

# **City and County of San Francisco**

## **DRAFT 2018-2019 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER)**

**For Program Year  
July 1, 2018 – June 30, 2019**

**For Public Review Between  
September 6, 2019 and September 20, 2019**

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

## **Welcome to San Francisco's DRAFT 2018-2019 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER).**

### **NOTES FOR PUBLIC REVIEW and COMMENT:**

- 1) This draft document is available for public review and comment between September 6 and September 20, 2019.
- 2) 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, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor; and
  - Main Branch of the SF Public Library, 100 Larkin Street, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Government Information Center.
- 3) Staff welcomes your comments in writing. They may be directed to: MOHCD, Draft 2018-2019 CAPER Staff, 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103. In your comment, please be specific about your issue and refer to a specific section of the Draft Report, if appropriate.
- 4) The close of the public comment period is September 20, 2019 at 5:00 p.m.
- 5) Thank you in advance for your participation in this process.

# Public Comment Form for Draft 2018-2019 CAPER

**Your Name (optional):** \_\_\_\_\_

Phone # (optional): \_\_\_\_\_ Email address (optional): \_\_\_\_\_

**Comments (Please refer to specific section(s) of the Draft Report, if appropriate):**

[illegible]

Please send your comments to:  
MOHCD – Draft 2018-2019 CAPER Staff  
1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94103

## CR-05 - Goals and Outcomes

### Progress the jurisdiction has made in carrying out its strategic plan and its action plan. 91.520(a)

This could be an overview that includes major initiatives and highlights that were proposed and executed throughout the program year.

The overarching objectives for San Francisco's use of funds, including CDBG, ESG, HOME and HOPWA funds, as reflected in its 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan are the following:

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

For each objective, there are priority needs and for each priority need, there are goals. The City is dedicated to the articulation of specific performance measures for each goal, to ensure that we are investing our resources to achieve optimal outcomes for our communities. We developed a Five-year Performance Measures Matrix to assess investment outcomes across the 2015-2019 timeframe of the Consolidated Plan. Performance under each measure will be tracked against a five-year goal and a one-year goal.

### Comparison of the proposed versus actual outcomes for each outcome measure submitted with the consolidated plan and explain, if applicable, why progress was not made toward meeting goals and objectives. 91.520(g)

Categories, priority levels, funding sources and amounts, outcomes/objectives, goal outcome indicators, units of measure, targets, actual outcomes/outputs, and percentage completed for each of the grantee's program year goals.

Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed									
Priority Need 1A: Develop and Maintain Affordable Housing									
Goal 1Ai. Increased supply of affordable housing									
Funding Amount	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Actual 5-year \$ Amount	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1 (2015-2016) \$ Amount	Actual Year 2 (2016-2017) \$ Amount	Actual Year 3 (2017-2018) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount	Actual Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount	Expected Year 5 (2019-2020) \$ Amount
CDBG	\$0	\$0			\$0				
HOME	\$15,201,664	\$19,081,296	126%	\$8,134,000	\$10,947,296	\$0	\$3,600,000	\$0	\$3,600,000
HOPWA	\$0	\$0			\$0				
ESG	\$0	\$0							
General Fund	\$0	\$0			\$0	\$0			

Housing Trust Fund	\$32,661,584	\$14,796,497	45%	\$2,169,139		\$9,099,649		\$3,527,709		\$0		\$0		\$0	
Housing Impact Fees	\$700,822,879	\$88,410,402	13%	\$11,566,906		\$21,526,407		\$23,761,130		\$221,382,548		\$31,555,959		\$66,901,273	
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$2,205,679	\$4,778,432	217%	\$2,778,432				\$2,000,000		\$0		\$0			
Other	\$199,305,098	\$55,950,288	28%	\$12,641,612		\$13,000,000		\$1,000,000		\$59,280,000		\$29,308,676		\$5,680,000	
OCII	\$367,336,000	\$133,432,560	36%	\$24,677,477		\$40,250,000		\$27,273,256		\$192,810,000		\$41,231,827		\$0	
Total	\$1,317,532,904	\$316,449,474	24%	\$61,967,566		\$94,823,352		\$57,562,094		\$477,072,548		\$102,096,462		\$76,181,273	
Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators	5-year Goal	5-year Actual to Date	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1		Actual Year 2		Actual Year 3		Expected Year 4		Actual Year 4		Expected Year 5	
				Actual #	Actual \$ Amt	Actual #	Actual \$ Amt	Actual #	Actual \$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt	Actual #	Actual \$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt
Outcome Indicator 1Ai. Number of affordable housing units created	5,549	3,205	58%	924	\$61,967,566	1,868	\$94,823,352	413	\$59,683,688	1,631	\$477,072,548		\$102,096,462	678	\$76,700,695
Performance Measures: Output Indicators	5-year Goal	5-year Actual to Date	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1		Actual Year 2		Actual Year 3		Expected Year 4		Actual Year 4		Expected Year 5	
				Actual #	Actual \$ Amt	Actual #	Actual \$ Amt	Actual #	Actual \$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt	Actual #	Actual \$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt
Output Indicator: Number of Permanent Supportive Housing units built for TAY (Parcel U, 17th & Folsom)	67	48	72%	25	\$6,114,474	23	\$2,000,000	0	\$270,000	38	\$5,941,422	-	\$0	-	\$2,000,000
Output Indicator: Number of Permanent Supportive Housing units built for seniors (24th St)	504	279	55%	98	\$2,169,139	144	\$2,500,000	0	\$0	51	\$12,054,000	37	\$10,887,239	102	\$18,178,806
Output Indicator: Number of Permanent Supportive Housing units built for veterans (MBS3E)	260	62	24%	50	\$1,250,000	0	\$0	12	\$9,608,672	105	\$13,600,000	-	\$506,000	105	\$13,800,000
Output Indicator: Number of Permanent Supportive Housing units built for homeless families (20% set-aside for MBS6E, Parcel O, 1950 Mission, SWL 322-1, MBS6W)	641	384	60%	51	\$5,824,585	278	\$22,580,838	40	\$11,516,655	208	\$63,803,631	15	\$4,233,926	174	\$28,181,652

Output Indicator: Number of affordable housing units built for low-income households at or below 60% AMI (non-homeless units for homeless family projects listed above, plus Alice Griffith Ph 1-3, HP Block 49, MBS7W, TB6, TB7)	2,912	1,723	59%	420	\$46,609,368	887	\$67,742,514	137	\$38,288,361	928	\$320,473,495	279	\$79,048,907	97	\$14,540,237
Output Indicator: Number of BMR housing units developed (884 MOHCD inclusionary + 214 OCII inclusionary)	1,000	1,181	118%	280		536		224		200		141		200	
Output Indicator: Number of workforce housing units developed beyond BMR	TBD	21		0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	101	\$61,200,000	21	\$7,420,390		
<b>Goal 1Aii. Preserve and Maintain Affordable Housing Supply</b>															
Funding Amount	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Actual 5-year \$ Amount	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1 (2015-2016) \$ Amount		Actual Year 2 (2016-2017) \$ Amount		Actual Year 3 (2017-2018) \$ Amount		Expected Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount		Actual Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount		Expected Year 5 (2019-2020) \$ Amount	
CDBG	\$26,247,066	\$9,200,231	35%	\$716,022		\$3,500,000		\$2,984,209		\$2,750,000		\$2,000,000		\$3,354,470	
HOME	\$8,000,000	\$1,476,500	18%	\$0		\$1,390,525		\$85,975		\$0		\$0		\$1,900,000	
HOPWA	\$0	\$152,000				\$152,000									
ESG	\$0	\$0													
General Fund	\$3,449,383	\$0	0%	\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0				\$0	
Housing Trust Fund	\$136,029,023	\$36,443,386	27%	\$28,933,500		\$2,847,704		\$3,979,061		\$23,043,600		\$683,121		\$65,497,712	
Housing Impact Fees	\$126,805,070	\$43,954,066	35%	\$8,626,774		\$20,674,120		\$8,157,233		\$28,581,375		\$6,495,939		\$15,657,886	
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$16,496,251	\$30,131,730	183%	\$15,231,776		\$11,559,979		\$3,339,975		\$8,300,000		\$0		\$400,000	
Other	\$145,486,217	\$79,417,461	55%	\$18,914,939		\$34,339,655		\$13,650,677		\$45,188,900		\$12,512,190		\$18,881,886	
OCII	\$19,547,988	\$9,749,278	50%	\$0		\$3,290,119		\$6,459,159		\$0		\$0		\$0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$482,060,998</b>	<b>\$210,524,651</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>\$72,423,011</b>		<b>\$77,754,102</b>		<b>\$38,656,288</b>		<b>\$107,863,875</b>		<b>\$21,691,250</b>		<b>\$105,691,954</b>	
Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators	5-year Goal	5-year Actual to Date	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1		Actual Year 2		Actual Year 3		Expected Year 4		Actual Year 4		Expected Year 5	
				Actual #	Actual \$ Amt	Actual #	Actual \$ Amt	Actual #	Actual \$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt	Actual #	Actual \$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt

Outcome Indicator: Number of affordable housing units preserved or maintained	4,472	3,500	78%	1,327	\$72,028,633	1,516	\$77,754,102	619	\$36,667,977	927	\$107,903,875	38	\$21,691,250	406	##### #
Performance Measures: Output Indicators	5-year Goal	5-year Actual to Date	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1		Actual Year 2		Actual Year 3		Expected Year 4		Actual Year 4		Expected Year 5	
				Actual #	Actual \$ Amt	Actual #	Actual \$ Amt	Actual #	Actual \$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt	Actual #	Actual \$ Amt	Goal	\$ Amt
Output Indicator: Number of units where lead hazards are addressed	75	5	7%	2	\$23,550	1	\$30,281	2	\$28,873	3	\$40,000	-	\$0	2	\$40,000
Output Indicator: Number of public housing units converted to private ownership under the Rental Assistance Demonstration program	2,279	2,149	94%	1,128	\$53,084,699	1,021	\$14,373,118	0	\$2,779,061	213	\$3,000,000	-	\$6,189,277	-	\$0
Output Indicator: Number of single family homes rehabilitated	115	261	227%	45	\$698,095	1	\$30,281	198		23		17		23	
Output Indicator: Number of multifamily units rehabilitated	1,320	862	65%	134	\$13,267,673	307	\$36,627,329	400	\$16,883,499	275	\$31,093,875	21	\$13,201,973	381	\$73,784,100
Output Indicator: Number of public housing units rebuilt under HOPE SF	683	223	33%	18	\$4,954,616	186	\$26,693,093	19	\$16,976,544	413	\$73,770,000	-	\$2,300,000		\$33,402,384
<b>Priority Need 1B: Make Housing Affordable</b>															
<b>Goal 1Bi. Increased affordability of rental housing</b>															
Funding Amount	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Actual 5-year \$ Amount	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1 (2015-2016) \$ Amount		Actual Year 2 (2016-2017) \$ Amount		Actual Year 3 (2017-2018) \$ Amount		Expected Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount		Actual Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount		Expected Year 5 (2019-2020) \$ Amount	
CDBG	\$0	\$0													
HOME	\$0	\$0													
HOPWA	\$0	\$0													
ESG	\$0	\$0													
General Fund	\$5,760,252	\$7,501,308	130%	\$127,953		\$527,327		\$1,535,783		\$1,240,369		\$5,310,245		\$943,062	
Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0													
Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0													
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0													

Other	\$0	\$0													
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$5,760,252</b>	<b>\$7,501,308</b>	<b>130%</b>	<b>\$127,953</b>		<b>\$527,327</b>		<b>\$1,535,783</b>		<b>\$1,240,369</b>		<b>\$5,310,245</b>		<b>\$943,062</b>	
<b>Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>5-year Actual to Date</b>	<b>5-year Actual % of Goal</b>	<b>Actual Year 1</b>		<b>Actual Year 2</b>		<b>Actual Year 3</b>		<b>Expected Year 4</b>		<b>Actual Year 4</b>		<b>Expected Year 5</b>	
				<b>Actual #</b>	<b>Actual \$ Amt</b>	<b>Actual #</b>	<b>Actual \$ Amt</b>	<b>Actual #</b>	<b>Actual \$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Actual #</b>	<b>Actual \$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Outcome Indicator: Number of lower income households served with the assistance of rental subsidies (LOSP)	246	123	50%	0	\$127,953	5	\$527,327	25	\$1,535,783	97	\$1,240,369	93	\$5,310,245	76	\$943,062
<b>Performance Measures: Output Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>5-year Actual to Date</b>	<b>5-year Actual % of Goal</b>	<b>Actual Year 1</b>		<b>Actual Year 2</b>		<b>Actual Year 3</b>		<b>Expected Year 4</b>		<b>Expected Year 4</b>		<b>Expected Year 5</b>	
				<b>Actual #</b>	<b>Actual \$ Amt</b>	<b>Actual #</b>	<b>Actual \$ Amt</b>	<b>Actual #</b>	<b>Actual \$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Actual #</b>	<b>Actual \$ Amt</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Output Indicator: Number of units supported with rental subsidies (Shelter plus Care or VASH)	24	24	100%	0		0		24		0		0		0	
<b>Goal 1Bii. Increased opportunities for sustainable homeownership</b>															
<b>Funding Amount</b>	<b>Expected 5-year \$ Amount</b>	<b>Actual 5-year \$ Amount</b>	<b>5-year Actual % of Goal</b>	<b>Actual Year 1 (2015-2016) \$ Amount</b>		<b>Actual Year 2 (2016-2017) \$ Amount</b>		<b>Actual Year 3 (2017-2018) \$ Amount</b>		<b>Expected Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount</b>		<b>Actual Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount</b>		<b>Expected Year 5 (2019-2020) \$ Amount</b>	
CDBG	\$1,533,916	\$928,000	60%	\$356,000		\$286,000		\$286,000		\$286,000				\$286,000	
HOME	\$0	\$0													
HOPWA	\$0	\$0													
ESG	\$0	\$0													
General Fund	\$2,031,231	\$1,058,191	52%	\$0		\$420,000		\$638,191		\$638,191				\$716,956	
Housing Trust Fund	\$20,356,296	\$11,231,523	55%	\$3,831,628		\$211,000		\$3,188,895		\$4,563,875		\$4,000,000		\$4,582,296	
Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0													
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0													
Other	\$11,583,551	\$20,302,255	175%	\$4,400,992				\$7,978,892		\$248,000		\$7,922,371		\$10,056,364	
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$35,504,994</b>	<b>\$33,519,969</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>\$8,588,620</b>		<b>\$917,000</b>		<b>\$12,091,978</b>		<b>\$5,736,066</b>		<b>\$11,922,371</b>		<b>\$15,641,616</b>	
<b>Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>5-year Actual to Date</b>	<b>5-year Actual % of Goal</b>	<b>Actual Year 1</b>		<b>Actual Year 2</b>		<b>Actual Year 3</b>		<b>Expected Year 4</b>		<b>Actual Year 4</b>		<b>Expected Year 5</b>	
				<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>

Outcome Indicator 18ii. Number of new homeowners created	950	1,157	122%	443	246%	238	132%	222	117%	200		254	127%	200	
Performance Measures: Output Indicators	5-year Goal	5-year Actual to Date	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1		Actual Year 2		Actual Year 3		Expected Year 4		Actual Year 4		Expected Year 5	
				Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt
Output Indicator: Number of new COP holders	205	209	102%	110	183%	44	73%	37	123%	30		18	60%	25	
Output Indicator: Number of new DTHP holders	600	865	144%	165	330%	167	334%	128	128%	100		405	405%	300	
Output Indicator: Number of individuals receiving pre-purchase education and counseling	12,100	14,386	119%	3,857	482%	4,006	501%	3,652	104%	3,500		2,871	82%	3,500	
Output Indicator: Number of individuals receiving post-purchase education and counseling	815	1,087	133%	339	484%	336	480%	193	51%	150		219	146%	150	
Output Indicator: Number of households receiving downpayment assistance loans	360	373	104%	139	139%	132	132%	60	100%	50		42	84%	50	
Output Indicator: Number of households receiving loans to purchase shares in co-ops	17	-	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0		0		5	
Output Indicator: Number of new BMR owners	775	500	65%	159	106%	185	148%	69	46%	200		87	44%	150	
Output Indicator: Number of MCCs issued	250	184	74%	49	98%	69	138%	35	70%	50		31	62%	50	
Output Indicator: Number of individuals submitting an online application for BMR homeownership housing	2,075	-	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0		0		1,000	

Goal 1Biii. Increase access to rental and homeownership housing															
Funding Amount	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Actual 5-year \$ Amount	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1 (2015-2016) \$ Amount		Actual Year 2 (2016-2017) \$ Amount		Actual Year 3 (2017-2018) \$ Amount		Expected Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount		Actual Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount		Expected Year 5 (2019-2020) \$ Amount	
CDBG	\$1,402,768	\$963,298	69%	\$231,844		\$150,000		\$295,454		\$325,000		\$286,000		\$325,000	
HOME	\$0	\$0													
HOPWA	\$224,202	\$100,262	45%	\$52,262				\$48,000		\$48,000				\$48,000	
ESG	\$578,487	\$0	0%							\$170,607				\$170,607	
General Fund	\$3,193,186	\$2,833,203	89%	\$627,320		\$730,348		\$926,889		\$998,223		\$548,646		\$1,357,583	
Housing Trust Fund	\$19,256,663	\$6,591,514	34%	\$711,048		\$769,750		\$737,744		\$3,840,244		\$4,372,972		\$4,686,175	
Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0													
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0													
Other	\$4,253,605	\$7,784,398	183%	\$0		\$160,000		\$74,999		\$124,999		\$7,549,399		\$75,000	
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$28,908,911</b>	<b>\$18,272,675</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>\$1,622,474</b>		<b>\$1,810,098</b>		<b>\$2,083,086</b>		<b>\$5,507,073</b>		<b>\$12,757,017</b>		<b>\$6,662,365</b>	
Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators	5-year Goal	5-year Actual to Date	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1		Actual Year 2		Actual Year 3		Expected Year 4		Actual Year 4		Expected Year 5	
				Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt
Outcome Indicator 1Biii. Number of households placed in BMR and affordable rental housing	1,923	884	46%	524	225%			155	31%	500				500	
Performance Measures: Output Indicators	5-year Goal	5-year Actual to Date	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1		Actual Year 2		Actual Year 3		Expected Year 4		Actual Year 4		Expected Year 5	
				Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt
Output Indicator: Number of households submitting an online application for BMR rental housing	183,000	152,430	83%	0	0%	60,000	667%	30,464	102%	60,000		61,966	103%	80,000	
Output Indicator: Number of households submitting an online application for affordable housing	158,000	153,252	97%	0	0%		0%	10,915	546%	2,000		142,337	7117%	150,000	

Output Indicator: Number of individuals receiving assistance in accessing housing, including preparing for successful rental application	13,100	12,706	97%	2,348	94%	2,770	111%	3,384	141%	2,700		4,204	156%	3,000	
Output Indicator: Number of new and re-rental BMR opportunities	800	949	119%	172	172%	417	417%	155	78%	200		205	103%	200	
Output Indicator: Number of existing BMR rental units	7,008	6,042	86%	1,145	138%	1,639	132%	1,729	120%	1,645		1,529	93%	1,845	
Output Indicator: Number of new COP holders	205	209	102%	110	183%	44	73%	37	123%	30		18	60%	25	
Output Indicator: Number of new DTHP holders	400	865	216%	165	330%	167	334%	128	128%	100		405	405%	100	
<b>Priority Need 1C: Prevent and End Homelessness</b>															
<b>Goal 1Ci. Reduced rate of evictions</b>															
Funding Amount	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Actual 5-year \$ Amount	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1 (2015-2016) \$ Amount		Actual Year 2 (2016-2017) \$ Amount		Actual Year 3 (2017-2018) \$ Amount		Expected Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount		Actual Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount		Expected Year 5 (2019-2020) \$ Amount	
CDBG	\$2,058,049	\$1,006,933	49%	\$267,500		\$162,500		\$316,933		\$312,500		\$260,000		\$1,018,203	
HOME	\$0	\$0													
HOPWA	\$0	\$0													
ESG	\$2,114,548	\$2,122,428	100%	\$470,607		\$550,607		\$550,607		\$380,000		\$550,607		\$380,000	
General Fund	\$16,164,060	\$13,073,589	81%	\$3,154,830		\$3,227,340		\$3,562,585		\$3,055,315		\$3,128,834		\$7,775,506	
Housing Trust Fund	\$11,680,636	\$8,187,094	70%	\$1,365,404		\$2,592,447		\$3,144,241		\$3,202,831		\$1,085,002		\$3,364,975	
Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0													
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0													
Other	\$500,000	\$700,000				\$200,000		\$150,000		\$150,000		\$350,000		\$150,000	
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$32,517,293</b>	<b>\$25,090,044</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>\$5,258,341</b>		<b>\$6,732,894</b>		<b>\$7,724,366</b>		<b>\$7,100,646</b>		<b>\$5,374,443</b>		<b>\$12,688,684</b>	
Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators	5-year Goal	5-year Actual to Date	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1		Actual Year 2		Actual Year 3		Expected Year 4		Actual Year 4		Expected Year 5	
				Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt

Outcome Indicator 1Ci. Number of individuals whose evictions have been prevented	11,500	10,649	93%	3,614	289%	3,537	283%	3,288	110%	3,000				3,000	
Performance Measures: Output Indicators	5-year Goal	5-year Actual to Date	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1		Actual Year 2		Actual Year 3		Expected Year 4		Actual Year 4		Expected Year 5	
				Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt
Output Indicator: Number of individuals receiving legal representation	13,800	14,448	105%	5,075	508%	4,358	436%	4,174	110%	4,000				4,000	
Output Indicator: Number of individuals receiving tenant education and counseling	11,500	10,030	87%	2,373	119%	3,320	166%	2,516	109%	2,600		1,821	70%	2,600	
Output Indicator: Number of individuals receiving short-term rental assistance	1,805	2,101	116%	767	295%	543	209%	462	120%	450		329	73%	450	
Output Indicator: Number of individuals receiving financial assistance, including moving costs, security deposits, utilities, last month's rent	44	-	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0		0		0	
<b>Goal 1Cii. Transitional housing is available for those who need it</b>															
Funding Amount	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Actual 5-year \$ Amount	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1 (2015-2016) \$ Amount		Actual Year 2 (2016-2017) \$ Amount		Actual Year 3 (2017-2018) \$ Amount		Expected Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount		Actual Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount		Expected Year 5 (2019-2020) \$ Amount	
CDBG	\$165,000	\$110,000						\$55,000		\$55,000		\$55,000		\$55,000	
HOME	\$0	\$0													
HOPWA	\$0	\$0													

ESG	\$110,000	\$110,000	100%	\$55,000		\$55,000									
General Fund	\$82,025	\$81,000						\$40,000		\$40,000		\$41,000		\$42,025	
Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0													
Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0													
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0													
Other	\$0	\$0													
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$357,025</b>	<b>\$301,000</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>\$55,000</b>		<b>\$55,000</b>		<b>\$95,000</b>		<b>\$95,000</b>		<b>\$96,000</b>		<b>\$97,025</b>	
<b>Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>5-year Actual to Date</b>	<b>5-year Actual % of Goal</b>	<b>Actual Year 1</b>		<b>Actual Year 2</b>		<b>Actual Year 3</b>		<b>Expected Year 4</b>		<b>Actual Year 4</b>		<b>Expected Year 5</b>	
				<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Outcome Indicator 1Cii. Number of individuals and/or families moving to permanent housing	27	16	59%	5	63%	3	38%	3	60%	3		5	167%	3	
<b>Performance Measures: Output Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>5-year Actual to Date</b>	<b>5-year Actual % of Goal</b>	<b>Actual Year 1</b>		<b>Actual Year 2</b>		<b>Actual Year 3</b>		<b>Expected Year 4</b>		<b>Actual Year 4</b>		<b>Expected Year 5</b>	
				<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Output Indicator: Number of individuals and/or families placed in transitional housing	75	62	83%	17	113%	15	100%	15	100%	15		15	100%	15	
<b>Goal 1Ciii. Homeless people receive basic shelter and support services</b>															
<b>Funding Amount</b>	<b>Expected 5-year \$ Amount</b>	<b>Actual 5-year \$ Amount</b>	<b>5-year Actual % of Goal</b>	<b>Actual Year 1 (2015-2016) \$ Amount</b>		<b>Actual Year 2 (2016-2017) \$ Amount</b>		<b>Actual Year 3 (2017-2018) \$ Amount</b>		<b>Expected Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount</b>		<b>Actual Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount</b>		<b>Expected Year 5 (2019-2020) \$ Amount</b>	
CDBG	\$953,304	\$712,907	75%	\$161,873		\$183,678		\$183,678		\$183,678		\$183,678		\$183,678	
HOME	\$0	\$0													
HOPWA	\$0	\$0													
ESG	\$4,006,045	\$3,271,753	82%	\$834,292		\$812,487		\$812,487		\$812,487		\$812,487		\$812,487	
General Fund	\$21,476	\$0	0%												
Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0													

Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0													
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0													
Other	\$0	\$0													
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$4,980,825</b>	<b>\$3,984,660</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>\$996,165</b>		<b>\$996,165</b>		<b>\$812,487</b>		<b>\$996,165</b>		<b>\$996,165</b>		<b>\$996,165</b>	
<b>Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>5-year Actual to Date</b>	<b>5-year Actual % of Goal</b>	<b>Actual Year 1</b>		<b>Actual Year 2</b>		<b>Actual Year 3</b>		<b>Expected Year 4</b>		<b>Actual Year 4</b>		<b>Expected Year 5</b>	
				<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Outcome Indicator 1Ciii. Number of individuals moved into more stable housing	960	673	70%	310	141%	151	69%	169	77%	150				150	
<b>Performance Measures: Output Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>5-year Actual to Date</b>	<b>5-year Actual % of Goal</b>	<b>Actual Year 1</b>		<b>Actual Year 2</b>		<b>Actual Year 3</b>		<b>Expected Year 4</b>		<b>Actual Year 4</b>		<b>Expected Year 5</b>	
				<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Output Indicator: Number of individuals receiving rapid-rehousing services, including case management, and housing placement	2,980	2,842	95%	207	32%	827	129%	517	86%	600		1,291	215%	500	
Output Indicator: Number of individuals receiving short-term rental assistance	310	263	85%	61	76%	45	56%	59	118%	50		98	196%	50	
Output Indicator: Number of individuals receiving financial assistance, including moving costs, security deposits, utilities, last month's rent	420	761	181%	169	1690%	170	1700%	169	169%	150		253	169%	150	

Output Indicator: Number of individuals and families receiving shelter services	3,445	3,726	108%	1,491	166%	512	57%	621	89%	450		1,102	245%	500	
Output Indicator: Number of units subsidized through LOSP	285	-	0%	0	0%		0%		0%	199			0%	18	
<b>Priority Need 1D: Provide Supportive Housing Services</b>															
<b>Goal 1Di. Increased access to services for public housing residents</b>															
<b>Funding Amount</b>	<b>Expected 5-year \$ Amount</b>	<b>Actual 5-year \$ Amount</b>	<b>5-year Actual % of Goal</b>	<b>Actual Year 1 (2015-2016) \$ Amount</b>		<b>Actual Year 2 (2016-2017) \$ Amount</b>		<b>Actual Year 3 (2017-2018) \$ Amount</b>		<b>Expected Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount</b>		<b>Actual Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount</b>		<b>Expected Year 5 (2019-2020) \$ Amount</b>	
CDBG	\$4,388,932	\$2,540,000	58%	\$65,000		\$490,000		\$955,000		\$1,015,000		\$1,030,000		\$1,015,000	
HOME	\$0	\$0													
HOPWA	\$0	\$0													
ESG	\$0	\$0													
General Fund	\$8,033,490	\$8,774,531	109%	\$1,663,353		\$2,386,607		\$2,361,428		\$2,269,553		\$2,363,143		\$2,324,483	
Housing Trust Fund	\$611,438	\$781,500						\$624,000		\$150,000		\$157,500		\$161,438	
Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$1,890										\$1,890			
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0													
Other	\$0	\$5,650						\$5,650							
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$13,033,860</b>	<b>\$12,103,571</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>\$1,728,353</b>		<b>\$2,876,607</b>		<b>\$3,946,078</b>		<b>\$3,434,553</b>		<b>\$3,552,533</b>		<b>\$3,500,921</b>	
<b>Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>5-year Actual to Date</b>	<b>5-year Actual % of Goal</b>	<b>Actual Year 1</b>		<b>Actual Year 2</b>		<b>Actual Year 3</b>		<b>Expected Year 4</b>		<b>Actual Year 4</b>		<b>Expected Year 5</b>	
				<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Outcome Indicator 1Di. Number of public housing residents that achieve 75% of their goals from their service plans	820	701	85%	197	134%	149	101%	192	85%	150		163	109%	150	
<b>Performance Measures: Output Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>5-year Actual to Date</b>	<b>5-year Actual % of Goal</b>	<b>Actual Year 1</b>		<b>Actual Year 2</b>		<b>Actual Year 3</b>		<b>Expected Year 4</b>		<b>Actual Year 4</b>		<b>Expected Year 5</b>	
				<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>

Output Indicator: Number of residents engaged in case management across four HOPE SF sites and beginning in 2016-2017 eight RAD sites	1,273	1,724	135%	244	116%	774	369%	361	143%	300		345	115%	300	
Output Indicator: Number of resident service referrals across four HOPE SF sites and beginning in 2016-2017 eight RAD sites	5,190	6,466	125%	1,158	180%	1,881	292%	1,769	136%	1,300		1,658	128%	1,300	
<b>Goal 1Dii. Increased access to permanent supportive housing and transitional housing for PLWHA</b>															
<b>Funding Amount</b>	<b>Expected 5-year \$ Amount</b>	<b>Actual 5-year \$ Amount</b>	<b>5-year Actual % of Goal</b>	<b>Actual Year 1 (2015-2016) \$ Amount</b>		<b>Actual Year 2 (2016-2017) \$ Amount</b>		<b>Actual Year 3 (2017-2018) \$ Amount</b>		<b>Expected Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount</b>		<b>Actual Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount</b>		<b>Expected Year 5 (2019-2020) \$ Amount</b>	
CDBG	\$0	\$0													
HOME	\$0	\$0													
HOPWA	\$31,682,860	\$26,041,312	82%	\$6,820,223		\$6,901,089		\$6,238,337		\$6,251,487		\$6,081,663		\$6,141,094	
ESG	\$0	\$0													
General Fund	\$6,857,803	\$5,648,948	82%	\$1,357,485		\$1,357,485		\$1,509,660		\$1,357,485		\$1,424,318		\$1,515,079	
Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0													
Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0													
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0													
Other	\$1,391,001	\$1,391,000				\$463,666		\$463,667		\$463,667		\$463,667		\$463,667	
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$39,931,664</b>	<b>\$33,081,260</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>\$8,177,708</b>		<b>\$8,722,240</b>		<b>\$8,211,664</b>		<b>\$8,072,639</b>		<b>\$7,969,648</b>		<b>\$8,119,840</b>	
<b>Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>5-year Actual to Date</b>	<b>5-year Actual % of Goal</b>	<b>Actual Year 1</b>		<b>Actual Year 2</b>		<b>Actual Year 3</b>		<b>Expected Year 4</b>		<b>Actual Year 4</b>		<b>Expected Year 5</b>	
				<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Outcome Indicator 1Dii: Number of individuals more stably housed	2,376	1,669	70%	574	115%	558	112%	537	102%	400			0%	452	
<b>Performance Measures: Output Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>5-year Actual to Date</b>	<b>5-year Actual % of Goal</b>	<b>Actual Year 1</b>		<b>Actual Year 2</b>		<b>Actual Year 3</b>		<b>Expected Year 4</b>		<b>Actual Year 4</b>		<b>Expected Year 5</b>	
				<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>

Output indicator: Number of individuals housed in long-term residential care facilities	712	486	68%	161	142%	161	142%	164	101%	162			0%	162	
Output indicator: Number of individuals housed in permanent facilities	340	205	60%	68	100%	69	101%	68	100%	68			0%	68	
Output indicator: Number of individuals housed in transitional facilities	88	90	102%	18	164%	24	218%	28	127%	22		20	91%	22	
Output indicator : Number of individuals receiving shallow rental subsidies	265	260	98%	101	112%	85	189%	74	114%	65			0%	0	
Output indicator : Number of individuals receiving long-term deep rental subsidies	1,094	846	77%	226	94%	219	91%	203	98%	207		198	96%	200	
<b>Objective 2: Communities Have Healthy Physical, Social, and Business Infrastructure</b>															
<b>Priority Need 2A: Enhance Community Facilities and Spaces</b>															
<b>Goal 2Ai. Key nonprofit service providers have high quality facilities</b>															
Funding Amount	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Actual 5-year \$ Amount	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1 (2015-2016) \$ Amount	Actual Year 2 (2016-2017) \$ Amount	Actual Year 3 (2017-2018) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount	Actual Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount	Expected Year 5 (2019-2020) \$ Amount						
CDBG	\$10,913,964	\$6,400,669	59%	\$2,675,718	\$2,253,046	\$899,800	\$1,835,126	\$572,105	\$1,895,021						
HOME	\$0	\$0													
HOPWA	\$0	\$908,821		\$402,986	\$366,985	\$138,850									
ESG	\$0	\$0													
General Fund	\$2,204,260	\$2,155,000	98%	\$950,000	\$510,000	\$385,000	\$10,000	\$310,000	\$10,000						
Housing Trust Fund	\$625,000	\$1,318,779		\$177,379	\$600,000	\$241,400	\$375,000	\$300,000	\$250,000						
Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0													
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0													
Other	\$1,000,000	\$4,171,800	417%	\$2,592,300	\$595,000	\$984,500									
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$14,743,224</b>	<b>\$14,955,069</b>	<b>101%</b>	<b>\$6,798,383</b>	<b>\$4,325,031</b>	<b>\$2,649,550</b>	<b>\$2,220,126</b>	<b>\$1,182,105</b>	<b>\$2,155,021</b>						
	5-year Goal			Actual Year 1	Actual Year 2	Actual Year 3	Expected Year 4	Actual Year 4	Expected Year 5						

Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators		5-year Actual to Date	5- year Actual % of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt
Outcome Indicator 2Ai. Number of individuals with increased access to community facilities	60,000	77,786	130%	59,882	499%		0%	17,904	149%	12,000			0%	12,000	
Outcome Indicator 2Ai(2). Improved capacity of nonprofit service providers to plan and secure resources for capital improvements	60	63	105%	30	250%	6	50%	7	58%	12		20	167%	12	
Performance Measures: Output Indicators	5-year Goal	5-year Actual to Date	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1		Actual Year 2		Actual Year 3		Expected Year 4		Actual Year 4		Expected Year 5	
				Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt
Output Indicator: Number of nonprofit service providers receiving capital improvements to their facilities	60	70	117%	30	250%	18	150%	15	125%	12		7	58%	12	
Output Indicator: Number of nonprofit service providers receiving Capital Needs Assessments	60	49	82%	16	133%	6	50%	7	58%	12		20	167%	12	
<b>Goal 2Aii. Enhanced public spaces</b>															
Funding Amount	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Actual 5-year \$ Amount	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1 (2015-2016) \$ Amount		Actual Year 2 (2016-2017) \$ Amount		Actual Year 3 (2017-2018) \$ Amount		Expected Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount		Actual Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount		Expected Year 5 (2019-2020) \$ Amount	
CDBG	\$0	\$142,480		\$70,230		\$72,250									
HOME	\$0	\$0													
HOPWA	\$0	\$0													
ESG	\$0	\$0													
General Fund	\$0	\$22,000										\$22,000			
Housing Trust Fund	\$4,575,000	\$2,155,604	47%	\$996,380		\$816,463		\$0		375,000		342,761		250,000	
Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0													
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0													
Other	\$0	\$0													

Total	\$4,575,000	\$2,320,084	51%	\$1,066,610		\$888,713		\$0		\$375,000		\$364,761		\$250,000	
Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators	5-year Goal	5-year Actual to Date	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1		Actual Year 2		Actual Year 3		Expected Year 4		Actual Year 4		Expected Year 5	
				Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt
Outcome Indicator 2Aiii. Number of individuals with increased access to community and public spaces	375,000	217,378	58%	217,378	290%		0%	0	0%	75,000			0%	75,000	
Performance Measures: Output Indicators	5-year Goal	5-year Actual to Date	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1		Actual Year 2		Actual Year 3		Expected Year 4		Actual Year 4		Expected Year 5	
				Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt
Output Indicator: Number of community and public spaces improved through capital investments	25	18	72%	9	180%	6	120%	0	0%	5		3	60%	5	
Priority Need 2B: Strengthen Small Businesses and Commercial Corridors															
Goal 2Bi. Thriving, locally-owned small businesses															
Funding Amount	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Actual 5-year \$ Amount	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1 (2015-2016) \$ Amount		Actual Year 2 (2016-2017) \$ Amount		Actual Year 3 (2017-2018) \$ Amount		Expected Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount		Actual Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount		Expected Year 5 (2019-2020) \$ Amount	
CDBG	\$6,938,485	\$5,583,098	80%	\$1,238,322		\$950,000		\$1,759,776		\$1,897,308		\$1,635,000		\$1,377,308	
HOME	\$0	\$0													
HOPWA	\$0	\$0													
ESG	\$0	\$0													
General Fund	\$3,845,000	\$2,706,302	70%	\$130,302		\$500,000		\$1,026,000		\$1,250,000		\$1,050,000		\$1,250,000	
Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0													
Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0													
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0													
Other	\$455,000	\$344,000		\$254,000						\$190,000		\$90,000		\$265,000	
Total	\$11,238,485	\$8,633,400	77%	\$1,622,624		\$1,450,000		\$2,785,776		\$3,337,308		\$2,775,000		\$2,892,308	
Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators	5-year Goal	5-year Actual to Date	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1		Actual Year 2		Actual Year 3		Expected Year 4		Actual Year 4		Expected Year 5	
				Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt

Outcome Indicator 2Bi. Number of jobs created via business technical assistance	800	1,098	137%	307	205%	97	65%	188	94%	150		506	337%	150	
Outcome Indicator 2Bi(2). Number of jobs created and retained via loans funded	825	1,259	153%	709	567%	327	262%	212.5	121%	200		10	5%	200	
Outcome Indicator 2Bi(3). Number of jobs retained via business technical assistance	1,125	1,981	176%	366	163%	641	285%	504	224%	225		470	209%	225	
Outcome Indicator 2Bi(5). Number of new businesses established via technical assistance provided	625	909	145%	261	522%	81	162%	79	45%	175		488	279%	175	
Outcome Indicator 2Bi(6). Number of borrowers that graduate to conventional lending	45	3	7%	3	30%	no longer track this outcome		no longer track this outcome		no longer track this outcome		no longer track this outcome		no longer track this outcome	
Performance Measures: Output Indicators	5-year Goal	5-year Actual to Date	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1		Actual Year 2		Actual Year 3		Expected Year 4		Actual Year 4		Expected Year 5	
				Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt
Output Indicator: # of startup businesses assisted	1,250	1,117	89%	267	89%	184	61%	156	62%	200		510	255%	200	
Output Indicator: # of existing businesses assisted	1,950	2,785	143%	953	238%	674	169%	647	185%	400		511	128%	400	
Output Indicator: # of partners that engage non-English speakers as clients	64	49	77%	13	130%	12	100%	12	100%	15		12	80%	15	
Output Indicator: # of long-term businesses in neighborhood commercial corridors assisted	450	458	102%	136	181%	64	85%	75	75%	100		183	183%	100	
Output Indicator: # of loans funded	475	473	100%	154	123%	69	55%	94	125%	75		156	208%	75	
Output Indicator: total dollar amount value of loans issued	20,000,000	33,788,960	169%	\$14,460,070	413%	\$8,258,769	206%	\$6,977,262	174%	\$4,000,000		\$4,092,859	102%	\$4,500,000	
Output Indicator: % of loan repaid	90%	95%		96%	107%	95%	106%	95%	106%	90%		95%		90%	

Output Indicator: # of Section 108 funded projects	1	-	0%	0	0%	0		0	0%	0		0		0	
<b>Goal 2Bii. Robust commercial corridors in low-income neighborhoods</b>															
Funding Amount	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Actual 5-year \$ Amount	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1 (2015-2016) \$ Amount		Actual Year 2 (2016-2017) \$ Amount		Actual Year 3 (2017-2018) \$ Amount		Expected Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount		Actual Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount		Expected Year 5 (2019-2020) \$ Amount	
CDBG	\$1,894,945	\$1,787,806	94%	\$445,983		\$390,131		\$485,000		\$371,561		\$466,692		\$371,561	
HOME	\$0	\$0													
HOPWA	\$0	\$0													
ESG	\$0	\$0													
General Fund	\$16,035,786	\$15,212,500	95%	\$2,576,000		\$1,731,000		\$3,831,000		\$3,831,000		\$7,074,500		\$4,066,786	
Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0													
Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0													
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0													
Other	\$0	\$0													
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$17,930,731</b>	<b>\$17,000,306</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>\$3,021,983</b>		<b>\$2,121,131</b>		<b>\$4,316,000</b>		<b>\$4,202,561</b>		<b>\$7,541,192</b>		<b>\$4,438,347</b>	
Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators	5-year Goal	5-year Actual to Date	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1		Actual Year 2		Actual Year 3		Expected Year 4		Actual Year 4		Expected Year 5	
				Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt
Outcome Indicator 2Bii. Number of jobs created	110	81	74%	21	84%	24	96%	19	95%	20		17	85%	20	
Outcome Indicator 2Bii(2). Number of jobs retained	115	59	51%	10	25%	20	50%	5	50%	10		24	240%	15	
Outcome Indicator 2Bii(3). Number of existing leases strengthened and businesses stabilized	200	255	128%	55	275%	97	323%	88	176%	50		15	30%	50	
Performance Measures: Output Indicators	5-year Goal	5-year Actual to Date	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1		Actual Year 2		Actual Year 3		Expected Year 4		Actual Year 4		Expected Year 5	
				Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt
Output Indicator: # of existing businesses assisted	485	423	87%	225	225%	80	80%	76	61%	80		42	53%	80	
Output Indicator: # of openings and expansions assisted	57	175	307%	106	1060%	26	260%	8	80%	12		35	292%	15	

Output Indicator: # of organizations that achieved some development benchmark including formalization, 501(c)(3) status, new paid staff, sustainable funding source	16	4	25%	0	0%	1	20%	2	100%	2		1	50%	2	
Output Indicator: # of façade improvement projects approved for grant funding	100	133	133%	29	290%	29	193%	30	150%	25		45	180%	30	
Output Indicator: # of completed façade improvement projects	30	81	270%	15	250%	6	100%	20	250%	8		40	500%	2	
Output Indicator: Total funds deployed for active and completed projects	2,500,000	4,013,301	161%	\$606,689	121%	\$1,600,000	320%	\$761,467	152%	\$500,000		\$1,045,145	209%	\$500,000	
Output Indicator: # of ADA workshops/merchant walks provided	31	11	35%	5		3	30%	3	60%	3		0	0%	3	
Output Indicator: # of grants made to fund accessibility improvements	105	104	99%	30	150%	32	160%	34	136%	30		8	27%	10	
Output Indicator: # of businesses assisted with ADA compliance	675	296	44%	72	58%	157	126%	41	33%	150		26	17%	150	
Output Indicator: # of catalytic projects that achieve entitlement, groundbreaking, or grand opening	8	4	50%	0	0%	1	100%	2	100%	2		1	50%	2	
Output Indicator: # of customized service plans developed or updated	40	45	113%	25	125%	20	100%	0	0%	0		0	0%	0	
<b>Priority Need 2C: Increase Community Cohesion and Infrastructure</b>															
<b>Goal 2Ci. Increased supports for residents to convene and build social capital</b>															
<b>Funding Amount</b>	<b>Expected 5-year \$ Amount</b>	<b>Actual 5-year \$ Amount</b>	<b>5-year Actual % of Goal</b>	<b>Actual Year 1 (2015-2016) \$ Amount</b>	<b>Actual Year 2 (2016-2017) \$ Amount</b>	<b>Actual Year 3 (2017-2018) \$ Amount</b>	<b>Expected Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount</b>	<b>Actual Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount</b>	<b>Expected Year 5 (2019-2020) \$ Amount</b>						
CDBG	\$195,000	\$50,000		\$50,000			\$65,000	\$0	\$65,000						

HOME	\$0	\$0													
HOPWA	\$0	\$0													
ESG	\$0	\$0													
General Fund	\$9,390,390	\$8,168,132	87%	\$1,147,830		\$1,841,493		\$2,501,607		\$2,354,045		\$2,677,202		\$2,650,196	
Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$83,786		\$49,393				\$34,393							
Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0													
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0													
Other	\$560,000	\$1,131,749		\$221,749		\$175,000		\$455,000		\$280,000		\$280,000		\$280,000	
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$10,145,390</b>	<b>\$9,433,667</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>\$1,468,972</b>		<b>\$2,016,493</b>		<b>\$2,991,000</b>		<b>\$2,699,045</b>		<b>\$2,957,202</b>		<b>\$2,995,196</b>	
<b>Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>5-year Actual to Date</b>	<b>5-year Actual % of Goal</b>	<b>Actual Year 1</b>		<b>Actual Year 2</b>		<b>Actual Year 3</b>		<b>Expected Year 4</b>		<b>Actual Year 4</b>		<b>Expected Year 5</b>	
				<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Outcome Indicator 2Ci. Number of residents engaged in opportunities for neighborhood involvement	5,210	7,792	150%	908	267%	403	119%	3,909	535%	800		2,572	322%	3,000	
<b>Performance Measures: Output Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>5-year Actual to Date</b>	<b>5-year Actual % of Goal</b>	<b>Actual Year 1</b>		<b>Actual Year 2</b>		<b>Actual Year 3</b>		<b>Expected Year 4</b>		<b>Actual Year 4</b>		<b>Expected Year 5</b>	
				<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Output Indicator: Number of planning processes completed	17	35	206%	15	1500%	8	800%	3	60%	5		9	180%	5	

Output Indicator: Number of residents participating in community building activities across four HOPE SF sites and beginning in 2016-17 eight RAD sites	9,477	8,263	87%	1,517	465%	1,044	320%	5,702	691%	4000			0%	4000	
Output Indicator: Number of community based organizations receiving grants through community grantmaking process	70	292	417%	96	686%	32	229%	39	279%	14		125	893%	14	
Output Indicator: Number of residents engaged in the community grantmaking process	100	80	80%		0%	40	267%	40	267%	20		0	0%	35	
<b>Goal 2Cii. Increased capacity for community-based organizations</b>															
Funding Amount	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Actual 5-year \$ Amount	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1 (2015-2016) \$ Amount		Actual Year 2 (2016-2017) \$ Amount		Actual Year 3 (2017-2018) \$ Amount		Expected Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount		Actual Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount		Expected Year 5 (2019-2020) \$ Amount	
CDBG	\$794,230	\$803,579	101%	\$226,039		\$200,310		\$153,410		\$153,410		\$223,820		\$153,410	
HOME	\$0	\$0													
HOPWA	\$0	\$0													
ESG	\$0	\$0													
General Fund	\$2,484,284	\$4,489,828	181%	\$2,790,237		\$632,613		\$583,255		\$618,826		\$483,723		\$627,650	
Housing Trust Fund	\$720,000	\$678,557	94%	\$0		\$200,000		\$289,247				\$189,310			
Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0													
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0													
Other	\$405,000	\$680,264		\$55,000		\$55,000		\$330,000		\$255,000		\$240,264		\$150,000	
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$4,403,514</b>	<b>\$6,652,228</b>	<b>151%</b>	<b>\$3,071,276</b>		<b>\$1,087,923</b>		<b>\$1,355,912</b>		<b>\$1,027,236</b>		<b>\$1,137,117</b>		<b>\$931,060</b>	
Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators	5-year Goal	5-year Actual to Date	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1		Actual Year 2		Actual Year 3		Expected Year 4		Actual Year 4		Expected Year 5	
				Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt

Outcome indicator 2Cii: Number of community based organizations benefiting from technical assistance and capacity building	380	881	232%	159	227%	200	286%	344	491%	70		178	254%	100	
Performance Measures: Output Indicators	5-year Goal	5-year Actual to Date	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1		Actual Year 2		Actual Year 3		Expected Year 4		Actual Year 4		Expected Year 5	
				Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt
Output Indicator: Number of community based organizations receiving technical assistance and capacity building	380	881	232%	159	227%	200	286%	344	491%	70		178	254%	100	
Objective 3: Families and Individuals are Resilient and Economically Self-Sufficient															
Priority Need 3A: Promote Workforce Development															
Goal 3Ai. Increased job readiness															
Funding Amount	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Actual 5-year \$ Amount	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1 (2015-2016) \$ Amount		Actual Year 2 (2016-2017) \$ Amount		Actual Year 3 (2017-2018) \$ Amount		Expected Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount		Actual Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount		Expected Year 5 (2019-2020) \$ Amount	
CDBG	\$2,070,000	\$1,646,666	80%	\$409,166		\$367,500		\$440,000		\$440,000		\$430,000		\$430,000	
HOME	\$0	\$0													
HOPWA	\$0	\$0													
ESG	\$0	\$0													
General Fund	\$195,000	\$715,757		\$565,757		\$20,000		\$65,000		\$65,000		\$65,000		\$65,000	
Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0													
Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0													
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0													
Other	\$0	\$0													
Total	\$2,265,000	\$2,362,423	104%	\$974,923		\$387,500		\$505,000		\$505,000		\$495,000		\$495,000	
Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators	5-year Goal	5-year Actual to Date	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1		Actual Year 2		Actual Year 3		Expected Year 4		Actual Year 4		Expected Year 5	
				Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt
Outcome Indicator 3Ai. Number of low-income SF residents who received job readiness services (includes job search)	4,570	4,465	98%	615	67%	735	80%	1,456	159%	914		1,659	182%	914	

Performance Measures: Output Indicators	5-year Goal	5-year Actual to Date	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1		Actual Year 2		Actual Year 3		Expected Year 4		Actual Year 4		Expected Year 5	
				Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt
Number of participants who complete one or more of the following: resume, mock interview, cover letter	4,570	4,357	95%	615	67%	735	80%	1,402	153%	914		1,605	176%	914	
<b>Goal 3Aii. Increased occupational skills that match labor market needs</b>															
Funding Amount	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Actual 5-year \$ Amount	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1 (2015-2016) \$ Amount		Actual Year 2 (2016-2017) \$ Amount		Actual Year 3 (2017-2018) \$ Amount		Expected Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount		Actual Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount		Expected Year 5 (2019-2020) \$ Amount	
CDBG	\$1,875,000	\$1,546,667	82%	\$586,667		\$625,000		\$162,500		\$162,500		\$172,500		\$172,500	
HOME	\$0	\$0													
HOPWA	\$0	\$0													
ESG	\$0	\$0													
General Fund	\$0	\$894,436		\$565,758		\$328,678									
Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0													
Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0													
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0													
Other	\$0	\$0													
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,875,000</b>	<b>\$2,441,103</b>	<b>130%</b>	<b>\$1,152,425</b>		<b>\$953,678</b>		<b>\$162,500</b>		<b>\$162,500</b>		<b>\$172,500</b>		<b>\$172,500</b>	
Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators	5-year Goal	5-year Actual to Date	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1		Actual Year 2		Actual Year 3		Expected Year 4		Actual Year 4		Expected Year 5	
				Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt
Outcome Indicator 3Aii. Number of occupational training graduates placed into employment	1,150	1,198	104%	463	140%	243	74%	162	58%	105		330	314%	105	
Performance Measures: Output Indicators	5-year Goal	5-year Actual to Date	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1		Actual Year 2		Actual Year 3		Expected Year 4		Actual Year 4		Expected Year 5	
				Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt
Number of participants enrolled into occupational training	1,970	2,306	117%	790	132%	535	89%	415	83%	135		566	419%	135	
<b>Goal 3Aiii. Access to job opportunities for disadvantaged San Francisco residents</b>															

Funding Amount	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Actual 5-year \$ Amount	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1 (2015-2016) \$ Amount		Actual Year 2 (2016-2017) \$ Amount		Actual Year 3 (2017-2018) \$ Amount		Expected Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount		Actual Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount		Expected Year 5 (2019-2020) \$ Amount	
CDBG	\$3,699,087	\$2,899,574	78%	\$528,667		\$532,000		\$976,378		\$952,529		\$862,529		\$952,529	
HOME	\$0	\$0													
HOPWA	\$0	\$0													
ESG	\$0	\$0													
General Fund	\$0	\$797,758		\$565,758		\$232,000									
Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0													
Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0													
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0													
Other	\$0	\$0													
Total	\$3,699,087	\$3,697,332	100%	\$1,094,425		\$764,000		\$976,378		\$952,529		\$862,529		\$952,529	
Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators	5-year Goal	5-year Actual to Date	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1		Actual Year 2		Actual Year 3		Expected Year 4		Actual Year 4		Expected Year 5	
				Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt
Outcome Indicator 3Aiii. Number of low income San Francisco residents who secure employment	3,856	3,984	103%	1,123	129%	974	112%	948	109%	620		939	151%	620	
Performance Measures: Output Indicators	5-year Goal	5-year Actual to Date	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1		Actual Year 2		Actual Year 3		Expected Year 4		Actual Year 4		Expected Year 5	
				Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt
Output Indicator: Number of low income SF residents that enrolled into workforce services	6,531	8,786	135%	1,666	121%	2,323	169%	2,320	168%	1,200		2,477	206%	1,200	
Priority Need 3B: Promote Economic Advancement Through Barrier Removal															
Goal 3Bi. Improved service connections															
Funding Amount	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Actual 5-year \$ Amount	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1 (2015-2016) \$ Amount		Actual Year 2 (2016-2017) \$ Amount		Actual Year 3 (2017-2018) \$ Amount		Expected Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount		Actual Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount		Expected Year 5 (2019-2020) \$ Amount	
CDBG	\$1,576,990	\$1,272,138	81%	\$375,000		\$337,138		\$305,000		\$305,000		\$255,000		\$255,000	
HOME	\$0	\$0													
HOPWA	\$0	\$0													
ESG	\$0	\$0													

General Fund	\$10,520,202	\$11,600,676	110%	\$3,099,985		\$2,598,615		\$2,646,594		\$3,133,419		\$3,255,482		\$3,551,916	
Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0													
Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0													
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0													
Other	\$300,000	\$0	0%	\$0											
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$12,397,192</b>	<b>\$12,872,814</b>	<b>104%</b>	<b>\$3,474,985</b>		<b>\$2,935,753</b>		<b>\$2,951,594</b>		<b>\$3,438,419</b>		<b>\$3,510,482</b>		<b>\$3,806,916</b>	
<b>Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>5-year Actual to Date</b>	<b>5-year Actual % of Goal</b>	<b>Actual Year 1</b>		<b>Actual Year 2</b>		<b>Actual Year 3</b>		<b>Expected Year 4</b>		<b>Actual Year 4</b>		<b>Expected Year 5</b>	
				<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Outcome Indicator 3Bi. Number of individuals who achieve at least 75% of their service plan	2,910	3,850	132%	958	342%	922	329%	1,037	148%	750		933	124%	900	
<b>Performance Measures: Output Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>5-year Actual to Date</b>	<b>5-year Actual % of Goal</b>	<b>Actual Year 1</b>		<b>Actual Year 2</b>		<b>Actual Year 3</b>		<b>Expected Year 4</b>		<b>Actual Year 4</b>		<b>Expected Year 5</b>	
				<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Output Indicator: Number of individuals connected to one or more service(s)	10,600	14,725	139%	3,717	620%	3,766	628%	3,677	153%	3,500		3,565	102%	3,500	
Output Indicator: Number of individuals receiving case management as an element of service connection	4,586	5,311	116%	1,256	251%	1,301	260%	1,445	147%	1,300		1,309	101%	1,300	

**Goal 3Bii. Improved foundational competencies and access to job training and employment opportunities for disconnected populations**

<b>Funding Amount</b>	<b>Expected 5-year \$ Amount</b>	<b>Actual 5-year \$ Amount</b>	<b>5-year Actual % of Goal</b>	<b>Actual Year 1 (2015-2016) \$ Amount</b>	<b>Actual Year 2 (2016-2017) \$ Amount</b>	<b>Actual Year 3 (2017-2018) \$ Amount</b>	<b>Expected Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount</b>	<b>Actual Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount</b>	<b>Expected Year 5 (2019-2020) \$ Amount</b>
CDBG	\$4,159,038	\$3,148,152	76%	\$775,000	\$680,000	\$823,000	\$830,000	\$870,152	\$997,152
HOME	\$0	\$0							
HOPWA	\$0	\$0							
ESG	\$0	\$0							
General Fund	\$4,218,778	\$5,527,154	131%	\$963,107	\$1,324,651	\$1,488,912	\$1,370,612	\$1,750,484	\$1,468,680
Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0							
Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0							

Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0													
Other	\$725,000	\$551,666	76%	\$88,333	\$88,333	\$200,000	\$250,000	\$175,000	\$175,000						
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$9,102,816</b>	<b>\$9,226,972</b>	<b>101%</b>	<b>\$1,826,440</b>	<b>\$2,092,984</b>	<b>\$2,511,912</b>	<b>\$2,450,612</b>	<b>\$2,795,636</b>	<b>\$2,640,832</b>						
Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators	5-year Goal	5-year Actual to Date	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1		Actual Year 2		Actual Year 3		Expected Year 4		Actual Year 4		Expected Year 5	
				Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt
Outcome Indicator 3Bii. Number of individuals with increased foundational competencies	5,100	8,259	162%	1,282	513%	2,087	835%	2,503	209%	1,700		2,387	140%	1,700	
Outcome Indicator 3Bii(2). Number of individuals receiving high school diploma, GED, and/or enrolling in post-secondary education	424	681	161%	123	615%	165	825%	212	189%	112		181	162%	160	
Performance Measures: Output Indicators	5-year Goal	5-year Actual to Date	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1		Actual Year 2		Actual Year 3		Expected Year 4		Actual Year 4		Expected Year 5	
				Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt
Output Indicator: Number of individuals trained in foundational competencies	8,250	10,352	125%	1,486	297%	2,714	543%	3,263	163%	2,500		2,889	116%	2,750	
<b>Goal 3Biii. Increased job retention and advancement supports through legal and other related services</b>															
Funding Amount	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Actual 5-year \$ Amount	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1 (2015-2016) \$ Amount		Actual Year 2 (2016-2017) \$ Amount		Actual Year 3 (2017-2018) \$ Amount		Expected Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount		Actual Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount		Expected Year 5 (2019-2020) \$ Amount	
CDBG	\$3,126,511	\$2,608,444	83%	\$925,111		\$685,111		\$685,111		\$685,111		\$313,111		\$313,111	
HOME	\$0	\$0													

HOPWA	\$0	\$0													
ESG	\$0	\$0													
General Fund	\$26,220,053	\$25,935,077	99%	\$4,230,450		\$5,036,073		\$7,157,791		\$6,475,291		\$9,510,763		\$9,786,306	
Housing Trust Fund	\$135,000	\$0												\$135,000	
Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0													
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0													
Other	\$0	\$0													
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$29,481,564</b>	<b>\$28,543,521</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>\$5,155,561</b>		<b>\$5,721,184</b>		<b>\$7,842,902</b>		<b>\$7,160,402</b>		<b>\$9,823,874</b>		<b>\$10,234,417</b>	
<b>Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>5-year Actual to Date</b>	<b>5-year Actual % of Goal</b>	<b>Actual Year 1</b>		<b>Actual Year 2</b>		<b>Actual Year 3</b>		<b>Expected Year 4</b>		<b>Actual Year 4</b>		<b>Expected Year 5</b>	
				<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Outcome Indicator 3Biii. Number of individuals with increased knowledge of their rights as determined by pre- and post-assessments	6,683	10,003	150%	106	13%	3387	423%	3,272	3942%	2,000		3,238	162%	3,000	
Outcome Indicator 3Biii(2). Number of individuals that with positive outcome indicators for their legal cases	4,950	6,855	138%	1,052	383%	1,861	677%	2,207	221%	1,500		1,735	116%	1,900	
<b>Performance Measures: Output Indicators</b>	<b>5-year Goal</b>	<b>5-year Actual to Date</b>	<b>5-year Actual % of Goal</b>	<b>Actual Year 1</b>		<b>Actual Year 2</b>		<b>Actual Year 3</b>		<b>Expected Year 4</b>		<b>Actual Year 4</b>		<b>Expected Year 5</b>	
				<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>% of Goal</b>	<b>Goal</b>	<b>\$ Amt</b>
Output Indicator: Number of individuals receiving legal representation	9,000	8,921	99%	1,719	123%	2,337	167%	2,754	153%	2,200		2,111	96%	2,200	
Output Indicator: Number of individuals receiving education about workers' rights	1,037	519	50%	129	37%	118	34%	152	130%	100		120	120%	120	
<b>Goal 3Biv. Improved financial literacy and management</b>															

Funding Amount	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Actual 5-year \$ Amount	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1 (2015-2016) \$ Amount		Actual Year 2 (2016-2017) \$ Amount		Actual Year 3 (2017-2018) \$ Amount		Expected Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount		Actual Year 4 (2018-2019) \$ Amount		Expected Year 5 (2019-2020) \$ Amount	
CDBG	\$1,788,004	\$1,490,000	83%	\$395,000		\$365,000		\$365,000		\$365,000		\$365,000		\$365,000	
HOME	\$0	\$0													
HOPWA	\$0	\$0													
ESG	\$0	\$0													
General Fund	\$562,327	\$826,877	147%	\$251,000		\$237,658		\$303,750		\$25,000		\$34,469		\$35,331	
Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0													
Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0													
Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0													
Other	\$576,652	\$587,885	102%	\$282,471		\$205,414		\$50,000				\$50,000		\$50,000	
Total	\$2,926,983	\$2,904,762	99%	\$928,471		\$808,072		\$718,750		\$390,000		\$449,469		\$450,331	
Performance Measures: Outcome Indicators	5-year Goal	5-year Actual to Date	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1		Actual Year 2		Actual Year 3		Expected Year 4		Actual Year 4		Expected Year 5	
				Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt
Outcome Indicator 3Biv. Number of individuals that increase their savings by 2% of net income	2,150	1,487	69%	242	30%	356	119%	518	173%	350		371	106%	400	
Outcome Indicator 3Biv(2). Number of individuals that improve their credit score by at least 35 points	2,200	1,284	58%	267	33%	376	125%	428	122%	350		213	61%	400	
Performance Measures: Output Indicators	5-year Goal	5-year Actual to Date	5-year Actual % of Goal	Actual Year 1		Actual Year 2		Actual Year 3		Expected Year 4		Actual Year 4		Expected Year 5	
				Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt	Actual	% of Goal	Goal	\$ Amt
Output Indicator: Number of individuals opening up savings accounts and/or IDAs	1,160	1,026	88%	240	96%	258	143%	349	194%	275		179	65%	275	
Output Indicator: Number of individuals receiving credit counseling and repair services	2,600	3,134	121%	687	229%	566	189%	1,181	295%	800		700	88%	800	

Output Indicator: Number of individuals receiving financial counseling and education	7,600	7,734	102%	1,424	71%	2,178	363%	2,401	240%	2,000		1,731	87%	2,000	
--	-------	-------	------	-------	-----	-------	------	-------	------	-------	--	-------	-----	-------	--

**Table 1 - Accomplishments – Program Year & Strategic Plan to Date**

**Assess how the jurisdiction's use of funds, particularly CDBG, addresses the priorities and specific objectives identified in the plan, giving special attention to the highest priority activities identified.**

In program year 2018-2019, CDBG, ESG, HOME and HOPWA investments were made in the following program areas:

- CDBG and HOME Affordable Housing Development;
- CDBG Capital Projects;
- CDBG Economic Development;
- CDBG Planning and Capacity Building;
- CDBG Public Services;
- ESG Rapid Re-Housing, Homeless Prevention and Emergency Shelter; and
- HOPWA Capital Projects, Rental Assistance Program and Supportive Services and Operating Subsidies.

Over the course of the 2018-2019 program year, San Francisco strategically used housing and community development funds, including CDBG, ESG, HOME and HOPWA funds, to support affordable housing; support public housing developments; support housing for people with AIDS; renovate and develop community facilities; improve ADA access to community facilities; deliver timely, relevant and effective social services; provide low-income residents with employment readiness skills; support the placement of residents in jobs that pay living wages; provide housing-related services including tenant rights counseling, eviction prevention counseling, tenant-based rental assistance and homeownership counseling; deliver services that help to prevent homelessness; provide shelter and essential social services to homeless individuals and families; and assist small businesses and micro-enterprises. Additionally, CDBG funds were used to support nonprofit organizational capacity building.

Select highlights of the 2018-2019 program year specific to the use of federal funding include:

- 4 capital projects were funded with CDBG
- 11,621 individuals received CDBG-funded public services;
- 1,679 individuals received ESG-funded homeless, homeless prevention or rapid re-housing services;
- 1,098 small businesses and micro-enterprises received business technical assistance;
- 1027 jobs were created or retained;
- 518 households received HOPWA-funded housing assistance, of which 431 were in San Francisco;
- 106 existing affordable housing units were funded with CDBG to be preserved;
- Significant progress towards the five-year goals for the six NRSAs;
- The City's leveraging of significant resources through public, private and not for profit support of programs that strengthen and optimize federal funds;
- Increased coordination of services; and
- Improved monitoring and management of sub-recipients.

In general, housing and community development activities that were implemented during program year 2018-2019 served the identified needs. The five-year performance measures matrix above shows 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.

## CR-15 - Resources and Investments 91.520(a)

Identify the resources made available

Sources of Funds	Resources Made Available
CDBG	\$10,559,644
HOME	\$0
HOPWA	\$4,197,488
ESG	\$123,322
Other - Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure Funding	\$41,231,827
Other - General Obligation Bond	\$40,779,272
Other - Housing Impact Fees	\$38,053,788
Other - Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0
Other - Local General Fund	\$35,698,937
Other - Local Housing Trust Fund	\$8,541,935
Other Funds	\$17,129,672
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$196,315,885</b>

Table 2a – Resources Made Available by Funding Source

Program Areas	Resources Made Available
Capital Improvements to Public Facilities	\$1,546,866
Downpayment Assistance	\$20,319,774
Economic Development	\$2,101,692
Multi-Family Housing Development	\$129,491,691
Planning and Organizational Capacity Building	\$4,094,319
Public Services	\$38,761,544
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$196,315,886</b>

Table 3b – Resources Made Available by Program Area

### Narrative

Tables 3a and 3b above show all resources that were made available during program year 2018-2019 by funding source and by program area, respectively.

## Identify the geographic distribution and location of investments

Target Area	Planned Percentage of Allocation	Actual Percentage of Allocation	Narrative Description
Bayview Hunters Point	10%	5%	See below
Chinatown	10%	1%	See below
Mission	10%	10%	See below
South of Market	10%	4%	See below
Tenderloin	10%	3%	See below
Visitation Valley	10%	1%	See below

**Table 3 – Identify the geographic distribution and location of investments**

### **Narrative**

#### **Bayview Hunters Point**

##### ***Community Development***

MOHCD worked with the Mayor's office and community organizations to increase resources for family support for the growing Latino population in Bayview Hunters Point. MOHCD similarly worked to increase funding for legal services specifically for low-income Bayview Hunters Point residents. MOHCD continued to fund an increased investment in providing access to housing services for Bayview Hunters Point residents. It continued to fund significant case management and service connection programs for residents of Hunters View, a HOPE SF project aimed at revitalizing this public housing site.

##### ***Workforce Development***

In alignment with MOHCD's efforts, OEWD facilitated a partnership with HOPE SF to connect public housing residents to employment opportunities. Service providers receive training on key success indicators and referral procedures for sector training employment pathway programs. OEWD and HOPE SF, in partnership with the San Francisco Housing Authority, collaborated to request federal funding for economic mobility coaches, targeted employment services, and earned income disregard policy changes to temporarily exclude new income from consideration for public housing rent increases. Similarly, OEWD partnered with City agencies and a labor management partnership to create an eight-week job training program targeted to residents of public housing. Collaborations such as these build capacity for service providers within public housing to move residents into economic mobility pathways and for residents to develop stable economic environments, ultimately alleviating intergenerational poverty.

OEWD additionally contracts with workforce community-based organizations in the Bayview Hunters Point area and maintains a high-performing jobs center which provides career training and certification, job readiness training, youth workforce development, and barrier removal services. As a deeply-embedded community-based organization, the Bayview Hunters Point job center is a known quantity in the Southeast corridor and conducts outreach to nine public housing sites.

##### ***Economic Development***

OEWD supported and completed a Choice Neighborhoods Initiative Critical Community Improvement (CCI)-leveraged façade and tenant improvement program for the Bayview commercial corridor. In partnership with Local Initiative Support Corporation (LISC), the program provided technical assistance, project management, architectural services, and grants to small businesses for construction. With over

30 vacancies and many occupied buildings in need of repair, the corridor needed a program to support more expensive structural improvements. The Bayview program gathered a team with such expertise and provided support for fourteen minor façade improvement as well as major commercial rehabilitation projects.

Businesses participating in the program received an assessment from San Francisco Small Business Development Center (SBDC) to review their existing financial statements and project viability before receiving funds. Each program participant is committed to complete eight hours of technical assistance with SBDC within one year of project approval to ensure the businesses have the tools for success.

Examples of projects completed under this program include the following:

- Café Envy – 1701 Yosemite Ave, San Francisco, CA 94124
- Gratta Wines - 5299 Third Street, San Francisco, CA 94124
- SF SQUARED INC - 4744 Third Street, San Francisco, CA 94124
- San Francisco Beauty Salon - 4928 Third Street, San Francisco, CA 94124
- Sam Jordan's Bar and Grill - 4004 Third Street, San Francisco, CA 94124

OEWD is currently working with the community to develop a strategy to encourage and invigorate commercial activity along the Bayview Third Street corridor, which includes over 16 businesses. The Third Street Economic Development Strategy will establish short-term interventions to strengthen businesses and community institutions, with the goal of maintaining a vibrant, clean, and safe commercial district with a diverse mix of businesses and cultural facilities.

Beginning in March 2018, OEWD staff partnered with community members to establish the African-American Arts & Cultural District. On December 11, 2018, the Board of Supervisors unanimously approved an ordinance introduced to recognize the African American Arts and Cultural District within the Bayview Hunters Point.

The new African American Arts and Cultural District within the Bayview Hunters Point acknowledges the importance of the neighborhood's history and seeks to preserve the legacy, cultural assets, arts and traditions that were uniquely born within Bayview Hunters Point. It was the sixth district recognized under the City's Cultural District Program led by MOHCD.

### ***Multi-Family Housing Development***

MOHCD continued with the rehabilitation of 446 units of distressed public housing under HUD's Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) Program, and continued to support the Mayor's HOPE SF Program by completing the construction of 72 units of new affordable housing at Potrero Terrace and Annex public housing site. Meanwhile MOHCD's sister housing finance agency, the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII) completed the construction 162 units at Alice Griffith Phase 3 and 4, all in support of the Mayor's HOPE SF program. All four phases of Alice Griffith include 226 replacement public housing units.

### **Chinatown**

#### ***Community Development***

MOHCD continued to provide support for programs targeting recent immigrants, especially those with limited English. MOHCD also provided support for the API Council, a unique collaboration of service

providers spanning a diverse set of service areas which operates to encourage service coordination and increase shared learning. MOHCD expanded its support for family economic support for APA families, and continued the support of a community “living room” for residents of Chinatown’s SROs.

### ***Workforce Development***

OEWD continued to provide funding and technical assistance to multiple community-based organizations in Chinatown. OEWD maintains a job center in Chinatown to help neighborhood residents access job training and counseling, and enroll in certificated, career pathway programs in the hospitality and home care industries. The job center developed additional hospitality training programs for its portfolio of services, and includes dedicated career pathways for older adults. The Chinatown neighborhood job center conducts workforce development outreach in two public housing sites and delivers services in English, Spanish, Cantonese, and Mandarin.

### ***Economic Development***

#### ***Business Technical Assistance***

- Central Subway Construction Mitigation: As part of an interagency collaboration with SFMTA, OEWD developed a direct business support grant program that provided technical assistance, resources and grant awards to small businesses that have been impacted by the construction of the Central Subway project. To date, 61 small businesses received \$387,500 in direct grants and technical assistance in marketing and strategic equipment purchases to catalyze additional revenue sources.
- Enhanced Chinatown Parking Pilot: Through a partnership with Portsmouth Square Garage and Chinese Newcomers Service Center, OEWD launched a Chinatown parking program to promote nighttime and weekend activity in Chinatown. The program will assist visitors and merchants to use parking discounts and marketing tools in the neighborhood, and to enhance business and community engagement towards Chinatown’s economic revitalization.
- Chinatown Corridor Manager: Since FY18-19, OEWD partners with Self Help for the Elderly to build capacity for Chinatown. The program hired a corridor manager to provide integrated services for local merchants and stakeholders for Chinatown. The corridor manager will conduct business outreach, engage businesses and the community to address business-related issues, work to develop strategies and solutions to resolve Chinatown small business concerns. This OEWD-IIN field representative would connect with the recorded 1200+ Chinatown businesses and 50+ local stakeholders on a regular basis to ensure that our services are accessible and our interventions align with their needs.

### ***Community Events and Marketing Campaigns***

#### ***Chinatown Springtime Festival (CSF)***

Since 2018, Community Youth Center hosted Chinatown Springtime Festival, a cross-cultural celebration to welcome the arrival of spring and demonstrate Chinese folk art and cuisine. CSF drew over 3,000 participants to Chinatown through social media and merchant/community referral. CSF worked with 30 local businesses to increase foot traffic and business revenue in Chinatown.

#### ***Summer Saturdays on Waverly***

Since FY18-19, Community Youth Center held 3 Saturday events on Waverly Place to feature Chinese community’s food, art, sport, and craft culture. These events had live demonstrations, interactive

workshops, and hands-on activities related to the theme. Tables and chairs were set up for attendees to relax and enjoy the ambiance. Each event had drawn at least 1,000 people into Chinatown.

### **Dancing on Waverly (DOW)**

Since FY14-15, IIN granted Chinese Culture Center to host Dancing on Waverly, a music and dance festival on Waverly Place to promote cross-cultural awareness and engagement and connect participants to Chinatown's historic and economic gems. Each year DOW provides an enjoyable and healthy activity to over 1,000 audiences and increases business opportunities for 150 storefronts nearby.

### **Chinatown Music Festival (CMF)**

Since FY15-16, IIN co-sponsored Chinese Culture Center's annual Chinatown Music Festival in Portsmouth Square for a free, fun-filled afternoon of music, dancing and exhibition of interactive art. This multi-cultural festival creates a deeper understanding of Chinatown's role in a multi-cultural society, and anchors a series of powerful arts initiatives to activate and build community. Each year CMF attracts approximately 2,000 visitors and enhances Chinatown's economic and cultural vibrancy.

### **Chinatown Halloween Neighborhood Festival (CHNF)**

In 2015, Community Youth Center launched the very first Chinatown Halloween event on Waverly Place, Willie Woo Woo Wong Playground and Chinatown YMCA. CHNF included fun activities like haunted house, bounce pit, game booths, arts & crafts, costume contest, kids' corner and entertainment. Chinese media reported that each year it brings over 6,000 attendees, with a majority of youth and families ages 3 to 80. CYC provided assistance to over 50 businesses with merchants outreach, raffle/food donation, and community networking/promotion

### **OEWD-IIN funded events in Chinatown FY 2019**

Apr 13	Chinatown Spring Time Festival (Community Youth Center)
Jun 15, Jun 29, Jul 13	Summer Saturdays on Waverly (Community Youth Center)
Jul 27	Dancing on Waverly (Chinese Culture Center)
Aug 10	Chinatown Music Festival (Chinese Culture Center)
Oct 26	Chinatown Neighborhood Halloween Festival

### ***Multi-Family Housing Development***

MOHCD continued the rehabilitation of 200 units of distressed public housing at Ping Yuen North development under the (RAD) Program.

### **Mission**

#### ***Community Development***

MOHCD continued its invested in a community education campaign designed to inform Mission residents and monolingual Spanish speakers about eviction defense and tenants' rights information to stabilize their housing and prevent mass displacement. The Department also continued to participate in the federally-funded Promise Neighborhood program focused in the Mission. Multiple City departments, partnering with community based organizations, continued to spend FY 2018-19 in a joint planning

process called Mission 2020 to examine the needs of the neighborhood holistically, in particular focusing on the affordable housing needs and the housing stabilization needs to better resource this neighborhood that is in danger of losing its long-term low-income and immigrant families and individuals. The City also increased its investment in legal services to protect the legal rights of immigrants throughout the City, many of which have chosen to live in the Mission, in particular the growing Latino community. MOHCD expanded its outreach to Latinos in the Mission to promote expanded access to affordable housing.

### ***Workforce Development***

OEWD continued to provide funding and technical assistance to multiple community-based organizations in the Mission to leverage City resources and develop pipelines for sufficiency wage employment. OEWD maintains a job center in the Mission to help residents access job readiness training, coaching, job placement and retention services, and receive referral to OEWD's certificated, career pathway programs in high-growth sectors. Providers deliver services in English and Spanish, and are embedded in the community in which they serve. The job center integrates services, including housing stabilization, to prioritize overall family system health and wellness, with an emphasis on economic self-sufficiency.

### ***Economic Development***

Economic development strategies play an important role in stabilizing and enhancing commercial districts. The Office on Economic and Workforce Development's Invest in Neighborhoods (IIN) program includes the Mission District the location of the City's Calle 24 Latino Cultural District. Part of our economic stabilization strategy within FY 2018-2019 included the following activities:

- Funding staffing to support small businesses and connect them to city services and opportunities
- Funding staffing to support marketing of the area by highlighting cultural events and promoting small business offerings and products, through website and social media
- Providing tailored technical assistance and funding to small businesses
- Assisting businesses in negotiating lease renewals for their commercial spaces
- Providing façade improvement grants

### ***Multi-Family Housing Development***

MOHCD supported the commencement or continued construction of 602 units of new affordable housing units, predevelopment of 175 additional new affordable units, as well as preserved the affordability of 17 units of housing at risk of converting to market rate in the Mission under MOHCD's Small Sites Program.

### **South of Market**

#### ***Community Development***

MOHCD continued its increase investment to access to housing services targeting the South of Market community and its immigrant residents, including the Filipino community. MOHCD also supports the facilitation of a SoMa community council to provide convening, strategy development and planning among SoMa community organizations. As part of its citywide Cultural District strategy, MOHCD provides funding to operate two Cultural Districts: SoMa Pilipinas and the Leather District.

The SoMa Fund continues to support foundational skill development and service connection to increase access to income opportunities as well as building community connections to potential employers.

### ***Workforce Development***

OEWD maintains its primary job center in SoMa, called the Comprehensive Access Point (CAP). We also maintain additional neighborhood job center targeted for peoples with disabilities. The CAP delivers the entire portfolio of workforce development services in San Francisco, and co-locates with additional service providers, including public benefits access. The SoMa neighborhood job centers serves residents also through on-the-job training and individual training accounts.

### ***Economic Development***

The Soma Fund provides support to small business development and incubation through event-based corridor activation and intensive business consulting for emerging community-serving businesses.

### ***Multi-Family Housing Development***

MOHCD completed construction of 83 units and supported predevelopment of 258 units of new affordable housing units in the South of Market. Additionally MOHCD supported the preservation of 24 units at risk of converting to market rate in the South of Market under MOHCD's Small Sites Program

### **Tenderloin**

#### ***Community Development***

MOHCD continued to provide key funding for translation services to the Southeast Asian community, and provided funding to support a coalition of Tenderloin-based youth service organizations. It also continued to fund a broad variety of homeless services in the Tenderloin. It continued its support for a Tenderloin-based cultural district serving the transgender community, especially those most vulnerable including transgender women of color leaving incarceration.

#### ***Workforce Development***

OEWD continues to provide funding and technical assistance to multiple community-based organizations in the Tenderloin to leverage City resources and develop pipelines for sufficiency wage employment. OEWD in 2017 opened a job center in the Tenderloin to help residents access job readiness training, coaching, job placement and retention services, and receive referral to OEWD's certificated, career pathway programs in high-growth sectors. Providers deliver services in English, Vietnamese and Chinese, and are embedded in the community in which they serve. The job center integrates services, including housing stabilization, to prioritize overall family system health and wellness, with an emphasis on economic self-sufficiency.

#### ***Economic Development***

Economic development strategies play an important role in stabilizing and enhancing commercial districts. The Office on Economic and Workforce Development's Invest in Neighborhoods (IIN) program includes the Tenderloin. Within the South of Market IIN has partnered with MOHCD to support and fund cultural district activities, within the Filipino cultural heritage district, that align with economic development goals in the area. Part of our economic stabilization strategy within FY 2018-2019 included retaining and attracting small businesses, small business incubation, supporting arts projects that activate and transform spaces, strengthening community partners, neighborhood marketing and investing city resources in cleaning and public safety.

- **Small Businesses:** retention and attraction of community serving businesses that improve safety by activating empty spaces including lease negotiations.. Providing temporary installation opportunities at events and popups in storefronts. Supporting development of a SOMA Pilipinas merchant association. Provided 12 mini grants to small businesses for purchasing equipment. required by SFDPH with the objective of improving health scores.
- **Arts:** support programming and partners including: 826 Valencia, A.C.T. Stand and The Costume Shop, Center for New Music, Hospitality House's Community Arts Program, Counterpulse, Luggage Store Gallery, and Safe House for the Arts.
- **Public safety:** the most significant increased public investment in safety in the Tenderloin has been the significant increase in the number of officers assigned to the Tenderloin station and support and investments from Safe Passage and the Golden Gate Safety Group, as well as support for the Community Benefits Districts safety camera program. Also, the City investments in improved facades with greater transparency and lighting features. Supported formation of community block safety groups.
- **Cleaning Services:** Public Works dispatches litter patrols for small items and steamer services 24 hours a day, 7 days a week to meet its street cleaning goal. Downtown Streets Team, Tenderloin Clean and SoMa Clean engage a community-based non-profit to employ individuals – many formerly incarcerated – to perform manual-street cleaning each weekday morning in areas of San Francisco most impacted by dirty streets.
- **Public Space Activations:** Supporting Filipino Night Market to create positive activation, improve public safety, celebrate the arts and providing opportunities for small businesses to make revenue and expose their products.
- **Neighborhood Marketing:** Marketing and promotion of activities within the Filipino cultural heritage district.

### ***Multi-Family Housing Development***

MOHCD supported the construction of 113 units and predevelopment of 108 units of new affordable rental housing in the Tenderloin. It also supported the continued rehabilitation of 96 units of rental housing preserved under the RAD Program.

### **Visitacion Valley**

#### ***Community Development***

MOHCD provided support for extensive supportive services to Sunnydale residents in this HOPE SF public housing site, ensuring ongoing tenant stability and relocation information. It also continued to support the monthly convening of Visitacion Valley social service providers to ensure coordination of services and ongoing communication about collaboration and program synergy. It also provided key capital funding to renovate the facility at 50 Raymond which serves as a services hub for the Visitacion Valley community.

#### ***Workforce Development***

In alignment with MOHCD's efforts, OEWD facilitated a partnership with HOPE SF to connect public housing residents to employment opportunities. Service providers receive training on key success indicators and referral procedures for sector training employment pathway programs. OEWD and HOPE SF, in partnership with the San Francisco Housing Authority, collaborated to request federal funding for economic mobility coaches, targeted employment services, and earned income disregard policy changes to temporarily exclude new income from consideration for public housing rent increases. Similarly,

OEWD partnered with City agencies and a labor management partnership to create an eight-week job training program targeted to residents of public housing. Collaborations such as these build capacity for service providers within public housing to move residents into economic mobility pathways and for residents to develop stable economic environments, ultimately alleviating intergenerational poverty.

OEWD additionally contracts with workforce community-based organizations in the Visitacion Valley area and maintains a high-performing jobs center which provides career training and industry certifications, job readiness training, youth workforce development, and barrier removal services. As a deeply-embedded community-based organization, the Visitacion Valley job center is a known quantity in the Southeast corridor and conducts outreach to nine public housing sites.

### ***Multi-Family Housing Development***

MOHCD continued to support the rebuilding efforts of Sunnydale under the HOPE SF Program by funding preconstruction activities for the second vertical development of the Sunnydale, which will result in 169 units of family housing including 125 replacement public housing units and continued construction of the first vertical phase of Sunnydale with 55 new units of which 41 are public housing replacement units.

## Leveraging

**Explain how federal funds leveraged additional resources (private, state and local funds), including a description of how matching requirements were satisfied, as well as how any publicly owned land or property located within the jurisdiction that were used to address the needs identified in the plan.**

Federal funds were leveraged with all of the additional resources that were originally indicated in the 2018-2019 Action Plan, and MOHCD provided certifications for consistency for other HUD programs.

### **City and County of San Francisco Local General Fund**

In 2018-2019, the City invested additional General Fund dollars to expand the City's community development portfolio. MOHCD administered approximately \$29 million of grant funding to support a diverse range of programs, including legal services, eviction prevention, service connection, services to transitional age youth, organizational capacity building, and services to residents of HOPE SF public housing sites.

During FY 2018-19, OEWD's Invest in Neighborhoods Initiative provided over \$7 million in General Fund for neighborhood projects, of which \$6.5 million was granted to local non-profits to support catalytic projects and programs in pilot commercial districts that contribute to neighborhood vitality, increase economic activity and leverage and build local leadership and social capital:

- **Healthy Retail SF:** OEWD in partnership with DPH, has helped over 20 corner stores in Tenderloin, Bayview, and the OMI through our Healthy Retail SF program to sell more healthy food options. The 9 Healthy RetailSF stores saw an average of 25% increase in sales - \$5000 a month per store - and over 11,000 units of produce being sold.
- **Disaster Relief Fund:** Unfortunately we had to utilize this program twice this year:
  - Geary St. was provided relief funds to 1 business and 1 nonprofit
  - Bayview was provided funds to 1 business.
- **Access to Capital:** By supporting the loan programs, we will be able to address the increasing needs for affordable and fair capital for the City's low-income, minority, and women-owned micro-entrepreneurs and small businesses.
- In FY18-19, San Francisco's loan programs provided 38 loans totaling more than \$3,588,363 to small businesses, creating and retaining 255 jobs.
- **Women Entrepreneurship Programs:** The SF Women Entrepreneurship Fund (SFWEF) successfully completed it's pilot year and funded 31 women-owned small businesses with a \$5,000 grant to expand their business. SFWEF joins OEWD's suite of programs assisting women entrepreneurs launch and grow in the City. Other long-standing programs include Bayview Women/Ren Tank, Established Women, La Cocina's Food Incubator Program, and Wu Yee Family Child Care Small Business Development Program.
- **Construction Mitigation:** As part of an interagency collaboration with SFMTA, Public Works, and PUC, a Citywide Construction Mitigation Program has been developed that provides a suite

of services to neighborhoods undergoing infrastructure improvements. This year OEWD has partnered with

- In addition, OEWD provided directed business support in the form of grants to 61 small businesses whose revenues had been adversely affected by the Central Subway Construction. Target neighborhoods included Chinatown, Union Square, and 4th street. Small business owners received one-on-one business assistance, resources and grants in the amount of \$5,000 or \$10,000 based on direct or indirect construction impact to help them improve their revenue and business operations.

San Francisco Small Business Development Center (SBDC): OEWD applied and was awarded a Small Business Administrations (SBA) grant of \$205,000 to implement the SBDC program, a program that provided no-cost business training and business consulting to San Francisco-based businesses. OEWD was awarded an additional \$266,418 by the State of California to implement an Access to Capital Program and Expand Technical assistance under the SBDC.

- Fiscal Year 2018-19 Milestones:
  - Counseled 665 Unique Clients
  - Provided 3,702 Hours of Consulting
  - Trained 504 Workshop Participants
  - Offered 59 Workshops
  - Change in Sales: \$63,894,256
  - Dollar Amount of Loans: \$2,011,250
  - Dollar Amount of Equity: \$9,671,066
  - Jobs Created: 194
  - Jobs Retained: 139
  - New Businesses Created: 30
- Business Retention / Strengthening: Our top priority has been to deploy targeted programs that retain and strengthen our small businesses including real estate and legal assistance, business planning, façade and tenant improvements, ADA compliance and assistance and continuation of the Women Entrepreneurship's Fund programs.
- Retention / Relocation: The Retention and Relocation program is a collaboration with Working Solutions and the Small Business Development Center (SBDC) focused on the proactive outreach to neighborhood-serving small businesses to strengthen their operations and leases to stay in the City. In Fiscal year 2018-19, the program assisted 34 new clients, reviewed 34 leases, submitted 17 letter of intent, and signed 16 new leases. Additionally, the program helped clients access \$173,310 in grants and \$25,000 in loans.

### **City and County of San Francisco Local Housing Trust Fund**

In 2012, the voters of San Francisco approved the creation of the Housing Trust Fund, with funding to begin in 2013. The Housing Trust Fund began with a set aside of \$20 million in general fund revenue and will increase to \$50 million over time. An estimated \$1.1 billion will be invested in affordable housing production over the next 30 years. In 2018-19 the City invested \$8.5 million from the Housing Trust Fund into affordable housing and related programs. The fund will:

- Develop more than 9,000 units of permanently affordable housing for residents whose average median income (AMI) is 60 percent or below. Those projects include the HOPE SF rebuild of Sunnydale and Potrero;
- Preserve the affordability of existing rent-controlled housing by acquiring the properties through MOHCD's Small Sites Program and enforcing affordability restrictions while not displacing any current residents;
- Investing in the conversion of over 3,400 distressed public housing to stable nonprofit private ownership and management under HUD's Rental Assistance Demonstration Program;
- Invest at least \$15 million over the first five years in a down payment assistance program for residents to purchase a home in San Francisco with no-interest loans to first-time homebuyers;
- Create a Complete Neighborhoods program that invests in improved community amenities in neighborhoods impacted by increased housing density;
- Support increased access to rental and ownership housing services;
- Support increased eviction prevention services, and
- Fund a Homeowner Emergency Loan Program to help distressed homeowners remain in their homes.

### **San Francisco General Obligation Bonds**

In November 2015 San Francisco voters approved a \$310 million Proposition A General Obligation Bond for financing the construction, acquisition, improvement, rehabilitation, preservation and repair of affordable housing for low and middle-income households. The first \$75 million of the bonds were issued in October 2016, of which \$40.6 million was for public housing revitalization, \$22.9 million for low-income housing, \$7.0 million for the Mission neighborhood, and \$3.8 million for downpayment assistance for middle-income households and the Teacher Next Door Program. The second \$143.1 million of the bonds were issued in May 2018, of which \$400,000 was for public housing revitalization, \$67.5 million for low-income housing, \$42.6 million for the Mission neighborhood, and \$29.8 million for middle-income housing, downpayment assistance and the Teacher Next Door program. A Notice of Fund Availability for the initial bond proceeds was issued for acquisition and predevelopment of new affordable housing developments, including funding specifically for a new development in the Mission neighborhood. As of June 2019 only approximately \$500,000 of the first \$75 million issuance and \$49 million of the second \$140 million remained unencumbered or unexpended but expect to be fully expended by early and late 2020 respectively. Expenditures to date include loans for 653 new affordable rental units in the Tenderloin, Excelsior and Mission neighborhoods as well as 178 new affordable and middle income units near the San Francisco waterfront on public land owned by the San Francisco Port and MOHCD and 82 units for educator rental housing in the Sunset on San Francisco Unified School District-owned land. Additional expenditures assisted 408 new affordable and replacement public housing units for public housing revitalization at Sunnydale and Potrero public housing sites. The 2015 Prop A Bond is also used for MOHCD's Small Sites Program, which helps nonprofits acquire and preserve the affordability of rent-controlled properties whose tenants are risk of eviction under the Ellis Act. As of June 2019 the 2015 Prop A bond helped acquire 12 at-risk buildings with 77 housing units under the Small Sites Program. The 2015 Prop A Bond also provide assistance to first-time homebuyers with downpayment assistance including educators with purchasing their first home. As of June 2019 the 2015 Prop A Bond provided 70 downpayment assistance loans for teachers and other first-time homebuyers. The third and final issuance of bonds for the remaining \$92 million is expected to occur in late 2019.

In November 2016 San Francisco voters approved Proposition C that repurposes existing bond authority to issue up to \$260.7 million to address critical housing needs, protect residents and stabilize communities. These bonds will be used to fund MOHCD's Preservation and Seismic Safety Program (PASS), which will 1) preserve affordability in existing housing at risk of market-rate conversion, 2) protect San Franciscans living in apartments at risk of displacement, and 3) improve the earthquake resilience of San Francisco's building stock. PASS provides MOHCD's borrowers with low-cost and long-term access to debt financing to acquire, rehabilitate, and preserve existing buildings as permanently affordable housing. Eligible projects may be small buildings like those typically funded by the City's Small Sites Program (e.g. 5 to 25 units), larger multifamily structures (e.g. 25+ units), or Single Room Occupancy hotels (SROs) of all sizes. The first issuance of \$72.4 million occurred in February 2019 and as of June 2019 already assisted with the acquisition and preservation of 30 projects with 406 affordable housing units, including a 86-unit building in the Tenderloin that is home to predominantly low-income individuals and families and 24 formerly homeless residents. The second issuance is projected to assist ten additional projects with 70 units.

### **Housing Impact Fees**

MOHCD receives various housing impact fees paid by market rate housing developers as a means to meet their inclusionary housing obligations. MOHCD also received housing impact fees from developers of non-residential development under the Jobs-Housing Linkage ordinance. Furthermore housing impact fees in specific plan areas developed by the Planning Department and approved by the Board of Supervisors are collected for investment by MOHCD in those plan areas. Of the housing impact fees collected for inclusionary housing in-lieu fees, 10% of those fees are required under City ordinance to be used for acquiring and rehabilitating existing housing stock that is 20 units and smaller as a way to preserve the existing housing for lower income San Francisco residents under MOHCD's Small Sites Program. In 2018-2019 MOHCD invested \$38 million of inclusionary housing and Jobs Housing Linkage impact fees for the development of 134 new affordable housing units for low-income families, seniors, the developmentally disabled and acquisition of two small properties under MOHCD's Small Sites Program.

### **Program Income from former Redevelopment Agency Assets**

With the dissolution of redevelopment agencies in 2011, MOHCD assumed responsibility of all former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency housing assets, including administration of any program income received from those assets. In 2018-2019 did not expend any program income from former redevelopment assets.

### **Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund**

The Low-Moderate Income Housing Asset Fund is the fund used to administer any program income received from former Redevelopment Agency assets. Please see the Program Income from former Redevelopment Agency Assets section above.

### **Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII) Funding**

The sources of funding for OCII's affordable housing include taxable housing bonds authorized under Redevelopment Dissolution law, "pay-go" tax increment, and developer fees such as jobs-housing linkage fees.

### **Healthy Homes and Lead-Based Paint Hazard Control Program**

The San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development is revising its administration of a City-funded program to address health and safety measures and lead-based paint hazard control. The new program will be a component of the day-to-day programmatic activities of MOHCD's Homeownership and Below-Market Rate programs available to low-income homeowners and to property owners with low-income tenants funded.

With the program revision, MOHCD will continue to address lead hazards and other health conditions stemming from poor quality housing and prioritizes lead remediation activities for qualifying properties referred by our public health, legal aid, code enforcement, and housing rights partners.

#### **South of Market Community Stabilization Fund (SoMa Fund)**

The SoMa Fund was created in 2005 to mitigate the impacts of residential development and provide community stabilization benefits in the South of Market (SoMa) neighborhood. Funds are used to address the impacts of rapid development and gentrification on residents and businesses in SoMa, including affordable housing, workforce and economic development, community cohesion, capital projects and physical infrastructure. A Community Advisory Committee, comprised of seven members representing various stakeholder groups in the neighborhood, makes recommendations to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors on the SoMa Fund's priorities and expenditures.

In 2018-2019, the SoMa Fund expended \$1.3 million on services, including organizational capacity building, neighborhood arts projects, eviction prevention, job skills and placement, small business incubation and cultural district support. \$150K was also allocated to develop and implement trauma-informed systems within the SoMa public school, Bessie Carmichael.

#### **Programmatic Agreement for Compliance with National Historic Preservation Act**

The City and County of San Francisco, acting through the Mayor's Office of Housing, negotiated a Programmatic Agreement (PA) with the California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) in January 2007. The agreement ensures that the City and County of San Francisco meets its obligations under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and establishes the standards, stipulations and procedures which govern the Section 106 review of City and County of San Francisco projects subject to 24 CFR Part 58. The agreement allows for the expedited review of construction projects which have the potential to affect cultural resources and which are subject to 24 CFR Part 58. Projects subject to 24 CFR Part 58 include the Community Development Block Grant, Emergency Solutions Grant, HOME Investment Partnership, Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS, and other numerous HUD programs.

The review process contemplated by the PA also allows for the exemption of routine capital projects necessary to maintain public facilities in good repair and ensure they comply with existing building codes. Examples of such projects include the replacement of roofing materials, the upgrading of electrical wiring and the repair of fencing. In addition, the PA sets forth methodology for the determination of eligibility of resources for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, consultation with Native Americans, and setting the boundaries of the Area of Potential Effects of different types of projects. The PA does not reduce the level of protection afforded by the National Historic Preservation Act to cultural resources; the PA expedites and streamlines review under the National Environmental Policy Act. The PA is authorized by 36 CFR §800.14(b).

The PA has been used to successfully conduct Section 106 reviews on projects ranging from routine rehabilitation to the construction of housing developments of over 3,400 units. The programmatic agreement has considerably reduced project implementation time and costs. Every six months, the City files a Programmatic Agreement Compliance Report (PACR) with the California Office of Historic Preservation and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. The PACR summarizes Part 58 activities subject to the PA during the previous six months. To date, 23 PACRS have been filed with the SHPO and the ACHP.

### **ESG Match**

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. For program year 2018-2019, a total of \$15,784,252 in non-ESG funds was provided by ESG sub-recipient to support the emergency shelter, rapid re-housing and homeless prevention activities that were supported by ESG funding.

### **HOME Match**

HOME regulations also require that localities provide a 25% match for HOME project expenditures. The City met its HOME Match amount by committing \$9,960,081 in local funds to HOME-funded projects in FY2018-2019.

### **Publicly Owned Land and Property**

San Francisco currently leverages publicly owned land to strategically deliver essential services when possible. For example, a number of social service hubs are operated out of City-owned buildings that are master-leased to community based organizations. In addition, many youth services are located within elementary, middle, or high schools within the public school system as part of San Francisco's "Beacon" program. Visitacion Valley, a HUD-approved NRSA, is an excellent example of this leveraging, as it has two different multi-tenant buildings owned by the City and leased to nonprofits to provide a range of childcare, youth, family resource, and senior services, in addition to a public-school base youth services Beacon Center.

In 2002, the City of San Francisco passed an ordinance requiring the transfer of underutilized or surplus property to the Mayor's Office of Housing for the development of affordable housing, particularly housing for the homeless.

Properties that are suitable for housing development are to be sold or leased to a non-profit for the development of affordable housing for the homeless and households earning less than 20 percent of Area Median Income or the property is sold and those proceeds are used to develop affordable housing for the homeless, or affordable housing for households earning less than 60 percent of AMI. Additionally MOHCD works with other agencies not subject to the Surplus Property Ordinance to acquire properties they deem surplus and develop the sites into affordable housing such as land from the San Francisco Unified School District, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, and the Port of San Francisco.

In 2018-2019, MOHCD provided preconstruction funding for three publicly-owned sites for which it issued Request for Proposals or Requests for Qualifications in 2017-2018. These projects include

affordable housing for low-income and homeless families or special need populations such as very low-income seniors or transition-age youth as well as low and moderate-income households.

<b>Fiscal Year Summary – HOME Match</b>	
1. Excess match from prior Federal fiscal year	14,279,435
2. Match contributed during current Federal fiscal year	9,960,081
3. Total match available for current Federal fiscal year (Line 1 plus Line 2)	24,239,516
4. Match liability for current Federal fiscal year	1,578,284
5. Excess match carried over to next Federal fiscal year (Line 3 minus Line 4)	22,661,232

**Table 4 – Fiscal Year Summary - HOME Match Report**

Match Contribution for the Federal Fiscal Year								
Project No. or Other ID	Date of Contribution	Cash (non-Federal sources)	Foregone Taxes, Fees, Charges	Appraised Land/Real Property	Required Infrastructure	Site Preparation, Construction Materials, Donated labor	Bond Financing	Total Match
1296 SHOTWELL GOB	6/30/2019	9,960,081	0	0	0	0	0	9,960,081

Table 5 – Match Contribution for the Federal Fiscal Year

### HOME MBE/WBE report

Program Income – Enter the program amounts for the reporting period				
Balance on hand at begin-ning of reporting period \$	Amount received during reporting period \$	Total amount expended during reporting period \$	Amount expended for TBRA \$	Balance on hand at end of reporting period \$
569,711	1,136,709	448,351	0	1,258,069

Table 6 – Program Income

Minority Business Enterprises and Women Business Enterprises – Indicate the number and dollar value of contracts for HOME projects completed during the reporting period						
	Total	Minority Business Enterprises				White Non-Hispanic
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	
Contracts						
Dollar Amount	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-Contracts						
Number	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dollar Amount	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	Women Business Enterprises	Male			
Contracts						
Dollar Amount	0	0	0			
Number	0	0	0			
Sub-Contracts						
Number	0	0	0			
Dollar Amount	0	0	0			

**Table 7 – Minority Business and Women Business Enterprises**

<b>Minority Owners of Rental Property – Indicate the number of HOME assisted rental property owners and the total amount of HOME funds in these rental properties assisted</b>						
	<b>Total</b>	<b>Minority Property Owners</b>				<b>White Non-Hispanic</b>
		<b>Alaskan Native or American Indian</b>	<b>Asian or Pacific Islander</b>	<b>Black Non-Hispanic</b>	<b>Hispanic</b>	
Number	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dollar Amount	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Table 8 – Minority Owners of Rental Property**

<b>Relocation and Real Property Acquisition</b> – Indicate the number of persons displaced, the cost of relocation payments, the number of parcels acquired, and the cost of acquisition						
Parcels Acquired		0		0		
Businesses Displaced		0		0		
Nonprofit Organizations Displaced		0		0		
Households Temporarily Relocated, not Displaced		0		0		
Households Displaced	Total	Minority Property Enterprises				White Non-Hispanic
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	
Number	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cost	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Table 9 – Relocation and Real Property Acquisition**

## CR-20 - Affordable Housing 91.520(b)

**Discuss how these outcomes will impact future annual action plans.**

As discussed above, any projects delayed from funding in 2018-2019 and funded in 2019-2020 will be applied toward the 2019-2020 Action Plan and its affordable housing goals.

**Include the number of extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income persons served by each activity where information on income by family size is required to determine the eligibility of the activity.**

Number of Persons Served	CDBG Actual	HOME Actual
Extremely Low-income	0	0
Low-income	106	0
Moderate-income	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>0</b>

**Table 10 – Number of Persons Served**

### **Narrative Information**

CDBG assisted the pre-rehabilitation planning of 106 units for low-income households in South of Market Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area.

## **CR-25 - Homeless and Other Special Needs 91.220(d, e); 91.320(d, e); 91.520(c) –**

**Evaluate the jurisdiction's progress in meeting its specific objectives for reducing and ending homelessness through:**

**Reaching out to homeless persons (especially unsheltered persons) and assessing their individual needs**

In December, 2015, Mayor Ed Lee announced the formation of a new Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing as part of his strategy to help homeless residents permanently exit the streets and move into housing and services. The new Department will help achieve the Mayor's goal to help at least 8,000 people out of homelessness forever through strategies that stabilize people's lives through the City's nationally recognized housing and support services and building a system that ends a person's homelessness before it becomes chronic. This Department launched on July 1, 2016.

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. Fifteen 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 assessed through Coordinated Entry as priority status, and not able to navigate health and human services system on their own. Care Managers accept referrals from SFHOT First Responders, through HSH coordinated services, and through high user treatment programs. Within 90 to 120 days, 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.

**Healthy Streets Operations Center:** In January of 2018, HSH joined with the Departments of Emergency Management, Public Works, Public Health, and the Police Department to develop an emergency command center staffed by each department to quickly triage and provide a coordinated response to homelessness and street behavior. HSOC dispatches teams from each agency as needed. HSH dispatches HOT Emergency Responders for urgent individual cases, and its Encampment Response Team for larger encampments. The goal is to connect people quickly to needed services, working as a multi-disciplinary team.

### **Addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons**

The City's Ten Year Plan to End Chronic Homelessness directed the City to move its focus away from traditional emergency shelters and toward shelters with 24-hour crisis clinics, and sobering centers. In 2017, HSH published its Strategic Framework to reduce chronic homelessness by 50%, end homelessness for families with minor children, end unsheltered family homelessness, and reduce homelessness among Transition Aged Youth by 50% by 2023.

Since the Plan was published, HSH has significantly expanded its Navigation Center programs. Navigation Centers are low-barrier shelters with flexible hours and meal times. They provide services specifically geared to navigate people to housing, and allow people to enter with partners, pets, and property. HSH now oversees five Navigation Centers with more than 570 beds, and is developing another 400 to be completed in the next year. The Department of Public Health has built and expanded its Behavioral Health Navigation Center, providing 29 beds.

The emergency shelter system for adults has remained stable at 1,203 beds. HSH has recently added a team of Housing Navigators to better reach and assess people staying in shelter and provide problem solving (diversion) services along with care management and housing navigation. Since February 2014, homeless persons can make 90-day shelter reservations by calling the City's 311 System. The process makes it easier for seniors, persons with disabilities, and non-English speakers to access the emergency shelter system by eliminating the need to wait in line and instead using the 311 system's 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year translation capabilities. By making it as convenient as possible for homeless adults to access safe, clean emergency shelters when needed, more time is available them to seek employment, to engage with vital services, and to find permanent housing. Providing better access to the emergency shelter system enables the City to maximize the number of beds that are used every night, leaving fewer people on the street at night.

Although permanent housing is the primary goal for people who are homeless, interim housing is a necessity until the stock of housing affordable to people with extremely low incomes can accommodate the demand. Interim housing should be available to all those who do not have an immediate option for permanent housing, so that no one is forced to sleep on the streets. HSH has worked to make interim housing safe and easily accessible and structured to provide services that assist people in accessing treatment and housing as quickly as possible.

Problem Solving engages the person or household in identifying possible solutions that will work best for them. It is a strengths-based and empowerment-driven approach: it recognizes and affirms the resiliency and resources of the person or household experiencing the housing crisis. Problem Solving maintains that the person or household drives their own solutions. By engaging all people seeking assistance in exploratory conversations around resources they may be able to access outside of shelters and the HRS, Problem Solving helps to ensure that all safe, alternate resources have been explored prior to accessing the limited resources of the system. This intervention preserves shelter and housing programs for those with highest needs who have no other options. Problem Solving also increases the efficiency of the HRS as well. Through connections to alternate mainstream and personal resources that help people maintain or regain housing, Problem Solving approaches support resolutions of homelessness at much lower costs and with greater timeliness than shelter, Navigation Centers or the HRS' permanent housing resources. In recognition that HRS financial resources to address housing crises is limited, the integration of lower-cost solutions is critical to the overall system's capacity to make an impact in significantly reducing homelessness.

Coordinated Entry is a key component, tying all of the system's programs together. Like a triage nurse in an emergency room, Coordinated Entry assesses needs and prioritizes available resources, while keeping track of all who seek assistance. Coordinated Entry provides a standardized assessment that matches the household in need with the most appropriate available resource. Coordinated Entry also prioritizes households seeking assistance to ensure that those with highest need do not fall through the cracks or get lost navigating the complexities of different programs.

HSH has opened 12 community-based Access Points to Provide Coordinated Entry Problem Solving to all people experiencing homelessness in San Francisco, and assess all people experiencing homelessness for housing solutions if Problem Solving is unable to resolve their homelessness. This year, HSH and our partners have provided Problem Solving and Assessment to 8,000 households in San Francisco.

**Helping low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless, especially extremely low-income individuals and families and those who are: likely to become homeless after 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); and, receiving assistance from public or private agencies that address housing, health, social services, employment, education, or youth needs**

MOHCD's homeless and homeless prevention programs align with the City's 5-Year Homeless Strategic Framework to achieve the Framework's following objective:

- Prevent homelessness by intervening to avoid evictions from permanent housing that lead to homelessness. Increase outreach and education about eviction-prevention resources, including

financial assistance and tenant rights laws. Provide short-term rental support and wraparound services to address underlying issues threatening housing stability and to prevent eviction. Increase the provision of legal services for individuals and families at risk of eviction. Provide rehousing support.

Effective homelessness prevention requires early identification and assistance to help people avoid losing their housing in the first place. Public agencies, including social service agencies, health clinics, schools, the foster care system and city government offices, have an important role to play in this effort as they are often in contact with these households and can provide key information and referrals. San Francisco has a long history of public support for tenant's rights and eviction prevention services which has led to model tenant protections and social support for tenants who are often at risk of eviction and displacement.

Strategies to facilitate the early identification and assistance needed to prevent homelessness include 1) expansion of resources available for rental assistance and for key services that address threats to housing stability; 2) facilitating access to eviction prevention services through education and outreach, expanded legal services and the establishment of specialized eviction prevention programs; and 3) development of standard "just-cause" eviction policies for city-funded programs.

To address the multi-various challenge of homelessness, the homelessness and homeless prevention program is grant-based and melds CDBG, ESG and Housing Trust Fund funding to support homeless prevention and eviction prevention programs, operating support for emergency and transitional shelters, direct services for homeless individuals and families, and supportive housing. This program coordinates closely with other City Departments, in particular the Human Services Agency, to align its strategies.

Through this program, MOHCD administers the HUD Emergency Solutions Grant program as authorized under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act. ESG grants support essential services related to emergency shelter or street outreach; ongoing operations of emergency shelters; and homeless prevention services for those individuals at imminent risk of homelessness.

MOHCD also utilizes Housing Trust Fund funds for tenant-based rental assistance for individuals and families. Finally, it utilizes CDBG funds to support programs preventing homelessness and providing direct services. Homeless prevention programs focus primarily on eviction prevention, including tenant rights trainings, legal representation at eviction hearings, as well as rental vouchers and assistance with first and last month rent. Direct service programs support case management and related services to individuals and families in shelters and on the streets, focusing on those services which will maximize housing stability for those individuals and families.

Ongoing housing stability also depends upon access to a stable and sufficient income stream. However, many homeless people have education deficits, limited job skills and/or gaps in their work history that make it difficult for them to obtain living wage employment. For these reasons, access to education, job training and employment services are vitally important. There are homeless-targeted training and employment services that offer these services in a way that is designed to meet the special needs of homeless people. While these programs are necessary and should be expanded, homeless people also need access to the mainstream workforce development system, which offers a wider range of resources. However, in order to be effective with this population, these mainstream programs must take steps to increase homeless families' and individuals' access and better accommodate their needs.

**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.

## **CR-30 - Public Housing 91.220(h); 91.320(j)**

### **Actions taken to address the needs of public housing**

In 2015, MOHCD closed the financing for Phase 1 of the City's Rental Assistance Demonstration Program (RAD), a HUD initiative that allows for the transfer of public housing buildings to nonprofit ownership. Through this transfer, selected affordable housing teams undertook substantial rehabilitation and preservation work at the properties. In 2016, MOHCD closed RAD Phase 2, bringing the total number of public housing units rehabilitated and preserved to 3,480, and the total value of new resources employed in the effort, including public and private funding, to over \$2 billion. As of September 2019, 27 of the 28 projects have completed rehabilitation. A historic transformation effort, San Francisco's RAD program ensures that thousands of the City's most vulnerable residents can permanently enjoy safe, decent, and affordable housing, with new and comprehensive supportive services in every building. Since 2017, MOHCD has provided technical assistance to owners of 23 San Francisco projects originally subsidized by HUD's Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation program, in support of RAD conversions that will result in increased operating income for these projects. Comprising a total of 1,052 units, these legacy projects date from the 1980s and 1990s and primarily house formerly homeless individuals. Only four of the 23 projects remain to convert under RAD.

#### HOPE SF

##### *Background*

Launched in 2007 and now spanning four mayoral administrations, HOPE SF is a twenty-year human and real estate capital commitment aimed at creating racially equitable, mixed-income communities in which the original public housing residents can experience the benefits of neighborhood transformation. Leveraging MOHCD's investments in public housing and affordable housing transformation, HOPE SF takes a place-based approach by expanding conditions of inclusion and the re-enfranchisement of public housing residents through deep investments in education, economic mobility, health, and community leadership across four of the largest and most historically isolated former public housing communities in the City: Hunters View, Alice Griffith, Potrero Terrace & Annex, and Sunnydale.

##### *Real Estate Development and Infrastructure*

**Hunters View.** With the completion of Block 10, the final 54 former public housing households at Hunters View were successfully re-housed in their community bringing the percentage of legacy families successfully relocated and retained to 70%, a remarkable achievement compared to the national rate of return of 27.6% for all public housing residents in HOPE VI developments from 1993 to 2014. A total of 286 units have been built. Block 10 also houses both a childcare facility and a health and wellness center; it will serve as the community hub of the Hunters View development. Also, the market-rate developer City Ventures finalized a deal to build 80 for-sale townhomes in the community, advancing the mixed-income vision of HOPE SF. Predevelopment on Phase III, which will bring another 107 affordable units to the community, including 54 public housing replacement units, is underway, with construction scheduled for 2020.

**Alice Griffith.** Across three phases, 333 units of newly built affordable housing were completed in Double Rock successfully housing all of the former public housing households, and bringing the retention rate to 82%

Potrero Hill. In January 2019, for the first time in three generations, new construction at Potrero Hill was complete, with 1101 Connecticut delivering 72 state-of-the-art affordable units, 53 of which are set aside for residents of Potrero's public housing units. Block B, the next vertical development, is scheduled to start construction in 2020, delivering up to 165 affordable units. Block A, a market rate project adjacent to Block B, is in its planning stages.

Sunnydale. Parcel Q (55 units) commenced construction in 2017 and is scheduled for completion in October 2019. 41 Sunnydale public housing residents will be rehoused in brand new units. Construction on Block 6 (157 units) will start in November 2019, delivering 125 public housing replacement units. Block 3 has launched predevelopment and will deliver 168 affordable units in 2023.

#### Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD)

MOHCD, San Francisco's affordable housing developers, and the San Francisco Housing Authority (SFHA) have joined forces to preserve public housing through HUD's Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) program. Our San Francisco "RAD Portfolio" includes:

- 28 projects in 8 neighborhood clusters
- 3,480 units
- 2 phases

Conversion to nonprofit ownership and operation under RAD means new project ownership and property management, rehabilitation, and onsite service providers. RAD converts existing public housing funding to long term Section 8 operating subsidies, using both RAD and non-RAD subsidies made available through the disposition of eight SFHA buildings. The combination of RAD and Section 18 rental subsidies results in operating income that has leveraged over \$720 million in tax credit equity and an additional \$240 million in debt to address rehabilitation needs for 3,480 units of public housing.

In March 2014, SFHA selected 8 developer teams (including nonprofit partners) to lead the recapitalization and substantial rehabilitation of "clusters" of buildings. The overall financing plan ensures permanent affordability through the public land trust model, whereby the SFHA retains ownership of the land and leases it to the developers through a 99 year ground lease. Additional safeguards on long-term affordability include a HUD RAD Use Agreement, regulatory restrictions by the City (55 years of affordability required by MOHCD loan documents), the State Tax Credit Allocation Committee (55 years of affordability required by the TCAC Regulatory Agreement), and a 20 year project-based voucher subsidy contract with mandatory renewal. The immediate result at conversion was:

- SFHA transfers ownership/operations to limited partnerships including nonprofit partners
- Rehabilitation of more units through combination of RAD and Section 18
- Better building management
- Improved on site services
- Long-term affordability through public land-trust model
- Buildings' useful lives extended beyond 20 years
- Tenant protections defined and preserved

#### *2014 Milestones (Phase I projects)*

1. HUD grants Commitment to Enter into a HAP (CHAP) for all 41 portfolio, HOPE VI, and HOPE SF projects in January 2014

2. SFHA released the developer RFQ in January 2014
3. SFHA Commission selected developer teams in March and April 2014
4. Tenant Protections - Developed in collaboration with the Housing Rights Committee, National Housing Law Project and Enterprise Foundation; builds on and extends RAD program protections:
  - No change in rent calculation (30% household income)
  - No re-screening
  - No demolition; rehabilitation only
  - No displacement – any resident temporarily relocated will have a right to return to a unit at the same development once repairs are completed
  - Residents will maintain the same eviction protections
  - Residents will maintain grievance procedure rights
  - Residents will maintain the right to file complaints with SFHA and HUD
  - Residents have the right to form resident associations:
    - New owners must provide \$25 per occupied unit per year for resident education, organizing around tenancy issues and training activities
    - At least \$15 per occupied unit must be provided to a legitimate resident association if one exists
    - Income from laundry and vending machines will provide support for the resident organization operations
5. Resident Engagement Strategy developed in collaboration with the Housing Rights Committee, National Housing Law Project, Enterprise Foundation, Public Housing Tenants Association, and Citywide Council – Senior Disabled
  - Multi-lingual flyers and materials were developed to inform residents about the program, tenant protections, FAQs, events and meetings, and the schedule
  - Meetings with residents and developers at the senior and family properties
  - HRC conducting outreach through events, meetings (small and large group) and door-to-door engagement for the senior and family properties
  - Residents met with development teams to provide input on repairs, priorities, and transition concerns
  - RAD working group established to identify best practice for Tenant Engagement
6. RAD working groups established to address policy, procedures and implementation of the following after conversion. Groups are led by MOHCD and SFHA, facilitated by Enterprise and attended by developers, service providers, residents and Tenant Advocates.
  - Relocation
  - Recertification
  - Lease and House Rules
  - Services
  - Waiting list and Referrals
  - Housing Retention
  - Tenant Council

#### *2015 Milestones (Phase 1 & 2)*

- SFHA Relocation Plan created and approved by SFHA Commission and HUD in February 2015
- Lender solicitation and acceptance in April 2015; Bank of America selected
- Projects applied for non-RAD project based vouchers in April 2015

- Projects applied for Tax Credits in June 2015
- Service Connection predevelopment contracts awarded in January 2015
- Workforce contracts for 7 family projects awarded April 2015
- Predevelopment Phase 2 activities begin in summer 2015 (tenant engagement, rehabilitation planning, financing)
- RAD Lease and House Rules packet adopted September 2015
- SFHA Family Briefings completed in August and September 2015
- Lease up activities conducted in September and October 2015
- 14 Phase 1 Housing Retention Plans were approved by MOHCD in October 2015
- 14 Phase 1 projects converted in November 2015
- City supplemental Services Contracts awarded in November 2015
- Relocation and construction began in December 2015

#### *2016 Milestones (Phase 1 & 2)*

- All Phase 2 projects apply to SFHA for non-RAD PBV vouchers in December 2015
- Phase 2 Lender and Investor selected in February 2016
- All Phase 2 environmental approvals completed by February 2016
- All Phase 2 projects applied for tax credits and bonds in Spring 2016
- All Phase 2 projects received bond allocations and tax credit awards in Summer 2016
- City approves soft financing commitments for all Phase 2 projects
- SFHA Phase 2 Family Briefings completed in May and June 2016
- City supplemental Services Contracts continued and awarded for all 28 projects in July 2016
- MOU for Tenant Councils with new owners developed and negotiated for implementation in August 2016. Tenant participation funds in Phase 1 sites held in trust or delivered manually.
- Wait list and Referral procedures developed for anticipated implementation in August 2016. Procedures to be included in MOHCD Tenant Selection plans
- Phase 2 Relocation plan updated for presentation at SFHA Commission in August 2016
- Tenant Selection plans completed for Phase 1 properties
- Lease up activities conducted in August and September 2016
- 14 Phase 2 Housing Retention plans were approved by MOHCD in September 2016
- 14 Phase 2 projects converted in October 2016
- Relocation and Construction began in November 2016
- 2 phase 1 projects completed construction and leased up vacancies by December 31, 2016

#### *2017 Milestones (Phase 1 & 2)*

- Tenant Selection plans completed for Phase 2 properties
- 12 Phase 1 properties leased up all vacancies
- 12 Phase 1 properties completed construction
- 3 Phase 1 properties converted their construction loans to permanent financing
- All Phase 2 properties on track to complete construction on time and within budget
- 23 Tenant Association MOUs are signed and money is dispersed according to the agreement. 5 MOUs have encountered barriers due to construction, relocation and elections.
- City supplemental Services Contracts continued and awarded for all 28 projects in July 2017
- Quarterly meetings for RAD Housing Retention working group consisting of property management staff from all 28 properties with a focus on housing stability systems

- Quarterly meetings for RAD Services working group consisting of services staff from all 28 properties with a focus on community building, health and wellness, economic self sufficiency and housing stability
- Monthly meetings for the RAD Wait list working group consisting of leasing staff with both MOHCD and SFHA to support all wait list and leasing activities in support of filling vacancies at both Phase 1 and Phase 2 sites
- Legal Status update
  - Phase 1 (from November 2015 – December 2017) = 1422 Households
    - 70 legal cases – 19 evictions, 51 stipulated/ mediated agreements **(5%)**
    - 157 repayment agreements **(11%)**
    - Voluntary move outs – 83 **(6%)** (this has been primarily death, higher level of care, moving to next opportunity, etc...)
  - Phase 2 (October 2016 – December 2017 from Phase 2 sites) = 2066 households
    - 48 legal cases – 13 evictions, 35 stipulated/ mediated agreements **(2%)**
    - 189 repayment agreements **(9%)**
    - Voluntary move outs – 84 **(4%)** (this has been primarily death, higher level of care, moving to next opportunity, etc...)

#### *2018 Milestones (Phase 1 & 2)*

- Last 2 Phase 1 properties leased up all vacancies
- Last 2 Phase 1 properties completed construction
- Last 11 Phase 1 properties converted their construction loans to permanent financing
- Phase 2 properties on track to complete construction on time and within budget
- 7 Phase 2 properties leased up all vacancies
- 26 Tenant Association MOUs are signed and money is dispersed according to the agreement. 2 MOUs have encountered barriers due to construction, relocation and elections.
- City supplemental Services Contracts continued and awarded for all 28 projects in July 2018
- Quarterly meetings for RAD Housing Retention working group consisting of property management staff from all 28 properties with a focus on housing stability systems
- Quarterly meetings for RAD Services working group consisting of services staff from all 28 properties with a focus on community building, health and wellness, economic self sufficiency and housing stability
- Monthly meetings for the RAD Wait list working group consisting of leasing staff with both MOHCD and SFHA to support all wait list and leasing activities in support of filling vacancies at primarily Phase 2 sites. Phase 1 sites are managing regular vacancy rates.
- Legal Status update
  - Phase 1 (from January – December 2018) = 1422 Households
    - 42 legal cases – 19 evictions, 35 stipulated/ mediated agreements (3%)
    - 79 repayment agreements (5%)
    - 56 Voluntary move outs – (4%) (this has been primarily death, higher level of care, moving to next opportunity, etc.)
  - Phase 2 (January – December 2018) = 2066 households
    - 49 legal cases – 17 evictions, 32 stipulated/ mediated agreements (2%)
    - 149 repayment agreements (7%)
    - 98 Voluntary move outs (5%) (this has been primarily death, higher level of care, moving to next opportunity, etc.)

## **Actions taken to encourage public housing residents to become more involved in management and participate in homeownership**

The RAD and HOPE SF revitalization programs will increase tenant engagement activities and tenant services substantially. The RAD Services Model and Engagement strategies follows below. At HOPE SF properties, this level of connection is exceeded, with deep case management services and community building supports available to many residents, as further described below.

### RAD Services Model

#### **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. who participate in Community Engagement and Community Building work are available for ongoing resources and activities (Health and Wellness, Educational, Economic Mobility) to learn and expose the community to new choices. One-on-one support is available for residents regarding any needs but especially related to housing stabilization. Staff teams are made up of paraprofessional to professional providers who respond quickly to requests with follow up to ensure information / activities are helpful and accurate. **Off-site services enhance these efforts.** Important key element is for onsite providers to have a relationship with offsite city service providers.

#### **Service Connection – Enhanced information and referral with follow up; Intentional Support for Housing Stabilization; Ongoing Health and Wellness, Educational, and Economic Mobility Activities**

Once engaged and investments have been made in the Housing Development the consistent staff teams who participate in Community Engagement and Community Building work are available for ongoing resources and activities (Health and Wellness, Educational, Economic Mobility) to learn and expose the community to new choices. One-on-one support is available for residents regarding any needs but especially related to housing stabilization. Staff teams are made up of paraprofessional to professional providers who respond quickly to requests with follow up to ensure information / activities are helpful and accurate. **Off-site services enhance these efforts.** Important key element is for onsite providers to have a relationship with offsite city service providers.

### RAD Engagement Strategies

- Weekly meetings between Property Management and Services to coordinate effort support tenants to remain stably housed.
- Monthly meetings between Services and Tenant Councils for coordination of activities and to gather insight into outreach and engagement of tenants.
- Monthly community meetings to inform tenants about what is happening in their development and provide opportunities for community voice
- Monthly newsletters

- Monthly calendar of activities
- Door to door outreach

#### HOPE SF Resident Services and Community Building

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 resident leadership, housing stability, economic mobility, public safety, health and wellness, and education.

In program year 2018-2019, the final two HOPE SF sites (Sunnydale and Potrero Hill) will complete phase one construction of replacement and affordable housing units, and relocation of original families into new units. As such, there continues to be services investments in housing stability activities across the four sites to ensure the successful transition and retention in new housing. New investments in Sunnydale and Potrero will leverage learnings from Hunters View and Alice Griffith, encouraging a collaborative approach to tenant education and intensive housing stability supports at the sites.

Across the HOPE SF portfolio, providers will continue to coordinate the training and placement of residents in construction jobs occurring on site. Developers will continue to engage Residents in community space planning efforts across all four sites, managed by the non-profit developers. Additionally, services and programming assisting with the transition to non-profit management will be ramped up, such as those related to financial literacy, workforce development, and tenant education. Community building activities -- such as senior, teen & family programming, community gardening, and community-wide celebrations -- will also continue to be executed at each of the four HOPE SF sites.

All four HOPE SF sites will continue to build on past success of the Peer Health Leadership program and pilot Health & Wellness Centers, with 4 DPH-led on-site wellness centers and activities launched. Similarly, HOPE SF sites will continue to deepen their educational strategies which are executed in collaboration with the four on-site Educational Liaisons, 8 HOPE SF schools, and families at each of the sites.

At Hunters View, the Bayview YMCA has successfully transitioned on-site households into new units. The YMCA will continue to support housing stability activities, as well as act as lead agency for community building and resident engagement activities at the site.

At Alice Griffith, we continue to support and intensify resident focused programs as we have fully transitioned from CHOICE Neighborhoods funding. The Urban Strategies team will focus on relocation of households and continue to link residents with senior programs, family support programming, youth and education programming, afterschool activities, health and wellness activities, and workforce development opportunities. Bayview Senior Services will provide support for housing stability and community engagement activities. Bayview Association for Youth will more intensively provide education supports to Alice Griffith residents, through the HOPE SF Education Liaison program.

At Potrero Annex/Terrace, Bridge Housing continues to provide community building activities

and foster individual participation in planning sessions. These activities included leadership development and safety workshops, healthy living and parenting groups, gardening/sustainability programs, social activities. Potrero Hill Family support Center (Urban Services YMCA) works with residents to assess, connect and support them in workforce, family support, and educational opportunities. The Potrero Hill Neighborhood House will focus primarily on case management and workforce development of transitional-aged youth. Shanti will work as lead agency in a collaborative intended to support housing stability at the site.

At Sunnydale, Mercy Housing, the Bayview YMCA, APA/Visitation Valley Strong Families, and Sunnydale Teen Center work collaboratively to provide outreach, family support, service connections, health and wellness, and educational activities and community convenings to Sunnydale residents. Mercy will work as lead agency in a collaborative intended to support housing stability at the site.

### **Actions taken to provide assistance to troubled PHAs**

HUD designated SFHA as a “Troubled” agency on December 13, 2012. SFHA executed a Public Housing Authority Recovery and Sustainability Agreement and Action Plan (PHARS) with HUD and the City and County of San Francisco on July 1, 2013. The PHARS Agreement and Action Plan included several milestones for SFHA to achieve recovery and long-term sustainability over fiscal years 2014 and 2015.

Starting in 2014, SFHA began to suffer from a series of more specific, disadvantageous operational events, including the loss of key finance staff, an inability to rehire knowledgeable replacements and a troubled conversion of program and administrative software to a new platform. At the same time, SFHA did have enough HAP funding to allow it to expand its HCV programs. Starting in 2015, SFHA embarked on a major, complex institutional repositioning with the conversion of 3,400 public housing units to the HCV program under the Rental Assistance Demonstration Program (RAD). SFHA also awarded PBV funding to other important affordable housing developments. Despite hiring a reputable consulting firm to help manage the RAD conversion process, hindsight reveals that SFHA did not have the staffing infrastructure to handle the magnitude of RAD’s complicated financing. Though SFHA made many attempts to address its operational and staffing problems, a lack of expert financial reporting and management continued to plague operations.

Housing authorities communicate HAP expenditures and funding projections through their Voucher Management System (VMS). A corollary document that projects annual and multi-year voucher utilization and HAP funding needs is the Two-Year Tool. If the VMS reporting is inaccurately done, then the Two-Year Tool projections are not reliable, and funding shortfalls can easily result. This was the case for SFHA.

On September 6, 2018, HUD’s “Shortfall Prevention Team” (SPT) notified SFHA staff that they were likely to have a shortfall in their HCV HAP funding by the end of the year. SFHA immediately began implementing HUD’s required actions to mitigate the shortfall. In October 2018, the HUD Quality Assurance Division (QAD) conducted onsite review of HCV HAP financials and concluded that, based upon reporting through October 2018, the shortfall would be between \$18 million and \$19 million. However, SFHA’s financial consultant, BDO, with whom SFHA had been working to resolve various accounting and financial issues, advised that the actual shortfall would exceed \$25 million. In Fall 2018

the City made a \$20 million emergency loan to SFHA to cover the shortfall. SFHA and HUD also contributed shortfall funds.

As a result of these developments, a letter from HUD to SFHA dated March 7, 2019, determined that SFHA was in default under its Housing Choice Voucher Consolidated Annual Contributions Contract and its Low Rent Public Housing ("LRPH") Consolidated Annual Contributions Contract. Under the Default Letter, HUD determined it to be in the best interests of the Authority's 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 SFHA's financial management. A Memorandum of Understanding between the City and HUD detailing the transfer of essential functions was drafted in Spring 2019 and is expected to be approved by the City's Board of Supervisors in Fall 2019. Progress toward outsourcing HCV and LRPH program functions is underway. In the interim period, QAD is working closely with SFHA to track a number of Corrective Actions related to QAD's findings. The City and multiple HUD divisions are in regular contact during the transition.

## CR-35 - Other Actions 91.220(j)-(k); 91.320(i)-(j)

**Actions taken 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. 91.220 (j); 91.320 (i)**

### Addressing Barriers to Housing Production<sup>1</sup>

#### Identify Sites Appropriate for Housing Development

San Francisco is relatively dense, and has limited opportunities for infill development. It is critical to identify and make available, through appropriate zoning, adequate sites to meet the City's housing needs—especially affordable housing. The San Francisco Planning Department has successfully developed neighborhood specific housing plans to accommodate the majority of new housing needs anticipated.

In an effort to identify *specific sites* for housing, as well as areas that can be zoned for housing development, all City agencies subject to the Surplus Property Ordinance annually report their surplus properties and those properties are evaluated with regard to their potential for affordable housing development. To the extent that land is not suitable for housing development, the City sells surplus property and uses the proceeds for affordable housing development.

In order to reduce the land required for non-housing functions, such as parking, the Planning Department will consider requiring parking lifts to be supplied in all new housing developments seeking approval for parking at a ratio of 1:1 or above. Also through area plans, especially in transit-rich neighborhoods, parking may be allowed at a ratio of less than 1:1 in order to encourage the use of public transit and maximize a site's use for housing.

Furthermore MOHCD worked closely with the Planning Department to enhanced the State Density Bonus law to fit the San Francisco context, ultimately developing an affordable housing density bonus program for San Francisco whereby additional residential density above what is permitted by regular zoning would be permitted if the development is 100% affordable housing.

#### Encourage "Affordability by Design": Small Units & Rental Units

Using less expensive building materials and building less expensive construction types (e.g. wood frame midrise rather than steel frame high-rise) and creating smaller units can reduce development costs per/unit. High development costs are a major barrier to affordable housing development. The City encourages this type of affordability by design.

---

<sup>1</sup> The following section on Addressing Barriers to Housing Production is cited from the June 2010 Draft Housing Element. The role of the Housing Element is to provide policy background for housing programs and decisions and broad directions towards meeting the City's housing goals. However, parameters specified in the Zoning Map and Planning Code can only be changed through a community process and related legislative process. Thus, not all strategies identified in the Housing Element are certain to be implemented. The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development will explore recommendations of the Housing Element as they pertain to findings from the 2013 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice.

### *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 has explored where secondary units can occur without adversely affecting the neighborhood. To that end the Board of Supervisors approved legislation making it easier to legalize in-law units in certain neighborhoods in San Francisco.

### *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 uses 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. As stated above MOHCD work with the Planning Department to develop a local affordable housing density program that will allow increased density, including 3 additional residential floors above the site's height limit if the housing is 100% affordable.

### *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 may 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 \$275,000-\$350,000 required per unit), financing is amongst the most challenging barriers to affordable housing production. Federal and State programs that historically have supported affordable housing development are not being funded. 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, it the City of San Francisco has stepped up with solutions to finance affordable housing production and preservation with local legislation and bond measures.

### *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 where appropriate, 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 funding source and began using funds from the Housing Trust Fund in July 2013.

#### *2015 Proposition A General Obligation Bond Proceeds*

San Francisco voters approved Proposition A in November 2015, which approved the sale of \$310 million in general obligation bonds to finance the construction, acquisition, improvement, rehabilitation, preservation and repair of affordable housing for low and middle income households, including funding specifically for new development in the Mission neighborhood. Please see the section above for more detail about uses of the bond in 2018-2019.

#### Reduce Regulatory Barriers

Public processing time, staffing, and fees related to City approval make up a considerable portion of affordable development costs. The City has implemented Priority Application Processing through coordination with the Planning Department, Department of Building Inspection, and Department of Public Works for 100% affordable projects. This expedites the review and development process and reduces overall development costs. Current City policy also allows affordable housing developers to pursue zoning accommodations through rezoning and application of a Special Use District. The Planning Department, in consultation with MOHCD and the development community, is implementing of a San Francisco-specific density bonus program expanding upon the State Density Bonus law, which enables a more expeditious land use entitlement process for projects that are 100% affordable housing than

required by local law and granting unlimited zoning exceptions including an increase in height by 3 floors and substantial increase in residential density.

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.

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.

#### **Actions taken to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)**

Obstacles to meeting underserved needs for San Francisco are related to the extent of need in the City and the diversity of the population of the City. Major obstacles are limited funds, language barriers and gaps in institutional structure.

Due to high housing costs, economic conditions, poverty and unemployment, a significantly large number of low-income San Franciscans are not economically self-sufficient. The limited resources that are available to support programs and services that help individuals and families to become self-sufficient are inadequate. The situation is made worse by reductions in funding at the federal, state and

local government levels at the same time as needs are increasing due to the weak economy. To minimize the impact of the City's limited resources, MOHCD and OEWD have increased our strategic coordination with other City departments in an effort to avoid duplication of services and to maximize the leveraging of federal, state and local dollars.

Another major set of obstacles are language barriers. San Francisco has historically been a haven for immigrants. Language barriers impact immigrants' abilities to access necessities such as employment, healthcare, and police protection. Many adult immigrants and refugees are not necessarily literate in their own native languages, and struggle to master the complexities of English. In particular, sophisticated transactions such as legal issues or governmental forms may be confusing. Of all San Franciscans over the age of five, 46% speak a language other than English at home, with the largest language groups being Chinese, Spanish, Tagalog and Russian. Fifty percent of the Asian population are of limited English proficiency (LEP), meaning that they speak English less than "very well." Thirty percent of Asian children are identified as LEP. Fourteen percent of San Francisco households are "linguistically isolated" with no one in the household over the age of 14 indicating that they speak English "well" or "very well". Among Asian households, that number increases to 35%. At the individual level, about 25% of all San Franciscans in the 2008 survey indicated that they did not speak English "very well", which is the third highest percentage in the state of California, and the 10<sup>th</sup> highest percentage of any county in the entire United States.

In response to this particular obstacle, San Francisco uses CDBG resources to provide language-appropriate services to linguistically and culturally isolated individuals and families, including translation services, legal services, vocational ESL instruction, information and referral, and case management. Services are provided through CDBG funding to neighborhood-based multi-service community centers.

Another action that will be taken will be granting those households displaced by Ellis Act evictions, owner move-ins, 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 taken to reduce lead-based paint hazards. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)**

The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development was a multi-grant recipient of HUD's Office of Lead Hazard Control and Healthy Homes until 2015. Since then MOHCD has funded the Healthy Homes and Lead-Based Paint Hazard Control program with City funds. Over the past 20 years, MOHCD 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.

To promote the occupancy of lead safe units by low-income families with children, the program requires property owners to execute a grant agreement, deed of trust, and declaration of restrictions that impose a five year restriction period; forbidding the property owner to evict current tenants; requiring property managers to maintain the property free of lead hazards; affirmatively marketing to low-income families with children; and advertising and coordinating re-rentals through our office. MOHCD maintains a registry of lead remediated housing units, which upon re-rental must be affirmatively marketed to low-income families with children. These re-rentals must also be advertised and coordinated through MOHCD. In addition, MOHCD's monitoring and asset management team performs compliance monitoring requiring the owner to provide documentation of current tenants and property maintenance.

MOHCD'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. Fundamental to the response system, the San Francisco Department of Public Health code enforcement has the legislative authority to cite property owners with a notice of violation whenever there is visibly deteriorated paint in the exterior or interior of a pre-1978 building where children under six may be exposed to the lead hazard. These violations become direct referrals to MOHCD, which provides assistance for the assessment and remediation services of lead hazards in low-income tenant- and owner-occupied housing.

### **Actions taken to reduce the number of poverty-level families. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)**

San Francisco is perceived as a wealthy area with a median household income of \$118,400. Comparatively, the Insight Foundation's Self-Sufficiency Standard assesses San Francisco's family self-sufficiency earnings between \$77,600 and \$148,200, depending on the age of the family's children.

By the federal poverty standard, about 10.1% of San Franciscans live in poverty. In contrast, San Francisco Human Service Agency uses the 200% Federal Poverty Level (FPL) measure to determine public benefits eligibility. At this point-in-time, residents experiencing poverty by San Francisco's standards make five times less than the city's median income earners. San Franciscans would need to make approximately 400% FPL in order to achieve self-sufficiency salaries. By these income measures, approximately 40% of city residents are not economically self-sufficient according to the U.S. Census Bureau's 2016 1-Year American Community Survey.

According to Chief Economist, Ted Egan, between 1990 and 2010, the population living in Extremely Low / Very Low income households (those earning less than 50% of Area Median Income) has grown the most. Growth has also been seen in households earning over 150% of area median income, and, to a lesser extent, in those earning 120-150% of AMI. The low income population (50-80% of AMI) has seen very slight growth, and the moderate income population (80-120%) experienced a decline in absolute numbers.

The cost of housing in San Francisco exacerbates the wealth disparity. Local housing costs not only exceed the national average but, thanks to a housing market crash that affected San Francisco less than other places, the city has the most expensive housing in the region.

OEWD has implemented evidence-based sector academies and programs that provide access to employment opportunities for our priority populations, those most affected by wealth disparity. Our sectors – healthcare, construction, information and communications technology, and hospitality – were selected because of their high growth potential, entry-level employment opportunities, and more importantly, because of their pathways to self-sufficiency and economic security. OEWD’s programming also includes services for more vulnerable populations, including justice-involved individuals, immigrants with limited English proficiency, immigrants with professional or specialized training, veterans, individuals with intellectual or developmental disability, individuals living with HIV/AIDS, and members of the LGBTQ+ community.

All San Franciscans deserve to live in safety and prosperity. But today, not all San Franciscans do. In truth, while we are one City, united in name and government, we remain separate communities. In neighborhoods with concentrated poverty, there is a San Francisco that is a community apart, separated by geography, violence, and decades of neglect. Despite our \$11 billion two-year budget and an unprecedented decade of continuous growth, our city economy remains fragile while 10.1% of our residents live in poverty and 40% do not earn sufficiency wages.

San Francisco’s unequal income distribution and skyrocketing housing prices could jeopardize the City’s future competitiveness and overall economic stability. The role of government is to intervene where the market fails society’s most vulnerable populations, the City’s poorest residents. At the neighborhood level, the City’s policy levers include investing public funds to counteract policies at other levels of government that disadvantage a geographic area, promote localized economic development, create jobs, and increase the provision of goods and services. Because most nonprofits lack the economies of scale to construct infrastructure, and private actors have little incentive to invest in reweaving the frayed social fabric, government through a strategic public-private partnership is uniquely positioned to create the required innovative infrastructure to eradicate poverty. This infrastructure facilitates novel policy development, the formation of equitable redevelopment, enhanced service access and social capital in areas of concentrated poverty.

The Center for American Progress’ Task Force on Poverty recommended that poverty alleviation strategies includes the following four principles:

- Promote Decent Work: People should work and work should pay enough to ensure that workers and their families can avoid poverty, meet basic needs, and save for the future;
- Provide Opportunity for All: Children should grow up in conditions that maximize their opportunities for success; adults should have opportunities throughout their lives to connect to work, get more education, live in a good neighborhood, and move up in the workforce;
- Ensure Economic Security: People should not fall into poverty when they cannot work or work is unavailable, unstable, or pays so little that they cannot make ends meet; and
- Help People Build Wealth: Everyone should have the opportunity to build assets that allow them to weather periods of flux and volatility, and to have the resources that may be essential to advancement and upward mobility.

San Francisco’s anti-poverty strategy embodies all of these guiding principles. Creating opportunity for socially and economically isolated San Franciscans requires a multifaceted and comprehensive approach.

### **Smart Government**

Smart government starts with inter-agency collaboration and community-based partnerships. Across the City, innovative strategies have been developed to provide unprecedented opportunities for our residents. From healthcare to housing, environment to employment, San Francisco is at the forefront of developing and implementing best practices to make our city better for everyone. However, many of the residents in our most disconnected neighborhoods lack the resources they need to connect to those programs and strategies. Low educational attainment, safety concerns, inability to access capital, and the lack of a cohesive social fabric to support residents makes it difficult to reach even the first rungs of these ladders. Working together in four priority areas – homelessness, asset building/homeownership, employment and youth/education – City departments are developing “on-ramps” that give residents the skills and resources they need to take advantage of the City’s innovations.

#### **“On-Ramp” Programs to Address City Goals**

Policy area	Homelessness	Asset Building/Homeownership	Employment	Youth/Education
Goal	To end chronic homelessness	Asset building for low- and moderate-income residents	Living-wage jobs with opportunities for career advancement	All students graduate high school and have the ability to go to college
City strategy	<b>Housing First</b> is a successful program that places homeless individuals into permanent supportive housing with wrap around services	<b>City’s First Time Homebuyers’ Program</b> helps low-income residents afford to own in San Francisco	<b>Four Sectors</b> have been identified by OEWD as having high growth potential for our city. Job training and development programs are aligned around those sectors	<b>SF Promise</b> guarantees college financial assistance for SF students who do well in school and graduate high school
“On-Ramp”	<b>Project Homeless Connect</b> reaches out to homeless individuals every other month and provides a one-stop shop of health and human services for them	<b>Bank on San Francisco</b> is an award winning national model program which allows families dependent on high-cost check-cashers to easily open a starter bank account with mainstream financial institutions <b>Financial Empowerment Center Initiative</b> is an	<b>Career Pathways that promote job mobility and advancement:</b> Creating career pathways that support the ability of residents and workers to attain the industry relevant/recognized	<b>Promise Neighborhood</b> is a federal Department of Education-supported program that brings together City departments and community-based organizations to

Policy area	Homelessness	Asset Building/Homeownership	Employment	Youth/Education
		inter-departmental program to support centers that will conduct financial triage, set goals, and establishes action plans in 5 service areas: money management, improved credit, decreased debt, safe and affordable banking relationships, and build savings	skills employers are looking for is key to job mobility and advancement in the San Francisco labor market. Working in partnership with employers, the City will continue to implement industry-driven pathway approaches that cross learning at the K-12 and post-secondary levels.	transform a low-income, largely immigrant neighborhood by linking family economic security with student academic achievement. It creates a comprehensive, integrated framework of evidence-based services that responds to urgent needs and builds on the foundation of student, family, community, and school strengths and assets. <b>The City's Family Resource Center Initiative</b> brings national and local best practices in parent education and family support to high need communities. This inter-departmental program has tracks for parents of new babies, preschoolers and young kids. It provides support for all parents so they can help each other in the knowledge that it "takes a village".

An on-ramp is only as good as the system to which it connects. In some cases, those systems are not working as well as they could. City departments are working together with community-based organizations to determine situations where existing systems need to be tweaked or overhauled to achieve their intended effect. A critical part is changing the way the system works. If we want these efforts to result in lasting change, we must move beyond the coordination efforts often associated with an initiative to true integration and a new system that lasts beyond the efforts of any group of individuals driving the initiative. To do that will require some changes in the infrastructure that support the programs and services offered by the City.

### **Community Voice**

Innovating means understanding problems and solutions at the ground level. The City must work alongside skilled and informed stakeholders that live in and know the neighborhoods and are able to work with us to pinpoint where systems are breaking down. These organized residents then hold everyone – the City, the nonprofit providers and their fellow residents themselves – accountable for measuring and achieving real results.

### **Shared Data and Goals**

The first fundamental change is to create a mechanism to better share data across City agencies. Sharing data is critical as it allows us to identify specific families in multiple systems of care, who require multiple interventions. Understanding the complete needs of an individual and family helps City programs provide a more customized set of services to those families, ensure those services are coordinated, and identify where there are gaps in services that need to be addressed. Residents will be able to provide informed consent to participate in data sharing.

### **Sector Based Approach to Workforce Development**

San Francisco has identified a sector, or industry-based approach to organize key aspects of its workforce development activities. Sector-based programs are skill-development that align training to meet the specific demands of growing or high demand industries. They incorporate case management, career counseling, and job search assistance for workers.

Sector strategies have emerged as a best practice within federal state and local policy. A report by Public/Private Ventures, *Targeting Industries, Training Workers and Improving Opportunities*, through a longitudinal random assign study found that sector strategies have produced the following results:

- Participants in skills-training programs had decreases in poverty, from 64 percent to 35 percent.
- Participants in skills-training programs accessed higher-quality jobs. The percentage of participants with health insurance available through their employers increased from 49 percent to 73 percent, while the percentage with paid sick leave increased from 35 percent to 58 percent.
- Many participants in skills-training programs obtained jobs in targeted sectors. Among advanced skills-training participants, these positions paid more than positions unrelated to training.
- Sectoral Employment Initiative participants believed the programs helped them achieve success in the labor market. Eighty-three percent of participants agreed that the training prepared them well for work in the targeted sector, and 78 percent said the program had improved their chances of getting a good job.
- Organizations using sectoral approaches other than or in addition to skills training demonstrated the potential to bring about systemic change. In very different contexts, through organizing and advocacy efforts or using leverage with industry contacts to negotiate with educational

institutions, organizations either led or were involved in efforts that brought about significant changes to systems—changes that had the potential to benefit less-educated workers throughout the targeted sector.<sup>2</sup>

San Francisco’s proven sector strategy for workforce development is rooted in detailed economic analysis and forecasting performed by both the San Francisco Office of Economic Analysis (OEA) and the California Employment Development Department (EDD).

The key characteristics of San Francisco’s Sector-Based Approach include

- Identified four priority industries based upon employment growth, job accessibility to moderately skilled workers, career ladder opportunities, and providing self-sufficiency wages.
- Align skill development and occupational skills training to meet the workforce needs of these priority industries.
- Identify intermediaries who can engage industries serve as a bridge to social service providers that work intensively with disadvantaged participants.
- Integrate intensive case management into skill development and job training programs
- Implement and enforce policies that generate employment opportunities for San Francisco workers
- Fund community-based organizations embedded in high-need areas for intervention

### ***Serious Collaboration***

The City will bring together public and philanthropic funding, tap into nonprofit expertise, and work with businesses and corporations to make sure that opportunity is accessible for all people in our communities and that every community can fully contribute its strengths and unique culture to our collective prosperity.

### **Nonprofit Collaboration**

The City cannot do this work alone. There are hundreds of nonprofit organizations that provide critical services, reach out to residents and advocate for change. Without these organizations the social service delivery system simply will not work. However, through surveys and focus groups, we heard from residents that the quality of services was uneven. We also heard from nonprofits themselves that they lacked access to the kind of training and capacity building they believed they needed in order to reach their full potential. The City is working with community-based organizations (CBOs) through a number of capacity building City initiatives to develop new capacity building supports and deeper partnerships. This include the Capacity Building Project within the City’s Controller’s Office; MOHCD’s capacity building programs; the Department of Children, Youth and their Family’s capacity building programs; and the newly created Nonprofit Sector Initiative within the Office of Economic and Workforce Development.

### **Private Investment**

Reducing poverty is a major transformation that the public sector cannot do alone. There is an important role for philanthropy and the private sector to play in its implementation. The vast majority of new job creation will occur in the private sector.

The City sees foundations playing several roles:

---

<sup>2</sup> Roder, Anne; Clymer, Carol; Wyckoff, Laura; *Targeting Industries, Training Workers and Improving Opportunities*; Public Private Ventures 2010

- Providing expert advice
- Jointly funding critical enabling elements of the strategy
- Aligning other funding with the strategy
- Providing support for the strategy in the San Francisco public debate
- Helping identify and raise other philanthropic support

### **Actions taken to develop institutional structure. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)**

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 in a regular working group focused on the issues of nonprofit displacement partnering with community organizations, the Office of Economic and Workforce Development, and the San Francisco Arts Commission. Another example is the Alignment Committee, which was created in 2014 to undertake long and short-term planning for the City's workforce development programs, to set goals and priorities for these programs, to coordinate workforce development activities among City departments, and to monitor their effectiveness. In the coming months, the Alignment Committee will engage with stakeholders from throughout San Francisco to refine this plan into a comprehensive strategy for City workforce development services and investments. Among other stakeholders, the Alignment Committee will hear from jobseekers, employers, community based organizations, labor, and education and training partners.

In addition, staff of the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development and the Office of Economic and Workforce Development uses the Consolidated Plan/Action Plan development process as an opportunity to engage other departments in a dialogue about the current developments and priorities. This dialogue aids the City in being more strategic in the investment of Consolidated Plan dollars.

### **Actions taken to enhance coordination between public and private housing and social service agencies. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)**

The Director of MOHCD meets on a weekly basis with the Director of Planning, the Director of the Building Inspection, the Executive Director of the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, the Mayor's Senior Advisor on Housing, staff from the Mayor's Budget Office, and the Director of

Development for the Office of Economic and Workforce Development to discuss affordable and market-rate housing development issues citywide.

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

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

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

Staff from MOHCD, OCII, the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing also meet on a bi-monthly basis to coordinate the development and operation of the City's permanent supportive housing pipeline and portfolio. This bi-monthly convening provides a regular forum to discuss issues of services coordination, policy, new initiatives, funding opportunities, and emerging needs specific for permanent supportive housing funded by these departments.

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

delivery systems interact to serve people, and recommends ways to improve service coordination and system interaction. Workgroups responsible for carrying out the activities in the plan provide periodic progress reports through presentations to the LTCCC.

MOHCD also coordinates its HOPWA housing activities closely with the San Francisco Housing Authority, in particular when a HOPWA subsidized unit is also supported by a project-based Section 8 voucher.

**Identify actions taken to overcome the effects of any impediments identified in the jurisdictions analysis of impediments to fair housing choice. 91.520(a)**

MOHCD has worked on various initiatives to address the impediments identified in the City's Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice report, including addressing the Impediments to Affordable Housing Development, Impediments to Utilization of Assisted Housing Programs, and Impediments Facing People With a Criminal Record. MOHCD has focused its efforts on increasing affordable housing production through site placement, working with other city agencies to remove regulatory barriers, and creating new financing sources all in order to increase the production of affordable housing as discussed above. In an attempt to overcome the impediment of utilizing assisted housing programs, MOHCD is developing a centralized online housing notification and application system called DAHLIA. This will centralize how people learn about affordable housing opportunities. It will also simplify and centralize how people apply to those housing opportunities. Additionally MOHCD continued to work closely with the Human Rights Commission to implement San Francisco's Fair Chance Ordinance in all City-assisted affordable housing in order to address the impediment facing people with a criminal record. The Fair Chance Ordinance requires that affordable housing providers must first screen housing applicants for all other resident selection criteria before reviewing an applicants criminal record.

## **CR-40 - Monitoring 91.220 and 91.230**

**Describe the standards and procedures used to monitor activities carried out in furtherance of the plan and used 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

In program year 2018-2019, the Community Development Division of MOHCD administered 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 administered the housing activities of the CDBG and HOPWA programs; and all HOME activities. The Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) administered CDBG economic development and workforce development activities. The Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing administered all but one of the ESG activities; the remaining ESG activity was administered by MOHCD.

Activities under the CDBG, ESG and HOPWA community development programs were provided primarily through grant agreements with community-based non-profit organizations which provide a range of services, including legal, job training and placement, case management, information and referral, technical assistance to small businesses and micro-enterprises, homeless, homeless prevention and housing services.

MOHCD and OEWD provided fiscal and programmatic monitoring of each project that received CDBG, ESG and/or HOPWA funds. Monitoring included both internal and on-site reviews. In addition, MOHCD monitored construction projects for labor standards compliance related to the Davis-Bacon regulations. MOHCD also monitored for access requirements related to Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act and the Americans With Disabilities Act. Fair Housing, EEO and Local Business Enterprise (LBE) contracting is monitored by the City's Contract Monitoring Division.

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 entered into a grant agreement which 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 were required of grant recipients, along with financial reports. Program site visits were conducted to determine client eligibility, compliance with Federal and local requirements and program progress. Since most CDBG Public Services grants qualified as limited clientele activities, recipient organizations had to demonstrate that they were verifying income eligibility for their clients to MOHCD and OEWD grant coordinators/community builders at site visits.

For each grant, a MOHCD/OEWD grant coordinator/community builder was responsible for providing technical assistance, reviewing progress reports, conducting on-site visits when appropriate, and evaluating performance outputs and program outcomes. The grant coordinator/community builder was also responsible for reviewing monthly expenditure reports and monitoring for fiscal compliance with regulations and accounting policies. In 201-19, MOHCD continued to dedicate a full-time staff person to focus exclusively on fiscal and compliance monitoring for all of its federally-funded grants.

#### For CDBG-Assisted Business Loans

Each loan recipient was required to enter into an agreement that stipulates the loan conditions and repayment schedule. The borrower was required to comply with a first source hiring agreement covering all jobs to be created as a condition of the loan.

#### Capacity Building for MOHCD/OEWD Staff and Delegate Agencies

In 2018-2019, MOHCD and OEWD continued to invest in the training of its staff to build internal capacity so that MOHCD and OEWD could 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. MOHCD and OEWD collaborated on aligning requests for proposals to minimize administrative burden for delegate agencies.

During the program year, MOHCD and OEWD staff worked closely with the Controller's Office and other City departments in assisting grantees to build internal capacity and to ensure compliance with all city, state and federal requirements.

### **Monitoring for Housing Activities**

#### Single Family (Owner-Occupied) Properties

MOHCD monitored 457 single-family owner-occupied MOHCD-funded properties in 18/19 to ensure ongoing compliance with the program requirements and to ensure that owners of MOHCD-assisted owner occupied properties continue to reside in the property; that they retain title to the property; and that property taxes are current. MOHCD continues to monitor all owner-occupied properties to ensure compliance with regulations and standards of the City's housing programs. In 2018-2019, MOHCD referred 9 non-program compliant homeowners to the City Attorney's Office for the collection of over \$4 million dollars in legal settlements from these homeowners.

#### Multifamily Properties

MOHCD monitored the compliance of 351 City-assisted multifamily rental projects, including 128 CDBG- and HOME-funded rental housing projects to assure compliance with program requirements. Monitoring activities included 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 continues 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 encompassed 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.

In 2018-2019, MOHCD inspected 15 HOME- funded properties.

Project Name	Building Number	Street	Project Sponsor	No. of Units	Inspection Date
Broadway Sansome Family Housing	235 - 295	Broadway	Chinatown Community Development Center	75	6/5/2019
Hunters View (Phase 1)	112	Middle Point	John Stewart Company / Ridgepoint / Devine & Gong	107	5/29/2019
Buena Vista Terrace	1250	Haight	Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation	40	5/22/2019
Crocker Amazon Senior Apartments	5199	Mission	Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center	37	6/19/2019
St. Peter's Place	420	29th	Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center	20	6/21/2019
Mosaica Family Apartments	680	Florida	Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation	93	5/20/2019
990 Polk	990	Polk	Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation	110	6/6/2019
149 Mason Street Apartments	149	Mason	Glide	56	6/26/2019
La Playa Apartments	770	La Playa	Progress Foundation	14	5/24/2019
Ritz Hotel	216	Eddy	Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation	89	6/25/2019
Veterans Commons	150	Otis	Swords To Plowshares / CCDC	76	5/30/2019
Arnett Watson Apartments	650	Eddy	Community Housing Partnership	83	5/16/2019
International Hotel	848	Kearny	Chinatown Community Development Center	105	5/8/2019
Bishop Swing Community House	275	10th	Episcopal Community Services	135	5/1/2019
Casa Quezada	35	Woodward	Dolores Street Community Services	52	5/23/2019

**Citizen Participation Plan 91.105(d); 91.115(d)**

**Describe the efforts to provide citizens with reasonable notice and an opportunity to comment on performance reports.**

The Draft 2018-2019 CAPER is available to the public for review and comment between September 6, 2019 and September 20, 2019. The City published a notice in the San Francisco Examiner on August 30 and September 11, 2019 informing the public of the availability of the draft document for review and comment. The public has access to a hard copy of the document at the Main Branch of the Public Library and at the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development. An electronic copy of the draft document is posted on MOHCD's website.

**CR-45 - CDBG 91.520(c)**

**Specify the nature of, and reasons for, any changes in the jurisdiction's program objectives and indications of how the jurisdiction would change its programs as a result of its experiences.**

No changes.

<b>Does this Jurisdiction have any open Brownfields Economic Development Initiative (BEDI) grants?</b>	No
--	----

**[BEDI grantees] Describe accomplishments and program outcomes during the last year.**

## CR-50 - HOME 91.520(d)

**Include the results of on-site inspections of affordable rental housing assisted under the program to determine compliance with housing codes and other applicable regulations**

**Please list those projects that should have been inspected on-site this program year based upon the schedule in §92.504(d). Indicate which of these were inspected and a summary of issues that were detected during the inspection. For those that were not inspected, please indicate the reason and how you will remedy the situation.**

MOHCD designates all units as HOME-assisted units in any project that receives HOME funding.

MOHCD requires the owner of each HOME-assisted project to submit a signed certification annually that includes the following statements:

The project has met affordability and other leasing provisions set forth in the funding agreement/s entered into with CCSF during the entire reporting period. As of the end date of the reporting period, _____ units ( <i>supply exact number</i> ) were occupied or held vacant and available for rental by low-income tenants meeting the income qualifications pursuant to the funding agreement/s entered into with CCSF.
---

The undersigned has obtained a tenant income certification and/or third party documentation to support that certification from each tenant household occupying a unit restricted to occupancy by income-qualified tenants. All income certifications are maintained onsite with respect to each qualified tenant who resides in a unit or resided therein during the immediately preceding business year.
---

The total charges for rent and a utility allowance to each income-qualified tenant in a restricted unit do not exceed the maximum rent specified in the funding agreement/s entered into with CCSF as adjusted by the most recent HUD income and rent figures, which have been taken from the figures that are supplied by MOHCD on its website.
--

## **Provide an assessment of the jurisdiction's affirmative marketing actions for HOME units. 92.351(b)**

MOHCD continues to rigorously review the affirmative marketing efforts of all of its borrowers at initial marketing and when developers open their wait lists. Monitoring marketing efforts improved greatly and became more efficient in 2018-2019 after MOHCD implemented its online application and listing system called Database of Affordable Housing Listings and Applications (DAHLIA) in 2017-2018.

## **Refer to IDIS reports to describe the amount and use of program income for projects, including the number of projects and owner and tenant characteristics**

MOHCD did not commit any HOME Program Income in Fiscal Year 2018-2019.

**Describe other actions taken to foster and maintain affordable housing. 91.220(k) (STATES ONLY: Including the coordination of LIHTC with the development of affordable housing). 91.320(j)**

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.

## CR-55 - HOPWA 91.520(e)

Identify the number of individuals assisted and the types of assistance provided

Table for report on the one-year goals for the number of households provided housing through the use of HOPWA activities for: short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance payments to prevent homelessness of the individual or family; tenant-based rental assistance; and units provided in housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds.

<b>Number of Households Served Through:</b>	<b>One-year Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>
Short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance payments	90	87
Tenant-based rental assistance	207	198
Units provided in transitional housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	22	20
Units provided in permanent housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	230	213
<b>Total</b>	<b>549</b>	<b>518</b>

**Table 11 – HOPWA Number of Households Served**

### Narrative

San Francisco's Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) is the lead agency to apply for, accept and expend HOPWA funds on behalf of the San Francisco EMSA, which includes the county of San Mateo.

For both the Five-Year Consolidated Plan and the 2018-2019 annual performance periods, HOPWA program goals and objectives were substantially met as evidenced by maximum occupancy of capital projects and rental assistance programs, service utilization, and program stability. HOPWA funds were disbursed and utilized in a timely way.

While no real barriers impacted overall HOPWA Program delivery or success, the exorbitant cost of living and inflated San Francisco housing market continually provided barriers, such as longer and more competitive housing searches, for HOPWA tenants. San Francisco's FMR was increased substantially based on a regional rent study whose findings were accepted by HUD, which may result in a significant number of landlords asking for an increase in rent and further depleting our limited HOPWA funds that support long-term rent subsidies. On-going State and City cuts to psychosocial and medical services raised expenses for HOPWA tenants, making basic survival for those on fixed incomes increasingly challenging. HOPWA subsidy amounts increased over time due to the fluctuating rental market.

The HOPWA Program is effectively meeting the local needs of the AIDS housing community to the extent that funding has allowed. MOHCD hired a programs manager to provide day-to-day oversight of HIV programs to ensure effective service delivery and technical assistance. MOHCD continues to be very

involved with HOPWA contractors to get mutual feedback and collaboration regarding any changing needs or program improvements that need to be made.

For fiscal year 2018-2019, MOHCD entered into an inter-governmental fiscal agreement with the San Mateo County AIDS Program which determines priorities for funding, selects project sponsors, administers the HOPWA funds, and ensures that all HOPWA regulations have been satisfied for their jurisdiction.

Funding for 2018-2019 is summarized as follows:

<b>County</b>	<b>Funding Per Action Plan</b>	<b>FY 18-19 Expenditures</b>
San Francisco	\$6,499,485	\$6,277,823
San Mateo	\$712,763	\$712,763
Total – San Francisco EMSA	\$7,212,248	\$6,990,586

The following sections (by county) provide an overview of the grantee and community, annual performance under the Action Plan, and barriers and trends as required under Part 1, Sections 5a through 5c, of the HOPWA CAPER Measuring Performances Outcomes. All required charts and certifications are located at Appendix B.

### **San Francisco Priorities, Allocations and Accomplishments**

In 2014, MOHCD estimated almost 78% of PLWHA were at-risk of experiencing homelessness, based on being low-income and not receiving any housing supports. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) estimates that, in 2017, 2,280 individuals in California were simultaneously living with HIV/AIDS and experiencing homelessness. Ensuring HIV/AIDS households are able to navigate housing resources and secure housing is critical to preventing homelessness for the PLWHA community.

Due to the nature of transmission, the conditions of homelessness can create further spread of HIV. According to data from Ward 86, the largest clinic in San Francisco serving PLWHA, nearly a third of the 2,600 patients who visit the clinic are extremely impacted by housing instability. In 2017, 14% of the new HIV diagnoses in San Francisco were for individuals experiencing homelessness. According to San Francisco's Department of Public Health (SFDPH), the rates of viral suppression are far lower for individuals with HIV who are also experiencing homelessness.

Community input was an integral part of the strategic planning process; In a series of focus groups conducted by MOHCD, PLWHA and HIV/AIDS service providers pointed out several characteristics that can improve the housing environments of PLWHA. These include safety, quiet and personal outdoor space, having a liaison between building management and tenants, and management being respectful and knowledgeable about HIV/AIDS.

Several notable trends remain 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.

- Of the almost 16,000 individuals living with HIV/AIDS in San Francisco, nearly two-thirds are age 50 and above, and 22% are age 60 and above.
- Persons with HIV/AIDS are living longer and have more stable health status due to antiretroviral therapy.

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

- Among HIV+ homeless individuals, the estimates are highest for subpopulations with co-occurring disorders, disabling HIV/AIDS, and chronic homelessness. Comparing and contrasting these subpopulations reveals that a higher proportion of individuals experience co-occurring disorders than either disabling HIV/AIDS or chronic homelessness. Close to half, 44.2%<sup>3</sup>, of all HIV+ homeless individuals also negotiate co-occurring disorders (defined as mental health and/or substance use addiction co-morbidities).
- Among HIV+ individuals at-risk for being homeless, estimates are highest for seniors and those not receiving care. Current and future support services should tailor their efforts to meet the needs of these subpopulations, and expanding the supportive housing services available would be one mean of doing so.

Examining the time trends of financial support available for HIV/AIDS housing services suggests a discouraging outlook. Ryan White CARE and General Fund support have remained approximately the same since 2007. Given inflation, significant increases in housing costs and increasing costs of service delivery over time, plateaus in funding effectively amount to fewer resources available for HIV/AIDS housing. Support from HOPWA has over time and HOPWA funding in 2019 is now less than that available in 2007, although costs have increased in every area of housing over the past 10 years.

Looking forward, a new HOPWA funding formula has been signed into law as a result of the Housing Opportunity Through Modernization Act of 2016 that was signed into law on July 29, 2016. This new formula is based in part on the number persons living with HIV/AIDS rather than cumulative AIDS cases, and incorporates local housing costs and poverty rates into the formula. The combination of these factors will negatively impact San Francisco's allocation significantly. The projection released by HUD in August, 2017 indicated that this new formula could result in a reduction in HOPWA funding to San Francisco of as much as \$1.3 million by 2022. The impact of this formula change in San Francisco has the potential to further reduce the number of HOPWA funded subsidies as well as reductions in capital.

The strategic planning process also focused on system improvements to make the current array of programs and services more responsive to client needs and the current housing market. System change discussions focused on:

- Matching clients with the best housing program to meet their need.
- Developing a more agile system to respond to clients' changing housing and health needs, as well as other changes to their situations (e.g. income changes).
- Ensuring that the array of housing programs more proportionally matches the needs of the current HIV+ population.

Since the creation of the initial Five-Year Plan, the annual HOPWA budget has been developed in consultation with DPH's HIV Health Services Office and the Planning Council. The FY 2018-2019 annual

budget was presented to the public through the MOHCD website, at a public hearing for citizens and consumers, and before San Francisco's Board of Supervisors prior to final approval.

The FY 2018-2019 Action Plan anticipated \$6,499,485 in HOPWA funding from annual formula allocation of \$6,449,485 and program income of \$50,000. Expenditures during FY 18-19 totaled \$6,277,823 of which \$5,716,687 was funded from annual formula funds and \$561,136 from program income received during FY 2018-2019.

	Funding Per Action Plan	FY 18-19 Expenditures
Capital Projects	\$218,004	\$196,471
Rental Assistance Program	\$2,128,175	\$1,988,128
Supportive Services and Operating Costs	\$3,861,821	\$3,824,206
Housing Information/Referral Services	\$98,000	\$119,103
Grantee Administrative Expenses	\$193,485	\$149,915
Total	\$6,499,485	\$6,277,823

The priorities and objectives of the HOPWA program as reflected in the 2018-19 Action Plan included:

1. Rental Assistance Program (198 tenant based rental assistance subsidies)

During 2018-2019, \$2.0 million was spent on rental assistance (32% of total expenditures). The program provided monthly rental subsidies and housing advocacy services to 198 households during FY 2018-19. This program was also supplemented with \$1.3 million in San Francisco General Funds during the fiscal year. In addition, case management services and employment assistance/training were provided to 83 clients through the Second Start Program.

The cost per unit for tenant based rental assistance (TBRA) continues to be above the national average for this category. This is mainly due to very high housing costs in San Francisco.

2. Services and operating subsidies for five licensed residential care facilities for people with HIV/AIDS and two other facilities for people with HIV/AIDS (192 units—181 in permanent housing facilities and 11 in transitional short-term housing facilities with 233 residents served).

During 2018-2019, \$3.8 million was spent on supportive services and operating subsidies at these 7 facilities (61% of total expenditures) with 233 unduplicated residents assisted. All residents are required to have an income below HUD's very low-income standard—50% of Area Median Income (AMI).

Case managers at the programs coordinate care for residents ensuring maximum usage of available resources. HOPWA provides the largest percentage of funding to these projects, covering supportive services (including nursing care) and a portion of operating expenses. Funding for these programs and facilities are supplemented with federal Ryan White funds, Section 8 project-based vouchers, project sponsor contributions, and private sector funding including grants and donations.

3. Capital Projects:

During FY 2018-2019, \$196,471 was spent on five capital improvement projects approved in prior years. One project was completed and the other four projects are in progress with completion projected in the next two years. There are three other capital improvement projects which have been approved for funding through the Request for Proposal (RFP) process, but not yet started.

All HOPWA activities are targeted to very low-income persons living with HIV/AIDS. Every effort is made to ensure that ethnic and gender diversity is achieved during the selection of eligible clients. Each applicant is required to complete a comprehensive eligibility intake to verify medical diagnosis, income level, and place of residency. Project sponsors are required to provide program evaluation reports on an annual basis.

The HIV Housing Referral List (HHRL), a waitlist managed by the SF Department of Public Health, served persons with HIV/AIDS for programs including HOPWA's Housing Subsidy Assistance Services. HHRL has been closed to new applicants, but in the fall of 2017, a new housing access placement program, called "Plus Housing" was created as part of MOHCD's new affordable housing data portal, Database for Affordable Housing Listings, Information, and Applications (DAHLIA). Since its creation the Plus Housing access placement program has provided a waitlist in which HIV positive households are able to request assistance obtaining a HOPWA subsidized unit as well as a HOPWA full or partial subsidy.

Projects selected to receive HOPWA funding are required to provide supportive services and to demonstrate the ability to access community-based HIV services, such as those funded under the Ryan White CARE Act and other public and private sources.

The following barriers were encountered during the program year:

- |   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> HOPWA/HUD Regulations | <input type="checkbox"/> Planning                      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Housing Availability | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rent Determination and Fair Market Rents |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Discrimination/Confidentiality   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple Diagnoses | <input type="checkbox"/> Eligibility                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Technical Assistance or Training                    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supportive Services   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Credit History     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rental History       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Criminal Justice History                 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Housing Affordability | <input type="checkbox"/> Other, please explain further |  |  |

HOPWA/HUD Regulations: Since the full housing needs of very low income people living with HIV/AIDS have never been fully met with HOPWA funds, increased HOPWA formula funds would best serve the community. In San Francisco, primarily due to access and adherence to anti-retrovirals, there are more people living with HIV/AIDS every year, meaning that there are more people who need housing assistance provided by HOPWA funds each year. It is very difficult to sustain our current programs, let alone meet the increasing need within the current and recent HOPWA funding allocations. Additional HOPWA funding is needed for capital improvements, repairs of existing projects, and for rental subsidies that are lost over time to attrition due to rising costs. Due to the recent decline in HOPWA funding, San Francisco's ability to provide support for capital improvements will come at the cost of direct services to individuals, a reduction in rental subsidies, and/or a reduction to operating cost support of residential facilities. The flexibility to use a portion of HOPWA formula funds for shallow rent subsidy programs would allow the HOPWA program in San Francisco to lose fewer rental subsidies to attrition over time.

Supportive Services: Long-term residential programs often struggle with the need to provide ongoing mental health support services to long-time survivors with intensive mental health needs. Because these mental health needs often exceed the capacity of existing supportive services offered in these facilities, providers often struggle to balance the needs of the individual who may be struggling with mental and behavioral issues, and the needs of the other facility residents who may have difficulty

dealing with the resident as he or she works through their complicated issues. Substance abuse treatment has also been a supportive service area in which providers have asked for more assistance.

Housing Affordability and Availability: Securing subsidies to remain in housing is a key solution to achieving healthy outcomes for PLWHA. In San Francisco, non-payment of rent is the leading cause of eviction. The aforementioned stigma and cost associated with HIV/AIDS care and treatment can create situations that interrupt the ability to pay a fixed rent. A 2012 analysis conducted by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention found that housing status is the strongest predictor of HIV/AIDS health outcomes. Preserving the housing of PLWHA is a fundamental support to ensure positive health outcomes.

Multiple Diagnoses: The overwhelming majority of HOPWA-served people are multiply diagnosed with substance abuse and/or mental health issues. For those living in or seeking independent subsidized housing, these issues can be barriers to finding and maintaining appropriate housing. While services are available at all HOPWA-funded housing programs, participants must be able to locate housing to participate. For those living in supportive HOPWA-funded housing, mental health and substance abuse issues can make living within a community more difficult for those affected by these issues and others living at the sites. HOPWA-funded housing programs do an excellent job in providing services to people who are multiply diagnosed, but these issues can still present barriers to people as they try to live within a supportive community or the greater community.

Long Term Survivor Health Issues: Though retroviral medications continue to sustain and enhance the lives of people living with AIDS, AIDS-related health issues, such as the high prevalence of Hepatitis C and cancers, such as lymphoma, continue to make living with AIDS an unpredictable medical experience. These health issues and the fear and anxiety regarding possible loss of benefits in returning to work continue to be barriers for those already very disabled with AIDs to be able to increase their incomes. Most recently, individuals are beginning to outlive their long-term disability insurance policies, putting their housing status at risk because of the imminent loss of income.

Credit, Rental, and Criminal Justice History: Credit, rental, and criminal justice history can be a barrier for many HOPWA-eligible people, particularly those who are seeking independent housing. As was previously mentioned, San Francisco's rental housing market is extremely competitive, so prospective landlords can be highly selective when choosing tenants. Often HOPWA-eligible people without stellar rental histories have difficulty finding housing even once they have received a rental subsidy.

Fair Market Rents: San Francisco is one of the most expensive and competitive rental housing markets in the country. This further limits the pool of housing available to people who have received HOPWA subsidies. Appropriate increases to FMR's should also be considered when determining the amount of HOPWA funding available to an area.

#### Program Contact

Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development – Manuel S. Vasquez, HIV Housing Programs Manager

***San Mateo Priorities, Allocations and Accomplishments***

San Mateo County's share of HOPWA funding for FY 2018-19 totaled \$712,763 and was fully expended during the fiscal year.

<b><i>Categories</i></b>	<b>Funding Per Action Plan</b>	<b>FY 18-19 Expenditures</b>
Rental Assistance Program	\$604,711	\$605,037
Supportive Services	\$65,373	\$65,373
Project Sponsor Administrative Exp	\$42,679	\$42,353
Total	\$712,763	\$712,763

From the total amount of the award, \$647,390 or 90.8% was utilized to provide housing services including, short-term rent, mortgage, emergency financial assistance, move-in costs, housing information and related project sponsor administrative expenses. \$65,373 or 9.2% of funding was used to provide case management services.

Housing affordability has turned out to be a long-term challenge for residents of San Mateo County. Housing affordability in the County continues to decline every year, while market average rents continue to climb higher and higher. According to September 2018 reports from Apartmentlist.com, San Mateo's median rent for a single bedroom unit was \$3,540 and for two bedrooms was \$4,450. This is a 2.5% increase from the previous year. Policymakers, state and county legislators have been trying to come up with legislation to help alleviate the housing crisis. Some proposed bills to help finance affordable housing may eventually help, but at the present time our clients are not getting a lot a relief. According to a recent study by the National Low Income Housing Coalition (NLIHC), a "fair-market" one-bedroom rate of \$2,500 rent would require at least an annual income of \$99,960 or an hourly rate of \$48.06. These amounts are too high for clients of the program to be able to afford; the difficulty of clients finding employment in general further increases the challenges of affordable housing. In the past few years, the Housing Authority and some shelters had arrangements/contracts for some units of affordable housing. The number of those units has also decreased due to the demand from the population at large, leaving our clients with even less choices. The effect of the high cost of housing has also affected the price of inexpensive hotels/motels, which are also having a higher demand and are able to increase their prices. All of these factors have had a negative impact on clients of the program. They are having to wait longer for the few housing options available, having to pay more from their disposable income for their housing, sometimes travel farther away to their medical appointments, and some have decided to move to other counties where housing has not been impacted as hard as the bay area and San Mateo County.

**A. Rental Assistance Program:**

87 households were assisted during this fiscal year with short-term/emergency rental assistance and 5 of these households also received housing placement services. The 2018-19 Action Plan anticipated that 90 households would be served during the fiscal year.

97% of clients reported that the assistance received from contractor helped them maintain or improve their quality of life.

100% of all clients who responded to an in-house client satisfaction survey indicated satisfaction with the housing services received from contractor.

#### B. Supportive Services:

For the 2018-19 Action Plan, Supportive Services/Medical Case management projected that 180 persons would receive case management services. 279 individuals received case management for need assessments, information and referrals and comprehensive case management, including treatment adherence and community based services aimed to increase their access to care, improve their opportunities of achieving a more stable living environment, and reduce their risk of becoming homeless.

62% of the clients reported that the support services provided by the benefits counselor improved their access to medical care with 36% stating they did not know. 49% said the support services they received at the clinic reduced their risk of homelessness with 38% stating they did not know.

#### Barriers and Trends

The following barriers were encountered during the program year:

- |   |   |  |   |
|---|---|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> HOPWA/HUD Regulations | <input type="checkbox"/> Planning                                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Housing Availability | <input type="checkbox"/> Rent Determination and Fair Market Rents |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Discrimination/Confidentiality   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple Diagnoses            | <input type="checkbox"/> Eligibility                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Technical Assistance or Training         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Supportive Services              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Credit History                | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rental History       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Criminal Justice History      |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Housing Affordability | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other, please explain further |  |   |

HOPWA/HUD Regulations: HOPWA regulations limit service to 21 weeks per year. This isn't always practical as it can take more time than that for clients to make progress toward stability. For example, it regularly takes 6 months to receive a response to a Social Security Disability application and clients rarely have enough income to pay rent while they wait.

Housing Affordability/Availability: Clients continue to be affected by the combination of lower disposable income for housing and the high cost of housing in San Mateo. Affordable housing and even shelter beds are very scarce in San Mateo. In addition, the scarcity of housing in general has increased the number of people who are competing for the few affordable housing units that become available. Housing funding available for clients in other departments has increased the demand for the same hotel/motel rooms and driven the prices up.

Multiple Diagnosis: It continues to be difficult to find housing for some of our multi-diagnosed clients. Some hotels/motels have clearly told us that they do not want to rent to our clients because the behavior they exhibit affects the other tenants and they prefer not to deal with that. This has decreased the availability of short-term housing for our program even more.

#### Credit, Rental, Criminal Justice History:

Many of our clients have poor rental histories and problematic credit histories, which along with a criminal record also have an effect on their ability to obtain housing. Adding these factors to the other health problems our clients have and to the lack of affordable housing units, makes it extremely difficult for our clients to compete for the few housing units available. Program staff works with clients to encourage them to start to establish a good tenant history.

#### Other, please explain further

There continues to be a small number of clients each year who need supported housing. These clients are usually people who are homeless or about to be homeless, ill, but not ill-enough to need long-term-care, and who have cognitive problems. These people would probably benefit from a board and care, but there are few boards and care in the county and wait lists are very long.

Program Contacts

San Mateo County STD/HIV Program - Matt Geltmaker, STD/HIV Program Director

Mental Health Association of San Mateo County - Susan Platte, Program Coordinator