qualified for mortgage with bank - only willing to make loan for less than what qualified for; more banks need to work with city
- Only one out of 20 banks accept ITIN

-No additional questions answered in this session-

Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups

Notes for the Long Range Housing Planning break-out groups will be synthesized and posted on the Planning Department's website after all of the forums have taken place.

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 5, 2019
Bayanihan Center (South of Market/District 6)

Table of Contents

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups.....	1
Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups.....	6
Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups	13
Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups	18

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups

Session #1

Station 1 – Neighborhood Change and Choice

- 1. Based on the maps and your personal experience, what are the most important or noteworthy changes in this neighborhood in the past 5 years?**
 - More homeless
 - Displaced long term residents
 - Loss of Filipino business
 - More dramatic income inequality
 - SRO's used by tourists more
 - Conversion of long term housing to short term
 - More traffic
- 2. What do you think has caused or contributed to those changes in your neighborhood?**
 - Rent is going up
 - Too much development in small area
 - Influx of tech industry : twitter, tax break
 - Increase in jobs not paired with increase in Housing
 - Real estate speculation
 - Lack of code enforcement
 - Cost of living going up
- 3. If money were not object, where would you choose to live (top 3 desirable places) and where would you choose to not live (top 3 least desirable places)?**
 - Most desirable places to live per map – SOMA (6), Outer Sunset (3), Inner Sunset, Inner Richmond, Mission (3), Excelsior, Silver Terrace, Bayview, Castro, Haight Ashbury, Pacific Heights, Marina, North Beach, all of San Francisco (generally)
 - Least desirable places to live per map - Marina, Treasure Island/ Yerba Buena Island, Tenderloin (2), Potrero Hill, Bayview, Excelsior, Parkmerced, Outer Sunset

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 5, 2019
Bayanihan Center (South of Market/District 6)

- 4. What makes a neighborhood a desirable place to live?**
 - Access to stores, services, parks
 - Family friendly
 - Cultural richness + street life
 - Fresh air, light
 - PED friendly / safe
- 5. Do you feel like you have a choice in where you live? And where do you live now (zip code)?**
 - No choice: 94117, 94103, 94116, 94117
 - A lot of choice:
- 6. What makes you feel like you have a choice or don't have a choice?**
 - Cost (rent control in current place)
 - Payment to paycheck
 - Salary can't keep up with rising rent
 - Not enough range of affordable housing
 - Credit rating

Station 2 – Access to Opportunity

- 7. What are the most pressing challenges to getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood?**

Challenges:

 - low paying jobs
 - seasonal jobs
 - fluctuating incomes
 - More job placement for homeless
 - Loss of PDR jobs
- 8. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or a keep a job?**

Assets:

 - There are jobs available
 - Employment center
 - Higher education jobs (tech)
- 9. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in accessing public transportation?**

Challenges:

 - Unreliable muni
 - Congested travel times
- 10. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in accessing public transportation?**

Assets:

 - Lots of buses
 - Muni

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 5, 2019
Bayanihan Center (South of Market/District 6)

- Bart
- Group connection to other neighborhoods

11. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in living in or creating more healthy neighborhoods?

-
-

12. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in live in or create healthy neighborhoods?

-

Station 3: Fair Housing Violations

13. Have you or a member of your household experienced a violation of your fair housing protections?

-

14. What did you do/Who did you go to for support? How helpful was it?

- Was helpful language barrier

Other Question

15. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

-

Session #2

Station 1 – Neighborhood Change and Choice

1. Based on the maps and your personal experience, what are the most important or noteworthy changes in this neighborhood in the past 5 years?

- Lack of family housing
- Conversation of family housing to live/ work
- Influx of big tech to 94103
- Costs of legally businesses
- Empty storefronts in new buildings
- More big tall buildings
- Not corresponding rise in parks/ public space (popo's not enough, not really for community)

2. What do you think has caused or contributed to those changes in your neighborhood?

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 5, 2019
Bayanihan Center (South of Market/District 6)

- High rent/ low income
 - White collar jobs
 - Policy not focused on low income
 - Twitter tax break
 - Jobs going up much faster than housing
 - Lack of transparency in development process, both in building and things like scooters/bikes
- 3. If money were not object, where would you choose to live (top 3 desirable places) and where would you choose to not live (top 3 least desirable places)?**
-
- 4. What makes a neighborhood a desirable place to live?**
- Pedestrian safety + general safety
 - Accessibility to parks, night life, shops, etc
 - Sense of community/ belonging
 - Transit
 - Proximity to schools, community spaces
 - weather
- 5. Do you feel like you have a choice in where you live? And where do you live now (zip code)?**
- No choice: 94124, 94122, 94117, 94103
 - A lot of choice:
- 6. What makes you feel like you have a choice or don't have a choice?**
- Golden handcuffs of rent controller apartments
 - Home owners might be locked in (generation)

Station 2 – Access to Opportunity

- 7. What are the most pressing challenges to getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood?**
- Challenges:
- P.D.R. jobs decrease
 - Lack of growth opportunities, blue collar jobs
 - Lack of neighborhood preference
- 8. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or a keep a job?**
- Assets:
- High tech jobs increasing
 - Lots of nonprofessional jobs
- 9. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in accessing public transportation?**
- Challenges:
- Traffic at freeway on off ramps

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 5, 2019
Bayanihan Center (South of Market/District 6)

- Poor transit planning
- Redirecting traffic from Market to Mission
- Chase center, Oracle park, Mission Bay Hospital convergence
- Crime on transit
- Scooter/ bike rentals

10. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in accessing public transportation?

Assets:

- Lots of transit of all kinds

11. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in living in or creating more healthy neighborhoods?

Challenges:

- Poop!
- Needles
- Air pollution
- Lack of shelter beds (waiting list)
- Drug dealing
- Police station promised but never arrived
- Homeless encampments
- Traffic
- Mental health services wait until crisis
- Affordability for services
- Lack of gathering spaces

12. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in live in or create healthy neighborhoods?

Assets:

- Health clinic sense of community
- Non professional
- Senior services
- Pit stop
- Cultural assets
- Churches

Station 3: Fair Housing Violations

13. Have you or a member of your household experienced a violation of your fair housing protections?

- Yes: 0
- No: 1

14. What did you do/Who did you go to for support? How helpful was it?

- Ca. Dept of Fair Housing + employment: Yes (employment)
- Human Rights Commission: yes

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 5, 2019
Bayanihan Center (South of Market/District 6)

Other Question

15. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- We should be having displacement benefit for market forces like we did for urban renewal projects like the lower Fillmore
- We should talk about overcrowding within individual residencies & people displaced by landlords cracking down on sub-leasing
- Airbnb and SIM hurt term conversions (S.R.G. conversion)
- General question about stories people can tell about encountering barriers
- A.M.I. levels of housing net aligned with need of people

Participant Worksheets

4. What makes a neighborhood a desirable place to live?

- Sunny parks/open space

8. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or a keep a job?

- n/a – we have jobs but also massive student loan debt

Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

1. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?

- Sports in Alleys!
- Culturally competent counseling
- Mental health/ multilingual
- Filipino language access
- Tenants
- Food security
- Employment training
- Housing- homeless support, job readiness, process help, worker rights, advocacy, after school support, education support new immigrants
- Other languages: Spanish, Arabic
- Seniors employment or activities
- Incorporate behavioral analysts

2. How would you find out about these services?

- Word of mouth
- Case workers
- Community outreach- events/forums, mtgs
- More agencies needed

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 5, 2019
Bayanihan Center (South of Market/District 6)

- Senior outreach is needed
 - CBO's- need improvements in digital
- 3. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?**
- Language access i.e. multilingual flyers
 - Mental health stigma
 - Neighborhood newsletter is needed
 - Fear especially in undocumented community
 - CBO's capacity is limited
 - Clients are busy working during CBO hours
 - Intimidation at agencies front door- needs to welcome (invite with food)
- 4. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?**
- Workforce
 - More forums to identify needs
 - Increase community engagement
 - More collaboration with case managers
 - Fund more for case workers= more support to clients
 - Public school teachers at Bessie need more support
 - Inter-generational activities
 - Citizenship immigration legal support + process help
- 5. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?**
- Legal help
 - Multilingual assist for digital divide- filling out online apps
 - Senior Housing information is not centralized
- 6. What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?**
- Priority to SOMA residents
 - Diversify industries OEWD focuses on
 - Job training/ coaching
 - Jobs near transportation
 - More outreach to residents to fill City jobs
 - Fund CBO's enough to pay staff a good wage
 - Bridge program
 - Workshops in community- resume, how to apply, navigate process,
 - Youth jobs
 - Entry level require support
 - Paid on the job training, apprenticeship
 - Pipeline pathway
- 7. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?**
- Flyers

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 5, 2019
Bayanihan Center (South of Market/District 6)

- Word of mouth
- 8. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?**
- Provide professional clothing for parents @ Bessie
 - Job interviews
 - Use schools- network
 - Direct placement for residents at major bus. in area
 - Training programs that lead to a real job
- 9. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?**
- Land grants
 - Lower rent
 - Make enough to buy a home
 - Citizenship support, access services
 - Financial literacy- culturally competent
 - Systemic racism needs to be addressed
- 10. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
- More trash cans
 - Gateway identifiers
 - Cultural identifiers
 - Parks
 - Privately owned public space access – these are hidden
 - Fund community to activate Popos
 - Park stewardship
 - BBQS/ events for community
 - Safety and street cleaning include
 - Lights in alleys
 - Homeless shelters with services
- 11. What do you like most and least about your neighborhood shopping area?**
-
- 12. What are things that would build your sense of community?**
-
- 13. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?**
-

Session #2

- 1. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?**

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 5, 2019
Bayanihan Center (South of Market/District 6)

- Job training
- Priority for residents
- Entry level jobs at small business
- Building capacity at small business to hire local

2. How would you find out about these services?

- Internet
- Newspaper
- School- Bessie C.
- CBO's / case managers, increase awareness
- Somcan, hospitality house
- More outreach of services
- Word of mouth
- Radio
- Need job fair in SOMA
- Work where you live
- Send mail to homes

3. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?

- Lack of awareness
- Need public posts
- Under staffed CBO's
- SRO residents need more education
- Re: community resources
- Too many steps + places to obtain help
- Too much trauma with retelling personal story
- Need more community mtgs.
- Re: resources + info + process help

4. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?

- Streamline process
- More outreach especially in SRO's + public housing
- More education : Housing rights + resources by the City
- Meet people where they are, give options
- Healthcare options education of public
- Improve access of healthcare
- Improve sharing of right education

5. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?

- Mental health service especially for youth
- Housing especially for seniors
- Laundromats. There is only 1
- Public parks in district 6

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 5, 2019
Bayanihan Center (South of Market/District 6)

- SOMA only has 1
 - More schools + more after school programs
 - Need to fund facilities
 - Daycare
 - More restrooms 24/7
- 6. What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?**
- More awareness on available jobs
 - Skills training update skills
 - Childcare for working parents
 - Driver License
 - Know your rights at work
 - Reporting process
- 7. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?**
- Access centers
 - Internet, newspaper
 - Somcan
- 8. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?**
- More funds for jobs
 - Outreach in media
 - Job lists to case workers
 - Language programs for translation + interpretation that residents can do
 - Manufacturing jobs attract business + new industries
 - Local hire policies
- 9. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?**
- Investment guidance –real estate
 - Food security is a challenge because of high rent
 - More grocery stores + pantry options
 - Affordable healthy food
 - Liquor stores are expensive
 - Financial literacy education re: basic skills i.e. banking, credit building, saving
 - Community based banks or credit union
 - Remittance budgeting help
- 10. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
- Need a Filipino grocery store
 - Too crowded
 - People have to go to Y.B. to enjoy public space
 - Public space

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 5, 2019
Bayanihan Center (South of Market/District 6)

11. What do you like most and least about your neighborhood shopping area?

- Need a Filipino grocery store
- Too crowded
- People have to go to Y.B. to enjoy public space
- Public space
- Reopen Filipino grocery store
- Lighting for safety
- Cultural identifiers
- Cleaner streets (relate to housing)
- Reduce feces + needles
- Programs to activate alleys + 6th street to be family friendly
- 6th street improved but can be better
- Accessible bus stops
- Cross walks for disabled
- More trees - greenery

12. What are things that would build your sense of community?

- More space to unify community
- More forums/ events
- City needs to work closely with community members
- Organizing, promotion
- Commercial corridor that addresses community needs
- Serve the community like Chinatown
- Family events- intergenerational

13. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

-

Participant Worksheets

1. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?

- Funded community coalitions help bridge community members
- Proximity to health care and education
- Sanitary and well-lit streets
- Balanced law enforcement
- Job training
- Priority for residents
- Language access
- Healthcare access
- Employment support
- Entry-level jobs at small businesses

2. How would you find out about these services?

- CBOs/non-profits

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 5, 2019
Bayanihan Center (South of Market/District 6)

- Word-of-mouth
 - School
 - Internet
- 3. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?**
- Understaffed CBOs
 - More clinics needed, more often
 - Too many steps & places to obtain help – trauma in retelling story just to get services!
- 4. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?**
- Streamlining communication!
 - More outreach!
- 5. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?**
- Childcare
 - Employment services
 - Parks
 - Public restrooms!
- 6. What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?**
- job training -> mobility
 - workers rights
 - DMV/Drivers license
- 7. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?**
- CBOs
 - Word-of-mouth
 - Internet
 - Social network/family
 - SOMCAN
- 8. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?**
- Provide job lists/availability
 - Pipeline for interpreters/multi-lingual people
 - More outreach
 - local hire strengthening
- 9. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?**
- Sustainable jobs with greater-than-living-wages. Nonprofit workers are some of the most exploited and wage range – they get burnt out for non-competitive wages – perpetuate the cycle of poverty
 - Food security

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 5, 2019
Bayanihan Center (South of Market/District 6)

- Investment guidance
- “financial literacy” -> workshops on how to build credit, apply for grants, etc.
- Community-based banks
- Support for families sending remittance

10. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?

- PARKS
- Lighting
- Cleaner streets/public restrooms
- Crossing times
- Cultural landmarks (SOMA Pilipinas)

11. What do you like most and least about your neighborhood shopping area?

- More options please!
- Unaffordable -> no grocery stores

12. What are things that would build your sense of community?

- Community gatherings, promotion, family events (age-appropriate)
- SOMA Pilipinas commercial corridor!
- More clinics for services, more often

Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?

- Drop in assistance with housing application
- Explanation of DAHLIA plus make it more user friendly
- Eviction defense
- Tenant counseling- know your rights
- More housing- lots of applicants
- Outreach in building, ESR SRO's
- Definition of affordability- limited option for people on fixed income
- Long waitlist for family disabled plus senior housing
- Fear of eviction
- Median income set for SF

2. In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?

- Elevators break down a lot, building conditions not adequate
- Language access-D6- (Filipino)
- Needed- barriers to asking- need to outreach to find + encourage people to connect- ex clinics, interpreters
- CBO's need space + technology to deliver services – ex Somcan survey, SOMA Pilipinas

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 5, 2019
Bayanihan Center (South of Market/District 6)

- More counselors, tenant outreach, more training for counselor especially in SRO's on 6th & TI limited counselors
 - Most services not immediate, long waitlists
 - Fear to get a raise if might lose housing
- 3. Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities.**
- Language
 - Fix building for access
 - Rental subsidy
 - Support services for seniors with disabilities
 - Veterans, including homeless, preference?
 - Middle household income
 - Neighborhood preference + protections for N. residents like neighborhood
 - Youth – 2500 in SFUSD
- 4. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified would you prefer?**
- Clinic/ workshops in every neighborhood
 - Ongoing + regular
 - Website
 - Flow chart of how application process works
 - Tenant counselor, direct to assistance
 - Letters for those without computers
 - Generally make easier, TV news approach to language
 - HUD has clinic to take
- 5. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?**
- Price
 - Availability
 - Qualification- ex credit history
 - Environmental conditions of sites like HV + TI
 - Allow groups to buy multi-FAM building to prevent evictions
- 6. What are the kinds of things that help people move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?**
- Adequate job training
 - Local hire priority
 - Mental health + rehab services, especially as alternative to policing people (as opposed to conservatorship)
 - How do we prevent homelessness? Focus on housing up front
 - More permanent supportive housing

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 5, 2019
Bayanihan Center (South of Market/District 6)

- Housing ladder, especially for SRO's
 - Like skills classes
 - More flexibility with shelter rules to facilitate employment
7. **What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
-
8. **What are things that would build your sense of community?**
-
9. **Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?**
-

Session #2

1. **What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?**
- Affordable housing
 - Family- size housing stock
 - More than minimum wage job
 - For low income / that people can afford
 - Especially 20% AMI, senior people on fixed income
 - Take on roommates
 - Landlord know their responsibilities
 - Rental subsidies beyond a few MOS
 - Senior housing without long waitlist
 - Flexible rules for occupancy, ex seniors with families/ grandchildren who need to stay
 - Clarity about what renters can ask a landlord to do
 - Housing application assistance, especially languages
 - More options across all income spectrum
 - clinics
2. **In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?**
- Service for immigrant newcomers is lacking
 - Should ask about quality + access of services
 - Need empathy + compassion
 - Education for providers needed
 - More counselors with bilingual skills needed
 - To increase quality of services, pay more \$ to staff, make careers more sustainable
 - Make sure BMR units are not in basement
 - Make process less stressful
3. **Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities.**

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 5, 2019
Bayanihan Center (South of Market/District 6)

- So many challenges
 - Teachers- match opportunities with pay scale
 - Seniors
 - Newcomers + people with language access needs, especially Filipino in SOMA
 - Use church + cultural art + school to outreach, create safe space to ask for help
 - Use cultural district
 - San Franciscans, perhaps by seniority
 - Use SFUSD definition of homelessness, work with SFUSD
- 4. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified would you prefer?**
- Outsource to private company
 - Electronically
 - Use existing community
 - Ex school, teachers, community
 - Create jobs for outreach
 - More CBO capacity
 - In person outreach
 - Church, cultural districts, relationships
- 5. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?**
- Credit, financial literacy
 - Income inequality
 - Down payment size, FICO score, flex on co-signer
 - Income VS. house price
 - Teachers pay
- 6. What are the kinds of things that help people move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?**
- Income vs. rents
 - Choices limited on lower salary/income
 - Rents term too high
 - Need so many resources to meet needs
 - Overcoming eviction
 - Also issue to more street shelter, relates to quality of services
 - Should observe services like "HOT" being provided
 - Streamlined path
- 7. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
- Parks- make more, make more child friendly
 - In SOMA, lots of popos but not child or senior friendly ex. Playground, pathway for easy access, don't require ID to access, label them (maps)
 - State park + bike paths that are safe

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 5, 2019
Bayanihan Center (South of Market/District 6)

- Pedestrian safety- ex lights + pedestrian lights
- No poop + no needles
- Connect with SFMTA efforts

8. What are things that would build your sense of community?

-

9. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

-

Participant Worksheets

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?

- “drop-in” assistance with housing applications
- Tenant counseling/tenant rights education
- Eviction defense
- More housing units/lots of applications
- People with needs aren’t even applying!!
- Outreach in buildings
- Definition of affordability must be refined (most of community don’t qualify)
- Need more user-friendly DAHLIA
- Long waitlists??? ☹

2. In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?

- Fear of asking for raises because = losing housing
- Elevators breaking down, buildings in bad condition
- Need to improve language access
- Hesitant to ask! Need the City to outreach to find where these families are (ex. Clinics, interpreters)
- Lack of space for CBOs! (eg. SOMCAN survey, SOMA Pilipinas)
- More tenant counselors, maintenance of buildings!
- Training counselors especially for SROs on 6th Street, Tenderloin, limited accountability
- MOHCD is not addressing immediate, long waitlists

3. Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities.

- Language access
- Rental subsidies
- Veterans/senior veterans
- Moderate income
- Neighborhood preference
- 2500 SFUSD homeless youth

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 5, 2019
Bayanihan Center (South of Market/District 6)

4. **If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified would you prefer?**
 - Email
 - Mailers to home address
 - Clinic/workshop
 - Website
 - Filing out application with client; reminders of requirements
 - Tenant-counselor with direct assistance
 - Mailing rather than computers
 - Generally easier/more accessible terminology
5. **If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?**
 1. Limited stock of range of income and housing lost brackets 80-120% AMI
 2. Can new buildings be split into tiers with some only for 60-80%, 80-100%, 100-120% AMI, etc. instead of broadly all below 100% AMI?
 3. PRICE
 4. AVAILABILITY!! Need MORE!!
 5. Requirements (credit, insurance, history, etc.)
 6. Environmental conditions of sites (Tenderloin, Bayview/Hunters Points)
 7. Allow CBO/nonprofit to buy buildings to prevent eviction
6. **What are the kinds of things that help people move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?**
 - Adequate job training
 - Local hire priority
 - Mental health and rehab services ESPECIALLY as alternative to policing
 - Homeless prevention rather than management/rehab centralization
 - More permanent supportive housing!!
 - Housing mobility (eg. Why are people living in SROs for 40 years)
7. **What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
 - Protected bike lanes
 - More open space – on-grade, rooftop, anything, open space all the time
 - Green space
 - No shadows on parks!
 - More public parks, not Privately Owned Public Open Space (POPOS)

Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups

Notes for the Long Range Housing Planning break-out groups will be synthesized and posted on the Planning Department's website after all of the forums have taken place.

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 10, 2018
Ortega Public Library (District 1 and District 4)

Table of Contents

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups.....	1
Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups.....	3
Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups	7
Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups	11

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups

Sessions #1 and #2

Neighborhood Change and Choice

- 1. Based on the maps and your personal experience, what are the most important or noteworthy changes in this neighborhood in the past 5 years?**
 - Inner Richmond – decrease in African American demo (6 dots)
 - Outer Sunset – fewer families with young kids, more wealthy families
 - Richmond – More younger adults, especially on Geary, less friendly; tech buses, younger demographic
 - Sunset – groups keep to themselves; Housing prices and rents (4 dots); high AirBNB presence – esp. beach (one dot); more renting to individuals to maximize income; more unstably housed college students; more market rate development newly created, less middle; house rich – cash poor seniors
 - Parkside – City policy that overrides neighborhood wishes (ex. L) (4 dots); loss of street parking affected businesses (one dot); lack of sensitivity to neighborhood issues (one dot)
- 2. What do you think has caused or contributed to those changes in your neighborhood?**
 - Sunset & Richmond – Maximizing income from rent (one dot); real estate speculation; number of people (increase in population); increase in income inequality; transit changes; park and rec changes; not enough community input; twitter tax break/business focus; development without community investment; YIMBY rhetoric about “should”.
- 3. If money were not object, where would you choose to live (top 3 desirable places) and where would you choose to not live (top 3 least desirable places)?**
 - Most desirable places to live per map – Outer Sunset (5), Inner Sunset (2), Twin Peaks (2), Mission, Glen Park (2), Silver Terrace, Western Addition (2), Pacific Heights (4), Outer Richmond (7), Inner Richmond (2), Seacliff (3), Pacific Heights (6), South of Market
 - Least desirable places to live per map – Outer Sunset (2), Bayview (6), Dogpatch, South of Market, Tenderloin (2), Financial District, North Beach

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 10, 2018
Ortega Public Library (District 1 and District 4)

4. What makes a neighborhood a desirable place to live?

- Accessible transit (one dot and one check mark)
- Low crime rate
- Clean
- Views
- Sunny/weather
- Less traffic congestion
- Schools (public) – esp. high schools
- Community involvement
- Character of neighborhood/quality of housing
- Shopping (neighborhood)
- Open space (one dot)
- Opposite/less desirable: toxins, homeless, too far west
- International communities
- Multi-cultural
- History/family connection
- People know each other, check on each other
- Thriving small business in neighborhood
- Excellent transit
- Multi-generational
- Sense of community
- Variety of architecture
- Gardens and open space and small parks
- Big parks
- Street trees
- Safety, lighting, no trash

5. Do you feel like you have a choice in where you live? And where do you live now (zip code)?

See flip chart

6. What makes you feel like you have a choice or don't have a choice?

Choice		No Choice
Ownership		Cost
Wealth		Affordability
Support network		
	Rent control	

Access to Opportunity

7. What are the most pressing challenges to getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood?

- Richmond - N/S transit

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 10, 2018
Ortega Public Library (District 1 and District 4)

- 8. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or keep a job?**
- Richmond – transit E/W
- 9. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in accessing public transportation?**
- N/S direction
 - Wait times
 - Heavy traffic on return to neighborhood on N
 - Transfers and frequency
 - N + 19th turnaround/switchback
 - L Taraval Communication
 - N unreliable
- 10. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in accessing public transportation?**
- E/W direction
 - Richmond– can get anywhere
 - Great system
- 11. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in living in or creating more healthy neighborhoods?**
- No answers
- 12. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood to live in or create healthy neighborhoods?**
- Sunset – low pollution

Fair Housing Violations

- 13. Have you or a member of your household experienced a violation of your fair housing protections?**
- Yes – race
 - Yes – Source of income (Section 8)
 - Yes – subtle / not documented
- 14. What did you do/Who did you go for support? How helpful was it?**
- SF HRC (human rights commission) very helpful
 - SF Housing rights committee
- 15. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?**

Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 10, 2018
Ortega Public Library (District 1 and District 4)

- 1. Let's list the non-housing needs that are most important for you and/or your family.**
 - Lighting for safety/security
 - More senior service facilities
 - Senior education needs: computers, ESL, citizenship classes, legal services
 - Safety: many car break-ins
- 2. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?**

Friends, neighbors, Self-help for the elderly Senior Center in West Portal and Chinatown, social workers, newspaper
- 3. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services that would meet those needs?**
 - Language access, more bilingual services
 - Facilities, more permanent facilities.
- 4. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?**
 - Permanent location for senior center
- 5. What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?**
 - No workforce services/center on West side of city
 - More staff for existing programs
- 6. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?**
 - Mostly seniors in this group
 - Those who need the service travel to Chinatown to obtain
- 7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?**
 - Improve public transit
 - Work with employers to incentivize them to hire people with high barriers to entry
 - Improve street safety
 - Too many applicants for few jobs
- 8. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?**
 - Estate planning
 - More financial education for youth
 - Increases in property/public taxes make saving harder
- 9. What do you like most and least about your local commercial corridor?**
 - Dislike marijuana shops, high opposition to marijuana stores
 - Dislike many empty commercial lots. Small businesses squeezed out. High cost like including minimum wage
 - Dislike small business need to pay surcharges which they pass to consumers.

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 10, 2018
Ortega Public Library (District 1 and District 4)

- Like – Clement street had holiday stroll, need more community building events
- Like – small business planning help

10. What are things that would build your sense of community?

- Seeing more instances of houses without occupants
- More policing for sense of safety in sunset/Richmond district
- Permanent place for senior center
- GHW should be pedestrian only, new Sunday streets events
- Continue outreach for traffic safety (speeding, etc.)
- More open spaces
- Need places to shower and get clean at beach

11. Which programs or services need to be offered in a language other than English?

No responses

12. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

No response

Session #2

1. Let's list the non-housing needs that are most important for you and/or your family.

- Permanent senior center
- Commercial rents high; prevents expansion of services, city needs to help senior center with rent and property acquisition
- Public transit late
- Paratransit
- IHSS more outreach

2. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?

- Internet, need more resources for outreach events, word of mouth, libraries.

3. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services that would meet those needs?

- Lack of information
- Language access, bilingual staff hard to find. City should help nonprofits with language access.

4. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?

- Permanent location for senior center

5. What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?

- Hard to find stable jobs, jobs with benefits
- City funded programs to help people understand new ways of job search (Linkedin, etc.)

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 10, 2018
Ortega Public Library (District 1 and District 4)

- 6. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?**
 - Direct outreach for schools
 - Outreach for senior centers
- 7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?**
 - Same suggestions as in break out group one
 - City can subsidize jobs that require bilingual skills
- 8. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?**
 - More financial education
 - Warn about scams, payday loans
- 9. What do you like most and least about your local commercial corridor?**
 - Dislike – lack of parking, some corridors have bad public transit, too much construction increases travel time
 - Sidewalks should be wider, different types of stores, vibrancy/diversity of Irving corridor
- 10. What are things that would build your sense of community?**
 - ESL classes, newcomer services
 - More volunteer opportunities
 - Health fitness/outdoor activities
- 11. Which programs or services need to be offered in a language other than English?**
 - Housing website needs to be multilingual, many times only main page of city website is multilingual
 - Alert SF messages only in English
- 12. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?**
 - Commercial corridor too spread out

Submitted Written Responses

Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- There is a very big tree with huge roots next to my house. The roots have grown through and punctured the pipe underneath my house and have cost me a few thousand dollars to fix. Can the government help me cut off the tree so that it will not puncture my pipe again? It is located right by my house on the street.

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 10, 2018
Ortega Public Library (District 1 and District 4)

Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

- 1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?**
 - Affordability – higher wage, lower priced housing, down payment assistance especially at higher income limits/levels;
 - More 100 percent affordable housing units to be built for median or lower-income households;
 - Getting to and from home – transportation;
 - Parking – difficult;
 - Access to medical/hospitals.
- 2. In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?**
 - Internet access to utilize DAHLIA;
 - No contact to real person, multiple persons contacted but get different answers;
 - No response/confirmation to applications
 - Low income housing unbalanced compared to outer sunset;
 - Access to affordable childcare;
 - More childcare;
 - Free, low-cost afterschool care;
 - Access to sport related materials for children/youth;
 - Playgrounds/Parks – staff until dark
 - Legal access I access to nature, gardens, outdoor spaces, smaller parks, dog parks, neighborhood parks;
 - Education about tenant rights;
 - Greater density in Sunset;
 - Not thoroughly planned infrastructure
- 3. Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities.**
 - TAY
 - Mental Health
 - Non-English Speaking ESL
 - New immigrants
 - Service for modifications for seniors as owners age Age in place
 - Reliable source for contractors
 - City wide connect seniors with students, etc., who want to rent with extra rooms
- 4. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being**

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 10, 2018
Ortega Public Library (District 1 and District 4)

notified you prefer?

- Text
- News
- Senior Centers
- Community based organizations
- 5-7 minute videos social media
- Newspapers
- Free community newspapers
- Postcards
- Flyers in library
- Facebook

5. **Aside from the high cost, what are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?**
 - Credit Score
 - Minimum income ((\$3,000) not usable for TAY
 - Knowing the steps of homeownership
 - How Tos homebuying
 - Dispersing information on homebuying on newspapers
6. **What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?**
 - Jobs
 - Households with vouchers relocate outside SF
 - Try to comeback but won't get preference because they are no longer SF residents
7. **What are things that would build your sense of community?**
 - Small business and commercial rent control
 - Creating stable housing creates stable communities
 - Low income housing and senior housing
 - Not a lot of multi-cultural presence in neighborhoods
 - More affordable housing may bring diversity
 - Economic diversity
 - Neighborhoods gentrified
 - Community Centers with various activities, events, etc.
 - Music, movie nights
8. **Which programs or services need to be offered in a language other than English?**
 - Data to support languages
 - SFHA can't get actual person to help
 - No language assistance
9. **Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?**
 - Red zone areas increasing throughout the city; affects small businesses
 - Small business support; more parking

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 10, 2018
Ortega Public Library (District 1 and District 4)

- Bus stops eliminated needs to stop
- Senior Housing

Session #2

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?

- Eviction forgiveness
- Senior rehabilitation of housing
- Lower rents
- Eviction protection
- Resources
- Deposit assistance for low to moderate income tenants
- Teachers need more housing
- Job availability for youth or younger population
- Housing and job programs for displaced or homeless individuals/families
- Encourage corporations to move to San Francisco to assist in building housing
- Access to available benefits
- Educate/incentives for owners to avoid eviction
- Affordable housing too expensive

2. In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?

- Need to promote services via social media; general lack of knowledge where to get services, what services are available
- Public assistance programs are intimidating
- Need more human interactions, access to more case workers
- Language accessibility
- Consider innovative, multi-use housing, use existing spaces, higher density housing
- Keep information updated at community organizations, senior centers
- More access to interpretation
- More community clinics, social work, housing, employment fairs

3. Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities.

- Undocumented population need legal access
- Housing subsidies, target for specific populations
- Housing people with mental health issues, function limitations
- Support services
- Plan for populations with different needs
- Increase, create more housing for teachers
- Rental assistance programs, subsidies
- Housing rehabilitation programs
- Section 8 programs

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 10, 2018
Ortega Public Library (District 1 and District 4)

- 4. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified you prefer?**
 - Email
 - Advertisements
 - Tsing Tao/World Journal
 - Chronicle, Examiner Newspapers
 - Senior Centers
 - Flyers
 - Public Radio
 - Text
- 5. Aside from the high cost, what are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?**
 - Lack of homes being built
 - Lower property taxes, lower interest rates
 - Down payment assistance, cheaper, bigger loans
 - Incentives to sell vacant homes
 - More student housing
 - Areas where homes can be store fronts
- 6. What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?**
 - Safer shelters
 - More case managers at shelters
 - Housing ladder – match populations to appropriate units
 - Credit and eviction history assistance
 - Subsidize housing, rent or employment assistance, employment subsidies
 - Provide more jobs for income, better access to housing
- 7. What are things that would build your sense of community?**
 - Art – artist housing
 - Art shows, concerts in the park
 - Opera in the park
 - More information about events
 - More events for children, families
 - More playgrounds
 - Flea market events
 - Exercise facilities at parks, accessible for everyone
 - More town hall meetings/community meetings
- 8. Which programs or services need to be offered in a language other than English?**
 - Need more languages to be represented in community organizations to close gaps
 - Public benefit forms, documents, applications in various languages
 - Access to language for lease agreements and other rental documents

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 10, 2018
Ortega Public Library (District 1 and District 4)

- Start at senior centers and provide language assistance and program forms in various languages
- Advocacy programs for those who need more hand holding

9. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- Rent is too high
- Help former SF residents move to more affordable housing in other areas/cities
- Senior population is growing, more senior housing.

Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups

Notes for the Long Range Housing Planning break-out groups will be synthesized and posted on the Planning Department's website after all of the forums have taken place.

**A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, January 22, 2019
Kelly Cullen Community (Tenderloin/District 6)**

Table of Contents

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups.....	1
Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups.....	4
Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups	9
Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups	12

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups

Sessions #1 and #2

Station 1 – Neighborhood Change and Choice

1. Based on the maps and your personal experience, what are the most important or noteworthy changes in this neighborhood in the past 5 years?

- Super Gentrification (2 dots)
- Higher income, white, young residents (2 dots)
- Racial tensions because of pitting races against each other
- Displacement of long-time residents (1 dot)
- More violence
- Lack of information about applying
- Price discrimination
- Disappearance of SRO's
- SRO and other building upkeep declining
- Exploitation by landlords
- Not enough units – no place to go for tenants as their income increases
- Increased drug use
- Empty store fronts
- Decline of “care not cash”
- Businesses for higher income households (1 dot)
- Open drug dealing (1 dot)
- Streets getting dirty
- More pets & mess (1 dot)
- More tents & cardboard homes street sleeping

2. What do you think has caused or contributed to those changes in your neighborhood?

- Capitalism
- Tech industry
- Current Federal Government

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, January 22, 2019
Kelly Cullen Community (Tenderloin/District 6)

- Drug addiction (1 dot)
 - Lack of sense of urgency for policy makers
 - City policies that caused changes police more people
 - Lack of accountability of City for quality services
 - Limited contracts & funding for services
 - Lack of resident input for quality control
 - Discrimination
 - Lack of affordable units
 - Lack of police
 - Tenderloin resources and services attract people from other neighborhood
- 3. If money were not object, where would you choose to live (top 3 desirable places) and where would you choose to not live (top 3 least desirable places)?**
- Desirable locations per map – Outer Richmond, Seacliff (2), Presidio, Inner Richmond (2), Marina, North Beach (3), Nob Hill (4), Tenderloin (5), South of Market (7), Mission (2)
 - Least desirable locations per map – Outer Sunset (4), Inner Sunset, Twin Peaks, Mission (4), Western Addition, Tenderloin (3), Potrero Hill, McLaren Park, Candlestick Point, Brisbane, Daly City (2)
- 4. What makes a neighborhood a desirable place to live?**
- Open spaces social tolerance (1 dot)
 - Safety (2 dots)
 - Near the water (1 dot)
 - Cleanliness (2 dots)
 - Things to do (3 dots)
 - Transportation (2 dots)
 - Diversity (1 dot)
 - Shopping (1 dot)
 - Affordable (1dot)
 - Schools (2 dots)
 - Church (1 dot)
 - Parks
 - Social services (1 dot)
 - Seniors, children, tenant advocacy, youth services
 - Convenience
 - Language access
 - Hospitals
 - Healthy food
 - Laundry services
 - Public restroom
 - Police station ccc tv
- 5. Do you feel like you have a choice in where you live? And where do you live now (zip code)?**
- More people have less choice in 94102 (1 dot) and 94103 (1 dot)

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, January 22, 2019
Kelly Cullen Community (Tenderloin/District 6)

- Some choice in 94133
- More choice in 94103 with voucher
- More choice in 94103 with lottery

6. What makes you feel like you have a choice or don't have a choice?

- Income (4 dots)
- Not enough
- Housing prices (3 dots)
- Racism (1 dot)
- Nimbys (1 dot)
- yimby

Station 2 – Access to Opportunity

7. What are the most pressing challenges to getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood?

Challenges:

- Transportation costs
- Pay not enough for high cost city (1 dot)
- Employment discrimination in hiring practices (1 dot)
- Age discrimination (1 dot)
- Lack of training/education for job opportunities (1 dot)
- Development takes away parking

8. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or a keep a job?

Assets

- Jobs
- Non-profit agencies

9. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in accessing public transportation?

Challenges:

- Limited routes in certain areas (2 dots)
- Not enough parking
- Parking unaffordable
- Sleeping in bus shelter
- Buses don't run on schedule
- Dirty bus stops
- Impatient drivers
- Scooters!

10. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in accessing public transportation?

Assets:

- We have great public transportation (2 dots)

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, January 22, 2019
Kelly Cullen Community (Tenderloin/District 6)

- Library system

11. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in living in or creating more healthy neighborhoods?

Challenges:

- Lack of trees
- Dirty streets (1 dot)
- Lack of public restrooms (1 dot)
- Homeless outreach team (HOT team) don't stop in the Tenderloin

12. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in live in or create healthy neighborhoods?

Assets:

- Health clinics (1 dot)
- Healthy food choices (1 dot)
- Food bank & farmers market (1 dot)
- Cleaning crews
- Bodekker Park
- Good schools
- Churches

Station 3: Fair Housing Violations

13. Have you or a member of your household experienced a violation of your fair housing protections?

- Disability discrimination
- Source of income
- Section 8 voucher
- No translation of housing documents

14. What did you do/Who did you go to for support? How helpful was it?

- No notes

Other Question

15. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- Harassment by real estate companies to get people out

Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

1. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?

- Lack of intersectionality, outreach specialist are v. focused on one issue

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, January 22, 2019
Kelly Cullen Community (Tenderloin/District 6)

- Lack of nonprofit space
- More programs to keep those newly placed in housing, housed -> psychological, emotional
- Services targeted to assist
- Hoarding and cluttering
- Mental health + substance use
- Public bathroom 24 hours!

2. How would you find out about these services?

- I don't. Lack of communication
- Not enough case managers who know services; not enough counselors
- Project Homeless Connect
- Listening on the street -> need street outreach. Not aggressive outreach. Need to be culturally comp.

3. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?

- Medical issues + access to Medical or other insurance
- Lack of communication/information, need shared info source among case managers. Coordination between case managers.
- Remote locations + restricted hours for services
- Stigma – esp. around mental health
- Help with initial connection: transit, social phobias
- Hoarding + cluttering
- Lack of signage on street or generic signage -> need descriptions + language diversity

4. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?

- More counselors, more \$, more cultural specialists
- All can be improved
- More accessibility -> physical space
- Some people claustrophobic or have other traumas which makes it hard to meet in an enclosed office. Alternate meeting locations; mobile service locations
- More support for homeless connect
- Warm hand off to doctors apt.
- Give counselors smaller caseload

5. What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?

- Reliable MUNI service. More drivers
- Help getting there the first 1-3 times
- Bus pass for first 2 weeks
- Training for youth; City College options
- Apprenticeship program -> better job matching -> needs to be paid internship
- Job finders
- Job coach
- Targeted services for recent immigrants

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, January 22, 2019
Kelly Cullen Community (Tenderloin/District 6)

- 6. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?**
 - Fliers
 - Word of mouth
 - Nonprofits
 - Central City SRO
 - Social media (facebook, twitter, insta)
 - Radio
 - Bay Area Video Coalition
- 7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?**
 - Public postings – physical job boards, not just electronic
 - Help with resumes
 - Intentional training, individualized support to get high paying jobs
 - Interview skills
 - Subsidized training – software engineers
 - Develop skills in the community
 - Hire in the community
 - Find out barriers to participating in programs
- 8. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?**
 - Jobs that pays more - more than just enough to cover rent
 - Lower rents
 - Local hiring – work where live
 - Low-income housing -> BMR
 - Childcare; elder/companion care
 - Home care
- 9. What do you like most and least about your neighborhood shopping area?**
 - Most: Good, affordable food.
 - Diversity: people, food, community services
 - Give incentives to businesses, esp. small bus.
 - Least: Develop more clear commercial corridors -> community – serving retail. Van Ness to Union Square
 - Businesses must have toilets for customers + non-customers
 - Overcharge women + homeless (eg banana)
 - Need more healthy + affordable food options
- 10. What are things that would build your sense of community?**
 - Craft/arts street fair
 - Free food truck festival for people who can't afford
 - Community events: music + food trucks, picnics
 - International/friendship day. July 30

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, January 22, 2019
Kelly Cullen Community (Tenderloin/District 6)

- Tenderloin Flea Market – Shannon Ally?
- Bodecker Park tree lightning/holiday celebrations
- Dance classes – public, a wide variety

11. Which programs or services need to be offered in a language other than English?

- Spanish: program/forum to inform about services; opportunity fair (also in Russian)
- More restaurants with menus in Spanish, Chinese
- Filipino/Tagalog, Arabic (need more translators), Farsi, Hindi (need more translators)
- All services

12. Is there anything important to you that we should have asked?

- Rental assistance -> more outreach + information about what is available. More \$
- Listing of social services
- Services for children in community esp. for ages 11-17. Year around. Gender-specific program

Session #2

1. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?

- Legal services for veterans, access to income + barrier removal (housing)
- Eviction prevention
- More Vietnamese + SE Asian services
- Immigration services, esp. Vietnamese
- Food services, esp. Cal Fresh. Counseling for those services
- Senior services
- Citizenship classes
- Access to good jobs that pay living wages
- More intensive case mgmt., esp. for formerly homeless, esp. for jobs
- Language issues but still need pathways to employment
- In hope support services in other language

2. How would you find out about these services?

- Community – SE Asian, word of mouth
- Case managers
- Community centers VYDC

3. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?

- Capacity: more demand than supply
- Not enough income -> income eligibility (eg. Medical)
- Transportation/cost of
- Childcare/cost of
- Language barrier – orgs lack capacity in the language or lack capacity in area of need
- Organizational capacity/staff capacity & knowledge; staff passion
- Take into account clientele b/f determining program intake requirements

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, January 22, 2019
Kelly Cullen Community (Tenderloin/District 6)

- Cleanliness of streets
 - Homeless challenges
- 4. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?**
- Employment: discrimination. Improve access to jobs; access/support to those who experience discrimination
 - Publish who is on housing list for temporary housing
 - Synthesize DAHLIA & other services
 - City staff provide presentations about availability of services. Provide points of contacts w/in org. (Long-term solutions for homeless)
 - Promote services
 - More stops for HOT (Homeless Outreach Team) accessible, visible
 - Safety + cleanliness of streets impact how services are provided. Esp. after dark
 - Mobile beds for homeless
- 5. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?**
- Services for homeless – short + long term
 - Mental health + substance use
 - Legal services – comprehensive + free /low-cost
 - Child support services -> difficult to afford housing if someone has child support payments
 - Citizenship + naturalizations, esp. for Vietnamese
- 6. What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?**
- High school diploma is a barrier. Are there options for those who do not have that or who don't have language skills
 - Apprenticeship programs for those who don't have education/language skills
 - Priority /for San Franciscans in jobs/hiring preference
 - Balance the above with recent immigrants needs
 - Vocational rehabilitation
 - Equity – race, disability -> how can those barriers be removed
 - Educate employees about diverse workforce. Hold people accountable
- 7. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?**
- See Q2
 - Cal Fresh office
 - hospital
- 8. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?**
- City job employment application. City workers needs to be improved. Language barriers
 - Classes about how to find + apply for jobs, digital library
 - Nonprofits should be able to pay their employees a living wage

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, January 22, 2019
Kelly Cullen Community (Tenderloin/District 6)

9. **What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?**
 - Not live in SF
 - Balance day-to-day expenses + long term needs
 - Need to take classes, but need child care to do so (esp. language classes)
 - Affordable housing = income
 - Affordable housing => needs to be safe neighborhood
 - Fear of losing benefits with higher income
10. **What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
 - Cleanliness, safety, lights
 - Mini-mobile home for homeless
 - Safe needle disposal
 - Quicker response time -> police, cleanliness
11. **What do you like most and least about your neighborhood shopping area?**
 - No notes
12. **What are things that would build your sense of community?**
 - No notes
13. **Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?**
 - No notes

Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

1. **What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?**
 - Need more BMR units
 - Higher paying jobs
 - Limit rent increases
 - More rent control
 - Ability to age in place – ADA – aging veterans
 - City needs to take action
 - Eviction protections
 - ADA-friendly units (affordable)
2. **In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?**
 - BMR units too expensive. Rent increases make housing inaccessible
 - DALP not competitive for market-rate unit
 - Language line should provide Vietnamese

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, January 22, 2019
Kelly Cullen Community (Tenderloin/District 6)

- Rent board hardship – advocate required ROSA@thclinic.org
 - Need more org's to serve Vietnamese/non English speaking groups
 - Need centralized & coordinated resources
- 3. Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities.**
- Family-sized units
 - Teacher housing... for teachers & our kids' futures
 - ADA/senior units
- 4. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified would you prefer?**
- Email, in our language
 - Community-based organizations
 - Text messages
 - Flyers in our building
 - Bus ads
- 5. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?**
- HOA fees too high
- 6. What are the kinds of things that help people move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?**
- Navigating the systems
 - Criminal background (barrier)
 - Credit issues (barrier)
 - Instability in shelter – time limits, etc. - stairs all over
 - Oversight for programs – to ensure efficiency, success for people
 - Consistency in resource communication – especially for domestic violence survivors
- 7. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
- No notes
- 8. What are things that would build your sense of community?**
- No notes
- 9. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?**
- No notes

Session #2

- 1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?**
- Higher wages

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, January 22, 2019
Kelly Cullen Community (Tenderloin/District 6)

- Affordable rents
 - Creative ways to pay rent (payment plan)
 - Rent control across the board
 - Eviction protections
 - Reliable transportation
 - Tenant protections
 - More BMR units – rental + ownership
 - BMR's that target lower –incomes 40-60% AMI
 - Improved mobility features to allow residents to age in place (elevator, stair lifts) – funding stream for ADA improvements
- 2. In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?**
- BMR units still not affordable to very low income (30% AMI)
 - Poor credit is large barrier to access
 - Need funding for first/last/security deposit
 - More housing for seniors + veterans on fixed incomes
- 3. Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities.**
- Child care
 - More support for single parents
 - Support for individuals with acquired disabilities – workforce training or re-entry assistance
 - Mental health resources – workforce training or re-entry assistance
 - Ongoing support & services
 - Social workers, community building activities
- 4. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified would you prefer?**
- Case managers
 - Text messages
 - Library
 - Bulletin boards
 - In-person assistance – not everyone has access or are internet savvy
 - Outreach workers
 - In-house supportive services
- 5. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?**
- No notes
- 6. What are the kinds of things that help people move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?**
- Social workers to assist in transition

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, January 22, 2019
Kelly Cullen Community (Tenderloin/District 6)

- Central location to access resources + information
- Housing option to help people move from transitional -> supportive -> permanent

7. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?

- Monitor pricing at corner bodegas
- More access to grocery stores, fresh food
- Accessible fitness opportunities in parks @ rec & park facilities
 - More variety of options, times, activities
 - For people with physical challenges
 - On-site managers
- More seating in parks, @ bus stops

8. What are things that would build your sense of community?

- No notes

9. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- No notes

Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups

Notes for the Long Range Housing Planning break-out groups will be synthesized and posted on the Planning Department's website after all of the forums have taken place.

**A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 26, 2019
Visitacion Valley Elementary (Visitacion Valley/District 10)**

Table of Contents

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups.....	1
Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups.....	5
Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups	9
Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups	11

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups

Session #1

1. What's important to you that brought you here tonight?

-

Station 1 – Neighborhood Change and Choice

2. Based on the maps and your personal experience, what are the most important or noteworthy changes in this neighborhood in the past 5 years?

-
-

3. What do you think has caused or contributed to those changes in your neighborhood?

-
-

4. If money were not object, where would you choose to live (top 3 desirable places) and where would you choose to not live (top 3 least desirable places)?

-

5. What makes a neighborhood a desirable place to live?

-
-

6. Do you feel like you have a choice in where you live? And where do you live now (zip code)?

-
-

7. What makes you feel like you have a choice or don't have a choice?

-
-

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 26, 2019
Visitacion Valley Elementary (Visitacion Valley/District 10)

Station 2 – Access to Opportunity

8. What are the most pressing challenges to getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood?
 -
 -
9. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or a keep a job?
 -
 -
10. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in accessing public transportation?
 -
 -
11. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in accessing public transportation?
 -
 -
12. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in living in or creating more healthy neighborhoods?
 -
 -
13. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in live in or create healthy neighborhoods?
 -

Station 3: Fair Housing Violations

14. Have you or a member of your household experienced a violation of your fair housing protections?
 -
15. What did you do/Who did you go to for support? How helpful was it?
 -

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 26, 2019
Visitacion Valley Elementary (Visitacion Valley/District 10)

Session #2

1. What's important to you that brought you here tonight?

- Resources for “the forgotten Valley”
- Equity & justice
- Understanding housing landscape
- Needs for youth and families
- Understanding how lottery system works

Station 1 – Neighborhood Change and Choice

2. Based on the maps and your personal experience, what are the most important or noteworthy changes in this neighborhood in the past 5 years?

- Displacement of African American population
- Multiple families living in same house
- Slow development (Sunnydale, schlage lock)
- Sub-standard schools
- Loss of businesses
- Loss of job-centers/ anchor
- Income growth hasn't kept up with rest of City

3. What do you think has caused or contributed to those changes in your neighborhood?

- Global capitalism
- Housing prices increasing
- Ability to make living wages decreasing
- Over incarceration of African-Americans “war on drugs”
- Racial discrimination in housing and employment
- Lottery system not prioritizing long-term residents
- Influx of tech workers

4. If money were not object, where would you choose to live (top 3 desirable places) and where would you choose to not live (top 3 least desirable places)?

-

5. What makes a neighborhood a desirable place to live?

- Good schools
- Good transportation
- Walkable to stores, social spaces, etc
- Economic stability
- Parks / open space
- Good, clean sidewalks, safe places to walk
- Safety
- Sense of community

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 26, 2019
Visitacion Valley Elementary (Visitacion Valley/District 10)

- 6. Do you feel like you have a choice in where you live? And where do you live now (zip code)?**
- No choice: 94114, 94102, 94110, 94134
 - A lot of choice: 94601
- 7. What makes you feel like you have a choice or don't have a choice?**
- No choice: money, available housing options, property taxes, number of people in households, pets, community distance to work
 - Choice: money, multiple income in household

Station 2 – Access to Opportunity

- 8. What are the most pressing challenges to getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood?**
- Challenges: Transportation more routes, high ER, education and training, Language barriers, Need more high quality childcare
- 9. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or a keep a job?**
- Assets: community ties/network, childcare (Felton), transportation (8 to bart)
- 10. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in accessing public transportation?**
- Challenges: T-line, elimination of 15, too slow, infrequent
- 11. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in accessing public transportation?**
- Assets: 8 direct to downtown, ride share is accessible
- 12. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in living in or creating more healthy neighborhoods?**
- Challenges: lack of grocery stores, safety, lack of medical services, no rec center, gyms, dirty streets need more DPW services, need O.E.W.D. outreach, Pedestrian safety "little village", liquor store selling to underage, drug / alcohol use
- 13. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in live in or create healthy neighborhoods?**
- Assets: McLarson park, green way

Station 3: Fair Housing Violations

- 14. Have you or a member of your household experienced a violation of your fair housing protections?**
- Yes- 3 people
 - No- 0 people
- 15. What did you do/Who did you go to for support? How helpful was it?**

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 26, 2019
Visitacion Valley Elementary (Visitacion Valley/District 10)

- Do: moved on, kept looking
- Go for help: HUD, CA Dept. of Fair Housing and Employment, Human Rights Commission

Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

1. What is important to you that brought you here tonight?

- City know our needs in Vis. Valley
- Development Board Base Neighborhood (Diverse)
- Needs & service in the City for Vis. Valley
- Access to services in Vis. Valley language, childcare, transportation
- Services in this area (Vis. Valley)

2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?

- Employment
- Workforce Development
- Education (2)-K through Adults and outdoor education
- Remedial reading
- Robust afterschool program
- Local newspaper in Vis Valley
- Other ways folks can be informed and involved
- Action plan. Neighborhood safety
- Program draw on senior and elders in neighborhood
- Farmers Market

3. How would you find out about these services?

- Large monitors in senior center, grocery outlet throughout Vis. Valley
- Multiple languages newspaper
- No current access to this information now
- Social media
- "page" for this neighborhood
- Communicate in all languages (Cantonese)
- 311 improve, not responsive
- Website specific or app for Vis. Valley
- Resources available
- Different attitudes from the city- take action when they get a request

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 26, 2019
Visitacion Valley Elementary (Visitacion Valley/District 10)

4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?

- Language
- Money!!
- Funding
- Digital Divide
- Lack of advertisement
- Town Hall meeting, bring back!
- Transportation
- Completing priorities, who they are working for
- Language services, barriers, information not provided to elders, and immigrants
- What can SF do for SF folks

5. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?

- Transportation
- **Muni planners need to work with community, increase of crime, more lighting & safety “police patrol” more and better retail in neighborhood
- Leland nor, more business
- More lighting of transportation, safety or shelter (7-11 location Arletta & Bayshore)
- Services for homelessness
- Better access to McLarson Park, feel blocked out, nor welcome entrance
- Feel for safety with homeless in area neighborhood
- Local pantry
- Homeless in neighborhood, refuse service and help
- Mental health, sewer lines too small and causing backup

6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?

- Homeless
- Safety lighting
- Teach prevention and intervention
- Basketball HUB and new neighborhood parking
- Police patrol, more patrols
- More police
- Assist business, empty store fronts along Leland
- Pay attention to Vis Valley “NOT FORGETTEN NEIGHBORHOOD”
- More resources, need attention
- Equity and justice policies (Sunnydale Housing)

7. What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?

- ESL classes in District 10
- Vocational education
- Career teen education in Vis. Valley
- Chinese as second language

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 26, 2019
Visitacion Valley Elementary (Visitacion Valley/District 10)

- Workforce Development
- Different ethnic group classes
- Robust reentry programs
- Amnesty program (license)

8. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?

- Word of mouth
- Electronic divide (digital divide)
- Bayview neighborhood jobs not vis valley
- Need to advertise in different language (college classes, vocational)
- Realistic outreach
- Program to assist families with children and parents. Services for parents to be able to communicate with children

9. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?

- Create pathway to trades electrical, carp, and plumbing
- Communicate, advertise, posting, classes in our neighborhood
- Recruit and outreach
- Re-entry
- Homelessness
- Easier access to City jobs
- Multi-language
- Come to Vis. Valley for assistance
- Funding its graduates to go to college (more funding)
- Housing- teachers and first responders
- Families moving out of the City

10. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?

-

11. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?

-

12. What do you like most and least about your neighborhood shopping area?

-

13. What are things that would build your sense of community?

-

Session #2

1. What is important to you that brought you here tonight?

- Working on Sunnydale- wanted to hear what the community had to say

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 26, 2019
Visitacion Valley Elementary (Visitacion Valley/District 10)

2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?
 -
3. How would you find out about these services?
 -
4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?
 -
5. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?
 -
6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?
 -
7. What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?
 -
8. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?
 -
 -
9. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?
 -
10. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?
 -
11. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?
 -
12. What do you like most and least about your neighborhood shopping area?
 -
13. What are things that would build your sense of community?
 -

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 26, 2019
Visitacion Valley Elementary (Visitacion Valley/District 10)

Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

- 1. What is important to you that brought you here tonight?**
 - Homeless & community activist looking for housing
 - Resources for section 8 vouchers
- 2. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?**
 - Housing voucher (stepping stone to get back on her feet)
 - Housing for dependent too, so senior housing. Not an option
- 3. In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?**
 - Section 8 housing is difficult to apply (requires computer literacy)
 - Not as easy to access
 - No family units available (senior only)
- 4. Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities.**
 - Seniors
 - Young ladies with children
 - Transition from shelter to housing
- 5. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified would you prefer?**
 - A lot of homeless people are not computer literate
 - Word of mouth from outreach, teams or community members
 - A lot of people don't have phones
 - In person communication
- 6. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?**
 - Credit (lack of)
 - Lack of programs (for info and build credit)
- 7. What are the kinds of things that help people move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?**
 - Counseling
 - To know all the steps to quality
 - Information on housing opportunities
- 8. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
 - Recreation center- brings community together

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 26, 2019
Visitacion Valley Elementary (Visitacion Valley/District 10)

- activities
 - events
 - kids programs
 - senior programs
 - food
 - outings
 - Fun activities to bring community together
- 9. What are things that would build your sense of community?**
- Community Center
 - Live music Brings cultures together and pushes out negativity
 - theater

Session #2

- 1. What is important to you that brought you here tonight?**
- New immigrants and parents that lost jobs and affects their growth
 - Applying for BMR for multiple tears
 - Community of folks that need Housing now and support
 - See pregnant patients that are assigned public housing out of SF and no resources
 - Need to be sensitive of homeless students in school
 - Concern about choices City is making
- 2. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?**
- More BMR opportunities (ex)
 - Difficult to find a good job
 - Due to language barrier
 - Limited housing options
 - Difficult to access information
- 3. In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?**
- Website not easy to access
 - Outreach when new opportunities come up
 - City contact list of people
 - Information is only presented online, mention on a news broadcast or social media
 - Concerns about housing will affect benefits (i.e. medical)
 - Undocumented individuals not accessing services in fear of immigration
 - Need to simplify processes, be more transparent
 - Through media broadcast differently information
 - Disconnect with City to community

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 26, 2019
Visitacion Valley Elementary (Visitacion Valley/District 10)

- 4. Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities.**
 - Parents with children
 - Immigrants
 - Expecting mothers (shouldn't be offered at 3rd trimester, but sooner)
 - College graduate
 - First time homeowners
 - Young people building careers
- 5. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified would you prefer?**
 - Media
 - Direct outreach to communities
 - One on one interaction
 - Social media (i.e. Facebook)
 - Explicit about application process
 - Schools- youth translate for families
 - Targeted outreach to communities
 - Unclear about housing qualifications
 - Language is a barrier. Allocate funds to translate application
 - Prove strategies on how to survive and adjust. Better linkage between community and City
 - Direct outreach to other City departments improved communication (i.e. reach out to schools)
 - Housing for college grads
- 6. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?**
 -
- 7. What are the kinds of things that help people move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?**
 -
- 8. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
 -
- 9. What are things that would build your sense of community?**
 -

Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups

Notes for the Long Range Housing Planning break-out groups will be synthesized and posted on the

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 26, 2019
Visitacion Valley Elementary (Visitacion Valley/District 10)

Planning Department's website after all of the forums have taken place.

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 31, 2019
Fillmore Heritage Center (District 5)

Table of Contents

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups.....	1
Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups.....	3
Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups	9
Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups	12

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups

Session #2 (No attendees in first session)

Station 1 – Neighborhood Change and Choice

- 1. Based on the maps and your personal experience, what are the most important or noteworthy changes in this neighborhood in the past 5 years?**
 - Feel pushed out
 - Business in Neighborhood serving wealthier residents
 - Racist
 - Security issues
 - High rents
 - More expensive here
 - Doesn't feel the same
 - More homeless on streets
 - Not serving the community that was here
 - Break-ins
 - Parklets taking up parking
 - Ford Bikes taking away parking for residents
 - Constant construction, parking ,
- 2. What do you think has caused or contributed to those changes in your neighborhood?**
 - Tech Industry
 - Air BnB impacting housing
 - Current president empowered racist white supremist
 - Foreign investment
 - Real estate speculation
 - REITs

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 31, 2019
Fillmore Heritage Center (District 5)

- 3. If money were not object, where would you choose to live (top 3 desirable places) and where would you choose to not live (top 3 least desirable places)?**
 - Most desirable places to live per map – Mission, Western Addition, Potrero Hill, Outer Sunset, Laurel Heights, Marina, North Beach, Embarcadero
 - Least desirable places to live per map – Marina, Tenderloin, South of Market, Bayview, Daly City (2)
- 4. What makes a neighborhood a desirable place to live?**
 - Safe neighborhood
 - Local businesses
 - Diversity
 - Inclusive
 - Feeling of community connection
 - Access to convenience stores transit, schools, city college, higher learning
 - Healthy
 - Clean fresh air, views, parks
 - Accessibility
 - Affordable for “my community” and other communities
 - Children, age, elders, others
- 5. Do you feel like you have a choice in where you live? And where do you live now (zip code)?**
 - No Choice
 - A lot of choice
 - No notes see flip chart for graph
- 6. What makes you feel like you have a choice or don’t have a choice?**
 - Have a choice- Money management over time, \$\$\$, Network
 - Don’t have a choice – highly dependent on roommates, compromise, price of housing, rent control

Station 2 – Access to Opportunity

- 7. What are the most pressing challenges to getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood?**
 - Tech jobs – contract, temp, no benefits
 - Low paying job for living wage
 - Competition for low wage jobs for commuters
 - Uber
- 8. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or a keep a job?**
 - More jobs
 - Uber, Lyft, Post-mates
 - Job placement for youth and TAY

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 31, 2019
Fillmore Heritage Center (District 5)

9. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in accessing public transportation?

- Unsafe buses, unsafe BART
- Clustered transit
- Lines not planned for where people need to go
- Delayed/backup
- Bike and pedestrian infrastructure

10. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in accessing public transportation?

- Free Clipper cards for minors
- Best transit system in the nation

11. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in living in or creating more healthy neighborhoods?

- Lack of Affordable Housing
- Food Choices
- Excess Liquor Stores
- More Fresh Food Markets
- Food Swap
- Homelessness
- Lack of Cleanliness
- Lack of Trash cans

12. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in live in or create healthy neighborhoods?

Station 3: Fair Housing Violations

13. Have you or a member of your household experienced a violation of your fair housing protections?

- Not so obvious redlining

14. What did you do/Who did you go to for support? How helpful was it?

Other Question

15. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 31, 2019
Fillmore Heritage Center (District 5)

- 1. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?**
 - Seniors/aging health care; i.e., dementia services
 - Mental Health services
 - Drug Rehab Services – need more funding
 - LGBT, HIV aging population support
- 2. How would you find out about these services?**
 - Department of Aging and Adult Services
 - People do not know about these resources
 - Bulletin/Public Boards for information regarding services
 - Mailings work
 - City clinics are great
- 3. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?**
 - No access to technology which is why mailings are helpful
 - Multiple language material
 - Isolation among seniors makes it hard to ask for help
 - Transportation issues: MUNI late
 - User friendly city processes
 - Services need to come to people
 - One stop shop type of access
- 4. If there are services that you use and you think need to be improved, how do they need to be improved?**
 - One stop shop style access
 - Mobile team from City department, i.e., HOT TEAM for elderly
 - Better education provides: culturally competent, depth of knowledge services
- 5. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?**
 - Dementia support
 - Coordination of services need to be better
 - Outreach to veterans, HIV patients
- 6. What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?**
 - Transportation that's reliable
 - Childcare
 - Job counseling/transportable skills
 - Transition with flexible work options, i.e., gig economy
 - Coaching/resume building support
 - Better understanding of seniors' skills
- 7. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?**
 - Department of Aging

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 31, 2019
Fillmore Heritage Center (District 5)

- Bulletin Boards
- Senior Centers
- Public Library
- 311
- Word of mouth social network
- Nextdoor.com

8. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?

- Information on how much can work with social security benefits
- Explanation of insurance options and benefits
- Case management assistance
- Public list of support centers
- Transparency from City
- Overwhelming process

9. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?

- More than minimum wage
- Universal healthcare would solve a lot: can work more, Canadian system I good, nationalized healthcare
- Define financially stable
- More availability of financial literacy/planning support
- Bank access/access to credit
- Moving cost for low income pop if they need to move

10. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?

- Renovate Japantown Peace Plaza
- Fixit crew needs more volunteers
- Sidewalk hazards pose issue esp. for seniors
- Dog park would alleviate dog feces on sidewalk
- Citywide campaign to clean the City

11. What do you like most and least about your neighborhood shopping area?

- Convenience/access
- Safety issues by Saint Francis Square
- Food desert for affordable groceries
- Vacancy issues

12. What are things that would build your sense of community?

- Public space for community events
- Give homeless a platform to voice their needs
- More impactful strategy to assist homeless – issue is the worst it's ever been
- Help keep people in their homes – secure housing

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 31, 2019
Fillmore Heritage Center (District 5)

13. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- Traffic congestion – better infrastructure
- Regulate Uber/Lyft drivers who double park illegally
- People don't seem to care about each other these days

Session #2

1. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?

- Income to pay rent
- Access to healthy affordable food
- Green space
- Clean water
- Mental health
- Language barriers
- Intimidation of undocumented
- No information on how to access support for new arrivals
- Crowded living situations
- Education on resources

2. How would you find out about these services?

- Bus stop ads
- Billboards
- On buses and trains
- Schools, churches, bulletin boards increase 311 awareness
- Facebook
- Radio ads
- TV ads
- Social media
- CBOs
- Public library offices

3. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?

- Stigma/fear especially in immigrant communities
- Misinformation
- Awareness
- Accessibility/long lines
- Language access of social services limited
- Mistreatment of immigrants

4. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?

- Seniors don't use tech – need more in-person outreach
- Hours and location need to be convenient: weekends, later hours

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 31, 2019
Fillmore Heritage Center (District 5)

- 5. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?**
 - Support for runaways at schools
 - Human trafficking victim support
 - No cultural sensitivity
 - Sexual harassment
 - Emergency housing/shelters for women and children
 - Holistic services for all needs so people don't have to go to different agencies
 - Opioid addiction services from CBOs
 - Culturally competent support
 - Youth development support
 - To be healthy member of society
- 6. What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?**
 - No discrimination
 - Training for moving up a career ladder
 - Success center support
 - CBO support of undocumented for fair work opportunities
 - Training within job. Coaching, mentorship
 - Investment in workers
 - Internships
 - Navigate health issues/education - eat healthy and why
 - Senior support for accessing support
- 7. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?**
 - Success centers
 - Church ministers can refer members where to go
 - Schools
 - Grocery stores/gas station
 - Advertising
- 8. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?**
 - Value workers more
 - Subsidize/more incentives to keep workers
 - Have seniors/elderly workers around
 - Training programs – soft skills
 - Offer flexibility
 - Encourage more co-ops
 - Commuter benefits
 - Preference to San Francisco residents – 1st Source expansion
- 9. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?**
 - Access to education
 - Understanding economics of investment (401K)

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 31, 2019
Fillmore Heritage Center (District 5)

- Affordable childcare
- Affordable transportation
- Reliable affordable transportation
- Managing debt support – credit cards, financial literacy
- Pay living wage
- Reasonable, reliable, accessible healthcare

10. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?

- More trees, parks, native plants, water installations, speed bumps
- Space for families to gather
- Community space – peace plaza renovation
- Road maintenance
- Public bathroom access
- Showers for homeless

11. What do you like most and least about your neighborhood shopping area?

- Food desert – unhealthy, not affordable
- High commercial rent
- More business attraction
- More availability/options of goods
- Support of mental health/homeless population would alleviate some blight
- Cleanliness is unattractive
- Parking is hard to find – break ins are an issue; tourists targeted

12. What are things that would build your sense of community?

- Communication to other communities = invite more
- Community centers with events, festivals to bring community together
- Welcome newcomers
- More language accessible
- Marketing of events
- Welcome/information center for neighborhood
- History
- Dog owner event
- Incentives for attending events
- Increase volunteer recruitment = community ambassadors
- Services at community centers

13. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- Need more services in general, i.e., youth, young adults
- Awareness of multiculturalism, health
- Empowerment of grassroots community involvement
- Communication on results of this community forum
- Addiction support
- Housing support for long term residents who may face issues re addiction, mental health

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 31, 2019
Fillmore Heritage Center (District 5)

Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?

- Good credit
- Savings, deposit
- Sufficient income
- Access to credit to take out senior lender (City)
- More affordable housing opportunities
- Help with looking for a place
- Info about lottery
- Lack of status info (phone and email)
- Access by zone/district
- Explanation of how lottery works
- Move apps. To next opportunity
- More access to housing for vets, services targeted to their special needs
- Overcrowded families, new arrivals, language services
- Assistance to fight eviction
- Policies to fight gentrification and displacement
- Inequities re: evictions v.v. housing improvements in Vis Valley
- Information and organizing support re/ land trust formation
- More communal housing

2. In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?

- Info not available/accessible re/ emergency housing for families, esp. new arrivals
- Process is long, arduous
- Income gap, more subsidized housing
- Info is difficult to locate, disjointed

3. Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities.

- Vets – need employment services, support during transition to civilian life; jobs/housing linkage
- Families – disabled members – barriers to employment + \$
- Youth – too young, no credit, emancipated youth, couch surfing
- All comes down to \$ and employment
- Lack of knowledge re/ how to get housing
- Single adults (homeless)

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 31, 2019
Fillmore Heritage Center (District 5)

- Conversion of vacant buildings to affordable housing for homeless (SRO)
 - Teaching folks re/ success in shared housing, e.g., H/P model
 - People with mental illness need other locations than Tenderloin
- 4. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified would you prefer?**
- Radio – various stations depending upon community
 - Festivals – outreach
 - Social Media – twitter, Facebook, Instagram, snapchat
 - Print Media – neighborhood news, Muni ads, other
 - Text alerts
 - Movie theaters
 - CBOs, schools, churches, community centers
- 5. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?**
- Competition – overbidding, all cash offers, investors
 - Availability – lack of supply
 - Cost – overbidding
 - Short term rentals – restrict supply
 - Access to regional opportunities - relocation
 - Poor transit hours access – barrier to homeownership outside of City
 - Cost of transit
 - FHA loan limits too low
 - Escrow close takes too long
 - Some housing needs repair first
 - Lack of regulation of market
- 6. What are the kinds of things that help people move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?**
- Peer support
 - Communal housing
 - Supportive services – e.g., case workers
 - Rental subsidies – deep or tapering
 - Lack of lottery preference for homeless, esp. folks in transition.
- 7. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
- Grass soccer fields
 - Youth activities
 - Workshop centers for youth
 - More trees, esp. in low income areas
 - More services, public bathrooms
 - Street maintenance, lighting

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 31, 2019
Fillmore Heritage Center (District 5)

- 8. What are things that would build your sense of community?**
- 9. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?**

Session #2

- 1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?**
- Money for high rents
 - Services with language access for folks with low-tech skills and experience
 - Assistance with legal status and document
 - Help with background issues: bankruptcies, convictions, evictions
 - Poor credit record – higher deposit
 - Seniors with limited income- maintenance, repairs, accessibility improvements
 - Age in place – services to support this
 - Vacancy rent control, V.V. related
 - Household members not on lease
- 2. In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?**
- Info hard to find, lack of awareness
 - 311 not promoted
 - Lack of accessibility for hearing impaired, esp. phone communication (TTY)
 - Transit for seniors and disabled to offices for services
- 3. Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities.**
- People with disabilities (mobility) lack of accessible housing
 - Very low income and cash based income – lack of documentation, creativity needed re/ verification
 - Seniors with dementia- struggle to maintain or get housing
 - Hard to find services info in one place
 - Homeless people – supportive housing with services for mentally ill/substance users
- 4. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified would you prefer?**
- Email
 - Phone calls for people without access to IT or social media
 - Churches
 - Craig's list
 - Local newspaper – foreign language locals
 - Social workers, hospitals, docs, nurses
 - Family friends

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 31, 2019
Fillmore Heritage Center (District 5)

- 5. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?**
 - Down payment
 - Property taxes – ongoing costs
 - Income limits of BMR units – narrow range for eligibility
 - Homebuying process – complicated, overwhelming
 - Cost - astronomical
- 6. What are the kinds of things that help people move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?**
 - Help/treatment re/ mental illness/addiction
 - Assistance navigating the system, knowing the resources
 - \$ for deposits, first and last month's rent, moving expenses, furniture
 - How to reach people with no address
 - Support folks re/ stigma of homelessness
- 7. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
 - More safe spaces for kids and seniors
 - San Francisco is losing its character and diversity
 - Higher development with more green open space through rezoning
 - More healthy grocery stores and other food options
 - Safer streets/paths for cycling
- 8. What are things that would build your sense of community?**
 - Adult education centers – enrichment
 - ESL classes
 - Community/neighborhood events
 - Street closures for recreational activities
 - Promote events/activities at SPL and other venues.
- 9. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?**

Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups

Notes for the Long Range Housing Planning break-out groups will be synthesized and posted on the Planning Department's website after all of the forums have taken place.

Focus Group Notes

1. African American Community
2. Arab Community
3. Cambodian Community
4. Council of Community Housing Organizations
5. Eviction Prevention & Tenant Empowerment Working Group
6. HIV Community
7. HIV Housing Providers
8. Homeowners
9. HOPE SF Hunters View Housing Community
10. HOPE SF Potrero Hill Housing Community Groups
11. HOPE SF Sunnydale Housing Community
12. Housing Action Coalition
13. Human Service Network
14. Latino Services Providers & Advocates
15. LGBTQ+ Community
16. Local Homeless Coordinating Board
17. Long Term Care Coordinating Council
18. Mayor's Disability Council
19. RAD – 1760 Bush Street Community
20. RAD – 1880 Pine Street Community
21. RAD – 18th Street Community
22. RAD – 25 Sanchez Street Community
23. RAD – 2698 California Street Community
24. RAD – 345 Arguello Street Community
25. RAD – 462 Duboce Street Community
26. RAD – 491 31st Avenue Community
27. RAD – 711 Pacific Community
28. RAD – Clementina Towers Community
29. RAD – Bernal Dwellings Housing Community
30. RAD – Hayes Valley North & South Community
31. RAD – JFK Community
32. RAD – Mission Dolores Community
33. RAD – Robert B. Pitts Community
34. RAD – Westside Courts Community
35. RAD – Woodside Community
36. Samoan Community
37. San Francisco Immigrant Legal & Education Network
38. Senior Disability Action
39. Transgender Community
40. Veterans' Comments
41. Vietnamese Community



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

African American Community Focus Group Notes

Date	3/11/2019
Location	MOHCD, Conference Room 5080
Host Organization	MOHCD and HRC African American Focus Group
# Attendees	35-40

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?
 - Sustainable employment
 - Affordable housing
 - Purchasing programming with down payment assistance
 - Housing production and retention (e.g. maintenance support, tax relief, refinancing/equity loan assistance). Production should be more community-based, emphasizing African-American ownership and occupancy
 - Certificate of preference (who is eligible expanded)
 - Preference of HIV positive folks getting into housing quicker
 - Black reforming
 - TAY/couch surfing preferences
 - Housing for teachers
 - Folks working at nonprofit services have preference
 - More awareness about resources (workforce) already available
 - Better access to getting into transitional/public housing/BMR
 - Need to know how to access the housing – what is the process?
 - Employment
 - Lower cost of living
 - Adequate income
 - Being open minded to staying with family members & maximizing benefits of that
 - COP ownership – allowing high income earners lottery preference
2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?
 - Employment/economic mobility and sustainability
 - Access to quality education
 - Mental health and education/training
 - Customer service, professionalism when dealing with African American residents
 - Helping seniors with renovations and upkeep
 - Mental health
 - Community recreation
 - Community healing
 - Being educated on navigating the housing search system
3. How would you find out about these services?
 - Through our youth access point
 - SFUSD



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Other CBOs in BVHP (YCD, SDHDC, etc.)
 - On-site services, churches, schools (primary and high school)
 - Word of mouth
 - Nextdoor
 - Community centers/CBO
 - Housing sites
 - Social media (Instagram/FB)
 - Announcements at meetings they attend
4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?
- Expanding certificate of preference to grandkids and great grandkids (also work or go to school in SF)
 - Weariness, depression, hopelessness...poor mental health overall
 - Bad experience
 - Misconceptions
 - Literacy
 - Door to door
 - Lack of awareness
 - Lack of documents
5. Do you have any suggestions for how to make our programs and services better to meet your community's need?
- Lower barriers (expand the income requirements)
 - Move waitlists faster
 - Allow subsidies to move with people
 - Need case workers (social workers) and counselors to help overcome familial/intergenerational patterns of mental incapacities
 - Build relationships
 - Customer service
 - High quality service
 - Common application
 - Hire from the community!!!
 - People to people
6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?
- Sustainable employment
 - Low cost or free mental health or supportive housing services
 - Affordable child care!
 - See above
 - Mental health closer connection
7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?
- Fix the T train
 - Add express services/shuttles
 - Free community shuttles downtown and to BART
 - Transportation is not a significant barrier in SF



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Expand the T train
 - Uber vouchers for families
 - City funded shuttles in remote areas
8. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified do you prefer?
- Emails
 - Text messages
 - At their schools
 - Health care providers' offices
 - Churches
 - Mail
 - Email
9. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?
- The down payment amount (without PMI)
 - Higher income to sustain a mortgage
 - Credit
 - Too many limitation
 - Not readily discussed as a realistic opportunity...\$\$\$
 - Need to train service providers/CBO
 - Credit and savings and wealth building
 - DALP lottery preference for COP holders
 - COP AMI gap
10. What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?
- Career preparedness that leads to a sustainable career
 - Substance abuse services
 - Child care to have consistent attendance at work to be sustainable
 - Navigation centers are really effective...support services there are best resource for navigation, thus, likely to be effective for other temporary and shelter residents
11. If you have children, what barriers do you have for them to attend a high performing public school?
- Are there any in our BVHP neighborhood???
 - Parents who are dysfunctional and no effective parenting
 - Access to childcare
 - High cost of childcare
12. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve equitable access to high performing public schools?
- Teaching housing packages
 - Teacher year-end bonuses
 - 3-5 yr. teacher contracts for consistency
 - Cultural competency professional development
 - Professional development for teachers and parents



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Family counseling, followed by parenting mentorship and conscientious school counselors
- 13.** What strategies, incentives, or policies would encourage landlords to participate in the Section 8 and other voucher programs?
- Having a liaison as a go-between landlord and tenants
 - First, last and security deposit
 - Prepaid rent for 6 months
 - Low-interest improvement loans
- 14.** What has helped you or others in your community get or keep a job?
- Warm hand offs to departments/organizations/job
 - Feedback to our organization to help keep the youth engaged/problem solve (liaison/advocate)
 - Work readiness training
 - Stable housing
 - Stable employment
- 15.** What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?
- Work with CBOs for recruitment
 - Decrease hiring times/testing time
 - Tutoring/test prep opportunities to get on the list
- 16.** What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?
- Homeownership
 - Land ownership
 - Business ownership
 - Reparations!!!
 - Stable jobs and financial counseling while living in stable housing
 - Start saving at a younger age
 - Financial education
- 17.** Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?
- Child care is paramount to anything we are trying to do; along with access to a good education.

CLOSING. Thank you again for your participation. Does anyone have any final reflections or closing thoughts?

- Type notes here
-

Arab Community Focus Group Notes

Date	March 27, 2019
Location	Arab Resource and Organizing Center
Host Organization	Arab Resource and Organizing Center
# Attendees	Lara Kiswani, E.D.

- What do your clients need to get or stay in housing?
 - Clients need to know where to find information. They need to qualify, they need support through the process, esp. with interpretation.
- Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for your clients?
 - Immigration, support with getting Calworks and other social services, the public school and community college system, work (finding jobs), free family law services
 - Healthcare. Public charge is scaring clients from getting MediCal and other government programs
- How would they find out about these services?
 - Mostly through word of mouth, clients/AROC seeks services at City departments, those departments make referrals for additional services. Clients find out from AROC. AROC's legal services are pretty well known, so they come to AROC for legal and get other referrals. AROC provides a packet of services re: programs and services.
- What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?
 - Language access. Can be difficult to find time to go to appointments because of work schedules, lack of childcare. AROC is family friendly, however. Sometimes clients don't qualify for programs, because for ex. They are not in SF, income too high, family size doesn't fit with program requirements.
 - Immigration status. Not all programs are accessible to undocumented or pending status clients
- Do you have any suggestions for how to make our programs and services better to meet your community's need?
 - Hard time knowing what City and MOHCD does, central info source is needed. AROC is relatively new to case management. There's a lot of information out there.
- Programs and services specifically for new immigrants What are the services that your clients need but have been unable to find?
 - Housing is the most common. AROC can support provide support for jobs and other services. Language interpretation, language access is difficult. Language line not that helpful because wait times, and accent and dialect is not appropriate for all. Sometimes clients' education level makes understanding interpreters challenging.
- What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?

- N/A
- If your clients wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified do they prefer?
 - Through one on one conversations. Tried sending out info (email), but it's not effective. Whats App has been useful. Can cluster recipients into groups, can use internationally. Social media helpful, for ex. Facebook.
 - Mailing resources, opportunities, and info sessions in Arabic
 - A concrete booklet of up to date services available
- If homeownership is something that your clients are considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?
 - N/A.
 - Income requirements and down payment
- What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?
 - Jobs, job security. Immigration status.
 - Programs that allow for formerly homeless to become renters
- What factors make housing opportunities welcoming to HIV+ individuals? Why?
 - N/A
- What programs or services could effectively help people with HIV improve their health?
 - N/A
- *[question repeated in Housing Providers section]* What are some ideas to create more housing for people living with HIV?
 - N/A
- If your client's have children, what barriers do you have for them to attend a high performing public school?
 - Parents don't know how to enroll their children, don't understand how to apply, enroll, and know what's available. Through AROC's advocacy, ex. Mission High has Arabic classes. Community experiences discrimination on buses, students have to commute too far (on bus)
 - Some parents have tried to change the school their kids attend for safety and quality reasons but have been unsuccessful due to address requirements
 - Students not feeling cared for or supported by the district or staff.
- Do you have any suggestions for how to improve equitable access to high performing public schools?
 - Work with community partners for outreach to community and provide education on how to enroll. City meetings are helpful, but community needs to be outreached to so they know they are happening. Have tried to work with District to help move students to different schools, but unclear on how to make this happen, little transparency around how these decisions are made. Immigrant communities are very much involved in their children's education.

- *[question repeated from HIV+ section]* What are some ideas to create more housing for people living with HIV?
 - N/A
- What strategies, incentives, or policies would encourage landlords to participate in the Section 8 and other voucher programs?
 - N/A.
- What would help developers invest in under-served neighborhoods?
 - N/A.
- **What has helped your community get or keep a job?**
 - Being employed by local business owners, but not all have capacity to hire a lot
- What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?
 - There aren't many good jobs in city for working class, like unionized jobs.
 - Provide support with getting certification to do a job since many jobs require a degree or certification
- What would your clients/community need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?
 - Immigration status, job security, low housing costs
- Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?
 - Question around how to City relates to undocumented clients, what services are or are not available. Seeing more and more young people stuck here, parents can't come because of Muslim ban, mostly Yemeni. Youth come over because cousin/ relative lives here. Family reunification difficult, makes them at risk. Youth often need to work to support families overseas, so can't finish school.

CLOSING. Thank you again for your participation. Does anyone have any final reflections or closing thoughts?

-

Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

- Type notes here

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?

- Type notes here



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

Cambodian Community Focus Group Notes

Date	3/20/2019
Location	875 O'Farrell Street
Host Organization	Cambodian Community Development Inc. (CCDI)
# Attendees	18

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?

- We come to CCDI to apply for housing. Coming here is convenient and language is available. However, the service provider is often busy helping families with children and cannot apply. Where can we go?
- The provider, Thearun at CCDI, communicates that it's difficult to serve everyone on housing needs so she refers to VYDC because staff have language capacity.
 - Brian explains that now applicant's do not need to apply in-person, but complete online
 - Not all the participants are able to use the internet to find housing, therefore they rely on Thearun to provide information on housing and others. Sometimes the participants are told by friends of services.
 - Thearun says she shares information about services to other participants and leaders in the community, including the Buddhist Temple that many of the residents attend in the Sunset.
 - Prior to working at CCDI, Thearun was working part-time with her degree in Criminology. Thearun was sought out by the Cambodian Community when they found out she can speak English and Cambodian. Now she volunteers part-time at CCDI to help the Cambodian community because she understands the need of her own community.
- One participant applied for housing, but the development was inconvenient and far away. She lives in a closet in someone's home for many years, "how can I get housing." In the past year she's applied to two sites for affordable housing, but has not heard anything back on her application. She did paper applications in the past two years. She is not able to understand online system, via Dahlia SF website online.

2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?

- Thearun is a part-time person doing social service assistance to the Cambodian population on Assistance with SSI, interpretation for doctors, mental health recommendation/interpretation, housing, etc. The participants come for most to all of these services.
- Majority of the participants are monolingual. They need help filling out government forms and translation services
- I attend the support groups here and I care for my grandchildren. I have added stress that do not have capacity to deal with mentally.

3. How would you find out about these services?

- Everybody understands Thearun is maximized. Although Thearun works part-time for CCDI, she takes work home and the clients have her personal cell phone number.



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?
 - Availability of language in Cambodian
 - Being aware of the different services provided for residents in SF and people of low income.
5. Do you have any suggestions for how to make our programs and services better to meet your community's need?
 - Attendees would like more staff that speak Cambodian to help conduct outreach, complete applications, and help with navigating through processes.
 - Have information available in Cambodian along bus routes, on the bus or neighborhood

6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?

Each participant was asked to respond to the question.

- My children live in LA and are not around to help me with completing forms for services that I need, including housing and health
- I am a new immigrant, I ended up one shelter to another shelter. The shelters are limited time, therefore they put me into a house in Richmond City. However, my husband works in SF, I received ESL classes in SF and children go to school and enrichment classes in San Francisco, so we commute every morning and evening to and from SF. My son is in high school and daughter is in middle school. We are familiar with San Francisco and how to get around. We developed relationships with teachers and friendships in San Francisco. We fear the change to start over in Richmond and finding services for my family in Richmond is difficult. My community is in San Francisco.
- Can you please help me with housing, my landlord wants me out to renovate the units. I need help to stay in my unit. I come to CCDI for translation and document completion.
- One client brings all documents, including doctor's letters and SSI, for Thearun to help with the processes.
- I come for the monthly support groups, translations, my kids live far away so I need help with completing forms.
- I have lots of problems. When I first got here, it was Thearun who helped me bring my one child from Cambodia to US. My husband had a lawyer to bring me to US first, my case was declined and the lawyers did nothing more. Thearun helped my husband to bring me here, then my son after me. My husband left for 5 years now and left to a different country. Financially, I hit rock bottom. My husband left and I did not speak English or understand the laws. My vehicle was towed, I financially couldn't pay to get my car out. More things occurred. Now I can't pay my bills and risk of getting my utilities shut off. Thearun has been able to help connect her with other services to
- I come to the support groups to help others.
- My health is deteriorating. Thearun helps me identify the issues to apply for assistance such as purchasing supplies. My husband is also blind. Mobility is challenging as I age, so I have difficulties coming to the monthly support group. The entire household needs support.
- My property owner is raising my rent and pushing me out. The landlord is telling me that she needs to leave because they are raising rent. I am in a bind because I need to find affordable housing now.
- I've been living here for quite sometime and I need to gain citizenship.
- My home has three generations in one studio apartment; this is an issue. We have only one person working in the household.



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Ever since my wife and I started attending the support group here, we feel less burden and stress. My wife has a lot of health issues. When my wife and I come here, one of the things is gaining citizenship. We heard of services through friends who were talking about depression and receiving support group services with mental health. Thearun works with RAM to provide assistance for mental health. We have lived here for 15 years now, but I just got citizenship this month (March). I failed the citizenship test the first two times I applied. I also help to take care of my grandchildren. I also have children in Cambodia, so I stress and think about them a lot. My son was able to obtain a green card here, but struggled mentally, so he went back to Cambodia. I suffer from PTSD because I was tortured during the Khmer Rouge, so I still deal with my experiences. We are waiting for my wife to get citizenship now.
 - Aside from being able to speak English, the participants expressed that the one challenge of passing their citizenship test is difficulties remembering studies for citizenship due to PTSD.
 - Thearun can help represent participants for their citizenship test. However, A doctors request, usually Chinatown Mental Health Clinic, is needed for Thearun to be able to be in the room during the interview.
 - Thearun is called to translate for the doctors directly. If there is a follow-up, the doctor's have her number to take messages for community.
 - We will go anywhere for housing in San Francisco, but it has to be safe.
 - People need funding for emergency funds, financial assistance
 - The providers response: 30-40 years later the community is still struggling. There is limited support as the older generation ages.
 - I really want to reunite with my son who has been deported. Even if for visiting rights, my husband passed away and could not come to his father's funeral.
7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?
- We have free passes, so no issues with transportation cost. Most of the attendees qualify for senior free passes SFMTA.
 - Woman who commutes from Richmond City to SF: "My kids pay 100% for their BART passes to go back home. Dolly referenced discount for low-income youth, so VYDC and CCDI will assist with her to apply for discount on BART at 50%.
 - We had a lot of wrong destinations. The participants are familiar with the neighborhoods with stops and familiarity of the area, rather than smart phones
8. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified do you prefer?
9. How do we give you information for services??? Facebook, word of mouth, CCDI (Thearun), community groups, Buddhist temple on Lincoln.
10. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?
- Type notes here
11. What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?
- Type notes here



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

12. Based on your personal experience or knowledge do you agree that rising housing prices in San Francisco is making racial segregation and the concentration of poverty in San Francisco better or worse? If so, how else do you think could be the causes of this segregation and concentration of poverty aside from high housing prices?
 - Type notes here
13. If you have children, what barriers do you have for them to attend a high performing public school?
 - My daughter is a single mom and we've had support coming to the house to ensure that my granddaughter is caught up with class
 - With my grandkids, everything is sufficient
14. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve equitable access to high performing public schools?
 - Type notes here
15. What has helped you or others in your community get or keep a job?
 - I want a job, but since I do not speak English it's been challenging. I attend to school full-time.
 - Private businesses reach out to Thearun to find employees from Cambodian Community, however they need staff that speak English and Citizenship. The employers do not want to train as well, therefore language barriers restrict them from getting a job.
 -
16. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?
 - Education first to learn English, then will be able to find other jobs (Donut shop, grocery store)
 - VYDC tries to support, but when there's time, the staff will try to help. However, the staff is specifically working on their assignments funded by MOHCD or other city departments
17. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?
 - Type notes here
18. Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?
 - Type notes here

What's been your experience applying for low-income housing or affordable housing?

- Thearun completed many forms, completing credit checks; The tenants have paid for the credit checks and do not get any explanation of why they did not qualify.
- Last year Thearun helped me apply. I applied two times, but was not chosen for any units.
- My son lived with me and qualified for the lottery, but not sure if he meets income level now
- I have HUD Section 8 housing voucher in a three bedroom home, but it's still not enough to help pay for rent. I pay \$2,000 outside of Section 8 subsidize. My daughter works but we still do not have enough to make rent. My daughter was paid a bit more, so the Housing Authority decreased our subsidy. Now our rents are increased
- The attendees do not understand that they need to meet a minimum income requirement to qualify for the BMR lottery of specific developments

CLOSING. Thank you again for your participation. Does anyone have any final reflections or closing thoughts?

- Type notes here



Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

-

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?

- Type notes here



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

CCHO Focus Group Notes

Date	2/27/19
Location	1180 Howard Street (8 th & Howard) Community Room
Host Organization	Council of Community Housing Organizations
# Attendees	14 (excluding MOHCD staff – Dan Adams & Teresa Yanga)

1. What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?
 - Lack of permanent housing
 - Lack of truly (i.e. deeply) affordable units
 - Change of prioritization of shelter beds from the street for chronically homeless versus pregnant homeless woman
2. What factors make housing opportunities welcoming to HIV+ individuals? Why?
 - (No answers given)
3. What programs or services could effectively help people with HIV improve their health?
 - Access to health care through the housing, i.e. on-site healthcare through a program or person available onsite so don't have to travel
 - Proximity to services (similar to TCAC scoring for proximity to services), including access to transit to get their medical appointments/medical services
4. Based on your experience with people applying for housing, what size units (i.e. number of bedrooms), are in highest demand and should be built in San Francisco?
 - Veterans need smaller size units
 - Family size – 3 bedrooms***
 - Units larger than 2-bedrooms to accommodate families
 - Cost considerations where families prefer (or income doesn't meet the income requirements) smaller units based on cost even though they may qualify for larger units
 - Finding that size of units is smaller by square footage in the market rate side
5. What strategies, incentives, or policies would encourage landlords to participate in the Section 8 and other voucher programs?
 - SDA finding housing listings accepting Section 8 vouchers in other counties but not in SF due to more money from non-voucher holders
 - Can City help with the timing of voucher payments immediately available to landlords?
 - Possibly have the City pre-pay the rent payments?
 - Possibly have fees waived for developers who are willing to commit a block of units for Section 8 for a period of time? i.e. inclusionary housing requirements?
 - Discrimination against Section 8 voucher holders is hard to prove, so can the City change the local law to enforce non-discrimination?



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Reduce the paperwork burden on landlords
 - Allowing Section 8s for non-traditional housing like co-ops?
6. Are there specific housing program or application requirements that you think hinder specific populations (i.e. persons with disabilities, immigrants, communities of color) from accessing affordable housing or should be changed to so that more diverse communities can access them?
- AMI levels
 - DAHLIA hopefully has diversified the applicant pool, but how are people accessing DAHLIA?
 - People get demoralized when people have to continuously apply so could people opt-in to be automatically apply for all housing opportunities to ease the application burden
 - Process, knowledge and treatment by property management varies greatly from leasing agent to leasing agent so it needs to be standardized**
 - Back-end needs to be easier\ once someone is selected in a lottery – need more than 5 days to collect documentation
 - Some consultants helping BMR property owners are not good
 - Need to be upfront of how good an applicant's odds are to win a lottery, i.e. odds are ____, to level set expectations
 - Can't assume everyone is technology-savvy or have access to internet
 - Language access is huge
 - Cannot assume that everyone knows about the DAHLIA – need to truly do outreach to community
 - some applications for housing are done by phone so not all applications done through DAHLIA
 - Strictness of income requirements disqualifies people, i.e. someone picks up a part-time job or self-employment***
 - why are there 2 ways to calculate self-employment income? Or taking the highest of the income for what people made last year even though their income dropped significantly this current year
7. In your opinion are new developments being marketed to the right/enough people? Are there individuals or groups of people that have an interest in affordable housing that are not being reached?
- Need to put up flyers to inform the community since not everyone has internet access
8. What would help affordable housing developers invest in higher opportunity neighborhoods?
- Free land or use of publicly-owned land
 - Need leadership of the district supervisor
 - Need to identify sites of a specific size like grocery stores or owned by tax-exempt organizations like churches
 - MOHCD needs to consider looking at smaller sites
 - Have resources like the contact information of property owners for sites in higher opportunity areas available to developers



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

9. Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?
- Don't just tie some sites to private development so that there's more reliable funding sources
 - Direct funding from non-traditional pools to incentivize development on those sites
 - Are there more things the City can do push the 20% affordable inclusionary requirements to 50% AMI rather than the inclusionary housing requirement range?

CLOSING. Thank you again for your participation. Does anyone have any final reflections or closing thoughts?

- Type notes here

Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

- Type notes here

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?

- Type notes here



Eviction Prevention and Tenant Empowerment Focus Group Notes

Date	January 4, 2019
Location	MOHCD Conference Room 5080
Host Organization	Eviction Prevention & Tenant Empowerment Working Group
# Attendees	25

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?

Suggestions: information about rental opportunities, assistance with applications, high paying job, better credit, first and last month rent, moving help, help paying my rent, an accessible unit, healthy food options, medical services, childcare, social services, better transportation, better school options, help with preventing eviction, help dealing with my landlord, down payment assistance, homeownership counseling, repairs to my home, modifications to make my home easier to get around, foreclosure assistance, help paying my mortgage, help paying my HOA dues

- Affordable rent
- All of the above (from our suggestions)
- Legal services employment law
- Livable wages
- Legal representation and tenants' rights, especially for tenants living in rent-controlled units
- More services in supportive housing, especially mental health supportive services
- Emergency rental assistance
- Third-party payee services
- More health care at home, to remain at home
- Subsidies for units exempted from rent control due to Costa Hawkins
- Affordable and accessible childcare
- Habitability repairs

2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?

- Mental health services
- Substance abuse services
- Civil legal assistance, including affirmative legal services
- Language support
- Childcare and aftercare
- Third-party payee services
- Public benefits assistance
- Elder and disability services

3. How would you find out about these services?

- Churches
- Mouth-to-mouth (friends and neighbors)



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Schools
 - Courts
 - SSI and other benefits offices
 - Language accessible flyers and other outreach materials
 - Networking through organizations
 - Adult Protective Services, Sheriff's Office
 - Libraries
 - Internet
 - Ads on MUNI
 - Ads on reusable shopping bags
 - Hospitals
4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?
- Technology (for instance, seniors having trouble using DAHLIA)
 - Citizenship status
 - Working families who can't access services during the day from M-F, 8-5
 - Strict or oppressive criteria for accessing services
 - Language barriers
 - Disability-related barrier – physical and mental/emotional
 - Location of services (travel duration)
 - Public charge (barrier for immigrants who are afraid to access services)
 - Excessive bureaucracy and systems (difficult to navigate)
 - Restrictions based on state laws (Costa Hawkins)
 - Capacity of service providers
 - Federal funding restrictions
5. Do you have any suggestions for how to make our programs and services better to meet your community's need?
- Connecting/networking/aligning with other service providers, such as with Bar Association
 - No reporting or easier reporting
 - More resources specifically for undocumented immigrants/families
 - Personal connections with City departments
 - Continuing to focus on in-person services (not apps or online services) that are culturally relevant
6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?
- Interpretation and translation services
 - Payee services
 - Long-term substance abuse treatment
 - Housing search services for people with Section 8 vouchers
 - Supportive services, particularly hoarding/cluttering and dealing with bed-bug issues
 - Services for people with service animals, care for the animals
 - Mental health services for youth (and for all), and in languages other than English
 - Shelter and housing
 - Emergency housing for families, transitional housing



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Mainstream banking services and assistance avoiding predatory lending schemes (financial education and services)
 - Healthy, affordable and accessible food
7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?
- Low price or free access for low-income people for MUNI
 - More parking
 - Safer cycling (more bike lanes)
 - Reliable, well-planned transportation (lines that connect easily) that actually gets people from where they live to where they need to go
 - Better paratransit
 - Working elevators and escalators in stations
 - Assistance/educational resources for planning routes
 - More accurate schedule for MUNI
 - City support for funded agencies to give tokens, taxi fare, etc. when referring clients to other organizations so they can get to their next appointment at another organization
 - Regional planning/synchronicity and police oversight
 - Forgiveness program for transportation fines
8. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified do you prefer?
- Churches
 - Promoters
 - Flyers
 - Social media (Facebook)
 - Radio
 - Schools
 - One, centralized website with all opportunities
 - Text
 - Same as responses to Question #3
 - Post in reception area of service providers
 - Mailings
 - Town hall meetings
 - DAHLIA notifications
9. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?
- Price
 - Down payment
 - Limited housing stock
 - Financing and underwriting/mortgages
 - Competing with cash offers and multiple offers
 - Housing stock often does not comply with State foster care requirements
 - Cost of maintaining house
 - Property taxes



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Lack of knowledge
- 10.** What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?
- Subsidies
 - Stable job
 - Security deposits
 - Forgiveness of past renter problems/evictions (sealing records)
 - Credit score
 - Asking about credit and past evictions
 - Strict, unreasonable and sometimes unlawful renting criteria by landlords (housing discrimination)
 - Trauma informed services and violence prevention services
 - Lack of affordable housing prices (leads to moving out of the City)
 - Signing up for eligible benefits
 - More social workers to help clients in shelters with housing search
- 11.** If you have children, what barriers do you have for them to attend a high performing public school?
- Current SFUSD lottery system
 - Access to transportation
 - Improve performance at all public schools, improve teacher salaries and resources for all San Francisco public schools
 - Improve school-based support such as health and mental health services
 - Neighborhoods with lots of families facing housing insecurity means more turnovers in students, and parents too stressed to be very involved in schools; these other needs prevent parents from accessing high performance schools
 - Parents may have mental health issues and may have difficulties navigating the system
- 12.** Do you have any suggestions for how to improve equitable access to high performing public schools?
- System difficult to navigate for parents with mental health disabilities, or who work multiple jobs/long hours
 - De-biasing training for staff and teachers
 - More support for students with mental disabilities (and their families) in how to navigate system
 - The needs at home are the needs at school
 - Parent engagement and empowerment
 - Therapy and mental health services in schools related to trauma, harassment and housing instability
- 13.** What strategies, incentives, or policies would encourage landlords to participate in the Section 8 and other voucher programs?
- Landlords often view these programs are dysfunctional and too difficult to deal with
 - Providing education and technical support to landlords to help them follow the rules and be effective landlords
 - Payee services for tenant portion
 - Section 8 FMR level is still too low (below market rate)



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Funding for habitability standards improvements
- Publication of success stories (by HomeBase) (to help combat the negative stories that predominate)
- Provide better incentives (perhaps a tax credit to landlords)
- For shorter term subsidies, funding for landlord if landlord needs to repair damages

14. What has helped you or others in your community get or keep a job?

- Living wage
- Job training programs only for jobs that are actually available/hiring
- Jobs that are close to home
- Back-up child care and "odd hour" care
- Paid internships
- Transportation
- Basic job training (what does it require to get and keep a job)
- Continued mentorship and coaching for keeping a job
- Support while in a job to advance to better job (from survival job with no benefits, no fixed hours, etc. to stable job with benefits, stability, good skill development)
- Education for employers to provide a work environment that is free of bad conditions, harassment, etc.

15. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?

- Incentives for employers to hire "difficult to hire" residents
- Incentives to hire SF residents, within local community
- De-bias training and discrimination training for employers
- Long-term support for clients who have navigated workforce development programs
- Provide incentives for employers to hire within the community
- Training for starting a business
- More internships and mentors by City employees
- Support for monolingual residents
- Supporting employees after a business closes
- Protection for small business owners/nonprofits from displacement

16. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?

- Not being under constant fear of losing housing/job
- Living wage and protections against wage and hour theft
- How to open savings and IRA accounts
- Legal services for estate planning
- Stable rents so you can plan
- Debt consolidation programs with no interest
- Savings match
- Education for those living on public benefits as to what their wealth-building options are
- Emergency low-interest loan options that are not predatory
- Clean Slate record expungement and reentry assistance
- Real living wage
- Penalties and fines are much harder on low-income residents



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- A San Francisco public bank that provides low no interest loans
- Consumer education (reverse mortgages, financial products, purchasing cars and other costly items, etc.)
- Addressing systemic issues, including racism and discrimination

17. Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- "What kind of city do you want to live in? How do we want to get there?"
- Staff turnover rate due to low salaries and stress/trauma in nonprofits, particularly in shelters; City should look at contracting that includes pay increases
- Evictions that result in people leaving SF (very difficult to return to SF if you have been displaced from the City)
- Ask these questions to youth
- Keeping the socio-economic mix in each neighborhood
- What's working? What's not working?
- Why do you want to live in SF?
- Keeping people in the City
- Questions about people who have already been displaced. How do we help already displaced persons (living on the streets)? How do we get them back into housing?
- Housed and homeless people need mental health and substance abuse services
- Ideal to have behavioral or mental health specialists on site at each service provider; HAP is an excellent model
- Solutions beyond the development of new affordable housing units



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

HIV Community Focus Group Notes

Date	
Location	
Host Organization	San Francisco AIDS Foundation
# Attendees	

Tonight's conversations will help shape the work of six plans for three departments:

- **Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)**
Provides financing for affordable housing in San Francisco, coordinates the City's housing policies, and invests in diverse and underserved communities.
- **Office of Economic and Workforce Development**
Supports San Francisco's ongoing economic health by strengthening its workforce, and its businesses and commercial areas.
- **Planning Department**
Manages long range planning, reviewing development applications, assessing environmental impacts, and preserving historic resources.

The three MOHCD plans:

- **HIV Housing Plan** focuses on housing-related programs for people living with HIV.
- **Consolidated Plan** is the primary MOHCD plan that identifies affordable housing and community development needs and priorities.
- **Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing** looks at ways to improve fair housing issues.

Your responses:

1. Help us understand affordable housing and community service needs
2. Inform our strategic plans
3. Guide our funding priorities

Community agreements:

- We'll be discussing some subjects tonight that people are passionate about. We'd like to establish some ground rules/agreement so we can make sure everyone has a chance to participate and be heard.
 - Assume the best intentions from others
 - Speak one at a time, do not interrupt others
 - Respect confidentiality
 - Silence your phone, take urgent calls outside
 - Stick to the topic
 - Practice "step up; step back"



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

To take a survey, and to learn more about our outreach and about how we use your input, please go to:

<https://sfmohcd.org/get-involved>

THANK YOU!

HIV HOUSING FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS

1. What do you or your family need to get or stay in housing?
Protective status for those who have been here a long time.

Subsidy for where I already live.

Having section 8 voucher didn't protect from investor evicting tenants and then there was a time limit on how long I had to find another resident, with all the requirements. Needed to re-apply for a new voucher.

Get rid of Ellis Act

2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important to you?

50+ and other social engagement

Transportation – free transit on Clipper

Openhouse

PRC

Food banks

Parks and community gardens

Emergency financial support with utilities

Food vouchers

ALRP

Comcast subsidized wi-fi

STRUT – physical space for community events

GLBT Community Center

Botanical gardens

AIDS Memorial Grove – sacred spaces

Showers for those in cars

3. How would you find out about these services?

Social workers

Flyers on windshield

Project Open hand bulletin board

BAR

Meet up



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Next door app

4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services that would meet those needs?

Not knowing about it

Shortage of resources

Personally challenged – mentally or physically

Clothing in winter – bad weather challenges

Consolidation of resources that are easy to access – newspapers, bulletin boards

Navigation points, centralized contact point

Case workers

5. How could we make those programs and services better meet the community's need?

Social workers familiar with services

Peer resource support, counseling

Companion pets

6. What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?

Paratransit, UBER, Lyft (contract with city for access by needy)

Support for bicycle use

Clipper card

Cell phone classes (not part of this but noted)

7. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of notification would you prefer?

DAHLIA

Phone, email or text

Newspaper

50+, library and other organizations

8. What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?

Nowhere to move to

Finances

Changing circumstances

Support for clean and sober living and skills to come clean



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Management of subsidized housing to eliminate discomfort of unit environment

9. What factors make housing opportunities welcoming to HIV+ individuals? Why?

Safety

Quiet

Housing as a right

Personal outdoor space

Liaison between building management and management being respectful and knowledgeable of HIV

Good transportation

Good floor plan

10. What programs or services could effectively help people with HIV improve their health?

Gym vouchers

Psychological services

Mental health

Economic support

Universal income

Social workers

11. What are some ideas to create more housing for people living with HIV?

Allow to buy-in

Build more

Eating children

Eminent domain for Pacific Heights

Housing in the Presidio

Housing on Treasure Island

More housing along accessible routes

12. What has helped you get or keep a job?

Training

Professional development

PRC

Job re-training

Simpler process and jobs for less aggressive careers

Job readiness, resume workshops

13. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

- Free tuition
- Jobs by big tech companies for retired and not just young people
- Code Tenderloin
- Gig economy
- More resources for older populations
- Mandates for older persons

14. What would you need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?

- Some type of assistance for transitioning from retiring from retirement check to new job in order to qualify for housing
- Subsidy for housing and making it more affordable
- Financial education
- Eliminates assets tests
- Realistic tests for means social realities

15. Is there anything else that we should have asked?

- Special category for HIV needs
- More activism and anger



HIV Housing Provider Focus Group Notes

Date	02/06/2019
Location	
Host Organization	HIV Housing Provider Focus Group Notes
# Attendees	

1. What do your clients and their families need to get or stay in housing?

- Housing! Affordable no more than 30% income
- Housing subsidies
- Meaningful housing
- Mental health/ substance abuse services
- Housing search support ex. Realtor
- Moving expenses- physically moving
- Money management for rent
- Coordinated strategy to address individuals needs
- Connection to community
- Safety (neighborhood exposure)
- Housing + workforce development (on-site)
- Consider aging population- priced out of healthcare + housing
- Access to medical services
- Preparation to be housed
- Creativity
- Housing public health issue

2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important to them?

- Hoarding
- Isolation
- Intensive case management services
- High-quality access to primary care
- Robust harm-reduction
- Shelters permit legal syringes
- Norcan
- Wellness checks

3. How would they find out about these services?

- Trust based, word of mouth- peers \$\$
- Services available in accessible places

4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services that would meet those needs?



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Lack of capacity in system
 - Level of disability preventing engagement
 - Easing access points
 - Stigma/ disclosing
 - Hours of operation
 - Evening hours mobile van visiting encampments
5. **How could we make those programs and services better meet the community's need?**
6. **What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?**
- Safety
 - Ridesharing
 - Make it free
 - Escorting clients to from appointments (doctor appointments)
 - Accessibility to individuals with disabilities
 - Crime/ policies presence
7. **If you're wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of notification would they prefer?**
- Case manager/ provider
 - Text alerts (if phone)
 - Being honest about housing odds
8. **What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?**
- Location (proximity to services, safety risk, staying in community)
 - County –by-county benefits (moving = loss of benefits)
 - Increase in both affordable + accessible housing
 - Income eligibility discrepancy (doesn't match SSI)
9. **What factors make housing opportunities welcoming to HIV + individuals? Why?**
- Other queer people
 - Sense of community
 - Choice
 - Run by community
 - Professionalism
 - Cultural humility
 - Affordable (30%)
 - Inclusion- not solely on basis of POS
 - On-site services
 - Roommates/ not only single unit (youth)
 - Inclusive "family" definition
10. **What programs or services could effectively help people with HIV improve their health?**



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Improving case management (navigating medical care)
- Stable housing
- Affordable food/ community meals

11. What are some ideas to create more housing for people living with HIV?

- Insurance companies (housing = health care)
- City funded section 8 (no HUD regulations)
- Provide in land trust (small sites)
- Incentivizing landlords to increase affordable housing

General comments:

- Recognizing investing in expertise/ organizations
- Support existing programs
- Tie goals to existing plans

Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

- Type notes here

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?

- Type notes here



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

Homeowners' Focus Group Notes

Date	March 27, 2019
Location	1 South Van Ness, 5 th Floor
Host Organization	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
# Attendees	

1. Do you or your family have any needs to be able to stay in your home?
 - HOA is not good. Ongoing increases. HOA is almost as high as my mortgage. Increases seem luxury. Every year increase almost 10% each year. +
 - HOA is more than 50% of my mortgage.
 - Service elevator and lighting issues in older building
 - Increase in HOA caused me to get a second job.
 - Cannot sustain increases in HOA
2. Do you have any suggestions for how to make our programs and services better to meet your needs?
 - I would like to attend workshops but they are inconveniently located. Not accessible by public transportation.
 - Some neighborhoods are getting priced out. Instead of markets and useful stores there are yoga studios, etc.
 - People don't know about programs. Teachers don't know about our programs.
 - Estimated monthly costs of homeownership units when marketing.
 - SF Librarians didn't know about program. Other agencies should know about our programs
 - We should target First responders so they can live in our City.
3. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?
 - Affordable Childcare facilities for working parents; income based +
 - "I don't know what I don't know" I feel like there are probably things out there that I'm not aware of.
 - City college offering free classes is great educational services
 - Job counseling
 - Gap between city sponsored health care and middle-income households. Healthcare is our 2nd biggest expense.
4. How would you find out about these services?
 - Friends. Word of mouth.
 - LGBT Center. Community groups.
 - Mortgage broker.
5. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?
 - Lots of services but it is all separated. Not in one place. We need a one stop shop for all City services



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

6. Are there any services that you need but have been unable to find?
 - Need help negotiating refinance
7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?
 - Potrero hill. Not much transportation. 19 and 10 buses only. Unreliable
 - No direct access to the beach or sunset area. Needs an express bus to move across neighborhoods
 - Muni direct from west portal to embarcadero turning into one train
8. Do you agree that rising housing prices are causing racial segregation and the concentration of poverty in San Francisco? If not, what else could be the causes aside from high housing prices?
 - Can we have people that we need in the city who can afford it
 - Potrero building is changing the neighborhood. Tech industry workers moving in pushing out everyone else.
 - I live in the Mission. It is drastically changing every day. More Latin's moving out. Neighborhood is looking very different
 - Yes, rising prices causing people to move. When you work here and commute in you are trading low housing costs for long commute.
 - People have to do two or three jobs just to stay in the City. Wages don't rise with the cost of living. That impacts racial segregation as well.
 - More homeless because everyone is getting pushed out of their homes. High housing costs trickle down to cause homelessness
9. If you have children, what barriers do you have for them to attend a high performing public school?
 - School lottery process
 - Lottery put my daughter in a school where she is a minority. No one else that looks like her or speaks her language or shares cultural similarities
10. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve equitable access to high performing public schools?
 - All of the schools should have great education. Teachers are struggling to do the number one most important job. Buying their own pencils, etc. we should focus more on our teachers then all schools will be better.
 - Financial parity among all schools in the district.
11. What has helped you or others in your community get or keep a job?
 - Standard work ethics
 - Networking events
12. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?
 - Best job market in the us being filled by people outside of sf. City should do better to fill that demand through improved education and skill building opportunities
13. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?
 - Retirement planning and resources to manage financial planning ++
 - Youth/high school financial education part of high school curriculum or extra curriculars



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Budget planning after purchase. Post purchase counseling and assistance
- Tips for financial planning/accounting consultation – buying bonds
- People have to live a practical lifestyle and it doesn't come natural to everyone
- Trustworthy source for financial planning and investments

14. Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- Trade up within the program for growing families – a program ladder+++
- Program for resales for City to purchase quickly and sell to new buyer
- Design of some units is not desirable
- Home improvement loan for repairs
- Upkeep of BMR buildings not in parity with market rate units
- There are some BMR units being rented +
- First mortgage loans are sold to new banks/servicers that can't find payments

CLOSING. Thank you again for your participation. Does anyone have any final reflections or closing thoughts?



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

Hope SF Hunters View Community Focus Group Notes

Date	January 28, 2019
Location	901 Fairfax Ave. SF, CA 94124
Host Organization	MOHCD
# Attendees	22

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?
 - Muni services in community (seniors)
 - Safety and safe passage
 - More maintenance
 - \$\$
 - Education
 - Affordable housing
 - Protection/ accountability for all
 - Jobs (meaningful)
 - Larger and gated parks
 - Recreation activities for kids
 - 5 key buses
 - Gated community and speed bumps
 - Crossing guards
2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?
 - Family outings
 - Programming re: how to respect self and others (anti –bullying)
 - Larger play structure (prom park)
 - Wrap- around services
 - Substance use programs
 - Domestic violence programs
 - Counseling services (long-term)
 - Community events
 - Community garden (LARGE)
 - Candy house
 - Pop. Up stores
3. How would you find out about these services?
 - Newsletter
 - Flyers
 - YMCA
 - Social media
 - Word of mouth
 - Constant outreach



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Boys & Girls Club
 - 311
 - Community boards (in common areas)
4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?
 - Lack of computers/ technology
 - Lack of access to common areas
 - Waiting until the last minute
 - People need to read literature
 - Engage in reading
 5. Do you have any suggestions for how to make our programs and services better to meet your community's need?
 - Everyone could clean up their respective floors/ areas
 - Add garbage cans outside of building
 - Poop scooper bags
 6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?
 - Better evacuation plan for residents (esp. disabled and seniors)
 - Free access to the public pool
 - Access to long term mental health SVCS
 - Rent payee program
 - Affordable housing (at all income levels)
 - Ownership housing opportunities
 - Training at HV about DAHLIA
 7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?
 - More parking
 - Neighborhood parking stickers
 8. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified do you prefer?
 - Mail
 - Email
 - Each site has its own website where residents can find out what's going on
 9. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?
 - Need affordable house ownership app in HV
 - High costs
 - Excellent credit
 - Need community to be safer
 - Education on the process
 10. What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Stabilized well-paying job
 - Substance use
 - Mental health
 - Intergenerational trauma
 - Bad credit
11. If you have children, what barriers do you have for them to attend a high performing public school?
- Transportation
 - Safety
 - Better early education (pre-mid)
12. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve equitable access to high performing public schools?
- All schools should have the platform- high performing so they can succeed
 - Make sure parents are educated
 - Homework hubs (at each HOPE SF sites)
 - Work not play
 - Should be able to attend school in community
13. *[question repeated from HIV+ section]* What are some ideas to create more housing for people living with HIV?
- Type notes here
14. What strategies, incentives, or policies would encourage landlords to participate in the Section 8 and other voucher programs?
- Type notes here
15. What would help developers invest in under-served neighborhoods?
- Type notes here
16. What has helped you or others in your community get or keep a job?
- Trying to build a better life
 - Transportation
 - Education
 - More \$\$
 - Accountability
 - Dreaming
17. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?
- Better process (city jobs)
 - Lower income people
 - Tie jobs to children who need jobs (safe passage)
 - End turf battles
 - Make the process easier to be a city employee
 - Training
18. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- More \$\$
- Ownership opportunities
- Habitat opportunities
- More business opportunities

19. Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- Health
- Quality healthcare
- Inclusiveness in every community

CLOSING. Thank you again for your participation. Does anyone have any final reflections or closing thoughts?

- Type notes here

Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

- Type notes here

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?

- Type notes here



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

Potrero Housing Focus Group Notes Group 1

Date	March 19, 2019
Location	Potrero
Host Organization	Bridge/ MOHCD
# Attendees	

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?
 - Getting the truth about: rules, SF Housing Authority
 - Transparency
 - More options + housing choices
 - Transportation equity: Muni availability
 - Consideration for elderly + disabled housing need
 - More information
 - Resources for help with literacy
 - More onsite resources for residents
 - Eviction resources for public housing residents
 - Collaboration with agencies
2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?
 - Legal
 - Safety
 - Case management
 - Literacy
 - Education: Kids, Adults
 - Community management/ information
 - Cultural connections: ways to be together and share similarities across cultures
 - Mutual respect
 - Activities available at different times: more frequent
3. How would you find out about these services?
 - Public kiosk
 - The NABE
 - Flyers
 - More strategies to reach more people
 - Face to face interactions
 - Reminders about event (phone)
 - Instagram/ social media
 - Hope SF app
 - Paper communications
 - Hope SF newspaper
 - New leadership



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?
 - Literacy
 - Computer literacy
 - Childcare
 - Other appointments at that time
 - Transportation: buses rerouted, some parts especially are cut off
 - Geography/ location of services especially on Missouri/ annex
 - Safety and security, walkways for later meetings
 - Consistent location
5. Do you have any suggestions for how to make our programs and services better to meet your community's need?
6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?
 - Gym
 - Childcare
 - Careers
 - Benefits: retirement insurance
 - Cultural connectedness
 - Healing spaces
 - Safe space to discuss personal issues/ advice center
 - Parking
 - Access to these. Amount of these.
 - Domestic violence/ crime victim services
 - Informational hotspots for flyers + notices
7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?
 - More buses/ we are underserved by muni
 - Dialogue with all voices, for equity
 - Direct communication with Muni leaders
 - Bus shelters- (rain)
 - Regular feedback + accountability
8. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified do you prefer?
 - US mail
 - Direct communication
 - Email
 - Text
 - Universal workshop- pathways to homeownership
9. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?
 - Ongoing, regular workshops
 - Cost: fees, down payment



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- More units
 - Expectations + disappointment
 - Realistic income limits
 - Income/ career
 - Help with mobility to other areas
- 10.** What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?
- Type notes here
- 11.** If you have children, what barriers do you have for them to attend a high performing public school?
- Type notes here
- 12.** Do you have any suggestions for how to improve equitable access to high performing public schools?
- Money
 - Transportation
 - Scholarships
 - Access to charter schools KIPP
 - Equitable information @opportunities made available at schools
 - Parent advocacy
- 13.** What strategies, incentives, or policies would encourage landlords to participate in the Section 8 and other voucher programs?
- Parent advocacy
 - Abundant information to all parents & in all communities
 - Resource library
 - Increased leadership
 - Computer access for research
- 14.** What would help developers invest in under-served neighborhoods?
- Attentiveness
 - Training
 - Motivation
 - Positive attitude (removal of) barriers
 - Family
 - Community connectedness
 - Childcare / early preschool + school readiness
 - Barrier removal
 - Barrier: tracking, preferential treatment for some programs
- 15.** What has helped you or others in your community get or keep a job?
- Training- lengthy + thorough
 - Paid work experience
 - Apprenticeships
 - On-the-job training
 - On site counselors



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Exportation assistance
- Removing unnecessary job requirements for education level
- Barrier removal
- Interview attire

16. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?

- Loan forgiveness
- Credit
- Better paying jobs
- Entrepreneurship
- Rebuilding our community
- Investments in people of the community

17. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?

- Type notes here

18. Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- Type notes here

CLOSING. Thank you again for your participation. Does anyone have any final reflections or closing thoughts?

- Type notes here

Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

- Type notes here

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?

- Type notes here



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

Potrero Housing Group Notes Group 2

Date	March 19, 2019
Location	Potrero
Host Organization	Bridge/ MOHCD
# Attendees	

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?
 - Lots of money
 - Flexible on income levels
 - Security deposits
 - Parking space
 - More senior housing
 - More documented in Spanish in other language
 - More affordable HSG @ more income levels
 - Mixed status housing affordable rents
 - Clear process to get AH
 - People need a clear system
2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?
 - Middle school in neighborhood (Potrero)
 - Mental health support
 - Free WIFI
 - Better + more open space + recreation opportunities
 - Access to health care
 - Access to affordable childcare
 - Convenient food shopping
 - Dedicated gyms (free)
 - The community needs a new community center with cooking classes, adult education classes, community meetings, and a place together with seniors, children, and youth. A place for neighbors to hangout that is safe; a place to meet friends
 - A center/ place to play bridge, activities seniors want to do together to get out of the house that is safe in the neighborhood. Right now, seniors have to go across the City to the center at the Fisherman's wharf in Maritime building
3. How would you find out about these services?
 - Social media
 - Networking
 - Publicizing through public schools (PTA, fliers, conferences)
 - Robust neighborhood council
 - Person @ library or community center that knows what is available + happening in each neighborhood



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- If City knew about HH incomes, it would reach out to all that could qualify
 - Sunday streets (street fairs)
 - Pop-up info booths
4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?
 - Tons of numbers that no one answers the number
 - Make services available outside business hours
 - Get smart about job description + scope of work
 - More work opportunities for people in the neighborhood
 5. Do you have any suggestions for how to make our programs and services better to meet your community's need?
 6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?
 7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?
 - More of it! BART, Muni, more lines more seats
 - Other ways to get across the Bay without a car (more ferries)
 - Safer, cleaner transit
 - More options for hilly neighborhoods
 - Cable cars in the air. Be innovative.
 8. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified do you prefer?
 9. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?
 - \$\$\$\$
 - Stable job
 - Loan qualification
 - Cost of living outpaces housing cost
 - Enough \$ beyond the home
 - HOA fees increases
 - Not enough BMR's
 - Affordable bounds are too rigid
 - City needs to take advantage of public land
 10. What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?
 - Type notes here
 11. What factors make housing opportunities welcoming to HIV+ individuals? Why?
 - Type notes here
 12. What programs or services could effectively help people with HIV improve their health?
 - Type notes here



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

13. *[question repeated in Housing Providers section]* What are some ideas to create more housing for people living with HIV?
- Type notes here
14. If you have children, what barriers do you have for them to attend a high performing public school?
- Limited seats
 - Not every neighborhood has high performing schools
 - Lottery system needs improvements
 - Prioritize neighborhood residents
 - Summer programs
 - After school care
 - Pre-school
15. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve equitable access to high performing public schools?
- Type notes here
16. *[question repeated from HIV+ section]* What are some ideas to create more housing for people living with HIV?
- Type notes here
17. What strategies, incentives, or policies would encourage landlords to participate in the Section 8 and other voucher programs?
- Type notes here
18. What would help developers invest in under-served neighborhoods?
- Type notes here
19. What has helped you or others in your community get or keep a job?
- Education
 - Livable wages
 - Transportation
 - Workforce development on service sector + trade jobs
 - Free resume services, etc. (JVS)
20. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?
- Compensation commensurate to cost of living
 - More transparency for City jobs
 - Residents with incarceration need some service- need special training, assist businesses with background checks
 - Corporate sponsored job training
 - \$\$ from corporation to go back into working people's lives in SF
 - Large internship programs for ALL AGES
21. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?
- Type notes here



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

22. Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- Type notes here

CLOSING. Thank you again for your participation. Does anyone have any final reflections or closing thoughts?

- Type notes here

Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

- Type notes here

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?

- Type notes here



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

Sunnydale HOPESF Focus Group Notes

Date	February 21, 2019
Location	Sunnydale Wellness Center
Host Organization	DPH
# Attendees	11 Residents, 2 Service staff, 3 MOHCD

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?
 - Clear and consistent communication
 - Mediators
 - Need high income or publicly supported below market rate
2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?
 - Mobile health and wellness resources
3. How would you find out about these services?
 - Word of mouth
 - Fliers, although these are inconsistent
 - See something happening, like a line out the door
4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?
 - Language barrier
 - Fliers / mailings inconsistent
 - No internet access, or very slow speeds when they do have access
 - Low level of tech skills
5. Do you have any suggestions for how to make our programs and services better to meet your community's need?
 - Training in tech; more exercising programs.
6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?
 - Exercise / dance
 - In-home care for seniors
 - Hotline for youth (pre-teen and teen) that is confidential and safe
 - Services for young kids
7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?
 - More door-to-door transit for seniors
8. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified do you prefer?
 - Seminars



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Email
 - Direct outreach to people who've attended previous meetings and shared their contact info
9. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?
- Credit
 - Color / race
10. What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?
- Skipped – no participation from residents.
11. If you have children, what barriers do you have for them to attend a high performing public school?
- Geography / district
 - No one wants Sunnydale students to succeed
 - Suggestion from one attendee to use "Parents for Public Schools" as a resource
 - Need school buses
12. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve equitable access to high performing public schools?
- Parents need to do more research, need to inform those that don't know their options
 - More summer programs, especially those that provide transportation
 - Encourage parent participation
13. What has helped you or others in your community get or keep a job?
- Local residents are having to compete with non-local for jobs.
14. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?
- Job core helped
 - If Housing Authority takes 30% of one's income, they could set aside some portion of that in a savings account for the resident
15. Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?
- Explain where the money goes
 - What are immediate plans to improve play structures, streets, improved turnaround time on work order requests
 - What does transition from Housing Authority to Mercy look like? How does it work?
 - Interim uses for un-used areas

CLOSING. Thank you again for your participation. Does anyone have any final reflections or closing thoughts?

- N/A – residents did not participate



Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?

- Mixed reaction, some seemed to appreciate it, others seemed to lack any trust that we'd make any meaningful changes.



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

Market Rate Developers Focus Group Notes

Date	April 4, 2019
Location	95 Brady St, San Francisco, CA 94103, USA
Host Organization	Housing Action Coalition
# Attendees	Todd David, Corey, Nico Nagle

1. Tell us about your experience of participating in the San Francisco BMR program?
 - After June 2016 (Pop C), it's more expensive to build homes
 - Good that it's financially equal in terms of alternatives
 - Need more homeownership opportunities, and it would be a good option to address the missing middle-income families
 - City slow process – over time, a rigid bureaucracy reduces efficiency.
 - Economic feasibility is a key factor for the developers to build homes in SF
 - It would be helpful if more wraparound services for certain populations (e.g. seniors) can be provided to onsite BMR projects
2. What, if any, barriers exist to market rate developers helping provide affordable housing in San Francisco?
 - Current zoning in SF
 - Economic feasibility
 - Slow project entitlement process – takes too long to build
 - For 100% affordable housing, too many requirements slow down the process. “Shadow Study” – the analysis of potential caused by shadows. Excessive shading may affect higher costs to build homes.
 - Positive improvement: DAHLIA has been a fantastic move for developers.
3. Have you considered investing in a third party to lease up/sell your BMR units?
 - Leasing agents have difficulty in calculating income because of inexperience with income documentation and Excel.
 - Hire third-party agents who are specialized in BMR qualification and process can speed up the process.
 - Suggest MOHCD doing the calculation and having developers pay MOHCD for staff time to improve efficiency - Todd will ask market rate developers for their input
4. What ideas do you have for ways to encourage market rate developers to increase the number of affordable housing units in San Francisco into the future?
 - No political process/ bureaucracy involved can speed up the process
 - Get the developers out of politics - do no deal with board of supervisors but go directly to Controller's Office – “buying rights” is the current practice.
 - Paying fees in the later process instead of up front would help building more projects. If the developers fail to build, City can impose a penalty.
 - Increase AMI levels to increase number of BMR units



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

5. What would help developers invest in under-served neighborhoods?
 - Legalize housing in low density west side of SF
 - Provide education services in certain neighborhood. People do not understand affordable housing - maybe have an open house day to education people; or hire a charity to hold bus tours to show people a few affordable projects.
 - Put together a package in each district. Every district will participate to address no density equity.
6. What would you suggest to address the problem of rising HOA dues for BMR owners?
 - Need a legislative fix
 - Subsidize HOA dues in the similar manner we subsidize housing
 - Redistribute HOA dues among the market rate owners
 - Most owners are not selling BMRs because of the rising HOA dues; however, we have been hearing that the rising HOA dues place a burden on owners.
7. Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?
 - HAC asked how to be more helpful in this conversation, such as distributing a survey.
 - HAC likes to have a list of the key players building affordable housing. HAC will share their existing member list, and add any new ones on MOHCD's list to coordinate work.

CLOSING. Thank you again for your participation. Does anyone have any final reflections or closing thoughts?

- Type notes here

Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

- Type notes here

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?

- Type notes here



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

Human Services Network Focus Group Notes

Date	February 13, 2019; 11:30am – 12:30pm
Location	
Host Organization	MOHCD
# Attendees	

PLEASE NOTE: We had a very informed and talkative group of experienced service providers, so we got through question 7 and then had to begin skipping questions to get through all the crucial ones.

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?

- Issue of availability
- Need wrap around services – mental health, substance abuse
- Need transportation – being able to connect from housing to services and vice versa
- Need housing for people with non-profit salaries, worker availability to provide these services
- Issues around availability of appropriate housing for moving people up the ladder (from supportive to transition to permanent, etc.)
- Need more food services – waitlist for people just to eat; lack of food programs for SRO residents
- There is a lack of 24/7 services (availability of mental health services outside of business hours)
- Need more housing opportunities in safe environments (housing where peoples drug dealers live, where the problems they are trying to leave behind – for example, the Tenderloin)
- Need more funding for Residential Care for the Chronically Ill (RCFCI's) - Catholic Charities – our contracts are not fully funded; not getting our indirect costs covered, we are currently providing services at such a loss
- Need affordability, proximity to transit, safety

2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?

- Legal services – child care/child support; broad array of civil legal needs (Driver's License, other needs)
- Case management services – people who have long-term care issues often cannot access needed services
- Transportation, particularly for elder and disabled
- Dealing with isolation and lack of community
- Payee services – can only find it if you're mandated into it; HSA/DAAS services are very limited
- Basic living skills for people exiting long-term homelessness (self-care, etc.); these services are very scattered
- Navigating the system of social services; not coordinated or sophisticated enough



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Public systems don't match up; city departments make decisions in their own bubbles; departments are often unaware of other departments' services

3. How do your clients find out about these services?

- Need to have more information in appropriate languages
- Need information and referral system that is easily and constantly updated; that system would need to cover the full range of services
- Nonprofits need to be funded to provide and coordinate information sharing so that each agency can participate
- Word of mouth is biggest means, particularly for homeless clients
- For staff – need better internet-based information
- For clients – it's primarily through word of mouth, at clinics, libraries
- Police are big referral provider for us, but they are often not well informed on the services, so they may send or bring client to services that are not the most appropriate
- Health care providers should be offering more information for clients who access those services
- Jails refer, particularly homeless clients
- Faith communities refer
- Schools are big referral source – participants asked, ARE WE TALKING TO SCHOOL DISTRICT AS PART OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PROCESS?

4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?

- Clients and agencies not knowing what each agency does
- Clients need personal relationships – case managers or outreach staff talking directly to clients, city is offering more of this now

5. How can we make MOHCD or workforce development programs work better? [Combination of questions 5 and 15]

- Need to match up employment and financial literacy services
- Treasure Island needs better outreach
- Duplication of services – are clients enrolling in program that is duplicative of something they're already connected to?
- Provide better understanding of who and what your targets are – nonprofit providers have had experience of OEWD needing to be more clear about wanting job placements, rather than significant progress towards that goal

6. What are services that you need but have been unable to find?

- Assistance for businesses displaced by fire
- Nonprofits are expected to "act like businesses but behave like nuns" – unrealistic funding and expectations given our actual business expenses (including rent)
- DPH won't talk about giving us more money for our buildings, only for direct services; but we can't provide services without appropriate space; maintenance and building improvement can't be built into contracts
- Nonprofit infrastructure funding is extremely limited, becomes extremely competitive, the funding opportunities for it tend to be extremely narrow and limited
- Nonprofits that are most "business-like" get least amount of assistance
- NCCLF funding for nonprofit displacement is clearly underfunded; only for agencies being displaced, not enough preventative
- "Utilities are killing us"



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Funding needs to help increase our capacity
- Need more affordable behavioral health – this becomes preventative for other issues arising
- Heavy flow of clients through our building creates wear-and-tear and capital improvement needs; we cannot not attract capital dollars to maintain safe, accessible, appropriate buildings for current services; even if we're not trying to expand, we're still falling behind
- Department of Building Inspection is under-resourced; review what they do and if they have capacity to do it

7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?

- Reduce cost
- Better access to paratransit
- Equitable services to underserved neighborhoods
- Help for grocery shopping and getting to medical appointments

11. What barriers do families experience in accessing high performing public schools?

- Places with housing for clients are not in neighborhoods with high-performing schools (for example, low-income children concentrated in Tenderloin are not near good schools)

13. What strategies, incentives, or policies would encourage landlords to participate in the Section 8 and other voucher programs?

- Do you have any strategies that would encourage landlords to participate in Section 8 program?
- Timely payment
- Customer service
- Tax credits
- Quicker inspection turnaround time

15. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?

- Understanding population that need jobs – need more supports around clothing, food costs, gas money ("startup costs" for getting and keeping a job)
- Incentivizing people to hire people over 65
- Employer education on dealing with certain populations
- People have fear of getting a job if they are on public benefits; client need pre-employment education
- Basic needs (uniform, tools, food)
- Can wage and benefits requirements be relaxed?
- More bridge programs to help people initially enter workforce for first time
- Affordable and accessible childcare

17. Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- Long term planning in terms of appropriate level of housing (there is no assisted living for clients under 60)
- Very difficult to find landlords willing to participate in scattered site supportive housing programs (agency is paying directly for this housing, how can we partner with city to improve landlord participation in these programs?)
- Supportive housing policies lead to concentrated poverty



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- No funding to help nonprofits with disaster preparedness and earthquake

Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

- Type notes here

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?

- Type notes here



Latino Service Providers and Advocates Focus Group Notes

Date	2/20/19 4 pm - 5:30 pm
Location	MNRC (SF Latino Parity & Equity Coalition)
Host Organization	MOHCD
# Attendees	19 participants, 3 staff (Brian, Julia, Hugo)

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?

- Affordability
- SFADC: organizing models so that tenants can see their cases through
- Type of housing is important: housing that is built for families for example (larger, safe, private bathrooms, open spaces)
- BMR: 150 families, 500 applications, only 10 placements (transformational but percentages are problematic)
- Resources to get clients through the month - emergency funds are impactful
- Tenants must be educated, organized, and empowered to avail themselves of help when they need it, help their neighbors, combat
- Language accessibility
- Families are afraid to access services because of immigration status
- Short- and long-term subsidies work (seasonal work = short-term subsidies)
- Mixed-income developments should serve all income levels, not just extremely low-income and middle income; cross subsidization of commercial

2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?

- Healthcare
- Education, especially for TAY who work and study
- Residential services that are relevant to the pop. living there
- Family engagement (residential)
- Childcare
- Employment support
- Tenant rights counseling
- Supportive/stabilization services (residential)
- Behavioral health; trauma-informed approach (DV, violence in home countries) for clients and staff
- Mental health services to document impacts of landlord harassment (see NYC)
- Family counseling
- Money management/financial literacy
- Cross-section of resiliency and environmental justice (less about social services) = gardening programming, bicycling programming = one of the few spaces that



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

cross ethnic/racial/generational/geographical (neighborhood)/POC = rare cross racial/multiracial

- Technology in both infrastructure (e.g., low-cost technology = phones, computers, WIFI), as well as 1:1 digital literacy that is tailored to individual needs
- Importance of affirmatively furthering fair housing at both the macro and services level - PLACE THIS AT THE RIGHT PLACE (Latino pop. is slowest growing of any other urban area)

3. How would you find out about these services?

- Word of mouth is powerful (family, neighbors, etc.)
- Written communication is still important, they'll take it to people they trust
- Spaces and centers that's welcoming to the pop. (e.g., for young people)
- Case management programs
- Family service specialist (warm/soft referrals)
- Relationship-based approach (where people already congregate and relationships are already built)
- Rental registry so that tenants can be contacted with important information
- There should be an investment into reproducing information on community resources; regularly update resource guides (electronic/paper) - valuable for both new and seasoned staff, but especially for newer staff
- Promoters are effective at getting information and have an impressive track record
- Family Success Coaches at schools using a shared referral system (Mission Promise Model)
- No magic bullet; it's all necessary (door to door, 1:1, online, paper, social media, etc.)
- Dedicated communications person is necessary
- Translation and interpretation (language access)

4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?

People don't know they exist

- Hours
- Living wage
- Immigration status
- Capacity at nonprofits
- Displaced clients live in new county but still have kids in school or work in
- Data compliance (intake sheets get bigger and bigger)
- Sense of danger for clients sharing their information or accessing services (not just undocumented immigrants)
- Work must be transformational, rather than transactional (deep services)



5. Do you have any suggestions for how to make our programs and services better to meet your community's need?

- Unrestricted funding to be responsive to the needs of clients
- Better serving undocumented immigrants
- Replicate 24th Street investments (cultural district, economic development, etc.) without it having to be crisis response
- Reexamine housing preferences, to target working class people

6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?

- More equitable distribution of services, specifically tenant legal services
- Undocumented youth system involved competency
- Literacy programs in native languages to be foundation for ESL
- Safe spaces for families (parks no longer serve that need)
- Mental health services for families/children
- Connect homegrown college graduates to SF employment
- Hire bilingual, bicultural people in City workforce and nonprofits
- More funding and higher pay for nonprofit sector, especially mental health service providers

7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?

- Reduce MUNI fares and subsidize for low income
- Eliminate red lanes in neighborhood corridors; local economy is dependent on these corridors, as are transit users
- MUNI needs to be more reliable and faster
- SFMTA needs to study divestment in public transit; look at transportation equity like LA; consider community benefit agreements that address this
- SFMTA must be more transparent and inclusive in its community engagement (they come to the community late in the process)
- SFMTA should integrate the learnings of other City departments that have a better grasp of equity, like MOHCD
- VIs Valley, Excelsior and other neighborhoods have limited and unsafe transportation infrastructure, including bicycle lanes for working class people
- Informal arrangements of neighbors helping neighbors without giving our money to Uber and Lyft
- Prioritize the largest transit hubs for affordable housing, rather than market rate
- SFMTA must stop criminalizing fare violators who cannot afford to pay



8. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified do you prefer?

- Not unlike previous question
- Trust sources
- Ed. institutions
- Faith based organizations
- Service providers
- Ethnic media

9. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?

- Access to loans
- Affordability
- Banking products that are unrealistic/not accessible
- Credit score
- Competition with foreign buyers, more affluent local buyers
- Invest in Small Sites Program
- Consider Right of First Refusal for tenants/MOHCD
- Teacher and nonprofit subsidies
- Propensity of people to flip housing rather than living in it
- Changing policies (incentives) for landlords to rent
- Single family homes as an opportunity for families to "cooperative" - 3-4 families going in on a house

10. What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?

- Subsidies (including permanent) for undocumented families (they shouldn't be limited to transitional housing) - to live up to our Sanctuary City policy
- Subsidies generally
- Quality of alternative housing/environment isn't always conducive to the person (e.g., an addict moving into an SRO in the TL)

11. If you have children, what barriers do you have for them to attend a high performing public school?

- Framing is problematic: Every school should be high-performing! Question should be: How do we get supports in the schools so that they become high-performing?
- School tours are not tailored to people other than white, middle class families (not language accessible, culturally competent, etc.)



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- High-performing can mean different things to different people; many factors
- Supports at the school may not be responsive to the specific needs of diverse students
- This is a complex issue

12. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve equitable access to high performing public schools?

- Mission Promise Neighborhood is a model to make all the schools high-performing; two generation approach; kinder readiness and the continuum of services
- Disaggregate data by POC and GENERATIONS

13. What strategies, incentives, or policies would encourage landlords to participate in the Section 8 and other voucher programs?

- Targeting small landlords and providing incentives to landlords to improve habitability and reduced fees

14. What has helped you or others in your community get or keep a job?

- High quality childcare
- TAY, justice-involved youth programming
- Employment legal services

15. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?

- Strong apprenticeship opportunities - mentorship, on the job and not just for construction sector
- Planning Dept. internship (14 coveted spots) program can be something to replicate; acquiring transferable skill set; create pipeline from community/nonprofits
- Explicit local hire policy, not just for building trade
- Latinos second largest in public schools, but no hiring preference in management or hiring more generally in civil service

16. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?

- Combination of financial education/coaching and affordable/accessible financial products - be supported in their financial planning in a way that's culturally relevant



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Encourage saving through matching/IDA/kindergarten-college fund/completing training program
- Budget planning and recognizing that rent will always be the biggest expense; therefore, we need more affordable housing, low-rate loans to purchase, access to capital for unions interested in building affordable housing
- Either we increase income, or we lower cost of housing; otherwise, people will get pushed out (these are structural issues)

17. Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- Internal displacement (not just pushed out of SF), so we should consider a closer analysis of informal housing (e.g., boarding houses/SROs or undocumented) and how we might be able to improve the situation
- Looking at ways of protecting marginalized pops., e.g., trans
- Police reform and City budget over-prioritizes policing
- Invest more in prevention, not just treatment
- Civic engagement (it's not just about safety net); politically empowered, civically minded residents are in the City's best interest; they're aren't just passive recipients of services
- City is supporting what's not working for too long; look at the data (achievement gaps, etc.); accountability is an essential part of equity
- Ask communities to look at their assessment of disparate impact (City caused)
- Affluent homogeneous neighborhoods, how do we integrate those areas?

CLOSING. Thank you again for your participation. Does anyone have any final reflections or closing thoughts?

- Type notes here

Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

- Type notes here

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?

- Type notes here



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

LGBT community Focus Group Notes

Date	March 20, 2019
Location	
Host Organization	LYRIC
# Attendees	

SERVICES. Thank you. The first set of discussion questions I have is about housing and community development services and programs in San Francisco.

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?
 - People getting out of jail have no where to go for housing, people get discouraged then go back to drugs, need more (transitional housing services right now
 - Eviction prevention, people at 0-50% AMI need housing rental assistance/education; they need to know their rights
 - No available rental or ownership housing, lack of affordable housing to apply to in DAHLIA. Need to educate people on their rights and responsibilities so that folks know how to protect themselves.
 - Undocumented immigrants don't have credit scores or financial education, so they don't know where to apply to; need assistance.
 - April 18 hearing on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity (SOGI) guidelines. Need enumerated data on LGBT access rates to services, to know which housing providers are getting access to and which are not getting access to, so we know where LGBT folks can live. Focus should be on outcomes! Need to create a system of carrots and sticks to compel housing providers to ensure access.
 - latent transphobia exists in elderly cis women; transitional housing needed, only have Jazzy's place.
2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?
 - Mental health
 - Dignity fund, LGBT has the lowest utilization rate to its own programs;
 - LGBT specific funded services
 - Mainstream services do not reach the LGBT because of transphobia.
 - The city must aggressively do better at creating more programs for trans shelters.
 - Must be mindful that there are people of color and that there is racism within the LGBT community.
 - TAY population need access to gainful employment, culturally sensitive services
 - reduce social isolation
 - Use multi threshold harm reduction model
 - Issues of discrimination towards LGBT, especially in certain neighborhoods and communities.



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Seniors need assistance with housing navigation and technology.
- Need language support/access and translation services.
- Need social workers.
- Need disabled access.

3. How would you find out about these services?

- Need social worker to help navigate, not enough service connection services.
- Build relationships through existing connections; be able to pay young people to do outreach and collaborations. Ask how does the funding support collaboration, with public health, freedom center, juvenile justice center; collaborate with non-LGBT agencies; connecting the adult world with the youth (using a holistic case management approach), through youth advocacy.
- Need first hand impacted clients and residents at these tables; want to see people communicate, collective/collaboration across disciplines and agencies. Waitlist, build housing for LGBT.
- Hiring trans folks to outreach to trans folks (e.g. mobile outreach unit)
- Cultural congruency is needed. Don't just send young people to website, warm face to face hand off is needed.
- Face to face, access points on site, use text messaging, tech support needed, use "robo calls"

4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?

- LGBT is most disconnected community when an issue comes up. Public education needed so people know where to go, digital outreach needed.
- Barriers include steering LGBT applicants away from housing opportunities.
- We need to test process.
- Mental health, traumatized people need help with navigation.
- Empty buildings need to be utilized as shelters, classrooms, kitchens, housing, services.
- Lack of trust, people are afraid to ask for help; they are struggling with health issues, healing. Need more health dollars; hard to navigate system.
- Shelters are too short term, and are always full. People give up, too many rules and restrictions; then people go back to abusive situations. People wind up feeling hopeless, income inequality keeps people discouraged.

5. Do you have any suggestions for how to make our programs and services better to meet your community's need?

- Long term ownership pipeline strategy
- More sustainable strategies (i.e. Home-sharing)
- Create a ladder to homeownership
- Shelters need to feel less like jails
- Provide trauma informed care
- Prioritize autonomy



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Re-examine oppressive number of rules for shelters and other forms of housing

6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?

- Clothes and food are always available, but there is no place to sleep on all levels, shelters, transitional, etc.
- People do drugs on the street to stay up because they have no place to stay/sleep.
- Create transitional housing, using empty buildings.
- Create specific LGBT services.
- Create LGBT priorities in housing policy.
- Create access to therapy; psychiatric services are hard to get.
- Need greater housing expertise for case managers, and focused system-wide skills building.
- Need legal services specific to LGBT community (ALRP is specific to those living with HIV/AIDS, is not an LGBT focused provider)
- Need rent subsidies on demand, for BMR lottery winners.
- Need rent payment/money management services for seniors.
- Address capacity issues with CBOs managing people's funds.
- Need modern ways to stop evictions and address root causes.
- Need language accessible programs, access for therapy, treatment programs.
- Need supportive services to retain housing, and to provide credit and debt management services.
- Need to build provider capacity regarding mental health issues.
- Need to increase outreach capacity of housing providers.
- Need to offer professional development.
- The City should be paying providers to be trauma informed.
- Offer RAMS training on mental health to other providers (it is a good training).
- Increase the sizes of grants for RFPs.
- Incentivize CBOs to pay living wages, then fund those orgs (through RFPs)
- Should stop homeless encampment sweeps, they have been a disaster
- 200 bed shelters will never work for Trans people, people of color; they are not safe
- Security and surveillance at shelters is inappropriate.
- Relationship building is needed.

Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

- Type notes here

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Type notes here



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

Homeless Focus Group Notes

Date	2/20/2019
Location	1 South Van Ness Avenue, 2nd Floor Atrium Conference Room
Host Organization	Local Homeless Coordinating Board
# Attendees	

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?
 - Resources - \$\$
 - Removing barriers
 - More affordable housing – more access to existing affordable housing
 - Connections to service providers / prop mgmt. / case management
 - Support to existing housed to maintain
2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?
 - Mental health
 - Affordable food
 - Services to help housed increase income
 - Employment training
 - Affordable transportation
 - Affordable childcare
 - Renters basic skills- base, rent paying, paying utilities
3. How would you find out about these services?
 - Through case mgmt., which is lacking
 - Churches
 - Other homeless
 - Website
 - Library
 - Seminars workshops
 - Put case managers where families/ clients are located
4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?
 - Clients may be using and ineligible
 - Clients need advocate
 - Information gap on what's available to clients
 - "silo" services
 - Stigma- embarrassed, humiliated
5. Do you have any suggestions for how to make our programs and services better to meet your community's need?
 - Install case manager type staff at MOHCD



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Make sure staff is trauma informed trained
 - Radical hospitality, humanize interactions
 - Hire friendly staff
6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?
- Navigating system for families that fall between cracks. They don't fit into standard categories
 - Employment programs not publicly notices
 - Affordable housing outside TL and Bayview
 - General transparency
7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?
- If in system automatic free pass
 - Uber/Lyft cards
 - Forgiving fines
8. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified do you prefer?
- Clients
 - Free phone that provide info
 - Paper forms
 - System for clients to receive mail/ messages
 - Small storage
9. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?
- Income requirements
 - Purchasing process is daunting
 - Income levels don't match reality
10. What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?
- Providing moving costs- security dep. 1st. month rent moving costs
 - Clear steps on process
 - Process and anxiety attached
 - Resources for furnishing unit
 - Flexible subsidy to change with circumstances
 - Section 8 not close to market
 - Moving after lease is up
11. What factors make housing opportunities welcoming to HIV+ individuals? Why?
- Type notes here
12. What programs or services could effectively help people with HIV improve their health?
- Type notes here
13. *[question repeated in Housing Providers section]* What are some ideas to create more housing for people living with HIV?



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Type notes here
14. If you have children, what barriers do you have for them to attend a high performing public school?
- Lottery system
 - Kids may have to travel further
 - More expenses
15. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve equitable access to high performing public schools?
- Type notes here
16. *[question repeated from HIV+ section]* What are some ideas to create more housing for people living with HIV?
- Type notes here
17. What strategies, incentives, or policies would encourage landlords to participate in the Section 8 and other voucher programs?
- Enforcement of discrimination policy
 - Open house visits
 - Financial incentives to landlords
 - Share more public, positive, stories about section 8 program
 - Pay for vacant units
 - Private party pays for property damage
18. What would help developers invest in under-served neighborhoods?
19. What has helped you or others in your community get or keep a job?
- Access to training
 - Stabilizing support
 - Standardize policies for clients with unique circumstances
 - Connection between housing job
 - Help with navigating application
 - Partnerships with local merchants
 - More vocational options
20. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?
- New SF Companies must hire local
 - Knowing and understanding trends to predict where new jobs will be in the future
 - Pay new workers salary not stipend give community for initially- at least minimum wage
 - Job readiness services
21. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?
- Affordable permanent housing
 - Checking accounts w/o exorbitant fees
 - Financial coaching thru SF office of financial empowerment= nonprofit
 - Livable Minimum wage
 - Taking existing clients and turn into teaching



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

22. Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- Services (housing) for undocumented clients
- Expansion of community land trust
- Coop housing
- Monthly summit to exchange info between providers
- MOHCD to provide contact info from today's meeting
- Query Providers on what population needs aren't being met

CLOSING. Thank you again for your participation. Does anyone have any final reflections or closing thoughts?

- Type notes here

Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

- Type notes here

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?

- Type notes here



Comments from Ward 86 UCSF General Hospital

Date	2/20/2019
Location	1 South Van Ness Avenue, 2nd Floor Atrium Conference Room
Host Organization	Local Homeless Coordinating Board
# Attendees	

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?
From a healthcare aspect:
 - Appointment reminders
 - Medication adherence support
 - On site supportive services that vary with degrees of support needed (appointment escort, drop in counseling, uber health rides.
2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?
 - Access to fresh food, access to free transportation services, access to job training and financial counseling that supports those to not impact SSI/SSDI. Benefits counseling, ADAP support.
3. How would you find out about these services?
Social workers, word of mouth from friends in the community, intakes in clinics
4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?
 - Stigma, medical acuity, substance use, mental health, need to work to access services needed, disorganization, homelessness.
 - Transitioning from homeless lifestyle or highly structured lifestyle (treatment program) and into independent living and not having proper support to do well.
 - Proper support will look different for everyone.
 - Important for all people to have some sort of a needs assessment to see what that may look like, and needs may fluctuate over time.
5. Do you have any suggestions for how to make our programs and services better to meet your community's need?
Housing with medical acuity support
6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?
 - Increase in affordable housing without on-site support to help people move into units that they can afford and live in independently and successfully.
 - Increase in affordable housing in other areas aside from Bayview, Soma, TL
7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?
 - Free BART



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- UBER Health from onsite home providers to and from verifiable medical and mental health appointments
8. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified do you prefer?
- Email
9. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?
- Lack of income
 - Lack of deposit
 - Lack of ability to keep up with repairs
 - Living "check to check"
10. What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?
- Subsidy support
 - 30% of income rental
 - Case management support
 - Donations from organizations to help them get set up for kitchen, bathroom, etc.
11. If you have children, what barriers do you have for them to attend a high performing public school?
- Lottery system
12. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve equitable access to high performing public schools?
- Improve teachers' wages
 - Improve educational programming in public schools
 - Mimic private school curriculum with public school curriculum
13. What strategies, incentives, or policies would encourage landlords to participate in the Section 8 and other voucher programs?
- Require payee services from tenant to ensure all money is received
 - If its project based, offer to pay even if the unit is vacant.
 - Have a partnership with the landlord so if a tenant is violating a lease agreement (ex 1: due to a behavioral problem/ noise complaint/nuisance, that whoever is managing the voucher will address the behavior, not the landlord).
 - Partnership with repair/building support if needed
 - Partnership with local security deposit support
14. What has helped you or others in your community get or keep a job?
15. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?
- ACCESS4JOBS
 - Expand employment vocational programs that aren't tied to mental health
 - DOR



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- City College being free → expansion of certificate programs
- Develop programs that help patients recover from where they came from (peer support, patient escort to appointments, etc.)

16. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?

- All basic needs met

17. Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- Type notes here

CLOSING. Thank you again for your participation. Does anyone have any final reflections or closing thoughts?

- Type notes here

Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

- Type notes here

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?

- Type notes here



LTCCC Focus Group Notes

Date	January 10, 2019
Location	1 South Van Ness Avenue, 2 nd Floor Atrium
Host Organization	Long Term Care Coordinating Council (LTCCC)
# Attendees	Around 50

1. What do your clients and their families need to get or stay in housing?

- Housing subsidies; deeper subsidies or housing that is deeply affordable
- Physical accessibility
- Mental health services
- For SROs, in home support services. There are eligibility issues, sometimes client needs to pay. Need to gain trust, cultural competency
- More outreach regarding services that are available
- Providers often learn about problems too late, like eviction notices
- Modifications for accessibility
- Problems if client needs a caregiver, caregivers may not be on lease
- Lawyers to keep people safe, eviction prevention
- Need more case management, only available in some supportive housing
- Good coordinated care. If someone needs residential treatment, help to preserve their housing while they are away. Eviction prevention. Help with things that could lead to eviction, like medication management to keep people healthy and able to stay stably housed
- Policies that discourage real estate speculation, encourage landlords to rent to elderly/disabled
- There is discrimination against people w/disabilities, especially mental health disabilities.
- Tenant and landlord education re: fair housing laws
- Policies that discourage displacement
- For BMR units, income criteria are prohibitive, for example, income requirement. Requiring a disabled person to have income 3x their rent is prohibitive
- Competent, culturally sensitive access to information and services

2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for your clients and their families?

- Nutrition services, provide food security screening
- Mental health services
- As HIV and aging intertwines, how does this fit with the current landscape
- Education regarding social security, disability insurance. Clients fear losing benefits
- Home care services across all incomes
- Mental health services that are accessible, that are behaviorally and culturally sensitive
- Mental health services at different levels of need
- Intensive case management and navigation assistance



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Assistive technology, such as wheelchairs
- Needs accessible, simplified access for older/disabled
- Service connection in HUD and non-HUD housing. Residents experience isolation. Need linkages to services. Need in house social workers
- Dementia as a disability, it is treated like an illness. In-house services and case management to increase ability to stay in housing
- Analysis of impediments, key findings handout was helpful as starting point
- Model of housing ladder – move from higher level of care to more generic form of housing. People who don't need to be institutional settings are stuck there, because there's no place to go, therefore people who need to be there can't get in.
- City needs strategy regarding institutionalized settings and exits. Determine the need, how many and what support is needed. What is turnover at other units?
- Accessible health care at SROs. Ex. One SRO has 125 vets, all have health issues, esp. mental health issues and behavioral problems, making access to medical health care challenging. Need in-house nursing.
- Support for people who hoard and/or clutter

3. How would your clients find out about these services?

- Need to reach the unreachable, many are isolated and lonely. Westside sends nurse, social worker and therapist to house, but those services are limited compared to the need.
- Access to technology, need building wide WIFI and computers, with assistance for residents to gain access to services and
- Need grassroots canvassing of buildings Ex. In NY, high school grads, internship program, provide personal connection/outreach to residents
- Also have older people doing peer outreach
- Work with HSH, they have blocks of housing. In SRO units, residents are underserved, need accessible health care
- Word of mouth
- 311, agency letters, flyers
- Agency newsletters
- Neighborhood newspapers
- Ethnic radio
- For older people with disabilities, do peer outreach. Print ads, ads on MUNI.
- Disseminate info to police, who can provide referrals. Educate the system on what out there
- Faith based organizations, tabling, street fairs
- Social media networks, Facebook, Twitter
- Get info to employees at social security office, medical settings, where people are already going. They can give info directly to clients.

4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?

- Capacity, most supportive housing full, clients on waitlist for months and years
- Transportation to access services or bring services to clients
- Lack of understanding of eligibility



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Capacity, waitlists
- There just aren't the services that people need
- Lack of cultural competence around disability, lack of disability access such as sign language
- Challenges with public transit access
- Lack of live person on phone, challenges when people are forced to go through phone trees to access info or speak to someone in person
- Lack of motivation, depressed and defeated attitudes, compounded by lack of access to services, lack of optimism
- Lack of access for Latino, LGBT communities
- Ageism
- Need a person to be a bridge, assistance with applications, dealing with bureaucracy, need connectors
- Isolation for aging population who are apartment-centered. Need service connection and navigation
- Wrong info given out

5. Do you have any suggestions for how to make our programs and services better to meet the needs of older adults and people with disabilities?

- Educate hospital systems, including ERs, where elderly show up. These providers don't know available services, health care community is unsure of what is out there
- Plain language, easy to understand forms or letters
- Centralize services, services are scattered throughout city
- Create ambassador program, to reach out to different language communities
- Leverage tech industry and their resources
- More money for good programs so they can provide high quality intake and info referrals
- Be able to recruit and retain good staff
- Expand home modification programs
- Expand home modification programs
- Look at SROs, expand elevator access/repair program
- Prevent SROs from kicking out elderly in order to make more money
- Improve dissemination of information. Have agencies work together to know what services they provide. Do a survey.
- Consistency of care, to gain trust, more coordinated care
- Staff retention

6. What are the services that your clients need but have been unable to find?

- Services in multiple languages. Not enough Cantonese services for monolingual speakers
- Affordable home care (including for people who do not qualify for SSI)
- Help with moving and intelligent help with decluttering
- Affordable home repair, there is a problem regarding deferred maintenance
- Social workers and mental health providers who can travel to resident's homes/buildings ex. Travelling AA meeting



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Targeted share of cost program, need City program to subsidize incomes so clients can qualify for MediCal, etc.
- Capital improvements, negotiate with landlords for repairs and accessibility needs, such as grab bars, etc. Create a non-legal process.

7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?

- Look at paratransit program, fix it
- Partnerships with Uber can be better than paratransit and less expensive (Uber Health)
- Wheelchair accessible transit on demand.
- Because of MUNI "consolidation" some stops have been removed or moved. Some stops are inaccessible
- Transportation needs to be on time
- Look at how many routes travel in certain neighborhoods, look at community needs and create better access and transit equity
- Muni is getting nicer buses, but they have lease seats. Look at lines that have high usage by seniors and people with disabilities
- For ex., 22 line estimates 10% of seats are for seniors or disabled, but 50% need it, look at different routes and plan accordingly
- Paratransit, can't recruit drivers, retention problems. Most are from out of town and burden the expense of traveling to SF, traffic problems. Drivers can't afford to live here.
- Clients need to know how to use online systems, need to know share of cost. Training needed.

8. If your clients wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified would they prefer?

- There are not a lot of opportunities, so moot question. Would be more meaningful if more housing opportunities were available, there are few slots.
- There is a digital divide, not everyone has cell phone
- Postal mail
- Public services announcements, bus ads
- Elderly are often not tech savvy, use mail, written word
- Need better housing information, low income buildings need to report to City regarding vacancies, etc. Access shouldn't depend on who has a good social worker. Not all report or report regularly. If proper information was available, then info out there first, then info could be disseminated on bus ads, etc., many do not have home internet
- Use trusted people, social workers, lawyers. People already at the table
- Need aging and disability resource centers and services for monolingual clients

9. What are the kinds of things that help your clients move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Need resources, more capacity, money
- More housing
- Employment for those who want it, need more income
- For those leaving shelter barriers include credit checks and lack of money management services, history of incarceration
- More permanent housing
- Need services in permanent housing, some get more services in shelter. Clients move from services to no services and there's no sense of community

10. What has helped your clients get or keep a job?

- Job training programs, need more
- Tech training
- Problem is discrimination - ageism and disability discrimination
- Child care
- Stable housing
- Elder care
- Jobs/income can affect eligibility for benefits
- Supported employment needed, especially for the Developmentally Disabled population. Have job coaches until stable, but also available if procedures change to help client adapt
- Opportunities for volunteering
- A sense of hopelessness, older populations not counted in statistics, need awareness of the value of older communities

11. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?

- Older population is not a priority, the workforce plan does not include "seniors", diversity efforts do not include older population
- City doesn't care about us

12. What would your clients and their families need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?

- Whole system is designed to build assets all your life, but you have to dump your assets to access MediCal once you reach 65, doesn't make sense; same issue for people with disabilities.
- Provide a way to provide employment for younger people who want to work and to make the benefits piece work with employment/more income
- Financial education and planning, for those in poverty and the young. Education re: savings, investing, tax credits, etc.
- Let people know about the working disabled program, allows clients to build assets.
- Middle income populations don't qualify but don't have enough resources
- Expansion of flexible, city rent subsidy programs even in rent-controlled units. Those on a fixed income in a rent-controlled unit can't afford the rent over time, subsidy would prevent eviction and allow for preservation of rent controlled units.



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Get out money quickly, prop C., other sources.
- Eviction prevention
- Expand tax breaks, earned income tax credit programs

13. Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- Not enough transparency around affordable housing policy, no housing commission. Confusing system makes it difficult to get info for clients. It is hard for communities to weigh in on housing policy.
- Stop seeing seniors/disabled as “clients” but as participants in the process. They are voters, neighbors, contributors to society. An example is to refer to participants as neighbors, not clients. Reframe image of senior/disabled.
- Engage private sector and see what they can do to help.
- We live in country that doesn't care about seniors and doesn't want to spend money on them. There is no long-term health care, which is prohibitively expensive

MOHCD identified the following next steps:

- Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing – if the LTCCC or Housing Committee could look at the Summary of Key Findings, Recommendations & Progress as of September 2018, that would be helpful for the new Analysis of Impediments plan.
- MOHCD will type of notes and distribute to the LTCCC.
- MOHCD will return in June / July and report back on strategies identified.
- DAAS will send out link to all of the forums coming up.

Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

- Appreciation that the AI Summary of Key Findings, Recs and Progress report was provided; desire to see more reports like this so that they are not reinventing the wheel each time
- They would like to discuss the AI Summary of Key Findings at the next LTCCC Housing Committee meeting on February; Anne will ask if Teresa can attend to obtain direct feedback

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?

- Good feedback and engaged participants, even though there was some frustration at the large scope of the questions and enormity of the need
- At LTCCC Housing Committee the next day, members suggested that the questions should be displayed on the PowerPoint one per slide at a time – to be more legible and less confusing
- They wondered if they could do specific groups with their clients, such as SDA with some of the members – how can they do this?



Mayor's Disability Council Focus Group Notes

Date	March 15, 2019
Location	1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 400 (City Hall)
Host Organization	Mayor's Disability Council
# Attendees	20

Teresa provided an overview of the Five-Year Strategic Plan process to the Council and the community engagement process. She informed them about the survey and focus groups and invited member to participate. She reviewed the timeline.

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?
 - a. Helen – I already filled out the survey twice with many of these questions – do you want my input a third time?
 - a. Teresa – yes, they were a little different.
 - b. Helen – I think there is a disconnect – we are focused on accessible housing, but you are focused on housing access. There was a lot of emphasis on economic access, which is legitimate. But my concern is that I didn't see the word "disability" and so I wonder if it is legitimate.
 - a. Teresa – yes, the intent was that we had so many questions – but we'll be talking about accessible housing in that specific focus group.
 - c. Helen – I want to know how to have the Board of Supervisors mandate the creation of a plan for the disabled community.
 - a. Also, we'll having specific conversations about the Analysis of Impediments.
 - d. Helen – I have a daughter who is in a wheelchair and has disabilities. We are lucky to have a rent-controlled apartment with an elevator. But many people don't have that. I've lived here for over 25 years, and feel like there is no interest to make that happen. A colleague said to me that at some point, we'll all be disabled, and the housing stock won't work for us. Accessibility really should be a priority for the City.
 - e. Alex – thank you for the presentation. I piggy back on what Helen said, but also want to comment that SF is unknown as a high rent place, and people with disabilities have limited income. My concern is affordability for people with disabilities.
 - a. Teresa – this can be met with rent control.
 - b. Second question about making sure the focus groups include people with disabilities and allies.
 - f. Chair_____ There are issues for deaf people in our community. There are many who live on SSI and may live in public housing. Workshops aren't accessible because don't provide them with sign language. We don't have a voice. People give up, they live on the street; those of us who hope to age in the City, it is hard to stay here. If we are thinking about accessibility, there are some issues that are being handled, but we also need to think about deaf people. They are not prioritized and don't have access to these programs.
 - g. Sasly McDonald. – Whatever issues there are, they are even stronger for people with disabilities. I'm also a homeowner in SF and also had to a make our home accessible for my daughter who is in a wheel chair. Something that would be helpful is to have the Planning



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

Dept. be helpful with these needs; the acknowledgement that here is a vertical City and this is an issue; they need to work with us, and not put up barriers.

- a. Tereasa – are road blocks being put up by other departments?
- b. Can't remember, but voluntary ADA access, doors started opening. Shouldn't have to play that game.
- c. Kate Williams – this past week, one of our students moved here from another City, and doesn't have housing. When she called each and every one of those services, the responses was that they weren't accepting applications and there is a waitlist. I don't know if there is another answer; am I not having her contact the right agency, or are there no listings in the City?
- d. Teresa – there could be applications at any point in time, but the vacancy rate is very low. We should make sure that she knows about DAHLIA. If you go on our website, or SFHOUSING.ORG, you'll see it.
- e. Helen – also, the Assessor's Office is challenging. We made several changes at our house to increase accessibility, and there is something in the SF Assessor's Office that you can indicate you are doing it to increase accessibility for a person with disabilities. It wore us down; it affected our property value and taxes.
- f. ___Director; I think the hardest part is the deposit. If you don't have enough money, it is a barrier. Also, there are cultural issues working with people with disabilities. It is an attitude that needs to change in the City as well.

Jim – we've given you a good number of things to think about. I commend you for coming to speak to us to hear our concerns. A few years ago, I was involved in the field of real estate. Yes, there were some people with disabilities who can afford to purchase homes due to their income. But there was a large number who could not afford it in SF. It isn't just the economic aspect, but it is the accessibility issue. How can homes be affordable and accessible? Some people just can't move there.

Staff Joanne (director of MOD) – we'd like to offer if you can send questions to me, I'm happy to distribute it to the group so they can respond to get multiple perspectives. I looked at the survey also, and noticed that when you wanted to address accessibility, physical access to space, a lot of those answers were written in answers; when look at our disability demographic, there may be different interpretations. Happy to work with you on this and provide subject matter experts. We are grateful and open to ongoing conversations about data and differing definitions.

Also, the DAHLIA team has presented to the Council in the past; we invited then today but they weren't available. Encourage they come another day to present on current status of the portal. That is it.

Thank you for presenting, we do want to work with you.

Public Comment:

Loretta Licky- I'm a disabled senior with MS. IT took me about 10 years to find housing. I was in a third-floor walkup and I couldn't walk up. I finally found a place. I want an accessible place that is affordable. I have a place with Bridge property management, may they rot in hell. Is there any way to convince the City to not use Bridge Housing Property Management? They are taking over 50 more places in CA. I've been there for three years, and they are taking more than ¾ of my income in rent.

My name is Theresa _ at SDA as a community organizer. I work on policy to get deeply affordable housing for seniors and people with disabilities. Market rate is not affordable to most San Franciscans today. I live in North Beach and we have the greatest density int terms of seniors and people with



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

disabilities. SROs are also being used for high earning tech workers. WE need to make sure that it is accessible so people can age in place. Need it to be accessible from Day 1 and housing that accommodates wheel chairs, different mobility mechanisms, etc.

One thing that we've seen is the idea that people with small children with disabilities who for a long time, but can no longer do that as they grow bigger; they should get a ground floor unit, but would then be required to market rate for the new unit. That shouldn't be and happens in many different buildings. People need to have ability to move from upper floor to ground floor without being paid an outrageous amount.

BRIDGE LINE:

Helen Walsh – I echo what the staff say, inclusion on surveys of people with disabilities, diverse disabilities who are low income. If our data isn't included in general surveys, we are missing out. Children grow up with disabilities and parents need housing to help grown children with disabilities. Important on surveys to find a way to include data on these needs. I know there will be focus groups, but data in survey is also important. Needs to be accessible to people who are deaf or blind as well so we can serve more people and we can ensure that housing is accessible.

I'd like to conclude = generated a lot of discussion and collaboration, we want to have a voice. Affordable and accessible housing going forward; we'll be looking at it carefully.

2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?
 - Type notes here
3. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?
 - Type notes here
4. Do you have any suggestions for how to make our programs and services better to meet your community's need?
 - Type notes here
5. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?
 - Type notes here
6. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified do you prefer?
 - Type notes here
7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?
 - Type notes here
8. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve equitable access to high performing public schools?
 - Type notes here
9. What has helped you or others in your community get or keep a job?
 - Type notes here



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

10. Based on your personal experience or knowledge do you agree that rising housing prices in San Francisco is making racial segregation and the concentration of poverty in San Francisco better or worse? If so, how else do you think could be the causes of this segregation and concentration of poverty aside from high housing prices?
 - Type notes here
11. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?
 - Type notes here
12. Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?
 - Type notes here

CLOSING. Thank you again for your participation. Does anyone have any final reflections or closing thoughts?

- Type notes here

Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

- Type notes here

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?

- Type notes here



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

1760 Bush Street RAD Focus Group Notes

Date	March 21, 2019
Location	1760 Bush St.
Host Organization	Mercy Housing
# Attendees	8

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?
 - Support around financial services, food HSS
2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?
 - Food services & in-home care
3. How would you find out about these services?
 - PM office, RS office, Flyers, meeting etc.
4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?
 - Employment, mental health issues, health appointment scheduling issues
5. Do you have any suggestions for how to make our programs and services better to meet your community's need?
 - More services, and more access
6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?
 - Moving services
7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?
 - Discount, better access
8. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified do you prefer?
 - RS office, HAS, social worker at community agency
9. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?
 - Finances, approvals, income, good credit
10. What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?
 - Money, planning, good credit, credit report
11. What factors make housing opportunities welcoming to HIV+ individuals? Why?



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Cultural sensitivity, awareness
12. What programs or services could effectively help people with HIV improve their health?
 - Med adherence, education
 13. *[question repeated in Housing Providers section]* What are some ideas to create more housing for people living with HIV?
 - Type notes here
 14. If you have children, what barriers do you have for them to attend a high performing public school?
 - Type notes here
 15. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve equitable access to high performing public schools?
 - Type notes here
 16. *[question repeated from HIV+ section]* What are some ideas to create more housing for people living with HIV?
 - Type notes here
 17. What strategies, incentives, or policies would encourage landlords to participate in the Section 8 and other voucher programs?
 - Type notes here
 18. What would help developers invest in under-served neighborhoods?
 - Type notes here
 19. What has helped you or others in your community get or keep a job?
 - Type notes here
 20. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?
 - Better way of listing jobs, more access to opportunities
 21. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?
 - More income, budget, creative ways to spend save
 22. Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?
 - Type notes here

CLOSING. Thank you again for your participation. Does anyone have any final reflections or closing thoughts?

- Type notes here



Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

- One resident with the majority of ideas

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?

- Residents were receptive



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

1880 Pine Street RAD Focus Group Notes

Date	March 22, 2019
Location	1880 Pine St
Host Organization	Mercy Housing
# Attendees	

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?
 - More staff/ more security
 - More tenant
 - More income
 - More mental health services for people with problems
2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?
 - Education rights advocacy
3. How would you find out about these services?
 - RSC Google
 - ask neighbors
 - Newspaper
 - Social work
4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?
 - Bias staffing discrimination
 - Transportation
 - Religious practices time
 - Transgender
5. Do you have any suggestions for how to make our programs and services better to meet your community's need?
 -
6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?
 - LGBT advocacy outreach
 - A few people need beds
 - Tenant
 - Legal rights advocacy
7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?
 - More muni cops to make it safer Uber vouchers



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

8. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified do you prefer?
 - Housing authority
 - Mercy housing
 - Staff
 - computers
9. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?
 - Money
 - Information about how to go about it
10. What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?
 - MOI Mayor's Office of Housing Initiation Navigating Centers
 - Mission Neighborhood Resource Center
11. What factors make housing opportunities welcoming to HIV+ individuals? Why?
 - Type notes here
12. What programs or services could effectively help people with HIV improve their health?
 - Type notes here
13. *[question repeated in Housing Providers section]* What are some ideas to create more housing for people living with HIV?
 - Type notes here
14. If you have children, what barriers do you have for them to attend a high performing public school?
 - Type notes here
15. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve equitable access to high performing public schools?
 - Hire more math and science teachers and increase salaries
16. *[question repeated from HIV+ section]* What are some ideas to create more housing for people living with HIV?
 - Type notes here
17. What strategies, incentives, or policies would encourage landlords to participate in the Section 8 and other voucher programs?
 - Type notes here
18. What would help developers invest in under-served neighborhoods?
 - Type notes here
19. What has helped you or others in your community get or keep a job?
 - Type notes here



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

20. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?

- Type notes here

21. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?

- Type notes here

22. Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- Type notes here

CLOSING. Thank you again for your participation. Does anyone have any final reflections or closing thoughts?

- Would like more accessibility
- Would like someone from the Mayor's office to come to speak to us

Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

- Type notes here

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?

- So many yellow cabs do not want to come to pick up people because some cause problems/ some going to the Bayview/ sometimes people do not pay the taxi cab drivers.
- Empty parking spot- need parking access. If someone goes to hospital, their car is towed. Also, you have to keep your tickets under 5 so your car is towed. Parking takes a lot of people's limited finances. If you did not have a car how would you get around? It would be difficult to do the hills. The closest Muni stop is up a big hill.



18th Street RAD Focus Group Notes

Date	March 22 nd , 2019
Location	3850 18 th Street RAD Site
Host Organization	Sequoia Living Resident Service Coordinators
# Attendees	13

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?
 - Pay rent on time
 - SSI and SSDI income
 - Space to get some permanent work that will increase my income and some room to keep some or most of that without giving it all to rent
 - Talk to Services
 - Get along with other residents
2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?
 - Access to more food—I am not old enough to be eligible for Food bank
 - Free meals and low rent
 - My family
 - Better access to healthcare
 - Access to health and wellness programs
 - Deep community connectedness
3. How would you find out about these services?
 - Onsite Services
 - Meetings and Flyers
 - My Neighbors
 - I search on my own via media
4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?
 - Not able to get around because of my legs
 - Nothing now, before, yes
 - Lack of information about them; I know this because this is true for other residents because I ask them
 - Eligibility issues---e.g., not old enough to get services (e.g., Marin and SF Food bank)
5. Do you have any suggestions for how to make our programs and services better to meet your community's need?
 - Transparency and communication of information (this is especially acute and chronic with property management)
 - Lower age eligibility to 60 (e.g., Clipper Card)
 - Nothing I can think of
 - Do like you've been doing by bringing services to the building



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Have exercise equipment (e.g., bicycles) in the community room so I don't have to go out
 - More outreach
 - Offer bus passes, taxi vouchers
 - Home visits for wellness checks. It would be nice for doctors to come to my home instead.
6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?
- Good doctors
7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?
- Give me more time to get on. Para transit leaves if I don't get to the lobby on time
 - Lower age eligibility for Clipper Card to at least 60 years old
 - Interconnected shuttles to and from other properties to build connections with other residents, perhaps twice a month
8. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified do you prefer?
- Phone or letter
 - Text and or email for people who have a phone or computer
9. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?
- This is a silly question
 - More money
 - A very high paying job that will accommodate my disabilities
10. What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?
- More money
 - No way, no money
 - Cost of living
 - Fixed income
 - First time home buyers' program
 - Credit/money
 - Aging
 - Disability
11. **HIV GROUPS ONLY.** What factors make housing opportunities welcoming to HIV+ individuals? Why?
- NA
12. **HIV GROUPS ONLY.** What programs or services could effectively help people with HIV improve their health?
- NA
13. **HIV GROUPS ONLY.** *[question repeated in Housing Providers section]* What are some ideas to create more housing for people living with HIV?
- NA



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

14. If you have children, what barriers do you have for them to attend a high performing public school?
 - NA
15. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve equitable access to high performing public schools?
 - NA
16. What has helped you or others in your community get or keep a job?
 - Education
 - Job experience
 - More jobs for seniors
17. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?
 - Remove tax breaks from tech companies
 - Car share companies need to be levied and not allowed to pass that on to riders
 - Job sharing to better accommodate people with disabilities (e.g., splitting the hours with someone else who also has a disability)
 - More jobs for older adults/seniors
 - Eliminate buy out/credits for developers who do not want to build low income housing
18. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth
 - SSI increase
 - Food Stamps
 - To be able to make more money and not to have government take that away; its like the more you make, the more they take
19. Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?
 - Every system ought to have checks and balances; this survey means to do that and we need one for each property.
 - Ask us about what we think about property management, and how our building is being cared for, and not being cared for

CLOSING. Thank you again for your participation. Does anyone have any final reflections or closing thoughts?

- I hope that our answers and suggestions are really considered and that some things will change.
- I love and respect the building I live at.
- God Bless America.



Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

- A couple of residents left because they did not want to be in the same space with certain other residents
- Very high energy in the room, often some residents talking over each other

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?

- Overall, residents seemed to appreciate being asked what they thought and felt
- For some residents, there was some comments around shortcomings from Property Management



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

25 Sanchez RAD Focus Group Notes

Date	3/14/2019
Location	25 Sanchez Community Room
Host Organization	Sequoia Living (formerly known as N.C.P.H.S)
# Attendees	11

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?
 - Making sure to not lose my income benefits (SSI/SSDI) by completing all paperwork necessary in a timely manner.
 - Money management due to medical appointments, forgetfulness, unable to write own checks
 - Support from Services staff with recertifications for Bridge and SFHA due to language barriers
2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?
 - On-site social services that educate residents on Community Organizations that cater to Low Income/ Minorities
 - Free Food Programs other than Food Stamps (Ex: Food Runners/ Olio phone application that makes food sharing easily accessible)
 - Volunteering opportunities (intergenerational options)
 - Free days/Discounted days throughout San Francisco (museum/movies/shows/
3. How would you find out about these services?
 - Full time on-site Social Services Staff / On-site bulletin board with monthly activities/Calendar/
 - Neighborhood bulletin boards (Duboce Café, local Safeway, Core Yoga,)
 - Neighbors in the building who are well connected to outside agencies (Case managers/Social Workers etc.)
4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?
 - Limited income (unable to pay for a Paratransit/taxi cab/bus)
 - Lack of strength/energy to travel outside of the building
 - Eligibility reasons (age/high income)
5. Do you have any suggestions for how to make our programs and services better to meet your community's need?
 - More programs that cater to younger adults (resume building classes/in building classes for GED/ESL Classes)
 - Technology classes (basic computer classes), access to computers/IPADS (make space for a lab in the building)
 - Exercise equipment in community room (rowing machine, bike, light weights etc.)
 - Exercise classes (sitting in chair classes, deep breathing)
6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- PCP that take more than 8 minutes meeting with me that speak other languages like Spanish, Russian, Chinese
 - Free of charge organizing agencies that assist individuals with decluttering/organizing
7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?
- Volunteer based transportation (ex: Silver Ride but free). Often programs like Meals on Wheels provides great volunteers but they are unable to drive us to run errands/medical appt's etc. due to liability reasons.
 - Shuttle Service
8. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified do you prefer?
- Written correspondence
 - Presentation in the building
9. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?
- Income requirements are too high
 - Unable to work which will make me ineligible for any type of loan
 - Poor credit
10. What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?
- Dedicated staff that is willing to put in time in assisting with paperwork
 - Knowledge of the housing options available to us
 - Job security
 - Job opportunities
11. **HIV GROUPS ONLY.** What factors make housing opportunities welcoming to HIV+ individuals? Why?
- N/A
12. **HIV GROUPS ONLY.** What programs or services could effectively help people with HIV improve their health?
- N/A
13. **HIV GROUPS ONLY.** *[question repeated in Housing Providers section]* What are some ideas to create more housing for people living with HIV?
- N/A
14. If you have children, what barriers do you have for them to attend a high performing public school?
- N/A
15. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve equitable access to high performing public schools?
- NONE



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

16. What has helped you or others in your community get or keep a job?

- Motivation from staff to challenge myself
- Knowing my job won't jeopardize my housing.
- Free educational courses that train us on job skills that we can use a lifetime.

17. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?

- Faster process of getting enrolled in programs that assist in accessing jobs in San Francisco
- Free transportation for the first year in new job
- Free college course/scholarships

18. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?

- Higher yearly COLA for our SSI/SDI payments
- Less income requirements to qualify for Food Stamps
- Drug information (how to keep habits, information on resources available to me to quit entirely).

19. Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- The importance of continuing to have services in our building! I had never been to a Giants Game until services provided free tickets with food
- Themed monthly activities have been exciting and have brought a sense of unity in our building

CLOSING. Thank you again for your participation. Does anyone have any final reflections or closing thoughts?

- Thank you for the recent renovations in my building/unit, I feel proud of the home I have made for myself
- We are happy Housing Authority is no longer running the building
- Bring back Sewing!
- Stable property management – they are constantly changing that we can't keep up.

Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

- The residents had a great time getting together and discussing the recent changes in the building, this is the first time since they have moved back after renovations that they were able to reflect on the positive changes. Many had good things to say about RAD and it seems that everyone is happy that SFHA is no longer property management.

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?

- Many of the residents did not feel that the questions pertained to their current living situations since they live alone and their children (if they have any) no longer attend public schools in San Francisco. Many of the residents also did not feel it was professional to include the HIV questions, specifically because they feel that is a private matter that others did not need to know about in a group setting.



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

2698 California RAD Focus Group Notes

Date	March 28, 2019
Location	2698 California St.
Host Organization	Mercy Housing
# Attendees	21

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?
 - Finances and staying clean and sober
2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?
 - 24-hour security or front desk clerks in the building
 - Better access to maintenance for after hour repairs
3. How would you find out about these services?
 - 311, Google, research, ask a friend, We chat
4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?
 - Not being aware of the services that are available in the area
 - Being a felon
5. Do you have any suggestions for how to make our programs and services better to meet your community's need?
 - Better communication
 - A block party, to get to know the neighbors
 - Correspondence put up around the building about the different programs in the community
6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?
 - A closer grocery store that is not expensive like Molly store in the area
 - A van that takes them to the grocery store once a month
 - Farmers market in the area
7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?
 - A bus stop in front of the building
8. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified do you prefer?
 - Mayor's office, DAHALIA.org, the internet
 - Compass felony support system
9. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Finances
 - Good credit
 - Handicap accessible
10. What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?
- Type notes here
11. What factors make housing opportunities welcoming to HIV+ individuals? Why?
- Type notes here
12. What programs or services could effectively help people with HIV improve their health?
- Type notes here
13. *[question repeated in Housing Providers section]* What are some ideas to create more housing for people living with HIV?
- Type notes here
14. If you have children, what barriers do you have for them to attend a high performing public school?
- Type notes here
15. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve equitable access to high performing public schools?
- Type notes here
16. *[question repeated from HIV+ section]* What are some ideas to create more housing for people living with HIV?
- Type notes here
17. What strategies, incentives, or policies would encourage landlords to participate in the Section 8 and other voucher programs?
- Type notes here
18. What would help developers invest in under-served neighborhoods?
- Type notes here
19. What has helped you or others in your community get or keep a job?
- CSEP program for people 55 and over that help them find employment
20. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?
- Workshops in the area
 - Develop a more accessible way of seeing jobs that are available
21. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?
- Job
 - Savings account
 - Score program



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

22. Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- Police security in the area
- Building a better relationship between the community and the police

CLOSING. Thank you again for your participation. Does anyone have any final reflections or closing thoughts?

- Type notes here

Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

- Type notes here

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?

- Type notes here



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

345 Arguello RAD Focus Group Notes

Date	March 24 th 2019
Location	345 Arguello BLVD
Host Organization	Mercy Housing
# Attendees	

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?
 - Money-but everyone agreed resources and information
2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?
 - Food
 - transportation
3. How would you find out about these services?
 - From my social worker but having a service provider connector onsite is truly helpful building a community
4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?
 - Sometimes I do not feel like going to activities
 - Lack of community
 - My stubbornness (I person) I added as it was funny. I like to do my own thing.
5. Do you have any suggestions for how to make our programs and services better to meet your community's need?
 - Would like more transportation
6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?
 - BCal methadone clinics
 - Food banks, rental; assistance
7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?
 - Sometimes it's not transportation, its location. My neighborhood is quit.
8. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified do you prefer?
 - Flyers most people but email some (minority)
9. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?
 - Past history of bad credit record (criminal)



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

10. What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?
 - People who assist with the knowledge peer support who have been there and walk you through not wanting to. Not wanting to pay more.
11. What factors make housing opportunities welcoming to HIV+ individuals? Why?
 - Type notes here
12. What programs or services could effectively help people with HIV improve their health?
 - Type notes here
13. *[question repeated in Housing Providers section]* What are some ideas to create more housing for people living with HIV?
 - Type notes here
14. If you have children, what barriers do you have for them to attend a high performing public school?
 - Type notes here
15. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve equitable access to high performing public schools?
 - Type notes here
16. *[question repeated from HIV+ section]* What are some ideas to create more housing for people living with HIV?
 - Type notes here
17. What strategies, incentives, or policies would encourage landlords to participate in the Section 8 and other voucher programs?
 - Type notes here
18. What would help developers invest in under-served neighborhoods?
 - Type notes here
19. What has helped you or others in your community get or keep a job?
 - By remaining sober
 - Encourage each other to do better
 - Being a community
 - Being accepted
20. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?
 - Better education starting with basics learning to read
21. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?
 - Type notes here
22. Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?
 - How comfortable about living where you live it's good for me. Not always bad!



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

CLOSING. Thank you again for your participation. Does anyone have any final reflections or closing thoughts?

- Type notes here

Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

- Type notes here

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?

- Type notes here



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

462 Duboce Avenue RAD Focus Group Notes

Date	3/13/19
Location	462 Duboce Avenue
Host Organization	Sequoia Living
# Attendees	6

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?
 - Help filling out paperwork, finding an accessible unit (disabled), continuous cash flow, better credit, help printing documents and rental assistance.
2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?
 - Medicare and MediCal, Free Muni, Free college classes at CCSF for older adults, Social workers/ case managers, legal services, financial and budget information, getting food and free clothing, mental health services, shredder access, and social and community events.
3. How would you find out about these services?
 - Social workers, word of mouth, internet, and building bulletin board.
4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?
 - Lack of transportation, Paratransit Taxi Vouchers needed to get to multiple medical appointments, sometimes I'm too tired, unable to stand in line for long periods, long waiting list, the service I need isn't offered, program requirements, and information on available services.
5. Do you have any suggestions for how to make our programs and services better to meet your community's need?
 - Explain housing options clearly in one place, including information on how to obtain housing, Waiting list etc. Have food distribution at each building instead of churches, better and continuous communication from MOHCD.
6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?
 - Help moving heavy items down to the street for curbside pick-up, rides to events
7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?
 - More busses are needed, and they need to update the fleet with modern busses that will load wheelchairs faster. Bus stops are taken over by drug dealers, need transportation for shopping
8. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified do you prefer?
 - Emails, texts and flyers
9. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?
 - Being low income and not knowing how to go about it, very high costs involved and lack of money.
10. What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?
 - Help with the down payment and security deposit for an apartment, the moving costs, and relocation assistance. lack of affordable housing and low energy get in the way of moving on. It is very depressing and debilitating to be in a community where everybody is so badly challenged.



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

11. **HIV GROUPS ONLY.** What factors make housing opportunities welcoming to HIV+ individuals? Why?
12. **HIV GROUPS ONLY.** What programs or services could effectively help people with HIV improve their health?
13. **HIV GROUPS ONLY.** *[question repeated in Housing Providers section]* What are some ideas to create more housing for people living with HIV?
 -
14. If you have children, what barriers do you have for them to attend a high performing public school?
 -
15. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve equitable access to high performing public schools?
 - Change the school zones to allow a better mix of economic and social levels.
16. What has helped you or others in your community get or keep a job?
 - Word of mouth or job programs
17. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?
 - Job training in programs such as SCSEP
18. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?
 - The ability to run a small business in our apartments, income assistance and financial advice groups.
19. Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

CLOSING. Thank you again for your participation. Does anyone have any final reflections or closing thoughts?

- We need more housing opportunities!

Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

- Residents want clearer communication on housing opportunities and available services

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?

- They were hopeful that their answers could help make a difference.



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

491 31st Avenue RAD Focus Group Notes

Date	March 28 th 2019
Location	491 31 st Ave
Host Organization	Mercy Housing
# Attendees	

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?
 - Additional HSS hours 25 we use in place. We have resources.
2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?
 - Food services.
 - In home care that is affordable to all!
3. How would you find out about these services?
 - Resident services
4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?
 - Knowing when they are available?
 - Service staff, have been providing information. Cal fresh, we know before it happens.
5. Do you have any suggestions for how to make our programs and services better to meet your community's need?
 - Having substations, state like offices
 - Close to all buildings
6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?
 - None now that we have services and computers
7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?
 - Transportation is great 38 goes most places or at least connects
8. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified do you prefer?
 - Fliers and letting staff knowing so we can know
9. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?
 - I would not be able to pay more or would I want too! My place is great.
10. What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Encouragement and knowledge. "I never thought possible"
- 11. What factors make housing opportunities welcoming to HIV+ individuals? Why?
 - Type notes here
- 12. What programs or services could effectively help people with HIV improve their health?
 - Type notes here
- 13. *[question repeated in Housing Providers section]* What are some ideas to create more housing for people living with HIV?
 - Type notes here
- 14. If you have children, what barriers do you have for them to attend a high performing public school?
 - Type notes here
- 15. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve equitable access to high performing public schools?
 - Type notes here
- 16. *[question repeated from HIV+ section]* What are some ideas to create more housing for people living with HIV?
 - Type notes here
- 17. What strategies, incentives, or policies would encourage landlords to participate in the Section 8 and other voucher programs?
 - Type notes here
- 18. What would help developers invest in under-served neighborhoods?
 - Type notes here
- 19. What has helped you or others in your community get or keep a job?
 - Accessibility
 - Being central to all things
- 20. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?
 - More education
- 21. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?
 - More access to money
- 22. Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?
 - What is it that you need to get better support you?

CLOSING. Thank you again for your participation. Does anyone have any final reflections or closing thoughts?

- We are lucky to have another resource online- "service and staff who want the best for all"



Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

- Type notes here

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?

- Type notes here



RAD 711 Pacific Avenue Community & Black Women's Circle Focus Group Script

Date	Friday, April 19, 2019, 12-3pm
Location	Pings: 711 Pacific Ave
Host Organization	Chinatown Community Development Center
# Attendees	7 (Towanna Granger, Gail Hills, Debra Brown, Tiffany Lawrence, Chyna Brown, Carolyn Pollard, Carol Williams) (Left early: Barbara Thomas)

SERVICES:

What does services mean to me?

- Things that I need but cannot get to yet
- Services: more things to do, engaged
- E.g. Hotline for domestic violence
- E.g. Interests (cook, activity, sewing classes)
- Services for young people
- No Black males in the community. Need more representation.
- Family supports.
- Single mom issues.
 - Ina has a class on parenting, why the low attendance rate?

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?

- Resurrect old SFHA policy where adult children can obtain their own units in the buildings.
 - "I was on my mom's lease, that's how I got my own unit. SFHA's rules have changed."
 - Our adult kids cannot afford the housing in SF and move out of our lease.
 - "Get my daughter out of my house. You can't take them off of your lease because new rules don't work like they used to"
 - Not signing nothing to get off the lease, get in to her own place at SFHA units.
- Owe back rent

2. Aside from housing, what are the services that are most important for you and your family?



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- No men, need more positive representation in the community.
- Kids and youth: more services and programs
- Mothers: more services for mothers, particularly single mothers
- Jobs training programs that lead to good income and long-term work (as opposed to three-month stipends and short-term work)
- Child support
 - Programs to offset this.
 - For housing, consider this to be an income responsibility, so that rent can be reduced.

Are those services offered in the community?

- Yes, some are. But most of us don't know about it, or don't think it's for us.
- APA Family Support Services. Many have not attended.
- Chinatown CDC Resident Services – Many have not attended

5. Do you have any suggestions for how to make our programs and services better to meet your community's need?

Able to access those services? Any barriers?

- Don't know.
- Don't feel like the services are inclusive towards me.
- The best times are during the day, like today, in the late afternoon (12-3pm) or 5pm-7pm.

Any ideas? (Programs and services)

- Movie nights, computer classes, art classes, ceramic classes, DIY soap classes.
- Field trips.
- Get our nails done.
- Have brunch one morning
- Go for a walk
- Thursday nights – museum exhibits.

Suggestions? (to better engage Black Women)

- **Assign a point person that is our friend and is a tenant leader (e.g. Towanna)**
- By mail
- Fliers, post door to door
- Fly-by intercepts at the lobbies, gates.
- Text message

EDUCATION/FAMILIES:

What are your experiences with the school system?

- It's hard. I cannot afford the afterschool programs offered at school. It's \$300 a year.
- Some of the kids need to help with their homework.



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Afterschool program in our own building would be nice.

Did you choose the schools your child attend? Why or why not?

- It's not easy to choose schools. Lack of school choice in SFUSD.
- Some of us get assigned our neighborhood schools.
- Some of us are bussed out of the neighborhood.

14. If you have children, what barriers do you have for them for attend a high performing public school?

Do you know there are high performing schools in SF?

- Our kids cannot get in to high performing schools.
- "When you apply for it, they're going to say no."

15. Do you have suggestions for how to improve equitable access to high performing public schools?

- Overcrowded – most popular
- Had to fight to get her son to McActeer
- Behavior and safety of students need to be addressed. Our kids that are good with boundaries and raised with the right values are mixed with the kids that are raised with no boundaries.

JOBS

16. What has helped you or others in your community get or keep a job?

What helped you get/keep a job?

- None. Community has not helped me get a job.
- Constructions jobs been helpful for my son.
- Need to be treated equally/fairly. Same opportunities are not given to them vs. other residents.
 - E.g. Tootie about applying for a job in the laundry room? Staff asked, "Do you speak Chinese" She countered that some staff don't really speak English.

17. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?

Access to a good job? Suggestions to improve access?

- Follow the Mayor's Office model for youth employment. When people work, there's a grace period where income is not counted towards their income. When it's not counted towards income, then it doesn't impact rent.
 - Better jobs can often cause hardship on the rent.
 - Take him off lease, once he is over-income, where is he going to go?
- Long term job training and jobs.
 - "I don't like stipends."
 - "After 3 months, it's gone."
- Trainings for residents to start small businesses.



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

TRANSPORTATION:

7. What, if any, suggestions for you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in SF?

Do you have safe and decent transportation? What are suggestions to improve it?

- There is safe and decent transportation.
- Most agreed that where they live at the Pings has multiple bus lines.
- Good Paratransit.
- For the car owner, parking is terrible. Got a car – Towanna, parking is terrible.

Parking lot:

- Resurrect old SFHA policy where adult children can obtain their own units in the buildings.
 - "I was on my mom's lease, that's how I got my own unit. SFHA's rules have changed."
- After rehab, our units got smaller
- Last minute and unrealistic timelines for re-certs
- Whenever there's funding, Chinatown gets the scraps, vs. Westside, Potrero Hill.
 - Joyce Armstrong – was a real talker, Potrero Hill. She was an activist that fought for resources in her community.
 - We had one too, Activist. Killuu Nyasha.
 - The Pings doesn't have a group of tenant leaders that are multiracial and diverse. (PYRIA)
 - We can be the group of leaders and activists.
- Washing machines – phone issue.
- Parking spaces for IHSS workers
- FOB keys, lose \$50 to replace.

Women's Circle

Interest:

Yes. If it's taking effect. We got to keep it moving.

Frequency:

- Twice a month. However, to start, we can do once a month.

Focus:

- We could talk about anything, about our kids, touch bases, support each other and our families, speak in English.
- Offer support and to talk
- Be the community leaders and activists for ourselves.
- Meal



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- News: share and review all the services and news offered at the Pings. We don't know which activities are happening.
- Activity on or off site.

Activities Brainstorm

- Dominoes and darts. Monopoly, Unos. Youth activities, Legos in the corner.
- Family Support Services from Ina to help with kids, youth, and [single] moms
- Movie Day
- Free activities, activities around the City,
- Bowling
- Karaoke
- Dance – residents. Karaoke night.
- Karaoke (Misty loves it)
- Giants Game (e.g. one member's interests is introduced and shared with each other.
- Paint night.
- Movies
- Classes that we do together: computer classes, art classes, ceramic classes, DIY soap classes.
- Field trips.
- Get our nails done.
- Have brunch one morning
- Go for a walk
- Thursday nights – museum exhibits.

Value:

- Gift bags from APA Family Support Services
- \$25 gift card from Chinatown CDC.
- Meals cooked by resident Towanna.



ALL CHINESE SPEAKING GROUP

MOHCD RAD Focus Group 2

All Chinese speaking group Caitlyn, Donna, Diana

#2: Other than housing, what are the services that are most important to you and your family?

- Free Wi-Fi for all: youth, seniors (Sau Ling).
- Antennas for TV for non-cable subscribers (Or Ho)
- Exercise/gym equipment (Tony)
- Karaoke machine (Amy)
- Resident lead committee for isolated residents, e.g. and esp. live alone seniors (Mr. Yu)
 - Medical alert systems (Caitlyn)
- IHSS paperwork and process can be simplified
- Senior meal site (have Pings become a congregate meal site) – (Mr. Yu)
 - Strategy or budget set-asides? – (Mr. Yu)
- Social activities or Rec Center at the Pings (look at 711 Pacific Community Room) – (Mr. Yu)
 - Chinese Chess, bingo, music, ball games,
 - Rec Center – for seniors, for youth
 - Tech
- Senior/community field trips (1-2 times a year) – (Mr. Yu)
- Invite presenters to educate/report residents on civil society and social issues, and how we can engage with the world! Treat us like students. Politics, technology, news, current events, culture, lifestyle, medical/health tech updates. (Mr. Yu)
 - What about health workshops?
- Computer/tablet classes (Caitlyn)
- Beginning/ESL Classes (what about City College?) (Mr. Yu)

Other notes:

- Property Management concerns about staff shortage, turnover, after business hours, and language (Mrs. Feng)
- Community safety – public safety, building safety (Ying)

#3: How would you find out about these services?

- Chinatown CDC. Our relationship with the org and the staff enables us to find out about these services
- We want to strongly encourage service funding be allocated to organizations in Chinatown
- Community Tenants Association aka CTA
- Self-Help for the Elderly
- City College of San Francisco
- Chinatown YMCA
- Geen Mun Center



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Asian Law Caucus
- Chinese Newcomer Services Center

#5: Do you have any suggestions for how to make our programs and services better to meet your community's needs?

- We need a centralized location for services.
 - The answer is Chinatown CDC: we already are centralized there and know the staff there. So, having a dedicated staff that can answer, provide information, refer and know us are important.
 - increase/hire more staff or increase their service times.
 - Staff turnover negatively impacts the community inside the building.
 - Increase salaries of nonprofit workers in order to retain them.
- Resource/Information directory
- Everything needs to be available (materials/staff/services) in English and Chinese
- Advocate City budget to allocate funding for services in Chinatown that do community building.
- Periodic MOHCD/City meetings to voice our concerns, like this opportunity.
- **Single Residential Occupancies (SROs):** Make people living in SROs a priority population for affordable housing lists.
 - Currently, homeless and formerly displaced/evicted communities are. We have a lot of Chinatown SROs. We have whole families living there, we have people working full time, and we have high rents in the SROs.
 - City needs to take in to account the working poor, rent burdens in SROs, and how they are continuously de-prioritized in waiting lists for affordable housing. We haven't heard any news of affordable housing applications in the last year or two. (Ms. Ho)
 - **City's "affordable housing" is not actually affordable.** We need real affordable housing. Make affordable housing truly 30% threshold of income.
- Housing information should be given officially weekly or bi-monthly to groups from the City.

#6: What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?

See also #5, section on **SROs and "Real Affordable Housing"**

(It is a follow-up to #2) Barriers to Services & Possible Solutions

- "Wait in line forever"
 - have to wait for a long time, drop in hours are limited at many of these community-based organizations.
 - Hard to reach, to locate/find people.
 - Existing staff are not enough. Still have gaps in services
 - Solution: we need more staff or expansion of hours.
- We need a centralized location for services and staff.
 - Not knowing English. We are monolingual Chinese speaking seniors
 - Solution: staff and materials are bi-literate in Chinese and English
- Letter reading, basic application assistance, annual re-certifications, income verification very difficult and hard.
- We need a center, a centralized location. Create a new center.



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- You raise our quality of life, you increase our longevity t



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

Clementina Towers RAD Focus Group Notes

Date	March 29, 2019
Location	Clementina Towers
Host Organization	
# Attendees	

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?
 - Residents have to be tolerant to each other, avoid conflicts
2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?
 - Social services
 - Transportation
 - Nursing station in housing
3. How would you find out about these services?
 - From social workers
4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?
 - No problem to use existing services
5. Do you have any suggestions for how to make our programs and services better to meet your community's need?
 - No suggestions, sorry
6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?
 - I don't know
7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?
 - No suggestions
8. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified do you prefer?
 - I don't want this info
9. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?
 - I don't consider that; it's absolutely unreal for me
10. What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?
 - Type notes here



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

11. What factors make housing opportunities welcoming to HIV+ individuals? Why?
 - Type notes here
12. What programs or services could effectively help people with HIV improve their health?
 - Type notes here
13. *[question repeated in Housing Providers section]* What are some ideas to create more housing for people living with HIV?
 - Type notes here
14. If you have children, what barriers do you have for them to attend a high performing public school?
 - Type notes here
15. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve equitable access to high performing public schools?
 - Type notes here
16. *[question repeated from HIV+ section]* What are some ideas to create more housing for people living with HIV?
 - Type notes here
17. What strategies, incentives, or policies would encourage landlords to participate in the Section 8 and other voucher programs?
 - Type notes here
18. What would help developers invest in under-served neighborhoods?
 - Type notes here
19. What has helped you or others in your community get or keep a job?
 - I don't have a job, I am retired, as well as majority in our housing
20. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?
 - Younger generation should be asked
21. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?
 - I'm OK with my SS benefits
22. Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?
 - Type notes here

CLOSING. Thank you again for your participation. Does anyone have any final reflections or closing thoughts?

- Type notes here



Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

- Type notes here

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?

- Type notes here



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

Bernal Dwellings RAD Focus Group Notes

Date	3.22.2019
Location	Bernal Dwellings Senior and Youth Services Center, 3111 26th Street
Host Organization	SFHDC
# Attendees	7

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?
 - Low Rent/ low income Housing 30% of income
2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?
 - Health, Emotional/mental health, disability, exercise classes/facilities, support services i.e. housing cleaning
3. How would you find out about these services?
 - Online, word of mouth
4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?
 - Accessibility: Awareness, Time & Days (scheduling restrictions)
5. Do you have any suggestions for how to make our programs and services better to meet your community's need?
 - Communication Flow, "GAPS" in communication between client & provider, more consistency
 - -More \$\$\$ funding for: Bernal Dwellings
 - -Youth i.e.: stipends, development programs, game room, baseball Teams, Mental Health "No reason for any child to not have a summer/after school job" *More services for youth
 - -Adults: i.e.: Stipends, Gift Cards
 - -Better Outreach Programs
 - -Mental Health Services
 - -Youth Programs
 - -Ensure Equity in Resource Access, Intentional Partnerships
 - *Include Public Housing Residents as part of community
6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?
 - Mental Health, Girl/Boy Scouts, Youth Counseling, Arbor work, Youth mentorship, safety, physical health, clean streets, street lighting, parking
7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?
 - "Bring it Back" the 26th & Folsom with Sheds & seats, "everything"



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

8. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified do you prefer?
 - All: email, letter, texts, flier, internet
9. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?
 - HUD, too many restrictions on affordable housing programs (MOHCD), too expensive/too small, location, red lining-still happening, only one-way to buy, discrimination by lenders
10. What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?
 - Discrimination, misallocation of funds, lack of transparency in spending
 - - lottery methods: hate-it (MOHCD)
 - -Open & not considering seniority and good standing, disability, health
 - -lack of senior housing/services/wellness checks
11. **HIV GROUPS ONLY.** What factors make housing opportunities welcoming to HIV+ individuals? Why?
 - Shame, fear, stigma, discrimination, fear of isolation rejection
 - -need more confidentiality
 - -need support for friends & family of HIV+ individuals
 - -need more specialized housing
 - -need support groups
12. **HIV GROUPS ONLY.** What programs or services could effectively help people with HIV improve their health?
 - More public education about housing programs and all programs
 - -health support (taking medications)
 - -individualized in-home counseling
13. **HIV GROUPS ONLY.** *[question repeated in Housing Providers section]* What are some ideas to create more housing for people living with HIV?
 - Discrimination against public housing
 - -emotional support
 - -SF School system sucks
 - -More advocacy for parents: IEP support
 - -single subject teachers
 - -not designed for PH youth to succeed
14. If you have children, what barriers do you have for them to attend a high performing public school?
 - Type notes here
15. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve equitable access to high performing public schools?



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Timely evaluations, more communication with parents, more training for school & program staff - T.I.C - Special ED
 - -Need more movement in classroom
 - -Stop labelling children
 - -family support
16. What has helped you or others in your community get or keep a job?
- Training - Daycare - OST programs, supportive services
17. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?
- More Jobs, more staff for youth programs, sensitivity training, food access (health) - in schools and cafeteria, see other suggestions
18. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?
- Money
 - -matching programs
 - -more public education on affordable housing programs, other grant, programs
 - -Stable mind
 - -financial education
 - -Job fairs - local hiring
 - -F.S.S program for public housing residents
 - -ability to use G.I. bill \$ for housing purchase
19. Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?
- Type notes here

CLOSING. Thank you again for your participation. Does anyone have any final reflections or closing thoughts?

- Type notes here

Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

- There was good engagement and many conversations among residents which did not apply directly to the survey questions, but still increased constructive dialogue among neighbors.

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?

- Residents were slow to participate at first, but soon warmed up to the process and we ended up going over our allotted time of 2 hours.



Hayes Valley North and South RAD Focus Group Notes

Date	3/18/2019
Location	401 Rose Street
Host Organization	SFHDC
# Attendees	17

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?
 - To only pay 30% of net income after accounting for basic expenses: utilities, phone, food, internet, cable, transportation, insurance
 - For Market Rate and Tax Credit Residents: Being able to keep up with rises in rental rates
 - Needs to be re-evaluated regularly
 - Lie within your means
 - Rent grace period while filing a disability claim
 - Better communication and coordination between SFHA and Property Management
 - Better Security
 - Family-loss support (death in family)
2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?
 - Repairs on time: Well communicated and coordinated house-visits by maintenance staff
 - Respectful maintenance staff: professional conduct
 - Working plumbing
 - "No band aids on broken arms"
 - Hire professional maintenance staff:
 - Plumbers and electricians who are bonded and insured
 - No nepotism in maintenance staff hiring or vendor contracting
 - Subsidized renters' insurance
 - Support Groups: Smoking, grief, general, woman's, men's, death notifications for neighbors
 - More Barbara Smiths
 - Quality Household Maintenance Items: plungers, brooms, mops
 - Functioning Alarms
 - Better Sound Insulation
 - Senior Services
 - Disability Services
 - ADA access
3. How would you find out about these services?
 - Website
 - Newsletters
 - Fliers
 - included with rent receipts
 - Word of mouth
 - Group Meetings



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Also, monthly meetings
 - Billboards and Community Bulletin Boards
 - Interpret and Translation
4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?
- Transportation
 - Need vouchers
 - Access/Awareness
 - Language Barriers
 - No on-site interpreters
 - Time/Schedule Restrictions
 - Need more options and multiple times
 - Lack of Information
 - Noisy Meetings
 - Interpretation @ meetings
 - Need Multiple locations for meetings and Services
 - Consistency
 - Notification of services
5. Do you have any suggestions for how to make our programs and services better to meet your community's need?
- Better Insure Resident Privacy
 - During property management staff changes
 - custody record for master keys for accessing units (maintenance staff entering for non-work)
 - Better communication
 - Vendor accountability
 - Regular recertifications:
 - one-time and accurate
 - regular lease renewals
 - Bring people together
 - Relevant programs based on actual needs
 - One recertification for SFHA and Property Management: One step for all issues
 - Better Training for Property Management Staff:
 - Maintenance issues
 - Customer Service
 - Compassion for residents
 - Bonded maintenance staff
 - diversity
 - trauma informed care
 - equity
 - More diverse staff
 - Equitable service
 - Regular replacement of appliances, blinds, floors, etc.
 - Timely processing of work orders
 - Secured doors and gates and windows (bars or secure screens)
 - Responsible and comprehensive repairs after leaks or floods
 - Consistency and continuity between property management staff
 - Better assessment
6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Tutoring
 - Discounted Furniture donation pick-up
 - Gym membership/weight room
 - Funeral insurance, additional insurance
 - counselling/mental health services
7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?
- Make it free
 - more stops/better service
 - diverse hiring practices for transit operators
 - diversity inclusion training
 - More paratransit options
8. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified do you prefer?
- Internet, newsletter, better targeted outreach
9. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?
- Too expensive
 - not a dream for some people
 - huge HPA fees/maintenance issues
 - very small units
 - awareness of support programs
 - credit issues/down payment
 - on-site education
10. What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?
- Money/credit/down payment
 - employment
11. **HIV GROUPS ONLY.** What factors make housing opportunities welcoming to HIV+ individuals? Why?
- Type notes here
12. **HIV GROUPS ONLY.** What programs or services could effectively help people with HIV improve their health?
- Type notes here
13. **HIV GROUPS ONLY.** *[question repeated in Housing Providers section]* What are some ideas to create more housing for people living with HIV?
- Type notes here



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

14. If you have children, what barriers do you have for them to attend a high performing public school?
- Transportation
 - neighborhood
 - fees for afterschool programs
 - health/parent limits and barriers - parenting support
15. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve equitable access to high performing public schools?
- resident location of funding programs
 - time it takes to research
 - better outside of school activities
 - Increase parent involvement
 - On-site counselling
16. What has helped you or others in your community get or keep a job?
- Friend referrals
 - Volunteering as stepping stones
 - continuing education
 - Show up!
 - Do what is expected of you and more
 - On-site workforce development
 - humble up - sell your best qualities
17. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?
- Dist. Supervisor presence in community
 - Directly address known issues
 - make sure city staff/agencies are accountable
 - invest in things that matter: education, transit, housing
 - Improve hiring process
18. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?
- Education - basic financial literacy and home maintenance
 - cheaper rent
 - good jobs
19. Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?
- Regulations in affordable housing can hold people back (e.g.: education/student credit limits)
 - how to make sure people can move forward with education and keep stable housing

CLOSING. Thank you again for your participation. Does anyone have any final reflections or closing thoughts?

- Type notes here



Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

- Things people love about living in SF:
 - Opportunities
 - people
 - Diversity
 - Mixed environment
 - educational system
 - Transportation system
 - Job Opportunities
 - Progressive
 - Neighbors
 - Born and raised
 - Everything
- Residents were very engaged and we struggled to complete this focus group exercise in 2 hours.

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?

- Residents were very happy for the opportunity to be heard and give feedback and advice.



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

JFK Towers Focus Group Notes

Date	March 21, 2019
Location	1760 Bush St.
Host Organization	JKF Tower
# Attendees	

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?
 - Everyone says, they do not need someone's taxes, they could always use more money
 - Nice/ clean right now/ some residents units are dirty with cockroaches/ assist people in keeping units clean
2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?
 - Mental health services, do not need extra services but know people who do
 - Mattress
 - Food Stamps
 - clothing
3. How would you find out about these services?
 - RSC, church, ads
4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?
 - No problems
 - Health
 - Language
5. Do you have any suggestions for how to make our programs and services better to meet your community's need?
 - Transportation, more groups
6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?
 - No/ can always go to resident service: mattresses/bed
7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?
 - More accessibility to transit; a van for the building to take to event/ appointments
8. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified do you prefer?
 - Type notes here
9. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- No have not considered
10. What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?
 - Substance abuse, money (finances)- if you miss one apt. you have to start all over
 11. What factors make housing opportunities welcoming to HIV+ individuals? Why?
 - Type notes here
 12. What programs or services could effectively help people with HIV improve their health?
 - Type notes here
 13. *[question repeated in Housing Providers section]* What are some ideas to create more housing for people living with HIV?
 - Type notes here
 14. If you have children, what barriers do you have for them to attend a high performing public school?
 - Type notes here
 15. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve equitable access to high performing public schools?
 - Type notes here
 16. *[question repeated from HIV+ section]* What are some ideas to create more housing for people living with HIV?
 - Type notes here
 17. What strategies, incentives, or policies would encourage landlords to participate in the Section 8 and other voucher programs?
 - Type notes here
 18. What would help developers invest in under-served neighborhoods?
 - Type notes here
 19. What has helped you or others in your community get or keep a job?
 - Mentors, younger, internship, volunteering
 20. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?
 - Set up tables at sites- jobfairs@sites
 21. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?
 - Type notes here
 22. Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?
 - Type notes here



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

CLOSING. Thank you again for your participation. Does anyone have any final reflections or closing thoughts?

- Type notes here

Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

- One resident with the majority of ideas

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?

- Residents were receptive



1855 15th Street RAD Focus Group Notes

Date	3/22/19
Location	Mission Dolores 1855 15 th St.
Host Organization	Sequoia Living – Dennis Coffman RSC
# Attendees	7

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?
 - All residents agreed that keeping their vouchers would be essential in keeping their current housing.
2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?
 - 1 said religious, 2 stated transportation, 4 replied that super markets/grocery stores/pharmacies
3. How would you find out about these services?
 - All participants stated that they would ask RSC or friends/family/internet.
4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?
 - All participants stated that other than internet access, there were no other barriers to services or programs.
5. Do you have any suggestions for how to make our programs and services better to meet your community's need?
 - Onsite computer room and programs/services be closer/easier to get to.
6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?

Participants agreed that San Francisco has all the services they need and are able to locate/access services that are appropriate for them.
7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?
 - 1 participant suggested there be an app, or telephone number/service for seniors to call for rides (especially people with disabilities) less expensive and easier to use than Uber/Para-transit.
8. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified do you prefer?
 - All participants stated that a hard copy would be the best means.
9. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?
 - No participants are interested in home ownership.



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

10. What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?
 - All participants reported that a Social Worker /Case Manager would be the kind of help most would use.
 - Drug addiction, relationship/family issues, fear of being independent.
11. **HIV GROUPS ONLY.** What factors make housing opportunities welcoming to HIV+ individuals? Why?
 - N/A
12. **HIV GROUPS ONLY.** What programs or services could effectively help people with HIV improve their health?
 - N/A
13. **HIV GROUPS ONLY.** *[question repeated in Housing Providers section]* What are some ideas to create more housing for people living with HIV?
 - N/A
14. If you have children, what barriers do you have for them to attend a high performing public school?
 - All participants' children are adults.
15. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve equitable access to high performing public schools?
 - No suggestions provided by participants.
16. What has helped you or others in your community get or keep a job?
 - 3 said job training, and the other 4 are unable to work.
17. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?
 - The general consensus among participants was to make good jobs available to residents without education/experience and provide on the job training to those folks.
18. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?
 - All participants are on a fixed income and receiving a higher monthly allotment would help in creating financial stability.
19. Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?
 - Some participants wanted to be asked about how they feel about the conversion from SFHA to Bridge.

CLOSING. Thank you again for your participation. Does anyone have any final reflections or closing thoughts?

- When are the food boxes coming back?
- Are they (Bridge Housing) going to create a garden for us?



Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

- Nothing particularly stood out, all participants got along and were courteous to each other.

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?

- They reacted to questions enthusiastically for the most part, especially the job/financial questions.



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

Robert B. Pitts RAD Focus Group Notes

Date	March 19 th , 2019	
Location	Robert B Pitts	
Host Organization	FRH Consulting	
# Attendees	20	

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?
 - Help with rent increases
2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?
 - Homeownership, credit monitoring, 1st time homeowners for seniors, Education: GED support, college, Mental Health support: Post violent incidents, substance abuse support, helpline
3. How would you find out about these services?
 - Internet, Community Service Providers (the connection center & Success Center)
4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?
 - Waitlists, Slow responses.
 - Solutions: information board
5. Do you have any suggestions for how to make our programs and services better to meet your community's need?
 - Having an advocate from another agency who can be a bridge
6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?
 - Children's programs, Childcare and Afterschool. Immigration (safe place to seek answers)
7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?
 - Taxi Vouchers are limited so Lyft/Uber Vouchers. Esp. at night for seniors.
8. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified do you prefer?
 - Presentation-interactive Q&A, text, email, snail mail, flyers posted in common areas/front door, Clip on Address Plaques
9. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?
 - High cost, lack of information, early start in life with budgets (financial management), needs vs wants, prioritizing needs. Education for Youth & Adults (Banking Choices, Taxes for teens)



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

10. What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?
Progress begins at home-expectations of children to grow into adulthood (school, work, etc.)
Learning skills of KEEPING a home. Transition support for inherited properties-Financial Management, property tax. End of life planning for heirs, Life insurance
11.
 - Type notes here
12. **HIV GROUPS ONLY.** What factors make housing opportunities welcoming to HIV+ individuals? Why?
 - Type notes here
13. **HIV GROUPS ONLY.** What programs or services could effectively help people with HIV improve their health?
 - Type notes here
14. **HIV GROUPS ONLY.** *[question repeated in Housing Providers section]* What are some ideas to create more housing for people living with HIV?
 - Type notes here
15. If you have children, what barriers do you have for them to attend a high performing public school?
 - Type notes here
16. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve equitable access to high performing public schools?
 - Type notes here
17. What has helped you or others in your community get or keep a job?
 - Type notes here
18. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?
 - Type notes here
19. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?
 - Type notes here
20. Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?
 - Type notes here

CLOSING. Thank you again for your participation. Does anyone have any final reflections or closing thoughts?

- Type notes here



Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

- Type notes here

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?

- Type notes here



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

Westside Courts RAD Focus Group Notes

Date	3/25/19
Location	Westside Courts
Host Organization	FRH Service Connector
# Attendees	9

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?
 - More money
2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?
 - Security/ safety, Accountability department for services that serve communities, senior programs, youth programs and services, programs for fitness and health.
3. How would you find out about these services?
 - Word of mouth, mail, fliers, emails
4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?
 - Lack of knowledge, to far with no direct transportation
5. Do you have any suggestions for how to make our programs and services better to meet your community's need?
 - Visit the different communities to talk directly to the community, surveys
6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?
 - Summer jobs, driver license programs, how to pay for tickets if your low income, free dental and eye glasses, affordable childcare, food programs for families, mental health /therapy
7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?
 - Help with clipper cards for low income families that don't receive government assistance, more free or cheaper transportation
8. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified do you prefer?
 - Presentations, fliers, phone calls
9. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?
 - Finances, raise minimum wage, lower cost of living, more lower income and first-time buyer programs



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

10. What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?
 - Determination, case managers, stipulations, lack of money.
11. **HIV GROUPS ONLY.** What factors make housing opportunities welcoming to HIV+ individuals? Why?
 - Type notes here
12. **HIV GROUPS ONLY.** What programs or services could effectively help people with HIV improve their health?
 - Type notes here
13. **HIV GROUPS ONLY.** *[question repeated in Housing Providers section]* What are some ideas to create more housing for people living with HIV?
 - Type notes here
14. If you have children, what barriers do you have for them to attend a high performing public school?
 - Didn't answer
15. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve equitable access to high performing public schools?
 - Didn't answer
16. What has helped you or others in your community get or keep a job?
 - Word mouth, trainings, communication, dress for success, life skills classes.
17. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?
 - Advertise, make it affordable to live in the city where they work, back ground checks, trainings.
18. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?
 - Better job opportunity, more pay
19. Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?
 - More trainings for adult programs.

CLOSING. Thank you again for your participation. Does anyone have any final reflections or closing thoughts?

- No answers.
-



Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

- Type notes here

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?

- Type notes here



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

Woodside RAD Focus Group Notes

Date	3/22/2019
Location	255 Woodside Ave. San Francisco, CA 94127
Host Organization	El Fattah & Vicky Guan (RSC's) Sequoia Living, Community Services
# Attendees	9

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?
 - IHSS support; providers coming to homes instead of going to provider.
 - Reduced cost of living. Cost of living to high. Need to meet income criteria for affordable housing.
 - Pay rent on time, abide by rules and policy procedures to keep existing housing.
2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?
 - Help with free services, such as, laundry vouchers, free transportation for senior and disable individuals. A free Regional Transit Card would be ideal.
 - Making the process for Food Bank sign-up, Cal-Fresh and other programs easier with less of a wait time.
 - Safety and security at housing sites.
 - Access to phone replacement services/ help with cell phones.
3. How would you find out about these services?
 - Case Managers/RSC's knowing all the latest programs available.
 - Monthly hard copy list available at all citywide locations where people get services (e.g. Saint Anthony's, CM/RSC's office, doctor/clinic's office, government agencies).
 - Rental packet upon move-in to Affordable Housing
 - Need available services in multiple languages.
4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?
 - Not wanting to seek services, difficulties in getting to services and completing applications.
 - Monthly/quarterly brochures of what programs can and can't be used. Knowing about available services/programs.
 - Not having the ability to speak with a live person, social interaction. Technology being an issue (having access to the technology, knowing how to use the technology) to access services and programs.
 - On-site presentations/workshops with program facilitator to explain if programs are good fit for residents. What programs are a good fit for individual's, seniors vs. non-senior community.
5. Do you have any suggestions for how to make our programs and services better to meet your community's need?



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Services that specifically address the trauma from being homeless (weekly, semi-monthly, monthly services geared towards individuals who maybe suffering from the differences of street life vs. being permanent housing).
 - Outside community engagement.
 - Resources and information at all community centers on a monthly basis. Newsletters.
 - Knowing San Francisco County's Policy/Procedures/Programs for Affordable Housing Sites.
6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?
- Legal services difficult to get ahold of. No access to pro-bono attorneys.
 - Access to a group/program that residents can turn to regarding Property Management. Outside authority between management and tenants. Outside support, besides property manager and service coordinator, regarding building issues. A special counsel to oversee property managers and building maintenance.
 - Good dental and vision services for individuals on a fixed income.
 - Interpretation services in all Social Service settings. Multiple languages.
7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?
- Free transportation
 - Central subway completion
 - Build more underground Muni lines
 - Most people in the focus group feel that transportation is adequate and meets their transportation needs.
8. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified do you prefer?
- Email
 - Newsletters/hardcopy in multiple languages.
 - Ability to speak to a live person, also available in multiple language
 - Workshops
9. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?
- Racial barriers
 - Ability to have a high income to keep up with cost of living.
 - Lack of affordable homes for sale throughout San Francisco. More demand less supply.
10. What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?
- Having a good case manager.
 - Access to jobs that will not affect SSI or SSDI or any other government assistance
 - Self-determination and Education
- What gets in the way of moving on?
- Drugs
 - Mental illness
 - Trying to stay organized and focused while in temporary housing/shelter
 - Knowing how to access services, having access to language services



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

11. **HIV GROUPS ONLY.** What factors make housing opportunities welcoming to HIV+ individuals? Why?
 - N/A
12. **HIV GROUPS ONLY.** What programs or services could effectively help people with HIV improve their health?
 - N/A
13. **HIV GROUPS ONLY.** *[question repeated in Housing Providers section]* What are some ideas to create more housing for people living with HIV?
 - N/A
14. If you have children, what barriers do you have for them to attend a high performing public school?
 - N/A, residents either don't have children or their children are adults now.
15. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve equitable access to high performing public schools?
 - N/A, residents either don't have children or their children are adults now.
16. What has helped you or others in your community get or keep a job?
 - Job trainings more available job openings.
 - Employer's wanting to hire people with disabilities, seniors and people who have a desire to want to work.
 - Having access to technology to find jobs/programs for job placement.
17. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?
 - San Francisco County providing an organization that can train and provide job placement regardless of their backgrounds.
 - Good paying jobs, converting formerly homeless individual's and seniors who want to work into city/government workers.
 - SF county providing job training/educational certificates for specific positions. Make it official.
18. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?
 - Changing the eligibility criteria for government assistance as the cost of living is significantly increasing at a rapid pace.
 - Taking into consideration that seniors and disable people have limited ability to increase their income. Therefore, certain services should be free or affordable to this community or anyone living in an affordable housing site.
 - Government can add more financial help for seniors and the disable people.
19. Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?
 - No questions/mention about mental health services both internally and externally
 - No questions/mention about the LBGTQI community
 - No Questions/mention about access to more services geared towards affordable housing seniors and disable people.
 - People in the community feel under represented due to their race.
 - Lack of acknowledgement for transportation support for people with mobility needs.



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

CLOSING. Thank you again for your participation. Does anyone have any final reflections or closing thoughts?

- Questions should be more specific and inclusive.
 - Happy that SF Mayor's Office want to hear feedback from the community.
-

Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

- Participants were very willing to answer questions and appeared to be happy to have the opportunity to be heard.
- Participants appeared to have put a lot of thought into their answers.
- Because this was a focus group, participants were talking over each other and facilitator had to remind everyone that they will get their turn to be heard. Lots of excitement.
- Participants were a diverse group, different age range and different backgrounds.

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?

- For the most part, most questions appeared to have be related to the participants, one way or another. The participants wanted to be heard and just about everyone wanted to say something. The questions that were asked are topics that the participants care about and that is why they were so enthusiastic about them. It seemed that at times, the participants wanted to talk more about other topics that were not related to the focus group. Facilitator had to ask the participants to refocus and facilitator was required to repeat the question again.



Samoan Community Focus Group Notes

Date	March 26, 201
Location	Sunnydale
Host Organization	MOHCD
# Attendees	

NOTE: WE DID NOT ASK ALL QUESTIONS OF THIS FOCUS GROUP

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?

- Public housing needs more **security; safety issues** from old developments remain the same, even in new developments like Hunters View and Alice Griffith; need more police presence
- "New" Alice Griffith – I live there, managers don't answer phones in their office, don't use cameras unless you make a complaint, but nobody is there to make a complaint to often; kids running around the hallways unattended, knocking on doors; there are no backyards, so kids don't have any safe outside space; kids from development and outside of community are running around; there is shooting in front of my unit, have a bullet hole in my car; we have to stand up and work together; I don't feel like I can stand up to them because I am afraid of these youth, we can't control them; all I can do is pray to God; even the police seem afraid; police "come when they want to come," do not respond quickly
- Sunnydale – so afraid to let my grandkids play outside, it is a little better now; if you call police it takes 30-60 minutes for them to arrive; there was a shoot-out on Sunnydale, police were called and they never came; we don't feel protected, we have to watch ourselves; Samoan community has to watch out for each other; similar problems as to in Alice Griffith
- I live at Oakdale/Hunters View – I think that is the most dangerous development; when there is a shooting I never hear about what happened; cameras don't work; party until 1-2am, police tell people to leave and they don't, seems like police don't really care
- A few people in group have applied for Below Market Rate housing lotteries; "I've applied for every opportunity, but never have a low number (seems like it's usually in the thousands), but it seems impossible to get in without a preference; I have found DAHLIA pretty easy to use, I get an email now every time a housing opportunity opens up in San Francisco; those housing opportunities are still pretty expensive, at least \$1,300 for a one bedroom, need to make three times rent to be eligible"
- Lots of people cannot afford even low rents of public housing, they add people to unit to help pay rent; but then issues arise about having residents that are not on lease, they can get evicted; people coming from the island are often not used to paying any rent and/or living with lots of people living together in one unit; difficult to learn how to survive in an environment when they have to earn this much money; we have elders how have lived in public housing for forty years, and not able to adjust to having to pay \$1,500 in rent
- In America it is all about money; we are used to relying on our families
- I had to complete a form to become a care-giver for my brother so that I could stay with him



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?

- We do have a center in the housing development at Oakdale; problem that some of our kids cannot work at Sunnydale or Alice Griffith; with rebuilt housing it does seem to be getting better
- Alice Griffith needs more parking; difficult to deal with parking because cars that aren't registered in their name because of bad credit, etc.; then they double-park car in front of unit where they can keep an eye on it
- **Need to fund more programs onsite for day care and youth programs to give kids more supervision**
- **Need more responsive management in new developments, need to answer phone**
- There are programs in housing to help people rebuild their credit, but not sure if people are using these services
- Need more positive activities – sports, etc.

3. What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?

- It works well in terms of transit and getting places; but there are lots of issues with safety (fights, robberies, etc.)

4. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?

5. Is owning your own home a possibility?

- **NO! San Francisco is totally out of range;** house on Sherwin Street in neighborhood for \$1.6 million, and this is still in a very unsafe neighborhood
- People are moving to East Bay, North Bay, Las Vegas, Alaska, Seattle

6. If you have children, what barriers do you have for them to attend a high performing public school?

- SFUSD is already underperforming school district, makes our students less competitive
- College tours work well
- Kids are not well prepared by schools, don't seem ready to think about college; that's why we take kids on college tours to help prepare them and start thinking about it; most of our kids are just trying to finish high school; at Sacramento City College we met with Pacific Islander community, they made the school seem more inviting, we ended up having three girls decide they wanted to apply there
- Everyone here is a teacher within the community
- In my experience, it is harder for Samoan kids whose parents were born in America and don't speak Samoan language or connect as much to culture

7. What has helped you or others in your community get or keep a job?



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Some kids do get involved in trade schools; but a lot of kids choose not to work
- **Need paid training and internships; requirements for these are often too high; give credits at school for work experience**
- Some people decide to just stay home and take care of their parents rather than get a job; some people stay home from school to take care of parents;
- also, some drug dealers on the street promote life style that they can make \$500 in an hour, why work for a whole week to make \$500?
- Not enough notification when there are job openings for HOPE SF, only get notifications of openings or trainings a few days before, bigger agencies get notice further in advance; Drew will come up with flyers; what is role of OEWD and NAP to inform this community about job openings?
- Our young people are interested in starting businesses that sell clothing, design, etc.

8. **What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?**

- Samoan CDC does now offer some financial literacy classes through its youth programming
- Nobody in focus group had heard about or been exposed to BALANCE's financial coaching services

9. **Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?**

- Community Assets/Community Center/Ownership of Building: Samoan Community Development Center needs more space; have to share this building with SFUSD, they have lot of building reserved but don't use it very often; the youth wish that this was really "our building;" need a real center for Pacific Islander community; we only have two classrooms for our afterschool programs, need more space
- Need to create atmosphere and sense of belonging;

Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

- Type notes here

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Type notes here



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

Sf Immigrant Legal Education Network Focus Group Notes

Date	3/11/19
Location	
Host Organization	
# Attendees	

1. What do your participants need to get or stay in housing?

- Security deposits, proof of income – many clients do not have prior rental history, or funds to make security deposit
- Credit and money
- Documents
- Immigration status to access city or government housing
- Bank accounts – with pending status clients are often not able to open a bank account
- Language – accessing services, completing forms
- Particularly indigenous dialects; Language Line is not usually able to support these languages
- For clients in removal proceedings, where ICE has their contact information, others will not want to live with them
- Undocumented minors also have problems finding g places to live; they may not be able to stay in household where they were living, often end up homeless or in shelters (particularly in ages 16-20)

2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for your participants?

- Mental health services
- Immigration process is re-traumatizing, they have to keep telling their stories in different settings
- Estrangement between parents and children (particularly upon re-unification), need wraparound services, case management, service connection and service coordination, system navigation
- Acclimation to new urban environment
- Emergency housing for recent arrivals
- Services that are easily set up for immediate access; crisis services (health care, mental health, food, housing)
- Legal service providers need better access to social services and case management; clients have wide range of needs that they present to legal providers
- Need assistance with family law issues; we have to spend time searching for pro bono help
- ILDC attorneys to some family law, but there is a wider set of needs to domestic violence survivors (custody, divorce, restraining orders)



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Domestic violence is not always partner based (can be a brother or some form of DV)
- Integration – cultural and social
- Recent immigrants often joining small churches (Evangelical, etc.) sometimes these churches can be exploitative
- SFUSD and local school systems can be very difficult for immigrant families to navigate
- Need for Cross-sectoral assistance – training other departments and institutions – SFILN trains clients – need resource for training other institutions and providers
- Immigration legal services – affirmative and defensive, the need is still very high; legal providers become primary point of contact
- Criminal immigration cases – clients have issues that we could clean up, need more resources
- Tenant counseling and employment rights services specific to immigrant clients

3. How do they find out about these services?

- Word of mouth is still key
- From attorneys (we are often first point of contact)
- Lack of needed case managers
- Outreach and education that the SFILN partners do
- PODER is seeing more newcomers in the Excelsior, this then means that those staff have to become case managers, may then connect clients to legal teams
- Promoters are out on the street talking to people about programs and resources
- CARECEN is on list that immigration court provides when people are released
- Challenge with age limits for case management (sometimes youth are assigned a case manager, but parents cannot get one)
- Ethnic media and social media
- School district could do a more comprehensive job in providing families with resources and information
- Outreach organizations do lots of relationship building with other organizations, building partnerships so that they can share information with all their clients
- Referrals from individuals and institutions in their countries of origin, also get this information at the border

4. What gets in the way of participants being able to access or use existing programs and services?

- Trump cracked down on people using public resources ("public charge" issue), making immigrants terrified to access any kind of public service
- SIJS – very long waiting period for these youth to access work permit, how can these young people work and economically survive while waiting for their Green Card
- Organizational capacity – demand for services far outstrips CBO capacity
- Our capacities are also limited by Federal barriers and backlogs
- Cost (or perceived cost) of fees and services becomes a barrier
- Sometimes people are will to pay notaries when they don't have to, because those notaries are well known
- Misinformation – for instance, DACA eligibility was not always understood



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Ability to hire qualified staff when cost of living in SF is so high compared to wages
- 5. Do you have any suggestions for how to make City programs and services better to meet your community's need?**
- Anti-poverty strategy and housing strategy for nonprofit workers
 - Difficult to even recruit Executive Directors
 - Better respect for language access ordinance
 - More leadership on equity and inclusion for city
- 6. How can we make transportation more accessible?**
- Too expensive – some clients don't attend food pantry because they don't have money for MUNI fare
 - Discount rate for nonprofit staff
 - Month free pass program for recent arrivals
 - Criminalization if you don't use system appropriately
 - Safety and security on BART and MUNI, particularly those previously victimized
- 7. How could community get best informed about housing opportunities?**
- Current means of outreach seems to be working pretty well
 - Bus ads
 - DAHLIA ends up just putting people on wait lists
 - Need simpler info-graphic that explains entire housing process for residents
 - MEDA is only agency doing follow up with residents who have been selected through lotteries
 - Better use of technology, text messages, short info video
- 8. What are the primary barriers to home ownership?**
- Poverty
 - Competition
 - Cost
 - Need better outreach and programs for nonprofit staff
 - Need more studies conducted regarding outmigration, residents outside of SF still access services in SF
 - Residency requirement for BMR and other programs
 - People are coming from hundreds of miles away because their case is in SF immigration court, but they cannot access of resources here
- 9. Barriers to clients children accessing high performing schools**
- Too few high performing schools, and they are all on the west side
 - Language barriers
 - Lots of kids have big gap in schooling, have trouble integrating back into school
 - District needs to introduce programming for recent immigrant students
 - Pathways for children who may have trouble accessing college
 - Parents need help navigating school system



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Policing of schools – bringing police into schools introduces complications into their immigration status, etc.

10. Landlords and Section 8

- Rebrand it – give it a new name
- Barriers for individuals with criminal records
- Providers are signing up clients for DAHLIA who may not meet any of the minimum requirements to access the housing opportunities

11. Access to good jobs

- Training programs for immigrant kids who have been working more of their lives, getting them into trade schools and other more high-wage professions; the GED or high-school diploma requirements are a barrier for many people
- City should be focusing more resources on tech, bio-tech, and other higher-wage industries; training for the industries that the city is most actively subsidizing
- Need accessible, entry level work
- Some job programs based on funding source require a social security number

12. What do participants need in order to be financially stable or to be able to build wealth?

- More investment in creation of entrepreneurship opportunities
- More incubators like La Cocina – provides infrastructure to small entrepreneurs
- Protecting and encouraging street vendors
- Extract promises from big high tech companies (internships, community benefit agreements) to help residents access opportunities

Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

- Type notes here

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?

- Type notes here



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

Senior Disability Action Focus Group Notes

Date	March 14, 2019
Location	Universal Unitarian Church
Host Organization	Senior Disability Action
# Attendees	40

Before launching into the Focus Group questions, Teresa opened up the floor for concerns to be expressed given concerns indicated via email about outreach for the forums, etc., for a 5-minute period.

Comment 1: How were the forums advertised?

Response 1: Through community organizations that MOCHD works with; plus, outreach through each district supervisor to advertise through the organizations they work with. Unfortunately, not everyone heard, which is why we are also doing focus groups.

Comment 2: A five-year plan is quite a distance down the road – are they modifiable if changes need to be made?

Response 2: Yes, they are drafted as broader plans but then we have individual strategies and indicators of success so that we can course correct if needed. We need to address problems that we encounter as we go and record those problems.

Comment 3: What about transit? Are you involved with transit changes on Van Ness?

Response 3: No, we work on housing, transit concerns can be addressed with MUNI.

Comment 4: I attended an organization event and sent in an application; no one answered so it seems like it is not responsive system.

Response 4: That is a good question. There is an online application process, DAHLIA, to submit housing applications. It lists all of the housing opportunities that MOCHD is involved with. We use a lottery system so if you apply that doesn't mean that you'll be offered a unit.

Comment 5: Apparently there are 30,000 luxury condos not being occupied – why can't we get access to those for people who need housing?

Response 5: I don't know how the City could take those over. I'll note that question and explore.

Comment 6: Are you going to the Senior Centers where there are low income seniors who don't have enough to eat? Are you thinking about affordable housing as it is represented in this room, with people living on \$800 / month and who have to choose between eating and medicine?

Response 6: We can't go to every senior center, but we are working with DAAS to outreach to senior centers.

Comment 7: Maybe seniors don't know how to use computers so DAHLIA may not be a resource for them. Also, the listings aren't deeply affordable as seniors and people with disabilities need. When the rent is \$1,000 or \$1,200 / month, most of the seniors we know don't have sufficient income to even be eligible. MOCHD should be the lead on this to make changes on the 5-year plan to address affordability.

Response 7: Thank you for the comment.



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

Comment 8: The Section 8 Waitlist – how long is it and is it closed?

Response 8: I don't know how long it is and I believe that it is closed. It is managed by the San Francisco Housing Authority. Thank you for your comments and now I'll go to our questions:

1. What is important to you or an unmet housing or community service need that MOHCD should know about?

- Does MOHCD do advocacy? Like Costa Hawkins; if legislators could pass statewide rent control, for example, that would be very helpful.
- When you talk about seniors and people with disabilities – do you have a plan to help people age in place and stay in their homes?
 - Response: We provide funding to Rebuilding Together who provide modifications to units to make them accessible.
- I've lived in a place for 44 years; I have a telephone line and no computer. Now the phone company will stop mailing statements and bills and I don't have a way to access my bills and pay online.
- I've been a renter living in my unit for 44 years and I've had to fight 11 evictions! My problem is how do you get landlords to do repairs? They don't do anything and this is the reality for so many people. I can't risk my housing by complaining.
- I wonder if there is a priority for people to stay in their neighborhoods; so many people are being displaced.
 - Response: There is a neighborhood / supervisorial district preference for new housing opportunities;
- However, this preference is not applied at all buildings, and the real problem is that many of them are still not affordable even if someone did get the preference.
- There seems to be a sliding scale for affordable housing; there are different classifications of low income; my suggestion is that you make a scale that is the same for all, get it standardized across programs.
- Some buildings target seniors and some target disabilities – the criteria seem to be as they choose and it is not standard across the board.
- We are doing individual fights for everything; you guys need to get your game together so we can be united rather than fighting; the big builders love chaos.

2. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?

- We need real affordability.
- Accessibility – one of my housemates is very disabled; they sent out someone to make repairs but they couldn't address everything she needed; that organization needs to be able to do more complex improvements.
- Housing is a right, not a privilege. There needs to be more subsidies and no vacancies; so, seniors and people with disabilities can have a place to live.
- If a senior can no longer afford to live here, that senior has to move. I know people who have had to move to Placerville, Stockton, and they can't even see their children. Their children need to work two to three jobs to make ends meet and live far away. This is breaking up families. I have a son and for him to get an apartment, I had to introduce him to a woman who makes far more money so he could live with her and afford the rent.



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- You are looking at the people who built San Francisco – and the City owes them a debt. The City should look at more than rent – look at medicine, utilities, phones, electricity, food, etc. Everything should be considered when you look at affordable housing. 30% of your income for housing doesn't work anymore.
 - For some people to stay in their homes, they need intensive case management; that is a great need that isn't in place.
 - I work with people in SROs, and one of the problems all over the City is if there is an empty room, the owner can turn it into a tourist room; that is happening all over the Mission, Chinatown, etc. The City needs to pass legislation to prohibit this.
 - In SROs, if the elevator doesn't work, people with disabilities and seniors can't do anything. These need to be fixed and checked every 3 or 4 months to make sure they are working. A check once a year is not enough.
 - There was some talk about San Francisco having its own Section 8 program since the federal one is not worth anything right now. Can we do that?
 - Response: As you know, we are facing challenges with the Housing Authority and we may be looking at a local type of program; I can't report on that now but will get back to you.
 - Sometimes it feels like we are providing feedback and then it goes down a deep well and we never hear about it again.
 - Response: We'll be collecting all of this feedback and will report out in June; we will be developing strategies based on all of the needs in the month of July; then we'll be releasing an RFP for services funding in August and funding will be available in January 2020. This meeting's feedback will be incorporated in all of the feedback we get. We will publish the strategies for broader comment.
3. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?
- Nutrition; transportation; database for all services; in all of the language we need them in; accessible urgent care; Sunshine ordinance; many people don't have access to or desire for the internet; if you don't have a computer you might use the library but the library closes, so it is not helpful to go to MOHCD.org. The best strategy is to post signs and flyers in each and every neighborhood and in different languages.
 - Seniors have a hard time going to meetings in evenings, the time when the forums were held; think about how it is harder for us to get around at night; we are here now because that is when we can be here. There is infrequent MUNI service at night.
4. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?
- Deeply affordable housing needs to be attached with services that include counseling so there is a gatekeeper to provide info., a counselor to help remind about rent payments, communication with hospitals, stay on track with health needs (like getting canes, walkers), take medication, assistance with bill paying, etc., help with day to day stuff that younger people are more able to manage.
 - Paratransit
 - I have a lot of health problems; if I paid attention to Western medicine, I wouldn't be walking now. Complementary alternative medicine at Glide has helped me enormously. We need to increase access to complementary medicine.
 - We need a more personal touch than a computer – if there is somewhere where there is a human presence, that would be really key so we are not anonymous.



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- A lot of seniors can use computers but can't afford them. It comes down to money. Library access and technical support is key.

CLOSING. Thank you again for your participation. Does anyone have any final reflections or closing thoughts?

We need deeply affordable housing. Most of us can't access the housing that is being created.

Notetaker / Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

- Meeting participants were passionate, supportive of each other, and wanted to be heard. They indicated that very low-income seniors and people with disabilities, the bulk of people they know and work with, aren't being considered in the design of our affordable housing programs. They feel left out. They want to see the notes and for us to report out what happens with all of this information.

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?

- They had a lot to say and we ran out of time which is why we couldn't go through all of the questions.



Transgender Community Focus Group Notes

Date	March 21, 2019
Location	730 Polk St.
Host Organization	St. James Infirmary/Open Hand
# Attendees	6

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?

- Mental health issues. Go to housing groups, understand what they're getting into.
 - People on the street now indoors, mental health issues.
 - Better jobs
 - How much do you need for below market rate units? On GA, not much.
 - Person on social security can get nice places. On GA don't qualify.
 - Senior on disability, 500/mo. To qualify for Laguna, needed to earn more. Had to get a rental subsidy. Need rental subsidies.
 - Application process for immigrants, language barriers make it difficult. Miscommunications. Need more support for applications, accessibility for multiple languages on site.
 - People don't earn enough to get into Laguna.
 - Open House, looking for rental subsidies to bridge.
 - 1300 people for 80 units.
 - 1% applicants get a BMR rental spot.
 - People come here for TG services. Think of something more long term. Work a job, but don't make too much money. What are you doing this for? Can't actually live here, fear of Ellis Acted out. Lots of people threatened with eviction. Trying to push us away. Housing and employment, interchangeable. Can't get one without the other. Need both.
 - Exiting jail, need address or violating probation. Some have jobs, but no place to live. People have gone out of the scope of their work to help people. Burn out.
 - Wages aren't livable.
 - Need more personal assistance.
 - Trans housing assistance advisor (Q Foundation). Some can't do the process. Need guidance through the process. On top of stress of their lives.
 - Need professional development
 - Community more receptive to those who look like them.
 - Someone to walk them through things
 - Folks are not prepared, and need training to keep the housing
 - Some people who get housing then get evicted as a result of not knowing how to keep it
 - And mental health and drug issues complicate that
 - Formerly incarcerated folks have particular challenges
 - Not surprising that some folks have serious acting out issues
- Do people know where to go for eviction resources?
- Example of someone that got support from eviction prevention but felt that she was manipulated/coerced by the support resources
 - Without eviction papers, you won't get any support



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- People need help before things get that bad
- It takes 30 days to get into shelter, so you'll be on the street until then
- There are many forms of discrimination – against formerly incarcerated, against transgender
- Issue of HOA fees going up – can't keep up
- Defense agencies are at their maximum
- Lot of frustration at 95 Laguna for trans elders – they don't get to 62 years perhaps, so their elder age should be lower

What are the mental health services that the community needs?

2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?
 - Preventive legal support
 - Post-surgery or medical transition services – need clean and safe place to transition and recover – but not just transgender persons
 - Have to keep your housing for the entire period while waiting for your surgery
3. How would you find out about these services?
 - Word of mouth
 - Internet
 - Mobile unit – clubs, bars, where people hang out
 - Bulk of one participant's job is helping people find out about services
 - You need people, need a person to help you through it
4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?
 - Limited capacity at service providers
 - Sometimes issues of poor or inadequate treatment of transgendered persons – not properly trained
 - Issues of internalized trans-phobia

[Would be good for us to learn good training/treatment of trans persons]

 - It's all about respect
 - **No space on lottery applications for preferred names or gender on a lottery application**
 - In 2019, we can't let someone else's comfort get in the way of treating someone properly (use of pronouns)
5. Do you have any suggestions for how to make our programs and services better to meet your community's need?
 - [see above]
6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?
 - Emergency housing resources
7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?
 - Works if you have a Clipper card and money on it
 - Can get a card with some work, and can ride for free in SF
8. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified do you prefer?



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Word of mouth
 - Reaching people where they are
 - Internet is possible through Obama phones (cheap/free phones)
9. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?
- Type notes here
10. What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?
- Type notes here
11. Based on your personal experience or knowledge do you agree that rising housing prices in San Francisco is making racial segregation and the concentration of poverty in San Francisco better or worse? If so, how else do you think could be the causes of this segregation and concentration of poverty aside from high housing prices?
- Type notes here
12. **HIV GROUPS ONLY.** What factors make housing opportunities welcoming to HIV+ individuals? Why?
- Type notes here
13. **HIV GROUPS ONLY.** What programs or services could effectively help people with HIV improve their health?
- Type notes here
14. **HIV GROUPS ONLY.** *[question repeated in Housing Providers section]* What are some ideas to create more housing for people living with HIV?
- Type notes here
15. If you have children, what barriers do you have for them to attend a high performing public school?
- [no input]
16. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve equitable access to high performing public schools?
- [no input]
17. What has helped you or others in your community get or keep a job?
- Job training/preparation, resume building, cover letter development, reference list
 - Retention support at the job they have
 - Shelter monitor position is a place to start – they have training for the jobs
18. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?
- People that clean the streets, pick up needles, etc., should be paid more – it's a hazard and hard work
19. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?
- "What finances?"



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Classes about when you get some money, how to use it
- How to open/manage a checking account
- Challenge of not earning too much so you don't lose services – have bills paid directly for example, would help
- Less expensive, more helpful banking services
- Representative payee services can be helpful

20. Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- "I think we've covered it all" between the various groups they went to
- Would be great if people in jail had more preparatory support for when they get out – housing, work, other supports – figuring out how to put that all together
- Concern about how data is used, related to trans folks – concern about what's done with what we've heard
 - Mention of our reporting back process
- Concern about getting the survey to the right folks – how do you get the word out?
- Want to make sure that what they're saying gets to the right people
- Concern about affordable housing management accountability

CLOSING. Thank you again for your participation. Does anyone have any final reflections or closing thoughts?

- Type notes here
-

Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

- Type notes here

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?

- Type notes here



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

VETERANS FOCUS GROUP

Date	March 26, 2019
Location	
Host Organization	MOHCD
# Attendees	

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?
 - Someone who accepts 100% disabled veteran
2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?
 - Mental Health therapy and education
3. How would you find out about these services?
 - Through VA or City housing project
4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?
 - My income which does not allow me to get affordable housing, although I am 100% disabled veteran.
5. Do you have any suggestions for how to make our programs and services better to meet your community's need?
 - Make more apartments available for physical and mentally disabled homeless which provides health care and mental health services on site.
6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?
 - Reasonable living conditions in different sections of town besides Tenderloin. Black veterans seem to get poorer housing choices than white veterans.
7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?
 - The transportation is still biased based upon skin color. It is sanctioned because the City tolerates it.
8. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified do you prefer?
 - Telephone
9. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?
 - The high prices for houses.



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

10. What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?
 - Lack of training and teaching.
11. What factors make housing opportunities welcoming to HIV+ individuals? Why?
 - It is making things get worse, the rich get housing; the poor move to Richmond, Pittsburgh, Oakland or homelessness
12. If you have children, what barriers do you have for them to attend a high performing public school?
 - Type notes here
13. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve equitable access to high performing public schools?
 - Tax exemption for schools that take in minority students free.
14. What strategies, incentives, or policies would encourage landlords to participate in the Section 8 and other voucher programs?
 - Fair Housing communication and developing partnership healthy living situations.
15. What would help developers invest in under-served neighborhoods?
 - Type notes here
16. What has helped you or others in your community get or keep a job?
 - VA training TWG Program
17. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?
 - Allow fair competition based on experience.
18. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?
 - Fair housing, health care and education
19. Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?
 -

CLOSING. Thank you again for your participation. Does anyone have any final reflections or closing thoughts?

- Why is it that homeless veterans have limited areas to live in like the Tenderloin when a lot of us are fighting mental illness, drug addiction? If this is all you see it limits your ability to grow and get better because being planted in one area with the ability to means your dead mentally, physically and spiritually. Give us a chance to move to the beach, to live on Russian Hill. How about North Beach or the marina or the sunset. Let the life spring forever for all need an equal field of play.



Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

-

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?

-



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

. Vietnamese Community Focus Group Notes

Date	March 19, 2019
Location	875 O'Farrell,
Host Organization	Vietnamese Family Service Center (Margaret Hoang – ED and translator)
# Attendees	18

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?
 - More money
 - Senior need service assistance, not working. Help paying for housing.
 - Support for finances, living cost in SF is too high. Income is very limited.
 - Rent is too high, need help with payment.
 - Housing too expensive, need law to protect people so they will not be evicted. Preventing eviction. Rent is too high.
 - The problem, want to evict you, so they don't do any repairs to house.
 - Landlord does pest inspections but does not spray, pest control. Cockroaches in house.
 - Hallway rug very dirty, landlord doesn't repair. No clean up of common areas.
 - Housing but no rent control. Rent went up to 2000 to 4000 section 8, too high. Their section 8 portion went up.
 - Five people in family, all squeeze into small place. Crowded, roaches, need more space for family. Would like to move, no choice. Wife, daughter and two niece/nephew.
 - Need housing, lives with parents, overcrowded. More than one family in unit.
2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?
 - Need in-home support for her.
 - Need to find job.
 - Need training for jobs. Help to pay for housing.
 - Need in home housing support, back pain, need house cleaner, etc.
 - School support.
 - Legal services for housing, landlord issues. Housing rights, tenant rights. Receives letters from landlord's lawyer.
3. How would you find out about these services?
 - They come to SEAAC, community center.
 - Community center offices.
 - Church, fellow church goers. Friends and family members.
 - Ask Margaret (VFSC ED and translator for this group)
 - Google.
4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?
 - Language access is biggest barrier.
 - Sometimes not served because no translator available.
 - Apply for housing, but income not high enough to qualify.



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Location, don't know where to get services. For this community, information isn't spreading, don't know what kind of services are available.
 - Don't know where to go. Sometimes they don't tell each other. Info no spreading.
 - Cultural, familiarity, barriers. Wont' seek out information for themselves. Not knowing other group/provider. Isolation. Info goes to immediate family and friends. Part of the culture.
5. Do you have any suggestions for how to make our programs and services better to meet your community's need?
- Have funds for communities, to gather people together and outreach to them with a cultural lens.
 - Monthly group here. Wants twice a month, for resources. Group meetings in different places.
 - More senior services.
 - Newspaper, magazine (Mo magazine, but it's not free). TV, channel 26, a couple others from San Jose.
 - Nothing local, news and info from San Jose, not in San Francisco. TV news.
 - Need something local.
 - Ads on buses in Vietnamese.
6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?
- Assume Margaret is not available.
 - If not Margaret, watch TV, read newspaper. But services not free, like here.
 - US Citizenship services, fee waiver, \$800-100 for application. Immigration/naturalization support.
 - The whole process of naturalization.
7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for making transportation more accessible to more diverse communities in San Francisco?
- Cost is expensive, low income, discount, but need to fill out paperwork in English. Need help to fill out forms. Every month need to go to office to get a new sticker. Have to go in person to pay, not online. Need to improve discount program. Income verification
 - Bayview services only half hour or hour, other places every five minutes.
 - Isolation because of access. SE sector in particular.
 - Prices high, 2.75 for 1.5 hours.
 - Richmond and Sunset well served. Need more weekend services.
8. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified do you prefer?
- Mail, letters in their languages and English (helps translator)
 - Text messages in their language.
 - Phone calls/messages are in English.
 - They do check Vietnamese box on housing website, but translation is poor, "fancy language" difficult to read.
 - No one looking for home ownership because of income. Want to.
 - Barriers, high cost, down payment, not enough income.
 - Process and success is impossible.
 - Experience getting rental housing, finding housing in SF
 - Lives on 3rd floor, accessibility problem. Want housing for seniors with accessibility problems.



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- Demand for housing high, when you get change, limited income, don't qualify. Rent too high.
 - Ask for two months deposit and last month.
 - Need help with affordable housing.
 - Affordable is not well defined. Affordable to who? Often income 1000/mo., so don't meet minimum salary req., so not affordable.
9. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?
- (no one in group considering homeownership)
10. What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?
- Shared housing more common in this community than shelter and transitional housing. So overcrowding, unstable housing is the issue
 - Income level too low
 - Housing availability limited.
 - Demand is high, price is high.
11. Based on your personal experience or knowledge do you agree that rising housing prices in San Francisco is making racial segregation and the concentration of poverty in San Francisco better or worse? If so, how else do you think could be the causes of this segregation and concentration of poverty aside from high housing prices?
- Type notes here
12. If you have children, what barriers do you have for them to attend a high performing public school?
- Grandkids want to attend certain school, lottery, did get it, no money for private school. Assigned a school they didn't want.
 - Lives in Richmond, assigned daughter to Mission High, appeal for admission to Washington High, unsuccessful, tried many times.
13. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve equitable access to high performing public schools?
- Schools are dirty. City is dirty. Improve the schools in general.
 - All schools should be good, equitable.
 - Should not have to send students two hours away.
14. What has helped you or others in your community get or keep a job?
- English, learn English to get good job.
 - Education, training, in-school training for jobs.
 - Connections, referrals to jobs from friends.
15. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?
- Need referrals. More referrals.
 - Has skills, needs referrals to jobs.
 - Have to learn culture here. Training on US workforce, employment systems, the process. Can't keep your culture and apply it to the US.
 - Basic English. Culturally competent training.
 - Dress codes, over there, wear slippers to work, here must wear shoes.



San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

Outreach & Engagement for the Consolidated Plan, HIV Housing Plan, and Analysis of Impediments

- What would motivate people to come to ESL classes? More flexible classes and childcare. If work 9-5, can't attend day classes. Flexible childcare for night shift workers.
- Childcare issues: some people get assistance. They compare. If go to work and have to pay for childcare, why work? Childcare might be more expensive than working. Lower education. Assistance covers basic.
- Childcare support is critical.

16. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?

- Win the lottery.
- Higher paying jobs. More assistance for seniors.

17. Is there something that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- More housing and more support. Support for housing processes, applications, resources, etc.
- Affordable housing, rent too high.
- Long waiting lists or lotteries for affordable housing.
- Trying more than ten years, section 8, affordable housing, MOHCD website. Most have tried for ten years at least.
- More than twenty years applying.
- Apply for senior housing, long time on waiting list. Updated information. Not contacted.
- Lottery system, people just a number, people on verge of losing home. Impersonal.
- Priorities for families with children, for seniors, children are gone.
- Got Section 8, can't chose your own home, in housing project, in bad area, don't want to move there. Need more low income housing, safe neighborhoods, clean.

CLOSING. Thank you again for your participation. Does anyone have any final reflections or closing thoughts?

- Type notes here

Facilitator Observations

Please note any interesting interactions or group dynamics that stood out to you.

In general, how do you feel participants reacted to the questions and/or discussion topics?

- Type notes here

Report Back Document

1. Summary of Key Findings from Community Engagement Document
 - a. English
 - b. Chinese
 - c. Filipino
 - d. Russian
 - e. Samoan
 - f. Spanish
 - g. Vietnamese
2. Summary of Written Comments Received
3. Notes from June 20, 2019 Meeting



Introduction

In support of the development of its 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan, Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice, and HIV Housing Plan, the City and County of San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) engaged in a community-wide outreach and engagement process with stakeholders and residents of San Francisco. This process serves as a framework to identify housing and community development priorities, which, in turn, drive the goals and strategies outlined in the final plans. Ultimately, MOHCD will use the community's input and priorities to inform decision-making for funding community and housing services.

MOHCD contracted with Resource Development Associates (RDA) to develop an integrated community outreach and engagement strategy for these three plans and as well as other planning efforts led by the Office of Economic and Workforce Development and the Planning Department. During this process, MOHCD outreached to a wide range of community stakeholders and residents for their perspectives, needs, feedback, and input, specifically targeting the City's most vulnerable populations.

Community input is a critical part of the strategic planning process, providing crucial data to ensure funded programs and services address the highest priority needs of vulnerable populations as well as the City holistically. During this process, public input was obtained through community meetings (neighborhood forums and population-specific focus groups) and two online surveys, for which paper surveys were also made available. Both participatory data-collection methods, and demographics of participants, are described in further detail below.

Community Forums and Focus Groups

MOHCD facilitated 10 neighborhood-based public forums and 38 population-specific focus groups. Representatives from across the housing spectrum participated in the forums and focus groups, including individuals experiencing homelessness, residents of public and subsidized housing, housing and social service providers, HIV/AIDS housing advocates, homeowners, new San Francisco residents, recent immigrants, and life-long residents of the City. MOHCD facilitated sessions with cultural groups including African American, Cambodian, Samoan, Vietnamese, Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/Transgender/Questioning, and HIV community members. Participants responded to a series of structured questions on a range of relevant domains including housing and service needs, barriers to housing access and choice, neighborhood change, and discrimination and fair housing.

A total of 1,395 individuals took part in the community meetings, which were held across San Francisco between November 2018 and March 2019. A total of 656 residents and stakeholders participated in the 10 neighborhood forums and at least 684 participated in the 38 focus groups, 16 of which were held at public housing sites converted through the Federal Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) program. These numbers may under-represent actual attendance because some participants did not sign in. The following tables list the events held during this process.



City and County of San Francisco, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
MOHCD 2020-2024 Strategic Planning Process: Summary Community Engagement and Key Findings

MOHCD Neighborhood Forums	
Bayview Hunters Point / District 10	South of Market / District 6
Castro / District 8 and District 7	Sunset / District 4 and District 1
Chinatown / District 3 and District 2	Tenderloin / District 6
Excelsior and OMI / District 11	Visitacion Valley / District 10
Mission / District 9	Western Addition / District 5

MOHCD Community Focus Groups	
African American Community	Human Service Network
Cambodian Community	LGBTQ Community
Council of Community Housing Organizations	Local Homeless Coordinating Board
Eviction Prevention / Tenant Empowerment	Long Term Care Coordinating Council
HIV Community	Mayor's Disability Council
HIV Housing Providers	Samoan Community
Homeowners - BMR	Senior Disability Action
HOPE SF Hunters View Housing Community	SF Immigrant Legal & Education Network
HOPE SF Potrero Hill Housing Community	SF Latino Parity & Equity Coalition
HOPE SF Sunnysdale Housing Community	Transgender Community
Housing Action Coalition	Vietnamese Community
Rental Assistance Demonstration Focus Group Sites	
1760 Bush Street	491 31st
1880 Pine Street	Bernal Dwellings
3850 18th Street	Clementina Towers
25 Sanchez	Hayes Valley North & South
255 Woodside	John F Kennedy Apts.
2698 California	Mission Dolores
345 Arguello	Robert B. Pitts
462 Duboce	Westside Courts

Community Surveys

MOHCD developed two community surveys to capture residents' housing and non-housing service needs as well as their experiences with MOHCD and OEWD programs and services.

Planning Survey

This survey asked respondents what they need to get and stay in housing, which non-housing services are most important for them and their family, how they prefer to access services, their opinions of MOHCD, and other quality of life questions. There was a total of 2,219 responses for this survey.



Program Evaluation Survey

After completing the Planning Survey, participants had the opportunity to complete the Program Evaluation survey, which asked about utilization of MOHCD and OEWD programs and services. Respondents were asked about their utilization of economic and workforce development programs, housing placement programs, housing services, and community services and then asked to rate and describe their overall experience with these programs and services. This survey was thus able to collect and compare specific utilization data from a range of City and community programs and services and nuance this data with participants' numerical rankings and qualitative assessments. There was a total of 1,537 responses for this survey.

Demographics of Participants

Participants in forums and focus groups were generally asked to complete forms identifying a number of demographic characteristics, including as gender, race or ethnicity, and sexual orientation, but not all participants opted to complete this form. The Planning Survey also included a demographic component where respondents indicated their age, race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, HIV/AIDS status, housing status, disability status, income level, educational attainment, and language preference.

The charts below outline demographic information for all forum, focus group and survey participants.

Table 1: Self-Reported Gender Identity Across Community Outreach Efforts

Gender Identity	%
Female	60%
Male	33%
I prefer not to answer	3%
Genderqueer/ Gender Non-binary	3%
Trans Female	<1%
Other	<1%
Trans Male	<1%

Table 2: Self-Reported Sexual Orientation Across Community Outreach Efforts

Sexual Orientation	%
Straight/Heterosexual	60%
Gay/Lesbian/Same Gender Loving	14%
Prefer not to answer	14%
Bisexual	9%
Other	3%
Questioning/Unsure	<1%

Table 3: Self-Reported Race/Ethnicity Across Community Outreach Efforts

Race/Ethnicity	%
Asian	33%
White	31%
Black, African American or African	14%
Latino/a or Hispanic	13%
American Indian or Alaska Native	5%
Middle Eastern or North African	2%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1%



Summary of Findings

General Community Needs and Concerns

1. Among the concerns identified during community engagement, San Francisco stakeholders are most frequently concerned about displacement, increasing housing prices, the overall cleanliness and safety of their neighborhoods, and transit accessibility.
2. Participants in MOHCD’s community engagement identified that services to support self-sufficiency and stability are as important as the need for housing itself.
3. Many stakeholders expressed a prominent need for culturally inclusive and culturally-specific services.
4. Participants expressed a need for greater awareness of, navigation of, and access to available services, including both housing and other supportive services.
5. Stakeholders expressed a desire for more inclusive and relaxed standards around affordable housing eligibility.
6. Many community members voiced the need for more opportunities to provide input on the City’s housing eligibility policies as well as participate in the development of affordable housing programs.
7. Stakeholders asked for more streamlined services, improved interagency collaboration, and stronger cross-agency communication to support the delivery of both housing and supportive services.

Housing Services

1. Community engagement participants emphasized the need for affordable housing environments at the most vulnerable end of the housing spectrum: shelters and transitional housing for persons experiencing homelessness, accessible housing for seniors and individuals with disabilities, and affordable housing for the lowest-income households.
2. While affordable housing was the most frequently mentioned housing services need, the recognition of the intersection of health and housing was a common thread throughout the discussions, as participants emphasized the need for safe and healthy living environments.
3. Community members expressed the need for stronger eviction and tenant supports and protections, including tenant education as well as City policies to prevent unlawful eviction.

**Top fifteen housing and housing service needs
(across all outreach methods)**

Affordable housing
Rental assistance/reduced-cost housing
Housing navigation and application assistance
Safe shelter, transitional, and permanent housing environments
More housing protections
Senior and accessible housing
Eviction prevention support
Housing subsidies
Tenant education
Supportive housing
Down-payment assistance
Housing close to employment
Landlord negotiation assistance
Relocation assistance
Mortgage, HOA dues or foreclosure assistance

Housing Access, Perceptions, and Barriers

1. Participants named displacement and increasing housing prices as the top concerns impacting housing access and the ability to remain in housing.
2. Both renters and homeowners express low overall housing choice because they feel “locked in.”



3. Participants highlighted barriers to homeownership centering on both housing prices and financing options.
4. Neighborhood forum participants shared the qualities that they believe make a neighborhood desirable, identifying such characteristics as public transit, green space, and safety.
5. Participants in community engagement shared multiple experiences of housing discrimination, but overall, their responses reveal that there is not one specific, overt type of discrimination. Their responses indicate a more pervasive and entrenched systemic discrimination that affects people of color and African American communities in particular.

Social and Supportive Services

1. Community members need affordable, targeted support for trauma, PTSD, substance use disorders, and other mental health conditions. Mental health and substance use services together were the most frequently mentioned social and supportive service need for all community meetings.
2. Compared to housing needs, social and supportive service needs are more intensive and vary by population. Surprisingly, across all community meetings, participants expressed a need for any type of social or supportive service roughly 860 times. Participants expressed any type of housing-related need 530 times. In addition to being expressed more frequently, social and supportive service needs also varied more by population.

Top fifteen social and supportive service needs (across all outreach methods)

Benefits assistance (CalWorks, SNAP, Medi-Cal, etc.)
Better access to healthcare
Access to healthy food
Mental health and substance use support
Language support
Knowledge of available services
Support for seniors and people with disabilities
Affordable childcare
Case management
Legal services – consumer/civil rights
Legal services – worker/employment rights
Legal services – immigration support
Access to recreation
Nutrition programs
Neighborhood clean-up and safety programs

Knowledge of and Access to Services

1. Participants indicated limited knowledge about availability of and eligibility for housing and social services, as well as a need for assistance navigating those services.
2. In addition to needing greater knowledge of eligibility requirements, stakeholders conveyed that eligibility requirements can be a barrier to accessing services.
3. Participants expressed a need for inclusive language support services, in order to promote both knowledge of services and service access, especially for health and housing.
4. Residents experience several barriers to transportation in San Francisco, including long wait times, safety, and cost of transportation, which impede their access to jobs, medical appointments, and other services.



Coordination of Services

1. Stakeholders asked for more streamlined services, improved interagency collaboration, and stronger cross-agency communication to support the delivery of both housing and supportive services.
2. Community members that participated in forums and focus groups asked for more financial and capacity-building support for nonprofit organizations and other service providers, including changes to contracting rules.

Economic Self-Sufficiency

1. Participants expressed an overwhelming need for paid job training programs that provide pathways to living-wage, sustainable employment. Participants emphasized that while there are current job training opportunities, they may not be paid and/or may not link to long-term employment.
2. There is a large need for financial literacy and planning programs as well as financial services, specifically savings and credit counseling services. In addition to significant income barriers, participants felt they lacked the financial planning tools and financial literacy to even start considering the process of homeownership.
3. Residents want San Francisco employers to hire more local residents. Participants have a nuanced understanding of the impact of hiring practices on very low-income residents. They indicated that incentivizing high-paying employers, who may hire locally for high-wage positions in specific industries, to move to San Francisco does not benefit the residents who most need living-wage jobs.

Top fifteen economic self-sufficiency needs (across all outreach methods)

Job training
Getting a job
Financial planning and education
Learning new job skills
Access to ESL classes
GED and high school diploma programs
Local hiring
Financing and credit services
Tech access/tech education
Permanent job/career opportunities
Employment coaching
"Working class" jobs
Employer programs
Senior/disability employment
Affordable higher education opportunities

Community Empowerment and Engagement

1. Vulnerable community stakeholders want better relationships and accountability with MOHCD. Overall, community members were very appreciative to have the opportunity to participate in the forums and focus groups and share their perspectives and suggestions, but participants expressed that they would like MOHCD to continue to hold community meetings like the forums to be able to keep a pulse on community needs, particularly the needs of vulnerable populations. Participants emphasized that, in order to rectify historical inequities, there must be accountability measures in place to which the City can be responsive.



2. Participants articulated a wide need for culturally-competent and inclusive outreach and community engagement strategies that promote community-building and link residents to services. Culturally-competent and inclusive community outreach was the most frequently mentioned need related to community engagement. Community members acknowledge that there are current outreach efforts marketing City-sponsored housing and supportive services, but these efforts are not reaching certain communities. Participants felt strongly that using culturally-competent outreach strategies will yield increased awareness of and engagement in services.
3. Similarly, respondents indicated that increasing the number of cultural events available to community members would increase their sense of community.

Top fifteen community empowerment & engagement needs (across all outreach methods)

Culturally competency and inclusivity (cultural events, cultural-based outreach)
Community events (block parties, holiday events, sports events, farmers markets)
Community space (recreational space, green space, art space)
Nonprofit support and capacity
Parking
Community planning
Support for small businesses
Volunteer opportunities
Community meetings and outreach
Accountability
Community engagement and communication efforts
Targeted marketing of services
Community-based neighborhood clean-up efforts
Senior services
Better street and outdoor lighting



介紹

為支援制定 2020-2024 年合併計畫 (Consolidated Plan)、公平住房選擇障礙分析 (Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice)，以及愛滋病住房計畫 (HIV Housing Plan)，舊金山市郡市長住房與社區發展辦公室 (Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development, MOHCD) 參與了舊金山全社區外展及利害關係人士和居民參與過程。此過程可作為確定住房和社區發展優先順序的架構，從而推動最終計畫所概述的目標和策略。最後，MOHCD 將根據社區的意見和優先事項做決策，為社區和住房服務提供資金。

MOHCD 與資源開發協會 (Resource Development Associates, RDA) 簽訂合約，為這三個計畫制定了綜合社區外展和參與戰略，並由經濟及人力資源發展辦公室 (Office of Economic and Workforce Development) 和規劃部 (Planning Department) 引導其他規劃工作。在此過程中，MOHCD 主動聯繫各種社區利害關係人士和居民（尤其是該市的弱勢族群），了解其觀點、需求、回饋和意見。

社區意見是此戰略規劃過程的關鍵部分，提供關鍵資料以確保資助計畫和服務能滿足弱勢族群和整個城市的最高優先需求。在此過程中，透過社區會議（鄰里論壇和針對特定族群的焦點團體訪談）和兩次線上調查（同時也提供紙本調查）取得大眾的意見。參與式的資料收集法和參與者的人口統計學資料都在下方進一步詳細說明。

社區論壇和焦點團體訪談

MOHCD 協辦了 10 個以鄰里為主的公共論壇和 38 個針對特定族群的焦點團體訪談。參加過社區論壇和焦點團體訪談的代表們來自各個住房區，其中包括曾經無家可歸的人士、公共住房和補貼住房的居民、住房和社會服務提供者、愛滋病毒/愛滋病住房倡導者、房東、舊金山市新市民、新移民和永久居民。MOHCD 與包括非裔美國人、柬埔寨人、薩摩亞人、越南人、所有非異性戀者 (LGBTQ) 和愛滋病病毒感染者 (PLWHA) 社區成員在內的文化團體協辦了數次講座。參與者填寫了一系列相關領域的結構性問卷問題，包括住房和服務需求、取得和選擇住房障礙、鄰里變化，以及歧視和公平住房。

共有 1,395 人參加了 2018 年 11 月至 2019 年 3 月間，於舊金山舉行的社區會議。共有 656 名居民和利害關係人士參加了 10 次社區論壇，並且至少有 684 人參加了 38 次焦點團體訪談，其中 16 次在透過聯邦租金補助示範 (Rental Assistance Demonstration, RAD) 計畫改建的公共住房場所舉辦。這些數字可能不足以代表實際的出席率，因為有些參與者並未簽到。下表列出了在此過程中所舉辦的活動。



舊金山市郡市長住房與社區發展辦公室

MOHCD 2020-2024 年戰略規劃過程：社區參與和主要發現摘要

MOHCD 鄰里論壇	
Bayview Hunters Point / District 10	South of Market / District 6
Castro / District 8 和 District 7	Sunset / District 4 和 District 1
Chinatown / District 3 和 District 2	Tenderloin / District 6
Excelsior 和 OMI / District 11	Visitation Valley / District 10
Mission / District 9	Western Addition / District 5

MOHCD 社區論壇團體	
非裔美國人社區	人類服務網路
柬埔寨社區	LGBTQ 社區
社區住房組織委員會 (Council of Community Housing Organizations)	當地無家可歸者協調委員會 (Homeless Coordinating Board)
預防迫遷/租戶輔導	長期照護協調委員會 (Long Term Care Coordinating Council)
愛滋病社區	市長身障者權益委員會 (Mayor's Disability Council)
愛滋病住房提供者	薩摩亞社區
房東 - 低於市場行情 (BMR)	老年身障者行動
HOPE SF Hunters View 住房社區	SF 移民法務和教育網路
HOPE SF Potrero Hill 住房社區	SF 拉丁裔平等和公平聯盟 (Latino Parity & Equity Coalition)
HOPE SF Sunnydale 住房社區	跨性別社區
住房行動聯盟 (Housing Action Coalition)	越南人社區
租金補助示範焦點團體場所	
1760 Bush Street	491 31st
1880 Pine Street	Bernal Dwellings
3850 18th Street	Clementina Towers
25 Sanchez	Hayes Valley North & South
255 Woodside	John F Kennedy Apts.
2698 California	Mission Dolores
345 Arguello	Robert B. Pitts
462 Duboce	Westside Courts

社區調查

MOHCD 進行了兩項社區調查，以了解居民的住房和非住房服務需求，以及他們在 MOHCD 和 OEWD 計畫和服務方面的體驗。

規劃調查

這項調查詢問了受訪者需要獲得和留在住房的條件、哪些非住房服務對他們及其家人而言最重要、他們偏好取得服務的方式、他們對 MOHCD 的看法，以及其他關於生活品質的問題。本次調查總共收到 2,219 份回覆。



計畫評估問卷調查

完成規劃調查後，參與者有機會填寫計畫評估問卷調查，該調查詢問了 MOHCD 和 OEWD 計畫和服務的使用情況。受訪者會被問及他們對經濟與人力發展計畫、住房安置計畫、住房服務和社區服務的利用情況，然後要求他們對這些計畫和服務的整體體驗進行評分和說明。因此，這項調查能收集和比較來自本市和各社區計畫與服務的具體使用資料，並細分這些資料與參與者數字排名和定性評估的差異。本次調查總共收到 1,537 份回覆。

參與者的人口統計資料

通常會要求論壇和焦點團體訪談的參與者填寫能區分人口統計特徵的表格，其中包括性別、種族或民族，以及性取向，但並非所有參與者都選擇填寫此表。規劃調查也包括人口統計學資料區，讓受訪者可以填寫其年齡、種族/民族、性別、性取向、愛滋病毒/愛滋病狀況、住房狀況、殘疾狀況、收入水平、教育程度和語言偏好。

下列圖表概述了所有論壇、焦點團體和問卷調查參與者的人口統計學資訊。

表 1：社區外展工作中自行報告的性別認同

性別認同	%
女性	60%
男性	33%
我不想回答	3%
性別酷兒/非二元性別	3%
跨性別女性	<1%
其他	<1%
跨性別男性	<1%

表 2：社區外展工作中自行報告的性取向

性取向	%
異性戀/同性戀	60%
男同性戀/女同性戀/同性戀愛	14%
不想回答	14%
雙性戀	9%
其他	3%
有疑問/不確定	<1%

表 3：社區外展工作中自行報告的種族/民族

種族/民族	%
亞洲人	33%
白人	31%
黑人、非裔美國人或非洲人	14%
拉丁裔或西班牙裔	13%
美國印地安人或阿拉斯加原住民	5%
中東人或北非人	2%
夏威夷原住民或其他太平洋島民	1%

調查結果摘要

一般社區需求和顧慮

1. 社區參與期間所發現的問題中，舊金山的利害關係人士最常關注搬遷、住房價格升高、鄰里的整體清潔和安全性，以及交通便利性。
2. MOHCD 社區參與的參與者認為，支援自給自足和穩定性的服務與住房本身的需求同樣重要。
3. 許多利害關係人士表達了對全方位文化和具體文化服務的顯著需求。



4. 參與者表示需要提高對可取得服務的認識、指引和獲取，其中包括住房和其他支援性服務。
5. 利害關係人士表示希望獲得平價住房資格的標準能更全方位、更寬鬆。
6. 許多社區成員表示需要有更多的機會能為本市的住房資格政策提供意見，並參與平價住房計畫的制定。
7. 利害關係人士要求簡化服務、改善機構間的合作，並加強跨機構間的溝通，以支援提供住房和支援性服務。

住房服務

1. 社區參與的參與者強調需要為住房弱勢族群提供平價住房環境：為無家可歸者提供收容所和過渡住房、為老年人和身障人士提供無障礙住房、為最低收入戶提供平價住房。
2. 雖然平價住房是最常提到的住房服務需求，但是健康和住房始終貫穿整個討論過程，因為參與者強調需要安全和健康的生活環境。
3. 社區成員表示需要更強有力的迫遷和租客支援與保護，包括租客教育以及城市政策以防止非法迫遷。

住房的取得、認知和障礙

1. 參與者將搬遷和住房價格升高列為影響取得和留住住房能力的首要問題。
2. 租客和房東皆表示，整體的住房選擇性低，讓他們感到「陷入困境」。
3. 參與者從房價和資金選項方面強調了取得自有住房的障礙。
4. 鄰里論壇參與者分享了他們認為可以使鄰里變得理想的品質，其中包括大眾運輸、綠地和安全性等條件。
5. 社區參與的參與者分享了多種住房歧視的經驗，但總體而言，他們的回覆顯示沒有具體、明顯的歧視。他們的回覆指出，存在更為普遍和根深蒂固的系統性歧視，對有色人種和非裔美國人社區的影響尤其大。

十五大住房和住房服務需求 (涵蓋所有外展方法)

平價住房

租金補助/較低成本的住房

住房指引和申請補助

安全的收容所、過渡和永久住房環境

更多的住房保護

樂齡和無障礙住房

預防迫遷支援

住房補貼

租客教育

支援性住房

頭期款補助

接近工作地點的住房

房東談判協助

重新安置補助

房屋貸款、HOA 應付款或取消贖回權相關協助



社會和支援服務

1. 社區成員需要有關創傷、創傷後症候群、物質使用障礙和其他心理健康狀況的平價、重點支援。心理健康和物質使用服務皆為所有社區會議最常提到的社會和支援服務需求。
2. 與住房需求相比，社會和支援服務的需求更加密切，且因族群而異。令人驚訝的是，在所有社區會議中，參與者表達任何類型社會和支援服務的需求大約出現過 860 次。參與者表達住房相關的需求出現過 530 次。除了頻繁提及這類需求外，社會和支援服務的需求也因族群而異。

十五大社會和支援服務需求 (涵蓋所有外展方法)

福利補助 (CalWorks、SNAP、Medi-Cal 等)
更多獲得醫療保健的機會
取得健康食物
心理健康和物質使用支援
語言支援
了解可用的服務
支援老年人和身障人士
平價托兒服務
個案管理
法律服務：消費者/公民權益
法律服務：勞工/就業權益
法律服務：移民援助
參加遊憩活動
營養計畫
鄰里清潔和安全性計畫

了解和獲得服務

1. 參與者表示對住房和社會服務的可得性和申請資格了解甚少，並表示需要獲得這些補助服務的指引。
2. 除了需要更加了解申請資格的要求外，利害關係人士表示，申請資格的要求可能成為獲取服務的障礙。
3. 參與者表示需要提供全方位的語言支援服務，以促進對服務和服務獲取的了解，特別是健康和住房方面。
4. 居民在舊金山遇到了一些交通障礙，其中包括漫長的等待時間、安全性和交通費用，這些會妨礙其取得就業、醫療約診就診和其他服務。

十五大經濟自給自足需求 (涵蓋所有外展方法)

職業訓練
就業
財務規劃和教育
學習新的工作技巧
參加以英語為第二外語 (English as a Second Language, ESL) 課程
一般教育文憑 (GED) 及高中文憑計畫
當地僱用
融資和信用服務
技術取得/技術教育
正式工作/就業機會
就業指導
「藍領」工作
雇主計畫
老年人/身障者就業

服務的協調

1. 利害關係人士要求簡化服務、改善機構間的合作，並加強跨機構間的溝通，以支援提供住房和支援性服務。
2. 參與論壇和焦點團體訪談的社區成員要求為非營利組織和其他服務提供者提供更多的財務和職能建立支援，其中包括變更合約規則。

經濟自給自足

1. 參與者表示極需要有償就業的訓練計畫，因為這些計畫能提供生活費和持續就業途



徑。參與者強調，雖然目前有就業訓練機會，但是這些訓練無法提供薪資和/或可能與長期就業無關。

2. 金融知識和規劃方案，以及金融服務，特別是儲蓄和信貸諮詢服務的需求很大。除了顯著的收入障礙外，參與者也認為他們缺乏取得自有住房的財務規劃工具和金融知識。
3. 居民希望舊金山的雇主能僱用更多的當地居民。參與者非常了解目前的招聘方式對極低收入居民的影響。他們表示，獎勵那些可能在當地僱用特定行業高薪職位的高薪雇主搬到舊金山，並不會使最需要生活費用的居民受益。

社區賦權和參與

1. 弱勢社區的利害關係人士希望與 MOHCD 建立更好的關係，並希望其建立更好的問責制度。整體而言，社區成員非常感謝有機會參加論壇和焦點團體訪談，並分享其觀點和建議，但是參與者表示，他們希望 MOHCD 能持續召開社區會議（例如論壇），以隨時了解社區的需求，特別是弱勢族群的需求。參與者強調，為了矯正歷史上的不公平現象，必須採取問責措施，使市政府能夠做出回應。
2. 與會者明確表達了廣泛需要熟悉文化和全方位外展和社區參與戰略，這些戰略可促進社區建設並為居民提供服務。熟悉文化和全方位性的社區外展活動是與社區參與度有關的最常見需求。社區成員承認目前有行銷本市贊助住房和支援服務的外展工作，但是這些努力並未普及至所有社區。參與者強烈認為，使用熟悉文化的外展策略將能提高人們對服務的認知和參與度。
3. 同樣地，受訪者表示增加社區成員可參與的文化活動能夠提升其社區意識。

十五大社區賦權和參與需求（涵蓋所有外展方法）

對文化的熟悉程度和全方位性 （文化活動、文化外展活動）
社區活動（街頭派對、節日活動、體育活動、農夫市集）
社區空間（休憩空間、綠地、藝術空間）
非營利性支援和能力
停車
社區規劃
支援小型企業
志工服務機會
社區會議和外展活動
問責制
社區參與和溝通工作
重點服務行銷
社區鄰里清潔工作
老年人服務
更好的街道和戶外照明



Lungsod at County ng San Francisco, Opisina ng Mayor para sa Pabahay at Pagpapaunlad ng Komunidad (City and County of San Francisco, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development)

MOHCD 2020-2024 Proseso ng Stratehikong Pagpapalano: Buod ng Pagpapalahok ng Komunidad at Mahahalagang Napag-alaman

Introduksiyon

Bilang pagsuporta sa pagbuo ng 2020-2014 Pinagsamang Plano (Consolidated Plan), Pagsusuri sa mga Hadlang sa Pagpili Tungo sa Makatarungang Pabahay (Fair Housing Choice), at Plano para sa Pabahay ng mga may HIV (HIV Housing Plan), lumahok ang Opisina ng Mayor para sa Pabahay at Pagpapaunlad sa Komunidad (Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development, MOHCD) sa pag-abot sa proseso ng pag-abot sa nakararami o pag-a-outreach at pagpapalahok sa kabuuan ng komunidad, kung saan kasama ang mga may nakatayang interes o stakeholders at mga residente ng San Francisco. Nagsisilbi ang prosesong ito bilang balangkas upang matukoy ang mga prayoridad sa pabahay at pagpapaunlad sa komunidad, at kasunod nito, maisulong ang mga layunin at stratehiya na naisa-isa-isa na sa mga pinal na plano. Sa huli, gagamitin ng MOHCD ang mga opinyon at prayoridad ng komunidad at nang mabigyan ng impormasyon ang paggawa ng desisyon sa pagpopondo ng mga serbisyo para sa komunidad at pabahay.

Nakipagkontrata ang MOHCD sa Resource Development Associates (RDA) upang makabuo ng magkasama nang stratehiya sa pag-abot sa nakararami at pagpapalahok sa tatlong planong ito, pati na rin sa mga pagsusumikap sa pagpapalano na pinamumunuan ng Opisina para sa Pagpapaunlad ng Ekonomiya at mga Nagtatrabaho (Office of Economic and Workforce Development) at ng Departamento para sa Pagpapalano (Planning Department). Sa panahon ng prosesong ito, nagsumikap ang MOHCD na abutin ang mas nakakarami sa malawak na saklaw ng mga stakeholder (mga nakatayang interes sa komunidad) at residente para sa kanilang perspektiba, pangangailangan, tugon, at opinyon, at espesipikong pinagtuunan nito ang pinakabulnerableng mga populasyon ng Lungsod.

Kritikal na bahagi ng prosesong ito ng stratehikong pagpapalano ang pagbibigay ng opinyon ng komunidad, dahil nagkakaloob ito ng mahalagang datos upang matiyak na natutugunan ng mga pinopondohang programa at serbisyo ang pinaka-prayoridad na pangangailangan ng bulnerableng mga populasyon, pati na rin ang Lungsod sa kabuuan. Sa panahon ng prosesong ito, nakuha ang opinyon ng publiko sa pamamagitan ng mga miting ng komunidad (porum sa komunidad at focus group [grupo para sa nakatuong diskusyon] na mula sa mga espesipikong populasyon) at dalawang online na sarbey, kung saan mayroon ding puwedeng masagutan na papel na sarbey. Inilalarawan sa mas detalyadong paraan sa ibaba ang dalawang paraan na ito ng pangongolekta ng datos nang may paglahok (participatory data collection) at ang demograpiya (mga katangian ng populasyon) ng mga kalahok.

Mga Porum sa Komunidad at Focus Group (grupo para sa nakatuong diskusyon)

Naging tagapagpadaloy (facilitator) ang MOHCD sa 10 pampublikong porum batay sa komunidad, at 38 focus group na nakatuon sa mga espesipikong populasyon. Lumahok ang mga kinatawan mula sa kabuuang hanay ng mga stakeholder sa pabahay sa mga porum at focus group, kasama na ang mga indibidwal na nakararanas ng kawalan ng tahanan (homelessness), residente ng pampubliko at may subsidyong pabahay, nagkakaloob ng serbisyo sa pabahay at serbisyong panlipunan, tagapagtaguyod ng pabahay para sa may HIV/AIDS, may-ari ng bahay, bagong residente sa San Francisco, bagong migrante, at habambuhay nang residente ng Lungsod. Naging tagapagpadaloy din ang MOHCD sa mga grupong pangkultura, kasama na ang mga miyembro ng mga komunidad na Aprikano Amerikano, Cambodian, Samoan, Vietnamese, LGBTQ, at PLWHA. Sinagutan ng mga kalahok ang serye ng may istrukturang mga tanong sa malawak na hanay ng mahahalagang larangan, kasama na ang mga pangangailangan para sa pabahay at serbisyo, hadlang sa pagkakaroon ng pabahay at mapagpipilian, pagbabago ng mga komunidad, at diskriminasyon at makatarungang pabahay.

May kabuuang bilang na 1,395 indibidwal ang nakibahagi sa mga miting ng komunidad na isinagawa sa iba't ibang lugar sa San Francisco sa pagitan ng Nobyembre 2018 at Marso 2019. May kabuuang bilang na 656 residente at stakeholder ang lumahok sa 10 porum sa komunidad, at hindi bababa sa 684 ang lumahok sa 38 focus group, kung saan 16 ang isinagawa sa mga lugar ng pampublikong pabahay na nagawang mga pabahay sa pamamagitan ng programang Federal Rental Assistance Demonstration (programang binibigyan ng awtorisasyon ang paglilipat ng anyo ng pederal na pondo, RAD). Posibleng mas maliliit ang mga numerong ito kaysa sa aktuwal na pagdalo dahil may ilang kalahok na hindi nag-sign in o nagpatala. Inililista ng mga sumusunod na table (talahanayan) ang mga pagtitipon na isinagawa sa panahon ng prosesong ito.



Lungsod at County ng San Francisco, Opisina ng Mayor para sa Pabahay at Pagpapaunlad ng Komunidad (City and County of San Francisco, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development)

MOHCD 2020-2024 Proseso ng Stratehikong Pagpapalano: Buod ng Pagpapalahok ng Komunidad at Mahahalagang Napag-alaman

Mga Porum sa Komunidad ng MOHCD	
Bayview Hunters Point / Distrito 10	South of Market / Distrito 6
Castro / Distrito 8 at Distrito 7	Sunset / Distrito 4 at Distrito 1
Chinatown / Distrito 3 at Distrito 2	Tenderloin / Distrito 6
Excelsior and OMI / Distrito 11	Visitation Valley / Distrito 10
Mission / Distrito 9	Western Addition / Distrito 5

Mga Focus Group ng MOHCD sa Komunidad	
Komunidad na Aprikano Amerikano	Human Service Network
Komunidad ng mga Cambodian	Komunidad ng LGBTQ
Konseho ng mga Organisasyon para sa Pangkomunidad na Pabahay (Council of Community Housing Organizations)	Lokal na Lupong Tagapag-ugnay para sa mga Walang Tahanan (Homeless Coordinating Board)
Pagpigil sa mga Pagpapaalis o Eviction/ Pagbibigay-lakas sa mga Umuupa o Tenant	Tagapag-ugnay na Konseho para sa Pangmatagalang Pangangalaga (Long Term Care Coordinating Council)
Komunidad ng mga may HIV	Konseho ng Mayor para sa Mga May Kapansanan (Mayor's Disability Council)
Mga Nagkakaloob ng Pabahay sa mga May HIV (HIV Housing Providers)	Komunidad ng mga Samoan
Mga May-ari ng Bahay (Homeowners) - BMR	Senior and Disability Action
HOPE SF Hunters View Housing Community	SF Immigrant Legal & Education Network
HOPE SF Potrero Hill Housing Community	SF Latino Parity & Equity Coalition
HOPE SF Sunnydale Housing Community	Komunidad ng mga Transgender
Koalisyon para sa Aksiyon sa Pabahay (Housing Action Coalition)	Komunidad ng mga Vietnamese
Mga Lugar para sa Focus Group ukol sa Rental Assistance Demonstration	
1760 Bush Street	491 31st
1880 Pine Street	Bernal Dwellings
3850 18th Street	Clementina Towers
25 Sanchez	Hayes Valley North & South
255 Woodside	John F Kennedy Apts.
2698 California	Mission Dolores
345 Arguello	Robert B. Pitts
462 Duboce	Westside Courts

Mga Sarbey sa Komunidad

Bumuo ang MOHCD ng dalawang sarbey sa komunidad upang makuha ang mga pangangailangan para sa serbisyo na nakatuon sa pabahay at hindi nakatuon sa pabahay, pati na rin ang kanilang karanasan sa mga programa at serbisyo ng MOHCD at OEWD.

Sarbey para sa Pagpapalano (Planning Survey)

Tinanong ng sarbey na ito sa mga sumagot kung ano ang kailangan nila upang makakuha ng pabahay at manatili sa pabahay, aling mga serbisyong hindi nakatuon sa pabahay ang pinakaimportante sa kanila at sa kanilang pamilya,



Lungsod at County ng San Francisco, Opisina ng Mayor para sa Pabahay at Pagpapaunlad ng Komunidad (City and County of San Francisco, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development)

MOHCD 2020-2024 Proseso ng Stratehikong Pagpapalano: Buod ng Pagpapalahok ng Komunidad at Mahahalagang Napag-alaman

anong paraan ang mas gusto nila upang makakuha ng serbisyo, ano-ano ang kanilang opinyon ukol sa MOHCD, at iba pang tanong tungkol sa kalidad ng buhay. May kabuuang bilang na 2,219 sagot sa sarbey na ito.

Sarbey tungkol sa Ebalwasyon ng Programa (Program Evaluation Survey)

Matapos makompleto ang Sarbey sa Pagpapalano, nagkaroon ng oportunidad ang mga kalahok na makompleto ang sarbey tungkol sa Ebalwasyon ng Programa, na nagtanong naman sa kanila tungkol sa paggamit ng mga programa at serbisyo ng MOHCD at ng OEWD. Tinanong ang mga sumagot tungkol sa kanilang paggamit ng mga programa para sa pagpapaunlad ng ekonomiya at mga nagtatrabaho, programa para sa pagbibigay ng puwesto sa pabahay, serbisyo para sa pabahay, at pangkomunidad na serbisyo, at pagkatapos, hiniling sa kanilang bigyan ng marka ang mga ito at ilarawan ang kanilang pangkalahatang karanasan sa mga programa at serbisyong ito. Dahil dito, nakakolekta ang sarbey ng espesipikong datos ukol sa paggamit (utilization data) at napaghambing ang mga ito sa malawak na hanay ng mga programa at serbisyo ng Lungsod at programa at serbisyong pangkomunidad, at tiningnan din ang bahagyang pagkakapareho o pagkakaiba sa numerikal na pagraranggo ng mga kalahok at ang kanilang kuwalitatibong pagtatasa (qualitative assessment). May kabuuang bilang na 1,537 sagot sa sarbey na ito.

Demograpiya ng mga Kalahok

Sa pangkalahatan, hiniling sa mga kalahok sa porum at focus group na kompletuhin ang mga form at tukuyin ang ilang katangiang demograpiko, kasama na ang kasarian, lahi o etnisidad, at seksuwal na oryentasyon, pero hindi piniling kompletuhin ng lahat ng kalahok ang form na ito. Kasama rin sa Sarbey ukol sa Pagpapalano ang bahaging demograpiko kung saan isinaad ng mga sumagot ang kanilang edad, lahi/etnisidad, kasarian, seksuwal na oryentasyon, estado ng pagkakaroon ng HIV/AIDS, estado ng pabahay, estado ng pagkakaroon ng kapansanan, antas ng kita, naabot na edukasyon, at mas pinipiling wika.

Binabalangkas ng mga tsart sa ibaba ang demograpikong impormasyon para sa lahat ng kalahok sa porum, focus group, at sarbey.

Table (Talahanayan) 1: Sariling Pag-uulat ukol sa Identidad sa Kasarian sa Kabuuan ng mga Pagsusumikap para sa Pag-a-outreach sa Komunidad

Identidad sa Kasarian	%
Babae	60%
Lalaki	33%
Mas gusto kong huwag sagutin ito	3%
Genderqueer (walang identipikasyon)/Gender Non-binary (hindi eksklusibong babae o lalaki)	3%
Trans na Babae	<1%
Iba pa	<1%
Trans na Lalaki	<1%

Table (Talahanayan) 2: Sariling Pag-uulat ukol sa Seksuwal na Oryentasyon sa Kabuuan ng mga Pagsusumikap para sa Pag-a-outreach sa Komunidad

Seksuwal na oryentasyon	%
Straight/ Heteroseksuwal	60%
Bakla/ Lesbiana/Nagmamahal sa taong pareho ang kasarian	14%
Mas gusto kong huwag sagutin ito	14%
Bisexual (dalawa ang kasarian)	9%
Iba pa	3%
Nagtatanong/Hindi tiyak	<1%



Table (Talaanayan) 3: Sariling Pag-uulat ukol sa Lahi/Etnisidad sa Kabuuan ng mga Pagsusumikap para sa Pag-a-outreach sa Komunidad

Lahi/Etnisidad	%
Asyano	33%
Puti	31%
Itim, Aprikano Amerikano o Aprikano	14%
Latino/a o Hispaniko	13%
Amerikanong Indian o Katutubong Taga-Alaska	5%
Taga-Gitnang Silangan o Hilagang Aprika	2%
Katutubong Hawaiiano o iba pang taga-Isla Pasipiko	1%

Buod ng mga Napag-alaman

Pangkalahatang mga Pangangailangan at Inaalala ng Komunidad

1. Sa mga natukoy na inaalala noong isinasagawa ang pagpapalahok sa komunidad, nakitang pinakamadalas na inaalala ng mga stakeholder sa San Francisco ang pagkawala ng tinitirhang lugar (displacement), pagtataas ng presyo sa pabahay, pangkalahatang kalinisan at kaligtasan ng komunidad, at pagkakaroon ng transportasyon.
2. Natukoy ng mga sumali sa pagpapalahok ng MOHCD sa komunidad na kasinghalaga ng pangangailangan mismo sa pabahay ang mga serbisyo upang masuportahan ang pagsandal sa sarili at pagkakaroon ng katatagan.
3. Marami sa mga stakeholder ang nagsaad ng malaking pangangailangan para sa mga serbisyo na inklusibo o bukas sa iba't ibang kultura at espesipiko sa iba't ibang kultura.
4. Ipinahayag ng mga kalahok ang pangangailangan para sa higit na kamalayan ukol sa mga pasikot-sikot at pamamaraan upang makakuha ng serbisyo, kasama na kapwa ang serbisyo sa pabahay, at iba pang serbisyo para sa pagbibigay ng suporta.
5. Ipinahayag ng mga stakeholder ang hangad nila para sa mas inklusibo at mas hindi mahigpit na mga pamantayan para sa pagiging kuwalipikado sa abot-kayang pabahay.
6. Isinaad ng marami sa mga miyembro ng komunidad ang pangangailangan para sa mas maraming oportunidad upang makapagbigay ng opinyon ukol sa mga polisiya ng Lungsod sa pagiging kuwalipikado sa pabahay, pati na rin sa pakikilahok sa pagbuo at pagpapaunlad ng mga programa para sa abot-kayang pabahay.
7. Humiling ang mga stakeholder ng higit na mas simple o streamlined na mga serbisyo, mas pinahusay na kolaborasyon sa pagitan ng mga ahensiya, at mas matibay na pakikipagkomunikasyon sa pagitan ng mga ahensiya, at nang masuportahan ang paghahatid kapwa ng mga serbisyo sa pabahay at serbisyo para sa pagbibigay ng suporta.

Labinlima na pinakakailangang pabahay at mga serbisyo para sa pabahay (sa kabuuan ng lahat ng paraan sa pag-a-outreach)

Abot-kayang pabahay
Tulong sa upa/murang pabahay
Tulong sa mga pasikot-sikot sa pabahay at sa aplikasyon
Ligtas na shelter o kanlungan, transisyonal at permanenteng kapaligiran para sa pabahay
Mas maraming proteksiyon sa pabahay
Pabahay para sa matatanda at pabahay na mapapasok at magagamit (accessible)
Suporta para maiwasan ang pagpapaalis o eviction
Mga subsidyo sa pabahay
Edukasyon para sa mga umuupa o tenant
Supportive housing (pabahay na may kasamang mga serbisyo para sa dating walang tahanan o may kapansanan)
Tulong sa paunang bayad o down-payment
Pabahay na malapit sa trabaho
Tulong sa pakikipagnegosasyon sa nagpapaupa o landlord

Mga Pabahay na Serbisyo

1. Binigyang-diin ng mga sumali sa pagpapalahok sa



Lungsod at County ng San Francisco, Opisina ng Mayor para sa Pabahay at Pagpapaunlad ng Komunidad
(City and County of San Francisco, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development)
MOHCD 2020-2024 Proseso ng Stratehikong Pagpapalano: Buod ng Pagpapalahok ng Komunidad at Mahahalagang Napag-alaman

2. komunidad ang pangangailangan para sa mga kapaligiran kung saan may abot-kayang pabahay para sa nasa pinakabulnableng dulo ng hanay ng mga pabahay: shelter o kanlungan at transisyonal na pabahay para sa nakararanas ng kawalan ng tahanan; nagagamit o accessible na pabahay para sa matatanda at indibidwal na may kapansanan; at abot-kayang pabahay para sa mga kabahayang pinakamababa ang kita.
3. Bagamat ang abot-kayang pabahay ang pinakamadalas banggitin na pangangailangan para sa mga serbisyo sa pabahay, patuloy na usapin ang pagkilala sa interseksiyon ng kalusugan at pabahay sa kabuuan ng mga diskusyon, dahil binigyang-diin ng mga kalahok ang pangangailangan para sa ligtas at malusog na kapaligiran para sa pamumuhay.
4. Nagpahayag ang mga miyembro ng komunidad ng pangangailangan para sa mas malakas na suporta at proteksiyon laban sa pagpapaalis, at para sa mga umuupa, kasama na ang edukasyon sa umuupa, at pati na rin ang mga polisiya ng Lungsod upang mapigil ang labag sa batas na pagpapaalis.

Pagkakaroon ng Pabahay, mga Persepsiyon o Inaakala, at mga Hadlang

1. Tinukoy ng mga kalahok ang pagkawala sa tinitirhang lugar (displacement) at ang tumataas na presyo ng pabahay bilang pinaka-inaalala na nakaaapekto sa pagkakaroon ng pabahay at sa kakayahan na manatili sa pabahay.
2. Ipinahayag kapwa ng mga umuupa at may-ari ng bahay na kakaunti ang pangkalahatang mapagpipilian sa pabahay dahil pakiramdam nila "naka-lock in o nakakulong" na sila.
3. Itinampok ng mga kalahok ang mga hadlang sa pagkakaroon ng bahay bilang nakasentro kapwa sa presyo ng bahay at opsiyon para sa pagpipinansiya.
4. Ibinahagi ng mga kalahok sa forum sa komunidad ang mga katangian na pinaniniwalaan nilang mayroon ang kaakit-akit na komunidad, at tinukoy nila ang mga katangiang tulad ng pampublikong transportasyon, berdeng espasyo, at kaligtasan.
5. Nagbahagi ang mga sumali sa pagpapalahok sa komunidad ng iba't ibang karanasan sa diskriminasyon sa pabahay, pero sa pangkalahatan, inilantad ng kanilang mga sagot na walang iisa, espesipiko, at lantad na uri ng diskriminasyon. Ipinapakita ng mga sagot na ito ang higit na malawakan at nakapirmi nang sistema ng diskriminasyon na nakaaapekto sa mga taong may kulay (people of color) at mga komunidad ng Aprikano Amerikano sa partikular.

Mga Serbisyong Panlipunan at Mga Serbisyong Nagbibigay ng Suporta

1. Kailangan ng mga miyembro ng komunidad ng abot-kaya at naka-target na suporta para sa matinding karanasan o trauma, PTSD, pagkakasakit kaugnay ng paggamit sa droga at iba pang sangkap, at iba pang kondisyon ng kalusugan sa isip. Ang magkasamang mga serbisyo para sa kalusugan ng isip at pag-iwas sa paggamit ng droga at iba pang sangkap ang pinakamadalas na nabanggit na kailangang serbisyong panlipunan at serbisyo para sa pagbibigay ng suporta sa lahat ng miting ng komunidad.
2. Kung ihahambing sa mga pangangailangan para sa pabahay, higit na masidhi ang pangangailangan para sa panlipunang serbisyo at serbisyong nagbibigay ng suporta, at nag-iiba-iba ang mga ito ayon sa populasyon. Kataka-taka,

Labinlima na pinakakailangang serbisyong panlipunan at serbisyo para sa pabahay (sa kabuuan ng lahat ng paraan sa pag-a-outreach)

Tulong sa mga benepisyo (CalWorks, SNAP, Medi-Cal, at iba pa)

Mas mahusay na daan para magkaroon ng pangangalaga sa kalusugan

Pagkararoon ng masustansiyang pagkain

Suporta para sa kalusugan ng isip (mental health) at suporta para maiwasan ang pang-aabuso sa droga at iba pang sangkap

Suporta sa wika

Kaalaman tungkol sa mga makukuhaang serbisyo

Suporta para sa matatanda at taong may kapansanan

Abot-kayang pangangalaga sa bata

Pamamahala sa kaso

Legal – mga karapatan ng konsumer/ karapatang sibil

Legal - mga karapatan ng manggagawa/ karapatan sa pag-eempleyo

Legal - suporta sa imigrasyon



Lungsod at County ng San Francisco, Opisina ng Mayor para sa Pabahay at Pagpapaunlad ng Komunidad
(City and County of San Francisco, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development)
MOHCD 2020-2024 Proseso ng Stratehikong Pagpapalano: Buod ng Pagpapalahok ng Komunidad at Mahahalagang Napag-alaman

3. pero humigit-kumulang na naipahayag nang 860 beses ng mga kalahok ang pangangailangan para sa anumang uri ng panlipunang serbisyo at serbisyo para sa pagbibigay ng suporta. Ipinahayag nang 520 beses ng mga kalahok ang anumang uri ng pangangailangan na kaugnay ng pabahay. Bukod sa mas madalas na naipahayag ito, nag-iba-iba rin ang mga pangangailangan para sa panlipunang serbisyo at serbisyo para sa pagbibigay ng suporta batay sa populasyon.

Kaalaman tungkol sa mga Serbisyo at Pagkakaroon ng mga Serbisyo

1. Isinaad ng mga kalahok na limitado ang kanilang kaalaman tungkol sa pagkakaroon ng serbisyo para sa pabahay at panlipunang serbisyo, at ang pagiging kuwalipikado para sa mga ito, pati na rin ang pangangailangan ng tulong upang malaman ang pasikot-sikot sa mga serbisyong ito.
2. Bukod sa pangangailangan para sa higit na kaalaman ukol sa mga kinakailangan upang maging kuwalipikado, ipinahayag din ng mga stakeholder na posibleng hadlang ang mga kinakailangan upang kuwalipikado sa pagkakaroon ng mga serbisyo.
3. Ipinahayag ng mga kalahok ang pangangailangan para sa inklusibo o bukas sa lahat na serbisyo upang magkaroon ng suporta sa wika, at nang sa gayon maitaguyod kapwa ang kaalaman tungkol sa mga serbisyo at ang pagkakaroon ng mga serbisyo, lalo na sa kalusugan at pabahay.
4. Nakaranas ang mga residente ng ilang hadlang sa transportasyon sa San Francisco, kasama na ang mahahabang panahon ng paghihintay, kaligtasan, at gastos sa transportasyon, na nagiging hadlang sa pagkakaroon ng trabaho, medikal na pakikipagkita, at iba pang serbisyo.

Koordinasyon ng mga Serbisyo.

1. Humiling ang mga stakeholder ng higit na mas simple o streamlined na mga serbisyo, mas pinahusay na kolaborasyon sa pagitan ng mga ahensiya at mas matibay na pakikipagkomunikasyon sa pagitan ng mga ahensiya, at nang masuportahan ang paghahatid kapwa ng mga serbisyo sa pabahay at serbisyo para sa pagbibigay ng suporta.
2. Humiling ang mga miyembro ng komunidad na lumahok sa mga forum at focus group ng higit na suportang pinansiyal at suporta sa pagkakaroon ng higit na kakayahan ng mga organisasyong non-profit at iba pang nagkakaloob ng serbisyo (service providers), kasama na ang pagbabago sa mga patakaran sa pangangontrata.

Pag-asa sa Sarili para sa Mga Pangangailangan sa Pera (Economic Self-sufficiency)

1. Ipinahayag ng mga kalahok ang lubos na pangangailangan para sa may bayad na mga programa ng pagsasanay para sa trabaho, na nagkakaloob ng mga landas tungo sa pag-eempleyo na may suweldong ikinabubuhay at nakapagpapanatili Binigyang-diin ng mga kalahok na bagamat mayroong mga oportunidad ng pagsasanay para sa trabaho sa kasalukuyan, walang bayad ang mga ito at/o posibleng hindi naka-ugnay sa pangmatagalang pagtatrabaho.
2. May malaking pangangailangan para sa mga programa ukol sa kaaalamang pinansiyal at pinansiyal na pagpapalano, pati na rin para sa mga pinansiyal na serbisyo, lalo na sa mga serbisyo sa pagpapayo ukol sa pagtitipid at credit. Bukod sa malalaking hadlang sa kita, nararamdaman ng mga kalahok na kulang sila sa mga kasangkapan para sa pinansiyal na

Labinlima na pinakakailangan upang umasa sa sarili para sa mga pangangailangan (sa kabuuan ng lahat ng paraan sa pag-a-outreach)

Pagsasanay sa Trabaho
Pagkakaroon ng Trabaho
Pagpapalano at edukasyon ukol sa pinansiya
Pagkakaroon ng mga bagong kakayahan sa trabaho
Pagkakaroon ng mga klaseng ESL (pag-aaral sa Ingles)
GED at mga programa para sa pagkuha ng diploma sa high school
Lokal na pag-eempleyo
Mga Serbisyong Pampinansiya at Serbisyo sa Credit
Pagkakaroon ng teknolohiya/Edukasyon ukol sa teknolohiya
Permanenteng trabaho/mga oportunidad sa karera
Pagpapayo o coaching ukol sa pag-eempleyo
Mga trabaho para sa "uring manggagawa o working class"



Lungsod at County ng San Francisco, Opisina ng Mayor para sa Pabahay at Pagpapaunlad ng Komunidad
(City and County of San Francisco, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development)
MOHCD 2020-2024 Proseso ng Stratehikong Pagpapalano: Buod ng Pagpapalahok ng Komunidad at Mahahalagang Napag-alaman

3. pagpapalano at kaalamang pinansiyal, kung kaya't hindi man lamang mapagsimulan ang proseso ng pagmamay-ari ng tahanan.
4. Gusto ng mga residente na kumuha ang mga taga-empleyo ng San Francisco ng mas maraming lokal na residente. Ang mga kalahok ay may pagkaunawang nuanced (nakikita ang iba't ibang aspeto) sa epekto ng mga nakasanayang gawain sa pag-empleyo sa mga residenteng napakababa ng kita. Isinaad nila na ang pagbibigay ng insentiba sa mga empleyadong mataas kung magpasuweldo, at posibleng mag-empleyo ng lokal na tao para sa mga posisyong mataas ang suweldo sa mga espesipikong industriya, at nang lumipat ang mga taga-empleyong ito sa San Francisco, ay hindi nakaaapekto sa mga residenteng pinakanangangailangan ng trabahong sapat ang kita upang mabuhay.

Pagbibigay ng Lakas sa Komunidad at Pagpapalahok Dito

1. Gusto ng mga bulnerableng stakeholder sa komunidad ng mas mahusay na mga relasyon at pagpapanagot sa MOHCD. Sa pangkalahatan, lubos na nagpapasalamat ang mga miyembro ng komunidad sa oportunidad na lumahok sa mga porum at focus group at ibahagi ang kanilang mga perspektiba at suhestiyon, pero ipinahayag din ng mga kalahok na gusto nilang ipagpatuloy ng MOHCD ang pagkakaroon ng mga miting sa komunidad na kagaya ng porum, at nang mapanatili ang pagkakaroon ng pulso sa mga pangangailangan ng komunidad, partikular na sa mga pangangailangan ng mga bulnerableng populasyon. Binigyang-diin ng mga kalahok na upang maiwasto ang historikal na kawalan ng pagkakapantay-pantay, kailangang may mga nakapirmi nang hakbang sa pagpapanagot upang makatugon ang Lungsod.

2. Ipinahayag ng mga kalahok ang malawakang pangangailangan para sa mga stratehiyang may kaalaman ukol sa kultura at inklusibo ang pag-a-outreach at pagpapalahok sa komunidad, at nang maitaguyod ang lalo pang pagpapalakas sa komunidad at maiugnay ang mga residente sa mga serbisyo. Pagkakaroon ng kaalaman sa kultura at inklusibong pag-a-outreach sa komunidad ang pinakamadalas na nabanggit na pangangailangan kaugnay ng pagpapalahok sa komunidad. Nagpapasalamat ang mga miyembro ng komunidad na may kasalukuyang mga pagsusumikap na makapag-outreach upang maipagbigay-alam ang mga itinataguyod ng Lungsod na serbisyo sa pabahay at serbisyo para sa pagbibigay ng suporta, pero hindi nakaaabot ang mga pagsusumikap na ito sa ilang komunidad. Lubos na naniniwala ang mga kalahok na magbubunga ang paggamit ng mga stratehiya sa pag-a-outreach na may kaalaman ukol sa kultura ng higit na kamalayan sa mga serbisyo at pakikilahok sa mga ito.

Labinlimang pinakakailangan para sa pagbibigay ng lakas sa komunidad at pagpapalahok dito (sa kabuuan ng lahat ng paraan ng pag-a-outreach)

Kaalaman ukol sa kultura at pagiging inklusibo (mga kultural na pagtitipon, pag-a-outreach na nakabatay sa kultura)

Mga pagtitipon ng komunidad (block party o kasiyahan sa kalye, pagtitipon sa pista opisyal o walang pasok, pagtitipon para sa sports, farmers market o tiangge)

Espasyo ng komunidad (espasyo para sa paglilibang, berdeng espasyo, espasyo para sa sining)

Suporta at kakayahan para sa nonprofit

Paradahan

Pagpapalano ng komunidad

Suporta para sa maliliit na negosyo

Mga oportunidad sa pagboboluntaryo

Mga pulong at workshop ng komunidad

Pagkakaroon ng pananagutan

Mga pagsusumikap para sa pagpapalahok at pakikipagkomunikasyon sa komunidad

Nakatuong pag-aalok ng mga serbisyo

Mga pagsusumikap sa paglilinis ng komunidad na naka-base sa komunidad

3. Katulad nito, ipinahayag ng mga sumagot na ang pagpaparami ng bilang ng mga pangkulturang pagtitipon na mapupuntahan ng mga miyembro ng komunidad ay makapagpapataas din ng kanilang pakiramdam ng pagkakaroon ng komunidad.



Управление мэрии и администрации округа Сан-Франциско по вопросам жилищного хозяйства и благоустройства

Процесс стратегического планирования МОНСД на 2020–2024 г.: краткий обзор программы по вовлечению общин и основные выводы

Введение

В рамках поддержки развития Консолидированного плана на 2020–2024 г., Анализа препятствий на пути внедрения программы справедливого решения жилищных вопросов и Программы обеспечения жильем ВИЧ-инфицированных Управление мэрии и администрации округа Сан-Франциско по вопросам жилищного хозяйства и благоустройства (Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development, МОНСД) вместе с заинтересованными сторонами и жителями Сан-Франциско приняло участие в процессе разъяснительной работы и взаимодействия с привлечением широких слоев населения. Данный процесс служит основой для определения приоритетов в сфере жилищного хозяйства и благоустройства, которые, в свою очередь, определяют цели и стратегии, представляемые в окончательных планах. В конечном итоге МОНСД использует вклад и приоритеты членов общин для подготовки информации для лиц, от которых зависит принятие решений в сфере финансирования деятельности по обслуживанию общин и жилищного сектора.

МОНСД заключил договор с Resource Development Associates (RDA) на разработку комплексной стратегии разъяснительной работы и взаимодействия в общинах для данных трех планов, а также для другой деятельности по планированию под руководством управления по развитию экономики и трудовых ресурсов и отдела планирования. В ходе данного процесса МОНСД провело разъяснительную работу с широким рядом заинтересованных лиц и жителей из числа представителей общин, обсудив их перспективы развития, потребности, замечания и предложения и уделив особое внимание наименее защищенным слоям населения города.

Мнение общины является важной частью процесса стратегического планирования и обеспечивает незаменимыми данными, благодаря которым финансируемые программы и услуги могут удовлетворять первоочередные потребности как незащищенных слоев населения, так и города в целом. В ходе данного процесса общественность смогла внести свой вклад благодаря встречам с представителями общин (форумам микрорайонов и фокус-группам для конкретных слоев населения) и двум онлайн-опросам, при которых была возможность заполнить анкеты и в бумажном виде. Оба метода сбора данных с участием населения и демографический состав участников подробно описаны ниже.

Форумы микрорайонов и фокус-группы

МОНСД организовало работу 10 общественных форумов, работающих по принципу принадлежности к конкретному микрорайону, и 38 фокус-групп для различных слоев населения. Представители, имеющие то или иное отношение к жилищному вопросу, приняли участие в формах и фокус-группах, в том числе лица, не имеющие определенного места жительства, лица, проживающие в государственном жилье и пользующиеся жилищными субсидиями, работники в сфере предоставления жилья и социальных услуг, защитники прав на жилье для лиц, страдающих ВИЧ/СПИД, собственники жилья, переселенцы в Сан-Франциско, иммигранты, недавно прибывшие в США, и коренные жители города. МОНСД поддерживает проведение сессий с культурными группами населения, включая афроамериканцев, камбоджийцев, самоанцев, вьетнамцев, членов ЛГБТ-сообщества и людей, живущих с ВИЧ/СПИДом. Участники дали ответы на ряд структурированных вопросов на соответствующие темы, включая потребности в жилье и услугах, препятствия на пути к получению жилья и ограничения в его выборе, смену района проживания, дискриминацию и справедливое решение жилищных вопросов.



Управление мэрии и администрации округа Сан-Франциско по вопросам жилищного хозяйства и благоустройства

Процесс стратегического планирования МОНCD на 2020–2024 г.: краткий обзор программы по вовлечению общин и основные выводы

В общей сложности в период с ноября 2018 года по март 2019 года во встречах с общинами, которые проводились по всему Сан-Франциско, приняли участие 1395 человек. Всего 656 жителей и заинтересованных лиц приняли участие в 10 форумах микрорайонов, и как минимум 684 человека участвовали в работе 38 фокус-групп, 16 из которых проводились в помещениях социального жилищного фонда, перестроенных в рамках Федеральной программы показательной помощи в аренде жилья (Federal Rental Assistance Demonstration, RAD). Эти цифры могут не отображать фактическое число участников, поскольку многие участники не пожелали регистрироваться. В следующих таблицах перечислены мероприятия, проведенные в рамках данного процесса.

Форумы микрорайонов МОНCD	
Bayview Hunters Point / район 10	South of Market / район 6
Castro / район 8 и район 7	Sunset / район 4 и район 1
Chinatown / район 3 и район 2	Tenderloin / район 6
Excelsior and OMI / район 11	Visitacion Valley / район 10
Mission / район 9	Western Addition / район 5



Управление мэрии и администрации округа Сан-Франциско по вопросам жилищного хозяйства и благоустройства

Процесс стратегического планирования МОНСД на 2020–2024 г.: краткий обзор программы по вовлечению общин и основные выводы

Общественные фокус-группы МОНСД	
Афроамериканская община	Сеть услуг для населения
Камбоджийская община	ЛГБТ-сообщество
Совет организаций социального жилья	Местный координационный комитет по делам бездомных
Борьба с выселением / защита прав нанимателей	Координационный совет по долгосрочному уходу
Сообщество живущих с ВИЧ/СПИДом	Совет по делам людей с инвалидностью при мэрии
Организации, предоставляющие жилье для ВИЧ-инфицированных	Самоанская община
Домовладельцы — жилье по ценам ниже рыночных	Общество помощи престарелым и людям с инвалидностью
Община домовладельцев Хантерз-Вью HOPE SF	Сеть юридической и образовательной помощи иммигрантам
Община домовладельцев Портеро-Хил HOPE SF	Латиноамериканская коалиция равенства и справедливости Сан-Франциско
Община домовладельцев Саннидейл HOPE SF	Трансгендерное сообщество
Коалиция по жилищным вопросам	Вьетнамская община
Пункты проведения встреч фокус-групп программы показательной помощи в аренде жилья	
1760 Bush Street	491 31st
1880 Pine Street	Bernal Dwellings
3850 18th Street	Clementina Towers
25 Sanchez	Hayes Valley North & South
255 Woodside	John F Kennedy Apts.
2698 California	Mission Dolores
345 Arguello	Robert B. Pitts
462 Duboce	Westside Courts

Опросы среди представителей общин

МОНСД разработало два опроса для представителей общин с целью сбора информации о потребностях жильцов в жилищных и нежилищных услугах, а также их отзывов о программах и услугах МОНСД и Отдела развития экономики и трудовых ресурсов (OEWD).

Опрос с целью планирования

В ходе данного опроса у респондентов спрашивали, что им нужно для получения и сохранения жилья, какие нежилищные услуги наиболее важны для них и их семей, каким образом они предпочитают получать доступ к услугам, об их мнении о МОНСД, а также задавали им другие вопросы о качестве жизни. Общее количество участников данного опроса составило 2219 человек.



Управление мэрии и администрации округа Сан-Франциско по вопросам жилищного хозяйства и благоустройства

Процесс стратегического планирования МОНCD на 2020–2024 г.: краткий обзор программы по вовлечению общин и основные выводы

Опрос на тему оценки программы

После прохождения опроса с целью планирования участникам была предоставлена возможность пройти опрос на тему оценки программы, в ходе которого задавались вопросы об использовании программ и услуг МОНCD и OEWD. Респондентам предложили ответить на вопросы об использовании ими программ по развитию экономики и трудовых ресурсов, программ расселения, жилищных услуг и социальных услуг, а также услуг, предоставляемых общиной, а затем попросили оценить свое общее впечатление от пользования этими программами и услугами. Таким образом, данный опрос помог собрать и сравнить конкретные данные об использовании целого ряда программ и услуг городской администрации и общин и дифференцировать эти данные с помощью баллов, выставленных участниками, и выполненной ими количественной оценки. Общее количество участников данного опроса составило 1537 человек.

Демографический состав участников

Ко всем участникам форумов и фокус-групп обратились с просьбой заполнить форму, в которой требовалось указать ряд демографических признаков, включая гендерную принадлежность, расовую или этническую принадлежность и сексуальную ориентацию, но не все участники пожелали заполнить форму. В опрос с целью планирования также входил раздел, в котором участники указывали свой возраст, расовую/этническую принадлежность, гендерную принадлежность, сексуальную ориентацию, наличие ВИЧ/СПИДа, наличие и тип жилья, инвалидность, уровень дохода, образование и предпочитаемый язык общения.

В таблице ниже указана сводная демографическая информация по всем участникам форумов, фокус-групп и участников опросов.

Таблица 1. Гендерная принадлежность, самостоятельно указанная участниками в ходе разъяснительных мероприятий с представителями общин

Гендерная принадлежность	%
Женщина	60 %
Мужчина	33 %
Предпочитаю не отвечать	3 %
Гендерквир / небинарная гендерная идентичность	3 %
Женщина-транссексуал	< 1 %
Другое	< 1 %
Мужчина-транссексуал	< 1 %

Таблица 2. Сексуальная ориентация, самостоятельно указанная участниками в ходе разъяснительных мероприятий с представителями общин

Сексуальная ориентация	%
Приверженец традиционной сексуальной ориентации / гетеросексуал	60 %
Гей / лесбиянка / приверженец однополый любви	14 %
Предпочитаю не отвечать	14 %
Бисексуал	9 %
Другое	3 %
Затрудняюсь ответить	< 1 %



Управление мэрии и администрации округа Сан-Франциско по вопросам жилищного хозяйства и благоустройства

Процесс стратегического планирования МОНCD на 2020–2024 г.: краткий обзор программы по вовлечению общин и основные выводы

Таблица 3. Расовая/этническая принадлежность, самостоятельно указанная участниками в ходе разъяснительных мероприятий с представителями общин

Расовая/этническая принадлежность	%
Выходец из Азии	33 %
Белый	31 %
Чернокожий / афроамериканец или африканец	14 %
Испаноязычный или латиноамериканец	13 %
Американский индеец или коренной житель Аляски	5 %
Выходец с Ближнего Востока или из Северной Африки	2 %
Коренной житель Гавайских Островов или других островов Тихого океана	1 %

Сводные результаты

Общие потребности и озабоченность общин

1. Среди вызывающих беспокойство вопросов, определенных в ходе взаимодействия с общинами, заинтересованные лица из Сан-Франциско чаще всего упоминают вынужденную смену жилья, растущие цены на жилье, общий уровень чистоты и безопасности в микрорайоне, а также доступность транспорта.
2. Участники программ МОНCD по взаимодействию с представителями общин указали, что услуги по поддержке финансовой самостоятельности и стабильности для них настолько же важны, насколько и сама потребность в жилье.
3. Многие заинтересованные лица выразили явную потребность в инклюзивных и специфических с точки зрения культуры услугах.
4. Участники выразили потребность в повышенной осведомленности о доступных услугах, улучшенном доступе к ним и ориентированию в них, включая как жилищные услуги, так и другие дополнительные услуги.
5. Заинтересованные лица выразили желание, чтобы при определении права на получение доступного жилья применялись более инклюзивные и менее жесткие критерии.
6. Многие члены общин высказали потребность в предоставлении им более широких возможностей участия в составлении политик городской администрации, регулирующих предоставление права на доступное жилье, а также в участии в разработке программ доступного жилья.
7. Заинтересованные лица обратились с просьбой, чтобы услуги предоставлялись более рационально, с улучшенной межведомственной кооперацией и оптимизированной межведомственной коммуникацией, что способствовало бы предоставлению как жилищных, так и вспомогательных услуг.



Управление мэрии и администрации округа Сан-Франциско по вопросам жилищного хозяйства и благоустройства

Процесс стратегического планирования МОНCD на 2020–2024 г.: краткий обзор программы по вовлечению общин и основные выводы

Жилищные услуги

1. Участники мероприятий по вовлечению представителей общин подчеркнули потребность в среде проживания с доступным жильем для наиболее уязвимых категорий нуждающегося в жилье населения: приюты и временное жилье для бездомных, доступное в физическом плане жилье для престарелых и людей с инвалидностью, а также экономически доступное жилье для семей с самым низким уровнем дохода.
2. Несмотря на то, что наиболее часто упоминавшейся требуемой жилищной услугой была услуга по предоставлению доступного жилья, общей темой, поднимавшейся в ходе обсуждений, было соприкосновение жилищного вопроса и вопроса здравоохранения, поскольку участники подчеркнули потребность в безопасных и здоровых условиях жизни.
3. Члены общин высказали потребность в усиленной поддержке и защите в борьбе с выселением, поддержке и защите квартиросъемщика, включая разъяснительную работу с квартиросъемщиками и использование политик городской администрации, направленных на предотвращение незаконного выселения.

Пятнадцать важнейших потребностей в жилье и жилищных услугах (по результатам всех методов взаимодействия с населением)

Доступное жилье

Помощь в аренде жилья / жилье по сниженным ценам

Помощь в ориентировании на рынке жилья и в использовании специализированных программ

Безопасные условия проживания в приютах, временном и постоянном жилье

Дополнительная защита жилья

Физически доступное жилье для престарелых

Поддержка в борьбе с выселением

Жилищные субсидии

Разъяснительная работа с квартиросъемщиками

Поддерживающее жилье

Содействие в вопросе внесения предоплаты

Жилье рядом с работой

Помощь в переговорах с домовладельцем

Помощь с переселением

Помощь с получением ипотечной ссуды, уплаты взносов в объединение домовладельцев или помощь в случае отчуждения недвижимости за задолженность по ипотеке

Доступ к жилью, восприятие и препятствия

1. Участники указали, что вынужденное выселение и растущие цены на жилье являются наиболее беспокоящими их вопросами, влияющими на доступ к жилью и на способность сохранить жилье за собой.
2. Как съемщики, так и домовладельцы отмечают, что выбор жилья в целом является ограниченным, потому что они чувствуют себя «привязанными».
3. Участники указали на препятствия, не позволяющие домовладельцам сосредоточиться как на ценах на жилье, так и на альтернативных схемах финансирования.



Управление мэрии и администрации округа Сан-Франциско по вопросам жилищного хозяйства и благоустройства

Процесс стратегического планирования МОНCD на 2020–2024 г.: краткий обзор программы по вовлечению общин и основные выводы

4. Участники форумов микрорайонов указали, какие характеристики, по их мнению, делают микрорайон привлекательным, упомянув такие характеристики, как общественный транспорт, зоны зеленых насаждений и безопасность.
5. Участники мероприятий по взаимодействию с общинами сообщили о многочисленных случаях дискриминации в жилищных вопросах, но в то же время их ответы свидетельствуют и о том, что не существует какого-то одного конкретного выраженного типа дискриминации. Их ответы указывают, что наиболее распространенным и укоренившимся типом системной дискриминации является дискриминация по цвету кожи, в частности дискриминация представителей афроамериканской общины.

Социальные и дополнительные услуги

1. Члены общин нуждаются в доступной, целевой поддержке лиц, страдающих от травматических и посттравматических расстройств, связанных с приемом наркотических веществ, и других расстройств психического здоровья. На всех встречах с общинами наиболее часто упоминаемыми социальными и дополнительными услугами, в которых нуждается население, были услуги для лиц, страдающих расстройствами психического здоровья и наркотической зависимостью.

Пятнадцать наиболее востребованных социальных и дополнительных услуг (по результатам всех методов взаимодействия с населением)

Помощь в получении льгот (CalWorks, SNAP, Medi-Cal и т. д.)
Облегчение доступа к медицинским услугам
Предоставление здоровых продуктов питания
Поддержка страдающих психическими заболеваниями и наркотической зависимостью
Языковая поддержка
Информация о доступных услугах
Поддержка престарелых и людей с инвалидностью
Присмотр за детьми по доступной цене
Сопровождение дел
Юридическая помощь — права потребителей / гражданские права
Юридическая помощь — права работников / право на труд
Юридическая помощь — поддержка иммигрантов
Право на отдых
Программы обеспечения питанием
Программы поддержания чистоты и обеспечения безопасности в микрорайонах

2. В отличие от потребности в жилье, необходимость в социальных и дополнительных услугах более сильно выражена и меняется в зависимости от категории населения. Как ни странно, на всех встречах с общинами участники выразили потребность в одном из видов социальных

и дополнительных услуг приблизительно 860 раз. Участники выразили потребность в одном из видов связанных с жильем услуг 530 раз. Потребности в социальных и дополнительных услугах не только упоминаются чаще других — им также свойственна большая изменчивость в зависимости от категории населения.



Управление мэрии и администрации округа Сан-Франциско по вопросам жилищного хозяйства и благоустройства

Процесс стратегического планирования МОНCD на 2020–2024 г.: краткий обзор программы по вовлечению общин и основные выводы

Осведомленность и доступ к услугам

1. Участники указали на ограниченную осведомленность о доступности жилищных и социальных услуг и о наличии у них права на их получение, а также на потребность в помощи с ориентированием в данных услугах.
2. Кроме требуемой большей осведомленности о критериях получения права на льготы заинтересованные лица заявили, что такие критерии могут стать препятствием для доступа к услугам.
3. Участники высказали потребность в инклюзивных услугах по языковой поддержке в целях как повышения осведомленности об услугах, так и облегчения доступа к услугам, включая жилищные услуги и здравоохранение.
4. Жители Сан-Франциско сталкиваются с рядом препятствий в использовании транспорта, включая длительное время ожидания, безопасность и стоимость проезда, затрудняющие возможности трудоустройства, посещения врачей и получения других услуг.

Координация услуг

1. Заинтересованные лица обратились с просьбой, чтобы услуги предоставлялись более рационально, с улучшенной межведомственной кооперацией и оптимизированной межведомственной коммуникацией, что поспособствовало бы предоставлению как жилищных, так и вспомогательных услуг.
2. Члены общин, принявшие участие в работе форумов и фокус-групп, попросили о предоставлении дополнительной финансовой поддержки и помощи в наращивании потенциала некоммерческих организаций и других поставщиков услуг, в том числе внесении изменений в правила подрядной деятельности.



Управление мэрии и администрации округа Сан-Франциско по вопросам жилищного хозяйства и благоустройства

Процесс стратегического планирования МОНCD на 2020–2024 г.: краткий обзор программы по вовлечению общин и основные выводы

Экономическая самостоятельность

1. Участники выразили преобладающую потребность в оплачиваемых программах профессиональной подготовки, открывающих путь к стабильному трудоустройству, позволяющему заработать на жизнь. Участники подчеркнули, что, несмотря на наличие текущих предложений по профессиональной подготовке, они могут быть неоплачиваемыми и (или) могут не гарантировать долгосрочное трудоустройство.
2. Существует большая потребность в программах обучения основам финансов и планирования, а также в финансовых услугах, в частности в консультациях по вопросам сбережений и кредитования. Помимо серьезных ограничений из-за низкого уровня доходов, участники чувствуют, что им не хватает инструментов финансового планирования и финансовой грамотности для того, чтобы хотя бы начать рассматривать возможность домовладения.
3. Жители хотят, чтобы работодатели Сан-Франциско предоставляли больше вакансий для местного населения. У участников неоднозначное понимание влияния, которое оказывают методы подбора персонала на жителей с очень низким уровнем дохода. Они указывают, что стимулирование к переносу в Сан-Франциско деятельности работодателей, предлагающих высокие зарплаты, которые могли бы принимать на высокооплачиваемые должности в определенных отраслях местных жителей, не поможет жителям, которым в большинстве случаев нужна работа, дающая возможность обеспечить свое существование.

Пятнадцать наиболее востребованных аспектов экономической самостоятельности (по результатам всех методов взаимодействия с населением)

Программы профессиональной подготовки
Трудоустройство
Финансовое планирование и образование
Овладение новыми профессиями и навыками
Доступ к курсам по изучению английского языка как иностранного
Программы общеобразовательной подготовки и получения аттестата средней школы
Предоставление вакансий местному населению
Финансовые и кредитные услуги
Доступ к техническим средствам / техническое обучение
Возможности постоянного трудоустройства / карьерного роста
Услуги специалиста по подготовке к трудоустройству
Рабочие места для трудовых слоев населения
Программы трудоустройства
Трудоустройство престарелых и людей с инвалидностью
Доступные возможности получения высшего образования



Управление мэрии и администрации округа Сан-Франциско по вопросам жилищного хозяйства и благоустройства

Процесс стратегического планирования МОНСД на 2020–2024 г.: краткий обзор программы по вовлечению общин и основные выводы

Наделение полномочиями и вовлечение общин

1. Представители общин, принадлежащие к незащищенным категориям населения, хотят улучшить взаимодействие с МОНСД и повысить ответственность и отчетность управления мэрии. В целом, члены общин с благодарностью воспользовались возможностью поучаствовать в форумах и фокус-группах и поделиться своими перспективами и предложениями, и при этом выразили желание, чтобы МОНСД продолжило проведение встреч с общинами в формате форумов, чтобы быть в курсе потребностей общин, в частности незащищенных категорий населения. Участники подчеркнули, что с целью исправления исторически сложившейся несправедливости необходимо внедрение мер отчетности, за соблюдение которых городская администрация несла бы ответственность.
2. Участники высказали широкую потребность в стратегиях культурно адаптированной и инклюзивной разъяснительной работы и взаимодействия с общинами, которые способствовали бы их построению и являлись бы звеном между жителями и поставщиками услуг. Культурно адаптированная и инклюзивная разъяснительная работа была наиболее часто упоминаемой потребностью, связанной с вовлечением общин. Члены общин признают наличие текущих разъяснительных мероприятий, рекламируемых спонсируемые городской администрацией жилищные и дополнительные услуги, но эти мероприятия не охватывают некоторые общины. Участники твердо убеждены в том, что применение культурно ориентированной и всеохватывающей стратегии разъяснительной работы даст результат в виде повышенной осведомленности об услугах и степени вовлеченности в процесс их предоставления.
3. Аналогично, респонденты отметили, что возросшее количество культурных мероприятий, доступных для посещения членами общины, помогло бы усилить чувство принадлежности к данной общине.

Пятнадцать главных потребностей в наделении полномочиями и вовлеченности (по результатам всех методов взаимодействия с населением)

Культурная адаптация и инклюзивность (культурные мероприятия, культурно-ориентированная разъяснительная работа)
Культурные мероприятия (вечеринки для жителей квартала, празднования, спортивные соревнования, сельскохозяйственные ярмарки)
Общественные пространства (места для отдыха граждан, зеленые зоны, арт-пространства)
Поддержка некоммерческих организаций и их материальной базы
Парковка
Районное планирование
Поддержка мелкого бизнеса
Участие в волонтерских программах
Встречи представителей общины и разъяснительная работа
Подотчетность
Мероприятия по вовлечению общин и информационные мероприятия
Целевой маркетинг услуг
Мероприятия по уборке микрорайона силами общины
Услуги для престарелых
Улучшенное освещение улиц и территорий



Uputomua

Ile lagolagoina ole fausiaina ole 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan (Peleni Faamaopooo), Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (Iloiloga o Faalavelave mo Filifiliga Talafeagai o Fale), ma le HIV Housing Plan (Peleni o Fale), ua auai le Aai ma le Itumalo o San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing ma le Community Development (MOHCD) ile matuā oo atu i vaipanoa ma auai i gaoioiga ma tagata o aafia ma latou o nonofo i San Francisco. O lenei faiga ua aogā e fai ma faavae ile iloa o fale ma mea o faamuamua ile vaipanoa, ma faapea ona uunaia ai sini ma gaoioiga faavae ua faataoto i peleni faai'u. Ise fua aoao, ole a faaoga ele MOHCD manatu mai le vaipanoa ma mea o faamuamua, i faaiuga atamai mo le faatupeina ole vaipanoa ma tautua mo fale.

Ua fai konekarate le MOHCD ma le Resource Development Associates (RDA) ina ia atia'e se vaipanoa o ituaiga tagata eseese ma gaoioiga faavae mo nei peleni e tolu e faapena ma isi taumafaiga o fuafua e ta'imua ai le Ofisa o Faafetauiga ma le Workforce Development ma le Matagaluga o Peleni. Ile taimi o lenei fuafuaga, e aapa atu ai le MOHCD ise vaipanoa e toatele ituaiga tagata o aafia ai ma latou o nonofo ai e tusa ma o latou manaoga, faamatalaga, manatu ae maise lava mea e taulai faapitoa atu ile toatele o tagata ole aai o afaina ai.

O manatu mai le vaipanoa ose vaega sili lea ona tūa ole faagasologa o le peleni mo fuafuaga fai, e saunia ai faamaumauga tūa ina ia mautinoa e taula'i atu tupe ole polokalame ma tautua i mea i sili ona manaomia e tagata o moomia e faapena ai ma sini aoao o le Aai. Ile taimi o lea fuafuaga, na maua mai manatu o le lautele e ala i fono ale vaipanoa (faatasiga a tuaoi ma faatasiga o le tuufaatasiga ose vaega faapitoa o tagata) ma suesuega e lua na faia, na faapea ona fai ai foi saililiga e faaoga ai pepa. O auala uma ia e lua o faamatalaga na ao mai ē na faisao, ma vaega faapitoa sa auai ua faamatala atili ile pito i lalo.

Fono ale Vaipanoa ma Vaega o Mata'ituina

Na faaogā ele MOHCD fono e 10 mai tagata lautele ma le 38 ose vaega faapitoa o tagata sa mata'ituina. O sui mai vaega eseese o fale sa faia ni o latou sao ma vaega o mata'ituina, e aafia ai ma latou o aafia ile leai o ni fale e nonofo ai, tagatanuu mai le lautele, ma latou o iai fale o loo maua le fesoasoani, ma vaega o vaaia fale ma tautua, latou o faasalalau atu fale HIV/AIDS, pule o fale, tagata e fou mai i San Francisco tagataese faatoa taunuu mai, ma latou ua loa ona nonofo ile Aai. Na fesoasoani le MOHCD i faatasiga o vaega mai aganuu eseese e aafia ai tagata Aferika Amerika, Cambodian, Samoa, Vietnamese, LGBTQ, ma sui o le vaipanoa mai PLWHA. O latou na auai sa tali i fesili faavae i vaega eseese e aafia ai fale ma tautua o loo manaomia, papupuni ile mauaina o fale ma filifiliga, suiga o tuaoi, faaitu'au ma tutusa le avanoa o fale mo tagata uma.

E 1,395 le aofaiga o tagata na faisao i fono ile vaipanoa ia na faia i San Francisco ile va o Novema 2018 ma Mati 2019. E 656 tagata nuu o ia vaipanoa ma faipisinisi sa faisao i fono e 10 i vaipanoa ma pe a ma le 684 na faisao ile 38 vaega o mata'ituina, e 16 na faia i nofoaga ia na suia ai fale mo le latutele e avea o fale o polokalame ole Federal Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD). O nei fuainumera atonu e itiiti mai ile aofiaga moni o latou na auai ona o nisi na auai e le'i sainia o latou suafa. O le lisi oi lalo ua tusia ai mea na faia ile faagasologa o lenei fuafuaga.



Aai ma le Itumalo o San Francisco, Mayor's Office of Housing ma le Community Development
MOHCD 2020-2024 Faagasologa o le peleni mo fuafuaga fai: Otootoga ole Faisao ole Vaipanoa
ma Manatu 'Autū na Maua

MOHCD Neighborhood Forums (MOHCD Fono a Tuaoi)	
Bayview Hunters Point / Itumalo 10	South of Market / Itumalo 6
Castro / Itumalo 8 ma le Itumalo 7	Sunset / Itumalo 4 ma le Itumalo 1
Chinatown / Itumalo 3 ma le Itumalo 2	Tenderloin / Itumalo 6
Excelsior ma OMI / Itumalo 11	Visitation Valley / Itumalo 10
Mission / Itumalo 9	Western Addition / Itumalo 5

MOHCD Community Focus Groups (Vaega Mata'ituina ile Vaipanoa)	
Vaipanoa o Tagata Aferika Amerika	Human Service Network
Cambodian Community	Vaipanoa LGBTQ
Council of Community Housing Organizations	Local Homeless Coordinating Board
Puipua o le Tuliese Faamalosia / Tenant Empowerment	Long Term Care Coordinating Council
Vaipanoa HIV	Mayor's Disability Council
Latou o Saunia Fale HIV	Vaipano o Tagata Samoa
Latou e Ona Fale - BMR	Tagata Matutua Gaoioiga mo Latou e lē Atoatoa le Malosi
HOPE SF Hunters View Housing Community	SF Immigrant Legal & Education Network
HOPE SF Potrero Hill Housing Community	SF Latino Parity & Equity Coalition
HOPE SF Sunnyside Housing Community	Transgender Community
Housing Action Coalition	Vietnamese Community

Rental Assistance Demonstration Focus Group Sites (Fesoasoani Mautotogi Vaega o Mata'ituina Nofoaga Faata'ita'i)	
1760 Bush Street	491 31st
1880 Pine Street	Bernal Dwellings
3850 18th Street	Clementina Towers
25 Sanchez	Hayes Valley North & South
255 Woodside	John F Kennedy Apts.
2698 California	Mission Dolores
345 Arguello	Robert B. Pitts
462 Duboce	Westside Courts

Community Surveys (Suesuega ole Vaipanoa)

Na fausia ele MOHCD ni suesuega se lua ole vaipanoa ina ia maua mai tautua o manaomia mo fale ma isi tautua faapena ma o latou feutagaiga ma le MOHCD ma polokalame ma tautua ale OEWD.

Suesuega o le Fuafuaina

E fesiligia ele suesuega latou o faatalanoa poo a mea latou mananao e maua ma nonofo i fale, o ā tautua oi fale e lē oi lalo o le polokalame e sili ona tāua mo latou ma ō latou aiga, auala sili latou te mananao e maua ai tautua, ō latou manatu ile MOHCD, ma isi fesili e faatatau ile olaga e sili ona lelei. E tusa ma le 2,219 le aofaiga o tali mo lenei suesuega.



Polokalame Suesuega e Faatulaga ai

Pe a uma ona faamae'a le Suesuega o le Fuafuaina, sa iai le avanoa mo latou na faisao e faamae'a ai le Polokalame Suesuega e Faatulaga ai, lea na fesili e faatatau ile faatinoina o le MOHCD ma polokalame ma tautua ale OEWD. O latou na tali mai sa fesiligia e faatatau i lo latou faaaogaina tatau ole tamaoaiga ma polokalame tauatia'e o galuegae, polokalame ole tuuina i fale, tautua mo fale ma tautua ile vaipanoa ona fesili atu lea iai e faatulaga ma faamatala le fua aoao o mea na oo ia latou e tusa ai o nei polokalame ma tautua. O lea ua mafai ai ona aoina mai ma faatusatusa numera faamaumau na maua mai i lenei suesuega i Aai eseese ma polokalame ole vaipanoa ma tautua ma faaatagia i lenei fua o faamaumauga o fuainumera o latou na faisao ma faia ai se faatatauga aogā. O latou na tali mai i lenei suesuega e 1,537.

Ituaiga Eseese o Latou na Faisaos

O latou na faaaoga ma vaega na taula'i iai na talosagaina ina ia faatumu le pepa ma faailoa mai ituaiga eseese e iloga ai, e aofia ai le itupa, lanu poo le tupuaga, ituaiga e iloa ai, peitai e lē o latou uma na faisao na filifili e faatumu lenei pepa. O le Suesuega o le Fuafuaina na faapea foi ona aofia ai vaega o tausaga eseese e faailoa mai ai e latou na faisao o latou tausaga, lanu/tupuaga, itupa, ituaiga e iloa ai, tulaga ile HIV/AIDS, tulaga o fale, tulaga o le lē atoatoa o le malosi, maua luga o totogi, maua luga o a'oa'oga, ma le gagana e fiafia iai.

Ole siata oi lalo ua faaaui mai ai faamatalaga mai i ituaiga o tagata eseese o fono uma lava, vaega na taula'i iai, ma latou na faisao ile suesuega.

Lisi 1: Tusia ele Tagata Lava Ia Lona Itupa e Iloa ai ile Across Community Outreach Efforts (Taumafaiga e Aapa Atu ile Vaipanoa)

Itupa e Iloa ai	%
Fafine	60%
Tane	33%
Ou te musu e tali	3%
Faafafine/Lē iloga	3%
Tamaita'i-Fai	<1%
Isi mea	<1%
Tane-Fai	<1%

Lisi 2: Tusia ele Tagata lava Ia le Ituaiga e Iloa ai i Taumafaiga e Aapa Atu ile Vaipanoa

Itupa e Manao e Iloa Ai	%
Tuusa'o/Fiafia na o le isi itupa	60%
Faafafine/Tauafafine/Tutusa-Fiafia i Ituaiga	14%
Ou te musu e tali	14%
Faafafine/Faatane	9%
Isi mea	3%
Fesiligia/Lē mautonu	<1%

Lisi 3: Tusia ele Tagata lava Ia le Lanu/Tupaga i Taumafaiga Uma ia Ausia Vaipanoa

Lanu/Tupupaga	%
Asia	33%
Pa'epa'e	31%
Uliuli, Aferika Amerika, poo Aferika	14%
Latino/a poo Hispanic	13%
Initia Amerika poo se Alaska Moni	5%
Sasa'e Tutotonu pe Aferika i Matu	2%
Hawaii Moni pe o Isi Pasefike Ailena	1%



Oototoga o Mea na Maua Mai

Manaoga ma Popolega Lautele o le Vaipanoa

1. Mai mea na iloa o popole iai ile faatalanoaina o tagata o le vaipanoa, o le tele o popolega o tagata na aafia i San Francisco o le siitiaese, faatupulaia le tau o fale, fua aoao o le mamā ma le saogalemu o latou tuaoi, ma le mauagofie o auala o femalagaaiga.
2. Na faailoa mai e latou na faisao ile vaipanoa i MOHCD na iloa o tautua e lagolago ile mafai ele tagata ona tausia ia lava ma faamautuina e tāua e pei lava o le manaomia o fale.
3. O le toatele o tagata aafia na latou tau'a le manaoaga sili o le faaaoafia o agaifanua ma tautua faapitoa faaleaganuu.
4. O latou na faisao na latou faailoa mai e iai se manaoga tele ole, iloa le itulagi e aga'i iai, ia mafai ona maua tautua o loo iai, e aafia ai fale ma isi tautua tau fesoasoani.
5. Na tau'a e tagata na aafia le naunau ia iai ni tapulaa maopoopo ma toafilemu i agavaa e maua ai fale taugofie.
6. O le toatele o sui o le vaipanoa na latou faaleo mai le manaomia ona tele avanoa ina ia saunia ai manatu i tulafono ale Aai i agavaa mo fale faapena ai ma le faisao ile fausia o polokalame mo fale taugofie.
7. Na talosagaina e latou na aafia ia tele ni tautua e faailoa mai i ala faasalalau, faaleleia le felagolagoma'i, ma ia malosi fesoataiga i matagaluega e lagolago le faaoina atu o fale ma tautua fesoasoani.

Tautua tau fale

1. O latou na faisao ile talanoaga ma le vaipanoa sa latou faamamafa ia maua se siomaga o fale taugofie ile vaega pito sili ona manaomia ai fale: falesulufa'i ma fale lē tumau mo tagata ua leai ni fale, ia iai ni fale mo tagata matutua ma latou e lē atoatoa le malosi, ma fale taugofie mo latou e sili ona maulalo totogi.
2. O le mataupu pito sili ona ta'ua soo o le manaoga ia iai ni tautua mo fale taugofie, ae o le iloa o le sootaga o le soifua maloloina i fale sa avea ma laina sa masani ona talanoaina, a'o faatāua ei latou sa faisao le manaomia ona saogalemu ma se siomaga e soifua maloloina lelei.
3. O sui o le vaipanoa na latou ta'ua e manaomia ona faamalosi le tuliese faamalosi ma le lagolagoina ma le puipuia o latou o nonofo i fale, e aafia ai le a'oa'oina o latou o nonofo i fale faapena ma tulafono a le Aai ina ia puipuia ai le tuliese faamalosi e lē tusa ai ma le tulafono.

Fale pito i luga e sefululima ma tautua manaomia mo fale (ose fua aoao o metotia uma na maua)

Fale taugofie

Fesoasoani i ē mautotogi/faaitiitia tau o fale

Fesoasoani e sailia ma le talosagaina o fale

Fale sulufa'i iai e saogalemu, suiga, ma le si'omaga tumau o fale

Faatele puipuiga o fale

Tagata matutua ma le mauaina o fale

Fesoasoani e puipuia ai le tuliese faamalosi

Fesoasoani i tau o fale

A'oa'oina o tagata e nonofo i fale

Fesoasoani ia maua fale

Fesoasoani mo tupe e totogi muamua

Fale e latalata i galuega

Fesoasoani e feutagai ma pule o fale

Fesoasoani ile siitiaese

Mokesi, pili HOA poo fesoasoani ile faatasuese o fale



Mauaina o Fale, Manatu, ma Papupuni

1. Na ta'ua e latou na faisao le siitiaese ma le faatuputeleina o tau o fale e avea ma popolega autū o aafia ile mauaina o fale ma avanoa e nonofo ai pea i fale.
2. O latou e mautotogi ma pule o fale na latou faapea uma mai e la'ititi filifiliga o iai mo fale talu ai latou te lagona ua "saisaitia latou."
3. Na faamatilatila mai e latou na faisao papupui ile mauaina o fale e faaautū i tau o fale ma avanoa e faatupe ai.
4. O latou na faisao ile fono ma tuaoi na faasoa mai uiga na latou talitonu e avea ai tuaoi ma tulaga moomia ile faailoa mai o mea e pei o femalagaaiga mo le lautele, siomaga e lausiusi laau ma laufanua ma e saogalemu.
5. O latou na faisao ile vaipanoa na latou faasoa mai mea na oo ia latou e faaapea e faaitu'au le mauaina o fale, ae i tulaga aoao, na faailoa mai ia latou tali e leai se vaega faaitu'au faapitoa e tasi, faaleaogaina le ituaiga o faaitu'au. O a latou tali na faailoa mai ai e tele ina iai faaitu'au i faamatalaga ma le auala o faia ai ua faapea ona aafia ai tagata lanu ma e faapitoa lava i tagata mai vaipanoa o Aferika Amerika.

Tautua Lautele ma Fesoasoani

1. E manaomia e tagata o le vaipanoa mea taugofie, fesoasoani e taula'i iai i taimi o puapuga, PTSD, mea e faaoga i gasegase o le mafaufau, ma isi tulaga soifua maloloina o le mafaufau. O le maloloina o le mafaufau ma tautua e faaogā faatasi ai ma le ta'ua soo o tautua e fesoasoani ile lautele mo fesoasoani i fono uma a le vaipanoa.
2. Pe a faatusatusa i manaoga mo fale, ma manaoga mo le fesoasoani i tautua o loo manaomia e sili ona mamafa ma eseese ile faitau aofa'i o tagata. Ise tulaga e faateia ai, i fonotaga mai vaipanoa uma, na faamatala e sui auai le manaomia o se ituaiga o tautua e fesoasoani ile lautele pe tusa ma le 860 taimi. O latou na faisao na latou ta'ua le manaomia o manatu e fesoata'i atu i fale e tusa ma le 530 taimi. E faaopoopo atu i mea na tau'a soo, o manaoga mo fesoasoani i tautua na eseese tulaga mai le faitau aofa'i o tagata.

Tautua lautele ma fesoasoani e sefulu lima pito i luga e manaomia (i metotia uma sa aoaoina mai)

Fesoasoani mo penefiti (CalWorks, SNAP, Medi-Cal, isi mea faapena)

Faaleleia tulaga ile mauaina o tausiga tausofua maloloina

Mauaina o taumafa tatau mo le soifua maloloina

Maloloina o le mafaufau ma fesoasoani i mea o faaogaina

Fesoasoani ile gagana

Malamalama i tautua o loo mafai ona maua

Fesoasoani i tagata matutua ma tagata e lē atoatoa le malos

Taugofie le tausia o fanau

Faafaeina o mataupu

Tautua faaletulafono – tagata faatau/āia tatau a tagata

Tautua faaletulafono – tagata faigaluega/āia tatau i galuega

Tautua faaletulafono – fesoasoani i femalagaaiga

Mauaina o mea e tafafao ai

Polokalame i mea'ai aogā

Galuega faamamā i tuaoi ma polokalame mo le saogalemu



Malamalama i Tautua ma le Mauaina

1. Na faailoa mai e latou na faisao le tapulaa o le malamalama e tusa ai ma le iai o avanoa e agavaa ai e maua fale ma tautua mo le latutele, faapena ai ma le manaoga ile sailia o na tautua.
2. E faaopoopo ile faatele o le malamalama i mea manaomia e agavaa ai, o latou na aafia na latou faailoa mai o mea e manaomia e agavaa ai e mafai ona avea ma papupuni ile mauaina o na tautua.
3. Na faamatala mai e latou na faisao ile manaoga ina ia faaaofia ai tautua fesoasoani mo gagana, ina ia mafai ona faaauiluma le malamalama ma tautua ma le mauaina o tautua, e faapitoa lava ile soifua maloloina ma fale.
4. O loo iai faigata i tagata o nuu i tulaga tau femalagaaiga i San Francisco, e aofia ai le umi o le taimi e faatali ai, saogalemu, ma le tau o femalagaaiga, ua fai ma faalavelave le oo atu i galuega, tuugatala mo le vaaia o foma'i, ma isi tautua.

Faamaopoopoina o Tautua

1. Na talosagaina e latou na aafia ia tele ni tautua e faailoa mai i ala faasalalau, faaleleia le felagolagoma'i, ma ia malosi fesoataiga i matagaluega e lagolago le faaoina atu o fale ma tautua fesoasoani.
2. O sui mai le vaipanoa ma latou na faisao i fonotaga ma vaega sa taula'i atu iai na latou fesili mai ia tele le fesoasaoni tautupe ma lagolagosua i faugafale mo faalapopotoga e lē galulue mo ni polofiti ma isi o latou saunia mai fesoasoani, e aofia ai suiga i tulafono faakonekarate.

Mautū le Tagata Lava Ia i Tulaga Tautupe

1. Na faamatala e latou na auai le tele o le manaoga mo galuega totogi, polokalame e toleni ai e faapea ona saunia ai le ala mo totogi e ola ai, ma galuega e mafai ona faatumauina. Na faamamafa mai e latou na auai e faapea o loo iai avanoa mo toleniga taugaluega ile taimi nei, atonu e lē o totogia ma/pe lē fesoata'i atu i galuega faaumiumi.
2. O loo iai se manaoga tele mo polokalame e a'oa'o ai le faitau ma le fuafuaina i mataupu tautupe ae maise lava i tupe teu ma tautua faaufautua i aitalafu. E faaopoopo atu i papupuni iloga tau tupemaua, na lagona e latou na faisao faapea e lē o lava meafaigaluega mo le fuafuaina ma le iloa faitau tulaga tautupe ile tauamataina ole fuafuaga ole faia ose fale.
3. O tagata o nonofo i San Francisco latou te

Manaoga e 15 pito maualuga o le mautū i tulaga tautupe (i metotia uma sa aoaoina mai)

Toleni mo Galuega
Mauaina ose galuega
Fuafuaina o tupe ma a'oa'oga
A'oa'oina ose tomai fou taugaluega
Mauina o vasega ESL
A'oa'oga – Polokalame GED ma tipiloma mo a'oga maualuga
Faafaigaluegaina ile mea o nofo ai
Fesoasoani ile faatupeina ma aitalafu
Mauaina o le Tech/a'oa'oga a le tech
Galuega tumau/avanoa mo galuega
Toleni mo galuega
Galuega "mo vaega o tagata"
Polokalame mo pule o galuega
Tagata matutua/galuega mo latou e lē atoatoa le malosi
Avanoa e maua a'oa'oga maualuga taugofie

mananao i pule o galuega e faafaigaluega le toatele o tagata e nonofo ile vaipanoa. O tagata na faisao e faaluafesasi lo latou malamalama ile aafiaga o faiga ile faafaigaluegaina o tagata o le vaipanoa e maulalo tele o latou totogi. Na latou faailoa mai e faapea o le faatosinaina o pule e tetelē o latou totogi, atonu o le a latou faafaigaluegaina ai tagata mai lea vaipanoa mo tulaga e tetelē totogi i



Aai ma le Itumalo o San Francisco, Mayor's Office of Housing ma le Community Development
*MOHCD 2020-2024 Faagasologa o le peleni mo fuafuaga fai: Oototoga ole Faisao ole Vaipanoa
ma Manatu 'Autū na Maua*

falefaigaluega faapitoa e sii atu i San Francisco e lē maua ai e tagata o loo sili ona manaomia ni galuega totogi e ola ai.

Faamalosia o le Vaipanoa ma le Faia o se Vaega

1. O latou oi le vaipanoa o loo aafia latou te mananao ise faiā lelei ma e iai ni tiutefai ile MOHCD. Ise fuaoao, na talisapaia tele e sui o le vaipanoa le maua o le avanoa e faisao ai i fono ma vaega na mata'ituina ma faasoa o latou manatu ma fautuaga, peitai na faamatala mai e latou na faisao lo latou mananao ile MOHCD e faaauau ona faia fono e pei o faatasiga ia ina ia mafai ona mata'ituina manaoga o le vaipanoa, ae maise lava manaoga ose vaega o tagata o afaina. Na faamamafa mai e latou na faisao e faapea, ina ia mafai ona toe faasa'o le talafaasolopito o le faaitu'au, e tatau ona iai se vaega e galue iai le Aai e tali atu iai.
2. Na faaleo mai e latou na faisao se manaoga tele ina ia fetauti le agaifanua ma ia faaafia ai i gaoioiga tatau ale vaipanoa e faapea ona faaauiluma ai fale o le vaipanoa ma faafesoota'i atu iai latou o nonofo iina i tautua o iai. O le fetauti o le agaifanua ma faaafia ai o le vaipanoa o le manaoga pito tele e fesoota'i atu ile faia o se vaega a le vaipanoa. Na ta'utino mai e sui o le vaipanoa e faapea o loo iai ile taimi nei taumafaiga ole faasalalau atu e maketi ai fale oi le vaaiga a Aai ma tautua fesoasoani, peitai o nei taumafaiga e lē oo atu i nisi vaipanoa. Na malosi le lagona o latou na faisao e faapea o le faaagaina o aganuu talafeagai e faaoo atu ai o le a fua mai ai le tele o le silafia ma fai vaega i tautua.
3. Ise tulaga tutusa, na faailoa mai e latou na tali mai e faapea ole faateleina o meafai faaleaganuu e faavanoa atu i sui ole vaipanoa e faatuputeleina ai o latou lagona o tagata o le vaipanoa.

Faamalosia o le vaipanoa pito sili e sefululima & manaoga e fai vaega (i metotia uma sa aaoaina mai)

Talafeagai aganuu ma faaafia ai (meafai faaleaganuu, nofoaga faavae aapa atu ai i agaifanua)

Meafai ile vaipanoa (patī a tagata o le poloka, meafai i aso malōlō, taaloga, maketi a le aufaifaatoaga)

Nofoaga avanoa ile vaipanoa (nofoaga avanoa mo tafaoga nofoaga e tele togalaau ma laau lauusiusi, nofoaga avanoa mo ātatusi)

Lagolago faalapopotoga e lē mo polofiti ma avanoa

Pakaga

Fuafuaga a le vaipanoa

Fesoasoani mo pisinisi laiti

Avanoa e tauofo ai

Fono ale vaipanoa ma faalauiloa atu

Vaegafai

Taumafaiga ale vaipanoa e faia se vaeaga ma fesoota'iga

Tautua o taula'i iai le maketiina

Taumafaiga ale vaipanoa ma tuaoi ile faamamāina

Tautua mo tagata matutua

Lelei auala ma molī i fafo



Introducción

Para respaldar el desarrollo de su Plan consolidado del 2020-2024, del Análisis de los obstáculos para elegir una vivienda con igualdad de oportunidad y del Plan de vivienda para las personas que padecen el VIH; la Oficina del Alcalde de Desarrollo Comunitario y de Viviendas (Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development, MOHCD) de la Ciudad y del Condado de San Francisco inició un proceso de alcance comunitario y de participación con los habitantes y las partes interesadas de San Francisco. Este proceso sirve de marco para identificar las prioridades de vivienda y de desarrollo comunitario que, a su vez, impulsan los objetivos y las estrategias presentadas en las planificaciones finales. En última instancia, la MOHCD hará uso de la opinión y de las prioridades de la comunidad para tomar decisiones relacionadas con la financiación de servicios de vivienda y de la comunidad.

La MOHCD se asoció a Resource Development Associates (RDA) para desarrollar una estrategia integral de alcance comunitario y de participación para estos tres proyectos, además de otras iniciativas de planificación dirigidas por la Oficina de Desarrollo Económico y Fuerza Laboral (Office of Economic and Workforce Development, OEWD) y del Departamento de Planificación (Planning Department). Durante el proceso, la MOHCD se acercó a diferentes partes interesadas y habitantes de la comunidad para conocer sus puntos de vista, necesidades, comentarios y opiniones, y se centró específicamente en la población más vulnerable de la ciudad.

La opinión de la comunidad es una parte clave del proceso estratégico de planificación, ya que se obtiene información indispensable para garantizar que los programas y los servicios financiados atiendan las necesidades de máxima prioridad de la población más vulnerable, además de la ciudad en su totalidad. Durante el proceso, la opinión del público se obtuvo mediante reuniones comunitarias (foros vecinales y grupos de debate específicos de la población) y dos encuestas en línea, que también podían completarse por escrito. Ambos métodos de recolección de datos participativa y la información demográfica de los participantes están detallados abajo.

Foros comunitarios y grupos de debate

La MOHCD posibilitó el desarrollo de 10 foros comunitarios en vecindarios y 38 grupos de debate específicos de la población. Representantes de todos los contextos de vivienda participaron en los foros y en los grupos de debate, como personas sin casa, habitantes de viviendas públicas y subsidiadas, proveedores de servicios sociales y de vivienda, defensores de la vivienda para personas que padecen el VIH/SIDA, propietarios, habitantes nuevos de San Francisco, inmigrantes recientes y personas que viven desde siempre en la ciudad. La MOHCD facilitó reuniones con diferentes grupos culturales, como los afroamericanos, los camboyanos, los samoanos, los vietnamitas y los miembros de las comunidades LGBTQ y PVVS. Los participantes respondieron una serie de preguntas estructuradas sobre una gama de dominios relevantes que incluían necesidades de vivienda y de servicios, obstáculos en el acceso a una vivienda y en la elección de una vivienda, cambio de vecindario, discriminación y vivienda justa.

Participaron 1395 personas en las reuniones comunitarias, que se celebraron en toda la ciudad de San Francisco entre noviembre de 2018 y marzo de 2019. Participaron 656 habitantes y partes interesadas en los 10 foros vecinales y, como mínimo, 684 personas participaron en los 38 grupos de debate, de los cuales 16 se llevaron a cabo en sitios de vivienda pública transformados por el Programa Federal de Demostración de Asistencia con la Renta (Federal Rental Assistance Demonstration, RAD). Es posible que estas cifras no representen realmente la concurrencia, ya que algunos participantes no se registraron. En los siguientes cuadros se enumeran los eventos que se hicieron durante el proceso.



Oficina de Vivienda y Desarrollo Comunitario del Alcalde de la Ciudad y del Condado de San Francisco
(City and County of San Francisco, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development)
Proceso de planificación estratégica para el periodo 2020-2024 de la MOHCD: Resumen de la participación comunitaria y resultados clave

Foros en vecindarios de la MOHCD	
Bayview Hunters Point/Distrito 10	South of Market/Distrito 6
Castro/Distrito 8 y Distrito 7	Sunset/Distrito 4 y Distrito 1
Chinatown/Distrito 3 y Distrito 2	Tenderloin/Distrito 6
Excelsior y OMI/Distrito 11	Visitation Valley/Distrito 10
Mission/Distrito 9	Western Addition/Distrito 5

Grupos de debate comunitarios de la MOHCD	
Comunidad de afroamericanos	Red de Servicios Humanos
Comunidad de camboyanos	Comunidad LGBTQ
Consejo de las Organizaciones de Vivienda Comunitaria	Junta de Coordinación Local para Personas sin Casa
Prevención de desalojo/Apoderamiento del inquilino	Consejo de Coordinación de Atención a Largo Plazo
Comunidad de personas con el VIH	Consejo del Alcalde de Discapacitados
Proveedores de vivienda para personas con el VIH	Comunidad de samoanos
Propietarios - BMR (viviendas con tasas inferiores a las del mercado)	Iniciativa para adultos mayores con discapacidad
Comunidad de vivienda HOPE SF Hunters View	Red para Inmigrantes sobre Asuntos Legales y Educativos en San Francisco
Comunidad de vivienda HOPE SF Potrero Hill	Unión de Latinos en San Francisco por la paridad y la igualdad
Comunidad de vivienda HOPE SF Sunnydale	Comunidad de personas transgénero
Unión de Iniciativa de Vivienda	Comunidad de vietnamitas
Sitios para grupos de debate sobre la Demostración de Asistencia con la Renta	
1760 Bush Street	491 31st
1880 Pine Street	Bernal Dwellings
3850 18th Street	Clementina Towers
25 Sanchez	Hayes Valley North & South
255 Woodside	John F Kennedy Apts.
2698 California	Mission Dolores
345 Arguello	Robert B. Pitts
462 Duboce	Westside Courts

Encuestas a la comunidad

La MOHCD elaboró dos encuestas para la comunidad para registrar las necesidades de servicios de vivienda y de otra índole de los habitantes, además de sus experiencias con los programas y servicios de la MOHCD y la OEWD.



Oficina de Vivienda y Desarrollo Comunitario del Alcalde de la Ciudad y del Condado de San Francisco (City and County of San Francisco, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development)

Proceso de planificación estratégica para el periodo 2020-2024 de la MOHCD: Resumen de la participación comunitaria y resultados clave

Encuesta de planificación

A través de esta encuesta, se le preguntó a los participantes qué necesitaban para conseguir una vivienda y permanecer en ella, qué servicios no relacionados con la vivienda eran más importantes para ellos y su familia, cómo preferían acceder a los servicios, qué opinaban de la MOHCD, además de otras preguntas relacionadas con la calidad de vida. Hubo un total de 2219 respuestas en esta encuesta.

Encuesta de evaluación de programas

Luego de completar la encuesta de planificación, los participantes tuvieron la oportunidad de completar la encuesta de evaluación de programas, a través de la cual se preguntaba acerca del uso de los programas y servicios de la MOHCD y la OEWD. Se le preguntó a los encuestados sobre su uso de los programas de desarrollo económico y de fuerza laboral, los programas de ubicación de vivienda, los servicios de vivienda y los servicios comunitarios. Además, se les pidió que calificaran y describieran su experiencia general con estos programas y servicios. De este modo, mediante esta encuesta se pudo recopilar y comparar información específica sobre el uso de una gama de programas y servicios de la ciudad y la comunidad. Además, se combinó esta información con las calificaciones y con las evaluaciones cualitativas de los participantes. Hubo un total de 1537 respuestas en esta encuesta.

Datos demográficos de los participantes

Generalmente, se les pidió a los participantes de los foros y de los grupos de debate que completaran formularios con información sobre algunos datos demográficos; entre ellos, el sexo, la raza o etnia y la orientación sexual. Sin embargo, no todos los participantes completaron este formulario. La encuesta de planificación también incluía un componente demográfico donde los encuestados indicaron su edad, raza o etnia, sexo, orientación sexual, estado con respecto al VIH/SIDA, estado con respecto a la vivienda, estado con respecto a la discapacidad, nivel de ingresos, nivel educativo e idioma de preferencia.

Los siguientes cuadros son un resumen de la información demográfica recopilada de todos los foros, los grupos de debate y los participantes de las encuestas.

Cuadro 1: Información facilitada por los participantes acerca de la identidad de género a través de las iniciativas de alcance comunitario

Identidad de género	%
Femenino	60 %
Masculino	33 %
Prefiero no responder	3 %
Género variante/Género no binario	3 %
Transgénero femenino	<1 %
Otro	<1 %
Transgénero masculino	<1 %

Cuadro 2: Información facilitada por los participantes acerca de la orientación sexual a través de las iniciativas de alcance comunitario

Orientación sexual	%
Heterosexual	60 %
Homosexual/Lesbiana/Amante del mismo género	14 %
Prefiero no responder	14 %
Bisexual	9 %
Otro	3 %
En duda/Sin determinar	<1 %



Cuadro 3: Información facilitada por los participantes acerca de la raza o etnia a través de las iniciativas de alcance comunitario

Raza/Etnia	%
Asiático	33 %
Blanco	31 %
Negro, afroamericano o africano	14 %
Latino o hispano	13 %
Indígena norteamericano o nativo de Alaska	5 %
Mediorienta o norteafricano	2 %
Nativo de Hawái u otras islas del Pacífico	1 %

Resumen de los resultados

Necesidades y preocupaciones de la comunidad en general

1. En la participación comunitaria de las partes interesadas de San Francisco, las preocupaciones más importantes que se identificaron fueron el desalojo, el aumento de los precios de las viviendas, el saneamiento y la seguridad general de sus vecindarios y la accesibilidad del tránsito.
2. Los participantes expresaron que los servicios para respaldar la autosuficiencia y la estabilidad son tan importantes como la necesidad de vivienda.
3. Muchas partes interesadas expresaron una gran necesidad de servicios culturales de inclusión y específicos para cada cultura.
4. Los participantes expresaron su necesidad de una mayor concientización, orientación y acceso a los servicios disponibles, incluidos los servicios de vivienda y otros servicios de asistencia.
5. Las partes interesadas expresaron su deseo de contar con criterios más inclusivos y flexibles respecto de la elegibilidad para viviendas asequibles.
6. Muchos miembros de la comunidad manifestaron la necesidad de mayores oportunidades para aportar su opinión sobre las políticas de elegibilidad para las viviendas de la ciudad y la necesidad de participar en el desarrollo de programas de viviendas asequibles.
7. Las partes interesadas solicitaron más servicios optimizados, una mejora en la colaboración interinstitucional y una comunicación entre instituciones más sólida para ayudar a la ejecución de servicios de vivienda y de apoyo.

Servicios de vivienda

1. Los participantes hicieron énfasis en la necesidad de alojamiento asequible para la población más vulnerable: albergues y viviendas de transición para personas sin casa, viviendas asequibles para adultos mayores y personas con discapacidad, y viviendas asequibles para los grupos familiares de más bajos ingresos.



Oficina de Vivienda y Desarrollo Comunitario del Alcalde de la Ciudad y del Condado de San Francisco
(City and County of San Francisco, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development)
Proceso de planificación estratégica para el periodo 2020-2024 de la MOHCD: Resumen de la participación comunitaria y resultados clave

2. Si bien el acceso a una vivienda asequible fue la necesidad más mencionada respecto de los servicios de vivienda, la convergencia entre la salud y la vivienda fue un tema frecuente en los debates, ya que los participantes enfatizaron la necesidad de entornos seguros y saludables para vivir.
3. Los miembros de la comunidad manifestaron la necesidad de una mayor protección y respaldo para el inquilino y con respecto al desalojo mediante educación para los inquilinos y políticas de la ciudad para impedir desalojos ilegales.

Acceso a la vivienda, percepciones y obstáculos

1. Según los participantes, los dos mayores factores de preocupación que afectan el acceso a la vivienda y la capacidad de permanecer en ella son el desalojo y el aumento de los precios de las viviendas.
2. Los inquilinos y los propietarios manifestaron que la posibilidad de elegir una vivienda es generalmente baja, ya que se sienten «acorralados».
3. Los participantes destacaron que los dos mayores obstáculos para ser propietario son el precio de las viviendas y las opciones de financiación.
4. Según los participantes de los foros vecinales, las cualidades que hacen que un vecindario sea atractivo son el transporte público, los espacios verdes y la seguridad.
5. Los participantes compartieron varias experiencias de discriminación relativa a la vivienda, pero, en general, las respuestas revelaron que no hay un solo tipo específico de discriminación evidente. Sus respuestas reflejaron una discriminación sistémica más generalizada y arraigada que afecta a las personas negras y a las comunidades de afroamericanos en particular.

Las quince necesidades más importantes de vivienda y de servicios de vivienda (en todos los métodos de alcance comunitario)

Vivienda asequible
Asistencia con la renta/Acceso a una vivienda de bajo costo
Asistencia con la búsqueda y la solicitud de una vivienda
Albergues seguros, de transición y espacios de vivienda permanente
Más protecciones en los programas de vivienda
Acceso a una vivienda asequible para adultos mayores
Asistencia con la prevención del desalojo
Subsidios de vivienda
Educación para inquilinos
Viviendas de apoyo
Asistencia con el pago inicial
Viviendas cercanas a los lugares de trabajo
Asistencia con la negociación con el propietario
Asistencia con la reubicación
Hipoteca, deudas a la HOA (Asociación de Propietarios de Viviendas) o asistencia con la ejecución hipotecaria



Servicios sociales y de apoyo

1. Los miembros de la comunidad necesitan asistencia asequible y específica para el tratamiento de traumas, TEPT, trastornos por consumo de sustancias y otras condiciones de salud mental. Los servicios de ayuda respecto de la salud mental y del consumo de sustancias fueron los más solicitados durante las reuniones comunitarias.
2. En comparación con las necesidades de vivienda, las necesidades de servicio social y de apoyo son más intensivas y varían según la población. Increíblemente, en todas las reuniones comunitarias, los participantes manifestaron la necesidad de cualquier tipo de servicio social o de apoyo unas 860 veces. Los participantes manifestaron cualquier tipo de necesidad relacionada con la vivienda unas 530 veces. Además de haber sido expresadas con más frecuencia, las necesidades de servicio social y de apoyo también variaban más según la población.

Las quince necesidades más importantes de servicios sociales y de apoyo (en todos los métodos de alcance comunitario)

Asistencia con beneficios (CalWorks, SNAP, Medi-Cal, etc.)
Mejor acceso a la atención médica
Acceso a comida saludable
Ayuda con el consumo de sustancias y la salud mental
Asistencia con el idioma
Conocimiento de los servicios disponibles
Ayuda para adultos mayores y personas con discapacidad
Cuidado infantil asequible
Manejo de casos
Servicios legales: derechos del consumidor/civiles
Servicios legales: derechos del trabajador/de empleo
Servicios legales: ayuda a inmigrantes
Acceso a la recreación
Programas de nutrición
Programas de saneamiento y seguridad en los vecindarios

Conocimiento de los servicios y acceso a los servicios

1. Los participantes indicaron que conocen muy poco sobre la disponibilidad y la elegibilidad para obtener viviendas y servicios sociales, además de la necesidad de asistencia para buscar esos servicios.
2. Además de la necesidad de conocer mejor los requisitos de elegibilidad, las partes interesadas expresaron que los requisitos de elegibilidad pueden ser un obstáculo a la hora de acceder a los servicios.
3. Los participantes manifestaron la necesidad de servicios de asistencia inclusiva con el idioma para promover el conocimiento de los servicios y el acceso a estos, especialmente, para la salud y la vivienda.
4. Los habitantes se enfrentan a varios obstáculos respecto del transporte en San Francisco; por ejemplo, los tiempos de espera prolongados, los problemas de seguridad y el costo del transporte impiden su llegada al trabajo, a las consultas médicas, y acceder a otros servicios.



Coordinación de los servicios

1. Las partes interesadas solicitaron más servicios optimizados, una mejora en la colaboración interinstitucional y una comunicación entre instituciones más sólida para ayudar a la ejecución de servicios de vivienda y de apoyo.
2. Los miembros de la comunidad que participaron en los foros y en los grupos de debate solicitaron más asistencia financiera y en el desarrollo de capacidades para organizaciones sin fines de lucro y otros proveedores de servicios, además de cambios en las disposiciones de contratación.

Autosuficiencia económica

1. Los participantes manifestaron una necesidad abrumadora de programas de formación de empleo pagos que los conduzcan hacia un empleo con un salario digno y sustentable. Los participantes destacaron que, aunque en la actualidad existen oportunidades de formación de empleo, es posible que no sean pagos o que no garanticen un trabajo fijo a largo plazo.
2. Existe una gran necesidad de programas de enseñanza y planificación financiera, además de servicios financieros, en especial, sobre ahorros y servicios de asesoramiento sobre créditos. Además de los considerables obstáculos generados por los bajos ingresos, los participantes expresaron que no cuentan con las herramientas de planificación financiera ni con el conocimiento financiero para siquiera comenzar a considerar el proceso para ser propietarios de una vivienda.
3. Los habitantes quieren que los empleadores

Las quince necesidades más importantes de la autosuficiencia económica (en todos los métodos de alcance comunitario)

Capacitación laboral
Obtención de un trabajo
Planificación financiera y educación
Aprendizaje de nuevas habilidades laborales
Acceso a clases de ESL (inglés como segunda lengua)
Programa GED (Desarrollo de educación general) y programa de finalización de la escuela secundaria
Contratación local
Servicios de financiación y crédito
Acceso a la tecnología/Educación tecnológica
Trabajo fijo/Oportunidades de empleo
Asesoramiento sobre el empleo
Empleos para la «clase trabajadora»
Programas para los empleadores
Empleos para adultos mayores/personas con discapacidad
Oportunidades asequibles de educación superior

de San Francisco contraten a más residentes locales. Los participantes cuentan con un entendimiento minucioso del impacto que las prácticas de contratación tienen sobre los habitantes con muy bajos ingresos. Manifestaron que incentivar a empleadores que pagan bien (que podrían contratar localmente para puestos con sueldos altos en industrias específicas) a mudarse a San Francisco no es beneficioso para los habitantes que más necesitan un empleo con salario mínimo.

Fortalecimiento de la comunidad y participación

1. Las partes interesadas más vulnerables de la comunidad quieren mantener una mejor relación con la MOHCD y que esta se responsabilice más. En general, los miembros de la comunidad valoraron mucho la oportunidad de participar de los foros y de los grupos de debate para compartir sus opiniones y



sugerencias. Sin embargo, también manifestaron que les gustaría que la MOHCD siga organizando reuniones comunitarias, como los foros para seguir en contacto con las necesidades de la comunidad, particularmente, con las necesidades de las poblaciones más vulnerables. Los participantes destacaron que, para rectificar las desigualdades históricas, deben tomarse medidas de responsabilidad de las cuales la ciudad se pueda hacer cargo.

2. Los participantes manifestaron una gran necesidad de un alcance comunitario culturalmente competente e inclusivo y de estrategias de participación comunitarias que incentiven el desarrollo de la comunidad y que vinculen a los habitantes con los servicios. La necesidad relativa a la participación de la comunidad más mencionada fue la del alcance comunitario culturalmente competente e inclusivo. Los miembros de la comunidad reconocen que en la actualidad hay iniciativas de alcance comunitario que promueven servicios de vivienda y de apoyo patrocinados por la ciudad, pero estas iniciativas no llegan a todas las comunidades. Los participantes creen firmemente que la implementación de estrategias de alcance comunitario culturalmente competentes generará una mayor concientización y participación respecto de los servicios.

Las quince necesidades más importantes del fortalecimiento de la comunidad y la participación (en todos los métodos de alcance comunitario)

Competencia cultural e inclusión (eventos culturales, alcance comunitario cultural)
Eventos comunitarios (fiestas en las manzanas, festividades, eventos deportivos, mercados de agricultores)
Espacios comunitarios (espacios recreativos, espacios verdes, espacios para el arte)
Apoyo y recursos sin fines de lucro
Estacionamiento
Planificación comunitaria
Apoyo a las pequeñas empresas
Oportunidades de voluntariado
Reuniones comunitarias y de alcance comunitario
Responsabilidad
Participación comunitaria e iniciativas de comunicación
Comercialización especializada de servicios
Iniciativas de saneamiento de vecindarios en la comunidad
Servicios para adultos mayores
Mejor iluminación en las calles y en exteriores

3. De manera similar, los encuestados manifestaron que, si se aumenta la cantidad de eventos culturales disponibles para los miembros de la comunidad, se incentivaría su sentimiento de unidad y pertenencia en la comunidad.



Giới thiệu

Để hỗ trợ cho việc phát triển Gói Hợp nhất 2020-2024, Phân tích các Trở ngại đối với việc tiếp cận Lựa chọn Nhà ở Công bằng và Gói Nhà ở HIV, Văn phòng Phát triển Cộng đồng và Nhà ở của Thị trường Thành phố và Quận San Francisco (MOHCD) đã tham gia vào quy trình tiếp cận và tăng cường gắn kết cộng đồng với các bên liên quan và cư dân của San Francisco. Quy trình này có vai trò như một khuôn khổ để xác định các ưu tiên phát triển nhà ở và cộng đồng, từ đó, thúc đẩy các mục tiêu và chiến lược được nêu trong các gói cuối cùng. Cuối cùng, MOHCD sẽ sử dụng thông tin đầu vào và các ưu tiên của cộng đồng để thông báo quyết định đưa ra đối với việc tài trợ cho các dịch vụ nhà ở và cộng đồng.

MOHCD đã ký hợp đồng với Hiệp hội Phát triển Tài nguyên (RDA) để phát triển một chiến lược tích hợp tiếp cận và tăng cường gắn kết cộng đồng đối với ba gói này cũng như các nỗ lực quy hoạch khác do Văn phòng Phát triển Kinh tế và Lực lượng Lao động và Sở Quy hoạch đứng đầu. Trong quy trình này, MOHCD đã tiếp cận một loạt các bên liên quan và cư dân trong cộng đồng về quan điểm, nhu cầu, phản hồi và thông tin đầu vào của họ, đặc biệt nhằm mục tiêu vào các nhóm dân số dễ bị ảnh hưởng nhất của Thành phố.

Thông tin đầu vào của cộng đồng là một phần rất quan trọng của quy trình quy hoạch chiến lược, cung cấp dữ liệu quan trọng để đảm bảo các chương trình và dịch vụ được giải ngân đáp ứng nhu cầu ưu tiên cao nhất của nhóm dân số dễ bị ảnh hưởng cũng như cả Thành phố. Trong quá trình này, thông tin đầu vào công khai thu được qua các cuộc gặp cộng đồng (diễn đàn khu phố và các nhóm dân số trọng tâm cụ thể) và hai cuộc khảo sát trực tuyến, trong đó có thực hiện khảo sát giấy. Cả hai phương pháp thu thập dữ liệu có sự tham gia của cá nhân và bao gồm thông tin nhân khẩu học của người tham gia, được mô tả chi tiết hơn dưới đây.

Diễn đàn Cộng đồng và Các Nhóm Trọng tâm

MOHCD tạo điều kiện cho 10 diễn đàn công cộng ở khu phố và 38 nhóm dân số trọng tâm cụ thể. Các đại diện từ khắp các nhóm nhà ở đã tham gia vào các diễn đàn và các nhóm tập trung, bao gồm các cá nhân vô gia cư, cư dân của các nhà cung cấp dịch vụ xã hội, nhà ở công và nhà ở trợ cấp, những người ủng hộ nhà ở HIV/AIDS, chủ nhà, cư dân mới ở San Francisco, người mới nhập cư và cư dân đã sống lâu ở Thành phố. MOHCD tạo điều kiện cho các buổi họp với các nhóm văn hóa bao gồm các thành viên cộng đồng người Mỹ gốc Phi, Campuchia, Samoa, Việt Nam, LGBTQ và PLWHA. Những người tham gia trả lời một loạt các câu hỏi có cấu trúc về một loạt các lĩnh vực liên quan bao gồm nhu cầu nhà ở và dịch vụ, các rào cản đối với việc tiếp cận và lựa chọn nhà ở, thay đổi khu phố, phân biệt đối xử và nhà ở công bằng.

Tổng cộng có 1.395 cá nhân tham gia vào các cuộc gặp cộng đồng, được tổ chức trên toàn San Francisco trong khoảng thời gian từ tháng 11 năm 2018 đến tháng 3 năm 2019. Tổng cộng có 656 cư dân và các bên liên quan đã tham gia vào 10 diễn đàn khu phố và ít nhất 684 người tham gia vào 38 nhóm tập trung, 16 trong số đó được tổ chức tại các địa điểm nhà ở công chuyển đổi thông qua chương trình Chứng minh Hỗ trợ Tiền thuê Liên bang (RAD). Những con số này có thể không thể hiện được hết số lượng tham dự thực tế bởi vì một số người tham gia không đăng ký. Các bảng sau liệt kê các sự kiện được tổ chức trong quy trình này.



Thành phố và Hạt San Francisco, Văn phòng Phát triển Nhà ở và Cộng đồng của Thị trường

Quy trình Quy hoạch Chiến lược của MOHCD 2020-2024: Tóm tắt Gắn kết Cộng đồng và Những phát hiện Chính

Diễn đàn Khu phố MOHCD	
Bayview Hunters Point / Quận 10	South of Market / Quận 6
Castro / Quận 8 và Quận 7	Sunset / Quận 4 và Quận 1
Chinatown / Quận 3 và Quận 2	Tenderloin / Quận 6
Excelsior và OMI / Quận 11	Visitation Valley / Quận 10
Mission / Quận 9	Western Addition / Quận 5

Các nhóm Trọng tâm của Cộng đồng MOHCD	
Cộng đồng người Mỹ gốc Phi	Mạng lưới Dịch vụ Con người
Cộng đồng Campuchia	Cộng đồng LGBTQ
Hội đồng Các tổ chức Nhà ở Cộng đồng	Ban Điều phối Người vô gia cư Địa phương
Ngăn Chặn Trục Xuất / Trao quyền cho Người thuê nhà	Hội đồng Điều phối Chăm sóc Dài Hạn
Cộng đồng HIV	Hội đồng Khuyết tật của Thị trường
Nhà cung cấp Nhà ở HIV	Cộng đồng người Samoa
Chủ nhà - BMR	Tổ chức Khuyết tật và Người cao tuổi
Cộng đồng Nhà ở Xem Săn bắn HOPE SF	Mạng lưới Giáo dục & Pháp lý cho Người nhập cư SF
Cộng đồng Nhà ở Đồi Potrero HOPE SF	Liên minh Công bằng & Bình đẳng Latinh SF
Cộng đồng Nhà ở Sunnydale HOPE SF	Cộng đồng Người chuyển giới
Liên minh Tổ chức Nhà ở	Cộng đồng người Việt Nam

Địa điểm nhóm trọng tâm Chứng minh Hỗ trợ Tiền thuê	
1760 Đường Bush	491 31st
1880 Đường Pine	Nhà ở Bernal
3850 18th Street	Tháp Clementina
25 Sanchez	Bắc & Nam Thung lũng Hayes
255 Woodside	Khu căn hộ John F Kennedy
2698 California	Mission Dolores
345 Arguello	Robert B. Pitts
462 Duboce	Westside Courts

Khảo sát Cộng đồng

MOHCD đã xây dựng hai cuộc khảo sát cộng đồng để nắm bắt nhu cầu dịch vụ nhà ở và phi nhà ở của cư dân cũng như trải nghiệm của họ với các chương trình và dịch vụ của MOHCD và OEWD.

Khảo sát Hoạch định

Khảo sát này đã hỏi những người trả lời xem họ cần gì để có và được ở trong nhà ở, dịch vụ phi nhà ở nào quan trọng nhất đối với họ và gia đình họ, họ thích tiếp cận các dịch vụ như thế nào, ý kiến của họ về MOHCD và các câu hỏi khác về chất lượng cuộc sống. Có tổng cộng 2.219 câu trả lời cho khảo sát này.



Thành phố và Hạt San Francisco, Văn phòng Phát triển Nhà ở và Cộng đồng của Thị trường

Quy trình Quy hoạch Chiến lược của MOHCD 2020-2024: Tóm tắt Gắn kết Cộng đồng và Những phát hiện Chính

Khảo sát Đánh giá Chương trình

Sau khi hoàn thành Khảo sát Hoạch định, những người tham gia có cơ hội hoàn thành khảo sát Đánh giá Chương trình, trong đó hỏi về việc sử dụng các chương trình và dịch vụ của MOHCD và OEWD. Những người trả lời đã được hỏi về việc sử dụng các chương trình phát triển kinh tế và lao động, chương trình sắp xếp nhà ở, dịch vụ nhà ở và dịch vụ cộng đồng và sau đó được yêu cầu đánh giá và mô tả trải nghiệm nói chung của họ với các chương trình và dịch vụ này. Do đó, khảo sát này có thể thu thập và so sánh dữ liệu sử dụng cụ thể từ một loạt các chương trình và dịch vụ của Thành phố và cộng đồng và đánh giá dữ liệu này theo xếp hạng số và đánh giá định tính của người tham gia. Có tổng cộng 1.537 câu trả lời cho khảo sát này.

Thông tin nhân khẩu học của Người tham gia

Những người tham gia diễn đàn và các nhóm tập trung thường được yêu cầu hoàn thành các biểu mẫu xác định một số đặc điểm nhân khẩu học, bao gồm giới tính, chủng tộc hoặc sắc tộc và khuynh hướng tình dục, nhưng không phải tất cả những người tham gia đều chọn hoàn thành biểu mẫu này. Khảo sát Hoạch định cũng bao gồm một phần nhân khẩu học trong đó người trả lời cho biết tuổi, sắc tộc/chủng tộc, giới tính, khuynh hướng tình dục, tình trạng HIV/AIDS, tình trạng nhà ở, tình trạng khuyết tật, mức thu nhập, trình độ học vấn và ưu tiên ngôn ngữ.

Các bảng dưới đây phác thảo thông tin nhân khẩu học cho tất cả các diễn đàn, nhóm trọng tâm và người tham gia khảo sát.

Bảng 1: Bản dạng giới Tự Báo cáo ở các chương trình Nỗ lực Tiếp cận Cộng đồng

Bản dạng giới	%
Nữ	60%
Nam	33%
Tôi không muốn trả lời	3%
Đa giới tính/Phi Nhị giới	3%
Chuyển Giới Nữ	<1%
Khác	<1%
Chuyển Giới Nam	<1%

Bảng 2: Khuynh hướng Tình dục Tự Báo cáo ở các chương trình Nỗ lực Tiếp cận Cộng đồng

Khuynh hướng tình dục	%
Thẳng/Dị Tính	60%
Đồng Tính Nam/Đồng Tính Nữ/Yêu Người Đồng Giới	14%
Không muốn trả lời	14%
Lưỡng tính	9%
Khác	3%
Không Biết/Không Chắc Chắn	<1%

Bảng 3: Sắc tộc/Chủng tộc Tự Báo cáo ở các chương trình Nỗ lực Tiếp cận Cộng đồng

Sắc Tộc/Chủng Tộc	%
Người Châu Á	33%
Người Da Trắng	31%
Người Da Đen, Người Mỹ Gốc Phi hoặc người Châu Phi	14%
Người Mỹ Latinh hoặc Người Gốc Tây Ban Nha	13%
Người Mỹ Da Đỏ hoặc Thổ Dân Alaska	5%
Người Trung Đông hoặc Người Bắc Phi	2%
Thổ Dân Hawaii hoặc Người Đảo Thái Bình Dương Khác	1%



Tóm tắt Kết quả

Nhu cầu và Quan tâm Chung của Cộng đồng

1. Trong số các mối quan tâm xác định thấy trong quá trình gắn kết cộng đồng, các bên liên quan ở San Francisco thường quan tâm nhất đến việc chuyển chỗ ở, tăng giá nhà đất, vấn đề sạch sẽ và an toàn nói chung ở các khu phố của họ và khả năng tiếp cận phương tiện di chuyển.
2. Những người tham gia chương trình tăng cường gắn kết cộng đồng của MOHCD xác định rằng các dịch vụ nhằm hỗ trợ khả năng tự cung cấp và ổn định cũng quan trọng như nhu cầu về nhà ở.
3. Nhiều bên liên quan bày tỏ một nhu cầu đáng lưu ý đối với các dịch vụ bao gồm văn hóa và dành riêng cho từng văn hóa.
4. Những người tham gia bày tỏ nhu cầu lớn hơn là muốn biết, chuyển hướng và tiếp cận các dịch vụ có sẵn, bao gồm cả nhà ở và các dịch vụ hỗ trợ khác.
5. Các bên liên quan cũng thể hiện mong muốn về các tiêu chuẩn toàn diện và dễ chịu hơn xung quanh việc đạt điều kiện mua nhà ở giá rẻ.
6. Nhiều thành viên cộng đồng lên tiếng về sự cần thiết phải tạo nhiều dịp cung cấp thông tin đầu vào hơn về các chính sách đủ điều kiện mua nhà ở của Thành phố cũng như tham gia vào việc phát triển các chương trình nhà ở giá rẻ.
7. Các bên liên quan đã yêu cầu các dịch vụ hợp lý hơn, cải thiện phối hợp liên ngành và công tác liên lạc giữa các cơ quan hiệu quả hơn để hỗ trợ việc cung cấp cả nhà ở và dịch vụ hỗ trợ.

Các dịch vụ nhà ở

1. Những người tham gia cộng đồng nhấn mạnh tới sự cần thiết của môi trường nhà ở giá rẻ đối với bộ phận cư dân dễ bị ảnh hưởng nhất của phân khúc nhà ở: nơi trú thân và nhà ở chuyển tiếp cho người vô gia cư, nhà ở dành riêng cho người già và người khuyết tật và nhà ở giá rẻ cho các hộ gia đình có thu nhập thấp nhất.



Thành phố và Hạt San Francisco, Văn phòng Phát triển Nhà ở và Cộng đồng của Thị trường
Quy trình Quy hoạch Chiến lược của MOHCD 2020-2024: Tóm tắt Gắn kết Cộng đồng và Những phát hiện Chính

- Trong khi nhà ở giá rẻ là dịch vụ nhà ở được nhắc đến thường xuyên nhất, thì sự công nhận về mối liên quan giữa sức khỏe và nhà ở cũng là một chủ đề chung trong các cuộc thảo luận, vì những người tham gia nhấn mạnh tới sự cần thiết của môi trường sống an toàn và lành mạnh.
- Các thành viên cộng đồng bày tỏ sự cần thiết phải ngăn chặn hành động đuổi đi mạnh mẽ hơn cũng như hỗ trợ và bảo vệ người thuê nhà, bao gồm giáo dục người thuê cũng như các chính sách của Thành phố để ngăn chặn việc đuổi đi trái luật.

Tiếp cận Nhà ở, Nhận thức và Rào cản

- Những người tham gia coi việc di chuyển chỗ ở và tăng giá nhà ở là mối quan tâm hàng đầu ảnh hưởng đến việc tiếp cận nhà ở và khả năng ở lại nhà ở.
- Cả người thuê nhà và chủ nhà nói chung đều thể hiện không có nhiều lựa chọn nhà ở vì họ cảm thấy “bị kẹt cứng”.
- Những người tham gia cũng nêu bật các rào cản đối với quyền sở hữu nhà ở tập trung vào cả giá nhà và các lựa chọn giải ngân.
- Những người tham gia diễn đàn khu phố đã chia sẻ những nét phẩm chất mà họ tin rằng làm cho một khu phố trở nên đáng sống, thông qua việc xác định các đặc điểm như giao thông công cộng, không gian xanh và an toàn.
- Những người tham gia vào chương trình tăng cường gắn kết cộng đồng đã chia sẻ nhiều trải nghiệm về phân biệt đối xử trong việc cung cấp nhà ở, nhưng nhìn chung, các phản hồi của họ cho thấy rằng không có loại phân biệt đối xử cụ thể, công khai nào. Những câu trả lời của họ cho thấy có sự phân biệt hệ thống phổ biến và cố hữu hơn, ảnh hưởng đến người da màu và cộng đồng người Mỹ gốc Phi nói riêng.

15 nhu cầu dịch vụ nhà ở và nhà ở hàng đầu (theo tất cả các phương pháp tiếp cận)

Nhà ở giá rẻ
Hỗ trợ tiền thuê/giảm giá nhà ở
Hỗ trợ tìm nhà ở và hỗ trợ đăng ký
Nơi trú ẩn an toàn, môi trường nhà ở chuyển tiếp và nhà ở vĩnh viễn
Bảo vệ nhà ở nhiều hơn
Nhà ở cho người lớn tuổi và dễ tiếp cận
Ngăn Chặn Trục Xuất
Trợ cấp nhà ở
Giáo dục người thuê nhà
Nhà ở hỗ trợ
Hỗ trợ đặt cọc
Nhà ở gần nơi làm việc
Hỗ trợ thương lượng với chủ nhà
HỖ TRỢ TÁI ĐỊNH CƯ
Thế chấp, phí HOA hoặc hỗ trợ nhà bị tịch thu



Thành phố và Hạt San Francisco, Văn phòng Phát triển Nhà ở và Cộng đồng của Thị trường

Quy trình Quy hoạch Chiến lược của MOHCD 2020-2024: Tóm tắt Gắn kết Cộng đồng và Những phát hiện Chính

Dịch vụ Xã hội và Hỗ trợ

1. Các thành viên cộng đồng cần giá cả phải chăng, nhằm đúng mục tiêu đối với hỗ trợ cho chấn thương, PTSD, rối loạn sử dụng chất và các tình trạng sức khỏe tâm thần khác. Các dịch vụ về sức khỏe tâm thần và sử dụng được chất cùng với nhau là nhu cầu dịch vụ xã hội và hỗ trợ được nhắc đến nhiều nhất ở tất cả các cuộc gặp cộng đồng.
2. So với nhu cầu nhà ở, nhu cầu dịch vụ xã hội và hỗ trợ chuyên sâu hơn và thay đổi theo dân số. Đáng ngạc nhiên là ở tất cả các cuộc gặp cộng đồng, những người tham gia đều bày tỏ nhu cầu về bất kỳ loại dịch vụ xã hội hoặc hỗ trợ nào vào khoảng 860 lần. Những người tham gia bày tỏ bất kỳ loại nhu cầu liên quan đến nhà ở nào 530 lần. Ngoài việc được bày tỏ thường xuyên hơn, nhu cầu dịch vụ xã hội và hỗ trợ cũng thay đổi nhiều hơn theo dân số.

15 nhu cầu dịch vụ xã hội và hỗ trợ hàng đầu (theo tất cả các phương pháp tiếp cận)

Hỗ trợ phúc lợi (CalWorks, SNAP, Medi-Cal, v.v.)
Tiếp cận tốt hơn với dịch vụ y tế
Tiếp cận thực phẩm lành mạnh
Hỗ trợ sử dụng được chất và sức khỏe tâm thần
Hỗ trợ ngôn ngữ
Kiến thức về các dịch vụ có sẵn
Hỗ trợ người cao tuổi và người khuyết tật
Giữ trẻ giá cả phải chăng
Quản lý trường hợp
Các dịch vụ pháp lý – quyền người tiêu dùng/dân quyền
Các dịch vụ pháp lý – quyền của người lao động/quyền được làm việc
Các dịch vụ pháp lý – hỗ trợ nhập cư
Tiếp cận dịch vụ giải trí
Chương trình dinh dưỡng

Kiến thức về và Tiếp cận Dịch vụ

1. Những người tham gia cho biết còn hạn chế kiến thức về sự sẵn có và khả năng đạt đủ điều kiện cho các dịch vụ nhà ở và xã hội, cũng như cần hỗ trợ điều hướng các dịch vụ đó.
2. Ngoài việc cần có kiến thức lớn hơn về các yêu cầu đủ điều kiện, các bên liên quan đã cho biết rằng các yêu cầu đủ điều kiện có thể là một rào cản đối với việc tiếp cận các dịch vụ.
3. Những người tham gia bày tỏ nhu cầu về các dịch vụ hỗ trợ ngôn ngữ toàn diện, để thúc đẩy cả kiến thức về dịch vụ và tiếp cận dịch vụ, đặc biệt là cho sức khỏe và nhà ở.
4. Cư dân gặp một số rào cản đối với việc đi lại ở San Francisco, bao gồm thời gian chờ đợi lâu, an toàn và chi phí vận chuyển, cản trở việc đi làm, các cuộc hẹn khám bệnh và các dịch vụ khác.

Điều phối dịch vụ

1. Các bên liên quan đã yêu cầu các dịch vụ hợp lý hơn, cải thiện phối hợp liên ngành và công tác liên lạc giữa các cơ quan hiệu quả hơn để hỗ trợ việc cung cấp cả nhà ở và dịch vụ hỗ trợ.
2. Các thành viên cộng đồng tham gia vào các diễn đàn và các nhóm trọng tâm đã yêu cầu hỗ trợ tài chính và xây dựng năng lực nhiều hơn cho các tổ chức phi lợi nhuận và các nhà cung cấp dịch vụ khác, bao gồm các thay đổi đối với quy tắc hợp đồng.



Kinh tế tự túc

1. Những người tham gia bày tỏ nhu cầu vô cùng lớn đối với các chương trình dạy nghề được trả lương, giúp đạt tới mức lương đủ sống, có việc làm bền vững. Những người tham gia nhấn mạnh tới những cơ hội dạy nghề hiện tại, họ có thể không được trả tiền và/hoặc có thể không liên kết với việc làm dài hạn.
2. Có nhu cầu lớn về kiến thức tài chính và các chương trình hoạch định cũng như các dịch vụ tài chính, đặc biệt là các dịch vụ tư vấn tiết kiệm và tư vấn tín dụng. Ngoài các rào cản thu nhập đáng kể, những người tham gia cảm thấy họ thiếu các công cụ hoạch định tài chính và kiến thức tài chính để thậm chí bắt đầu cân nhắc tới quyền sở hữu nhà.
3. Người dân muốn chủ sử dụng lao động ở San Francisco thuê thêm cư dân địa phương.

Những người tham gia có hiểu biết sâu sắc về tác động của các hoạt động tuyển dụng đối với cư dân có thu nhập rất thấp. Họ chỉ ra rằng việc khuyến khích người sử dụng lao động trả lương cao, những người có thể tuyển dụng ở địa phương cho các vị trí lương cao trong những ngành cụ thể chuyển tới San Francisco không có lợi cho những cư dân cần việc làm lương cao nhất.

15 nhu cầu về kinh tế tự túc (theo tất cả các phương pháp tiếp cận)

Dạy nghề
Có việc làm
Lập kế hoạch và giáo dục về tài chính
Học kỹ năng công việc mới
Tiếp cận các lớp học tiếng Anh
Chương trình văn bằng GED và trung học
Thuê nhân công địa phương
Dịch vụ giải ngân và tín dụng
Tiếp cận công nghệ/giáo dục công nghệ
Cơ hội nghề nghiệp/công việc vĩnh viễn
Huấn luyện việc làm
Công việc “Giai cấp công nhân”
Chương trình dành cho chủ sử dụng lao động
Việc làm cho người cao tuổi/người khuyết tật
Cơ hội giáo dục đại học giá rẻ

Trao quyền và Gắn kết Cộng đồng

1. Các bên liên quan trong cộng đồng dễ bị ảnh hưởng muốn có mối quan hệ tốt hơn và trách nhiệm với MOHCD. Nhìn chung, các thành viên cộng đồng rất cảm kích khi có cơ hội tham gia các diễn đàn và các nhóm trọng tâm cũng như được chia sẻ quan điểm và đề xuất của họ, nhưng những người tham gia cũng bày tỏ rằng họ muốn MOHCD tiếp tục tổ chức các cuộc gặp cộng đồng như các diễn đàn để có thể nắm bắt kịp nhu cầu của cộng đồng, đặc biệt là nhu cầu của nhóm dân số dễ bị ảnh hưởng nhất. Những người tham gia nhấn mạnh rằng, để khắc phục sự bất bình đẳng mang tính lịch sử, phải có các biện pháp có trách nhiệm mà Thành phố có thể đáp ứng.



Thành phố và Hạt San Francisco, Văn phòng Phát triển Nhà ở và Cộng đồng của Thị trường
Quy trình Quy hoạch Chiến lược của MOHCD 2020-2024: Tóm tắt Gắn kết Cộng đồng và Những phát hiện Chính

2. Những người tham gia đã nêu rõ một nhu cầu lớn đối với các chiến lược tiếp cận toàn diện và đúng theo văn hóa cũng như các chiến lược gắn kết cộng đồng thúc đẩy xây dựng cộng đồng và liên kết cư dân với dịch vụ. Tiếp cận cộng đồng toàn diện và đúng theo văn hóa là nhu cầu được đề cập thường xuyên nhất liên quan đến gắn kết cộng đồng. Các thành viên cộng đồng thừa nhận rằng có những nỗ lực tiếp cận hiện tại tiếp thị cho các dịch vụ hỗ trợ và nhà ở do Thành phố tài trợ, nhưng những nỗ lực này không đến được với một số cộng đồng nhất định. Những người tham gia cảm thấy rõ rằng sử dụng các chiến lược tiếp cận đúng theo văn hóa sẽ mang lại nhận thức cao hơn và khả năng tham gia vào các dịch vụ.

**15 nhu cầu trao quyền và gắn kết cộng đồng hàng đầu
(theo tất cả các phương pháp tiếp cận)**

Năng lực văn hóa và tính toàn diện (các sự kiện văn hóa, tiếp cận dựa trên văn hóa)
Sự kiện cộng đồng (tiệc khởi nhà, các sự kiện vào ngày nghỉ lễ, sự kiện thể thao, thị trường nông dân)
Không gian cộng đồng (không gian giải trí, không gian xanh, không gian nghệ thuật)
Hỗ trợ và năng lực phi lợi nhuận
Đỗ xe
Lập kế hoạch cộng đồng
Hỗ trợ cho các doanh nghiệp nhỏ
Các cơ hội tình nguyện
Các cuộc gặp và tiếp cận cộng đồng
Trách nhiệm giải trình
Nỗ lực gắn kết cộng đồng và truyền thông
Tiếp thị dịch vụ nhằm đúng mục tiêu
Những nỗ lực làm sạch khu phố dựa trên cộng đồng
Dịch vụ cho người cao tuổi
Ánh sáng đường phố và ngoài trời tốt hơn

3. Tương tự, những người trả lời chỉ ra rằng việc tăng số lượng các sự kiện văn hóa dành cho các thành viên cộng đồng sẽ làm tăng ý thức cộng đồng của họ.

Public Comments Received and Responses on Report Back

Name	Affiliation	Comment	MOHCD/OEWD/HSR Response
Chanthanom Ounkeo	Lao Seri Association	Suggests having a city-wide housing lottery for all low-income housing and establishing quotas based on populations so small groups can be represented for housing placement. The chances of getting placed for small groups in SF such as Laotian, Cambodian, Mongolian, Burmese, Thai and others are next to none because each lottery is so small, based upon only the single apartment building or complex.	The current lottery system is not a MOHCD policy. MOHCD is responsible for implementing the law (Article 47 of the City Administrative Code) that governs the program. In addition, each project has different eligibility requirements.
Chanthanom Ounkeo	Lao Seri Association	Suggests having all low-income applications city-wide use the same form to make it easier for everyone to get housing.	The DAHLIA application is the one application that's used for all MOHCD affordable housing opportunities, and we have done significant work to streamline the application process. This is the DAHLIA link: https://housing.sfgov.org
Whitney Jones	Chinatown CDC	With regard to the summary of key findings, there were some important findings - I note particularly that the feedback emphasized needs at "the most vulnerable end of the housing spectrum"; the need for strong anti-displacement efforts; the need for a culture of accountability; and the need for culturally competent and inclusive outreach efforts. However, the report presents everything at such a level of abstraction that it is hard to identify priorities or specific strategies that might address identified needs.	Thank you for the comment. Development of strategies is the next step and will include specific activities.

**MOHCD and OEWD Five-Year Strategic Planning
Report Back on Community Engagement Findings
Thursday, June 20, 2019
HSA Born Auditorium 170 Otis Street
Meeting Notes**

Speaker #1: **Name:** Marsha Jaga, COC

Comment: I wanted to speak to the proliferation of Ellis Act evictions, of which I have been a victim. We need to give tenants a longer period of time to find suitable housing. I know two people who are homeless now. Even if you give them a certain amount of money, it is not enough time. Serial evictors are now in the city. I know it is complex but somehow, we need to get the word out to help support that idea and prevent displacement. New apartments are not being maintained. New owners need to learn how to maintain their housing. Job training and other social services could be attached to it.

Speaker #3: **Name:** Evan R. Seamone, Legal Director, Swords to Plowshares

Comment: Legal Director of Swords to Plowshares who has worked with veterans for many years to remove barriers to VA benefits. It is unclear how many of your respondents held veteran status. When identifying groups with unique needs and who are susceptible to homelessness, veterans have this status. We need to focus on the veteran population as a San Francisco population with unique and pressing activities. When looking at each of these areas of housing and social services, the ability to have eligibility for VA benefits will often satisfy many of these services. The return on investment from focusing on those barriers can give you several times the effectiveness and cut across several priority areas. Please consider funding this type of support (i.e. VA benefits advocacy and legal services).

Speaker #5: **Name:** Hillary Brown, SFMTA

Comment: I actually work with SFMTA, but I am also a resident of the city. I have been a part of these meetings over the last few months. People with mobility issues have difficulty opening the doors to their units, or even to the bathroom. I too have accessibility needs. Persons with mobility issues need assistance. I knew someone who could not leave their daughter at home because of their mobility issues.

Speaker #8: **Name:** Henry Brown, Homeless and User

Comment: I think that building equity and subsidizing homes is a good idea. Services to prevent displacement is also important. A lot of people do not know about subsidized housing. Being able to market to those individuals would be beneficial.

Speaker #10: **Name:** Ivan Hartanto, Shelter Tech

Comment: I am from Shelter Tech, a MOHCD grantee. Thank you for the support from the City. I am encouraged by what you are doing. On behalf of everyone in the organization, I want to see more benefits for the persons we are serving. I definitely want to see more digital services and users. I wanted to mention several demographics. I want to learn more about age differences. I have been very

**MOHCD and OEWD Five-Year Strategic Planning
Report Back on Community Engagement Findings
Thursday, June 20, 2019
HSA Born Auditorium 170 Otis Street
Meeting Notes**

interested in at-risk youth, because I relate to them since I am in the same age group. I can guess their issues are related to job training and having more economic opportunities.

Speaker #N/A: Name: Laurie Sanchez, Community Tech Network

Comment: We are a recipient of MOHCD grants. Two things: I want to encourage collaboration across grantees and organizations. People do not know about the services that are available. We need to have multiple agencies delivering the message about available services. We need organizations to collaborate in serving the same populations. Community outreach has been a huge thing related to people not knowing or not believing that services exist. Flyers and hitting the streets has been crucial to getting the word out and engaging people with services.

Speaker #N/A: Name: Demetrius Durham

Comment: Thank you. It looks like a lot of great data that you pulled. There were just a few areas that stood out that I wanted to call your attention to. Housing and sustainability issues are often related to health issues. It is access to health services. Mental health as well as substance use services for young adults, too. I know DCYF covers that transitional age. But right outside, in the 24 to 30-year-old age group, is where we are seeing a gap in services. In SF, these folks are starting to get enrolled in the housing and services available. Invest in agencies providing retention services. There are lots of great agencies out there. They can get somebody a job, a house. It is about connecting with the right people to help you find a house or job. Invest in agencies providing the 1-year or 2-year retention services. It is important to retain that housing, or job, or schooling. Your 5-year funding cycle helps with that, too.

Speaker #: Name: Del Seasomer (HSH)

Comment: Great feel good presentation. Housing crisis is over. This housing situation is here to stay. We can't deal with it as a crisis. It's not going away. It's getting dire. The City should provide housing and services for the persons who want to leave here, but all people who want to leave here in SF but there's not enough space. We need to figure out how we provide housing, subsidies, and management of resources. We have no problem housing 3,000 plus prisoners, but we can't house others? There's an argument we can't deal with housing in other counties. Why can't we partner with other counties to provide housing, where housing is easier and cheaper. We need to talk to other counties. We need to start partnerships with other counties. We need to start playing well with others. Until we address this we'll be stuck.

Speaker #: Name: Laurie Brienstien (consultant)

**MOHCD and OEWD Five-Year Strategic Planning
Report Back on Community Engagement Findings
Thursday, June 20, 2019
HSA Born Auditorium 170 Otis Street
Meeting Notes**

Comment: I work with agencies who work with people on the ground. I'm a consultant and work with people who are on the ground. There are a lot of great ideas. Please be flexible with funding to provide seed money for new and innovative ideas. And leave more open for ideas to take a chance on.

Speaker #: **Name: David Woo**

Comment: Piece missing. The planning dept. is missing. Why aren't they here to present out on their findings. It's not clear to me if they are going to have their own report back session. Extremely relevant to the discussion. Piece on community empowerment and community planning needs to be addressed by Planning. Where is the planning dept on that point? Affordable housing needs, where is Planning on that and what will their process be.

Speaker #: **Name: Tina DiRrenzo (Swords to Plowshares)**

Comment: Appreciate efforts to get info before moving forward. One thing missing. Keeping people housed. Vet not identified. Getting their rent paid. They need payee services. They make the majority of the homeless population. Social security has eliminated the payee service. You also call out service for eviction prevention, they should be protected. There are services out there and there needs to be more work to knowledge of available services. They don't know what is out there. Before spending more money on new services, spend funds on making sure people know what services are out there.

Speaker #: **Name: Oscar Grande (Poder)**

Comment: Appreciated effort. What stood out. Significant investments in the mission. Seeds for the other two districts and we are starting to see those efforts grow. Investments and support to support our efforts. We agree with the list and need for culture and community. That's harder to replicate but it's what strengthens neighborhoods. We are about keeping place. We'd like to see more community asset approach for commercial space. We see the displacement of commercial space and we see the displacement to small businesses and immigrant owned businesses. Inter-agency agency collaboration to reduce repeated efforts and leverage our work.

Speaker #: **Name: Jane (Mark interpreted)**

Comment: Represents nonprofit that helps senior. It's self-supported and with no finding from the City. 800 members in organization. Every week 350 participate in weekly services, Services include Tai Chi, singing, and dancing. All work with volunteers for 60 years. Wants more info about how to apply for grants from the City. Recently received 501c3 designation and wants more info and support for the application process because the organization doesn't have any experience in applying.

Proposed Strategies Document

1. Proposed Strategies Documents
 - a. English
 - b. Chinese
 - c. Filipino
 - d. Russian
 - e. Samoan
 - f. Spanish
 - g. Vietnamese
2. Summary of Written Comments Received
3. Notes from August 5, 2019 Meeting

City and County of San Francisco



PROPOSED STRATEGIES for 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan

For Public Review Between
July 29, 2019 and August 19, 2019

Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)
Office of Economic & Workforce Development (OEWD)
Department of Homelessness and Supportive Services (HSH)

2020-2024 CONSOLIDATED PLAN STRATEGIES

Introduction

In support of the development of its 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan, Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice, and HIV Housing Plan, the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development engaged in a community-wide outreach and engagement process with stakeholders and residents of San Francisco. This process serves as a framework to identify housing and community development priorities, which, in turn, drive the goals and strategies outlined in the final plans. Ultimately, MOHCD will use the community's input and priorities to inform decision-making for funding community and housing services.

This document includes proposed strategies for the 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan. Proposed strategies for the Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice will be available for public review and comment in late Summer/early Fall of this year. Strategies for the HIV Housing Plan are being developed through our HIV Housing Workgroup; please let us know if you would like to be involved in that group.

Document Overview

This document follows the development of the MOHCD/OEWD/HSR theory of change, which includes a statement of the ultimate desired impact for our programs and policies:

“Vibrant and healthy communities across San Francisco with equitable opportunity for self-sufficiency.”

To achieve that impact, five high-level objectives were created, as listed in this document. For each objective, a list of related priority needs derived from the community engagement process is provided. A list of goals follows each priority need. Finally, specific proposed activities are provided for each goal.

Please note that underlined terms are defined in the glossary found at the end of this document.

Review and Comments

This document is available for public review and comment between July 29, 2019 and August 19, 2019. You may review the on-line version or review a hard copy of the draft document at the following locations:

- MOHCD, 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor;
- OEWD at City Hall, Room 448, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place and 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor; and
- Main Branch of the SF Public Library, 100 Larkin Street, 5th Floor, Government Information Center.

Staff welcomes your comments in writing. They may be directed to: MOHCD, Strategic Planning Staff, 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103. Your comments will be directed to the appropriate area. In your comment, please be specific about your issue and refer to a specific goal or activity, if appropriate.

2020-2024 CONSOLIDATED PLAN STRATEGIES

The public is also invited to provide comments on the draft strategies at a public meeting on Monday, August 5, 2019 at 6:00pm. The meeting will take place at the HSA Born Auditorium at 170 Otis Street, San Francisco, CA 94103.

Thank you for your participation in this process. For more information, please visit <https://sfmohcd.org/plans-development> or call 415-701-5500.

2020-2024 CONSOLIDATED PLAN STRATEGIES

OBJECTIVE 1: FAMILIES AND INDIVIDUALS ARE STABLY HOUSED

Priority Need 1A: Develop and maintain accessible and affordable housing

Goal 1Ai: Create more affordable housing

Activities:

- Explore new finance mechanisms to create more affordable housing
- Acquire privately owned buildings to create new affordable units
- Ensure geographic diversity in location of affordable housing, especially in high opportunity neighborhoods
- Improve coordination with the Planning Department, Department of Building Inspection, and Mayor's Office on Disability related to housing and permitting processes to expedite housing production
- Continue to implement affordable housing components of HOPE SF
- Monitor the development of below market rate units in projects with Development Agreements or subject to the Inclusionary Housing Program
- Review and evaluate applicant and occupant data from the Inclusionary Housing Program on an ongoing basis to inform housing policies and procedures
- Explore increasing the number of Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)-required ADA units in MOHCD-supported housing
- Increase housing dedicated to supporting HIV+ households
 - Explore creative approaches to increasing housing supply
 - Improve Plus Housing program access to HOPWA units
- Increase housing opportunities for people who are homeless or formerly homeless

Goal 1Aii: Preserve affordable housing

Activities:

- Purchase housing at risk of losing affordability
- Rehabilitate existing housing to preserve its affordability
- Negotiate extension of affordability restrictions for existing affordable housing
- Find creative ways to leverage capital to preserve affordable housing, including sources from other City departments
- Continue to leverage RAD to rehabilitate and preserve federally-subsidized housing
- Continue to support lead hazard reduction programs
- Continue to support home modification programs that benefit low-income homeowners, increasing safety, accessibility and health outcomes, as well as access to solar power
- Explore ways to assist homeowners with deferred property maintenance
- Continue to monitor homeowners and building owners for compliance with programmatic requirements
- Improve coordination among City agencies and non-profits providing post-purchase/preservation services

Goal 1Aiii: Improve data and analytics on affordable housing inventory and placements

2020-2024 CONSOLIDATED PLAN STRATEGIES

Activities:

- Create more robust tools to track Inventory and placement of MOHCD-sponsored housing
- Continue to develop and refine DAHLIA (Database of Affordable Housing Listings, Information and Application) and Salesforce capacity to track demand for affordable housing, including enhanced web analytics
- Partner with other DAHLIA jurisdictions on aggregated data sharing, to better understand demand pressures on San Francisco

Priority Need 1B: Make housing more affordable

Goal 1Bi: Reduce development costs to help leverage local housing resources and serve lower income households

Activities:

- Pursue alternative construction types and methods to reduce development costs such as modular construction
- Leverage free or low-cost land such as public land for development
- Pursue new local and state sources of funding
- Work with state and federal agencies to acquire land dedicated for affordable housing, including housing for people who are homeless

Goal 1Bii: Increase affordability of rental housing

Activities:

- Continue to support long-term rental subsidies and explore subsidy expansion for low-income residents to stabilize their housing
 - Advocate for and pursue State and Federal rental subsidy sources
- Continue to administer the Local Operating Subsidy Program
- Expand AMI range for select projects, which will fund more housing for lower-income households
- Pilot new rent subsidy programs for underserved populations
- Increase housing subsidies and vouchers for HIV+ households
- Increase housing subsidies and vouchers for homeless households and other vulnerable populations

Goal 1Biii: Increase opportunities for sustainable homeownership

Activities:

- Continue to support, and take steps to improve the quality and standardization of, homebuyer education and post-purchase counseling
- Continue to provide Inclusionary ownership opportunities for low- and moderate-income households
- Improve mobility for growing ownership households
 - Explore allowing Inclusionary owners to purchase a second unit (and sell the prior)

2020-2024 CONSOLIDATED PLAN STRATEGIES

- Evaluate Inclusionary re-sale pricing to ensure future affordability
- Explore options to help homeowners with unaffordable HOA dues and rehab costs
- Continue to pursue funding opportunities for DALP for higher income households, including first responders and educators
- Continue to support the Mortgage Credit Certificate program
- Explore strategies to increase lender participation in homeownership programs
- Continue to streamline MOHCD real estate transaction practices through the DAHLIA system

Goal 1Biv: Increase access to rental and homeownership housing

Activities:

- Continue to support rental housing counseling services to help residents navigate and have equitable access to the City's affordable housing programs
 - Include housing counseling for HIV+ persons to support navigation and placement challenges
 - Include housing counseling for formerly homeless households and other vulnerable populations to support navigation and placement challenges
 - Provide additional support/capacity building to service providers to meet increasing demand
- Continue to develop and maintain DAHLIA
 - Add additional functionality, and additional programs and resources
 - Add information for other San Francisco affordable housing, including housing not funded by MOHCD
 - Expand outreach to include community centers, including workforce access points, public libraries, etc.
- Increase awareness about available housing resources
 - More outreach to smaller groups, especially select demographics
- Continue to support developers and property managers to create and maintain Inclusionary rental opportunities
- Evaluate housing lottery preference programs to ensure they meet their intended goals
- Continue to monitor lottery/lease up to ensure that housing programs reach the intended beneficiaries
 - Ensure ADA units are going to the right people

Priority Need 1C: Prevent and reduce homelessness

Goal 1Ci: Improve systems to help each person find the right path to permanent housing

Activities:

- Implement coordinated systems for adults, families with children, and youth
- Implement performance accountability across all programs and systems

Goal 1Cii: Reduce homelessness for adults, youth and families

2020-2024 CONSOLIDATED PLAN STRATEGIES

Activities:

- Develop homelessness prevention and problem solving (diversion) activities targeting people with a history of homelessness and people being discharged into homelessness from mainstream institutions
- Develop new permanent supportive housing units for adults, youth and families

Goal 1Ciii: Ensure no families with children are unsheltered

Activities:

- Identify unsheltered families through targeted outreach
- Offer all unsheltered families shelter placement
- Increase access to family-serving shelter beds

Goal 1Civ: Improve the City's response to street homelessness and end large, long-term encampments

Activities:

- Conduct quarterly counts of tents and vehicle encampments
- Provide targeted outreach to large encampments
- Place people into low-barrier shelters
- Conduct assessments and housing prioritization using mobile outreach teams

Goal 1Cv: Better align MOHCD's work with Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing

Activities:

- Continue and improve the production and lease-up of permanent supportive housing, including coordination of lease up of permanent supportive housing units with Coordinated Entry
- Improved coordination of the placement of HOPWA, RAD, PBV, and other supportive housing units
- Create linkage between DAHLIA and Coordinated Entry

Goal 1Cvi: Expand services to prevent homelessness and stabilize housing for formerly homeless households and those at risk of homelessness

Activities:

- Provide on-site services with clinical support within supportive housing buildings
- Partner to provide targeted services to vulnerable clients to access the homelessness response system
- Prioritize homelessness prevention resources for households with a history of homelessness or shelter use

Priority Need 1D: Provide services to maintain housing stability

Goal 1Di: Reduce rate of evictions

2020-2024 CONSOLIDATED PLAN STRATEGIES

Activities:

- Under Tenant Right to Counsel initiative, expand support for full scope legal representation for residents facing eviction
- Continue to support tenant counseling, outreach and education, mediation, housing stability case management, and short-term rental assistance activities
- Expand longer-term rental subsidy programs
- Continue to engage community stakeholders around eviction defense strategies to maximize effectiveness

Goal 1Dii: Increase access to services for residents of public and publicly subsidized housing, RAD projects, and single room occupancy hotels

Activities:

- Continue to support and develop a more comprehensive continuum of services including enhanced information and referral, service connection, and case management/coordination for HOPE SF and RAD residents
- Explore expansion of services to residents of single room occupancy hotels
- Combine service connection and skill development strategies to provide more comprehensive services that increase clients' economic self-sufficiency
- Locate key services, such as tenant counseling and eviction prevention, legal services, financial education and counseling, on-site at HOPE SF and RAD projects
- Continue to support community building and resident leadership development programs

Goal 1Diii: Provide support for other affordable housing residents to ensure success in their housing placement

Activities:

- Create welcome packet to be distributed to new affordable housing residents, and explore connecting social services to residents
- Work with City departments to explore improving housing stability through mental health and substance abuse services
- Facilitate connection to mediation services when needed
- Require notification of services to tenants when evicting tenants from MOHCD-sponsored housing
- Provide additional housing services, as required, for current HOPWA units and those in development

Goal 1Div: Increase mobility between levels of housing for HIV+ households

Activities:

- Ensure assessment of tenant ability to live independently in order to move to more appropriate housing

2020-2024 CONSOLIDATED PLAN STRATEGIES

OBJECTIVE 2: FAMILIES AND INDIVIDUALS ARE RESILIENT AND ECONOMICALLY SELF-SUFFICIENT

Priority Need 2A: Promote workforce development

Goal 2Ai: Provide access to employment opportunities across multiple sectors for vulnerable populations

Activities:

- Provide workforce services to vulnerable populations to prepare them for employment opportunities
- MOHCD and Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) work collaboratively to provide jobs for residents in their neighborhoods
 - Expand Local Hire targeting so residents of the property get priority for construction jobs and explore Local Hire for property management jobs
 - Encourage developers to expand employment opportunities within their developments
 - Provide links to neighborhood job opportunities on DAHLIA
 - Advertise job listing sign-up on MOHCD website

Priority Need 2B: Increase opportunities through improved language access and core skills development

Goal 2Bi: Improve access to MOHCD programs and services through translation of paper and digital resources

Activities:

- Improve language access for all MOHCD programs and services, community workshops and meetings
- Develop and maintain a detailed resource guide that lists programs and services by language that services are provided in
- Explore making DAHLIA accessible to more populations through translation into additional languages

Goal 2Bii: Provide skill development and training resources

Activities:

- Continue to support and refine skills development programs in areas such as life skills, GED and diploma programs, and English as a Second Language
- Focus skill development programming to create clear pathways to more advanced training opportunities
- Combine service connection and skill development strategies to provide more comprehensive services

Goal 2Biii: Improve financial literacy and personal finance management

2020-2024 CONSOLIDATED PLAN STRATEGIES

Activities:

- Continue to support financial counseling and education, asset and credit building, debt reduction, access to banking, and credit counseling and repair services
- Increase investment in more intensive services that build the financial capability of clients, and ongoing one-on-one coaching services that produce long-term economic improvements
- Encourage co-location of financial services at housing sites and at community-based organizations

Goal 2Biv: Improve digital literacy

Activities:

- Provide training in basic, intermediate and advanced digital skills, through workshops and drop-in hours, and new innovative delivery models at community-based digital literacy projects
- Provide refurbishment and distribution of computers and other devices for low-income households
- Work with neighborhood hubs, including libraries and community centers to utilize their free computers to expand digital literacy for beneficiaries of MOHCD-funded services
- Support programs that provide digital access and assist with digital literacy for affordable housing residents and sites
- Support internet access for SRO residents
- Build technology capacity of community based organizations (CBOs), empowering CBO staff to lead digital literacy trainings and services

Priority Need 2C: Provide equitable access to civil legal services for immigration and other critical issues

Goal 2Ci: Increase access to civil legal services

Activities:

- Continue to provide support for immigration-related legal services
- Continue to support and develop more targeted funding and service strategies for areas of civil law including employment, family, consumer, benefits and disability

Priority Need 2D: Help households connect to services

Goal 2Di: Increase access to community-based services

Activities:

- Continue to support and develop a more comprehensive continuum of services including enhanced information and referral, service connection, and case management/coordination
- Combine service connection and skill development strategies to provide more comprehensive services
- Support innovative community outreach strategies

2020-2024 CONSOLIDATED PLAN STRATEGIES

OBJECTIVE 3: COMMUNITIES HAVE HEALTHY PHYSICAL, SOCIAL AND BUSINESS INFRASTRUCTURE

Priority Need 3A: Enhance community facilities and spaces

Goal 3Ai: Ensure nonprofit service providers have high quality, stable facilities

Activities:

- Continue to provide support for capital improvements for community facilities providing essential public services
- Facilitate the development of capital needs assessments for community facilities to ensure long-term sustainability
- Provide support to meet design needs related to maximizing the utility of facilities
- Provide support for organizations to acquire and/or identify lease opportunities to remain in and better serve their communities

Goal 3Aii: Enhance public spaces

Activities:

- Create and improve community amenities designed to serve low-income residents

Priority Need 3B: Strengthen small business and commercial corridors

Goal 3Bi: Encourage the development and sustainability of thriving locally owned businesses

- 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

Goal 3Bii: Support the development and sustainability of 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 tenant improvements
- Increase investments in accessibility and compliance projects
- Continue a geographically-focused approach to deliver services in a way that leverages other City investments

Priority Need 3C: Support community-driven comprehensive strategies

Goal 3Ci: Support neighborhood-based planning efforts

Activities:

2020-2024 CONSOLIDATED PLAN STRATEGIES

- Continue to support and expand cultural district programs in Board-approved Cultural Districts
- Continue to support neighborhood planning processes that bring together low-income, vulnerable, and disenfranchised populations to meaningfully participate in their communities
- Strengthen economic development strategies and activities in community-driven plans

Goal 3Cii: Support locally-based community building

Activities:

- Continue to support networks of community-based organizations and other key community stakeholders that provide increased service coordination and collaboration for both neighborhoods and specific populations
- Continue to support neighborhood-based community action grant programs

Priority Need 3D: Support capacity needs of community-based organizations and MOHCD professional partners

Goal 3Di: Increase capacity of community-based organizations

Activities:

- Build organizational capacity of MOHCD grantees/providers through trainings, cohort-based work, subject matter experts, and other technical assistance methodologies
- Prioritize strengthening of community-based organizations and developers serving historically underserved populations
- Support agency staff in digital skills training

OBJECTIVE 4: COMMUNITIES AT RISK OF DISPLACEMENT ARE STABILIZED

Priority Need 4A: Address inequitable impacts of economic growth through anti-displacement measures for residents and businesses

Goal 4Ai: Implement policies and programs that prioritize current residents and businesses

Activities:

- Continue to administer housing lottery preference programs
- As MOHCD evaluates and updates policies and procedures for the Inclusionary Housing Program to meet current needs, recommend parallel changes/updates to the Planning Code and non-profit developer loan agreements
- Implement right-to-return policy for re-leasing of buildings where tenants were displaced
- Implement the City's first right to purchase laws for acquiring buildings at risk of being unaffordable

2020-2024 CONSOLIDATED PLAN STRATEGIES

Goal 4Aii: Encourage commercial tenants to locate on ground-floor spaces of MOHCD's affordable housing developments

Activities:

- Work with OEWD to financially support commercial tenant improvements (build outs) for ground-floor spaces
- Work with OEWD to market commercial space opportunities to local non-profits

Goal 4Aiii: CD: Reduce displacement of residents and businesses

Activities:

- Utilize rental subsidies to reduce displacement of tenants
- Leverage programs such as Tenant Right to Counsel and tenant counseling to support residents to stay in their homes
- Create and implement policies to mitigate negative impacts of rent increases
- Expand programs designed to retain homeowners in communities experiencing a legacy of exclusion
- Coordinate with other departments to ensure the long-term sustainability of neighborhood-based organizations
- Leverage Cultural Districts to support anti-displacement policies
- Increase access to resources for small businesses in low-income neighborhoods that want to stay in San Francisco

Priority Need 4B: Ensure economic growth offers benefits to existing communities

Goal 4Bi: Require local hiring to the greatest extent possible in MOHCD's projects and programs

Activities:

- Coordinate with OEWD for job readiness and job placement on affordable housing projects
- Continue to support job readiness and placement for RAD and HOPE SF projects

Goal 4Bii: Ensure adequate City services in neighborhoods where MOHCD's affordable housing is located

Activities:

- Work with City partners such as San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) on transportation issues
- Work with key City departments to identify needs and opportunities for service implementation and coordination

Goal 4Biii: Implement programs that provide direct benefits resulting from neighborhood-based economic growth to local communities

Activities:

- Target amenities development to communities impacted by increased housing density

2020-2024 CONSOLIDATED PLAN STRATEGIES

- Coordinate Cultural District programming with other community development initiatives
- Continue to identify ways in which existing businesses and residents can access increased employment and access to capital
- Collaborate with other City departments to identify additional ways to support local micro enterprise and entrepreneurs

OBJECTIVE 5: THE CITY WORKS TO ELIMINATE THE CAUSES OF RACIAL DISPARITIES

Priority Need 5A: Ensure racially equitable access to programs and services, in coordination with other City departments

Goal 5Ai: Develop specific funding, policies and practices to ensure equitable access to MOHCD and OEWD programs

Activities:

- Review and evaluate outreach practices with a racial equity lens
- Improve outreach to historically underserved neighborhoods and communities
- Leverage culturally-competent outreach to increase awareness about available housing and service resources
- Continue standardization of housing and program eligibility criteria, and other policies, with a racial equity lens
- Evaluate and improve MOHCD programs and services to ensure equitable access
- Analyze gaps in placement success for different demographics, and determine required interventions to create equitable access to affordable housing resources
- Explore options for extending the benefits of the Certificate of Preference program
- Increase funding and services for communities most deeply impacted by legacy of exclusion
- Explore and implement racial equity performance measures into procurement processes, including MOHCD and OEWD RFQ/RFP selection criteria
- Partner with the Human Right Commission to implement racial equity policies
- Implement department-wide trauma-informed trainings and systems to support improved customer service and self-care

Priority Need 5B: Instill racial equity and trauma-informed values and practices in the work of MOHCD and its partners

Goal 5Bi: Incorporate cultural competency, trauma-informed systems, and other equity training and resources for MOHCD's partners

Activities:

- As part of existing training program, develop and implement cultural sensitivity training for grantees, developers, and housing placement and property management partners
- Education for housing and service providers for HIV+ persons to increase cultural competency and reduce stigma

2020-2024 CONSOLIDATED PLAN STRATEGIES

Goal 5Bii: Incorporate racial equity principles in MOHCD's hiring and promotion practices

Activities:

- Review MOHCD hiring and promotion practices
- Implement changes to better support a diverse and inclusive work environment

Goal 5Biii: Implement racial equity and trauma-informed values and approaches throughout MOHCD

Activities:

- Develop and implement a racial equity plan for MOHCD
- Conduct a complete racial equity analysis of MOHCD's internal policies
- Communicate values to external community and stakeholders
- Continue to convene the Racial Equity Work Group to create and implement MOHCD's racial equity plan
- Create a trauma-informed working group to support implementation of healing practices

2020-2024 CONSOLIDATED PLAN STRATEGIES

Glossary of Terms

Terms:

ADA (Americans with Disability Act) – a civil rights law enacted in 1990 that prohibits discrimination based on disability; used in this context to refer to units with special mobility or communication features

AMI (Area Median Income) – the midpoint household income for a given metropolitan area (half of households earn more and half earn less). AMIs are published for household sizes from one to nine persons.

Certificate of Preference – a housing lottery preference granted to persons displaced by specific actions of the former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency in the 1960s through 1980s

Coordinated Entry – a centralized assessment and prioritization system for the placement of homelessness resources

Cultural Districts – a City program with designated community-defined areas intended to celebrate and strengthen the unique cultural identities of San Francisco and to coordinate resources to assist in stabilizing vulnerable communities facing, or at risk of, displacement

DAHLIA (Database of Affordable Housing Listings, Information and Application) – an online tool to help households find and apply for affordable housing

DALP (Down Payment Assistance Loan Program) – a down payment loan program that helps households bid on a property within the open market

Development Agreements – contracts entered into by the City and County of San Francisco and a developer that define a development project's rules, regulations, commitments, and policies for a specific period of time

HOA (Home Owners Association) – an organization of homeowners of a housing development, the purpose of which is to preserve, maintain, and enhance homes and their value

HOPE SF – An initiative that seeks to transform four of San Francisco's most distressed public housing sites (Hunters View, Alice Griffith, Sunnysdale-Velasco and Potrero Terrace and Annex) into vibrant, thriving communities through holistic revitalization

HOPWA (Housing Opportunity for People With AIDS) – a federal program that helps people living with HIV/AIDS to obtain and maintain their housing through rental subsidies and other housing supports

Inclusionary (Housing Program) – a City program that requires market-rate housing developers to provide affordable housing units, as required by Section 415 of the San Francisco Planning Code

Local Hire – a San Francisco policy that promotes the hiring of local residents for locally-sponsored construction projects

Local Operating Subsidy Program – a San Francisco subsidy program designed to address gaps between the amount of rent formerly homeless residents can pay and the cost to operate housing for homeless persons

2020-2024 CONSOLIDATED PLAN STRATEGIES

Mortgage Credit Certificate Program – a program of the California Housing Finance Agency that allows low to moderate income first-time homebuyers to convert a portion of their annual mortgage interest payment into a tax credit

PBV (Project-based Voucher) – a rental subsidy from the Housing Authority attached to a particular unit, not to a tenant

Plus Housing – the primary MOHCD program that places housing units and subsidies with HIV+ households

RAD (Rental Assistance Demonstration) – an initiative that rehabilitates and transitions public housing properties to Section 8 project based voucher properties

RFQ (Request for Qualifications)/RFP (Request for Proposal) – two standard types of public sector methods used to solicit vendors or agencies to bid on services or provide a proposal for services

SRO (Single Room Occupancy) – a type of housing unit typically where certain facilities such as bathroom and kitchen are shared among a number of units

Tenant Right to Counsel – an initiative approved by voters that provides full legal representation to households facing eviction

三藩市市縣



2020-2024 年綜合計畫的擬議策略

將於
自 2019 年 7 月 29 日至 2019 年 8 月 19 日
交由大眾審議

住房和社區發展市長辦公室 (MOHCD)
經濟與勞動力發展辦公室 (OEWD)
無家可歸者安置和支持性住房服務局 (HSH)

2020-2024 綜合計畫策略

介紹

為了協助制定 2020-2024 年綜合計畫、公平住房選擇障礙分析和愛滋病住房計畫，住房和社區發展市長辦公室與三藩市的利益相關者和居民一起展開全社區的推廣活動和參與流程。先根據這個流程確定住房和社區發展優先事項的基本結構，接下來再推動最終計畫中概述的目標和策略。住房和社區發展市長辦公室（以下稱 MOHCD）最終會利用從社區意見和優先事項匯總的資訊，做出資助社區和住房服務的決策。

本文包含 2020-2024 年綜合計畫的擬議策略。住房公平選擇障礙分析的擬議策略將在今年夏末/秋初交由公眾審查與評論。目前我們的愛滋病住房工作小組正在制定愛滋病住房計畫的實施策略；請告訴我們您是否有意願加入小組工作。

文件概述

本文遵循 MOHCD / OEWD / HSH 變革理論的發展，其中包括對我們的計畫和政策最終預期影響的聲明：

「三藩市每個充滿活力的健康社區都擁有公平的機會實現自給自足。」

本文列出五個高等級目標，以期實現這個願景。本文針對每項目標提供從社區參與流程中得出的相關優先需求清單。每一項優先需求後面都有一個目標清單。最後還為每個目標提供具體的擬議活動。

請注意，劃底線的術語定義見本文結尾處的詞彙表。

審議和評論

本文可在 2019 年 7 月 29 日至 2019 年 8 月 19 日期間供公眾審議和評論。您可以在下列地點查閱本策略草案的線上版本或複印件：

- MOHCD, 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor ;
 - OEWD at City Hall, Room 448, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place and 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor ; 及
- Main Branch of the SF Public Library, 100 Larkin Street, 5th Floor, Government Information Center 。

工作人員亦歡迎您提出書面意見。您的意見可能會被轉交給：MOHCD, Strategic Planning Staff, 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103。您的意見將交由相關領域的部門。請在您的意見中具體說明您的問題，並且在適當的情況下參考具體的目標或活動。

我們也邀請公眾在 2019 年 8 月 5 日星期一下午 6:00 的公開會議上就策略草案提出意見。會議將在 170 Otis Street, San Francisco, CA 94103 的 HSA Born Auditorium 舉行。

感謝您參與策略制定流程。請造訪 <https://sfmohcd.org/plans-development> 或致電 415-701-5500 以瞭解詳細資訊。

2020-2024 綜合計畫策略

目標 1：家庭和個人有穩定的住所

優先需要 1A：開發與維護無障礙且可負擔的平價住房

目標 1Ai：創造更多平價住房

活動內容：

- 探索新的融資機制，以創造更多平價住房
- 收購私人建築物以創造新的可負擔單元
- 確保平價住房的地理環境多樣性，特別是在機會多的社區內
- 加強與規劃部門、建築檢查部門和殘障人士市長辦公室在住房和許可流程方面的協調合作，以加快住房建設
- 繼續推動實施 **HOPE SF** 的平價住房組成部分
- 監控在有開發協議或遵守包容性住房計畫的專案中低於市場價格的單元開發
- 審視和評估包容性住房計畫中的申請人和居住者資料，以便為住房政策和程序提供資訊
- 探討能否增加在 **MOHCD** 支持住房中住房和社區發展市長辦公室 (**MOHCD**) 所要求的 ADA (殘障人士住房) 單元數量
- 增加專為支持愛滋病毒攜帶者家庭的住房
 - 探索增加住房供應的創新方法
 - 改善進入到 **HOPWA** 單元的 **Plus Housing** 方案
- 為無家可歸或曾經無家可歸的人增加住房機會

目標 1Aii：保留平價住房

活動內容：

- 購置有可能失去可負擔性的住房
- 改造現有住房以保持其可負擔性
- 協商以延長現有平價住房的可負擔性限制
- 找到創造性的方法來利用資本槓桿保留平價住房，包括使用來自其他城市部門的資源
- 繼續利用 **RAD** 來改造和保留聯邦政府補貼的住房
- 繼續支持鉛危害削減計畫
- 繼續支持有利於低收入房主的房屋改造計畫，提高安全性、可及性、健康結果以及太陽能的獲取
- 探索協助房主進行延期物業維護的方法
- 繼續監控房主和業主是否符合計畫要求
- 改善市政機構和非營利組織之間的協調，提供購後/保存服務

目標 1Aiii：改善平價住房庫存和安置的資料和分析

活動內容：

- 創造更強大的工具來追蹤 **MOHCD** 資助住房的庫存和安置

2020-2024 綜合計畫策略

- 繼續開發與完善 DAHLIA（平價住房清單、資訊和應用資料庫）和銷售團隊的能力，以追蹤平價住房的需求，包括強化的網路分析
- 與其他 DAHLIA 管轄區共同合作共用匯總資料，以更好地瞭解三藩市的需求壓力

優先需要 1B：讓住房更容易負擔

目標 1Bi：降低開發成本，幫助利用當地住房資源，為低收入家庭提供服務

活動內容：

- 尋求替代施工類型和方法以降低開發成本，例如模組化建築
- 利用如公共土地等免費或低成本的土地進行開發
- 尋求新的當地和州資金來源
- 與州和聯邦機構合作，購買專用於建造平價住房的土地，包括提供給無家可歸者的住房

目標 1Bii：提高租賃住房的可負擔性

活動內容：

- 繼續支持長期租金補貼並尋求增加低收入居民的補貼以穩定他們的住房
 - 宣導並尋找州和聯邦租賃補貼來源
- 繼續管理本地營運補貼計畫
- 擴大特定專案的 AMI 範圍，這將資助低收入家庭獲得更多住房
- 針對服務不足人群試行新的租金補貼計畫
- 增加愛滋病毒攜帶者的家庭住房補貼和優惠
- 增加針對無家可歸者家庭和其他弱勢群體的住房補貼和優惠

目標 1Biii：增加獲得可持續自擁住房的機會

活動內容：

- 繼續支持並採取措施改善購房者教育和購後諮詢的品質和規範化程度
- 繼續為低收入和中等收入家庭提供包容性自擁住房機會
- 提高日益增加的自擁住房家庭的流動性
 - 探討是否允許包容性房主購買第二套住房（並出售前一套住房）
- 評估包容性轉售定價以確保未來的可負擔性
- 探索幫助房主承擔難以負擔的 HOA 會費和康復費用的方法
- 繼續為較高收入家庭（包括急救人員和教育工作者）尋求 DALP 的融資機會
- 繼續支持抵押貸款信用證書計畫
- 探索增加貸款機構參與房屋所有權計畫的策略
- 繼續通過 DAHLIA 系統簡化 MOHCD 房地產交易過程

目標 1Biv：增加獲得租賃和自擁住房的機會

活動內容：

2020-2024 綜合計畫策略

- 繼續支持租賃住房諮詢服務，幫助居民確定適合自己的計畫並能公平地享受本市的平價住房計畫
 - 包括為愛滋病毒攜帶者提供住房諮詢，以幫助解決定位和安置的挑戰
 - 為曾經無家可歸的家庭和其他弱勢群體提供住房諮詢，以幫助解決定位和安置的挑戰
 - 為服務提供商提供額外的支持/能力建設，以滿足不斷增長的需求
- 繼續開發和維護 **DAHLIA**
 - 增加附加功能以及額外的方案和資源
 - 增加其他三藩市平價住房的資訊，包括不是由 **MOHCD** 資助的住房
 - 擴大推廣範圍以包括社區中心、勞動力接入點、公共圖書館等。
- 提高對可用住房資源的認識
 - 增加針對尤其是特定人口統計學小型團體的推廣活動
- 繼續支持開發商和物業經理以建立和維護**包容性**租賃的機會
- 評估安居住房優待計畫以確保他們達到預期目標
- 繼續監控安居住房/租賃以確保住房計畫能惠及預期的受益人
 - 確保 **ADA** 單元分配給合適的人選

優先需要 1C：預防和減少無家可歸的現象

目標 1Ci：改進系統以幫助所有人找到永久住房的正確途徑

活動內容：

- 實施針對成年人、有孩子的家庭和青少年的協調系統
- 在所有計劃和系統內實施績效問責制

目標 1Cii：減少成年人、青少年和家庭無家可歸的現象

活動內容：

- 針對曾經無家可歸者和從主流機構中脫離變成無家可歸的人們展開預防和解決（分散）無家可歸問題活動
- 為成年人、青年人和家庭開發新的永久支持性住房單元

目標 1Ciii：確保有孩子的所有家庭都不至於流離失所

活動內容：

- 通過針對性的推廣活動識別流離失所的家庭
- 為流離失所的所有家庭提供庇護所安置
- 增加獲得為家庭服務的庇護所床位的機會

目標 1Civ：改善城市對街頭無家可歸者的應對機制，並結束大型長期暫住營地

活動內容：

- 每個季度進行一次帳篷和車輛營地清點

2020-2024 綜合計畫策略

- 為大型營地提供針對性的推廣服務
- 將人們安置於低度限制庇護所內
- 使用行動推廣團隊進行評估和住房優先排序

目標 1Cv：使 MOHCD 與無家可歸者安置和支持性住房局的工作彼此更加配合

活動內容：

- 繼續並改善永久性支持性住房的生產和租賃，包括與 Coordinated Entry 合作協調租賃永久性支援性住房單元
- 改善了 HOPWA、RAD、PBV 以及其他支持性住房單元的配置協調
- 建立 DAHLIA 與 Coordinated Entry 之間的連結

目標 1Cvi：擴大服務範圍以防止無家可歸，並且穩定先前無家可歸的家庭和面臨無家可歸風險者的住房情況

活動內容：

- 在支持性住房建築內提供現場臨床支援服務
- 展開合作為弱勢客戶提供針對性的服務，使其能使用無家可歸者應對系統
- 將無家可歸者預防專案資源優先提供給曾經無家可歸或使用過庇護所的家庭

優先需要 1D：提供服務以維持住房穩定性

目標 1Di：降低驅逐率

活動內容：

- 根據租戶法律諮詢權益倡議的規定，擴大對面臨驅逐的居民全方位法律代表的支持
- 繼續支持租戶諮詢、推廣和教育服務、調解、住房穩定案件管理和短期租賃援助活動
- 擴展長期租賃補貼計畫
- 繼續讓社區利益相關者參與防驅逐策略，以盡可能地提高效率

目標 1Dii：為公共住房和公共補貼住房、RAD 專案和單人入住酒店的居民增加獲得服務的機會

活動內容：

- 繼續支持和開發更全面的連續服務，包括為 HOPE SF 和 RAD 居民增強資訊和轉介、服務聯繫和個案管理/協調
- 探討如何為單人入住酒店的居民擴大服務
- 結合服務連接和技能發展策略，提供更全面的服務以使客戶在經濟上更能自給自足
- 在 HOPE SF 和 RAD 專案現場找到關鍵服務，例如租戶諮詢和驅逐預防、法律服務、金融教育和諮詢
- 繼續支持社區建設和居民領導力發展計畫

目標 1Diii：為其他平價住房居民提供支援以確保他們成功獲得住房安置

活動內容：

2020-2024 綜合計畫策略

- 製作歡迎資料袋分發給新來的平價住房居民，並探討如何將社會服務與居民聯繫起來
- 與城市各部門合作，探討如何通過心理健康和藥物濫用（戒毒）服務來改善住房穩定性
- 在需要時推動與調解服務的聯繫
- 規定從 MOHCD 資助的住房驅逐租戶時，必須向租戶提供服務通知
- 根據規定為現有的 HOPWA 單元和正在開發的單元提供額外的住房服務

目標 1Div：增加愛滋病毒攜帶者家庭住房水準之間的流動性

活動內容：

- 確保評估租戶獨立生活的能力，以便轉移到更合適的住房

目標 2：家庭和個人適應性強並且在經濟上自給自足

優先需要 2A：促進勞動力發展

目標 2Ai：為弱勢群體提供多個部門的就業機會

活動內容：

- 為弱勢群體提供勞動力服務，讓他們為就業機會做好準備
- MOHCD 和經濟與勞動力發展辦公室 (OEWD) 協力合作，為其社區居民提供工作機會
 - 擴展 Local Hire 針對性，以便物業居民優先獲得營建工作，並可搜尋 Local Hire 上的物業管理工作
 - 鼓勵開發商在其開發專案中增加就業機會
 - 在 DAHLIA 上提供社區工作機會的連結
 - 在 MOHCD 網站上刊登招聘資訊

優先需要 2B：通過提高語言協助服務水準和開發核心技能來增加機會

目標 2Bi：翻譯印刷和數位資源以增加享受 MOHCD 計畫和服務的機會

活動內容：

- 提高所有 MOHCD 計畫和服務以及參加社區研討會和會議的語言協助服務水準
- 制定並維護詳細的資源指南，其中按照提供服務的語言列出各項計畫和服務名稱
- 探討如何通過翻譯成其他語言，讓更多群體可以接觸到 DAHLIA

目標 2Bii：提供技能發展和訓練資源

活動內容：

- 繼續支持和完善生活技能、GED 和文憑課程以及英語作為第二語言等領域的技能發展計畫
- 重點關注技能發展計畫，為更高級的訓練機會創造明確的途徑
- 結合服務連接和技能發展策略以提供更全面的服務

2020-2024 綜合計畫策略

目標 2Biii：提高金融知識和個人財務管理能力

活動內容：

- 繼續支持財務諮詢和教育、資產和信貸建立、減債、獲得銀行服務以及信貸諮詢和維修服務
- 增加對更密集服務的投資以建立客戶財務能力，以及增加投資進行持續的一對一輔導服務，從而形成長期的經濟改善
- 鼓勵金融服務機構與住宅區和社區組織共處

目標 2Biv：提高數位技術素養

活動內容：

- 通過研討會和上班時間提供基礎、中級和高級數位技能訓練，並在社區數位掃盲專案中提供新的創新交付模式
- 為低收入家庭提供翻新服務並分發電腦和其他裝置
- 與附近的活動中心（包括圖書館和社區中心）合作，利用其免費電腦來為 MOHCD 資助的服務受益者提高數位技術素養
- 支持為平價住房居民和地點提供數位資源並協助數位掃盲的計畫
- 支持 SRO 居民存取網際網路
- 建立社區組織 (CBO) 的技術能力，使 CBO 員工能夠領導數位掃盲訓練和服務

優先需要 2C：為移民問題和其他關鍵問題提供公平的民事法律服務

目標 2Ci：增加民事法律服務的可及性

活動內容：

- 繼續提供與移民有關的法律服務支援
- 繼續支持和制定包括就業、家庭、消費者、福利和殘疾等民法領域內更具針對性的資助和服務策略

優先需要 2D：幫助家庭連接到服務

目標 2Di：增加社區服務的可及性

活動內容：

- 繼續支持和開發更全面的連續服務，包括增強資訊和轉介、服務聯繫和個案管理/協調
- 結合服務連接和技能發展策略以提供更全面的服務
- 支持創新的社區外展推廣策略

目標 3：社區擁有健全的物質、社會和商業基礎設施

優先需要 3A：加強社區設施和空間

2020-2024 綜合計畫策略

目標 3Ai：確保非營利性服務提供者擁有優質、穩定的設施

活動內容：

- 繼續支持提供基本公共服務的社區設施資本改善
- 促進社區設施資本需求評估的發展以確保長期可持續性
- 為滿足與儘量發揮設施效用相關的設計需求提供支援
- 為組織提供支援以獲取和/或識別租賃機會，以便留在社區內為社區做出更多貢獻

目標 3Aii：改善公共空間

活動內容：

- 建立與改善旨在為低收入居民提供服務的社區設施

優先需要 3B：加強小型企業和商業走廊建設

目標 3Bi：鼓勵蓬勃發展的本地企業的可持續性發展

- 繼續通過社區合作夥伴為新創公司和現有企業提供文化、種族和語言方面的業務技術援助
- 繼續提高技術業務援助的效率
- 繼續支持小型企業貸款投資

目標 3Bii：支持低收入社區商業走廊的蓬勃發展和可持續性

活動內容：

- 繼續支持以振興商業走廊為重點的地方經濟發展工作
- 增加對外牆和其他租戶改進的投資
- 增加對可及性和合規性專案的投資
- 繼續借助於地理位置優勢，以利用其他城市投資的方式提供服務

優先需要 3C：支持社區主導的綜合策略

目標 3Ci：支持社區鄰里規劃工作

活動內容：

- 在理事會核准的文化區內繼續支持與擴大文化區計畫
- 繼續支持社區鄰里規劃流程，將低收入、弱勢群體和被剝奪權利的群體聚集在一起，並有意義地參與他們的社區
- 在社區主導的計畫中加強經濟發展策略和活動

目標 3Cii：支持以地方為基礎的社區建設

活動內容：

2020-2024 綜合計畫策略

- 繼續支持社區組織和其他主要社區利益相關者的網路，為社區和特定群體提供更多的服務協調和協作
- 繼續支持社區鄰里的社區行動補助計畫

優先需要 3D：支持社區組織和 MOHCD 專業合作夥伴的能力需求

目標 3Di：提高社區組織的能力

活動內容：

- 通過訓練、基於群組的工作、主題專家和其他技術援助方法，建立 MOHCD 受贈人/提供者的組織能力
- 優先加強為素來服務不足的群體服務的社區組織和開發人員能力
- 支持機構工作人員接受數位技能訓練

目標 4：穩定那些有可能被迫遷移的社區

優先需要 4A：通過針對居民和企業的反遷移措施解決經濟增長的不公平影響

目標 4Ai：實施優先考慮當前居民和企業的政策和計畫

活動內容：

- 繼續管理安居住房優待計畫
- 由於 MOHCD 評估和更新包容性住房計畫的政策和程序以滿足目前的需求，建議對規劃代碼和非營利性開發商貸款協議進行平行變更/更新
- 承租人搬遷後，實施建築物再承租的返回權政策
- 實施城市首個購買權法律，以獲得可能負擔不起的建築物。

目標 4Aii：鼓勵商業租戶在 MOHCD 平價住房開發的地下空間租用商鋪

活動內容：

- 與 OEWD 合作，為地面空間的商業租戶改善（擴建）提供財務支援
- 與 OEWD 合作，向當地非營利組織推銷商業空間機會

目標 4Aiii：CD：減少居民和企業被迫遷移的情況

活動內容：

- 利用租金補貼來減少租戶被迫遷移的情況
- 利用租戶法律諮詢權益等計畫和租戶諮詢，以支持居民一直居住在原住處
- 制定並實施政策以減輕租金上漲的負面影響
- 擴展旨在留住社區中受到排斥的房主的計畫
- 與其他部門協調以確保社區組織的長期可持續性
- 利用文化區來支持反遷移政策
- 增加低收入社區內想留在三藩市的小型企業獲取資源的途徑

2020-2024 綜合計畫策略

優先需要 4B：確保經濟增長為現有社區帶來益處

目標 4Bi：在 MOHCD 的專案和計畫中盡可能地要求雇用當地居民

活動內容：

- 與 OEWD 協調在平價住房專案上的就業準備和工作安排
- 繼續支持 RAD 和 HOPE SF 專案的就業準備和安置

目標 4Bii：確保在 MOHCD 平價住房所在的社區提供足夠的城市服務

活動內容：

- 與三藩市市交通局 (SFMTA) 等城市合作夥伴針對運輸問題展開合作
- 與城市主要部門合作以識別服務實施與協調的需求和機會

目標 4Biii：實施能為當地社區提供社區經濟增長帶來的直接效益的各項計畫

活動內容：

- 針對受住房密度增加影響的社區開發目標設施
- 與其他社區發展計畫協調 文化區 計畫
- 繼續確定現有企業和居民如何獲得更多就業機會和資本的途徑
- 與其他城市部門合作以識別支持當地微型企業和企業家的更多方式

目標 5：城市努力消弭引起種族差異的誘因

優先需要 5A：與其他城市部門協調以確保在種族平等的前提下享受計畫和服務

目標 5Ai：制定具體的資助、政策和做法，以確保能公平地享受 MOHCD 和 OEWD 計畫

活動內容：

- 以種族平等的視角審視和評估推廣實踐
- 改善對素來服務不足的街區和社區的推廣活動
- 利用具有文化能力的推廣活動，提高對可用住房和服務資源的認識
- 以種族平等的視角繼續實行住房和計畫資格標準以及其他政策的規範化
- 評估與改進 MOHCD 計畫和服務以確保公平的獲取途徑
- 分析不同人口統計資料的安置成功差距，並確定必要的干預措施，以創造公平獲取平價住房資源的途徑
- 探討擴展 特惠稅證 計畫的好處的方法
- 為受排斥影響最嚴重的社區增加資金和服務
- 在採購過程中探索和實施種族公平績效指標，包括 MOHCD 和 OEWD DRFQ/RFP 選擇標準
- 與人權委員會合作實施種族平等政策
- 實施整個部門的創傷知情訓練和系統，以支持改善客戶服務和自我治療

優先需要 5B：在 MOHCD 及其合作夥伴的工作中灌輸種族平等和創傷知情的價值觀和實踐

2020-2024 綜合計畫策略

目標 5Bi：為 MOHCD 的合作夥伴整合文化能力、創傷知情系統以及其他公平訓練和資源

活動內容：

- 作為現有訓練計畫的一部分，為受助者、開發商、住房安置和物業管理合作夥伴制定並實施文化敏感性訓練
- 為愛滋病毒攜帶者提供住房和服務提供者教育，以提高文化水準並減少恥辱感

目標 5Bii：將種族平等原則納入 MOHCD 的招聘和推廣實踐

活動內容：

- 回顧檢討 MOHCD 招聘和推廣實踐
- 實施變革以大力支持多元化和包容性的工作環境

目標 5Biii：在整個 MOHCD 全面實施種族平等和創傷知情的價值觀和方法

活動內容：

- 制定並實施 MOHCD 的種族平等計畫
- 對 MOHCD 的內部政策進行完整的種族平等分析
- 向外部社區和利益相關者傳達價值觀
- 繼續召集種族平等工作小組，以制定和實施 MOHCD 的種族平等計畫
- 組建創傷知情工作小組以支持療癒實踐的實施

2020-2024 綜合計畫策略

詞彙表

術語：

ADA（美國殘障人士法） - 1990 年頒佈的民權法，禁止以殘疾為由而歧視；在本文中是指具有特殊機動性或通訊功能的住房單元

AMI（地區中位收入） - 特定大都會區的中位點家庭收入（一半家庭收入較多，一半家庭收入較少）。AMI 適用於 1 到 9 人的家庭規模。

特惠稅證 - 由於前三藩市重建局 (San Francisco Redevelopment Agency) 於 20 世紀 60 年代至 80 年代採取的特定行動而被迫遷移的人們獲得安居住房優待

Coordinated Entry - 用於安置無家可歸者資源的集中評估和優先排序系統

文化區 - 一項城市計畫，其中包含指定的社區定義區域，旨在彰顯和加強三藩市獨特的文化特徵，並協調資源以幫助穩定面臨被迫遷移風險的弱勢社區

DAHLIA（平價住房清單、資訊和應用資料庫） - 幫助家庭尋找和申請平價住房的線上工具

DALP（頭款援助貸款計畫） - 幫助家庭在公開市場上競標房產的一項頭款貸款計畫

開發協議 - 三藩市市縣與開發商簽訂的合約，其中定義開發專案在一段特定時間內的規則、規定、承諾和政策

HOA（業主協會） - 旨在保護、維護與改善房屋及其價值的房屋開發業主組織

HOPE SF - 旨在將三藩市最受困擾的四個公共住宅區（Hunters View、Alice Griffith、Sunnydale-Velasco 和 Potrero Terrace 及附樓）通過整體振興改造成充滿活力、蓬勃發展社區的一項計畫

HOPWA（愛滋病患者住房機會） - 通過租房補貼和其他住房支持幫助愛滋病毒感染者/愛滋病患者獲得和保有住房的一項聯邦計畫

包容性（住房計畫） - 按照三藩市規劃法第 415 條的規定，要求市場住房開發商提供平價住房單元的一項城市計畫

當地雇用 - 三藩市的一項政策，旨在促進當地資助的營建專案雇用當地居民

地方營運補貼計畫 - 三藩市的補貼計畫，旨在解決曾經無家可歸的居民可支付的租金金額與無家可歸者的住房費用之間的差距

抵押貸款證書計畫 - 加州住房金融機構的一項計畫，允許低收入和中等收入的首次購房者將其一部分年度抵押貸款利息轉為稅收抵免

PBV（基於專案的優惠） - 房屋管理局附加於特定單元（非租戶）的租金補貼

Plus Housing - 將住房單元和補貼提供給愛滋病毒攜帶者家庭的主要 MOHCD 計畫

RAD（租賃援助示範） - 將公共住房物業恢復和過渡到第 8 節基於專案的優待物業的一項倡議

2020-2024 綜合計畫策略

RFQ（資格要求）/RFP（徵求建議書） - 兩種標準類型的公共部門方法，用於徵求供應商或代理商對服務進行的投標或提供的服務建議

SRO（單人間入住） - 一種住房單元，通常由幾個單元共用浴室和廚房等設施

租戶法律諮詢權益 - 一項由選民批准的倡議，為面臨驅逐的家庭提供全面的法律代表

Lungsod at County ng San Francisco



**MGA MUNGKAHING STRATEHIYA
para sa
2020-2024 Pinagsamang Plano
(Consolidated Plan)**

Para sa Pagrerepaso ng Publiko sa Pagitan ng
Hulyo 29, 2019 at Agosto 19, 2019

Opisina ng Mayor para sa Pabahay at Pagpapaunlad sa Komunidad (Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development)

Opisina para sa Pag-unlad ng Ekonomiya at mga Nagtatrabaho (Office of Economic and Workforce Development, OEWD)

Departamento para sa Kawalan ng Tahanan at Pabahay na may Kasamang Suporta sa Dating Walang Tahanan (Department of Homelessness and Supportive Services, HSH)

2020-2024 MGA STRATEHIYA PARA SA PINAGSAMANG PLANO (CONSOLIDATED PLAN STRATEGIES)

Introduksiyon

Bilang pagsuporta sa pagbuo ng 2020-2014 Pinagsamang Plano (Consolidated Plan), Pagsusuri sa mga Hadlang sa Pagpili Tungo sa Makatarungang Pabahay (Fair Housing Choice), at Plano para sa Pabahay ng mga may HIV (HIV Housing Plan), lumahok ang Opisina ng Mayor para sa Pabahay at Pagpapaunlad sa Komunidad (Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development, MOHCD) sa proseso ng pag-abot sa nakararami o pag-a-outreach at pagpapalahok sa kabuuan ng komunidad, kung saan kasama ang mga may nakatayang interes o stakeholders at mga residente ng San Francisco. Nagsisilbi ang prosesong ito bilang balangkas upang matukoy ang mga prayoridad sa pabahay at pagpapaunlad sa komunidad, at kasunod nito, maisulong ang mga layunin at stratehiya na naisa-isa na sa mga pinal na plano. Sa huli, gagamitin ng MOHCD ang mga opinyon at prayoridad ng komunidad, at nang mabigyan ng impormasyon ang paggawa ng desisyon sa pagpopondo ng mga serbisyo para sa komunidad at pabahay.

Kasama sa dokumentong ito ang mga mungkahing stratehiya para sa 2020-2024 Pinagsamang Plano (Consolidated Plan). Makukuha ang mga mungkahing stratehiya para sa Pagsusuri sa mga Hadlang sa Makatarungang Pagpili ng Pabahay (Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice) at nang marepaso ito at mabigyan ng komento ng publiko sa huling bahagi ng Summer (Tag-araw)/maagang bahagi ng Fall (Taglagas) ng taong ito. Binubuo ang mga stratehiya para sa Planong Pabahay para sa mga may HIV (HIV Housing Plan) sa pamamagitan ng aming Pangkat para sa Pagtatrabaho para sa Pabahay ng May HIV (HIV Housing Workgroup), kaya't mangyaring ipagbigay-alam sa amin kung gusto ninyong makatrabaho ang grupong iyon.

Pangkalahatang Impormasyon Tungkol sa Dokumento

Sinusundan ng dokumentong ito ang pagkakabuo at pagpapaunlad sa teorya ng pagbabago ng MOHCD/OEWD/HSR, kung saan may kasamang pahayag tungkol sa pinakadulong gustong maging epekto sa mga programa at polisiya.

“Masisigla at malulusog na komunidad sa kabuuan ng San Francisco, kung saan may katarungan sa pagkakapantay-pantay sa mga oportunidad upang magkaroon ng sapat na kakayahang maitaguyod ang sarili. (Vibrant and healthy communities across San Francisco with equitable opportunity for self-sufficiency.)”

Upang matamo ang epektong ito, lumikha ng limang layunin na matataas ang antas, na nakalista sa dokumentong ito. Para sa bawat layunin, nagkakaloob ng listahan ng kaugnay na mga pangangailangan na may prayoridad, na nakuha mula sa proseso ng pagpapalahok sa komunidad. May kasunod na listahan ng mga tunguhin o goal ang bawat pangangailangan na may prayoridad. Panghuli, may ipinagkakaloob na mga espesipikong mungkahing gawain para sa bawat tunguhin.

Pakitandaan na binibigyang-kahulugan ang mga nakasalungguhit na termino sa glossary (talasalitaan) na nasa dulo ng dokumentong ito.

Pagrerepaso at Pagbibigay ng Komento

Puwedeng makuha ang dokumentong ito para sa pagrerepaso at pagbibigay ng komento ng publiko sa pagitan ng Hulyo 29, 2019 at ng Agosto 19, 2019. Puwede ninyong repasuhin ang on-line na bersiyon o repasuhin ang papel na kopya ng borador (draft) ng dokumento sa mga sumusunod na lugar:

2020-2024 MGA STRATEHIYA PARA SA PINAGSAMANG PLANO (CONSOLIDATED PLAN STRATEGIES)

- MOHCD, 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor;
- OEWD sa City Hall, Room 448, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place at 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor; at
- Main Branch ng SF SF Public Library, 100 Larkin Street, 5th Floor, Government Information Center

Ikinalulugod ng mga kawani na matanggap ang inyong mga nakasulat na komento. Puwedeng madirekta ang mga ito sa: MOHCD, Strategic Planning Staff, 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103. Idirekta ang inyong komento sa naaangkop na larangan. Sa inyong komento, mangyaring maging espesipiko tungkol sa inyong problema at banggitin ang espesipikong tunguhin o gawain, kung naaangkop.

Imbitado rin ang publiko na magbigay ng komento sa mga stratehiyang nasa draft sa pampublikong miting sa Lunes, Agosto 5, 2019, nang 6:00 p.m. Isasagawa ang miting sa HSA Born Auditorium, na nasa 170 Otis Street, San Francisco, CA 94103.

Salamat po sa paglahok sa prosesong ito. Para sa iba pang impormasyon, pakibisita ang <https://sfmohcd.org/plans-development> o tumawag sa 415-701-5500.

2020-2024 MGA STRATEHIYA PARA SA PINAGSAMANG PLANO (CONSOLIDATED PLAN STRATEGIES)

LAYUNIN 1: NABIGBIGYAN NG MATATAG O HINDI NAGBABAGO-BAGONG PABAHAY ANG MGA PAMILYA AT INDIBIDWAL

Pangangailangang May Prayoridad 1A: Mag-develop at panatilihin sa maayos na kondisyon ang accessible (may mga mapapasukan at madaraan ang lahat, kasama na ang may kapansanan) at abot-kayang pabahay

Tunguhin 1A: Lumikha ng mas maraming abot-kayang pabahay

Mga gawain:

- Magsiyasat tungkol sa mga bagong mekanismo sa pagpipinansiya upang makalikha ng mas maraming abot-kayang pabahay
- Bumili ng mga gusaling pag-aari ng pribadong sektor, upang makalikha ng mga bagong unit na abot-kaya
- Tiyakin na may pagkakaiba-ibang heyograpiko sa kinaroroonang lugar ng abot-kayang pabahay, lalo na sa mga komunidad kung saan maraming oportunidad
- Paghusayin ang pakikipagkoordinasyon sa Departamento para sa Pagpapalano (Planning Department), Departamento para sa Pag-iinspeksiyon ng mga Gusali (Department of Building Inspection), at Opisina ng Mayor Ukol sa mga Kapansanan (Mayor's Office on Disability) kaugnay ng pabahay at mga proseso ng pagbibigay ng permit, at nang mapabilis ang produksiyon ng pabahay
- Patuloy na ipatupad ang mga bahagi ukol sa abot-kayang pabahay ng HOPE SF
- Subaybayan ang pagde-develop ng mga unit na may presyong mas mababa kaysa sa presyo sa merkado (below market rate) sa mga proyekto na may Kasunduan sa Pagdedevelop (Development Agreements) o nasasaklaw ng Programa para sa Pabahay na Bukas sa Lahat (Inclusionary Housing Program)
- Repasuhin at gawan ng ebalwasyon ang datos ukol sa aplikante at nakatira (occupant) mula sa Inclusionary Housing Program nang tuloy-tuloy at nang mabigyan nito ng impormasyon ang mga polisiya at patakaran sa pabahay.
- Siyasatin ang dumaraming bilang ng itinatakda ng ADA na unit ng Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) na nasa pabahay na suportado ng MOHCD
- Damihan pa ang pabahay na nakatuon lamang sa pagsuporta sa mga kabahayang HIV+
 - Magsiyasat ng malikhaing mga lapit sa pagpaparami ng suplay sa pabahay
 - Paghusayin pa ang pag-akses o pamamaraang makakuha ng Programang Plus Housing para sa mga unit na HOPWA
- Damihan pa ang mga oportunidad sa pabahay para sa mga taong homeless (walang tahanan) o dating homeless.

Tunguhin 1Aii: Panatilihin ang abot-kayang pabahay

Mga gawain:

- Bumili ng pabahay na may panganib na hindi na maging abot-kaya
- Gawan ng rehabilitasyon ang nariyan nang pabahay upang mapanatili ang pagiging abot-kaya ng mga ito
- Makipagnegosasyon para sa pagpapahaba ng panahon ng mga restriksiyon para sa naririyang nang abot-kayang pabahay

2020-2024 MGA STRATEHIYA PARA SA PINAGSAMANG PLANO (CONSOLIDATED PLAN STRATEGIES)

- Maghanap ng malilikhaing paraan upang magamit ang kapital upang mapreserba ang abot-kayang pabahay, kasama na ang mga mapagkukunan mula sa iba pang departamento ng Lungsod.
- Patuloy na gamitin ang RAD upang magawan ng rehabilitasyon at mapreserba ang pabahay na may subsidyo mula sa pederal na gobyerno
- Patuloy na suportahan ang mga programa para mabawasan ang panganib sa tingga (lead hazard reduction program)
- Patuloy na suportahan ang mga programa para sa paggawa ng mga pagbabago sa tahanan (home modification program) na napakikinapangan ng mga may-ari ng tahanan na mababa ang kita, at kung saan nagkakaroon ng higit na kaligtasan, pag-akses o pamamaraang makagamit, at mas magandang kalusugan, pati na rin ng pag-akses sa enerhiyang mula sa araw (solar power)
- Magsiyasat ng mga paraan upang matulungan ang mga may-ari ng tahanan na may naipagpalibang pagpapanatili sa ari-arian sa maayos na kondisyon
- Patuloy na subaybayan ang mga may-ari ng tahanan at may-ari ng gusali sa pagsunod ng mga ito sa mga itinatakda sa pagpoprograma.
- Paghusayin ang koordinasyon sa pagitan ng mga ahensiya ng Lungsod at non-profit na nagkakaloob ng mga serbisyo matapos ang pagbili/preserbasyon

Tunguhin 1Aiii: Paghusayin pa ang datos at pagsusuri ukol sa imbentaryo ng abot-kayang pabahay at pagbibigay ng puwesto

Mga gawain:

- Lumikha ng mas mahuhusay na kagamitan upang masubaybayan ang imbentaryo ng pabahay na itinataguyod ng MOHCD at ang pagbibigay ng puwesto sa mga ito
- Patuloy na buuin at pinuhin pa ang DAHLIA (Database of Affordable Housing Listings, Information and Application o Imbakan ng Datos Tungkol sa mga Listahan, Impormasyon at Aplikasyon para sa Abot-kayang Pabahay) at kakayahan ng Salesforce na masubaybayan ang pangangailangan para sa abot-kayang pabahay, kasama na ang pinahusay pang web analytics (pangongolekta at pagsusuri ng datos ng internet)
- Makipag-partner sa iba pang hurisdiksiyon ng DAHLIA ukol sa bahaginan ng pinagsamang datos (aggregated data sharing), upang higit na maintindihan ang mga hrap sa San Francisco

Pangangailangang May Prayoridad 1B: Gawing mas abot-kaya ang pabahay

Tunguhin 1Bi: Bawasan ang mga gastusin sa development upang makatulong sa pagamit ng mga lokal na rekurso sa pabahay, at nang mapagsilbihan ang mga kabahayan na mas mababa ang kita

Mga gawain:

- Maghanap ng mga alternatibong uri at pamamaraan ng konstruksiyon upang mabawasan ang gastusin sa development, tulad ng modular na konstruksiyon
- Gumamit ng libre o murang lupa tulad ng pampublikong lupa para sa development.
- Maghanap ng bagong mapagkukunan ng pondo sa lokal at pang-estadong gobyerno
- Makipagtrabaho sa mga ahensiya ng estado at pederal na gobyerno upang makakuha ng lupa na nakatuon sa abot-kayang pabahay, kasama na ang pabahay para sa mga taong homeless

Tunguhin 1Bii: Higitan pa ang pagiging abot-kaya ng pabahay na pinauupahan

Mga gawain:

2020-2024 MGA STRATEHIYA PARA SA PINAGSAMANG PLANO (CONSOLIDATED PLAN STRATEGIES)

- Patuloy na suportahan ang pangmatagalang subsidyo sa pag-upa at siyasatin ang pagpapalawak ng mga subsidyo para sa mga residenteng mababa ang kita, at nang hindi maging pabago-bago ang kanilang pabahay
 - Ipaglaban ang pagkakaroon, at maghanap, ng mga mapagkukunan ng subsidyo sa pag-upa mula sa Estado at Pederal na Gobyerno
- Patuloy na magbigay ng Programa para sa mga Lokal na Ipinatutupad na Subsidyo (Local Operating Subsidy Program)
- Palawakin ang saklaw ng AMI para sa piling mga proyekto, na magpopondo ng mas maraming pabahay para sa mga kabahayang mas mababa ang kita
- Magpasimula ng mga bagong programa sa subsidyo sa pag-upa, na para sa mga populasyong mas hindi nakakukuha ng mga serbisyo.
- Dagdagan ang mga subsidyo at voucher sa pabahay para sa mga kabahayang HIV+
- Dagdagan ang mga subsidyo at voucher sa pabahay para sa mga kabahayang homeless (walang tahanan) at iba pang bulnerable o higit na may pangangailangang populasyon

Tunguhin 1Biii: Dagdagan ang mga oportunidad para sa napananantiling pagmamay-ari ng tahanan

Mga gawain:

- Patuloy na suportahan ang edukasyon para sa bumibili ng tahanan at pagpapayo matapos ang pagbili, at gumawa ng mga hakbang upang mapahusay ang kalidad at standardisasyon ng mga ito.
- Patuloy na magkaloob ng inclusionary (pabahay na bukas sa lahat o para sa mababa ang kita) na oportunidad sa pagmamay-ari para sa mga kabahayang mababa at katamtaman ang kita.
- Paghusayin pa ang kakayahang makakilos para sa mga kabahayang lumalaki ang pagmamay-ari
 - Siyasatin ang pagpapahintulot sa mga may-ari ng inclusionary na pabahay na bumili ng ikalawang unit (at ibenta ang naunang unit)
- Gawan ng ebalwasyon ang presyo sa muling pagbebenta ng inclusionary na pabahay, at nang matiyak ang pagiging abot-kaya nito sa hinaharap
- Siyasatin ang mga opsiyon upang matulungan ang mga may-ari ng bahay na may hindi abot-kayang HOA na bayarin at gastos sa rehabilitasyon
- Patuloy na maghanap ng mga oportunidad sa pagpopondo para sa DALP, na para sa mga kabahayang mas matataas ang kita, kasama na ang mga first responder (unang tumutugon) at edukador
- Patuloy na suportahan ang programang Programa na Sertipiko para sa Pagbabawas sa Buwis Batay sa Utang sa Bahay (Mortgage Credit Certificate).
- Magsiyasat ng mga stratehiya upang magkaroon ng higit na partisipasyon ang mga nagpapautang (lender) sa mga programa para sa pagmamay-ari ng bahay
- Patuloy na gawing mas simple ang mga gawaing pantransaksiyon sa real-estate o ari-arian ng MOHCD sa pamamagitan ng sistemang DAHLIA.

Tunguhin 1Biv: Magkaroon ng mas maraming pamamaraan upang makakuha ng mauupahan at magmay-ari ng bahay

Mga gawain:

- Patuloy na suportahan ang mga serbisyo sa pagpapayo tungkol sa pinauupahang pabahay, at nang matulungan ang mga residente sa mga dapat gawin, at magkaroon ng equitable o may katarungan sa pagkakapantay-pantay na pag-akses sa mga programa sa abot-kayang pabahay ng Lungsod.

2020-2024 MGA STRATEHIYA PARA SA PINAGSAMANG PLANO (CONSOLIDATED PLAN STRATEGIES)

- Magsama ng pagpapayo tungkol sa pabahay sa mga taong may HIV+, at nang masuportahan ang mga hamon sa mga dapat gawin at pagkakaroon ng puwesto sa pabahay
- Magsama ng pagpapayo tungkol sa pabahay sa mga kabahayang dating homeless, at sa iba pang bulnerableng populasyon, at nang masuportahan ang mga hamon sa mga dapat gawin at pagkakaroon ng puwesto sa pabahay
- Magkaloob ng karagdagang suporta/pagbubuo ng kakayahan sa mga tagabigay ng serbisyo, at nang matugunan ang mas lumalaking pangangailangan
- Patuloy na paghusayin pa at panatilihin maayos ang DAHLIA
 - Magdagdag na iba pang gamit, at iba pang programa at mapagkukunan ng tulong at impormasyon
 - Magdagdag na impormasyon para sa iba pang abot-kayang pabahay ng San Francisco, kasama na ang pabahay na hindi pinopondohan ng MOHCD
 - Palawakin ang pag-a-outreach o pag-abot sa nakararami upang makasama ang mga sentrong pangkomunidad, kasama na ang mga napupuntahan ng mga nagtatrabaho, pampublikong aklatan, at iba pa
- Dagdagan pa ng kamalayan tungkol sa makukuhang mga rekurso sa pabahay
 - Gumawa ng mas maraming pag-abot sa mas maliliit na grupo, lalo na ang ilang piling pangkat ng mga tao.
- Patuloy na suportahan ang mga developer at property manager (tagapamahala ng gusali o ari-arian), upang makalikha ng mga inclusionary (pabahay na bukas sa lahat) na oportunidad sa mga pinauupahang unit
- Gawin ng ebalwasyon ang mga programa para sa pagbibigay ng preperensiya sa lottery o palabunutan sa pabahay, at nang matiyak na natutugunan ng mga ito ang layuning kalalabasan
- Patuloy na subaybayan ang lottery/lease up (panahon hanggang sa makakuha ang bagong paupahan ng sapat na uupa), at nang matiyak na naaabot ng mga programa sa pabahay ang layuning mga benipisyaryo ng mga ito
 - Tiyakin na napupunta ang mga unit na ADA sa tamang tao

Pangangailangang May Prayoridad 1C: Pigilan at bawasan ang kawalan ng tahanan

Tunguhin 1Ci: Paghusayin pa ang mga sistema upang matulungan ang bawat tao na makahanap ng tamang landas tungo sa permanenteng pabahay

Mga gawain:

- Ipatupad ang mga sistemang may koordinasyon para sa mga nasa sapat na gulang, pamilyang may mga anak, at kabataan
- Ipatupad ang pagpapanagot sa pagganap ng trabaho sa kabuuan ng lahat ng programa at sistema

Tunguhin 1Cii: Bawasan ang kawalan ng tahanan para sa mga nasa sapat na gulang, kabataan, at pamilya

Mga gawain:

- Lumikha ng mga gawain para maiwasan ang kawalan ng tahanan at malutas ang mga problema (dibersiyon), na nakatuon sa mga taong may kasaysayan ng pagiging homeless, at mga taong palabas ng mga karaniwang institusyon tungo sa pagiging homeless

2020-2024 MGA STRATEHIYA PARA SA PINAGSAMANG PLANO (CONSOLIDATED PLAN STRATEGIES)

- Lumikha ng bago at permanenteng unit sa supportive housing (pabahay na may kasamang mga serbisyo para sa dating walang tahanan o may kapansanan), para sa mga nasa sapat na gulang, kabataan, at pamilya

Tunguhin 1Ciii: Tiyakin na walang mga pamilyang may mga anak ang walang masilungan

Mga gawain:

- Tukuyin ang mga pamilyang walang masilungan sa pamamagitan ng naka-target na pag-a-outreach o pag-abot sa nakararami
- Mag-alok ng pagbibigay ng puwesto sa shelter sa lahat ng pamilyang walang masilungan
- Magkaroon ng mas maraming paraan para makakuha ng kama sa shelter na naglilingkod sa mga pamilya

Tunguhin 1Civ: Paghusayin pa ang tugon ng Lungsod sa kawalan ng tahanan ng mga nakatira sa kalye, at wakasan na ang malalaki at pangmatagalang kampuhan

Mga gawain:

- Magsagawa ng pagbilang tuwing ikatlong buwan (quarterly) ng kampuhan ng mga tent at sasakyan
- Magkaloob ng nakatarget na pag-a-outreach sa malalaking kampuhan
- Ilagay ang mga tao sa mga low barrier shelter (tumatanggap sa lahat, ano man ang kondisyon, at may kasama mang alagang hayop)
- Magsagawa ng pagtatasa (assessment) at pagbibigay ng prayoridad sa pabahay, gamit ang mga mobile outreach team (pangkat na direktang pumupunta sa kalye at kampuhan para magbigay ng serbisyo sa nakararami)

Tunguhin 1Cv: Higit na iayon ang trabaho ng MOHCD sa Departamento para sa Kawalan ng Tahanan at Pabahay na may Kasamang Suporta sa Dating Walang Tahanan (Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing)

Mga gawain:

- Ipagpatuloy at paghusayin pa ang produksiyon at lease-up (panahon hanggang sa makakuha ang bagong paupahan ng sapat na uupa) ng permanenteng supportive housing (pabahay na may kasamang serbisyo), kasama na ang koordinasyon ng pagli-lease up ng mga unit ng supportive housing sa Coordinated Entry (proseso kung saan tinitiyak na agad na natutulungan at nakokonekta ang mga taong humaharap sa krisis sa tirahan)
- Higit na koordinasyon sa pagbibigay ng puwesto sa HOPWA, RAD, PBV, at iba pang unit na supportive housing.
- Lumikha ng ugnayan sa pagitan ng DAHLIA at Coordinated Entry

Tunguhin 1Cvi: Palawakin ang mga serbisyo upang maiwasan ang kawalan ng tahanan at gawing matatag ang pabahay para sa mga kabahayang dating walang tahanan at may panganib na mawalan ng tahanan

Mga gawain:

- Magkaloob ng mga serbisyo on-site (sa lugar mismo), na may klinikal na suporta, sa loob ng mga gusali para sa supportive housing

2020-2024 MGA STRATEHIYA PARA SA PINAGSAMANG PLANO (CONSOLIDATED PLAN STRATEGIES)

- Makipag-partner sa iba upang magkaloob ng mga naka-target na serbisyo sa vulnerable o higit na nangangailangang na mga kliyente, at nang makagamit sila ng sistema para sa pagtugon sa kawalan ng tahanan
- Bigyan ng prayoridad ang mga kabahayang may kasaysayan ng pagiging homeless o ng paggamit ng shelter, sa pagkakaroon ng mga rekurso para maiwasan ang kawalan ng tahanan

Pangangailangang May Prayoridad 1D: Magkaloob ng mga serbisyo upang mapanatili ang pagiging matatag ng pabahay

Tunguhin 1Di: Bawasan ang porsiyento ng mga pagpapaalis sa tirahan (eviction)

Mga gawain:

- Sa ilalim ng inisyatibang Karapatan ng Umuupa na Magkaroon ng Abugado (Tenant Right to Counsel), palawakin pa ang suporta upang buong masaklaw ang legal na representasyon para sa mga residenteng humaharap ng pagpapaalis sa tirahan
- Patuloy na suportahan ang pagpapayo sa mga tenant (umuupa), pag-abot sa nakararami at edukasyon, pamamagitan (mediation), pamamahala ng kaso para sa pagiging matatag ng pabahay, at mga pangmaiksing panahon na gawain ng pagtulong sa upa
- Palawakin pa ang pangmatagalang mga programa ng subsidyo sa upa (rental subsidy)
- Patuloy na palahukin ang mga may interes o stakeholder sa komunidad tungo sa mga stratehiya upang madepensahan ang pagpapaalis sa tirahan, at sa gayon, lalo pang maging epektibo

Tunguhin 1Dii: Damihan pa ang paraan para makakuha ng serbisyo ang mga residente ng pampublikong pabahay at pabahay na may pampublikong subsidyo, proyektong RAD, at single-room occupancy hotel (mga paupahang kuwarta sa isang gusali)

Mga gawain:

- Patuloy na suportahan at paunlarin pa ang mas komprehensibong pagpapatuloy ng mga serbisyo, kasama na ang mas mahusay na pagbibigay ng impormasyon at rekomendasyon, pagkonekta ng mga serbisyo, at pamamahala/koordinasyon ng kaso para sa mga residente ng HOPE SF at RAD
- Siyasatin ang pagpapalawak ng mga serbisyo sa mga residente ng mga single room occupancy hotel
- Ipagsama ang pagkonekta ng mga serbisyo at mga stratehiya upang mapaghusay ang kakayahan, at nang makapagbigay ng mas komprehensibong serbisyo, kung saan higit na nagkakaroon ng pang-ekonomiyang kakayahan ang mga kliyente upang maitaguyod ang sarili
- Ilagay on-site (sa lugar mismo), sa mga proyektong HOPE SF at RAD ang mahahalagang serbisyo, tulad ng pagpapayo sa tenant at pag-iwas sa pagpapaalis, serbisyo para sa mga legal na usapin, pinansiyal na edukasyon, at pagpapayo
- Patuloy na suportahan ang mga programa para sa pagpapalakas sa komunidad at pagpapaunlad sa pamumuno ng mga residente

Tunguhin 1Diii: Magkaloob ng suporta para sa iba pang residente ng abot-kayang pabahay, at nang matiyak ang tagumpay ng pagbibigay ng puwesto sa kanila para sa pabahay

Mga gawain:

2020-2024 MGA STRATEHIYA PARA SA PINAGSAMANG PLANO (CONSOLIDATED PLAN STRATEGIES)

- Gumawa ng welcome packet (pakete para sa pagbati sa bagong dating), na ipamamahagi sa mga bagong residente ng abot-kayang pabahay, at siyasatin ang pagkonekta ng mga serbisyong panlipunan sa mga residente
- Makipagtrabaho sa mga departamento ng Lungsod para siyasatin kung paano hgiit pang magkakaroon ng katatagan sa pabahay sa pamamagitan ng mga serbisyo para sa kalusugan ng isip at pagtugon sa pang-aabuso sa drogo, alak, at iba pang sangkap
- Pabilisin ang koneksiyon sa mga serbisyo para sa pamamagitan (mediation) kung kinakailangan
- Itakda ang pagkakaroon ng mga abiso ukol sa mga serbisyo sa mga tenant o umuupa, kapag pinapaalis ang mga tenant mula sa pabahay na itinataguyod ng MOHCD
- Magkaloob ng dagdag na serbisyo sa pabahay, ayon sa itinatakda, para sa kasalukuyang mga unit na HOPWA, at iyong mga nasa development (ginagawa pa lamang)

Tunguhin 1Div: Gawing higit na mabilis ang paglipat sa pagitan ng mga lebel ng pabahay para sa mga kabahayang HIV+

Mga gawain:

- Tiyakin ang pagtatasa ng kakayahan ng tenant na independiyenteng makapamuhay, at nang makalipat sa mas naaangkop na pabahay

LAYUNIN 2: MATATATAG AT MAY SAPAT NANG KAKAYAHANG PANG-EKONOMIYA ANG MGA PAMILYA AT INDIBIDWAL, UPANG MAITAGUYOD ANG SARILI

Pangangailangang May Prayoridad 2A: Itaguyod ang pagpapaunlad sa mga nagtatrabao

Tunguhin 2Ai: Magkaloob ng pamamaraan upang makakuha ng mga oportunidad sa pagtatrabaho sa iba't ibang sektor ang mga populasyong bulnerable o higit na may pangangailangan

Mga gawain:

- Magkaloob sa mga bulnerableng populasyon ng mga serbisyo para sa nagtatrabaho (workforce services), at nang maihanda sila para sa mga oportunidad para sa pagtatrabaho
- Nagtatrabaho nang may kolaborasyon ang MOHCD at ang Opisina para sa Pagpapaunlad ng Ekonomiya at mga Nagtatrabaho (Office of Economic and Workforce Development, OEWD) upang mabigyan ng trabaho ang mga residente sa kani-kanilang komunidad
 - Palawakin pa ang pagta-target ng Local Hire (polisiya ukol sa pag-eempleyo sa mga lokal na manggagawa), upang mabigyan ng prayoridad ang mga residente ng gusali o property para sa mga trabaho sa konstruksiyon, at siyasatin ang Local Hire para sa mga trabaho sa property management (pamamahala sa gusali o ari-arian).
 - Hikayatin ang mga developer na palawakin pa ang mga oportunidad sa trabaho sa kanilang mga development
 - Magkaloob ng mga link sa mga oportunidad sa trabaho sa komunidad sa DAHLIA
 - I-advertise ang pagpaparehistro para sa mga listahan ng mga trabaho sa website ng MOHCD.

2020-2024 MGA STRATEHIYA PARA SA PINAGSAMANG PLANO (CONSOLIDATED PLAN STRATEGIES)

Pangangailangang May Prayoridad 2B: Palawakin ang mga oportunidad sa pamamagitan ng mas mahusay na language access (tulong sa mga taong hindi Ingles ang pangunahing wika) at pagpapaunlad ng batayang mga kakayahan

Tunguhin 2Bi: Higit pang magkaroon ng paraang makagamit ng mga programa at serbisyo ng MOHCD sa pamamagitan ng pagsasalin ng mga rekurso o mapagkukunan ng tulong at impormasyon na nasa papel at nasa digital na anyo

Mga gawain:

- Higit pang magkaroon ng tulong sa wika para sa lahat ng programa at serbisyo ng MOHCD, workshop o palihan na pangkomunidad at mga miting
- Bumuo ng detalyadong gabay sa makukuhang tulong at impormasyon, kung saan nakalista ang mga programa at serbisyo sa pamamagitan ng wika kung saan ipinagkakaloob ang serbisyo, at panatiliing maayos ang gabay na ito
- Siyasatin kung paano mas madaling magagamit ang DAHLIA ng mas maraming populasyon sa pamamagitan ng pagsasalin nito sa mas maraming wika

Tunguhin 2Bii: Magkaloob ng mga rekurso para sa pagpapahusay ng mga kakayahan at mga pagsasanay

Mga gawain:

- Patuloy na suportahan at pabutihin pa ang mga programa para sa pagpapahusay ng mga kakayahan, sa mga larangang tulad ng kakayahan sa buhay (life skills), programa para sa GED at diploma, at Ingles Bilang Pangalawang Wika (English as a Second Language)
- Ituon ang pagpoprograma para sa pagpapahusay ng kakayahan upang makalikha ng malinaw na madaraanang tungo sa mas abanteng pagsasanay
- Ipagsama ang pagkonekta ng mga serbisyo at mga stratehiya sa pagpapaunlad ng mga kakayahan, at nang makapagbigay ng mas komprehensibong mga serbisyo

Tunguhin 2Biii: Paghusayin pa ang kaalaman ukol sa pinansiya at personal na pamamahala sa pinansiya

Mga gawain:

- Patuloy na suportahan ang ang pagpapayo at edukasyon ukol sa pinansiya, pagkakaroon at pagpapatatag ng mga pag-aari at credit, pagbabawas sa utang, pamamaraang makapagbangko, at mga serbisyo sa pagpapayo ukol sa credit at pag-aayos ng credit
- Mas malaking pamumuhan sa mas masinsing mga serbisyo upang higit na magkaroon ng pinansiyal na kakayahan ang mga kliyente, at patuloy na indi-indibidwal na serbisyo sa paggabay, na humahantong sa pangmatagalan na pang-ekonomiyang pag-unlad
- Paghikayat sa pagkakaroon ng mga serbisyong pinansiyal sa kinaroroonan mismo ng mga pabahay at sa mga organisasyong naka-base sa komunidad

Tunguhin 2Biv: Pagpapahusay sa digital literacy o kaalaman sa paggamit ng teknolohiya para sa impormasyon at komunikasyon

Mga gawain:

2020-2024 MGA STRATEHIYA PARA SA PINAGSAMANG PLANO (CONSOLIDATED PLAN STRATEGIES)

- Magkaloob ng mga pagsasanay sa batayan, panggitna at abanteng kakayahan sa paggamit sa teknolohiya para sa impormasyon at komunikasyon, sa pamamagitan ng mga workshop o palihan, at oras na puwedeng komunsulta (drop-in hours), at bago at inobatibong mga modelo sa paghahatid ng teknolohiya, at naka-base sa komunidad na proyekto sa digital literacy
- Magbigay ng refurbishment (pagseserbisyo o pagsasaayos ng lumang kagamitan) at pamamahagi ng mga computer at iba pang kagamitan sa mga kabahayang mababa ang kita
- Makipagtrabaho sa mga lugar kung saan nagtitipon-tipon ang komunidad, kasama na ang mga aklatan at sentrong pangkomunidad upang magamit ang kanilang mga libreng computer, at sa gayon mapalawak ang kaalaman sa paggamit sa teknolohiyang digital ng mga benipisyaryo ng serbisyong pinopondohan ng MOHCD
- Suportahan ang mga programang nagkaloob ng digital na paggamit, at tumulong sa kaalaman sa teknolohiyang digital para sa mga residente at lugar ng abot-kayang pabahay
- Suportahan ang pagkakaroon ng internet ng mga residente ng SRO
- Gawing mas mahusay pa ang kakayahan sa teknolohiya ng mga organisasyong naka-base sa komunidad (community-based organizations, CBO), upang mabigyang-lakas ang mga kawani ng CBO na pamunuan ang mga pagsasanay at serbisyo kaugnay ng paggamit ng teknolohiya

Pangangailangang May Prayoridad 2C: Magkaloob ng pamamaraang makakuha ng serbisyo para sa mga usapin sa batas na pangmamamayan (civil legal services) para sa imigrasyon at iba pang napakahahalagang usapin

Tunguhin 2Ci: Magkaroon ng higit na pamamaraan para makakuha ng civil legal service mga serbisyo para sa mga usapin sa batas na pangmamamayan

Mga gawain:

- Patuloy na magkaloob ng suporta para sa serbisyo sa mga legal na usapin kaugnay ng imigrasyon
- Patuloy na sumuporta at lumikha pa ng mga stratehiya upang magkaroon ng higit na naka-target na pondo at serbisyo sa mga larangan ng batas sibil, kasama na ang pag-eempleyo, pamilya, mamimili o konsumer, mga benepisyo, at kapansanan

Pangangailangang May Prayoridad 2D: Tulungan ang mga kabahayan na makakonekta sa mga serbisyo

Tunguhin 2Di: Magkaroon ng higit na pamamaraan para makakuha ng mga serbisyo na naka-base sa komunidad

Mga gawain:

- Patuloy na sumuporta at lumikha ng mas komprehensibong pagpapatuloy ng mga serbisyo, kasama na ang pinahusay pang impormasyon at pagbibigay ng rekomendasyon, pagkonekta sa serbisyo, at pamamahala/koordinasyon ng mga kaso
- Ipagsama ang pagkonekta ng mga serbisyo at mga stratehiya sa pagpapaunlad ng mga kakayahan, at nang makapagbigay ng mas komprehensibong mga serbisyo
- Suportahan ang mga inobatibong stratehiya para sa higit na pag-abot sa nakakarami sa komunidad

2020-2024 MGA STRATEHIYA PARA SA PINAGSAMANG PLANO (CONSOLIDATED PLAN STRATEGIES)

LAYUNIN 3: PAGKAKAROON ANG MGA KOMUNIDAD NG MALUSOG NA IMPRASTRUKTURANG PISIKAL, PANLIPUNAN, AT PANGNEGOSYO

Pangangailangang May Prayoridad 3A: Pagandahin pa ang mga pasilidad at espasyo ng komunidad

Tunguhin 3Ai: Tiyakin na may mga pasilidad na mataas ang kalidad at matatatag ang nonprofit na tagabigay ng serbisyo

Mga gawain:

- Patuloy na magkaloob ng suporta para sa capital improvement (permanenteng istruktural na pagbabago o pagpapanumbalik ng ari-arian na posibleng makapagdagdag sa halaga nito) para sa mga pasilidad ng komunidad na nagkaloob ng mahahalagang pampublikong serbisyo
- Padaliin pa ang pagbubuo ng mga pagtatasa o assessment ng mga pangangailangan ng mga gusali, at nang matiyak ang pangmatagalang pagpapanatili sa mga pasilidad ng komunidad sa maayos na kondisyon
- Magkaloob ng suporta upang matugunan ang mga pangangailangan sa disenyo, at sa gayon, lubusang magamit ang mga pasilidad
- Magkaloob ng suporta sa mga organisasyon upang makakuha sila at/o matukoy nila ang mga oportunidad sa pag-upa, at nang manatili sila sa mga komunidad at higit na makapaglingkod

Tunguhin 3Aii: Pagandahin pa ang mga pampublikong espasyo

Mga gawain:

- Lumikha at paghusayin pa ang amenities o mga nagugustuhan o malaki ang gamit na katangian ng komunidad, at nang makapaglingkod sa mga residenteng mababa ang kita

Pangangailangang May Prayoridad 3B: Palakasin ang maliliit na negosyo at komersiyal na lugar

Tunguhin 3Bi: Hikayatin ang pagpapaunlad at pagpapanatili sa masisiglang negosyong pagmamay-ari ng mga lokal na negosyante

- Patuloy na magkaloob sa mga nagsisimula at nariyan nang negosyo ng teknikal na tulong na pangnegosyo sa pamamagitan ng mga ka-partner sa komunidad, kung saan naka-ayon ito sa kultura, etnisidad, at wika
- Patuloy na higitan pa ang kahusayan ng teknikal na tulong sa mga negosyo
- Patuloy na suportahan ang pamumuhan sa pagpapautang sa maliliit na negosyo

Tunguhin 3Bii: Suportahan ang pagpapaunlad at pagpapanatili ng masisiglang komersiyal na lugar sa mga komunidad na mababa ang kita

Mga gawain:

- Patuloy na suportahan ang mga pagsusumikap sa pagpapaunlad sa lokal na ekonomiya na nakatuon sa muling pagpapasigla sa mga komersiyal na lugar
- Magkaroon ng higit na pamumuhunan sa harapan ng gusali at iba pang pagpapahusay para sa mga tenant

2020-2024 MGA STRATEHIYA PARA SA PINAGSAMANG PLANO (CONSOLIDATED PLAN STRATEGIES)

- Magkaroon ng higiit na pamumuhunan sa mga proyektong kaugnay ng accessibility (pagkakaroon ng paraan na makapasok at makagamit sa mga gusali) at pagsunod sa batas
- Ipagpatuloy ang lapit na nakatuon sa kinaroroonan (geographically-focused approach) upang makapaghatid ng serbisyo sa paraan na ginagamit ang iba pang pamumuhunan ng Lungsod

Pangangailangang May Prayoridad 3C: Suportahan ang mga komprehensibong stratehiya na itinutulak ng komunidad

Tunguhin 3Ci: Suportahan ang mga pagsusumikap sa pagpapalano na nakabatay sa komunidad

Mga gawain:

- Patuloy na suportahan at palawakin ang mga pangkulturang programa ng distrito sa mga aprubado ng Board (Lupon) na mga Distritong Pangkultura (Cultural District)
- Patuloy na suportahan ang mga proseso sa pagpapalano ng komunidad na nasasama-sama sa mga populasyong mababa ang kita, bulnerable, at hindi nabibigyan ng mga karapatan o pribilehiyo, at nang makabuluhang makalahok sa kanilang mga komunidad
- Palakasin ang mga stratehiya at gawain sa pagpapaunlad ng ekonomiya sa mga planong itinutulak ng komunidad

Tunguhin 3Cii: Suportahan ang pagpapalakas sa komunidad na isinasagawa sa lokal

Mga gawain:

- Patuloy na suportahan ang mga ugnayan o network ng mga organisasyong naka-base sa komunidad at iba pang mahahalagang may interes o stakeholder na nagkakaloob ng higit na koordinasyon at pakikipagkolaborasyon sa mga serbisyo, kapwa para sa mga komunidad at mga espesipikong populasyon
- Patuloy na suportahan ang mga programa ng pagbibigay ng grant (tulong pinansiyal) para sa pag-aksiyon ng komunidad, na nakabase rin sa komunidad

Pangangailangang May Prayoridad 3D: Suportahan ang mga pangangailangan sa kakayahan ng mga organisasyong naka-base sa komunidad at propesyonal na ka-partner ng MOHCD

Tunguhin 3Di: Palakasin pa ang kakayahan ng mga organisasyong naka-base sa komunidad

Mga gawain:

- Paghusayin pa ang kakayahang pang-organisasyon ng mga grantee (tumatanggap ng tulong)/tagabigay ng serbisyo ng MOHCD sa pamamagitan ng mga pagsasanay, pagtatrabaho nang pangkat-pangkat (co-hort based), mga eksperto sa paksa, at iba pang metodolohiya para a teknikal na pagtulong
- Bigyan ng prayoridad ang pagpapalakas sa mga organisasyong naka-base sa komunidad at mga developer na may kasaysayan ng paglilingkod sa mga populasyong mas hindi nakatatanggap ng mga serbisyo
- Suportahan ang mga kawani ng ahensiya sa pagsasanay sa kakayahan sa teknolohiyang digital

2020-2024 MGA STRATEHIYA PARA SA PINAGSAMANG PLANO (CONSOLIDATED PLAN STRATEGIES)

LAYUNIN 4: MAPATATAG ANG MGA KOMUNIDAD NA MAY PANGANIB NA MAWALAN NG MGA TIRAHAN AT ESPASYO

Pangangailangang May Prayoridad 4A: Tugunan ang hindi makatarungang epekto ng pag-unlad ng ekonomiya sa pamamagitan ng mga hakbang na laban sa pagkawala mga tirahan at espasyo, na ginagawa para sa mga residente at negosyo

Tunguhin 4Ai: Magpatupad ng mga polisiya at programa na nagbibigay ng prayoridad sa mga kasalukuyang residente at negosyo

Mga gawain:

- Patuloy na pamahalaan ang mga programa para sa pagbibigay ng preperensiya sa lottery o palabunutan sa pabahay
- Habang ginagawan ng ebalwasyon at binabago ng MOHCD ang mga polisiya at patakaran para sa Programa para sa Pabahay na Bukas sa Lahat (Inclusionary Housing Program), at nang matugunan ang kasalukuyang mga pangangailangan, magrekomendada na naayon ditong mga pagbabago/pag-a-update sa Kodigo sa Pagpaplano (Planning Code) at kasunduan sa pagpapautang sa pagitan ng mga non-profit at developer
- Ipatupad ang polisiyang karapatang-bumalik (right-to-return) para sa muling pagpapaupa ng mga gusali kung saan nawalan ng tirahan o espasyo ang mga tenant
- Ipatupad ang mga batas ukol sa pagkakaroon ng Lungsod unang karapatan na bilhin ang mga gusali na may panganib na hindi na maging abot-kaya

Tunguhin 4Aii: Hikayatin ang mga komersiyal na tenant na makahanap ng mga espasyong nasa unang palapag ng mga development ng MOHCD para sa abot-kayang pabahay

Mga gawain:

- Makipagtrabaho sa OEWD upang magbigay ng pinansiyal na suporta sa mga komersiyal na tenant tungo sa pagpapaganda (build out o trabaho para makompleto ang konstruksiyon) sa mga espasyong nasa unang palapag
- Makipagtrabaho sa OEWD upang mailok ang mga oportunidad para sa komersiyal na espasyo sa non-profit

Tunguhin 4Aiii: CD: Bawasan ang pagkawala ng tirahan at espasyo sa mga residente at negosyo

Mga gawain:

- Gamitin ang subsidyo sa pag-upa upang mabawasan ang pagkawala ng tirahan at espasyo ng mga tenant
- Gamitin ang mga programang tulad ng Karapatan ng Umuupa na Magkaroon ng Abugado (Tenant Right to Counsel) at pagpapayo sa tenant upang masuportahan ang pananatili ng mga residente sa kani-kanilang mga tahanan
- Lumikha at magpatupad ng mga polisiya upang mabawasan ang negatibong epekto ng pagtataas ng upa.
- Palawakin ang mga programang dinisenyo upang mapanatili ang mga may-ari ng bahay sa mga komunidad na nakararanas ng namamanang hindi pagkakasali o legacy of exclusion.

2020-2024 MGA STRATEHIYA PARA SA PINAGSAMANG PLANO (CONSOLIDATED PLAN STRATEGIES)

- Makipagkoordinasyon sa iba pang departamento upang matiyak ang pangmatagalang pagpapanatili sa mga organisasyong naka-base sa komunidad
- Gamitin ang mga Pangkulturang Distrito (Cultural District) upang masuportahan ang mga polisiya para sa paglaban sa pagkawala ng tirahan at espasyo
- Magkaroon ng mas maraming paraang makakuha ng mga rekurso ang maliliit na negosyong nasa mga komunidad na mababa ang kita, at gustong manatili sa San Francisco

Pangangailangang May Prayoridad 4B: Tiyakin na naghahandog ang pang-ekonomiyang pag-unlad ng pakinabang sa naririyang mga komunidad

Tunguhin 4Bi: Itakda ang lokal na pag-eempleyo, hanggang sa pinakaposibleng magawa ito, sa mga proyekto at programa ng MOHCD

Mga gawain:

- Makipagkoordinasyon sa OEWD para sa kahandaan sa trabaho at pagbibigay ng trabaho sa mga proyekto para sa abot-kayang pabahay
- Patuloy na suportahan ang kahandaan sa trabaho at pagbibigay ng trabaho sa mga proyektong RAD at HOPE SF

Tunguhin 4Bii: Tiyakin ang sapat na serbisyo ng Lungsod sa mga komunidad kung saan matatagpuan ang abot-kayang pabahay ng MOHCD

Mga gawain:

- Makipagtrabaho sa mga ka-partner ng Lungsod tulad ng Ahensiya ng San Francisco para sa Municipal na Transportasyon (San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, SFMTA) sa mga usaping pantransportasyon.
- Makipagtrabaho sa mahahalagang departamento ng Lungsod upang matukoy ang mga pangangailangan at oportunidad para sa pagpapatupad ng mga serbisyo at pakikipagkoordinasyon

Tunguhin 4Biii: Ipatupad ang mga programa na nagkakaloob ng direktang pakinabang mula sa naka-base sa komunidad na pang-ekonomikong pag-unlad tungo sa mga lokal na komunidad

Mga gawain:

- I-target ang pagpapahusay ng amenities o mga nagugustuhan o malaki ang gamit na katangian, sa mga komunidad na naaapektuhan ng mas nagiging siksik na pabahay
- Gawan ng koordinasyon ang pagpoprograma ng Pangkulturang Distrito at ang iba pang inisyatiba para sa pagpapaunlad ng komunidad
- Patuloy na tumukoy ng mga paraan kung paanong makakauha ang naririyang mga negosyo at residente ng trabaho at kapital
- Makipagkolaborasyon sa iba pang departamento ng Lungsod upang makatukoy ng dagdag na mga paraan upang masuportahan ang lokal na maliliit na negosyo at mga negosyante

2020-2024 MGA STRATEHIYA PARA SA PINAGSAMANG PLANO (CONSOLIDATED PLAN STRATEGIES)

LAYUNIN 5: NAGTATRABAHO ANG LUNGSOD UPANG MATANGGAL ANG MGA DAHILAN NG HINDI PAGKAKAPANTAY-PANTAY NANG DAHIL SA LAHI

Pangangailangang May Prayoridad 5A: Tiyakin na may katarungan sa pagkakapantay-pantay sa pagkakaroon ng mga programa at serbisyo, anuman ang lahi, sa pamamagitan ng pakikipagtulungan sa iba pang departamento ng Lungsod

Tunguhin 5Ai: Paghusayin pa ang mga espesipikong pagpopondo, polisiya at gawain, at nang matiyak ang katarungan sa pagkakapantay-pantay na makagamit ng mga programa ng MOHCD at OEWD

Mga gawain:

- Repasuhin at gawan ng ebalwasyon ang mga gawain para sa pag-abot sa nakararami, kung saan tinitingnan ito mula sa pananaw ng pagkakaroon ng katarungan sa pagkakapantay-pantay ng mga lahi.
- Paghusayin pa ang pag-abot sa nakararami na nasa mga kapitbahayan at komunidad na may kasayasayan na hindi gaanong nakatatanggap ng mga serbisyo
- Gamitin ang pag-abot sa nakararami na may kaalaman sa kultura, at nang magkaroon ng higit na kamalayan tungkol sa makukuhang pabahay at rekurso para sa serbisyo
- Ipagpatuloy ang standardisasyon ng mga pamatayan para sa pagiging kuwalipikado sa pabahay at mga programa, at ibang polisiya, kung saan tinitingnan ito mula sa pananaw ng pagkakaroon ng katarungan sa pagkakapantay-pantay ng mga lahi.
- Bigyan ng ebalwasyon at paghusayin pa ang mga programa at serbisyo ng MOHC, upang matiyak ang mga pamamaraang makuha ito nang may katarungan sa pagkakapantay-pantay
- Suriin ang mga pagitan sa pagkakaroon ng tagumpay sa pagbibigay ng tirahan sa iba't ibang demograpiya, at pagpasyahan ang kinakailangang interbensiyon upang makalikha ng mga pamamaraan upang makakuha ng mga rekurso sa abot-kayang pabahay, nang may katarungan sa pagkakapantay-pantay
- Siyasatin ang mga opsiyon upang mapalawak pa ang mga pakinabang sa programang Sertipiko na Nagbibigay ng Preperensiya (Certificate of Preference)
- Lakihan pa ang pondo at damihan pa ang mga serbisyo sa mga komunidad na pinakanaapektuhan ng namamanang hindi pagkakasali o legacy of exclusion
- Siyasatin pa at ipatupad ang mga pagsukat sa pagpapatupad ng katarungan sa pagkakapantay-pantay, anuman ang lahi, sa mga proseso ng procurement (pagkuha ng gamit o serbisyo), kasama na ang pamantayan sa pagpili ng MOHCD at OEWD RFQ/RFP
- Makipag-partner sa Komisyon sa mga Karapatang Pantao (Human Rights Commission) upang maipatupad ang mga polisiya sa katarungan sa pagkakapantay-pantay, anuman ang lahi
- Ipatupad ang mga pagsasanay at sistema na may kaalaman ukol sa matitinding karanasan o trauma, at ginagawa sa kabuuan ng departamento, at nang masuportahan ang mas mahusay na serbisyo sa kostumer at pangangalaga sa sarili

Pangangailangang May Prayoridad 5B: Pagkikintal ng mga pinahalagahan o values at gawain para sa katarungan sa pagkakapantay, kung saan may kamalayan ukol sa matitinding karanasan o trauma, sa trabaho ng MOHCD at mga ka-partner nito

2020-2024 MGA STRATEHIYA PARA SA PINAGSAMANG PLANO (CONSOLIDATED PLAN STRATEGIES)

Tunguhin 5Bi: Ipagsama-sama ang kaalaman ukol sa kultura, mga sistemang may kamalayan ukol sa impormasyon tungkol sa matitinding karanasan o trauma, at iba pang pagsasanay at rekurso ukol sa katarungan sa pagkakapantay-pantay, para sa mga ka-partner ng MOHCD

Mga gawain:

- Bilang bahagi ng nariyan nang programa ng pagsasanay, lumikha at magpatupad ng pagsasanay ukol sa pagiging sensitibo sa kultura para sa grantee (nakakakuha ng tulong), developer, at mga ka-partner sa pagbibigay ng puwesto sa pabahay at property manager (tagapamahala ng mga gusali at ari-arian)
- Edukasyon para sa tagabigay ng pabahay at serbisyo para sa mga taong HIV+, at nang magkaroon ng higit na kaalaman ukol sa kultura at mabawasan ang pagkakaroon ng stigma o pagdungis sa pagkatao ng mga taong may HIV+

Tunguhin 5Bii: Isama ang mga prinsipyo ng katarungan sa pagkakapantay-pantay, ano man ang lahi, sa mga gawain ng MOHCD sa pag-eempleyo at promosyon

Mga gawain:

- Repasuhin ang mga gawain sa pag-eempleyo at promosyon ng MOHCD
- Ipatupad ang mga pagbabago upang mas masuportahan ang kapaligiran sa trabaho kung saan may pagkakaiba-iba o diversity, at mayroong pagsasama ng lahat o inclusion

Tunguhin 5Biii: Ipatupad sa kabuuan ng MOHCD ang mga pinahahalagahan o values at lapit kung saan may katarungan sa pagkakapantay-pantay, anuman ang lahi, at may impormasyon tungkol sa matitinding karanasan o trauma

Mga gawain:

- Bumuo at magpatupad para sa MOHCD ng plano para sa katarungan sa pagkakapantay-pantay, anuman ang lahi (racial equity plan)
- Magsagawa ng pagsusuri ng mga internal na polisiya ng MOHCD kaugnay ng katarungan sa pagkakapantay-pantay, anuman ang lahi
- Patuloy na ipaabot ang mga pinahahalagahan o values sa panlabas na komunidad o mga may interes o stakeholder
- Patuloy na pagpulongin ang Pangkat na Nagtatrabaho para sa Katarungan sa Pagkakapantay-pantay Anuman ang Lahi (Racial Equity Work Group), upang mabuo at maipatupad ang plano para sa katarungan sa pagkakapantay-pantay, anuman ang lahi
- Lumikha ng nagtatrabahong pangkat (work group) na may kaalaman ukol sa matitinding karanasan o trauma para masuportahan ang pagpapatupad ng mga gawain sa paghilom

2020-2024 MGA STRATEHIYA PARA SA PINAGSAMANG PLANO (CONSOLIDATED PLAN STRATEGIES)

Glossary o Talasalitaan ng mga Termino

Mga Termino o Katawagan:

ADA (Americans with Disability Act o Batas para sa mga Amerikanong may Kapansanan) – batas tungkol sa mga karapatang sibil, na pinagtibay noong 1990, at nagbabawal sa diskriminasyon batay sa kapansanan; ginagamit sa kontekstong ito upang tukuyin ang unit na may espesyal na katangian para sa pagkilos at pakikipagkomunikasyon

AMI (Area Median Income o Panggitnang Kita sa Lugar) – ang panggitnang kita ng kabahayan para sa isang natukoy na lugar sa lungsod (kalahati sa mga kabahayan ang kumikita ng mas mataas at kalahati ang kumikita ng mas mababa). Inilalathala ang AMI para sa mga laki ng kabahayan na isa hanggang siyam na tao

Sertipiko na Nagbibigay ng Preperensiya (Certificate of Preference) – pagbibigay ng preperensiya sa lottery o palabunutan para sa pabahay sa mga taong nawalan ng tirahan nang dahil sa mga espesipikong aksiyon ng dating Ahensiya ng San Francisco para sa Redevelopment (San Francisco Redevelopment Agency) noong mga dekada ng 1960 hanggang 1980

Coordinated Entry (proseso kung saan tinitiyak na agad na natutulungan at nakokonekta ang mga taong humaharap sa krisis sa tirahan)– sentralisadong sistema ng pagtatasa at pagbibigay ng prayoridad para sa pagbibigay ng mga rekursong para sa kawalan ng tahanan

Pangkulturang Distrito (Cultural District) - programa ng Lungsod na may mga lugar batay sa komunidad, sa intensiyon na ipagdiwang at palakasin ang natatanging mga pangkulturang identidad ng San Francisco, at upang magkaroon ng koordinasyon sa mga rekursong, at sa gayon, matulungang maging matatag ang bulnerable o higit na may pangangailangan

DAHLIA (Database of Affordable Housing Listings, Information and Application o Imbakan ng Datos Tungkol sa mga Listahan, Impormasyon at Aplikasyon para sa Abot-kayang Pabahay) – online na kagamitan upang matulungan ang mga kabahayan na makahanap ng abot-kayang pabahay at makapag-aplay para dito

DALP (Down Payment Assistance Loan Program o Programa ng Pagpapautang Bilang Tulong sa Downpayment o Paunang Bayad) – programa para sa pag-utang ng down payment, na tumutulong sa mga kabahayan na makapagbibigay ng bid o alok na halaga sa ari-arian sa loob ng bukas na merkado

Kasunduan sa mga Development (Development Agreements) – mga kontratang pinapasok ng Lungsod at County ng San Francisco at ng developer, kung saan binibigyang-depinisyon ang mga patakaran, regulasyon, pananagutan, at polisiya para sa espesipikong tagal ng panahon

HOA (Home Owners Association o Samahan ng mga May-ari ng Tahanan) – organisasyon ng mga may-ari ng tahanan o homeowner ng development para sa bahay, na ang layunin ay mapanatili, gawing laging nasa maayos na kondisyon, at pagandahin pa ang mga tahanan at ang halaga ng mga ito

HOPE SF – Inisyatiba na naglalayong baguhin ang apat na pinakagipit na lugar para sa pampublikong pabahay (Hunters View, Alice Griffith, Sunnysdale-Velasco at Potrero Terrace at Annex) tungo sa pagiging masisigla at mauunlad na komunidad sa pamamagitan ng holistikong pagbibigay ng bagong buhay

HOPWA (Housing Opportunity for People With AIDS o Oportunidad sa Pabahay para sa mga Taong may AIDS) – pederal na programa na tumutulong sa mga taong nabubuhay nang may HIV/AIDS upang makakuha at makapagpanatili ng pabahay sa pamamagitan ng mga subsidyong sa pag-upa at iba pang suporta sa pabahay

2020-2024 MGA STRATEHIYA PARA SA PINAGSAMANG PLANO (CONSOLIDATED PLAN STRATEGIES)

Inclusionary o Bukas sa Lahat (Programa sa Pabahay) – programa ng Lungsod na nagtatakda sa mga developer ng pabahay na market-rate (may presyo ng merkado) na magkaloob ng mga unit ng abot-kayang pabahay, ayon sa itinatakdang Seksiyon 415 ng Kodigong Pagpapalano (Planning Code) ng San Francisco

Lokal na Pag-eempleyo (Local Hire) – polisiya ng San Francisco na nagtataguyod ng pagbibigay ng trabaho sa mga lokal na residente para sa mga proyekto sa konstruksiyon na lokal na itinataguyod

Programa para sa mga Lokal na Ipinatatutupad na Subsidyo (Local Operating Subsidy Program) – programa ng San Francisco para sa subsidyo, na dinisenyo upang matugunan ang mga puwang sa pagitan ng upa na kayang bayaran ng mga residenteng dating homeless at ang gastos upang mapatakbo ang pabahay para sa mga taong homeless

Programa na Sertipiko para sa Pagbabawas sa Buwis Batay sa Utang sa Bahay (Mortgage Credit Certificate Program) – programa ng Ahensiya ng California para sa Pagpipinansiya ng Pabahay (California Housing Finance Agency) na nagpapahintulot sa mga bumibili ng bahay sa unang pagkakataon at may mababa hanggang katamtamang kita na baguhin ang bahagi ng kanilang bayad sa interes sa mortgage (utang sa bahay) tungo sa tax credit (bawas sa buwis)

PBV (Project-based Voucher o pinansiyal na tulong para sa mga espesipikong pribadong gusali lamang)) – subsidyo sa upa mula sa Awtoridad sa Pabahay (Housing Authority) na nakakabit sa mga partikular na unit, at hindi sa tenant o umuupa

Plus Housing – ang pangunahing programa ng MOHCD na nagbibigay ng mga unit sa pabahay at subsidyo sa mga kabahayang may HIV+

RAD (Rental Assistance Demonstration o programang binibigyang awtorisas ang paglilipat ng anyo ng pederal na pondo)) – inisyatiba sa rehabilitasyon at transisyon ng mga ari-ariang par sa pampublikong pabahay tungo sa mga ari-arian na para sa may Seksiyon 9 na project-based voucher

RFQ (Request for Qualifications o Kahilingan para sa mga Kuwalipikasyon)/RFP (Request for Proposal o Kahilingan para sa mga Mungkahi) – dalawang karaniwang uri ng paraan na ginagamit ng pampublikong sektor upang makakuha ng mga nagbebenta (vendor) o ahensiya upang mag-bid o mag-alok ng halaga para sa mga serbisyo o magbigay ng mungkahi para sa mga serbisyo

SRO (Single Room Occupancy o (mga paupahang kuwarto sa isang gusali)) – uri ng unit sa pabahay na karaniwan nang magkasalo ang paggamit ng ilang pasilidad tulad ng banyo at kusina sa pagitan ng mga unit

Karapatan ng Umuupa na Magkaroon ng Abugado (Tenant Right to Counsel)– inisyatibang inaprubahan ng mga botante kung saan nagkaloob ng buong legal na representasyon sa mga kabahayang humaharap ng pagpapaalis sa tirahan

Город и округ Сан-Франциско



ПРЕДЛАГАЕМЫЕ СТРАТЕГИИ для Сводного плана на 2020–2024 гг.

Для публичного обсуждения в период
с 29 июля 2019 г. по 19 августа 2019 г.

Городской исполнительный комитет по жилищному строительству и
развитию общин (MOHCD)

Управление экономического развития и развития трудовых ресурсов (OEWD)

Управление по делам бездомных и оказанию им поддержки (HSH)

СТРАТЕГИИ ДЛЯ СВОДНОГО ПЛАНА НА 2020-2024 ГГ.

Введение

Городской исполнительный комитет по жилищному строительству и развитию общин принял участие в процессе общественного оповещения и взаимодействия с заинтересованными сторонами и жителями Сан-Франциско в рамках разработки Сводного плана на 2020–2024 гг., Анализа препятствий для справедливого выбора жилья и Плана по обеспечению жильем для ВИЧ-инфицированных. Этот процесс служит основой для определения приоритетов жилищного строительства и развития общин, что, в свою очередь, определяет цели и стратегии, которые будут оформлены в окончательных планах. В конечном итоге принятие решений по финансированию жилищно-коммунальных услуг Городским исполнительным комитетом по жилищному строительству и развитию общин (МОНCD) будет основываться на общественном участии и приоритетах общины.

Настоящий документ включает в себя предлагаемые стратегии для Сводного плана развития на 2020–2024 гг. Предлагаемые стратегии по Анализу препятствий для справедливого выбора жилья будут доступны для публичного ознакомления и обсуждения в конце лета/начале осени этого года. Планы Стратегии разрабатываются нашей рабочей группой по жилищному строительству для ВИЧ-инфицированных; пожалуйста, дайте нам знать, если вы хотите стать членом этой группы.

Обзор документа

Этот документ следует принципу развития МОНCD / OEWD / HSH, который включает в себя утверждение конечного желаемого результата наших программ и стратегий:

«Жизнедеятельные и здоровые общины с равными возможностями самодостаточности, охватывающие весь Сан-Франциско».

Для достижения такого результата были поставлены пять первостепенных целей, перечисленных в этом документе. Для каждой цели предоставляется список взаимосвязанных приоритетных потребностей, полученных в процессе взаимодействия с общиной. Список целей следует каждой приоритетной потребности. И наконец, для каждой цели предлагаются конкретные мероприятия.

Обратите внимание, что подчеркнутые выражения определены в словаре терминов, приведенном в конце этого документа.

Обзор и комментарии

Этот документ доступен для публичного ознакомления и обсуждения в период с 29 июля 2019 года по 19 августа 2019 года. Вы можете ознакомиться с онлайн-версией или просмотреть печатную копию проекта документа по следующим адресам:

- МОНCD, 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5-ый этаж;
- OEWD, City Hall, Room 448, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place and 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5-ый этаж; и
- Главный филиал Публичной библиотеки СФ, 100 Larkin Street, 5-ый этаж, Правительственный информационный центр (Government Information Center).

СТРАТЕГИИ ДЛЯ СВОДНОГО ПЛАНА НА 2020-2024 ГГ.

Персонал признателен вам за комментарии в письменном виде. Их можно направить по адресу: МОНCD, МОНCD, Strategic Planning Staff, 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor, Сан-Франциско, СА 94103. Ваши комментарии будут направлены в соответствующий департамент. В своем комментарии, пожалуйста, конкретизируйте вашу проблему и, при необходимости, укажите цель или направление деятельности.

Мы также приглашаем общественность высказать свои замечания по проектам стратегий на открытом заседании в понедельник, 5 августа 2019 года, в 18:00. Заседание будет проводиться по адресу: HSA Born Auditorium, 170 Otis Street, Сан-Франциско, СА 94103.

Благодарим вас за участие в этом процессе. Для получения дополнительной информации, пожалуйста, посетите вебсайт <https://sfmohcd.org/plans-development> или позвоните по телефону 415-701-5500.

СТРАТЕГИИ ДЛЯ СВОДНОГО ПЛАНА НА 2020-2024 ГГ.

ЦЕЛЬ 1: НАЛИЧИЕ ПОСТОЯННОГО ЖИЛЬЯ У СЕМЕЙ И ОДИНОКИХ ЛЮДЕЙ

Приоритетная потребность 1А: Создание и поддержка доступного жилья

Цель 1Ai: Создание более доступного жилья

Мероприятия:

- Изучение новых финансовых механизмов для создания более доступного жилья
- Приобретение частных зданий для создания новых доступных квартир
- Обеспечение географической представленности местонахождений доступного жилья, особенно в перспективных жилых районах
- Улучшение координации с Департаментом градостроительства, Департаментом надзора за строительством и Городским исполнительным комитетом по делам инвалидов, связанных с жилищным строительством и с получением разрешений для ускорения жилищного строительства
- Продолжение внедрения объектов доступного жилья по программе HOPE SF
- Мониторинг строительства жилья со стоимостью ниже рыночной в проектах с Договорами на застройку или в рамках Инклюзивной жилищной программы
- Регулярный анализ и оценка данных о кандидатах и жильцах из Инклюзивной жилищной программы в целях обоснования жилищной политики и принятых процедур
- Изучение вопроса об увеличении количества квартир, требующихся Городскому исполнительному комитету по жилищному строительству и развитию общин (МОНСД) по Закону об американцах-инвалидах, в жилищных комплексах, спонсируемых МОНСД
- Увеличение количества жилья, предназначенного для поддержки семей с ВИЧ-инфицированными членами
 - Изучение креативных подходов для увеличения снабжения жильем
 - Повышение доступа программы Plus Housing к квартирам HOPWA
- Улучшение жилищных возможностей для бездомных или бывших бездомных

Цель 1Aii: Сохранение доступного жилья

Мероприятия:

- Покупка жилья, рискующего потерять доступность
- Восстановление существующего жилья для сохранения его доступности
- Проведение переговоров о продлении ограничений по доступности для имеющегося доступного жилья
- Поиск креативных способов привлечения капитала в целях сохранения доступного жилья, включая источники из других городских управлений
- Продолжение внедрения инициативы RAD для восстановления и сохранения жилья, субсидируемого федеральными властями
- Продолжение поддержки программ по снижению рисков свинцового загрязнения
- Продолжение поддержки программ модификации жилья, осуществляющихся в интересах домовладельцев с низкими доходами, увеличивающих его безопасность и доступность, улучшающих состояние здоровья, а также облегчающих доступ к солнечной энергии.

СТРАТЕГИИ ДЛЯ СВОДНОГО ПЛАНА НА 2020-2024 ГГ.

- Изучение способов оказания помощи домовладельцам с отсроченным эксплуатационным обслуживанием жилья
- Продолжение наблюдения за домовладельцами и застройщиками на предмет соответствия программным требованиям
- Улучшение координации между городскими службами и некоммерческими организациями, предоставляющими услуги по послепродажному обслуживанию недвижимости и ее сохранению

Цель 1Aiii: Улучшение данных и аналитики относительно инвентаризации и выделения доступного жилья

Мероприятия:

- Создание более надежных инструментов для отслеживания инвентаризации и выделения жилья, спонсируемого МОНСД
- Продолжение разработки и совершенствования базы данных DANLIA (Базы данных со списками доступного жилья, информацией о нем и подачей заявок на него) и расширение возможностей агентов по недвижимости для отслеживания спроса на доступное жилье, включая расширенную веб-аналитику
- Сотрудничество с другими правовыми системами DANLIA в обмене агрегированными данными для лучшего понимания факторов «спросового давления» в Сан-Франциско

Приоритетная потребность 1B: Обеспечение большей доступности жилья

Цель 1Bi: Сокращение затрат на застройку для облегчения привлечения местных жилищных ресурсов и обслуживания домохозяйств с низким доходом

Мероприятия:

- Использование альтернативных типов и методов строительства для снижения затрат на застройку, таких как блочное строительство
- Использование свободных или недорогих земель, например, государственных земель, под застройку
- Поиск новых источников финансирования на местном уровне и на уровне штата
- Работа органами власти штата и федерального уровня по приобретению земли, предназначенной для строительства доступного жилья, включая жилье для бездомных

Цель 1Bii: Повышение доступности арендуемого жилья

Мероприятия:

- Продолжение поддержки долгосрочных субсидий на аренду и изучение возможностей расширения субсидий для малообеспеченных жителей в целях обеспечения постоянного жилья
 - Поддержка и использование источников субсидирования аренды жилья на уровне штата и на федеральном уровне
- Продолжать осуществление Местной программы эксплуатационных субсидий
- Расширение диапазона усредненного дохода по региону на отдельные проекты, что позволит финансировать больше жилья для малоимущих семей

СТРАТЕГИИ ДЛЯ СВОДНОГО ПЛАНА НА 2020-2024 ГГ.

- Опробование новых экспериментальных программ субсидирования аренды жилья для малообеспеченных слоев населения
- Повышение жилищных субсидий и ваучеров для семей с ВИЧ-инфицированными членами
- Повышение жилищных субсидий и ваучеров для семей бездомных и других уязвимых групп населения

Цель 1Biii: Расширение возможностей для долгосрочного домовладения

Мероприятия:

- Продолжать поддерживать и принимать шаги по повышению качества и стандартизации образования среди покупателей жилья и послепродажного консультирования
- Продолжение предоставления инклюзивных возможностей владения для домохозяйств с низким и средним уровнем дохода
- Повышение мобильности для растущих домохозяйств с правом собственности
 - Изучение возможности инклюзивных владельцев приобрести вторую квартиру (и продать предыдущую)
- Оценка инклюзивной цены перепродажи в целях дальнейшей доступности жилья
- Изучение вариантов по оказанию помощи домовладельцам, для которых недоступны взносы в Общество совладельцев многоквартирного дома и расходы на реконструкцию
- Продолжение использования возможности финансирования по Вспомогательной авансовой кредитной программе для домохозяйств с более высоким доходом, в том числе для сотрудников служб экстренной помощи и педагогов
- Продолжение поддержки программы «Сертификат на ипотечное кредитование»
- Изучение стратегий по расширению участия кредиторов в программах домовладения
- Продолжение оптимизации практики сделок с недвижимостью МОНCD через систему базы данных DANLIA

Цель 1Biv: Повышение доступа к аренде жилья и домовладению

Мероприятия:

- Продолжение поддержки консультативных услуг по аренде жилья, чтобы помочь жителям ориентироваться и иметь равный доступ к городским программам доступного жилья
 - Включение консультирования по вопросам жилья для ВИЧ-инфицированных с целью поддержки решения задач по определению места жительства и поселению
 - Включение консультирования по вопросам жилья для семей бывших бездомных и других уязвимых групп населения с целью поддержки в вопросах по определению места жительства и поселению
 - Предоставление дополнительной поддержки / наращивание возможностей для поставщиков услуг для удовлетворения растущего спроса
- Продолжение разработки и поддержки базы данных DANLIA
 - Добавление дополнительных функций, а также дополнительных программ и ресурсов
 - Добавление информации о другом доступном жилье в Сан-Франциско, включая жилье, не финансируемое МОНCD

СТРАТЕГИИ ДЛЯ СВОДНОГО ПЛАНА НА 2020-2024 ГГ.

- Расширить охват информирования на общественные центры, включая точки доступа рабочей силы, публичные библиотеки и т. д.
- Повышение осведомленности о доступных жилищных ресурсах
 - Увеличение активного взаимодействия с небольшими группами населения, особенно с отдельными демографическими группами
- Продолжение поддержки застройщиков и управляющих недвижимостью в целях создания и поддержки возможностей инклюзивной аренды
- Оценка программы предпочтений в жилищной лотерее для обеспечения их соответствия поставленным целям
- Продолжение мониторинга лотереи / аренды в целях доведения жилищных программ до предполагаемых бенефициаров
 - Обеспечение определенных категорий людей квартирами по Закону об американцах-инвалидах

Приоритетная потребность 1С: Профилактика и сокращение бездомности

Цель 1Ci: Улучшение систем, помогающих каждому человеку получить постоянное жилье

Мероприятия:

- Реализация согласованных систем для взрослых, семей с детьми и молодежи
- Реализация учета производительности во всех программах и системах

Цель 1Cii: Сокращение бездомности среди взрослых, молодежи и семей

Мероприятия:

- Разработка мероприятий по предотвращению бездомности и решению (отвлечению) проблем бездомных, ориентированных на людей, которые когда-либо были бездомными, а также людей, ставших бездомными после освобождения из мест лишения свободы или психиатрических больниц
- Создание новых постоянных квартир в социально-жилищных комплексах для взрослых, молодежи и семей

Цель 1Ciii: Предоставление крова бесприютным семьям с детьми

Мероприятия:

- Целевое выявление бесприютных семей
- Предоставление места бесприютным семьям в приюте
- Расширение доступа к местам в семейных приютах

Цель 1Civ: Совершенствование мер, предпринимаемых городом, по борьбе с уличной бездомностью с целью устранения крупных многолетних палаточных лагерей бездомных

Мероприятия:

- Проведение ежеквартального подсчета палаток и стоянок автомобилей, в которых проживают бездомные
- Проведение информационной работы среди больших лагерей для бездомных
- Размещение людей в приюты с низким порогом приема

СТРАТЕГИИ ДЛЯ СВОДНОГО ПЛАНА НА 2020-2024 ГГ.

- Проведение оценки и расстановки приоритетов жилья с помощью выездных групп по работе с бездомными

Цель 1Cv: Улучшение согласованности работы Городского исполнительного комитета по жилищному строительству и развитию общин (MOHCD) с Департаментом по вопросам бездомности и вспомогательного жилья

Мероприятия:

- Продолжение и улучшение производства и арендования постоянного жилья с программами поддержки на дому, включая согласование аренды квартир в социально-жилищных комплексах с системой согласованного доступа
- Повышение согласованности выделения HOPWA-, RAD-, PBV-квартир и других квартир в социально-жилищных комплексах
- Создание связи между базой данных DAHLIA и системой согласованного доступа

Цель 1Cvi: Расширение услуг по предотвращению бездомности и обеспечению постоянным жильем бывших бездомных и тех, кто подвержен риску бездомности

Мероприятия:

- Предоставление выездных услуг с медицинской поддержкой в социально-жилищных комплексах
- Сотрудничество для предоставления целевых сервисов уязвимым клиентам в целях получения доступа к услугам по решению проблемы бездомности
- Расстановка приоритетов выделения денежных средств на профилактику бездомности для семей, имеющих историю бездомности или проживающих в приютах

Приоритетная потребность 1D: Предоставление услуг с целью сохранения жилья

Цель 1Di: Снижение уровня выселений

Мероприятия:

- Расширение поддержки полного представительства правовых интересов жильцов, которым грозит выселение, в рамках инициативы «Право арендатора на адвоката»
- Продолжение поддержки мероприятий по консультированию, просвещению и образованию арендаторов, посредничеству, ведению дел по вопросам сохранения жилья и по оказанию помощи в краткосрочной аренде
- Расширение долгосрочных программ субсидирования аренды жилья
- Продолжение вовлечения заинтересованных сторон общины в стратегиях для защиты от выселения в целях увеличения эффективности

Цель 1Dii: Расширение доступа к услугам для жителей государственного и субсидируемого государством жилья, объектов RAD и одноместных комнат в общежитиях

Мероприятия:

- Продолжение поддержки и увеличение охвата комплекса услуг, включая улучшение справочно-информационных данных, подключение к услугам и ведение/согласование дел для жителей инициатив HOPE SF и RAD
- Изучение расширения спектра услуг для жителей однокомнатных общежитий

СТРАТЕГИИ ДЛЯ СВОДНОГО ПЛАНА НА 2020-2024 ГГ.

- Сочетание связанных между собой сервисов и развития навыков для предоставления более комплексных услуг, которые повышают экономическую самостоятельность клиентов
- Поиск ключевых услуг, таких как консультирование арендаторов и предотвращение выселения, юридические услуги, финансовое образование и консультирование по месту на объектах инициатив HOPE SF и RAD
- Продолжение поддержки программ по созданию общин и развитию лидерских навыков у жителей

Цель 1Diii: Предоставление поддержки другим потребителям доступного жилья для обеспечения успешного расселения

Мероприятия:

- Создание приветственного пакета, предназначенного для распространения среди новых получателей доступного жилья, и изучение возможности предоставления жильцам социальных услуг
- Работа с городскими управлениями по изучению вопроса повышения стабильности обеспечения жильем, через службы психиатрической и наркологической помощи
- Упрощение подключения к услугам посредников по необходимости
- Требовать уведомления жильцов об услугах, предоставляемых арендаторам, при выселении арендаторов из жилья, спонсируемого МОНCD
- Предоставление дополнительных жилищных услуг для существующих квартир по программе HOPWA и строящихся квартир

Цель 1Div: Повышение мобильности между уровнями жилищных условий для семей с ВИЧ-инфицированными членами

Мероприятия:

- Оценивать способность арендатора жить самостоятельно для переезда в более подходящее жилье в случае необходимости

ЦЕЛЬ 2: ЖИЗНЕСПОСОБНОСТЬ И ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКАЯ САМОСТОЯТЕЛЬНОСТЬ СЕМЕЙ И ОДИНОКИХ ЛЮДЕЙ

Приоритетная потребность 2A: Содействие в подготовке трудовых ресурсов

Цель 2Ai: Обеспечение доступа уязвимых групп населения к возможностям трудоустройства в различных секторах

Мероприятия:

- Предоставление услуг в сфере занятости уязвимым группам населения с целью подготовки к трудоустройству
- Совместная работа Городского исполнительного комитета по жилищному строительству и развитию общин (МОНCD) и Управления экономического развития и развития трудовых ресурсов (OEWD) над созданием рабочих мест для жителей в районе их проживания

СТРАТЕГИИ ДЛЯ СВОДНОГО ПЛАНА НА 2020-2024 ГГ.

- Расширение найма на местах, с приоритетом получения строительных рабочих мест жильцами объекта недвижимости, а также изучение возможностей найма на местах на рабочие места по управлению недвижимостью
- Поощрение застройщиков в расширении возможностей трудоустройств, которые они предоставляют на своих объектах
- Предоставление ссылок на вакантные рабочие места по соседству из базы данных DAHLLIA
- Рекламирование объявлений о вакансиях на веб сайте MOHCD

Приоритетная потребность 2В: Расширение возможностей за счет повышения языковой доступности и развития базовых навыков

Цель 2Vi: Повышение доступа к программам и услугам MOHCD путем перевода бумажных и цифровых ресурсов на разные языки

Мероприятия:

- Повышение языковой доступности ко всем программам и услугам MOHCD, семинарам и собраниям общественности
- Разработка и поддержание подробного руководства по ресурсам, описывающих программы и услуги в соответствии с языком, на котором они предоставляются
- Изучение возможности сделать базу данных DAHLLIA доступной для большего числа людей путем перевода на другие языки

Цель 2Vii: Предоставление ресурсов для развития навыков и профессиональной подготовки

Мероприятия:

- Продолжение поддержки и совершенствования программы развития умений в таких направлениях, как жизненные навыки, общеобразовательные и дипломные программы, а также английский в качестве второго языка
- Специализированное повышение квалификации для создания четкого пути к более продвинутым возможностям профессионального обучения
- Совмещение стратегий сочетания услуг и развития навыков для предоставления более комплексных услуг

Цель 2Viii: Повышение финансовой грамотности и управление личными финансами

Мероприятия:

- Продолжение поддержки в области финансового консультирования и образования, наращивания активов и кредитов, сокращения задолженности, доступа к банковским услугам, а также к кредитным консультациям и услугам по восстановлению
- Увеличение инвестиций в более интенсивные формы обслуживания, повышающие финансовые возможности клиентов, а также в текущие услуги по индивидуальному обучению, обеспечивающие долгосрочные экономические улучшения
- Поощрение совместного размещения финансовых услуг на жилищных объектах и в общественных организациях

Цель 2Viv: Повышение компьютерной грамотности

СТРАТЕГИИ ДЛЯ СВОДНОГО ПЛАНА НА 2020-2024 ГГ.

Мероприятия:

- Обеспечение обучения базовым, средним и продвинутым компьютерным навыкам с помощью семинаров и лекций, а также новых инновационных моделей обучения в проектах обучения компьютерной грамотности на уровне общин
- Обеспечение обновления и распределения компьютеров и других устройств среди домохозяйств с низким уровнем доходов
- Работа с местными центрами, в том числе с библиотеками и общественными центрами, позволяющими использовать бесплатные компьютеры для повышения компьютерной грамотности среди получателей услуг, оплачиваемых МОНCD
- Поддержка программ, которые предоставляют доступ к компьютерам и помогают овладеть компьютерной грамотностью жителям и объектам доступного жилья
- Поддержка доступа в интернет для жителей однокомнатных общежитий.
- Нарастание технологического потенциала общественных организаций (ОО), наделение сотрудников ОО полномочиями для проведения тренингов и предоставления услуг по овладению компьютерной грамотностью

Приоритетная потребность 2C: Обеспечение равного доступа к гражданским юридическим услугам по иммиграционным и другим важным вопросам

Цель 2Ci: Увеличение доступа к гражданским юридическим услугам

Мероприятия:

- Продолжение оказания поддержки по юридическим услугам, связанным с иммиграцией
- Продолжение поддержки и разработки более целевых стратегий финансирования и обслуживания в областях гражданского права, включая трудоустройство, семью, потребительские нужды, пособия и инвалидность

Приоритетная потребность 2D: Оказание помощи домохозяйствам в подключении к услугам

Цель 2Di: Увеличение доступа к общественным услугам

Мероприятия:

- Продолжение поддержки и разработки более широкого комплекса услуг, включая улучшение справочно-информационных данных, подключение к услугам, а также к ведению/согласованию дел
- Комбинирование стратегий для сочетания сервисов и развития навыков для предоставления более комплексных услуг
- Поддержание инновационных стратегий работы с населением

ЦЕЛЬ 3. НАЛИЧИЕ У ОБЩИН ЗДОРОВОЙ ФИЗИЧЕСКОЙ, СОЦИАЛЬНОЙ И БИЗНЕС-ИНФРАСТРУКТУРЫ

Приоритетная потребность 3A: Расширение общественных зданий и пространств

Цель 3Ai: Предоставление некоммерческим организациям высококачественных постоянных общественных зданий

СТРАТЕГИИ ДЛЯ СВОДНОГО ПЛАНА НА 2020-2024 ГГ.

Мероприятия:

- Продолжение оказания поддержки по реконструкции общественных зданий, предоставляющих основные коммунальные услуги
- Содействие разработке оценки потребностей в капитале для общественных зданий в целях обеспечения долгосрочной устойчивости
- Обеспечение поддержки для удовлетворения проектных потребностей, связанных с увеличением полезности объектов
- Оказание поддержки организациям в приобретении и (или) определении арендуемых объектов, чтобы оставаться в них и лучше обслуживать жителей своего района

Цель 3Ai: Расширение общественных пространств

Мероприятия:

- Создание и благоустройство объектов инфраструктуры, предназначенных для обслуживания малоимущих жильцов

Приоритетная потребность 3В: Усиление малого бизнеса и коммерческих коридоров

Цель 3Vi: Содействие развитию и устойчивости процветающих местных предприятий

- Продолжение предоставления технической помощи бизнесу через партнеров общины с учетом культурных, этнических и лингвистических особенностей для стартапов и существующих предприятий
- Продолжение повышения эффективности технической помощи бизнесу
- Продолжение поддержки инвестиций в кредитование малого бизнеса

Цель 3Vii: Поддержка развития и устойчивости надежных коммерческих коридоров в малоимущих микрорайонах

Мероприятия:

- Продолжение поддержки усилий по местному экономическому развитию, направленных на оживление коммерческих коридоров
- Увеличение инвестиций в фасады и другую модернизацию
- Увеличение инвестиций в проекты по доступности и соответствию
- Продолжение географически-ориентированного подхода для предоставления услуг, позволяющих использовать другие городские инвестиции

Приоритетная потребность 3С: Поддержка комплексных стратегий на уровне общины

Цель 3Ci: Поддержка усилий по планированию микрорайонов

Мероприятия:

- Продолжение поддержки и расширения программ культурных районов в утвержденных Советом культурных районах
- Продолжение поддержки процессов планирования микрорайонов, которые объединяют малообеспеченное, уязвимое и бесправное население в целях его полноценного участия в жизни общин

СТРАТЕГИИ ДЛЯ СВОДНОГО ПЛАНА НА 2020-2024 ГГ.

- Укрепление стратегий экономического развития и мероприятий в рамках планов, управляемых общиной

Цель 3Cii: Поддержка создания общины на местном уровне

Мероприятия:

- Продолжение поддержки сети общинных организаций и других ключевых заинтересованных сторон, обеспечивающих более эффективную координацию и сотрудничество в сфере услуг, как для микрорайонов, так и для конкретных групп населения
- Продолжение поддержки грантовых программ мероприятий общин на уровне микрорайонов

Приоритетная потребность 3D: Поддержка потребностей общинных организаций и профессиональных партнеров МОНСД в расширении своего потенциала

Цель 3Di: Повышение потенциала общинных организаций

Мероприятия:

- Нарастивание организационного потенциала получателей и поставщиков грантов МОНСД за счет тренингов, работы с определенными социальными группами, привлечения узкопрофильных специалистов и других методов технической помощи
- Приоритетное укрепление общинных организаций и застройщиков, обслуживающих исторически малообеспеченные слои населения
- Поддержка персонала агентства в обучении навыкам работы с компьютером

ЦЕЛЬ 4: ОБЕСПЕЧЕНИЕ СТАБИЛЬНОСТИ ОБЩИН, НАХОДЯЩИХСЯ ПОД УГРОЗОЙ ВЫСЕЛЕНИЯ

Приоритетная потребность 4A: Устранение несправедливых последствий экономического роста за счет принятия мер по борьбе с выселением жильцов и компаний

Цель 4Ai: Реализация стратегий и программ, которые делают приоритетными нынешних жильцов и компании

Мероприятия:

- Продолжение администрирования программ по преференциям в жилищной лотерее
- Поскольку МОНСД оценивает и обновляет стратегию и процедуры для Инклюзивной жилищной программы в соответствии с текущими потребностями, мы рекомендуем параллельное внесение изменений/обновлений в Градостроительный кодекс и договора о кредитовании некоммерческим застройщиком
- Внедрение возможностей по праву возврата сдаваемых в аренду зданий, из которых были выселены арендаторы
- Исполнение законов о преимущественном праве покупки городом зданий с риском потери финансовой доступности

Цель 4Aii: Поощрение коммерческих арендаторов размещать в помещениях на первых этажах доступное жилье МОНСД

СТРАТЕГИИ ДЛЯ СВОДНОГО ПЛАНА НА 2020-2024 ГГ.

Мероприятия:

- Работа с OEWD над финансовой поддержкой модернизации (расширения) коммерческими арендаторами помещений на первых этажах
- Работа с OEWD над продажей коммерческой недвижимости местным некоммерческим организациям

Цель 4Aiii: CD: Сокращение случаев выселения жильцов и компаний

Мероприятия:

- Использование субсидий на аренду жилья для сокращения случаев выселения арендаторов
- Использование таких программ, как «Право арендатора на адвоката», и консультирование арендатора для помощи жильцам в предотвращении выселения из своих домов
- Разработка и реализация стратегий, направленных на смягчение негативных последствий повышения арендной платы
- Расширение программ, предназначенных для удержания домовладельцев в общинах, пострадавших от отчуждений
- Согласование с другими управлениями для обеспечения долгосрочной устойчивости организаций на уровне микрорайонов
- Использование культурных районов для поддержки стратегий по борьбе с выселением
- Увеличение доступа малых предприятий к денежным средствам в малоимущих микрорайонах, которые хотят остаться в Сан-Франциско.

Приоритетная потребность 4B: Обеспечение пользы существующим общинам в результате экономического роста

Цель 4Bi: Требование о найме максимально возможного количества местных сотрудников для работы в проектах и программах МОНСД

Мероприятия:

- Согласование с OEWD готовности к работе и трудоустройству в проектах по доступному жилью
- Продолжение поддержки готовности к работе и трудоустройству для проектов RAD и HOPE SF

Цель 4Bii: Обеспечение соответствующих городских услуг в микрорайонах, где находится доступное жилье МОНСД

Мероприятия:

- Работа с городскими партнерами, такими как Управление городского транспорта Сан-Франциско (SFMTA), по вопросам транспорта
- Работа с ключевыми городскими департаментами над определением потребностей и возможностей для реализации и согласования услуг

Цель 4Biii: Реализация программ, которые обеспечивают прямые выгоды в результате роста экономики на уровне микрорайонов для местных общин

СТРАТЕГИИ ДЛЯ СВОДНОГО ПЛАНА НА 2020-2024 ГГ.

Мероприятия:

- Целевая разработка объектов инфраструктуры для общин, на которые влияет повышенная плотность застройки
- Согласование программ культурного района с другими инициативами по застройке общины
- Продолжение определения способов, с помощью которых существующие компании и жильцы могут добиться повышения занятости и доступа к капиталу.
- Сотрудничество с другими городскими департаментами по определению дополнительных способов поддержки локальных микро предприятий и предпринимателей.

ЦЕЛЬ 5: РАБОТА ГОРОДА НАД УСТРАНЕНИЕМ ПРИЧИН РАСОВОЙ ДИСКРИМИНАЦИИ

Приоритетная потребность 5А: Обеспечение равного доступа разных рас к программам и услугам при взаимодействии с другими городскими департаментами

Цель 5Аi: Разработка определенного финансирования, политики и практики по обеспечению равного доступа к программам МОНCD и OEWD

Мероприятия:

- Рассмотрение и оценка практики работы с населением с точки зрения расовой справедливости
- Увеличение активности в работе с населением в исторически малообеспеченных микрорайонах и общинах
- Использование культурно-грамотного информирования для повышения осведомленности о доступном жилье и услугах
- Развитие стандартизированных критериев отбора в вопросах предоставления жилья и жилищных программ, а также других вопросах, через призму расового равенства
- Оценка и улучшение программ и услуг МОНCD для обеспечения равного доступа
- Анализ пробелов в успешности выделения жилья для различных демографических групп и определение необходимых мер для создания равного доступа к доступному жилью
- Изучение вариантов увеличения преимуществ по программе Свидетельства о преференции
- Увеличение финансирования и услуг для общин, наиболее пострадавших от отчуждений
- Изучение и реализация мер по обеспечению расовой справедливости в процессах закупок, включая критерии отбора запроса квалификаций / запроса предложения МОНCD и OEWD.
- Сотрудничество с Комиссией по правам человека в реализации политики в области расовой справедливости
- Проведение в департаменте тренингов и систем информирования о последствиях психологической травмы для улучшения обслуживания клиентов и самообслуживания

СТРАТЕГИИ ДЛЯ СВОДНОГО ПЛАНА НА 2020-2024 ГГ.

Приоритетная потребность 5В: Прививание внимательности к вопросам расового равенства и к перенесенным стрессам при работе с МОHCD и его партнерами

Цель 5Bi: Внедрение культурной грамотности, систем учета перенесённых стрессов и других тренингов и ресурсов по вопросам справедливости для партнеров МОHCD

Мероприятия:

- В рамках существующей учебной программы следует разработать и провести тренинг по учету культурных особенностей для получателей, застройщиков, партнеров по выделению жилья и управлению недвижимостью.
- Подготовка поставщиков жилья и услуг для ВИЧ-инфицированных в целях повышения культурной грамотности и уменьшения стигматизации

Цель 5Bii: Включение принципов расовой справедливости в практику найма и продвижения по службе в МОHCD

Мероприятия:

- Обзор практики найма и продвижения по службе в МОHCD
- Внесение изменений с целью улучшения поддержки многонациональной и инклюзивной рабочей среды

Цель 5Biii: Реализация принципов и подходов, основанных на расовой справедливости и информировании о психологических травмах, на всей территории МОHCD

Мероприятия:

- Разработка и реализация плана по расовой справедливости для МОHCD
- Проведение полного анализа расовой справедливости во внутренней политике МОHCD
- Сообщение о своих ценностях внешнему сообществу и заинтересованным сторонам
- Продолжение созыва Рабочей группы по расовой справедливости в целях создания и реализации плана по расовой справедливости для МОHCD
- Создание рабочей группы информирования о психологических травмах для поддержки реализации лечебных практик

СТРАТЕГИИ ДЛЯ СВОДНОГО ПЛАНА НА 2020-2024 ГГ.

Словарь терминов

Термины:

АДА (Закон об американцах-инвалидах) — закон о гражданских правах, принятый в 1990 году, который запрещает дискриминацию по признаку инвалидности; используется в этом контексте применительно к квартирам со специальными функциями мобильности или связи

АМІ (Усредненный доход по региону) — средний доход домохозяйства для данного мегаполиса (одна половина домохозяйств зарабатывает больше, а другая — меньше). Усредненные доходы по региону публикуются для домохозяйств от одного до девяти человек.

Свидетельство о преференции — преференция в жилищной лотерее, предоставляемая лицам, выселенным в результате конкретных действий бывшего Управления реконструкции Сан-Франциско в 1960–1980-х годах

Система согласованного доступа — централизованная система оценки и расстановки приоритетов для выделения денежных средств на бездомных

Культурные районы — городская программа для специально выделенных районов, предназначенная для продвижения и укрепления уникальной культурной самобытности Сан-Франциско, а также для координации выделения средств на оказание помощи в стабилизации социально уязвимым группам населения, сталкивающимся или находящимся под угрозой выселения

ДАНЦІА (База данных со списками доступного жилья, информацией про него и подачей заявок на него) — онлайн-инструмент, который поможет домохозяйствам найти и подать заявку на доступное жилье

DAIP (Вспомогательная авансовая кредитная программа) — авансовая кредитная программа, которая помогает домохозяйствам участвовать в тендере на объект недвижимости на открытом рынке

Договоры на застройку — договоры, заключенные между городом/округом Сан-Франциско и застройщиком, в которых определены правила, нормы, обязательства и политика проекта застройки на определенный период времени

НОА (Общество совладельцев многоквартирного дома) — организация собственников жилья жилой застройки целью которой является сохранение, поддержание и благоустройство домов и их стоимости

НОРЕ SF (НАДЕЖДА СФ) — инициатива, направленная на превращение четырех наиболее проблемных объектов социального жилья в Сан-Франциско (Hunters View, Alice Griffith, Sunnydale-Velasco и Potrero Terrace and Annex) в яркие, процветающие общины путем целостной реконструкции

СТРАТЕГИИ ДЛЯ СВОДНОГО ПЛАНА НА 2020-2024 ГГ.

НОРВА (Жилищная возможность для инфицированных СПИДом лиц) — федеральная программа, которая помогает людям, живущим с ВИЧ / СПИДом, получать и поддерживать свое жилье за счет субсидий на аренду жилья и других жилищных пособий

Инклюзивная (жилищная программа) — городская программа, требующая от застройщиков с рыночными ценами на жилье предоставлять часть квартир по доступным ценам, как того требует Раздел 415 Градостроительного кодекса Сан-Франциско

Наём местных сотрудников — политика Сан-Франциско, которая способствует найму местных жителей на спонсируемые городом строительные объекты

Местная программа эксплуатационных субсидий — программа субсидий в Сан-Франциско, предназначенная для устранения различий между суммой арендной платы, которую могут заплатить бывшие бездомные, и стоимостью эксплуатации жилья для бездомных

Программа «Сертификат на ипотечное кредитование» — программа Калифорнийского управления по финансированию жилищного строительства, которая позволяет покупателям, впервые приобретающим жилье и имеющим низкий и средний доход, конвертировать часть годового платежа по ипотечному кредиту в налоговый кредит

PBV (основанный на проекте ваучер) — субсидия на аренду жилья от Жилищного управления, привязанная к определенной квартире, а не к арендатору

Plus Housing (Плюс жилье) — основная программа Городского исполнительного комитета по жилищному строительству и развитию общин (MОНCD), которая выделяет квартиры и субсидии домохозяйствам ВИЧ-инфицированных

RAD (Демонстрация помощи с арендой) — инициатива, которая восстанавливает и переводит объекты социального жилья в приватизированные объекты недвижимости на основе проекта Раздела 8

RFQ (Запрос квалификаций) / RFP (Запрос предложения) — два стандартных типа методик в государственном секторе, которые используются для того, чтобы предложить поставщикам или управлениям участвовать в тендерах на услуги или подавать предложение на услуги

SRO (одноместная комната в общежитии) — тип жилой квартиры, где определенные помещения, такие как ванная комната и кухня, совместно используются несколькими квартирами

Право арендатора на адвоката — инициатива, одобренная избирателями, обеспечивающая полное представительство правовых интересов домохозяйств, которым грозит выселение

Ole 'A'ai ma le Itumalo o San Francisco



FUAFUAGA TAU FA'AOFI mo le 2020-2024 Fuafuaga Tu'ufa'atasia

Mo le maimoaina e tagata laua'itele mai le
Aso 29 o Iulai, 2019 e o'o atu ile Aso 19 o Aukuso, 2019

Ofisa ole Pulenu'u, Matagauega o Fale ma le Atiina'e Fa'alaua'itele (MOHCD)
Ofisa ole Atiina'e o Galuega ma Galuega (OEWD)
Matagaluega o Tagata ua leai ni Fale ma Fesoasoani Fa'apitoa (HSH)

FUAFUAGA FAATAATIA MO LE 2020-2024

Upu Tomua

Mo le lagolagoina ole fa'atinoina ole Fuafuaga Tu'ufa'atasia 2020-2024, Le iloiloga o tulaga e fa'afaigata ai e tagata ona ulufale atu i Fale Taugofie, ma le Avanoa mo Fale mo e ua maua ile faama'i ole HIV, sa fa'ao'o atu ai e le Ofisa ole Pulenu'u i lona Matagaluega o Fale ma le Atiina'e Fa'alaua'itele se talosaga i le mamalu o tagata nuu o San Francisco faapea i latou e afaina i ia fuafuaga, mo se feiloa'iga ma se fetufaiga. Ole fetufaiga lenei ole a mafai ai e lenei ofisa ona faavasega vaega taua i mea tau Fale ma le Atiina'eina Fa'alaua'itele ina ia mafai ona fa'agaoioi ni fa'amoemoe po'o matati'a fa'atu olo'o ua fa'ata'atia i totonu o nei fuafuaga mautu. Ole a fa'atauaina e le matagaluega lenei o le MOHCD so'o se manatu autu ma finagalo ole a fa'aalia mai e le mamalu ole atunu'u, ile taimi latou te faatinoina ai le fa'atupeina ma le fa'atinoina o 'au'aunaga mo le manuia lau'itele o le 'a'ai ae maise i mea tau Fale e nonofo ai.

O lenei tusi fa'apitoa olo'o iai totonu fuafuaga uma mo le 2020-2024 Fuafuaga Tu'ufa'atasia. O fuafuaga tau fa'aofi uma lava mo le iloiloga o tulaga e fa'afaigata ai e tagata ona ulufale atu i Fale Taugofie ole a fa'aavanoaina mo le maimoaga ma le faitioga e le mamalu ole atunu'u ile tau'uga ole tau mafanafana se'i o'o atu le amataga ole tau malulu ole tausga nei lava. O fuafuaga tau fa'aofi mo le fa'atinoina o Fale mo e ua maua i le fa'ama'i ole HIV ole a talanoaina lea ile Vaega e Talanoaina Fale mo HIV; afai e te fia auai i le talanoaga lea fa'ailoa mai fa'amolemole.

Fa'amoemoe o lenei Tusi Fa'apitoa

O le tusi faapitoa lenei e mulimulita'i i le fa'atinoina o le Fa'amoemoe Tusia mo Fesuia'iga ua 'au tasi iai matagaluega nei ole MOHCD/OEWD/HSH, olo'o fa'amatalaina mai e le manatu autu ua ta'atia mo le fa'atinoina o nei polokalama ma fa'asinomaga e fa'apea:

“O tagata malolosi ma le sogasoga i San Francisco olo'o faamanuaina i avanoa tutusa mo le fa'aeaina.”

Ina ia fa'atinoina lea manatu autu e lima taunu'uga taua ma le maua'uga olo'o ua iai i lenei tusi faapitoa. O taunu'uga maua'uga nei e lima olo'o tofu ma se lisi o mataupu autu sa tu'uina mai e le mamalu ole atunu'u sa mafai ona faatalanoaina mo lea faamoemoe. O loo iai ma se lisi o taunu'uga poo matati'a oloo fia ausia e mataupu taua nei. Ona iai lea ma Gaoioiga Faapitoa mo le faatinoina o taunu'uga po'o matati'a fa'atu ta'itasi nei.

O upu uma e iai se laina i lalo ole a fa'amatalaina au'ili'ili ile vaega fa'ai'u ole tusi fa'apitoa lenei e ta'ua ole Glossary.

Toe Fa'amanatu ma Fautuaga

Ole tusi fa'apitoa lenei ole a avanoa mo le maimoaina e le mamalu ole atunu'u mo ni o latou faitioga po'o manatau fa'aalia mai le aso 29 o Iulai, 2019 se'ia oo atu ile aso 19 o Aukuso, 2019. E te mafai ona taga'i i le atoaga ole tusi fa'apitoa lenei e ala ile upega tafa'ilagi po'o lou maliu atu i se tasi o nei nofoaga e te faitauina ai se kopi lomai:

FUAFUAGA FAATAATIA MO LE 2020-2024

- MOHCD, 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor;
- OEWD at City Hall, Room 448, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place and 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor; and
- Main Branch of the SF Public Library, 100 Larkin Street, 5th Floor, Government Information Center.

E avanoa lou tusia o ni manatu ma avatu i le au faigaluega i nofoaga nei. A e finagalo e lafo i se tusi ou manatu e mafai ona lafo i le tuatusi lenei: MOHCD, Strategic Planning Staff, 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103. So'o se manatu e taunu'u atu ole a fa'apea ona tufaina i le vaega fa'apitoa e tataua ona o'o atu iai lea manatu. Afai ole a momoli atu sou manatu fa'amolemole ia tusia i se auala e faigofie ona silafia ai e le au faigaluega po'o fea le gaoioiga faapitoa poo le matati'a sa e faitauina i lenei tusi fa'apitoa, oloo fa'atatau iai lou manatu po'o se faitioga fo'i.

E vala'auina fo'i le mamalu ole atunuu ina ia faatasi atu ise fonotaga faapitoa mo lenei fuafuaga ole a faia i le aso Gafua, aso lima o Aukuso, 2019 ile ono ile afiafi. Ole a faia lea fonotaga ile HSA Born Auditorium, 170 Otis Street, San Francisco, CA 94103.

E momoli atu le fa'afetai ona o lou auai i lenei taumafaiga. Mo nisi fa'amatalaga alu ile <https://sfmohcd.org/plans-development> pe vala'au atu ile telefoni 415-701-5500.

FUAFUAGA FAATAATIA MO LE 2020-2024

FAAMOEMOE 1: IA NOFO FALE AIGA MA TAGATA TA'ITO'ATASI UMA I FALE MAUTU

Manatu Autu 1A: Fa'atino ma fa'amautuina le avanoa i soo se tasi mo fale taugofie

Matati'a 1 Ai: Ia toe fa'aopoopoina ma fausia fale taugofie

Gaoioiga Faapitoa:

- Ia sa'ili atu ni alaga tupe mo le fa'atupeina o le fauina o Fale Taugofie
- Ia fa'atauina ni fale mai e olo'o pule ai mo le fa'aliliuina i potu taugofie
- Ia fa'alateleina atu tulaga o nei Fale Taugofie i nofoaga o lo'o nofoia e tagata maumea po'o nofoaga e maua ai avanoa lelei
- Fa'aleleia le feutanaiga ile va ole Matagaluega o Fuafuaina, le Matagaluega o Asiasiga o Fale, ma le Vaega ole Ofisa ole Pulenu'u oloo faafeagai ma tulaga o Tagata e iai Mana'oga Fa'apitoa i avanoa mo Fale ae maise mo le fa'atinoina ise auala vave le fauina o fale fou
- Ia fa'amautuina le galuea'ina o vaega o le fa'amoemoe mo Fale Taugofie e ala ile HOPE SF
- Ia maitauina le faasologa o le faatinoina o potu ma fale e taugofie atu i lo'o le tau masani i lea nofoaga i gaoioiga faapitoa ua iai Maliliega mo Atiina'e i lalo ole pulega a le Polokalama mole Fa'avanoaina o Fale i So'ose Tasi
- Ia fa'aauau le toe va'aia ma le fa'amaonia ole tauaofiaga o fa'amatalaga e uiga i tagata o lo'o fia maua ia Fale Taugofie mai le Polokalama mo le Fa'aavanoaina o Fale i So'ose Tasi ina ia latou silafia tulaga 'ese'ese i mataupu ma faatinoga o ia 'au'aunaga.
- Ia taga'i ile fa'ateleina ole fuainumera o potu ma Fale Taugofie poo le ADA i lalo ole Atiina'e Fa'alaua'itele a le Ofisa ole Pulenu'u (MOHCD)
- Ia toe fa'aopoopoina fale poo nofoaga mo i latou oloo maua ile ma'i ole HIV
 - Ia sa'ili auala lelei e toe fa'ato'ateleina ai nofoaga mo tagata
 - Fa'aleleia avanoa o le Plus Housing Program poo le polokalama ole Fa'aopoopoina o Fale ina ia ofi atu i fale ole HOPWA
- Ia toe fa'aopoopoina fale mo i latou ua leai ni fale e nonofo ai pe sa leai se mea e nonofo ai.

Matati'a 1Aii: Fa'asaoina o Fale Taugofie

Gaoioiga Fa'apitoa

- Ia fa'atauina fale a o iai se avanoa e le'i matua taugata ai fale nei.
- Ia toe fa'afouina Fale Taugofie olo'o iai nei ina ia puipuia ai le taugofie o nei fale

FUAFUAGA FAATAATIA MO LE 2020-2024

- la faia feutana'iga ma e pulea fale nei mo le toe fa'aauauina o tau taugofie o nei fale
- la sa'ilia auala fou mo le fa'atinoina ai o alaga tupe ina ia saogalemu fale taugofie e aofia ai ma le fa'aogaina o tupe mai isi matagaluega
- la fa'aauau ona fa'amalosia le fa'atupeina o le RAD in ia fa'atumauiina le fesoasoani i Fale Taugofie mai le Federal po'o le Malo tele.
- la fa'atumauiina le ave'eseina o le lead po'o mea faufale o'ona
- la fa'atumauiina le lagolagoina o polokalama mo le toe fa'aleleia o fale taugofie ae maise fale olo'o nonofo ai tagata matitiva, ma e olo'o mana'omia le fa'ateteleina ole saogalemu, faafaigofie le ulu fale ma le alu ese, ma le faafaigofie ona maua o togafiti a foma'i poo le lata ifo iai o falema'i, ae le gata i lea ole lata ane o le Solar power poo eletise e aumai mai le la
- Sa'ili o auala e fesoasoani atu ai i e oloo pulea a latou fale oloo ua tuai ona maua se fesoasoani mo le faaleleia o a latou nofoaga
- Ina ia toe mata'i e o pulea a latou lava fale ma e oloo pulea fale tetele mo le usita'ia o vaega eseese o nei polokalama a le Malo
- la maua se feutanaiga o Matagaluega a le Malo ma Sosaiete Fesoasoani olo'o ave a latou fesoasoani mo tagata oloo pule a latou fale ma o loo fia maua se fesoasoani mo le faaleleia o nei fale

Matati'a 1Aiii: la faaleleia atili ituaiga faamaumauga poo su'esu'ega mo le faaputuina o le aofa'i o Fale Taugofie ma le aofa'i ua nofoia i lalo o nei polokalama

Gaoioiga Faapitoa

- la faaleleia atili mea faigaluega oloo fa'aogaina e iloa ai le aofa'i o Fale Taugofie ma le toatele ua nofoia i fale oloo i lalo ole MOHCD
- la fa'aauau ona fa'aleleia ma fa'ateteleina ole DAHLIA (Fa'amaumauga o le aofa'i o Fale Taugofie, Fa'amatalaga ma Pepa Faatumu) fa'apea ma le malosia ole au fa'atau latou te faamaumauina o le avanoa o Fale Taugofie e aofia ai ma ni su'esu'ega i Fale Taugofie e maua ile Upega Tafa'lagi.
- Feutana'i ma isi vaega ole DAHLIA oloo i isi nofoaga mo nisi faamaumauga ina ia fetufaa'i nei malamalama mo le fa'ateteleina o le atamai i tulaga tau mana'o i Fale i San Francisco.

Manatu Autu 1B: la fa'ataugofie Fale mo le au matitiva

Matati'a 1Bi: la faaitiitia tau o faatulagaga o polokalama ina ia mafai ai ona siitia ai alaga tupe mo Fale Taugofie ina ia fesoasoani atu ai i aiga ma tagata matitiva

Gaoioiga Faapitoa

FUAFUAGA FAATAATIA MO LE 2020-2024

- Saili ituaiga fausaga fale e fou ma auala e faaitiitia ai le tau faatulagaina o ituaiga fausaga fale faamodular
- Ia fa'aavanoaina fanua e maua fua poo fanua taugofie e avea ma fanua e faaoga mo le fauina o Fale Taugofie
- Sa'ili nisi auala mai le Setete poo le afioaga lenei mo tupe faanono
- Ia galulue faatasi ma matagaluega a le Setete faapea le Malo tele poo le Federal ina ia mafai ona maua mai ni fanua e faatatau mo Fale Taugofie, ae maise Nofoaga mo tagata ua leai ni o latou fale

Matati'a 1Bii: Ia toe faataugofieina atili fale mautotogi

Gaoioiga Faapitoa:

- Ia faatumauiina le lagolagoina o le faaumiina o taimi e mautotogi ai se tasi i Fale Taugofie ma ia sa'ili le faateteleina o avanoa mo e e matitiva ina ia faamautuina ai le latou nofo i se fale e tasi
 - Ia avea ma sui i se talanoaga mo le faamautina o alaga tupe mai le Setete poo le Malo Tele e ala i le faatupeina o fesoasoani mo aiga matitiva e faaatoaina ai le tupe e totogi ai le latou rent
- Ia faaauauina na pulea le Vaega e Faatupeina le faaatoaina o tupe totogi i fale mautotogi
- Ia faalateleina le aofa'o o polokeki a le AMI, ina ia faaopoopoina nisi Fale Taugofie mo e matitiva pe lima vaivai
- Amataina ni polokalama fou e faatupeina ai le faaatoaina o tupe totogi i masina ta'itasi i fale mautotogi mo tagata matitiva
- Ia siitia le aofa'i ole tupe e mafai ona fesoasoani atu ai i tagata e maua i le faama'i ole HIV ma o latou aiga
- Ia siitia le aofa'i o tupe mo aiga e leai ne o latou fale ma isi tagata oloo mafatia i tulaga ole le lava o mea e nonofo ai

Matati'a 1Biii: Faateteleina avanoa ina ia pulea ai e le tagata lona ia Fale

Gaoioiga Faapitoa:

- Ia faamautuina le faia o a'oa'oga mo i latou oloo fia faatauina se fale fou faapea ma a'oa'oga mo i latou ua faatauina a latou fale fou
- Ia faaauauina avanoa e mafai ai ona pule toatele pe pule faatasia e nisi se Fale ae maise i latou e maualalo pe feololo a latou totogi.
- Ia faaalualu i luma le toatele o tagata e pulea a latou lava fale

FUAFUAGA FAATAATIA MO LE 2020-2024

- la sa'ili auala e mafai ai e tagata e pule toatele pe pule faatasia se fale ina ia toe faatauina seisi fale ae faatau atu le fale muamua
- la iloilo ina le fefaatauiga o fale e i latou e pulea toatele poo le pule faatasia ose fale ina ia mautinoa le mafai ona latou faatauina seisi fale ile lumana'i
- Iloilo ina avanoa e fesoasoani atu ai i tagata e pule i o latou lava fale i le taugata o tupe totogi a Sosaiete o Tagata e pulea a latou Fale (HOA) faapea ma tupe mo le faafouina o fale
- la faatumauiina le sa'iliga o alagatupe maua mo le DALP mo i latou oloo totogi lelei a latou galuega e aofia ai ma tagata e faasaoina tagata manu'a ma i latou e galue faafaiaoga
- la faatumauiina le lagolagoina o le polokalama Faailoga Aitalafu tupe ma Mokesi
- la Sa'ili mo fuafuaga Faapitoa e siitia ai le toatele o le au faanono tupe mo i latou e fia auai i le polokalama mo faatauina o Fale fou
- la faaauau ona faaititia tulaga mana'omia i le fefaatauiga o fale i lalo ole MOHCD pe a uia le vaega ole DAHLIA

Matati'a 1Biv: Faaopoopoina le avanoa e maua ai Fale Mautotogi ma Fale Faatau motu

Gaoioiga Faapitoa

- Fa'aauiina ole lagolagoina o a'oa'oga ma fautuaga i tagata ina ia fesoasoani atu ai mo le latou silafia o polokalama eseese oloo avanoa i le tulaga o le sa'iliga o Fale Taugofie
 - Faaopoopo iai ma fautuaga mo i latou oloo afaina ile faama'i ole HIV ina ia maua se fesoasoani i femalagaiga ma le faafaleina
 - la maua fautuaga mo i latou sa nonofo i le auala tele ma isi vaega ole atunuu e afaina i nisi o faaletonu ile tau sa'iliga o se mea e nofo ai
 - Toe faaopoopo nisi fesoasoani mo le faaleleia o gaoioiga a i latou oloo faia galuega fesoasoani i tagata fia maua se fesoasoani ina ia mafai ona latou tautua pea ma fesoasoani i le lautele
- la faatumauiina le faalkeleia ma le faamautuina ole DAHLIA
 - Toe faaopoopo le faatinoina o gaoioiga ma nisi polokalama aoga e mafai ona fesoasoani atu ai i tagata fia maua ni Fale
 - la faalauteleina atu le silafia mo isi Fale taugofie i San Francisco e le o faatupeina e le MOHCD
 - la faalauteleina atu fesootaiga e aofia ai Nofoga Mautu o Sosaiete oloo aofia ai ma polokalama fesoasoani mo i latou oloo sa'ili ni a latou galuega ae le gata i lea o Faletusi
- Faateleina le silafia i le avanoa o fesoasoani mo i latou oloo fia maua ni Fale Taugofie

FUAFUAGA FAATAATIA MO LE 2020-2024

- Faafesoota'i atu i sosaiete laiti oloo fesoasoani i ituaiga tagata faapitoa e le to'atele
- la faaauau le fesoasoani mo i latou oloo fauina nofoaga tetele ma fale ae legata i lea o i latou oloo va'aia fale tetele ina ia latou tuuina mai nisi nofoaga e faatinoina ai lea fesoasoani mo tagata e mana'omia le fesoasoani ia faaavanoaina ni fale poo potu mautotogi mo i latou oloo faailogaina ona o faama'i poo le le mauoloa.
- Faia ni faatusatusaga o polokalama faaLotto poo le se'i mo le sa'iliina o nisi e manuia i nei polokalama ina ia mautinia oloo faatinoina nei polokalama i le auala amiotonu
- la faaauau ona taga'i manino i polokalama faaLotto poo le se'i ina ia mautinoa oloo oo atu nei fuafuaga i e oloo faamoemoeina e manuia ai
 - la mautinoa oloo ave fale poo potu ADA i tagata oloo tatau ona latou mauaina nei fesoasoani

Manatu Autu 1C: Taofia ma faaitiitia Tagata e leai ni fale

Matati'a 1Ci: Faaleleia o gaoioiga e fesoasoani e maua ai e tagata le auala e aga'i atu ai se tagata ile pule i lona lava fale

Gaoioiga Faapitoa:

- Faatinoina o fuafuaga mo tagata matutua, aiga ma le autalavou
- Faamaninoina o tulaga uma oloo faia i totonu o nei polokalama mo le silafia e le mamalu o le atunuu

Matati'a 1Cii: Faaitiitia le aofa'i o tagata nonofo i le auala e leai ni fale, amata mai tagata matutua, au talavou ma aiga

Gaoioiga Faapitoa:

- Faatulaga ni polokalama e taofia ai le nofo o tagata i le auala e aunoa ma se fale e nofo ai, ma ia faasino tonu ia polokalama i e ua iai se talafaasolopito i lea tulaga o le leai o se fale e nofo ai, ae maise nisi oloo ua tuli esea mai ni fale e pulea e le Malo
- la faatulaga ni fale mautu e nonofo ai tagata matutua, au talavou ma aiga

Matati'a 1Ciii: la mautinoa e leai se aiga oloo iai fanau iti e leai se fale e nonofo ai

Gaoioiga Faapitoa:

- la tusituaisa uma suafa o aiga oloo iai fanau iti oloo le maua se fale e nonofo ai e ala i vaega oloo galulue ma fesoasoani i tagata faapea
- la tuuina atu i aiga oloo iai fanau iti le avanoa e oo atu ai ise nofoaga e malu puipuia ai

FUAFUAGA FAATAATIA MO LE 2020-2024

- la faateteleina moega ma nofoaga faamautu atu iai aiga ma a latou fanau iti ua leai se fale e nonofo ai

Matati'a 1Civ: Toe faaleleia le tali atu o le Malo i le faafitauli ole nonofo o tagata i le auala ua leai ni fale ma faaumatia nofoaga fale ie mautu

Gaioioiga Fapitoa:

- Faitauina le aofa'i o fale ie ma e oloo nonofo i taavale ile ta'i 3 masina
- la faaoo atu i nei taulaga fale ie le fesoasoani ma faailoa iai polokalama fou nei
- la ave ese mai tagata i fale ie ae ave i fale mauualalo
- la faia ni suesuega ina ia faatulagaina tagata e fiamaua vave le fesoasoani i totonu o taulaga fale ie nei e ala i e oloo faia le fesoasoani tumau i nei tagata

Matati'a 1Cv: la tuufaatasia le galuega a le MOHCD ma le matagaluega e va'aia e oloo nonofo ile auala e leai ni o latou fale ma le vaega e fesoasoani ile faafaleina o tagata

Gaioioiga Faapitoa:

- la faatumaui le faateleina ma le fauina o fale fesoasoani mautu faapea ma le faatulagaina o nofoaga e lisiina potu ma nofoaga tumau e iai le Ulufale Faapitoa
- Toe faaleleia le galulue faatasi o vaega nei e iai le HOPWA, RAD, PBV, ma isi ituaiga fale poo potu fesoasoani
- la faia se fesootaiga i le va ole DAHLIA ma le Ulufale Faapitoa

Matati'a 1Cvi: Faalauteleina o fesoasoani ina ia faatapula le aofa'i o aiga nonofo ile auala e leai ni o latou fale ae maise i latou oloo latalata ona oo atu i le pagatia lea ole nofo ile auala ua leai se fale e nofo ai

Gaioioiga Faapitoa:

- la fauina ni vaega fesoasoani faapea ma tausima'i i totonu o fale fesoasoani faapitoa nei
- la faapa'aga ma isi faalapotopotoga mo le tuuina atu o fesoasoani faapitoa i e ua mana'omia lea fesoasoani ma oloo nonofo i nei fale fesoasoani faapitoa
- Faamuamua le tagata poo aiga ua leva ona nonofo i le auala tele ina ia latou maua le fesoasoani i tulaga ole mauaina o Fale Taugofie

Manatu Autu 1D: Tuuina atu le fesoasoani mo le faamautuina o nofoaga tumau ia i latou ua ofi i totonu o Fale Taugofie

FUAFUAGA FAATAATIA MO LE 2020-2024

Matati'a 1Di: Faaitiitia le tuli eseea o i latou ua maua nofoaga mautotogi mai o latou nofoaga

Gaioioiga Faapitoa:

- I lalo ole polokalama ole Aia e maua ai e se tasi le fesoasoani mai se Loia ia maua e nei tagata le fesoasoani atoatoa i tulaga faaletulafono mo i latou oloo nofoia fale mautotogi, oloo tau tuli ese e le e pule ile fale
- Faaauau le fesoasoani i e oloo mautotogi ina ia maua ni o latou fautuaga, fesoasoani ma le faamalamalamaina o mataupu, le faia o talanoaga, le faamautuina o polokalama mo fale mautotogi faatasi ai ma fesoasoani faatopetope tau tupe e tototgi ai le latou rent
- Toe faaauau le polokalama mo le fesoasoani tau tupe i e o fia maua se fesoasoani i o latou tupe e mautotogi ai i se fale
- Ia faalatalatana mai le tele o vaega eseese oloo latou faia nei ituaiga fesoasoani mo tagata ua leai ni fale ae maise ina ia fesoasoani atu iai pe afai ua iai se tulaga ole a tuli eseina ai mai le latou fale.

Matati'a 1Dii: Faateleina le avanoa mo fesoasoani i oloo nonofo i Fale e pulea e le Malo, polokalama mo le faatupeina o le tologiina o fale mautotogi, polokalama ole RAD, ma fale talimalo e tasi le potu e nofo ai se tasi

Gaioioiga Faapitoa:

- Ina ia faaauauina le felagolagoma'i ma faatulagaina o isi fesoasoani e aofia ai le faateleina o le poto i tulaga eseese o ia polokalama ae maise le faalauteleina o galuega fesoasoani, ole fasootaiga, ole faamautuina o galuega fai faapea le galulue faatasi ole HOPE SF ma RAD
- Faalauteleina o fesoasoani mo i latou oloo nonofo i fale talimalo ta'i tasi potu moe
- Tuufaatasia o galuega fesoasoani ma le faaleleia o le auala e fesoasoani atu ai mo le faaleleia o avanoa e mafai ai ona tutoatasi se tagata i tulaga tau tupe
- Ia sailia ma faaavanoaina fesoasoani e pei ole fautuaina o tagata ma le faatapulaaina ole tulieseina o e oloo i lea polokalama mai nofoaga nofo mautotogi, a'oa'oina o tulaga ile faaogaina o tupe, ae maise le avanoa o fautuaga i polokalama ole HOPE SF ma le RAD
- Faaauauina le galulue faatasi ma sosaiete i le afioaga poo tagata laua'itele oloo faafoeina polokalama eseese e faaleleia ai le nuu

Matati'a 1Diii: Fesoasoani atu i isi tagata oloo nonofo i Fale Taugofie ina ia maua e i latou le alualu i luma i tulaga tau fale

Gaioioiga Faapitoa:

- Ia faia se tuufaatasiga o pepa e faatalofa atu ai i tagata ua maua a latou Fale Taugofie ma ia fesoata'i atu ai i isi vaega fesoasoani oloo iai

FUAFUAGA FAATAATIA MO LE 2020-2024

- la galulue faatasi ma matagaluega a le Malo poo le A'ai mo nisi fesoasoani e ala atu i le togafitia o tulaga faaletonu ole mafaufau faapea ma le faaogaina o fualaau oona
- Faafesootai tagata nei ma ni vaega e mafai ona tu ile va o latou ma isi pe a mana'omia
- la faamalosi le faailoina muamua i le oloo nofo mautotogi, ole a tuli ese latou mai se nofoaga faapitoa a le MOHCD
- la toe faaopoopo nisi nofoaga e pei ona mana'omia e nofoaga a le HOPWA ma isi nofoaga oloo fauina

Matati'a 1Div: la faateteleina le femalaga'i i8le va o fale mo e e maua ile HIV ma isi nofoaga

Gaioioiga Faapitoa:

- la faia ni sa'iliga maumaututu pe a oo ina siitia ese le tagata sa nofo i Fale taugofie ma ua sauni e suia i se fale ua faataau i lona ia tulaga lelei.

FAAMOEMOE 2: O AIGA MA TAGATA TA'ITO'ATASI E MALOLOS I LOTO MA MAFAI ONA TUTO'ATASI I TULAGA TAU TUPE

Manatu Autu 2A: la faamalosi le tulaga e saunia ai mo le faafaigaluegaina

Matati'a 2Ai: la faaulu atu tagata oloo faigata na maua ni galuega i avanoa o galuega maua i le tele o ituaiga galuega eseese

Gaioioiga Faapitoa:

- la tuuina atu ni fesoasoani i tagata vaivai ina ia saunia ai mo avanoa e faafaigaluega ai
- Ole a galulue faatasi le MOHCD ma le Matagaluega o Tupe Maua ma le Faafaigaluegaina o Tagata (OEWD) ina ia maua ni galuega a tagata vaivai nei i totonu o a latou lava nuu poo a'ai
- la faalauteleina le Local Hire e faasagatonu a latou polokalama i tagata vaivai oloo nonofo i se a'ai ia muamua latou i galuega tau faufale ma ia sa'ili le Local Hire mo galuega ole va'aia pe pulea fanua ma fale
- la faamalosi au atu i kaumpani fau fale ina ia faatele avanoa mo tagata vaivai i o latou galuega tetele
- la tuuina atu sootaga i avanoa mo galuega i le DAHLIA
- Faasalalau galuega pe a amata i le upega tafa'ilagi a le MOHCD

FUAFUAGA FAATAATIA MO LE 2020-2024

Manatu Autu 2B: Faalateleina avanoa e ui atu i le faaleleia o le tautala i le gagana faaperetania ae maise nisi o aga e tatau on masani ai le tagata pe a su'e se galuega

Matati'a 2Bi: Toe faaleleia o le auala atu i polokalama ole MOHCD poo a latou fesoasoani maua e ala lea i faaliliuina o tusituisga ma tusitusi faakompiuta

Gaioioiga Faapitoa:

- la faaleleia o le tautala i le gagana peretania mo le aga'i atu i polokalama ma fesoasoani ole MOHCD, fonotaga faalaua'itele ale a'ai ma isi fono
- la faatulaga ma faamautuina se tusi taulima e maua uma ai polokalama ma fesoasoani atoa ai ma le gagana oloo mafai ona faaogaina i ia fesoasoani ma polokalama
- la taumafai ina ia mafai ona faaogaina pe faaliliuina le polokalama ole DAHLIA ma fesoasoani i gagana eseese ina ia mafai e tagfata uma ona maua ia fesoasoani

Matati'a 2Bii: la faamautuina le atamai faapitoa ma a'oa'oga faapitoa mo tagata uma

Gaioioiga Faapitoa:

- la faamanatu ma faamautuina poto faapitoa ae maise le poto masani i tulkaga ole faia ole soifuaga, mauaina le GED poo le tusi faau'uina mai le Aoga Maua, poo tipiloma ae maise le malamalama ile gagana faaperetania
- la faaauauina le sa'iliga ole atamai e ala i aoga mo le poto faapitoa ina ia faafaigofie on toe siitia atu le tulaga e ala i a'oa'oga faapitoa
- la tuufaatasia matagaluega uma nei faapea ma aoga faapitoa ina ia mafai ona toe faapoopoina ni fesoasoani faapitoa

Matati'a 2Biii: Faaleleia le malamalama ile faaogaina o tupe mo se lumana'i manuia

Gaioioiga Faapitoa:

- la faamalositia le sa'ili atu o fautuaga i tulaga ole faaogaina o le tupe, faateleina o aseta ma le faaleleia ole credit, ole faaitiitia ole aitalafu, fautuaga ma le faaleleia i mea tau credit
- la faateteleina o le atamai o tagata e ala i a'oa'oga ina ia latou iloa le faaogaina lelei o a latou tupe ina ia aua le faama'umauina ae ia maua pea e nei tagata ni feiloaiga mo le fautuaina pea i mataupu e maua ai le faatamaoaigaina i le tulaga ole faaogaina o tupe maua i se taimi umi ma saogalemu ai mai le mativa
- Ole faaluaina o fesoasoani tau tupe i totonu o nofoaga e iai le toatele o tagata sa'ili fesoasoani mo Fale Taugofie ma isi polokalama faatulagaina mo i latou

Matati'a 2Biv: la faaleleia le faaogaina o le Kompiuta ma le upega tafa'ilagi

Gaioioiga Faapitoa:

FUAFUAGA FAATAATIA MO LE 2020-2024

- Faavaeina ni a'oa'oga ile tulaga o mea tau faaogaina o le Kompiuta e amata mai le tulaga tau amata faasolo atu i le tulaga taufeololo ae faai'uina i le tulaga ole atamai faapuitoa i lea matafaioi faadigital. Ia faia ia a'oa'oga e ala i polokalama ma vasega faapitoa e iai tulaga o le ofi atu i soo itula faapea ma isi aoga oloo faatuina i totonu o le A'ai mo le fesoasoani i tagata ina ia maua lea matafaioi faapitoa
- Ia faaleleia Kompiuta ua tuai ma tufa nisi kompiuta i aiga e vaivai le tagolima
- Ia galulue faatasi ma isi o sosaiete oloo iai i totonu o nofoaga eseese e aofia ai fale tusi ma Nofoaga faapitoa i totonu o A'ai e mafai ona faaogaina ai a latou kompiuta ina ia faalateleina le malamalama i lea matafaioi ia i latou oloo i le MOHCD
- Ia lagolagoina polokalama e faaavanoaina le 'au'aunaga e ala i le upega tafa'ilagi e a'oa'oina ai i latou oloo afifio i nofoaga poo Fale Taugofie
- Ina ia maua fua le ofi atu ile initaneti mo i latou oloo ta'ua o tagata SRO
- Fauina malosiaga faatekanolosi i totonu o nofoaga e mau ai le toatele o tagata poo CBOs ma ia faamalosia ai le au faigaluega a le CBO latou te ta'ita'iina lea au'aunaga mo le faamautuina ole atamai faadigital e ala i vasega ma fesoasoani

Manatu Autu 2C: Ia faatutusa le avanoa e maua ai e nei tagata fesoasoani faaLoia mo le tulaga o opepa femalaga'i ma isi tulaga faapitoa

Matati'a 2Ci: Ia faateleina le avanoa mo le fesoasoani mai o e malamalama ile tulafono

Gaioioiga Faapitoa:

- Ia faatumauiina galuega faatino o le tulafono mo le faiga o pepa o femalaga'iga
- Ia faateteleina le fesoasoani ma le faatinoina o nisi alaga tupe poo fesoasoani i vaega o le tulafono faalevanofolelei ole atunuu i tulaga tau galuega, fefaataua'iga, begefiki ma le tulaga o tupe maua pe a afaina le tino ma ua faaletonu ai le galuega

Manatu Autu 2D: Fesoasoani atu i aiga ina ia fesoata'i ma fesoasoani faatulagaina mo tagata laua'itele

Matati'a 2Di: Faateleina le avanoa mo le mauaina o fesoasoani faalaua'itele

Gaioioiga Faapitoa:

- Faaauauina le felagolago ma'i ma le faatulagaina o fesoasoani faalaua'itele e iai le faailoaina o mataupu faapitoa ae le gata i lea o le fetufa'iina o suafa, o le tuufaatasia o auala fesoasoani ma le faatinoina o su'esu'ega ma le faaleleia o tulaga oloo aafia ai tagata ta'ito'atasi oloo iai i ia polokalama

FUAFUAGA FAATAATIA MO LE 2020-2024

- la tuufaatasia 'au'aunaga eseese ae maise le faasili ole atamai i matafaioi ole a maua e se tasi ona o le tele o fesoasoani maua mai nei vaega ole Malo
- la lagolagoina le tele o fesootaiga poo feutanaiga faale'a'ai mo le manuia o tagata ole a iai i nei polokalama

FAAMOEMOE 3: O NUU E IAI A LATOU FAASINOMAGA UA FAATAMAOAIGAINA ILE SOIFUA MALOLOINA FAALETINO, FAALEVAFEALOALOA'I MA LE FAALEPISINISI

Manatu Autu 3A: Faaleleia fale ma nofoaga ile a'ai

Matati'a 3Ai: la mautinoa ole a mautu lelei nofoaga a vaega galulue mo le faatinoina o fesoasoani ia ua sauni

Gaioioiga Faapitoa:

- la faaauauina ona faatino le fesoasoani mo le faaopopoina ma le faaleleia o fale poo Ofisa oloo faatinoina ai galuega a nei matagaluega
- Ina ia faatulagaina le su'esu'ega ole aofa'iga o tupe e faamautuina ai le faaleleia o fale ma ofisa poo mea e fai ai le galuega ina ia umi se taimi o faatino nei fesoasoani
- Ina ia faatinoina le fesoasoani mo le tusia o ata e fau ai fale faatu poo mea e faatino ai le faamoemoe mo le faaogaina lelei o nei fale poo ofisa
- la fesoasoani i sosaiete ina ia latou maua fanua lisi poo fanua faatau ina ia faatino ai le galuega ma manuia ai le atunuu

Matati'a 3Aii: Faaogaina o fanua faalaua'itele i totonu o le a'ai

Gaioioiga Faapitoa:

- la fausia ma faaleleia vaega eseese i totonu ole afioaga mo le tautuaina e i latou oloo tuuina atu le fesoasoani mo tagata pagatia

Manatu Autu 3B: la faamalositia pisinisi laiti ma avanoa mo pisinisi eseese

Matati'a 3Bi: la faamalositia le faatulagaina ma le faamautuina o pisinisi o tagata oloo nonofo i ia nofoaga ole a faatino ai le galuega poo le polokalama lenei

- la faaauau ona fesoasoani atu i pisinisi e ala atu i fesoasoani faapitoa e ui atu i pa'aga faaleaganuu, ituaiga atunuu, ma le gagana ise auala mo le manuia o pisinisi ae maise le faatuina o pisinisi fou
- la faateteleina fesoasoani faapitoa mo pisinisi i totonu o nei nofoaga

FUAFUAGA FAATAATIA MO LE 2020-2024

- la faaaauau ona fesoasoani atu ina ia iai vaega tupe maua mai e faatino ai le faaleleia o nei pisinisi e all i tupe nono

Matati'a 3Bii: la faatu ma faamautuina ni alaga tupe i totonu o nofoaga nei e ala i le malosi o pisinisi

Gaioioiga Faapitoa:

- Faaauau ona lagolagoina le faateteleina o le tuputupu a'e o pisinisi ma alaga tupe e faatupe ai nei pisinisi
- la faaopoopoina ni alaga tupe mo le faaleleia o luma fale o taulaga ae m,aise nofoaga o loo nonofo ai tagata
- la faaopoopoina ni alaga tupe i le faaleleia o le ulufale ma le usita'ia o mana'oga o faatulaga i nofoaga fou
- la faaaauau le faatinoina o le tufaina atu o fesoasoani e ala i le taatia ole laufanua ina ia faapea ona manuia lautele ai fesoasoani ma polokalama eseese a le A'ai poo le Malo

Manatu Autu 3C: Faamalosia le galulue faatasi o tagata uma o se nofoaga ina ia faatino ai se fuafuaga manuia

Matati'a 3Ci: la fesoasoani atu i sosaiete a tagata o loo iai i totonu o nei nofoaga ma a latou fuafuaga fai

Gaioioiga Faapitoa:

- Faaauau le fesoasoani ina ia faamalosia le faavaeina ma le toe faateteleina o Pitonuu Faaleaganuu i lalo ole pulega a le Fono
- la toe faaopoopoina le fesoasoani i fuafuaga fai a pitonuu ta'itasi oloo taumafai e tuu faatasia o i latou oloo matitiva, leai se puipuiga, ma le vaega oloo le amana'iaina ina ia mafai ona latou galulue faatasi i totonu o lea nofoaga
- la faamalosia le faavaeina o ni fuafuaga tuma'oti mo le nofoaga lea ma e faatinoina e tagata nuu o ia nofoaga

Matati'a 3Cii: la faamalosia taumafaiga mo le faatuina o sosaiete fesoasoani i totonu o nofoaga nei

Gaioioiga Faapitoa:

- la tumau pea le lagolagoina o fesootaiga ile va o sosaiete i totonu o afioaga nei faatasi ai ma isi tagata poo vaega taua oloo iai i nei nofoaga oloo mafai ona latou faatuina ni auala e galulue faatasi ai ma fetufaa'i ai ituaiga tagata eseese oloo nonofo i ia nofoaga i se auala filemu ma le maopoopo
- la faaaauau ona faamalosia alaga tupe poo fesoasoani tau tupe mo nei sosaiete.

FUAFUAGA FAATAATIA MO LE 2020-2024

Manaoga Autu 3D: Ia lagolagoina mana’oga faapitoa o nei sosaiete ua faatuina i nei nofoaga faatasi ai ma pa’aga faaporofesa a le MOHCD

Matati’a 3Di: Faateteleina le malosi o sosaiete ua faatuina i nei nofoaga latou te faatinoina ai a latou fuafuaga

Gaioioiga Faapitoa:

- Ia faamautuina le malosi faalesosaiete o i latou oloo maua tupe faavae mai le MOHCD latou te faatinoina ai lea faamoemoe, e ala i vasega, galuega tuu faatasi o ni tagata, a’oa’oga mai nisi e atatamamai i nei mataupu, faapea ma nisi fesoasoani faapitoa
- Ia faamuamua le fauina ma le faamalositia o sosaiete oloo faavaeina i totonu o nei nofoaga e tagata oloo nonofo ai faatasi ai ma vaega ua leva ona latou faia nei fesoasoani mo tagata mafatia
- Ia faalelei i latou ole a galulue i nei sosaiete ile faaogaina o masini poo le tekalofo fou

FAAMOEMOE 4: IA LAVEA’IINA TAGATA OLOO TAU TULI ESEA MA FAAMAUTUINA LATOU NOFOAGA

Manatu Autu 4A: Ia faatalanoaina vaega le tutusa oloo ua aafia ai le siitia o le tamaoaga o se nofoaga pe a taofia le aveese faamalosi o tagata ma pisinisi

Matati’a 4Ai: Ia faamalositia tulaga ma polokalama e faamuamua ai le manuia o tagata ma pisinisi

Gaioioiga Faapitoa:

- Ia faaauau ona faia Lotto poo se se’i mo le avanoa e maua ai se fale
- Ia faia ni su’esu’ega ma faaleleia polokalama a le MOHCD mo le latou faamoemoe o se Nofoaga e Tuu faatasi ai Tagata ina ia fetauti ma faafiatauli oloo iai nei, ma ia faailoaina atu vaega e tutusa ai latou ma suiga ile Tulafono o le Malo e faatatau i Fuafuaga fai, faapea ma le faateteleina o tupe Nono e maua e sosaiete e le sa’ili polofiti mo le fauina o nofoaga faapenei
- Ia faamalositia le avanoa e toe fo’i atu ma toe mautotogi ai ni tagata mautotogi sa aveese faamalosi mai se fale
- Ia faamalositia le tulaga e mafai ai e le Malo ona faatauina se fale mautotogi ole a oo ina tagata tele mo le faatinoina o polokalama fesoasoani faapenei

Matati’a 4Aii: Ia una’iina pisinisi ina ia latou nofoia le foga fale a lalo o nei fale mautotogi fesoasoani mo tagata mafatia oloo pulea e le MOHCD

Gaioioiga Faapitoa:

-

FUAFUAGA FAATAATIA MO LE 2020-2024

- la galulue faatasi pisinisi ma le OEWD ina ia fesoasoani i nei pisinisi mo le fausia o potu e aoga mo pisinisi
- la galulue faatasi ma le OEWD ina ia faailoina le avanoa o nei tulaga pisinisi mo sosaiete e le sa'ili polofiti

Matati'a 4iii: CD: Faaitiitia le tuli esea o tagata mautotogi ma pisinisi

Gaioioiga Faapitoa:

- la faaogaina le fesoasoani mo le totogiina o rent o tagata ia taofia ai le tuli esea o tagata mai nofoaga mautotogi
- la toe faamalosia polokalama e iai le Aia o le tagata mautotogi i se Loia faatasi ai ma le faufautua i tagata ina ia mafai ona nonofo pea i fale oloo mautotogi ai
- Faavae ma faatinoina ni tulaga ina ia faaitiitia ai le tigaina o tagata ile siitia o tau e mautotogi ai ise fale
- Faateteleina polokalama ina ia faatumauina tagata e pule i fale mautotogi ina ia aua ne'i o ese mai se nofoaga oloo iai le fa'iloga tagata
- la galulue faatasi ma isi matagaluega a le Malo ina ia mautu le faatinoina o nei fuafuaga poo sosaiete fesoasoani i tagata mafatia, mo se vaitaimi umi
- la faamalosia Pitonuu Faaleaganuu ina ia mafai ona latou lagolagoina le faaitiitia o le malaga ese o tagata
- la faateteleina le avanoa mo tagata latou te mauaina ai fesoasoani mo pisinisi laiti ia oo mai i totonu o nofoaga e maualao le tamaoaiga ma ia nonofo ai pea i San Francisco

Manatu Autu 4B: la mautinoa ole a manuia ma faatuputeleina le tamaoaiga i pitonuu ole a aafia i nei polokalama

Matati'a 4Bi: la faamalosia le faafaigaluegaina o tagata o loo nonofo i ia nofoaga oloo pulea e le MOHCD

Gaioioiga Faapitoa:

- Galulue faatasi ma le OEWD ina ia saunia tagata e faigaluega ma ia maua ni galuega e tuuina iai tagata nei
- la tumau pea le fesoasoani i polokalama mo le sauni atu mo galuega faapea ma le faafaigaluegaina o tagata i lalo ole RAD ma le HOPESF poloketi

Matati'a 4Bii: la iai vaega eseese ole Malo e iai falema'i ma leoleo ma le au fui mu, i nofoaga oloo iai fale e pulea e le MOHCD

Gaioioiga Faapitoa:

FUAFUAGA FAATAATIA MO LE 2020-2024

- la galulue faatasi ma pa'aga ile Malo e iai le San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) i mataupu tau femalagaiga
- la galulue ma matagaluega faapitoa ole Malo ina ia faatinoina mana'oga faapitoa ma avanoa e faatino ai fesoasoani mai ia matagaluega

Matati'a 4Biii: Faavae polokalama e maua ai fesoasoani mai gaioioiga e manuia lautele ai ma faatamaoaigaina ai tagata nuu o le nofoaga

Gaioioiga Faapitoa:

- la faamautuina le faatulagaina o meatotino e matagofie ai se nofoaga i Fale Taugofie ae maise pe a tele fale mo tagata mafatia
- la galulue faatasi Pitonuu Faaleaganuu i o latou polokalama ma isi vaega ole nofoaga poo le nuu oloo faia tulaga nei
- la toe faapupulaina auala e mafai ai e pisinisi ma latou oloo nonofo i ia nofoaga ona siitia tulaga faatamaoaiga ma la mauaina o galuega
- la faalatalata atu i isi matagaluega a le malo mo ni manatu fou poo fuafuaga faatu ina ia fesoasoani atu ai i pisinisi laiti ma tagata fai pisinisi i totonu olea nofoaga

FAAMOEMOE 5: OLE A GALUE LE MALO INA IA AVEESEINA LE POGAI O LE FA'ILOGA LANU

Manatu Autu 5A: la faamautuina le tutusa ole avanoa mo soo se tagata latou te maua ai fesoasoani mai le Malo

Matati'a 5Ai: la saili mai alaga tupe, fuafuaga ma tulaga ina ia mautinoa le leai o se faailoga tagata i avanoa e au atu ai i polokalama o le MOHCD poo le OEWD

Gaioioiga Faapitoa:

- la toe teuteu ma faamautuina fesoasoani tuuina atu ina ia mautinoa le leai ose faailoga tagata
- Toe faaleleia fesoasoani tuuina atu ina ia oo atu i tagata mafatia ua leva ona latou iai i lea tulaga
- Faamalosia fesoasoani tuuina atu faaleaganuu ina ia faailoaina atu ia polokalama i tagata o a latou ituaiga
- la faamanoina vaega mautu o polokalama o Fale Taugofie ae maise le auala e mafai ai ese tasi ona ia ulufale i nei polokalama ma isi tulaga, ole a le iai se faailoga tagata
- la faamautina pe faaleleia polokalama ma fesoasoani a le MOHCD ina ia aveeseina ai le faailoga tagata

FUAFUAGA FAATAATIA MO LE 2020-2024

- la su'esu'eina pogai o le iai o le eseese o tulaga tau le manuia o taumafaiga o tagata e su'e avanoa i nei polokalama ma ia maua ai ni fesoasoani faapitoa ina ia aveesea ai le faailoga tagata a o saili e tagata Fale Taugofie
- la saili le tatau ona faaauau le polokalama ole Faailoga ole Faasili ona Mana'omia
- la toe siitia atu vaega tupe ma fesoasoani eseese i nofoaga poo tagata ua afaina tele i uiga faailoga tagata
- la su'esu'eina ma faaogaina le tulaga ole inosia o uiga faailoga tagata i le faaavanoaina o fesoasoani nei ae maise ile tuuina atu o galuega i e latou te fia faia se konakarate ma le MOHCD poo le OEWD. O tulaga e maua ai ia konakarate e uia le RFQ/RFP
- la faapa'aga ma le vaega poo le Komisi mo Aia Tatau a Tagata ina ia faamautuina le ave ese ole faailoga tagata i nofoaga nei
- la faia ni vasega i totonu ole Matagaluega atoa ina ia a'oa'oina auala ia fai latou galuega tautua ma le leai ose faailoga tagata

Manatu Autu 5: la faamautuina le leai ose faailoga tagata ma le faatinoina o galuega ole MOHCD ma ona pa'aga i auala e faatauina ai le lavea'iina o tagata mafatia

Matati'a 5Bi: la a'oa'oina tagata faigaluega ole MOHCD ma ona pa'aga, ina ia silafia uiga o tagata ma a latou aganuu, ae maise le faatinoina o le fesoasoani ona oloo mafatia tagata nei ma e mana'omia le mataala ina ia tutusa uma tagata

Gaioioiga Faapitoa:

- I totonu o vasega oloo faia nei mo i latou e aveina le fesoasoani, i latou oloo faatulagaina nei fesoasoani ae maise i latou oloo fetufaa'iina nofoaga ma fale i tagata mafatia, ina ia toe faaopoopoina le malamalama i aganuu eseese o tagata ia ole a latou faafeagai
- I vasega mo e ole a fesoasoani atu i tagata loo maua i le faama'i ole HIV+ mo le faafaleina o nei tagata ole a faamalosia ai le latou silafia o uiga faaleaganuu ma ia aveeseina ni manatu faailoga tagata ona ole faama'i

Matati'a 5Bii: la faaopoopo le a'oa'oina o le aveeseina o le Faailoga Tagata e tulaga ole faafaigaluegaina poo le siitia o tulaga faigaluega i totonu ole MOHCD

Gaioioiga Faapitoa:

- Toe faalelei tulaga ile faafaigaluegaina o tagata ma le siitia o tulaga i totonu ole MOHCD
- la suia ni vaega pe a mana'omia ile faia o galuega laua'itele a le MOHCD ina ia tulaga tonu ma aveeseina le Faailoga Tagata

FUAFUAGA FAATAATIA MO LE 2020-2024

Matati'a 5Biii: la faamautuina le aveeseina ole manatu faapito ma ia faamalosia le manatu alofa i tagata mafatia i soo se vaega ole MOHCD

Gaioioiga Faapitoa:

- la faatuina ma faagaoiaina se fuafuaga mo le aveeseina ole Faailoga Tagata i totonu ole MOHCD
- la faia se su'esu'ega faapitoa i galuega a le MOHCD poo le a le tulaga o iai e tusa ai ma le Faailoga Tagata
- la fesoota'i ma le mamalu ole atunuu ma e taua i le nofoaga lea
- la aua ne'i faamutaina le galuega o le Vaega Mo le Aveeseina ole Faailoga Tagata i le latou faatinoina o suiga mo le faaleleia o le va o tagata eseese ile MOHCD
- la faatuina ni vaega e faia tulaga i le fesoasoani atu i tagata mafatia ina ia faia nei fesoasoani i se auala e manuia ai tagata uma

FUAFUAGA FAATAATIA MO LE 2020-2024

Faamatalaina o Upu

Upu:

ADA (Americans with Disability Act) – ose tulafono na pasia ile 1990 e faasaina le faailoga tagata ona o se mana’oga faapitoa ua afaina ai se tagata, oloo faogaina i le tusi faapitoa lenei ona o isi potu poo fale oloo iai suiga mo tagata e iai mana’oga faapitoa

AMI (Area Median Income) – ose numera ua faaogaina e faailoa ai le ogatotonu lemu o le aofa’i o tupe maua mai le mauoloa se’ia oo i le pito i mativa i se nofoaga. Oloo faaogaina mo le totatele ose aiga e amata mai le to’a tasi se’ia oo atu ile to’a iva

Certificate of Preference, Ole faailoga mo le faasili ona mana’omia – O se faatulagaina sa faaogaina e le vaega toe faaleleia San Francisco e amata mai le 1960s e oo atu ile 1980s a o faia le latou se’i mo fale e fesoasoani atu ai i tagata mafatia

Coordinated Entry, Ulufale Faapitoa – O se faatulagaina o avanoa mo tagata mafatia e sa’ili ai mai tagata mafatia e maua le fesoasoani

Cultural Districts, Pitonuu Faaleaganuu – O se polokalama a le Malo sa faaogaina ai le faavasegaina o nofoaga eseese i totonu o San Francisco e iloa ai ituaiga tagata oloo nonofo i lea vaega ma lea vaega ole a’ai ma sa faamoemoe e faalauiaina ai aganuu o nai tagata ma ia faafaigofie ona fetufaa’i vaega o fesoasoani i nei pitonuu e faatatau i ituaiga fesoasoani oloo mana’omia e nei tagata

DAHLIA (Database of Affordable Housing Listings, Information and Application) –

Ole lisi o aiga oloo i luga o upega tafa’ilagi e fesoasoani ai ina ia latou maua ni fale taugofie

DALP (Down Payment Assistance Loan Program) – Ose polokalama e maua ai nisi le tupe e mafai ai ona latou tuuina i lalo se downpayment mo se fale fou ma tauva atu ai fale oloo fiafaatau i lea nofoaga

Development Agreements, loega mo le faaleleia o laueleele – o konakarate nei ua malilie iai le A’ai poo le Itumalo o San Francisco ma se tagata fau fale, oloo faatulagaina ai tulafono ma tulaga uma e tataua ona faia e lea kamupani fau fale mo se vaitaimi ua atofaina

HOA (Home Owners Association) – Ole asosi o tagata oloo nonofo i se nofoaga e tasi, ma o le latou faamoemoe ina ia tumau le matagofie ma le lelei o le nofoaga

HOPE SF – O se taumafaiga ina ia faaleleia pitonuu e fa ua iai ni Fale Mautotogi e pulea e le Malo ua sili ona mafatia i San Francisco (Hunters View, Alice Griffith, Sunnydale-Velasco and Potrero Terrace and Annex) ma avea o ni nofoaga matagofie ma le alualu i luma

FUAFUAGA FAATAATIA MO LE 2020-2024

HOPWA (Housing Opportunity for People With AIDS) – O se polokalama a le Malo Tele (Federal) e fesoasoani atu ai i tagata oloo maua ile faama'i ole HIV/AIDS ina ia maua ni o latou Fale Taugofie e ala i fesoasoani tau tupe mo le totogiina o a latou rent ma isi fesoasoani

Inclusionary (Housing Program), Nofoaga e tuufaatasia ai tagata – O se polokalama a San Francisco e iai le tulaga ina ia fauina e tagata poo kamupani fau fale ni Fale Taugofie pe a latou fauina ni vaega fale tetele, ia iai ni Fale Taugofie e tusa ma le Tulafono ole Fuafuaina o San Francisco vaega 415

Local Hire – o se tulaga faapitoa a San Francisco e faamalosi ai le faafaigaluegaina o tagata o le nofoaga mo galuega faakamuta poo le fauina o fale

Local Operating Subsidy Program – ose polokalama e mafai ai ona faatumuina ni pu i le va o tupe e mafai e tagata mafatia ona totogi mo se fale mautotogi ma le tau ole faatinoina ole fesoasoani mo tagata mafatia ua fia maua ni fale

Mortgage Credit Certificate Program, Faailoga aitalafu tupe ma Mokesi – O se polokalama a le California Housing Finance Agency e mafai ai e tagata totogi maualalo e oo atu i e totogi feololo ona ulufale i se faatauina o se fale muamua ina ia faaliliuina le faasili ole mokesi faaletausaga ina ia avea ma se faaitiitia o le Lafoga

PBV (Project-based Voucher) – O se fesoasoani mai le Housing Authority e faapipii i se potu mautotogi, ose polokalama e fesoasoani tele i e ua maua ile faama'i ole HIV/AIDS

RAD (Rental Assistance Demonstration) – O se avanoa e mafai ai ona suia fale sa fauina e le malo mo tagata mafatia, ia avea ma fale i lalo ole Section 8 e maua ai vaega tupe fesoasoani mo le totogiina

RFQ (Request for Qualifications)/RFP (Request for Proposal) – O ni auala e mafai ai e nisi o kamupani ona latou tausinio mo le faatinoina o polokalama fesoasoani i tagata mafatia

SRO (Single Room Occupancy) – O se fale e faaogaina e le toatele le fale uila ma le umu kuka ae momoe i o latou lava potu poo moega

Tenant Right to Counsel, Aia e maua ai e se tasi le fesoasoani mai se Loia – O se fesoasoani mo tagata mafatia e mafai ai ona maua e tagata le fesoasoani a se Loia e aunoa ma se totogi, i se tulaga oloo fia tuli eseina latou e le e pule ile fale mautotogi

Ciudad y condado de San Francisco



ESTRATEGIAS PROPUESTAS para el Plan consolidado 2020-2024

Para su revisión pública entre el
29 de julio de 2019 y el 19 de agosto de 2019

Oficina del Alcalde de Vivienda y Desarrollo Comunitario (MOHCD, por sus siglas en inglés)

Oficina de Desarrollo Económico y de los Trabajadores (OEWD, por sus siglas en inglés)

Ministerio para las Personas sin Hogar y de Servicios de Apoyo (HSH, por sus siglas en inglés)

ESTRATEGIAS DEL PLAN CONSOLIDADO 2020-2024

Introducción

En apoyo al desarrollo de su Plan consolidado para el período comprendido entre 2020 y 2024, su Análisis de Impedimentos para la Igualdad de Oportunidades de Vivienda y su Plan de Viviendas para Personas con VIH, la Oficina del Alcalde de Vivienda y Desarrollo Comunitario se consagró a un proceso de actuación y de servicios respecto de toda la comunidad junto con personas interesadas y residentes de San Francisco. Este proceso sirve de marco para reconocer las prioridades en cuanto al desarrollo de la vivienda y de la comunidad, que, a su vez, impulsan los objetivos y estrategias resumidos en los planes definitivos. Así pues, la MOHCD aprovechará los comentarios y las prioridades de la comunidad para sustentar la toma de decisiones respecto del financiamiento de los servicios comunitarios y de vivienda.

En este documento figuran las estrategias propuestas para el Plan consolidado 2020-2024. Las estrategias propuestas para el Análisis de Impedimentos para la Igualdad de Oportunidades de Vivienda estarán disponibles para revisión y observaciones públicas a finales del verano o a principios del otoño del año actual. Las estrategias para el Plan de Viviendas para Personas con VIH se están elaborando a través de nuestro Grupo de Trabajo sobre Viviendas para Personas con VIH. Por favor háganos saber si le gustaría formar parte de ese grupo.

Resumen del documento

Este documento es el resultado de la evolución de la teoría de cambio de la MOHCD, la OEWD y el HSH, que incluye una declaración del impacto definitivo deseado por lo que respecta a nuestros programas y políticas, a saber:

"Comunidades sanas y dinámicas en todo San Francisco con oportunidades equitativas en cuanto a la autosuficiencia".

Para lograr ese impacto, se crearon cinco objetivos de alto nivel, que se enumeran en el presente documento. Para cada objetivo, se presenta una lista de las necesidades prioritarias derivadas del proceso de participación comunitaria. Una lista de objetivos acompaña cada necesidad prioritaria. Por último, se proponen actividades específicas para cada objetivo.

Tenga en cuenta que los términos subrayados se definen en el glosario que figura al final de este documento.

Revisión y Comentarios

Este documento estará disponible para revisión y comentarios públicos en el período del 29 de julio de 2019 y el 19 de agosto de 2019. Usted puede examinar la versión en línea o una copia impresa del borrador del documento en los siguientes lugares:

- MOHCD, 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5.º piso;
- OEWD en el Ayuntamiento, Sala 448, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place y 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5.º piso; y
- Sucursal principal de la Biblioteca Pública de SF, 100 Larkin Street, 5.º piso, Centro de Información Gubernamental.

ESTRATEGIAS DEL PLAN CONSOLIDADO 2020-2024

El personal recibirá con agrado sus comentarios por escrito a la siguiente dirección: MOHCD, Personal de Planificación Estratégica, 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5.º Piso, San Francisco, CA 94103. Sus observaciones se enviarán al lugar pertinente. En su comentario, sea específico sobre la cuestión a la que quiere llamar la atención y haga referencia a un objetivo o actividad específicos, si corresponde.

También se invita al público a que haga comentarios sobre los proyectos de estrategias en una reunión pública que se llevara a cabo el lunes 5 de agosto de 2019 a las 6:00 p. m. La reunión tendrá lugar en el Auditorio HSA Born en 170 Otis Street, San Francisco, CA 94103.

Gracias por su participación en este proceso. Para más información, visite <https://sfmohcd.org/plans-development> o llame al 415-701-5500.

ESTRATEGIAS DEL PLAN CONSOLIDADO 2020-2024

OBJETIVO 1: FAMILIAS Y PERSONAS CON ESTABILIDAD EN CUANTO A LA VIVIENDA

Necesidad prioritaria 1) A): Construir y mantener viviendas accesibles a precios razonables

Objetivo 1) A) I): Crear viviendas más asequibles

Actividades:

- Examinar nuevos mecanismos de financiación para crear viviendas más asequibles
- Adquirir construcciones de propiedad privada para crear nuevas unidades de vivienda a precios razonables
- Disponer lo necesario para que haya diversidad geográfica en cuanto a la ubicación de las viviendas a precios razonables, especialmente en vecindarios de gran oportunidad
- Mejorar la coordinación con el Ministerio de Planificación, el Ministerio de Inspección de Edificaciones y la Oficina del Alcalde para la Discapacidad con lo que respecta a los permisos de vivienda y de concesión a fin de acelerar la producción de viviendas
- Seguir poniendo en práctica componentes de viviendas a precios razonables de HOPE SF
- Hacer un seguimiento de la construcción de unidades de vivienda con precios por debajo de los del mercado en proyectos con Contratos de construcción o sujetos al Programa Inclusivo de Vivienda
- Examinar y valorar los datos de los solicitantes y beneficiarios del Programa Inclusivo de Vivienda de manera permanente a fin de sustentar las políticas y los procedimientos relativos a la vivienda
- Estudiar la posibilidad de aumentar el número de unidades compatibles con la ADA que exige la Oficina del Alcalde de Vivienda y Desarrollo Comunitario (MOHCD) en las viviendas que cuentan con el apoyo de la MOHCD
- Aumentar las viviendas dedicadas a dar apoyo a los hogares de personas que viven con el VIH
 - Estudiar enfoques creativos para aumentar la provisión de viviendas
 - Aumentar el acceso del programa de Vivienda Plus a las unidades que forman parte del programa HOPWA
- Aumentar las oportunidades de vivienda para las personas que no han tenido o que no tienen hogar

Objetivo 1) A) II): Mantener las viviendas asequibles

Actividades:

- Adquirir viviendas que estén en riesgo de perder su asequibilidad
- Reacondicionar las viviendas que ya existen para mantener su asequibilidad
- Negociar la ampliación de las restricciones de asequibilidad de las viviendas asequibles que ya existen

ESTRATEGIAS DEL PLAN CONSOLIDADO 2020-2024

- Encontrar maneras creativas de aprovechar el capital para mantener las viviendas asequibles, por ejemplo, con recursos de otros ministerios de la ciudad
- Continuar aprovechando el programa RAD para reacondicionar y mantener las viviendas subsidiadas por el Gobierno federal
- Continuar brindando apoyo a los programas de reducción del peligro causado por el plomo
- Continuar apoyando los programas de modificación de viviendas que benefician a los propietarios de bajos ingresos, lo cual aumenta o mejora la seguridad, la accesibilidad y los desenlaces clínicos, así como el acceso a la energía solar
- Explorar maneras de ayudar a los propietarios con el mantenimiento diferido de la propiedad
- Seguir haciendo un seguimiento de los propietarios de viviendas y edificios para ver si cumplen con los requisitos programáticos
- Mejorar la coordinación entre las agencias municipales y las organizaciones sin fines de lucro que prestan servicios de poscompra y mantenimiento

Objetivo 1) A) III): Mejorar los datos y los análisis sobre la lista y la ubicación de las viviendas a precios razonables

Actividades:

- Crear herramientas más consistentes para hacer un seguimiento de la lista y la ubicación de las viviendas patrocinadas por la MOHCD
- Continuar fomentando y perfeccionando la capacidad que tienen la Base de datos de información, uso y lista de viviendas asequibles (DAHLIA, por sus siglas en inglés) y Salesforce para hacer un seguimiento de la demanda de viviendas a precios razonables, incluida la mejora del análisis web
- Asociarse con otros sectores de la DAHLIA para intercambiar datos globales a fin de comprender mejor las presiones de la demanda en San Francisco

Necesidad prioritaria 1) B): Hacer que las viviendas tengan precios más razonables

Objetivo 1) B) I): Reducir los costos de construcción para ayudar a potenciar los recursos locales de viviendas y atender las necesidades de los hogares de menores ingresos

Actividades:

- Buscar métodos y tipos de construcción alternativos para reducir los costos de construcción, por ejemplo, la construcción modular
- Aprovechar los terrenos gratuitos o de bajo costo, por ejemplo, los terrenos públicos, para la construcción
- Buscar nuevas fuentes de financiación municipal y estatal
- Colaborar con agencias estatales y federales para adquirir terrenos destinados a viviendas asequibles, incluidas viviendas para personas sin hogar

ESTRATEGIAS DEL PLAN CONSOLIDADO 2020-2024

Objetivo 1) B) II): Aumentar la asequibilidad de las viviendas para alquiler

Actividades:

- Seguir sustentando los subsidios al alquiler a largo plazo y estudiar la posibilidad de ampliar subsidios para que los residentes de bajos ingresos puedan tener estabilidad en cuanto a la vivienda
 - Promover y buscar fuentes estatales y federales de subsidios al alquiler
- Continuar administrando el Programa de Subsidios a la Operación Local
- Ampliar el rango de la AMI de proyectos selectos, con lo cual se financiarán más viviendas para familias y personas de bajos ingresos
- Poner a prueba nuevos programas de subsidios al alquiler para poblaciones marginadas
- Aumentar los subsidios y vales de viviendas para los hogares con personas que viven con el VIH
- Aumentar los subsidios y vales de vivienda para los hogares de personas sin hogar y otros grupos vulnerables

Objetivo 1) B) III): Aumentar las posibilidades de ser propietario de una vivienda sostenible

Actividades:

- Continuar dando apoyo y tomando medidas para mejorar la calidad y la uniformación de la educación de los compradores de viviendas y del asesoramiento posterior a la compra
- Continuar brindando oportunidades de propietarios mediante el programa Inclusivo para los hogares de ingresos bajos y medios
- Mejorar la movilidad de la creciente cantidad de propietarios de viviendas
 - Estudiar la posibilidad de que los propietarios del programa Inclusivo compren una segunda unidad de vivienda (y vendan la anterior)
- Evaluar los precios de reventa del programa Inclusivo para asegurar que los precios continúen siendo razonables en el futuro
- Explorar opciones para ayudar a los propietarios de viviendas con la posible inasequibilidad de las deudas de la HOA y de los costos de rehabilitación
- Continuar buscando oportunidades de financiamiento para el DALP dirigidas a los hogares de mayores ingresos, en especial a los socorristas y educadores
- Continuar apoyando el programa de Certificados de Créditos Hipotecarios
- Explorar estrategias para aumentar la participación de los prestamistas que participan en los programas de compra de viviendas
- Continuar optimizando las prácticas de transacción de bienes raíces de la MOHCD a través del sistema DAHLIA

ESTRATEGIAS DEL PLAN CONSOLIDADO 2020-2024

Objetivo 1) B) IV): Aumentar el acceso al alquiler y adquisición de viviendas

Actividades:

- Continuar dando apoyo a los servicios de asesoramiento de alquiler de viviendas para ayudar a los residentes a que se orienten y tengan igualdad de oportunidades de acceso por lo que respecta a los programas municipales de viviendas a precios razonables
 - Incluir el asesoramiento de vivienda para personas que viven con el VIH y así ayudar con los desafíos relativos a la búsqueda y la ubicación
 - Incluir el asesoramiento de vivienda para personas que no tenían hogar y para otros grupos vulnerables y así ayudar con los desafíos relativos a la búsqueda y la ubicación
 - Brindar capacitación o apoyo adicionales a los proveedores de servicios para satisfacer la creciente demanda
- Continuar perfeccionando y manteniendo la DAHLIA
 - Agregar más funcionalidad, como así también programas y recursos adicionales
 - Agregar información sobre otras viviendas asequibles de San Francisco, incluyendo viviendas no financiadas por la MOHCD
 - Ampliar la difusión para incluir centros comunitarios, incluidos puntos de acceso a puestos de trabajo, bibliotecas públicas, etc.
- Concientizar sobre los recursos de vivienda disponibles
 - Mas alcance a los grupos pequeños, especialmente a ciertos grupos demográficos
- Seguir apoyando a los constructores y gestores de propiedades para crear y conservar oportunidades inclusivas de alquiler
- Analizar los programas de preferencia de sorteo de viviendas para velar por que cumplan los objetivos propuestos
- Seguir haciendo un seguimiento del sorteo y de los alquileres para velar por que los programas de vivienda lleguen a los beneficiarios previstos
 - Velar por que las unidades compatibles con la ADA estén dirigiéndose a las personas adecuadas
-

Necesidad prioritaria 1) C): Prevenir el sinhogarismo y reducir el número de personas sin hogar

Objetivo 1) C) I): Mejorar los sistemas para ayudar a cada persona a que descubra el camino correcto hacia la vivienda permanente

Actividades:

- Poner en ejecución sistemas coordinados para adultos, jóvenes y familias con niños
- Adoptar medidas para garantizar la rendición de cuentas respecto del desempeño en todos los programas y sistemas

ESTRATEGIAS DEL PLAN CONSOLIDADO 2020-2024

Objetivo 1) C) II): Reducir el número de personas sin hogar entre los adultos, los jóvenes y las familias

Actividades:

- Preparar actividades de prevención y solución de problemas de falta de vivienda (desviación) dirigidas a personas con antecedentes de falta de vivienda y a personas que han sido puestas en situación de sinhogarismo en instituciones convencionales
- Construir nuevas unidades de vivienda de apoyo permanente para adultos, jóvenes y familias

Objetivo 1) C) III): Velar por que ninguna familia con niños esté desprotegida

Actividades:

- Encontrar a las familias desprotegidas a través de actividades de difusión específicas
- Ofrecer refugio a todas las familias desprotegidas
- Aumentar el acceso a las camas de los refugios que dan apoyo a las familias

Objetivo 1) C) IV): Mejorar la respuesta de la ciudad al sinhogarismo en las calles y poner fin a los grandes campamentos armados para el largo plazo

Actividades:

- Llevar a cabo conteos trimestrales de las tiendas de campaña y los campamentos de vehículos
- Alcanzar específicamente a los grandes campamentos
- Ubicar a las personas en refugios de fácil acceso
- Llevar a cabo evaluaciones y establecer prioridades en materia de vivienda empleando equipos móviles de difusión

Objetivo 1) C) V): Sincronizar mejor el trabajo de la MOHCD con el Ministerio de Personas sin Hogar y Viviendas de Apoyo

Actividades:

- Continuar y mejorar la construcción y el alquiler de viviendas de apoyo permanentes, incluida la coordinación del alquiler de unidades de vivienda de apoyo permanente con la Entrada coordinada
- Mejor coordinación de la ubicación de los programas HOPWA, RAD, PBV y otras unidades de vivienda de apoyo
- Crear un vínculo entre la DAHLIA y la Entrada coordinada

ESTRATEGIAS DEL PLAN CONSOLIDADO 2020-2024

Objetivo 1) C) VI): Ampliar los servicios para prevenir el sinhogarismo y lograr estabilidad de viviendas para las familias que antes no tenían hogar y para las que corren el riesgo de perderlo

Actividades:

- Brindar servicios *in situ* con apoyo clínico dentro de edificios de viviendas de apoyo
- Asociarse para brindar servicios específicos a clientes vulnerables a la hora de acceder al sistema de respuesta ante las personas sin hogar
- Priorizar los recursos de prevención del sinhogarismo para las familias o personas con antecedentes de sinhogarismo o de uso de refugios

Necesidad prioritaria 1) D): Proveer servicios para mantener la estabilidad en cuanto a la vivienda

Objetivo 1) D) I): Reducir la tasa de desalojo

Actividades:

- En virtud de la iniciativa del derecho de los inquilinos a la asistencia legal, ampliar el respaldo para que todos los residentes que se enfrentan al desalojo cuenten con representación legal plena
- Continuar con el apoyo al asesoramiento, la difusión, la educación y la mediación de los inquilinos, a la gestión de casos de estabilidad en cuanto a la vivienda y a las actividades de asistencia con el alquiler a corto plazo
- Ampliar los programas de subsidios al alquiler a largo plazo
- Seguir implicando a personas interesadas de la comunidad en estrategias de defensa contra el desalojo a fin de maximizar la eficacia

Objetivo 1) D) II): Aumentar el acceso a los servicios para los residentes de viviendas públicas y subsidiadas por el Estado, a proyectos de RAD y a cuartos individuales

Actividades:

- Continuar sustentando y perfeccionando una gama más amplia de servicios, que incluya información y remisiones mejoradas, conexión de servicios y gestión o coordinación de casos para los residentes de HOPE SF y RAD
- Explorar la posibilidad de ampliar servicios a los residentes de cuartos individuales
- Combinar la conexión de servicios y las estrategias de fomento de destrezas para brindar servicios más completos que aumenten la autosuficiencia económica de los clientes
- Emplazar servicios claves, tales como la orientación a inquilinos y la prevención de desalojo, servicios legales, educación económica y asesoramiento, en el mismo lugar en los proyectos HOPE SF y RAD
- Continuar con el apoyo al desarrollo de la comunidad y a los programas de fomento del liderazgo de los residentes

ESTRATEGIAS DEL PLAN CONSOLIDADO 2020-2024

Objetivo 1) D) III): Brindar apoyo a otros residentes de viviendas asequibles para velar por que tengan éxito en cuanto a la ubicación de sus viviendas

Actividades:

- Crear un paquete de bienvenida para ser distribuido a los nuevos residentes de viviendas asequibles y explorar la posibilidad de conectar servicios sociales con los residentes
- Colaborar con los ministerios municipales para explorar la posibilidad de mejorar la estabilidad en cuanto a las viviendas a través de los servicios de salud mental y contra el abuso de sustancias
- Facilitar la conexión con los servicios de mediación cuando sea necesario
- Exigir la notificación de servicios adicionales a los inquilinos de las viviendas financiadas por la MOHCD cuando sean desalojados
- Brindar servicios adicionales de vivienda, según sea necesario, para las unidades de HOPWA ya construidas y las que están en obra

Objetivo 1) D) IV): Aumentar la movilidad entre los niveles de viviendas en que hay personas que viven con el VIH

Actividades:

- Disponer lo necesario para que se evalúe la capacidad del inquilino de vivir independientemente a la hora de mudarse a una vivienda más adecuada

OBJETIVO 2: FAMILIAS Y PERSONAS RESISTENTES Y ECONÓMICAMENTE AUTOSUFICIENTES

Necesidad prioritaria 2) A): Promover el desarrollo de los trabajadores

Objetivo 2) A) I): Brindar acceso a oportunidades de empleo en múltiples sectores a las poblaciones vulnerables

Actividades:

- Brindar servicios en materia laboral a las poblaciones vulnerables para prepararlas para las oportunidades de empleo
- La MOHCD y la Oficina de Desarrollo Económico y de los Trabajadores (OEWD, por sus siglas en inglés) colaboran para brindar puestos de empleo a los residentes de sus vecindarios
 - Ampliar la prioridad de la Contratación local para que los residentes de la propiedad tengan prioridad para los trabajos de construcción y estudiar la posibilidad de la Contratación local para los trabajos de administración de la propiedad
 - Alentar a las empresas de construcción a que amplíen las oportunidades de empleo dentro de sus proyectos
 - Establecer conexiones con oportunidades de trabajo en el vecindario en la DAHLIA

ESTRATEGIAS DEL PLAN CONSOLIDADO 2020-2024

- Publicitar la inscripción en la lista de puestos de empleo en el sitio web de la MOHCD

Necesidad prioritaria 2) B): Aumentar las oportunidades a través de un mejor acceso lingüístico y del fomento de las destrezas básicas

Objetivo 2) B) I): Mejorar el acceso a los programas y servicios de la MOHCD a través de la traducción de recursos impresos y digitales

Actividades:

- Mejorar el acceso lingüístico respecto de todos los programas y servicios de la MOHCD, así como también en los talleres y las reuniones organizados en la comunidad.
- Preparar y administrar una guía de recursos detallada donde se enumeren los programas y servicios por idioma en que se prestan los servicios
- Estudiar la posibilidad de que la DAHLIA sea accesible a más poblaciones a través de la traducción a otros idiomas

Objetivo 2) B) II): Brindar recursos de capacitación y de fomento de destrezas

Actividades:

- Continuar apoyando y perfeccionando los programas de fomento de destrezas en cuestiones como las destrezas para la vida, los programas de estudio y diplomas de Equivalencia General a los Estudios Secundarios, así como también inglés como segundo idioma
- Centrar la atención en la planificación del fomento de destrezas para crear caminos claros hacia oportunidades de capacitación más avanzadas
- Combinar la conexión de servicios y estrategias de fomento de destrezas para brindar servicios más integrales

Objetivo 2) B) III): Mejorar la educación económica y la gestión de las finanzas personales

Actividades:

- Continuar apoyando el asesoramiento y la educación económica, la constitución de activos y créditos, la reducción de la deuda, el acceso al sistema bancario y los servicios de reparación y asesoramiento crediticios
- Aumentar la inversión en servicios más intensivos que establezcan la capacidad económica de los clientes y en servicios de asesoramiento individualizado continuo que produzcan mejoras económicas a largo plazo
- Fomentar la ubicación conjunta de servicios económicos en sitios de vivienda y en organizaciones comunitarias

ESTRATEGIAS DEL PLAN CONSOLIDADO 2020-2024

Objetivo 2) B) IV): Mejorar la competencia digital

Actividades:

- Brindar capacitación en competencias digitales básicas, intermedias y avanzadas a través de talleres y consultas por orden de llegada, así como nuevos e innovadores modelos de entrega en proyectos comunitarios de alfabetización digital
- Disponer la renovación y la distribución de computadoras y otros dispositivos por lo que respecta a los hogares de bajos ingresos
- Colaborar con los centros vecinales, incluidas las bibliotecas y los centros sociales, para utilizar sus computadoras gratuitas a fin de ampliar la competencia digital de los beneficiarios de los servicios financiados por la MOHCD
- Apoyar programas que brinden acceso digital y que ayuden con la competencia digital por lo que respecta a los residentes y sitios de viviendas a precios razonables
- Sustentar el acceso a Internet para los residentes de cuartos individuales (SRO, por sus siglas en ingles)
- Fomentar la capacidad tecnológica de las organizaciones comunitarias (OBC, por sus siglas en inglés), con lo cual se faculta al personal de las OBC para que dirijan las capacitaciones y servicios de capacitación digital

Necesidad prioritaria 2) C): Proveer acceso equitativo a servicios legales en materia civil por lo que respecta a la inmigración y a otros asuntos críticos

Objetivo 2) C) I): Aumentar el acceso a los servicios legales en materia civil

Actividades:

- Seguir prestando apoyo a los servicios legales relativos a la inmigración
- Seguir sustentando y elaborando estrategias más específicas de financiación y servicios para los campos del Derecho civil, incluidos el empleo, la familia, el consumidor, las prestaciones y la discapacidad

Necesidad prioritaria 2) D): Ayudar a las familias y personas a que se conecten con los servicios

Objetivo 2) D) I): Aumentar el acceso a los servicios comunitarios

Actividades:

- Seguir sustentando y fomentando una gama más amplia de servicios, lo que incluye la mejora de la información y las remisiones, la conexión con los servicios y la gestión o coordinación de casos

ESTRATEGIAS DEL PLAN CONSOLIDADO 2020-2024

- Combinar la conexión de servicios y estrategias de fomento de destrezas para brindar servicios más integrales
- Apoyar estrategias innovadoras de alcance comunitario

OBJETIVO 3: COMUNIDADES CON UNA INFRAESTRUCTURA FÍSICA, SOCIAL Y EMPRESARIAL SALUDABLE

Necesidad prioritaria 3) A): Mejorar los espacios y las instalaciones comunitarios

Objetivo 3) A) I): Velar por que los proveedores de servicios sin fines de lucro tengan instalaciones estables y de gran calidad

Actividades:

- Continuar brindando apoyo a las mejoras de capital por lo que respecta a las instalaciones comunitarias que prestan servicios públicos esenciales
- Facilitar el perfeccionamiento de las evaluaciones de necesidades de capital por lo que respecta a las instalaciones comunitarias a fin de velar por la sostenibilidad a largo plazo
- Brindar apoyo para satisfacer las necesidades de diseño relativas a la optimización de los servicios públicos de las instalaciones
- Brindar apoyo a las organizaciones para que adquieran o reconozcan oportunidades de alquiler a fin de permanecer en sus comunidades y prestarles un mejor servicio

Objetivo 3) A) II): Mejorar los espacios públicos

Actividades:

- Crear y mejorar los servicios comunitarios concebidos para prestar servicio a los residentes de bajos ingresos

Necesidad prioritaria 3) B): Fortalecer los corredores comerciales y de pequeñas empresas

Objetivo 3) B) I): Fomentar el desarrollo y la sostenibilidad de empresas prósperas de propiedad local

- Seguir brindando asistencia técnica empresarial a través de socios de la comunidad: una asistencia adaptada cultural, étnica y lingüísticamente para la creación de empresas y para los negocios que ya existen
- Seguir aumentando la eficiencia de la asistencia técnica empresarial
- Continuar dando apoyo a las inversiones en los préstamos para pequeñas empresas

ESTRATEGIAS DEL PLAN CONSOLIDADO 2020-2024

Objetivo 3) B) II): Apoyar el desarrollo y la sostenibilidad de corredores comerciales sólidos en vecindarios de bajos ingresos

Actividades:

- Continuar dando apoyo a las iniciativas de desarrollo económico local centradas en el fortalecimiento de los corredores comerciales
- Aumentar las inversiones en las fachadas y otras mejoras por lo que respecta a los inquilinos
- Aumentar las inversiones en proyectos de accesibilidad y cumplimiento de normativas
- Continuar con un enfoque geográficamente centrado por lo que respecta a la prestación de servicios de manera que se aprovechen otras inversiones municipales

Necesidad prioritaria 3) C): Brindar apoyo a estrategias integrales impulsadas por la comunidad

Objetivo 3) C) I): Apoyar iniciativas de planificación vecinales

Actividades:

- Continuar apoyando y ampliando programas de distritos culturales en los Distritos culturales aprobados por la junta directiva
- Continuar brindando apoyo a los procesos de planificación de vecindarios que impulsen a las poblaciones de bajos ingresos, vulnerables y marginadas a que participen de forma fructífera en sus comunidades
- Fortalecer las estrategias y actividades de desarrollo económico en los planes impulsados por la comunidad

Objetivo 3) C) II): Apoyar el desarrollo de comunidades locales

Actividades:

- Continuar brindando apoyo a las redes de organizaciones comunitarias y a otros interesados clave de la comunidad que brindan una mayor coordinación de servicios y colaboración tanto para los vecindarios como para poblaciones específicas
- Continuar apoyando programas vecinales de subsidios de acción comunitaria

Necesidad prioritaria 3) D): Ayudar a atender las necesidades de capacidad de las organizaciones comunitarias y de los socios profesionales de la MOHCD

Objetivo 3) D) I): Aumentar la capacidad de las organizaciones de base comunitaria

Actividades:

- Construir la capacidad de organizaciones beneficiarias o proveedoras de la MOHCD mediante capacitaciones, trabajo en grupo, expertos en la materia y otros métodos de asistencia técnica

ESTRATEGIAS DEL PLAN CONSOLIDADO 2020-2024

- Dar prioridad al fortalecimiento de las organizaciones comunitarias y de las empresas de construcción que prestan servicio a poblaciones históricamente marginadas
- Apoyar al personal de la agencia por lo que respecta a la capacitación en habilidades digitales

OBJETIVO 4: ESTABILIZACIÓN DE LAS COMUNIDADES EN RIESGO DE SER DESALOJADAS

Necesidad prioritaria 4) A): Dar respuesta a las consecuencias no equitativas del crecimiento económico a través de medidas contra el desalojo para los residentes y las empresas

Objetivo 4) A) I): Poner en práctica políticas y programas que prioricen a los residentes y a las empresas actuales

Actividades:

- Continuar administrando los programas de sorteo de preferencia de la vivienda
- A medida que la MOHCD evalúe y actualice las políticas y los procedimientos para que el Programa Inclusivo de Vivienda pueda satisfacer las necesidades actuales, recomendar cambios o actualizaciones paralelas respecto del Código de Planificación y de los contratos de préstamo para desarrolladores sin fines de lucro
- Implementar una política de derecho de reingreso para los nuevos alquileres de edificios de donde el inquilino haya sido desalojado
- Poner en marcha las primeras ordenanzas municipales relativas al derecho a compra para la adquisición de edificios en riesgo de ser inasequibles

Objetivo 4) A) II): Alentar a los inquilinos comerciales a que se instalen en los espacios de la planta baja de los proyectos de viviendas a precios razonables de la MOHCD

Actividades:

- Colaborar con la OEWD para sustentar económicamente las mejoras de los inquilinos comerciales (construcción en función de las necesidades del inquilino) por lo que respecta a los espacios de la planta baja
- Colaborar con la OEWD para ofrecer oportunidades de espacios comerciales a organizaciones locales sin fines de lucro

Objetivo 4) A) III): Reducir el número de desalojos de residentes y empresas

Actividades:

- Utilizar subsidios al alquiler para reducir el número de desalojo de inquilinos
- Aprovechar programas como el Derecho de los inquilinos a un abogado y el asesoramiento de inquilinos para ayudar a los residentes a que permanezcan en sus hogares

ESTRATEGIAS DEL PLAN CONSOLIDADO 2020-2024

- Crear y poner en marcha políticas para mitigar las consecuencias negativas de los aumentos de alquiler
- Ampliar los programas concebidos para retener a los propietarios de viviendas en comunidades que tienen antecedentes de exclusión
- Coordinar con otros ministerios para velar por la sostenibilidad a largo plazo de las organizaciones vecinales
- Aprovechar los Distritos culturales para brindar apoyo a las políticas contra el desalojo
- Aumentar el acceso a los recursos para las pequeñas empresas ubicadas en vecindarios de bajos ingresos que deseen permanecer en San Francisco

Necesidad prioritaria 4) B): Velar por que el crecimiento económico ofrezca beneficios a las comunidades que ya existen

Objetivo 4) B) I): Exigir la contratación local en la mayor medida posible por lo que respecta a los proyectos y los programas de la MOHCD

Actividades:

- Coordinar con la OEWD la preparación para el trabajo y la asignación de puestos de trabajo en proyectos de viviendas asequibles
- Continuar brindando apoyo a la preparación y asignación laborales respecto de los proyectos de RAD y HOPE SF

Objetivo 4) B) II): Velar por que haya servicios municipales adecuados en los vecindarios donde haya viviendas asequibles de la MOHCD

Actividades:

- Colaborar con socios de la ciudad como la Agencia Municipal de Transporte de San Francisco (SFMTA, por sus siglas en inglés) en temas relacionados al transporte
- Colaborar con ministerios municipales claves con el fin de reconocer necesidades y oportunidades para la inauguración y coordinación de servicios

Objetivo 4) B) III): Poner en marcha programas que brinden beneficios directos como resultado del crecimiento económico basado en el vecindario a las comunidades locales

Actividades:

- Dirigir la ampliación de servicios a las comunidades afectadas por el aumento de la densidad de viviendas
- Coordinar la programación del Distrito cultural con otras iniciativas de desarrollo comunitario
- Seguir encontrando formas en que las empresas y los residentes que ya existen puedan acceder a más puestos de empleo y a más capital

ESTRATEGIAS DEL PLAN CONSOLIDADO 2020-2024

- Colaborar con otros ministerios de la ciudad para encontrar formas adicionales de apoyar a las pequeñas empresas y a los empresarios locales

OBJETIVO 5: LA CIUDAD TRABAJA PARA ELIMINAR LAS CAUSAS DE LAS DESIGUALDADES RACIALES

Necesidad prioritaria 5) A): Velar por un acceso equitativo en materia racial a los programas y servicios, en coordinación con otros ministerios de la ciudad

Objetivo 5) A) I): Establecer financiamiento, políticas y prácticas específicas para velar por el acceso equitativo a los programas de la MOHCD y de la OEWD

Actividades:

- Examinar y valorar las prácticas de difusión teniendo en cuenta la equidad racial
- Mejorar la difusión a los vecindarios y comunidades históricamente marginados
- Aprovechar el alcance culturalmente competente para aumentar el conocimiento sobre los recursos de vivienda y los servicios disponibles
- Seguir la uniformización de los criterios y otras políticas de selección respecto de viviendas y programas teniendo en cuenta la equidad racial
- Valorar y mejorar los programas y servicios de la MOHCD para velar por un acceso equitativo
- Analizar las deficiencias en cuanto al éxito de la asignación por lo que respecta a diferentes grupos demográficos y determinar las intervenciones necesarias para crear un acceso equitativo a los recursos de vivienda asequible
- Estudiar opciones para ampliar los beneficios del programa de Certificado de preferencia
- Aumentar la financiación y mejorar los servicios para las comunidades más profundamente afectadas por la exclusión a lo largo de su historia
- Estudiar y poner en ejecución medidas de desempeño de equidad racial en los procesos de adquisición, incluidos los criterios de selección de RFQ/RFP de la OEWD y de la MOHCD
- Asociarse con la Comisión de Derechos Humanos para poner en ejecución políticas de equidad racial
- Poner en marcha capacitaciones y sistemas relativos a cuidados específicos sobre el trauma en todos los ministerios para apoyar la mejora del servicio al cliente y el cuidado personal

Necesidad prioritaria 5) B): Inculcar valores y prácticas de equidad racial y de cuidados específicos sobre el trauma en el trabajo de la MOHCD y sus socios

Objetivo 5) B) I): Incorporar la competencia cultural, los sistemas de cuidados específicos sobre el trauma y otros recursos y formación en materia de equidad por lo que respecta a los socios de la MOHCD

ESTRATEGIAS DEL PLAN CONSOLIDADO 2020-2024

Actividades:

- Como parte del programa de capacitación que ya existe, perfeccionar y poner en práctica una capacitación sobre sensibilidad cultural para beneficiarios, empresas de construcción y socios en la ubicación de viviendas y la administración de propiedades
- Educar a los proveedores de viviendas y servicios a fin de que las personas que viven con el VIH aumenten la competencia cultural y sean menos estigmatizados

Objetivo 5) B) II): Incorporar los principios de equidad racial en las prácticas de contratación y promoción de la MOHCD

Actividades:

- Examinar las prácticas de contratación y promoción de la MOHCD
- Poner en práctica cambios para mejor apoyar un ambiente de trabajo diverso e inclusivo

Objetivo 5) B) III): Aplicar valores y enfoques basados en la equidad racial y en valores de cuidados específicos sobre el trauma en toda la MOHCD

Actividades:

- Perfeccionar y poner en ejecución un plan de equidad racial para la MOHCD
- Llevar a cabo un análisis completo de la equidad racial en las políticas internas de MOHCD
- Comunicar valores a la comunidad externa y a los interesados
- Continuar convocando al Grupo de Trabajo de Equidad Racial para crear y poner en ejecución el plan de equidad racial de la MOHCD
- Crear un grupo de trabajo de cuidados específicos sobre el trauma para apoyar la adopción de prácticas de sanación

ESTRATEGIAS DEL PLAN CONSOLIDADO 2020-2024

Glosario de términos

Términos:

ADA, por sus siglas en inglés (Ley de Estadounidenses con Discapacidad): una ley de derechos civiles promulgada en 1990 que prohíbe la discriminación basada en la discapacidad; utilizada en este contexto para referirse a unidades con características especiales por lo que respecta a la movilidad o a la comunicación.

AMI, por sus siglas en inglés (Mediana de ingresos para la zona): el punto medio de los ingresos de los hogares para una zona metropolitana determinada (la mitad de los hogares ganan más y la otra mitad menos). Las AMI tienen en cuenta los hogares de entre una y nueve personas.

Certificado de preferencia: un sorteo de preferencia de viviendas destinado a personas desalojadas por acciones específicas de la antigua Agencia de Reurbanización de San Francisco entre los años 60 y 80.

Entrada coordinada: un sistema centralizado de evaluación y priorización para la asignación de recursos para personas sin hogar.

Distritos culturales: un programa de la ciudad con zonas designadas definidas por la comunidad que tiene por objeto celebrar y fortalecer las identidades culturales únicas de San Francisco y coordinar recursos para ayudar a estabilizar comunidades vulnerables que enfrenten o que estén en riesgo de sufrir un desalojo.

DAHLIA, por sus siglas en inglés (Base de datos de información, uso y lista de viviendas asequibles): una herramienta en línea para ayudar a los residentes a que encuentren y soliciten una vivienda a precios razonables.

DALP, por sus siglas en inglés (Programa de Préstamo de Asistencia para el Pago Inicial): un programa de préstamos para el pago inicial que ayuda a los residentes a que hagan ofertas por una propiedad en el mercado abierto.

Contratos de construcción: contratos firmados por la ciudad y el condado de San Francisco y un agente que define las reglas, normativas, obligaciones y políticas relativas a un proyecto de construcción por un período concreto.

HOA, por sus siglas en inglés (Asociación de Propietarios de Viviendas): una organización de propietarios de viviendas de un proyecto de vivienda, cuyo propósito es preservar, mantener y mejorar las viviendas y su valor.

HOPE SF: una iniciativa que busca transformar cuatro de los sitios de vivienda pública más afectados de San Francisco (Hunters View, Alice Griffith, Sunnyside-Velasco y Potrero Terrace y sus anexos) en comunidades activas y prósperas a través de una reanimación holística.

HOPWA, por sus siglas en inglés (Oportunidades de Vivienda para las Personas con Sida): un programa federal que ayuda a las personas que viven con VIH/sida a que obtengan o mantengan la vivienda a través de subsidios al alquiler y otros apoyos para la vivienda.

ESTRATEGIAS DEL PLAN CONSOLIDADO 2020-2024

Inclusivo (Programa para viviendas): un programa de la ciudad que requiere que los constructores de viviendas a precio de mercado brinden unidades de vivienda a precios razonables, en virtud del Artículo 415 del Código de Planificación de San Francisco.

Contratación local: una política de San Francisco que promueve la contratación de residentes locales para proyectos de construcción financiados localmente.

Programa de Subsidios a la Operación Local: un programa de subsidios de San Francisco concebido para reducir la brecha entre el monto del alquiler que los residentes que antes no tenían hogar pueden pagar y el costo de operación de la vivienda para las personas sin hogar.

Programa de Certificados de Créditos Hipotecarios: un programa de la Agencia de Financiamiento de la Vivienda de California que les permite a aquellas personas con ingresos entre bajos y moderados que compren su vivienda por primera vez que conviertan una parte de su pago anual de intereses hipotecarios en un crédito fiscal.

PBV, por sus siglas en inglés (Vale basado en proyecto): un subsidio al alquiler de la Autoridad de Vivienda vinculado a una unidad en particular, no a un inquilino.

Plus Housing: el principal programa de la MOHCD que asigna unidades de vivienda y subsidios a los residentes que viven con el VIH.

RAD, por sus siglas en inglés (Demostración de Asistencia de Alquiler): una iniciativa que reacondiciona y transfiere las propiedades de vivienda pública a propiedades de vales basadas en proyectos de la Sección 8.

RFQ, por sus siglas en inglés (Solicitud de calificaciones), y RFP, por sus siglas en inglés (Solicitud por propuesta): dos tipos ordinarios de métodos del sector público empleados para solicitar a proveedores o a agencias que liciten servicios o que presenten una propuesta de servicios.

SRO, por sus siglas en inglés (Cuartos individuales): un tipo de unidad de vivienda en la que ciertas instalaciones como el baño y la cocina se comparten entre varias unidades

Derecho de los inquilinos a un abogado: una iniciativa aprobada por los votantes que ofrece representación legal completa a los hogares que enfrentan el desalojo.

Thành Phố và Quận San Francisco



Kế Hoạch Đề Xuất Các Phương Án Củng Cố Giai Đoạn 2020-2024

Được Xem Xét Công Khai Từ
Ngày 29 Tháng 7 Năm 2019 đến Ngày 19 Tháng 8
Năm 2019

Văn Phòng Thị Trưởng về Nhà Ở và Phát Triển Cộng Đồng (MOHCD)
Văn Phòng Phát Triển Kinh Tế & Lao Động (OEWD)
Sở Vô Gia Cư và Dịch Vụ Hỗ Trợ (HSH)

KẾ HOẠCH CHO PHƯƠNG ÁN CỨNG CỐ GIAI ĐOẠN 2020-2024

Giới Thiệu

Để hỗ trợ cho việc hình thành phương án củng cố trong giai đoạn 2020-2024, bản Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (Phân tích về Trở ngại Trong Lựa chọn Nhà Ở Công Bằng) và HIV Housing Plan (Phương Án Nhà Ở Dành Cho Người Nhiễm HIV), Văn Phòng Thị Trưởng Về Nhà Ở và Phát Triển Cộng Đồng (MOHCD) tham gia vào quá trình tiếp xúc với cộng đồng và có những cuộc gặp gỡ với các bên liên quan và cư dân của San Francisco. Quá trình này là một khuôn khổ để xác định các trọng điểm phát triển về nhà ở và cộng đồng, từ đó thúc đẩy việc thực hiện các mục tiêu và kế hoạch được nêu trong các phương án cuối. Sau cùng, MOHCD sẽ sử dụng ý kiến đóng góp và cân nhắc các trọng điểm của cộng đồng để báo cho bên có quyền quyết định cấp tài trợ cho cộng đồng và các dịch vụ nhà ở.

Trong tài liệu này có những kế hoạch đề xuất cho Phương Án Củng Cố Giai Đoạn 2020-2024. Các kế hoạch đề xuất cho bản Phân tích về Trở ngại Trong Lựa chọn Nhà Ở Công Bằng sẽ được xem xét và góp ý công khai vào cuối mùa hè/đầu thu năm nay. Nhóm Công Tác Nhà Ở Dành Cho Người Nhiễm HIV đang chịu trách nhiệm lập những Phương Án Nhà Ở Dành Cho Người Nhiễm HIV; vui lòng cho chúng tôi biết nếu quý vị muốn tham gia vào nhóm.

Tổng Quan Về Tài Liệu

Tài liệu này tuân theo sự hình thành về lý thuyết thay đổi của MOHCD/OEWD/HSR, gồm có tuyên bố về những dự định có tác động cuối cùng dành cho các chương trình và chính sách của chúng tôi:

"Các cộng đồng năng động và lành mạnh trên khắp San Francisco có cơ hội bình đẳng để tự lập về kinh tế".

Để có được những tác động đó, chúng tôi đã lập năm mục tiêu cấp cao, có nêu trong tài liệu này. Trong mỗi mục tiêu sẽ có danh sách liệt kê các nhu cầu trọng yếu liên quan trong quá trình tiếp xúc với cộng đồng và kèm theo là danh sách các mục tiêu cho mỗi nhu cầu trọng yếu. Sau cùng, mỗi mục tiêu sẽ có liệt kê các đề xuất về hoạt động cụ thể.

Xin lưu ý: những điều khoản được gạch dưới sẽ có trong bảng chú giải được tìm thấy ở cuối tài liệu này.

Xem xét và Góp ý

Tài liệu này sẽ có sẵn để xem xét và góp ý công khai từ ngày 29 tháng 7 năm 2019 đến ngày 19 tháng 8 năm 2019. Quý vị có thể xem lại phiên bản trực tuyến hoặc bản in giấy của tài liệu dự thảo tại các địa điểm sau:

- MOHCD, Số 1 Đại Lộ South Van Ness, Tầng 5;
- OEWD tại Tòa Thị Chính, Phòng 448, Số 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place và Số 1 Đại Lộ South Van Ness, Tầng 5; và
- Chi Nhánh Chính của Thư Viện Công Cộng SF, 100 Larkin, Tầng 5, Government Information.

Nhân viên sẽ tiếp nhận ý kiến nhận xét của quý vị qua thư viết. Họ có thể được hướng dẫn đến địa chỉ: MOHCD, Strategic Planning Staff, 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor, San Francisco,

KẾ HOẠCH CHO PHƯƠNG ÁN CÙNG CỘ GIAI ĐOẠN 2020-2024

CA 94103. Ý kiến của quý vị sẽ được chuyển đến nơi thích hợp. Trong phần góp ý của quý vị, vui lòng nêu cụ thể vấn đề và nêu rõ mục tiêu hoặc hoạt động cụ thể, nếu cần thiết.

Công chúng cũng được mời đóng góp ý kiến về các kế hoạch dự thảo tại cuộc họp công khai được tổ chức vào thứ Hai, ngày 5 tháng 8 năm 2019 lúc 6 giờ tối. Cuộc họp sẽ diễn ra [tại Cơ Quan Dịch Vụ Nhân Sinh (Human Services Agency-HSA)] Born Auditorium tại 170 Otis Street, San Francisco, CA 94103.

Cảm ơn quý vị đã tham gia vào quá trình này. Để biết thêm thông tin, vui lòng truy cập <https://sfmohcd.org/plans-development> hoặc gọi số 415-701-5500.

KẾ HOẠCH CHO PHƯƠNG ÁN Củng Cố GIAI ĐOẠN 2020-2024

MỤC TIÊU 1: GIA ĐÌNH VÀ CÁ NHÂN ĐƯỢC CẤP NHÀ Ở ỔN ĐỊNH

Nhu Cầu Trọng Yếu 1A: Phát triển và duy trì điều kiện tiện lợi để có nhà ở và với giá hợp lý

Mục Tiêu 1Ai: Tạo thêm nhà ở với giá hợp lý

Hoạt động:

- Khám phá các cơ chế tài chính mới để tạo thêm nhà ở với giá hợp lý
- Thu lại các tòa nhà thuộc sở hữu tư nhân để tạo ra những căn nhà mới có giá hợp lý
- Đảm bảo vị trí nhà ở với giá hợp lý nằm trong nhiều khu vực khác nhau, đặc biệt trong khu dân cư có nhu cầu cao
- Tăng cường sự phối hợp với Planning Department (Phòng Quy Hoạch), Department of Building Inspection (Sở Kiểm Tra Thi Công) và Văn Phòng Thị Trưởng Dành Cho Người Khiếm Khuyết liên quan đến nhà ở và quá trình cấp giấy phép xây nhà nhanh hơn
- Tiếp tục thi hành các thành phần trong điều khoản nhà ở với giá hợp lý của chương trình HOPE SF
- Theo dõi sự phát triển của những căn nhà có mức giá thấp hơn giá thị trường trong các dự án theo Development Agreements (Các Hợp Đồng Phát Triển) hoặc tuân thủ theo Inclusionary Housing Program (Chương Trình Nhà Ở Giá Hợp Lý)
- Liên tục xem xét và đánh giá thông tin về người nộp đơn và người ở trong Inclusionary Housing Program (Chương Trình Nhà Ở Giá Hợp Lý) để báo cho bên đảm nhiệm các chính sách và quy trình về nhà ở
- Tìm hiểu về cách gia tăng số lượng căn nhà trong chương trình nhà ở của Văn Phòng Thị Trưởng về Nhà Ở và Phát Triển Cộng Đồng (MOHCD) theo yêu cầu của Đạo Luật Người Mỹ Tàn Tật (*The Americans with Disabilities Act – ADA*) được MOHCD hỗ trợ về nhà ở
- Tăng số lượng nhà ở dành riêng để hỗ trợ cho những gia đình có thành viên bị nhiễm HIV
 - Tìm hiểu các cách thức sáng tạo nhằm tạo điều kiện tiện lợi để tăng nguồn cung cấp nhà ở
 - Cải thiện điều kiện tiện lợi để nhiều người tham gia trong chương trình Người Thuê Nhà Đang Bị Thuê Với Giá Cao (Plus Housing program) nhận những căn nhà thuộc chương trình Cơ hội cấp Nhà ở cho Người bị AIDS (Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS- HOPWA)
- Tăng cơ hội cho những người vô gia cư hoặc trước đây là người vô gia cư có nhà ở

Mục Tiêu 1Aii: Bảo quản nhà ở với giá hợp lý

Hoạt động:

- Mua những khu nhà ở đang bị nguy cơ không có khả năng chi trả
- Phục hồi nhà ở hiện có để bảo quản khả năng chi trả

KẾ HOẠCH CHO PHƯƠNG ÁN CỨNG CỐ GIAI ĐOẠN 2020-2024

- Điều đình để gia hạn khả năng chi trả cho nhà ở giá rẻ hiện tại
- Tìm kiếm các cách thức sáng tạo để tận dụng nguồn vốn nhằm duy trì nhà ở với giá hợp lý, bao gồm các nguồn vốn từ các sở ban ngành khác trong Thành Phố
- Tiếp tục tận dụng Luận Chứng Về Trợ Cấp Cho Người Thuê Nhà (Rental Assistance Demonstration) RAD để phục hồi và duy trì nhà ở được liên bang trợ cấp
- Tiếp tục hỗ trợ các chương trình giảm thiểu rủi ro nhiễm chì
- Tiếp tục hỗ trợ các chương trình sửa đổi nhà ở có lợi cho chủ sở hữu nhà có thu nhập thấp, nâng cao sự an toàn, tăng điều kiện tiện lợi và kết quả sức khỏe, cũng như tăng số người tham gia sử dụng nguồn năng lượng từ mặt trời
- Khám phá cách thức hỗ trợ chủ sở hữu nhà bảo trì tài sản trì hoãn
- Tiếp tục giám sát việc tuân thủ các yêu cầu của chương trình của chủ sở hữu nhà và chủ sở hữu tòa nhà
- Nâng cao phối hợp giữa các cơ quan trong Thành Phố và các tổ chức phi lợi nhuận cung cấp dịch vụ sau khi mua nhà/bảo quản nhà

Mục Tiêu 1Aiii: Cải thiện dữ liệu và phân tích về tình trạng tồn trữ và sắp đặt nhà ở với giá hợp lý

Hoạt động:

- Tạo ra các công cụ thiết thực hơn để theo dõi Tình Trạng Tồn Trữ và sắp đặt nhà ở được MOHCD tài trợ
- Tiếp tục phát triển và điều chỉnh DAHLIA (Cơ Sở Dữ Liệu về Việc Lập Danh Sách, Thông Tin và Ứng Dụng Nhà Ở Với Giá Hợp Lý) và năng lực của phần mềm Salesforce để theo dõi nhu cầu về nhà ở với giá hợp lý, bao gồm số liệu phân tích nâng cao trên trang mạng
- Hợp tác với các khu vực pháp lý khác của DAHLIA để chia sẻ dữ liệu tổng hợp nhằm hiểu rõ hơn về áp lực nhu cầu ở San Francisco

Nhu Cầu Trọng Yếu 1B: Làm cho giá nhà ở hợp lý hơn

Mục Tiêu 1Bi: Giảm chi phí phát triển để giúp tận dụng nguồn lực nhà ở tại địa phương và phục vụ các hộ gia đình có thu nhập thấp

Hoạt động:

- Tìm kiếm các loại và phương pháp xây dựng thay thế để giảm chi phí phát triển như xây dựng theo kiểu cấu kiện – kết cấu theo tiêu chuẩn khi xây dựng
- Tận dụng đất miễn phí hoặc chi phí thấp như đất công để xây dựng
- Tìm kiếm các nguồn tài trợ mới của địa phương và tiểu bang
- Làm việc với các cơ quan tiểu bang và liên bang để thu được đất dành riêng cho việc xây dựng nhà ở với giá hợp lý, bao gồm nhà ở cho những người vô gia cư

Mục Tiêu 1Bii: Tăng khả năng chi trả cho người thuê những căn nhà đang cho thuê

Hoạt động:

- Tiếp tục hỗ trợ cung cấp các khoản trợ cấp cho thuê dài hạn và tìm hiểu mở rộng trợ cấp cho cư dân có thu nhập thấp để ổn định nhà ở
 - Ủng hộ và tìm kiếm các nguồn trợ cấp thuê nhà của Tiểu Bang và Liên Bang

KẾ HOẠCH CHO PHƯƠNG ÁN Củng Cố GIAI ĐOẠN 2020-2024

- Tiếp tục quản lý Chương Trình Trợ Cấp Hoạt Động Tại Địa Phương (Local Operating Subsidy Program)
- Mở rộng phạm vi AMI cho các dự án được chọn, nhằm mục đích tài trợ thêm nhà ở cho các hộ gia đình có thu nhập thấp
- Áp dụng thí điểm các chương trình mới về trợ cấp thuê nhà cho những nhóm người chưa nhận được trợ cấp
- Tăng khoản trợ cấp nhà ở và phiếu trợ cấp cho các hộ gia đình có thành viên bị nhiễm HIV
- Tăng khoản trợ cấp nhà ở và phiếu trợ cấp cho các hộ gia đình vô gia cư và các nhóm người có nguy cơ bị vô gia cư khác

Mục Tiêu 1Biii: Tăng cơ hội sở hữu nhà ở lâu dài

Hoạt động:

- Tiếp tục hỗ trợ và thực hiện các bước để cải thiện chất lượng và tiêu chuẩn của việc giáo dục người mua nhà và tư vấn sau khi mua nhà
- Tiếp tục mang đến các cơ hội sở hữu nhà ở với giá hợp lý (Inclusionary) cho các hộ gia đình có thu nhập thấp và trung bình
 - Cải thiện sự thích nghi cho các hộ gia đình sở hữu nhà với số lượng ngày càng tăng
 - Tìm hiểu cách thức cho phép các chủ sở hữu nhà ở với giá hợp lý (Inclusionary) mua căn nhà ở thứ hai (và bán căn nhà ở trước đó)
 - Đánh giá việc định giá bán lại nhà ở với giá hợp lý (Inclusionary) để đảm bảo khả năng chi trả trong tương lai
 - Tìm hiểu các phương án để giúp các chủ sở hữu nhà trả các khoản phí Hiệp Hội Chủ Nhà (HOA) và chi phí phục hồi không có khả năng chi trả
 - Tiếp tục tìm hiểu các cơ hội tài trợ của DALP cho các hộ gia đình có thu nhập cao hơn, bao gồm những nhân viên làm trong ngành cấp cứu và các giáo viên
 - Tiếp tục hỗ trợ chương trình Chứng Nhận Tín Dụng Thế Chấp (Mortgage Credit Certificate)
 - Khám phá các kế hoạch nâng cao sự tham gia của người cho vay trong các chương trình sở hữu nhà
 - Tiếp tục sắp xếp các quy tắc giao dịch bất động sản của MOHCD thông qua hệ thống DAHLIA

Mục Tiêu 1Biv: Nâng cao điều kiện tiện lợi cho người tham mua nhà ở và thuê nhà

Hoạt động:

- Tiếp tục hỗ trợ các dịch vụ tư vấn nhà ở cho thuê để giúp cư dân định hướng và có quyền tham gia vào các chương trình nhà ở với giá hợp lý của Thành Phố một cách công bằng
 - Bao gồm tư vấn nhà ở cho người bị nhiễm HIV để giúp giải quyết các thách thức, khó khăn về định hướng và sắp xếp nhà ở
 - Bao gồm tư vấn nhà ở cho các hộ gia đình vô gia cư trước đây và các nhóm người có nguy cơ bị vô gia cư khác để giúp giải quyết các khó khăn về định hướng và sắp xếp nhà ở
 - Hỗ trợ thêm/nâng cao năng lực cho các nhà cung cấp dịch vụ để đáp ứng nhu cầu ngày càng cao

KẾ HOẠCH CHO PHƯƠNG ÁN CÙNG CỐ GIAI ĐOẠN 2020-2024

- Tiếp tục phát triển và duy trì DAHLIA
 - Bổ sung thêm chức năng và các chương trình và tài nguyên
 - Bổ sung thông tin về việc cấp nhà ở với giá hợp lý khác ở San Francisco, bao gồm việc cấp nhà ở không được MOHCD tài trợ
 - Mở rộng phạm vi tạo điều kiện tiện lợi cho người tham gia để bao gồm các trung tâm cộng đồng, các điểm tiếp xúc với lực lượng lao động, thư viện công cộng, v.v.
- Gia tăng hiểu biết về tài nguyên nhà ở có sẵn
 - Tiếp xúc nhiều hơn với các nhóm nhỏ, đặc biệt là theo thông tin đặc trưng đã chọn
- Tiếp tục hỗ trợ các nhà phát triển và các nhà quản lý bất động sản tạo ra và duy trì các cơ hội thuê nhà Nhà ở với giá hợp lý (Inclusionary)
- Đánh giá các chương trình ưu tiên cấp nhà ở ngẫu nhiên để đảm bảo đáp ứng mục tiêu dự định của họ
- Tiếp tục theo dõi cơ hội ngẫu nhiên/cho thuê để đảm bảo rằng các chương trình nhà ở tiện lợi hơn để cho những người hưởng lợi theo dự định tham gia
 - Đảm bảo các đơn vị nhà ở ADA sẽ được cung cấp cho những người phù hợp

Nhu Cầu Trọng Yếu 1C: Ngăn chặn và giảm tình trạng vô gia cư

Mục Tiêu 1Ci: Tăng cường các hệ thống giúp đỡ từng người theo đúng hướng để sở hữu nhà ở lâu dài

Hoạt động:

- Triển khai các hệ thống phối hợp cho người lớn, gia đình có trẻ em và thanh thiếu niên
- Thi hành trách nhiệm thực hiện trên tất cả các chương trình và hệ thống

Mục Tiêu 1Cii: Giảm tình trạng vô gia cư đối với người lớn, thanh thiếu niên và các gia đình

Hoạt động:

- Thành lập các hoạt động ngăn chặn tình trạng vô gia cư và giải quyết vấn đề (chuyển hướng) nhằm vào những người có tiền sử vô gia cư và những người được giải thoát khỏi tình trạng vô gia cư từ các cơ quan chính thống
- Thành lập các căn nhà ở mới được hỗ trợ vĩnh viễn cho người lớn, thanh thiếu niên và các gia đình

Mục Tiêu 1Ciii: Đảm bảo tất cả các gia đình có trẻ em đều có chỗ ở

Hoạt động:

- Xác định các gia đình không có chỗ ở thông qua phương thức tập trung tiếp xúc với những người có nhu cầu
- Sắp xếp chỗ ở cho các gia đình không có chỗ ở
- Tăng cường số lượng các gia đình cần có chỗ ngủ

Mục Tiêu 1Civ: Cải thiện những hoạt động của Thành phố để đối phó với tình trạng vô gia cư trên đường phố và chấm dứt tình trạng cư dân dựng các lều trại dài hạn

KẾ HOẠCH CHO PHƯƠNG ÁN CỨNG CỐ GIAI ĐOẠN 2020-2024

Hoạt động:

- Tiến hành kiểm đếm lều trại và xe trú ẩn mỗi quý
- Tập trung tiếp xúc với những người sống trong các lều trại lớn
- Đưa người vào nơi trú ẩn có rào chắn thấp
- Tiến hành đánh giá và ưu tiên nhà ở thông qua các nhóm tiếp xúc di động

Mục Tiêu 1Cv: Phối hợp tốt hơn với Sở Vô Gia Cư và Nhà Ở Hỗ Trợ để thực hiện các công việc của MOHCD

Hoạt động:

- Tiếp tục và tăng cường việc tạo và cho thuê nhà ở được hỗ trợ lâu dài, bao gồm cả việc phối hợp cho thuê các đơn vị nhà ở hỗ trợ lâu dài với Tiếp Nhận Phối Hợp (Coordinated Entry)
- Cải thiện khả năng điều phối việc bố trí, sắp xếp HOPWA, RAD, PBV và các đơn vị nhà ở hỗ trợ khác
- Tạo ra mối liên kết giữa DAHLIA và Tiếp Nhận Phối Hợp (Coordinated Entry)

Mục Tiêu 1Cvi: Mở rộng dịch vụ để ngăn chặn tình trạng vô gia cư và ổn định nhà ở cho các hộ gia đình trước đây là người vô gia cư và những gia đình có nguy cơ vô gia cư

Hoạt động:

- Cung cấp các dịch vụ tận nơi như hỗ trợ y tế ngay trong chính các tòa nhà về nhà ở đang trợ giúp
- Hợp tác cung cấp dịch vụ được nhắm mục tiêu cho các những người có nguy cơ cao tiếp xúc hệ thống đối phó với tình trạng vô gia cư
- Ưu tiên cung cấp các nguồn lực ngăn chặn tình trạng vô gia cư cho các hộ gia đình có tiền sử vô gia cư hoặc sử dụng chỗ ở tạm

Nhu Cầu Trọng Yếu 1D: Cung cấp dịch vụ để duy trì ổn định nhà ở

Mục Tiêu 1Di: Giảm tỷ lệ bị đuổi ra khỏi nhà

Hoạt động:

- Theo Quyền Được Tư Vấn của Người Thuê Nhà (Tenant Right to Counsel), tăng cường hỗ trợ đại diện pháp lý trong mọi phạm vi cho cư dân có nguy cơ bị đuổi ra khỏi nhà
- Tiếp tục hỗ trợ người thuê nhà thông qua tư vấn, tiếp xúc và giáo dục, hòa giải, quản lý hồ sơ ổn định nhà ở, và các hoạt động hỗ trợ cho thuê ngắn hạn
- Mở rộng các chương trình trợ cấp cho thuê dài hạn
- Tiếp tục thu hút các bên liên quan trong cộng đồng tham gia thực hiện các kế hoạch ngăn ngừa bị đuổi ra khỏi nhà nhằm nâng cao hiệu quả

Mục Tiêu 1Dii: Tăng điều kiện tiện lợi cho nhiều người sử dụng các dịch vụ cho cư dân về nhà ở công cộng và được trợ cấp công cộng, các dự án RAD và các khách sạn phòng đơn

Hoạt động:

KẾ HOẠCH CHO PHƯƠNG ÁN CÙNG CỐ GIAI ĐOẠN 2020-2024

- Tiếp tục hỗ trợ và phát triển dịch vụ liên tục toàn diện hơn bao gồm tăng cường cung cấp thông tin và giới thiệu, kết nối dịch vụ và quản lý/điều phối hồ sơ cho các cư dân HOPE SF và RAD
- Tìm hiểu mở rộng dịch vụ cho cư dân cư trú ở các khách sạn phòng đơn
- Kết hợp giữa kết nối dịch vụ và chiến lược phát triển kỹ năng để cung cấp các dịch vụ toàn diện hơn nhằm nâng cao khả năng tự cung tự túc về kinh tế của khách hàng
- Định vị các dịch vụ thiết yếu như tư vấn thuê nhà và ngăn ngừa bị đuổi ra khỏi nhà, các dịch vụ pháp lý, giáo dục và tư vấn tài chính tại chỗ thuộc các dự án HOPE SF và RAD
- Tiếp tục hỗ trợ xây dựng cộng đồng và các chương trình phát triển khả năng lãnh đạo cho cư dân

Mục Tiêu 1Diii: Cung cấp hỗ trợ cho những cư dân ở nhà ở với giá hợp lý khác để đảm bảo sắp xếp nhà ở tốt cho họ

Hoạt động:

- Tạo tập thông tin chào đón để phát cho cư dân ở nhà ở với giá hợp lý mới và tìm hiểu kết nối các dịch vụ xã hội với cư dân
- Làm việc với các sở ban ngành của Thành Phố để tìm cách nâng cao cư trú ổn định trong nhà ở thông qua các dịch vụ lạm dụng được chất và sức khỏe tâm thần
- Tạo điều kiện kết nối với các dịch vụ hòa giải khi cần thiết
- Yêu cầu thông báo các dịch vụ cho người thuê khi đuổi ra khỏi nhà họ khỏi nhà ở được MOHCD tài trợ
- Cung cấp các dịch vụ nhà ở bổ sung theo yêu cầu cho các đơn vị nhà ở HOPWA hiện tại và những đơn vị nhà ở đang được xây dựng

Mục Tiêu 1Div: Tăng cường sự thích nghi giữa các cấp nhà ở cho các hộ gia đình bị nhiễm HIV

Hoạt động:

- Đảm bảo sự đánh giá về khả năng của người thuê nhà có khả năng sống độc lập để chuyển đến nhà ở phù hợp hơn

MỤC TIÊU 2: GIA ĐÌNH VÀ CÁ NHÂN CÓ KHẢ NĂNG PHỤC HỒI VÀ TỰ TÚC VỀ KINH TẾ

Nhu Cầu Trọng Yếu 2A: Thúc đẩy phát triển lực lượng lao động

Mục Tiêu 2Ai: Tạo điều kiện tiện lợi về việc làm trên nhiều lĩnh vực cho các nhóm người có nguy cơ cao

Hoạt động:

- Cung cấp dịch vụ lực lượng lao động cho các nhóm người có nguy cơ cao để chuẩn bị cho họ cơ hội việc làm
- MOHCD và Văn phòng Phát triển Kinh tế và Lực lượng lao động (OEWD) hợp tác cung cấp việc làm cho cư dân trong khu phố của họ

KẾ HOẠCH CHO PHƯƠNG ÁN Củng Cố GIAI ĐOẠN 2020-2024

- Mở rộng chương trình Tuyển Dụng Địa Phương (Local Hire) tập trung vào cư dân được ưu tiên nhận các công việc thi công, xây dựng và tìm hiểu Tuyển Dụng Địa Phương để tìm việc làm quản lý bất động sản
- Khuyến khích các nhà phát triển xây dựng mở rộng cơ hội việc làm trong quá trình phát triển của họ
- Cung cấp liên kết đến các cơ hội việc làm trong khu phố trên DAHLIA
- Quảng cáo việc làm trên trang web MOHCD

Nhu Cầu Trọng Yếu 2B: Tăng cường cơ hội thông qua cải thiện khả năng tiếp xúc với nhiều ngôn ngữ và phát triển kỹ năng cốt lõi

Mục Tiêu 2Bi: Cải thiện khả năng tiếp xúc các chương trình và dịch vụ của MOHCD thông qua công tác dịch thuật tài nguyên thông tin trên định dạng giấy và kỹ thuật số

Hoạt động:

- Cải thiện khả năng tiếp xúc với nhiều ngôn ngữ cho tất cả các chương trình và dịch vụ của MOHCD, các buổi hội thảo và các cuộc họp cộng đồng
- Xây dựng và lưu giữ tài liệu hướng dẫn tài nguyên thông tin chi tiết liệt kê các chương trình và dịch vụ theo ngôn ngữ cung cấp dịch vụ
- Tìm hiểu cách khiến cho DAHLIA có thể tiếp xúc được với nhiều nhóm người hơn bằng cách phiên dịch sang thêm nhiều ngôn ngữ nữa

Mục Tiêu 2Bii: Cung cấp tài nguyên thông tin để phát triển và đào tạo kỹ năng

Hoạt động:

- Tiếp tục hỗ trợ và hoàn thiện các chương trình phát triển kỹ năng trong các lĩnh vực như kỹ năng sống, GED và chương trình cấp văn bằng và chương trình tiếng Anh là Ngôn Ngữ Thứ Hai (ESL)
- Tập trung lập trình phát triển kỹ năng để tạo lộ trình rõ ràng đến các cơ hội đào tạo nâng cao hơn
- Kết hợp các chiến lược phát triển kỹ năng và kết nối dịch vụ để cung cấp các dịch vụ toàn diện hơn

Mục Tiêu 2Biii: Nâng cao hiểu biết về tài chính và quản lý tài chính cá nhân

Hoạt động:

- Tiếp tục hỗ trợ tư vấn và giáo dục tài chính, tạo dựng tài sản và tín dụng, giảm nợ, điều kiện tham gia các dịch vụ của ngân hàng và dịch vụ tư vấn và sửa đổi tín dụng
- Tăng cường đầu tư vào các dịch vụ chuyên sâu hơn nhằm tạo khả năng tài chính của người cần giúp và các dịch vụ huấn luyện trực tiếp liên tục tạo ra những cải thiện về kinh tế lâu dài
- Khuyến khích xác định các dịch vụ tài chính tại các cơ sở nhà ở và tại các tổ chức dựa vào cộng đồng

Mục Tiêu 2Biv: Nâng cao kiến thức kỹ thuật số

Hoạt động:

KẾ HOẠCH CHO PHƯƠNG ÁN CÙNG CỐ GIAI ĐOẠN 2020-2024

- Cung cấp đào tạo các kỹ năng kỹ thuật số cơ bản, trung cấp và nâng cao, thông qua các buổi hội thảo và giờ làm việc, và các mô hình phân phối sáng tạo mới tại các dự án nâng cao kiến thức kỹ thuật số dựa vào cộng đồng
- Tân trang và phân phối máy tính và các thiết bị khác cho các hộ gia đình có thu nhập thấp
- Làm việc với các trung tâm trong khu phố, bao gồm thư viện và trung tâm cộng đồng để có thể sử dụng miễn phí máy tính của họ nhằm mở rộng kiến thức kỹ thuật số cho những người hưởng lợi từ các dịch vụ do MOHCD tài trợ
- Hỗ trợ các chương trình cung cấp khả năng tiếp xúc kỹ thuật số và hỗ trợ nâng cao kiến thức kỹ thuật số cho cư dân và cơ sở nhà ở với giá hợp lý
- Hỗ trợ khả năng truy cập internet cho cư dân SRO
- Xây dựng năng lực công nghệ cho các tổ chức dựa trên cộng đồng (CBO), khuyến khích nhân viên CBO tổ chức lãnh đạo các khóa đào tạo và dịch vụ nâng cao kiến thức kỹ thuật số

Nhu Cầu Trọng Yếu 2C: Cung cấp quyền được nhận các dịch vụ pháp lý dân sự giải quyết vấn đề nhập cư và các vấn đề quan trọng khác một cách công bằng

Mục Tiêu 2Ci: Tăng điều kiện tiện lợi cho nhiều người nhận các dịch vụ pháp lý dân sự

Hoạt động:

- Tiếp tục cung cấp hỗ trợ cho các dịch vụ pháp lý liên quan đến nhập cư
- Tiếp tục hỗ trợ và phát triển các kế hoạch về dịch vụ và tài trợ tập trung vào các lĩnh vực thuộc luật dân sự bao gồm việc làm, gia đình, người tiêu dùng, phúc lợi và tình trạng khiếm khuyết

Nhu Cầu Trọng Yếu 2D: Giúp các hộ gia đình kết nối với các dịch vụ

Mục Tiêu 2Di: Tăng điều kiện tiện lợi cho nhiều người nhận các dịch vụ dựa trên cộng đồng

Hoạt động:

- Tiếp tục hỗ trợ và phát triển dịch vụ liên tục toàn diện hơn bao gồm tăng cường thông tin và giới thiệu, kết nối dịch vụ và quản lý/điều phối trường hợp
- Kết hợp các chiến lược phát triển kỹ năng và kết nối dịch vụ để cung cấp các dịch vụ toàn diện hơn
- Hỗ trợ các kế hoạch tiếp xúc với cộng đồng

MỤC TIÊU 3: CỘNG ĐỒNG CÓ CƠ SỞ HẠ TẦNG VẬT CHẤT, XÃ HỘI VÀ KINH DOANH LÀNH MẠNH

Nhu Cầu Trọng Yếu 3A: Tăng cường các cơ sở vật chất và địa điểm cộng đồng

Mục Tiêu 3Ai: Đảm bảo các nhà cung cấp dịch vụ phi lợi nhuận có cơ sở vật chất ổn định, chất lượng cao

Hoạt động:

KẾ HOẠCH CHO PHƯƠNG ÁN Củng Cố GIAI ĐOẠN 2020-2024

- Tiếp tục cung cấp hỗ trợ cải thiện vốn cho các cơ sở trong cộng đồng cung cấp các dịch vụ công cộng thiết yếu
- Tạo điều kiện xây dựng các đánh giá về nhu cầu vốn cho các cơ sở cộng đồng để đảm bảo khả năng phát triển bền vững lâu dài
- Cung cấp hỗ trợ để đáp ứng nhu cầu thiết kế liên quan đến việc tối đa hóa tiện ích của các cơ sở
- Cung cấp hỗ trợ cho các tổ chức để có được và/hoặc nhận ra các cơ hội cho thuê nhằm duy trì và phục vụ tốt hơn cho cộng đồng của họ

Mục Tiêu 3Aii: Tăng thêm địa điểm công cộng

Hoạt động:

- Tạo và cải thiện các tiện ích cộng đồng được thiết kế để phục vụ cư dân có thu nhập thấp

Nhu Cầu Trọng Yếu 3B: Tăng cường lãnh đạo chính trị cho giới thương mại và kinh doanh nhỏ

Mục Tiêu 3Bi: Khuyến khích khả năng phát triển và phát triển bền vững của các doanh nghiệp thuộc sở hữu địa phương

- Tiếp tục cung cấp hỗ trợ kỹ thuật kinh doanh thông qua các đối tác cộng đồng phù hợp về mặt văn hóa, dân tộc và ngôn ngữ cho các doanh nghiệp khởi nghiệp và hiện tại đang kinh doanh
- Tiếp tục tăng hiệu quả hỗ trợ kinh doanh kỹ thuật
- Tiếp tục hỗ trợ đầu tư cho vay doanh nghiệp nhỏ

Mục Tiêu 3Bii: Hỗ trợ phát triển và phát triển các lãnh đạo chính trị dành cho giới thương mại trong các khu dân cư thu nhập thấp

Hoạt động:

- Tiếp tục hỗ trợ thực hiện nỗ lực phát triển kinh tế địa phương tập trung vào phục hồi hành lang thương mại
- Tăng cường đầu tư vào mặt tiền và các cải tiến khác cho người thuê nhà
- Tăng cường đầu tư vào các dự án tiếp xúc và tuần thủ
- Tiếp tục thực hiện phương thức tiếp xúc tập trung vào địa lý để cung cấp dịch vụ theo cách thức thúc đẩy các khoản đầu tư khác của Thành Phố

Nhu Cầu Trọng Yếu 3C: Hỗ trợ các kế hoạch toàn diện hướng đến cộng đồng

Mục Tiêu 3Ci: Hỗ trợ thực hiện nỗ lực lập kế hoạch dựa vào khu phố

Hoạt động:

- Tiếp tục hỗ trợ và mở rộng các chương trình văn hóa của quận tại các Khu Văn Hóa được Hội Đồng phê duyệt
- Tiếp tục hỗ trợ các quy trình lập kế hoạch khu phố tập hợp những cư dân có thu nhập thấp, có nguy cơ rủi ro cao và bị tước quyền tham gia vào cộng đồng của họ

KẾ HOẠCH CHO PHƯƠNG ÁN Củng Cố GIAI ĐOẠN 2020-2024

- Tăng cường các kế hoạch và hoạt động phát triển kinh tế trong các kế hoạch hướng đến cộng đồng

Mục Tiêu 3Cii: Hỗ trợ xây dựng cộng đồng tại địa phương

Hoạt động:

- Tiếp tục hỗ trợ các mạng lưới tổ chức dựa vào cộng đồng và các bên liên quan quan trọng khác trong cộng đồng nhằm tăng cường điều phối và phối hợp dịch vụ cho cả các khu phố và nhóm dân cư cụ thể
- Tiếp tục hỗ trợ các chương trình tài trợ hành động trong cộng đồng tại khu phố

Nhu Cầu Trọng Yếu 3D: Hỗ trợ nhu cầu năng lực của các tổ chức dựa vào cộng đồng và các đối tác chuyên nghiệp của MOHCD

Mục Tiêu 3Di: Tăng cường năng lực của các tổ chức dựa vào cộng đồng

Hoạt động:

- Xây dựng năng lực tổ chức của những người được trợ cấp/nhà cung cấp MOHCD thông qua các khóa đào tạo, công việc dựa trên đoàn hệ, chuyên gia về chủ đề và các phương pháp hỗ trợ kỹ thuật khác
- Ưu tiên tăng cường củng cố các tổ chức và nhà phát triển dựa vào cộng đồng phục vụ nhóm người chưa từng được phục vụ
- Hỗ trợ nhân viên cơ quan đào tạo kỹ năng kỹ thuật số

MỤC TIÊU 4: CỘNG ĐỒNG CÓ NGUY CƠ DI DỜI ĐƯỢC ỔN ĐỊNH

Nhu Cầu Trọng Yếu 4A: Giải quyết các tác động bất bình đẳng về tăng trưởng kinh tế thông qua các biện pháp chống di dời cư dân và doanh nghiệp

Mục Tiêu 4Ai: Thực hiện các chính sách và chương trình ưu tiên cư dân và doanh nghiệp hiện tại

Hoạt động:

- Tiếp tục quản lý các chương trình ưu đãi chọn nhà ở ngẫu nhiên
- Khi MOHCD đánh giá và cập nhật các chính sách và quy trình cho Chương Trình Nhà Ở Nhà ở với giá hợp lý (Inclusionary) để đáp ứng nhu cầu hiện tại, khuyến nghị thay đổi/cập nhật song song cho Quy Chuẩn Quy Hoạch và các thỏa thuận cho vay dành cho nhà phát triển phi lợi nhuận
- Thực hiện chính sách quyền trả lại đối với việc cho thuê lại các tòa nhà nơi người thuê phải di dời
- Triển khai các luật của Thành Phố quy định quyền ưu tiên mua khi mua các tòa nhà có nguy cơ không thể chi trả

Mục Tiêu 4Aii: Khuyến khích người thuê nhà thương mại ở các không gian tầng trệt của các công trình phát triển nhà ở với giá hợp lý của MOHCD

Hoạt động:

KẾ HOẠCH CHO PHƯƠNG ÁN Củng Cố GIAI ĐOẠN 2020-2024

- Phối hợp với OEWD để hỗ trợ tài chính cho các cải tiến người thuê thương mại (công trình xây dựng hoàn thiện) cho các không gian ở tầng trệt
- Phối hợp với OEWD để tiếp thị các cơ hội không gian thương mại cho các tổ chức phi lợi nhuận địa phương

Mục Tiêu 4Aiii: CD: Giảm tình trạng di dời cho cư dân và doanh nghiệp

Hoạt động:

- Sử dụng các khoản trợ cấp cho thuê để giảm tình trạng di dời cho người thuê nhà
- Tận dụng các chương trình như Quyền Được Tư Vấn của Người Thuê Nhà và tư vấn cho người thuê nhà để hỗ trợ cư dân ở trong nhà của họ
- Thiết lập và thực hiện chính sách để giảm thiểu tác động tiêu cực của việc tăng tiền thuê nhà
- Mở rộng các chương trình được thiết kế để giữ chân chủ sở hữu nhà trong các cộng đồng đã từng bị loại trừ
- Phối hợp với các sở ban ngành khác để đảm bảo khả năng phát triển lâu dài của các tổ chức dựa vào khu vực lân cận
- Tận dụng các Khu Vực Văn Hóa (Cultural District) để hỗ trợ các chính sách chống di dời
- Tăng cường khả năng tiếp xúc các nguồn tài nguyên cho các doanh nghiệp nhỏ ở các khu vực thu nhập thấp muốn ở lại San Francisco

Nhu Cầu Trọng Yếu 4B: Đảm bảo tăng trưởng kinh tế mang lại lợi ích cho các cộng đồng hiện tại

Mục Tiêu 4Bi: Yêu cầu triển khai tuyển dụng địa phương ở mức độ lớn nhất có thể trong các dự án và chương trình của MOHCD

Hoạt động:

- Phối hợp với OEWD để sẵn sàng nhận việc và sắp xếp việc làm cho các dự án nhà ở với giá hợp lý
- Tiếp tục hỗ trợ tạo khả năng sẵn sàng nhận việc và sắp xếp công việc cho các dự án RAD và HOPE SF

Mục Tiêu 4Bii: Đảm bảo cung cấp đầy đủ các dịch vụ của Thành Phố trong các khu phố nơi có nhà ở với giá hợp lý của MOHCD

Hoạt động:

- Phối hợp với các đối tác của Thành Phố như Cơ Quan Giao Thông Vận Tải Thành Phố San Francisco (SFMTA) về các vấn đề giao thông
- Phối hợp với các sở ban ngành quan trọng của Thành Phố để xác định nhu cầu và cơ hội thực hiện và điều phối dịch vụ

Mục Tiêu 4Biii: Thực hiện các chương trình cung cấp lợi ích trực tiếp từ tăng trưởng kinh tế trong khu phố cho cộng đồng địa phương

Hoạt động:

KẾ HOẠCH CHO PHƯƠNG ÁN CÙNG CỐ GIAI ĐOẠN 2020-2024

- Tập trung vào phát triển tiện ích cho cộng đồng bị ảnh hưởng từ mật độ nhà ở gia tăng
- Phối hợp lập kế hoạch cho Khu Vực Văn Hóa (Cultural District) với các chương trình khởi xướng phát triển cộng đồng khác
- Tiếp tục xác định các cách thức theo đó các doanh nghiệp và cư dân hiện tại có thể tiếp xúc việc làm gia tăng và điều kiện tiện lợi để nhận vốn
- Phối hợp với các sở ban ngành khác của Thành Phố để xác định các cách thức bổ sung nhằm hỗ trợ doanh nghiệp và thương nghiệp quy mô siêu nhỏ tại địa phương

MỤC TIÊU 5: THÀNH PHỐ TIẾN HÀNH LOẠI BỎ NGUYÊN NHÂN GÂY CHÊNH LỆCH DO CHỦNG TỘC

Nhu Cầu Trọng Yếu 5A: Đảm bảo khả năng tiếp xúc công bằng các chương trình và dịch vụ, phối hợp với các sở ban ngành khác của Thành Phố

Mục Tiêu 5Ai: Phát triển tài trợ, chính sách và thông lệ thực tiễn cụ thể để đảm bảo quyền tiếp xúc công bằng với các chương trình MOHCD và OEWD

Hoạt động:

- Xem xét và đánh giá các hoạt động tiếp xúc với quan điểm công bằng về chủng tộc
- Cải thiện khả năng tiếp xúc với các khu phố và cộng đồng trước đây chưa được phục vụ
- Tận dụng khả năng tiếp xúc với nhiều văn hóa để tăng cường nhận thức về các nguồn lực dịch vụ và nhà ở hiện có
- Tiếp tục tạo tiêu chuẩn cho các điều kiện yêu cầu hội đủ để nhận nhà ở và chương trình, và các chính sách khác với quan điểm công bằng về chủng tộc
- Đánh giá và cải thiện các chương trình và dịch vụ của MOHCD để đảm bảo quyền tiếp xúc công bằng
- Phân tích những thiếu sót trong hoạt động sắp đặt cho các đối tượng có đặc trưng khác nhau và xác định các biện pháp can thiệp cần thiết để tạo quyền tiếp xúc công bằng với các tài nguyên nhà ở với giá hợp lý
- Khám phá các tùy chọn để mở rộng lợi ích của chương trình Chứng Nhận Ưu Tiên
- Tăng cường tài trợ và dịch vụ cho các cộng đồng chịu ảnh hưởng sâu sắc nhất từ việc loại trừ
- Khám phá và triển khai các biện pháp thực hiện công bằng về chủng tộc vào các quy trình mua, bao gồm các tiêu chuẩn lựa chọn của MOHCD và OEWD RFQ/RFP
- Hợp tác với Ủy Ban Nhân Quyền để thực hiện các chính sách công bằng về chủng tộc
- Triển khai các khóa đào tạo và hệ thống nhận thức chấn thương trên toàn sở ban ngành để hỗ trợ cải thiện dịch vụ khách hàng và khả năng tự chăm sóc

Nhu Cầu Trọng Yếu 5B: Truyền dẫn thông tin về tính công bằng chủng tộc và các giá trị cũng như thông lệ về khả năng tổn thương trong công việc của MOHCD và các đối tác

Mục Tiêu 5Bi: Kết hợp năng lực văn hóa, hệ thống nhận thức khả năng tổn thương và các nguồn lực và đào tạo khác về tính công bằng cho các đối tác MOHCD

KẾ HOẠCH CHO PHƯƠNG ÁN Củng Cố GIAI ĐOẠN 2020-2024

Hoạt động:

- Thuộc một phần trong chương trình đào tạo hiện có, xây dựng và tiến hành đào tạo về độ nhạy cảm văn hóa cho người được hưởng trợ cấp, các nhà phát triển và các đối tác quản lý tài sản và nhà ở
- Giáo dục cho các nhà cung cấp dịch vụ và nhà ở cho những người bị nhiễm HIV để tăng cường năng lực văn hóa và giảm kỳ thị

Mục Tiêu 5Bii: Kết hợp các nguyên tắc về công bằng chủng tộc trong thực tiễn tuyển dụng và thăng chức của MOHCD

Hoạt động:

- Xem xét các hoạt động tuyển dụng và thăng chức của MOHCD
- Thực hiện các thay đổi để hỗ trợ tốt hơn cho môi trường làm việc đa dạng và toàn diện

Mục Tiêu 5Biii: Tiến hành các nguyên tắc đạo đức và cách tiếp xúc công bằng với mọi chủng tộc và nhận thức chấn thương trong MOHCD

Hoạt động:

- Thành lập và thực hiện kế hoạch công bằng chủng tộc cho MOHCD
- Thực hiện phân tích công bằng với mọi chủng tộc hoàn chỉnh trong các chính sách nội bộ của MOHCD.
- Truyền đạt các nguyên tắc đạo đức cho cộng đồng bên ngoài và các bên liên quan
- Tiếp tục triệu tập Nhóm Công Tác về Công Bằng Chủng Tộc để tạo và thực hiện kế hoạch công bằng với mọi chủng tộc của MOHCD
- Tạo nhóm công tác nhận thức chấn thương để hỗ trợ thực hiện các hoạt động chữa trị

KẾ HOẠCH CHO PHƯƠNG ÁN Củng Cố Giai Đoạn 2020-2024

Bảng Chú Giải Thuật Ngữ

Thuật Ngữ:

ADA (Đạo Luật Người Mỹ Khuyết Tật) – luật dân quyền ban hành năm 1990 cấm phân biệt đối xử dựa trên tình trạng khuyết tật; được sử dụng trong ngữ cảnh này để chỉ các đơn vị có khả năng di động hoặc liên lạc đặc biệt

AMI (Thu Nhập Trung Bình Trong Khu Vực) – thu nhập hộ gia đình ở mức trung bình đối với khu vực đô thị nhất định (một nửa số lượng hộ gia đình kiếm được nhiều tiền hơn và một nửa số lượng hộ gia đình kiếm được ít tiền hơn). AMI được công bố đối với quy mô hộ gia đình từ một đến chín người.

Giấy Chứng Nhận Ưu Tiên – ưu tiên cung cấp nhà ở ngẫu nhiên cho những người bị di dời theo các hành động cụ thể của Cơ Quan Tái Phát Triển San Francisco trước đây trong những năm 1960 đến 1980

Phối Hợp Nhập Cảnh – hệ thống đánh giá và ưu tiên tập trung để bố trí, sắp xếp nguồn lực cho người vô gia cư

Khu Văn Hóa – chương trình của Thành Phố với các khu vực chỉ định trong cộng đồng nhằm tôn vinh và củng cố bản sắc văn hóa độc đáo của San Francisco và để phối hợp các nguồn lực nhằm hỗ trợ tạo khả năng ổn định cho các cộng đồng dễ bị tổn thương khi phải đối mặt hoặc có nguy cơ bị di dời

DAHLIA (Cơ Sở Dữ Liệu về Việc Lập Danh Sách, Thông Tin và Ứng Dụng Nhà Ở Giá Cả Phải Chăng) – công cụ trực tuyến giúp các hộ gia đình tìm kiếm và đăng ký nhận nhà ở với giá hợp lý

DALP (Chương Trình Cho Vay Hỗ Trợ Tiền Đặt Cọc) – chương trình cho vay hỗ trợ tiền đặt cọc giúp các hộ gia đình đầu giá nhận tài sản trong thị trường mở

Thỏa Thuận Phát Triển – các hợp đồng được ký kết bởi Thành Phố và Quận San Francisco và nhà phát triển quy định các quy tắc, quy định, cam kết và chính sách của dự án phát triển trong một khoảng thời gian cụ thể

HOA (Hiệp Hội Chủ Sở Hữu Nhà) – tổ chức của chủ sở hữu nhà phát triển nhà ở, mục đích là để bảo tồn, duy trì và nâng cao nhà ở và giá trị nhà ở

HOPE SF – Sáng kiến tìm cách chuyển đổi bốn trong số các cơ sở nhà ở có tình cảnh khó khăn nhất của San Francisco (Hunters View, Alice Griffith, Sunnysdale-Velasco và Potrero Terrace và Annex) thành các cộng đồng phát triển mạnh mẽ thông qua quá trình phục hồi toàn diện

HOPWA (Cơ Hội Nhà Ở Cho Người Bị AIDS) – chương trình liên bang giúp những người nhiễm HIV/AIDS có được và duy trì nhà ở thông qua các khoản trợ cấp cho thuê và các hỗ trợ nhà ở khác

KẾ HOẠCH CHO PHƯƠNG ÁN CÙNG CỐ GIAI ĐOẠN 2020-2024

(Chương Trình Nhà Ở) Bao Gồm – chương trình của Thành Phố yêu cầu các nhà phát triển nhà ở giá thị trường cung cấp các đơn vị nhà ở với giá hợp lý, theo quy định của Mục 415 của Bộ Luật Quy Hoạch San Francisco

Tuyển Dụng Địa Phương – chính sách của San Francisco nhằm thúc đẩy tuyển dụng cư dân địa phương cho các dự án xây dựng do địa phương tài trợ

Chương Trình Trợ Cấp Điều Hành Tại Địa Phương – chương trình trợ cấp của San Francisco nhằm thu hẹp khoảng cách giữa số tiền thuê nhà mà cư dân trước đây bị vô gia cư có thể trả và chi phí vận hành nhà ở cho người vô gia cư

Chương Trình Chứng Nhận Tín Dụng Thế Chấp – chương trình của Cơ Quan Tài Chính Nhà Ở California cho phép người mua nhà lần đầu có thu nhập thấp đến trung bình chuyển đổi một phần khoản thanh toán lãi thế chấp hàng năm của họ thành tín dụng thuế

PBV (Ưu Đãi dựa trên Dự Án) – khoản trợ cấp cho thuê từ Cơ Quan Nhà Ở gắn liền với một đơn vị cụ thể, không dành cho người thuê

Nhà Ở Bổ Sung – chương trình MOHCD chính bố trí các đơn vị nhà ở và trợ cấp cho các hộ gia đình HIV+

RAD (Chứng Minh Hỗ Trợ Tiền Thuê) – sáng kiến phục hồi và chuyển đổi tài sản nhà ở công cộng sang các thuộc tính chứng từ dựa trên dự án Mục 8

RFQ (Yêu Cầu Trình Độ)/RFP (Yêu Cầu Đề Xuất) – hai loại phương pháp tiêu chuẩn của khu vực công dùng để thu hút các nhà cung cấp hoặc cơ quan đấu thầu dịch vụ hoặc đưa ra đề xuất cho dịch vụ

SRO (Cư Trú Phòng Đơn) – loại đơn vị nhà ở thường là nơi một số các đơn vị nhà ở dùng chung một số tiện nghi như phòng tắm và nhà bếp

Quyền Được Tư Vấn của Người Thuê Nhà – sáng kiến được người bỏ phiếu chấp thuận cung cấp đại diện pháp lý đầy đủ cho các hộ gia đình phải đối mặt với việc đuổi ra khỏi nhà

Public Comments Received and MOHCD Responses - Strategies

Name	Affiliation	Comment	MOHCD/OEWD/HSR Response
Ayanna Weathersby	BHNC	Please add the reentry community (to the needs listed for the HIV+ persons)	The reentry community will be included in the theory of change target populations section addressing the needs of people with HIV.
Ellen Hammerle	Catholic Charities	The clinical and substance abuse issues have increased for HIV+ persons given acuity levels. Services that could be provided on site at programs would be helpful to our clients.	Our work with other City departments to explore improving housing stability through mental health and substance abuse services is now included under 1Dii.
Dario R. Martin	Piramid-All	After several months of work and waiting, I have finished: developing, calculating, registering, and patenting a House of the Future, which I called Piramid-All. This house can be self-supplied totally or partially with renewable energy.	MOHCD appreciates the information about the proposed product.
Marty Cerles		The Housing Shortage Crises is the Number One issue facing all San Franciscans. The only solution to this Crises is by streamlining the construction of housing at all income levels and by reducing local opposition/control to new housing construction. I do not see any of this in the materials provided and would strongly urge you to include this.	Streamlining is generally stated under 1Ai and all City permitting agencies are directed to expedite housing production in San Francisco under Executive Directive 17-02, which the Mayor issued on September 17, 2017.
Winnie Yu	Self-Help for the Elderly	Given the growing demographic trends, we urge the City and MOHCD to include immigrants and seniors as target populations in the proposed strategies because they have critical needs requiring appropriate strategies to address them.	Seniors and immigrants are included in the theory of change target populations.

Public Comments Received and MOHCD Responses - Strategies

Name	Affiliation	Comment	MOHCD/OEWD/HSB Response
Lavada Gascoigne-Smith	DPH	For Goal 1Bii - Increase affordability of rental housing - bullet point number 4 - Pilot new rent subsidy programs for underserved populations, research at the DPH Maternal Child & Adolescent Health has shown that pregnant African American women are definitely an underserved population, especially in the Bayview Hunters Point district. We have seen that housing insecurities are one of the factors in hypertension issues for the mother, premature births, and the most tragic, infant deaths. What would it entail to get African American pregnant women as a priority population?	African Americans are included in the theory of change target populations.
Finn Black	Berkeley Free Clinic	My main comment is on Goal 1Civ, which involves "ending encampments" and conducting counts of tents and vehicles. Focusing on measures of visible homelessness should not be equated with actually reducing homelessness. Some potential alternatives to the focus on ending encampments include developing higher quality shelters, offering high quality long-term shelters, and include a genuine bridge to permanent housing.	Thank you for the comment. HSB and our partners continue to provide street outreach to provide care, and connection to housing, shelter and other services for people experiencing homelessness.
Finn Black	Berkeley Free Clinic	For Goal 5Ai and 5Bi, I suggest focusing on cultural humility rather than cultural competency.	The department will reference both concepts in the strategies.

Public Comments Received and MOHCD Responses - Strategies

Name	Affiliation	Comment	MOHCD/OEWD/HSR Response
Michael Blecker	Swords to Plowshares	Missing from this plan are specific goals and activities targeting San Francisco's low-income and homeless senior population. The Department of Aging and Adult Services provides critical services to our City's seniors and adults with disabilities; however, their focus is not on those who are homeless or severely impoverished. Additional targeted efforts led by MOHCD and DSHS are essential to ensuring that some of our most vulnerable neighbors are adequately supported.	Seniors are included in the theory of change target populations. HSR will continue to fund supportive housing and shelter dedicated to seniors.
Michael Blecker	Swords to Plowshares	Goal 1Bii: Increase affordability of rental housing Activities (1Bii): Expand AMI range for select projects, which will fund more housing for lower-income households and extremely low-income housing for those living on a fixed income.	MOHCD investigating rental subsidy options to assist extremely low-income households living on a fixed income.
Michael Blecker	Swords to Plowshares	Goal 1Cii: Reduce homelessness for adults, seniors, veterans, youth, and families Indicators of success (1Cii): Reduce chronic homelessness for veterans by 50% by December 2021	Thank you for the comment. HSR will continue to fund supportive housing dedicated to veterans.
Michael Blecker	Swords to Plowshares	Goal 1Cvi: Expand services to prevent homelessness and stabilize housing for formerly homeless households and those at risk of homelessness Activities (1Cvi): Allow for transfers across subsidies so that tenants can move up or down in their level of residential care based on their clinical or medical needs.	Thank you for the comment. HSR will continue to transfer veterans and other formerly homeless adults in housing between sites in response to their reasonable accommodation needs.

Public Comments Received and MOHCD Responses - Strategies

Name	Affiliation	Comment	MOHCD/OEWD/HSR Response
Michael Blecker	Swords to Plowshares	Goal 1Di: Reduce rate of evictions Activities (1Di): Address barriers that keep people from seeking treatment such as loss of housing (i.e. 90 days out of subsidized unit means a loss of subsidy which can include time during hospitalization, incarceration, or treatment programs)	While most absence policies of publicly assisted housing indicate that a unit is to be turned over after a 90-day absence, in practice City agencies and their housing partners either accommodate a longer absence or prioritize housing placement post-treatment after the loss of the original unit, as to not disincentivize treatment.
Michael Blecker	Swords to Plowshares	Goal 2Di: Help households connect to services Activities (2Di): Increase staffing according to needs based on the clients served now with coordinated entry in place	We have increased average grant size to be able to better support the full cost of programs, which may include increased staffing
Michael Blecker	Swords to Plowshares	Goal 2Ci: Increase access to legal services Activities (2Ci): Increase support and targeted funding for legal services specifically providing services to obtain disability benefits and compensation through VA and social security Indicator of success (2Ci): Number of low-income and/or homeless veterans with disabilities who have their veterans' benefits (access to healthcare, benefits, disability) successfully resolved with legal assistance	MOHCD supports a variety of civil legal services, including those that relate to health and long-term care (Medicare, Medicaid, Medi-Cal, etc.), and income-maintenance (CalWORKs, Food Stamps, Social Security, SSI, Unemployment Compensation, Veteran Benefits, Workers' Compensation, etc.). We will specifically track the number of clients that obtain Veterans benefits through our Activities and Outcomes within the Benefits Advocacy strategy area.
Michael Blecker	Swords to Plowshares	Goal 3Ai: Ensure nonprofit service providers have high quality, safe and stable facilities Activities (3Ai): Provide support for facilities improvements that address safety for staff working with acute populations	These facilities improvements are eligible to be addressed through MOHCD's Capital Improvements program.

Public Comments Received and MOHCD Responses - Strategies

Name	Affiliation	Comment	MOHCD/OEWD/HSR Response
Michael Blecker	Swords to Plowshares	Goal 3Di: Increase capacity of community-based organizations Activities (3Di): Provide targeted funding for enhancing data collection capacity and infrastructure	We have increased average grant size to be able to better support the full cost of programs, which may include data collection capacity and infrastructure
Michael Blecker	Swords to Plowshares	Goal 5Biii: Implement racial equity and trauma-informed values and approaches throughout MOHCD and its partners Activities (5Biii): Create trauma-informed working group with providers and people with lived experiences (youth, seniors, veterans, LGBTQI, etc.) to support implementation of healing practices	We are currently forming an internal trauma-informed working group (and have had an internal racial equity working group since the Fall of 2017). These internal working groups will engage in dialogue with external stakeholders (including grantees and residents) as their work progresses.
Tobias Damm-Luhr	Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights	Under 4.A.ii., Encourage commercial tenants to locate on ground-floor spaces of MOHCD's affordable housing developments: In addition to the activity, "Work with OEWD to market commercial space opportunities to local non-profits," we propose adding, "Work with OEWD to market commercial space opportunities in MOHCD's affordable housing developments to registered Legacy Businesses and other small businesses owned by low-income people that have been identified as at-risk of displacement" to the extent that this is not already taking place.	Community partners work closely with Legacy Businesses and other small businesses owned by low income people; a such, OEWD will promote and share commercial space opportunities with CDBG funded partners in an effort to increase awareness among our targeted populations.

Public Comments Received and MOHCD Responses - Strategies

Name	Affiliation	Comment	MOHCD/OEWD/HSR Response
Tobias Damm-Luhr	Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights	Under 4.A.iii: CD: Reduce displacement of residents and businesses, In addition to the activity, "Utilize rental subsidies to reduce displacement of tenants," and, "Create and implement policies to mitigate negative impacts of rent increases," we propose adding: --"Enact limits on monthly rental rate increases for local small businesses who rent space in City-owned properties"; and --"Provide small businesses renting space in City-owned properties with flexible rental rates and options to extend their leases."	Community Cornerstones is a program in its first-year pilot phase that allocates funding to support MOHCD affordable housing developments that contain commercial ground floor space. The program provides funds to nonprofits located within new affordable housing developments with grants and guidance around needed tenant improvements. Separately, Community Cornerstones supports small businesses within commercial sites acquired through MOHCD's small site acquisition by also providing funds to support the required tenant improvements once the buildings are acquired. The goal of the program is to secure and stabilize nonprofits and small businesses in commercial spaces.
Jessica Lehman	Senior and Disability Action, in collaboration with other members of the LTCCC's Housing Workgroup	Goal 1Ai: Create more affordable housing: add Advocate for the federal government to release more Frank Melville Act funding	MOHCD will investigate the inclusion of such advocacy as part of the City's federal legislative agenda.
Jessica Lehman	SDA, with other members of the LTCCC's Housing Workgroup	Goal 1Ai: Create more affordable housing: add Increase housing opportunities for seniors and people with disabilities, and/or ensure that new affordable units are accessible and affordable to people on very low incomes (such as SSI or Social Security)	MOHCD will continue to explore how to increase housing opportunities for seniors and persons with disabilities through its housing pipeline for the 5-year Consolidated Plan period.

Public Comments Received and MOHCD Responses - Strategies

Name	Affiliation	Comment	MOHCD/OEWD/HSR Response
Jessica Lehman	SDA, with other members of the LTCCC's Housing Workgroup	Goal 1Aii: Preserve affordable housing: add Preserve affordable residential SRO units / prevent conversion to tourist units or short-term rental units / fund enforcement of current laws regarding SROs. (This is partly an issue of landlords "choosing" not to re-rent.)	Acquisition of existing SRO buildings is a permitted use of MOHCD's Small Sites Program in order to preserve them as affordable housing. Enforcement of residential hotel conversions is not under MOHCD's jurisdiction, therefore MOHCD does not fund that activity. Short-term rentals are not a permitted use of MOHCD's below market rate housing.
Jessica Lehman	SDA, with other members of the LTCCC's Housing Workgroup	Goal 1Aii: Preserve affordable housing: Under "Continue to support home modification programs that benefit low-income homeowners," add "and renters"	Rehab of existing rental affordable housing that is owned by non-profits is listed under "Rehabilitate existing housing to preserve its affordability". We do not have a program for private rental housing landlords to rehab their buildings other than the elevator rebate program, where we provide up to 40% of the cost for elevator rehab or replacement in SROs.
Jessica Lehman	SDA, with other members of the LTCCC's Housing Workgroup	Goal 1Aiii: Improve data and analytics on affordable housing inventory and placements: Suggested activity: Ensure that open waiting lists for all affordable housing in San Francisco, not just MOHCD-sponsored affordable housing, are included on DAHLIA. Of the providers of HUD-funded affordable housing in SF, only TNDC consistently lists its open waiting lists on DAHLIA. This leaves many potential applicants for affordable housing, especially those with Extremely Low Income, unaware of possible resources that they deeply need. It will be a challenge to ensure that housing providers who receive no City funding list their waitlist openings with DAHLIA;	Every non-profit housing developer that receives City funds must open their waitlists for all their properties in DAHLIA. DAHLIA has a link to the HUD website. We agree that it will be a challenge to require housing providers with no City funding to list their available units in DAHLIA.

Public Comments Received and MOHCD Responses - Strategies

Name	Affiliation	Comment	MOHCD/OEWD/HSR Response
		perhaps the City could contact HUD Fair Housing for help with this issue.	
Jessica Lehman	SDA, with other members of the LTCCC's Housing Workgroup	Goal 1Aiii: Improve data and analytics on affordable housing inventory and placements: Suggested activity: Create a registry of all housing in San Francisco	MOHCD has a list of all affordable housing units within our portfolio. It would be a challenge to require private landlords who receive no City funding to register their housing units with the City.
Jessica Lehman	SDA, with other members of the LTCCC's Housing Workgroup	Goal 1Bii: Increase affordability of rental housing: Suggested activity: Look into the feasibility of promoting the use of HUD's Section 811 PRA program ("Frank Melville") funds to target persons with mobility impairments, so that these renters can find affordable, accessible units in new affordable housing complexes. While other HUD programs that target non-senior people with disabilities (for example, Mainstream vouchers) can make SF housing affordable, the Section 811 PRA program provides for housing that is both affordable and physically accessible.	MOHCD has a strong desire to leverage all Federal funding programs available and can explore this suggestion.

Public Comments Received and MOHCD Responses - Strategies

Name	Affiliation	Comment	MOHCD/OEWD/HSR Response
Jessica Lehman	SDA, with other members of the LTCCC's Housing Workgroup	Goal 1Bii: Increase affordability of rental housing: Suggested activity: Under "Continue to support long-term rental subsidies," add: "Including rental subsidies specific to senior and people with disabilities," and add: Establish permanent operating subsidies for seniors and people with disabilities.	MOHCD recognizes that seniors and people with disabilities have severe rent burdens (meaning that they pay 50% or more of their income toward rent). Long-term rental subsidies (tenant-based) are designed to lessen this burden to a level that is sustainable. Similarly, permanent operating subsidies (project-based) enable households of lower incomes to access more deeply subsidized housing. At MOHCD, these subsidies primarily target seniors and people with disabilities.
Jessica Lehman	SDA, with other members of the LTCCC's Housing Workgroup	Goal 1Biii: Increase opportunities for sustainable homeownership: Under "Improve mobility for growing ownership households," insert "or shrinking"	We have incorporated this change.
Jessica Lehman	SDA, with other members of the LTCCC's Housing Workgroup	Goal 1Biv: Increase access to rental and homeownership housing: Under the first activity, add o Include housing counseling for seniors and people with disabilities who have been in units for a long period and are targeted for displacement.	Seniors and persons with disabilities are included within "populations at risk of displacement," and MOHCD is funding projects that specifically focus on these populations.
Jessica Lehman	SDA, with other members of the LTCCC's Housing Workgroup	Goal 1Biv: Increase access to rental and homeownership housing: Under "continue to develop and maintain DAHLIA," "Add additional functionality and additional programs and resources," add "including programs and resources for extremely low-income people"	We have incorporated this change.

Public Comments Received and MOHCD Responses - Strategies

Name	Affiliation	Comment	MOHCD/OEWD/HSR Response
Jessica Lehman	SDA, with other members of the LTCCC's Housing Workgroup	Goal 1Biv: Increase access to rental and homeownership housing: Change "Ensure ADA units are going to the right people" to: Ensure units that are accessible for people with disabilities go to people who need them. If someone is placed into an accessible unit who does not need it, create a plan for the person to move to an inaccessible unit when someone needs the accessible unit.	We have incorporated this change.
Jessica Lehman	SDA, with other members of the LTCCC's Housing Workgroup	Goal 1Ci: Improve systems to help each person find the right path to permanent housing: Add: Continue triage efforts to identify and properly place seniors and people with disabilities, so that people get the care they need in the community whenever possible.	Thank you for your comment. HSR continues to provide Coordinated Entry prioritization for housing and services to all people experiencing homelessness to access the most appropriate available care in the Homeless Response System.
Jessica Lehman	SDA, with other members of the LTCCC's Housing Workgroup	Goal 1Cii: Reduce homelessness for adults, youth, and families: "mainstream" institutions – what does that refer to? Just hospitals and jails?	Mainstream institutions refer to hospitals, jails, prisons, other health, and behavioral health settings (treatment, long term care facilities, etc.).
Jessica Lehman	SDA, with other members of the LTCCC's Housing Workgroup	Goal 1Cii: Reduce homelessness for adults, youth and families: Add: Ensure that seniors and people who are ready to exit Laguna Honda Hospital, Skilled Nursing Facilities (SNFs), RCFCIs, or other facilities can get housing to do so.	Thank you for the comment. Seniors are part of the adult population and some seniors are also members of families.

Public Comments Received and MOHCD Responses - Strategies

Name	Affiliation	Comment	MOHCD/OEWD/HSR Response
Jessica Lehman	SDA, with other members of the LTCCC's Housing Workgroup	Goal 1Cvi: Expand services to prevent homelessness: Add: Provide culturally competent mental health services to people in a variety of locations (mobile, 24-hour, etc.)	Thank you for the comment. HSR and our partners continue to provide street outreach to provide care, and connection to housing, shelter and other services for people experiencing homelessness and partner with the Department of Public Health and others to maximize access to care for people experiencing homelessness.
Jessica Lehman	SDA, with other members of the LTCCC's Housing Workgroup	Goal 1Di: Reduce rate of evictions: Add: Determine how people with disabilities can get additional support as needed in preventing eviction. (accompaniment to hearings, assistance filling out paperwork, e.g.)	MOHCD recognizes that people with disabilities are better served with additional support. Our model of eviction-related legal services, for example, integrates social work and legal fields. Social workers and advocates work in tandem with attorneys. Tenant counseling programs similarly offer more intensive assistance to people who need it. For example, a tenant counseling program may assist a tenant with completing a Rent Board petition and accompany that tenant to the Rent Board hearing. We consider these approaches a best practice.
Jessica Lehman	SDA, with other members of the LTCCC's Housing Workgroup	Goal 1Di: Reduce rate of evictions: In "Under Tenant Right to Counsel initiative...", edit: "expand support for full scope tenant counseling and legal representation for ALL residents facing eviction"	While MOHCD's multi-pronged eviction prevention strategy includes tenant counseling (i.e., tenants' rights counseling provided by a non-attorney), the Tenant Right to Counsel initiative involves full-scope legal representation that only a licensed attorney can provide. The universal nature of the initiative is noted.

Public Comments Received and MOHCD Responses - Strategies

Name	Affiliation	Comment	MOHCD/OEWD/HSR Response
Jessica Lehman	SDA, with other members of the LTCCC's Housing Workgroup	Goal 1Dii: Increase access to services for residents of public...: The activity "Explore expansion of services to residents of SRO hotels" is good but should be more specific.	The strategies in this document are often broad because we want the community and nonprofit partners to be able to help inform our response to these needs. Through our recent RFP process, we have expanded services to SRO residents through both on-site social services and shallow rent subsidies.
Jessica Lehman	SDA, with other members of the LTCCC's Housing Workgroup	Goal 2Ai: Provide access to employment: First activity should not use vulnerable (it's very disempowering and sometimes insulting) but should spell out the populations, such as: seniors, people with disabilities, formerly homeless people, and other marginalized populations...	We have incorporated this change.
Jessica Lehman	SDA, with other members of the LTCCC's Housing Workgroup	Goal 2Di: Increase access to community-based services: Add: Ensure that DAHLIA housing information and all other MOHCD resources continue to be available by paper for those who cannot or do not use a computer.	MOHCD will continue to provide funding for housing counselors to provide assistance with DAHLIA. MOHCD will continue to accept paper housing applications.
Jessica Lehman	SDA, with other members of the LTCCC's Housing Workgroup	Goal 3Ai: Add: Provide support for increased rent needed for nonprofit organizations to remain in their communities. With this corresponding indicator: # of organizations receiving rental assistance	MOHCD partners with the Office of Economic and Workforce Development, the SF Arts Commission, and Community Vision (formerly Northern California Community Loan Fund) to provide technical assistance, lease negotiation assistance, and grant assistance for relocation or acquisition costs. Grantees are also able to pay for rent through their grants with MOHCD, in

Public Comments Received and MOHCD Responses - Strategies

Name	Affiliation	Comment	MOHCD/OEWD/HSR Response
			accordance with their own cost allocation procedures.
Jessica Lehman	SDA, with other members of the LTCCC's Housing Workgroup	Goal 3Ai: Somewhere under Objective 3, it would be good to include work on or even just support for efforts to improve pedestrian safety, so that residents, including seniors and people with disabilities, can get around their communities safely and confidently.	Improvements such as these can included as part of projects through our Complete Neighborhoods Program, for designated areas impacted by housing development. We have also completed pedestrian safety projects, such as installing traffic lights and "bulb outs" at designated intersections, through our South of Market Stabilization Fund.

Public Comments Received and MOHCD Responses - Strategies

Name	Affiliation	Comment	MOHCD/OEWD/HSR Response
Jessica Lehman	SDA, with other members of the LTCCC's Housing Workgroup	<p>Goal 4Ai: Implement policies and programs that prioritize current residents and businesses: Add: Add a preference for SF residents who need, but do not have, a UFAS (ADA) accessible unit to the City's displacement preference. This would apply to both homeless SF residents with mobility impairments, and SF residents with mobility impairments who are staying in inaccessible units but cannot afford to leave them. The old "Federal preferences" promulgated by HUD gave a displacement preference to applicants needing (and not living in) an accessible unit. Giving SF residents needing a UFAS unit a local displacement preference would mirror this policy.</p> <p>Given that roughly half the housing in San Francisco was built before 1940 (according to SF's Housing Element) and is mostly inaccessible, there is an almost total disconnect in the for-profit market between affordability and accessibility. The SF Rent Law restricts rent-controlled housing to housing built and occupied before June 1979, while the Federal Fair Housing Amendments Act requires only those market-rate multifamily buildings built since March 1991 to include accessible units.</p> <p>Giving applicants needing a UFAS unit a preference in BMR units, especially, would ensure that such applicants have a better chance to find housing that is both affordable and accessible.</p>	<p>This would require a change in City law as housing preferences are legislated and then they are codified in Article 47 of the City Administrative Code.</p>

Public Comments Received and MOHCD Responses - Strategies

Name	Affiliation	Comment	MOHCD/OEWD/HSR Response
Jessica Lehman	SDA, with other members of the LTCCC's Housing Workgroup	Goal 4Aii: Add indicator: # of community-serving non-profits who locate in MOHCD's affordable housing developments	MOHCD can explore inclusion of this indicator.
Jessica Lehman	SDA, with other members of the LTCCC's Housing Workgroup	Goal 4Aiii overlaps greatly with the section on eviction. No harm in repeating these important issues but the layout is a little confusing.	This redundancy is noted but given the importance of displacement and eviction issues for our department (and the city as a whole), the department chose to highlight it in both sections.
Jessica Lehman	SDA, with other members of the LTCCC's Housing Workgroup	Objective 5 is very important and should be moved up, not buried in the back. And you might add a section on other cultural competency. It would be powerful for MOHCD to go through training on disability and ableism, as the staff of the Department of Aging and Adult Services has done.	Thank you for the comment. Cultural competency/cultural humility training is included in the strategies.
Jessica Lehman	SDA, with other members of the LTCCC's Housing Workgroup	Glossary: It is confusing to use ADA to refer to accessible units, as the ADA actually does not cover accessible units at all. This is from the Fair Housing Act and Amendments, and the Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards.	MOHCD can refer to accessible units as mobility or communication units rather than using American Disabilities Act to refer to accessible units.

MOHCD, OEWD and HSH Public Meeting
Proposed Strategies for 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan
Monday, August 5, 2019
HSA Born Auditorium 170 Otis Street

Speaker #: 1 Name: Winnie Yu

Comment: Thank you for meeting and invitation Love this chart with target populations. Reiterate importance of immigrants in SF. Communities live in isolation. Seniors and people of disability make up a significant part of the immigrant population. Senior population is growing rapidly. Age group 85+ is fastest growing segment in SF. Persons with disabilities 25%. Seniors 60+ are 20% now but will be 26% in 2030. Many, especially API seniors, are living in poverty. 42% of API live in poverty, 1/3 are seniors. Immigrants have bilingual needs, especially workforce and connection to city services. Linguistic isolation. English only is 35%. Top language Chinese, Spanish, Tagalog, Russian. Older adults tend to be low-income, with high cost of living in SF, need lots more services to help immigrants remain in the city. More affordable housing rental subsidies, adult day, senior services, bilingual job training services needed.

Speaker #: 2 Name: David Woo

Comment: Of SOMA Community Action Network. On affordable housing, can't rely on private development to fund new and preserve old. Need a stable dedicated source of funding especially for site preservation. Can't provide funding that exacerbates existing issues. Need to scale up affordable housing, especially by MOHCD at grassroots level where it grew out of. All public land should be public development, no public land for private development. Especially as city is talking about needing to save money in development process. We need to do land banking, land price goes up every year, so that will save money for the future. Land banking is a way for the city to save on development costs. Looking at development cost, should leverage public land for development. Public land should be for public development only. Especially since city needs to save money. Land banking should be done aggressively. Saves money now. Public land in public hands and land banking as strategy is way to save on costs. Supportive community building – need to let communities lead this, grassroots process. Feel that planning department is missing from conversation, wondering where their process is on that in land use planning.

Speaker #: 3 Name: Loraine Petty

Comment: Was a participant in the Western Addition forum, a member of Senior Disability Action and a housing advocate. A lot of great stuff, read the report, every word. Want to make sure it's not purely aspirational, wants to make sure it gets carried out. Everyone is counting on you. Like very much about supporting and expanding long term rent subsidies for inclusionary housing. Fully support using public lands for public housing. Like David, no public land for private housing, none for market rate housing. Support commitment to reporting how much housing is built, how many people are served, but should be annual, not every 5 years. Should be modeled after recent legislation proposed last week by Norman Yee 190846 – calls for annual housing development and pipeline report for seniors and people with disabilities. For multi-unit housing Information needs to be culturally and neighborhood accessible. Not

MOHCD, OEWD and HSH Public Meeting
Proposed Strategies for 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan
Monday, August 5, 2019
HSA Born Auditorium 170 Otis Street

just throw it up online. Wants AMI to be expanded to extremely low-income folks. Ground floor retail with rents affordable to neighborhood servicing businesses and nonprofits.

Speaker #: **Name:** Linda Richardson

Comment: Wearing many hats, former SF planning commissioner, working to help city build large scale affordable housing. Good plan, needs \$2b to do it. Mayor Breed proposing \$600m, needs at least \$1b. MOHCD is a gold standard for helping people with HIV in housing. Only city going above and beyond in this. Can't do any of this without public private partnership. The infrastructure that you need, the city cannot afford that. You need private funds. The market rate housing subsidizes the affordable housing. That's the way it is. The question is where are you able to get the funding to accomplish even 10% of all these brilliant plans.

Speaker #: 7 Name: Sarah Sherburn-Zimmer

Comment: Housing Rights Committee of SF. Thank you for adding communities with AIDS. Applaud you for adding addressing racial disparities. This framework is important piece of that. Want to stress when talking about affordable housing and displacement. Rent control is one of the sources of affordable housing in San Francisco. Important to keep people in that housing, many are tricked into leaving. Outreach to those who are most vulnerable: seniors, people with disabilities, families with children. So not only provide legal services, but also need to provide information to them, not expect them to come to you. On topic of creating, purchasing, building new affordable housing – we get all wonky about AMI, half of seniors in San Francisco are under 30% of AMI. The real importance of housing at 30% AMI for seniors and families with kids is that people have enough money to eat.

Speaker #: 8 Name: David Hyman

Comment: Member of LGBT Cultural District but not speaking for them, but very eager to help with this plan any way they can. A very daunting list of needs but very inspiring list of things you might do. Question is if this is exhaustive list or have you already pared down and prioritized? Had feeling that there should be a larger document behind the scenes that identifies who is responsible for each of these activities and are they already doing this, or if it not started, what is the status. Wants to know which activities were not included on the list of activities. Would be helpful to us because we're hiring a new director; we would want to know where this person should start to get educated. This person will be a resource for the community, for example business facing displacement or business with a new idea, want to be a resource, need to know where to start to get this person education and learn where the gaps are. Who is out there who might be able to help this situation, even if we don't have the resources

MOHCD, OEWD and HSH Public Meeting
Proposed Strategies for 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan
Monday, August 5, 2019
HSA Born Auditorium 170 Otis Street

Speaker #: 10 Name: Theresa Imperial

Comment: Consolidated plan is very extensive but also wondering where the money is coming from. Looking at prevent and reduce homelessness. ...Glad of increase to accessibility for rental assistance, MOHCD requirement is 70% rent burden, people who are looking for assistance is already 50% rent burden and they can already access this. When it comes to assistance, lots of requirements to fill out paperwork. Especially for senior population, a discombobulated process. Need to make rental assistance more accessible, information more consistent across the housing counseling agencies. Even when people are applying for affordable housing, they still need rental assistance.

Speaker #: 11 Name: Theodore Randolph

Comment: Seems to me that this plan doesn't have anything in it to address the scale of the problem. The amount of AH that we're short is the high tens thousands at minimum. But the multimillion-dollar bond would only add a thousand or a few thousands if we lower cost of building. So, it seems that the money we have on hand is very short of the money that we need. And also, that the methods we are thinking of increasing the money available is also inadequate. So, in short term we have a lot of leveraged market rate development – a good thing to do, but still not addressing the scale. In order to really address the scale, we need to have things that address the culture. Clearly there are some major cultural disagreements in the city and so we really should be trying to increase the diversity of the people who are in the marketplace to provide housing so we're not only limited to these companies. Market rate housing is super expensive. And address the paternalism that's making it difficult for people to provide diversity of housing. Like in my neighborhood, we have people who are trying to make some affordable housing but are receiving opposition because their housing is not in line with our paternalistic values.

Speaker #: 12 Name: Deven Richardson

Comment: San Francisco Housing Development Corporation (SFHDC), chair African American Arts and Cultural District in Bayview Hunters Point. Plan touches on all priority needs, but want to ask you to look at prioritizing African Americans in San Francisco. Born and raised here, over the years, I have seen the city become less family friendly. Many Certificate of Preference (COP) holders have died or moved out of city. seen policy passed onto family members. Want to see list of COP holders taken out of city and managed by Community Based Organizations (CBO) like ours. We would do a lot better at marketing to COP holders that moved to East Bay, we know families and people better than City mailing postcards. Make the DALP program available to COP holders. Workforce development – need these services ongoing to those families: Hunters Point East West, Bernal Dwellings, all of them need workforce services to the families, not just during RAD conversion. Community Facilities Rehabilitation – SFHDC is trying to make 1030 Oakdale more accessible, it is very cumbersome to apply for CDBG every few years to make these improvements for accessibility when we don't know who will need it.

MOHCD, OEWD and HSH Public Meeting
Proposed Strategies for 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan
Monday, August 5, 2019
HSA Born Auditorium 170 Otis Street

Speaker #: 14 Name: Shivaun Nestor

Comment: With Department of Public Health (DPH), concerned about pregnant women and families with children. Impressed by extensiveness of the plan and care you took to develop it incorporating community feedback. Have questions about how we do all this with the money we have but trying to be optimistic. Two questions. First thank you for including families with children on discussion about homelessness. But didn't see mention of women who are pregnant, especially in first months of pregnancy. WE have protections for women in final months, but first months are equally important. All phases are. First trimester has major development milestones Second question. SO excited that you included families with young children. Know you want to make sure all families are housed. Policy currently is rapid rehousing, but they go to communities outside of San Francisco, where they have no supports or things that can help them survive in conditions of poverty. This does families an injustice. Serves to tear up communities even more. When thinking about how to preserve community, want to put that forward as something to consider.

Speaker #: 16 Name: Aline Armstrong

Comment: Thank you so much for all the voices supported in your work. Want to make sure as you think about women and children. They are placed in neighborhoods with high crime rate and high social determinants of health. Need to be spread out so they are in communities where they can thrive.

Speaker #: 18 Name: Shelli Rawlings-Fein

Comment: Work with First 5 SF. Services for families up to age 5. Echo appreciation for what you are doing for families with children in the plan. Great innovative portion. Want to see pregnant families and those with very young children prioritized. Crucial period for brain development and stable housing during this period is so crucial. Will go a long way to end intergenerational trauma and homelessness.

Speaker #: 20 Name: Judy Young

Comment: Executive Director of Vietnamese Youth Development Center (VYDC). Echo everyone's comments on the plan, very extensive. For our community, emphasize immigrants and refugees, especially those that lack language to get access to housing and access to workforce. Decreasing racial disparity means increasing language access. Prioritize those languages and having the capacity to serve them. Providers that can speak the populations language. Not just being written, but having people to serve them. They don't read and write in those languages. Need people on the ground that gets information out in the community. Second is fairness of housing being available for diverse groups. Like smaller groups, they can be on the list for years and don't know that they've been taken off the list... For Southeast Asian population, very few getting into the affordable housing units. Need to look at the lotteries to see if those getting in are representative of who is applying. How do we do make the selection of households among ethnic groups and racial groups? Need to be explored. 36% of

MOHCD, OEWD and HSH Public Meeting
Proposed Strategies for 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan
Monday, August 5, 2019
HSA Born Auditorium 170 Otis Street

households are immigrant. For our target population, very rare that they're getting into affordable units. Need to look at whether these systems are working well.

Notes from NRSA Strategies Meetings, October-November 2019

1. Bayview Hunters Point NRSA Strategies Meeting
2. Chinatown NRSA Strategies Meeting
3. Mission NRSA Strategies Meeting
4. South of Market NRSA Strategies Meeting
5. Tenderloin NRSA Strategies Meeting
6. Visitacion Valley NRSA Strategies Meeting

Bayview NRSA Mtg Comments

October 10, 2019

Comments

1. Cultural District – excited about the new African American Arts and Culture District
2. Accountability and trust issues – how can the community be informed about the city's progress towards meeting these goals? There are trust issues because there have been many promises made in the past, and many of those promises have not been fulfilled.
3. Youth Development / Job Readiness – the language of job readiness does not address the importance of entrepreneurship, which is a very different skill set [Note – entrepreneurship is specifically supported through the Economic Development division of OEWD]
4. Academic Preparedness and Assistance – the focus should not just be on college preparation, but also on vocational training and high-quality careers that do not require a college education
5. Below Market Rate Homeownership opportunities – would like to know how many of the new affordable units being created in the neighborhood are for ownership. Would like more outreach and education on how that program works
6. Affordable Housing - Can the city buy up units to keep them affordable? Particularly properties that are owned by seniors who do not have family members to pass that property on to – could the city buy these up, renovate them and keep them affordable?
7. Child care
 - a. There is a lack of space for childcare providers
 - b. Small family care homes do not receive the support they need, provide much of the childcare in this neighborhood
 - c. Families in subsidized units cannot be childcare providers – they will lose their federal subsidies if they receive this income. How can we advocate to change these rules?
8. Housing for Youth – Provide more transitional housing for TAY and bundle with services such as financial education
9. Third Street Improvements
 - a. Need technology upgrades and improved wi-fi access
 - b. Space availability is issue for nonprofits
 - c. Vacancies and empty storefronts – some storefronts on Third Street have been vacant for years; how can neighborhood groups and community-based organizations access these spaces and activate them?
10. Timeline – question around timeline for implementation of this five-year set of strategies
11. Environmental issues – naturally occurring asbestos from shipyard– is anything being done to manage the airborne contamination?
12. Supporting neighborhood businesses
 - a. Identify vacant storefronts and accept proposals from local businesses
 - b. Provide mentorship
 - c. Provide employment support
 - d. Provide business support
13. Coordinate more with other departments to ensure we are meeting whole needs of families
 - a. Utilizing city-owned properties and working with other departments on real estate issues (permits, building, renovations)

14. Provide child care provided for classes, training, workshops so that residents can access these services
15. Could the city establish a satellite office in the neighborhood
16. Issues of low salaries for nonprofit staff and resulting high level of staff turnover
17. Make sure that RFP's and funding opportunities are shared with neighborhood organizations
18. Community Youth Center commented on need to expand API center on Third Street
19. Meeting closed – send any additional comments to Pierre Stroud, pierre.stroud@sfgov.org

Chinatown NRSA Meeting

October 7, 2019

Comments

1. There is support for workforce only in certain sectors; need more support for childcare so that low-income parents can access jobs and training
2. Finding it more difficult to link to City College; for instance community needs more home health aide classes, but these were recently cut; also recently cut bilingual consumer classes for seniors
3. Seems hard for City College to think about community-based services and working with CBO's; met with Chinatown campus staff and they were not aware of MOHCD encouraging linkages for ESL programs
4. What about other affordable housing development opportunities? Are there small sites opportunities in Chinatown?
5. Housing-place based services support community events for Ping Yuen. Does MOHCD also support broader community events?
6. Need transitional housing and services for survivors of human trafficking
7. Concern by some current grantees about fitting existing, successful programs into MOHCD's new strategies.
8. Space issues and rising rents for OEWD [referred to OEWD's program; encouraged agencies to include full costs in proposals]
9. Can some commercial vacancies become spaces for nonprofits? [OEWD currently working on finding a space that could fit 3-5 nonprofits in Chinatown]
10. Graduates of agency's culinary program do not want to work in Chinatown because many restaurants do not even pay minimum wage; these restaurant small businesses need employer education and technical assistance [OEWD does have a program focused on restaurants]

Mission NRSA Meeting Notes

October 16, 2019

Comments

1. Workforce – I don't see opportunities for young folks to access the workforce pipeline, particularly youth from SFUSD to be able to access jobs in the city
2. The City should leverage private sector in city that are receiving tax breaks to increase employment opportunities.
3. How can we use First Source and other local hiring requirements to ensure that San Francisco residents are able to access good jobs, particularly outside of the construction industry?
4. Are the department looking at the community land trust model – how does a community come together to own and use space?
5. Homelessness issue is become more severe, particularly in the Lower Mission area between Duboce and 17th Street. The homeless encampments continue to grow.
6. Public safety is an issue
7. I don't see childcare discussed in the plan – that is a key issue for families, and can be both a barrier to employment and an opportunity for employment
8. Displacement is key neighborhood issue
9. Mental health is impacted by all of these stressors
10. We need to have a holistic approach. People don't live in the silos, but that is how the city departments and funding works. How can the city work in a more coordinated and holistic way?
11. How is the city going to continue to be a welcoming gateway community for immigrants? How can immigrants access housing opportunities?
12. Affirmatively furthering fair housing – what are city strategies to integrate neighborhoods, build affordable housing in predominately white neighborhoods like Pacific Heights, and build more affordable housing in the western neighborhoods?
13. How will city reduce speculation and modulate market forces? Can we look at models of other cities globally, such as Singapore, Vienna and Vancouver?
14. Medium and low income housing inclusion needs to be increased
15. In the current strategies I don't see indicators for success for homelessness strategies
16. MOHCD has put out a great RFP, very responsive to community needs. How can we encourage other departments to take a similar approach?
17. How does being a NRSA effect funding, and what is the impact for low income neighborhoods that aren't currently NRSA's, such as the Excelsior?
18. How can the city support worker cooperatives and other empowering forms of economic and workforce development?

SoMa NRSA Meeting Notes

October 17, 2019

Comments

1. How do homeless services fall into this?
2. How does the city ensure that the neighborhood's priorities are not conflated with the cultural district's priorities?
3. List of housing development projects and whether they are fully funded
4. Job center – where is it—Hamilton and Goodwill
5. Mental health services?
6. How do you ensure that organizations are stable enough to provide the services that the City wants to have provided through its partners? Accountability—how are organizations monitored? What kind of data will the city use to determine languages?
7. Question for Patrick – in terms of how can we support a coordinated effort when OEWD comes in a decides that something is a cultural corridor or a business corridor. You fixed Stevenson, but everyone who was here just moved to other areas? When initiatives come in for one block, they just move to the next block.

Tenderloin NRSA Meeting Notes

October 18, 2019

Comments

1. Lot of SRO buildings, many units empty on any given night. What are the city's strategies to preserve affordability and use of SRO's? Would like to connect with information on that, preservation of SRO stock. Vacated spots go to market rate. [Referred to HSH]
2. Housing creation, what are the types of housing being created? We are seeing issues for clients with trauma. SRO rooms can be extremely small and oppressive, with no communal or light space, these residents end up hanging on street because they need to get out of their buildings. Issue of building supportive v. affordable housing.
3. Neighborhood stabilization, green space and open space. Per capita open space in TL is the size of a yoga mat. Impact of development leading to higher density, effect on health of residents. [Discussed Complete Neighborhoods Program, public space improvement program at MOHCD.]
4. Question regarding kind of projects funded through Community Building program area. [Most projects born of community advocacy, discretionary funding process. Support groups of residents and stakeholders, so they can influence neighborhood planning and projects.]
5. South East Asian Development Center had question regarding system navigation and the behavioral health issues that frequently come up. How can we collaborate and coordinate better with Department of Public Health? [MOHCD can help facilitate a connection with DPH]
6. South East Asian Youth Development Center – Can you talk more about how GED programs fit into the skill development area?
7. Where are the new affordable housing projects being built, and what are the boundaries of Tenderloin NRSA? How will they affect open space? What about housing for neighborhood residents in other neighborhoods? [Referred to Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing plan and Teresa Yanga.]
8. What about idea of creating a rental registry, and why isn't this part of the current strategies? [MOHCD is working with Rent Board and others on this strategy, referred to Hugo Ramirez]
9. South East Asian Community Center – Questions regarding the Below Market Rate housing application process and long wait times. [Referred to Below Market Rate housing team at MOHCD]
10. TGI Justice Project – question regarding the Compton's Cultural District project and how that will be leveraged to create jobs and ownership opportunities [Referred to Cultural District Program Manager, Julia Sabory].

Visitacion Valley NRSA Meeting Notes

11/7/19

Comments

1. Interested in economic development programs – support for small businesses, including child support providers; how to leverage African American Arts and Culture District? Renaissance Entrepreneurship Center has program currently for women living in Sunnydale – talk to Russel Morine about doing more work with Visitacion Valley residents (has been primarily working in Bayview and Excelsior) – connect David, Drew, Russel to Visitacion Valley Invest in Neighborhoods contact
2. Health department has been working with School District, but need more funding for programs like family reunification – need services for fathers, including family law
3. Asian Pacific American Community Center (APACC) – thanks to MOHCD for their support, we now receive funding for children's services through Department of Children, Youth and Families (DCYF)
4. Any plans for the portable restrooms that have been set up in the Tenderloin and other neighborhoods for Visitacion Valley?

Proposal ID	Agency Name	Proposal Name	Program Area	Strategy	FY 2020-21 Grant Rec	Written Public Comment	Author	Date
134546-20	Community Awareness Resources Entity (C.A.R.E.)	Access to Opportunity	Access to Opportunity	Housing Place-Based Services	\$ -	I would like to formally request that the funding committee reconsider and fund Community Awareness Resources Entity (C.A.R.E.). CARE was started by couple of residents that live in Potrero Hill public housing. The non -profit is located in the middle of the development. We work hard to meet the needs of the community young and old. CARE is in a unique situation because we are residents to be bale to reach people quicker and have built up trust among the residents. CARE submitted two RFP in order to one work with community on a broader scale and to also be able to hire from within the community. The second RFP was to be able to take a group of youth to Washington D.C. to participate educational with Close-Up. Close-Up focus is to inform, inspire, and empower young people to exercise the rights and accept the responsibilities of citizens in democracy. The non-profit is unique because it is resident created and ran. Our focus is to unite the community as a whole and encourage adults to see that just because you live in a low income community does not mean you can not strive to achieve more in life. I myself come from being a drug addict, homeless, and few other things to now have a B.A. in Human Service Management as well as Masters in Public Administration. CARE has been operating for the past seven years in the pubic housing with the focus of helping the community grow. If you can not fund both RFP please reconsider finding the youth for the next three years because they are the future. Attached is the flyer for their first fundraiser so that you can see they are empowered to do better and be better. Thank you for reading this email which is the first of many more to come from community members to show that CARE does good work and has the support of many community members.	Uzuri Pease-Greene	1/15/2020
134748-20	Community Awareness Resources Entity (C.A.R.E.)	Community Building	Access to Opportunity	Housing Place-Based Services	\$ -	I would like to formally request that the funding committee reconsider and fund Community Awareness Resources Entity (C.A.R.E.). CARE was started by couple of residents that live in Potrero Hill public housing. The non -profit is located in the middle of the development. We work hard to meet the needs of the community young and old. CARE is in a unique situation because we are residents to be bale to reach people quicker and have built up trust among the residents. CARE submitted two RFP in order to one work with community on a broader scale and to also be able to hire from within the community. The second RFP was to be able to take a group of youth to Washington D.C. to participate educational with Close-Up. Close-Up focus is to inform, inspire, and empower young people to exercise the rights and accept the responsibilities of citizens in democracy. The non-profit is unique because it is resident created and ran. Our focus is to unite the community as a whole and encourage adults to see that just because you live in a low income community does not mean you can not strive to achieve more in life. I myself come from being a drug addict, homeless, and few other things to now have a B.A. in Human Service Management as well as Masters in Public Administration. CARE has been operating for the past seven years in the pubic housing with the focus of helping the community grow. If you can not fund both RFP please reconsider finding the youth for the next three years because they are the future. Attached is the flyer for their first fundraiser so that you can see they are empowered to do better and be better. Thank you for reading this email which is the first of many more to come from community members to show that CARE does good work and has the support of many community members.	Uzuri Pease-Greene	1/15/2020

Proposal ID	Agency Name	Proposal Name	Program Area	Strategy	FY 2020-21 Grant Rec	Written Public Comment	Author	Date
134548-20	FRH Consulting LLC	Community-Based Services	Access to Opportunity	Housing Place-Based Services	\$ -	<p>On behalf of FRH Consulting and many agencies in San Francisco, I would like to share my concerns on the HUD Funding Recommendations. FRH Consulting is an African American founded agency whom staff are a direct representation of the communities we are directed to serve, we are also San Francisco natives. The core of our team was born in public housing and some still reside within these communities. It is disheartening to read the results of the "recommendations" for funding. Not only did our agency not receive any "recommendations," but our community partners we work closely with weren't in consideration. The purpose of this funding was reach to the communities who have been neglected, better yet failed due to systemic racism. As a partnering agency, I was excited to see MOHCD make such a considerable effort to change how things have been operating, but after seeing these results and once again the African American agencies who work diligently within these communities are being left out, leaves me puzzled. Many of the agencies that were "suggested" do great work, but there are still great cultural disparities that need to be addressed. The truth of our work is in the results. Many African American community based agencies understand the needs of the communities MOHCD wants to focus on. We work intimately with these residents everyday in different capacities, we've been leveraging resources and partnerships to go above and beyond for our African American communities, yet we are not being considered for the appropriate funding to remain sustainable. If MOHCD, decides to proceed with funding the recommended agencies, we will continue to serve our families that are suffering the most due to poverty, but eventually band-aids will fall off and the wounds will still be unhealed. Our approach as a City, as a Community, and as individuals needs to be more united and extremely intentional if we want to heal and rebuild our broken African American communities. I would love to discuss this in greater depth as soon as possible. I believe there are many voices that should be represented when making these decisions on equity for African Americans in San Francisco. If you need help pulling them together I would love to contribute names of organizations and African American leaders who are being called upon, by the residents on a daily basis. Thank you for your time.</p>	Danielle Banks, Director of Resident Services	2/5/2020

Proposal ID	Agency Name	Proposal Name	Program Area	Strategy	FY 2020-21 Grant Rec	Written Public Comment	Author	Date
134504-20	HOMEY	HOMEY HUB	Access to Opportunity	Community-Based Services	\$ 135,000	Brian and Michael-- I write you today to say thank you for including HOMEY in the awards list as many organizations were not awarded any funds at all through your most recent RFP. However, I also want to communicate my concern in the allocation and would like to inquire to you, and your review committee, on the process by which you decided on amounts and program awards. HOMEY submitted two proposals and your office awarded us one without any explanation. Your office allocated us the same level of funding that we were awarded 5 years ago under the cdbg funding source. As you know, HUD funding receives no cost of doing business increases in the manner that general fund grants do and their administrative fee only allows 10% and yet we received the same funding this cycle as in years past. Given the cost of living increases in SF and the impact it has on staffing consistency, I am curious why you would keep our funding flat without accounting for a living wage for staff or increased operational expenses in one of the most expensive regions of the world as we outlined in both proposals to mohcd. Additionally, because you decided to only fund a new program proposal, as it relates to mohcd's scope, and to essentially de-fund our current IMPACT program without bridge funds, which most funders do, you have given us no choice but to cut all programming as of June 30th. Please note, the primary population (80%), we are serving in jails are African-American and Latinx. What message does this send to them? How does this fit into the City and County of San Francisco's racial equity strategy? It's unfortunate that no one from your leadership team has reached out to me, and although there is a public hearing tonight, on the federally funded portion of your portfolio, it is not the venue to have these particular discussions in terms of your rationale and explanations. HOMEY is thankful that we are remaining a part of the MOHCD portfolio, however, we aren't even receiving the same amount we are currently in contract for right now. I am concerned, yet hopeful, that someone will respond with clarity so I can message back to our clients, staff, allies and the community what your rationale, strategy and hope you consider a change to our award moving forward. Thank you for your time--	Roberto Alfaro, Executive Director	2/4/2020
134717-20	San Francisco Community Land Trust	Equitable Governance: Reinforcing Resident Leadership in San Francisco Cooperative Housing	Community Building	Convening and Collaboration	\$ -	To whom it may concern at MoHCD, My name is Praveen Sinha and I have been a resident of the San Francisco for 17 years and living in the mission district for 14 years. During that process the San Francisco Land Trust (SF CLT) was able to the buy out the house I am living in and allow me rent and income stability for myself and dozens of others living in this house. Even though I started out as a "techie", it is because of rent stabilization through the SF CLT that I was able to pursue meaningful full time employment at a social justice oriented non-profit. I and dozens of others on our property additionally rely on the SFCLT on a day-to-day basis to help out with maintenance and overall sustainability of our house. I ask the commission to continue funding for education and outreach for the SFCLT, as it has great positive daily benefit in my life and the lives all residents in the Land Trust community.	Praveen Sinha Merry-go-Round house, district 9	2/3/2020
134717-20	San Francisco Community Land Trust	Equitable Governance: Reinforcing Resident Leadership in San Francisco Cooperative Housing	Community Building	Convening and Collaboration	\$ -	Hello, My name is Jonathan Bonato and I live at Columbus United Cooperative, 53 Columbus Ave, a housing cooperative supported by the San Francisco Community Land (SFCLT). I am alarmed to learn that the SFCLT was denied funding requests to preserve and expand affordable housing and denied funding to provide post purchase counseling. The work of SFCLT enabled me to overcome homelessness, giving me the opportunity for homeownership in a racially diverse , intergenerational cooperative. Please restore funding to the SF Community Land Trust as it continues to help me and so many others stay in their homes.	Jonathan Bonato Homeowner	2/3/2020

Proposal ID	Agency Name	Proposal Name	Program Area	Strategy	FY 2020-21 Grant Rec	Written Public Comment	Author	Date
134717-20	San Francisco Community Land Trust	Equitable Governance: Reinforcing Resident Leadership in San Francisco Cooperative Housing	Community Building	Convening and Collaboration	\$ -	<p>Good Afternoon, My name is Linda Brockway and I am a member of the National Association of Housing Cooperatives and the California Association of Housing Cooperatives. The two organizations have worked with the San Francisco for the Community Land Trust (SFCLT) for the last five years to promote and present out annual Cooperative conference that is held on the second Saturday of May. The organizations are disappointed that the SFCLT did not receive the requested grant money from the City of San Francisco.</p> <p>This grant money may also be used to support the conference that is attended by 65-100 cooperative board members from the City of San Francisco. This conference presents opportunities for the cooperative members to enhance their learning experience regarding financing to increase capital improvements, governance and conflict of interest classes to increase board member knowledge. It is extremely important that the City, the SFCLT and the cooperatives continue to work together to promote community living in the City of San Francisco.</p>	Linda Brockway Chairperson, Member Services National Association of Housing Cooperatives	2/4/2020
134717-20	San Francisco Community Land Trust	Equitable Governance: Reinforcing Resident Leadership in San Francisco Cooperative Housing	Community Building	Convening and Collaboration	\$ -	<p>My name is Jacqueline Henderson and I am a shareholder resident at Ammel Park Cooperative. I am alarmed to learn that the San Francisco Community Land Trust was denied funding which assists me in sustainable home residency. Partnership with SF Community Land Trust provides our cooperative with technical assistance and access to services. Their support helps me to continue to live in a racially diverse intergenerational community in a neighborhood facing historic displacement of African Americans, seniors. and disabled residents. Please restore funding to the SF Community Land Trust.</p>	Jacqueline Henderson	2/4/2020
134717-20	San Francisco Community Land Trust	Equitable Governance: Reinforcing Resident Leadership in San Francisco Cooperative Housing	Community Building	Convening and Collaboration	\$ -	<p>To Who It May Concern: My Name is Raymond S. Brown, and I live at 915B Golden Gate Avenue, housing cooperative supported by the San Francisco Community Land Trust. I am alarmed to learn that the Land Trust was denied funding requests to preserve and expand affordable housing and denied funding to provide post purchase counseling. The work the Land Trust does prevented me from becoming homeless, and gave me an opportunity for homeownership in a racially diverse, intergenerational cooperative. Please restore funding to the S. F. Community Land Trust as it continues to help me and so many others stay in their homes.</p>	Raymond S. Brown	2/4/2020
134717-20	San Francisco Community Land Trust	Equitable Governance: Reinforcing Resident Leadership in San Francisco Cooperative Housing	Community Building	Convening and Collaboration	\$ -	<p>To Whom I May Concern: My name is Norma Brown, and I'm a homeowner at Loren Miller Homes. I'm alarmed to learn that San Francisco Community Land Trust was denied funding which assists me in sustainable home ownership. Partnership with S. F. Community Land Trust provides me technical assistance and access to services. Their support helps me to continue to live in a racially diverse intergenerational community in a neighborhood facing historic displacement of African Americans, seniors, and disabled San Franciscans. Please restore funding to the S. F. Community Land Trust.</p>	Norma Coignet Brown	2/4/2020

Proposal ID	Agency Name	Proposal Name	Program Area	Strategy	FY 2020-21 Grant Rec	Written Public Comment	Author	Date
134723-20	SFCASA	Fostering Futures: Mentorship and Connection to Services for Transition-Age Foster Youth	Access to Opportunity	Community-Based Services	\$ -	<p>Dear Mayor Breed, I'm writing to ask that you reconsider including San Francisco Court Appointed Special Advocates (SFCASA), an organization that supports foster youth through mentorship and advocacy, in your Office of Housing and Community Development Grant award. I have personally witnessed the positive benefits a CASA volunteer can have on a foster youth's life. A CASA can truly make all the difference to a foster child's sense of community when the foster youth is placed in an otherwise isolating situation, such as those 650 foster children who will be placed outside the County or 250 who will be placed in foster homes more than 100 miles away this year.</p> <p>Regardless of the location of their placement, foster youth are San Francisco citizens who are currently not being served by the programs funded by San Francisco taxpayers, and were not on the preliminary award list for this grant.</p> <p>SFCASA is the only organization that consistently ensures that our most vulnerable youth receive services to thrive even when they are placed outside the city. I'd ask that you reconsider including SFCASA as a grant award recipient to make sure that San Francisco's current and recent foster youth are not further isolated from their home and community.</p>	Gretchen Eschbacher Koch	1/29/2020
134723-20	SFCASA	Fostering Futures: Mentorship and Connection to Services for Transition-Age Foster Youth	Access to Opportunity	Community-Based Services	\$ -	<p>Dear Mayor Breed, I'm writing to ask that you reconsider including San Francisco Court Appointed Special Advocates (SFCASA), an organization that supports foster youth through mentorship and advocacy, in your Office of Housing and Community Development Grant award. I have personally witnessed the positive benefits a CASA volunteer can have on a foster youth's life. A CASA can truly make all the difference to a foster child's sense of community when the foster youth is placed in an otherwise isolating situation, such as those 650 foster children who will be placed outside the County or 250 who will be placed in foster homes more than 100 miles away this year.</p> <p>Regardless of the location of their placement, foster youth are San Francisco citizens who are currently not being served by the programs funded by San Francisco taxpayers, and were not on the preliminary award list for this grant.</p> <p>SFCASA is the only organization that consistently ensures that our most vulnerable youth receive services to thrive even when they are placed outside the city. I'd ask that you reconsider including SFCASA as a grant award recipient to make sure that San Francisco's current and recent foster youth are not further isolated from their home and community.</p>	Sarah Cummings	1/29/2020

Proposal ID	Agency Name	Proposal Name	Program Area	Strategy	FY 2020-21 Grant Rec	Written Public Comment	Author	Date
134723-20	SFCASA	Fostering Futures: Mentorship and Connection to Services for Transition-Age Foster Youth	Access to Opportunity	Community-Based Services	\$ -	<p>Dear Mayor Breed, I'm writing to ask that you reconsider including San Francisco Court Appointed Special Advocates (SFCASA), an organization that supports foster youth through mentorship and advocacy, in your Office of Housing and Community Development Grant award. I have personally witnessed the positive benefits a CASA volunteer can have on a foster youth's life. A CASA can truly make all the difference to a foster child's sense of community when the foster youth is placed in an otherwise isolating situation, such as those 650 foster children who will be placed outside the County or 250 who will be placed in foster homes more than 100 miles away this year.</p> <p>Regardless of the location of their placement, foster youth are San Francisco citizens who are currently not being served by the programs funded by San Francisco taxpayers, and were not on the preliminary award list for this grant.</p> <p>SFCASA is the only organization that consistently ensures that our most vulnerable youth receive services to thrive even when they are placed outside the city. I'd ask that you reconsider including SFCASA as a grant award recipient to make sure that San Francisco's current and recent foster youth are not further isolated from their home and community.</p>	Carlie Bernal Heights resident, CASA volunteer and mother of two	1/29/2020
134723-20	SFCASA	Fostering Futures: Mentorship and Connection to Services for Transition-Age Foster Youth	Access to Opportunity	Community-Based Services	\$ -	<p>Dear Mayor Breed, I'm writing to ask that you reconsider including San Francisco Court Appointed Special Advocates (SFCASA), an organization that supports foster youth through mentorship and advocacy, in your Office of Housing and Community Development Grant award. I have personally witnessed the positive benefits a CASA volunteer can have on a foster youth's life. A CASA can truly make all the difference to a foster child's sense of community when the foster youth is placed in an otherwise isolating situation, such as those 650 foster children who will be placed outside the County or 250 who will be placed in foster homes more than 100 miles away this year.</p> <p>Regardless of the location of their placement, foster youth are San Francisco citizens who are currently not being served by the programs funded by San Francisco taxpayers, and were not on the preliminary award list for this grant.</p> <p>SFCASA is the only organization that consistently ensures that our most vulnerable youth receive services to thrive even when they are placed outside the city. I'd ask that you reconsider including SFCASA as a grant award recipient to make sure that San Francisco's current and recent foster youth are not further isolated from their home and community.</p>	Omar Serang	1/29/2020

Proposal ID	Agency Name	Proposal Name	Program Area	Strategy	FY 2020-21 Grant Rec	Written Public Comment	Author	Date
134723-20	SFCASA	Fostering Futures: Mentorship and Connection to Services for Transition-Age Foster Youth	Access to Opportunity	Community-Based Services	\$ -	<p>Dear Mayor Breed, I'm writing to ask that you reconsider including San Francisco Court Appointed Special Advocates (SFCASA), an organization that supports foster youth through mentorship and advocacy, in your Office of Housing and Community Development Grant award. I have personally witnessed the positive benefits a CASA volunteer can have on a foster youth's life. A CASA can truly make all the difference to a foster child's sense of community when the foster youth is placed in an otherwise isolating situation, such as those 650 foster children who will be placed outside the County or 250 who will be placed in foster homes more than 100 miles away this year.</p> <p>Regardless of the location of their placement, foster youth are San Francisco citizens who are currently not being served by the programs funded by San Francisco taxpayers, and were not on the preliminary award list for this grant.</p> <p>SFCASA is the only organization that consistently ensures that our most vulnerable youth receive services to thrive even when they are placed outside the city. I'd ask that you reconsider including SFCASA as a grant award recipient to make sure that San Francisco's current and recent foster youth are not further isolated from their home and community.</p>	Kenneth Kuchman, Bernard E. & Alba Witkin Charitable Foundation	1/29/2020
134723-20	SFCASA	Fostering Futures: Mentorship and Connection to Services for Transition-Age Foster Youth	Access to Opportunity	Community-Based Services	\$ -	<p>Dear Mayor Breed, I'm writing to ask that you reconsider including San Francisco Court Appointed Special Advocates (SFCASA), an organization that supports foster youth through mentorship and advocacy, in your Office of Housing and Community Development Grant award. I have personally witnessed the positive benefits a CASA volunteer can have on a foster youth's life. A CASA can truly make all the difference to a foster child's sense of community when the foster youth is placed in an otherwise isolating situation, such as those 650 foster children who will be placed outside the County or 250 who will be placed in foster homes more than 100 miles away this year.</p> <p>Regardless of the location of their placement, foster youth are San Francisco citizens who are currently not being served by the programs funded by San Francisco taxpayers, and were not on the preliminary award list for this grant.</p> <p>SFCASA is the only organization that consistently ensures that our most vulnerable youth receive services to thrive even when they are placed outside the city. I'd ask that you reconsider including SFCASA as a grant award recipient to make sure that San Francisco's current and recent foster youth are not further isolated from their home and community.</p>	Robert Smith	1/29/2020

Proposal ID	Agency Name	Proposal Name	Program Area	Strategy	FY 2020-21 Grant Rec	Written Public Comment	Author	Date
134723-20	SFCASA	Fostering Futures: Mentorship and Connection to Services for Transition-Age Foster Youth	Access to Opportunity	Community-Based Services	\$ -	<p>Dear Mayor Breed, I'm writing to ask that you reconsider including San Francisco Court Appointed Special Advocates (SFCASA), an organization that supports foster youth through mentorship and advocacy, in your Office of Housing and Community Development Grant award. I have personally witnessed the positive benefits a CASA volunteer can have on a foster youth's life. A CASA can truly make all the difference to a foster child's sense of community when the foster youth is placed in an otherwise isolating situation, such as those 650 foster children who will be placed outside the County or 250 who will be placed in foster homes more than 100 miles away this year.</p> <p>Regardless of the location of their placement, foster youth are San Francisco citizens who are currently not being served by the programs funded by San Francisco taxpayers, and were not on the preliminary award list for this grant.</p> <p>SFCASA is the only organization that consistently ensures that our most vulnerable youth receive services to thrive even when they are placed outside the city. I'd ask that you reconsider including SFCASA as a grant award recipient to make sure that San Francisco's current and recent foster youth are not further isolated from their home and community.</p>	Marta Bayol	1/29/2020
134723-20	SFCASA	Fostering Futures: Mentorship and Connection to Services for Transition-Age Foster Youth	Access to Opportunity	Community-Based Services	\$ -	<p>Dear Mayor Breed, I'm writing to ask that you reconsider including San Francisco Court Appointed Special Advocates (SFCASA), an organization that supports foster youth through mentorship and advocacy, in your Office of Housing and Community Development Grant award. I have personally witnessed the positive benefits a CASA volunteer can have on a foster youth's life. A CASA can truly make all the difference to a foster child's sense of community when the foster youth is placed in an otherwise isolating situation, such as those 650 foster children who will be placed outside the County or 250 who will be placed in foster homes more than 100 miles away this year.</p> <p>Regardless of the location of their placement, foster youth are San Francisco citizens who are currently not being served by the programs funded by San Francisco taxpayers, and were not on the preliminary award list for this grant.</p> <p>SFCASA is the only organization that consistently ensures that our most vulnerable youth receive services to thrive even when they are placed outside the city. I'd ask that you reconsider including SFCASA as a grant award recipient to make sure that San Francisco's current and recent foster youth are not further isolated from their home and community.</p>	Sally Stocks	1/30/2020

Proposal ID	Agency Name	Proposal Name	Program Area	Strategy	FY 2020-21 Grant Rec	Written Public Comment	Author	Date
134723-20	SFCASA	Fostering Futures: Mentorship and Connection to Services for Transition-Age Foster Youth	Access to Opportunity	Community-Based Services	\$ -	<p>Dear Mayor Breed, I'm writing to ask that you reconsider including San Francisco Court Appointed Special Advocates (SFCASA), an organization that supports foster youth through mentorship and advocacy, in your Office of Housing and Community Development Grant award. I have personally witnessed the positive benefits a CASA volunteer can have on a foster youth's life. A CASA can truly make all the difference to a foster child's sense of community when the foster youth is placed in an otherwise isolating situation, such as those 650 foster children who will be placed outside the County or 250 who will be placed in foster homes more than 100 miles away this year.</p> <p>Regardless of the location of their placement, foster youth are San Francisco citizens who are currently not being served by the programs funded by San Francisco taxpayers, and were not on the preliminary award list for this grant.</p> <p>SFCASA is the only organization that consistently ensures that our most vulnerable youth receive services to thrive even when they are placed outside the city. I'd ask that you reconsider including SFCASA as a grant award recipient to make sure that San Francisco's current and recent foster youth are not further isolated from their home and community.</p>	Leticia Palacios	1/30/2020
134723-20	SFCASA	Fostering Futures: Mentorship and Connection to Services for Transition-Age Foster Youth	Access to Opportunity	Community-Based Services	\$ -	<p>Dear Mayor Breed, I'm writing to ask that you reconsider including San Francisco Court Appointed Special Advocates (SFCASA), an organization that supports foster youth through mentorship and advocacy, in your Office of Housing and Community Development Grant award. I have personally witnessed the positive benefits a CASA volunteer can have on a foster youth's life. A CASA can truly make all the difference to a foster child's sense of community when the foster youth is placed in an otherwise isolating situation, such as those 650 foster children who will be placed outside the County or 250 who will be placed in foster homes more than 100 miles away this year.</p> <p>Regardless of the location of their placement, foster youth are San Francisco citizens who are currently not being served by the programs funded by San Francisco taxpayers, and were not on the preliminary award list for this grant.</p> <p>SFCASA is the only organization that consistently ensures that our most vulnerable youth receive services to thrive even when they are placed outside the city. I'd ask that you reconsider including SFCASA as a grant award recipient to make sure that San Francisco's current and recent foster youth are not further isolated from their home and community.</p>	Mike McKay	1/30/2020

Proposal ID	Agency Name	Proposal Name	Program Area	Strategy	FY 2020-21 Grant Rec	Written Public Comment	Author	Date
134723-20	SFCASA	Fostering Futures: Mentorship and Connection to Services for Transition-Age Foster Youth	Access to Opportunity	Community-Based Services	\$ -	Dear Mayor Breed, I'm writing to ask that you reconsider including San Francisco Court Appointed Special Advocates (SFCASA), an organization that supports foster youth through mentorship and advocacy, in your Office of Housing and Community Development Grant award. As a 9 year CASA volunteer, I have personally witnessed the positive benefits a CASA volunteer can have on a foster youth's life. A CASA can truly make all the difference to a foster child's sense of community when the foster youth is placed in an otherwise isolating situation, such as those 650 foster children who will be placed outside the County or 250 who will be placed in foster homes more than 100 miles away this year. I have directly experienced being the only person in a 6 year old's life who visits her as she moves from out of county foster home to out of county group home to in county residential placement. My present CASA youth lives in Santa Rosa. Regardless of the location of their placement, foster youth are San Francisco citizens who are currently not being served by the programs funded by San Francisco taxpayers, and were not on the preliminary award list for this grant. SFCASA is the only organization that consistently ensures that our most vulnerable youth receive services to thrive even when they are placed outside the city. I'd ask that you reconsider including SFCASA as a grant award recipient to make sure that San Francisco's current and recent foster youth are not further isolated from their home and community.	Ann E. Kirk	1/31/2020
134723-20	SFCASA	Fostering Futures: Mentorship and Connection to Services for Transition-Age Foster Youth	Access to Opportunity	Community-Based Services	\$ -	Dear Mayor Breed: I am writing to ask you to reconsider including San Francisco Court Appointed Special Advocates(SFCASA) in your Office of Housing and community Development Grant Award. I am a donor and volunteer with this organization and I have personally witnessed the positive benefits a CASA volunteer can have on a foster youth's life. Today many of San Francisco's foster children are being placed outside the city because of the high cost of living in the city and a lack of foster homes in SF. This issue makes it even more imperative that these foster youth have a CASA so that they are not further isolated from their homes and community. It is important that they continue to receive services provided by SFCASA even when they are placed outside the city. Being a foster child can be a lonely and traumatic experience and SFCASA is so important for providing the connections these children need to thrive. Please reconsider this grant for SFCASA. Thank you very much.	Heather Hughes	2/1/2020
134723-20	SFCASA	Fostering Futures: Mentorship and Connection to Services for Transition-Age Foster Youth	Access to Opportunity	Community-Based Services	\$ -	Dear Mayor Breed, I'm writing to ask that you reconsider including San Francisco Court Appointed Special Advocates (SFCASA), an organization that supports foster youth through mentorship and advocacy, in your Office of Housing and Community Development Grant award. I have personally witnessed the positive benefits a CASA volunteer can have on a foster youth's life. A CASA can truly make all the difference to a foster child's sense of community when the foster youth is placed in an otherwise isolating situation, such as those 650 foster children who will be placed outside the County or 250 who will be placed in foster homes more than 100 miles away this year. Regardless of the location of their placement, foster youth are San Francisco citizens who are currently not being served by the programs funded by San Francisco taxpayers, and were not on the preliminary award list for this grant. SFCASA is the only organization that consistently ensures that our most vulnerable youth receive services to thrive even when they are placed outside the city. I'd ask that you reconsider including SFCASA as a grant award recipient to make sure that San Francisco's current and recent foster youth are not further isolated from their home and community.	Sola Morrissey	2/1/2020

Proposal ID	Agency Name	Proposal Name	Program Area	Strategy	FY 2020-21 Grant Rec	Written Public Comment	Author	Date
134723-20	SFCASA	Fostering Futures: Mentorship and Connection to Services for Transition-Age Foster Youth	Access to Opportunity	Community-Based Services	\$ -	Dear Mayor Breed, I'm writing to ask that you reconsider including San Francisco Court Appointed Special Advocates (SFCASA), an organization that supports foster youth through mentorship and advocacy, in your Office of Housing and Community Development Grant award. I have personally witnessed the positive benefits a CASA volunteer can have on a foster youth's life. A CASA can truly make all the difference to a foster child's sense of community when the foster youth is placed in an otherwise isolating situation, such as those 650 foster children who will be placed outside the County or 250 who will be placed in foster homes more than 100 miles away this year. Regardless of the location of their placement, foster youth are San Francisco citizens who are currently not being served by the programs funded by San Francisco taxpayers, and were not on the preliminary award list for this grant. SFCASA is the only organization that consistently ensures that our most vulnerable youth receive services to thrive even when they are placed outside the city. I'd ask that you reconsider including SFCASA as a grant award recipient to make sure that San Francisco's current and recent foster youth are not further isolated from their home and community.	J. Peter Bardwick	2/3/2020
134723-20	SFCASA	Fostering Futures: Mentorship and Connection to Services for Transition-Age Foster Youth	Access to Opportunity	Community-Based Services	\$ -	Dear Mayor Breed, I'm writing to ask that you reconsider including San Francisco Court Appointed Special Advocates (SFCASA), an organization that supports foster youth through mentorship and advocacy, in your Office of Housing and Community Development Grant award. I have personally witnessed the positive benefits a CASA volunteer can have on a foster youth's life. A CASA can truly make all the difference to a foster child's sense of community when the foster youth is placed in an otherwise isolating situation, such as those 650 foster children who will be placed outside the County or 250 who will be placed in foster homes more than 100 miles away this year. Regardless of the location of their placement, foster youth are San Francisco citizens who are currently not being served by the programs funded by San Francisco taxpayers, and were not on the preliminary award list for this grant. SFCASA is the only organization that consistently ensures that our most vulnerable youth receive services to thrive even when they are placed outside the city. I'd ask that you reconsider including SFCASA as a grant award recipient to make sure that San Francisco's current and recent foster youth are not further isolated from their home and community.	Shelley W. Gottlieb	2/4/2020
134723-20	SFCASA	Fostering Futures: Mentorship and Connection to Services for Transition-Age Foster Youth	Access to Opportunity	Community-Based Services	\$ -	Dear Mayor Breed, I'm writing to ask that you reconsider including San Francisco Court Appointed Special Advocates (SFCASA), an organization that supports foster youth through mentorship and advocacy, in your Office of Housing and Community Development Grant award. I have personally witnessed the positive benefits a CASA volunteer can have on a foster youth's life. A CASA can truly make all the difference to a foster child's sense of community when the foster youth is placed in an otherwise isolating situation, such as those 650 foster children who will be placed outside the County or 250 who will be placed in foster homes more than 100 miles away this year. Regardless of the location of their placement, foster youth are San Francisco citizens who are currently not being served by the programs funded by San Francisco taxpayers, and were not on the preliminary award list for this grant. SFCASA is the only organization that consistently ensures that our most vulnerable youth receive services to thrive even when they are placed outside the city. I'd ask that you reconsider including SFCASA as a grant award recipient to make sure that San Francisco's current and recent foster youth are not further isolated from their home and community.	Amy DiBenedetto, Controller & Operations Director	2/10/2020

Proposal ID	Agency Name	Proposal Name	Program Area	Strategy	FY 2020-21 Grant Rec	Written Public Comment	Author	Date
134723-20	SFCASA	Fostering Futures: Mentorship and Connection to Services for Transition-Age Foster Youth	Access to Opportunity	Community-Based Services	\$ -	Dear Mayor Breed, I'm writing to ask that you reconsider including San Francisco Court Appointed Special Advocates (SFCASA), an organization that supports foster youth through mentorship and advocacy, in your Office of Housing and Community Development Grant award. I have personally witnessed the positive benefits a CASA volunteer can have on a foster youth's life. A CASA can truly make all the difference to a foster child's sense of community when the foster youth is placed in an otherwise isolating situation, such as those 650 foster children who will be placed outside the County or 250 who will be placed in foster homes more than 100 miles away this year. Regardless of the location of their placement, foster youth are San Francisco citizens who are currently not being served by the programs funded by San Francisco taxpayers, and were not on the preliminary award list for this grant. SFCASA is the only organization that consistently ensures that our most vulnerable youth receive services to thrive even when they are placed outside the city. I'd ask that you reconsider including SFCASA as a grant award recipient to make sure that San Francisco's current and recent foster youth are not further isolated from their home and community.	Katy Hope	2/10/2020
134723-20	SFCASA	Fostering Futures: Mentorship and Connection to Services for Transition-Age Foster Youth	Access to Opportunity	Community-Based Services	\$ -	Dear Mayor Breed, I have seen firsthand the challenges that are resulting from the crisis in San Francisco's foster care system, with only 35% of our city's foster youth being placed in the city. Given this crisis, I was disappointed to learn that the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development Grant award did not include San Francisco Court Appointed Special Advocates (SFCASA) or any organization focusing on the needs of current and recent foster youth in its funding recommendation. San Francisco is separating the majority of foster youth from the only community they know, deepening social isolation and depriving them of the many programs that city taxpayers support through the Mayor's Office, DCYF and other city departments. Stockton, Fresno and Antioch do not have the richness of programs available here and neither DCYF or any other city department is ensuring youth placed in those far away cities have access to our resources. SFCASA is the only organization that consistently ensures that our most vulnerable youth receive services to thrive even when they are placed outside the city. I'd ask that you reconsider including SFCASA as a grant award recipient to make sure that San Francisco's current and recent foster youth are not further isolated from their home and community. Thank you for your consideration.	Paul Knudsen	2/11/2020

Proposal ID	Agency Name	Proposal Name	Program Area	Strategy	FY 2020-21 Grant Rec	Written Public Comment	Author	Date
134723-20	SFCASA	Fostering Futures: Mentorship and Connection to Services for Transition-Age Foster Youth	Access to Opportunity	Community-Based Services	\$ -	Dear Mayor Breed, We were disappointed to learn that the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development Grant award did not include San Francisco Court Appointed Special Advocates (SFCASA) or any organization focusing on the needs of current and recent foster youth in its funding recommendation. Currently placing more than 65% of youth in foster care outside the county, our city is separating these youth from the only community they know, deepening the social isolation common to foster youth, while also depriving them of the many programs that city taxpayers support through the Mayor's Office, DCYF and other city departments. San Francisco CASA provides vital advocacy and mentorship to San Francisco's foster youth, identifying youth strengths and interests and facilitating participation in all sorts of programs and activities wherever they are placed. A CASA can truly make all the difference to a foster child's sense of community when the foster youth is placed in an otherwise isolating situation, such as those 650 foster children who will be placed outside the County or 250 who will be placed in foster homes more than 100 miles away this year. Our proposal directed a significant portion of the requested grant towards supporting volunteer travel to youth placed far away, a cost that is preventing many capable citizens from taking on the role of a CASA. Regardless of the location of their placement, foster youth are San Francisco citizens and those placed outside the county are being shortchanged both in the funds allocated through this process, and generally by the city and county. SFCASA is the only organization that consistently ensures that our most vulnerable youth receive services to thrive even when they are placed outside the city. I'd ask that you reconsider including SFCASA as a grant award recipient to make sure that San Francisco's current and recent foster youth are not further isolated from their home and community.	Renée Espinoza, Executive Director	2/12/2020
134723-20	SFCASA	Fostering Futures: Mentorship and Connection to Services for Transition-Age Foster Youth	Access to Opportunity	Community-Based Services	\$ -	Dear Mayor Breed, I'm writing to urge you to reconsider including San Francisco Court Appointed Special Advocates (SFCASA), an organization that supports foster youth through mentorship and advocacy, in your Office of Housing and Community Development Grant award. I am a board member of SFCASA and cannot emphasize enough how transformative a CASA volunteer can be on a foster youth's life. A foster youth will on average change school's seven times and move seven times, which can be completely isolating during a time in a child's development when they should feel supported, connected, and loved. A CASA volunteer provides consistent, dependable support and can make a foster child feel the sense of community that they so desperately need and deserve. Foster youth are San Francisco citizens who are currently not being served by the programs funded by San Francisco taxpayers, and were not on the preliminary award list for this grant. I'd urge you to reconsider including SFCASA as a grant award recipient to make sure that San Francisco's current and recent foster youth are not further isolated from their home and community.	Katherine Rockwell	2/14/2020

Proposal ID	Agency Name	Proposal Name	Program Area	Strategy	FY 2020-21 Grant Rec	Written Public Comment	Author	Date
134623-20	The Richmond Neighborhood Center	Networks in the Richmond District: Safety and Community Coalition	Community Building	Convening and Collaboration	\$ -	Thank you for your honesty about the difficult decisions you've had to make regarding the Community Development RFP process, we understand that it was highly competitive and there were hundreds of proposals not funded. As an organization that has been convening a coalition of community based organizations for over 20 years and have adapted and strategized to meet the needs of the neighborhood together, we were disappointed in the results. As advocates for the Richmond District we would be remiss to not draw attention to the loss of this important program. This program created a network for community based organizations to reach the most vulnerable clients in our neighborhood with greater efficiency and streamlined outreach opportunities. The loss of this funding impacts the seniors, youth, and families who rely on these services and resources, not those just served by The Richmond Neighborhood Center, but by those served by the 35 diverse organizations who actively participate in this coalition. The intentions of this comment are to remind the public, decision-makers and city departments of the needs in the Richmond District and the loss of support after two decades of coalition building. We know that these are very difficult decisions and we appreciate your thoughtful consideration.	Michelle Cusano, Executive Director	2/21/2020



CITIZENS' COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PUBLIC HEARING

Tuesday, February 4, 2020
San Francisco Main Public Library, Koret Auditorium
30 Grove Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
5:30 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.

MINUTES

1. Call to Order at 5:50 p.m.

Committee Members Present: Marc Vogl, Clinton Loftman, Irene Riley, Aileen Hernandez, Azalea Renfield, and Emma Kelsey.

City Staff Attendance: Brian Cheu (MOHCD), Pierre Stroud (MOHCD), Helen Hale (MOHCD), Mike King (MOHCD), Alex Banh (MOHCD), Barry Roeder (MOHCD), Michael Solomon (MOHCD), Manuel Vasquez (MOHCD), Malik Looper (MOHCD), Hugo Ramirez (MOHCD), David Taylor (OEWD), Glenn Eagleson (OEWD), Tina Rose Novero (OEWD), Angel Cardoz (OEWD), and Dedria Black (HSH).

2. Public Comment on the Preliminary Funding Recommendations for FY 2020-21

Clinton Loftman provided an introduction, including an overview of the CCCD and its role in the funding process. Michael Solomon read three speaker names at a time, in the order their cards were received. Individual speakers were allowed 3 minutes for comment, while groups were allowed 5 minutes.

Speaker #1. Jackie Flinn et. al, A. Philip Randolph Institute (APRI)

"I am the Executive Director of APRI. I have asked community members to come and speak...

I was one of the very first participants at APRI. People in my family have called me a problem child. I have been taught many things by my family. They taught me whatever we go through we should always maintain hope. I have learned how to be a mom and how to utilize resources for housing. Without APRI's help, I do not know where I would be. I would like to see them expand throughout San Francisco, not just in the Bayview. This organization serves not only the Bayview, they are seen as a resource to many in the community. I have worked on my resume with the staff. They have given me access to so many resources.

I have been with APRI for 6 years. I have learned so much, improved my networking skills. I have gained more connections in my community. I have stepped up as a leader. Jackie and Kurt taught me how to use my voice to make action. They are my second family.

Everyone here has a connection to APRI and how they have helped them. I am concerned with the current funding award for APRI. If our city is moving forward with racial equity, then why is there only 2% of the funding for Black-led organizations? We need to back up our words with funds.”

Speaker #2. Jennifer DaSilva, Start Small Think Big

“Our mission is to help lower income people start for-profit businesses. We help businesses in underserved areas so their owners can build personal financial security and economic activity in their area. Our participants come primarily from very low income and underserved areas. We are based in New York City, but we opened up an office here in San Francisco four years ago. We have been providing primarily legal services for the last four years, and we know this is a priority for the department. We were awarded some of the money we requested and for that we are grateful.

The grant is to expand services, including marketing. We are only providing legal services here now. The grant would allow us to provide marketing support. We have done that in New York City but have not been able to do that in San Francisco. We want to hire a full-time person to provide marketing support, which would require another \$25,000. The full range of services for entrepreneurs is financial services, legal, and marketing. People who receive all of these services have seen their revenues increase by at least 60% in one year, and their personal income increase by 25%. So, getting this support will make a big difference for the communities we serve. By providing that, you will help us expand our services in San Francisco.”

Speaker #3. Genny Price, Success Centers

“Success Centers was founded 30 years ago. We serve youth and adults through workforce programming. Several years ago, we were able to expand our executive leadership staff through funding awards which helped us grow to serve more people. Success Centers is here because we are concerned about Black-led organizations that do not have all the resources they need to successfully sustain. They are underfunded. Because of years of underfunding, this has caused stress to staff. We ask for capacity building opportunities to strengthen services. We find the rising rent and increased disparities make it hard to operate as a community-based organization in San Francisco.”

Speaker #4. Adrian Williams, The Village Project

“I am the Executive Director at The Village Project. I work with youth, families and seniors in the Western Addition. I have been a one-woman show for a long time. I am concerned that less than 2% of funding (out of \$42 million) is going to Black-led organizations. I have been told to delegate yet there is no money to add more staff.

I was recently confronted with a challenge. For years this organization was rent free, but now, because of the local and national attitude, I have been asked to pay rent now. I was unfairly over-charged \$800 for rent, where some other community-based organizations are only charged \$1 for rent. I was told I was not qualified for many funding sources in the city. I have had to make a lot of calls I have not made in 14 years. How can we build capacity if we are not able to become a subcontractor with appropriate funding? I see so many people have to move from the city with a subsidy certificate. There is a systemic problem. We are not getting funding and are being pushed out. I do not get it. The math does not make sense.”

Speaker #5. Michael Blecker, Swords to Plowshares

“Our particular proposal was for securing Veterans Affairs (VA) benefits for homeless veterans and disabled vets. We are a homeless veteran-serving organization. We have received MOHCD funds for legal services for about 27 years. We now have been recommended for another \$81,000. We appreciate it, but it just falls so far short for getting veterans legal services for their VA claims.

In this city, there are 8,100 unsheltered veterans. We have some of the best attorneys in the world doing this work. Swords is very unique in this country and nationally-recognized. We have more than a 90% success rate. We have won millions of dollars in lifetime benefits. Not just income but eligibility for health services, which is life-saving. Our attorneys are nationally-recognized, and we started pro bono services with more law firms. So, we try to leverage these funds as much as we can. And we have made huge in-roads, leading to policy changes at the VA. But the low amount of funding is a huge stressor for a nonprofit like us to make changes and implement these changes.

Consider our proposal at a higher level than \$81,000. We are grateful but we just need a much higher level of funding to provide these legal services.”

Speaker #6. Mahogany Roland, Rebuilding Together San Francisco

“Our organization is over 30 years old. We provide affordable housing for San Franciscans. These include low-income households in the Bayview and Hunters Point. They include seniors, disabled folks, and single household families. We get our funding through MOHCD. The funding has been critical for repairs that bring hot water and heat to families. This makes a big difference in the quality of life of the people we serve. Our main emphasis is to serve communities of color in San Francisco. We need to continue to receive funding to keep up the good work.”

Speaker #7. Karina Galvan-Torres et. al, BALANCE

“It is such an honor to share this space tonight. We share one common goal: a commitment to serve the residents of San Francisco. At BALANCE, we believe in building strong, thriving communities. When you ask how we should change this process, we recommend bonus weight given to organizations whose practices reflect our values, such as hiring from the communities they serve. And with their business practices, like using vendors who are sourcing from local businesses. Maybe someday this will not be a bonus, but just the norm.”

Speaker #8. Lyslynn Lacoste, BMAGIC

"I am here to speak in solidarity with other Black-led community-based organizations. Whether through systemic failures, etc., government action is undermining Black-led organizations. Black-led organizations are essential to respond to the needs of Black-led communities. Black-led organizations serve, with the least amount of resources, communities that need it most. Black-led organizations are expected to provide more with less. Black-led organizations have fewer cash reserves and are more dependent on grants.

Of the 16 Black-led organizations that submitted proposals, only 6 received a funding recommendation, totaling less than 2% of the \$42 million over the next five years. You can and we should all do better."

Speaker #9. Joi Jackson-Morgan, 3rd Street Youth Center and Clinic

"This morning you should have received a letter on behalf of the Black-led organizations. My organization is actually recommended for funding, but this is not a push for my organization. This is a push for my community. It is a shame that combined we have over 200 years of experience serving our community and we have to beg for more than 2%. It is a disrespect to our expertise. What you are talking about is not equity, it is equality. Black and people of color are not the same thing. The pie chart you have is misleading. It says 18%, when it is only 2% (of the funding) for Black-led organizations.

To fix this, we need your help. As you heard before, some Black-led organizations might lack the infrastructure to manage the grant. Sometimes managing the grant is way more than doing the work. People are being pushed out at alarming rates, so we cannot wait to fix this. We need to do this today. Please put your money where your mouth is when you talk about equity and start giving to Black-led organizations."

Speaker #10. Erris Edgerly, Brothers For Change

"We serve the Western Addition and black families. I have helped grow big agencies while my agency has stayed small. I have seen Adrian Williams walk up and down the streets with kids. It is the Black migration that has helped grow and build San Francisco and the Western Addition. Then we were kicked out and told we could come back with a Certificate of Preference, 50 years later. The Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) is not supporting us. We are moving backwards. Please give us the funding and we will give to others.

Our families are in crisis. We have high rates of school dropout. If we cannot come to you all and ask for funding, we should have the benefit. All of our positions/jobs need appropriate funding. The City is well-staffed. We do so much with very little. Please hear our recommendations/asks. We can work magic. We know how to do a lot with a little. We are collaborating. When you call on one of us, you call on all of us."

Speaker #11. Roderick Magbual et. al, Pin@y Educational Partnerships (PEP)

"I stand in solidarity with all the organizations in this room. It is an honor to be in this room with everyone who serves our communities.

Please reconsider the proposed \$27,000 funding cut to our organization. This cut will impact all of our teacher and education services. We serve the underserved and under resourced Filipino community. We have provided ethnic studies for 14,500 students. Out of 310 PEP teachers, 2/3 are San Francisco residents. Over 60% of PEP teachers have gone on to graduate programs, becoming doctors and professors across the nation. We started a course so high school students can receive college course credit. PEP students can get college-level courses and community organizing experience. Many PEP teachers are now recognized SFUSD teachers. We have published ethnic studies books, and are influential in schools. My son and many others are reaping the benefits of this. I am also an elected official in a local town and we are booming in economic development. Booming economic development can serve these programs. I am not blind to the economic opportunity that is happening here.

Additional speakers on behalf of PEP...

I am a professor in ethnic studies at San Francisco State University. Thanks for the support you have given us for the past two decades. Because of the support, we have been successful. But, at some point, I think people did not realize how that success happens. You can see it in the impact we have had in this room, all the people in this room, and this is just a small fraction. We started in 2001. When we first started PEP, it was about addressing the challenges our Filipino community was facing. No one was doing this at the time. The youth did not understand their identity. This led to a high dropout rate, self-harm, and growing tensions. Our solution was an adult teaching force, to address the needs of youth. We created the answer in our own hands. This is our own equity.

This is only a little bit of us here tonight. The reputation of someone that came from PEP is highly regarded. I receive daily requests for folks to hire from PEP. Daily. We are proof that it works. Funding is very, very important. We have the evidence what we are doing is successful, and we need the funding to keep it going. We provide a social justice workforce. This is part of your mission. We want to continue and see that funding is restored.

Being Filipino is not even on this paper. If you are crippling our community, you are crippling the city.

I am a doctor at San Francisco State University. Thank you for the funding over the years. Because of your support we have been successful. Some do not understand our success, but look around the room. One phone call made this happen. In 2001, when we first started, we addressed the growing challenges of Filipino families. Our curriculum taught unity within the Filipino community. We developed an adult teaching workforce. We went from being a youth organization to being such a diverse community within PEP. I get daily requests for jobs.

We are proof that the funding MOHCD provides makes a difference. If it goes away, we will see less people become successful. We provide a social justice workforce."

Speaker #12. Sacha Steinberger, Legal Link

"I am here in support of the legal services award to Homeless Prenatal Program, of which Legal Link is a subgrantee. Low-income households face 6 or more legal issues each year. Many issues can be addressed with timely legal help, but many do not know how to access the system. Only 14% of the time do they receive the help they need."

Speaker #13. Marcus Tarrt et. al, Renaissance Bayview

"We provide comprehensive services to small businesses in the Bayview. I want to highlight the theory of change you show here. It says that ensuring economic growth offers benefits to the communities. We see a lot of economic growth potential in the Bayview. The challenge is, will we be here to see it? Will we be here long enough to see it? So many Black leaders are having to leave San Francisco. We believe small businesses support neighborhoods and communities. By supporting Little Leagues, supporting the communities and neighborhoods nearby, small businesses help Black communities thrive. I brought someone from the community that can speak to the struggles of a business..."

My husband and I were born and raised here. Without Renaissance we would not be here. Bayview is now a Cultural District but there are no small Black businesses in the Bayview because they say we are not qualified. How do I not qualify? This does not make sense? I say to other Black-led organizations, stay in the city. But the funding is not adequate. Just being a business owner in the Bayview is important. The limitations to get access are just too much and too far. I think we should structure things to work better for low-income households."

Speaker #14. Thu Banh, BRIDGE Housing

"We were recommended to receive funding for housing and community development projects. Thanks for your continued support. We are working on a project in Potrero. This funding gives a lot of reassurance to our organization and to the residents of Potrero that we can continue to provide quality programming. We are reshaping the community. Across 80 events so far, thousands of people have come out to discuss the development plans and shape their community. In addition, we have community services and classes, Zumba, and gardening. Thousands have come out. Each of these interactions help residents break the social isolation that they are feeling now in Potrero Hill.

In the next three years, we will be adding another 140 housing units, that Potrero families can call their new homes. And bringing on a new child care center to add much needed child care for the neighborhood. We are also creating public open space for communities to gather. Housing redevelopment means not only economic opportunities through construction, That is just the beginning. BRIDGE wants to work with nonprofits and businesses, beyond construction. Health care for example. We want to ensure residents are in well-paying jobs that have the opportunity for economic advancement. Another area we want to support is entrepreneurship.

In closing, we express our gratitude. I look forward to coming back and sharing more stories. I also stand in solidarity with many of the Black-led organizations in this room. I have worked with many of them and consulted with many of them over the years."

Speaker #15. Desi Danganan, Kultivate Labs

“We were fortunate to be funded. Our main mission is to help build neighborhoods to thrive with local businesses. We were very fortunate to develop UNDISCOVERED SF, a Filipino initiative, through SoMa funds. Every year we have grown Filipino businesses which has added to the economic growth in the SoMa. 6th and Mission is the most challenging area of San Francisco – in terms of quality of life, crime and drugs – yet Filipino business owners want to do business in this area. We ask that you increase our funding to do more work in the 6th and Mission area. To help more entrepreneurs in the 6th and Mission area thrive. We need community support to be successful. We are up for the job. We out-perform metrics on all of our grants. People of color do this for the love and betterment of the community.”

Speaker #16. Lavert James, Independent Bayview Resident

“We have to come here to beg. My great grandmother was the first Black woman in San Francisco to buy her own home. My other grandmother just passed away last week. You can see the balloons on Cesar Chavez that they dedicated in her honor. Her name is Bessie Webb. This pisses me off. Organizations like APRI have helped me and my family get jobs and pay dues. They have helped all these people get off the streets to do something, to be better. My community has been on drugs since I was little, but we are not stopping. We are going to be something. We need our young people to be something. \$42 million is really nothing. It is not enough. But to get 2% of that, for our community, for our organizations, we need to do better. As a people, as a city, as a united front, we have to do better. I do not know what to say but I pray that you all can do something. I do not like to beg, but we need something more than this.”

Speaker #17. Dina Mendoza et. al, Tenderloin Housing Clinic's La Voz Latina

“Since 2005, La Voz Latina has served as a resource center for Latinas in danger of eviction. In the past two years we have expanded the neighborhoods served, because our staff is culturally competent. We provide back rent. We accompany tenants with an attorney if they need representation. We help advocate for tenants with landlords. We work hard to ensure livable conditions for our clients. Our budget has been reduced by a third. This will affect our operating hours, key community leader positions, and limit services. We will not be able to provide supplemental funding that helps us expand our reach. We will have to eliminate our community leader programs.

Recently four tenants were served with eviction notices. These tenants need services. One tenant is being evicted through new ownership, but thanks to our organization, she was able to find a new home. We are committed to keeping households stably housed. Please reconsider our funding recommendation so that we can continue to bring great services to the community. Thank you for our community and staff present today.

Additional speakers on behalf of La Voz Latina...

A lot of great organizations are being cut. Why are we doing this to organizations that are doing great work on the ground. I really hope that you would reconsider how you make your funding decisions. Pull funding from other services in the city to fund these great organizations that are really helping the community. Funders at MOHCD need to come to our communities and see the struggles and disparities and social injustices. We need to have funding increased to help support these traumatized citizens. This is a great city, but do not cut services.

Single room occupancy hotels (SROs) have become a battleground for funding. When a building is sold, people are displaced. La Voz Latina has helped us come to the table with landowners. This past year we had a Lower Nob Hill resident of 20 years that was facing eviction for hoarding. The organizers helped coordinate a negotiation for the tenant to move and have her unit treated for bedbugs. She kept her housing. These services are essential. We need good organizers now more than ever. Please prioritize these organizations for funding."

Speaker #18. Tracy Brown and Aleks Zavaleta, Mission Language and Vocational School (MLVS)

"I am a graduate of MLVS. I graduated in 1985. The first job I got when I could not afford college. I was born and raised in the Mission. We did not have opportunities that others have. Many became citizens as a result of MLVS. My daughter now has a job at Kaiser Permanente because of MLVS. This is what MLVS does. We have been funded many years by MOHCD. We are an anchor institution, for the community at-large. We serve students who are failing, because the schools are failing them. We serve people with limited English proficiency and immigrants.

Do everything you can to support leaders of color. This lack of support needs to be addressed. You need to deliberate and really talk about everything you are hearing. We have been around for many years. We are one of three state-accredited vocational programs in San Francisco. Without the MOHCD funding, we will not be able to offer any of these services. People are not able to get jobs. They do not have the schooling. We provide the services for them, including job training and computer literacy.

I am a product of San Francisco. My daughter is a product of San Francisco. Do not leave people behind.

Additional speakers on behalf of MLVS...

I am a current student. This program is very important. It gives us the skills so we can have a better future in this life and to provide for our community.

I am outraged that the African American community is only getting 2%. It makes me want to cry. It feels weird having to fight for funding. The reason why this is so important is because a lot of members of our community start off in really bad situations. The moment they enter elementary school they are trapped. They do not get the services that other communities get. Whether it is because they are people of color, speak other languages, have behavioral issues, or whatever other reason. This school allows for students who did not get good grades, who did not make it in high school, to be really amazing students. Now they come into the office and say I want to see a transcript because they got a 4.0. With the right equipment, the right people, they can be amazing. Nineteen students we placed at Kaiser Permanente, Veterans Affairs and other hospitals. They will be able to climb the

ladder at the hospitals, buy a house, and take their families out of really bad situations. We have students who are starting their own catering businesses, being sous chefs. All they need is a little help. 316 organizations, \$42 million. Everyone could have gotten some."

Speaker #19. Sarah Wan, Community Youth Center of San Francisco (CYC)

"We provide transitional-age youth services. We opened in the Bayview 10 years ago. The purpose of our cultural center was to embrace different ethnic groups in the Bayview. With the current funding cut to our organization, I will need to cut staff and cut daily services that are essential for the populations we serve. We cannot continue to be a bridge, or hold cultural programs with these funding cuts. Please reconsider our funding recommendation as this will greatly affect the community we serve and our organization."

Speaker #20: Monique LeSarre, Rafiki Coalition

"I am representing Rafiki Coalition for Health and Wellness. I am also representing The Coalition for Black/African American Prosperity in San Francisco. It includes groups such as the SF NAACP, Success Centers, New Community Leadership Foundation, SF Bayview Newspaper, 100 Black Organizations, Black police officers, Fillmore Rising, Liberation House, Inc., A. Philip Randolph Institute, 100% College Prep, Young Community Developers, SisterWeb, Urban Ed Academy, SFHDC, Greater Life Church, Tabernacle CDC, 3rd Street Youth Center & Clinic, and Booker T. Washington Community Service Center. I represent all of these organizations.

Rafiki was recommended for a small amount of funding. The gossip was Rafiki got funding. We got \$50,000, which we got before. Then we got \$200,000, most of which is going to subcontracts to folks on this list. And we also served as a fiscal agent for a Native American organization. When I heard someone say \$81 million, I lost my mind. I think it was Swords to Plowshares. If the Black community got that kind of money, we would be in a very different situation. You can say "we checked the box, we serve black communities." Guess what, Black-led organizations are different. We are the community we serve. We are the places people go to. We have the relationships with the people. These larger organizations with all the back-office shops are gobbling up all the funding. It is not impacting smaller organizations.

We are requesting increased funding, and increased funding to help support the infrastructure for Black-led organizations. You need to do this because of the harm that has been done to the Black community in this city. This can only be fixed and achieved when Black-led organizations and Black leadership are prioritized. This is not acceptable, MOHCD. Not acceptable. Do better."

Speaker #21. Kim Johnson, 100 Black Organizations

"The proposed recommendations MOHCD put out were shocking to see. I know you have seen the documentary of what happened to the Fillmore. It used to be a thriving Black community. Now the Fillmore Cultural Center needs funding so that it can help sustain the community. MOHCD needs to go to the Fillmore and look around. How do you design your grant applications? They are ridiculous to complete. You need to go and look at the Fillmore. We are penalized if we do not complete grant applications. Black communities have been here the longest and have had the

worst conditions. A black man founded San Francisco and the school system in San Francisco. MOHCD is not being fair. We ask that you treat us fairly. We need more black businesses. You are keeping your foot on our neck. We ask for a fair chance.”

Speaker #22. Jameel Rasheed Paterson, New Community Leadership Foundation (NCLF)

“We specialize in civic engagement. We work on the good, old fashioned values we got away from. Local people, local businesses, local organizations, local politicians. I love this diverse city. I think we have the opportunity to be a beacon for the rest of the country, especially this month, which really symbolizes what San Francisco is about. Chinese New Year and Black history month. We have the opportunity for diversity or division. We can pit it against each other, but that is not what San Francisco is about. It is about celebrating variety.

The Black community is always brought up regarding social experiences. We are number one in high school dropouts and number one in incarceration. But when it comes to investment, we are the lowest. Everyone needs to be invested in equity, but the African American community has a huge influence on this city. You have people who are not Black calling themselves the N word. And there is Telly Mac, the hip hop legend. When you invest in the African American community, you invest in influencing the whole city. Our communities, and the Mission, are the most inclusive. If you do not invest in us, you are not investing in the whole city. Investing in the African American community would impact Chinese kids, Latino kids. Look at Rudy Corpuz at United Playaz. A huge organization, a huge influence, but that is coming from the African American influence.

With that I want to say ‘Unite the City.’”

Speaker #23. Majeid Crawford, New Community Leadership Foundation (NCLF)

“The disparities you see in the Black community are not by accident. Our own city, our own Board of Supervisors, instituted programs that impacted the Black community. We have always had a presence in the city. And in the 1940s and 1950s, when we came to work in the shipyards, we were forced to live in the Fillmore and the Bayview. The most polluted areas. We were redlined.

But we did not let that stop us. We built our own businesses, created our own resources. We had the highest rate of homeownership in the Bayview. We had our own businesses. But then they saw that, so they started urban renewal. Forty blocks in the Fillmore were bulldozed, then left vacant for years. People got put in the high rises but left the land vacant. Same as Bayview. We already had the power plant, but when it was time to build the sewage plant, they did not put it in the Sunset, which did not have any of this yet. They put it in Bayview. Do you want Black people to stay in the city? Because for the past 40 years, you have been pushing us out. If you want Black people to stay in the city, please fund all Black-led organizations in full.”

Speaker #24. Darlene Roberts, Fillmore Jazz Ambassadors

“I wish I could speak to the audience. MOHCD does not want you here. They will give you less and less. If you pay your taxes, you have a reason to demand from your Supervisor to speak up for you. MOHCD is sick and tired of hearing from you. Our kids are ill and dying. In the 1950s,

Harry Truman came up with model cities. They did not include Black people. They are not including you for a reason. Do not humble yourself for these people. She does not have pity for you. You show them your records. This is sweeping across the nation from Boston to Philly, all places with jazz and Black culture. I founded the Fillmore Jazz Ambassadors because I was excited. Black people in the 1950s did not have the right to vote. We will not get anything. These proposed funding choices are your funding. I will shut up. I am mad at every last one of you.”

Speaker #25. Hays Berry, Sequoia Living

“Our proposal to expand experience corps from Marin to San Francisco was wholeheartedly denied in its entirety. What this is, is it takes elderly volunteers and pairs them with younger individuals from poor communities. It feeds two birds with one worm. Everyone needs more of this money to go around. This intergenerational approach can increase the effectiveness for the children served *and* for the volunteers. A study called Double Jeopardy says a 3rd grader is four times less likely to graduate from high school if they cannot read at grade level by third grade. And the rate is even worse in low-income families. The neighborhoods we wanted to serve were in the Western Addition, Haight, many of the neighborhoods represented in this room. And the studies done on the impact of social isolation for seniors, this impacts all the seniors in San Francisco. I ask that you reconsider the Sequoia approach for funding and the intergenerational approach as a whole.”

Speaker #26. Saara Ahmed, Asian Women’s Shelter

“As a grant manager, I want to recognize the amount of work this takes. I am coming off a lot of application submissions. While we are here talking about big topics, I want to acknowledge all the marginalized folks here. Our programs help women overcome domestic violence trauma. Many of our clients have experienced legacies of trauma. Our clients are survivors and face displacement and economic disparity. Most are non-English speakers who have migrated and are fearful of accessing public services. We serve all survivors of violence. We provide English as a Second Language (ESL) programs and support service connection. We look forward to future collaboration.”

Speaker #27. Drew Jenkins, J & J Community Resource Center

“In the past weeks, I have seen so much disappointment from the African American community that is putting in the work. Before you make the recommendations, please go to the ground level and go to the communities that these bigger organizations claim they are serving. They are skimming the money. The money is not getting down to the communities. You are shortchanging the community-based organizations that are actually putting in the work. My organization has been putting in the work, and the one time that we asked you for something, we did not get anything. Go to the communities and ask them what they need. Get away from the paper because you are taking away the money from the kids that are dying. Come down to Sunnydale. I am there every day. See the cause and effect of pulling money away from the small organizations.

These are fake numbers. I have been in the room with organizations with over 200 years of history. 2% of the money is going to African American communities. Most of the people who are

dying by gun violence are in the African American community. And if we are shortchanging them and the kids, it does not make sense. Please get from behind the desk and rethink this. I am sorry to cut this off but I do not even want to listen to this anymore.”

Speaker #28. Val et. al, Purple House Project and San Francisco Community Land Trust

“We are LGBTQI members, expats. Every single cause that MOHCD claims to support. This is a Black woman-led organization. I am the Executive Director. It is just as important to evaluate fiscal health and support it. Those that struggle are the ones that need the funding the most. We need to look at this history of people served through organizations like Purple House Project. Working with community partners like San Francisco Community Land Trust, we have helped programs thrive and support local residents. We need to renew the spirit of volunteers.

Additional speaker on behalf of San Francisco Community Land Trust...

One thing I have learned to say is I agree when Val speaks. I came to San Francisco in 2009. The San Francisco Community Land Trust is extremely underfunded. Our proposal was disqualified. I want to explain what the San Francisco Community Land Trust is. When a house goes up for sale, the Land Trust comes in, buys it, and freezes the rent for tenants to pay under the fair market rate. This is a way to preserve housing for those that need it and cannot afford the high prices being charged on the private market.”

Speaker #29. Deven Richardson, African American Arts & Cultural District and San Francisco Housing Development Corporation (SFHDC)

“I am the Director of Community Equity for SFHDC and proud co-chair of the African American Arts & Cultural District. I join the Black-led organizations that you heard from earlier. You cannot change what you do not acknowledge. I believe the City has acknowledged the fact that African Americans have been disenfranchised. A lot of history of harm has been done to our people, through eminent domain, redevelopment, and on and on. You, exerting your power and influence, need to make a drastic paradigm shift to what is on that piece of paper. The Black community is in a state of crisis. I was born here. And the decline has not stopped. SFHDC was started by Black professionals 30 years ago to thwart the exodus. 30 years ago. And we are still doing that work today.

We are interested in making drastic change to the declining African American population. This will require drastic and bold changes. We need to go back and look at all the recommendations, all the funding that Black-led organizations have asked for, and restore it to full funding. You say you have this new focus on equity, but you are trying to be equitable and be fair at the same time, which you just cannot do. This typical way you do RFPs and scoring, you are going to get the same results. We need to make the changes today. They need to be bold and drastic. We are on the start of a new Census, and we say everyone needs to be counted. Why? Because of the funding. This funding. Folks like you all need to be bold and say these numbers do not mean anything. You need to be bold. You need to change things. What do you have to lose?”

Speaker #30. Terrence Valen et. al, Filipino Community Center

“We have been around for 15 years. In the beginning, we had the highest rate of homicide. We hope to strengthen our services. We focus on women and families, and the traumas facing San Francisco, such as trafficking and domestic violence. We want to see certain programs restored. Neighborhood-based community organizations need to be funded. Our communities are being pushed out. They are going to Contra Costa and want to come back, but we need to stop displacement. Many services in the city are not language accessible for the Filipino community. We help support these people and stop the continued trauma.”

Speaker #31. Raquel Redondiez, SOMA Pilipinas

“This is the anniversary of the start of the Filipino-American War. This is important because for the first time MOHCD has acknowledged historical trauma. This is the reason why Filipinos are here in San Francisco. We have been here for 120 years. Last year the City established Cultural Districts to stop the displacement of Filipinos and communities of color. We recognize that we are losing these communities fast. One of our main missions is to preserve community-based organizations that serve these communities.

A concern for us is the recommendations cut half a million dollars to Filipino organizations. On one hand we are establishing the CHHESS Report – the cultural heritage economic strategy - for all of our communities. And a big part of that is cultural competency. And this at a time that the Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs (OCEIA) released a report completed by SOMCAN about the failure of City departments to provide language access to Filipinos. This is an official City language, and the community-based organizations are the only ones providing these services. And half a million dollars of these services are being cut.

We ask you to consider that and reconcile. We are working with MOHCD to provide these services. The way to provide language access and cultural competency is to fund these organizations. And here we are, cutting it to the tune of half a million dollars. And work with City departments like OCEIA who are trying to provide language access.”

Mike King thanked the remaining audience members for attending.

3. Adjournment at 8:03 p.m.

Public Comments Received and MOHCD Responses – Consolidated Plan

Name	Affiliation	Comment	MOHCD/OEWD/HSR Response
Sheridan Gray		<p>Over the years I have grown increasingly concerned by the issue of homelessness and its related issues in the city and made it my 2020 New Year's Resolution to become a more informed and engaged citizen on those topics. That led me to read, in its entirety, the draft 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan and 2020-2021 Action Plan.</p> <p>The only change I would advocate for is the allocation to the Emergency Services Grant (ESG) in the SP-35 Anticipated Resources section. The annual allocation totals \$511,180,186 yet only \$1,595,423, or 0.3%, is allocated to ESG. Admittedly, I do not understand all of the interconnected agencies and processes, but the ESG seems to be one of the programs providing direct support to the unsheltered homeless population and this allocation seems incredibly low.</p>	The \$1,595,423 is the ESG annual entitlement grant to San Francisco from HUD.

Public Comments Received and MOHCD Responses – Consolidated Plan

Name	Affiliation	Comment	MOHCD/OEWD/HSR Response
Sheridan Gray		<p>The NA-10 Housing Needs Assessment – 24 CFR 91.205 section says:</p> <p>The goal for new housing production for very low to moderate income households ... is nearly three times San Francisco's average production rate.</p> <p>Based on housing production data from 2014–2018, San Francisco did not meet any of its annual production goals for any income category. 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.</p> <p>What major policy changes are being considered to expedite the production of new housing units? Who are the decision-makers and key influential stakeholders that need to align?</p>	<p>Under Executive Directive 17-02, issued by Mayor Edwin Lee on September 27, 2017, City departments are directed to speed up construction and delivery of housing units with specific timing targets. This directive was not in effect prior to 2017 and therefore 2014-2018 housing production would not have benefited from the directive. The Executive Directive requires City departments to expedite its design review and approval processes and timing including pre- and post-entitlement reviewing and permitting. Because this is an Executive Directive, all relevant department heads and their respective departments must comply with the directive. These departments include all permitting agencies such as the Planning Department, Department of Building Inspection, Department of Public Works, Municipal Transportation Agency, Public Utilities Commission, Fire Department, Recreation and Parks Department, and Mayor's Office on Disability.</p>

Public Comments Received and MOHCD Responses – Consolidated Plan

Name	Affiliation	Comment	MOHCD/OEWD/HSB Response
Sheridan Gray		<p>The SP-80 Monitoring – 91.230 section says:</p> <p>A five-year performance measures matrix will be used to assess investment outcomes and outputs across the 2020–2024 time frame of the Consolidated Plan. Performance under each measure will be tracked against a five-year goal and a one-year goal.</p> <p>When and where will the results of these performance measures be made available to review? Which agency is ultimately responsible for the successful execution of the Consolidated Plan?</p>	<p>The five-year goals and one-year goals are included in this document, the Draft 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan and 2020-2021 Action Plan. After each program year ends on June 30th, San Francisco starts to develop the HUD-required CAPER (Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report), which is available for public review and comment in early September. The CAPER is due to HUD on September 30th. MOHCD is responsible for implementation of affordable housing and community development activities described in the Consolidated Plan; OEWD is responsible for economic development and workforce development activities; and HSB is responsible for activities related to homelessness and supportive housing.</p>
Sheridan Gray		<p>What are the ways that I, as an individual citizen continue to learn and advocate for solutions to the homelessness crisis currently affecting San Francisco?</p>	<p>The Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSB) is the department within the City and County of San Francisco whose primary focus is to make homelessness in San Francisco rare, brief, and one time. Launched on July 1, 2016, HSB combines key homeless serving programs and contracts from the Department of Public Health (DPH), the Human Services Agency (HSA), the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), and the Department of Children Youth and Their Families (DCYF). This consolidated department has a singular focus on</p>

Public Comments Received and MOHCD Responses – Consolidated Plan

Name	Affiliation	Comment	MOHCD/OEWD/HSH Response
			preventing and ending homelessness for people in San Francisco. For more information and resources, please visit http://hsh.sfgov.org/
Sheridan Gray		The HSH budget website is several years old. http://hsh.sfgov.org/overview/budget/ Is there a more up to date version available to the public?	HSH is in the process of updating its website and this comment has been passed on to our IT department to be included in the updates.
Sharon Batton		Is the funding to help homeless individuals living on the streets that may have mental health and substance abuse issues?	Homelessness is a crisis due to the loss of housing. While in a state of crisis, some may use substances to cope. Funds provided through Emergency Solutions Grant support shelter, outreach, rapid rehousing prevention and data collection. The goal of these funds to assist individuals at-risk or experiencing homelessness and align with the evidence-based practice of Housing First. These funds do not specifically fund treatment services. Studies show that once stable in housing, drug use and other risky behaviors may greatly reduce. Additionally, rapidly resolving housing instability and paired with appropriate behavioral health or other support services can have long-term benefits.

Public Comments Received and MOHCD Responses – Consolidated Plan

Name	Affiliation	Comment	MOHCD/OEWD/HSR Response
			<p>HSR partners with the Department of Public Health to align mental and behavioral health services in the households at-risk or experiencing homelessness.</p>
Ilsa Lund	Larkin Street Youth Services	<p>How can we improve the current youth homeless response system? (Referring to pg. 320 of the plan)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve TAY Navigation trainers --- include more bi-lingual staff, translation services • Add more vulnerability ranges in the CE assessment questions to be more inclusive of inter-sectional experiences • Ask the city to reduce human bias for how the system prioritizes housing • Seems like CE is structured more so for people who may not be able to maintain their housing (substance use abusers, etc.) • Provide individual plans for people so they can maintain their housing; e.g. ensure every individual has a case manager <p>PROPOSED SOLUTION OPTION FOR CE TO HELP TAY: * HSR CREATE A USER PORTAL FOR YOUTH TO ACCESS</p>	<p>HSR will continue to work with local stakeholders to make improvements to the Homeless Response System especially for youth in San Francisco. Improvements to our system will include evaluating our Coordinated Entry System and ensuring youth at-risk or experiencing homelessness connect to housing and/or support services that meet their needs. HSR strives for a fair and equitable system and will continue to research, support and implementing evidence-based best practices in Coordinated Entry process improvement. Coordination is critical to Housing First and helps to maximize the use of limited housing funds. Additionally, Coordinated Entry is designed to help give households with severe needs who have been historically overlooked or avoided due to their inability to advocate for themselves</p>

Public Comments Received and MOHCD Responses – Consolidated Plan

Name	Affiliation	Comment	MOHCD/OEWD/HSR Response
		<p>TO SEE THEIR HOUSING STATUS AND/OR IF THEY'VE COMPLETED THEIR ASSESSMENT</p> <p>* PORTAL TO ALLOW ALL PROVIDERS TO ACCESS IT (tracking system based on DOB, name, optional SSC)</p>	<p>to finally access housing. Without coordination, households fall through the cracks and perpetuate an inequitable system. The ONE system is an evolving and HSR always seeks input regarding ways to better communicate within our provider network. These recommendations will be passed on to the Functional Steering Committee at HSR.</p>
Ilsa Lund	Larkin Street Youth Services	Allocate 20% of projects from PROP C funds for TAY-specific programming/resources (p. 324)	HSR is required to balance the needs of all populations in the Homeless Response System. Funding allocations are reviewed annually and HSR will review and discuss this recommendation.
Ilsa Lund	Larkin Street Youth Services	Add "youth of color" to the strategy of "acknowledge and develop strategies to address the unique needs specific sub-population groups, including veterans, youth, and LGBTQ+ populations" on p. 324	Reviewing demographics especially race impacts all populations. HSR will change the bullet point to reflect the following: "Acknowledge and develop strategies to address the unique needs specific sub-population groups, including veterans, youth, and LGBTQ+ populations. HSR will evaluate disparities due to race and use data

Public Comments Received and MOHCD Responses – Consolidated Plan

Name	Affiliation	Comment	MOHCD/OEWD/HSB Response
			and best practices when developing these strategies."
Ilsa Lund	Larkin Street Youth Services	Broaden definition of "disability" to be capture more disabilities and diagnoses that may prevent an individual from maintaining employment. e.g. mental health illnesses (p. 325)	HSB is willing to discuss these recommendations but the definition of "disability" and how it is applied is not in the purview of this department. HSB supports changes and will assist in connecting to departments to make appropriate modifications to better serve our citizens.
Ilsa Lund	Larkin Street Youth Services	Under strategy 2, also provide more mental health and psychiatric youth-specific support; More support for LGBTQ+ identified youth / resources (p. 325)	HSB allocation of ESG funds are only allowed on eligible activities on shelter, outreach, prevention, rapid rehousing and data collection as defined by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development. To support successful connections to housing and to help all sustain housing, HSB works closely with the Department of Public Health who oversee Mental and Behavior Health to coordinated and provide mental and behavioral health services. HSB will continue to advocate for mental health and psychiatric services for youth and LGBTQ+ identified youth.

Summary of Comments Received on First Draft Amendment and Responses

Name	Affiliation	Comment	MOHCD/HSR/HSA Response
Maureen Sedonaen and Peter Dunne	Habitat for Humanity Greater San Francisco (HGSF)	Requests MOHCD to consider including support for homeownership with this funding; describes HGSF's work in building homes to create homeownership opportunities for low-income families and preserving homeownership for long-time homeowners, especially low-income seniors by providing critical home repairs.	Thank you for your comment. The proposed uses for the CARES Act funding is based on eligible uses for CDBG, ESG and HOPWA that we are seeing as the greatest needs for housing support to vulnerable populations related to the COVID-19 pandemic. We agree that support to homeowners is vital in our response and have created an emergency mortgage and HOA dues program to meet the specific needs of homeowners experiencing financial harm due to COVID-19. Additionally, MOHCD supports long time homeowners whose homes are in need of repair in partnership with non-profits that provide these direct services.
Ilsa Lund	Larkin Street Youth Services	<p>Provided the summary of recommendations for services for homeless youth, aligned and adapted from National Guidance for Emergency Homeless Services for Youth:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Carve out a youth set-aside from all CARES Act funding streams that targets youth experiencing homelessness that is proportional to the rate of youth homelessness in San Francisco. 2. Engage youth-specific homeless service providers who may not be receiving ESG, CDBG, or HOPWA funding. 3. Encourage providers to tailor responses to the needs of young people of color and those who identify as LGBTQ. 4. Invite young people with lived experience and providers to have input into the decision-making process, particularly young people of color and those who identify as LGBTQ. 5. Funding should be used to address both the immediate health and safety and long-term needs of young people. 6. Administrators and providers can leverage HUD waivers and offer needed flexibility in service provision. 7. Priority funding areas for youth were listed. 	Thank you for your comment. The proposed uses for the CARES Act funding is based on eligible uses for CDBG, ESG and HOPWA that are allowed by HUD and what we are seeing as great needs for housing support to vulnerable populations. In addition, these are areas where the City is experiencing the greatest costs related to COVID-19 response.

Summary of Comments Received on Second Draft Amendment and Responses

Name	Affiliation	Comment	MOHCD/HSR/HSA Response
Alfred Martinez, Professional Engineer		San Francisco's Public Housing and Community Development would be better served if a small percentage of public funds from rounds 1 and 2 were earmarked, or set aside, to LBE/MBE/WBE firm participation, in the engineering and design of community housing. Furthermore, this assistance should also be extended to the supervision of community development housing construction and/or construction management of public housing.	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>The proposed uses for rounds 1 and 2 of the HUD CARES Act funding are based on the HUD eligible uses for the CDBG, ESG and HOPWA programs and what the City is seeing as the most urgent needs for supporting vulnerable populations during this pandemic. Construction-related activities are not being proposed with these funds. However, MOHCD provides funding for affordable housing and community development construction activities with its other funding sources. The City's Local Business Enterprise Utilization and Non-Discrimination in Contracting Ordinance (LBE Ordinance) applies to all MOHCD-funded affordable housing and community construction-related projects that meet the established threshold that is set by the LBE ordinance, which is codified in Chapter 14B of the San Francisco Administrative Code.</p> <p>If you would like additional information about the City's LBE ordinance or opportunities for LBEs, you may contact Romulus Asenloo, Director of the City's Contract Monitoring Division, at Romulus.asenloo@sfgov.org.</p>
Deborah Kaplan	Deputy Director for Programmatic Access, Mayor's Office on Disability (MOD)	<p>For all of the projects to be funded, MOD recommends that in addition to the services included, the following accessibility services and items be included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff assessment of disability-related accessibility and functional needs; • Provision of accessible facilities; • Modification of existing facilities to enhance accessibility; • Provision of assistive technology for mobility and other functional needs; • Provision of personal care services; • Accessible communication equipment and services; • Independent Living Skills Training. 	As part of the City's response to COVID-19, the Emergency Alternative Housing System was developed, which includes Shelter in Place Hotels and Safe Sleeping Villages that are projects covered partially by the proposed CARES Act funding. As part of the referral process to resources within the Alternative Housing System, all individuals entering the system complete an assessment that was developed in partnership with HSH, the Department of Public Health (DPH) and Human Service Agency's (HSA) In Home Support Services (IHSS) to ensure all onsite services and facilities meet the needs of the individual including disability-related accessibility, functional needs and personal care services. HSH and our partners welcome MOD's continued partnership in strengthening the integration of accessibility services and other items recommended here.
Stella Kunkat	outreach for Coalition on Homelessness; journalist for Street Sheet newspaper	Urges the department to please create more housing for the homeless and people on SSI (seniors and disabled), who make less than \$12,000 a year. Housing is deserved and needed by everyone, and I hope and beg this department to prioritize our most at-risk residents.	The City recognizes that housing is healthcare and it is imperative to continue to invest in all types of housing to serve San Franciscans. These funds are being used for the City's Alternative Housing System, which – in accordance with CDC and FEMA guidelines – is targeted to homeless individuals over 65 or with chronic health conditions since they are most vulnerable to COVID-19. The City is committed to not exiting this population from the non-congregate shelters to the streets. The budget also does include some additional locally-funded resources for housing focused on seniors and adults with disabilities. Development of affordable or supportive housing is not proposed with these funds as housing projects have identified through other local, state and federal resources. The Mayor's proposed Homelessness Recovery Plan includes the largest expansion of Permanent Supportive Housing in San Francisco in the last 20 years over the next two years and is reflected in the proposed FY20-21 budget. Approximately 800 units in MOHCD's affordable housing pipeline in the next five years are planned to be dedicated housing units for seniors or mobility/ADA units.

Summary of Comments Received on Second Draft Amendment and Responses

Name	Affiliation	Comment	MOHCD/HSR/HSA Response
Zach Karnazes, Disability Advocate	Journalist for San Francisco Street Sheet	People with disabilities comprise the vast majority of our current homeless population. Disabled people and seniors who cannot work, are evicted, and have chronic health problems (including life-threatening health problems) are feeling the brunt of the "housing crisis." I want to express the seriousness of this; these are people literally dying on our streets. The maximum that California SSI recipients get is \$943.72 a month. Urges HUD to prioritize housing developments for well below 20% AMI, that are exclusively targeted at severely disabled people and seniors, and do not allow rentals above 20% AMI. Unfortunately, even though the FHA says discrimination against disability is illegal, in my experience, it happens all the time. It is one of the reasons I've struggled personally to get housing in the past. People with rent control, and thus affordable housing, also frequently do not have ADA access since the laws for access primarily only apply to new units built after 1990.	The City recognizes that housing is healthcare and it is imperative to continue to invest in all types of housing to serve San Franciscans. These funds are being used for the City's Alternative Housing System, which – in accordance with CDC and FEMA guidelines – is targeted to homeless individuals over 65 or with chronic health conditions since they are most vulnerable to COVID-19. The City is committed to not exiting this population from the non-congregate shelters to the streets. The budget also does include some additional locally-funded resources for housing focused on seniors and adults with disabilities. Development of affordable or supportive housing is not proposed with these funds as housing projects have identified through other local, state and federal resources. The Mayor's proposed Homelessness Recovery Plan includes the largest expansion of Permanent Supportive Housing in San Francisco in the last 20 years over the next two years and is reflected in the proposed FY20-21 budget. Approximately 800 units in MOHCD's affordable housing pipeline in the next five years are planned to be dedicated housing units for seniors or mobility/ADA units.
Starr Wilson		I lost my home to a vicious tenant here in the city and ended up homeless. Thanks to Swords to Plowshares, over a year later, I was able to get low income housing. If I lose this housing, I will not be able to rent or buy any place in San Francisco because my income is solely Social Security and some disability money, but not enough to even make one-third of the average rent in the City. On top of that, I am 72 years old and considered unemployable and invisible to employers. Nor do I qualify for most food programs because my income is \$5 too much per month, which means I have to stretch my meager income for rent, utilities and food. Many elderly homeless people are on the street because they were evicted by "new owners" and over the last four years over 100 of them have died on our streets. As you may be aware, over 30% of empty apartments and condos are owned by investors, as my house was bought, for greed, not because they care for San Francisco's population. The affordable market homes are not affordable to those of us on Social Security and/or fixed incomes. Please create affordable housing for seniors and disabled and follow through on the promise that we will have a safe affordable place to live in our golden years.	The City recognizes that housing is healthcare and it is imperative to continue to invest in all types of housing to serve San Franciscans. These funds are being used for the City's Alternative Housing System, which – in accordance with CDC and FEMA guidelines – is targeted to homeless individuals over 65 or with chronic health conditions since they are most vulnerable to COVID-19. The City is committed to not exiting this population from the non-congregate shelters to the streets. The budget also does include some additional locally-funded resources for housing focused on seniors and adults with disabilities. Development of affordable or supportive housing is not proposed with these funds as housing projects have identified through other local, state and federal resources. The Mayor's proposed Homelessness Recovery Plan includes the largest expansion of Permanent Supportive Housing in San Francisco in the last 20 years over the next two years and is reflected in the proposed FY20-21 budget. Approximately 800 units in MOHCD's affordable housing pipeline in the next five years are planned to be dedicated housing units for seniors or mobility/ADA units.
Bob Planthold		I am a senior with a lifelong mobility disability. The amount of fully accessible housing that SF builds does not meet the need. Too often developers of LI and VLI housing follow HUD guidelines, which themselves under-estimate the percentage of the population that has a disability needing physical accommodation in housing. Even HUD's recent guideline for 1% of housing be accessible is not adequate to meet our needs. That a subsidized housing unit is considered "adaptable" may sound good to able-bodied people. Because the units need to be rented out quickly, so the developer can meet the mortgage payments, many able-bodied people reside in those "adaptable" units. Those able-bodied people cannot be forced to move, to accommodate a person with a disability. The adaptability is often an unused, if not irrelevant feature of LI and VLI housing. SF needs to allocate more money and more housing for people with disabilities.	The City recognizes that housing is healthcare and it is imperative to continue to invest in all types of housing to serve San Franciscans. These funds are being used for the City's Alternative Housing System, which – in accordance with CDC and FEMA guidelines – is targeted to homeless individuals over 65 or with chronic health conditions since they are most vulnerable to COVID-19. The City is committed to not exiting this population from the non-congregate shelters to the streets. The budget also does include some additional locally-funded resources for housing focused on seniors and adults with disabilities. Development of affordable or supportive housing is not proposed with these funds as housing projects have identified through other local, state and federal resources. The Mayor's proposed Homelessness Recovery Plan includes the largest expansion of Permanent Supportive Housing in San Francisco in the last 20 years over the next two years and is reflected in the proposed FY20-21 budget. Approximately 800 units in MOHCD's affordable housing pipeline in the next five years are planned to be dedicated housing units for seniors or mobility/ADA units.

Summary of Comments Received on Second Draft Amendment and Responses

Name	Affiliation	Comment	MOHCD/HSR/HSA Response
Larry Ackerman		Please create more housing for the homeless and people on SSI (seniors and disabled), who make less than \$12,000 a year. Housing is deserved and needed by everyone, and I hope and plead for this department to prioritize our most at-risk residents.	The City recognizes that housing is healthcare and it is imperative to continue to invest in all types of housing to serve San Franciscans. These funds are being used for the City's Alternative Housing System, which – in accordance with CDC and FEMA guidelines – is targeted to homeless individuals over 65 or with chronic health conditions since they are most vulnerable to COVID-19. The City is committed to not exiting this population from the non-congregate shelters to the streets. The budget also does include some additional locally-funded resources for housing focused on seniors and adults with disabilities. Development of affordable or supportive housing is not proposed with these funds as housing projects have identified through other local, state and federal resources. The Mayor's proposed Homelessness Recovery Plan includes the largest expansion of Permanent Supportive Housing in San Francisco in the last 20 years over the next two years and is reflected in the proposed FY20-21 budget. Approximately 800 units in MOHCD's affordable housing pipeline in the next five years are planned to be dedicated housing units for seniors or mobility/ADA units.
Wendy		I feel this public comment period of 5 days is insufficient for public comments. I am asking for a presentation and workshop perhaps during the Mayor's Disability Council meeting. I am further asking for an extension of a public comment period. I do not understand why this is so rushed and under the radar and cannot be done within a wider 30 day period.	The CARES Act authorizes HUD to implement alternative requirements of statutes and regulations to expedite and facilitate the use of funds to prepare for and respond to COVID-19, including a five-day public comment period for amendments to the Consolidated Plan/Action Plan.
Carol Sacco	Acting Director Department on the Status of Women	Urges MOHCD to prioritize the needs of women vulnerable to homelessness and housing instability, especially survivors of gender-based violence, in allocating ESG funding. Based on our funded community based organization's needs, the current health pandemic, and recent data, we request that CARES Act funding be used for additional funds for emergency shelters for survivors.	The CDBG and ESG CARES Act funds are used to continue the operation of Shelter In Place Hotels, which are currently sheltering over 2,200 most vulnerable individuals in our city, which is one of the most critical needs for the City at the moment. Emergency shelters for survivors are not included in the proposed funding. However, funding in the FY20-21 budget has been allocated to support survivors of violence through existing programs, including emergency shelters serving survivors of violence. HSR also has plans to invest a RRH program for women by utilizing HUD CoC funding in FY 2021.
Michael Santos	Housing and Homelessness Staff Attorney, San Francisco Regional Office, Bay Area Legal Aid	Encourages the following additional considerations on how the City should spend ESG-CV2 funds, in case this is not already integrated into the city's planning: -Provide adequate training to SIP hotel staff; -Provide adequate staffing for SIP hotels and coordinated entry services; -Implement procedural protections for tenants in SIP hotels to address their grievances; -Ensure that hotels are accessible to tenants with disabilities and comply with federal, state, and local disability rights law; -Increase access to SIP hotels for those vulnerable individuals and households that may otherwise be ineligible under restrictive FEMA rules; -Provide rental assistance to prevent further displacement; -Adequately fund other City efforts to reduce and prevent homelessness; -Fund legal and other essential services that could be provided by agencies like Bay Area Legal Aid to prevent homelessness.	The proposed CARES Act funding supports the essential services and operations of Shelter in Place (SIP) Hotels. This includes support for staffing, training and continued development of program guidelines and rules. The proposed CARES Act funds do not extend to Coordinated Entry, Problem Solving or other services such as Bay Area Legal Aid's or rental assistance, as these programs are funded through other sources in the FY20-21 budget. The City has committed that all guests sheltering in Shelter in Place (SIP) hotel and other alternative housing sites will be connected to Problem Solving and Coordinated Entry as part of the Mayor's Homelessness Recovery Plan that ensures no one is returned to the streets.

Summary of Comments Received on Second Draft Amendment and Responses

Name	Affiliation	Comment	MOHCD/HSR/HSA Response
Winnie Yu	Director of Programs & Administration, Self-Help for the Elderly	<p>There are many needs of the diverse Asian and Pacific Islander (API) population in San Francisco which is 35% of the city's population, but funding is lacking in many areas to address these many needs, some examples are highlighted below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 35% of API San Franciscans are currently living in poverty • Neighborhood safety and overcrowded households: less than half of Visitacion Valley residents, two thirds being API, feel safe in their neighborhood; 24.4% of API residents in Chinatown and 5.1% of API residents citywide, are living in overcrowded households • Asian seniors age 55 or older have the highest unemployment rate of all seniors in the nation, and seniors age 65 or older have the highest unemployment rate of all populations at 18.9% (July 2, 2020 U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics report) • API workers disproportionately hold high-contact essential jobs that place them at greater health risk during the COVID-19 pandemic. Asian-owned businesses are overrepresented in sectors that have been hardest hit by COVID-19 (August 6, 2020 McKinsey & Company article: COVID-19 and advancing Asian American recovery) • COVID-19 has exacerbated anti-Asian xenophobia and racism: more than 800 anti-Asian American hate incidents related to COVID-19 were reported across in California over the three months between March and June 2020 (July 5, 2020 CBS San Francisco news report) • Projected to be the largest immigrant population in the U.S. by 2055, and San Francisco being the gateway city for immigrants from Asia, the API population continues to have many needs in the areas of health and social services, job training and placement, children, youth and senior services, housing, legal services, and support for small businesses and neighborhood economic development 	<p>The proposed uses of the CARES Act funding focus on maintaining and expanding the Alternative Housing System for those most vulnerable, which in turn supports the health, safety and resiliency of all San Franciscans.</p>

From: [Barnes, Maximilian \(MYR\)](#)
To: [Woo, Gloria \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: RE: Proposed timeline for CDBG, ESG and HOPWA CARES Act Funding
Date: Monday, June 1, 2020 4:37:23 PM
Attachments: [image005.jpg](#)
[image006.jpg](#)
[image001.jpg](#)

I just uploaded the language you sent and we decided it would be more apparent in a "banner" [on our homepage](#).

If you visit the MOHCD homepage and click the banner titled "Comment on MOHCD public plans by June 12, 2020" it takes you to an ["information page"](#) that has the public noticing language.

Please give it a look and let me know if any additional changes are necessary.



Max Barnes

Joint Information Section PIO – Homelessness (Interim)
Emergency Operations Center

From: Woo, Gloria (MYR)
Sent: Monday, June 1, 2020 4:10 PM
To: Barnes, Maximilian (MYR) <maximilian.l.barnes@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: Proposed timeline for CDBG, ESG and HOPWA CARES Act Funding

The draft document will not be ready until next Monday. We need to provide notice about 7 days in advance.

Gloria Woo
Director of Data, Evaluation and Compliance
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)
1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103
415-701-5586 (phone); 415-701-5501 (fax)
gloria.woo@sfgov.org
My pronouns: she, her, hers (See www.mypronouns.org to learn more.)

From: Barnes, Maximilian (MYR)
Sent: Monday, June 1, 2020 4:06 PM
To: Woo, Gloria (MYR) <gloria.woo@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: Proposed timeline for CDBG, ESG and HOPWA CARES Act Funding

Hi Gloria,

Can you send me the link to the actual draft documents for me to include in the web posting?

Sending people straight to the MOHCD page is a bit confusing.



Max Barnes

Joint Information Section PIO – Homelessness (Interim)
Emergency Operations Center

From: Woo, Gloria (MYR)
Sent: Monday, June 1, 2020 3:14 PM
To: Barnes, Maximilian (MYR) <maximilian.l.barnes@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: Proposed timeline for CDBG, ESG and HOPWA CARES Act Funding

Thank you Max!

Gloria Woo
Director of Data, Evaluation and Compliance
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)
1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103
415-701-5586 (phone); 415-701-5501 (fax)
gloria.woo@sfgov.org
My pronouns: she, her, hers (See www.mypronouns.org to learn more.)

From: Barnes, Maximilian (MYR)
Sent: Monday, June 1, 2020 10:48 AM
To: Woo, Gloria (MYR) <gloria.woo@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: Proposed timeline for CDBG, ESG and HOPWA CARES Act Funding

Hi Gloria,

Thanks for sending over. It will be posted today.

Best,
Max



Max Barnes
Communications Manager
Mayor's Office of Housing + Community Development
Desk: 415.701.5529 | Follow: [@sfmohcd](https://twitter.com/sfmohcd)

From: Woo, Gloria (MYR)
Sent: Saturday, May 30, 2020 6:18 PM
To: Barnes, Maximilian (MYR) <maximilian.l.barnes@sfgov.org>
Subject: Fw: Proposed timeline for CDBG, ESG and HOPWA CARES Act Funding

Hi Max,

I know you will be deployed to the EOC again. Can you post this notice on the MOHCD website, as a News item, as we had discussed?

Thanks,
Gloria

From: Woo, Gloria (MYR)
Sent: Wednesday, May 27, 2020 7:16 PM
To: Duning, Anna (MYR) <anna.duning@sfgov.org>; Catapang, Rally (MYR) <Rally.Catapang@sfgov.org>; King, Michael (MYR) <michael.king@sfgov.org>; Whitley, Gigi (HOM) <gigi.whitley@sfgov.org>; Davis, Heather (HSA) <heather.davis@sfgov.org>; Flannery, Eugene (MYR) <eugene.flannery@sfgov.org>; Chan, Amy (MYR) <amy.chan@sfgov.org>; Cheu, Brian (MYR) <brian.cheu@sfgov.org>; Chinn, Julie (CII) <julie.chinn@sfgov.org>
Cc: Shaw, Eric (MYR) <eric.shaw@sfgov.org>; Ramirez, Hugo (MYR) <hugo.ramirez@sfgov.org>; Vasquez, Manuel (MYR) <manuel.s.vasquez@sfgov.org>; Hale, Helen (MYR) <helen.hale@sfgov.org>; Stroud, Pierre (MYR) <pierre.stroud@sfgov.org>; McCloskey, Benjamin (MYR) <benjamin.mccloskey@sfgov.org>; Barnes, Maximilian (MYR) <maximilian.l.barnes@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: Proposed timeline for CDBG, ESG and HOPWA CARES Act Funding

Hi everyone,

We've changed the public comment period for the Amendment to the Action Plan because the 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan and 2020-2021 Action Plan are currently out for public comment until June 5th. See changes highlighted in yellow below.

Also, FYI, attached is a draft of the public notice of availability of the Amendment for review and comment. This notice will be posted on the MOHCD website and emailed out to our contact list.

Gigi and Heather: can you also post it on the HSH/HAS website and forward it to your contact lists?

Thanks,
Gloria

BOS Accept and Expend Process		
Who	What	By When
Anna/MBO	Finalize proposed uses and amounts	5/26/2020
Rally, Mike, Gigi, Heather, Eugene	Finalize budget resolution packets internally 1) Cover letter (Rally) 2) Proposed budget resolutions (Rally) 3) Grant Information Form with disability checklist (Rally) 4) Expenditure schedules (Mike, Gigi, Heather) 5) Ethics Form 126 (Mike) 6) Environmental record review (Eugene)	5/27/2020
Rally	Submit budget resolution packets to Controller's Office; will be forwarded to the Mayor's Budget Office and then to the BOS	5/28/2020
Anna/MBO/Amy	Mayor's Office introduces budget resolutions at BOS meeting	6/9/2020
Brian/Gigi/Heather	BOS Budget and Finance Committee hearing	6/24/2020
Brian/Gigi/Heather	BOS approval	6/30/2020
	Last day for Mayor's signature of resos	7/10/2020
Gloria	Mayor signs SF 424s and certifications	7/1/2020

Amendment to 2020 Action Plan (HUD application) Process		
Who	What	By When
Gloria	Issue public notice of availability of Amendment to Action Plan	6/1/2020
Gloria	Develop the Amendment to Action Plan	6/5/2020
Gloria	Draft Amendment to Action Plan available for public review and comments (5 days)	6/8-6/12/2020
Gloria	Incorporate any public feedback to Amendment to Action Plan	6/12/2020
Gloria/Rally/Julie	Setup of projects in IDIS completed	7/3/2020
Gloria	Submit Amendment to Action Plan to HUD	7/10/2020

Gloria Woo
Director of Data, Evaluation and Compliance
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)
1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103
415-701-5586 (phone); 415-701-5501 (fax)

gloria.woo@sfgov.org

My pronouns: she, her, hers (See www.mypronouns.org to learn more.)

From: Woo, Gloria (MYR)

Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2020 11:13 AM

To: Duning, Anna (MYR) <anna.duning@sfgov.org>; Catapang, Rally (MYR) <Rally.Catapang@sfgov.org>; King, Michael (MYR) <michael.king@sfgov.org>; Whitley, Gigi (HOM) <gigi.whitley@sfgov.org>; Davis, Heather (HSA) <heather.davis@sfgov.org>; Flannery, Eugene (MYR) <eugene.flannery@sfgov.org>; Chan, Amy (MYR) <amy.chan@sfgov.org>; Cheu, Brian (brian.cheu@sfgov.org) <brian.cheu@sfgov.org>; Chinn, Julie (CII) <julie.chinn@sfgov.org>

Cc: Shaw, Eric (MYR) <eric.shaw@sfgov.org>; Ramirez, Hugo (MYR) <hugo.ramirez@sfgov.org>; Vasquez, Manuel (MYR) <manuel.s.vasquez@sfgov.org>; Hale, Helen (MYR) (helen.hale@sfgov.org) <helen.hale@sfgov.org>; Stroud, Pierre (MYR) <pierre.stroud@sfgov.org>; McCloskey, Benjamin (benjamin.mccloskey@sfgov.org) <benjamin.mccloskey@sfgov.org>

Subject: Proposed timeline for CDBG, ESG and HOPWA CARES Act Funding

Hi all,

I thought it would be good to have a timeline for the CDBG, ESG and HOPWA CARES Act funding. Does the timeline below work for everyone?

Thanks,

Gloria

Gloria Woo

Director of Data, Evaluation and Compliance

Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)

1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103


415-701-5586 (phone); 415-701-5501 (fax)

gloria.woo@sfgov.org

My pronouns: she, her, hers (See www.mypronouns.org to learn more.)

From: [Woo, Gloria 2020](#)
To: [Woo, Gloria 2020](#)
Subject: Proof of publication on MOHCD website
Date: Monday, July 27, 2020 4:43:24 PM
Attachments: [WooGloria.png](#)

Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
City and County of San Francisco



London N. Breed
Mayor

Eric D. Shaw
Director

**Public Review and Comment on
San Francisco's Proposed Uses of CARES Act ESG Round 1 and Round 2 Funds**

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has allocated a second round of Emergency Solution Grant (ESG) funding to the City and County of San Francisco under the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act to help prevent, prepare for and respond to the impacts of the global COVID-19 pandemic. The amount of the second round of CARES Act ESG funding for San Francisco is \$43,605,003. San Francisco received \$5,501,459 in the first round of CARES Act ESG funding. San Francisco also received funding from HUD under the CARES Act Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS (HOPWA) programs in the first round of funding.

For the first round of HUD CARES Act funding, the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) issued two documents for public review and comment from June 8, 2020 to June 12, 2020.

1. An Amendment to San Francisco's 2020-2021 Action Plan that described the proposed uses of the first round of funding provided by HUD to San Francisco under the CARES Act.
2. An Amendment to San Francisco's Citizen Participation that allowed MOHCD to implement an expedited public participation process in accordance with HUD guidelines for CARES Act funding.

MOHCD will make available a second Amendment to San Francisco's 2020-2021 Action Plan for public review and comment from August 3, 2020 to August 7, 2020. This second Amendment will include the proposed uses of the second round of ESG funding as well as the proposed revised uses of the first round of ESG funding under the CARES Act.

The 2020-2021 Action Plan is the first-year implementation plan under the 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan. It outlines community development and affordable housing strategies and priorities that will be supported with HUD funding and other funding administered by MOHCD during the program year that starts on July 1, 2020 and ends on June 30, 2021. HUD requires that the plan be amended to incorporate the CARES Act funding and its proposed uses.

The second Amendment to the 2020-2021 Action Plan will be available for review beginning Monday, August 3, 2020. The draft documents will be available electronically on the MOHCD website at <https://sfmohcd.org/>, HSA website at <http://hsh.sfgov.org/>, and HSA website at <https://www.sfhia.org>. Due to the current shelter in place order, hard copies of these documents will not be available.

Members of the public who wish to provide feedback on the documents may do so by submitting written comments to gloria.woo@sfgov.org. The deadline for receiving written comments is Friday, August 7, 2020, at 5:00 p.m.

One South Van Ness Avenue, Fifth Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103
Phone: 415.701.3388 Fax: 415.701.3301 TDD: 415.701.3383 www.sfmohcd.org

Gloria Woo
Director of Data, Evaluation and Compliance
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)
1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th floor, San Francisco, CA 94103
415-701-5586 (phone); 415-701-5501 (fax)
gloria.woo@sfgov.org
My pronouns: she, her, hers (See www.mypronouns.org to learn more.)



City and County of San Francisco

Citizen Participation Plan

for the
Community Development Block Grant,
Emergency Solutions Grant,
Home Investment Partnerships, and
Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS Programs

Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
Office of Economic and Workforce Development
Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing
One South Van Ness Avenue, Fifth Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
Phone: 415-701-5500; TDD: 415-701-5503
Website: www.sfmohcd.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. BACKGROUND	2
II. PUBLIC INPUT ON REVISED CITIZEN PARTICIPATION PLAN	3
III. PURPOSE	3
IV. CONSOLIDATED PLAN AND ACTION PLAN	4
A. Consultation With Other Community Development and Housing Agencies	4
B. Public Hearings and Notification of Hearings	4
C. Public Review of Draft Consolidated Plan/Action Plan	5
V. AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSOLIDATED PLAN/ACTION PLAN	7
A. Substantial Amendments	7
B. Public Review Process for Substantial Amendments	7
VI. CONSOLIDATED ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND EVALUATION REPORT	8
VII. AMENDMENTS TO THE CITIZEN PARTICIPATION PLAN	9
A. Substantial Amendments	9
B. Public Review Process for Substantial Amendments	9
VIII. AVAILABILITY OF DOCUMENTS TO THE PUBLIC.....	10
IX. ACCESS TO RECORDS.....	10
X. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO ORGANIZATIONS REQUESTING CDBG, ESG, HOME OR HOPWA FUNDING	11
XI. COMPLAINTS	11

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 and HOPWA activities. The Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) is responsible for economic development and workforce development activities of the CDBG program. The Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH) administers ESG activities and oversees HMIS reporting.

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 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 minor updates to its current Citizen Participation Plan, primarily updating the methods that it will use to provide notification of public meetings and availability of documents for public review and comment.

II. PUBLIC INPUT ON REVISED CITIZEN PARTICIPATION PLAN

The updates 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 updates was not solicited.

III. PURPOSE

The Citizen Participation Plan sets forth policies and procedures that the CCCD, MOHCD, OEWD and HSH 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 targeted neighborhoods, in public and publicly subsidized 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 targeted 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 affordable 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 affordable 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, OEWD and HSH will consult with and review reports and policy documents of public and private agencies to identify shared needs and solutions to persistent community problems, including the local Homeless Coordinating Board. 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 affordable 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 affordable housing needs.

The CCCD will convene another public hearing during the development of the annual Draft Action Plan, which will include preliminary funding recommendations. 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, OEWD and HSH 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 targeted neighborhoods and in public and publicly subsidized housing developments.

With advance notice, MOHCD, OEWD and HSH will accommodate the needs of LEP residents with interpretation 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 will be published in neighborhood newspapers and ethnic group-specific publications that are used by the Board of Supervisors for outreach, if space is available;
2. Notices will be posted on the MOHCD, OEWD and HSH websites;
3. Notices will be emailed to non-profit organizations on MOHCD's contact list.

The publication of notices in newspapers, web postings, and via email 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, notices will be posted on the MOHCD, OEWD and HSH websites and published in neighborhood and ethnic group-specific newspapers that are used by the Board of Supervisors for outreach, if space is available. The notice will also be emailed to non-profit organizations on MOHCD's contact list. The notice will summarize 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.

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, OEWD and HSH 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, OEWD and HSH websites, at the offices of MOHCD, OEWD and HSH, 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 public 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, community facilities, 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 and review process is as follows:

1. Notices will be posted on the MOHCD, OEWD and HSH websites and published in neighborhood and ethnic group-specific newspapers that are used by the Board of Supervisors for outreach, if space is available. The notice will also be emailed to non-profit organizations on MOHCD's contact list. The notice will inform the public of the proposed changes, and locations where a copy of the draft amendment may be reviewed.
2. After public notice of approximately 7-10 days, the draft amendment will be available for public review and comment electronically on the MOHCD, OEWD and/or HSH websites, at the offices of MOHCD, OEWD and/or HSH, 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, if one is scheduled 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, OEWD and HSH 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, notices will be posted on the MOHCD, OEWD and HSH websites and published in neighborhood and ethnic group-specific newspapers that are used by the Board of Supervisors for outreach, if space is available. The notice will also be emailed to non-profit organizations on MOHCD's contact list. The notice 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.

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, OEWD and HSH websites, at the offices of MOCD, OEWD and HSH, 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 a CCCD meeting, if one is scheduled within the 15-day 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. Notices will be posted on the MOHCD, OEWD and HSH websites and published in neighborhood and ethnic group-specific newspapers that are used by the Board of Supervisors for outreach, if space is available. The notice will also be emailed to non-profit organizations on MOHCD's contact list. The notice will inform the public of the proposed changes, and locations where a copy of the draft amendment may be reviewed.
2. After public notice of approximately 7-10 days, the draft amendment will be available for public review and comment electronically on the MOHCD, OEWD and/or HSH websites, at the offices of MOHCD, OEWD and/or HSH, 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 a CCCD meeting, if one is scheduled within the 15-day 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, OEWD and HSH 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, OEWD and HSH websites. Upon request, MOHCD, OEWD or HSH will make available a hard copy (printout) version and a version in a format 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, OEWD and HSH 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, OEWD and HSH 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, OEWD and HSH 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, OEWD or HSH, 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 HOME and HOPWA activities, please contact the Director of MOHCD.

For concerns related to CDBG economic development and workforce development activities, please contact the Director of OEWD.

For concerns related to ESG activities, please contact the Director of HSH.

Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

* 1. Type of Submission:

- ☐ Preapplication
☐ Application
☒ Changed/Corrected Application

* 2. Type of Application:

- ☒ New
☐ Continuation
☐ Revision

* If Revision, select appropriate letter(s):

* Other (Specify):

* 3. Date Received:

02/01/2021

4. Applicant Identifier:

2020-2021 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:

Eric

Middle Name:

D.

* Last Name:

Shaw

Suffix:

Title: Director

Organizational Affiliation:

Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

* Telephone Number: 415-701-5500

Fax Number:

* Email: eric.shaw@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:

2020-2021 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.

Add Attachment

Delete Attachment

View Attachment

17. Proposed Project:* a. Start Date: * b. End Date: **18. Estimated Funding (\$):**

* a. Federal	<input type="text" value="18,649,794.00"/>
* b. Applicant	<input type="text"/>
* c. State	<input type="text"/>
* d. Local	<input type="text"/>
* e. Other	<input type="text" value="446,805.00"/>
* f. Program Income	<input type="text" value="6,550,000.00"/>
* g. TOTAL	<input type="text" value="25,646,599.00"/>

*** 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:

- ☐ Preapplication
☐ Application
☒ Changed/Corrected Application

* 2. Type of Application:

- ☒ New
☐ Continuation
☐ Revision

* If Revision, select appropriate letter(s):

* Other (Specify):

* 3. Date Received:

02/01/2020

4. Applicant Identifier:

2020-2021 HOME

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:

Eric

Middle Name:

D.

* Last Name:

Shaw

Suffix:

Title: Director

Organizational Affiliation:

Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

* Telephone Number: 415-701-5500

Fax Number:

* Email: eric.shaw@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:

2020-2021 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="5,402,373.00"/>
* 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="2,400,748.00"/>
* g. TOTAL	<input type="text" value="7,803,121.00"/>

*** 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:

- ☒ Preapplication
- ☐ Application
- ☐ Changed/Corrected Application

* 2. Type of Application:

- ☒ New
- ☐ Continuation
- ☐ Revision

* If Revision, select appropriate letter(s):

* Other (Specify):

* 3. Date Received:

06/15/2020

4. Applicant Identifier:

2020-2021 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:

Eric

Middle Name:

D.

* Last Name:

Shaw

Suffix:

Title:

Director

Organizational Affiliation:

Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

* Telephone Number:

415-701-5500

Fax Number:

* Email:

eric.shaw@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:

2020-2021 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="1,595,423.00"/>
* 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="1,595,423.00"/>

*** 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:	<input type="text" value="Ms."/>	* First Name:	<input type="text" value="London"/>
Middle Name:	<input type="text" value="N."/>		
* Last Name:	<input type="text" value="Breed"/>		
Suffix:	<input type="text"/>		

* Title: * Telephone Number: Fax Number: * Email:

* Signature of Authorized Representative:

* Date Signed:

Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

* 1. Type of Submission:

- ☒ Preapplication
☐ Application
☐ Changed/Corrected Application

* 2. Type of Application:

- ☒ New
☐ Continuation
☐ Revision

* If Revision, select appropriate letter(s):

* Other (Specify):

* 3. Date Received:

06/15/2020

4. Applicant Identifier:

2020-2021 HOPWA

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:

Eric

Middle Name:

D.

* Last Name:

Shaw

Suffix:

Title:

Director

Organizational Affiliation:

Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

* Telephone Number:

415-701-5500

Fax Number:

* Email:

eric.shaw@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:

14-241

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:

2020-2021 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="7,067,229.00"/>
* b. Applicant	<input type="text"/>
* c. State	<input type="text"/>
* d. Local	<input type="text"/>
* e. Other	<input type="text" value="2,000,000.00"/>
* f. Program Income	<input type="text" value="1,200,000.00"/>
* g. TOTAL	<input type="text" value="10,267,229.00"/>

*** 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:	<input type="text" value="Ms."/>	* First Name:	<input type="text" value="London"/>
Middle Name:	<input type="text" value="N."/>		
* Last Name:	<input type="text" value="Breed"/>		
Suffix:	<input type="text"/>		

* Title: * Telephone Number: Fax Number: * Email:

* Signature of Authorized Representative:

* Date Signed:

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 15 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0042), Washington, DC 20503.


PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR COMPLETED FORM TO THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET. SEND IT TO THE ADDRESS PROVIDED BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY.

NOTE: Certain of these assurances may not be applicable to your project or program. If you have questions, please contact the Awarding Agency. Further, certain Federal assistance awarding agencies may require applicants to certify to additional assurances. If such is the case, you will be notified.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I certify that the applicant:

1. Has the legal authority to apply for Federal assistance, and the institutional, managerial and financial capability (including funds sufficient to pay the non-Federal share of project costs) to ensure proper planning, management and completion of project described in this application.
2. Will give the awarding agency, the Comptroller General of the United States and, if appropriate, the State, the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the assistance; and will establish a proper accounting system in accordance with generally accepted accounting standards or agency directives.
3. Will not dispose of, modify the use of, or change the terms of the real property title or other interest in the site and facilities without permission and instructions from the awarding agency. Will record the Federal awarding agency directives and will include a covenant in the title of real property acquired in whole or in part with Federal assistance funds to assure non-discrimination during the useful life of the project.
4. Will comply with the requirements of the assistance awarding agency with regard to the drafting, review and approval of construction plans and specifications.
5. Will provide and maintain competent and adequate engineering supervision at the construction site to ensure that the complete work conforms with the approved plans and specifications and will furnish progressive reports and such other information as may be required by the assistance awarding agency or State.
6. Will initiate and complete the work within the applicable time frame after receipt of approval of the awarding agency.
7. Will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that constitutes or presents the appearance of personal or organizational conflict of interest, or personal gain.
8. Will comply with the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. §§4728-4763) relating to prescribed standards of merit systems for programs funded under one of the 19 statutes or regulations specified in Appendix A of OPM's Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration (5 C.F.R. 900, Subpart F).
9. Will comply with the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. §§4801 et seq.) which prohibits the use of lead-based paint in construction or rehabilitation of residence structures.
10. Will comply with all Federal statutes relating to non-discrimination. These include but are not limited to: (a) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin; (b) Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended (20 U.S.C. §§1681 1683, and 1685-1686), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex; (c) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. §794), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicaps; (d) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§6101-6107), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age; (e) the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-255), as amended relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse; (f) the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-616), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse or alcoholism; (g) §§523 and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1912 (42 U.S.C. §§290 dd-3 and 290 ee 3), as amended, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records; (h) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. §§3601 et seq.), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental or financing of housing; (i) any other nondiscrimination provisions in the specific statute(s) under which application for Federal assistance is being made; and (j) the requirements of any other nondiscrimination statute(s) which may apply to the application.

11. Will comply, or has already complied, with the requirements of Titles II and III of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) which provide for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced or whose property is acquired as a result of Federal and federally-assisted programs. These requirements apply to all interests in real property acquired for project purposes regardless of Federal participation in purchases.
12. Will comply with the provisions of the Hatch Act (5 U.S.C. §§1501-1508 and 7324-7328) which limit the political activities of employees whose principal employment activities are funded in whole or in part with Federal funds.
13. Will comply, as applicable, with the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U.S.C. §§276a to 276a-7), the Copeland Act (40 U.S.C. §276c and 18 U.S.C. §874), and the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act (40 U.S.C. §§327-333) regarding labor standards for federally-assisted construction subagreements.
14. Will comply with flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-234) which requires recipients in a special flood hazard area to participate in the program and to purchase flood insurance if the total cost of insurable construction and acquisition is \$10,000 or more.
15. Will comply with environmental standards which may be prescribed pursuant to the following: (a) institution of environmental quality control measures under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-190) and Executive Order (EO) 11514; (b) notification of violating facilities pursuant to EO 11738; (c) protection of wetlands pursuant to EO 11990; (d) evaluation of flood hazards in floodplains in accordance with EO 11988; (e) assurance of project consistency with the approved State management program developed under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. §§1451 et seq.); (f) conformity of Federal actions to State (Clean Air) implementation Plans under Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act of 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§7401 et seq.); (g) protection of underground sources of drinking water under the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended (P.L. 93-523); and, (h) protection of endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (P.L. 93-205).
16. Will comply with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 (16 U.S.C. §§1271 et seq.) related to protecting components or potential components of the national wild and scenic rivers system.
17. Will assist the awarding agency in assuring compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. §470), EO 11593 (identification and protection of historic properties), and the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. §§469a-1 et seq.).
18. Will cause to be performed the required financial and compliance audits in accordance with the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996 and OMB Circular No. A-133, "Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations."
19. Will comply with all applicable requirements of all other Federal laws, executive orders, regulations, and policies governing this program.
20. Will comply with the requirements of Section 106(g) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) of 2000, as amended (22 U.S.C. 7104) which prohibits grant award recipients or a sub-recipient from (1) Engaging in severe forms of trafficking in persons during the period of time that the award is in effect (2) Procuring a commercial sex act during the period of time that the award is in effect or (3) Using forced labor in the performance of the award or subawards under the award.

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED CERTIFYING OFFICIAL 	TITLE Mayor
APPLICANT ORGANIZATION City and County of San Francisco	DATE SUBMITTED 06/12/2020

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 15 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0042), Washington, DC 20503.


PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR COMPLETED FORM TO THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET. SEND IT TO THE ADDRESS PROVIDED BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY.

NOTE: Certain of these assurances may not be applicable to your project or program. If you have questions, please contact the Awarding Agency. Further, certain Federal assistance awarding agencies may require applicants to certify to additional assurances. If such is the case, you will be notified.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I certify that the applicant:

1. Has the legal authority to apply for Federal assistance, and the institutional, managerial and financial capability (including funds sufficient to pay the non-Federal share of project costs) to ensure proper planning, management and completion of project described in this application.
2. Will give the awarding agency, the Comptroller General of the United States and, if appropriate, the State, the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the assistance; and will establish a proper accounting system in accordance with generally accepted accounting standards or agency directives.
3. Will not dispose of, modify the use of, or change the terms of the real property title or other interest in the site and facilities without permission and instructions from the awarding agency. Will record the Federal awarding agency directives and will include a covenant in the title of real property acquired in whole or in part with Federal assistance funds to assure non-discrimination during the useful life of the project.
4. Will comply with the requirements of the assistance awarding agency with regard to the drafting, review and approval of construction plans and specifications.
5. Will provide and maintain competent and adequate engineering supervision at the construction site to ensure that the complete work conforms with the approved plans and specifications and will furnish progressive reports and such other information as may be required by the assistance awarding agency or State.
6. Will initiate and complete the work within the applicable time frame after receipt of approval of the awarding agency.
7. Will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that constitutes or presents the appearance of personal or organizational conflict of interest, or personal gain.
8. Will comply with the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. §§4728-4763) relating to prescribed standards of merit systems for programs funded under one of the 19 statutes or regulations specified in Appendix A of OPM's Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration (5 C.F.R. 900, Subpart F).
9. Will comply with the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. §§4801 et seq.) which prohibits the use of lead-based paint in construction or rehabilitation of residence structures.
10. Will comply with all Federal statutes relating to non-discrimination. These include but are not limited to: (a) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin; (b) Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended (20 U.S.C. §§1681 1683, and 1685-1686), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex; (c) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. §794), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicaps; (d) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§6101-6107), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age; (e) the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-255), as amended relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse; (f) the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-616), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse or alcoholism; (g) §§523 and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1912 (42 U.S.C. §§290 dd-3 and 290 ee 3), as amended, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records; (h) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. §§3601 et seq.), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental or financing of housing; (i) any other nondiscrimination provisions in the specific statute(s) under which application for Federal assistance is being made; and (j) the requirements of any other nondiscrimination statute(s) which may apply to the application.

11. Will comply, or has already complied, with the requirements of Titles II and III of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) which provide for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced or whose property is acquired as a result of Federal and federally-assisted programs. These requirements apply to all interests in real property acquired for project purposes regardless of Federal participation in purchases.
12. Will comply with the provisions of the Hatch Act (5 U.S.C. §§1501-1508 and 7324-7328) which limit the political activities of employees whose principal employment activities are funded in whole or in part with Federal funds.
13. Will comply, as applicable, with the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U.S.C. §§276a to 276a-7), the Copeland Act (40 U.S.C. §276c and 18 U.S.C. §874), and the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act (40 U.S.C. §§327-333) regarding labor standards for federally-assisted construction subagreements.
14. Will comply with flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-234) which requires recipients in a special flood hazard area to participate in the program and to purchase flood insurance if the total cost of insurable construction and acquisition is \$10,000 or more.
15. Will comply with environmental standards which may be prescribed pursuant to the following: (a) institution of environmental quality control measures under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-190) and Executive Order (EO) 11514; (b) notification of violating facilities pursuant to EO 11738; (c) protection of wetlands pursuant to EO 11990; (d) evaluation of flood hazards in floodplains in accordance with EO 11988; (e) assurance of project consistency with the approved State management program developed under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. §§1451 et seq.); (f) conformity of Federal actions to State (Clean Air) implementation Plans under Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act of 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§7401 et seq.); (g) protection of underground sources of drinking water under the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended (P.L. 93-523); and, (h) protection of endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (P.L. 93-205).
16. Will comply with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 (16 U.S.C. §§1271 et seq.) related to protecting components or potential components of the national wild and scenic rivers system.
17. Will assist the awarding agency in assuring compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. §470), EO 11593 (identification and protection of historic properties), and the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. §§469a-1 et seq.).
18. Will cause to be performed the required financial and compliance audits in accordance with the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996 and OMB Circular No. A-133, "Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations."
19. Will comply with all applicable requirements of all other Federal laws, executive orders, regulations, and policies governing this program.
20. Will comply with the requirements of Section 106(g) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) of 2000, as amended (22 U.S.C. 7104) which prohibits grant award recipients or a sub-recipient from (1) Engaging in severe forms of trafficking in persons during the period of time that the award is in effect (2) Procuring a commercial sex act during the period of time that the award is in effect or (3) Using forced labor in the performance of the award or subawards under the award.

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED CERTIFYING OFFICIAL 	TITLE Mayor
APPLICANT ORGANIZATION City and County of San Francisco	DATE SUBMITTED 06/12/2020

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 15 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0042), Washington, DC 20503.


PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR COMPLETED FORM TO THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET. SEND IT TO THE ADDRESS PROVIDED BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY.

NOTE: Certain of these assurances may not be applicable to your project or program. If you have questions, please contact the Awarding Agency. Further, certain Federal assistance awarding agencies may require applicants to certify to additional assurances. If such is the case, you will be notified.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I certify that the applicant:

1. Has the legal authority to apply for Federal assistance, and the institutional, managerial and financial capability (including funds sufficient to pay the non-Federal share of project costs) to ensure proper planning, management and completion of project described in this application.
2. Will give the awarding agency, the Comptroller General of the United States and, if appropriate, the State, the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the assistance; and will establish a proper accounting system in accordance with generally accepted accounting standards or agency directives.
3. Will not dispose of, modify the use of, or change the terms of the real property title or other interest in the site and facilities without permission and instructions from the awarding agency. Will record the Federal awarding agency directives and will include a covenant in the title of real property acquired in whole or in part with Federal assistance funds to assure non-discrimination during the useful life of the project.
4. Will comply with the requirements of the assistance awarding agency with regard to the drafting, review and approval of construction plans and specifications.
5. Will provide and maintain competent and adequate engineering supervision at the construction site to ensure that the complete work conforms with the approved plans and specifications and will furnish progressive reports and such other information as may be required by the assistance awarding agency or State.
6. Will initiate and complete the work within the applicable time frame after receipt of approval of the awarding agency.
7. Will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that constitutes or presents the appearance of personal or organizational conflict of interest, or personal gain.
8. Will comply with the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. §§4728-4763) relating to prescribed standards of merit systems for programs funded under one of the 19 statutes or regulations specified in Appendix A of OPM's Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration (5 C.F.R. 900, Subpart F).
9. Will comply with the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. §§4801 et seq.) which prohibits the use of lead-based paint in construction or rehabilitation of residence structures.
10. Will comply with all Federal statutes relating to non-discrimination. These include but are not limited to: (a) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin; (b) Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended (20 U.S.C. §§1681 1683, and 1685-1686), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex; (c) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. §794), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicaps; (d) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§6101-6107), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age; (e) the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-255), as amended relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse; (f) the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-616), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse or alcoholism; (g) §§523 and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1912 (42 U.S.C. §§290 dd-3 and 290 ee 3), as amended, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records; (h) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. §§3601 et seq.), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental or financing of housing; (i) any other nondiscrimination provisions in the specific statute(s) under which application for Federal assistance is being made; and (j) the requirements of any other nondiscrimination statute(s) which may apply to the application.

11. Will comply, or has already complied, with the requirements of Titles II and III of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) which provide for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced or whose property is acquired as a result of Federal and federally-assisted programs. These requirements apply to all interests in real property acquired for project purposes regardless of Federal participation in purchases.
12. Will comply with the provisions of the Hatch Act (5 U.S.C. §§1501-1508 and 7324-7328) which limit the political activities of employees whose principal employment activities are funded in whole or in part with Federal funds.
13. Will comply, as applicable, with the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U.S.C. §§276a to 276a-7), the Copeland Act (40 U.S.C. §276c and 18 U.S.C. §874), and the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act (40 U.S.C. §§327-333) regarding labor standards for federally-assisted construction subagreements.
14. Will comply with flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-234) which requires recipients in a special flood hazard area to participate in the program and to purchase flood insurance if the total cost of insurable construction and acquisition is \$10,000 or more.
15. Will comply with environmental standards which may be prescribed pursuant to the following: (a) institution of environmental quality control measures under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-190) and Executive Order (EO) 11514; (b) notification of violating facilities pursuant to EO 11738; (c) protection of wetlands pursuant to EO 11990; (d) evaluation of flood hazards in floodplains in accordance with EO 11988; (e) assurance of project consistency with the approved State management program developed under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. §§1451 et seq.); (f) conformity of Federal actions to State (Clean Air) implementation Plans under Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act of 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§7401 et seq.); (g) protection of underground sources of drinking water under the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended (P.L. 93-523); and, (h) protection of endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (P.L. 93-205).
16. Will comply with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 (16 U.S.C. §§1271 et seq.) related to protecting components or potential components of the national wild and scenic rivers system.
17. Will assist the awarding agency in assuring compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. §470), EO 11593 (identification and protection of historic properties), and the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. §§469a-1 et seq).
18. Will cause to be performed the required financial and compliance audits in accordance with the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996 and OMB Circular No. A-133, "Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations."
19. Will comply with all applicable requirements of all other Federal laws, executive orders, regulations, and policies governing this program.
20. Will comply with the requirements of Section 106(g) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) of 2000, as amended (22 U.S.C. 7104) which prohibits grant award recipients or a sub-recipient from (1) Engaging in severe forms of trafficking in persons during the period of time that the award is in effect (2) Procuring a commercial sex act during the period of time that the award is in effect or (3) Using forced labor in the performance of the award or subawards under the award.

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED CERTIFYING OFFICIAL 	TITLE Mayor
APPLICANT ORGANIZATION City and County of San Francisco	DATE SUBMITTED 06/12/2020

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 15 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0042), Washington, DC 20503.


PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR COMPLETED FORM TO THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET. SEND IT TO THE ADDRESS PROVIDED BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY.

NOTE: Certain of these assurances may not be applicable to your project or program. If you have questions, please contact the Awarding Agency. Further, certain Federal assistance awarding agencies may require applicants to certify to additional assurances. If such is the case, you will be notified.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I certify that the applicant:

1. Has the legal authority to apply for Federal assistance, and the institutional, managerial and financial capability (including funds sufficient to pay the non-Federal share of project costs) to ensure proper planning, management and completion of project described in this application.
2. Will give the awarding agency, the Comptroller General of the United States and, if appropriate, the State, the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the assistance; and will establish a proper accounting system in accordance with generally accepted accounting standards or agency directives.
3. Will not dispose of, modify the use of, or change the terms of the real property title or other interest in the site and facilities without permission and instructions from the awarding agency. Will record the Federal awarding agency directives and will include a covenant in the title of real property acquired in whole or in part with Federal assistance funds to assure non-discrimination during the useful life of the project.
4. Will comply with the requirements of the assistance awarding agency with regard to the drafting, review and approval of construction plans and specifications.
5. Will provide and maintain competent and adequate engineering supervision at the construction site to ensure that the complete work conforms with the approved plans and specifications and will furnish progressive reports and such other information as may be required by the assistance awarding agency or State.
6. Will initiate and complete the work within the applicable time frame after receipt of approval of the awarding agency.
7. Will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that constitutes or presents the appearance of personal or organizational conflict of interest, or personal gain.
8. Will comply with the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. §§4728-4763) relating to prescribed standards of merit systems for programs funded under one of the 19 statutes or regulations specified in Appendix A of OPM's Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration (5 C.F.R. 900, Subpart F).
9. Will comply with the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. §§4801 et seq.) which prohibits the use of lead-based paint in construction or rehabilitation of residence structures.
10. Will comply with all Federal statutes relating to non-discrimination. These include but are not limited to: (a) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin; (b) Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended (20 U.S.C. §§1681 1683, and 1685-1686), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex; (c) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. §794), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicaps; (d) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§6101-6107), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age; (e) the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-255), as amended relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse; (f) the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-616), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse or alcoholism; (g) §§523 and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1912 (42 U.S.C. §§290 dd-3 and 290 ee 3), as amended, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records; (h) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. §§3601 et seq.), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental or financing of housing; (i) any other nondiscrimination provisions in the specific statute(s) under which application for Federal assistance is being made; and (j) the requirements of any other nondiscrimination statute(s) which may apply to the application.

11. Will comply, or has already complied, with the requirements of Titles II and III of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) which provide for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced or whose property is acquired as a result of Federal and federally-assisted programs. These requirements apply to all interests in real property acquired for project purposes regardless of Federal participation in purchases.
12. Will comply with the provisions of the Hatch Act (5 U.S.C. §§1501-1508 and 7324-7328) which limit the political activities of employees whose principal employment activities are funded in whole or in part with Federal funds.
13. Will comply, as applicable, with the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U.S.C. §§276a to 276a-7), the Copeland Act (40 U.S.C. §276c and 18 U.S.C. §874), and the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act (40 U.S.C. §§327-333) regarding labor standards for federally-assisted construction subagreements.
14. Will comply with flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-234) which requires recipients in a special flood hazard area to participate in the program and to purchase flood insurance if the total cost of insurable construction and acquisition is \$10,000 or more.
15. Will comply with environmental standards which may be prescribed pursuant to the following: (a) institution of environmental quality control measures under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-190) and Executive Order (EO) 11514; (b) notification of violating facilities pursuant to EO 11738; (c) protection of wetlands pursuant to EO 11990; (d) evaluation of flood hazards in floodplains in accordance with EO 11988; (e) assurance of project consistency with the approved State management program developed under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. §§1451 et seq.); (f) conformity of Federal actions to State (Clean Air) implementation Plans under Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act of 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§7401 et seq.); (g) protection of underground sources of drinking water under the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended (P.L. 93-523); and, (h) protection of endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (P.L. 93-205).
16. Will comply with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 (16 U.S.C. §§1271 et seq.) related to protecting components or potential components of the national wild and scenic rivers system.
17. Will assist the awarding agency in assuring compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. §470), EO 11593 (identification and protection of historic properties), and the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. §§469a-1 et seq.).
18. Will cause to be performed the required financial and compliance audits in accordance with the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996 and OMB Circular No. A-133, "Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations."
19. Will comply with all applicable requirements of all other Federal laws, executive orders, regulations, and policies governing this program.
20. Will comply with the requirements of Section 106(g) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) of 2000, as amended (22 U.S.C. 7104) which prohibits grant award recipients or a sub-recipient from (1) Engaging in severe forms of trafficking in persons during the period of time that the award is in effect (2) Procuring a commercial sex act during the period of time that the award is in effect or (3) Using forced labor in the performance of the award or subawards under the award.

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED CERTIFYING OFFICIAL 	TITLE Mayor
APPLICANT ORGANIZATION City and County of San Francisco	DATE SUBMITTED 06/12/2020

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.

Uniform Relocation Act and 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, (42 U.S.C. 4601-4655) and implementing regulations at 49 CFR Part 24. It has in effect and is following a residential anti-displacement and relocation assistance plan required under 24 CFR Part 42 in connection with any activity assisted with funding under the Community Development Block Grant 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 Community Development Block Grant, HOME, Emergency Solutions Grant, and Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS funds are consistent with the strategic plan in the jurisdiction's consolidated plan.

Section 3 -- It will comply with section 3 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 (12 U.S.C. 1701u) and implementing regulations at 24 CFR Part 135.


Signature of Authorized Official

6/15/20
Date

Mayor, San Francisco
Title

Specific Community Development Block Grant 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 plan identifies community development and housing needs and specifies both short-term and long-term community development objectives that have been developed in accordance with the primary objective of the CDBG program (i.e., the development of viable urban communities, by providing decent housing and expanding economic opportunities, primarily for persons of low and moderate income) and requirements of 24 CFR Parts 91 and 570.

Following a Plan -- It is following a current consolidated plan 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 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 CDBG-assisted activities which the grantee certifies are designed to meet other community development needs having 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 (see Optional CDBG Certification).

2. Overall Benefit. The aggregate use of CDBG funds, including Section 108 guaranteed loans, during program year(s) 2020 [a period specified by the grantee 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.

In addition, 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 U.S.C. 2000d) and the Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 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 of Authorized Official

6/15/20

Date


Mayor

Title

OPTIONAL Community Development Block Grant Certification

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 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 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 of Authorized Official

6/15/20

Date

Mayor

Title


Specific HOME Certifications

The HOME participating jurisdiction certifies that:

Tenant Based Rental Assistance -- If it plans to provide tenant-based rental assistance, the tenant-based rental assistance is an essential element of its consolidated plan.

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.

Subsidy layering -- 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 of Authorized Official

6/15/20

Date

Mayor

Title

Emergency Solutions Grants Certifications

The Emergency Solutions Grants Program recipient certifies that:

Major rehabilitation/conversion/renovation – If an emergency shelter's rehabilitation costs exceed 75 percent of the value of the building before rehabilitation, the recipient 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 recipient 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 recipient 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 recipient 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 recipient 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 recipient 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 these individuals.


Matching Funds – The recipient will obtain matching amounts required under 24 CFR 576.201.

Confidentiality – The recipient 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 recipient 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 recipient undertakes with assistance under ESG are consistent with its consolidated plan.

Discharge Policy – The recipient 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.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Linda Brund", written over a horizontal line.

Signature of Authorized Official

6/15/20

Date

Mayor

Title


Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS 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 consolidated plan:

1. For a period of not less than 10 years in the case of assistance involving new construction, substantial rehabilitation, or acquisition of a facility,
2. For a period of not less than 3 years in the case of assistance involving non-substantial rehabilitation or repair of a building or structure.



Signature of Authorized Official

6/15/20

Date

Mayor

Title

APPENDIX TO CERTIFICATIONS

INSTRUCTIONS CONCERNING LOBBYING CERTIFICATION:

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.

Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

*** 1. Type of Submission:**

- ☒ Preapplication
☐ Application
☐ Changed/Corrected Application

*** 2. Type of Application:**

- ☒ New
☐ Continuation
☐ Revision

*** If Revision, select appropriate letter(s):**

*** Other (Specify):**

*** 3. Date Received:**

09/04/2020

4. Applicant Identifier:

Round 1 CDBG-CV

5a. Federal Entity Identifier:

5b. Federal Award Identifier:

B-20-MW-06-0016

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:**

Eric

Middle Name:

D.

*** Last Name:**

Shaw

Suffix:

Title:

Director

Organizational Affiliation:

Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

*** Telephone Number:**

415-701-5500

Fax Number:

*** Email:**

eric.shaw@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:

CARES Act Community Development Block Grant Program (Round 1) 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="10,972,734.00"/>
* 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="10,972,734.00"/>

*** 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:	<input type="text" value="Ms."/>	* First Name:	<input type="text" value="London"/>
Middle Name:	<input type="text" value="N."/>		
* Last Name:	<input type="text" value="Breed"/>		
Suffix:	<input type="text"/>		

* Title: * Telephone Number: Fax Number: * Email:

* Signature of Authorized Representative:

* Date Signed:

Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

*** 1. Type of Submission:**

- ☒ Preapplication
☐ Application
☐ Changed/Corrected Application

*** 2. Type of Application:**

- ☒ New
☐ Continuation
☐ Revision

*** If Revision, select appropriate letter(s):**

*** Other (Specify):**

*** 3. Date Received:**

09/04/2020

4. Applicant Identifier:

Round 1 and 2 ESG-CV

5a. Federal Entity Identifier:

5b. Federal Award Identifier:

E-20-MW-06-0016

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:**

Eric

Middle Name:

D.

*** Last Name:**

Shaw

Suffix:

Title: Director

Organizational Affiliation:

Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

*** Telephone Number:** 415-701-5500

Fax Number:

*** Email:** eric.shaw@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:

CARES Act Emergency Solutions Grant Program (Round 1 and 2) 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.

17. Proposed Project:* a. Start Date: * b. End Date: **18. Estimated Funding (\$):**

* a. Federal	<input type="text" value="49,106,462.00"/>
* 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="49,106,462.00"/>

*** 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:	<input type="text" value="Ms."/>	* First Name:	<input type="text" value="London"/>
Middle Name:	<input type="text" value="N."/>		
* Last Name:	<input type="text" value="Breed"/>		
Suffix:	<input type="text"/>		

* Title: * Telephone Number: Fax Number: * Email:

* Signature of Authorized Representative:

* Date Signed:

Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

*** 1. Type of Submission:**

- ☒ Preapplication
☐ Application
☐ Changed/Corrected Application

*** 2. Type of Application:**

- ☒ New
☐ Continuation
☐ Revision

*** If Revision, select appropriate letter(s):**

*** Other (Specify):**

*** 3. Date Received:**

09/04/2020

4. Applicant Identifier:

Round 1 HOPWA-CV

5a. Federal Entity Identifier:

5b. Federal Award Identifier:

CAH20-FHW003

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:**

Eric

Middle Name:

D.

*** Last Name:**

Shaw

Suffix:

Title:

Director

Organizational Affiliation:

Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

*** Telephone Number:**

415-701-5500

Fax Number:

*** Email:**

eric.shaw@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:

14-241

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:

CARES Act Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS Program (Round 1) 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.

17. Proposed Project:* a. Start Date: * b. End Date: **18. Estimated Funding (\$):**

* a. Federal	<input type="text" value="1,028,483.00"/>
* 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="1,028,483.00"/>

*** 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:	<input type="text" value="Ms."/>	* First Name:	<input type="text" value="London"/>
Middle Name:	<input type="text" value="N."/>		
* Last Name:	<input type="text" value="Breed"/>		
Suffix:	<input type="text"/>		

* Title: * Telephone Number: Fax Number: * Email:

* Signature of Authorized Representative:

* Date Signed:

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 15 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0042), Washington, DC 20503.


PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR COMPLETED FORM TO THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET. SEND IT TO THE ADDRESS PROVIDED BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY.

NOTE: Certain of these assurances may not be applicable to your project or program. If you have questions, please contact the Awarding Agency. Further, certain Federal assistance awarding agencies may require applicants to certify to additional assurances. If such is the case, you will be notified.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I certify that the applicant:

1. Has the legal authority to apply for Federal assistance, and the institutional, managerial and financial capability (including funds sufficient to pay the non-Federal share of project costs) to ensure proper planning, management and completion of project described in this application.
2. Will give the awarding agency, the Comptroller General of the United States and, if appropriate, the State, the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the assistance; and will establish a proper accounting system in accordance with generally accepted accounting standards or agency directives.
3. Will not dispose of, modify the use of, or change the terms of the real property title or other interest in the site and facilities without permission and instructions from the awarding agency. Will record the Federal awarding agency directives and will include a covenant in the title of real property acquired in whole or in part with Federal assistance funds to assure non-discrimination during the useful life of the project.
4. Will comply with the requirements of the assistance awarding agency with regard to the drafting, review and approval of construction plans and specifications.
5. Will provide and maintain competent and adequate engineering supervision at the construction site to ensure that the complete work conforms with the approved plans and specifications and will furnish progressive reports and such other information as may be required by the assistance awarding agency or State.
6. Will initiate and complete the work within the applicable time frame after receipt of approval of the awarding agency.
7. Will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that constitutes or presents the appearance of personal or organizational conflict of interest, or personal gain.
8. Will comply with the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. §§4728-4763) relating to prescribed standards of merit systems for programs funded under one of the 19 statutes or regulations specified in Appendix A of OPM's Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration (5 C.F.R. 900, Subpart F).
9. Will comply with the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. §§4801 et seq.) which prohibits the use of lead-based paint in construction or rehabilitation of residence structures.
10. Will comply with all Federal statutes relating to non-discrimination. These include but are not limited to: (a) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin; (b) Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended (20 U.S.C. §§1681 1683, and 1685-1686), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex; (c) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. §794), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicaps; (d) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§6101-6107), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age; (e) the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-255), as amended relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse; (f) the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-616), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse or alcoholism; (g) §§523 and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1912 (42 U.S.C. §§290 dd-3 and 290 ee 3), as amended, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records; (h) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. §§3601 et seq.), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental or financing of housing; (i) any other nondiscrimination provisions in the specific statute(s) under which application for Federal assistance is being made; and (j) the requirements of any other nondiscrimination statute(s) which may apply to the application.

11. Will comply, or has already complied, with the requirements of Titles II and III of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) which provide for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced or whose property is acquired as a result of Federal and federally-assisted programs. These requirements apply to all interests in real property acquired for project purposes regardless of Federal participation in purchases.
12. Will comply with the provisions of the Hatch Act (5 U.S.C. §§1501-1508 and 7324-7328) which limit the political activities of employees whose principal employment activities are funded in whole or in part with Federal funds.
13. Will comply, as applicable, with the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U.S.C. §§276a to 276a-7), the Copeland Act (40 U.S.C. §276c and 18 U.S.C. §874), and the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act (40 U.S.C. §§327-333) regarding labor standards for federally-assisted construction subagreements.
14. Will comply with flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-234) which requires recipients in a special flood hazard area to participate in the program and to purchase flood insurance if the total cost of insurable construction and acquisition is \$10,000 or more.
15. Will comply with environmental standards which may be prescribed pursuant to the following: (a) institution of environmental quality control measures under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-190) and Executive Order (EO) 11514; (b) notification of violating facilities pursuant to EO 11738; (c) protection of wetlands pursuant to EO 11990; (d) evaluation of flood hazards in floodplains in accordance with EO 11988; (e) assurance of project consistency with the approved State management program developed under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. §§1451 et seq.); (f) conformity of Federal actions to State (Clean Air) implementation Plans under Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act of 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§7401 et seq.); (g) protection of underground sources of drinking water under the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended (P.L. 93-523); and, (h) protection of endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (P.L. 93-205).
16. Will comply with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 (16 U.S.C. §§1271 et seq.) related to protecting components or potential components of the national wild and scenic rivers system.
17. Will assist the awarding agency in assuring compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. §470), EO 11593 (identification and protection of historic properties), and the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. §§469a-1 et seq).
18. Will cause to be performed the required financial and compliance audits in accordance with the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996 and OMB Circular No. A-133, "Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations."
19. Will comply with all applicable requirements of all other Federal laws, executive orders, regulations, and policies governing this program.
20. Will comply with the requirements of Section 106(g) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) of 2000, as amended (22 U.S.C. 7104) which prohibits grant award recipients or a sub-recipient from (1) Engaging in severe forms of trafficking in persons during the period of time that the award is in effect (2) Procuring a commercial sex act during the period of time that the award is in effect or (3) Using forced labor in the performance of the award or subawards under the award.

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED CERTIFYING OFFICIAL	TITLE
	Mayor
APPLICANT ORGANIZATION	DATE SUBMITTED
City and County of San Francisco	08/28/2020

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 15 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0042), Washington, DC 20503.


PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR COMPLETED FORM TO THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET. SEND IT TO THE ADDRESS PROVIDED BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY.

NOTE: Certain of these assurances may not be applicable to your project or program. If you have questions, please contact the Awarding Agency. Further, certain Federal assistance awarding agencies may require applicants to certify to additional assurances. If such is the case, you will be notified.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I certify that the applicant:

1. Has the legal authority to apply for Federal assistance, and the institutional, managerial and financial capability (including funds sufficient to pay the non-Federal share of project costs) to ensure proper planning, management and completion of project described in this application.
2. Will give the awarding agency, the Comptroller General of the United States and, if appropriate, the State, the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the assistance; and will establish a proper accounting system in accordance with generally accepted accounting standards or agency directives.
3. Will not dispose of, modify the use of, or change the terms of the real property title or other interest in the site and facilities without permission and instructions from the awarding agency. Will record the Federal awarding agency directives and will include a covenant in the title of real property acquired in whole or in part with Federal assistance funds to assure non-discrimination during the useful life of the project.
4. Will comply with the requirements of the assistance awarding agency with regard to the drafting, review and approval of construction plans and specifications.
5. Will provide and maintain competent and adequate engineering supervision at the construction site to ensure that the complete work conforms with the approved plans and specifications and will furnish progressive reports and such other information as may be required by the assistance awarding agency or State.
6. Will initiate and complete the work within the applicable time frame after receipt of approval of the awarding agency.
7. Will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that constitutes or presents the appearance of personal or organizational conflict of interest, or personal gain.
8. Will comply with the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. §§4728-4763) relating to prescribed standards of merit systems for programs funded under one of the 19 statutes or regulations specified in Appendix A of OPM's Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration (5 C.F.R. 900, Subpart F).
9. Will comply with the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. §§4801 et seq.) which prohibits the use of lead-based paint in construction or rehabilitation of residence structures.
10. Will comply with all Federal statutes relating to non-discrimination. These include but are not limited to: (a) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin; (b) Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended (20 U.S.C. §§1681 1683, and 1685-1686), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex; (c) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. §794), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicaps; (d) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§6101-6107), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age; (e) the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-255), as amended relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse; (f) the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-616), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse or alcoholism; (g) §§523 and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1912 (42 U.S.C. §§290 dd-3 and 290 ee 3), as amended, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records; (h) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. §§3601 et seq.), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental or financing of housing; (i) any other nondiscrimination provisions in the specific statute(s) under which application for Federal assistance is being made; and (j) the requirements of any other nondiscrimination statute(s) which may apply to the application.

11. Will comply, or has already complied, with the requirements of Titles II and III of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) which provide for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced or whose property is acquired as a result of Federal and federally-assisted programs. These requirements apply to all interests in real property acquired for project purposes regardless of Federal participation in purchases.
12. Will comply with the provisions of the Hatch Act (5 U.S.C. §§1501-1508 and 7324-7328) which limit the political activities of employees whose principal employment activities are funded in whole or in part with Federal funds.
13. Will comply, as applicable, with the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U.S.C. §§276a to 276a-7), the Copeland Act (40 U.S.C. §276c and 18 U.S.C. §874), and the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act (40 U.S.C. §§327-333) regarding labor standards for federally-assisted construction subagreements.
14. Will comply with flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-234) which requires recipients in a special flood hazard area to participate in the program and to purchase flood insurance if the total cost of insurable construction and acquisition is \$10,000 or more.
15. Will comply with environmental standards which may be prescribed pursuant to the following: (a) institution of environmental quality control measures under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-190) and Executive Order (EO) 11514; (b) notification of violating facilities pursuant to EO 11738; (c) protection of wetlands pursuant to EO 11990; (d) evaluation of flood hazards in floodplains in accordance with EO 11988; (e) assurance of project consistency with the approved State management program developed under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. §§1451 et seq.); (f) conformity of Federal actions to State (Clean Air) implementation Plans under Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act of 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§7401 et seq.); (g) protection of underground sources of drinking water under the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended (P.L. 93-523); and, (h) protection of endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (P.L. 93-205).
16. Will comply with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 (16 U.S.C. §§1271 et seq.) related to protecting components or potential components of the national wild and scenic rivers system.
17. Will assist the awarding agency in assuring compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. §470), EO 11593 (identification and protection of historic properties), and the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. §§469a-1 et seq).
18. Will cause to be performed the required financial and compliance audits in accordance with the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996 and OMB Circular No. A-133, "Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations."
19. Will comply with all applicable requirements of all other Federal laws, executive orders, regulations, and policies governing this program.
20. Will comply with the requirements of Section 106(g) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) of 2000, as amended (22 U.S.C. 7104) which prohibits grant award recipients or a sub-recipient from (1) Engaging in severe forms of trafficking in persons during the period of time that the award is in effect (2) Procuring a commercial sex act during the period of time that the award is in effect or (3) Using forced labor in the performance of the award or subawards under the award.

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED CERTIFYING OFFICIAL	TITLE
	Mayor
APPLICANT ORGANIZATION	DATE SUBMITTED
City and County of San Francisco	08/28/2020

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 15 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0042), Washington, DC 20503.


PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR COMPLETED FORM TO THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET. SEND IT TO THE ADDRESS PROVIDED BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY.

NOTE: Certain of these assurances may not be applicable to your project or program. If you have questions, please contact the Awarding Agency. Further, certain Federal assistance awarding agencies may require applicants to certify to additional assurances. If such is the case, you will be notified.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I certify that the applicant:

1. Has the legal authority to apply for Federal assistance, and the institutional, managerial and financial capability (including funds sufficient to pay the non-Federal share of project costs) to ensure proper planning, management and completion of project described in this application.
2. Will give the awarding agency, the Comptroller General of the United States and, if appropriate, the State, the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the assistance; and will establish a proper accounting system in accordance with generally accepted accounting standards or agency directives.
3. Will not dispose of, modify the use of, or change the terms of the real property title or other interest in the site and facilities without permission and instructions from the awarding agency. Will record the Federal awarding agency directives and will include a covenant in the title of real property acquired in whole or in part with Federal assistance funds to assure non-discrimination during the useful life of the project.
4. Will comply with the requirements of the assistance awarding agency with regard to the drafting, review and approval of construction plans and specifications.
5. Will provide and maintain competent and adequate engineering supervision at the construction site to ensure that the complete work conforms with the approved plans and specifications and will furnish progressive reports and such other information as may be required by the assistance awarding agency or State.
6. Will initiate and complete the work within the applicable time frame after receipt of approval of the awarding agency.
7. Will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that constitutes or presents the appearance of personal or organizational conflict of interest, or personal gain.
8. Will comply with the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. §§4728-4763) relating to prescribed standards of merit systems for programs funded under one of the 19 statutes or regulations specified in Appendix A of OPM's Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration (5 C.F.R. 900, Subpart F).
9. Will comply with the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. §§4801 et seq.) which prohibits the use of lead-based paint in construction or rehabilitation of residence structures.
10. Will comply with all Federal statutes relating to non-discrimination. These include but are not limited to: (a) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin; (b) Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended (20 U.S.C. §§1681 1683, and 1685-1686), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex; (c) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. §794), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicaps; (d) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§6101-6107), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age; (e) the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-255), as amended relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse; (f) the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-616), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse or alcoholism; (g) §§523 and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1912 (42 U.S.C. §§290 dd-3 and 290 ee 3), as amended, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records; (h) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. §§3601 et seq.), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental or financing of housing; (i) any other nondiscrimination provisions in the specific statute(s) under which application for Federal assistance is being made; and (j) the requirements of any other nondiscrimination statute(s) which may apply to the application.

11. Will comply, or has already complied, with the requirements of Titles II and III of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) which provide for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced or whose property is acquired as a result of Federal and federally-assisted programs. These requirements apply to all interests in real property acquired for project purposes regardless of Federal participation in purchases.
12. Will comply with the provisions of the Hatch Act (5 U.S.C. §§1501-1508 and 7324-7328) which limit the political activities of employees whose principal employment activities are funded in whole or in part with Federal funds.
13. Will comply, as applicable, with the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U.S.C. §§276a to 276a-7), the Copeland Act (40 U.S.C. §276c and 18 U.S.C. §874), and the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act (40 U.S.C. §§327-333) regarding labor standards for federally-assisted construction subagreements.
14. Will comply with flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-234) which requires recipients in a special flood hazard area to participate in the program and to purchase flood insurance if the total cost of insurable construction and acquisition is \$10,000 or more.
15. Will comply with environmental standards which may be prescribed pursuant to the following: (a) institution of environmental quality control measures under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-190) and Executive Order (EO) 11514; (b) notification of violating facilities pursuant to EO 11738; (c) protection of wetlands pursuant to EO 11990; (d) evaluation of flood hazards in floodplains in accordance with EO 11988; (e) assurance of project consistency with the approved State management program developed under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. §§1451 et seq.); (f) conformity of Federal actions to State (Clean Air) implementation Plans under Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act of 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§7401 et seq.); (g) protection of underground sources of drinking water under the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended (P.L. 93-523); and, (h) protection of endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (P.L. 93-205).
16. Will comply with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 (16 U.S.C. §§1271 et seq.) related to protecting components or potential components of the national wild and scenic rivers system.
17. Will assist the awarding agency in assuring compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. §470), EO 11593 (identification and protection of historic properties), and the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. §§469a-1 et seq).
18. Will cause to be performed the required financial and compliance audits in accordance with the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996 and OMB Circular No. A-133, "Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations."
19. Will comply with all applicable requirements of all other Federal laws, executive orders, regulations, and policies governing this program.
20. Will comply with the requirements of Section 106(g) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) of 2000, as amended (22 U.S.C. 7104) which prohibits grant award recipients or a sub-recipient from (1) Engaging in severe forms of trafficking in persons during the period of time that the award is in effect (2) Procuring a commercial sex act during the period of time that the award is in effect or (3) Using forced labor in the performance of the award or subawards under the award.

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED CERTIFYING OFFICIAL	TITLE
	Mayor
APPLICANT ORGANIZATION	DATE SUBMITTED
City and County of San Francisco	08/28/2020

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 15 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0042), Washington, DC 20503.


PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR COMPLETED FORM TO THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET. SEND IT TO THE ADDRESS PROVIDED BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY.

NOTE: Certain of these assurances may not be applicable to your project or program. If you have questions, please contact the Awarding Agency. Further, certain Federal assistance awarding agencies may require applicants to certify to additional assurances. If such is the case, you will be notified.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I certify that the applicant:

1. Has the legal authority to apply for Federal assistance, and the institutional, managerial and financial capability (including funds sufficient to pay the non-Federal share of project costs) to ensure proper planning, management and completion of project described in this application.
2. Will give the awarding agency, the Comptroller General of the United States and, if appropriate, the State, the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the assistance; and will establish a proper accounting system in accordance with generally accepted accounting standards or agency directives.
3. Will not dispose of, modify the use of, or change the terms of the real property title or other interest in the site and facilities without permission and instructions from the awarding agency. Will record the Federal awarding agency directives and will include a covenant in the title of real property acquired in whole or in part with Federal assistance funds to assure non-discrimination during the useful life of the project.
4. Will comply with the requirements of the assistance awarding agency with regard to the drafting, review and approval of construction plans and specifications.
5. Will provide and maintain competent and adequate engineering supervision at the construction site to ensure that the complete work conforms with the approved plans and specifications and will furnish progressive reports and such other information as may be required by the assistance awarding agency or State.
6. Will initiate and complete the work within the applicable time frame after receipt of approval of the awarding agency.
7. Will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that constitutes or presents the appearance of personal or organizational conflict of interest, or personal gain.
8. Will comply with the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. §§4728-4763) relating to prescribed standards of merit systems for programs funded under one of the 19 statutes or regulations specified in Appendix A of OPM's Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration (5 C.F.R. 900, Subpart F).
9. Will comply with the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. §§4801 et seq.) which prohibits the use of lead-based paint in construction or rehabilitation of residence structures.
10. Will comply with all Federal statutes relating to non-discrimination. These include but are not limited to: (a) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin; (b) Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended (20 U.S.C. §§1681 1683, and 1685-1686), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex; (c) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. §794), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicaps; (d) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§6101-6107), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age; (e) the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-255), as amended relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse; (f) the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-616), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse or alcoholism; (g) §§523 and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1912 (42 U.S.C. §§290 dd-3 and 290 ee 3), as amended, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records; (h) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. §§3601 et seq.), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental or financing of housing; (i) any other nondiscrimination provisions in the specific statute(s) under which application for Federal assistance is being made; and (j) the requirements of any other nondiscrimination statute(s) which may apply to the application.

11. Will comply, or has already complied, with the requirements of Titles II and III of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) which provide for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced or whose property is acquired as a result of Federal and federally-assisted programs. These requirements apply to all interests in real property acquired for project purposes regardless of Federal participation in purchases.
12. Will comply with the provisions of the Hatch Act (5 U.S.C. §§1501-1508 and 7324-7328) which limit the political activities of employees whose principal employment activities are funded in whole or in part with Federal funds.
13. Will comply, as applicable, with the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U.S.C. §§276a to 276a-7), the Copeland Act (40 U.S.C. §276c and 18 U.S.C. §874), and the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act (40 U.S.C. §§327-333) regarding labor standards for federally-assisted construction subagreements.
14. Will comply with flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-234) which requires recipients in a special flood hazard area to participate in the program and to purchase flood insurance if the total cost of insurable construction and acquisition is \$10,000 or more.
15. Will comply with environmental standards which may be prescribed pursuant to the following: (a) institution of environmental quality control measures under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-190) and Executive Order (EO) 11514; (b) notification of violating facilities pursuant to EO 11738; (c) protection of wetlands pursuant to EO 11990; (d) evaluation of flood hazards in floodplains in accordance with EO 11988; (e) assurance of project consistency with the approved State management program developed under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. §§1451 et seq.); (f) conformity of Federal actions to State (Clean Air) implementation Plans under Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act of 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§7401 et seq.); (g) protection of underground sources of drinking water under the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended (P.L. 93-523); and, (h) protection of endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (P.L. 93-205).
16. Will comply with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 (16 U.S.C. §§1271 et seq.) related to protecting components or potential components of the national wild and scenic rivers system.
17. Will assist the awarding agency in assuring compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. §470), EO 11593 (identification and protection of historic properties), and the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. §§469a-1 et seq).
18. Will cause to be performed the required financial and compliance audits in accordance with the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996 and OMB Circular No. A-133, "Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations."
19. Will comply with all applicable requirements of all other Federal laws, executive orders, regulations, and policies governing this program.
20. Will comply with the requirements of Section 106(g) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) of 2000, as amended (22 U.S.C. 7104) which prohibits grant award recipients or a sub-recipient from (1) Engaging in severe forms of trafficking in persons during the period of time that the award is in effect (2) Procuring a commercial sex act during the period of time that the award is in effect or (3) Using forced labor in the performance of the award or subawards under the award.

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED CERTIFYING OFFICIAL	TITLE
	Mayor
APPLICANT ORGANIZATION	DATE SUBMITTED
City and County of San Francisco	08/28/2020

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.

Uniform Relocation Act and 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, (42 U.S.C. 4601-4655) and implementing regulations at 49 CFR Part 24. It has in effect and is following a residential anti-displacement and relocation assistance plan required under 24 CFR Part 42 in connection with any activity assisted with funding under the Community Development Block Grant 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 Community Development Block Grant, HOME, Emergency Solutions Grant, and Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS funds are consistent with the strategic plan in the jurisdiction's consolidated plan.

Section 3 -- It will comply with section 3 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 (12 U.S.C. 1701u) and implementing regulations at 24 CFR Part 135.


Signature of Authorized Official

08/28/2020
Date

Mayor
Title

Specific Community Development Block Grant 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 plan identifies community development and housing needs and specifies both short-term and long-term community development objectives that have been developed in accordance with the primary objective of the CDBG program (i.e., the development of viable urban communities, by providing decent housing and expanding economic opportunities, primarily for persons of low and moderate income) and requirements of 24 CFR Parts 91 and 570.

Following a Plan -- It is following a current consolidated plan 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 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 CDBG-assisted activities which the grantee certifies are designed to meet other community development needs having 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 (see Optional CDBG Certification).

2. Overall Benefit. The aggregate use of CDBG funds, including Section 108 guaranteed loans, during program year(s) 2020 [a period specified by the grantee 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.

In addition, 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 U.S.C. 2000d) and the Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 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 of Authorized Official

08/28/2020
Date




Mayor
Title

OPTIONAL Community Development Block Grant Certification

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 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 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 of Authorized Official

08/28/2020

Date

Mayor

Title


Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS 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 consolidated plan:

1. For a period of not less than 10 years in the case of assistance involving new construction, substantial rehabilitation, or acquisition of a facility,
2. For a period of not less than 3 years in the case of assistance involving non-substantial rehabilitation or repair of a building or structure.



Signature of Authorized Official

08/28/2020

Date

Mayor

Title

INTERIM ESG-CV Certifications (NON-STATE) (Round 1)

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.

EXCEPTION: In accordance with the CARES Act, the certifications in this paragraph do not apply with respect to CARES Act funding that is used to provide temporary emergency shelters (through leasing of existing property, temporary structures, or other means) to prevent, prepare for, and respond to coronavirus.

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.

EXCEPTION: In accordance with the CARES Act, the certification in this paragraph does not apply with respect to CARES Act funding that is used to provide temporary emergency shelters (through leasing of existing property, temporary structures, or other means) to prevent, prepare for, and respond to coronavirus.

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

08/28/2020

Date

Mayor
Title

INTERIM ESG-CV Certifications (NON-STATE) (Round 2)

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.

EXCEPTION: In accordance with the CARES Act, the certifications in this paragraph do not apply with respect to CARES Act funding that is used to provide temporary emergency shelters (through leasing of existing property, temporary structures, or other means) to prevent, prepare for, and respond to coronavirus.

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.

EXCEPTION: In accordance with the CARES Act, the certification in this paragraph does not apply with respect to CARES Act funding that is used to provide temporary emergency shelters (through leasing of existing property, temporary structures, or other means) to prevent, prepare for, and respond to coronavirus.

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

08/28/2020

Date

Mayor
Title

APPENDIX TO CERTIFICATIONS

INSTRUCTIONS CONCERNING LOBBYING CERTIFICATION:

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.