

File No. 200461

Committee Item No. 7

Board Item No. 16

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Budget & Finance Committee

Date May 20, 2020

Board of Supervisors Meeting

Date June 2, 2020

Cmte Board

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Motion |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Resolution |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Ordinance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Legislative Digest |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Budget and Legislative Analyst Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Youth Commission Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Introduction Form |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | MOU |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Grant Information Form |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Grant Budget |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Subcontract Budget |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Contract/Agreement |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Form 126 – Ethics Commission |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Award Letter |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Public Correspondence |

OTHER (Use back side if additional space is needed)

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Environmental Review Record |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |

Completed by: Linda Wong

Date May 15, 2020

Completed by: Linda Wong

Date May 21, 2020

1 [Apply for, Accept, and Expend Grant - United States Department of Housing and Urban
2 Development - Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS Program - \$10,267,229 -
3 FY2020-2021]

4 **Resolution approving the FY2020-2021 Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS**
5 **(HOPWA) Program; and authorizing the Mayor, on behalf of the City and County of San**
6 **Francisco, to apply for, accept, and expend the City’s FY2020-2021 HOPWA Program**
7 **entitlement from the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development in**
8 **the amount of \$7,067,229 and to expend program income and reprogrammed funds in**
9 **the amount of \$3,200,000 for a combined total of \$10,267,229 for the period of July 1,**
10 **2020, through June 30, 2025.**

11
12 WHEREAS, Under the AIDS Housing Opportunity Act, Subtitle D of Title VIII of the
13 National Affordable Housing Act of 1990, Public Law Number 101-625, the City and County of
14 San Francisco is eligible to apply for and receive funds from the Housing Opportunities for
15 Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) Program; and

16 WHEREAS, The City and County of San Francisco anticipates receiving
17 approximately \$7,067,229 in FY2020-2021 HOPWA Program funds from HUD and has
18 approximately \$3,200,000 in anticipated Program Income and from previous HOPWA grants
19 and program income from prior years, for a combined total of approximately \$10,267,229; and

20 WHEREAS, The City and County of San Francisco is responsible for distributing a
21 portion of the HOPWA funds to the County of San Mateo as the lead agency for the San
22 Francisco Eligible Metropolitan Statistical Area (EMSA); and

23 WHEREAS, The Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)
24 has prepared programs and a proposed Expenditure Schedule for FY2020-2021 HOPWA
25

1 funding, including the distributions to the County of San Mateo, a copy of which is located
2 in Clerk of the Board of Supervisors File No. 200461 (the "Expenditure Schedule"); and

3 WHEREAS, The proposed grant does not require an Annual Salary Ordinance
4 amendment; and

5 WHEREAS, The funding agency (HUD) does not allow use of grant on indirect costs;
6 now, therefore, be it

7 RESOLVED, That the Mayor of the City and County of San Francisco is hereby
8 authorized to apply for, accept, and expend the City's FY2020-2021 HOPWA Program
9 entitlement grant from HUD and expend an estimated \$3,200,000 in Program Income and
10 Reprogrammed funds, all in accordance with the purposes and goals for the funding as
11 generally set forth in the 2020-2024 Five Year Consolidated Plan and the Expenditure
12 Schedule; and, be it

13 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors does hereby approve the
14 purposes and goals for FY2020-2021 HOPWA Program funding as set forth in the
15 Expenditure Schedule for recipient agencies and departments; and, be it

16 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors hereby waives inclusion of
17 indirect costs in the grant budget; and, be it

18 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Mayor is hereby authorized to enter into and execute
19 agreements between the City and County of San Francisco and the various agencies
20 consistent with the FY2020-2021 HOPWA Program and the Expenditure Schedule; and, be it

21 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Mayor is hereby authorized to submit documentation
22 and certifications as may be requested or required by HUD, and to take such additional
23 actions as may be required to apply for, accept and expend the FY2020-2021 HOPWA funds
24 consistent with this Resolution and the goals of the FY2020-2021 HOPWA Program and all
25 applicable legal requirements, and any such actions are solely intended to further the

1 purposes of this Resolution, and are subject in all respect to the terms of this Resolution, and
2 any such action cannot increase the risk to the City, or require the City to expend any
3 resources, and that the Mayor shall consult with the City Attorney prior to execution and
4 provided that within 30 days of the agreements approved by this Resolution being executed
5 by all parties, such final documents (showing marked changes, if any) shall be provided to the
6 Clerk of the Board, for inclusion in the official file, together with a brief explanation of any
7 actions from the date of the adoption of this Resolution; and, be it

8 FURTHER RESOLVED, That all actions heretofore taken by the officers of the City
9 with respect to the application for, or the acceptance or expenditure of, FY2020-2021 HOPWA
10 funds as consistent with the documents herein and this Resolution, are hereby approved,
11 confirmed and ratified.

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 Recommended:

2

3 /s/
Eric D. Shaw, Director

4

5 Approved:

6

7 /s/
London N. Breed, Mayor

/s/
Ben Rosenfield, Controller

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

File Number: _____
(Provided by Clerk of Board of Supervisors)

Grant Resolution Information Form
(Effective July 2011)

Purpose: Accompanies proposed Board of Supervisors resolutions authorizing a Department to accept and expend grant funds.

The following describes the grant referred to in the accompanying resolution:

1. **Grant Title:** Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS

2. **Department:** Mayor's Office of Housing

3. **Contact Person:** Benjamin McCloskey Telephone: 415-701-5575

4. **Grant Approval Status (check one):**

Approved by funding agency

Not yet approved

5. **Amount of Grant Funding Approved or Applied for:** \$7,067,229 plus an estimated \$1,200,000 in program income and \$2,000,000 in reprogrammed funds

6a. **Matching Funds Required:** N/A

b. **Source(s) of matching funds (if applicable):**

7a. **Grant Source Agency:** US Department of Housing and Urban Development

b. **Grant Pass-Through Agency (if applicable):** N/A

8. **Proposed Grant Project Summary:** Proposed Expenditure Schedule attached

9. **Grant Project Schedule, as allowed in approval documents, or as proposed:**

Start-Date: July 1, 2020

End-Date: June 30, 2025

10a. **Amount budgeted for contractual services:** None; attached expenditure schedule details grants to be made to nonprofit agencies.

b. **Will contractual services be put out to bid?** N/A

c. **If so, will contract services help to further the goals of the Department's Local Business Enterprise (LBE) requirements?** N/A

d. **Is this likely to be a one-time or ongoing request for contracting out?** N/A

11a. **Does the budget include indirect costs?** Yes No

b1. **If yes, how much?** \$

b2. **How was the amount calculated?**

c1. **If no, why are indirect costs not included?**

Not allowed by granting agency

To maximize use of grant funds on direct services

Other (please explain):

c2. **If no indirect costs are included, what would have been the indirect costs?** None.

12. Any other significant grant requirements or comments: CFDA 14.241

****Disability Access Checklist***(Department must forward a copy of all completed Grant Information Forms to the Mayor's Office of Disability)**

13. This Grant is intended for activities at (check all that apply):

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Existing Site(s) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Existing Structure(s) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Existing Program(s) or Service(s) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rehabilitated Site(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> Rehabilitated Structure(s) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Program(s) or Service(s) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> New Site(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> New Structure(s) | |

14. The Departmental ADA Coordinator or the Mayor's Office on Disability have reviewed the proposal and concluded that the project as proposed will be in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and all other Federal, State and local disability rights laws and regulations and will allow the full inclusion of persons with disabilities. These requirements include, but are not limited to:

1. Having staff trained in how to provide reasonable modifications in policies, practices and procedures;
2. Having auxiliary aids and services available in a timely manner in order to ensure communication access;
3. Ensuring that any service areas and related facilities open to the public are architecturally accessible and have been inspected and approved by the DPW Access Compliance Officer or the Mayor's Office on Disability Compliance Officers.

If such access would be technically infeasible, this is described in the comments section below:

Comments:

Departmental ADA Coordinator or Mayor's Office of Disability Reviewer:

Eugene Flannery
(Name)

Environmental Compliance Manager
(Title)

Date Reviewed: 3-16-20

Eugene Flannery
(Signature Required)

Department Head or Designee Approval of Grant Information Form:

Daniel Adams
(Name)

Acting Director
(Title)

Date Reviewed: 3/13/20

[Signature]
(Signature Required)



City and County of San Francisco

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

**For Public Review and Comment Between
May 7, 2020 and June 5, 2020**

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

Welcome to San Francisco's DRAFT 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan and 2020-2021 Action Plan.

NOTES FOR PUBLIC REVIEW and COMMENT:

- 1) This draft document is available for public review and comment between May 7 and June 5, 2020.
- 2) Due to the current shelter in place order, hard copies of this document will not be available.
- 3) Staff welcomes your comments in writing via email. They may be directed to gloria.woo@sfgov.org. 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 June 5, 2020 at 5:00 p.m.
- 5) Thank you in advance for your participation in this process.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
ES-05 Executive Summary – 24 CFR 91.200(c), 91.220(b)	3
The Process	6
PR-05 Lead & Responsible Agencies – 24 CFR 91.200(b).....	6
PR-10 Consultation – 91.100, 91.200(b), 91.215(l).....	7
PR-15 Citizen Participation – 91.105, 91.115, 91.200(c) and 91.300(c).....	19
Outreach and Engagement Participant Demographics	19
Needs Assessment	36
NA-05 Overview	36
NA-10 Housing Needs Assessment – 24 CFR 91.205 (a,b,c)	39
NA-15 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Problems – 91.205 (b)(2)	53
NA-20 Disproportionately Greater Need: Severe Housing Problems – 91.205 (b)(2)	58
NA-25 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens – 91.205 (b)(2).....	63
NA-30 Disproportionately Greater Need: Discussion – 91.205(b)(2)	65
Households that spend more than 50% of their income on their homes are classified by the National Low Income Housing Coalition as severely cost-burdened.	66
NA-35 Public Housing – 91.205(b)	67
NA-40 Homeless Needs Assessment – 91.205(c).....	71
NA-45 Non-Homeless Special Needs Assessment – 91.205 (b,d)	77
NA-50 Non-Housing Community Development Needs – 91.215 (f)	88
Facilities to Address the Ongoing Crisis for Persons Experiencing Homelessness	88
Housing Market Analysis.....	101
MA-05 Overview	101
MA-10 Number of Housing Units – 91.210(a)&(b)(2).....	103
MA-15 Housing Market Analysis: Cost of Housing – 91.210(a)	107
MA-20 Housing Market Analysis: Condition of Housing – 91.210(a).....	111
MA-25 Public and Assisted Housing – 91.210(b)	114
MA-30 Homeless Facilities and Services – 91.210(c)	121
MA-35 Special Needs Facilities and Services – 91.210(d).....	126
MA-40 Barriers to Affordable Housing – 91.210(e)	129
MA-45 Non-Housing Community Development Assets – 91.215 (f)	131
MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion	143
MA-60 Broadband Needs of Housing occupied by Low- and Moderate-Income Households – 91.210(a)(4), 91.310(a)(2).....	177
MA-65 Hazard Mitigation – 91.210(a)(5), 91.310(a)(3)	178
Strategic Plan	184
SP-05 Overview	184
SP-10 Geographic Priorities – 91.215 (a)(1).....	241
SP-25 Priority Needs - 91.215(a)(2).....	276
SP-30 Influence of Market Conditions – 91.215 (b).....	298

SP-50 Public Housing Accessibility and Involvement – 91.215(c)	396
SP-55 Barriers to affordable housing – 91.215(h).....	402
SP-60 Homelessness Strategy – 91.215(d).....	409
SP-65 Lead based paint Hazards – 91.215(i)	414
SP-70 Anti-Poverty Strategy – 91.215(j)	415
AP-15 Expected Resources – 91.220(c)(1,2)	427
AP-35 Projects – 91.220(d).....	430
AP-38 Project Summary	431
AP-50 Geographic Distribution – 91.220(f).....	432
Affordable Housing	433
AP-55 Affordable Housing – 91.220(g).....	433
AP-60 Public Housing – 91.220(h).....	434
AP-65 Homeless and Other Special Needs Activities – 91.220(i).....	435
AP-70 HOPWA Goals– 91.220 (l)(3)	441
AP-85 Other Actions – 91.220(k).....	443
Program Specific Requirements.....	448
Appendix	467
Appedix A: Citizen Participation Comments Attachment	
Appendix B: Integrated Needs Analysis	

Executive Summary

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

1. Introduction

The Office of Community Planning and Development (CPD) of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requires that jurisdictions consolidate goals for all CPD programs into one strategic plan, called the Consolidated Plan. The four federal grant programs included in this Plan are 1) the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program; 2) the Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) program; 3) the HOME Investment Partnerships program (HOME); and 4) the Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS (HOPWA) program. A strategic plan must be submitted to HUD at least once every five years. This Consolidated Plan covers the time period of July 1, 2020 through June 30, 2025.

The Consolidated Plan serves the following purposes:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3. Evaluation of past performance

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

4. Summary of citizen participation process and consultation process

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

5. Summary of public comments

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

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

- Need assessment phase
 - 10 community forums, 40 focus groups and two surveys
 - Report back meeting
- Strategy development phase
 - Public review and comment period
 - Proposed strategies meeting
 - Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area (NRSA) strategies meetings
- Funding recommendations phase

- Public hearing on preliminary funding recommendations
- Consolidated Plan/Action Plan development phase
 - Public review and comment period

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

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

Not applicable

7. Summary

As part of the strategic planning process, the needs assessment data was reviewed. Other strategic planning components included developing a Theory of Change (ToC) for MOHCD; leveraging the expertise of MOHCD staff and their understanding of City concerns, service delivery, and programmatic operations; and analyzing the funding available from MOHCD as well as other City agencies. This information was synthesized to inform the objectives, priority needs, goals and activities for the Consolidated Plan.

The Process

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

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

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

Table 1 – Responsible Agencies

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

Narrative

In San Francisco, MOHCD is the lead agency responsible for the consolidated planning process and for submitting the Consolidated Plan, annual Action Plans and Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation Reports to HUD. MOHCD administers all HOME and HOPWA activities as well as the CDBG housing, public facility, non-workforce development public service and organizational planning/capacity building activities. OEWD is responsible for economic development and workforce development activities of the CDBG program. HSH administers ESG activities and oversees the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) reporting.

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

Consolidated Plan Public Contact Information

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

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

1. Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

The directors of MOHCD, OCII and HSH meet monthly to discuss permanent supportive housing issues. Staff from MOHCD, OCII, and HSH also meet monthly to coordinate the development and operation of the City’s permanent supportive housing pipeline and portfolio. These monthly convenings provide a regular forum to discuss issues of services coordination, policy, new initiatives, funding opportunities and emerging needs specific for permanent supportive housing funded by these departments.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Table 2 – Agencies, groups, organizations

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

	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Market Analysis Non-Housing Community Development
3	Agency/Group/Organization	Council of Community Housing Organizations
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Market Analysis Non-Housing Community Development
4	Agency/Group/Organization	Eviction Prevention & Tenant Empowerment Working Group
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services – Housing
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Market Analysis Non-Housing Community Development
5	Agency/Group/Organization	HIV Housing Providers
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services – Housing Services – Persons with HIV/AIDS
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Non-Homeless Special Needs Market Analysis Non-Housing Community Development
6	Agency/Group/Organization	Housing Action Coalition
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Market Analysis Non-Housing Community Development

7	Agency/Group/Organization	Human Services Network
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services – Housing Services – Children Services – Education Services – Elderly Persons Services – Employment Services – Fair Housing Services – Health Services – Homeless Services – Persons with Disabilities Services – Persons with HIV/AIDS Services – Victims Services – Victims of Domestic Violence
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Market Analysis Non-Housing Community Development
8	Agency/Group/Organization	Local Homeless Coordinating Board
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services – Homeless
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs – Chronically Homeless Homeless Needs – Families with Children Homelessness Needs – Unaccompanied Youth Homelessness Needs – Veterans Market Analysis Non-Housing Community Development
9	Agency/Group/Organization	Long Term Care Coordinating Council
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services – Elderly Persons Services – Persons with Disabilities
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Market Analysis Non-Housing Community Development
10	Agency/Group/Organization	Mayor's Disability Council
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services – Persons with Disabilities

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

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

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

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

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

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

Name of Plan	Lead Organization	How do the goals of your Strategic Plan overlap with the goals of each plan?
HIV Housing Five-Year Plan, 2016–2020	MOHCD	This plan focuses on housing for the HIV community, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals.
Economic Strategic Plan 2014 Update	OEWD	This plan focuses on economic development strategies, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.
Workforce Alignment 2016 Update	OEWD	This plan focuses on workforce development strategies, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.
Department of Aging and Adult Services (DAAS) Dignity Fund Community Needs Assessment (DFCNA), 2018	DAAS	This plan focuses on the needs of seniors and persons with disabilities, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.
Community Needs Assessment, 2016	DCYF	This plan focuses on the needs of children, youth and their families, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.
Service Allocation Plan, 2018–2023	DCYF	This plan focuses on the needs of children, youth and their families, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.
2017–2021 Integrated HIV Prevention and Care Plan	DPH	This plan focuses on HIV prevention and care, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals.
AOT Annual Report, 2017	DPH	This plan includes healthcare for the HIV community, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals.
Community Health Needs Assessment	DPH	This plan includes healthcare for the HIV community, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals.

Name of Plan	Lead Organization	How do the goals of your Strategic Plan overlap with the goals of each plan?
Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) 3-year integrated Plan, 2017–2020	DPH	This plan includes healthcare for the HIV community, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals.
MHSA Annual Update, 2018/2019	DPH	This plan includes healthcare for the HIV community, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals.
MHSA Community Program Planning Report, 2017	DPH	This plan includes healthcare for the HIV community, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals.
Whole Person Care DHCS application, 2016	DPH	This plan includes healthcare for the HIV community, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals.
Whole Person Care Update, 2018	DPH	This plan includes healthcare for the HIV community, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals.
Housing Authority Annual Administrative Plan	San Francisco Housing Authority (SFHA)	This plan focuses on public housing, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals.
Our Children Our Families (OCOF) Five-Year Plan, Year One Report 2016	OCOF Commission	This plan focuses on the needs of children, youth and their families, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.
2009 Report of the SF Mayor's Task Force on African-American Out-Migration	SF Mayor's Task Force on African-American Out-Migration	This plan focuses on the needs of the African American community, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.
Annual Eviction Reports	SF Planning Department	This report focuses on eviction prevention, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals.
Central SOMA Plan	SF Planning Department	This plan focuses on the needs of the South of Market neighborhood, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.

Name of Plan	Lead Organization	How do the goals of your Strategic Plan overlap with the goals of each plan?
Central Waterfront/Dogpatch Public Realm	SF Planning Department	This plan focuses on the needs of the Central Waterfront/Dogpatch neighborhood, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.
Citywide Planning Division Five-Year Work Program, 2014–2019	SF Planning Department	This plan focuses on citywide needs, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.
Civic Center Public Realm Plan	SF Planning Department	This plan focuses on the needs of the Civic Center/Tenderloin neighborhood, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.
General Plan 2014 Housing Element	SF Planning Department	This plan focuses on housing needs, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.
Housing Balance Reports	SF Planning Department	This plan focuses on housing needs, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.
Housing for Families with Children (Family Friend Housing White Paper)	SF Planning Department	This plan focuses on housing needs, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.
Hub Area Plan update	SF Planning Department	This plan focuses on the needs of the Market and Octavia Area, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.
Mission Action Plan 2020	SF Planning Department	This plan focuses on the needs of the Mission District, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.
Southeast Framework	SF Planning Department	This plan focuses on the needs of the Southeast sector of the City, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.
Sustainable Chinatown	SF Planning Department	This plan focuses on the needs of Chinatown, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals.

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

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

MOHCD works closely with OCII, which is the successor agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, and the SFHA on affordable housing activities. In addition, the City and County of San Francisco works with the County of San Mateo on the use of HOPWA funds.

Narrative (optional):

See discussion above.

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

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

Summarize citizen participation process and how it impacted goal-setting

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

Community Outreach and Engagement

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

Outreach and Engagement Participant Demographics

MOHCD’s community outreach process engaged a total of 3,614 participants across community forums, focus groups and web surveys. While all survey participants provided demographic information, this information was more difficult to capture during in-person events. About twice as many women as men participated, with this ratio remaining consistent across engagement events. Participants represented a diversity of sexual orientation and racial/ethnic identities, with about one third identifying as LGBTQ+ and two thirds identifying with a race or ethnicity other than white. Tables 4–6 below summarize gender identity, sexual orientation, and race/ethnicity for all community participants who completed a demographic form, either in person or online. Although most participants did provide this information, the values in the tables below may under-represent actual participation totals.

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

¹ American Community Survey, 2017

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. Community Forums and Focus Groups

MOHCD facilitated 10 neighborhood-based public forums and 40 population-specific focus groups. Representatives from across the housing spectrum participated in the forums and focus groups, including individuals experiencing homelessness, residents of public and subsidized housing, housing and social service providers, HIV/AIDS housing advocates, homeowners, new San Francisco residents, recent immigrants, and life-long residents of the City. MOHCD facilitated sessions with cultural groups including African American, Cambodian, Samoan, Vietnamese, LGBTQ+, and people living with HIV/AIDS

(PLWHA) community members. Participants responded to a series of structured questions on a range of relevant domains including housing and service needs, barriers to housing access and choice, neighborhood change, and discrimination and fair housing. The following tables list the events held during this process, and the numbers of attendees participating in each.

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

Community Forums	District(s)	Attendees²
Bayview Hunters Point	D10	70
Castro	D7 & D8	29
Chinatown	D2 & D3	165
Excelsior and OMI	D11	79
Mission	D9	54
South of Market	D6	51
Sunset	D1 & D4	55
Tenderloin	D6	85
Visitacion Valley	D10	30
Western Addition	D5	38
Total Participants		656

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

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

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

Forum and Focus Group Participant Demographics

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. Community Surveys

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

Planning Survey

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

Planning Responses
2,219 total responses

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

Program Evaluation Survey

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

Program Evaluation Responses
1,537 total responses

Survey Respondent Demographics

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

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

Table 9 – Planning Survey Responses by Neighborhood of Residence

Neighborhood	#	%
Mission	232	12%
Tenderloin	175	9%
Chinatown	139	7%
South of Market	135	7%
Sunset/Parkside	126	6%
Bayview Hunters Point	121	6%
Castro/Upper Market	79	4%
Western Addition	76	4%
Excelsior	68	3%
Outer Richmond	65	3%
Bernal Heights	57	3%
Haight Ashbury	57	3%
Oceanview/Merced/Ingleside	50	3%
Hayes Valley	47	2%
Outer Mission	44	2%
Inner Sunset	43	2%
Mission Bay	43	2%
North Beach	41	2%
Financial District	38	2%
Inner Richmond	36	2%
Potrero Hill	35	2%
Glen Park	31	2%
Portola	31	2%
Visitacion Valley	29	1%
Pacific Heights	23	1%
Twin Peaks	21	1%
Nob Hill	21	1%
Noe Valley	20	1%
Marina	19	1%
Russian Hill	18	1%
Japantown	16	1%
West of Twin Peaks	15	1%
Lakeshore	13	1%
Golden Gate Park	10	1%
Treasure Island	8	0%
Lone Mountain/USF	7	0%
Presidio	6	0%
Presidio Heights	5	0%
Lincoln Park	4	0%
McLaren Park	3	0%
Seacliff	3	0%
Total Participants Self-Reporting Neighborhood	2,219	100%

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




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





Figure 3: Self-Reported Race/Ethnicity, Planning Survey Respondents³



Document Review

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

Secondary Data

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

Additional Public Meetings

Report Back Meeting

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

Proposed Strategies Meeting

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

Strategies for Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area (NRSA) Meetings

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Citizen Participation Outreach

Table 10 – Citizen Participation Outreach

Sort Order	Mode of Outreach	Target of Outreach	Summary of response/ attendance	Summary of Comments received	Summary of comments not accepted and reasons	URL (If applicable)
1	Community Forum in the Castro on 12/3/2018	Non-targeted/ broad community outreach in Districts 7 and 8	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
2	Community Forum in the Sunset on 12/10/2018	Non-targeted/ broad community outreach in Districts 1 and 4	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
3	Community Forum in the Excelsior/ OMI on 1/16/2019	Non-targeted/ broad community outreach in District 11	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
4	Community Forum on the Tenderloin on 1/22/2019	Non-targeted/ broad community outreach in Tenderloin/ District 6	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a

Sort Order	Mode of Outreach	Target of Outreach	Summary of response/ attendance	Summary of Comments received	Summary of comments not accepted and reasons	URL (If applicable)
5	Community Forum in the Western Addition on 1/31/2019	Non-targeted/ broad community outreach in District 5	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
6	Community Forum in the South of Market on 2/5/2019	Non-targeted/ broad community outreach in South of Market/ District 6	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
7	Community Forum in the Mission on 2/13/2019	Non-targeted/ broad community outreach in District 9	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
8	Community Forum in Chinatown on 2/19/2019	Non-targeted/ broad community outreach in Districts 2 and 3	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
9	Community Forum in Bayview Hunters Point on 2/20/2019	Non-targeted/ broad community outreach in BVHP/ District 10	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a

Sort Order	Mode of Outreach	Target of Outreach	Summary of response/ attendance	Summary of Comments received	Summary of comments not accepted and reasons	URL (If applicable)
10	Community Forum in Visitacion Valley on 2/26/2019	Non-targeted/ broad community outreach in Visitacion Valley/ District 10	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
11	Focus Group with African American Community on 3/11/2019	African American residents, advocates, service providers and stakeholders	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
12	Focus Group with Cambodian Community on 3/20/2019	Cambodian residents, advocates, service providers and stakeholders	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
13	Focus Group with HIV+ Community on 2/20/2019	HIV+ clients of SF AIDS Foundation	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
14	Focus Group with BMR Homeowners on 3/27/2019	BMR homeowners	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a

Sort Order	Mode of Outreach	Target of Outreach	Summary of response/ attendance	Summary of Comments received	Summary of comments not accepted and reasons	URL (If applicable)
15	Focus Group with HOPE SF Hunters View Community on 1/28/2019	Hunters View residents	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
16	Focus Group with HOPE SF Potrero Hill Community on 3/19/2019	Potrero Terrace and Annex residents	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
17	Focus Group with HOPE SF Sunnydale Community on 2/21/2019	Sunnydale residents	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
18	Focus Group with LGBTQ+ Community on 3/20/2019	LGBTQ+ residents, advocates, services providers and stakeholders	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
19	16 Focus Groups in 16 RAD Developments in the Month of March 2019	Residents of 16 RAD developments	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
20	Focus Group with Samoan Community on 3/26/2019	Samoan residents, advocates, service providers and stakeholders	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a

Sort Order	Mode of Outreach	Target of Outreach	Summary of response/ attendance	Summary of Comments received	Summary of comments not accepted and reasons	URL (If applicable)
21	Focus Group with Transgender Community on 3/21/2019	Transgender residents, advocates, service providers and stakeholders	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
22	Focus Group with Vietnamese Community on 3/19/2019	Vietnamese residents, advocates, service providers and stakeholders	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
23	Online and Paper Survey on Housing and Community Development Needs	Non-targeted/ broad community outreach	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
24	Report Back on Needs Analysis Meeting on 6/20/2019	Non-targeted/ broad community outreach	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
25	Proposed Strategies Public Review and Comment Period and Meeting on 8/5/2019	Non-targeted/ broad community outreach	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
26	Chinatown NRSA Strategies Meeting on 10/7/2019	Chinatown residents, advocates, service providers and stakeholders	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a

Sort Order	Mode of Outreach	Target of Outreach	Summary of response/ attendance	Summary of Comments received	Summary of comments not accepted and reasons	URL (If applicable)
27	Bayview Hunters Point NRSA Strategies Meeting on 10/10/2019	Bayview Hunters Point residents, advocates, service providers and stakeholders	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
28	Mission NRSA Strategies Meeting on 10/16/2019	Mission residents, advocates, service providers and stakeholders	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
29	South of Market NRSA Strategies Meeting on 10/17/2019	South of Market residents, advocates, service providers and stakeholders	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
30	Tenderloin NRSA Strategies Meeting on 10/18/2019	Tenderloin residents, advocates, service providers and stakeholders	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
31	Visitacion Valley NRSA Strategies Meeting on 11/7/2019	Visitacion Valley residents, advocates, service providers and stakeholders	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a

Sort Order	Mode of Outreach	Target of Outreach	Summary of response/ attendance	Summary of Comments received	Summary of comments not accepted and reasons	URL (If applicable)
32	Preliminary Funding Recommendations for 2020–2021 CDBG, ESG, HOME and HOPWA Programs Public Review and Comment Period from 1/22–3/2/2020 and Meeting on 2/4/2020	Non-targeted/ broad community outreach	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a
33	Public Review and Comment Period for the Draft 2020–2024 Consolidated Plan and 2020–2021 Action Plan from 5/4–6/2/2020	Non-targeted/ broad community outreach	See narrative above and Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	See Citizen Participation Comments Attachment in Appendix A	n/a	n/a

Needs Assessment

NA-05 Overview

Needs Assessment Overview

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

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

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

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

Summary of Findings

Cross-cutting Community Needs and Concerns

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

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

Housing Services

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

Social and Supportive Services

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

Economic Self-Sufficiency

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

Knowledge of and Access to Services

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

Community Empowerment and Engagement

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

Coordination of Services

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

Housing Access, Perceptions, and Barriers

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

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

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

Summary of Housing Needs

Permanent Affordable Housing Needs

Exhibit 1 – Regional Housing Needs Assessment for San Francisco, 2014–2022

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

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

Exhibit 2 – New Affordable Housing Construction by Income Level, 2014–2018

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

Source: San Francisco Planning Department, 2018 Housing Inventory

Two governmental bodies, The State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), set San Francisco’s “fair share of the regional housing need” – the amount of new housing that should be built in order to house increasing numbers of residents. This Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) process also establishes the number of units that should be affordable to lower income households. The 2014 Housing Element suggested that the total number of housing units allocated to San Francisco by the RHNA process was not realistic. The goal for new housing production for very low to moderate income households outlined for the 2014–2022 planning period (16,333 units total or 2,178 per year) is nearly three times San Francisco’s average production rate of 707 units per year (based on 2005–2013 data).³ Based on housing production data from 2014–2018, San Francisco did not meet any of its annual production goals for any income category.

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

Furthermore, funds available for new affordable housing construction, rehabilitation and supportive service provision come primarily from Federal and State sources that, in the absence of major policy change, will not increase.

Cost Burden

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

San Francisco renter households who earn less than 30% of area median income are cost burdened, with the elderly renters most impacted (Tables 11 and 12). The most recent data indicates that 76% of renters who are at less than 50% of area median income are severely cost burdened (paying more than 50% of their income on rent) (Table 13). This data underscores the affordable housing crisis for San Francisco’s lowest income households, most especially the elderly whose incomes typically do not increase significantly each year. In order to make production of rental housing for the lowest income levels economically feasible, the City will continue to subsidize housing development chiefly for extremely low and very low-income renters.

Table 11 – Cost Burden for Renters >30%




Table 12 – Cost Burden for Owners >30%




Table 13 – Cost Burden for Renters >50%





Table 14 – Cost Burden for Renters >50%



Overcrowding

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

The 2011–2015 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data indicates that very low-income single-family renter households are the most overcrowded at 50% of total San Francisco households with that need (Table 15).

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

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

Table 15 – Overcrowding for Renters






Table 16 –Overcrowding for Owners



Map 1 – Proportion of Households Living in Overcrowded Conditions



Substandard Housing – Lack of Kitchen and Plumbing Facilities

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

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

Citywide, only a small percentage of housing units lack kitchen facilities (4.2%) or plumbing facilities (2.3%). However, housing without kitchen or plumbing facilities are highly concentrated in three small neighborhoods: the Tenderloin, Chinatown, and the Financial District. These low-income neighborhoods have many of the City’s Single-Room Occupancy (SRO) buildings. And extremely low-income renters are disproportionately impacted (67%) by having one or more housing problems.

Exhibit 3 – Severe Housing Problems for Renters (from Table)




Table 17 – Housing Needs Assessment Demographics

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

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

Number of Households Table

Table 18 – Housing Urban Development Area Median Family Income (HAMFI) by Households

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

Data Source: 2011–2015 CHAS

Housing Needs Summary Tables

Table 19 – Housing Problems (Households with one of the listed needs)

	Renter					Owner				
	0–30% AMI	>30– 50% AMI	>50– 80% AMI	>80– 100% AMI	Total	0–30% AMI	>30– 50% AMI	>50– 80% AMI	>80– 100% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS										
Substandard Housing – Lacking complete plumbing or kitchen facilities	10,325	1,940	1,420	540	14,225	145	155	210	55	565
Severely Overcrowded – With >1.51 people per room (and complete kitchen and plumbing)	3,230	1,825	1,365	620	7,040	60	270	380	195	905
Overcrowded – With 1.01–1.5 people per room (and none of the above problems)	2,130	1,310	1,265	425	5,130	240	505	940	690	2,375
Housing cost burden greater than 50% of income (and none of the above problems)	26,475	7,430	2,500	425	36,830	6,975	4,285	3,985	1,620	16,865

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
Housing cost burden greater than 30% of income (and none of the above problems)	8,695	9,290	11,710	3,760	33,455	1,775	1,915	4,545	3,165	11,400
Zero/negative Income (and none of the above problems)	4,035	0	0	0	4,035	795	0	0	0	795

Data Source: 2011-2015 CHAS

Table 20 – Housing Problems 2 (Households with one or more Severe Housing Problems: Lacks kitchen or complete plumbing, severe overcrowding, severe cost burden)

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS										
Having 1 or more of four housing problems	42,160	12,505	6,550	2,010	63,225	7,425	5,215	5,510	2,560	20,710
Having none of four housing problems	19,925	15,470	26,470	15,950	77,815	5,060	7,260	13,740	9,650	35,710

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
Household has negative income, but none of the other housing problems	4,035	0	0	0	4,035	795	0	0	0	795

Data Source: 2011-2015 CHAS

Table 21 – Cost Burden > 30%

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS								
Small Related	9,760	5,100	3,320	18,180	1,910	2,445	3,840	8,195
Large Related	1,200	1,090	335	2,625	400	785	1,320	2,505
Elderly	15,450	4,005	1,830	21,285	5,290	2,510	2,540	10,340
Other	20,355	8,945	9,575	38,875	1,490	1,125	1,550	4,165
Total need by income	46,765	19,140	15,060	80,965	9,090	6,865	9,250	25,205

Data Source: 2011-2015 CHAS

Table 22 – Cost Burden > 50%

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS								
Small Related	6,605	1,825	550	8,980	1,725	1,700	1,445	4,870
Large Related	815	310	0	1,125	345	390	400	1,135
Elderly	9,530	1,575	505	11,610	3,780	1,750	1,315	6,845
Other	16,940	4,335	1,725	23,000	1,350	750	985	3,085
Total need by income	33,890	8,045	2,780	44,715	7,200	4,590	4,145	15,935

Data Source: 2011-2015 CHAS

Table 23 – Crowding (More than one person per room)

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS										
Single family households	5,095	2,655	1,930	605	10,285	290	345	605	585	1,825
Multiple, unrelated family households	525	795	445	220	1,985	30	360	705	330	1,425
Other, non-family households	1,105	365	530	285	2,285	0	80	10	0	90
Total need by income	6,725	3,815	2,905	1,110	14,555	320	785	1,320	915	3,340

Data Source: 2011-2015 CHAS

Table 24 – Crowding Information – 2/2

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

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

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

Table 25 – San Francisco Household Sizes and Unit Sizes, 2012

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

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

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

It is estimated that 10.3% of all San Franciscans have a disability. Of this disabled population, 35.5% are people aged 65 or older and 6.6% are younger adults⁴. Many rely on federal disability benefits (SSI) as their sole source of income, which is only \$943.72 per month for an elderly or single disabled person in California. Comparatively the average monthly rent for a two-bedroom apartment in San Francisco as of 2018 was \$4,650 per month.⁵ In addition, domestic violence was attributed to be the cause of homelessness among 22% of survey respondents living in families during the bi-annual homeless Point-in-Time (PIT) Count,⁶ with one in four domestic violence survivors being turned away from shelters due to lack of space.⁷ Although an exact percentage of families in need of housing assistance that fall into these categories is not available, the risk factors as described above would indicate that a high percentage of these families fall into these categories.

What are the most common housing problems?

The most common housing problems are the lack of available affordable housing and the severe cost burden impacting very-low and low-income households. In particular, the growing affordability gap between incomes earned and rental and ownership housing costs has made housing extremely unaffordable for many San Franciscans. Since the economic recovery started in 2011, the median rent and home prices in San Francisco have skyrocketed, making housing only affordable to higher income households. The *Housing Affordability Strategy* recently published by the San Francisco Planning Department states that a household would need to earn about \$169,000 per year to afford the median rent in 2019, while a homebuyer would need to earn over \$307,000 per year to afford the median home price of \$1,387,278.⁸

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

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

Very Low-Income Seniors

The 2010 Census counted 154,730, or 20% of San Francisco's population as 60 years or older with the 2018 ACS estimating the population to be about 21.7% of San Francisco's population. San Francisco's elderly population is expected to grow to 23% by 2020 and 26% by 2030. Older adults in San Francisco also tend to be low income: approximately 22% live just above the Federal poverty line while 16% of San Francisco seniors live below the Federal poverty line. Additionally, San Francisco's older adult population is also predominantly female, persons of color, immigrants, speak a primary language other than

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

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

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

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

⁸ San Francisco Housing Affordability Strategies, 2020

English, and the lowest income seniors are concentrated in particular neighborhoods such as Chinatown, South of Market and the Tenderloin.⁹

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

Persons with Disabilities

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

Housing options for people with disabilities range from acute care in an institution, to supportive housing, to living independently. Institutional living provides the most restricted and limited environment for people with disabilities yet costs the government many times more than other housing options. However, people with disabilities face numerous barriers, both physical and procedural, to securing an affordable and accessible home in the open market.

People with accessibility needs face challenges obtaining housing with appropriate amenities, such as wheelchair-accessible entrances, wide interior spaces for wheelchair circulation, accessible bathing facilities, and counters and cabinets with adjustable heights. Approximately 58% of San Francisco's housing stock was built before 1950, without these accommodations in mind. Most housing is difficult to convert to accessible standards. Although disability rights laws require that a landlord allow accessibility modifications in rental units, the burden of paying for such modifications is on the tenants themselves, who are frequently living in poverty.

Transitional Age Youth

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

Within the youth population in San Francisco there are also subpopulations with their own unique needs. San Francisco has historically been a sanctuary for LGBTQ+ youth. Of the youth survey respondents for the 2019 PIT count, 46% of the respondents identified to be LGBTQ+ compared to 23%

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

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

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

of the adult population. Also, one in five youth exiting the foster care system experience homelessness within four years of exiting foster care.

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


Very Low-Income Families with Children

According to 2018 ACS data, approximately 69,700 or 19% of family households in San Francisco have children. There are higher concentrations of households with children under 18 years old in the southeast section of San Francisco – Bayview Hunters Point, Portola, Outer Mission, Excelsior, and Visitation Valley (Map 2). These are neighborhoods with large minority population concentrations (Map 6) and low-income concentrations (Map 10). Roughly 18,000 households have five persons or more. San Francisco has too few large affordable units to accommodate the needs of these families, and as a result, larger families are more likely than smaller households to live in overcrowded conditions.

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

Discussion

See above.

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

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

Introduction

The four housing problems are: (1) housing lacks complete kitchen facilities, (2) housing lacks complete plumbing facilities, (3) there is more than one person per room, and (4) cost burden is greater than 30%. Analysis of the 2011–2015 CHAS data shows no particular racial or ethnic group having a disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.

Table 26 – 0–30% of Area Median Income

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	60,055	14,515	4,830
White	20,580	4,335	1,750
Black/African American	6,395	2,370	575
Asian	20,530	5,715	1,950
American Indian, Alaska Native	320	35	4
Pacific Islander	400	125	40
Hispanic	9,735	1,645	370

Disproportionately Greater Need 0–30% AMI

Data Source: 2011–2015 CHAS

Exhibit 4 – Housing Problems by Ethnicity – 0–30% of Area Median Income




Table 27 – 30–50% of Area Median Income

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	28,920	11,530	0
White	11,995	4,030	0
Black/African American	1,470	1,095	0
Asian	9,075	4,125	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	20	20	0
Pacific Islander	45	4	0
Hispanic	5,515	2,005	0

Disproportionally Greater Need 30–50% AMI

Data Source: 2011–2015 CHAS

Exhibit 5 – Housing Problems by Ethnicity – 30–50% of Area Median Income




Table 28 – Disproportionally Greater Need 50–80% AMI

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	28,315	23,955	0
White	13,080	10,585	0
Black/African American	1,195	1,690	0
Asian	8,310	7,435	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	15	40	0
Pacific Islander	160	160	0
Hispanic	4,775	3,275	0

Data Source: 2011–2015 CHAS

Exhibit 6 – Housing Problems by Ethnicity – 50–80% of Area Median Income





Table 29 – Disproportionally Greater Need 80–100% AMI

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	11,495	18,675	0
White	5,795	9,795	0
Black/African American	330	820	0
Asian	3,545	5,220	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	45	55	0
Pacific Islander	0	29	0
Hispanic	1,480	2,085	0

Data Source: 2011–2015 CHAS

Exhibit 7 – Housing Problems by Ethnicity – 80–100% of Area Median Income



Discussion

Based on HUD’s definition of disparate impact (percentage of households with housing problems or no/negative income > 10% than the jurisdiction as a whole for the income category), this data does not reveal disparate impacts on any particular racial or ethnic group. Please note that the margins of error make the statistics for some categories of households not as reliable as others (e.g. Pacific Islanders; American Indian, Alaska Native).

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

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

Introduction

The four severe housing problems are: (1) housing lacks complete kitchen facilities, (2) housing lacks complete plumbing facilities, (3) there is more than one person per room, and (4) cost burden is greater than 50%. Analysis of the 2011–2015 CHAS data shows no particular racial or ethnic group having a disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.

Table 30 – Severe Housing Problems 0–30% AMI

Severe Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	49,585	24,985	4,830
White	17,460	7,465	1,750
Black/African American	4,895	3,870	575
Asian	16,725	9,525	1,950
American Indian, Alaska Native	295	60	4
Pacific Islander	235	285	40
Hispanic	8,075	3,305	370

Data Source: 2011–2015 CHAS

Exhibit 8 – Severe Housing Problems by Ethnicity – 0–30% of Area Median Income (Table 17)




Table 31 – 30–50% of Area Median Income

Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	17,720	22,730	0
White	6,990	9,035	0
Black/African American	690	1,875	0
Asian	6,105	7,095	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	10	30	0
Pacific Islander	34	14	0
Hispanic	3,450	4,070	0

Severe Housing Problems 30–50% AMI

Data Source: 2011–2015 CHAS

Exhibit 9 – Severe Housing Problems by Ethnicity – 30–50% of Area Median Income (Table 18)




Table 32 – 50–80% of Area Median Income

Severe Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	12,060	40,210	0
White	4,540	19,115	0
Black/African American	380	2,505	0
Asian	4,105	11,640	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	0	55	0
Pacific Islander	120	200	0
Hispanic	2,780	5,275	0

Severe Housing Problems 50–80% AMI

Data Source: 2011–2015 CHAS

Exhibit 10 – Severe Housing Problems by Ethnicity – 50–80% of Area Median Income





Table 33 – 80–100% of Area Median Income

Severe Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	4,570	25,600	0
White	1,920	13,670	0
Black/African American	120	1,025	0
Asian	1,765	7,000	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	0	100	0
Pacific Islander	0	29	0
Hispanic	565	3,005	0

Severe Housing Problems 80–100% AMI

Data Source: 2011–2015 CHAS

Exhibit 11 – Severe Housing Problems by Ethnicity – 80–100% of Area Median Income (Table 20)



Discussion

Based on HUD’s definition of disparate impact (percent of households with severe housing problems or no/negative income > 10% than the jurisdiction as a whole for the income category), this data does not reveal disparate impacts on any particular racial or ethnic group, with the exception of low-income American Indian, Alaska Native at 80–100% AMI. However, we would want to examine the housing problem data by race/ethnicity and income group more closely before taking any conclusions. Please note that the margins of error make the statistics for some categories of households not as reliable as others (e.g. Pacific Islanders, American Indian, Alaska Native).

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

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

Introduction

Analysis of the 2011–2015 CHAS data shows no particular racial or ethnic group having a disproportionately greater housing cost burden need in comparison to the needs of that income category of need as a whole.


Table 34 – Housing Cost Burden

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

Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens AMI

Data Source: 2011–2015 CHAS

Exhibit 12 – Housing Cost Burden by Ethnicity



Discussion

Analysis of the 2011–2015 CHAS data shows no particular racial or ethnic group having a disproportionately greater housing cost burden need in comparison to the needs of that income category or the jurisdiction as a whole. What the table does clearly indicate is that, when compared to the rest of that racial or ethnic group as a whole, very low-income households at or below 30% AMI of all ethnic groups are disproportionately impacted by the housing cost burden.

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

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

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


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

Not applicable.

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

The neighborhoods with the highest housing cost burden (see Map 3) correlate with the areas of minority concentration; namely, the Bayview, Lakeshore, Tenderloin and Chinatown. See Map 6 for Areas of Minority Concentration.

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



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

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

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

NA-35 Public Housing – 91.205(b)

Introduction

The SFHA’s express mission is to “provide safe, sanitary, affordable, and decent housing to very low-income families, senior citizens and persons with disabilities.” Founded in 1938, it was the first established housing authority in California, and receives nearly all of its \$65+ million operating income from HUD and tenant-paid rents. The SFHA is overseen by seven citizen commissioners, all of whom are appointed by the Mayor. Two of those commissioners must be current SFHA residents. Starting in 2020, the Mayor will appoint four members directly, at least one of whom must be an SFHA resident. Three members will be recommended by motion at the sole discretion of the Board of Supervisors; of the Board’s three appointment recommendations, at least one must be an SFHA resident 62 years of age or older.

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

Totals in Use

Table 35 – Public Housing by Program Type

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

Table 36 – Characteristics of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

	Program Type							
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers			Special Purpose Voucher	
				Total	Project-based	Tenant-based	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program
Average Annual Income	0	10,284	20,390	19,443	17,507	21,560	17,459	0
Average length of stay	0	7	11.8	10	5	15	9	13
Average Household size	0	1	2.5	2	2	2	1	3
# Homeless at admission	0	23	6	64	47	17	6	0
# of Elderly Program Participants (>62)	0	74	203	6,424	3,196	3,228	346	3
# of Disabled Families	0	78	366	8,417	4,543	3,874	616	18
# of Families requesting accessibility features	0	N/A	171	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
# of HIV/AIDS program participants	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
# of DV victims	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

2. Ethnicity of Residents

Table 37 – Ethnicity of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Ethnicity	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Program Type					
				Vouchers			Special Purpose Voucher		
				Total	Project-based	Tenant-based	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
Hispanic	0	35	244	1672	988	579	84	21	6
Not Hispanic	0	224	806	12079	5385	5783	828	83	69

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

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

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

Approximately 3,200 or roughly one-third of the portfolio of SFHA’s former public housing units are designated as “senior/disabled.” This high proportion requires accessible features in those units, though, given the age of the portfolio, appropriate accessibility improvements are not always installed. Tenant needs include wheelchair accessibility, appropriate turning radii in elevators and bathrooms, bathroom grab bars, removable kitchen cabinetry, and accessible door and window handles, among other things.

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

The SFHA HCV wait list is closed.

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

The needs of the prioritized households on the SFHA wait list are self-explanatory. In addition, note that the average annual income of SFHA residents is less than \$15,000, a number that includes multi-person families. Since the 2019 median income of a household of 3 in San Francisco is \$110,850, SFHA residents and would-be residents are in particular need of extremely low-cost housing in order to survive.

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

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

Discussion

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

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

NA-40 Homeless Needs Assessment – 91.205(c)

Introduction

All jurisdictions receiving federal funding to provide housing and services for homeless individuals and families are required by HUD to conduct a biennial point-in-time (PIT) count of unsheltered and sheltered homeless persons. This count must include all unsheltered and sheltered homeless persons staying in emergency shelters and transitional housing programs on the date of the count.

Every two years, during the last ten days of January, San Francisco conducts a comprehensive count of its homeless population in order to gain a better assessment of the individuals who are currently experiencing homelessness.¹³ San Francisco worked in conjunction with Applied Survey Research to conduct the 2019 San Francisco Homeless Count and Survey. The San Francisco homeless count has two primary components: a PIT enumeration of unsheltered homeless individuals and families (those sleeping outdoors, on the streets, in parks, or vehicles, etc.) and PIT enumeration of homeless individuals and families who have temporary shelter (those staying in an emergency shelter, transitional housing, or using stabilization rooms).

The 2019 San Francisco PIT Count was a city-wide effort. With the support of over 400 community volunteers, staff from various City departments and the San Francisco Police Department, the entire city was canvassed between the hours of 8 p.m. and midnight on January 24, 2019. This resulted in a visual count of unsheltered homeless individuals and families residing on the streets, in vehicles, makeshift shelters, encampments and other places not meant for human habitation. Shelters and facilities reported the number of homeless individuals and families who occupied their facilities on the same evening.

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

In the weeks following the street count, an in-depth survey was administered to 1,000 unsheltered and sheltered homeless individuals of all ages to gather more in-depth information about the characteristics and needs of the homeless population.

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

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

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

For many individuals, the experience of homelessness is part of a long and recurring history of residential instability. Individuals may fall in and out of homelessness as they assemble different subsistence strategies and housing opportunities. Thirty-one percent of survey respondents reported they were experiencing homelessness for the first time in 2019, a decrease from 53% in 2011.¹⁴ The length of time survey respondents reported being homeless was similar to previous years.

Nature and Extent of Homelessness: (Optional)

Table 38 – Homeless Needs Assessment

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

Data Source Comments: 2019 Homeless Count and Survey

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

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

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

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

¹⁶

One-third of respondents in families with children reported experiencing homelessness for the first time, compared to 31% of all other respondents. Sixty percent reported experiencing homelessness for a year or more. Respondents in families with children were largely long-term San Francisco residents; 86% reported living in San Francisco at the time they most recently became homeless and 50% reported having lived in the city for at least ten years. Prior to experiencing homelessness, 33% reported they were living in a home owned or rented by themselves or a partner.

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

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

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

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

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

Describe the Nature and Extent of Unsheltered and Sheltered Homelessness.

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

Discussion:

San Francisco is experiencing a homelessness crisis. Data indicates that there are more homeless people in the city than we have seen since 2002; conditions have become exceedingly difficult for unhoused San

Franciscans who are getting older and sicker over time. This crisis impacts housed people as well, reducing the overall quality of life in the City. This section describes some of the conditions driving this crisis, efforts to serve the homeless population in San Francisco, and plans to expand and improve the City's response.

San Francisco and the Bay Area are in the midst of an unprecedented housing affordability crisis that impedes efforts to address homelessness. Both home prices and rents have outpaced inflation over the past decade. Greater demand for housing has also created a decline in overall housing affordability. Though housing production for low-income households in 2017–2018 outpaced the 10-year historic average, overall housing production has failed to keep pace with employment growth or the rising number of high-income households.¹⁷ The City's existing stock of an estimated 160,000 rent-controlled units have historically helped to keep housing options affordable. However, new move-ins over the past five years have reflected higher income households compared to historic trends; only 40% of new move-ins earned less than 80% of AMI, compared to more than 60% of new move-ins ten or more years ago.¹⁸ Low-income residents are hardest hit by housing availability and affordability, and are much less likely to have alternate housing options if forced to move out of their current residence. Thirty five percent of the 2018 SF Planning Department Housing Survey respondents earning 30% or less of AMI indicated that they would have no housing options if forced to move out; in contrast, only 12% of those earning between 120–200% of AMI reported having no options.¹⁹ Research from Zillow Economic Research demonstrates the relationship between rent affordability and homelessness. A recent study indicates that communities experience a sharp increase in homelessness when median rent accounts for 32% or more of median income. San Francisco remains well above this threshold for rent affordability, with median rent accounting for 39% of median income on average through 2017 and 2018.²⁰ Housing market trends, along with other factors, led to increases in homelessness during the past ten years. These were driving factors in the City's creation of a new department dedicated to addressing homelessness.

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

The framework enumerates the following goals:

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

17

18

19

20

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

- Helped over 5,500 people exit homelessness through housing, rent subsidies, and reunification programs
- Provided prevention and diversion services to over 4,000 households
- Sheltered over 15,000 people
- Conducted outreach to over 19,000 people
- Maintained housing for over 9,500 people living in permanent supportive housing
- Opened 675 Temporary Shelter beds, including five Navigation Centers
- Added 550 units of Permanent Supportive Housing
- Launched the Moving On Initiative, helping over 200 supportive housing tenants move to other housing
- Added over 500 new Rapid Re-Housing and Rent Subsidy slots
- Added 500 Problem Solving slots to help prevent and quickly end homelessness
- Opened five “Access Points” that have assessed over 4,700 adults and 1,600 families for homeless services
- Implemented a Coordinated Entry System to prioritize people for housing and other services
- Launched the ONE System, a “by-name” expanded homelessness management information system
- Reduced TAY homelessness 22% from 2015–2019
- Reduced student homelessness 23% in the SFUSD from 2014–2018
- Reduced veteran homelessness 11% since 2017

Despite reductions in some subpopulations, this crisis continues to grow in San Francisco and the conditions on our streets are unacceptable for both housed and unhoused residents. There is a significant increase in adult homelessness and chronic homelessness in the City. Compounding this challenge is the fact that the homeless population is getting sicker: in 2017, 55% of survey respondents reported having one or more disabling conditions; this increased to 69% in 2019. Although the City has significantly reduced large, long-term tent encampments²¹, the 2019 PIT Count shows an increase in the number of people sleeping unsheltered, with two-thirds of this growth attributable to people sleeping in vehicles. With this updated information on current homeless population trends, HSH plans to respond with additional resources and new interventions targeted to vehicle encampments, chronic adult homelessness and prevention and diversion efforts.

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

HSH helps over 2,000 people exit homelessness each year but estimates that over 7,000 individuals enter homelessness annually. In other words, for every person HSH helps find housing, there are more

21

than three newly homeless individuals. This issue is one of the biggest challenges to solving San Francisco's homelessness crisis. To address the rate at which people are becoming homeless, Mayor Breed proposed a \$5.2M investment in homelessness prevention and diversion (also known as Problem Solving) in the FY19–20 budget.

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

Unsheltered or street homelessness continues to be a significant crisis in San Francisco that requires immediate response in order to meet the health, welfare, and safety needs of people on the streets as well as their housed neighbors. Though HSH has opened 675 new shelter beds for families and adults since mid-2016, the unsheltered population observed during the 2019 PIT Count was 19% greater than in 2017. The demand for adult shelter beds remains high, with 1,190 individuals on the adult shelter waitlist on the week of the 2019 PIT Count. HSH is committed to expanding its resources to respond to this deficit and expects to open at least 700 additional temporary shelter beds by 2020. On January 16, 2018, the City launched the Healthy Streets Operations Center (HSOC), a multi-departmental effort to address increasing public concern about street homelessness and, in particular, a rise in large-scale encampments in 2016–2017. HSOC co-located staff from HSH, the San Francisco Police Department, San Francisco Public Works, the San Francisco Department of Emergency Management, the San Francisco DPH, and other departments to employ an Incident Command System approach for issues regarding street safety and cleanliness, encampments, medical and behavioral health issues of individuals on the street, and referral needs to homelessness services. Over the course of 2018, homeless-related requests for services via SF311 declined by 33%, with average call response times declining 27%.²² HSOC has also effectively maintained the progress of HSH's Encampment Resolution Team in eliminating all large-scale encampments, identified as sites occupied by six or more tents or improvised structures and in place for 30 days or longer. Though tent encampments continue to remain a priority for HSH to monitor, HSOC and HSH have begun to identify an increase in persons sleeping in vehicles in certain regions of the City. This increase is reflected in the recent PIT Count data; approximately two-thirds of the increase in the unsheltered count can be attributed to the increase in people enumerated as sleeping in vehicles. A count conducted by HSOC on April 24, 2019 identified 578 passenger vehicles and RVs or vans that appeared to be inhabited. To address the growing population of people living in their vehicles, HSH has expanded the focus of the Encampment Resolution Team to now include encampments of inhabited vehicles. The City is also piloting a program to allow for safe overnight parking and will soon open a Vehicle Triage Center.

22

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

Introduction:

Seniors

The number and diversity of the elderly population of the United States continues to grow and as housing cost burdens continue to increase, the inequities become more evident. The number and the age range of the elderly population is predicted to continue rising as Baby Boomers age, with households age 80 and over accounting for 12% of the American population by 2038.²³ Furthermore, the Harvard study estimates the elderly population will become more ethnically diverse with Hispanics growing from 7% of the elderly population in 2018 to 12% by 2038, as well as Asian elderly growing in number while the number of white households decreases from 78% to 70% during that same time period. Because Hispanic and Asian households are more likely to live in multigenerational households, the housing needs of this growing elderly population may need to change to accommodate their households' composition. Income inequities between higher-income seniors and low-income seniors is also increasing. Wealthier seniors are able to invest in stocks and benefit from a healthy stock market; conversely, low-income seniors reliant on Social Security payments as their primary source of income have not seen payment growth commensurate with the cost-of-living increase. Racial disparities for homeownership amongst seniors, one of the primary means to grow wealth in the United States, has also grown. In 2018 the black-white homeownership gap grew to a 30-year high of 19.4% according to the Harvard analysis of ACS data.

Persons with Disabilities

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

Veterans

Veterans often struggle returning to civilian life after military service. A 2017 needs assessment of more than 700 San Francisco veterans found a number of challenges for veterans in the City ranging from finding meaningful employment at wages above the poverty line, finding housing in San Francisco that is affordable for their wages, encountering unstable housing situations but not meeting HUD's definition of homeless, physical and psychological health issues, and barriers to access to services, especially for those veterans with non-honorable discharge status.²⁴

Re-Entry Populations

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

²³ Housing American's Older Adults 2019, Joint Center for Housing Studies of Harvard University, 2019

²⁴ The State of the American Veterans: A San Francisco Veterans Study, University of Southern California School of Social Work, 2017

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

Transitional Age Youth

TAY emancipating from foster care are one-fourth more likely to become homeless. Youth experiencing homelessness identified their top 10 needs in the following order: food, clothing, shelter/housing, dental care, health care, personal hygiene, employment, education, transportation, and eye care.²⁵ An assessment of San Francisco TAY found a need for coordinated youth referral process, including a centralized and up-to-date inventory of TAY housing sites, increased communication among TAY referral agencies and stakeholders, additional options to improve entry processes, the need for high quality youth-specific services, and physical design and location of housing sites responsive to TAY needs.²⁶

Persons Living with HIV/AIDS

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

Housing in San Francisco has become increasingly expensive, exceeding the values established by HUD’s Fair Market Rents (FMR) and making it difficult for subsidy programs to be implemented effectively. Subsidy programs are designed to help lessen the financial burden of housing costs for beneficiaries. In order to enroll in subsidy programs, potential participants must find a housing unit with a rental price that cannot exceed HUD’s FMR. San Francisco’s current housing market makes it extremely difficult to find an apartment at or under HUD’s fair market rent value. Large gaps exist between HUD’s FMR and the realities of the City’s housing market: the average cost of a San Francisco studio apartment is \$3,688²⁷ while the FMR for a one-bedroom apartment is \$2,720.²⁸

There are significant numbers of individuals who are aging while living with HIV/AIDS. In San Francisco, 67% of people living with HIV are over 50 years old²⁹ and face health issues related to aging with HIV disease. Much of the senior-specific housing (e.g. project-based Section 8 and federally funded senior projects) is targeted to those aged 62 and older. Older individuals with HIV may need more health-related support as they age, but may not qualify for currently-available services.

Many of those who are newly diagnosed with HIV are homeless. Among those individuals diagnosed with HIV infection from 2009–2016, between 12–13% were homeless.³⁰ Compared to the San Francisco HIV/AIDS population overall, homeless persons newly diagnosed with HIV/AIDS are more likely to be women (including transgender women), African American, and injection drug users.³¹ Services should be culturally competent to meet the needs of these individuals.

²⁵ San Francisco Coordinated Community Plan to Prevent and End Youth Homelessness, SF Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, January 2018

²⁶ Providing Stability and Support: An Assessment of San Francisco’s TAY Housing and Services System, Corporation for Supportive Housing, November 2015.

²⁷ Rent Café Website, February 2020

²⁸ HUD FMR Guidelines, 2020

²⁹ San Francisco Department of Public Health, HIV Semi-Annual Surveillance Report, December 2019

³⁰ SF EMA HIV Community Planning Council 2017 Summit Report

³¹ San Francisco Department of Public Health, HIV/AIDS Epidemiology Annual Report, 2018

As was the case when developing the 2014 plan, persons with HIV/AIDS are living longer and have more stable health status due to antiretroviral therapy. Among those who received a Stage 3 (AIDS) diagnosis between 2012–2019, 97% were alive five years later, compared to 84% who received the diagnosis between 2001–2012 and 79% who received the same diagnosis between 1996–2000.³² As a result, facilities offering higher levels of care, such as Residential Care Facilities for the Chronically Ill (RCFCIs), may experience a change in the type of demand for these services. RCFCIs may be needed for support during acute and temporary cases of illness, after which patients can return to independent living.

HOPWA

Table 39 – HOPWA Data

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

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

HIV Housing Need (HOPWA Grantees Only)

Table 40 – HIV Housing Need

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

Describe the characteristics of special needs populations in your community:

Populations with Emerging Needs: As a highly diverse and complex region with an expanding HIV caseload, the San Francisco Eligible Metropolitan Statistical Area (EMSA) is home to many populations with emerging needs, including women, youth, and transgender people; members of distinct ethnic, cultural, and linguistic groups; homeless and formerly incarcerated persons; and members of diverse social and behavioral communities. These groups require specialized interventions to link and retain them in care; meet their service needs; and empower them to become effective self-care advocates.

³² San Francisco Department of Public Health, HIV/AIDS Epidemiology Annual Report, 2018

The challenge of effectively meeting the needs of emerging populations in the context of declining resources remains one of the most daunting issues facing the local system of care. The following six emerging populations face evolving needs for specialized HIV care: 1) Persons with HIV 50 Years of Age and Older; 2) Transgender Persons; 3) Men of color who have sex with men; 4) Homeless individuals; 5) African Americans; and 6) Latino/as. All of these groups have growing incidences of HIV infection resulting in increased costs to the local system of care. Each population is described briefly below.

Emerging Population # 1: Persons With HIV 50 Years of Age and Older. In part because it was one of the first regions hard hit by the HIV epidemic and in part because of its success in ensuring that a large proportion of persons with HIV have access to high quality treatments and therapies, the HIV-infected population of the San Francisco EMA continues to age dramatically at levels unimaginable during the first decade of the epidemic. As of December 31, 2018, more than three out of every five persons living with HIV and AIDS in the San Francisco EMA were 50 and older (10,671 persons, 67%).³³ At the same time, for the second year, persons 50 and older make up more than half of all persons living with AIDS in the EMA (6,039 out of 11,464 persons, 52.7%). An analysis conducted in late 2011 of the 8,252 persons age 50 and above living with HIV/AIDS as of December 31, 2010 in San Francisco County revealed many startling facts about this population, including the fact that there are 2,631 PLWHA age 65 and above in San Francisco.

Emerging Population # 2: Transgender Persons. Transgender persons are traditionally defined as those whose gender identity, expression, or behavior is not traditionally associated with their birth sex. Some transgender individuals experience gender identity as being incongruent with their anatomical sex and may seek some degree of gender confirmation surgery, take hormones, or undergo other cosmetic procedures. Others may pursue gender expression (whether masculine or feminine) through external self-presentation and behaviors. Key HIV risk behaviors among transgender persons include multiple sex partners, irregular condom use, and unsafe injection practices stemming both from drug use and from the injection of hormones and silicone. Because of the region's traditional openness to diverse lifestyles, many transgender individuals move to the San Francisco EMA seeking greater acceptance and an expanded sense of community.

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

Emerging Population # 3: Men of Color Who Have Sex with Men. Men who have sex with men (MSM) overall make up by far the most heavily HIV-impacted population in the San Francisco EMA, accounting for the largest number of newly diagnosed with HIV and AIDS as of December 31, 2018. Among MSM newly diagnosed with HIV from 2009–2018, Whites accounted for the largest number of diagnoses in San Francisco. The number of MSM newly diagnosed with HIV from 2009–2018 declined in White and Latino/a persons. Annual number of Latino MSM diagnosed exceeded the number of White MSM in

³³ HIV Epidemiology Report December 2018

2018. The annual number of Asian/Pacific Islander MSM diagnosed increased from 36 in 2009 to a high of 46 in 2012 and then decreased to 15 in 2018. Among MSM, Whites made up 31%, African Americans 17%, Latino/a persons 38% and Asian/Pacific Islanders 10% of new diagnoses in 2018.³⁴

Emerging Population # 4: Homeless Individuals. Homelessness is an ongoing crisis for the San Francisco EMA, contributing to high rates of HIV infection and creating an intensive need for integrated, tailored services that bring homeless individuals into care, stabilize their life circumstances, and retain them in treatment. Among homeless persons newly diagnosed with HIV from 2009–2018, the number of diagnoses peaked at 67 in 2010, and in 2018 the number was 40. The proportion of new diagnoses among homeless individuals fluctuated but showed an overall increasing trend in the more recent years: 11% in 2016, 13% in 2017, and 20% in 2018 – the highest during the 2009–2018 time period. Compared to all persons diagnosed with HIV in 2009–2018, persons who were homeless at time of HIV diagnosis were more likely to be women or trans women, African American, PWID, and men who have sex with men and who also inject drugs (MSM-PWID).

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

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

35

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

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

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

34

35 HIV Epidemiology Report December 2018

process to develop the next iteration of the HIV/AIDS Housing Plan. The stakeholder council reflected a range of perspectives on HIV/AIDS housing, including housing providers, developers, and advocates for PLWHA among others.

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

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

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

- The proportion of all people newly diagnosed with HIV who are homeless has steadily increased from 10% in 2006 to 14% in 2017 (HIV Epidemiology Section, Population Health Division, San Francisco DPH, 2018).
- The risk of HIV infection due to homelessness can be exacerbated in particular subpopulations of people experiencing homelessness. For example, youth who have unstable housing are known to be more likely to engage in high-risk substance use.³⁶
- Homelessness has been associated with a greater likelihood of experiencing transphobic victimization (emotional, physical, and sexual abuse due to being transgender) and engaging in sexual risk taking among race minority women and the lack of access to basic living necessities has been found to impact black trans women's linkage to healthcare and HIV prevention knowledge.³⁷
- As a result of increased risk of HIV due to the factors described above, persons experiencing homelessness are disproportionately affected by HIV. An estimated 3.3% of homeless population are living with HIV compared to 1.8% of stably-housed populations.³⁸

Current HIV/AIDS Housing Inventory

In San Francisco, HIV/AIDS housing resources are limited by the available funding. Each year, a portion of these resources become available to new households due to attrition or death. Because the cost of

³⁶ Pilarinos, A., Kennedy, M. C., McNeil, R., Dong, H., Kerr, T., & DeBeck, K. (2017).

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

³⁷ Sevelius, J. M., Patouhas, E., Keatley, J. G., & Johnson, M. O. (2014). Barriers and facilitators to engagement and retention in care among transgender women living with human immunodeficiency virus. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine: A Publication of the Society of Behavioral Medicine*, 47(1), 5–16. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12160-013-9565-8>

³⁸ Thakarar, K., Morgan, J. R., Gaeta, J. M., Hohl, C., & Drainoni, M. L. (2016). Homelessness, HIV, and Incomplete Viral Suppression. *J Health Care Poor Underserved*, 27(1), 145–156. <https://doi.org/10.1353/hpu.2016.0020>

housing is rising, not all housing resources that turn over will become available to new households. This plan estimates that there are 28 units or subsidies that will become available each year to new HIV/AIDS households, assuming constant funding for HIV/AIDS housing resources.

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

Subsidy Programs

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

Table 41 – Subsidies

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

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

To demonstrate how rising costs affect the number of subsidies available, the following charts illustrate that costs for SFAF subsidies increased each year between FY 14/15 and FY 19/20, and, as a result, the

number of subsidies available for new households decreased.³⁹ These trends indicate that planning for future housing assistance for PLWHA in San Francisco should account for continued attrition as housing costs continue to rise.

Figure 4: SFAF Subsidy Costs by Type, FY 14/15 to FY 19/20





Figure 4: SFAF Subsidies by Type, FY 14/15 to FY 19/20



Permanent Capital Units

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

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

³⁹ Data were collected in October of 2019, so estimates for FY 19/20 are incomplete.

- *TH* services support individuals as they move from homelessness to permanent housing. Residents of *TH* facilities receive case management and referral services for short or moderate stays, typically lasting 6–12 months.

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

Table 42 – Dedicated Permanent HIV/AIDS Units, 2019

Unit Type	Quantity
ILA	304
BSLP	11
PSH	5
TH	11
RCFCI	113
TOTAL	444

Turnover Rate for HIV/AIDS Housing Resources

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

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

Supportive Housing

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

- **Non-profit owned housing developed with HOPWA funding.** With scattered site housing, HOPWA funding provides initial capital for construction to create a dedicated unit that is set aside for a HOPWA eligible client. The supportive housing entity agrees to set aside this unit for 50–55 years. These dedicated HOPWA units are part of larger developments with a mixture of funding sources and populations served. In the case of Derek Silva Community, the entire building is dedicated to PLWHA. HOPWA capital funds can also be used for rehabilitation of existing facilities. In many cases, rehabilitation extends the agency’s set aside commitment. Since its inception, HOPWA resources have supported a total of 440 non-profit housing units reserved for PLWHA.
- **Master-leased housing in properties leased by the City & County of San Francisco from private owners.** Currently, supportive housing programs have been established in these properties that are funded through either DPH or HSA.

- **Set-asides units in nonprofit owned affordable housing that are funded by a specific City-funded source and reserved for the clients served by that funding source.** For example, the DAH Program provides operating support to units in exchange for reserving them for DAH-eligible clients.

Other Forms of Non-Permanent Housing

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

As of December 31, 2018, 15,990 San Francisco residents at diagnosis were alive and 9,673 (60%) of these residents were still living in the city based on their most recent available address. The total number of PLWHA with a current address of San Francisco is 12,749.⁴⁰

White MSM (non-PWID) comprised half of men living with HIV in San Francisco. Among African American men, there was a higher proportion of PWID and MSM-PWID. White and African American men had similar age distributions at the end of 2018, while Latino/a, Asian/ Pacific Islander, Native American, and multi-racial men were younger than whites and African Americans. Injection drug use was the predominant transmission category for white, African American, and multi-racial women while heterosexual sex was the predominant transmission category for Latina and Asian/Pacific Islander and Native American women combined. Latino/as and African Americans each accounted for 36% and 31%, respectively, of trans women living with HIV.⁴¹

Discussion

When discussing the most pressing needs for persons living with HIV/AIDS, two issues that often arise are the aging population and the high housing costs. The current state of the rental market in San Francisco makes it virtually impossible for residents to use federal rental subsidies, as they are unable to locate a rental unit at or below the HUD-determined Fair Market Rent. Additionally, the aging nature of the population, while clearly a positive statement about the efficacy of current HIV treatment, means that individuals who receive a HOPWA-funded rental subsidy, or who occupy a HOPWA-supported supportive housing unit or an RCFCI, are unlikely to leave that unit for many years. With shrinking HOPWA funds the number of new HOPWA beds will be small. This leaves newly-diagnosed people living with HIV/AIDS who have housing needs without access to these existing HOPWA resources.

HOPWA Assistance Baseline Table

Table 43 – HOPWA Assistance Baseline

Type of HOWA Assistance	Number of Units Designated or Available for People with HIV/AIDS and their families
TBRA	187
PH in facilities	175
STRMU	117
ST or TH facilities	43
PH placement	28

Data Source: HOPWA CAPER and HOPWA Beneficiary Verification Worksheet

⁴⁰

⁴¹ HIV Epidemiology Report December 2018

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

Describe the jurisdiction’s need for Public Facilities

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

Free and/or Low-cost Exercise and Recreational Facilities

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

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

Community Centers and Gathering Spaces

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

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

Facilities to Address the Ongoing Crisis for Persons Experiencing Homelessness

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

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

How were these needs determined?

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

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

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

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

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

Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Improvements

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

Clean, Sanitary, and Safe Public Spaces

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

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

In the DPH's Community Health Needs Assessment, residents voiced a desire for a cleaner and safer city—some did not feel safe to exercise in their neighborhood—and suggested more green spaces, community gardens, public parks, and clean public restrooms.⁴² Participants in data collection for the Consolidated Plan cited needs for more community-based neighborhood clean-up efforts, better street lighting, and better outdoor lighting in general.

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

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

Greener Public Spaces

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

Safe, Reliable, and Accessible Public Transportation

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

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

⁴² Department of Public Health, Community Health Needs Assessment, pg 39

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

- **Seniors and Persons with Disabilities.** Many participants emphasized transportation accessibility challenges for seniors and persons with disabilities, including bus stops that require walking up steep hills, challenges with Paratransit, unreliable or non-functioning station elevators and escalators, and inconsistent availability of seats for older adults and people with disabilities. The DAAS DFCNA also highlighted residents' concerns with existing assisted transportation services, including a lack of reliability, long wait times and no-shows from Paratransit, inflexible routes, and expensive fares, even for individuals receiving subsidized rides. Also, some seniors shared a need for assisted transportation services that support them in getting from their residence or pick-up location to the transportation vehicle.⁴³
- **Families and Youth.** Many OCOF participants on the southeast side of the city expressed concerns about the quality, reliability, and safety of public transportation. This plan described that parents from this quadrant would allow their children to attend afterschool programs if they could count on safe, reliable transportation home.
- **Black/African Americans.** Members of this community noted that they need to rely on safer public transit options to take them to and from work, school, and other activities.
- **Residents of Public Housing.** Public Housing residents noted the need for more robust, reliable, and safe public transportation options.

How were these needs determined?

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

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

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

⁴³ Department of Aging and Adult Services, 2018 Dignity Fund Community Needs Assessment

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

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

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

Describe the jurisdiction’s need for Public Services

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

Housing Services

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

Table 44 – Most Frequently Mentioned Housing Service Needs

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

Housing Navigation and Other Services for Persons Experiencing Homelessness

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

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

Tenants’ Rights Education and Eviction Prevention Services

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

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

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

- **Seniors.** Seniors and older adults who participated in data collection for the DAAS DFCNA discussed frustration, confusion, and need for more education around their legal rights related to evictions and mistreatment from property managers.⁴⁴

Landlord Education & Section 8 Recruitment Services

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

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

⁴⁴ Department of Aging and Adult Services, 2018 Dignity Fund Community Needs Assessment

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

Social and Supportive Service Programs

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

Table 45 –Most Frequently Mentioned Social Service Needs

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

Benefits Assistance, Service Navigation, and Case Management

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

Along these lines, the Homeownership SF assessment, which included focus groups with older adults, adults with disabilities, LGBTQ+ households, persons living with HIV, and Asian/Pacific Islander communities, found that housing instability has impacted their health and/or ability to find stable employment. Participants frequently shared that the act of navigating complicated bureaucracies left them feeling hopeless, and restricted their ability to engage in activities or programming to achieve a greater level of self-sufficiency.⁴⁵

⁴⁵ Homeownership SF report: Results from 2017-2018 Focus Groups. Assessment of Housing Needs and Barriers experienced by Black, Latino/a and Pacific Islander Communities, LGBT households, Seniors, and Persons with Disabilities

In the DAAS DFCNA, residents expressed frustration about navigating what they perceive as a large, decentralized, and often complicated service system. They discussed the time it takes to navigate the system and to determine what services are available, where they are located, and whether they meet eligibility requirements. As an example of the complications associated with navigating the system, many consumers from different groups cited an extensive amount of paperwork, which is often redundant across different services or programs.

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

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

Behavioral Health Services

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

- **Persons Experiencing Homelessness.** Participants specifically called for accessible and culturally competent mental health services to address the trauma of homelessness. The DCYF Community Needs Assessment also pointed to a need for social-emotional support for youth and families who lack basic housing and/or are facing homelessness.⁴⁶

⁴⁶ DCYF Community Needs Assessment

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

Affordable Childcare and After-School Services

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

Improved Cultural Inclusivity and Accessibility for Public Services

San Franciscans consistently articulated the need to expand and improve access to existing public services for various culturally-specific resident populations, as well as ensure these services are accessible for community members who are monolingual speakers of threshold languages other than English. Among those discussed during data collection, stakeholders identified the need to translate materials for housing services, health services, emergency services, and services that help residents enroll in public benefits and entitlements. The most common response to questions about language translation needs was that all housing and social service materials need to account for the linguistic diversity of residents and be culturally inclusive. The need for language support more generally was an overarching theme across the community meetings. Residents expressed an interest in innovative strategies for integrating language services, such as maximizing “the effectiveness of reaching non-English speakers by collaborating with housing advocacy and community groups that already conduct trainings and disseminate fair housing information to specific populations.”⁴⁷

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

- **Seniors and Persons with Disabilities.** Across many public forums and focus groups, residents raised the need for information about public services to be written in plain language, and for

⁴⁷ Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), 2013-2018 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice

events to include simultaneous translation into American Sign Language. The Homeownership SF report found that residents with limited technological skills or internet access emphasized a need for centralized information about housing programs and public services.⁴⁸

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

Education and Economic Self-sufficiency Services

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

Table 46 – Top Education and Economic Self-Sufficiency Service Needs

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

Workforce Readiness, Job Training, and Placement Services

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

⁴⁸ Homeownership SF report: Results from 2017-2018 Focus Groups. Assessment of Housing Needs and Barriers experienced by Black, Latino/a and Pacific Islander Communities, LGBT households, Seniors, and Persons with Disabilities

a practice test for City jobs to allow those with additional barriers to learn more about what to expect from the real exam.

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

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

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

Financial Education, Empowerment, and Planning Services

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

- **Recent Immigrants.** In particular, participants raised a need for culturally-competent financial literacy programs for recently-arrived immigrants, including those that regularly send money to relatives in their countries of origin.
- **Residents of Public Housing.** Banking and credit counseling services emerged as a priority need among residents of public housing.

- **Persons Experiencing Homelessness.** Banking and credit counseling services also emerged as a priority among those experiencing homelessness.
- **Youth and TAY.** In the community input sessions, six groups discussed the needs of 14- to 24-year-olds and prioritized the need for youth to develop life skills and independence, with a particular emphasis on financial literacy (e.g., banking, building credit, taxes, and savings). In the DCYF Community Needs Assessment, service provider grantees emphasized the need for developing financial literacy, including debt and debt management, information about student loans, credit building, access to banking, and avoiding check cashers and predatory lenders.⁴⁹
- **Black/African American and Latino/a.** Survey respondents from these communities listed financial literacy and budgeting as a top need.

Education Services

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

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

How were these needs determined?

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

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

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

⁴⁹ Department of Children Youth and Families, 2016 DCYF Community Needs Assessment

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

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

Housing Market Analysis

MA-05 Overview

Housing Market Analysis Overview

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

Lack of Affordability: Rental Housing

Low-income households face a significant gap between what they can afford and the price of available housing. According to HUD standards, renters earning 50% of AMI, or \$55,450 for a three-person household, should pay \$1,386 for a two-bedroom apartment, which is 30% of gross household income.⁵⁰ In 2018 the average San Francisco apartment rented for more than three times that value or \$4,650 per month.⁵¹

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

Table 47 – Rental Housing Affordability Gap in San Francisco, 2019

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

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

⁵⁰ “2019 Maximum Income by Household Size, Unadjusted AMI for HUD Metro Fair Market Rent Area that contains San Francisco,” and “2019 Maximum Monthly Rent by Unit Type derived from the Unadjusted AMI,” both available online at the MOHCD website at: <https://sfmohcd.org/ami-levels> (May 3, 2019).

⁵¹ SF Planning Department, 2018 Housing Inventory, 2019.

Lack of Affordability: Ownership Housing

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

Table 48 – Homeownership Affordability Gap in San Francisco by Income Level, 2019

Income Levels ^[1]	2019	
	Affordable Sales Price ^{[2],[3]}	Affordability Gap ^[4]
130% AMI	\$605,000	(\$705,000)
105% AMI	\$463,000	(\$847,000)
80% AMI	\$320,000	(\$990,000)
Median Home Value^[5]	\$1,310,000	

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

^[1] Income categories are based on SF MOHCD's income table named "[2019 Maximum Income by Household Size derived from the Unadjusted Area Median Income \(AMI\) for HUD Metro Fair Market Rent \(HMFA\) that contains San Francisco.](#)" Households earning up to 100% of AMI are eligible to apply for low-income BMR Ownership Units with an affordable purchase price set at 80% of AMI or less. Households earning from 95% to 120% of AMI eligible to apply for moderate-income BMR Ownership Units with an affordable purchase price set at 105% of AMI or less. Households earning from 120% to 150% of AMI are eligible to apply for middle-income BMR Ownership Units with an affordable purchase price set at 130% of AMI or less.

^[2] Affordable sales prices and median sales prices are rounded to nearest \$1,000.

^[3] Affordable sales price calculation assumes 33% of income is spent on housing, including taxes and insurance, a 10% downpayment, and 90% financing based on an annual average interest rate per the Federal Reserve Bank.

^[4] Affordability gap equals affordable sales price minus median sales price for 2-bedroom unit.

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

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

Introduction

San Francisco’s housing stock is roughly divided into low-, medium-, and higher-density structures. San Francisco’s housing stock is older than other West Coast cities, with almost 50% of San Francisco’s housing units constructed before World War II. San Francisco’s housing tends to be smaller in size, with about 71% of all units containing two bedrooms or less. San Francisco, like most large cities, is a city of renters who live in 64% of occupied housing units in the City.

All residential properties by number of units

Table 49 – Residential Properties by Unit Number

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

Data Source: 2011-2015 ACS

Unit Size by Tenure

Table 50 – Unit Size by Tenure

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

Data Source: 2011-2015 ACS

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

There are approximately 25,000 existing affordable housing units that have received local financial assistance from MOHCD or from the former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency or are monitored by MOHCD for long-term affordability. Those units also received a combination of federal or state assistance ranging from Low Income Housing Tax Credits, HUD Section 202/811 capital funding or

funding from the California Department of Housing and Community Development. They targeted households earning 60% of area median income or below and served populations ranging from very low-income seniors, TAY, homeless adults to low-income families. In 2019, there were 1,911 public housing units and 12,165 HCV vouchers (both tenant and project based) under SFHA management. The average annual household income for SFHA clients is \$14,590. Without public housing and HCV vouchers, virtually all SFHA clients would be forced to live outside the City or even face homelessness.

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

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

Table 51 – San Francisco Affordable Housing Units with Expiring Federal Rental or Operating Subsidy Between 2019 and 2024

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

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

Source: HUD Section 8 Contracts database

NOTES

HUD

Scale:

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

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

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

Describe the need for specific types of housing:

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

Discussion

Public Housing

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

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

Rent-Controlled Apartments

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

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

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

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

Introduction

San Francisco’s housing prices are among the highest in the nation for both renters and homeowners. Despite price declines in the middle of 2019, the median home value for a single-family home in San Francisco in 2019 exceeded \$1.4 million, has risen by 55.7% since 2015 and is predicted to rise by another 5.7% within the next year.¹⁰² The median sales price for San Francisco was over 1.7 times the cost of similar housing in the Bay Area and over five times the national average.¹⁰³

Table 52 – Cost of Housing

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

Cost of Housing

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

Table 53 - Rent Paid

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

Data Source: 2011–2015 ACS

Table 54 – Housing Affordability

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

Data Source: 2011–2015 CHAS

Table 55 – Monthly Rent

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

Data Source: HUD FMR and HOME Rents

Is there sufficient housing for households at all income levels?

There is insufficient housing for very-low income households as shown on previous Table 35.

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

Housing affordability will get worse should home values increase and rents increase between now and 2024.

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

Table 56 – Area Median Rent Compared to Fair Market Rent and HOME Rents

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

Data Source: HUD FMR; 2019 HOME Rents; Zillow

The area median rent is more than 1.5 times to up 2.9 times the Fair Market Rent or Low HOME Rents. The significant price differential only emphasizes the need to construct more affordable rental housing.

Discussion


Rental Housing Market Trends

San Francisco has one of the highest cost housing markets in the country. Because the City is only 7 miles square, and has scarce undeveloped land, housing is truly at a premium. Furthermore, cultural and culinary attractions, natural beauty, and jobs in highly skilled occupations have drawn a relatively large upper income population to the area. Yet, San Francisco is home to many low-income residents as well as upper-income professionals. According to the CHAS data in Table 8, at least a third of San Francisco's population is very low-income and earns less than half of the Area Median Income (HUD 50% unadjusted AMI in 2019 is equivalent to \$43,100/year or \$3,592/month for a single individual). At this income level, market rate rents are out of reach with market rent for a studio or efficiency apartment at \$2,990. According to HUD, an "affordable" rent should not exceed 30% of a household's total income. Thus, the affordable rent for a single person earning \$43,100 50% AMI would be \$1,078, *less than 36%* of the actual market rate rent for a studio apartment. Due to the City's overall high housing costs, San Francisco is predominantly a city of renters – 65% of all households rent.¹⁰⁴ With strong job market growth and correlating increase in the demand for housing, rental prices continue to rise.

Ownership Housing Market Trends

San Francisco is consistently ranked as one of the most expensive for-sale housing markets in the country. In 2019, San Francisco had an estimated median sale price of \$1,310,000.¹⁰⁵ While the strength of San Francisco's housing market is positive in many respects, it also means that few households can afford to buy (see "San Francisco Homeownership Affordability Gap" table above). Many homeowners in San Francisco bought their homes many years ago and could not afford to buy today. For that reason, neighborhoods with high homeownership rates are not necessarily high-income communities. Bayview, Excelsior, and Portola house many of San Francisco's lowest-income communities, yet they also have some of the highest homeownership rates in the City. Conversely, some high-income communities such as the Marina and Nob Hill have low ownership rates (Map 4).

Map 4 – Proportion of Owner-Occupied Housing



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

Introduction

The City and County of San Francisco housing stock contains 42% of the units possess one of more conditions that threaten the vitality of its occupants. Renter-occupied households are more likely to live in substandard housing than owner-occupied counterparts. Moreover, 83% of housing units in San Francisco were built prior to 1980 – 58% were built prior to 1950 with 5% of units built before 1980 with children present, therefore having a number of aging units at risk for presenting lead-based paint hazards that can harm children.

Definition for "substandard condition" and "substandard condition but suitable for rehabilitation:"

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

Table 57 - Condition of Units

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

Data Source: 2011-2015 ACS

Table 58 – Year Unit Built

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

Year Unit Built	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Number	%	Number	%
Total	128,685	99%	224,585	100%

Data Source: 2011–2015 CHAS

Table 59 – Risk of Lead-Based Paint

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

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

Table 60 – Vacant Units

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

Need for Owner and Rental Rehabilitation

San Francisco’s historical architectural and aging housing landscape is susceptible to deteriorating housing conditions. Of the 353,270 housing units, the majority or 92% were built before 1980 and 58% were built before 1950. Forty-two percent or 149,940 of San Francisco housing units have one or more conditions that could classify them as substandard housing. The need to provide housing rehabilitation programs to address the substandard conditions of tenant- and owner-occupied housing is not only prevalent today, but will continue to be so for decades to come.

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

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

Discussion

Substandard Housing

San Francisco has an older housing stock, with 58% of all units built before 1950 as illustrated in Table 38

above. This is the largest concentration of older housing stock in the State.

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

Health and Building Code Violations

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

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

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

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

Buildings At-Risk from Seismic Activity

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

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

Introduction

The SFHA’s express mission is to “provide safe, sanitary, affordable, and decent housing to very low-income families, senior citizens and persons with disabilities.” Founded in 1938, it was the first established housing authority in California, and receives nearly all of its \$65+ million operating income from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and tenant-paid rents. The SFHA is overseen by seven citizen commissioners, all of whom are appointed by the Mayor. Two of those commissioners must be current SFHA residents.

In 2012, HUD designated SFHA as a “Troubled” agency, the lowest designation prior to putting an agency under federal receivership. From 2015-2020, SFHA implemented its Public Housing Authority Recovery and Sustainability Agreement and Action Plan (PHARS), which it executed on July 1, 2013 with HUD and the City and County of San Francisco.

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

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

Table 61 – Totals Number of Units

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

Describe the supply of public housing developments:

After the 2015–2016 RAD conversion of 3,480 public housing units (see Table 62 below), only 1,911 public housing units remain in SFHA’s portfolio. The bulk of these are located at Sunnysdale-Velasco (665 units, reduced from original total of 785 units), and Potrero Terrace/Potrero Annex (514, down from original total of 606 units). Note that both Sunnysdale and Potrero are “HOPE SF” projects, described in greater detail below.

An additional 584 units of public housing in HOPE VI “mixed finance” projects are also being converted under RAD. Between 1993 and 1997, HUD funded the redevelopment of six SFHA projects through HOPE VI. Private housing providers redeveloped and operated the 1,149 housing units (756 of which were public housing replacement units) on the six sites, including two Hayes Valley sites, shown in Exhibit 3 below. The Housing Authority formed limited partnerships with four of the housing providers for Bernal Dwellings, Hayes Valley North and South, and Plaza East, in which the limited partnerships entered into long-term ground leases for the sites; and entered into long-term ground leases with the non-profit housing providers for North Beach and Valencia Gardens.

Exhibit 13 – San Francisco HOPE VI projects

Project Name	AMP	Neighborhood	Total PIC Units	Project type
Plaza East	963	Western Addition	193	Family
Bernal Dwellings	962	Bernal/Mission	160	Family
Hayes Valley North	960	Western Addition	51	Family
Halley Valley South	961	Western Addition	66	Family
North Beach	990	North Beach	138	Family
Valencia Gardens	991	Mission	148	Family
TOTAL HOPE VI			756	

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

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

Table 62 – Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) Conversion List

Project Name	AMP	Neighborhood	Total PIC Units	Project type
CHINATOWN				
227 Bay	972	Chinatown	50	Senior
990 Pacific	976	Chinatown	92	Senior
Ping Yuen	972	Chinatown	234	Family
Ping Yuen North	976	Chinatown	200	Mixed
<i>Subtotal</i>			576	
W ADDITION 1				
Robert B. Pitts	988	Western Addition	200	Family
Westside Courts	969	Western Addition	135	Family
<i>Subtotal</i>			335	
W ADDITION 2				
939 Eddy	987	Western Addition	36	Senior
951 Eddy	987	Western Addition	24	Senior
1750 McAllister	985	Western Addition	97	Senior

Project Name	AMP	Neighborhood	Total PIC Units	Project type
Rosa Parks	978	Western Addition	200	Senior
<i>Subtotal</i>			353	
TENDERLOIN/SOMA				
666 Ellis	981	Tenderloin	100	Senior
430 Turk	987	Tenderloin	89	Senior
350 Ellis	981	Tenderloin	96	Senior
320 & 330 Clementina	983	SOMA	276	Senior
<i>Subtotal</i>			561	
BERNAL HEIGHTS				
Holly Courts	966	Bernal	118	Family
Alemany	966	Bernal	150	Family
<i>Subtotal</i>			268	
MISSION/CASTRO				
25 Sanchez	986	Castro	89	Senior
462 Duboce	986	Castro	42	Senior
255 Woodside	979	Forest Hill	110	Senior
3850 18th St.	982	Mission	107	Senior
Mission Dolores	980	Mission	92	Senior
<i>Subtotal</i>			441	
LOWER PAC HEIGHTS				
1880 Pine	977	Lower Pac Heights	113	Senior
345 Arguello St.	986	Richmond	69	Senior
491 31st	986	Richmond	75	Senior
1760 Bush	977	Lower Pac Heights	108	Senior
Kennedy Towers	984	Lower Pac Heights	98	Senior
2698 California St	984	Lower Pac Heights	40	Senior
<i>Subtotal</i>			503	
SOUTHEAST				
Hunter's Point E/W	973	Southeast	213	Family
Westbrook Apartments	970	Southeast	226	Family
<i>Subtotal</i>			439	
TOTAL PORTFOLIO			3,480	

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

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

With the exception of RAD conversions of 546 HOPE VI units and the Section 18 disposition of 70 scattered site units, disposition of the remaining public housing units under SFHA’s jurisdiction will take place through the HOPE SF program, begun by SFHA in collaboration with the City in 2005. HOPE SF is the nation’s first large-scale community development and reparations initiative aimed at creating vibrant, inclusive, mixed-income neighborhoods without mass displacement of original low-income communities of color. Through intensive community and economic development, combined with comprehensive resident service supports, HOPE SF seeks to reintegrate these long-isolated public housing communities with the City and to connect HOPE SF families with all the opportunities the City has to offer. The housing development-related work is carried out by MOHCD in coordination with OCII. Each site has a community building and service connection partnership through community-based organizations that provide activities and services on site.

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

The HOPE SF active public housing sites are:

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

The status of the individual HOPE SF sites follows:

Hunters View

The replacement of Hunters View’s 267 public housing units is currently underway. All original households have been rehoused in replacement units; an additional 53 replacement units will be completed in 2023. The new mixed-income community will include 745 homes, comprised of 1:1 public housing replacement units, 86 new affordable units, and up to 392 market rate units. While the Hunters View site has stunning views due to its very steep terrain, this site condition has made design and planning very difficult and the site’s new infrastructure particularly expensive. The benefits of this investment are many, however. Hunters View’s new streets will connect it with the broader Bayview neighborhood for the first time. Eased access to the Third Street Muni rail line, bus transit, and community services should enhance day-to-day life for all Hunters View residents.

Alice Griffith

Alice Griffith’s revitalization began in January 2015, and all public housing households have been rehoused in brand new units. An additional 30 public housing replacement units that satisfy the replacement requirements will be constructed in 2022. The overall development program includes the 1:1 replacement of 256 public housing units, 248 new affordable units, and 706 market-rate units, providing 1,210 new units overall. Like Hunters View, Alice Griffith’s redevelopment benefited from the ability to temporarily relocate families on site while construction was underway, thus avoiding disruptive off-site relocation. Alice Griffith enjoyed the additional benefit of a \$30.5 million Choice Neighborhoods Initiative grant from HUD, awarded to help transform the housing and broader neighborhood and provide meaningful supportive services to residents.

Potrero Terrace and Potrero Annex

The steady growth of the Potrero Hill neighborhood’s affluence and prosperity over the years has not improved conditions at Potrero Terrace and Potrero Annex. Crumbling infrastructure, disconnected streets, and the dilapidated housing stock at the sites have preserved conditions of poverty. The Potrero revitalization program anticipates 1,600 new units, including 606 public housing replacement units, an additional 385 new affordable housing units, and 609 new market rate or workforce housing units. The development will include new streets, new parks, and a new community facility as well as community-serving retail. The first 72 public housing replacement units were completed in 2019. As of January 2020, another 167 units are in predevelopment. The entire project is expected to be complete in 2030.

Sunnydale-Velasco

Sunnydale-Velasco’s 785 public housing units are spread over 50 hillside acres in an isolated corner of Visitacion Valley. The magnitude of the Sunnydale site amplifies its disconnectedness and infrastructure needs. The newly envisioned Sunnydale will include the replacement of its public housing units, 307 new affordable units, and 645 market rate units, together totaling 1,651 new units. New community facilities, parks, community gardens and an orchard, and new retail will enhance the housing revitalization plan. The first 53 public housing replacement units were completed in 2019. As of January 2020, over 310 units are in predevelopment or construction. The entire project is expected to be complete in 2030.

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

Public Housing Condition

Table 63 – Public Housing Condition

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

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

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

See the information provided above regarding the RAD and HOPE SF restoration and revitalization efforts currently underway.

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

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

In addition, at all RAD and HOPE SF sites, new developer-owners provide new supportive services that will include case management and community building activities. Areas of emphasis will include health and wellness (including mental health), educational needs, and social interactions.

Discussion:

Please see above.

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

Introduction

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

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

Permanent supportive housing is a nationally-recognized practice that has been shown to be effective: About three quarters of those who enter supportive housing stay for at least two years, and about half retain the housing for three to five years.⁵² In addition, a study of two programs in San Francisco found that people in supportive housing have lower service costs, with a 57% reduction in emergency room visits and a 45% reduction in inpatient admissions.⁵³

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

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

⁵² Wong YI, Hadley TR, Culhane DP, Poulin SR, Davis MR, Cirksey BA, Brown JL. Predicting Staying or Leaving in Permanent Supportive Housing that Serves Homeless People with Serious Mental Illness. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research, Washington DC. March 2006. and Lipton, F.R., Siegel, C., Hannigan, A., et al. Tenure in supportive housing for homeless persons with severe mental illness. *Psychiatric Services* 51(4): 479-486, 2000.

⁵³ Martinez T and Burt M. Impact of Permanent Supportive Housing on the use of Acute Health Care Services by Homeless Adults. *Psychiatric Services*, Vol.57, No. 7, July 2006.

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

Facilities and Housing Targeted to Homeless Households

Table 64 – Facilities and Housing Targeted to Homeless Households

	Emergency Shelter Beds		Transitional Housing Beds	Permanent Supportive Housing Beds	
	Year Round Beds (Current & New)	Voucher / Seasonal / Overflow Beds	Current & New	Current & New	Under Development
Households with Adult(s) and Child(ren)	391		297	2,000	232
Households with Only Adults	1,900	200	278	6,000	75
Chronically Homeless Households				6,000	307
Veterans	56		198	960	100
Unaccompanied Youth	60		35	79	54

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The City supports a number of emergency shelters that serve homeless single youth and adults. Currently eight shelters offer a total of 305 beds dedicated to women and 829 beds for men in the San Francisco Adult Shelter System. Adult Shelter System provides short-term emergency shelter for adults experiencing homelessness in San Francisco. The current adult shelter system has 1,203 shelter beds for adults over the age of 18. To access shelter, please create a profile by visiting any of the shelter reservation sites below. More information on the 90-day shelter bed reservation system is available

in [English](#) and in [Spanish](#). Lists of adult shelters and resource centers are also available in both [English](#) and [Spanish](#). Further since 2016, San Francisco has implemented a substantial increase in shelter beds at Navigation Centers and SAFE Centers that serve people of any gender. San Francisco's first Navigation Center opened in March 2015 and was a successful pilot serving San Francisco's highly vulnerable and long-term unhoused neighbors who are often fearful of accessing traditional shelter and services. HSH subsequently opened 8 Navigation Centers and currently has 6 in operation. For more information, [click here](#).

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

The SAFE Navigation Center Model

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

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

Seasonal Shelter Programs

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

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

The City also supports organizations that provide transitional housing to help homeless individuals move from the street to permanent housing. Clients using transitional housing may stay in the housing for six months to two years and receive intensive services such as education, job training and placement, substance abuse counseling, parenting classes and childcare services. They usually pay 30 percent of their income for services and housing.

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

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

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

Introduction

With the adoption of the 10 Year Plan to End Chronic Homelessness in 2004, San Francisco launched an ambitious supportive housing development program to create 3,000 new units for the chronically homeless within a 10-year period. The focus on permanent supportive housing encompasses various special need populations with wrap around service supports to stabilize residents who have faced long-term homelessness. By the end of the 10-year plan period, just over 3,000 units came on line which provided specialized housing and services to single person households, families, seniors, frail seniors, veterans, TAY, persons with HIV / AIDS, and people with serious mental illness. While San Francisco successfully met the target production goal of 3,000 units from this plan, there remains a significant need for permanent supportive housing across diverse populations. During the period of 2020–2024, San Francisco will continue to build on successful models to continue creating new permanent supportive housing units.

HOPWA Assistance Baseline Table

Table 65 – HOPWA Goals

One year goals for the number of households to be provided housing through the use of HOPWA for:	
Short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance to prevent homelessness of the individual or family	93
Tenant-based rental assistance	187
Units provided in permanent housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	232
Units provided in transitional short-term housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	28
Total	540

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

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

Community-based long-term care services include: in-home supportive services; home health care; adult day services; paratransit services; home-delivered meals; supportive services in a hotel; care in residential care facilities, including board and care and assisted living; and other health and social

services. Long term care and supportive services can be provided in home and community-based settings, as well as in institutional settings, depending on need and choice.

Persons with Disabilities – As described in Section NA-10, there is a significant need for affordable housing and permanent supportive housing for adults with disabilities

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

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

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

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

Transitional Age Youth – Children and youth make up 20% of the homeless population in San Francisco. It is estimated that about 2,000 youth are homeless, marginally housed or at risk of homelessness in San Francisco on any given night. Young people in San Francisco face significant challenges accessing affordable and safe housing. They often do not know what is available; they also face prohibitive eligibility restrictions, long wait lists, and a lack of affordable options in safe neighborhoods.

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

To maximize the efficacy of its hospital discharge planning, the DPH funds a Medical Respite and Sobering Center in partnership with Community Awareness & Treatment Services. The Center provides approximately 75 respite beds (collocated with a 12-bed sobering center), and temporary housing with medically oriented support services for medically frail, homeless persons leaving San Francisco General Hospital or other clinics. The Center also includes a full-service kitchen that provides three hot meals per day and prepares special menus for any dietary needs of the clients. Medical respite episodes provide an important alternative to costly emergency care and also link individuals to longer-term residential options.

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

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

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

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

HIV Housing 5-Year Plan Goals

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

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

Negative Effects of Public Policies on Affordable Housing and Residential Investment

Barriers to Affordable Housing Production

Developing housing in San Francisco is an expensive endeavor and a complex and lengthy process. Factors including high land and construction costs, scarce developable parcels, protracted entitlement and permitting processes, and organized opposition from neighbors pose real obstacles to developing market rate or affordable housing in San Francisco.

Barriers to construction of affordable housing include:

- Strong housing demand, leading to high land values and the ability of property owners to command high land sale prices and lack of available land
- High construction costs
- Lengthy permitting process, due in part to environmental review and resident concerns over growth

High Land Costs and Lack of Available Land: San Francisco is a peninsula of only 48.8 square miles. It has an established, relatively dense development pattern and is considered by many to be substantially built-out. While there are parcels of land still potentially available for development, San Francisco's tight land market increases pressures on land values. Both market-rate and affordable housing developers have reported to departments in San Francisco city government that acquiring land for housing San Francisco is a challenge. The heightened values of land make some of the land identified as a potential housing site infeasible for actual housing development, especially housing affordable to lower income households. San Francisco's finite supply of land, coupled with strong development pressure, means that land-owners can expect high prices for parcels they own, if they choose to sell for housing development at all.

High Construction Costs: In addition to high land costs, other direct costs of building new housing – the cost of labor, of construction materials and contractor fees – continue to escalate. Steep construction costs are generally seen as a major constraint on housing development and especially impacts affordability. The 2020 University of California Berkeley study of hard construction costs in California found that construction costs in the state had risen by 25% and by 119% in the Bay Area between 2008 and 2018, Bay Area construction costs are the most expensive in the state, and affordable housing construction costs are more expensive than comparable market rate or mixed-income developments.⁵⁴ Contributors to these high costs include the higher cost of living in the Bay Area, which exacerbate the need for higher labor costs.

Governmental Constraints: Housing production in San Francisco is affected by a number of governmental regulations, from local policies and codes to state and federal land use regulations and state environmental laws. These regulatory controls have been carefully crafted over time to balance citywide needs and address public concerns. For example, affordable housing is subject to some form of prevailing wage requirements if it is funded by low income housing tax credits or federal funding.

⁵⁴ Turner Center for Housing Innovation, The Hard Costs of Construction: Recent Trends in Labor and Materials Costs for Apartment Buildings in California, March 2020.

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

Overcoming Barriers

Building anything new requires extensive local review and approval processes to ensure that the final structure is safe, respects the neighborhood context, serves community needs and meets environmental standards. From start to finish, the typical development process can take anywhere from three to five years.

Recognizing the need to expedite housing production to address the need for housing for all income levels, Mayor Lee committed the City delivering at least 5,000 units of new or rehabilitated housing every year for the foreseeable future and consequently issued Executive Directive 17-02 on September 27, 2017. This Directive supplements Executive Directive 13-01 on December 18, 2013. It ordered all City departments that have the legal authority over the permitting or mapping of new or existing housing to prioritize in their administrative work plans the construction and development of all net new housing including permanently affordable housing. Directive 17-02 aims to deliver faster approvals for housing development projects at both the entitlement stage and the post-entitlement permitting stage. It directed City permitting and housing delivery agencies to work together to implement specific:

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

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

Introduction

According to the San Francisco Office of Economic Analysis (2020), the San Francisco economy remains healthy (2020, p. 15).⁵⁵ The average unemployment rate for the last two years remained at an all-time low of approximately 2.3%. The September 2019 unemployment rate of 1.8% was the lowest level ever recorded in San Francisco, and is far below what most economists consider full employment. Since 2010, the City has added, on average, about 24,000 jobs per year, with almost every major sector contributing to this growth.

Per the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and California Employment Development Department (December 2019), San Francisco has added 203,000 jobs (36.4% increase) since 2010⁵⁶, though only 135,000 more San Franciscans have jobs since 2010 (30.3% increase)⁵⁷; therefore, jobs in San Francisco are growing faster than job growth for San Francisco residents.

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

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

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

⁵⁵ San Francisco Controller, Office of Economic Analysis. (3 January 2020). *Five Year Financial Plan Update: FY 2020-21 through FY 2023-24*. Author.

⁵⁶ Source: US Bureau of Labor Statistics Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages (www.bls.gov/cew)

⁵⁷ Source: California Employment Development Department (www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov)

Economic Development Market Analysis

Business Activity

Table 66 – Business Activity

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

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

Table 67 – Labor Force

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

Data Source: 2011-2015 ACS

Table 68 – Occupations by Sector

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

Occupations by Sector	Number of People
Construction, extraction, maintenance and repair	16,750
Production, transportation and material moving	12,315

Data Source: 2011-2015 ACS

Table 69 – Travel Time

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

Data Source: 2011-2015 ACS

Education

Table 70 – Educational Attainment by Employment Status (Population 16 and Older)

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

Data Source: 2011-2015 ACS

Table 71 - Educational Attainment by Age

	Age				
	18–24 yrs	25–34 yrs	35–44 yrs	45–65 yrs	65+ yrs
Less than 9th grade	865	3,975	5,675	20,815	23,175
9th to 12th grade, no diploma	3,180	4,405	5,195	12,715	9,615
High school graduate, GED, or alternative	12,420	13,855	13,885	35,650	20,555
Some college, no degree	29,220	24,525	17,900	38,075	18,075

	Age				
	18–24 yrs	25–34 yrs	35–44 yrs	45–65 yrs	65+ yrs
Associate's degree	3,040	7,945	7,155	14,780	6,645
Bachelor's degree	18,195	90,465	47,825	54,650	22,250
Graduate or professional degree	1,380	42,360	38,670	40,085	18,865

Data Source: 2011-2015 ACS

Table 72 – Educational Attainment – Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months

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

Data Source: 2011-2015 ACS

Based on the Business Activity table above, what are the major employment sectors within your jurisdiction?

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

Growing jobs, increasing housing, and improving transportation will keep the City on a positive economic development trajectory. To keep up with our growing industries, Workforce has developed four workforce academies in construction, health care, hospitality, and technology to train and connect residents to jobs. We have also invested in efforts to grow jobs across every sector - in professional services, tech, biotech and cleantech, international trade and tourism, film and video production, advanced manufacturing, construction and health care - all parts of the City’s diverse economy.

Describe the workforce and infrastructure needs of the business community

Construction

In 2020, construction cranes continue to dot the San Francisco skyline, reflecting a construction boom unseen in decades. According to the San Francisco Planning Department, the total cost of construction associated with building permits in 2015 was \$3.4 billion, exceeding the average of the previous nine years by a billion dollars. And the construction boom is projected to continue.

The San Francisco CityBuild Academy aims to meet the demands of the construction industry by

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

Health Care

The health care sector grew 16.2% from 2010 – 2020, and it is projected to grow 8.2% by 2025, solidifying its role as a vital San Francisco industry⁵⁸. This role will be further enhanced by the completion of major public and private hospital projects, including the recently completed rebuild of Laguna Honda Hospital, two California Pacific Medical Center’s San Francisco hospitals, and the ongoing rebuild of San Francisco General Hospital and other publicly-funded clinics.

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

The San Francisco health care sector represents an opportunity for middle-skill jobs, demonstrating higher than average entry- and middle-skill wages above the self-sufficiency wage rate⁵⁹. Employment is certification-based, and there are clear pathways from entry-level to advanced middle-skill employment. This provides an opportunity for low-income and disconnected workers to enter a career pathway without advanced degrees.

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

Generally speaking, health care employers do not report tremendous difficulty finding qualified applicants. However, according to employers we work with, they anticipate that nurses who chose not to retire during the recession will begin to leave the workforce. In addition, employers report that they experience difficulty keeping their employees current on new technology. There may be more opportunities for incumbent worker training in the upcoming years as technology changes and employees retire.

Hospitality

Despite growing employment opportunities and career pathways, the hospitality industry continues to face serious workforce challenges related to staff attraction and retention. In particular, hospitality struggles to retain entry-level staff and younger demographic workers. According to the U.S. Bureau of

⁵⁸ Economic Modeling Specialists International. (February 2020). *Industry Snapshot: Healthcare*, EMSI Q1 2020 Data Set.

⁵⁹ JPMorgan Chase & Co. (May 2015). *Strengthening the Bay Area: Building a Middle-Skill Workforce to Sustain Economic Growth and Expand Opportunity*.

Labor Statistics, Leisure and Hospitality occupations experienced a 76.7% total annual separation rate for employees in 2018. This figure is staggering, especially when juxtaposed with the total rate of US. employee separations at 44.3 %.⁶⁰ While the cyclical nature of hospitality industry allows workers to enter the market and either move up through the sector to on to another, this trend necessitates investment from workforce entities and employers to ensure a continuous pool of job-ready candidates. The issue of staff attraction and retention affects a diversity of employers within the hospitality sector. In 2016, The National Restaurant Association calculated that the employee turnover rate for the industry was 61%, with that figure nearly doubling for front-line positions (hosts, servers, support staff).⁶¹ Hoteliers are also struggling to replace staff that are exiting the industry. Nationally, hoteliers are experiencing an approximate employee separation rate of 73.8%, though locally, this can largely be attributed to large scale retirements.⁶² In conversations with San Francisco stakeholders, including the SF Hotel Council and Local 2, OEWD has been advised that a large proportion of union hotel employees are expected to retire within the next few years. In fact, in 2019, the Hotel Council reported a decline in San Francisco hotel workers who reside in the city, with 47% of employees commuting in from places like San Mateo, Contra Costa, and Alameda counties. This figure depicts a 7% decrease in SF residency for hotel workers since 2016, and underlines the importance of local workforce training.⁶³ As commuting and transportation challenges continue to face this workforce, it can be expected that the separation rate will also continue to increase.

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

Tech

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

The Bureau of Labor Statistics projects that nationwide employment in software development will grow by 24% between 2016–2026, much faster than the average growth across all sectors.² This projection likely underestimates future growth in high tech for the San Francisco Bay Area, where the local high

⁶⁰ <https://www.bls.gov/news.release/jolts.t16.htm>

⁶¹ <https://upserve.com/restaurant-insider/3-common-reasons-restaurant-employee-turnover/>

⁶² <https://business.dailypay.com/blog/staff-turnover-rates-hotel-motel-hospitality-industry>

⁶³ <https://www.bizjournals.com/sanfrancisco/news/2019/08/20/tourism-hotels-economic-impact-hotel-council-sf.html>

technology sector both drives national and international technological innovation and local economic growth. Amidst the historic growth in the sector, the pipeline for tech careers has not kept up with the demand and hiring qualified tech workers has continued to be a challenge for local tech employers. Across the U.S. and specifically the San Francisco Metro Statistical Area, tech growth has consistently outpaced almost all other industries and occupations, growing 6.7% annually.³ Additionally, it is the general consensus that large racial and gender disparities exist across industries, occupations, and pipeline stages of the high tech sector. African American and Latino/a employees are significantly underrepresented within technical occupations, such as computer programmers and software developers, and decision-making roles, such as managers and executives. Women, and especially women of color, are likewise inadequately represented. To further exacerbate this divide is the high tech industry's reliance on talent from top-tiered universities. As a result, the San Francisco Metro Statistical Area has a high tech workforce that is less diverse across racial and gender lines than any other major tech hub in the country.

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

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

Businesses

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

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

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

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

Describe any major changes that may have an economic impact, such as planned local or regional public or private sector investments or initiatives that have affected or may affect job and business growth opportunities during the planning period. Describe any needs for workforce development, business support or infrastructure these changes may create.

Housing

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

Transportation

San Francisco is also addressing our transportation challenges. We are working to improve road conditions, overcrowded transit, streets and cross walks that are unsafe for pedestrians, and congestion. An estimated 88,000 workers commute to San Francisco daily. Transportation is a key factor in affordability and that's why we are making critical investments.

With all the movement that takes place in the City, we are in the process of maximizing transportation connections to the local and regional workforce with major transportation projects including: Transbay

Transit Center, Central Subway, Van Ness and Geary Bus Rapid Transit, the Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP), San Francisco Pedestrian Strategy and WalkFirst, Bay Area Bike Share, and SFMTA Bicycle Strategy. The Caltrain Downtown Extension (TTC/DTX), landing at the City's Transbay Transit Center, will transform regional transportation. By extending Caltrain that short 1.3 miles from Fourth and King to the new Transbay Transit Center, the City can better connect hundreds of thousands of regional residents with their jobs; and by building that tunnel for future high-speed rail service, the City can in the future connect millions of Californians with the Bay Area's epicenter in Downtown San Francisco and relieve the capacity of our airports.

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

Infrastructure Improvements Recent and in the Future

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

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

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

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

Construction Mitigation

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

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

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

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

Twice as many San Francisco residents hold a bachelor's degree or higher compared to the general U.S. population. Due to the City's historically low unemployment rate of 1.9%⁶⁴, local industries' high-demand for middle skill and thought workers⁶⁵, and the higher-than-average availability of degree-holders, residents with advanced education credentials gain access to the majority of well-paying jobs, especially in the information and communication technology and professional and business services sectors.

This educated worker supply creates a local economy which demands workers with the highest degree available, and in which San Franciscans with lower educational attainment cannot adequately compete, thereby creating inflation of degree requirements for entry-level jobs and a growing opportunity gap for people without postsecondary educational attainment⁶⁶.

Additionally, the federal poverty rate—defined as earnings less than or equal to \$12,100 for an individual or \$25,100 for families—for San Francisco working age adults without a college degree is between 11% and 20.2%, compared to 5.2% for those who hold bachelor's degrees and higher⁶⁷. The Insight Center for Community Economic Development assessed the San Francisco Self-Sufficiency Standard—a measure of the required earned income to cover basic necessities without public assistance— for single adults to be \$55,860 and for a two-adult, two-child household to be \$77,600 to \$149,200 depending on children's age⁶⁸. The ACS (2016) demonstrates that San Francisco bachelor's degree holders earn a median income of \$76,065 per year, while residents with lower educational

⁶⁴ California Employment Development Division. (January 2020). *Monthly Labor Force Data for Counties, December 2019*. <https://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/data/unemployment-and-labor-force.html>

⁶⁵ San Francisco Office of Economic and Workforce Development. (2018). *San Francisco County Highest Ranked Occupations, 2017-2019*. EMSI Economic Modeling.

⁶⁶ JPMorgan Chase & Co. (May 2015). *Strengthening the Bay Area: Building a Middle-Skill Workforce to Sustain Economic Growth and Expand Opportunity*.

⁶⁷ U.S. Census. (2016). *San Francisco County Educational Attainment, American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates, 2016*.

⁶⁸ Pearce, D. (2018). California self-sufficiency standard, 2018. *Insight Center for Community Economic Development*. <https://insightcced.org/2018-family-needs-calculator/>

attainment earn a median income of less than \$41,100⁶⁹. Therefore, many residents who earn above the federal poverty rate still have difficulty surviving in the Bay Area, and this need is more pronounced among people without postsecondary educational attainment.

The knowledge-based economy in San Francisco and in the region indicates that these individuals will need specialized workforce services to help them be competitive in the labor market. As San Francisco's Chief Economist, Ted Egan, noted "Living-wage job opportunities requiring short- or medium-term on-the-job training, a post-secondary vocational certificate, or Associates degree, are growing in San Francisco." In response, the public workforce system has responded by creating programming for middle skill jobs which do not require advanced education and incumbent worker training.

Describe any current workforce training initiatives, including those supported by Workforce Investment Boards, community colleges and other organizations. Describe how these efforts will support the jurisdiction's Consolidated Plan.

In 2014, San Francisco has established "sector academies" that provide postsecondary training in the following fields: technology, health care, hospitality, and construction. These sector academies braid vocational training in a growing field with supportive services and, ultimately, employment services and post-placement support.

San Francisco's sector academy approach also provides the opportunity for participants to sequence credentials within a field. For example, the health care academy offers training from personal care giver and certified home health aide to certified nursing assistant.

San Francisco will continue to match the most current Labor Market Information (LMI) data with real-time information on hiring trends from local and regional employers to inform its sector academy approach to workforce development, adjusting its training as needed based on employment projections and employer feedback. The WISF will not only evaluate the effectiveness of current efforts but will also determine if additional sector academies would be beneficial to its efforts.

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

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

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

The CEDS vision is: A dynamic and resilient economy, spurred by a culture of innovation and inclusion, providing opportunities, shared prosperity, and a sustainable quality of life for all residents and workers.

⁶⁹ U.S. Census. (2016). *San Francisco County median earnings in the past 12 months (in 2016 Inflation-Adjusted Dollars) by sex by educational attainment for the population 25 years and over, American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates, 2016*.

The vision statement is the distillation of conversations among business, workforce, local government and community stakeholders, reflecting the region's aspirations for the economy and its participants over the next 10 to 20 years.

If so, what economic development initiatives are you undertaking that may be coordinated with the Consolidated Plan? If not, describe other local/regional plans or initiatives that impact economic growth.

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

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

Discussion

See above.

MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion

Are there areas where households with multiple housing problems are concentrated? (include a definition of "concentration")

Based on the various maps shown above, the neighborhood of Visitacion Valley has both an overcrowding and housing cost burden problem. Chinatown has both an overcrowding and substandard housing problems with a higher concentration of housing code violations than other neighborhoods.

Are there any areas in the jurisdiction where racial or ethnic minorities or low-income families are concentrated? (include a definition of "concentration")


Although racial and ethnic groups are distributed throughout the City, certain neighborhoods have higher than average concentrations of minority households. HUD requires recipients of its funding to identify areas of minority concentration in the aggregate as well as by specific racial/ethnic group.

Areas of Minority Concentration

San Francisco has defined an area of aggregate minority concentration as any census tract with a minority population that is 20 percentage points greater than that of the City's total minority percentage. According to the 2017 ACS 5-Year Estimates, 59.16% of the City's population is identified as being composed of minorities, and therefore any census tract in which more than 79.16% of the population is classified as minority would qualify as an Area of Minority Concentration. Using this definition, the following neighborhoods in San Francisco have Areas of Minority Concentration (see Map 5):

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

Map 5 – Areas of Minority Concentration



Areas of Racial/Ethnic Group Concentration


San Francisco defines an area of concentration for a specific racial/ethnic group as any census tract in which the population for that group is 20 percentage points greater than the Citywide percentage for that segment of the population.

Areas of African American Concentration

Based on the 2017 ACS 5-Year Estimates, African Americans comprise 5.09% of San Francisco’s overall population. Therefore, an Area of African American Concentration is a census tract in which more than 25.09% of the population is identified as African American. Using this definition, the following neighborhoods in San Francisco have Areas of African American Concentration (see Map 6):

- Bayview Hunters Point; and
- Western Addition.

Map 6 – Areas of African American Concentration




Areas of Asian American Concentration

Based on the 2017 ACS 5-Year Estimates, Asian Americans comprise 33.87% of San Francisco's overall population. Therefore, an Area of Asian American Concentration is a census tract in which more than 53.87% of the population is identified as Asian American. Using this definition, the following neighborhoods in San Francisco have Areas of Asian American Concentration (see Map 7):

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

Map 7 – Areas of Asian American Concentration




Areas of Hispanic or Latino/a Concentration

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

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


Map 8 – Areas of Hispanic or Latino/a Concentration



Areas of Low- and Moderate-Income Concentration

San Francisco uses HUD income data to calculate low- and moderate-income concentration. San Francisco’s definition of low- and moderate-income concentration is a census tract in which more than 51% of the population is low- and moderate-income. The following neighborhoods in San Francisco have areas of low- and moderate-income concentration, based on HUD income data (see Map 9): Bayview Hunters Point; Bernal Heights; Chinatown; Haight Ashbury; Hayes Valley; Excelsior; Inner Richmond; Inner Sunset; Japantown; Lakeshore; Mission; Nob Hill; North Beach; Oceanview/Merced/Ingleside; Outer Mission; Outer Richmond; Portola; Potrero Hill; Russian Hill; South of Market; Sunset/Parkside; Tenderloin; Treasure Island; Twin Peaks; Visitacion Valley; West of Twin Peaks; and Western Addition.

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



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

Bayview Hunters Point

Demographics

Approximately 37,600⁷⁰ people live in the Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood. Its population is more diverse than San Francisco's. The Bayview has a higher proportion of children under 18 years old and a lower proportion of residents over 60 years old than Citywide averages. It has a higher proportion of Black, Latino/a, and Asian residents than San Francisco overall; and while its proportion of White residents is smaller, the community as a whole is becoming more and more diverse. There are about 12,040 housing units in the area, 52% of which are owner-occupied.⁷¹ The median household income is lower than the City's median income. See the San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

Neighborhood Features

Third Street in the Bayview Hunters Point is an industrial neighborhood located in the southeastern part of San Francisco that experienced disinvestment when businesses moved out of the area after the end of WWII and the closures of the shipyards. It is historically an African American district that in the past decade has become increasingly diverse, with an increasing percentage of Asian, Latino/a and Caucasian households. The community is proud of their heritage which is reflected in the commercial corridor with bright murals, painted by local artists, celebrating and commemorating African American culture and neighborhood diversity. Third Street is also home to a plethora of soul food cafes, decorative gardens and new residents attracted to recent developments located near Paul Avenue.

Commercial District Health

Third Street offers affordable dining choices and a handful of retail shops. Although capital investments and economic development activities in the neighborhood have contributed to slight improvements in the business climate along Third Street, Bayview residents remain marginalized, with high rates of unemployment and poverty. The two greatest challenges for the commercial district are the volume of commercial vacancies and the perception of the neighborhood as unsafe. The December 2013 IIN Business Inventory Report indicated that Third Street's vacancy rate was 24.1%, or 42 vacancies out of 174 storefront, there were slight improvements year by year. The December 2019 IIN Business Inventory Report a high vacancy rate of 21.3%, or 37 vacancies out of 174 storefronts. New businesses opened following the 2007 installation of the Third Street Light Rail, but many closed during the construction period due to diminished foot traffic. With strong neighborhood support and assistance from the City, moderately-priced food establishments have been attracted to Third Street, but these businesses are struggling and require more assistance and foot traffic in order to thrive.

Public safety for Bayview business owners and residents. While the area has a high level of crime relative to the City overall, improvements to safety have been achieved. Over the past 3 years, incidences of violent crimes have decreased by 11% and incidents of property crimes have decreased by 10%. (Source: SFPD incidents data, November 2017-October 2020).

⁷⁰ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

⁷¹ U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2016 Five-Year Estimates

Opportunities

Bayview continues to be a high economic and workforce development priority for the City. Invest in Neighborhoods (IIN), a division within the Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD), deploys focused investments and resources in the Bayview and has celebrated several successes. These successes include: the opening of over 10 community serving businesses/facilities along the Third Street Corridor; the deployment of over 40 neighborhood events centered in the Town Center of Third Street; and the investment of over \$1,000,000 into programs and projects that supported the continued revitalization of Third Street.

Opportunities in the area exist in working with neighborhood entrepreneurs to open or expand businesses while engaging residents and “re-introducing” them to the area, as many are not aware of the new restaurants and recreational programming on Third Street. The success of the abutting neighborhood, “Dogpatch”, can also be capitalized on to draw visitors to unique restaurants along Third Street. All projects can also be leveraged to address public safety concerns; including beautification enhancements which can include pedestrian lighting and jobs for local residents through a safety and cleaning ambassador program. Given the relatively low cost of land in Bayview, development of affordable and workforce housing is a prime opportunity.

Bernal Heights

Demographics

Approximately 26,140⁷² people live in the Bernal Heights neighborhood. Bernal Heights has a higher proportion of children under 18 years old and a lower proportion of residents over 60 years old than Citywide averages. The largest racial group is White, which makes up 57% of the population. It has a smaller proportion of Asians than citywide. Latino/as make up 29% of the population, which is almost twice that of the City overall. The proportion of Blacks is the same as the City’s. There are about 9,770 housing units in the neighborhood, 57% of which are owner-occupied⁷³. The median household income is higher than the City’s median household income. See the San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

Neighborhood Features

Mission Street, Cesar Chavez to Bosworth, is a thriving district south of the Mission neighborhood and on the western part of Bernal Heights. This active corridor features a mix of locally-owned bars, cafes, specialty shops, service providers, and anchored by Cole Hardware, Big Lots, Walgreens and Safeway. Although there are some destination businesses and well-regarded restaurants that attract visitors from around the City, it remains a district patronized primarily by local residents.

The neighborhood south of the intersection of Randall and Mission is known as College Hill. This section of Mission Street is known for its Central American food establishments and businesses predominantly owned by and serving Mexican and Central American families.

Commercial District Health

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

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

This section of Mission Street features a healthy mix of neighborhood-serving retail, well established and locally-owned restaurants, green grocers, and ethnic shops and service providers. The corridor is home to a high number of food and beverage stores and general merchandise. The December 2013 IIN Business Inventory Report indicated that Mission-Bernal's vacancy rate was 12.1% , or 27 vacancies out of 223 storefront. The December 2019 IIN Business Inventory Report recorded a vacancy rate of 12.4%, or 37 vacancies out of 174 storefronts.

Opportunities

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

Opportunity exists to develop capacity and relationships among the Mission Street/College Hill businesses, residents and agencies to improve the economic vitality of the area and contribute to maintaining the district's cultural diversity.

Chinatown

Demographics

Approximately 14,820⁷⁴ people live in the Chinatown neighborhood. Its population is significantly older than San Francisco's with a higher proportion of residents over 60 years old. The majority, or 81%, of Chinatown residents are of Asian descent and the neighborhood does not have the racial diversity of the City overall. There are about 7,430 housing units in the area, 93% of which are renter-occupied⁷⁵. The median household income for the neighborhood is less than a fourth of the Citywide median and more than a quarter of residents live below the poverty level. See the San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

Neighborhood Features

Established in 1848, San Francisco's Chinatown is the oldest and second largest Chinese-American community in the United States (after New York City). Chinatown is the densest neighborhood in the city, and has retained its own customs, languages, places of worship, social clubs, and identity. The neighborhood continues to play an integral role in shaping the Chinese-American experience; serving as the gateway for immigrants to find work, learn English, receive social services, and participate in community activities.

Chinatown is multi-faceted: Stockton Street as Chinatown's marketplace serves the local community; Grant Avenue, with its various curio shops, is the top tourist destination; and Kearny is the

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

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

neighborhoods' vehicular gateway. The neighborhood offers affordable goods and services and a variety of authentic restaurants, herbal and curio shops, fish markets, and vegetable stands. The festivals, temples, renowned Dragon's Gate entrance, historical buildings, and alleyways are among Chinatown's strengths as a pedestrian accessible neighborhood. The neighborhood also features a large network of longstanding family associations, arts, culture and community-based organizations that offer a range of social services and resources to support and promote the history and culture of Chinatown.

Commercial District Health

Located in downtown San Francisco, Chinatown covers 24 square blocks and overlaps with five different postal codes, with over 32,600 residents, 22,700 housing units and 4,000 small businesses within one-quarter mile radius. Since 2012, Invest In Neighborhoods (IIN) has leveraged City programs and resources to respond to the specific needs and opportunities in Chinatown. Through building rapport and relationships with business owners/operators, local stakeholders and community partners, our goal is to support district's economic vitality, strengthen neighborhood serving businesses, increase physical and cultural attractions, and enhance business development in this historic, unique neighborhood.

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

Public safety in Chinatown is a concern for businesses and other community stakeholders. From 2009 to 2012 the neighborhood experienced an increase in the number of vehicle thefts/thefts from vehicles and slight decreases in assaults and robberies. Hotspots of criminal activity occur along Stockton Street and near the intersection of Broadway and Columbus. (Source: SFPD incidents data, November 2009-October 2012) Over the past 3 years, incidences of violent and property crimes have fluctuated. Overall, incidences of violent crimes have decreased by 5% and incidences of property crimes have decreased by 12% in the area. (SFPD CompStat Reports January 2017-2020)

Opportunities

Opportunities exist in leveraging the cultural events and programs that market local businesses by supporting local revitalization initiatives that have brought increased traffic to the local economy and highlighted the culture and arts in the community. A large component of the cultural experience in Chinatown is the storefronts that line the street. These businesses have been in operation for many years with little changes and can benefit from some assistance in refreshing their facades making them more attractive and inviting for customers. While several construction projects will improve the infrastructure and amenities of the neighborhood, businesses will need strategic advising to help them endure and grow as the Central Subway station, Portsmouth Square, Chinese Hospital, and Willie Woo Woo Wong playground undergo construction.

Since 2012, Invest in Neighborhoods (IIN), a division of the Office of Economic and Workforce Development, has implemented strategic activities based on a comprehensive service plan tailored to respond to the community's unique opportunities and needs. As a part of the Chinatown IIN customized service plan, the following projects have been deployed by local stakeholders and the inter-agency team

to date: a safety and cleaning program to help businesses impacted by key construction projects along Jackson, Washington, and Stockton streets; a marketing campaign aimed at local shoppers during the Lunar New Years; an education and ADA compliance program to businesses interested in removing physical barriers from their sites; and neighborhood events that celebrate the community's arts and culture.

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

Excelsior and Outer Mission

Demographics

Approximately 63,610⁷⁶ people in the Excelsior and Outer Mission neighborhoods. It has a higher proportion of children under 18 years old and also a slightly higher proportion of residents over 60 years old than the city overall. Nearly half of the residents in the Excelsior and Outer Mission are Asian. Its proportion of Latino/a residents is approximately double that of San Francisco's overall proportion. There are about 18,320⁷⁷ housing units. A higher proportion, 65%, of households in the Excelsior and Outer Mission are owner-occupied households. The median household income of the Excelsior and Outer Mission is lower than the City's median income. See the San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

Neighborhood Features

The Excelsior/Outer Mission neighborhood is an ethnically and economically diverse community situated between Balboa Park and McLaren Park. Residents and business owners are fond of the small town feel in this residential enclave of a bustling city. Streets such as Persia, Russia and Madrid are uniquely named after international cities and countries, reflecting the neighborhood's history as a magnet for international immigrants. The twelve-block commercial corridor of Mission Street, south of Interstate 280, is the economic center of the neighborhood.

The Excelsior/Outer Mission features strong neighborhood institutions and resident groups dedicated to improving the commercial district, including the Excelsior Action Group. A corridor manager, primarily funded by the City, works full time supporting local merchants and implementing neighborhood improvement projects. The neighborhood also has a strong community of nonprofit organizations that offer family services and arts and cultural programming. Recently, over a dozen community-based

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

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

organizations, including the Excelsior Action Group, have united to form the Excelsior Planning Collaborative, which prioritizes community vitality and economic development among its aspirational values.

Commercial District Health

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

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

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

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

Opportunities

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

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

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

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

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

Hayes Valley

Demographics

Approximately 18,250⁷⁸ people in Hayes Valley. It has a lower proportion of children under 18 years old and of residents over 60 years old than the city overall. The population is predominately White, 67%. The Asian population is 14%; the Black population is 9%; and, the Latino/a population is 11%. There are about 9,650⁷⁹ housing units, of which 81% is renter occupied. The median household income of Hayes Valley is higher than the City's median income. See the San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

Neighborhood Features

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

Commercial District Health

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

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

Opportunities

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

Inner Richmond

Demographics

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

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

Approximately 22,500⁸⁰ people live in the Inner Richmond neighborhood. It has a slightly lower proportion of children under 18 years old and a slightly higher proportion of residents over 60 years old than the city overall. The population is predominately White, 54%, and Asian, 36%. Its proportion of Latino/a population at 9% and Black population at 2% are lower than the City overall. There are about 9,960⁸¹ housing units, of which 68% is renter occupied. The median household income of the Inner Richmond neighborhood is slightly lower than the City's median income. See the San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

Neighborhood Features

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

Commercial District Health

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

Opportunities

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

Japantown

Demographics

Approximately 3,650⁸² people live in Japantown. It has a significantly lower proportion of children under 18 years old and a significantly higher proportion of residents over 60 years old than the city overall. The population is predominately White, 57%, and Asian, 35%. Its proportion of Latino/a population at 9% and Black population at 3% are lower than the City overall. There are about 2,500⁸³ housing units, of which 86% is renter occupied. The median household income of Japantown is lower than the City's median income. See the San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at

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

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

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

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

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

Neighborhood Features

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

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

Commercial District Health

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

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

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

Public safety is a concern for business owners and residents.

Opportunities

The Invest in Neighborhoods (IIN) division of the Office of Economic and Workforce Development aims to strengthen small businesses, improve physical conditions, increase quality of life, and increase community capacity. IIN, in collaboration with community stakeholders, provide small business technical assistance such as lease negotiations, legal assistance, and small business financing to respond to the

community's unique opportunities and needs. The strategy primarily focuses on the preservation and strengthening of the corridor's existing businesses and cultural vitality. With these goals in mind we have developed programs to reduce business vulnerabilities and foster growth while leveraging opportunities.

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

Mission

Demographics

Approximately 58,640⁸⁴ people live in the Mission District. It is a young and diverse population. It has a lower proportion of residents 60 years and older than the City overall. The proportion of White residents has grown to 57%, but the neighborhood remains part of the Latino/a heart of the City, with Latino/as making up 39% of the neighborhood. There are about 25,860⁸⁵ housing units in the area, mostly in small multi-family structures of two to nine units. About 75% of households are renters. The median household income is lower than that of the City overall. See the San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

Neighborhood Features

The Mission District is located in the center of San Francisco's eclectic and predominantly Latino/a Lower 24th Street and Mission Street commercial corridors. Lower 24th Street features a richness of culture and vibrancy unmatched anywhere else in the city. The corridor, with over 200 small businesses, is a bustling enclave for many Latino/a businesses including specialty food stores, restaurants, cafes, taquerias, Mexican bakeries, butchers, art galleries, and gift shops that serve the needs of local residents. The uniqueness of the area and multi-modal transportation options have proven attractive to new residents and new businesses.

Mission Street includes a diverse business mix that provides neighborhood-serving goods and services, as well as restaurants and services that serve a more regional customer base. Ground floor storefronts on Mission Street are occupied by a mix of traditional retail (i.e., stores that sell products to the general public); services (including personal, financial, and medical services); and eating and drinking places. The upper floors include a range of office uses (including medical, professional, and tech firms) and some residential uses. In comparison to Valencia Street, which is characterized by a concentration of high-end stores and restaurants, Mission Street has a variety of businesses serving low- and moderate-income households as well as higher-income households. Typically, grocery stores and other types of local-serving retail draw local customers during the day, while bars, restaurants and nightclubs bring in a younger, more affluent clientele at night, from the neighborhood and beyond. Medical and social service providers also attract clients from outside the neighborhood, as well as serving local residents.

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

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

The district is an art and cultural mecca boasting the largest collection of murals in the city and hosting a multitude of events that enliven the neighborhood with history, spirituality, and community throughout the year. Mission District businesses, residents, arts organizations and long-established non-profit agencies collaborate to organize events such as Carnaval, Cesar Chavez Parade and Festival, and Day of the Dead.

With easy access to 16th and 24th Street BART Stations, Muni bus lines, and the 101 Freeway, this beautiful tree-lined thoroughfare provides neighborhood residents and visitors many choices for traveling within San Francisco and throughout the region.

Commercial District Health

The 24th Street Latino/a Cultural District and Mission Street commercial districts are thriving and vibrant corridors, with over 700 ground floor businesses and a moderate vacancy rate of 14% and a high level of foot traffic. The corridors feature a high number of eating and drinking establishments, with opportunities for growth in general merchandise and financial institutions. The district also features the highest concentration of Latino/a owned businesses in the City.

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

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

Opportunities

Opportunities in the Mission District exist in strengthening the businesses, institutions and cultural assets that have made the corridors what they are today. Beyond the establishments, the residents as well as the non-profit directors, business owners and property owners are an important component of maintaining the integrity of this corridor and have formed a council to work together in developing and implementing a vision for this Latino/a Cultural District. The Mission District has a high level of social capital, featuring an active community organization that includes many community-based arts, cultural, and social service organizations. This has created an opportunity for the City to strengthen our partnership and support the neighborhood with services and funding that aligns with their process.

The Invest in Neighborhoods (IIN) division of the Office of Economic and Workforce Development aims to strengthen small businesses, improve physical conditions, increase quality of life, and increase community capacity. IIN, in collaboration with community stakeholders, created a comprehensive service plans tailored to respond to the community's unique opportunities and needs. The strategy primarily focuses on the preservation and strengthening of the corridor's existing businesses and cultural vitality. With these goals in mind we have developed programs to reduce business vulnerabilities and foster growth. These include business technical assistance that provides professional business consulting advice; lease strengthening workshops and counseling to businesses and cultural

institutions. These business assistance programs are complemented by a number of community efforts to recognize and preserve the neighborhood’s cultural assets and to maintain the diversity that has made this neighborhood so beloved by residents and visitors alike. In support of these efforts we have funded a public process to gather input on the mission, vision and goals of the Latino/a Cultural District. Some of the major investments that resulted from that plan include sidewalk repairs, ADA accessible curbs, façade improvements, pedestrian lighting, and a street cleaning program.

North Beach

Demographics

Approximately 12,600⁸⁶ people live in the North Beach neighborhood. It is a population that is older than San Francisco’s overall and is less diverse. A higher share of its residents are over 60 years old and a lower share under 18 years old compared to San Francisco. 51% of residents in the North Beach are White and 40% are of Asian descent, with a lower share of Black, and Latino/a residents. There are about 7,250⁸⁷ housing units in the area. Renting households predominate, as 80% of the households are renter-occupied. The median household income of the North Beach neighborhood is lower than the Citywide median. See the San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

Neighborhood Features

North Beach, nestled within the scenic hills of northeast San Francisco, is one of the City’s signature neighborhood commercial districts. The businesses of Columbus Avenue, Grant Avenue and around Washington Square serve local residents but also create a regional destination for the Bay Area and tourists from around the world. San Francisco’s “Little Italy” is crowded with Italian restaurants, cafes, specialty food shops, and one of the only Italian pottery stores outside of Italy. Local clothing, craft, and artisan shops populate Grant Avenue, one of the oldest blocks in the City, and offer locals and visitors alike diverse choices for neighborhood dining and entertainment. City Lights Bookstore and Vesuvio Café, at the intersection of Columbus and Broadway, divided by Jack Kerouac Alley, stand as landmarks of the neighborhood’s historic reputation as a center of Beat Generation culture in the middle part of the 20th century. North Beach features a strong and highly active merchants association and neighborhood groups committed to addressing and advocating for the needs of small businesses and the community.

Commercial District Health

North Beach is a thriving commercial district with distinct character and a diverse mix of businesses, although vacancy rates are higher than the citywide average at 18.7% in 2019. The Central Subway construction remains an issue for some merchants and neighborhood stakeholders who express concerns about the negative impact on local businesses.

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

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

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

Opportunities

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

Oceanview/Merced/Ingleside (OMI)

Demographics

Approximately 28,010⁸⁸ people live in the OMI. Its population has a higher proportion of children under 18 years old than the City overall. 54% of the population is made up of Asian residents, and it has a higher proportion of Black and Latino/a residents than that found Citywide. There are about 8,330 housing units in the area, of which 65% are owner-occupied⁸⁹. The median household income for the neighborhood is lower than the Citywide median income. See the San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

Neighborhood Features

The OMI (Oceanview, Merced Heights and Ingleside neighborhoods) is located between City College of San Francisco and San Francisco State University in the southwestern part of San Francisco. It is a middle-class district of single-family, owner-occupied homes. Approximately 75% percent of the land area in the OMI is residential. While the population has been mostly African-American, in recent years the neighborhood has witnessed an influx of Asian-American and other ethnic groups, making it one of San Francisco's most diverse neighborhoods.

Ocean Avenue, the main street of the OMI, has over 160 storefronts and was recently transformed by Avalon Bay's 173 unit market rate housing with a new Whole Foods market on the ground floor. Pending development projects include the Municipal Transit Agency's redevelopment of the Phelan Bus Loop and City College's new Performing Arts Center.

In 2010, Ocean Avenue Association became a Community Benefit District (CBD) with a management focusing on cleaning and maintenance, safety, marketing, and streetscape improvements. The CBD also serves as an advocate for the 11-block district. Other nonprofit organizations in the area provide an array of programs supporting youth development, the arts and culture, education and advocacy for residents in the community.

The Broad Street commercial corridor, including Broad and Randolph streets, primarily serves the Ocean View neighborhood, the "O" in the three neighborhoods commonly referred to together as the "OMI":

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

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

Ocean View, Merced Heights, and Ingleside. It is home to a long-standing African American community and growing Chinese and Latino/a communities.

Broad Street and Randolph connect through Orizaba forming a major road artery of the neighborhood. The area is mostly composed of single-family residences with family serving businesses mostly at block corners along the corridor.

Ocean View public library anchors the social capital of the neighborhood, offering support and resources to the community. Several organizations have been active over the years in providing services to the corridor and advocating for improvement.

Commercial District Health

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

Broad Street is a small, mostly residential commercial district with a total of 50 storefronts and moderate vacancy rate of 18% in 2019. The corridor features a high concentration of churches and social service agencies, a few small markets and liquor stores, and a small number of neighborhood-serving retail establishments. The corridor struggles with vacant retail spaces that appear to require a high capital investment in order to become leasable.

Opportunities

Opportunities exist to enhance economic development and physical attributes of the Ocean Avenue commercial district through continued support of the CBD. Outreach efforts to promote available services including grants, loans, technical assistance and other programs would strengthen existing businesses and attract new tenants to the district. Lastly, property improvements would enrich the appearance of the neighborhood and increase its ability to support stronger, healthier businesses, adding to the diversity of shopping and dining options for the neighborhood. The corridor's growth opportunities include lawn and garden supplies, home furnishings, general merchandise, clothing, shoes, and jewelry, luggage and leather goods.

Opportunities exist to improve pedestrian safety, beautify the neighborhood, support existing businesses and build on the momentum of residents organizing to beautify the area around Broad and Randolph Streets.

Outer Richmond

Demographics

Approximately 44,870⁹⁰ people live in the Outer Richmond. This population is slightly older than that of San Francisco's overall, with residents 60 years and older forming a bigger share than Citywide. The neighborhood has an almost equal share of White and Asian residents, 44% and 46% respectively; it has a smaller proportion of Blacks and Latino/as than San Francisco overall. There are about 20,140⁹¹

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

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

housing units in the area. Renting households predominate, with less than 40% home-owning households. The median household income for the neighborhood is lower than that of the City overall. See the San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

Neighborhood Features

The Outer Richmond district is one of the most diverse neighborhoods in San Francisco with Chinese, Russian, Korean, Japanese, Irish and Cambodian residents. Geary Boulevard, a major east-west commercial thoroughfare, is surrounded by a ring of parks including the Presidio, Ocean Beach, Lands End, and Golden Gate Park. The corridor is a bustling district that is known for its Korean and Chinese restaurants, Irish bars, Russian grocery stores, personal care services, chain stores, fast food, neighborhood serving shops, and financial institutions.

Geary Boulevard has several community-based organizations providing supportive services and enrichment activities for youth and families. An active merchants' association exists with the potential to create a vibrant and sustainable CBD that will attract a mix of new businesses to the corridor.

Commercial District Health

Geary Boulevard is a thriving and vibrant commercial district, with a low vacancy rate of 8.5% in 2019 and a high level of foot traffic. The corridor features a high number of eating and drinking establishments and personal care. The December 2013 IIN Business Inventory Report indicated that Geary Boulevard's vacancy rate was 6.9% or 16 vacancies out of 232 storefronts, which fluctuated year by year. The December 2019 IIN Business Inventory Report recorded a vacancy rate of 8.5%, or 20 vacancies out of 236 storefronts.

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

Opportunities

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

Opportunities exist to improve fill long time vacancies with neighborhood serving businesses, marketing the neighborhood, and support existing businesses. The corridor's retail opportunities include the development and activation of the Alexandria Theater site.

Portola

Demographics

Approximately 16,410⁹² people live in the Portola neighborhood. Although Portola has a higher proportion of children under 18 years old, its population is a little older than San Francisco's overall. The majority of Portola's residents are Asian; its proportion of Latino/a residents is also higher than Citywide. There are about 4,990 housing units in the area, of which 65% are owner-occupied⁹³. The median household income for the Portola neighborhood is lower than the City's median income. See the San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

Neighborhood Features

Bordered by Silver Avenue, McLaren Park and the 101 Highway, the Portola District is a family-oriented, multi-cultural neighborhood. Comprised mainly of single-family homes, the Portola's residents represent a variety of ages, incomes, and cultural backgrounds, including new residents and others who have lived in the neighborhood for over 80 years. San Bruno Avenue is the thriving commercial main street of the Portola District. The street is a mix of neighborhood-serving retail, locally-owned restaurants, green grocers, and specialty food stores which have served the community for generations. It also features a high concentration of vibrant businesses owned by and serving Chinese Americans.

The Portola Neighborhood Association, comprised of local merchants, property owners, and residents, is committed to improving the commercial corridor and the neighborhood. Other nonprofit organizations in the area provide support services and activities targeting local youth, seniors and immigrants. In the last few years, San Bruno Avenue has undergone significant physical improvements including the undergrounding of utility lines, placement of new street lights, façade renovation of the 1927 Art Deco style Avenue Theater, planting of trees and fortnight lilies, mural installations, and numerous storefront improvement projects.

Commercial District Health

San Bruno Avenue is a mix of neighborhood-serving retail, locally-owned restaurants, green grocers, and specialty food stores that have served the community for generations. According to the Invest In Neighborhoods Storefront Vacancy Survey for San Bruno Ave., vacancy rates declined 4.9 % between 2013 and 2016, and then rose 3.1% between 2016 and 2018. The December 2019 IIN Business Inventory Report recorded a vacancy rate of 9.9%, or 16 vacancies out of 162 storefronts.

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

Opportunities

Opportunities in the area exist in supporting existing local businesses to expand their customer base beyond the Portola Neighborhood. The success of attracting the first coffee shop in 20 years and the anticipated re-opening of long-time neighborhood restaurant, Breakfast at Tiffany's, as well as Churn Urban Creamery ice cream shop will undoubtedly help in attracting more customers to the area. All projects can also be leveraged to address public safety concerns; specifically in the realm of pedestrian safety. The corridor's growth opportunities include apparel, shoe stores, and full-service food establishments.

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

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

Potrero Hill

Demographics

Approximately 13,770⁹⁴ people live in the Potrero Hill neighborhood. This neighborhood has a higher proportion of children under 18 years old and a lower proportion of residents 60 years and older than San Francisco overall. The population is predominately White, 64%. The Asian population is 16%; the Latino/a population is 14%; and the Black population is 6%. There are about 6,510 housing units in the area, of which 52% are renter-occupied⁹⁵. The median household income for the Potrero Hill neighborhood is significantly higher than the City's median income. See the San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

Neighborhood Features

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

Commercial District Health

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

Opportunities

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

South of Market

Demographics

Approximately 19,180⁹⁶ people live in San Francisco's South of Market Area, or SOMA. Its population is older than San Francisco's with a higher proportion of residents over 60 years old. It has a higher proportion of Black and Asian residents than San Francisco overall; and while its proportion of White and Latino/a residents is smaller than the City overall, the community as a whole is becoming more and

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

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

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

more diverse. There are about 12,110⁹⁷ housing units in the area. About 82% of households are renters. The median household income is less than half of the City's median household income. See the San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

Neighborhood Features

The neighborhood is a vast and diverse stretch of warehouses, auto repair shops, nightclubs, residential hotels, art spaces, loft apartments, furniture showrooms, condominiums, and technology companies. SOMA is home to many of San Francisco's museums, including SFMOMA, the Yerba Buena Center for the Arts, and the Museum of the African Diaspora. The Cartoon Art Museum, the children's Zeum, and the Contemporary Jewish Museum are also in the Yerba Buena area. The Center for the Arts, along with Yerba Buena Gardens, the Metreon, and many small theatre companies and venues, add to the cultural attraction of the SOMA. Despite the Dot-Com crash of the early 2000s, major software and technology companies have headquarters here. The area is also home to the few Big-box stores in San Francisco. SOMA is also home to two of the San Francisco's Cultural Districts, SoMa Pilipinas, established in 2016, and LGBTQ+ and Leather Cultural District, established in 2018. SoMa Pilipinas seeks to increase the visibility and celebrate the contributions of the Filipino community with history in SOMA spanning 100 years. LGBTQ+ and Leather Cultural District commemorating the history and culture of the leather subculture active in the area for approximately half a century.

Commercial District Health

Vacancy rates in Central Market are the highest citywide, approximately 25% for retail storefronts. Nevertheless, from 2006 to 2012 sales tax collected in the district grew by 24%, a greater increase than the City-wide rate (17%). While the variety and selection of retail and restaurants has increased over the past several years, the area still lacks sufficient neighborhood-serving establishments. Public safety is one of the most pressing issues for Central Market; the area has an extremely high volume of criminal activity. From 2011 to 2019, hotspots of criminal activity occurred along Sixth Street, Taylor Street, and at the intersection of Market and Seventh Street and Jones Street. Relative to other commercial districts the neighborhood experiences higher concentrations of assault, robbery, and drug and alcohol violations. (Source: SFPD incidents data, November 2009-October 2019)

Opportunities

The Central Market Strategy which will be updated in 2021, has helped engage an extensive network of more than 25 city agencies and dozens of private and nonprofit stakeholders to work together to implement the goals set forth by the community. As a result, a number of new programs and investments are now being implemented both along Central Market and in the Tenderloin, such as a program to help existing businesses, arts groups and nonprofits stay and grow in the neighborhood; a major lighting improvement project by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission; and an expansion of the Tenderloin Safe Passage program, which ensures school children move between school and activities safely. Additionally, public and private entities have funded Urban Alchemy, a non-profit that deploys ambassadors to bring safety through de-escalation to the neighborhood.

These developments have created more opportunities for the City to serve the neighborhood and an increased need for coordination of a growing number of stakeholders. Under the previous leadership of

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

Mayor Lee, in 2014 the Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) and the Planning Department formed an Interagency Working Group to update and expand the Strategy with a focus on priority areas along Central Market, Sixth Street, and in the Tenderloin. The primary aim of the Strategy update was to harness the new investment along Central Market to create a diverse, healthy, mixed-income neighborhood that offers safety and well-being to all who live and work there.

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

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

Sunset/Parkside

Demographics

Approximately 81,050⁹⁸ people live in the Sunset/Parkside neighborhood. Its population is older than San Francisco's overall, with a higher proportion of residents over 60 years old. The neighborhood, however, also has a slightly higher proportion of children under 18 years old. The neighborhood is predominantly Asian, 57%, and 35% White; there are very few black residents. Its Latino/a population is also smaller than the City overall. There are about 29,310 housing units in the area, of which 60% are owner-occupied⁹⁹. The median household income in the Sunset/Parkside is about the same as Citywide median. See the San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

Neighborhood Features

The Sunset/Parkside neighborhood is a highly residential, middle class neighborhood that has become an ethnic enclave over the last several decades attracting young families and diverse populations, while retaining many long-time residents.

Outer Irving, between 19th and 27th Avenues, is a growing retail district. The food offerings are diverse and multi-ethnic, including Japanese, Middle Eastern, Indian, Thai, Korean, Irish, Mexican and Chinese restaurants. Irving Street is a destination for not only locals, but students and foodies on the hunt for good, cheap eats. Irving also has multiple financial institutions, boutiques, clothing stores, dry cleaners, pharmacies, and vibrant markets.

Noriega Street from 19th to 47th Avenue is a distinctive commercial corridor that meets the needs and is reflective of the diverse surrounding population. The section from 19th to 33rd features Chinese

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

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

groceries, popular restaurants, bakeries, financial institutions and other neighborhood serving retail. The section from 45th to 47th is a favorite among surfers and beachgoers due to its proximity to Ocean Beach. These two blocks are an enclave of boutiques, with a popular custom board shop, bakery, produce market, pet supply store, pizza parlor, and taqueria. Noriega is developing into a destination for shopping and dining for young urban professionals with disposable income.

The Taraval commercial district—Taraval Street from 19th Avenue to 48th Avenue—features several nodes of active retail activity broken up by residential and office uses. The corridor features affordable and multi-ethnic cafés, locally serving restaurants and service businesses, light traffic and ample parking. Recent, streetscape improvements for Outer Taraval include sidewalk bulb-outs at key intersections, crosswalk enhancements, light fixture upgrades, new plantings, site furnishings, and possibly a gateway feature.

Commercial District Health

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

Noriega Street is a unique and diverse commercial district, with a low vacancy rate of 6.0% in 2019 and a relatively high level of foot traffic. The corridor features a high number of specialty food and personal care establishments. Noriega Street experiences a low volume of criminal incidents compared with other commercial districts around the City. Merchants and advocates express concern about prostitution and robberies.

Taraval Street is a large, multi-ethnic commercial corridor with approximately 205 businesses and high level of daytime foot traffic and an 8.9% vacancy rate in 2019. The corridor features a high number of lawn and garden equipment and supply stores and drinking establishments, with opportunities for growth in jewelry, luggage, leather goods, books, periodicals, and music stores. The strength of their merchant association has drawn significant city investment into their existing and new small businesses. The People of Parkside Sunset won best Merchant Association of the Year from the Council of District Merchants in 2019.

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

Opportunities

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

Opportunities exist on the Irving Street commercial corridor to increase collaboration among the diverse merchant population to support beautification efforts and engage in business retention strategies to strengthen the economic vitality of the corridor.

Opportunities also exist to increase community capacity and develop partnerships among merchants in upper and lower Noriega to support business growth and transform the corridor into a destination.

In addition, opportunities exist to develop partnerships for the Taraval commercial corridor, with a focus on beautification, increasing merchant communication and neighborhood promotional events.

Tenderloin/Central Market

Demographics

Approximately 28,220¹⁰⁰ people live in San Francisco's Tenderloin neighborhood. Its population is older than San Francisco's overall, with a higher proportion of residents over 60 years old. The population is reflective of San Francisco's overall population in that it is racially and ethnically diverse. In particular, the Tenderloin and adjacent neighborhoods have historically been home to large communities of people of Southeast Asian origin.

There are about 19,210 housing units in the neighborhood¹⁰¹. About 97% of households are renters. A large percentage of the housing stock in the neighborhood is affordable—developed as permanently affordable housing, or as residential hotels—providing a crucial resource for people who would otherwise be unable to secure housing in San Francisco. There is also a high concentration of residential hotels (also known as single-room occupancy hotels, or SROs). In many areas of the Tenderloin the average percentage of housing units by block group that are single room is over 50%, compared to a Citywide average of 10%. Many affordable housing and SRO units are subsidized by various DPH and Human Service Agency housing programs, which serve people who are recently homeless, people with behavioral health diagnoses, and other vulnerable populations.

The median household income for the neighborhood is less than one third of the Citywide median and 30% of residents live below the poverty level. See the San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

Neighborhood Features

The Tenderloin is centrally located within the City and region, adjacent to other thriving and diverse neighborhoods and commercial districts (e.g., South of Market, Union Square, Civic Center). The neighborhood has historically been home to a variety of arts organizations, including small and large theaters, galleries, rehearsal spaces, and headquarters. Over the past two years, arts entities have increasingly expressed interest in relocating to the area. Dozens of nonprofit agencies, including several of the City's leading service providers, are headquartered and/or have service sites within the district.

Market Street is the region's most important transit corridor, served by BART, the MUNI metro subway, and multiple bus lines.

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

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

Commercial District Health

In the last several decades Tenderloin and Central Market have struggled with high vacancy rates, a lack of private investment, physical blight, a lack of sufficient neighborhood-serving establishments, public safety issues, and a mix of social challenges. We know from community engagement work in 2013 that neighborhood residents, business owners, community organizations and new stakeholders in the neighborhood believe the area could be cleaner, safer, and healthier; there are also concerns about displacement. MOHCD conducted a survey of residents in 2019. When asked what they liked most about the neighborhood shopping area, residents most frequently cited the location and accessibility. Top concerns included crime and safety issues, blight, and lack of parking.

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

A number of public, private and nonprofit entities are working to revitalize Central Market and Tenderloin. The area features three different Community Benefit Districts (CBDs) and a number of resident associations. The Mid-Market Business Association is a community-led effort to coordinate activities and spur private-sector efforts to improve the neighborhood.

Over the past nine years Central Market has undergone extraordinary physical and economic changes that have attracted new residents, businesses, shoppers, and visitors to the area. Since the Central Market Economic Strategy was launched in late 2011, it has effectively helped coordinate public and private investment along Central Market. Currently under construction or approved for the area are 3,264 housing units with approximately 786 which will be below market rate. The storefront vacancy rate has gone down from 30% in 2010 to 12.2 percent in 2018. 17 new arts venues have opened with 10 of them being relocations or expansions of arts venues from within the neighborhood or elsewhere in San Francisco.

Opportunities

The Central Market Strategy which will be updated in 2021, has helped engage an extensive network of more than 25 city agencies and dozens of private and nonprofit stakeholders to work together to implement the goals set forth by the community. As a result, a number of new programs and investments are now being implemented both along Central Market and in the Tenderloin, such as a program to help existing businesses, arts groups and nonprofits stay and grow in the neighborhood; a major lighting improvement project by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission; and an expansion of the Tenderloin Safe Passage program, which ensures school children move between school and activities safely. Additionally, public and private entities have funded Urban Alchemy, a non-profit that deploys ambassadors to bring safety through de-escalation to the neighborhood.


These developments have created more opportunities for the City to serve the neighborhood and an increased need for coordination of a growing number of stakeholders. Under the previous leadership of Mayor Lee, in 2014 the Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) and the Planning Department formed an Interagency Working Group to update and expand the Strategy with a focus on priority areas along Central Market, Sixth Street, and in the Tenderloin. The primary aim of the Strategy

update was to harness the new investment along Central Market to create a diverse, healthy, mixed-income neighborhood that offers safety and well-being to all who live and work there.

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

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

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



In 2014, new developers, tech companies, small businesses and arts groups continued to move in, eager to contribute to and invest in the neighborhood – including the Tenderloin. An increasing number of improvement projects were also planned for the physical landscape. This confluence of energy, creativity and resources presented an opportunity to better coordinate and leverage the efforts of public and private actors to better serve the neighborhood.

The 2014 Central Market/Tenderloin Strategy update process documented the many public realm improvements planned or proposed for the area; engaged additional City agencies through the convening of a Central Market/Tenderloin Interagency Working Group; and conducted extensive community engagement including participation in numerous community planning processes, hosting or presenting at dozens of meetings, and conducting new focus groups and surveys.

This update process led to the inescapable conclusion that the area comprised of Central Market, Sixth Street and the Tenderloin should be treated as one distinct neighborhood, not three separate neighborhoods. These areas are interdependent, face similar challenges, and have long deserved a better quality of life for their residents. They have also become both a literal and symbolic center of a City struggling with a growing economic divide. Area residents and stakeholders have voiced a resounding commitment to ensuring that the area remains affordable and supportive of San Franciscans with substantial needs. And there is optimism that the area's unique assets discussed above provide the opportunity to revitalize the neighborhood while ensuring low-income residents, including families and children and immigrant business owners, can benefit from cleaner and safer streets, quality businesses, recreation, and other opportunities alongside newcomers.

The update process has culminated in the creation of a new Strategy in 2015. To deepen and sustain the nascent revitalization on Market Street, this Strategy is expanded to include priority areas along Sixth Street and in the heart of the Tenderloin. The new Strategy captures important work underway as well as identifies new interventions that are planned or needed, as determined during the update process. It also creates a much-needed structure for implementation that allows work by the growing number of diverse public and private stakeholders to proceed with increased coordination now and into the future. The goal is to harness the new investment in the area to create a diverse, healthy, mixed-income neighborhood that offers safety and well-being to all who live, work and visit the area.

Treasure Island

Demographics

Approximately 3,090¹⁰² people live on Treasure Island. Its population is younger than San Francisco's overall, with a proportion of residents between the ages of 18-34 years that is almost double that of San Francisco's, and a significantly lower proportion of residents ages 35-59 years and 60 years and older. More than 30% of the neighborhood is White. Black residents comprise a higher share of the population, 20%, than the City overall. Latino/a residents also comprise a higher share of the population than the City overall. The proportion of Asian population in the neighborhood is smaller than the City's proportion. There are about 770¹⁰³ housing units in the neighborhood, all of which are renter occupied. The median household income for Treasure Island is significantly lower than the City's median income. See the San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

Neighborhood Features

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

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

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

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

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

The on-Island residential community also includes participants in supportive-housing programs overseen by One Treasure Island. One Treasure Island is a collaborative of 20 community agencies originally formed in 1994 to develop the formerly-homeless housing and support component of the Reuse Plan for Treasure Island. One Treasure Island initiates community-building efforts to help develop this newly forming San Francisco neighborhood and also provides an organized way for member agencies and others to participate. Part of this effort includes developing and/or coordinating access to support services for residents such as a food pantry, recreation activities, health services, and children and youth programs.

Opportunities

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

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

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

Visitacion Valley

Demographics

Approximately 18,570¹⁰⁴ people live in Visitacion Valley. Despite a higher proportion of children in Visitacion Valley, median age for its population is older than San Francisco's. A majority of its population is Asian, and it has a higher proportion of Black and Latino/a residents than San Francisco overall. There are about 5,280 housing units in the neighborhood, of which 53% are owner-occupied¹⁰⁵. The median household income for the neighborhood is significantly lower than that of the City overall. See the San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

Neighborhood Features

Visitacion Valley, tucked away in the southeastern section of San Francisco, features retail corridors along Leland Ave and Bayshore Boulevard. It is home to recent immigrants (predominantly Asian) and long-time San Francisco families alike. Local landmarks include Eichler homes, a Julia Morgan designed church, the Visitacion Valley Greenway, and the regional attractions of Candlestick Park and Cow Palace. With easy access to the 101 Freeway, T-Third Light Rail Line and Caltrain's Bayshore Station, residents and visitors have many choices for traveling within San Francisco and throughout the region.

Commercial District Health

Visitacion Valley has several challenges affecting the health of the commercial district including low foot traffic; it has a total of 77 storefronts with the City's highest commercial vacancy rate of 24.7% in 2019. Businesses along the corridor include retail, food services, professional services and social assistance agencies.

Opportunities

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

In 2012 the dissolution of the Redevelopment Agency resulted in loss of public funding for the redevelopment of the Schlage Lock an industrial site making the planned mixed-use development unfeasible. Even with this setback we have worked in close partnership to the mixed-use developer to secure and maximize public amenities while ensuring the project would be financially feasible. Since 2012 we led an extensive community planning/vision process which resulted in the adoption of a development agreement by the Board of Supervisors in 2014. We expect that the new residents and amenities to the area will contribute to the revitalization of Leland Avenue.

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

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

Opportunities for growth exist in expanding marketing strategies for existing businesses and in attracting new businesses to fill vacant retail spaces. The expected redevelopment of the large vacant property located on Bayshore Boulevard (formerly occupied by a Schlage Lock factory) is anticipated to bring new residents and amenities to the area.

Western Addition

Demographics

Approximately 22,220¹⁰⁶ people live in the Western Addition. This population is slightly older than San Francisco's population overall, with a higher proportion of residents 60 years and older than the City. More than 40% of the neighborhood is White, and Black residents comprise a higher share of the population, 21%, than the City overall. The proportion of the Latino/a and Asian population in the neighborhood are smaller than the City's proportions. There are about 12,540¹⁰⁷ housing units in the neighborhood. A majority of households, 79%, in the Western Addition are renters. The median household income for the Western Addition is lower than the City's median income. See the San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles at https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/SF_NGBD_SocioEconomic_Profiles/2012-2016_ACS_Profile_Neighborhoods_Final.pdf for additional demographic data by neighborhood.

Neighborhood Features

The Fillmore is the commercial corridor serving the Western Addition neighborhood by the same name. During the middle part of the twentieth century, the demographics in the neighborhood shifted; as Jewish families moved out, and Japanese and Japanese-American families suffered internment, many African Americans who came to San Francisco for war industry jobs arrived in the Western Addition. The burgeoning African American community supported a slew of new jazz clubs and neighborhood businesses flourished; the district was dubbed 'the Harlem of the West'. Unfortunately, during the postwar period, Redevelopment in the Western Addition did severe damage to the community fabric, displacing residents and small businesses and disrupting the community network.

Today, the commercial district is home to a growing food scene with new award-winning restaurants such as State Bird Provisions and 1300 on Fillmore.

Commercial District Health

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

Public safety along the Fillmore is a primary concern for business owners and residents. The area experiences a high volume of crime relative to other commercial districts around the City. The 2018

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

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

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

Opportunities

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

Opportunities exist to build on the community the active neighborhood associations and other community-based and cultural organizations working to preserve the history of the neighborhood and contribute to the quality of life of the area. With the two Merchants Associations in the area, they will be able to support existing businesses and attract new customers to the corridor.

Are there any community assets in these areas/neighborhoods?

Yes, as described above, these neighborhoods have many community assets, including transit and bus services, commercial corridors, community centers and community organizations.

Are there other strategic opportunities in any of these areas?

Yes, strategic opportunities in these neighborhoods are described above.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

What is Climate Change?

Carbon dioxide is a naturally occurring gas produced by decay, fermentation, and combustion, and absorbed by plants through photosynthesis. Carbon dioxide is one of many greenhouse gases, which are chemical compounds that allows sunlight to reach the earth’s surface in one form (as visible light), but absorbs reradiated energy (in the form of heat) from the earth and inhibits it from escaping the atmosphere.¹⁰⁸ Beginning in the 20th century, industrial emissions, energy production, transportation, agricultural production, as well as deforestation of the plants that absorb carbon dioxide has increased the concentration of these greenhouse gases in our atmosphere. As these greenhouse gases trap heat, global temperatures increase, and weather becomes more variable and extreme.¹⁰⁹

Climate change is already happening. The National Ocean and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) identifies 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018 as the four hottest years in recorded history.¹¹⁰ These extreme temperatures have a significant and cascading impact on global weather patterns. High temperatures melt polar ice caps and contribute to the thermal expansion of the oceans which cause global sea levels to rise. Warm ocean temperatures also increase evaporation, and this increased concentration of water vapor in the atmosphere changes rainfall patterns as storms and droughts both become more extreme.

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

- Increasing temperatures
- Rising sea levels
- Changing precipitation patterns

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

Increasing Temperatures

As a result of climate change, San Francisco is already experiencing an increase in temperatures. From 1950 through 2005, the Bay Area saw an average annual maximum temperature increase of 1.7° F.¹¹¹ San Francisco reached an all-time high temperature of 106° F on September 1, 2017.¹¹² Climate scientists project 15-40 extreme heat days per year by mid-century, and upwards of 90 extreme heat

¹⁰⁸ <https://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/monitoring-references/faq/greenhouse-gases.php>

¹⁰⁹ San Francisco Climate and Health Adaptation Framework

¹¹⁰ <https://www.noaa.gov/news/2018-was-4th-hottest-year-on-record-for-globe>

¹¹¹ California National Resources Agency. California’s Fourth Climate Change Assessment: San Francisco Bay Area Region Report. Retrieved from: <http://www.climateassessment.ca.gov/regions/docs/20180827-SanFranciscoBayArea.pdf> (Accessed: 9/10/2018)

¹¹² <http://sanfrancisco.cbslocal.com/2017/09/01/excessive-heat-warning-declared-for-entire-bay-area/>

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

Implications for Future Hazards

Higher temperatures influence several hazards, including:

- San Francisco will experience more extreme heat days and heatwaves will be longer. San Franciscans are particularly vulnerable to extreme heat
- Drought and wildfires may become more frequent and severe. Higher temperatures increase evaporation, which dries out soils and vegetation, increasing the severity of drought and making the region more prone to wildland-urban-interface fires.¹¹³ In addition, more wildfires can increase the occurrence of poor air quality events

Rising Sea Levels

Rising sea levels will have implications for flooding and liquefaction risks. Sea levels in the Bay Area have already risen by as much as 8 inches in the last 100 years.¹¹⁴ Some areas of the city developed on bay fill zones also face the prospect of subsidence increasing the relative impact of SLR. According to Guidance from the State, San Francisco may see 11-24 inches of sea level rise by 2050 and 30–83 inches by 2100. For an in-depth treatment of SLR Projections and detailed mapping, please see the San Francisco Sea Level Rise Vulnerability & Consequences Assessment,¹¹⁵ which uses 10 scenarios that represent a range of SLR projections.

Implications for Future Hazards

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

- Low-lying areas that are not currently exposed to tides will experience inundation during high tides in the long-term.¹¹⁶
- Coastal flooding will become more frequent as Bay and sea levels occur more often. Coastal flooding will be more extensive and longer-lasting, especially during storm events.¹¹⁷
- Stormwater flooding will increase as high bay levels can impede drainage of stormwater runoff.¹¹⁸
- Higher sea levels will also increase the elevation of the groundwater table, increasing the susceptibility of some soils to liquefaction during an earthquake.¹¹⁹

Changing Precipitation Patterns

¹¹³ Ekstrom, Julia A., and Susanne C. Moser. 2012. Climate Change Impacts, Vulnerabilities, and Adaptation in the San Francisco Bay Area: A Synthesis of PIER Program Reports and Other Relevant Research. California Energy Commission. Publication number: CEC-500-2012-071.

¹¹⁴ California National Resources Agency. California's Fourth Climate Change Assessment: San Francisco Bay Area Region Report. Retrieved from: <http://www.climateassessment.ca.gov/regions/docs/20180827-SanFranciscoBayArea.pdf> (Accessed: 9/10/2018)

¹¹⁵ City and County of San Francisco, (Publication forthcoming). "Draft Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Consequences Assessment".

¹¹⁶ City and County of San Francisco, 2016. "Sea Level Rise Action Plan."

¹¹⁷ Ibid

¹¹⁸ Ibid

¹¹⁹ Adapting to Rising Tides, "Climate Impacts and Scenarios." <http://www.adaptingtorisingtides.org/portfolio/climate-impacts-and-scenarios/>

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

Implications for Future Hazards

Changing precipitation patterns may influence several hazards, including:

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

Table 73 – Summary of Climate Change Implications for Hazards

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

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


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

Flooding

Single family homes have low exposure to all types of flooding, but around 800 homes are in the 100-year stormwater flood zone. Around 12,000 multifamily units are exposed in both the stormwater flooding and 24" sea level rise zones. The proportion of affordable housing exposed to all types of flooding is higher than rates for other housing types. The 66" sea level rise zone contains over 4,000 affordable units.

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

Map 11 – Subsidized Affordable Housing and Flood Hazard



0 0.5 1 2
Miles

Flood Risk Subsidized Affordable Housing

Flood Hazards

- 100 Year Stormwater Runoff
- FEMA 100 Year Coastal Flood Zone
- 100 Year Storm + 24" Sea Level Rise
- 100 Year Storm + 66" Sea Level Rise

Number of Low Income Units

- 1 - 49
- 50 - 149
- 150 - 449
- 450 - 766

Sources: Public Utilities Commission
100-Year Storm Flood Risk Map;
FEMA Preliminary Flood Insurance
Rate Maps; ART Bay Area Sea Level
Rise and Shoreline Analysis Maps;
Affordable Housing data compiled
by SF Planning in 2018 from CHPC,
HUD, MOHCD



This map is intended for planning-level analysis and should not be used for permitting, regulatory, or other legal uses. Flooding is possible in areas outside of those displayed on this map. The risk zones are based on model outputs and relied on LIDAR data collected in 2010 and additional survey data (where available). Although care was taken to capture all relevant topographic features and structures, site specific conditions may not be fully represented.

Extreme Heat and Poor Air Quality

Older and un-weatherized buildings or those without air conditioning can lead to unhealthy conditions for occupants, particularly the elderly, children, and those with illnesses that make them more sensitive to heat. Given the usually mild conditions in San Francisco, most housing does not have air conditioning. Older housing without adequate HVAC puts residents at higher risk of heat and air quality health impacts from wildfire smoke. This has a particular impact on sensitive populations, such as children, the elderly, those who are pregnant, and those with medical conditions. This can be particularly acute in Single Room Occupancy buildings (SROs), as well as Skilled Nursing Facilities.

Vulnerabilities for Low- and Moderate-Income Households

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strategic Plan

SP-05 Overview

Strategic Plan Overview

Based on the key findings from the community engagement process and on MOHCD's role within the City structure, MOHCD has determined that the optimum way to address the City's priority needs is to work towards a set of five interconnected, multidisciplinary objectives that cross program areas and utilize leveraged strategies both internally and across multiple city departments (see Exhibit 14 for Theory of Change diagram). Funding for these strategies will be coordinated across City departments, so that HUD funds can be maximized in those areas that are both of highest priority to MOHCD/OEWD/HSH and where HUD funds can provide the maximum benefit in terms of unmet need and resource scarcity. These five objectives are:

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

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


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

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

Exhibit 14 – MOHCD Theory Change

MOHCD Theory of Change

(includes OEWD/HSB Consolidated Plan work)



Objectives

Families and Individuals are Stably Housed

The San Francisco Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) has undergone several significant changes in the past 5 years which affect the management and delivery of its housing programs and services.

First, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, along with all 400 redevelopment agencies in California, was dissolved on February 1, 2012, by order of the California Supreme Court in a decision issued on December 29, 2011 (California Redevelopment Association et al. v. Ana Matosantos). On June 27, 2012, the California Legislature passed and the Governor signed AB 1484, a bill making technical and substantive changes to AB 26, the dissolution bill that was found largely constitutional by the Supreme Court on December 29, 2011. Dissolution of redevelopment agencies in California eliminated a large source of funding for the development of affordable housing across the State. The impact was especially felt in San Francisco since the Redevelopment Agency historically devoted 50% of its tax increment financing to affordable housing. In response to the requirements of AB 26 and AB 1484, the City and County of San Francisco created OCII as the Successor Agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency. Pursuant to state and local legislation, two bodies govern the Successor Agency, the Oversight Board of the Successor Agency and the Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure for the major development areas of Mission Bay, Transbay, and Hunters Point Shipyard. Also pursuant to

state and local legislation, the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development was named as the successor-housing agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency. As the successor-housing agency, MOHCD has jurisdiction over all of the former Redevelopment Agency's housing assets in existence as of February 1, 2012. The major development areas of Mission Bay, Transbay and Hunters Point Shipyard continue to have affordable housing production requirements under their development agreements that were approved by the California Department of Finance as enforceable obligations of OCII. After those developments are completed they will be transferred to MOHCD as the successor-housing agency and then MOHCD will monitor compliance of those housing assets for the term of their affordability restrictions. Therefore, some of the goals and activities below speak to the continued integration of the Redevelopment Agency functions and infrastructure into MOHCD.

Second, the City and County of San Francisco has launched HOPE SF, which aims to move public housing away from the failed model of large, isolated islands of poverty and deteriorating housing and toward a new vision of high-quality mixed-income housing developments. HOPE SF's new model for revitalizing public housing draws on learning from more than 15 years of national HOPE VI experience, as well as on research by the Urban Institute, the Brookings Institute, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, and the Harlem Children's Zone. Then-Mayor Gavin Newsom and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors authorized \$95 million in local bond funding to launch HOPE SF, evidence of unprecedented City commitment to public housing. This amount exceeded the annual HOPE VI funding that year for the entire nation. HOPE SF will rebuild over 1,900 units in four public housing sites. Modern design principles will be used to transform more than 100 acres of dilapidated apartments into 2,400 additional homes, including both rental and for-sale units. The first HOPE SF site began construction in early 2010. This model will serve as a proving ground for various housing, community development, and economic and workforce development strategies being deployed elsewhere in the City.

In addition to HOPE SF, MOHCD is working closely with the SFHA to rehabilitate and convert over 3,400 public housing units to private ownership and management under HUD's RAD (RAD) program within the next 5 years. This effort will preserve an important housing safety net for some of San Francisco's poorest and most vulnerable residents.

Families and Individuals are Resilient and Economically Self-Sufficient

For San Francisco's low- and moderate-income residents to feel secure in their housing, advance towards their economic goals, and fully engage as resilient members of their community, each individual and their families need to be able to successfully move towards economic self-sufficiency. San Francisco uses as its basis for economic self-sufficiency the Family Economic Self-Sufficiency Standard (Self-Sufficiency Standard), which measures how much income is needed for a family of a certain composition living in a particular county to adequately meet its minimal basic needs. It is based on the costs families face on a daily basis – housing, food, childcare, out-of-pocket medical expenses, transportation, and other necessary spending – and provides a complete picture of what it takes for families to make ends meet. Calculated for 156 different family compositions in all 58 California Counties (and 35 other states), the Family Standard is based on credible, publicly available data sources, including:

- Housing costs: US Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Fair Market Rents and National Low-Income Housing Coalition (NLIHC)
- Childcare costs: California Department of Education (CDE)
- Food costs: US Department of Agriculture (USDA) low-cost food plan and ACCRA Cost of Living Index
- Health insurance costs: Medical Expenditure Panel Survey (MEPS)
- Transportation costs: U.S. Census and the National Association of Insurance Commissioners.

As stated by Diana Pearce in the Methodology Appendix for the Self Sufficiency Standard for California 2008, “Economic self-sufficiency cannot necessarily be achieved by wages alone. Public work supports (e.g., MediCal) are often necessary, even critical, for some families to meet the high costs of necessities in California, including housing, childcare, and health care. True self-sufficiency requires access to education, training, and jobs that provide skill development and career advancement over the long-term, rather than a specific job with a certain wage and benefits at one point in time. Being “self-sufficient”, however, does not imply that any family at any income should be completely self-reliant and independent of one another or the community-at-large. Indeed, it is through interdependence among families and community institutions (such as schools or religious institutions), as well as informal networks of friends, extended family, and neighbors that many families are able to meet both their non-economic and economic needs.” Research based on 20148 data by the Insight Center for Community Economic Development shows that of San Francisco’s households, 28% are living below the self-sufficiency standard. These households will not be able to move towards their goals of stable housing, healthy families, education and employment that moves them up the income ladder, without first knowing that they can meet their basic needs. San Francisco’s Consolidated Plan focuses on moving its residents towards self-sufficiency as the necessary first step towards success with all of their remaining goals.

Table 74 – Self-Sufficiency Standard for San Francisco Households with Two Adults, One Pre-Schooler and One Child 13–18

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

Communities Have Healthy Physical, Social, and Business Infrastructure

Communities rely on strong infrastructures, which require investment in social capital within neighborhoods, safe and accessible buildings which offer valuable services to its residents, and vibrant commercial corridors with neighborhood-serving businesses that meet the needs of the local residents. To this end, San Francisco has chosen to invest in enhancing community facilities and public spaces,

strengthening small businesses and commercial corridors, and increasing community cohesion through supporting community-based planning, leadership development, and community-led investment.

Communities at Risk of Displacement Are Stabilized

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

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

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

City Works to Eliminate the Causes of Racial Disparities

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

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

Target Populations

Extremely and Very Low-Income Households

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

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

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

Households with Barriers to Access to Opportunities

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

Households at Risk of Displacement

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Households Experiencing a Legacy of Exclusion

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

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

Households Destabilized by Systemic Trauma

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

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

Target Sub-Populations

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

Culturally Specific Groups

Black and African American

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Latino/a

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Middle Eastern and North African

Specific target populations were invited to participate in focus groups during data collection for this Consolidated Plan. Analysis of population-specific input reflects specific needs for public facilities,

improvements, and services. Workforce Readiness, Job Training, and Placement Services are the top needs identified by the Middle Eastern and North African community during focus groups, forums, and surveys.

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

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

Native American and Indigenous

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

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

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

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

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

Samoan

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

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

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

Southeast Asian (Primarily Cambodian, Laotian, Vietnamese)

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

- **Cambodians**
 - Targeted Outreach
 - Housing Navigation and Other Services for Persons Experiencing Homelessness
 - Benefits Assistance, Service Navigation, and Case Management
 - Improved Cultural Inclusivity and Accessibility for Public Services
- **Vietnamese**
 - Targeted Outreach
 - Housing Navigation and Other Services for Persons Experiencing Homelessness
 - Improved Cultural Inclusivity and Accessibility for Public Services
 - Education Services (GED/HS programs)

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

- Housing – More affordable housing
- Employment – Learning new skills
- Employment – Higher Income
- Benefits – Help with CalWorks, SNAP, MediCare, MediCal, General Assistance, etc.
- Health – Better access to healthcare
- Employment – Getting a job

Very Low-Income Households that are Not Homeless

This target population are very low income households that may be living in housing but whose housing may be precarious due to possibility of unaffordable rent increases. These households may include very low-income families or individuals working low-wage jobs or receiving public assistance.

Very Low-Income Homeowners

San Francisco has a 37.6% homeownership rate compared to the national rate of 64.3%. Homeownership is concentrated in the west and southern and southeastern parts of the city (see Map 4). The southern neighborhoods are also areas of low-income concentration. Although homeownership provides some level of financial security due to the equity homeowners may have in their homes, elderly homeowners may be on fixed incomes and therefore may not have the cash available to perform extensive home repairs without taking equity out of their homes. Home improvements often needed for elderly homeowners are improvements to make their homes more accessible as they age in their homes.

Persons Experiencing Homelessness

See Homeless Needs Assessment section of this document. For details about persons experiencing homelessness, see the 2019 San Francisco Homeless Count Report at http://hsh.sfgov.org/wp-content/uploads/2019HIRDReport_SanFrancisco_FinalDraft.pdf

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

- Benefits Assistance, Service Navigation, and Case Management
- Behavioral Health Services
- Workforce Readiness, Job Training, and Placement Services
- Financial Education, Empowerment, and Planning Services

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

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

Households with Low Educational Attainment

The self-sufficiency standards for San Francisco households are some of the highest in the country. As a result, it is becoming increasingly difficult for many San Francisco residents to earn a livable wage if they do not have a college degree (Citywide Workforce Services Alignment Plan, 2017).

Among San Franciscans 25 years and older, nearly 83,000 or 12% do not have a high school diploma credential but no college degree. They are predominantly from communities of color. Racial groups with a proportion of community members without a high school diploma that's higher than the citywide proportion are Latino/a (23%), Asian (21%) and American Indian and Alaska Native (19%).

These residents are in need of academic skills that can help bridge the gap between their current educational attainment and entry into post-secondary institutions or industry-aligned job training and apprenticeship programs.

The survey data shows that the following needs were the most cited by respondents without a high school diploma:

- Housing – More affordable housing
- Health – Better access to healthcare
- Employment – Getting a job
- Financial – Rental subsidy, housing voucher, or other reduced-cost housing
- Childcare – After-school programs
- Employment – Learning new skills
- Benefits – Help with CalWorks, SNAP, MediCare, MediCal, General Assistance, etc.

Limited English Proficient Households

In San Francisco, language access is highly correlated with educational attainment and household income. Most San Franciscans with a high school degree or less are either naturalized citizens or citizens of another country (Citywide Workforce Services Alignment Plan, 2017). Many do not speak English or do not speak English well enough to access workforce, educational and other community opportunities (including critical services).

171,041 or 21% of San Francisco’s population five years and older speak English less than very well. Of this population who speak English less than “very well”:

- 96,338 (57%) speak Chinese (including Mandarin and Cantonese)
- 34,760 (20%) speak Spanish
- 8,989 (5%) speak Tagalog
- 6,593 (4%) speak Russian, Polish, or other Slavic language
- 6,049 (4%) speak Vietnamese

The survey data shows that the following needs were the most cited by respondents who preferred a language other than English:

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

Immigrants, including Undocumented Immigrants and Refugees

The San Francisco Immigrant Legal & Education Network

The San Francisco Immigrant Legal & Education Network (SFILEN) is a collaboration of thirteen multiracial, multilingual community-based organizations that provide critical legal services and outreach to San Francisco immigrants. SFILEN clients face barriers in accessing social services, have fear of local

law enforcement, and are being detained and deported in record numbers. SFILEN staff has direct experience supporting low-income, underserved immigrants with culturally and linguistically appropriate services to address the barriers facing San Francisco’s immigrant communities.

The San Francisco Immigrant Integration Project (2014)

SFILEN conducted a two-year community research effort, the San Francisco Immigrant Integration Project (“Integration Project”). The goal of the Integration Project was to engage a broad range of stakeholders on immigrant integration issues, to document the unique needs of the immigrant community, and to propose relevant policies and practices for meaningful integration.

Based on figures from the ACS, San Francisco’s adult foreign-born population (18 years and older) comprises nearly 40% of the city. While San Francisco is often perceived as an immigrant friendly and welcoming sanctuary city, participants in the integration project have stated otherwise. Many are immigrants struggling to find a job and affordable housing in an expensive city. The warm welcome of San Francisco is sharply contrasted with the lack of access to city resources and limited meaningful engagement from city stakeholders.

This project documents how San Francisco immigrant communities struggle to gain access to services and what they do in the face of these service gaps. This project also provides recommendations for San Francisco to improve immigrant integration through an emphasis on effective and accessible city services, the removal of cultural and linguistic barriers, and the participation of all stakeholders.

The Integration Project consisted of three community-based phases: (1) collaborative, multilingual planning and research, including a preliminary interview process with select community members; (2) community-based research with focus groups and administration of a multilingual survey to San Francisco immigrants; and (3) a community engagement process to present the project’s findings and begin to frame future policy or advocacy recommendations for SFILEN.

SFILEN staff and community leaders surveyed 625 San Francisco immigrants with 609 valid, complete surveys. The Integration Project was distributed in the community for six weeks and the survey was available in Spanish, Chinese, San Francisco Immigrant Legal & Education Network 3 Tagalog, Arabic, Tigrinya, and English. All participants were San Francisco residents, 18 years or older, and “immigrant” was defined as those born outside of the United States. Most survey participants were clients of SFILEN’s legal services, constituent members of SFILEN organizations, or other immigrant residents that came in contact with SFILEN service providers. The staff at the University of San Francisco’s Leo T. McCarthy Center for Public Service and the Common Good was instrumental in the survey design, processing and disaggregation of quantitative data from the surveys.

In addition to the survey, SFILEN staff and community leaders conducted more than 30 one-on-one interviews, nine in-language focus groups, and brought together more than 150 community members for convenings to share the results. In total, SFILEN engaged more than 800 San Francisco community members and immigrants.

Key Findings

1. **Common Dreams:** Nearly 63% of survey participants indicated that they came to the U.S. for “a better life.” Focus group participants further explained that they had hope for better employment and educational opportunities, to reunite with family members, or to escape political turmoil in their home countries.

2. **Access to Services:** Despite feeling welcome in San Francisco (63% of respondents said they felt adjusted to U.S. culture), most immigrants still face barriers to critical services and programs. All survey participants indicated they had unmet needs when it comes to accessing basic support.
3. **Key Challenges:** The San Francisco immigrant community has the most difficulty with employment and housing. San Francisco immigrants are unemployed and underemployed with 45% indicating they are out of work and 21% working only part time. They indicated that employment services are inaccessible due to language barriers or being difficult to locate. Additionally, 45% of participants indicated that their housing needs are not being met and 58% have difficulty accessing housing services.
4. **Immigrant Access to Healthcare:** A majority of immigrants indicated that their health care needs are being met, but there is still some confusion and misinformation about eligibility for local health care programs. Nearly 70% of all immigrants indicated they have been able to access health services. But many immigrants indicated that they were not entirely clear about the requirements for health care programs, including some people fearing that their information would be turned over to immigration officials.
5. **Undocumented Immigrants:** Approximately 20% of survey respondents indicated they are undocumented while 7% declined to state their immigrant status. San Francisco's undocumented immigrant community faces additional barriers when it comes to accessing city services. Undocumented immigrants have difficulty accessing most programs because of a lack of documentation/ identification and limited funds. Additionally, fear of law enforcement is a daily challenge for most immigrant communities, but particularly Latino/a immigrants who witness increased police presence in their neighborhoods. They also witness growing collaboration between police officers and immigration authorities.
6. **Civic Participation:** Most immigrants, 60% of survey participants, indicated that they wish civic participation was a bigger part of their lives. They wish to participate in voting, community education events, attend city hearings, and community rallies more to be a part of improving their own communities.
7. **Support systems:** Immigrant communities utilize creative, community-based support systems because they lack access to or do not trust city agencies. Immigrant communities are using mutual aid programs, cooperative models, and informal networks between friends to try to fill service gaps.

Recommendations

1. Redefine immigrant integration to move beyond welcoming messages and cultural celebrations. What is most meaningful to new immigrants is access to critical services (such as housing, employment, and health care) that are needed for a good quality of life.
2. Expand community education and outreach. Immigrants in San Francisco have trouble accessing services due to lack of information or misinformation. They are also unaware of pro-immigrant policies and programs that they could benefit from. Targeted education and outreach conducted by community members with existing relationships and linguistic and cultural competency can fill the gap.

3. Promote best practices and innovative strategies to increase access to services. San Francisco stakeholders can implement a number of initiatives to increase access for immigrants such as workforce training initiatives for low-skilled workers, expanding worker protection laws, and creating a centralized housing database. Best practices account for linguistic, cultural, and educational barriers that immigrant communities most often face.
4. Build bridges with the receiving community. The existing neighborhoods and residents of a demographically changing city have a stake in this as well. With better immigrant integration, our local schools, local economy, and neighborhood relationships all improve. Greater interactions, relationship-building, and mutual support between immigrants and receiving communities should be promoted and supported by city officials.
5. Support community-based research. The Integration Project was the first of its kind to document the experiences of a significant number of undocumented and underserved immigrants. Because it was a community-driven process, immigrants felt comfortable being candid and direct about their experiences accessing services in San Francisco. The project opened up many new research inquiries that require follow up to properly assess how all communities can thrive in San Francisco.

For more details, please see The San Francisco Immigrant Integration Project Findings from Community-Based Research Conducted by the San Francisco Immigrant Legal & Education Network (SFILEN) at <https://sfilen.org/publication/>

Households with Low Digital Access/Literacy

In addition to spoken and written language, digital literacy is now increasingly necessary to navigate the modern employment landscape, as well as to make connections to fellow San Franciscans.

Low-income residents face a shortage of no cost tech support services to help with issues like malware removal, addressing online scams, and diagnosing hardware and software issues; non-English digital literacy trainings, particularly in Cantonese and Spanish; smartphone trainings; opportunities to learn basic digital skills, such as online safety and online banking and bill pay; and opportunities to learn intermediate and advanced digital skills, such as computer programming, particularly for non-youth audiences (Digital Divide Survey, 2018).

The most significant gaps in technology usage, access and skills exist among four demographic groups: low-income residents and families; limited English proficient residents; adults with disabilities; and older adults. A concentrated need exists among the following low-income neighborhoods: Bayview Hunters Point; Chinatown; Mission; Ocean/Merced/Ingleside; Excelsior; Tenderloin and Mid-Market; and Visitacion Valley and Sunnydale.

The Consolidated Plan survey data shows that the following needs were the most cited by respondents in households with no access to the internet:

- Health – Better access to healthcare
- Housing – More affordable housing
- Benefits – Help with CalWorks, SNAP, MediCare, MediCal, General Assistance, etc.
- Better safety
- Wellness – Access to healthy food

- Housing – More protections to stay in housing

Public Housing, RAD and HOPE SF residents

Residents of HOPE SF and RAD converted public housing developments, as well as Single Room Occupancy (SRO) housing developments, experience similar but also unique needs compared to other low-income households throughout the city.

Many do not speak English as their primary language, and need assistance and services offered in multiple languages or through interpretation and translation services. They require assistance accessing healthy foods, and a majority report feeling socially isolated.

Many have difficulty coping with stress, anxiety, or depression, and many report feeling unsafe within their homes, buildings and/or neighborhoods. Families and households need housing stabilization services to ensure timely rent payment, compliance with house and lease rules, and ongoing housing stability.

For seniors and persons with disabilities in these units, it can be a challenge, physically and psychologically, to leave home and access services. They require case management and care coordination, community engagement, and transportation options to help them identify and address barriers to self-sufficiency.

Given the myriad economic, social, mental health, mobility and language needs within these developments, it is essential for service providers to adopt place-based activities that build community cohesion and develop skills for coping with daily stresses. In many cases, residents will express their needs but not show an interest in receiving services that might be available to them. Case management is required to help residents feel safe enough to request and follow through with the services they may need. Case managers must listen carefully to successfully address the unique needs of each property and the residents who live there.

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

Residents of public and subsidized housing conveyed the most needs for public services of all groups across the City. The needs most frequently discussed by this community include:

- Landlord Education & Section 8 Recruitment Services
- Benefits Assistance, Service Navigation, and Case Management
- Behavioral Health Services
- Financial Education, Empowerment, and Planning Services
- Accessible and Safe Public Transportation
- Access to Healthy Food and Grocery Stores
- Physical Health and Wellness Facilities and Services

This community was the only group that self-identified challenges around food security, and the need for food access was among the top needs mentioned in these conversations.

The survey data shows that the following needs were the most cited by respondents who indicated that they rent from the SFHA:

- Housing – More affordable housing
- Housing – More protections to stay in housing
- Financial – Rental subsidy, housing voucher, or other reduced-cost housing
- Housing – Accessible or adaptable unit for persons with disabilities
- Benefits – Help with CalWorks, SNAP, MediCare, MediCal, General Assistance, etc.
- Health – Mental health/substance use help
- Wellness – Access to healthy food
- Employment – Getting a job

Disconnected Transitional Age Youth (TAY)

In San Francisco, and across the nation, many young people age 18–24 are disconnected from the supports and services they need to ensure a successful transition into stable and self-sufficient adulthood. Most of these disconnected TAY have to overcome challenging backgrounds, often including significant trauma, and are at an elevated risk for unemployment, poverty, involvement with the criminal justice system, and homelessness.¹²⁰ San Francisco’s Children and Families First Legislation defines “disconnected TAY” as young people age 18–24 who:¹²¹

- are homeless or in danger of homelessness;
- have dropped out of high school;
- have a disability or other special needs, including substance abuse;
- are low-income parents;
- are undocumented;
- are new immigrants and/or English learners;
- are LGBTQ+; and/or
- are transitioning from the foster care, juvenile justice, criminal justice or special education system.

In 2014, the City and County of San Francisco renamed the Children’s Fund to the Children and Youth Fund, expanding its use to include services for TAY. As part of this expansion, the Department of Children, Youth, and Their Families (DCYF) began administering funds for TAY services. In 2016, DCYF awarded its first rounds of pilot grants designated for TAY-serving organizations throughout San Francisco.

In “Valuing Individuality while Building Community”, the March 2018 Final Evaluation Report on San Francisco Department of Children, Youth, and Their Families’ Grants for Disconnected Transitional Age Youth, the document presents findings that draw on the following data sources:

¹²⁰ Disconnected Transitional Youth In San Francisco; Mayor’s Transitional Youth Task Force, 2007

¹²¹ Charter Section 16.108 of the Children and Families First Legislation

- A TAY survey completed by 144 program participants, administered by grantees throughout the fiscal year 2016–17;¹²²
- A survey of all DCYF-funded TAY grantees (23 respondents total), administered in October 2017;
- Three focus groups conducted with a total of 17 participants representing 15 funded organizations in November 2017; and
- Year-end reports and associated data for 13 TAY grants (10 innovation and 3 collaboratives) submitted to DCYF through its Contract Management System (CMS), capturing data for fiscal year 2016–17.¹²³

While San Francisco’s disconnected TAY face a number of shared challenges, the population includes a number of distinct subgroups including former foster youth, justice-involved TAY, and young parents—each with their own unique experiences and needs. We first describe the common challenges that disproportionately affect the population as a whole. We then explore these dynamics for several of the subgroups within San Francisco’s TAY population. Data sources for this section include the TAY survey, grantee survey, and grantee focus groups.

Common Challenges and Needs

Disconnected TAY face a number of common challenges that impact their ability to engage in programming and maintain participation. According to grantees, the most widespread challenges for this population include being homeless or at risk of homelessness, the need to prioritize basic needs over program participation, trauma exposure and social anxiety, and substance abuse and mental health challenges.

Finding secure housing and help with transportation rose to the top as services that about one-fifth of TAY participants (19 percent and 18 percent, respectively) reported not being able to get through the program in which they participated. Among grantees, 39 percent offer services to help participants find secure housing, and about half (52 percent) provide help with transportation. Although almost all grantees (91 percent) reported providing help with finding a job, this was among the top three unmet needs reported by TAY participants, indicating a need for additional supports and/or employment opportunities—the latter being largely outside the scope of what grantees are able to offer. The next most common unmet needs were help with paying the rent and counseling or mental health services, which are both provided by a relatively small share of grantees (17 percent and 22 percent, respectively). While referrals may help meet some of this need, the high cost of living and lack of mental health services for TAY in San Francisco create additional challenges in these areas.

In terms of other commonly-reported needs, smaller percentages of TAY participants (8 percent each) also reported needing help with getting food and with getting medical services (each offered by 39 percent of grantees) and help with managing money (offered by 52 percent of grantees). Smaller shares of TAY participants reported needing support with getting into school, legal issues, reconnecting with family, childcare, and substance abuse treatment.

¹²² Note: Data from the TAY survey are available at <http://dcyf.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=5171>

¹²³ Note: Contract Management System data available at <http://dcyf.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=5171>

Some needs are not so easily met by grantees, and speak to structural and systemic constraints that providers and TAY across the city face. These include, most notably, housing, as well as mental health services and substance abuse treatment. As discussed below, grantees shared how these needs can have a significant impact on young people’s ability to remain stable and engage in programming.

All grantees highlighted homelessness and a lack of stable housing as particular challenges for TAY. Most grantees discussed the extremely high cost of housing in the Bay Area as a tremendous challenge.

Some grantees noted that turbulence at home can also impact young people’s housing stability. Providers also noted the need for more emergency and short-term shelter options for TAY who are homeless or at risk of homelessness. One grantee highlighted a shortage of TAY-specific beds in emergency shelters throughout San Francisco, sharing that, “for every five young people who experience homelessness, there are two beds. We have one of the worst unsheltered rates in the nation.”

Both grantees and service participants highlighted mental health services and substance abuse treatment as significant needs. More than three-quarters of TAY participants (77 percent) reported needing help for emotional or mental health problems during the past year. Grantees agreed that there is a significant need for additional mental health support for TAY in San Francisco. Providers discussed the struggle many young people face when trying to deal with both substance abuse and what one called “untreated mental illness.

While none of these grantees were funded to provide mental health services, many still had to address this need as part of their work with disconnected young people. Grantees shared that, while they are able to offer TAY some mental health resources and referrals to outside agencies, their capacity in this area is often limited.

TAY Subgroups

While San Francisco’s disconnected TAY share some common characteristics as discussed above, there are also a number of distinct and often intersecting subgroups, each with its own unique needs and assets. In fact, intersectionality among San Francisco’s TAY seems to be the norm. The intersectional nature of many young people’s identities is particularly important to note, because while TAY may engage with services that are designed for a specific facet of their identity, they often have additional needs that impact their ability to engage and sustain participation. The remainder of this section explores several subgroups of San Francisco’s disconnected TAY that rose to the top throughout this evaluation.

Grantees explained that **former foster youth** can be “invisible” because they may not disclose their involvement in the foster care system. One quarter (26 percent) of grantees identified current or former foster care participants as a target population, yet some held that these participants are often more willing to share information about other characteristics or needs when engaging in services. Another mentioned that some former foster youth prefer to identify with the present rather than the past. One provider recalled only learning about a participant’s time in foster care through internal program records. Not knowing this important information about participants’ history makes it challenging for providers to develop a full understanding of their past experiences and thus design an approach to best meet their needs.

While grantees may be meeting the needs of **TAY with disabilities and special needs**, data on this topic is limited. About one fourth of funded agencies (26 percent) reported TAY with disabilities or special needs as a target population for their services. This evaluation did not collect additional information from grantees about the extent to which they are able to accommodate these needs. Additional research would be necessary to develop a deeper understanding of what those needs are and how grantees are responding to them.

Grantees agreed that community is especially important for **young people who identify as LGBTQ+**. One-third of grantees (30 percent) identified LGBTQ+ TAY as a target population, and they shared that many of these young people do not have family support and need to build a “family” of choice among their peers. According to providers who work with this population, these social connections are a key reason why some LGBTQ+ young people remain engaged in programming. Knowing that many LGBTQ+ TAY participate and stay involved in programming as a way to be of service to their peers and community can help inform a tailored approach to engaging and retaining these young people. Such an approach should include mechanisms to support community building, engage current participants to reach out to others, and keep former participants connected.

Providers noted that **justice-involved young people** may view their programming as an extension of “the system,” and experience referrals as punitive rather than positive. For these reasons, engaging justice-involved young people in programming can be challenging, although one-third (30 percent) of grantees identified this group as a target population. Recidivism is a significant risk for justice system-involved youth,¹²⁴ and grantees stressed the importance of meeting these young people where they are and providing additional supports when necessary. One provider that works with this population with the goal of “having people not recidivate” noted that they “encourage participants to be connected to our program at whatever level feels comfortable [for them].” At another agency, providers advocate for these participants when needed; one grantee reported that “We’re... showing up to people’s court cases, standing up in court to say, ‘I’m here on behalf of so and so.’” Multigenerational justice system involvement appears to have a significant impact on TAY as well. Forty-two percent of TAY participants reported having a parent who has been incarcerated, and those young people were more likely to report having been detained or incarcerated themselves. Parental incarceration can also affect TAY economically and disrupt supportive adult relationships, which grantees identified as being key to TAY stability and success.

TAY parents have responsibilities that their non-parenting peers do not face—most significantly, caring for their children. About the same percentage of participants who identified as parents (11 percent) reported “being a better parent” as one of their goals when deciding to enroll in the funded program (8 percent). One-third of grantees (30 percent) identified low-income parents as a target TAY population. Those who serve TAY parents noted that many of these young people were not interested in parenting programs designed for the general adult population, suggesting a need for parenting programs and other related services that are tailored to this age group.

Grantees also noted that a lack of childcare can prevent TAY parents from engaging and persisting with services. Specifically, grantees identified a need for drop-in childcare, in addition to full- and part-time scheduled childcare, allowing for more wraparound support for parenting TAY.

¹²⁴ <https://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/fact-sheet-reducing-recidivism-justiceinvolved-youth>

Many grantees identified **TAY who are “truly disconnected”** (i.e., not working, in school, or connected to any programs) as particularly difficult to reach even though they may be most in need of services. Grantees noted that many of these young people, especially those who do not live or congregate in the locations where other TAY are typically reached, are unaware of available programs and services. Grantees noted, however, that reaching young people in their mid-teens who are at least marginally connected to systems or services can help prevent true disconnection.

Couch-surfing youth who are not connected to systems or services TAY face unique challenges accessing supports in part because they and others may not consider themselves to be homeless and are often unaware of services designed for homeless young people on the streets. Although they are unstably housed, couch-surfing youth may not identify as truly homeless, and as a result may not seek programs and services that they could benefit from. San Francisco’s 2017 Point In Time (PIT) Homeless Count¹²⁵ highlights the “hidden nature” of youth homelessness, and notes how that impacts their disconnection from services: “Young people experiencing homelessness have a harder time accessing services... due to the stigma of their housing situation, lack of knowledge of available resources, and a dearth of services targeted to young people.”

The current political climate has led to an increased sense of fear and vulnerability among undocumented individuals, including **undocumented TAY**. Grantees explained that, in some cases, undocumented TAY choose to remain completely disconnected for fear of being reported and/or detained, which can make them difficult to find and serve. According to providers, word-of-mouth referrals, one of the most successful means of reaching TAY in general, are also the most effective way to connect undocumented TAY with services.

TAY who are undocumented share a unique set of challenges, particularly related to employment. Some grantees shared that TAY without documentation that allows them to work may not be eligible for certain aspects of workforce development programs, including some internships and job placements. Grantees added that constraints within the immigration system often leave TAY waiting for several years to obtain needed legal documentation.

Displaced young people. The housing crisis in San Francisco and the rest of the Bay Area has led to increased youth displacement. According to data submitted by grantees, almost half (47 percent) of TAY participants who are enrolled in high school attend high school outside of San Francisco, indicating that they likely also live outside of the city limits. Grantees reported that some youth commute long distances to remain engaged in services located in San Francisco, as even the cost of living continues to rise in formerly affordable surrounding areas. One grantee noted that not all disconnected TAY who leave San Francisco do so by choice, and may have strong connections to communities that draw them back. This person explained, “San Francisco ships a lot of kids for foster care and transitional housing out of County to the East Bay and out of state. Youth commute from the East Bay back to San Francisco where their community is.”

TAY from San Francisco. Some grantees reported that TAY who are originally from San Francisco can be among the most challenging to reach and engage in services. They shared that long-term, multigenerational socioeconomic stress has impacted communities throughout San Francisco, leaving many of these young people with a sense of immobility. One provider noted that “those who have lived

¹²⁵ <http://hsh.sfgov.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/2017-SF-Point-in-Time-CountGeneral-FINAL-6.21.17.pdf>

in San Francisco the longest are hard to reach,” adding that “TAY who have lived in disadvantaged communities in San Francisco just don't see the motivation anymore.” By hiring community members to serve as outreach and program staff, some grantees were able to more effectively engage San Francisco-born TAY.

Grantees highlighted the individuality of each disconnected young person, noting that the strengths and challenges they bring impact the way they experience services from outreach to completion. TAY come to services with different levels of socio-emotional development, soft skills, education, and work experience. They also come with a range of previous experiences, often including significant exposure to trauma. Grantees repeatedly highlighted the need to meet TAY where they are, and tailor services, timelines, and anticipated outcomes to each individual served.

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

- Benefits Assistance, Service Navigation, and Case Management
- Workforce Readiness, Job Training, and Placement Services
- Financial Education, Empowerment, and Planning Services

The survey data shows that the following needs were the most cited by respondents between the ages of 18-24:

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

Persons Living with HIV/AIDS (PLWHA)

See Non-homeless Special Needs Assessment section of this document for a description of the PLWHA community.

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

Focus groups with persons living with HIV and HIV service providers highlighted the need for services that address the health, mental health, housing, and employment needs that many low-income individuals living with HIV encounter. Members of this community indicated needs for case management services, with discussions focusing on the value of appointment reminders, support for medication adherence, and onsite supportive services that vary with degrees of support needed (e.g.,

appointment escort, drop in counseling, and transportation to appointments). Job training and culturally relevant mental health support also emerged as top needs.

- Benefits Assistance, Service Navigation, and Case Management
- Behavioral Health Services
- Workforce Readiness, Job Training, and Placement Services
- Recent Immigrants
- Workforce Readiness, Job Training, and Placement Services
- Financial Education, Empowerment, and Planning Services

The survey data shows that the following needs were the most cited by respondents who indicated that they are living with HIV/AIDS:

- Housing – More affordable housing
- Benefits – Help with CalWorks, SNAP, MediCare, MediCal, General Assistance, etc.
- Financial – Rental subsidy, housing voucher, or other reduced-cost housing
- Health – Mental health/substance use help
- Wellness – Access to healthy food
- Housing – More protections to allow me to stay in my housing
- Legal – Eviction prevention

Seniors and Persons with Disabilities

San Francisco is home to 169,189 adults ages 60 or over and 33,463 adults ages 18–59 living with a disability. In 2016, older adults comprised 20% of the City’s population, a number that will rise to 26% by 2030.¹²⁶ Older adults and adults with disabilities are important, vibrant members of the San Francisco community who face a unique set of challenges. As these groups of individuals grow in number, the need to provide programs and services to support them also increases. In recognition of the challenges facing these groups, voters passed legislation to both define and support the needs of older adults and adults with disabilities. On November 8, 2016, voters approved Proposition I¹²⁷ to amend the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco to establish the Dignity Fund, a guaranteed funding stream to provide these needed services and supports for older adults and adults with disabilities, to be administered by DAAS.

SF DAAS services aim to maximize self-sufficiency, safety, health, and independence so older adults and adults with disabilities may live in the community for as long as possible while maintaining the highest quality of life. An Oversight and Advisory Committee (OAC) comprised of representatives from the Aging and Adult Services Commission, the SF DAAS Advisory Council, the Long Term Coordinating Council, and at-large mayoral appointments ensures responsible and equitable allocation of the Fund.

¹²⁶ San Francisco HSA Planning Unit. 2016. Assessment of the Needs of San Francisco Seniors and Adults with Disabilities. Accessed on February 2018 from <https://www.sfhsa.org/about/reports-publications/olderadults-and-people-disabilities/2016-seniors-and-adults-disabilities>.

¹²⁷ For original text of the amendment, see: <http://69.89.31.206/~sfcommun/sfdignityfund/wpcontent/uploads/2016/11/Leg-Final.pdf>

Proposition I also outlined a planning process to begin in FY17–18 and repeat every fourth fiscal year. The DAAS DFCNA represents the start of this planning process. The findings from each DFCNA will inform the Service Allocation Plan (SAP) developed in the subsequent year.

This DFCNA integrated findings from two concurrent efforts – Community Research and an Equity Analysis – to identify consumer needs, system-level strengths and gaps, and underserved community members. The Community Research component collected new data from a wide breadth of community members and service providers. Community forums in each supervisorial district and 29 focus groups with a variety of demographic groups reached 744 consumers and service providers, while online, paper, and phone surveys reached 1,127 consumers and 298 service providers. The Equity Analysis leveraged existing data sources, such as the Census and SF DAAS administrative data, to calculate SF DAAS service participation rates for consumers with the presence of an equity factor and across districts and income levels, as well as financial benefits across districts.

Key Findings

Over the past several years, SF DAAS has invested extensive time and funding into improving its capacity to serve and support older adults and adults with disabilities so they can maintain independence and contribute to their neighborhoods and communities. Findings suggest that SF DAAS' efforts to support older adults and adults with disabilities and allow them to continue contributing to their communities have been largely successful. Connected consumers rated programs and services favorably and shared many stories of positive experiences. Findings also indicate that there continue to be opportunities to improve outreach and service efforts to meet the needs of older adults and adults with disabilities. The Community Research efforts also highlighted the structural problems that persist throughout San Francisco and often amplify the challenges in providing social services to large groups of individuals who are struggling to meet their basic needs. Key findings include:

1. The majority of service-connected consumers have positive service experiences and enjoy their participation. Consumers who participate in existing programs view them favorably. Those programs and services that promote meaningful community and social connection are an important and beneficial resource that enhance consumers' quality of life.
2. Consumers and service providers described several barriers and challenges to accessing services that can limit engagement in services and programs that support older adults and adults with disabilities. They identified a need for more information about and increased visibility of existing programs and services that support older adults and adults with disabilities. They also described barriers such as navigation challenges and confusion around eligibility. Adults with disabilities called out an increased navigation challenge because the name of SF DAAS does not specifically call out adults with disabilities as a population served.
3. San Francisco residents display limited awareness of the challenges facing older adults and adults with disabilities, which compounds existing barriers to service engagement for these groups. Consumers and service providers voiced concern that younger adults and those without a disability lack awareness of the challenges facing older adults and adults with disabilities. They expressed interest in promoting awareness of these challenges among the broader San Francisco community.

4. There are opportunities to enhance existing collaboration efforts and establish new partnerships throughout the community, both across agencies and within community groups. Community members and providers identified important opportunities to continue or begin collaboration efforts between agencies in San Francisco. Consumers also expressed appreciation for collaboration efforts that involve other community members, not just those who are not adults with disabilities or older adults. They expressed interest in being integrated into their community through programs and services.

For more details, please see March 2018 DFCNA here:

<https://www.sfhsa.org/sites/default/files/Dignity%20Fund%20Community%20Needs%20Assessment%20FINAL%20Draft%20Report%20%284.6.18%29.pdf>

Specific target populations were invited to participate in focus groups during data collection for this Consolidated Plan. Analysis of population-specific input reflects specific needs for public facilities, improvements, and services.

People with Disabilities

Below are the top needs identified by the persons with disabilities community during focus groups, forums, and surveys:

- Community Centers and Gathering Spaces
- Safe, Reliable, and Accessible Public Transportation
- Targeted Outreach
- Benefits Assistance, Service Navigation, and Case Management
- Behavioral Health Services
- Improved Cultural Inclusivity and Accessibility for Public Services
- Workforce Readiness, Job Training, and Placement Services

The survey data shows that the following needs were the most cited by respondents that indicated that they have a disability:

- Housing – More affordable housing
- Financial – Rental subsidy, housing voucher, or other reduced-cost housing
- Benefits – Help with CalWorks, SNAP, MediCare, MediCal, General Assistance, etc.
- Wellness – Access to healthy food
- Employment – Higher Income
- Health – Better access to healthcare
- Housing – More protections to stay in housing
- Health - Mental health/substance use help

Seniors

Below are the top needs identified by the HIV community during focus groups, forums, and surveys:

- Community Centers and Gathering Spaces
- Safe, Reliable, and Accessible Public Transportation
- Targeted Outreach
- Landlord Education & Section 8 Recruitment Services
- Benefits Assistance, Service Navigation, and Case Management

- Improved Cultural Inclusivity and Accessibility for Public Services
- Workforce Readiness, Job Training, and Placement Services

The survey data shows that the following needs were the most cited by respondents that are 63 years and older:

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

LGBTQ+

The 2017 San Francisco Bay Area LGBTQ+ Community Needs Assessment was commissioned by Horizons Foundation (Horizons) and conducted by Learning for Action. This report, based on the findings from a survey of over 1,400 LGBTQ+ community members and nearly two dozen interviews with field experts, describes the needs and experiences of diverse LGBTQ+ community members across the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area in the topics of: basic needs and safety, including economic and housing security; medical and mental health care; drug and alcohol recovery; housing; legal assistance; community connection and social life; and civic engagement.

The needs assessment surfaced the following key findings:

LGBTQ+ community members seek economic stability, safety, and equal rights. When asked to share their biggest overall concerns right now as a member of the LGBTQ+ community, survey respondents most commonly named: the high cost of living and limited affordable housing opportunities in the Bay Area, being targets of violence and discrimination, and fears of losing rights and access to services, including health care, in the current national political climate. Service priorities include: employment opportunity programs; affordable and secure housing, particularly for LGBTQ+ older adults; and increased access to high-quality and LGBTQ+-competent health care.

There is continued need for funding and services to focus on community safety and economic safety net direct service provision for LGBTQ+ community members in the Bay Area. LGBTQ+ community members across all Bay Area counties, income and education levels, racial identities, sexual orientations, gender identities, and ages report feeling unsafe in living their daily lives; have had trouble meeting basic needs such as housing, food, and medicine in the past 12 months; and have had unmet need for critical services such as health care, legal, and housing services or have had negative experiences getting such services in the past three years.

- More than one-third (36%) of respondents report feeling “unsafe more often than safe” or “unsafe most or all of the time” in at least one facet of their lives.
- More than one in five (21%) have had trouble meeting at least one basic need (for shelter, food, medicine, transportation, or gas, electric, or water in their home) because of economic hardship in the 12 months prior to answering the survey.

- About one in three (34%) respondents was not able to access at least one service they needed in the past three years, such as health care, mental or behavioral health care, or legal or housing services.

Within this picture of need throughout the LGBTQ+ community, an intersectional analysis shows that some community members are systematically more affected by a lack of safety, economic security, and access to needed services. Analysis of LGBTQ+ community members who experience precarity or need in two or more areas of safety, economic security, and access to services reveal that a nearly identical list of factors substantially increases risk of high need in each domain.

1. LGBTQ+ community members are **more likely to feel unsafe in at least two facets of life** (such as in their neighborhood, at work or school, on public transit, or interacting with law enforcement);

AND

2. LGBTQ+ community members are **more likely to have had at least two unmet basic needs** in the past year;

AND

3. LGBTQ+ community members are **more likely to not have been able to access at least two types of services they needed** in the past three years;

IF THEY:

- Have an income of less than \$60,000 per year;
- Do not have a Bachelor's degree or higher educational attainment;
- Are people of color;
- Are bisexual;
- Are transgender or genderqueer/non-binary (compared to cisgender LGBTQ community members)
- Are younger than 25;
- Have a disability;
- Ever lived in foster care; or
- Live in Alameda (1 only), Contra Costa, Napa, Santa Clara (3 only), and Solano (1 and 2) Counties.

There is a role for funders, movement leaders, and organizations to adopt an intersectional lens and to actively oppose racism, classism, transphobia, biphobia, sexism, xenophobia, ableism, ageism, and other roots of disparities within the LGBTQ+ community's experiences to ensure that being bisexual, or transgender, or a person of color, or disabled, or young, or any other core aspects of identity do not make community members systematically more vulnerable, excluded, or poorly served.

Field experts also call for other ways to address these disparities and strengthen the LGBTQ+ community and the network of organizations serving this community in the Bay Area:

- Movement leaders must work to heal the pain of class, race, and gender identity divisions within the LGBTQ+ community, build relationships across identity groups, and honor the rich diversity of the community in order for the movement to advance.

- Expand and support programming that: builds community; fosters connection among and outside of the LGBTQ+ community; provides opportunities for community members to support each other; encourages inter-generational connections; and celebrates culture.
- Increase understanding and data about transgender and non-binary identities and people through research, funder and organizational education, and public campaigns
- Support intersectional movement building across and beyond the nine counties through investments in collaboration and partnership structures
- Expand funder support of differentiated and grassroots strategies that allow smaller and more specialized organizations and programs to provide critical and nuanced support to those whose needs are not well addressed by one-size-fits-all approaches within larger LGBTQ+ organizations.
- Prioritize the following policy and advocacy efforts for the Bay Area LGBTQ+ community:
 - Ensure that hard-won legal protections for the LGBTQ+ community remain in place
 - Justice system reform, including reforming prison, jail, and policing policies and practices
 - Protect queer and trans immigrant communities that are currently being targeted for deportation
 - Protect and advocate for queer- and trans-friendly health care policies and research

For more details, please see the Horizons Foundation 2018 San Francisco Bay Area LGBTQ+ Community Needs Assessment at <https://www.horizonsfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/SF-Bay-Area-LGBTQ-Needs-Assessment-Report-2018-.pdf>

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

- Homeless Shelters
- Benefits Assistance, Service Navigation, and Case Management
- Behavioral Health Services

The survey data shows that the following needs were the most cited by respondents that identified as lesbian, gay or bisexual:

- Housing – More affordable housing
- Financial – Rental subsidy, housing voucher, or other reduced-cost housing
- Benefits – Help with CalWorks, SNAP, MediCare, MediCal, General Assistance, etc.
- Employment – Higher Income
- Wellness – Access to healthy food
- Health – Mental health/substance use help
- Legal – Eviction prevention

The survey data shows that the following needs were the most cited by respondents that identified as transgender or gender non-conforming:

- Benefits – Help with CalWorks, SNAP, MediCare, MediCal, General Assistance, etc.
- Housing – More affordable housing
- Health – Better access to healthcare

- Health – Mental health/substance use help
- Financial – Rental subsidy, housing voucher, or other reduced-cost housing
- Employment – Higher Income
- Wellness – Access to healthy food
- Employment – Learning new skills
- Financial – Down payment help

Small Businesses with Cultural Competency

With the great level of diversity of race, ethnicity, culture and language, the City and County of San Francisco has a history of commitment culturally and linguistically appropriate for its diverse population. According to the 2017 ACS 5-Year Estimates, 59.16% of the City’s population is identified as being composed of minorities. The Invest in Neighborhoods (IIN) division of the Office of Economic and Workforce Development is committed to creating inclusive economic development programs that meet the dynamic needs of San Francisco’s small business community.

Culturally and linguistically appropriate services are increasingly recognized as foundational requirements for a successful economic development strategy. The primary focus of IIN’s Economic Development strategy is to provide technical assistance to low-moderate income micro entrepreneurs, to small businesses that employ or will employ low-moderate income jobs, and entrepreneurs that face particular challenges (LGBTQ+ entrepreneurs facing homophobia, as well as immigrants and monolingual Chinese and Spanish speakers) in addition to more universal needs for technical assistance, financing and professional development. IIN works with community-based organizations with existing relationships and linguistic and cultural competency to fill the gap in customized business technical assistance for immigrant and low-to-moderate small business owners.

Opportunity Neighborhood Residents

OEWD provides more than \$12 million in grant awards through its Invest In Neighborhoods (IIN) division to strengthen neighborhood commercial districts by implementing neighborhood improvement projects and providing a variety of technical services related to neighborhood economic development citywide. IIN works closely with merchant associations, commercial corridor representatives, local businesses, and other community stakeholders to develop and deploy small business services and reach targeted communities.

IIN’s Opportunity Neighborhood’s program targets neighborhoods that have experienced historic divestment and have an economic development strategy that promotes diversity, equity and inclusion. These neighborhoods have an assigned project manager that works closely with community stakeholders and other city departments to strategically disburse investments including funds and services and support an economic development strategy. IIN promotes, funds, and is actively involved in neighborhood-based planning efforts to create a healthy commercial corridor which reflects the unique characteristics and needs of the surrounding community.

The opportunity neighborhoods include:

- Bayview
- Central Market/Tenderloin
- Chinatown

- Excelsior
- Lower Fillmore
- Mission (24th and Mission Streets)

Veterans

According to the ACS 2017 5-Year estimates, there are 24,582 veterans in San Francisco. This represents 3.3% of the civilian population 18 years and over. Of this veteran population, 92.5% are men and 7.5% are women. The vast majority are seniors, with 30% being over 75 years old, while another 40% are between the ages of 55 to 74. Sixty-one percent are white, 13% are black, 18% are Asian, and 10% are Latino/a. The median income of veterans overall is \$43,811, compared to \$45,675 for San Francisco's overall civilian population 25 years and older. Nearly 7% are unemployed. 6,825, or 28% of veterans were identified as having a disability.

According to the March 2018 San Francisco DAAS DFCNA, older adult veterans represent a key demographic slice of San Francisco, with the majority having called the City home for at least 30 years. These veterans often present with both overlapping and unique needs compared to their peers, including high rates of chronic health issues, Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), and other emotional and physical challenges.

Veterans make up almost 12% of the older adult population (65+) currently residing in San Francisco. To understand their experience using community support services, DAAS sought feedback from 164 veterans through surveys, focus groups, and community forums, and found that veterans experienced many of the same challenges as their peers when it came to aging in place in the Bay Area, as well as additional obstacles that may affect their daily well-being.

Among survey respondents, nearly half of older adult veterans reported experiencing long-term/chronic health issues, while one in three reported having a disability requiring accommodation. Veterans also reported experiencing frequent concerns about meeting their healthcare and medication needs.

In focus groups, veterans shared stories about the impact of invisible disabilities on their daily lives. For example, PTSD can create barriers to essential City services like public transportation. Many veterans reported intense discomfort and fear of riding public transportation due to the potential triggering effect of being in crowded, enclosed spaces. One participant who experiences PTSD shared that riding public transportation "is really dangerous because it's all you can do to not seriously react [in] situations when high school kids on the bus route are acting up." He and other participants went on to emphasize a desire for the expansion and improvement of SF DAAS-funded assisted transportation services as a means to improve their transportation safety.

Female veterans described challenges as a gender minority in many programs and facilities aimed at veterans. Focus group attendees explained that, "women veterans are a little different and it can be difficult being one or two women in the room or building." To address this challenge, participants suggested women's activity/support groups that meet consistently and reliably.

Veterans face unique challenges and barriers in accessing services. Older adults and adults with disabilities who are veterans make up an important part of the DAAS Dignity Fund target population. Across community research, veterans highlighted gaps in accessing healthcare and medication services to help support them in living with chronic health issues. In addition, veterans may have disabilities requiring specific accommodations, housing support, and transportation services related to previous

combat experience, such as PTSD. Further exploration is warranted to better understand the needs of older adults and adults with disabilities who are also veterans.

Survivors of Domestic Violence

Highlights of the Fiscal Year 2017 Report on Family Violence in San Francisco that was issued in January 2019 by the San Francisco DOSW indicate that community-based organizations play an important role in supporting victims of domestic violence. In FY 2017, there were three times as many people served in community-based organizations for domestic violence than people who called 911.

Demographic factors impact an individual's vulnerability to domestic violence.

- Women are more likely than men to experience multiple forms of intimate partner violence across their lifespans and within individual violent relationships.
- People of color are disproportionately victimized in every victim age bracket. In cases where the victim was under the age of 18, 47% were Latino/a, and in cases where the victim was over 60, 37% were black.
- Lesbian, gay, and bisexual high school students were three and a half times more likely to experience sexual dating violence than their heterosexual peers and more than twice as likely to experience physical dating violence.

Guns pose a lethal threat in domestic violence cases. Domestic violence calls to 911 have increased 69% since 2014, and half of all San Francisco domestic violence homicides since 2014 involved guns.

Households Experiencing Violence

Family violence and street violence not only hurt those directly involved, but also negatively affect the greater San Francisco community.

Re-entry Population

Populations Impacted by Realignment

Along with the overall number of individuals involved in the criminal justice system in San Francisco, the number of individuals sentenced, supervised, or jailed in San Francisco due to Realignment has been steadily declining since its implementation in October 2011. Because the population in state prison that is eligible for release to Post Release Community Supervision (PRCS) was largely fixed at the start of Realignment implementation and most individuals sentenced to non-violent, non-serious, non-sex offense charges are now sentenced to County Jail under PC § 1170(h), it was expected that there would be a large number of releases to PRCS at the beginning of Realignment implementation and that the number would then decline over time. This trend is clear in the average number of PRCS releases per month over the three years of Realignment: 37 in the first year, 16 in the second, and 12 in the third. However, while it was expected that the number of individuals sentenced under PC § 1170(h) would increase as the PRCS numbers declined, San Francisco has also experienced a steady decline in PC § 1170(h) sentences from an average of 19 per month in the first year of Realignment to 15 in the second and 13 in the third. This reflects an overall drop in felony sentencing in the County since 2008: the average felony arraignments per month has decreased 50 percent since 2008, including an 11 percent decrease since the onset of Realignment.¹²⁸

¹²⁸ San Francisco Superior Court

From the beginning of Realignment implementation, the overwhelming majority of individuals impacted by AB109 changes were state parole violators, although these numbers have also been declining steadily over the last three years. An average of 156 individuals began a state parole violation sentence per month during the first year of Realignment, 131 per month in the second, and 109 per month in the third. In July 2013, state parole violation hearings were transferred from the State's Board of Parole Hearings to Superior Courts in the counties in which the parolee was released, increasing the burden of proof for conviction, as well as the defense resources available to defendants. This development, along with Parole's implementation of graduated sanctions, rewards, and responses and greater latitude by the supervising Parole Unit to make sanctioning decisions, contributed to the overall downward trend in the number of individuals awaiting parole violation proceedings in County Jail.

Average Daily Population

While the discussion above summarizes the number of individuals impacted by Realignment, a discussion of the impacts of Realignment on CCSF's criminal justice agencies requires accounting for the length of sentences these individuals serve. A calculation of each agency's Average Daily Population (ADP) takes into account the average number of individuals served over a period of time, given the number of individuals starting a sentence during that time period and the lengths of their sentences.

Not surprisingly, the Adult Probation Department's ADP of AB109 individuals increased in the first two years of Realignment, as new PRCS and Mandatory Supervision clients started sentences that range from several months to several years. In the third year of Realignment, the AB109 ADP in the Adult Probation Department leveled off, as many completed their supervision terms and fewer individuals began new PRCS or Mandatory Supervision sentences, as discussed above. The total AB109 ADP in the Adult Probation Department grew from 284 in the first year of Realignment to 523 in the second and remained constant at 524 in the third.

The Sheriff's Department's ADP of AB109 individuals remained relatively stable for the first two years of Realignment and then declined in year three, due to the overall decrease in the number of individuals serving state parole violation sentences. The Sheriff's Department's AB109 ADP dropped slightly from 262 in year one to 234 in year two and then dropped more dramatically in year three to 140. As is clear in the chart below, the composition of the Sheriff's Department ADP of AB109 individuals has changed as the proportion of state parole violators has decreased and the proportion of those sentenced under PC § 1170(h) has increased.

While the impact of AB109 on CCSF's criminal justice system has been significant, AB109 clients represent a fraction of the total population served by this system. However, as indicated by the COMPAS risk and needs assessments conducted, and discussed below, the AB109 population is, on average, a higher risk and higher need population than the non-AB109 clients served in San Francisco.

AB109 Clients' Risks and Needs

San Francisco has a long-standing commitment to collaborative court models which provide alternatives to eligible individuals involved in the criminal justice system. Individuals sentenced to state prison in San Francisco tend to be those who have exhausted or are not eligible for these programs because they have been convicted of more serious crimes or have a longer criminal history than individuals who have historically been on probation or in County Jail. Thus, the AB109 population is a significantly higher-risk and higher-need population than the non-AB109 populations served.

San Francisco's PRCS clients have had an average of eight prior felony convictions and a quarter of PRCS clients have had 11 or more prior felony convictions. Furthermore, while PRCS eligibility requires individuals' current offense to be a non-serious, non-violent, or non-sex offense, over two-thirds of PRCS clients have a serious, violent, or sex offense in their past. These characteristics of the San Francisco PRCS population have been unchanged since the onset of Realignment.

APD Deputy Probation Officers conduct a COMPAS assessment with clients to determine their risk of recidivating and to identify their criminogenic needs. A vast majority (80 percent) of APD's clients have significant needs, with most assessed as having one or more of the following: vocational/education, substance abuse, cognitive behavioral, criminal personality, criminal opportunity, social environment, residential instability, and criminal thinking self-report. A large proportion of AB109 clients have needs in every category.

APD has used this information to target AB109 funding to those services that meet the most prevalent needs, including vocational/education programs, substance abuse treatment, cognitive behavioral programming, mental health treatment, and housing, as discussed in more detail below.

In 2014 APD partnered with George Mason University's Center for Advancing Correctional Excellence! (ACE!) to conduct an analysis of the County's reentry service delivery system. ACE! examined the criminogenic needs of APD's clients as well as the services provided by APD-funded and community-based reentry service providers. Service providers completed online assessments and met with ACE! researchers to discuss strategies for adjusting services and programs to better align with evidence-based practices.

ACE! is also using its Risk Need Responsivity (RNR) tool to conduct an analysis that will identify any gaps between APD's clients' needs and the reentry services provided in the County. APD will then adjust its reentry services funding strategies accordingly. This project is one of the County's continuous quality improvement efforts, to ensure that resources are targeted to the most critical needs of clients and that the services offered are high quality and adhere to best practices.

In the coming year, San Francisco will continue to set up performance measurement systems for its reentry service providers. This, along with the Risk Need Responsivity project begun in 2014 with George Mason University's Center for Advancing Correctional Excellence!, will allow the County to assess the efficacy and outcomes of its programs and strategies, as well as use data and information to adjust programs, target them to those clients most likely to benefit, and identify CCSF's gaps between available services and clients' needs.

A continuing focus on research and evaluation in 2015 will allow San Francisco criminal justice partners to further refine and tailor their Realignment strategies to be more effective, cost-efficient, and evidence-based.

Racial Disparities Persist Amid Large Drug Arrest Decline

Amid drastic changes in San Francisco's drug enforcement and statewide drug policy reforms, disproportionate arrests among African American residents continue. This section excerpts key findings from a recent study by CJCJ's Senior Research Fellow, Mike Males, and San Jose State University Human Rights Institute Professor, William Armaline. The study, *San Francisco's Drug Arrests Drop 90% through 2016; Disproportionate Arrests of African Americans Persist*, details drug arrest patterns by race since the 1980s and provides comprehensive insight on the City's fluctuating trends. Some figures differ

slightly from those in the original report due to updated information from the Department of Justice and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention through 2016.

- **Even as San Francisco's population grew by 150,000, the city's drug arrests plummeted by 92 percent since 1988-89, the peak years for drug arrests.**

Despite population growth in San Francisco, drug arrests declined sharply through 2015 and 2016. The decline has been especially steep during the last seven years as statewide criminal justice reforms reclassified several drug offenses from felonies to misdemeanors and marijuana was decriminalized, then legalized. Drug law reforms, policing changes, and other, unknown factors have reduced drug felony arrest drastically in San Francisco (down 92% for African Americans and 85% for other races from their 2008 peak compared to 2016).

- **Felony drug arrest rates were 10 times higher for African Americans in San Francisco than residents of other races in 2016.**

Racial disparities in 2016 have narrowed from the peak year, 2008, when African Americans in San Francisco were 19.2 times more likely than San Franciscans of other races, and 4.5 times more likely than African Americans elsewhere in California, to be arrested for a drug felony. In 2016, African Americans in San Francisco experienced felony drug arrest rates 10 times higher than San Franciscans of other races, and 2.4 times higher than African Americans elsewhere in California.

- **Misdemeanor drug arrests fell by 85 percent in San Francisco from 2008-2009 to 2015-2016.**

While some of the decline in felony arrests can be attributed to the reclassification of many felony drug offenses as misdemeanors due to recent reforms, misdemeanor drug arrests also fell by 85 percent in San Francisco from 2008-2009 to 2015-2016, both two-year periods.

- **Steep declines in juvenile drug arrests have accompanied continuing reductions in youth crime, drug overdose deaths, and violence.**

Arrest rates of youth in San Francisco for felonies have declined by 94 percent in recent years, including a decline of 98 percent among African American youth. Notably, only one African American female youth was arrested in San Francisco for a drug felony in 2016 after years of deeply disproportionate drug arrest rates (CJCJ, 2015). Additionally, marijuana arrests among teenagers have declined by 80 percent since 2010. Declines in juvenile drug arrests have accompanied large, continuing declines in juvenile crime, violent deaths, traffic deaths, school dropout, teen pregnancy, and related problems among youth through 2016 (CDC, 2018).

- **Racial patterns in drug arrests still do not match racial patterns in drug use.**

Of the 839 people who died from using illicit drugs in San Francisco during the five year, 2012-2016 period, 57 percent were non-Latino/a white residents, 25 percent were African American, 10 percent were Latino/a, and 8 percent were Asian. In contrast, 42 percent of the city's 5,691 drug felony arrests during this period were African Americans (other races are not detailed by San Francisco police).

While San Francisco's major decline in drug arrests show improvement, steep racial disparities in drug arrests must be addressed by law enforcement and policy leaders in order to better serve the city's diverse communities. By investigating racial disparities and uniting local policies with fair practices, San Francisco can invest in the safety and health of its residents.

Adult Probation Department (APD) Re-entry Community

The most pressing needs of the APD re-entry community, as expressed by the Community Assessment and Services Center lead provider (UCSF Citywide Forensics) are housing, mental health treatment and substance use treatment.

Based on the APD March 2018 Strategic Plan, the following are strategies for the department to meet the needs of the APD re-entry community:

- Provide Services that Break the Cycle of Crime
 - Increase public safety through effective engagement with individuals on community supervision.
 - Connect clients, including TAY, with specialized programming and social services to increase well-being and likelihood for long-term success.
- Support Victims of Crime
 - Help victims of crime recover from financial and emotional hardships
- Enhance Services Provided at a One-Stop Center
 - Provide effective case management services that support each client to achieve individualized success at a one-stop re-entry center.
 - Through partnerships, deliver timely and effective mental health and substance use treatment services that address identified behavioral health needs.
- Strengthen Collaboration Across Agencies and Community-based Organizations to Better Address Offender Needs
 - Partner to implement a new pre-booking diversion program for low level drug offenders that serves as an alternative to arrest or jail time, better meets clients' needs, and reduces criminal behavior.
- Improve Data Collection and Reporting
 - Develop a robust case management system that: 1) enhances the ability to collect, analyze, and report data; and 2) allows for a data-informed approach to services designed to reduce recidivism and increase client well-being.

Key Demographics of Juvenile Justice-Involved Youth¹²⁹

The United States has seen a marked decline in juvenile offenses since 2000. Overall, there were 36% fewer juvenile arrests nationally in 2014 compared to 2000.¹³⁰ This trend of decreasing juvenile arrests persists at the state level as well with California seeing an impressive nearly 64% fewer arrests statewide in 2014 compared to 2000¹³¹. San Francisco is no exception to this national and statewide trend. Locally, San Francisco saw nearly 70% fewer juvenile arrests in 2014 compared to 2000. This profound shift away from arrest as a solution to delinquent behavior is the result of the tremendous work San Francisco has done to reduce reliance on the juvenile justice system and incarceration.

¹²⁹ City and County of San Francisco's Comprehensive Multi-agency Local Action Plan: Strategies for San Francisco Juvenile Justice, March 2017

¹³⁰ UCR, 2015, Arrests by Age

¹³¹ California Criminal Justice Statistics Center. State of California, Attorney General, Criminal Justice Statistic Center. Retrieved February 6, 2017, from <https://oag.ca.gov/crime/cjsc/stats/arrests>

This reduction in juvenile arrests has been driven in large part by the decrease in arrests for more serious, felony offenses. There were 60% fewer boys arrested in San Francisco in 2014 (717 male arrests) than there were in 2006 (1773 male arrests), the year with the highest number of total arrests in the last twelve years. Even more impressively there were 69% fewer arrests of young women in 2014 (210 female arrests) than in 2006 (673 female arrests).

While this total reduction in system involvement is encouraging, San Francisco has become increasingly aware that the reduction in arrests and referrals to the Juvenile Probation Department (JPD) has not benefitted all San Francisco youth equally. In fact, in 2014 African-American youth in San Francisco made up eight percent of the general youth population, but accounted for over half of all referrals to JPD. This extraordinary disproportionality has persisted in San Francisco for over ten years. Though African-American children have comprised no more than 12% of San Francisco's youth population since 2005, they have consistently accounted for a disproportionate representation of young people in the juvenile justice system: over 44% of young people in the juvenile justice system are African-American, increasing to nearly 53% in 2014.

This disproportionality in the juvenile justice system persists for other groups of young people as well. Within San Francisco, both African American and Hispanic/Latinx youth experience higher rates of poverty, lower rates of academic achievement, and higher rates of involvement with the juvenile justice system than other racial/ethnic groups in the city.¹³² Because of an inconsistent measurement of Asian/Pacific Islander youth in Census population surveys, this population of young people is not included. However, it is important to note that San Francisco's Asian/Pacific Islander (API) youth are consistently disproportionately represented in the juvenile justice system as well. In 2014, API youth made up six percent of the system-involved population while Asian/Pacific Islander San Franciscans of all ages routinely make up under one percent of our city's population.

Disproportionate contact persists at the neighborhood level as well. The young people in Bayview-Hunters Point only make up 9.3% of San Francisco's youth population but they accounted for 17% of all referrals to JPD¹³³. Similarly, though young people in Visitacion Valley only make up 3.6% of San Francisco's youth population they made up 8% of JPD's referrals¹³⁴.

Across the nation, we have seen that LGBTQ/GNCT (lesbian, gay, bisexual, questioning/gender non-conforming, trans) youth¹³⁵, homeless youth¹³⁶, youth in foster care¹³⁷, and children with a system-involved or incarcerated family member¹³⁸ are disproportionately represented and/or disparately impacted by involvement in the juvenile justice system. Unfortunately, there is no reason to assume

¹³² Not controlling for offense or other factors. Mission Analytics. (2015). Analysis of Racial and Ethnic Disparities in SF Juvenile Justice. Mission Analytics

¹³³ American Community Survey, 5-Year Estimates 2011-2015; San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department. (2015).

¹³⁴ Ibid

¹³⁵ Sherman, F. and Black, A. (2015) Gender Injustice: System-Level Juvenile Justice Reforms for Girls. The National Crittenton Foundation, National Women's Law Center

¹³⁶ Applied Survey Research. (2015) San Francisco Homeless Point-In-Time Count & Survey Comprehensive Report.

¹³⁷ Huang, H., Ryan, J., & Herz, D. (2012) The Journey of Dually-Involved Youth: The Description and Prediction of Rereporting and Recidivism. Children and Youth Services Review.

¹³⁸ Hairston, C. (2007) Focus on Children with Incarcerated Parents: An Overview of the Research Literature. Annie E. Casey Foundation.

that this is different in San Francisco. In an evaluation commissioned by the San Francisco Human Rights Commission to determine violence prevention needs for San Francisco's LGBTQ+ community, nearly half of participants were under 25, more than half identified as trans, and nearly two-thirds had ever experienced homelessness.¹³⁹ The city's Homeless PIT Count in 2015 found 853 unaccompanied youth or TAY under 25 living on the street or in shelters¹⁴⁰. In early 2016, there were 924 San Francisco children in foster care¹⁴¹. A 2015 survey of incarcerated adults in the San Francisco County jail system found that 59% are parents to a total of approximately 1,110 children in San Francisco. While we only have data on the presence of these populations of young people locally, the national data paired with the qualitative evidence gathered from interviews and focus groups bears out the concern of disproportionate representation in and disparate impact of system involvement on these young people. Many system partners are also concerned about gang-involved youth in San Francisco whose interactions with law enforcement and the juvenile justice system are seen as much more likely and normalized. Additionally, while we know that the implications of justice system-involvement can be negative for all youth, justice system partners acknowledge that there is special attention to be paid to the disparate impact of involvement on the aforementioned young people as well as on undocumented youth, youth 13 and younger, and girls.

Community Needs Assessment for Juvenile Justice-Involved Youth¹⁴²

To fulfill the planning requirements of the Children and Youth Fund, DCYF engages young people, parents, and service providers in a Community Needs Assessment (CNA) every five years. The results of the CNA inform the development of a citywide action plan (the Services Allocation Plan) and strategic funding priorities. In developing its CNA, DCYF, in collaboration with the OCOF Council, Office of Early Childcare and Education (OECE), and San Francisco Board of Supervisors, held a series of Community Input Sessions across all 11 supervisorial districts in San Francisco with 362 participants. Additionally, DCYF compiled a vast literature review and conducted a series of expert interviews and focus groups. As a part of the data collection process, on March 23, 2016 DCYF held an All-Grantee meeting to gather feedback on the needs of children, youth, and their families in San Francisco from over 200 service providers who work directly with the young people of San Francisco and their families. Information relevant to the juvenile justice system involved population is included in the present report.

The following findings reflect information gathered through the following sources: interviews with the Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council members, violence prevention and intervention grantee input sessions, focus groups in Juvenile Justice Center, and other targeted information gathering. Information was coded and categorized into ten discrete topic areas, represented here by each heading. In each of the following sections is an explanation of the topic area as well as suggestions that arose in the information gathering process. While the following findings discuss San Francisco's justice-involved youth population broadly, stakeholders, young people, and research recognize that we must

¹³⁹ San Francisco Human Rights Commission, The SF LGBTQ Center, Learning for Action. (January 2015). San Francisco Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer & Intersex Violence Prevention Needs Assessment. San Francisco, CA.

¹⁴⁰ Applied Survey Research. (2015) San Francisco Homeless Point-In-Time Count & Survey Comprehensive Report

¹⁴¹ Webster, D., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Dawson, W., Magruder, J., Exel, M., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Putnam-Hornstein, E., King, B., Rezvani, G., Wagstaff, K., Sandoval, A., Yee, H., Xiong, B., Benton, C., Tobler, A., & Romero, R. (2016). CCWIP Reports. Retrieved from http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare

¹⁴² City and County of San Francisco's Comprehensive Multi-agency Local Action Plan: Strategies for San Francisco Juvenile Justice, March 2017

strategically target specific special populations of young people who are system-involved, which are described above.

Policy Review

Throughout all of the information gathering processes, system stakeholders, youth, and community members identified policies and/or practices that were outdated, out of sync with the City's vision, and needed to change. This included the VPI Joint Funders, a collaborative body made up of DCYF, DPH, and JPD, who stressed the immediate need to address the implications of AB 403, referred to as Continuum of Care Reform. AB 403 is a state effort that draws together a series of existing and new reforms to child welfare services and reduces reliance on congregate care while increasing reliance on short-term, therapeutic interventions for young people separated from their biological parents, particularly as applicable to young people committed to out-of-home placements. Additionally, stakeholders identified the need to organize a policy working group and/or seek other opportunities to revise and/or eliminate functions, operations, practices, and policies that promote inefficiency, unnecessary delays, inequity, or contribute to racial and ethnic disparity.

Trained and Supported Workforce

Stakeholders, system partners, and youth alike offered suggestions focused on ensuring that there is a well-trained and well-supported workforce for all partners who work with youth in the juvenile justice system.

Young people felt a bias in the systems they interacted with, especially with police, juvenile probation, and in school (especially teachers). Additionally, youth suggested that law enforcement can and should make stronger connections to the communities they serve.

Similarly, service providers felt that departments and agencies working with system-involved youth should be providing developmentally appropriate services, have culturally and linguistically appropriate staff and use trauma-informed, harm reduction, and restorative justice approaches.

Collaboration and Communication

All system partners cited the need for City departments and agencies to work together in service of San Francisco's most vulnerable young people. Many people mentioned that San Francisco ought to capitalize on this moment in the city when leadership is progressive, respects and likes each other, and shares a vision for system-involved youth.

Some specific suggestions were to ensure that all agencies and organizations that touch system-involved youth maintain an ongoing dialogue, are transparent with one another, and commit to collaborations that best support young people and their families.

Alternatives to Formal Involvement and Incarceration

Often identified and discussed throughout our information gathering was the need to ensure that there are multiple opportunities for youth to exit the detention center and/or formal system involvement where and when appropriate and to keep youth from deeper involvement in the justice system. Many stakeholders and youth identified this particularly in terms of a continuum of additional community supervision services that include, but are not limited to: diversion, home detention, electronic monitoring, and reporting centers as well as restorative justice opportunities.

Some system partners cited the need for more diversion opportunities at time of arrest so a young person never has to go through formal processing or involvement with JPD where possible and when appropriate. Many others recognized that while San Francisco has what resembles a continuum of alternatives, many resources, such as the evening reporting center, are vastly underutilized.

Academic and Alternative Education Opportunity

Many young people in San Francisco's juvenile justice system are completely disconnected from a traditional school setting, and stakeholders discussed the need for multiple alternatives for appropriate education and workforce opportunities for system-involved youth and stressed the overall need to be more creative.

All of the young people discussed their connection or lack thereof to school. Young people acknowledged that school inside juvenile hall was too easy and did not match their experience in district schools. Similarly, many young people expressed the desire for extra support in school and recognized that incentives were helpful in encouraging attendance. The JPD Directors and VPI Joint Funders echoed this and called out the need for effective academic supports for young people in the hall. The VPI Joint Funders also identified the need for more workforce development opportunities.

Whole Family Engagement

All system partners recognize that the juvenile justice system has traditionally focused on each individual young person and that it is integral to consider youth in the context of their family and community. Many young people mentioned feeling isolated from friends and family while incarcerated or in out-of-home placements. Partners stressed that including and engaging families in every step of the juvenile justice process is imperative to a young person's successful transition out of the system. Ensuring that families have access to the services and resources they need will help ensure that the caring adults in a system-involved young person's life are equipped to provide appropriate care.

One focus group emphasized the need for more family-oriented programs to help keep families together, noting that problems often start in the home and that building support systems can strengthen individuals and their families.

Basic Needs/Access to Service and Transportation

All sources cited the inextricable connection between access to basic services and the success of youth in the juvenile justice system.

Service providers observed that youth are often compelled to prioritize meeting their immediate and basic needs over participating in services. They also cited trauma, social anxiety, substance use and mental health issues, and delayed socio-emotional development as common barriers to engagement in supportive services. Additional challenges to young people's engagement in services include a distrust of institutions, language and literacy barriers, scheduling, parenting responsibilities, and concerns about losing eligibility for other benefits. Service providers specifically reported that lack of safe transportation to and from programs is a significant barrier for youth from high crime neighborhoods.

Affordable housing and housing support was one of the most pressing needs cited by sources. Community input session participants acknowledged that while the City has increased efforts to address housing needs, disconnected youth and their families have particular needs for intentional services for the whole family (as discussed above).

Service Connection & Coordination

The need for intentional, continuous, and coordinated services for youth throughout the juvenile justice process was a continuous thread throughout all information gathering. Many system partners identified that services started in custody ought to continue out of custody.

Youth also identified a need for better outreach to improve awareness about available programs for career development and job-training opportunities, especially those who are not in school and system-involved.

Quite a few young people mentioned that being in custody provides time to reflect and get the help they need, but that once released help and support becomes inconsistent. Additionally, many expressed that the help and support available does not always fit what they want or need. Many young people expressed immense anxiety and apprehension about getting out, mostly centered around a sense of dread and fear of failure, as well as apprehension around social circles and friend groups.

Quality Programming

The majority of stakeholders discussed the type, quality and accountability of programming available to young people in the juvenile justice system.

Young people and partners alike expressed the need for quality programming that offers enrichment (arts and music), life skills, anger management, conflict resolution, education about the dangers of social media, and exposure to a greater diversity of environments. JPD Directors called out a need for robust workforce development opportunities for justice-involved young people. Young people also expressed interest in pathways to upward mobility and mentorship with adults in their communities who have successfully transitioned out of public housing, off public assistance, and into gainful employment and independent living.

Similarly, young people and service providers stressed the need to develop life skills and independence, with a particular emphasis on financial literacy (e.g., banking, building credit, taxes, and savings).

Youth highlighted the particular challenge immigrants in the city face in obtaining employment because of the lack of language-appropriate, culturally competent job training programs. Additionally, they mentioned that programs are held only during the workweek and are located in parts of the city that are difficult for them to access.

There is a continued demand for more safe spaces and culturally competent and culturally specific community programs, where family-community connections can be developed and strengthened. Youth expressed concerns about crime and violence in their communities, indicating a need for better security in their neighborhoods. They felt that existing parks and recreation centers need to be renovated and maintained, and that housing projects should have their own centers for youth and separate spaces for teens to recreate in a healthy, safe environment.

Youth Culture and Perspective

Most young people felt that their involvement with the justice system was unsurprising and expected. However, every young person at some point throughout each focus group session mentioned wanting to grow, learn, or do something different with their lives.

Many participants in the young women’s focus group lead independent lives filled with responsibility on the outside but feel like they are treated like children while incarcerated, highlighting a perceived incongruence between needs of young people and services the system provides. When asked where they saw themselves in a year, youth in detention responded with a range of responses from “Opening my eyes” (being alive) to “Going to college” or “Working with animals.”

Outline of Objectives, Priority Needs, Goals and Activities

OBJECTIVE 1: FAMILIES AND INDIVIDUALS ARE STABLY HOUSED

Priority Need 1A: Develop and maintain accessible and affordable housing

Goal 1Ai: Create more affordable housing

Activities:

- Explore new finance mechanisms to create more affordable housing
- Acquire privately owned buildings to create new permanently affordable units
- Encourage geographic diversity in location of affordable housing, especially in high opportunity neighborhoods through MOHCD's funding opportunities
- Improve coordination with the Planning Department, Department of Building Inspection, Mayor's Office on Disability, DPW, and SFMTA related to housing and permitting processes to expedite housing production in accordance with Mayor's Executive Directive 17-02
- Continue to implement affordable housing components of HOPE SF
- Monitor the development of below market rate units in projects with Development Agreements or subject to the Inclusionary Housing Program
- Review and evaluate applicant and occupant data from the Inclusionary Housing Program and MOHCD-sponsored affordable housing on an ongoing basis to inform housing policies and procedures
- Explore increasing the number of MOHCD-required ADA accessible units in MOHCD-supported housing
- Explore creative approaches to increasing housing supply
- Increase housing dedicated to supporting HIV+ households
 - Improve Plus Housing program access to HOPWA units
- Increase housing opportunities for people who are homeless or formerly homeless
- Increase housing opportunities for vulnerable populations, including seniors, persons with disabilities, TAY, an- veterans
- Support City-funded nonprofit-operated shared housing programs that leverage existing housing to provide affordable housing opportunities for vulnerable populations, such as seniors and systems-involved youth

Goal 1Aii: Preserve affordable housing

Activities:

- Purchase housing at risk of losing affordability
- Rehabilitate existing housing to preserve its affordability
- Negotiate extension of affordability restrictions for existing affordable housing
- Explore ways to leverage capital to preserve affordable housing, including sources from other City departments
- Continue to leverage RAD to rehabilitate and preserve federally-subsidized housing
- Continue to support lead hazard reduction programs

- Continue to support home modification programs that benefit low-income homeowners, increasing safety, accessibility and health outcomes, as well as access to solar power
- Explore ways to assist homeowners with deferred property maintenance
- Continue to monitor homeowners and building owners for compliance with programmatic requirements
- Improve coordination among City agencies and non-profits providing post-purchase/preservation services
- Improve coordination with HUD and private property owners to engage in preservation of privately owned, federally supported existing affordable housing

Goal 1Aiii: Improve data and analytics on affordable housing inventory and placements

Activities:

- Create more robust tools to track housing portfolio, pipeline and placement of applicants for MOHCD-sponsored housing
- Continue to develop and refine DAHLIA (Database of Affordable Housing Listings, Information and Application) and Salesforce capacity to track demand for affordable housing, including enhanced web analytics
- Partner with other DAHLIA jurisdictions on aggregated data sharing, to better understand demand pressures on San Francisco

Priority Need 1B: Make housing more affordable

Goal 1Bi: Reduce development costs to help leverage local housing resources and serve lower income households

Activities:

- Pursue alternative construction types and methods to reduce development costs such as modular construction
- Leverage free or low-cost land such as public land for development
- Pursue new local and state sources of funding
- Work with state and federal agencies to acquire land with priority for affordable housing, including housing for people who are homeless
- Work with City agencies to identify local fees and processes that could be reduced or waived to limit the overall cost of affordable housing

Goal 1Bii: Increase affordability of rental housing

Activities:

- Continue to support long-term rental subsidies and explore subsidy expansion target populations to stabilize their housing
 - Advocate for and pursue State and Federal rental subsidy sources, such as CoC, HOPWA, Section 202 and Section 811
- Continue to administer the Local Operating Subsidy Program

- Expand AMI range for select projects, which will fund more housing for lower-income households
- Pilot new tenant and building based rent subsidy programs for underserved populations
- Identify additional capital subsidies and tenant based rent subsidies for HIV+ households, homeless households and other vulnerable populations

Goal 1Biii: Increase opportunities for sustainable homeownership

Activities:

- Continue to support, and take steps to improve the quality and standardization of, homebuyer education and post-purchase education and counseling
- Continue to provide Inclusionary ownership opportunities for low- and moderate-income households
- With the Planning Department, explore allowing Inclusionary owners to purchase a second unit (and sell the prior) to improve mobility for growing or shrinking ownership households
 - Explore allowing Inclusionary owners to purchase a second unit (and sell the prior)
- Evaluate Inclusionary, City Second, and Limited Equity Program re-sale pricing to ensure future affordability
- Explore more options to help homeowners with unaffordable HOA dues and rehab costs
- Continue to pursue funding opportunities for DALP for higher income households, including first responders and educators
- Explore strategies to increase lender participation in homeownership programs
- Explore strategies to increase realtor participation in homeownership programs, especially realtors serving target populations
- Continue to streamline MOHCD real estate transaction practices through the DAHLIA system

Goal 1Biv: Increase access to rental and homeownership housing

Activities:

- Continue to support rental housing counseling services to help residents navigate and have equitable access to the City's affordable housing programs
 - Increase language access and cultural competency/cultural humility for housing counseling services
 - Include housing counseling for HIV+ persons to support navigation and placement challenges
 - Include housing counseling for formerly homeless households and other populations at risk of displacement to support navigation and placement challenges
 - Provide additional support/capacity building to service providers to meet increasing demand
- Continue to develop and maintain DAHLIA
 - Add additional functionality, and additional programs and resources, including programs and resources for extremely low-income people
 - Continue to provide housing listings and applications in Chinese, Spanish and Filipino

- Expand outreach to include community centers, including workforce access points, public libraries, etc.
- Increase awareness about available housing resources
 - More outreach to smaller groups, especially select demographics
- Continue to support developers and property managers to create and maintain Inclusionary rental opportunities
- Evaluate housing lottery preference programs to ensure they meet their intended goals
- Continue to monitor lottery/lease up to ensure that housing programs reach the intended beneficiaries
 - Ensure units that are accessible and intended for persons with mobility and communication disabilities go to people who need them
- Implement Right to Return Legislation allowing preference and priority for former residents of HOPE SF sites in HOPE SF replacement units

Priority Need 1C: Prevent and reduce homelessness
--

Goal 1Ci: Improve systems to help each person find the right path to permanent housing

Activities:

- Implement coordinated systems for adults, families with children, and youth
- Implement performance accountability across all programs and systems

Goal 1Cii: Reduce homelessness for adults, youth and families
--

Activities:

- Develop homelessness prevention and problem solving (diversion) activities targeting people with a history of homelessness and people being discharged into homelessness from mainstream institutions such as hospitals, jails, prisons, and health and behavioral health setting
- Develop new permanent supportive housing units for adults, youth and families

Goal 1Ciii: Ensure no families with children are unsheltered

Activities:

- Identify unsheltered families through targeted outreach
- Offer all unsheltered families shelter placement
- Increase access to family-serving shelter beds

Goal 1Civ: Improve the City's response to street homelessness and end large, long-term encampments

Activities:

- Continue to provide street outreach to provide care, and connection to housing, shelter and other services for people experiencing homelessness
- Conduct quarterly counts of tents and vehicle encampments

- Provide targeted outreach to large encampments
- Place people into low-barrier shelters
- Conduct assessments and housing prioritization using mobile outreach teams

Goal 1Cv: Further align MOHCD’s work with Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing

Activities:

- Strengthen planning and coordination between MOHCD and HSH to maximize resources and funding to better serve households experiencing housing instability
- Improve processes to support coordinated entry and increase the production and lease-up of permanent housing
- Improved coordination of the placement of HOPWA, RAD, PBV, and other supportive housing units
- Create linkage between DAHLIA and Coordinated Entry
- Coordinate HSH homelessness prevention and problem-solving activities with MOHCD eviction prevention and housing stabilization activities to support a comprehensive strategy to divert or prevent households from experiencing homelessness

Goal 1Cvi: Expand services to prevent homelessness and stabilize housing for formerly homeless households and those at risk of homelessness

Activities:

- Provide on-site services with clinical support within supportive housing buildings
- Partner to provide targeted services to clients at risk of homelessness to access the homelessness response system
- Prioritize homelessness prevention and problem-solving resources for households with a history of homelessness or shelter use
- Create shallow subsidies that would add another layer to the housing safety net, easing the transition from housing instability and relieving some of the demand on housing programs with deeper subsidies

Priority Need 1D: Provide services to maintain housing stability

Goal 1Di: Reduce rate of evictions

Activities:

- Under Tenant Right to Counsel initiative, expand support for full scope legal representation for residents facing eviction
- Continue to support tenant counseling, outreach and education; mediation; housing stability case management, and direct financial assistance (one-time assistance and flexible tenant-based subsidies) activities
- Standardize renter education curriculums delivered by City-funded housing counseling programs
- Expand longer-term rental subsidy programs

- Continue to engage community stakeholders around eviction prevention strategies to maximize effectiveness

Goal 1Dii: Increase access to services for residents of public and publicly subsidized housing, RAD projects, HOPWA subsidized housing, and single room occupancy hotels

Activities:

- Continue to support and develop a more comprehensive continuum of services including enhanced information and referral, service connection to identify and meet short-term client goals, case management to address more complex and/or longer-term needs, and case coordination to coordinate services for a client between multiple providers and systems
- Work with City departments to explore improving housing stability through mental health and substance abuse services
- Explore expansion of services to residents of single room occupancy hotels
- Combine service connection and skill development strategies to provide more comprehensive services that increase clients' economic self-sufficiency
- Locate key services, such as tenant counseling and eviction prevention, legal services, financial education and counseling, on-site at HOPE SF and RAD projects
- Continue to support community building and resident leadership development programs

Goal 1Diii: Provide support for other affordable housing residents to ensure success in their housing placement

Activities:

- Create welcome packet to be distributed to new affordable housing residents, and explore connecting social services to residents
- Facilitate connection to mediation services when needed
- Require notification of services to tenants when evicting tenants from MOHCD-sponsored affordable housing
- Provide housing retention services, as needed, for current HOPWA units and those in development

Goal 1Div: Increase collaboration between healthcare and housing systems by increasing mobility between levels of care (high to low acuity) in residential settings for HIV+ households

Activities:

- Ensure assessment of tenant ability to live independently in order to move to more appropriate housing

OBJECTIVE 2: FAMILIES AND INDIVIDUALS ARE RESILIENT AND ECONOMICALLY SELF-SUFFICIENT

Priority Need 2A: Promote workforce development

Goal 2Ai: Provide access to employment opportunities across multiple sectors for unemployed and underemployed populations

Activities:

- Provide workforce services to unemployed and underemployed residents to prepare them for future employment opportunities
- MOHCD and Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) work collaboratively to provide jobs for residents in their neighborhoods
 - Expand Local Hire targeting so residents of the property get priority for construction jobs and explore Local Hire for property management jobs
 - Encourage developers to expand employment opportunities within their developments
 - Provide links to neighborhood job opportunities on DAHLIA
 - Advertise job listing sign-up on MOHCD website

Priority Need 2B: Increase opportunities through improved language access and core skills development

Goal 2Bi: Improve access to MOHCD programs and services through translation of paper and digital resources

Activities:

- Improve language access for all MOHCD programs and services, community workshops and meetings
- Develop and maintain a detailed resource guide that lists programs and services by language that services are provided in
- Explore making DAHLIA accessible to more populations through translation into additional languages

Goal 2Bii: Provide skill development and training resources

Activities:

- Continue to support and refine skills development programs in areas including life skills and personal effectiveness, educational skills (including GED and diploma programs), English as a Second Language training, and workplace readiness skills
- Support programs that create clear pathways to more advanced training opportunities, including post-secondary educational programs, more advanced ESL programming at San Francisco City College, and sector-specific job training programs through the Office of Economic and Workforce Development and other entities

- Combine service connection and skill development strategies to provide more comprehensive services

Goal 2Biii: Improve financial literacy and personal finance management

Activities:

- Continue to support financial counseling and education, asset and credit building, debt reduction, access to banking, and credit counseling and repair services
- Increase investment in more intensive services that build the financial capability of clients, and ongoing one-on-one coaching services that produce long-term economic improvements
- Encourage co-location of financial services at housing sites and at community-based organizations

Goal 2Biv: Improve digital literacy

Activities:

- Provide training in basic, intermediate and advanced digital skills, through workshops and drop-in hours, and new innovative delivery models at community-based digital literacy programs
- Support programs that refurbish and distribute computers and other digital devices for low-income households
- Work with neighborhood hubs, including libraries and community centers to leverage their computer facilities to expand Internet access and digital literacy for beneficiaries of MOHCD-funded services
- Support programs that provide Internet access and assist with digital literacy for affordable housing residents and sites, especially at HOPE SF, RAD, and SRO housing
- Build technology capacity of community-based organizations (CBOs), empowering CBO staff to lead digital literacy trainings and services

Priority Need 2C: Provide equitable access to civil legal services for immigration and other critical issues

Goal 2Ci: Increase access to civil legal services

Activities:

- Continue to provide support for immigration-related legal services
- Continue to support and develop more targeted funding and service strategies for areas of civil law including employment, family, consumer, benefits and non-eviction related housing issues

Priority Need 2D: Help households connect to services

Goal 2Di: Increase access to community-based services

Activities:

- Continue to support and develop a more comprehensive continuum of services including enhanced information and referral, service connection to identify and meet short-term client goals, case management to address more complex and/or longer term needs, and case coordination to coordinate services for a client between multiple providers and systems
- Combine service connection and skill development strategies to provide more comprehensive services
- Support innovative community outreach strategies

OBJECTIVE 3: COMMUNITIES HAVE HEALTHY PHYSICAL, SOCIAL AND BUSINESS INFRASTRUCTURE

Priority Need 3A: Enhance community facilities and spaces

Goal 3Ai: Ensure nonprofit service providers have high quality, stable facilities

Activities:

- Continue to provide support for capital improvements for community facilities providing essential public services
- Facilitate the development of capital needs assessments for community facilities to ensure long-term sustainability
- Provide support to meet design needs related to maximizing the utility of facilities
- Provide support for organizations to acquire and/or identify lease opportunities to remain in and better serve their communities

Goal 3Aii: Enhance public spaces

Activities:

- Create and improve community amenities designed to serve low-income residents

Priority Need 3B: Strengthen small businesses and commercial corridors

Goal 3Bi: Encourage the development and sustainability of thriving locally owned businesses

Activities:

- Continue to provide business technical assistance through community partners that is culturally, ethnically and linguistically tailored for startup and existing businesses
- Continue to increase efficiency of technical business assistance
- Continue supporting investments in small business lending

Goal 3Bii: Support the development and sustainability of robust commercial corridors in low-income neighborhoods

Activities:

- Continue to support local economic development efforts focused on revitalizing commercial corridors

- Increase investments in façade and other tenant improvements
- Increase investments in accessibility and compliance projects
- Continue a geographically-focused approach to deliver services in a way that leverages other City investments

Priority Need 3C: Support community-driven comprehensive strategies

Goal 3Ci: Support neighborhood-based planning efforts

Activities:

- Provide infrastructure for communities to launch, lead, and determine their own cultural stabilization strategies with extensive support from City Agencies through the Cultural District Program
- Continue to support neighborhood planning processes that bring together low-income, and disenfranchised populations at risk of displacement to meaningfully participate in their communities' planning processes
- Support neighborhood residents and leaders to learn about City processes, programs and initiatives
- Strengthen economic development strategies and activities within community-driven plans

Goal 3Cii: Support locally-based community building

Activities:

- Continue to support networks of community-based organizations and other key community stakeholders that provide increased service coordination and collaboration for both neighborhoods and specific populations
- Continue to support neighborhood-based community action grant programs

Priority Need 3D: Support capacity needs of community-based organizations and MOHCD professional partners

Goal 3Di: Increase capacity of community-based organizations

Activities:

- Build organizational capacity of MOHCD grantees/providers through outreach, relationship building and recruitment, organizational assessments, trainings and coaching, cohort-based and project-based work, subject matter experts, and other technical assistance methodologies
- Prioritize strengthening the following community-based organizations and developers
 - Black-led, Native American-led, Mayan-led, Southeast Asian-led, Transgender-led and volunteer-led organizations
 - Organizations under fiscal sponsorship
 - Organizations serving a majority of clients from our six NRSAs (Bayview Hunters Point, Chinatown, Mission, South of Market, Tenderloin and Visitacion Valley)

OBJECTIVE 4: COMMUNITIES AT RISK OF DISPLACEMENT ARE STABILIZED

Priority Need 4A: Address inequitable impacts of economic growth through anti-displacement measures for residents and businesses

Goal 4Ai: Implement policies and programs that prioritize current residents

Activities:

- Continue to administer housing lottery preference programs
- As MOHCD evaluates and updates policies and procedures for affordable housing to meet current needs, recommend parallel changes/updates to the Inclusionary Planning Code and non-profit developer loan agreements
- Implement right-to-return policy for re-leasing of buildings where tenants were displaced
- Implement the City's first right to purchase laws for acquiring buildings at risk of being unaffordable
- Support "Mixed Status Families" at risk of losing their housing subsidies due to immigration status

Goal 4Aii: Encourage commercial tenants to locate on ground-floor spaces of MOHCD's affordable housing developments

Activities:

- Work with OEWD to financially support commercial tenant improvements (build outs) for ground-floor spaces
- Work with OEWD to market commercial space opportunities to local non-profits

Goal 4Aiii: Reduce displacement of residents and businesses

Activities:

- Provide flexible tenant-based rental subsidies to reduce household rent burdens to more sustainable (less than 70% of income toward rent) or affordable (30% of income toward rent) levels
- Leverage programs that help households understand and assert tenants' rights, including Tenant Right to Counsel; tenant counseling, education, and outreach; and tenant-landlord and tenant-tenant alternative dispute resolution (mediation)
- Create and implement policies to mitigate negative impacts of rent increases
- Expand programs designed to retain homeowners in communities experiencing a legacy of exclusion
- Coordinate with other departments to ensure the long-term sustainability of neighborhood-based organizations
- Leverage place-based strategies such as legislated cultural districts and the Central SOMA Plan to shape and exercise control over their physical, social, economic and cultural environment

- Increase access to resources for small businesses in low-income neighborhoods that want to stay in San Francisco
- Expand programs to offer capital funding for tenant improvements to launch new commercial locations

Priority Need 4B: Ensure economic growth offers benefits to existing communities

Goal 4Bi: Require local hiring to the greatest extent possible in MOHCD's projects and programs

Activities:

- Coordinate with OEWD for job readiness and job placement on affordable housing projects
- Continue to support job readiness and placement for RAD and HOPE SF projects

Goal 4Bii: Ensure adequate City services in neighborhoods where MOHCD's affordable housing is located

Activities:

- Work with City partners such as San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) on access to and quality of low-cost transportation
- Work with key City departments to identify needs and opportunities for service implementation and coordination
- Participate in interdepartmental meetings for the development of strategies that result in improved service delivery in neighborhoods where MOHCD's affordable housing is located.

Goal 4Biii: Implement programs that provide direct benefits resulting from neighborhood-based economic growth to local communities

Activities:

- Target amenities development to communities impacted by increased housing density
- Coordinate Cultural District programming with other community development initiatives
- Increased partnerships between City Departments and Cultural District community groups to better coordinate resources and develop policy solutions
- Continue to identify ways in which existing businesses and residents can access increased employment and access to capital
- Collaborate with other City departments to identify additional ways to support local micro enterprise and entrepreneurs
- Coordinate with OEWD for new retail and community supported businesses retained or created in MOHCD-supported affordable housing sites

OBJECTIVE 5: THE CITY WORKS TO ELIMINATE THE CAUSES OF RACIAL DISPARITIES

Priority Need 5A: Ensure racially equitable access to programs and services, in coordination with other City departments

Goal 5Ai: Develop specific funding, policies and practices to ensure equitable access to MOHCD and OEWD programs

Activities:

- Review and evaluate outreach practices with a racial equity lens
- Improve outreach to historically underserved neighborhoods and communities
- Leverage culturally-competent outreach to increase awareness about available housing and service resources
- While housing and community development policies and programs are informed by a host of stakeholders and regulations, including the Mayor, elected officials, and federal and state funding requirements, MOHCD, in its outreach and engagement practices, shall provide voice to communities most impacted by racial inequity and support their agency in both shaping and achieving housing and community development goals.
- Continue standardization of housing and program eligibility criteria, and other policies, with a racial equity lens
- Evaluate and improve MOHCD programs and services to ensure equitable access
- Analyze gaps in placement success for different demographics, and determine required interventions to create equitable access to affordable housing resources
- Explore options for extending the benefits of the Certificate of Preference program
- MOHCD shall prioritize communities most impacted by racial inequities in its contracts, grants, community development services and affordable housing opportunities, and will develop and expand programs that focus on serving these communities.
- Explore and implement racial equity performance measures into procurement processes, including MOHCD and OEWD RFQ/RFP selection criteria
- Partner with the Human Right Commission's Office of Racial Equity to implement racial equity policies
- Implement department-wide trauma-informed trainings and systems to support improved customer service and self-care
- Develop a resource guide that is organized by target populations
- In order to inform decisions, guide resource allocation, and evaluate the effectiveness of its programs, MOHCD shall employ robust, inclusive, disaggregated and equitable data collection and analysis strategies.

Priority Need 5B: Instill racial equity and trauma-informed values and practices in the work of MOHCD and its partners

Goal 5Bi: Incorporate cultural competency, trauma-informed systems, and other equity training and resources for MOHCD's partners

Activities:

- Create a comprehensive action plan for incorporating Racial Equity into MOHCD programs and operations
- Explore further development and implementation of trainings for grantees, developers, and housing placement and property management partners, including trainings on implicit bias, cultural competence/cultural humility, trauma informed systems and racial equity
- Education for housing and service providers for HIV+ persons to increase cultural competency and reduce stigma
- In order to consistently focus on addressing racial inequities, MOHCD shall integrate a racial equity framework into all facets of its culture, practices, and work plans, and work to ensure that all staff feel that their contributions are integral to MOHCD's mission, that their identities and experiences are celebrated, and that their voices are heard and considered.

Goal 5Bii: Incorporate racial equity principles in MOHCD's hiring and promotion practices

Activities:

- Review MOHCD hiring and promotion practices and implement changes to better support a diverse and inclusive work environment
- MOHCD shall develop and implement staff recruitment and retention strategies such that MOHCD staff, at all levels, is diverse and representative of the communities we serve.

Goal 5Biii: Implement racial equity and trauma-informed values and approaches throughout MOHCD

Activities:

- Develop and implement a racial equity plan for MOHCD
- Conduct a complete racial equity analysis of MOHCD's internal policies
- Communicate values to external community and stakeholders
- Continue to convene the Racial Equity Work Group to create and implement MOHCD's racial equity plan
- Create a trauma-informed working group to support implementation of healing practices
- In order to advance this Racial Equity Plan, MOHCD shall ensure that the racial equity initiative is sustainably resourced and appropriately staffed.

SP-10 Geographic Priorities – 91.215 (a)(1)

Geographic Area

Table 72 – Geographic Priority Areas

1	Area Name:	Bayview Hunters Point
	Area Type:	Strategy area
	Other Target Area Description:	
	HUD Approval Date:	6/18/1996
	% of Low/ Mod:	
	Revital Type:	
	Other Revital Description:	
	Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.	MOHCD, along with the DPH and the Planning Department, has defined San Francisco neighborhoods by census tract boundaries (see Map 11). The Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood consists of the following census tracts: 230.01, 230.03, 231.02, 231.03, 232, 233, 234, 610, 612, 9806 and 9809.
	Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.	See MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion
	How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?	In 1993-94 San Francisco applied to HUD for consideration of six neighborhoods as federally designated Enterprise Communities. In order to be considered, all six neighborhoods developed ten-year strategic plans for community development. Of the six neighborhoods considered for recognition as Enterprise Communities, four were selected: Bayview Hunters Point; Visitacion Valley; South of Market and the Mission. The two neighborhoods not selected include Chinatown and the Tenderloin. The ten-year plans developed for the Enterprise Community application was sufficient for HUD to designate all six neighborhoods as Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas (NRSAs) in 1996.
Identify the needs in this target area.	<p>The following are the priority activities that will be carried out under the Consolidated Plan in the Bayview Hunter’s Point NRSA, organized by the Plan’s Objectives and Priority Needs.</p> <p>Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 1A: Develop and maintain accessible and affordable housing 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to implement affordable housing components of <u>HOPE SF at Hunters View and Alice Griffith</u> ▪ Complete 28 new affordable housing projects currently in the development pipeline for the neighborhood, which will add 1,513 of affordable housing ➤ Priority Need 1B: Make housing more affordable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Robustly fund Homeownership counseling programs based in the neighborhood ▪ Robustly fund home modification programs that focus on helping low-income homeowners (a significant population in Bayview Hunters Point) modify and be able to stay in their homes ▪ Robustly fund Rental Housing Counseling programs based in the neighborhood ➤ Priority Need 1C: Prevent and reduce homelessness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduce the inflow of households entering the homeless response system by engaging in diversion or funding prevention services ▪ Maintain support to homeless outreach, shelters and social services for people actively experiencing homelessness in the southeast sector ▪ Increase the outflow from the homeless response system by supporting the development of affordable housing and rental assistance ➤ Priority Need 1D: Provide services to maintain housing stability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide robust support for RAD Family Services projects at Hunters Point East, Hunters Point West, and Westbrook housing developments ▪ Provide robust support for HOPE SF Housing Retention and Case Management services ▪ Locate other key services, such as tenant counseling and eviction prevention, legal services, financial education and counseling, on-site at <u>HOPE SF</u> and <u>RAD</u> projects ▪ Continue to support community building and resident leadership development programs ▪ Support Tenant Right to Counsel providers based in the neighborhood, to ensure that
--	---

		<p>residents have access to full scope legal representation when facing eviction</p> <p>Objective 2: Families and Individuals are Resilient and Economically Self-Sufficient</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 2A: Promote workforce development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide a full range of employment and training services through The Bayview-Hunters Point Job Center, including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Job readiness workshops, job search assistance, career planning and connections to employment. ○ Certifications and license(s) attainment assistance to enhance employment. ○ Outreach, hiring and training of residents for HOPE SF housing sites in BVHP. ○ Open computer lab with staff assistance available. ○ Targeted outreach to neighborhood seniors and older adults for employment assistance. ▪ Support Bayview-Hunters Point organizations for youth workforce services. This includes sector services, youth development for the workforce, barrier removal services and paid internship opportunities. ➤ Priority Need 2B: Increase opportunities through improved language access and core skills development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support skills development programs in areas including life skills and personal effectiveness, educational skills (including GED and diploma programs), English as a Second Language training, and workplace readiness skills ▪ Support programs that create clear pathways to more advanced training opportunities, including post-secondary educational programs, more advanced ESL programming at San Francisco City College, and sector-specific job training programs through the Office of Economic and Workforce Development and other entities ▪ Ensure that skill development programs based in Bayview Hunters Point are funded, and that these programs are accessible to RAD and HOPE SF residents,
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support financial counseling and education, including intensive one-on-one financial coaching; ensure that these services are located in Bayview Hunters Point including on-site at HOPE SF and RAD housing sites ▪ Support digital literacy programs, including programs that provide Internet access and assist with digital literacy for affordable housing residents and sites, especially at HOPE SF and RAD housing sites <p>➤ Priority Need 2C: Provide equitable access to civil legal services for immigration and other critical issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure that a comprehensive civil legal services provider is located in Bayview Hunters Point, and that residents have access to legal counseling and representation in a wide range of crucial legal areas <p>➤ Priority Need 2D: Help households connect to services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support a comprehensive continuum of services including enhanced information and referral, service connection to identify and meet short-term client goals, case management to address more complex and/or longer term needs, and case coordination to coordinate services for a client between multiple providers and systems. Ensure that these services are located in the Bayview. <p>Objective 3: Communities Have Healthy Physical, Social and Business Infrastructure</p> <p>➤ Priority Need 3A: Enhance community facilities and spaces</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure nonprofit service providers have high quality, stable facilities ▪ Enhance public spaces <p>➤ Priority Need 3B: Strengthen small businesses and commercial corridors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to provide business technical assistance through community partners ▪ Support economic revitalization and façade improvement efforts along the Third Street Commercial Corridor- Evans to Jamestown Avenues
--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lead 6 month community engagement process to develop and prioritize goals in the Cultural District strategy ➤ Priority Need 3C: Support community-driven comprehensive strategies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Through the African American Arts and Cultural District in Bayview Hunters Point, provide infrastructure for the community to launch, lead, and determine its own cultural stabilization strategies, with extensive support from City Agencies ▪ Support neighborhood planning processes focused on Bayview Hunters Point, including supporting convening of nonprofits services in Southeast San Francisco, and collaboratives of organizations led by underrepresented populations (including African-American led organizations) ➤ Priority Need 3D: Support capacity needs of community-based organizations and MOHCD professional partners <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Build organizational capacity of MOHCD’s Bayview Hunters Point grantees/providers through outreach, relationship building and recruitment, organizational assessments, trainings and coaching, cohort-based and project-based work, subject matter experts, and other technical assistance methodologies <p>Objective 4: Communities At Risk of Displacement are Stabilized</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 4A: Address inequitable impacts of economic growth through anti-displacement measures for residents and businesses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Leverage African-American Arts & Cultural District to support anti-displacement policies ▪ Play a key role in strategy and program development, coordinating resources for small businesses and property owners, supporting inter-agency and community collaborations, and facilitate community engagement for the Bayview/Third Street Corridor merchants ➤ Priority Need 4B: Ensure economic growth offers benefits to existing communities
--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Coordinate with OEWD for job readiness and job placement on affordable housing projects ▪ Continue to support job readiness and placement for <u>RAD</u> and <u>HOPE SF</u> projects ▪ Coordinate Cultural District programming with other community development initiatives to provide maximum economic benefit to neighborhood residents <p>Objective 5: The City Works to Eliminate the Causes of Racial Disparities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 5A: Ensure racially equitable access to programs and services, in coordination with other City departments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ➤ Priority Need 5B: Instill racial equity and trauma-informed values and practices in the work of MOHCD and its partners <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪
	What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?	Opportunities for improvement are listed under each of the needs above.
	Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?	
2	Area Name:	Chinatown
	Area Type:	Strategy area
	Other Target Area Description:	
	HUD Approval Date:	6/18/1996
	% of Low/ Mod:	
	Revital Type:	
	Other Revital Description:	
	Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.	MOHCD, along with the DPH and the Planning Department, has defined San Francisco neighborhoods by census tract boundaries (see Map 11). The Chinatown neighborhood consists of the following census tracts: 107, 113, 118 and 611.
	Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.	See MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion
How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as	In 1993–94 San Francisco applied to HUD for consideration of six neighborhoods as federally designated Enterprise Communities. In order to be considered, all six	

<p>a target area?</p>	<p>neighborhoods developed ten-year strategic plans for community development. Of the six neighborhoods considered for recognition as Enterprise Communities, four were selected: Bayview Hunters Point; Visitacion Valley; South of Market and the Mission. The two neighborhoods not selected include Chinatown and the Tenderloin. The ten-year plans developed for the Enterprise Community application was sufficient for HUD to designate all six neighborhoods as Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas (NRSAs) in 1996.</p>
<p>Identify the needs in this target area.</p>	<p>The following are the priority activities that will be carried out under the Consolidated Plan in the Chinatown NRSA, organized by the Plan’s Objectives and Priority Needs.</p> <p>Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 1A: Develop and maintain accessible and affordable housing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Complete Ping Yuen North RAD rehabilitation project, providing 199 affordable units ▪ Complete 772 Pacific Avenue project, providing an estimated 49 affordable units ➤ Priority Need 1B: Make housing more affordable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Robustly fund Homeownership counseling programs that can serve neighborhood residents, including monolingual Chinese speakers ▪ Robustly fund Rental Housing Counseling programs based in the neighborhood, and ones that can serve neighborhood residents, including monolingual Chinese speakers ➤ Priority Need 1C: Prevent and reduce homelessness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduce the inflow of households entering the homeless response system by engaging in diversion or funding prevention services ▪ Maintain support to homeless outreach, shelters and social services for people actively experiencing homelessness in the northwest sector ▪ Increase the outflow from the homeless response system by supporting the development of affordable housing and rental assistance ➤ Priority Need 1D: Provide services to maintain housing stability

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide robust support for RAD Family Services projects at Ping Yuen and Ping Yuen North ▪ Ensure that other key services, such as tenant counseling and eviction prevention, legal services, financial education and counseling, are accessible to residents of these <u>RAD</u> projects ▪ Continue to support community building and resident leadership development programs ▪ Support Tenant Right to Counsel providers based in the neighborhood, to ensure that residents have access to full scope legal representation when facing eviction ▪ Support tenant counseling and education organizations based in the neighborhood <p>Objective 2: Families and Individuals are Resilient and Economically Self-Sufficient</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 2A: Promote workforce development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide employment and training services to local residents through the Chinatown Job Center, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Job readiness workshops, job search assistance, career planning and connections to employment opportunities. ▪ Services in English, Spanish, Cantonese, and Mandarin. ▪ Career pathways programs for older adults ▪ Additional targeted outreach in two public housing sites in Chinatown. ▪ Sector trainings in both Health Care and Hospitality, to provide residents with skills and training to enter these industries. ▪ Additional Workforce partners specialize in providing general workforce services to newly arrived immigrants to help them successfully integrate in the workforce. ➤ Priority Need 2B: Increase opportunities through improved language access and core skills development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support skills development programs in areas including life skills and personal effectiveness, educational skills (including GED and diploma programs), English as a Second Language training, and workplace readiness skills, and
--	--	---

		<p>that these are accessible to recent immigrants, LEP and monolingual residents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support programs that create clear pathways to more advanced training opportunities, including post-secondary educational programs, more advanced ESL programming at San Francisco City College, and sector-specific job training programs through the Office of Economic and Workforce Development and other entities ▪ Ensure that skill development programs based in Chinatown are supported, and that these programs are accessible to RAD residents ▪ Support financial counseling and education, including intensive one-on-one financial coaching; ensure that financial counseling services are available in Chinatown ▪ Support digital literacy programs, including programs that provide Internet access and assist with digital literacy for affordable housing residents and sites, especially at RAD housing sites <p>➤ Priority Need 2C: Provide equitable access to civil legal services for immigration and other critical issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure that civil legal services providers are located in Chinatown, and that residents have access to legal counseling and representation in a wide range of crucial legal areas, and in the necessary languages <p>➤ Priority Need 2D: Help households connect to services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support a comprehensive continuum of services including enhanced information and referral, service connection to identify and meet short-term client goals, case management to address more complex and/or longer term needs, and case coordination to coordinate services for a client between multiple providers and systems; ensure that these services are available in needed languages, and that appropriate translation services are accessible; ensure that services are based in Chinatown.
--	--	---

	<p>Objective 3: Communities Have Healthy Physical, Social and Business Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 3A: Enhance community facilities and spaces <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure Chinatown nonprofit service providers have high quality, stable facilities ▪ Enhance public spaces ➤ Priority Need 3B: Strengthen small businesses and commercial corridors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Expand services to existing businesses to help them stay and grow in the Central Subway Station and Grant Avenue area ▪ Provide support to and invest in local revitalization and marketing initiatives ➤ Priority Need 3C: Support community-driven comprehensive strategies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support work of the API Council to convene and coordinate efforts of organizations that serve Chinatown and other API communities ▪ Support work of the API Council to convene and coordinate efforts of organizations that serve Chinatown and other API communities ➤ Priority Need 3D: Support capacity needs of community-based organizations and MOHCD professional partners <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Build organizational capacity of MOHCD’s Chinatown grantees/providers through outreach, relationship building and recruitment, organizational assessments, trainings and coaching, cohort-based and project-based work, subject matter experts, and other technical assistance methodologies <p>Objective 4: Communities At Risk of Displacement are Stabilized</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 4A: Address inequitable impacts of economic growth through anti-displacement measures for residents and businesses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ OEWD Corridor Manager will provide business engagement and vacancy tracking ➤ Priority Need 4B: Ensure economic growth offers benefits to existing communities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Coordinate with OEWD for job readiness and job placement on affordable housing projects
--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to support job readiness and placement for <u>RAD</u> projects ▪ Economic Development activities focusing on vacancy activation, including short-term “pop up” businesses and improvements to attract long-term tenants <p>Objective 5: The City Works to Eliminate the Causes of Racial Disparities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 5A: Ensure racially equitable access to programs and services, in coordination with other City departments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ➤ Priority Need 5B: Instill racial equity and trauma-informed values and practices in the work of MOHCD and its partners <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪
	What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?	Opportunities for improvement are listed under each of the needs above.
	Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?	
3	Area Name:	Mission
	Area Type:	Strategy area
	Other Target Area Description:	
	HUD Approval Date:	6/18/1996
	% of Low/ Mod:	
	Revital Type:	
	Other Revital Description:	
	Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.	MOHCD, along with the DPH and the Planning Department, has defined San Francisco neighborhoods by census tract boundaries (see Map 11). The Mission NRSA neighborhood consists of the following census tracts: 177, 201, 202, 208, 209, 228.01, 228.02, 228.03, 229.01, 229.02 and 229.03.
	Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.	See MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion
How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as	In 1993–94 San Francisco applied to HUD for consideration of six neighborhoods as federally designated Enterprise Communities. In order to be considered, all six neighborhoods developed ten-year strategic plans for	

<p>a target area?</p>	<p>community development. Of the six neighborhoods considered for recognition as Enterprise Communities, four were selected: Bayview Hunters Point; Visitacion Valley; South of Market and the Mission. The two neighborhoods not selected include Chinatown and the Tenderloin. The ten-year plans developed for the Enterprise Community application was sufficient for HUD to designate all six neighborhoods as Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas (NRSAs) in 1996.</p>
<p>Identify the needs in this target area.</p>	<p>The following are the priority activities that will be carried out under the Consolidated Plan in the Mission NRSA, organized by the Plan’s Objectives and Priority Needs.</p> <p>Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 1A: Develop and maintain accessible and affordable housing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 34 new affordable housing projects currently in development in the neighborhood, which will add 1,429 units of affordable housing ▪ This includes primarily new construction, along with small sites acquisition, rehabilitation, and inclusionary housing ➤ Priority Need 1B: Make housing more affordable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Robustly fund Homeownership counseling programs based in the neighborhood ▪ Robustly fund Rental Housing Counseling programs based in the neighborhood ▪ Continue and complete Bernal Dwellings RAD rehabilitation project, providing affordable 160 units ➤ Priority Need 1C: Prevent and reduce homelessness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduce the inflow of households entering the homeless response system by engaging in diversion or funding prevention services ▪ Maintain support to homeless outreach, shelters and social services for people actively experiencing homelessness in the Mission ▪ Increase the outflow from the homeless response system by supporting the development of affordable housing and rental assistance ➤ Priority Need 1D: Provide services to maintain housing stability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support Tenant Right to Counsel providers based in the neighborhood, to ensure that

		<p>residents have access to full scope legal representation when facing eviction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support tenant counseling and education organizations based in the neighborhood <p>Objective 2: Families and Individuals are Resilient and Economically Self-Sufficient</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 2A: Promote workforce development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide employment and training services to local residents, through the Mission Job Center, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Job readiness workshops, job search assistance, career planning and connections to employment opportunities. ▪ Services in English and Spanish. ▪ Career pathways programs for public housing residents, and targeted outreach in five public housing sites in the Mission. ▪ Training for tech careers and office administration. ▪ Additional Mission-based Workforce partners specialize in providing workforce and training services in hospitality and healthcare. ➤ Priority Need 2B: Increase opportunities through improved language access and core skills development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support skills development programs in areas including life skills and personal effectiveness, educational skills (including GED and diploma programs), English as a Second Language training, and workplace readiness skills ▪ Support programs that create clear pathways to more advanced training opportunities, including post-secondary educational programs, more advanced ESL programming at San Francisco City College, and sector-specific job training programs through the Office of Economic and Workforce Development and other entities ▪ Ensure that skill development programs based in the Mission are funded, and that these programs are accessible to RAD residents ▪ Support financial counseling and education, including intensive one-on-one financial coaching; ensure that these services are located in the Mission
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support digital literacy programs, including programs that provide Internet access and assist with digital literacy for affordable housing residents and sites, especially at RAD housing sites in the Mission <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 2C: Provide equitable access to civil legal services for immigration and other critical issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure that civil legal services providers are located in the Mission, and that residents have access to legal counseling and representation in a wide range of crucial legal areas, and in the necessary languages ▪ Due to large number of immigrant families, ensure that legal services are available to them in the neighborhood, and in the necessary languages ➤ Priority Need 2D: Help households connect to services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support a comprehensive continuum of services including enhanced information and referral, service connection to identify and meet short-term client goals, case management to address more complex and/or longer term needs, and case coordination to coordinate services for a client between multiple providers and systems; ensure that these services are available in needed languages (including Spanish as well as Mayan and other indigenous languages), that appropriate translation services are accessible, and that providers are located in the Mission <p>Objective 3: Communities Have Healthy Physical, Social and Business Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 3A: Enhance community facilities and spaces <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure Mission nonprofit service providers have high quality, stable facilities ▪ Enhance public spaces ➤ Priority Need 3B: Strengthen small businesses and commercial corridors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide small businesses with individualized technical assistance through community partners
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support neighborhood events to attract people to the corridor, fill vacancies, improve business storefronts, and conduct business outreach and tailored business services ➤ Priority Need 3C: Support community-driven comprehensive strategies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Leverage Mission 2020 and Mission Promise Zone planning processes ▪ Strengthen economic development strategies and activities in community-driven plans ➤ Priority Need 3D: Support capacity needs of community-based organizations and MOHCD professional partners <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Build organizational capacity of MOHCD’s Mission neighborhood grantees/providers through outreach, relationship building and recruitment, organizational assessments, trainings and coaching, cohort-based and project-based work, subject matter experts, and other technical assistance methodologies <p>Objective 4: Communities at Risk of Displacement are Stabilized</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 4A: Address inequitable impacts of economic growth through anti-displacement measures for residents and businesses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Leverage Calle 24 Latino/a Cultural District to support anti-displacement policies ▪ Look to the Mission Action Plan as a guide for implementing strategies that reduce displacement and seek stabilization ➤ Priority Need 4B: Ensure economic growth offers benefits to existing communities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Calle 24 Latino/a Cultural District will be an economically vibrant community that is inclusive of diverse income households and businesses that together compassionately embrace the unique Latino/a heritage and cultures of 24th Street and that celebrate Latino/a cultural events, foods, businesses, activities, art and music. ▪ Coordinate with OEWD for job readiness and job placement on affordable housing projects ▪ Continue to support job readiness and placement for <u>RAD</u> projects
--	--	---

		<p>Objective 5: The City Works to Eliminate the Causes of Racial Disparities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 5A: Ensure racially equitable access to programs and services, in coordination with other City departments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ➤ Priority Need 5B: Instill racial equity and trauma-informed values and practices in the work of MOHCD and its partners <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪
	What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?	Opportunities for improvement are listed under each of the needs above.
	Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?	
4	Area Name:	South of Market
	Area Type:	Strategy area
	Other Target Area Description:	
	HUD Approval Date:	6/18/1996
	% of Low/ Mod:	
	Revital Type:	
	Other Revital Description:	
	Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.	MOHCD, along with the DPH and the Planning Department, has defined San Francisco neighborhoods by census tract boundaries (see Map 11). The South of Market neighborhood consists of the following census tracts: 176.01, 178.01, 178.02 and 180.
	Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.	See MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion
How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?	In 1993-94 San Francisco applied to HUD for consideration of six neighborhoods as federally designated Enterprise Communities. In order to be considered, all six neighborhoods developed ten-year strategic plans for community development. Of the six neighborhoods considered for recognition as Enterprise Communities, four were selected: Bayview Hunters Point; Visitacion Valley; South of Market and the Mission. The two neighborhoods not selected include Chinatown and the Tenderloin. The ten-year plans developed for the Enterprise Community application was sufficient for HUD	

	to designate all six neighborhoods as Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas (NRSAs) in 1996.
<p>Identify the needs in this target area.</p>	<p>The following are the priority activities that will be carried out under the Consolidated Plan in the South of Market NRSA, organized by the Plan’s Objectives and Priority Needs.</p> <p>Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 1A: Develop and maintain accessible and affordable housing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Complete 31 new affordable housing projects currently in development in the neighborhood, which will add 1,170 units of affordable housing ▪ Includes new construction, rehabilitation, and inclusionary units ▪ Includes both rental and homeownership opportunities ➤ Priority Need 1B: Make housing more affordable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Robustly fund Homeownership counseling programs based in the neighborhood ▪ Robustly fund Rental Housing Counseling programs based in the neighborhood ➤ Priority Need 1C: Prevent and reduce homelessness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduce the inflow of households entering the homeless response system by engaging in diversion or funding prevention services ▪ Maintain support to homeless outreach, shelters and social services for people actively experiencing homelessness in SOMA ▪ Increase the outflow from the homeless response system by supporting the development of affordable housing and rental assistance ➤ Priority Need 1D: Provide services to maintain housing stability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support Tenant Right to Counsel providers based in the neighborhood, to ensure that residents have access to full scope legal representation when facing eviction ▪ Support tenant counseling and education organizations based in the neighborhood

	<p>Objective 2: Families and Individuals are Resilient and Economically Self-Sufficient</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 2A: Promote workforce development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide employment and training services to local residents through the SOMA Job Center, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Job readiness workshops, job search assistance, career planning and connections to employment opportunities. ○ Access to paid training and on the job training opportunities. ○ Partnerships with other city/state agencies that offer public assistance, disability and unemployment services. ▪ Additional SOMA-based Workforce partners specialize in providing workforce and training services to veterans and those with developmental disabilities. ➤ Priority Need 2B: Increase opportunities through improved language access and core skills development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support skills development programs in areas including life skills and personal effectiveness, educational skills (including GED and diploma programs), English as a Second Language training, and workplace readiness skills ▪ Support programs that create clear pathways to more advanced training opportunities, including post-secondary educational programs, more advanced ESL programming at San Francisco City College, and sector-specific job training programs through the Office of Economic and Workforce Development and other entities ▪ Ensure that skill development programs based in SOMA are funded ➤ Priority Need 2C: Provide equitable access to civil legal services for immigration and other critical issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure that civil legal services providers are located in SOMA, and that residents have access to legal counseling and representation in a wide range of crucial legal areas, and in the necessary languages
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 2D: Help households connect to services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support a comprehensive continuum of services including enhanced information and referral, service connection to identify and meet short-term client goals, case management to address more complex and/or longer term needs, and case coordination to coordinate services for a client between multiple providers and systems; ensure that these services are available in needed languages, and that appropriate translation services are accessible; ensure that these providers are located in SOMA <p>Objective 3: Communities Have Healthy Physical, Social and Business Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 3A: Enhance community facilities and spaces <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure SOMA nonprofit service providers have high quality, stable facilities ▪ Enhance public spaces ➤ Priority Need 3B: Strengthen small businesses and commercial corridors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide business retention & attraction services for neighborhood-serving businesses on the Sixth Street action zone ▪ Complete 6th Street Pedestrian Safety Project, to make street safer, more accessible, and more attractive; provide construction mitigation support ▪ Foster events and activations to strengthen foot traffic and build community ➤ Priority Need 3C: Support community-driven comprehensive strategies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Implement & refresh Mayor’s Central Market/Tenderloin Strategy, which includes SOMA ▪ Support Cultural District planning and strategies ▪ Support block specific groups and strategies, such as on Stevenson and Jessie Street ➤ Priority Need 3D: Support capacity needs of community-based organizations and MOHCD professional partners
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Build organizational capacity of MOHCD’s SOMA neighborhood grantees/providers through outreach, relationship building and recruitment, organizational assessments, trainings and coaching, cohort-based and project-based work, subject matter experts, and other technical assistance methodologies <p>Objective 4: Communities At Risk of Displacement are Stabilized</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 4A: Address inequitable impacts of economic growth through anti-displacement measures for residents and businesses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Leverage two cultural districts in this neighborhood: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SoMa Pilipinas – Filipino Cultural District, whose mission is to prevent the displacement of the Filipino community, protect its historic and cultural assets, help develop and sustain its legacy institutions and support its anchor community organizations, while improving the living conditions of the whole community. ○ Leather and LGBTQ+ Cultural District, whose mission is to preserve, advance, and promote San Francisco’s Leather and LGBTQ+ Cultural District as a local, national, and international resource, and as a culturally and commercially enriched neighborhood and district. ➤ Priority Need 4B: Ensure economic growth offers benefits to existing communities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Leverage Central SOMA cultural preservation and community services for current residents ▪ Coordinate with OEWD for job readiness and job placement on affordable housing projects ▪ Continue to support job readiness and placement for <u>RAD</u> projects <p>Objective 5: The City Works to Eliminate the Causes of Racial Disparities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 5A: Ensure racially equitable access to programs and services, in coordination with other City departments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪
--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 5B: Instill racial equity and trauma-informed values and practices in the work of MOHCD and its partners <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪
	What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?	Opportunities for improvement are listed under each of the needs above.
	Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?	
5	Area Name:	Tenderloin
	Area Type:	Strategy area
	Other Target Area Description:	
	HUD Approval Date:	6/18/1996
	% of Low/ Mod:	
	Revital Type:	
	Other Revital Description:	
	Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.	MOHCD, along with the DPH and the Planning Department, has defined San Francisco neighborhoods by census tract boundaries (see Map 11). The Tenderloin neighborhood consists of the following census tracts: 122.01, 122.02, 123.01, 123.02, 124.01, 124.02, 125.01 and 125.02.
	Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.	See MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion
	How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?	In 1993-94 San Francisco applied to HUD for consideration of six neighborhoods as federally designated Enterprise Communities. In order to be considered, all six neighborhoods developed ten-year strategic plans for community development. Of the six neighborhoods considered for recognition as Enterprise Communities, four were selected: Bayview Hunters Point; Visitacion Valley; South of Market and the Mission. The two neighborhoods not selected include Chinatown and the Tenderloin. The ten-year plans developed for the Enterprise Community application was sufficient for HUD to designate all six neighborhoods as Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas (NRSAs) in 1996.
Identify the needs in this target area.	The following are the priority activities that will be carried out under the Consolidated Plan in the Tenderloin NRSA, organized by the Plan's Objectives and Priority Needs.	

	<p>Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 1A: Develop and maintain accessible and affordable housing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Complete 22 new affordable housing projects currently in development in the neighborhood, which will add 1,265 units of affordable housing ▪ Includes new construction, rehabilitation, and inclusionary units ▪ Includes both rental and homeownership opportunities ➤ Priority Need 1B: Make housing more affordable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Robustly fund Homeownership counseling programs based in the neighborhood ▪ Robustly fund Rental Housing Counseling programs based in the neighborhood ➤ Priority Need 1C: Prevent and reduce homelessness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduce the inflow of households entering the homeless response system by engaging in diversion or funding prevention services ▪ Maintain support to homeless outreach, shelters and social services for people actively experiencing homelessness in the Tenderloin ▪ Increase the outflow from the homeless response system by supporting the development of affordable housing and rental assistance ➤ Priority Need 1D: Provide services to maintain housing stability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support Tenant Right to Counsel providers based in the neighborhood, to ensure that residents have access to full scope legal representation when facing eviction ▪ Support tenant counseling and education organizations based in the neighborhood <p>Objective 2: Families and Individuals are Resilient and Economically Self-Sufficient</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 2A: Promote workforce development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide employment and training services to local residents through the Tenderloin Job Center, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Job readiness workshops, job search assistance, career planning and
--	--

		<p>connections to employment opportunities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Services/information in English, Spanish and Vietnamese. ○ Assistance with employment barrier removal such as basic computer, substance abuse and temporary housing. ▪ Additional Tenderloin-based Workforce partners specialize in providing workforce and training services to the Vietnamese community, to residents wanting tech training/employment and working the hotel lobby/hospitality industry. <p>➤ Priority Need 2B: Increase opportunities through improved language access and core skills development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support skills development programs in areas including life skills and personal effectiveness, educational skills (including GED and diploma programs), English as a Second Language training, and workplace readiness skills ▪ Support programs that create clear pathways to more advanced training opportunities, including post-secondary educational programs, more advanced ESL programming at San Francisco City College, and sector-specific job training programs through the Office of Economic and Workforce Development and other entities ▪ Ensure that skill development programs based in the Tenderloin are funded <p>➤ Priority Need 2C: Provide equitable access to civil legal services for immigration and other critical issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure that civil legal services providers are located in the Tenderloin, and that residents have access to legal counseling and representation in a wide range of crucial legal areas, and in the necessary languages <p>➤ Priority Need 2D: Help households connect to services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support a comprehensive continuum of services including enhanced information and referral, service connection to identify and meet short-term client goals, case
--	--	---

		<p>management to address more complex and/or longer term needs, and case coordination to coordinate services for a client between multiple providers and systems; ensure that these services are available in needed languages, and that appropriate translation services are accessible; ensure that these providers are located in the Tenderloin</p> <p>Objective 3: Communities Have Healthy Physical, Social and Business Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 3A: Enhance community facilities and spaces <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure Tenderloin nonprofit service providers have high quality, stable facilities ▪ Enhance public spaces ➤ Priority Need 3B: Strengthen small businesses and commercial corridors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to increase efficiency of technical business assistance ▪ Continue business attraction efforts that provide affordable goods and services; use SF Shines façade and tenant improvement grants to help facilitate this. ▪ Support efforts to upgrade the exterior of commercial buildings and undertake efforts to bring positive activation to storefronts and sidewalks ➤ Priority Need 3C: Support community-driven comprehensive strategies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participation on block groups, such as Golden Gate Safety Group, to support small businesses and residents and address safety and security concerns ➤ Priority Need 3D: Support capacity needs of community-based organizations and MOHCD professional partners <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Build organizational capacity of MOHCD’s Tenderloin neighborhood grantees/providers through outreach, relationship building and recruitment, organizational assessments, trainings and coaching, cohort-based and project-based work, subject matter experts, and other technical assistance methodologies
--	--	--

		<p>Objective 4: Communities At Risk of Displacement are Stabilized</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 4A: Address inequitable impacts of economic growth through anti-displacement measures for residents and businesses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Leverage Compton’s Transgender Cultural District to address displacement of this community ▪ The mission of the district is to create an urban environment that fosters the rich history, culture, legacy, and empowerment of transgender people and its deep roots in the southeastern Tenderloin neighborhood. ▪ The transgender district aims to stabilize and economically empower the transgender community through ownership of homes, businesses, historic and cultural sites, and safe community spaces. ➤ Priority Need 4B: Ensure economic growth offers benefits to existing communities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Coordinate with OEWD for job readiness and job placement on affordable housing projects ▪ Continue to support job readiness and placement for <u>RAD</u> projects <p>Objective 5: The City Works to Eliminate the Causes of Racial Disparities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 5A: Ensure racially equitable access to programs and services, in coordination with other City departments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ➤ Priority Need 5B: Instill racial equity and trauma-informed values and practices in the work of MOHCD and its partners <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪
	<p>What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?</p>	<p>Opportunities for improvement are listed under each of the needs above.</p>
	<p>Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?</p>	
<p>6</p>	<p>Area Name:</p>	<p>Visitacion Valley</p>
	<p>Area Type:</p>	<p>Strategy area</p>
	<p>Other Target Area Description:</p>	
	<p>HUD Approval Date:</p>	<p>6/18/1996</p>

% of Low/ Mod:	
Revital Type:	
Other Revital Description:	
Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.	MOHCD, along with the DPH and the Planning Department, has defined San Francisco neighborhoods by census tract boundaries (see Map 12). The Visitacion Valley neighborhood consists of the following census tracts: 264.01, 264.02, 264.03, 264.04 and 605.02.
Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.	See MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion
How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?	In 1993-94 San Francisco applied to HUD for consideration of six neighborhoods as federally designated Enterprise Communities. In order to be considered, all six neighborhoods developed ten-year strategic plans for community development. Of the six neighborhoods considered for recognition as Enterprise Communities, four were selected: Bayview Hunters Point; Visitacion Valley; South of Market and the Mission. The two neighborhoods not selected include Chinatown and the Tenderloin. The ten-year plans developed for the Enterprise Community application was sufficient for HUD to designate all six neighborhoods as Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas (NRSAs) in 1996.
Identify the needs in this target area.	<p>The following are the priority activities that will be carried out under the Consolidated Plan in the Visitacion Valley NRSA, organized by the Plan's Objectives and Priority Needs.</p> <p>Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 1A: Develop and maintain accessible and affordable housing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue phased construction and development of Sunnydale HOPE SF mixed-income housing ▪ 775 public housing replacement units will be constructed within 12 buildings on site, along with 196 affordable units (set at 60% AMI, selected through lottery process) ▪ Each building will be 75% replacement units and 25% affordable units ▪ Parcel Q, the first development, is in lease up currently with 55 units ▪ Block 6 will start construction in December 2019, with 167 units


	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Block 3, with about 150 units of affordable housing, and the Community Center will both start construction in 2023 ➤ Priority Need 1B: Make housing more affordable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ➤ Priority Need 1C: Prevent and reduce homelessness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduce the inflow of households entering the homeless response system by engaging in diversion or funding prevention services ▪ Maintain support to homeless outreach, shelters and social services for people actively experiencing homelessness in Visitacion Valley ▪ Increase the outflow from the homeless response system by supporting the development of affordable housing and rental assistance ➤ Priority Need 1D: Provide services to maintain housing stability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support Tenant Right to Counsel providers based in the neighborhood, to ensure that residents have access to full scope legal representation when facing eviction ▪ Support tenant counseling and education organizations based in the neighborhood <p>Objective 2: Families and Individuals are Resilient and Economically Self-Sufficient</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 2A: Promote workforce development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide employment and training services to local residents through the Visitacion Valley Job Center, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Job readiness workshops, job search assistance, career planning, public computer access, and connections to employment opportunities. ○ Services/information in English, Spanish and Chinese. ○ Assistance with employment opportunities at San Francisco Airport. ○ Assistance with driving opportunities with San Francisco Muni. ▪ OEWD partners with Visitacion Valley based partners who prioritize providing workforce and training services to residents under the HOPE SF program.
--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 2B: Increase opportunities through improved language access and core skills development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support skills development programs in areas including life skills and personal effectiveness, educational skills (including GED and diploma programs), English as a Second Language training, and workplace readiness skills ▪ Support programs that create clear pathways to more advanced training opportunities, including post-secondary educational programs, more advanced ESL programming at San Francisco City College, and sector-specific job training programs through the Office of Economic and Workforce Development and other entities ▪ Ensure that skill development programs are based in Visitacion Valley, and can provide services to diverse population (including services in English, Spanish and Chinese) ➤ Priority Need 2C: Provide equitable access to civil legal services for immigration and other critical issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure that civil legal services providers have regular presence in Visitacion Valley, and that residents have access to legal counseling and representation in a wide range of crucial legal areas, and in the necessary languages ➤ Priority Need 2D: Help households connect to services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support a comprehensive continuum of services including enhanced information and referral, service connection to identify and meet short-term client goals, case management to address more complex and/or longer term needs, and case coordination to coordinate services for a client between multiple providers and systems; ensure that these services are available in needed languages, and that appropriate translation services are accessible; ensure that these providers are located in Visitacion Valey
--	--	---

	<p>Objective 3: Communities Have Healthy Physical, Social and Business Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 3A: Enhance community facilities and spaces <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure Visitacion Valley nonprofit service providers have high quality, stable facilities ▪ Enhance public spaces ➤ Priority Need 3B: Strengthen small businesses and commercial corridors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to provide small businesses with individualized technical assistance through community partners ▪ Continue supporting neighborhood events to attract people to the Leland Street corridor, fill vacancies, improve business storefronts, and conduct business outreach and tailored business services ➤ Priority Need 3C: Support community-driven comprehensive strategies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ➤ Priority Need 3D: Support capacity needs of community-based organizations and MOHCD professional partners <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Build organizational capacity of MOHCD’s Visitacion Valley neighborhood grantees/providers through outreach, relationship building and recruitment, organizational assessments, trainings and coaching, cohort-based and project-based work, subject matter experts, and other technical assistance methodologies <p>Objective 4: Communities At Risk of Displacement are Stabilized</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 4A: Address inequitable impacts of economic growth through anti-displacement measures for residents and businesses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Leverage Cultural Districts to support anti-displacement policies ▪ Increase access to resources for small businesses in low-income neighborhoods that want to stay in San Francisco ▪ Provide technical assistance and access to resources to existing business to support their stabilization and growth within the neighborhood.
--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 4B: Ensure economic growth offers benefits to existing communities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Coordinate with HOPE SF and OEWD for job readiness and job placement on affordable housing projects, particularly on the Sunnydale HOPE SF site ▪ Continue to support job readiness and placement for HOPE SF and <u>RAD</u> projects <p>Objective 5: The City Works to Eliminate the Causes of Racial Disparities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Priority Need 5A: Ensure racially equitable access to programs and services, in coordination with other City departments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ➤ Priority Need 5B: Instill racial equity and trauma-informed values and practices in the work of MOHCD and its partners <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪
	<p>What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?</p>	<p>Opportunities for improvement are listed under each of the needs above.</p>
	<p>Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?</p>	

Map 12 – Map of San Francisco with Neighborhood Boundaries



General Allocation Priorities

Describe the basis for allocating investments geographically within the jurisdiction (or within the EMSA for HOPWA)

Assistance will be directed in HUD-designated Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas (NRSAs), HUD-defined areas of low- and moderate-income concentration and minority concentration, and Invest in Neighborhoods Commercial Districts. HUD funds will be primarily directed in NRSAs and in areas of low- and moderate-income and minority concentration. See Map 12 for these geographic areas.

Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas (NRSAs)

In 1993–94 San Francisco applied to HUD for consideration of six neighborhoods as federally designated Enterprise Communities. In order to be considered, all six neighborhoods developed ten-year strategic plans for community development. Of the six neighborhoods considered for recognition as Enterprise Communities, four were selected: Bayview Hunters Point; Visitacion Valley; South of Market and the Mission. The two neighborhoods not selected include Chinatown and the Tenderloin. The ten-year plans

developed for the Enterprise Community application was sufficient for HUD to designate all six neighborhoods as Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas (NRSAs) in 1996.

MOHCD has made investments in each of these areas that correspond to the key principles of the original Enterprise Community Program, including 1) economic opportunity; 2) sustainable community development; 3) community-based partnerships; and 4) strategic visions for change. The strategic plans for these neighborhoods provide substantive detail regarding community priorities such as economic development and job training; safe and affordable housing; public safety; neighborhood beautification; education; childcare and public service support.

MOHCD respectfully requests renewal for all six of the current NRSA designations as provided for at 24 CFR 91.215(g) and CPD Notice CPD-16-16.

MOHCD compliance with HUD criteria:

- **Boundaries:** MOHCD has provided census tract boundaries to specifically define each neighborhood according to year 2010 census tract boundaries (see Map 12);
- **Demographic Criteria:** Each of the designated neighborhoods meets or exceeds the requirement that it be primarily residential and contain a percentage for low- and moderate-income residents that is equal to the “upper quartile percentage” (as computed by HUD pursuant to 24 CFR 570.208(a)(1)(ii)) of 65%;
- **Consultation:** Strategic plans were developed for all six neighborhoods in consultation with the area’s key stakeholders, including residents, non-profit organizations, and community groups that are in or serve the neighborhood (see PR-15 Citizen Participation section);
- **Assessment:** See MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion section for a neighborhood profile of each of the six neighborhoods;
- **Housing and Economic Opportunities:** MOHCD, OEWD and HSH have developed realistic housing and community and economic development strategies with each neighborhood’s residents and stakeholders to promote the substantial revitalization of each of the neighborhoods. See SP-10 Geographic Priorities for the six neighborhood strategies;
- **Performance Measurement:** MOHCD, OEWD and HSH have developed a program matrix that identifies reliable indicators of success, which are measurable over time (see SP-45 Goals Summary section); and,
- **Leverage:** Federal funds will be leveraged with state and local funds (see SP-35 Anticipated Resources section).

In addition to the HUD guidelines, MOHCD has taken the additional step of reviewing each of the neighborhood strategic plans and is committed to achieving very specific outcomes over the next five years. The table above provides a supplemental snapshot of neighborhood assets, persistent needs and five-year opportunities for each neighborhood.

Areas of Low- and Moderate-Income Concentration

HUD calculates low- and moderate-income concentration by census block groups. See Map 12 for what HUD considers as areas of low- and moderate-income concentration in San Francisco.

Areas of Minority Concentration

Although racial and ethnic groups are distributed throughout the City, certain neighborhoods have higher than average concentrations of minority households. HUD requires recipients of its funding to identify areas of minority concentration in the aggregate as well as by specific racial/ethnic group.

San Francisco has defined an area of aggregate minority concentration as any census tract with a minority population that is 20 percentage points greater than that of the City's total minority percentage. According to the 2017 ACS 5-Year Estimates, 59.16% of the City's population is identified as being composed of minorities, and therefore any census tract in which 79.16% of the population is classified as minority would qualify as an Area of Minority Concentration. See Map 12.

Invest In Neighborhoods Commercial Districts

Invest In Neighborhoods (IIN) is a division within the Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) that implements programs focused on neighborhood commercial district planning, management, safety, and vibrancy. The strategies deployed are intended to advance opportunities for all. The division implements programs and services with the support of community partners to increase quality of life and economic opportunities within neighborhoods and commercial corridors. IIN seeks to advance economic opportunities in the City's neighborhoods using strategies centered on diversity, equity, and inclusion to ensure increased quality of life and prosperity for all residents.

The division's guiding objectives are to build community capacity, fortify neighborhoods and their economies, improve physical conditions and strengthen small businesses. Some of the services offered support small business assistance, safety and cleanliness, physical improvements to buildings or spaces, positive activation of public spaces and engagement of residents along targeted corridors throughout the city. IIN programs and services are intended to maximize impact within five strategic areas: small businesses, storefronts and buildings, commercial corridors, public spaces and neighborhoods. A comprehensive approach to stabilization of neighborhoods and commercial districts is best aligned with our neighborhood strategic area of impact.

Services provided under the impact area for neighborhoods are streamlined under three programs: Community Benefit Districts, Opportunity Neighborhoods and Cultural Districts.

Community Benefit Districts

The Community Benefit District (CBD) Program provides technical assistance for management plan and engineer's report development, district establishment, and operational support to improve the overall quality of life in targeted commercial districts and mixed-use neighborhoods through partnerships between the City and local communities.

OEWD oversees 18 local community benefit districts in the City. Each CBD is managed by a non-profit agency. Community Benefit Districts are required to complete an annual report that outlines the year's achievements and financials including income, expense, asset, liabilities, new assets, and carry over which are reviewed by OEWD and heard by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors' Government Audit and Oversight Committee. OEWD's annual report shares the Department's accomplishments and financials from that fiscal year.

Some CBDs tailor services specific to the neighborhood's needs. For example, the Tenderloin CBD manages the Safe Passage Program, which is a coalition of Corner Captains who are trained to respond to different emergencies in the neighborhood and maintain a daily positive presence for children and

youth walking on the sidewalks. The Lower Polk CBD hosts a Tenant-Landlord Clinic designed to help prevent homelessness by keeping people housed in their current homes.

Opportunity Neighborhoods

The Opportunity Neighborhood's program targets neighborhoods that have experienced historic divestment and have an economic development strategy that promotes diversity, equity and inclusion. These neighborhoods have an assigned project manager that works closely with community stakeholders and other city departments to strategically disburse investments including funds and services and support an economic development strategy.

The opportunity neighborhoods include:


- Bayview
- Central Market/Tenderloin
- Chinatown
- Excelsior
- Lower Fillmore
- Mission (24th and Mission Streets)

Cultural Districts

The Office of Economic and Workforce Development is a key partner to the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development in the implementation of the Cultural District program whose focus is on advancing equitable and shared prosperity for San Franciscans by growing sustainable jobs, supporting businesses of all sizes, creating great places to live and work, and helping everyone achieve economic self-sufficiency. Staff supports and leverages economic resources to ensure that there is alignment and a comprehensive approach to each district's economic development strategies. In addition, our division coordinates with our neighborhood project managers where the districts overlap with our programs.

Customized economic interventions for each neighborhood are selected from a broad-ranging suite of tools aimed at supporting small businesses and their surrounding commercial districts. OEWD utilizes CDBG along with General Fund dollars to provide these programs and services, and leverages them with resources and efforts from other City agencies and often private partners.

Map 13 – NRSAs, Areas of Low- and Moderate-Income Concentration, Areas of Minority Concentration and Invest In Neighborhoods Commercial Districts



SP-25 Priority Needs - 91.215(a)(2)

Priority Needs

Table 75 – Priority Needs Summary

1	Priority Need Name	Develop and maintain accessible housing and affordable housing
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Low Moderate Middle Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse Veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families Victims of Domestic Violence Non-housing Community Development Other - Immigrants
	Geographic Areas Affected	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley
	Associated Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create more affordable housing • Preserve affordable housing • Improve data and analytics on affordable housing inventory and placements
	Description	The development of new affordable housing and the preservation and maintenance of the existing affordable housing stock has never been more important as the demand for both rental and homeownership housing threatens to push low and moderate income households out of San Francisco.

		New housing must be built to address the growing population but also to replace San Francisco’s aging housing supply. Preservation of existing housing stock through acquisition of smaller properties and taking them off the speculative market, addressing environmental concerns from housing such as lead-based paint, or rehabilitation of thousands of public housing units will preserve what historically has been considered the housing of “last resort” to San Francisco’s poorest residents.
	Basis for Relative Priority	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.
2	Priority Need Name	Make housing more affordable
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Low Moderate Middle Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse Veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families Victims of Domestic Violence Non-housing Community Development Other - Immigrants
	Geographic Areas Affected	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley
	Associated Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce development costs to help leverage local housing resources and serve lower income households

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase affordability of rental housing • Increase opportunities for sustainable homeownership • Increase access to rental and homeownership housing
	Description	As the cost to develop and operate housing in San Francisco increases and outpaces the income growth of low-income households, rental housing must be made affordable for these households through securing rental subsidies to supplement low-income tenant’s ability to pay their rent. Affordable homeownership opportunities must also be provided to help increase financial mobility up the housing ladder by expanding down payment assistance programs or educating homebuyer/homeowners prior to or after purchasing a home. Strengthening the housing application system and community-based organization’s capacity to assist clients finding housing must also expand access to rental and homeownership opportunities. MOHCD will work closely with both homeownership and rental housing counseling agencies to better coordinate services, reach vulnerable populations and strive for equity in access, and use data-driven methods to improve effectiveness and impact.
	Basis for Relative Priority	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.
3	Priority Need Name	Prevent and reduce homelessness
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Low Moderate Middle Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse Veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families Victims of Domestic Violence

		Non-housing Community Development Other - Immigrants
	Geographic Areas Affected	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley
	Associated Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve systems to help each person find the right path to permanent housing • Reduce homelessness for adults, youth and families • Ensure no families with children are unsheltered • Improve the City’s response to street homelessness and end large, long-term encampments • Better align MOHCD’s work with Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing • Expand services to prevent homelessness and stabilize housing for formerly homeless households and those at risk of homelessness
	Description	Homelessness locks people into an unhealthy crisis mode of existence, making it difficult for them to regain their health, effectively engage in mental health and substance abuse treatment, and address education and skill gaps that limit their ability to access decent employment. In order to break this damaging and costly cycle and to help people to end their homelessness, the City needs an adequate supply of permanent affordable housing. The City also needs to prevent homelessness as the most cost-effective strategy. Homeless prevention programs focus primarily on eviction prevention, including tenant rights trainings, legal representation at eviction hearings, as well as rental vouchers and assistance with first and last month rent. Direct service programs support case management and related services to individuals and families in shelters and on the streets, focusing on those services which will maximize housing stability for those individuals and families.
	Basis for Relative Priority	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.
4	Priority Need Name	Provide services to maintain housing stability
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Low Moderate Middle Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children

	<p>Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse Veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families Victims of Domestic Violence Non-housing Community Development Other - Immigrants</p>
Geographic Areas Affected	<p>Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley</p>
Associated Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce rate of evictions • Increased access to services for residents of public and publicly subsidized housing, RAD projects, HOPWA subsidized housing, and single room occupancy hotels • Provide support for other affordable housing residents to ensure success in their housing placement • Increased mobility between levels of housing for HIV+ households
Description	<p>Under the <u>Tenant Right to Counsel</u> initiative, MOHCD is expanding support for full scope legal representation for residents facing eviction, which is a highly effective and efficient strategy for reducing the rate of evictions and keeping vulnerable residents in their current homes. We will also continue to support other proven strategies, including tenant counseling, outreach and education; mediation; housing stability case management, and direct financial assistance (one-time assistance and flexible tenant-based subsidies) activities, and we will expand longer-term rental subsidy programs. MOHCD will continue to engage community stakeholders around eviction prevention strategies to maximize effectiveness.</p> <p>Residents of publically subsidized housing will need support services to help them remain stably housed including through any transition periods such as related to the RAD project. Persons living with HIV/AIDS also face their own unique housing challenges and need access to supportive housing and support services, be it permanent supportive housing or transitional housing settings, rental subsidies, or a more efficient housing and service delivery system.</p>

		In order to assist public housing residents in the conversion of their housing through the RAD program, they will need support services to help them understand what RAD is and how this significant change will affect them. Persons living with HIV/AIDs also face their own unique housing challenges and need access to supportive housing and support services, be it permanent supportive housing or transitional housing settings, rental subsidies, or a more efficient housing and service delivery system.
	Basis for Relative Priority	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.
5	Priority Need Name	Promote workforce development
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Low Moderate Middle Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse Veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families Victims of Domestic Violence Non-housing Community Development Other - Immigrants
	Geographic Areas Affected	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley
	Associated Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide access to employment opportunities across multiple sectors for unemployed and underemployed populations

	Description	<p>Based on the local area population trends and specific industry analyses, implementing strategies and identifying opportunities that will promote entry into the workforce, pathways to a career, and self-sufficiency will continue to be our primary objective. An approach that focuses on building skills aligned with DOL’s competency model and ongoing employer engagement will be the anchor of all our programming. Based on our own best-practices and the evidence base in the field, we have identified the following program elements for success:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recruitment, screening, and intake processes to ensure a good match between the applicant, the program, and the target occupation. • Job readiness, basic skills, including digital literacy skills and hands-on technical skills training offered through the lens of specific industries and occupations. • Individualized services to support training completion, industry- and occupation-specific job search, and success on the job. • A strong link to local and regional employers that results in an evolving and responsive understanding of the target industries, occupations and connections to jobs that provide self-sufficiency pathways.
	Basis for Relative Priority	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.
6	Priority Need Name	Increase opportunities through improved language access and core skills development
	Priority Level	High
	Population	<p>Extremely Low Low Moderate Middle Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse Veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families Victims of Domestic Violence</p>

		Non-housing Community Development Other - Immigrants
	Geographic Areas Affected	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley
	Associated Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve access to MOHCD programs and services through translation of paper and digital resources • Provide skill development and training resources • Improve financial literacy and personal finance management • Improve digital literacy
	Description	<p>MOHCD’s skill development programming supports community-based services in areas including life skills and personal effectiveness, educational skills (including GED and diploma programs), English as a Second Language training, and workplace readiness skills. There is an emphasis on supporting programs that create clear pathways to more advanced training opportunities, including post-secondary educational programs, more advanced ESL programming at San Francisco City College, and sector-specific job training programs through the Office of Economic and Workforce Development and other entities.</p> <p>Through MOHCD’s Financial Capability portfolio we support financial counseling and education, asset and credit building, debt reduction, access to banking, and credit counseling and repair services. This includes an increased investment in more intensive services that build the financial capability of clients, and ongoing one-on-one coaching services that produce long-term economic improvements. We encourage co-location of financial services at housing sites and at community-based organizations.</p> <p>An important new point of emphasis is supporting programs to improve digital literacy and access to technology, reflecting the growing importance of technology and digital skills in education, employment, and economic self-sufficiency and the specific needs of very low and low income families in keeping up the pace.</p>
	Basis for Relative Priority	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.
7	Priority Need Name	Provide equitable access to civil legal services for immigration and other critical issues
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Low Moderate Middle Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents

	<p>Chronic Homelessness</p> <p>Individuals</p> <p>Families with Children</p> <p>Mentally Ill</p> <p>Chronic Substance Abuse</p> <p>Veterans</p> <p>Persons with HIV/AIDS</p> <p>Victims of Domestic Violence</p> <p>Unaccompanied Youth</p> <p>Elderly</p> <p>Frail Elderly</p> <p>Persons with Mental Disabilities</p> <p>Persons with Physical Disabilities</p> <p>Persons with Developmental Disabilities</p> <p>Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions</p> <p>Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families</p> <p>Victims of Domestic Violence</p> <p>Non-housing Community Development</p> <p>Other - Immigrants</p>
Geographic Areas Affected	<p>Tenderloin</p> <p>Chinatown</p> <p>South of Market</p> <p>Mission</p> <p>Bayview Hunters Point</p> <p>Visitacion Valley</p>
Associated Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve access to civil legal services
Description	<p>It is estimated nationally that 71% of low-income households experienced at least one civil legal problem in 2017, and that those in need were unable to obtain adequate legal assistance 86% of the time. The unmet need is particularly high for undocumented and recent immigrants, seniors, survivors of domestic violence, families with minor children, and adults with disabilities. The law pervades all aspects of life: family, community, work, health, finance, safety, and beyond. Most San Franciscans “go it alone” without the assistance of a legal professional in urgent, complex and high-stakes civil legal matters. When access to the civil legal services needed to address their most fundamental rights is limited, this only reinforces existing disparities. Through the Access to Civil Justice portfolio, MOHCD supports access to high quality legal representation and counseling in the core areas of immigration, employment, consumer, benefits advocacy, housing, and family law. We also support a community legal navigator program to help social service providers identify and make appropriate referrals for clients with legal needs.</p>
Basis for Relative Priority	<p>Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.</p>
8 Priority Need Name	<p>Help households connect to services</p>

Priority Level	High
Population	Extremely Low Low Moderate Middle Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse Veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families Victims of Domestic Violence Non-housing Community Development Other - Immigrants
Geographic Areas Affected	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley
Associated Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase access to community-based services
Description	When MOHCD engaged residents and stakeholders of low-income communities to inform the development of our 2020–2025 Consolidated Plan, they highly prioritized the need for better and more efficient service connection, as well as case management and case coordination services that help them navigate the array of services available, create linkages across service providers, and create individual service plans through which they can create and achieve clear goals. MOHCD will support a wide range of both community- based and housing place-based projects that are able to provide culturally and linguistically appropriate services to San Francisco’s diverse communities, and ensure that families and individuals from these communities are able to effectively access needed resources and navigate the social service environment.

	Basis for Relative Priority	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.
9	Priority Need Name	Enhance community facilities and spaces
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Low Moderate Middle Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse Veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families Victims of Domestic Violence Non-housing Community Development Other - Immigrants
	Geographic Areas Affected	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley
	Associated Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure nonprofit service providers have high quality, stable facilities • Enhance public spaces
	Description	MOHCD has for many years served as the only City agency that consistently provides financial support for community facilities. No other City department, (and only a small number of private philanthropic organizations), provides support to the numerous nonprofits in the Northern California Bay Area. In a time where commercial real estate is perhaps the most expensive of any city in the U.S., the ability of social service providers to have a safe, secure, and permanent location from which to provide services has never been more

		<p>important. Because of the scarcity of funding for this kind of support, and given the priority many non-profits and funds place on supporting programs rather than capital improvements, MOHCD is committed to continuing to use CDBG funds to fill this particular gap through its community facility capital improvements program. These funds have been used to cover the costs of tenant improvements that allow service providers to expand existing services, and to construct new facilities. In addition to protecting and expanding services, capital funds are used to ensure that these facilities are accessible to all and meet health and safety standards.</p> <p>MOHCD has focused on supporting the following types of facilities: neighborhood and constituency-focused multi-service centers; family resource centers, senior centers; childcare facilities; workforce service nodes; and youth centers. Special attention is given to those improvements that support ADA-mandated improvements and health and safety improvements. Other types of improvements have included HVAC, roofs, program space build-outs, elevators, ramps, boilers, and other essential capital improvements.</p> <p>San Francisco prides itself on being a green city, and has therefore prioritized greening as a vital public improvement. The City has partnered with community-based organizations that leverage community volunteers to provide trees and sidewalk gardens in distressed neighborhoods, working with local homeowners and institutions to ensure the long-term sustainability of the City's greening efforts. In addition, the City's new Housing Trust Fund provides additional resources for Mello-Roos-type infrastructure improvements to areas impacted by increased housing density. These improvements can include public park landscaping, furnishings and recreation equipment, pocket parks and parklets, murals, neighborhood gardens, and public right of way improvements including paving, furnishings and plantings.</p>
	Basis for Relative Priority	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.
10	Priority Need Name	Strengthen small businesses and commercial corridors
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Low Moderate Middle Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse Veterans

		Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families Victims of Domestic Violence Non-housing Community Development Other - Immigrants
	Geographic Areas Affected	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley
	Associated Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage the development and sustainability of thriving locally owned businesses • Support the development and sustainability of robust commercial corridors in low-income neighborhoods
	Description	San Francisco’s use of Community Development Block Grants to support economic development activities falls into two general categories of programs and services: support for small businesses and entrepreneurs, and support for the commercial corridors in which these small businesses reside.
	Basis for Relative Priority	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.
11	Priority Need Name	Support community-driven comprehensive strategies
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Low Moderate Middle Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse Veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS

	<p>Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families Victims of Domestic Violence Non-housing Community Development Other - Immigrants</p>
Geographic Areas Affected	<p>Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley</p>
Associated Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support neighborhood-based planning efforts • Support locally-based community building
Description	<p>This strategy supports San Franciscans to come together to proactively build their communities. Whether bound by a shared identity, geography or values, people should have the resources necessary to engage with one another, with local government, institutions and businesses, and with their public spaces. This strategy aims to remove barriers to convening and collaboration so communities can transform themselves in new and positive ways.</p> <p>To make it easier for low-income, vulnerable and disenfranchised populations to participate in civic and community opportunities, we seek to fund:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Neighborhood and community planning processes that bring together these populations to meaningfully participate in their communities. 2. Neighborhood-based community action grant programs. 3. Networks of community-based organizations that provide increased service coordination and collaboration for both neighborhoods and specific populations. <p>This strategy supports the formation and ongoing development of collaboratives working together to accomplish one or more of the following community benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify community needs and gaps in services • Share resources (including small grants for community-led projects) • Develop approaches and solutions to critical community issues, such as the need to heal recurring trauma experienced by residents • Advocate for policies and practices that benefit their community • Develop community leaders and authentic voices • Improve communication between residents and institutions

		Small business and financing programs, in combination with other economic development tools, are specifically designed to support community-driven comprehensive strategies. First, OEWD makes use of a City-wide business needs assessments to better understand the needs and service gaps in the small business community; in particular, the needs in opportunity neighborhoods. Second, OEWD works closely with merchant associations, commercial corridor representatives, local businesses, and other community stakeholders to develop and deploy small business services and reach targeted communities. Finally, Invest in Neighborhoods, a division of OEWD, promotes, funds, and is actively involved in neighborhood-based planning efforts.
	Basis for Relative Priority	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.
12	Priority Need Name	Support capacity needs of community-based organizations and MOHCD professional partners
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Low Moderate Middle Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse Veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families Victims of Domestic Violence Non-housing Community Development Other - Immigrants
	Geographic Areas Affected	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market

		Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley
	Associated Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase capacity of community-based organizations
	Description	Capacity building is an investment in the effectiveness and future sustainability of a nonprofit organization. Many nonprofits serving vulnerable populations do not have the resources to maximize their impact on the residents they serve. MOHCD recognizes the gaps in funding and resources that exist for many nonprofits, including its own grantees. We also recognize how practices within our sector perpetuate a cycle in which funders continually under-resource the nonprofits they support. These funds are one strategy to provide less restricted support to nonprofits so they can build systems and the increased capacity to execute their missions into the future. Distinct capacity building projects, such as improving fundraising and communication strategies, offering training and skill-building for staff and leadership, developing a leadership succession plan, or building financial adaptability, all build the capacity of nonprofits to effectively execute their mission in the future. Common capacity building interventions include connecting organizations and their staff to information, peer learning or convening (e.g. cohorts), education and training (e.g. workshops or webinars), and consulting or coaching. MOHCD will also fund organizational assessments to identify capacity challenges and/or areas for improvement, and to plan appropriate interventions. We encourage our nonprofit grantees to identify the areas of their operations where these funds would be most impactful.
	Basis for Relative Priority	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.
13	Priority Need Name	Address inequitable impacts of economic growth through anti-displacement measures for residents and businesses
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Low Moderate Middle Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse Veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth

	<p>Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families Victims of Domestic Violence Non-housing Community Development Other - Immigrants</p>
Geographic Areas Affected	<p>Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley</p>
Associated Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement policies and programs that prioritize current residents • Encourage commercial tenants to locate on ground-floor spaces of MOHCD's affordable housing developments • Reduce displacement of residents and businesses
Description	<p>One of the crucial elements of our anti-displacement strategy for current San Francisco residents is implementation of the <u>Tenant Right to Counsel</u> initiative, through which we have vastly expanded support for full scope legal representation for residents facing eviction. This is proven to be a highly effective and efficient strategy for keeping vulnerable residents in their current homes, reducing homelessness and displacement. We will also continue to support other proven strategies, including tenant counseling, outreach and education; mediation; housing stability case management, and direct financial assistance (one-time assistance and flexible tenant-based subsidies) activities, and we will expand longer-term rental subsidy programs. MOHCD will continue to engage community stakeholders around eviction prevention strategies to maximize effectiveness and minimize displacement.</p> <p>The most recent report by the City's Budget and Legislative Analyst's Office on the topic showed the closure of small businesses in San Francisco has reached record numbers with almost 4,000 small businesses closing in 2014, compared to 693 small businesses closed in 1994. The report draws connections to San Francisco's skyrocketing rents and the high level of commercial evictions. In response, OEWD has deployed a range of services to small businesses including but not limited to small business consulting, lease negotiation assistance, small business loans, legacy business registry, façade improvement assistance, commercial corridor management, relocation and broker services, business permit assistance, and coordination with city agencies.</p> <p>With aging buildings and rising HOA costs, low to moderate income first time homeowners need access to support for sustainable homeownership. Resources</p>

		and information on topics such as refinancing mortgages, taxes and insurance, HOA membership, and home repair and maintenance are essential.
	Basis for Relative Priority	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.
14	Priority Need Name	Ensure economic growth offers benefits to existing communities
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Low Moderate Middle Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse Veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families Victims of Domestic Violence Non-housing Community Development Other - Immigrants
	Geographic Areas Affected	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley
	Associated Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require local hiring to the greatest extent possible in MOHCD's projects and programs • Ensure adequate City services in neighborhoods where MOHCD's affordable housing is located • Implement programs that provide direct benefits resulting from neighborhood-based economic growth to local communities

	Description	<p>Provide resources and coordination to ensure that the social services safety net, economic self-sufficiency projects, health and wellness programs and housing stability services are located and serving those communities and neighborhoods most in need</p> <p>The Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) seeks to help all San Franciscans benefit equitably from the prosperity of our city. As San Francisco experiences long periods of economic growth, low unemployment rates and increased investments in City services, OEWD remains committed to realizing equitable outcomes for the communities and industries that we serve.</p> <p>OEWD recognizes the deep and pervasive impacts that past and present structural and institutional inequities have created in many of our communities, and in particular, our communities of color. We’ve seen that the unprecedented economic opportunities realized in San Francisco have not been accessible to all. Many OEWD services are designed to reach those who have been traditionally excluded from that prosperity.</p>
	Basis for Relative Priority	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.
15	Priority Need Name	Ensure racially equitable access to programs and services, in coordination with other City departments
	Priority Level	High
	Population	<p>Extremely Low</p> <p>Low</p> <p>Moderate</p> <p>Middle</p> <p>Families with Children</p> <p>Elderly</p> <p>Public Housing Residents</p> <p>Chronic Homelessness</p> <p>Individuals</p> <p>Families with Children</p> <p>Mentally Ill</p> <p>Chronic Substance Abuse</p> <p>Veterans</p> <p>Persons with HIV/AIDS</p> <p>Victims of Domestic Violence</p> <p>Unaccompanied Youth</p> <p>Elderly</p> <p>Frail Elderly</p> <p>Persons with Mental Disabilities</p> <p>Persons with Physical Disabilities</p> <p>Persons with Developmental Disabilities</p> <p>Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions</p> <p>Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families</p>

	<p>Victims of Domestic Violence Non-housing Community Development Other - Immigrants</p>
Geographic Areas Affected	<p>Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley</p>
Associated Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop specific funding, policies and practices to ensure equitable access to MOHCD and OEWD programs
Description	<p>MOHCD is in the middle of a multi-year process that began in December of 2016. MOHCD staff were invited to participate in a regional training cohort put together by the national racial equity organization, the Government Alliance on Race and Equity (GARE). The GARE work informed the City’s racial equity initiative. As part of both the first and second GARE cohorts, MOHCD created its own internal Racial Equity Working Group, consisting of staff and managers across all of its program divisions, in the fall of 2017. In April of 2018, MOHCD began a series of monthly all-staff racial equity meetings to lay out the framework for racial equity across the entire department. MOHCD engaged a consultant specializing in racial equity as its lead consultant to guide our racial equity work, and began working with her in February, 2019. MOHCD has now created a draft racial equity action plan which will be finalized in Spring 2020 and will serve as the department road map over the next three years.</p> <p>In terms of MOHCD’s work with the community, MOHCD is committed to ensuring racially equitable access to programs and services, in coordination with other City departments; incorporating racial equity principles into its own hiring and promotion practices, and implement racial equity and trauma-informed values and approaches throughout MOHCD.</p> <p>A few of the key elements of MOHCD’s plans include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving outreach to historically underserved neighborhoods and communities; • Providing voice to communities most impacted by racial inequity and support their agency in both shaping and achieving housing and community development goals; • Analyzing gaps in placement success for different demographics, and determine required interventions to create equitable access to affordable housing resources; • Prioritizing communities most impacted by racial inequities in its contracts, grants, community development services and affordable housing opportunities, and will develop and expand programs that focus on serving these communities; • In order to inform decisions, guide resource allocation, and evaluate the effectiveness of its programs, MOHCD shall employ robust, inclusive, disaggregated and equitable data collection and analysis strategies.

	Basis for Relative Priority	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.
16	Priority Need Name	Instill racial equity and trauma-informed values and practices in the work of MOHCD and its partners
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Low Moderate Middle Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse Veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families Victims of Domestic Violence Non-housing Community Development Other – Immigrants Other – Black/African Americans Other – Native Americans
	Geographic Areas Affected	Tenderloin Chinatown South of Market Mission Bayview Hunters Point Visitacion Valley
	Associated Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate cultural competency, trauma-informed systems, and other equity training and resources for MOHCD’s partners • Incorporate racial equity principles in MOHCD’s hiring and promotion practices

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement racial equity and trauma-informed values and approaches throughout MOHCD
Description	<p>MOHCD is in the middle of a multi-year process that began in December of 2016. MOHCD staff were invited to participate in a regional training cohort put together by the national racial equity organization, the Government Alliance on Race and Equity (GARE). The GARE work informed the City’s racial equity initiative. As part of both the first and second GARE cohorts, MOHCD created its own internal Racial Equity Working Group, consisting of staff and managers across all of its program divisions, in the fall of 2017. In April of 2018, MOHCD began a series of monthly all-staff racial equity meetings to lay out the framework for racial equity across the entire department. MOHCD engaged a consultant specializing in racial equity as its lead consultant to guide our racial equity work, and began working with her in February, 2019. MOHCD has now created a draft racial equity action plan which will be finalized in Spring 2020 and will serve as the department road map over the next three years.</p> <p>In terms of MOHCD’s work with the community, MOHCD is committed to ensuring racially equitable access to programs and services, in coordination with other City departments; incorporating racial equity principles into its own hiring and promotion practices, and implement racial equity and trauma-informed values and approaches throughout MOHCD.</p> <p>A few of the key elements of MOHCD’s plans include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving outreach to historically underserved neighborhoods and communities; • Providing voice to communities most impacted by racial inequity and support their agency in both shaping and achieving housing and community development goals; • Analyzing gaps in placement success for different demographics, and determine required interventions to create equitable access to affordable housing resources; • Prioritizing communities most impacted by racial inequities in its contracts, grants, community development services and affordable housing opportunities, and will develop and expand programs that focus on serving these communities; • In order to inform decisions, guide resource allocation, and evaluate the effectiveness of its programs, MOHCD shall employ robust, inclusive, disaggregated and equitable data collection and analysis strategies.
Basis for Relative Priority	Through our strategic planning process, this need has been determined to be high priority.

SP-30 Influence of Market Conditions – 91.215 (b)

Influence of Market Conditions

Table 76 – Influence of Market Conditions

Affordable Housing Type	Market Characteristics that will influence the use of funds available for housing type
Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA)	High market-rate rents in most neighborhoods of San Francisco combined with Fair Market Rents that lag significantly behind actual rents will limit the ability of HCV holders to successfully obtain rental housing.
TBRA for Non-Homeless Special Needs	Same as above.
New Unit Production	The strong job market in the burgeoning high tech industry combined with rising market-rate rents and some of the highest homeownership prices in the country has spurred an increase in new housing unit production, especially market-rate rentals and condominiums. The City continues to work toward its 2014 target of constructing or rehabilitating 30,000 housing units by 2020, with at least one-third of those permanently affordable to low and moderate income families, and the majority of those within financial reach of working, middle income San Franciscans.
Rehabilitation	The City has utilized and continues to take advantage of various HUD tools including the RAD program and Section 18 Disposition Program in order to access the resources necessary to rehabilitate and preserve and in some cases place deteriorating public housing, given the chronic underfunding of public housing agencies across the country by Congress. Units converted under RAD or replaced under Section 18 will function as permanently affordable housing owned by private tax credit limited partnerships.
Acquisition, including preservation	The strong market-rate rental housing market is causing rental property owners to put their rent-controlled buildings on the market, which investors and property “flippers” are quickly buying to renovate and sell for a substantial profit. Tenants in those rent-controlled apartments, who are more often than not elderly or low-income families are receiving Ellis Act eviction notices. These existing rent-controlled buildings who serve low-income households are more at-risk of being lost to profit-driven investors and developers, making preservation of these properties even more of a priority.

SP-35 Anticipated Resources – 91.215(a)(4), 91.220(c)(1,2)

Introduction

For the 2020–2024 Consolidated Plan five-year time period, San Francisco anticipates the use of federal CDBG, HOME, ESG and HOPWA funds as well as local funds for the housing and community development activities described in this Plan. Local funding sources include General Fund, Housing Trust Fund and housing impact fees.

Anticipated Resources

Table 75 – Anticipated Resources

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Remainder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
CDBG	public - federal	Acquisition Admin and Planning Economic Development Housing Public Improvements Public Services	\$18,653,085	\$6,550,000	\$446,805	\$25,649,890	\$74,400,000	Assumes flat funding and no additional program income in future years.
HOME	public - federal	Acquisition Homebuyer assistance Homeowner rehab Multifamily rental new construction Multifamily rental rehab New construction for ownership TBRA	\$5,403,449	\$2,400,748	\$0	\$7,804,197	\$21,600,000	Assumes flat funding and no additional program income in future years.

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Remainder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
HOPWA	public - federal	Permanent housing in facilities Permanent housing placement Short term or transitional housing facilities STRMU Supportive services TBRA	\$7,067,229	\$1,200,000	\$2,000,000	\$10,267,229	\$27,161,177	Assumes HOPWA Modernization Projection Scenario 2 for San Francisco and no additional program income in future years.
ESG	public - federal	Financial Assistance Overnight shelter Rapid re-housing (rental assistance) Rental Assistance Services Transitional housing	\$1,595,423	\$0	\$0	\$1,595,423	\$6,000,000	Assumes flat funding and no additional program income in future years.

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
General Fund	public - local	Approximately \$34M grants to CBOs for services predominantly serving low and moderate income residents. Balance is affordable housing loans for acquisition/preservation and new construction.	\$124,400,000	\$0	\$0	\$124,400,000	\$176,000,000	Assumes reduced ERAF in FY21-22 and no ERAF thereafter.
Housing Trust Fund	public - local	Affordable housing related services and loans	\$39,600,000	\$0	\$0	\$39,600,000	\$186,400,000	Full HTF allocation, including portion spent on administration.
LMI Housing Asset Fund	public - local	Affordable housing related and loans	\$4,000,000	\$0	\$10,000,000	\$14,000,000	\$16,000,000	Assumes flat revenue rate each year.

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
Housing Impact Fees	public - local	Affordable housing related loans	\$91,371,000	\$0	\$161,760,000	\$253,131,000	\$318,100,000	Housing impact fees based on projections tied to actual projects which have been assessed fees.
GO Bond	public - local	Affordable housing related capital expenditures	\$161,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$161,000,000	\$426,000,000	\$600M 2019 Affordable Housing GO Bond less \$13M in cost of issuance.
OCII	public - local	Affordable housing related capital expenditures	\$58,180,000	\$0	\$0	\$58,180,000	\$696,435,000	Based on OCII housing pipeline budgeting worksheet

Explain how federal funds will leverage those additional resources (private, state and local funds), including a description of how matching requirements will be satisfied

San Francisco leverages local and state dollars to support its affordable housing and community development activities in various ways.

The City's General Fund supports additional services coordinated through MOHCD, primarily focusing on legal services for immigrants and for residents facing eviction; revitalization efforts in public housing, including HOPE SF and the City's RAD public housing conversion projects; increased support for neighborhood-based services; increased support for immigrant communities seeking additional training in foundational life skills and transitions to self-sufficiency, and community planning efforts with residents in low-income communities; and digital equity programming, including digital skills training and broadband adoption. The City's Capital Budget supports the expansion and maintenance of the facilities necessary for Fiber to Housing. In addition, General Fund is used to fund affordable housing loans for acquisition/preservation and new construction

The City's Housing Trust Fund provides funding for affordable housing development, homeownership counseling, eviction prevention, access to rental housing, downpayment assistance, neighborhood infrastructure, and homeowner home rehabilitation.

The South of Market Community Stabilization Fund provides resources to assist vulnerable South of Market residents and support affordable housing, economic development and community cohesion through a residential impact fee imposed on residential developers in that specific neighborhood.

In addition to CDBG workforce dollars, OEWD leverages WIA and local funds to execute local workforce development strategies. WIA funds a comprehensive range of workforce development activities to benefit job seekers, laid off workers, youth, incumbent workers, new entrants to the workforce, veterans, persons with disabilities, and employers. The purpose of these activities is to promote an increase in the employment, job retention, earnings, and occupational skills improvement by participants.

The ESG program requires a match in an amount that equals the amount of ESG funds provided by HUD. Matching contributions may be obtained from any source, including any federal resource other than the ESG program, as well as state, local and private sources. According to the ESG regulations, the City may comply with this requirement by providing the matching funds itself, or through matching funds provided by any ESG sub-recipient. San Francisco will comply with this requirement by using General Fund to support HSH's emergency shelter programs that are supported with ESG funding.

HOME regulations require that participating jurisdictions match federal HOME funds that are used for housing development, rental assistance or down payment assistance with local sources at a rate of 25%. The City intends to satisfy this requirement by allocating sufficient funds from the Affordable Housing Fund for this purpose.

OEWD leverages General Funds to enhance small business technical assistance and financing programs. Additionally, General Funds are used to support façade & tenant improvements, activate public spaces, and drive commercial district programming, all of which have a direct impact and benefits for commercial corridors and businesses. Finally, OEWD leverages General Funds to provide ADA

compliance assistance, support Legacy Businesses, and make mini-grants available for women-owned businesses.

Invest in Neighborhoods receives funds from the Small Business Administration (SBA) and the Governor's Office of Business and Economic Development to fund the San Francisco Small Business Development Center, a program developed to help existing and aspiring entrepreneurs start and expand businesses.

If appropriate, describe publicly owned land or property located within the jurisdiction that may be used to address the needs identified in the plan

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

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

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

Discussion

San Francisco will continue to leverage local, state, federal and private philanthropic dollars to maximize the effectiveness of HUD funds. The City strategically seek out other governmental funding opportunities such as Choice Neighborhood, Byrne, Promise Neighborhood, and other sources that support its integrated inter-departmental strategies of community revitalization. The City also utilizes its own property as appropriate to support the needs of the Consolidated Plan. In particular, the City has prioritized all appropriate surplus property to be dedicated first to affordable housing development, demonstrating the strong commitment the City has towards providing housing for its neediest residents.

SP-40 Institutional Delivery Structure – 91.215(k)

Explain the institutional structure through which the jurisdiction will carry out its consolidated plan including private industry, non-profit organizations, and public institutions.

Table 77 – Institutional Delivery Structure

Responsible Entity	Responsible Entity Type	Role	Geographic Area Served
See narrative below.			

Community Development Service Delivery System

This section describes the institutional structure through which San Francisco implements its community development program. Essential partners are the private, non-profit and public sectors. They are integral parts of San Francisco’s community development planning and service delivery system. This section will discuss the role of each partner within the system, strengths and weaknesses of these roles, and strategies for strengthening the system.

Private Sector

City staff works regularly with local, private foundations and community development divisions of corporations and banks. These interactions are substantially consultative regarding non-profit funding applications. Typical consultations include 1) non-profit organization submits a proposal to a local business for funding, and the business consults with City staff regarding the merits of the proposal and capacity of the applicant organization; and 2) non-profit organizations makes an inquiry to City staff who discuss the proposal.

The City and the private sector engage in dialogue to better inform our mutual community investments. The City is working to strengthen its private sector communications to better leverage and coordinate resources.

Non-profit Organizations

Local non-profit organizations receive grants through a competitive process. Non-profits are the primary implementation arm of the City in program areas such as construction and rehabilitation of community centers and the provision of a variety of social services such as job training, legal services, health and domestic violence services, housing counseling, and economic development technical assistance to small and micro businesses.

Non-profit organizations provide an invaluable source of information regarding the changing needs, gaps in services and successes in our community development activities. These organizations often provide stability in neighborhoods that have few other resources for receiving information, assistance and services.

The large number of non-profit organizations serving low-income communities in San Francisco is both an asset and a challenge. With a long history of serving the community, the sheer number of non-profits leads to increased competition for limited resources. Conversely, the benefits of a rich variety of social service organizations often translates to more community-based and culturally competent services for

low-income residents. The City has already begun an initiative to engage non-profits in organizational and programmatic capacity building to strengthen the effective and efficient delivery of services.

Public Institutions

It is the City's policy to coordinate community development activities among its agencies. Typically, these opportunities arise along with a common interest in a particular neighborhood, issue or population. The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development, OCII (Successor to the Redevelopment Agency), Office of Economic and Workforce Development, DCYF, HSA, DOSW, and DAAS confer regularly with each other on subjects such as applicant capacity and community needs.

San Francisco uses the proposal review process as an opportunity to engage departments in a dialogue about the current developments and priorities in other City departments. This dialogue aids the City in being more strategic in the investment of CDBG dollars.

Organizational Relationship Between the City and the Public Housing Authority

In past decades, the nature of the City's working relationship with the SFHA (SFHA) was largely one of resource sharing and planning. MOHCD supported the SFHA by providing grants and loans to support capital improvements in light of SFHA's limited funding, and contributed over \$100M in City funds to support the conversion of 3,480 public housing units under the federal RAD program. In addition, MOHCD and SFHA have collaborated on utilization of SFHA's project-based and tenant based vouchers for special populations and in supportive housing environments. Lastly, SFHA and MOHCD have collaborated closely on the HOPE SF program.

In 2019, the City's role in SFHA's programmatic and financial functions changed dramatically. By a letter from HUD to the Authority dated March 7, 2019, HUD determined that SFHA was in default under its Housing Choice Voucher Consolidated Annual Contributions Contract ("HCV ACC") and its Low Rent Public Housing Consolidated Annual Contributions Contract ("LRPH ACC"). After a determination of default, HUD has the authority to take possession of all or a part of the Authority or require the Authority to make other arrangements consistent with HUD requirements that are in the best interests of the public housing residents and families assisted by HUD.

Under the Default Letter, HUD determined that it is in the best interests of public housing residents and assisted families to allow SFHA the opportunity to cure the Default as follows: (i) the City's assumption of responsibility of the programmatic and financial functions under the HCV ACC and LRPH ACC, including financial management, program management, wait list and admissions, inspections, eligibility determinations, and lease and grievance procedures, and (ii) outsourcing programmatic and financial administration of the HCV program and LRPH program, including continued outsourcing of Authority's financial management.

The City approved a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between SFHA and the City in December 2019, and reviewed by HUD, outlining the preliminary terms of the City's assumption of Housing Authority functions as shown below:

Labor Relations: SFHA gave notice to its existing employees on the reduction in Housing Authority staffing, resulting from the City's assumption of and contracting out of SFHA functions, as required by HUD. SFHA developed severance packages for employees who were impacted and is partnering with the City to assist with finding City jobs for these employees when possible.

Restructuring of the Housing Authority: The MOU provided a preliminary restructuring plan that included:

- Appointment of City staff to provide executive management oversight of Housing Authority functions;
- Plan to contract out the Housing Authority's public housing and HCV programs; and
- Development of a specific timeline to integrate the Housing Authority's systems, processes, and the policies with the City for financial oversight, information technology, human resources, real estate, purchasing, and legal oversight. The MOU further provided for the parties (HUD, Housing Authority, City) to commit to the capital funding necessary to redevelop the public housing under HOPE SF; and to continue to convert the public housing units to project based vouchers.

Shortfall Funding: HUD maintains a fund to annually augment local housing authorities' budgets that have a shortfall in their housing voucher programs. HUD provided \$10 million in shortfall funding to the Housing Authority in 2018. According to the MOU, the Housing Authority will apply for HUD's shortfall funding annually, or as frequently as needed.

Executive Management and Shared Services:

- The City will provide executive management staff to the Housing Authority, including a chief executive officer reporting to the Mayor or the Mayor's designee.
- The Housing Authority will integrate with City services over time, including information technology, human resources, purchasing, real estate, financial systems, and other services. The timing and process of integration will be developed in consultation with MOHCD, Controller, and General Services Agency. Administration and Oversight
- The annual Housing Authority budget will be submitted to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors, who may accept or reject the budget. The budget submission will be consistent with City procedures and HUD timelines and requirements.
- Administration of the HCV program and public housing will be contracted to third parties, as required by HUD and discussed above. The Housing Authority will work with the City to procure third-party contractors, but the contracting process must conform to HUD requirements. Contracts for property transactions will be subject to third-party appraisal with the exception of properties conveyed for development of affordable housing.
- Financial management of the Housing Authority will be contracted to a third party with expertise and experience in HUD financial Introduction Budget and Legislative Analyst's Office 10 reporting and requirements. Currently, the Housing Authority contracts with BDO USA LLP for financial management and reporting.
- Issuance of debt by the Housing Authority must be approved by the Authority and the Board of Supervisors.
- Any material amendment to the MOU is subject to prior approval by the Board of Supervisors. Housing Authority Commission
- The Housing Authority Commission is authorized by state law to have seven members, appointed by the Mayor, two of whom must be Housing Authority residents. Under the proposed MOU, the Mayor would appoint four members directly, and three members recommended by motion at the sole discretion of the Board of Supervisors. Of the Mayor's four appointments, at least one must be a Housing Authority resident. Of the Board's three appointments, at least one must be a Housing Authority resident 62 years of age or older.

Non-Housing Assets

- The Housing Authority will (a) inventory non-housing assets, including the building at 1815 Egbert Street, vehicles, and other assets; (b) identify which assets are needed for ongoing operations; and (c) plan disposition of surplus assets in accordance with HUD requirements. Loans made by the City to the Housing Authority will be repaid from surplus funds from the disposition of assets, subject to HUD requirements.

Workforce Development Service Delivery System

The Citizens' Committee on Community Development (CCCD) and the Workforce Investment Board of San Francisco (WISF) establish policies for workforce development in San Francisco and influence the design of the delivery system. Where the CCCD contributes workforce development expertise from community members and advocacy groups, the WISF contributes expertise from industry and articulates the current workforce trends and needs of the local labor market.

The mission of the WISF is to provide a forum where business, labor, education, government, community-based organizations and other stakeholders work together to increase their collective capacity to address the supply and demand challenges confronting the workforce. The WISF provides leadership in developing a strong and vital partnership between businesses, education, community-based organizations, and city agencies.

Specifically the WISF is responsible for:

- Establishing the direction of workforce development in support of San Francisco's vision for economic competitiveness;
- Creating strategic workforce connections between industry, business, labor, educational institutions, and community-based organizations to serve the needs of workers and employers in the region;
- Providing job seekers with education and training needs to achieve self-sufficiency; and,
- Creating a framework to merge public and private resources and expertise to create an integrated workforce development and business service system.

The WISF is staffed by the Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD), which is charged with coordinating and centralizing the youth and adult workforce systems in San Francisco. OEWD will provide staffing support for the quarterly meetings including taking minutes, scheduling of meetings, and ensuring compliance with regulations governing the WISF. The partnership with OEWD and the Mayor's Office ensures that the WISF provides city-wide leadership for workforce development, business attraction, and retention.

In the June, 2014, new local legislation was passed to coordinate and align workforce development services, establishing the Committee on City Workforce Alignment ("Alignment Committee") comprised of department heads across City departments and the Workforce Community Advisory Committee (WCAC), comprised of leadership from community-based organizations with deep specialization in community development.

The Alignment Committee includes one member designated by the Mayor, one member of the Board of Supervisors or a City employee designated by the Board, and the department heads of the following City departments: OEWD; HSA; DCYF; Public Utilities Commission; Public Works, Department of Human Resources, and Human Rights Commission. The Director of Workforce Development and Director of the Human Rights Commission co-chair Alignment Committee.

The Alignment Committee and WCAC are charged with developing and submitting a Citywide Workforce Development Plan to the WISF for its review and comment, which was submitted and approved in late 2017. The five-year plan includes an assessment of the City's anticipated workforce development needs and opportunities and a strategy to meet the identified needs, which influences the City and County of San Francisco's CDBG decision-making around resource allocation. The plan will also include goals and strategies for all Workforce Development Services in San Francisco and a projection of the funding needed to achieve the goals, consistent with the Strategic Plan for Economic Development approved by the Board of Supervisors and the Local Plan approved by WISF.

The Alignment Committee and WCAC legislation sunset in 2019, and all members agreed to continue the work under good faith effort until the legislation is reauthorized.

Housing Development Delivery System

This section examines the institutional structure by which the City creates and maintains affordable housing and delivers services linked with that housing. It includes a general review of the major components of both the housing development and services delivery systems.

General Structure of the Housing Development System

The three major components of the delivery system for the production of affordable housing in San Francisco are the public sector, the private sector, and the non-profit sector. Their primary roles and interrelationships are discussed below.

Key to this coordination is the ability to include multiple agencies in decision-making at the project level on affordable housing developments in the City. Coordination also exists at the level of individual project funding decisions. Members of the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development, Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH) and the OCII as successor to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (OCII) comprise the Citywide Affordable Housing Loan Committee. This committee makes funding recommendations to the Mayor for affordable housing development throughout the City or to the OCII Commission for affordable housing under its jurisdiction. MOHCD works closely with OCII, and HSH to issue requests for qualifications (RFQs) or notices of funding availability (NOFAs) on a regular basis to seek applications for particular types of developments. NOFAs are generally issued for projects to serve specific populations (family renters, single adults, seniors, people requiring supportive services, etc.), while RFQs are generally issued for specific development sites. Staff develops funding and general policy recommendations to the Loan Committee.

The Roles of Local Government Entities in Affordable Housing Production

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

The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development is the City's primary affordable housing agency, operating out of the Mayor's Office. The responsibilities of MOHCD include:

- Administration of Community Development Block Grant activities with respect to housing. The staff of MOHCD administers the CDBG-funded site acquisition and rehabilitation loan programs; the monitoring of housing development and housing counseling subgrantees; and monitoring of ongoing compliance of developments funded with CDBG funds.
- Administration of the HOME Investment Partnerships Program including monitoring of ongoing compliance of developments funded with HOME funds.
- Successor Housing Agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency - With the passage of State Assembly Bill AB x1 26 in 2011, the Redevelopment Agency was dissolved as of February 1,

2012. The City and County of San Francisco created OCII to be the successor agency of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency for the major development areas of Mission Bay, Transbay, and Hunters Point Shipyard, and named the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development to be the successor housing agency. As the successor housing agency, MOHCD has jurisdiction over all of the former Redevelopment Agency's housing assets in existence as of February 1, 2012. The major development areas of Mission Bay, Transbay and Hunters Point Shipyard continue to have affordable housing production requirements under their development agreements that were approved by the California Department of Finance as enforceable obligations of OCII. After those developments are completed they will be transferred to MOHCD as the successor housing agency and then MOHCD will monitor compliance of those housing assets for the term of their affordability restrictions.

- Administration of the Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS (HOPWA) program for the San Francisco, Marin, and San Mateo counties. Marin County is now no longer part of this shared program and receives funding separately.
- Administration of City-funded housing finance programs including Affordable Housing Fund consisting of fees generated by the Inclusionary Housing and Jobs-Housing Linkage programs; the Housing Trust Fund that was created with the voter-approved Proposition C in November 2012, and general obligation bonds for affordable housing passed by voters in 2015 and 2016. In certain cases, where another City department receives funds that are related to an affordable housing development, MOHCD may make funding recommendations to those department heads, and administers the funds if are approved.
- Administration of housing revenue bond financed programs including single-family and multifamily projects and of the mortgage credit certificate program.
- Providing technical assistance to sub-grantees and other housing developers in coordinating their applications for other sources of assistance such as state housing funds, low-income housing tax credits, HUD's Section 202, 811, 221(d)(4), and other programs.
- Monitoring of projects funded by City and mortgage revenue bond monies for ongoing compliance with legal and regulatory agreement requirements, including the resale of single-family units developed with bond funds or converted under the City's Condominium Conversion Ordinance.
- Advising and representing the Mayor with respect to housing policy issues including planning issues, code compliance and similar issues, and coordinating the efforts of other City departments in housing program initiatives.
- In coordination with the Planning Department, administering the inclusionary zoning requirements on projects approved for conditional use, and developing recommendations for ensuring the long-term affordability of those units.
- Establishing standards for affirmative marketing programs for all city assisted projects, including inclusionary housing units.

San Francisco Housing Authority

SFHA's express mission is to "provide safe, sanitary, affordable, and decent housing to very low-income families, senior citizens and persons with disabilities." Founded in 1938, it was the first established housing authority in California, and receives nearly all of its \$65+ million operating income from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and tenant-paid rents. SFHA is overseen by seven citizen commissioners, all of whom are appointed by the Mayor. Two of those commissioners must be current SFHA residents. Starting in 2020, the Mayor will appoint four members directly, and three members recommended by motion at the sole discretion of the Board of Supervisors. Of the

Mayor's four appointments, at least one must be a Housing Authority resident. Of the Board's three appointment recommendations, at least one must be a Housing Authority resident 62 years of age or older. The Commission is responsible for the policies and procedures of the Authority, as well as for the selection of the Authority's Executive Director.

SFHA administers both public housing and the HCV program. In 2019, there were 1,911 public housing units and 12,165 HCV vouchers (both tenant and project based) under SFHA management. The average annual household income for SFHA clients is \$14,590. Without public housing and HCV vouchers, virtually all SFHA clients would be forced to live outside the City or even face homelessness. The Authority derives a portion of its revenues from rents (residents pay 30% of their income for rent), but its budget and activity are substantially dependent on federal policy and programs.

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

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

Office of Economic and Workforce Development

The Office of Economic and Workforce Development administers programs to enhance the business climate and assist San Franciscans, business owners and job seekers. It also oversees the City's workforce development programs and is working with MOHCD on Section 3 hiring in MOHCD housing and capital projects.

Planning Commission and Planning Department

The Planning Commission plays a central role in the development of housing policy through the Housing Element of the General Plan. The Planning Department provides yearly data and analysis of housing trends, which other agencies and the public rely on to help guide the development of housing programs. Since the mid-1970s, it has developed several types of zoning controls and area plans which attempt to directly or indirectly encourage the retention of existing affordable housing or the production of new affordable housing. Among the mechanisms implemented by Planning Department are Affordable Housing Special Use Districts, density bonuses for affordable housing, floor area ratio and height exceptions for affordable housing in certain plan areas, jobs-housing linkage requirements, inclusionary zoning requirements, restrictions on condominium conversions, and restrictions on the conversion of residential units to commercial or hotel uses.

Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing

HSH is the lead entity for the San Francisco Homeless Response System and the lead for the San Francisco HMIS, CoC. Through the provision of coordinated, compassionate, and high-quality services, the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing strives to make homelessness in San Francisco

rare, brief, and one time. The Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH) launched on July 1, 2016. The department combines key homeless serving programs and contracts from DPH, HSA, MOHCD and the DCYF. This consolidated department has a singular focus on preventing and ending homelessness for people in San Francisco.

Human Service Agency

San Francisco HSA is San Francisco's home for help with food, health insurance, supportive care, financial assistance, childcare, and more. The HSA provides specialty programs for veterans, families, and people with HIV/AIDS and serves as a thought leader on poverty and solutions.

Department of Public Health

DPH administers public health programs through San Francisco General and Laguna Honda Hospitals, five district health centers, and mental health centers throughout the City. Community Mental Health Services (CMHS), a division of DPH, operates a number of programs for specific groups, including seniors, women and children, and persons with drug and alcohol dependency. These services can be linked with affordable housing developments assisted by other City departments. MOHCD's Lead Hazard reduction staff works closely with DPH. The Lead Hazard Reduction staff also works very closely with DPH personnel.

Human Rights Commission

The City's Human Rights Commission supports and monitors Fair Housing Access laws and reports to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors with findings and policy recommendations on issues of accessibility and discriminatory barriers. The Commission protects persons from housing discrimination on the basis of medical disability, sexual orientation, family status, race, religion, or national origin. It also assists in resolving problems with SRO hotel management and advocates for the protection of disenfranchised groups. The Commission monitors fair housing practices at housing projects that receive public assistance and strives to correct policies and practices that could result in discriminatory practices.

Rent Stabilization Board

The Rent Stabilization Board administers the City's rent control ordinance and hears arbitration appeals regarding rent disputes. The Board consists of five members appointed by the Mayor: two landlords, two tenants and one person who is neither. The Rent Board also monitors owner move-in evictions and Ellis Act evictions and advises the Mayor on rent control and eviction policies.

Mayor's Office on Disability

The Mayor's Office on Disability (MOD) is the City's principal agency for ensuring access to City programs and facilities for people with disabilities. With respect to affordable housing development, MOD works closely with the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development to review its programs and projects and ensure that these projects provide not only the accessibility required by federal, state and local law, but also the greatest accessibility feasible. MOD also provides building permit plan check review and construction period inspections for all affordable housing funded by MOHCD or OCII.

Department of Aging and Adult Services

DAAS is a division of the HSA and coordinates programs addressing the needs of seniors. DAAS has established a network of Senior Central centers throughout the City, which disseminate information about programs and services for seniors.

Department of Children, Youth and Their Families

DCYF coordinates programs addressing the needs of children and youth, including disconnected TAY. DCYF has established a network Beacon Centers throughout the City which partner with local schools, transforming them into safe spaces where children, youth, parents and community members can engage in positive, educational, enriching and healthy activities during extended hours, youth in the community will benefit.

Department of Building Inspection

The Department of Building Inspection (DBI) is responsible for the permitting and inspection of new construction and alterations, the maintenance of building records, and the enforcement of residential energy conservation standards. DBI conducts plan checking and performs building, electrical, housing, and plumbing inspections.

The Roles of Non-Profit Entities in Affordable Housing Production

For more than two decades, nonprofit organizations have been an essential element in the City's strategy for affordable housing production. Their roles include:

Affordable Housing Production

The City's CDBG program provides administrative funding to a number of nonprofit corporations to acquire and rehabilitate existing buildings and to acquire sites for development of new housing for low-income households. Both sub-grantee and other nonprofit corporations have also received loans or grants from the CDBG site acquisition and rehabilitation loan pools for these activities. A number of these nonprofits qualify as Community Housing Development Organizations under the HOME program.

Housing Counseling Services

Numerous nonprofit organizations receive CDBG funds to provide housing counseling services to low-income households and to other non-profits. The housing counseling agencies receive housing discrimination complaints from the public and counsel individuals on their rights and remedies under state and federal laws, and work to prevent illegal lockouts, evictions and hotel conversions. In 2018 the City approved a ballot measure mandating that the City provide full-scope legal representation to all individuals who received an unlawful detainer notice. This has resulted in expanded resources given to legal service organizations providing full-scope eviction defense, and has significantly increased the number of households who are able to remain in their housing following the receipt of an unlawful detainer notice.

These housing counseling agencies also provide homeownership counseling to potential low-and moderate-income homebuyers, as well as assistance in applying for affordable rental housing.

Housing Services Providers

The trend toward linking affordable housing development with on-site supportive services has led to increased collaboration between housing developers, service providers and the City. Supportive service agencies such as Conard House and Episcopal Community Services have become essential partners in the development of affordable housing, including serving as co-owner with an experience affordable housing developer so that the service agency becomes the long-term owner of the property over time and build its housing asset portfolio.

Community Lending

Four nonprofit lenders and intermediaries based in San Francisco, the Low Income Investment Fund, Local Initiatives Support Corporation, and Community Vision (formerly Northern California Community Loan Fund), and the San Francisco Accelerator Fund play an important role in lending to affordable housing developers, particularly during the acquisition and predevelopment stages of a project.

The Roles of Private Sector Entities in Affordable Housing Production

Lenders

Financial institutions participate in the affordable housing development process on many different levels. Thrift institutions have established the Savings Associations Mortgage Company (SAMCO) and commercial banks have established the California Community Reinvestment Corporation (CCRC) to provide long-term, fixed interest rate permanent financing for affordable housing. Each group understands the needs of non-profit developers, and would benefit from increased capitalization and more members. Some commercial banks are very active as construction lenders for affordable housing projects and engage in bridge loan lending on tax credit transactions.

Legal Services

A number of local corporate law firms provide legal services for non-profit housing developers. Some of these services are provided at market rate; others are pro bono, representing a significant contribution to reduced project costs.

For-Profit Developers

The very high cost of development in San Francisco has been a challenge for for-profit developers in affordable housing in recent years. Due to the large subsidies needed to build or rehabilitate affordable housing, the City has required most developers to agree to long-term affordability as a condition of receiving financing.

In specific niche areas, for-profit developers play a very important role. The City's inclusionary requirements for new construction of market rate housing ensure that most new market rate rental/condominium developers are participating actively in developing affordable housing through providing below market rate units within their market rate project, providing units on a different site, payment of a fee in-lieu of providing below market rate units on-site or off-site, or in certain neighborhoods in San Francisco acquiring land and transferring ownership of it to the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development for the development of affordable housing.

Rental Property Owners

Most owners of residential rental properties have little experience in providing affordable housing. Certain groups of property owners, however, continue to play a role in maintaining the affordable housing stock. For-profit owners of HUD-assisted properties continue to make up a significant portion of the operators of this housing. To the extent that those owners do not seek to prepay mortgages and terminate Section 8 contracts, they will continue to provide (though not produce) affordable housing. Similarly, operators of board and care facilities provide a significant source of affordable housing.

Tax Credit Investor

As limited partners in affordable housing developments sponsored by non-profit corporations, private investors provide one of the most important sources of equity for affordable housing. Continuation of the tax credit program at the federal and state levels provides an incentive for their participation.

Architects, Engineers and Construction Contractors

The majority of these stakeholders in affordable housing development come from the private sector. In periods when market-rate development is strong, nonprofit developers experience increased costs due to the competitive demand for these services.

Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS (HOPWA) Delivery System

This section describes the institutional structure through which MOHCD administers the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) Program. Primary partners are the private, non-profit and public sectors which help to create capital projects, provide supportive services, rental assistance, and technical assistance. This section outlines the role of these primary partners and related issues.

Private Sector

Because federal regulations mandate that tenants in HOPWA assisted units be charged no more than 30% of their gross annual income, the rents at newly developed units are generally affordable for tenants. As a result, the income collected from these units is usually insufficient to leverage private conventional debt. In an attempt to mitigate this effect, and at the request of the HIV/AIDS community, San Francisco has focused its provision of newly developed HOPWA units in larger mixed-population affordable housing developments. By doing so, HOPWA units can take advantage of a development's overall income potential to secure conventional loans and benefit from private equity provided through the federal Low Income Housing Tax Credit Program.

The San Francisco HOPWA program's primary interface with the public sector occurs through its site tenant-based rental assistance programs. Clients of the rental assistance programs use certificates to locate and secure units, which exist on the private rental market. San Francisco continues to strategize ways to increase participation from the private sector in providing housing to persons with HIV/AIDS and to ensure that the clients can be competitive in the City's tight rental market. An example of these efforts is fostering good landlord-tenant relationships through the provision of supportive services and intervention.

Non-profit Organizations

MOHCD enters into legal agreements with non-profit housing developers, supportive service providers, and other housing related agencies to disburse HOPWA funds. New HOPWA projects are either solicited or unsolicited and proposed by non-profit housing developers or other community organizations. Typically, when HOPWA funds are available for new projects, MOHCD issues a Request for Proposals (RFP), which is widely advertised to local community organizations, including grassroots and faith-based organizations.

HIV housing program providers are typically community based and frequently collaborate with non-HIV service providers. Many of these providers receive City funding other than HOPWA funds to provide comprehensive health care, substance abuse and mental health treatment, case management, money management, nursing and attendant care, and food service to people living with HIV.

Public Sector

MOHCD participates in a monthly Pipeline meeting with other City staff that are collaboratively involved to address funding needs of all new and existing affordable housing projects, including those funded by HOPWA. MOHCD's primary partners in implementing the HOPWA program are DPH, which administers the Ryan White Comprehensive AIDS Resource Emergency (CARE) funds and HSH, which administers McKinney funds.

In the beginning of the HOPWA program (1995), SFRA and DPH's HIV Health Services Branch collaborated on a 5 Year HIV/AIDS Housing Plan to set future funding directions for HIV housing. The plan was updated in 1998 and outlined needs which resulted in SFRA and DPH co-funding many HOPWA projects, frequently prioritizing HOPWA monies for capital and CARE monies for service funds (since CARE cannot be used for capital). Both HOPWA and CARE have funded rental assistance, initially co-funding several subsidy programs, and in more recent years, funding separate programs. In 2006, the City's Board of Supervisors established the HIV/AIDS Housing Work Group (with 24 members from various City agencies, SFRA, and community stakeholders) mandating that the group develop a Comprehensive HIV/AIDS Housing Plan for the City. This plan was published in May 2007 and identifies deficiencies in the current system and addresses them by developing specific, concrete goals and recommendations to address unmet housing needs among persons living with HIV/AIDS (including those at risk of homelessness). In 2014, MOHCD partnered again with DPH, HSA, and community-based HIV service organizations to create another 5-Year AIDS Housing Plan, which was issued in December, 2014. In 2018, MOHCD again partnered with City agencies and community organizations to create its next five-year plan, which will be issued in the summer/fall of 2020.

HOPWA staff and DPH have taken additional housing advisory direction from the HIV Health Services' Planning Council. Many funding decisions that result from the Planning Council's recommendations have been handled between HOPWA staff and DPH; these include: HOPWA funds predominately funding the creation and maintenance of five licensed Residential Care Facilities for the Chronically Ill (RCFCIs); co-funding rental assistance programs; and DPH taking the lead on master leasing Single Room Occupancy hotels. MOHCD is currently engaged a consultant to draft a white paper to examine the current status of these RCFCIs to ensure their sustainability and determine their best use based on the evolving nature of the HIV epidemic.

Other Institutional Partners

In addition to the partners listed above, other key partners collaborate to achieve the City's housing and community development goals.

Mayor

The Mayor is the elected chief executive officer of the City. The Mayor, through her various offices, carries out delivery of services and coordinates the activities of other City departments. The Mayor's Office prepares the City's annual proposed budget and makes recommendations to the Board of Supervisors for allocation of General Fund and other monies to be used for housing, homeless programs and community development. The Mayor may also sponsor legislation setting policies and establishing programs in those areas. The Mayor appoints members of commissions that oversee many of the departments involved in service delivery, including the OCII, the Planning Commission, the Health Commission, the Human Services Commission, the Board of Commissioners of the Housing Authority, the Human Rights Commission, and the Citizen's Committee on Community Development.

Board of Supervisors

The Board of Supervisors is the elected governing body of the City and County of San Francisco. It establishes, by ordinance and resolution, the policies that affect the delivery of affordable housing, homeless services and community development services in San Francisco. The Board also approves the lease or disposition of publicly owned land as sites for affordable housing development or community development facilities. The Board reviews and approves the zoning and conditional use actions of the

Planning Commission. Actions of the Board are required to be approved by the Mayor, whose veto can be overridden by a vote of eight supervisors.

Assess of Strengths and Gaps in the Institutional Delivery System

Overall, the City has well-established relationships within each institutional sector. These relationships provide a strong foundation for information and resource sharing, leveraging, collaborative planning and implementation. Our affordable housing development and homeless systems are interwoven, with close communication between departments allowing for strategic decision-making. We continue to explore all opportunities for partnership and collaboration. The City also strives for transparency between government and the community, inviting community stakeholders to participate in working groups, task forces, and citizen advisory committees.

In the area of workforce development, the City’s strength is its successful sector strategy, a workforce development strategy that aligns the city’s workforce programs around the needs of local and regional industry growth sectors, and through its “access points” strategy, creates training and employment pathways for disadvantaged San Franciscans.

San Francisco will expand the availability of and participation in “Earn and Learn” models such as apprenticeships, OJT, and other customized training where workers can build skills while working. Both research and practice strongly argue that deepening the deliberate connectivity of work and learning will increase the success both of learners of all ages and employers.

Availability of services targeted to homeless persons and persons with HIV and mainstream services

Table 78 – Homeless Prevention Services Summary

Homelessness Prevention Services	Available in the Community	Targeted to Homeless	Targeted to People with HIV
Homelessness Prevention Services			
Counseling/Advocacy	X	X	X
Legal Assistance	X	X	X
Mortgage Assistance	X		
Rental Assistance	X	X	X
Utilities Assistance	X	X	
Street Outreach Services			
Law Enforcement	X	X	
Mobile Clinics	X	X	X
Other Street Outreach Services	X	X	X
Supportive Services			
Alcohol & Drug Abuse	X	X	X
Childcare	X	X	
Education	X	X	

Employment and Employment Training	X	X	X
Healthcare	X	X	X
HIV/AIDS	X	X	X
Life Skills	X	X	X
Mental Health Counseling	X	X	X
Transportation	X	X	
Other			
Other			

Describe how the service delivery system including, but not limited to, the services listed above meet the needs of homeless persons (particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth)

Overview of the HIV/AIDS Local System of Care

The San Francisco EMA has a long and distinguished history of responding to the HIV crisis with a comprehensive continuum of service programs that are impactful, innovative, competent, and cost effective. During the first decade of the AIDS epidemic, when San Francisco was one of the hardest-hit cities by the AIDS crisis, the region developed a comprehensive network of services that utilized case management to link individuals to medical and supportive services. This system became known as the “San Francisco Model of Care” and had a lasting impact on the organization of HIV services in the US. Over the past decade and a half, the EMA has continued to evolve and grow to respond to changes in the epidemic and its affected populations, while incorporating new treatment developments. In the mid- 1990s, as the epidemic had an increasing effect on disenfranchised individuals, San Francisco developed the Integrated Services Program, a multidisciplinary model of HIV care in which services were merged, coordinated, and linked to stabilize and retain hard to- reach and severely affected individuals. This approach culminated in a significant intensification of the integrated services model in the form of the EMA’s seven Centers of Excellence –“one stop shop” programs similar to medical homes with wraparound services which work toward the goal of stabilizing the lives of multiply diagnosed and severe need populations through neighborhood-based, multi-service centers tailored to the needs of specific cultural, linguistic, and behavioral groups.

Throughout the San Francisco EMA, the emphasis on high-quality, client-centered, and culturally competent primary medical care services remains at the heart of the local care continuum, with medical case management offering individualized assessment, coordination, and linkage to a full range of social and supportive services.

Gaps in HIV/AIDS Systems of Care

In terms of youth, the San Francisco EMA service system has for many years been actively engaged in efforts to expand mobile and alternative approaches to HIV testing, and in systems such as the new LINCS Program that immediately link to care individuals who test positive in both public and private settings. The EMA has developed cooperative education and outreach programs in collaboration with regional prevention providers - programs that have consistently expanded the proportion of young people who enter the care system annually. At the same time, innovative approaches such as the Centers of Excellence model are specifically designed to expand awareness of and access to HIV services

among young people within ethnic minority communities in San Francisco County, and to overcome barriers to care resulting from distrust of the medical system, fear of disclosure of HIV status, and fear of not receiving culturally appropriate services.

Overcoming Gaps in HIV/AIDS Systems of Care

The San Francisco EMA as a whole is continually seeking new approaches to fill identified gaps in care, particularly in regard to the growing number of multiply diagnosed and highly marginalized individuals who are infected with HIV in our region. This need is addressed both directly and indirectly throughout all facets of City's 2012-2014 Comprehensive HIV Health Services Plan. The City seeks to ensure a client-centered, coordinated, culturally competent continuum of essential services for all Ryan White-eligible persons with HIV, with a special focus emerging populations, persons experiencing health disparities, and persons with severe needs. This includes ensuring equity in service access and ensuring that all low-income persons with HIV in the region are able to access high-quality, culturally and linguistically competent care. Care gaps will also be addressed by increasing the number of HIV-infected individuals who are aware of their serostatus and are effectively engaged in care on a long-term basis. Care gaps will also be filled by enhancing and expanding inter-agency collaboration and service partnerships, including partnerships that expand the availability of multi-service, HIV specialist medical homes in the EMA. Finally, the City will be focusing specifically on the impacts of healthcare reform, and the need for pro-active research and service planning to ensure that no individual is lost to care in the transition to expanded Medicaid coverage and in the face of the healthcare system's increasing emphasis on client-level outcomes and population-based panel management approaches.

Overview of Homeless Framework for Care

According to the 2017 PIT Count, 1,363 unaccompanied and transitional-age youth (TAY) comprised 18% of the total homeless population in San Francisco, and 20% of homeless adults.¹ This is a 28% decline from the 2013 count, but still indicates that nearly one in five adults experiencing homelessness in San Francisco are under 25.

Because young people experience homelessness in ways that differ from adults and often do not access services designed for adults, accurate enumeration of youth is especially challenging. Since 2013, San Francisco has conducted a supplemental youth count to ensure full representation of youth.

The transitional-age (18-24) population is diverse and faces many and varied challenges. LGBTQ+ youth represent nearly half (49%) of the population of homeless youth in San Francisco. Black (26%) and Multi-Racial (35%) youth are significantly over-represented in the population of homeless youth compared to the estimated population of all people between the ages of 15 and 24 (7.4% and 6.5% respectively).³ Youth that identify as belonging to minority racial groups and as LGBTQ+ make up a significant portion of the San Francisco youth population experiencing homelessness, and these young people face increased economic, housing, and social and structural barriers.⁴

More than half of youth experiencing homelessness (56%) say they became homeless while living in San Francisco. This is somewhat lower than 69% for the overall homeless population. Some youth arrive after becoming homeless, seeking a place to live safely, and others are mobile, coming into and leaving the City frequently. About 27% have been in foster care.⁵ While their circumstances vary, these youth share a transitional stage of life—their needs often differ from those of families and adults that experience homelessness and require different responses.

San Francisco's youth providers and HSH work closely together and offer a range of approaches that includes drop-in centers, Street Outreach, Temporary Shelter (both emergency shelter and transitional housing), Rapid Rehousing and Permanent Supportive Housing specifically targeted to the needs of youth. Most of the youth system's resources, however, have traditionally been focused on transitional programs. While this is aligned with the life stage and needs of some youth, it leaves gaps for youth with higher needs and those with less severe needs. Because transitional programs are often long and intensive, a more limited number of youth can be served.

The current set of youth resources has not had a comprehensive, coordinated method for access, and youth report that they often have to go many places to seek help or cannot get the help they need.⁶ A portion of the adult system also serves TAY, though that percent is estimated at significantly less than 10% of the available shelter and housing resources, despite the estimated size of the youth population.

In 2017, San Francisco was awarded a two-year demonstration grant from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), known as the Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program (YHDP), to plan for a systemic approach to meet the needs of homeless youth. This grant provided resources to analyze the current system, identify gaps, and develop a detailed plan with articulated vision and goals. Providers, advocates, and a wide range of youth participated in framing the challenges and shaping the plan, leading to a shared vision for a future state:

With shared responsibility in San Francisco, our vision is a city where no youth experience homelessness. To that end we will prevent and end youth homelessness using a coordinated community response that offers low-barrier, flexible housing models and uniquely tailored services ensuring that homelessness is rare, brief, and one-time, while empowering youth to define and achieve their own self-sufficiency through immediate and equal access to the continuum of resources, support, and care.⁷

The YHDP process catalyzed significant movement on youth homelessness, including creating the Youth Policy and Advisory Council (YPAC) of youth 24 and under, bringing new funding and capacity to providers serving youth experiencing homelessness and forming a Youth Homelessness Oversight and Action Council (YHOAC) consisting of providers, public funders, and youth. (See side bars on the Coordinated Community Plan and YPAC.)

It also laid the groundwork for the development of Coordinated Entry for Youth, a system change to ensure that youth are able to access resources in a clear and consistent way through youth-oriented Access Points. All youth will be offered Problem Solving services to attempt immediate resolution of a housing crisis, and those who are assessed as highest need will be prioritized for quick enrollment in youth-targeted housing resources.

Accelerated progress toward this goal is already being made. Between FY17-18 and FY18-19 resources for addressing youth homelessness have more than doubled. Rising Up, a new public private partnership, launched in October 2018, will raise \$30 million from combined federal, state, local, and private sources to fund at least 500 rapid rehousing slots linked to jobs/vocational training and education, and problem solving for 450 youth (see Rising Up sidebar). The Federal YHDP grant will also fund additional capacity, including contributing to the Rising Up expansion of Rapid Rehousing, creating 10 new units of Permanent Supportive Housing (in addition to 40 already in the pipeline) and supporting the creation of 10-15 Host Homes. Host Homes will provide a new housing intervention in San Francisco, utilizing existing housing stock and community activation to house more of our City's youth. This pilot provides a non-institutional, community-based housing option for LGBTQ+ youth and youth of color and

will increase the limited supply of housing for pregnant and parenting youth. HSH is planning to open a TAY Navigation center which will provide safety, stability, and an entry point into permanent housing for youth living outside.

In addition to expanding capacity, changes and improvements in the system include launching Coordinated Entry for youth and implementing youth-specific data collection in the ONE System to strengthen the ability to coordinate care and track outcomes. Strengthening the system will include continuing work on equity and intersectionality throughout the system, working with other City departments to effectively and creatively use existing resources, and centering the voices of the youth experiencing homelessness. Youth will have access to a range of services that are critical to ending their homelessness, including family reunification and permanent connections, education, employment, and behavioral health services.

To make the system more responsive with all resources, HSH will work to lower access barriers and build in greater flexibility in TAY program models, allowing youth to move across housing programs as their needs change. In addition, as high-priority youth 18 and over are also eligible for housing from the adult system, HSH and its partners will work to analyze barriers to youth access or stabilization in this portfolio by improving integration and responsiveness between the youth, family, and adult systems. The City's Moving On Initiative (MOI) will provide youth in permanent supportive housing with opportunities to transition to more independent housing situations with continuing subsidy support.

NEXT STEPS

Key next steps include:

1. Continue to collaborate with youth in all decision-making and in oversight of the system as it develops.
2. Complete the launch of Rising Up, including raising \$30 million in combined public and private resources; with \$10 million in public and millions of dollars in private funding committed as of the writing of this report. The resources will rehouse at least 500 youth with Rapid Rehousing and job/vocational training and education, and provide Problem Solving to at least 450 youth over the next three years.
3. Complete planning and launch Coordinated Entry for youth to identify, assess, and prioritize the needs of youth experiencing homelessness, including establishing youth-focused access points, by Spring of 2019.
4. Implement problem-solving strategies, including family reunification, to prevent at-risk and homeless youth from needing to enter the Homelessness Response System through immediate resolution of their housing crisis whenever possible.
5. Finalize the selection of a site and open a youth-targeted Navigation Center, offering 50 - 75 additional beds for prioritized unsheltered youth, by end of 2019.
6. Ensure all housing and service options are low-barrier, coordinated, equally accessible and have a Housing First orientation with high-quality, client-centered services.
7. Create movement through the system, including the ability to support youth transitioning out of time-limited programs into long-term independent housing.

8. Set goals for equity and inclusion that address intersections of identity and center the voices of youth experiencing disproportionate barriers by developing interventions to assist them in accessing responsive services.
9. Strengthen collaboration with the HSA and Adult and Juvenile Probation Departments to work towards the goal of preventing homelessness for all youth as they exit foster care and justice systems. Additionally, work with the DPH and DCYF to fully integrate education, employment, and behavioral health services more seamlessly with programs serving youth experiencing homelessness.
10. Based on an analysis of current barriers, work to better integrate the Adult and Youth systems, and ensure that age-appropriate services and program models are offered as needed in Adult-targeted programs to ensure TAY are welcomed and well-served.
11. With full implementation of the ONE System, improve youth-specific data collection and ability to analyze outcomes for all programs and communities, including improved analysis for evidence of racial disparities in access, services, or results, and especially any impact of the intersectionality of race, sexual orientation, and gender identity on outcomes for youth.

REDUCE HOMELESSNESS AMONG YOUTH BY 50% BY 2023

Modeling developed by HSH indicates that homelessness among youth can be reduced by half by the beginning of 2023. This will require the implementation of critical system changes, such as coordinated entry, greater flexibility across programs, and the addition of significant new resources for Rapid Rehousing, Problem Solving, and other housing models. HSH has adopted this as its Strategic Framework goal for youth.

This strategic planning framework builds from the success, lessons learned, and guidance of *Toward Ending Homelessness In San Francisco*¹⁴³, the Five-Year Strategic Plan of the San Francisco Local Homeless Coordinating Board, 2008-2013 and *The San Francisco Plan To Abolish Chronic Homelessness, 2004–2014*.¹⁴⁴

In 2008, the San Francisco LHCb began implementing a five-year strategic plan, *Toward Ending Homelessness in San Francisco*. The purpose of the 2008 strategic plan was to provide one unified citywide plan to prevent and eradicate homelessness. That plan, adapted from a number of preexisting strategic plans, including *The San Francisco Plan To Abolish Chronic Homelessness, 2004-2014*, provided San Francisco with a roadmap to assist people who are homeless and those at risk for homelessness in our community, with the goal of ending homelessness.

The LHCb is the lead entity for the San Francisco CoC. The LHCb works to ensure a unified homeless strategy that is supported by the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, City departments, nonprofit agencies, people who are homeless or formerly homeless and the community at large. All efforts are aimed at permanent solutions, and the range of services is designed to meet the unique and complex needs of individuals who are threatened with or currently experiencing homelessness.

A CoC is a group organized locally to carry out homeless planning and evaluation activities that is composed of a wide range of community stakeholders (e.g. homeless-service providers, faith-based organizations, school representatives, etc.) The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and other Federal agencies use the CoC structure to distribute funds.

¹⁴³ San Francisco Local Homeless Coordinating Board, *Toward Ending Homelessness in San Francisco, 2008-2013*

¹⁴⁴ San Francisco Ten Year Planning Council, *The San Francisco Plan to Abolish Chronic Homelessness, 2004-2014*

In 2013, the Strategic Planning Committee of the LHCB convened to update and review its strategic plan to incorporate best practices, lessons learned, and new research into the community's plan to end homelessness. A focus of the Committee has been identifying measurable performance outcomes that will demonstrate that San Francisco is successfully responding to homelessness locally. With the assistance of key stakeholders and community members, the LHCB will use this plan to guide, monitor, and follow efforts towards ending homelessness in San Francisco.

The Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness, *Opening Doors*¹⁴⁵, began implementation in 2010. The Federal Strategic Plan resulted from extensive research and review of national best practices, and will guide the allocation of Federal resources. Seeing many benefits to aligning local and Federal policy, the LHCB determined that this plan should use the structure of *Opening Doors*. In addition, the Strategic Planning Committee incorporated relevant *Opening Doors* strategies and action steps into this document, including a focus on chronically homeless persons, veterans, and families and youth.

The Plan's five high-level goals are to:

- Increase access to stable and affordable housing
- Increase economic security
- Improve health and stability
- Retool the homeless emergency response system
- Improve leadership, collaboration, and civic engagement

Goal: Increase Access to stable and affordable housing

The City of San Francisco strives to increase the supply of subsidized permanent housing so that it is affordable to people who are experiencing homelessness, accessible, and offers services to achieve housing stability. At the conclusion of five years this strategic plan will result in more homeless people accessing housing that ends their homelessness.

Indicators of Success

- Create 200 new permanent supportive housing placement to house chronically homeless individuals and families each year, while maintaining current permanent supportive housing units.
- Create access to 100 additional housing units affordable for people who are homeless each year, or who are exiting permanent supportive housing, while maintaining current affordable units.
- Improve the percentage of households successfully matched with correct housing type and level of service, from year to year, as indicated by length of stay and housing provider survey.
- Exit 75% of households from permanent supportive housing that are stabilized, interested in moving to other housing, and able to maintain housing without services, as indicated by housing provider survey.
- Reduce the number of homeless households that are barred from housing to 0.
- Ensure the number of evictions in Permanent Supportive Housing units is less than 10%.

¹⁴⁵ United States Interagency Council on Homelessness, *Opening Doors Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness*, 2010

- Reduce evictions from subsidized housing that lead to homelessness by 10%.

STRATEGY #1: Increase Supply of housing available to homeless households

KEY ACTION STEPS

- Expand the supply of permanent supportive housing, especially for chronically homeless people and other vulnerable populations. New housing should provide a range of choice, including different levels of service, geographic diversity, co-housing, and other options. Increase supply of affordable housing through new construction, expansion of master-leasing, and prioritization of housing subsidies.
- Develop innovative housing models, including especially congregate housing, to meet the needs of various homeless populations (e.g. long-term shelter stayers)
- Prioritize awards of Proposition C Funds for projects targeting homeless and those exiting from permanent supportive housing into affordable housing.
- Develop a sustainable regional network to improve new housing development and availability for homeless persons and those exiting PSH with 0–30% AMI, including participation of housing authorities from neighboring counties.
- Identify more coordinated, sustainable, dependable sources of supportive housing service funding. Improve leverage of existing funding.

STRATEGY #2: Improve access to housing and housing services for homeless households

KEY ACTION STEPS

- Implement a coordinated assessment system for all homeless housing to ensure most appropriate placement for each household and to streamline access to housing. Require that City-supported housing projects participate. Use coordinated assessment to understand systemic gaps. Ensure that the system has access to housing that adopts the least restrictive tenant eligibility criteria based upon eviction, credit, and/or criminal histories.
- Expand access to affordable housing for homeless households by including additional units in the coordinated assessment system and increasing set-asides of mainstream housing resources, such as HCVs, for homeless persons.
- Increase service-enriched housing by identifying funding and resources to support co-location of services with affordable housing.
- Build relationships with landlords and establish strategies to increase access to housing in San Francisco for homeless and at-risk households. Create renters’ academies, personal finance courses, and other resources to maximize the success of new renters.
- Acknowledge and develop strategies to address the unique needs specific sub-population groups, including veterans, youth, and LGBTQ+ populations.

STRATEGY #3: prioritize housing resources

KEY ACTION STEPS

- Use the coordinated assessment system to prioritize and target supportive housing for the households that require the associated level of support to end their homelessness.
- Evaluate all residents of city-funded supportive housing projects annually to determine housing stability and identify candidates for transition into more independent housing. Create incentives, including stipends, internships, and employment supports, to help people who have achieved stability in supportive housing to move into more independent housing in order to open units for others.

- Improve the link between eviction prevention services and placement in more intensive service environments, including guardianships and acute-level care to stabilize the most vulnerable households in permanent housing.
- Prevent homelessness by intervening to avoid evictions from permanent housing that lead to homelessness. Increase outreach and education about eviction-prevention resources, including financial assistance and tenant rights laws. Provide short-term rental support and wraparound services to address underlying issues threatening housing stability and to prevent eviction. Increase the provision of legal services for individuals and families at risk of eviction. Provide rehousing support.

Goal: Increase economic security

The City of San Francisco strives to increase the income of people who are experiencing homelessness by improving access to public benefits and employment opportunities. At the conclusion of five years this strategic plan will result in more homeless and formerly homeless people having income sufficient to maintain housing.

Indicators of Success

- Reduce the number of adults who become homeless again after being permanently housed by our CoC to less than 10%.
- Improve the percentage of homeless adults and formerly homeless adults in permanent supportive housing who are employed (including part-time, seasonal, and supported employment) to at least 20%.
- Reduce the percentage of homeless households with no income to less than 5%.
- Increase the percentage of disabled homeless adults who access SSI/SSDI, veteran benefits, or SDI to 80%.

STRATEGY #1: Increase Employment Opportunities

KEY ACTION STEPS

- Develop easily-accessed employer incentives (like JobsNOW!) to encourage employment of homeless individuals.
- Collaborate with workforce development agencies to develop additional job support services, including skills training, stipends, childcare, and aftercare to encourage job retention, including through building linkages with the Department of Rehabilitation and the Department of Aging. Also work together to assist homeless persons with barriers to employment, such as criminal backgrounds.
- Connect veterans with veteran-specific employment training and access opportunities.
- Provide disabled clients with SSI and SSDI benefits in place with systematic and clear information about employment options while receiving disability benefits.
- Provide Care Not Cash recipients with employment incentives and assist with transition from CAAP to employment.

STRATEGY #2: Increase employment-readiness in homeless populations

KEY ACTION STEPS

- Prioritize workforce development resources for those homeless individuals assessed as most likely to obtain and retain employment.
- Provide youth-specific education, training and job-placement resources, including compliance with the city’s Homeless Education Plan.

- Expand funding and support for programs that target homeless and formerly homeless people, including programs that target the most in need, and may have lower job placement numbers than programs that take all unemployed applicants.

STRATEGY #3: Expand access to mainstream income benefits

KEY ACTION STEPS

- Screen all homeless persons who access coordinated assessment or are clients of city-funded homeless programs for mainstream income benefits and provide support throughout the application process for each eligible benefit. Reevaluate benefits on an annual basis to determine if additional benefits are available.
- Invest in improving access for homeless veterans to veterans benefits.
- Increase connections to SSI and SSDI for homeless and formerly homeless housed San Franciscans.
- Improve linkages between homeless housing and CalWORKS and CAAP.
- Consider ways to streamline benefits applications or group multiple benefits in one application.

Goal: Improve Health and Stability

The City of San Francisco aims to improve the health and housing stability of people experiencing homelessness in the city by ensuring that all individuals have access to an appropriate and effective level of care. At the conclusion of five years, this strategic plan will expand access to healthcare services for homeless people, improve health and stability outcomes, and reduce the burden on mainstream emergency medical services.

Indicators of Success

- Enroll 100% of eligible homeless individuals in MediCal, Covered CA, or Healthy SF.
- Ensure that 100% of residents in homeless housing programs have a “medical home” that provides integrated care for medical and behavioral health.
- Using housing as a health care intervention, improve the health outcomes of homeless individuals suffering from chronic health conditions by reducing hospitalizations of chronically homeless individuals by 10% every two years.
- Using housing as a health care intervention, reduce the number of emergency room and community paramedic encounters by homeless individuals by 10% every two years.
- Expand non-acute medical resources by increasing the number of medical respite beds by 10%.
- Reduce the number of homeless households and the number of households in permanent supportive housing experiencing hunger by 50%.

In addition to the strategies and action steps set forth below, the implementation of *San Francisco Community Health Improvement Plan*¹⁴⁶ will support the goals of this plan and improve our success.

STRATEGY #1: Fully Integrate the Affordable Care Act

KEY ACTION STEPS

- Ensure that all homeless residents have access to healthcare services by facilitating the enrollment of all eligible homeless individuals in California’s MediCal insurance program, and

¹⁴⁶ <http://www.sfdph.org/dph/comupg/knowlcol/chip/default.asp>

ensuring that non-MediCal eligible individuals are enrolled in Covered CA or Healthy San Francisco.

- Pursue new opportunities for alternative models of care under the Affordable Care Act, including pursuing waivers, Behavioral Health Homes, Targeted Case Management Services, Medicaid Rehabilitative Services, and Home and Community Based Services.
- Increase awareness among homeless housing and service providers about changes and opportunities under the Affordable Care Act. Provide adequate support and training throughout the transition and implementation.
- Ensure every resident in homeless housing has a designated medical home to coordinate medical, behavioral-health care services, and other needed health care, like dental care, with supportive services.
- Increase availability of medical services to ensure accessibility of medical care. The implementation of the *Health Care Services Master Plan Update*¹⁴⁷ will support this plan and increase our success.

STRATEGY #2: Expand access to care at homeless programs

KEY ACTION STEPS

- Develop strategies for providing enhanced care to aging and other vulnerable homeless populations, including dementia and Alzheimer's patients, including creating resources like mobile medical teams able to provide care at housing sites without permanent medical facilities.
- Develop procedures for residents of homeless housing or shelter who are vulnerable (e.g. elders, people who are seriously mentally ill, etc.) and unable to maintain that housing or shelter to "step up" to a higher level of care, including through the coordinated assessment system.
- Foster and expand partnerships between housing providers and health and behavioral health care providers in order to co-locate and/or coordinate health, behavioral health, safety and wellness services with housing.

STRATEGY #3: Improve access to healthy, nutritious food

KEY ACTION STEPS

- Increase use of CalFresh benefits by increasing enrollment and increasing the number of retailers that accept EBT and Restaurant Meal Vendors.
- Increase meals to school-aged children through school meal programs (including breakfast, after the bell, lunch, after school, and summer).
- Fund nonprofit meal/grocery programs to scale (including congregate meals for seniors/adults with disabilities, dining room, pantry, home-delivered meal and home-delivered grocery programs).
- Increase the number of housing units with kitchens.
- Create "Eat-SF" a local subsidy to supplement CalFresh, beginning with SSI recipients who are ineligible for CalFresh.

The implementation of the detailed recommendations in the *San Francisco Food Security Task Force, Assessment of Food Security in San Francisco*¹⁴⁸ will support the goals of this plan and improve our success.

¹⁴⁷ <http://www.sfdph.org/dph/comupg/knowlcol/HCSMP/>

¹⁴⁸ <http://www.sfdph.org/dph/files/mtgsGrps/FoodSecTaskFrc/docs/FSTF-AssessmentOfFoodSecurityInSF-2013.pdf>

Goal: Retool the Homeless Emergency Response System

The City of San Francisco strives to retool the city's homeless emergency response in order to reduce the number of households that experience homelessness, especially unsheltered homelessness.

Indicators of Success

- Reduce the unsheltered homeless population of San Francisco by 30% by January 2022
- Divert 5% of shelter seekers to stable housing.
- Transition 50% of long-term shelter residents (defined as over three 90-day stays) to permanent housing units annually
- Serve an additional 500 adults through rapid rehousing.
- Increase percentage of people served by the coordinated assessment system that are successfully connected with prevention, rapid rehousing, or diversion resources, versus other resources, year to year.
- Reduce the number of people accessing shelter or homeless housing that come directly from the criminal justice system, foster care, and health care institutions by 75%.

Priority #1: Prevent households from experiencing homelessness

KEY ACTION STEPS

- Create and expand rapid rehousing and diversion programs for single adults and families, and make them available where people access the homeless system, including in shelters, coordinated assessment points, and Resource Centers. Improve program performance by implementing *San Francisco Homelessness Prevention and Rental Assistance Programs Workgroup Summary Report*¹⁴⁹ recommendations.

Priority #2: Improve discharge planning processes

KEY ACTION STEPS

- Prevent homelessness by supporting the transition from incarceration, foster care, and hospitals into permanent housing that is not provided by the homeless system of care.
- Build partnerships across systems to support discharge planning.
- Build additional policies to support creating housing plans and discharge planning to promote housing. Ensure medically-vulnerable individuals are never discharged to the streets or to the homeless system of care.
- Increase the options for appropriate housing units for recently discharged people.

Priority #3: Provide and improve interim housing and shelter

Open 1,000 shelter beds in the 2016–2023 period.

KEY ACTION STEPS

- Provide additional services in shelters that lead to accessing and maintaining permanent housing, including increasing housing placement and case management staff.

¹⁴⁹ <http://www.sfgov3.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=3501>

Priority #4: Expand access and coordination of emergency Response system

KEY ACTION STEPS

- Increase coordination and streamline efforts of city agencies and committees working to end homelessness.
- Increase street outreach.
- Provide broader outreach and access to services in the Southeast and other underserved neighborhoods. Increase housing and services in those neighborhoods.
- Build regional collaboration to better serve homeless people moving among Bay Area counties.
- Use the coordinated assessment system (referred to in the goal about increasing access to stable and affordable housing) to understand community need. Work to build linkages between coordinated assessment and other systems of care to improve assessment and access to resources.

Goal: Improve Leadership, collaboration, and Civic Engagement

- The key to ending homelessness in San Francisco is harnessing the will and the resources of all stakeholders towards one goal. Ending homelessness requires collaborative leadership at all levels of government and across all sectors.
- The City of San Francisco is committed to improving collaboration and increasing knowledge and implementation of successful interventions to prevent and end homelessness.
- At the conclusion of five years, this strategic plan will reduce homelessness in this community by:
 - Expanding and deepening collaboration between government agencies and private partners
 - Broadening capacity of these organizations to prevent and end homelessness; and
 - Increasing awareness of homelessness, related issues, and best practices.

Indicators of Success

- Reduce the number of people who are homeless by 10%, including reducing the number of chronically homeless persons by 30%, the number of veterans who are homeless by 30%, the number of homeless families by 20%, the number of homeless youth by 20%, and the number of homeless LGBTQ+ persons by 10%, annually.¹⁵⁰
- Reduce the average length of time people are homeless in San Francisco by 10%, year to year.
- Improve the data quality in San Francisco's HMIS by reducing the number of required missing or null values to less than 6%.

¹⁵⁰ Translated to real numbers, using the 2013 Point in Time Count, each year reduce:

- Number of homeless people by 735
- Number of chronically homeless people by 593
- Number of veterans by 215
- Number of individuals in homeless families by 136
- Number of homeless youth by 183
- Number of homeless LGBT by 213

These numbers may include people in more than one category, for example, an LGBT youth is reflected in both the youth count and the LGBT count.

- Improve the data quality in San Francisco’s HMIS by increasing the bed coverage rate of all shelters, transitional housing, and permanent supportive housing programs in San Francisco to 95%.

STRATEGY #1: Unify response to homelessness

KEY ACTION STEPS

- By acceptance of this plan at the Board of Supervisors, the various City Departments, and the local non-profits addressing homelessness, have one unified city policy on how San Francisco will end homelessness.
- Improve coordination between LHCB, the Mayor’s Office, the Board of Supervisors, the SFHA, and City departments. Hold regular, director-level meetings of all city agencies that work with homeless persons or people at imminent risk of homelessness.
- Build partnerships with other systems of care that serve homeless people, especially school districts.
- Expand the decision-making authority of the LHCB and consider expanding LHCB membership or structure to include more participation from city agencies with a central role in San Francisco’s response to homelessness.

STRATEGY #2: Increase collaboration and cooperation with private sector

KEY ACTION STEPS

- Increase private investment in solutions to homelessness and build public/private partnerships.
- Increase engagement of neighborhood and community groups in responding to homelessness, and in improving factors that increase homelessness.
- Ensure that information on best practices, financing strategies, and other resources are readily available to homeless service providers, by supporting communication and technical assistance.

STRATEGY #3: Support community planning by improving data collection about homelessness

KEY ACTION STEPS

- Publish a quarterly report regarding the performance of the homeless system of care at LHCB meetings, online, and with the Board of Supervisors. The report will use HMIS data to demonstrate improvement in the measures identified in this Plan over time.
- Align City-wide data collection efforts by coordinating at Department level.
- Provide additional training and monitoring to improve HMIS data quality and reduce the number of null or missing values.
- Improve HMIS system performance and utilization, and facilitate the exchange of data between other data systems.

Describe the strengths and gaps of the service delivery system for special needs population and persons experiencing homelessness, including, but not limited to, the services listed above

The San Francisco EMA has a long and distinguished history of responding to the HIV crisis with a comprehensive continuum of service programs that are impactful, innovative, competent, and cost effective. During the first decade of the AIDS epidemic, when San Francisco was one of the hardest-hit cities by the AIDS crisis, the region developed a comprehensive network of services that utilized case management to link individuals to medical and supportive services. This system became known as the “San Francisco Model of Care” and had a lasting impact on the organization of HIV services in the US.

Over the past decade and a half, the EMA has continued to evolve and grow to respond to changes in the epidemic and its affected populations, while incorporating new treatment developments. In the mid- 1990s, as the epidemic had an increasing effect on disenfranchised individuals, San Francisco developed the Integrated Services Program, a multidisciplinary model of HIV care in which services were merged, coordinated, and linked to stabilize and retain hard to- reach and severely affected individuals. This approach culminated in a significant intensification of the integrated services model in the form of the EMA's seven Centers of Excellence –“one stop shop” programs similar to medical homes with wraparound services which work toward the goal of stabilizing the lives of multiply diagnosed and severe need populations through neighborhood-based, multi-service centers tailored to the needs of specific cultural, linguistic, and behavioral groups.

Throughout the San Francisco EMA, the emphasis on high-quality, client-centered, and culturally competent primary medical care services remains at the heart of the local care continuum, with medical case management offering individualized assessment, coordination, and linkage to a full range of social and supportive services.

Gaps in HIV/AIDS Systems of Care

In terms of youth, the San Francisco EMA service system has for many years been actively engaged in efforts to expand mobile and alternative approaches to HIV testing, and in systems such as the new LINCS Program that immediately link to care individuals who test positive in both public and private settings. The EMA has developed cooperative education and outreach programs in collaboration with regional prevention providers - programs that have consistently expanded the proportion of young people who enter the care system annually. At the same time, innovative approaches such as the Centers of Excellence model are specifically designed to expand awareness of and access to HIV services among young people within ethnic minority communities in San Francisco County, and to overcome barriers to care resulting from distrust of the medical system, fear of disclosure of HIV status, and fear of not receiving culturally appropriate services.

Overcoming Gaps in HIV/AIDS Systems of Care

The San Francisco EMA as a whole is continually seeking new approaches to fill identified gaps in care, particularly in regard to the growing number of multiply diagnosed and highly marginalized individuals who are infected with HIV in our region. This need is addressed both directly and indirectly throughout all facets of City's 2012-2014 Comprehensive HIV Health Services Plan. The City seeks to ensure a client-centered, coordinated, culturally competent continuum of essential services for all Ryan White-eligible persons with HIV, with a special focus emerging populations, persons experiencing health disparities, and persons with severe needs. This includes ensuring equity in service access and ensuring that all low-income persons with HIV in the region are able to access high-quality, culturally and linguistically competent care. Care gaps will also be addressed by increasing the number of HIV-infected individuals who are aware of their serostatus and are effectively engaged in care on a long-term basis. Care gaps will also be filled by enhancing and expanding inter-agency collaboration and service partnerships, including partnerships that expand the availability of multi-service, HIV specialist medical homes in the EMA. Finally, the City will be focusing specifically on the impacts of healthcare reform, and the need for pro-active research and service planning to ensure that no individual is lost to care in the transition to expanded Medicaid coverage and in the face of the healthcare system's increasing emphasis on client-level outcomes and population-based panel management approaches.

Provide a summary of the strategy for overcoming gaps in the institutional structure and service delivery system for carrying out a strategy to address priority needs

The large number of non-profit organizations serving low-income communities in San Francisco is both an asset and a challenge. With a long history of serving the community, the sheer number of non-profits leads to increased competition for limited resources. Conversely, the benefits of a rich variety of social service organizations often translates to more community-based and culturally competent services for low-income residents. Lack of organizational capacity of non-profits is another gap in institutional structure. In response, the City is engaged in an ongoing effort to work with non-profits in organizational and programmatic capacity building to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of service delivery.

It is the City's policy to coordinate community development and housing activities among its departments. Because this work involves many City departments, coordination and information sharing across the various departments are challenges. City staff meets on a regular and as-needed basis with colleagues from other City departments to overcome gaps in institutional structure. For example, MOHCD participates with OEWD and the Arts Commission in a regular working group focused on the issues of nonprofit displacement through a number of OEWD-funded initiatives to stabilize nonprofits.

In the June, 2014, new local legislation was passed to coordinate and align workforce development services, establishing the Committee on City Workforce Alignment ("Alignment Committee") comprised of department heads across City departments and the Workforce Community Advisory Committee (WCAC), comprised of leadership from community-based organizations with deep specialization in community development.

The Alignment Committee includes one member designated by the Mayor, one member of the Board of Supervisors or a City employee designated by the Board, and the department heads of the following City departments: OEWD; HSA; DCYF; Public Utilities Commission; Public Works, Department of Human Resources, and Human Rights Commission. The Director of Workforce Development and Director of the Human Rights Commission co-chair the Alignment Committee.

The Alignment Committee and WCAC are charged with developing and submitting a Citywide Workforce Development Plan to the WISF for its review and comment, which was submitted and approved in late 2017. The five-year plan includes an assessment of the City's anticipated workforce development needs and opportunities and a strategy to meet the identified needs, which influences the City and County of San Francisco's CDBG decision-making around resource allocation. The plan will also include goals and strategies for all Workforce Development Services in San Francisco and a projection of the funding needed to achieve the goals, consistent with the Strategic Plan for Economic Development approved by the Board of Supervisors and the Local Plan approved by WISF.

The Alignment Committee and WCAC legislation sunset in 2019, and all members agreed to continue the work under good faith effort until the legislation is reauthorized.

In addition, staff of MOHCD and OEWD uses the Consolidated Plan/Action Plan development process as an opportunity to engage other departments in a dialogue about the current developments and priorities. This dialogue aids the City in being more strategic in the investment of Consolidated Plan dollars.

SP-45 Goals Summary – 91.215(a)(4)

Goals Summary Information

Table 78 – Goals Summary

Goal ID	Goal
1Ai	Goal 1Ai: Create more affordable housing
1Aii	Goal 1Aii: Preserve affordable housing
1Aiii	Goal 1Aiii: Improve data and analytics on affordable housing inventory and placements
1Bi	Goal 1Bi: Reduce development costs to help leverage local housing resources and serve lower income households
1Bii	Goal 1Bii: Increase affordability of rental housing
1Biii	Goal 1Biii: Increase opportunities for sustainable homeownership
1Biv	Goal 1Biv: Increase access to rental and homeownership housing
1Ci	Goal 1Ci: Improve systems to help each person find the right path to permanent housing
1Cii	Goal 1Cii: Reduce homelessness for adults, youth and families
1Ciii	Goal 1Ciii: Ensure no families with children are unsheltered
1Civ	Goal 1Civ: Improve the City’s response to street homelessness and end large, long-term encampments
1Cv	Goal 1Cv: Further align MOHCD’s work with Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing
1Cvi	Goal 1Cvi: Expand services to prevent homelessness and stabilize housing for formerly homeless households and those at risk of homelessness
1Di	Goal 1Di: Reduce rate of evictions
1Dii	Goal 1Dii: Increase access to services for residents of public and publicly subsidized housing, RAD projects, HOPWA subsidized housing, and single room occupancy hotels
1Diii	Goal 1Diii: Provide support for other affordable housing residents to ensure success in their housing placement
1Div	Goal 1Div: Increase collaboration between healthcare and housing systems by increasing mobility between levels of care (high to low acuity) in residential settings for HIV+ households
2Ai	Goal 2Ai: Provide access to employment opportunities across multiple sectors for unemployed and underemployed populations
2Bi	Goal 2Bi: Improve access to MOHCD programs and services through translation of paper and digital resources
2Bii	Goal 2Bii: Provide skill development and training resources
2Biii	Goal 2Biii: Improve financial literacy and personal finance management

Goal ID	Goal
2Biv	Goal 2Biv: Improve digital literacy
2Ci	Goal 2Ci: Increase access to civil legal services
2Di	Goal 2Di: Increase access to community-based services
3Ai	Goal 3Ai: Ensure nonprofit service providers have high quality, stable facilities
3Aii	Goal 3Aii: Enhance public spaces
3Bi	Goal 3Bi: Encourage the development and sustainability of thriving locally owned businesses
3Bii	Goal 3Bii: Support the development and sustainability of robust commercial corridors in low-income neighborhoods
3Ci	Goal 3Ci: Support neighborhood-based planning efforts
3Cii	Goal 3Cii: Support locally-based community building
3Di	Goal 3Di: Increase capacity of community-based organizations
4Ai	Goal 4Ai: Implement policies and programs that prioritize current residents
4Aii	Goal 4Aii: Encourage commercial tenants to locate on ground-floor spaces of MOHCD's affordable housing developments
4Aiii	Goal 4Aiii: Reduce displacement of residents and businesses
4Bi	Goal 4Bi: Require local hiring to the greatest extent possible in MOHCD's projects and programs
4Bii	Goal 4Bii: Ensure adequate City services in neighborhoods where MOHCD's affordable housing is located
4Biii	Goal 4Biii: Implement programs that provide direct benefits resulting from neighborhood-based economic growth to local communities
5Ai	Goal 5Ai: Develop specific funding, policies and practices to ensure equitable access to MOHCD and OEWD programs
5Bi	Goal 5Bi: Incorporate cultural competency, trauma-informed systems, and other equity training and resources for MOHCD's partners
5Bii	Goal 5Bii: Incorporate racial equity principles in MOHCD's hiring and promotion practices
5Biii	Goal 5Biii: Implement racial equity and trauma-informed values and approaches throughout MOHCD

Goal Descriptions

Table 79 – Goal Descriptions

2020–2024 Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix

Table 80 – Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix

Goal ID	Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 5 (2024-2025) \$ Amount
1Ai	CDBG	\$0					
	HOME	\$750,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000
	HOPWA	\$0					
	ESG	\$0					
	General Fund	\$0					
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0					
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0					
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0					
	Other	\$0					
	OCII	\$0					
Total		\$750,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000
1Aii	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$2,365,348	\$450,000	\$461,250	\$472,781	\$484,601	\$496,716
	Housing Trust Fund	\$940,883	\$179,000	\$183,475	\$188,062	\$192,763	\$197,583
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$3,306,231	\$629,000	\$644,725	\$660,843	\$677,364	\$694,298
1Aiii	CDBG	\$0					
	HOME	\$0					
	HOPWA	\$0					

Goal ID	Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 5 (2024-2025) \$ Amount
	ESG	\$0					
	General Fund	\$0					
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0					
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0					
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0					
	Other	\$0					
	OCII	\$0					
Total		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
1Bi	CDBG	\$0					
	HOME	\$0					
	HOPWA	\$0					
	ESG	\$0					
	General Fund	\$0					
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0					
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0					
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0					
	Other	\$0					
	OCII	\$0					
Total		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
1Bii	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$1,305,080	\$261,016	\$261,016	\$261,016	\$261,016	\$261,016
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$7,095,996	\$1,349,991	\$1,383,741	\$1,418,334	\$1,453,793	\$1,490,137
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$6,800,000	\$3,800,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$0

Goal ID	Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 5 (2024-2025) \$ Amount
	OCl	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$15,201,076	\$5,411,007	\$2,644,757	\$2,679,350	\$2,714,809	\$1,751,153
1Biii	CDBG	\$1,672,600	\$334,520	\$334,520	\$334,520	\$334,520	\$334,520
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$5,101,162	\$970,480	\$994,742	\$1,019,611	\$1,045,101	\$1,071,228
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OCl	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$6,773,762	\$1,305,000	\$1,329,262	\$1,354,131	\$1,379,621	\$1,405,748
1Biv	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$4,592,055	\$873,624	\$895,465	\$917,851	\$940,797	\$964,317
	Housing Trust Fund	\$7,024,431	\$1,336,376	\$1,369,785	\$1,404,030	\$1,439,131	\$1,475,109
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OCl	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$11,616,486	\$2,210,000	\$2,265,250	\$2,321,881	\$2,379,928	\$2,439,426
1Ci	CDBG	\$0					
	HOME	\$0					
	HOPWA	\$0					
	ESG	\$0					

Goal ID	Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 5 (2024-2025) \$ Amount
	General Fund	\$0					
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0					
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0					
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0					
	Other	\$0					
	OCII	\$0					
Total		\$0					
1Cii* *see 1Ai for funding for PSH units	CDBG	\$0					
	HOME	\$0					
	HOPWA	\$0					
	ESG	\$0					
	General Fund	\$0					
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0					
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0					
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0					
	Other	\$0					
	OCII	\$0					
Total		\$0					
1Ciii	CDBG	\$0					
	HOME	\$0					
	HOPWA	\$0					
	ESG	\$0					
	General Fund	\$0					
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0					
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0					
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0					
	Other	\$0					
	OCII	\$0					

Goal ID	Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 5 (2024-2025) \$ Amount
Total		\$0					
1Civ	CDBG	\$0					
	HOME	\$0					
	HOPWA	\$0					
	ESG	\$0					
	General Fund	\$0					
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0					
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0					
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0					
	Other	\$0					
	OCII	\$0					
Total		\$0					
1Cv	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
1Cvi	CDBG	\$0					
	HOME	\$0					
	HOPWA	\$0					
	ESG	\$6,934,855	\$1,386,971	\$1,386,971	\$1,386,971	\$1,386,971	\$1,386,971
	General Fund	\$1,200,000,000	\$240,000,000	\$240,000,000	\$240,000,000	\$240,000,000	\$240,000,000

Goal ID	Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 5 (2024-2025) \$ Amount
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0					
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0					
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0					
	Other	\$0					
	OCII	\$0					
Total		\$1,206,934,855	\$241,386,971	\$241,386,971	\$241,386,971	\$241,386,971	\$241,386,971
1Di	CDBG	\$18,523,090	\$3,704,618	\$3,704,618	\$3,704,618	\$3,704,618	\$3,704,618
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$18,700,361	\$3,557,685	\$3,646,627	\$3,737,793	\$3,831,238	\$3,927,019
	Housing Trust Fund	\$25,550,004	\$4,860,808	\$4,982,328	\$5,106,886	\$5,234,559	\$5,365,423
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$62,773,455	\$12,123,111	\$12,333,573	\$12,549,297	\$12,770,414	\$12,997,059
1Dii	CDBG	\$4,615,235	\$923,047	\$923,047	\$923,047	\$923,047	\$923,047
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$18,915,208	\$3,598,559	\$3,688,523	\$3,780,736	\$3,875,254	\$3,972,136
	Housing Trust Fund	\$788,449	\$150,000	\$153,750	\$157,594	\$161,534	\$165,572
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$24,318,893	\$4,671,606	\$4,765,320	\$4,861,377	\$4,959,835	\$5,060,755

Goal ID	Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 5 (2024-2025) \$ Amount
1Diii	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$250,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OClI	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$250,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000
1Div	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$12,521,680	\$2,504,336	\$2,504,336	\$2,504,336	\$2,504,336	\$2,504,336
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$7,622,529	\$1,586,608	\$1,453,558	\$1,489,897	\$1,527,144	\$1,565,323
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OClI	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$20,144,209	\$4,090,944	\$3,957,894	\$3,994,233	\$4,031,480	\$4,069,659
2Ai	CDBG	\$7,325,145	\$1,465,029	\$1,465,029	\$1,465,029	\$1,465,029	\$1,465,029
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Goal ID	Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 5 (2024-2025) \$ Amount
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$7,325,145	\$1,465,029	\$1,465,029	\$1,465,029	\$1,465,029	\$1,465,029
2Bi	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Total		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2Bii	CDBG	\$1,790,000	\$358,000	\$358,000	\$358,000	\$358,000	\$358,000
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$17,968,759	\$3,418,500	\$3,503,963	\$3,591,562	\$3,681,351	\$3,773,384
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$19,758,759	\$3,776,500	\$3,861,963	\$3,949,562	\$4,039,351	\$4,131,384
2Biii	CDBG	\$260,000	\$52,000	\$52,000	\$52,000	\$52,000	\$52,000

Goal ID	Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 5 (2024-2025) \$ Amount
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$2,565,088	\$488,000	\$500,200	\$512,705	\$525,523	\$538,661
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$2,825,088	\$540,000	\$552,200	\$564,705	\$577,523	\$590,661
2Biv	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$1,839,715	\$350,000	\$358,750	\$367,719	\$376,912	\$386,335
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$1,839,715	\$350,000	\$358,750	\$367,719	\$376,912	\$386,335
2Ci	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$60,966,798	\$11,598,742	\$11,888,711	\$12,185,928	\$12,490,577	\$12,802,841
	Housing Trust Fund	\$3,416,614	\$650,000	\$666,250	\$682,906	\$699,979	\$717,478
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Goal ID	Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 5 (2024-2025) \$ Amount
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$64,383,412	\$12,248,742	\$12,554,961	\$12,868,835	\$13,190,555	\$13,520,319
2Di	CDBG	\$1,790,000	\$358,000	\$358,000	\$358,000	\$358,000	\$358,000
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$17,968,759	\$3,418,500	\$3,503,963	\$3,591,562	\$3,681,351	\$3,773,384
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$19,758,759	\$3,776,500	\$3,861,963	\$3,949,562	\$4,039,351	\$4,131,384
3Ai	CDBG	\$6,409,560	\$196,780	\$1,553,195	\$1,553,195	\$1,553,195	\$1,553,195
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$4,400,992	\$3,200,992	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$10,810,552	\$3,397,772	\$1,853,195	\$1,853,195	\$1,853,195	\$1,853,195
3Aii	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Goal ID	Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 5 (2024-2025) \$ Amount
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Trust Fund	\$2,000,000	\$0	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OClI	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$2,000,000	\$0	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000
3Bi	CDBG	\$4,606,228	\$1,088,869	\$879,340	\$879,340	\$879,340	\$879,340
	HOME	\$0					
	HOPWA	\$0					
	ESG	\$0					
	General Fund	\$0					
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0					
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0					
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0					
	Other	\$0					
OClI	\$0						
Total		\$4,606,228	\$1,088,869	\$879,340	\$879,340	\$879,340	\$879,340
3Bii	CDBG	\$1,812,974	\$428,570	\$346,101	\$346,101	\$346,101	\$346,101
	HOME	\$0					
	HOPWA	\$0					
	ESG	\$0					
	General Fund	\$0					
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0					
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0					
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0					

Goal ID	Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 5 (2024-2025) \$ Amount
	Other	\$0					
	OCl	\$0					
Total		\$1,812,974	\$428,570	\$346,101	\$346,101	\$346,101	\$346,101
3Ci	CDBG	\$761,452	\$180,000	\$145,363	\$145,363	\$145,363	\$145,363
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$3,750,000	\$750,000	\$750,000	\$750,000	\$750,000	\$750,000
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$6,100,000	\$1,220,000	\$1,220,000	\$1,220,000	\$1,220,000	\$1,220,000
OCl	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Total		\$10,611,452	\$2,150,000	\$2,115,363	\$2,115,363	\$2,115,363	\$2,115,363
3Cii	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$6,065,803	\$1,154,000	\$1,182,850	\$1,212,421	\$1,242,732	\$1,273,800
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$15,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000
OCl	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Total		\$21,065,803	\$4,154,000	\$4,182,850	\$4,212,421	\$4,242,732	\$4,273,800
3Di	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Goal ID	Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 5 (2024-2025) \$ Amount
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$5,129,577	\$975,886	\$1,000,283	\$1,025,290	\$1,050,922	\$1,077,196
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$5,129,577	\$975,886	\$1,000,283	\$1,025,290	\$1,050,922	\$1,077,196
4Ai	CDBG	\$0					
	HOME	\$0					
	HOPWA	\$0					
	ESG	\$0					
	General Fund	\$0					
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0					
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0					
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0					
	Other	\$0					
	OCII	\$0					
Total		\$0					
4Aii	CDBG	\$0					
	HOME	\$0					
	HOPWA	\$0					
	ESG	\$0					
	General Fund	\$0					
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0					
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0					
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0					
	Other	\$0					

Goal ID	Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 5 (2024-2025) \$ Amount
	OCII	\$0					
Total		\$0					
4Aiii	CDBG	\$423,028	\$100,000	\$80,757	\$80,757	\$80,757	\$80,757
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$4,932,674	\$975,000	\$980,625	\$986,391	\$992,300	\$998,358
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$1,500,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$6,855,702	\$1,375,000	\$1,361,382	\$1,367,148	\$1,373,057	\$1,379,115
4Bi	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
4Bii	CDBG	\$0					
	HOME	\$0					
	HOPWA	\$0					
	ESG	\$0					

Goal ID	Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 5 (2024-2025) \$ Amount
	General Fund	\$0					
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0					
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0					
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0					
	Other	\$0					
	OCII	\$0					
Total		\$0					
4Biii	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$2,500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$1,500,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$4,000,000	\$800,000	\$800,000	\$800,000	\$800,000	\$800,000
5Ai	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Goal ID	Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 5 (2024-2025) \$ Amount
Total		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
5Bi	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Total		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
5Bii	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Total		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
5Biii	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Goal ID	Funding Source	Expected 5-year \$ Amount	Expected Year 1 (2020-2021) \$ Amount	Expected Year 2 (2021-2022) \$ Amount	Expected Year 3 (2022-2023) \$ Amount	Expected Year 4 (2023-2024) \$ Amount	Expected Year 5 (2024-2025) \$ Amount
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Goal ID	Indicator	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal
1Ai	Release a quarterly pipeline report of all BMR projects and units (OCII, Inclusionary, 100% Affordable)	0	0	0	0	0	0
	# of new HOPE SF units developed	389	64	0	158	0	167
	# of HIV+ dedicated housing units developed	10	0	0	10	0	0
	# of Plus Housing applicant placements (move to Access to Housing strategy?)	25	5	5	5	5	5
	# of housing units for families developed						
	# of dedicated housing units for families developed	4,254	1300	647	1535	351	421
	# of dedicated housing units for seniors developed	765	0	0	480	285	0
	# of dedicated housing units for person with disabilities developed	0	0	0	0	0	0
	# of mobility/ADA units developed	31	0	0	14	17	0
	Continue to improve internal systems (Salesforce, etc.) to increase housing placement efficiencies	25	5	5	5	5	5

Goal ID	Indicator	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal
1Aii	# of Small Sites units preserved/made permanently affordable	535	171	171	175	9	9
	# of units made code compliant (for example, seismic, fire) or received health and safety improvements	169	113	0	0	56	0
	# of low-income homeowners who have assessments completed and home modifications installed that increase safety, accessibility and health outcomes	25	5	5	5	5	5
	# of low-income homeowners who have solar assessments completed and solar modifications installed	40	8	8	8	8	8
	Decrease in number of out of compliance (with Planning or MOHCD program requirements) homeowners and property owners	150	30	30	30	30	30
	# of HOPE SF public housing units replaced or # of HOPE VI units rehabilitated	151	121	0	0	30	0

Goal ID	Indicator	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal
	# of RAD-like conversion units rehabilitated	70	70	0	0	0	0
1Aiii							
1Bii	# of residents receiving rental subsidies	1,100	220	220	220	220	220
	# of housing subsidies and vouchers for HIV+ households	935	187	187	187	187	187
	# of new LOSP units funded	0					
1Biii	# of residents receiving homeownership education and counseling	16,000	3,200	3,200	3,200	3,200	3,200
	# of residents receiving homeownership counseling services who successfully become homeowners	1,725	345	345	345	345	345
	# of homeowners who receive post-purchase education and counseling	1,250	250	250	250	250	250
	# of homeowners who receive legal representation to avoid foreclosure	100	20	20	20	20	20
	# of higher-income households, including first responders and educators, who receive DALP	150	30	30	30	30	30

Goal ID	Indicator	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal
	# of homebuyers served from previously underserved select demographic populations	75	5	10	15	20	25
1Biv	# of residents receiving rental housing education and counseling	18,000	3,600	3,600	3,600	3,600	3,600
	# of residents submitting at least one application for a rental housing opportunity	1,000,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
	# of residents who successfully move into MOHCD-sponsored affordable housing	3,750	750	750	750	750	750
	# of new DAHLIA accounts created	150,000	20,000	25,000	30,000	35,000	40,000
	# of leasing agents, lenders and housing counselors who receive training on MOHCD housing programs	1,175	235	235	235	235	235
	# of housing education opportunities for HIV+ persons	25	5	5	5	5	5
	# of HIV+ residents receiving rental housing counseling services who successfully move into MOHCD-sponsored affordable housing	25	5	5	5	5	5

Goal ID	Indicator	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal
	# of households receiving rental housing at HOPE SF sites via the HOPE SF Right to Return legislation	125	25	25	25	25	25
1Ci	Clear set of entry points	0					
	Standardized method to assess and prioritize people needing assistance	0					
	Streamlined process for rapidly connecting people to a housing solution	0					
1Cii	# of permanent supportive housing units for adults developed	414	29	276	0	25	84
	# of permanent supportive housing units for youth developed	42	0	32	10	0	0
	# of permanent supportive housing units for families developed	335	110	20	205	0	0
	End family homelessness by December 2021	0					
	Reduce chronic homelessness for adults by 50% by December 2022	0					
	Reduce homelessness among youth by 50% by December 2023	0					

Goal ID	Indicator	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal
1Ciii	No families with children are unsheltered according to annual Point-in-Time Counts	0					
1Civ	0 large, long-term encampments on the streets of San Francisco	0					
1Cv	# of MOHCD placements to HOPWA units	25	5	5	5	5	5
	Reduction in duration of time to successfully complete HQS inspections	0					
1Cvi	Expansion of roving housing stabilization	0					
	Number of people experiencing homelessness (including staying in shelter) who receive problem solving	0					
	Discuss with HSH: # of new projects with appropriate level of support services calibrated with Coordinated Entry	0					
	Discuss with HSH: # of sites with increased level of support services for existing sites to calibrate the level of services with Coordinated Entry	0					

Goal ID	Indicator	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal
1Di	# of tenants facing eviction who receive full legal representation	9,800	1,800	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
	# of tenants facing eviction able to stay in their current unit	4,900	900	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
	# of tenants receiving emergency rental assistance to stabilize their housing	3,650	730	730	730	730	730
	# of tenants receiving Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) services	3,000	600	600	600	600	600
	# of residents receiving tenants' rights counseling/education	4,500	900	900	900	900	900
1Dii	Number of HOPE SF and RAD residents participating in community building activities that increase cohesion and trust, provide leadership opportunities, and lead to healthier outcomes for residents	20,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000
	# of resident leaders who successfully support or lead the implementation of programming at their site	200	40	40	40	40	40

Goal ID	Indicator	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal
	# of clients receiving information and referral, service connection and case coordination services	6,500	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300
	# of clients engaged in case management, including development of Individual Service Plan	1,500	300	300	300	300	300
	# of clients who complete at least 50% of the goals from their Individual Service Plan	750	150	150	150	150	150
1Diii	# of welcome packets received by new tenants in MOHCD-sponsored affordable housing projects	2,850	100	500	750	750	750
	# of MOHCD affordable housing tenants at risk of eviction that receive notification of eviction support services	0					
	# of clients receiving housing retention services residing in new and existing HOPWA units	935	187	187	187	187	187
1Div	# of acuity-based assessments for housing placements	25	5	5	5	5	5

Goal ID	Indicator	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal
2Ai	Number of unemployed and underemployed residents that successfully enroll into workforce services in aim of securing employment	3,475	695	695	695	695	695
2Bi							
2Bii	# of clients who receive training in life skills/personal effectiveness, educational skills, ESL, and workplace readiness	19,000	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800
	# of clients who achieve a high school diploma or GED or enroll in post-secondary education programs	875	175	175	175	175	175
	# of clients who enroll in a sector-specific job training program	1,750	350	350	350	350	350
2Biii	# of clients receiving financial counseling	10,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
	# of clients who increase savings by at least one week of income	2,075	415	415	415	415	415
	# of clients who decrease debt by at least 10%	1,125	225	225	225	225	225

Goal ID	Indicator	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal
	# of clients who increase their credit score by at least 35 points	1,250	250	250	250	250	250
	# of clients who open safe and affordable bank accounts	1,000	200	200	200	200	200
	# of programs being implemented on-site at RAD and HOPE SF housing developments	30	6	6	6	6	6
2Biv	# of clients who receive free or low-cost digital devices	1,500	300	300	300	300	300
	# of clients who receive training in digital skills, including basic digital literacy, online safety, privacy, information literacy, and advanced education or employment related skills	2,500	500	500	500	500	500
	# of clients in affordable housing with increased access to high-speed internet	15,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
2Ci	# of clients receiving a limited legal service	21,000	4,200	4,200	4,200	4,200	4,200
	# of clients receiving an extended legal service	12,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500

Goal ID	Indicator	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal
	# of clients who have their civil legal issue successfully resolved	10,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
2Di	# of clients receiving information and referral, service connection and case coordination services	20,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000
	# of clients engaged in case management, including development of Individual Service Plan	7,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500
	# of clients who complete at least 50% of the goals from their Individual Service Plan	5,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
3Ai	# of facilities receiving capital improvements	48	0	12	12	12	12
	# of facilities receiving capital needs assessments	5	1	1	1	1	1
3Aii	# of communities facing increased housing density receiving community amenities	16	0	4	4	4	4
3Bi	# of startup businesses assisted	676	160	129	129	129	129
	# of existing businesses assisted	2,074	490	396	396	396	396
	# of businesses engaged in a language other than English	210	50	40	40	40	40

Goal ID	Indicator	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal
	Total dollar amount value of loans accessed	14,806,004	\$3,500,000	\$2,826,501	\$2,826,501	\$2,826,501	\$2,826,501
	# of loans funded	231	55	44	44	44	44
	Total dollar amount value of equity invested	7,403,004	\$1,750,000	\$1,413,251	\$1,413,251	\$1,413,251	\$1,413,251
	# of jobs retained via business technical assistance	1,482	350	283	283	283	283
	# of jobs created via business technical assistance	1,482	350	283	283	283	283
	# of new businesses established via technical assistance provided	210	50	40	40	40	40
	# of leases strengthened and businesses stabilized	189	45	36	36	36	36
3Bii	# of SF Shines façade applications completed	26	6	5	5	5	5
	# tenant improvements completed	26	6	5	5	5	5
	# of jobs created via business technical assistance	319	75	61	61	61	61
	# of training workshops offered via business technical assistance	1,268	300	242	242	242	242
3Ci	# of community-generated planning processes that lead to measurable	43	8	9	6	10	10

Goal ID	Indicator	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal
	benefits for the neighborhood						
	# of nonprofit organizations that will produce cultural events, arts, cultural activities, and public place keeping projects	115	23	23	23	23	23
	# of businesses assisted as part of a community-driven comprehensive strategy (Cultural Districts, neighborhood strategy)	147	35	28	28	28	28
	# of jobs created via business technical assistance as part of a community-driven comprehensive strategy	126	30	24	24	24	24
	# of jobs retained via business technical assistance as part of a community-driven comprehensive strategy	126	30	24	24	24	24
3Ci	# of community-driven reports completed	50	10	10	10	10	10
3Di	# of organizations receiving capacity building and technical assistance	400	80	80	80	80	80

Goal ID	Indicator	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal
	# of organizations who successfully achieved at least one of their capacity building goals, as measured by pre- and post-assessment	75	15	15	15	15	15
4Ai	# of residents who access affordable housing through lottery preference programs	1,250	250	250	250	250	250
	# of "Mixed Status Families" stabilized via support services and subsidies	715	130	140	145	150	150
4Aii	# of commercial spaces created in MOHCD's affordable housing developments	0					
4Aiii	# of tenants receiving emergency rental assistance to stabilize their housing (also in 1Di)	3,650	730	730	730	730	730
	# of tenants facing eviction able to stay in their current unit (also in 1Di)	4,900	900	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
	# of households receiving tenant education and counseling	4,500	900	900	900	900	900
	# of households receiving full-scope eviction defense	9,800	1,800	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000

Goal ID	Indicator	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal
	# of households receiving other eviction defense services	5,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
	# of households whose housing crisis was resolved with emergency rental assistance	3,650	730	730	730	730	730
	# of existing businesses assisted	189	45	36	36	36	36
	# of eligible Legacy Businesses assisted	42	10	8	8	8	8
	# existing leases strengthened and businesses stabilized	105	25	20	20	20	20
	# of activities or projects completed that sustained a neighborhood's art, culture, tradition, way of life, history or overall ecosystem	165	31	32	34	34	34
4Bi	# of participants who receive job readiness services in HOPE SF and RAD sites	250	50	50	50	50	50
	# of participants who are placed in jobs at HOPE SF and RAD sites	125	25	25	25	25	25

Goal ID	Indicator	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal
4Biii	# of outreach and community input activities provided by City Departments to communities	70	14	14	14	14	14
	# of plans developed to address stabilization and economic growth needs in communities and neighborhoods	24	5	5	2	6	6
5Ai	# of City staff who attend GARE training workshops	35	7	7	7	7	7
	# of staff trained in trauma informed systems and self-care activities	150	50	50	50	0	0
	Execution of racial equity analysis in MOHCD RFQ/RFP selection criteria	1	1	0	0	0	0
	Creation of MOHCD community outreach strategies that address racial disparities, historically underserved populations, cultural competency, and cultural humility	5	1	1	1	1	1

Goal ID	Indicator	5-year Goal	Year 1 Goal	Year 2 Goal	Year 3 Goal	Year 4 Goal	Year 5 Goal
5Bi	# of partner staff trained in implicit bias, cultural competency, trauma informed systems and equity trainings	50	10	10	10	10	10
	# of HIV-specific education seminars and trainings	5	1	1	1	1	1
	# of trainings for community partners hosted by MOHCD and OEWD	5	1	1	1	1	1
5Bii	Execute MOHCD Racial Equity plan	3	1	1	1	0	0
5Biii	Execute MOHCD Racial Equity plan	3	1	1	1	0	0
	Implement changes to MOHCD internal policies	5	1	1	1	1	1
	Inclusion of Trauma Champions, Catalysts, and Leaders in MOHCD's Racial Equity Working group	15	3	3	3	3	3

Funding and Indictors of Success by NRSA

Goal ID	Funding Source	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
1Ai	CDBG						
	HOME						
	HOPWA						
	ESG						
	General Fund						
	Housing Trust Fund						
	Housing Impact Fees						
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund						
	Other						
	OCII						
Total		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
1Aii	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$177,312	\$0	\$22,396	\$0	\$14,680	\$48,058
	Housing Trust Fund	\$70,531	\$0	\$8,909	\$0	\$5,839	\$19,117
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$247,842	\$0	\$31,304	\$0	\$20,519	\$67,175
1Aiii	CDBG						
	HOME						
	HOPWA						
	ESG						

Goal ID	Funding Source	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
	General Fund						
	Housing Trust Fund						
	Housing Impact Fees						
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund						
	Other						
	OCII						
Total		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
1Bi	CDBG						
	HOME						
	HOPWA						
	ESG						
	General Fund						
	Housing Trust Fund						
	Housing Impact Fees						
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund						
	Other						
	OCII						
Total		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
1Bii	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$6,525	\$0	\$45,678	\$91,356	\$32,627	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$113,999	\$77,999	\$73,043	\$125,999	\$485,214	\$0
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$275,887	\$174,734	\$231,428	\$330,547	\$1,154,442	\$42,000
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Goal ID	Funding Source	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
Total		\$396,412	\$252,733	\$350,148	\$547,902	\$1,672,283	\$42,000
1Biii	CDBG	\$50,582	\$16,072	\$42,162	\$36,893	\$12,951	\$10,246
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$146,743	\$46,627	\$122,317	\$107,031	\$37,574	\$29,723
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Total		\$197,325	\$62,700	\$164,479	\$143,924	\$50,525	\$39,969
1Biv	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$172,245	\$31,847	\$137,385	\$112,012	\$126,571	\$25,040
	Housing Trust Fund	\$199,906	\$40,044	\$157,681	\$101,600	\$97,972	\$33,051
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$372,151	\$71,891	\$295,067	\$213,612	\$224,543	\$58,091
1Ci	CDBG						
	HOME						
	HOPWA						
	ESG						
	General Fund						

Goal ID	Funding Source	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
	Housing Trust Fund						
	Housing Impact Fees						
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund						
	Other						
	OCII						
Total							
1Cii* *see 1Ai for funding for PSH units	CDBG						
	HOME						
	HOPWA						
	ESG						
	General Fund						
	Housing Trust Fund						
	Housing Impact Fees						
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund						
	Other						
	OCII						
Total							
1Ciii	CDBG						
	HOME						
	HOPWA						
	ESG						
	General Fund						
	Housing Trust Fund						
	Housing Impact Fees						
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund						
	Other						
	OCII						
Total							

Goal ID	Funding Source	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
1Civ	CDBG						
	HOME						
	HOPWA						
	ESG						
	General Fund						
	Housing Trust Fund						
	Housing Impact Fees						
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund						
	Other						
	OCII						
Total							
1Cv	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
1Cvi	CDBG						
	HOME						
	HOPWA						
	ESG						
	General Fund						
	Housing Trust Fund						

Goal ID	Funding Source	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
	Housing Impact Fees						
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund						
	Other						
	OCII						
Total							
1Di	CDBG	\$232,407	\$145,373	\$409,799	\$566,637	\$687,327	\$101,608
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$282,042	\$178,111	\$461,393	\$606,180	\$812,361	\$101,608
	Housing Trust Fund	\$317,534	\$198,621	\$559,902	\$774,187	\$939,083	\$138,826
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Total		\$831,984	\$522,104	\$1,431,095	\$1,947,003	\$2,438,771	\$342,042
1Dii	CDBG	\$140,952	\$133,555	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$241,075
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$934,617	\$866,301	\$150,000	\$0	\$0	\$939,848
	Housing Trust Fund	\$22,905	\$13,903	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$39,176
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Total		\$1,098,474	\$1,013,759	\$150,000	\$0	\$0	\$1,220,100
1Diii	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Goal ID	Funding Source	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
1Div	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$362,377	\$54,413	\$383,163	\$1,158,166
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$229,582	\$34,473	\$242,751	\$733,750
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$0	\$0	\$591,958	\$88,887	\$625,915	\$1,891,916
2Ai	CDBG	\$200,000	\$0	\$50,000	\$200,000	\$450,000	\$33,000
	HOME						
	HOPWA						
	ESG						
	General Fund						
	Housing Trust Fund						
	Housing Impact Fees						

Goal ID	Funding Source	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund						
	Other						
	OCII						
Total		\$200,000	\$0	\$50,000	\$200,000	\$450,000	\$33,000
2Bi	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2Bii	CDBG	\$24,825	\$26,102	\$33,428	\$19,690	\$43,086	\$18,871
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$285,827	\$297,696	\$419,165	\$206,306	\$442,529	\$193,838
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$310,652	\$323,798	\$452,593	\$225,997	\$485,615	\$212,709
2Biii	CDBG	\$8,025	\$4,758	\$7,686	\$5,225	\$2,581	\$5,241
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Goal ID	Funding Source	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$75,314	\$44,650	\$72,133	\$49,031	\$24,224	\$49,186
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$83,339	\$49,408	\$79,819	\$54,255	\$26,805	\$54,427
2Biv	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2Ci	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$1,516,523	\$339,846	\$2,834,253	\$359,079	\$1,829,811	\$889,199
	Housing Trust Fund	\$74,279	\$18,043	\$155,478	\$18,978	\$99,170	\$49,439
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Goal ID	Funding Source	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$1,590,802	\$357,889	\$2,989,731	\$378,058	\$1,928,982	\$938,638
2Di	CDBG	\$24,825	\$26,102	\$33,428	\$19,690	\$43,086	\$18,871
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$285,827	\$297,696	\$419,165	\$206,306	\$442,529	\$193,838
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Total		\$310,652	\$323,798	\$452,593	\$225,997	\$485,615	\$212,709
3Ai	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Total		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3Aii	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Goal ID	Funding Source	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3Bi	CDBG						
	HOME						
	HOPWA						
	ESG						
	General Fund						
	Housing Trust Fund						
	Housing Impact Fees						
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund						
	Other						
	OCII						
Total		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3Bii	CDBG						
	HOME						
	HOPWA						
	ESG						
	General Fund						
	Housing Trust Fund						
	Housing Impact Fees						
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund						
	Other						

Goal ID	Funding Source	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitation Valley
	OCII						
Total		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3Ci	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$200,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$175,000
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$230,000	\$0	\$230,000	\$530,000	\$230,000	\$0
OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Total		\$430,000	\$0	\$230,000	\$530,000	\$230,000	\$175,000
3Cii	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$131,250	\$29,678	\$149,267	\$164,800	\$97,000	\$4,200
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$230,000	\$0	\$460,000	\$460,000	\$230,000	\$0
OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Total		\$361,250	\$29,678	\$609,267	\$624,800	\$327,000	\$4,200
3Di	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Goal ID	Funding Source	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
	General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
4Ai	CDBG						
	HOME						
	HOPWA						
	ESG						
	General Fund						
	Housing Trust Fund						
	Housing Impact Fees						
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund						
	Other						
	OCII						
Total							
4Aii	CDBG						
	HOME						
	HOPWA						
	ESG						
	General Fund						
	Housing Trust Fund						
	Housing Impact Fees						
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund						
	Other						
	OCII						

Goal ID	Funding Source	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
Total							
4Aiii	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$381,250	\$625	\$7,500	\$7,500	\$11,250	\$8,125
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$300,000	\$0	\$0
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$381,250	\$625	\$7,500	\$307,500	\$11,250	\$8,125
4Bi	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
4Bii	CDBG						
	HOME						
	HOPWA						
	ESG						
	General Fund						

Goal ID	Funding Source	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
	Housing Trust Fund						
	Housing Impact Fees						
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund						
	Other						
	OCII						
Total							
4Biii	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$100,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$100,000
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$300,000	\$0	\$0
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$100,000	\$0	\$0	\$300,000	\$0	\$100,000
5Ai	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Goal ID	Funding Source	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
5Bi	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
5Bii	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
5Biii	CDBG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOPWA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	ESG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Housing Trust Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Goal ID	Funding Source	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
	Housing Impact Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OCII	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Goal ID	Indicator	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
1Ai	Release a quarterly pipeline report of all BMR projects and units (OCII, Inclusionary, 100% Affordable)						
	# of new HOPE SF units developed	64					
	# of HIV+ dedicated housing units developed						
	# of Plus Housing applicant placements						
	# of housing units for families developed			130	273		
	# of dedicated housing units for families developed						
	# of dedicated housing units for seniors developed						
	# of dedicated housing units for person with disabilities developed						
	# of mobility/ADA units developed						
Continue to improve internal systems (Salesforce, etc.) to increase housing placement efficiencies							
1Aii	# of Small Sites units preserved/made permanently affordable						
	# of units made code compliant (for example, seismic, fire) or received health and safety improvements		88				
	# of low-income homeowners who have assessments completed and home modifications installed that increase safety, accessibility and health outcomes	2	0	0	0	0	1
	# of low-income homeowners who have solar assessments completed and solar modifications installed	3	0	0	0	0	1
	Decrease in number of out of compliance (with Planning or MOHCD program requirements) homeowners and property owners						
	# of HOPE SF public housing units replaced or # of HOPE VI units rehabilitated	53					
	# of RAD-like conversion units rehabilitated						
1Aiii							

Goal ID	Indicator	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
1Bii	# of residents receiving rental subsidies	16	10	14	22	68	2
	# of housing subsidies and vouchers for HIV+ households						
	# of new LOSP units funded						
1Biii	# of residents receiving homeownership education and counseling	484	154	403	353	124	98
	# of residents receiving homeownership counseling services who successfully become homeowners	52	17	43	38	13	11
	# of homeowners who receive post-purchase education and counseling	38	12	32	28	10	8
	# of homeowners who receive legal representation to avoid foreclosure	3	1	3	2	1	1
	# of higher-income households, including first responders and educators, who receive DALP						
	# of homebuyers served from previously underserved select demographic populations	1	0	1	1	0	0
1Biv	# of residents receiving rental housing education and counseling	606	117	481	348	366	95
	# of residents submitting at least one application for a rental housing opportunity	33,679	6,506	26,703	19,331	20,321	5,257
	# of residents who successfully move into MOHCD-sponsored affordable housing						
	# of new DAHLIA accounts created						
	# of leasing agents, lenders and housing counselors who receive training on MOHCD housing programs						
	# of housing education opportunities for HIV+ persons						
	# of HIV+ residents receiving rental housing counseling services who successfully move into MOHCD-sponsored affordable housing						
	# of households receiving rental housing at HOPE SF sites via the HOPE SF Right to Return legislation						

Goal ID	Indicator	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
1Ci	Clear set of entry points						
	Standardized method to assess and prioritize people needing assistance						
	Streamlined process for rapidly connecting people to a housing solution						
1Cii	# of permanent supportive housing units for adults developed						
	# of permanent supportive housing units for youth developed						
	# of permanent supportive housing units for families developed						
	End family homelessness by December 2021						
	Reduce chronic homelessness for adults by 50% by December 2022						
	Reduce homelessness among youth by 50% by December 2023						
1Ciii	No families with children are unsheltered according to annual Point-in-Time Counts						
1Civ	0 large, long-term encampments on the streets of San Francisco						
1Cv	# of MOHCD placements to HOPWA units						
	Reduction in duration of time to successfully complete HQS inspections						
1Cvi	Expansion of roving housing stabilization						
	Number of people experiencing homelessness (including staying in shelter) who receive problem solving						

Goal ID	Indicator	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
	Discuss with HSH: # of new projects with appropriate level of support services calibrated with Coordinated Entry						
	Discuss with HSH: # of sites with increased level of support services for existing sites to calibrate the level of services with Coordinated Entry						
1Di	# of tenants facing eviction who receive full legal representation	124	78	212	289	362	51
	# of tenants facing eviction able to stay in their current unit	62	39	106	145	181	25
	# of tenants receiving emergency rental assistance to stabilize their housing	50	31	86	117	147	21
	# of tenants receiving Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) services	41	26	71	96	121	17
	# of residents receiving tenants' rights counseling/education	62	39	106	145	181	25
1Dii	Number of HOPE SF and RAD residents participating in community building activities that increase cohesion and trust, provide leadership opportunities, and lead to healthier outcomes for residents						
	# of resident leaders who successfully support or lead the implementation of programming at their site						
	# of clients receiving information and referral, service connection and case coordination services						
	# of clients engaged in case management, including development of Individual Service Plan						
	# of clients who complete at least 50% of the goals from their Individual Service Plan						
1Diii	# of welcome packets received by new tenants in MOHCD-sponsored affordable housing projects						

Goal ID	Indicator	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
	# of MOHCD affordable housing tenants at risk of eviction that receive notification of eviction support services						
	# of clients receiving housing retention services residing in new and existing HOPWA units						
1Div	# of acuity-based assessments for housing placements						
2Ai	Number of unemployed and underemployed residents that successfully enroll into workforce services in aim of securing employment	130	0	25	107	228	22
2Bi							
2Bii	# of clients who receive training in life skills/personal effectiveness, educational skills, ESL, and workplace readiness	313	326	455	227	489	214
	# of clients who achieve a high school diploma or GED or enroll in post-secondary education programs	14	15	21	10	23	10
	# of clients who enroll in a sector-specific job training program	29	30	42	21	45	20
2Biii	# of clients receiving financial counseling	309	183	296	201	99	202
	# of clients who increase savings by at least one week of income	64	38	61	42	21	42
	# of clients who decrease debt by at least 10%	35	21	33	23	11	23
	# of clients who increase their credit score by at least 35 points	39	23	37	25	12	25
	# of clients who open safe and affordable bank accounts	31	18	30	20	10	20
	# of programs being implemented on-site at RAD and HOPE SF housing developments						
2Biv	# of clients who receive free or low-cost digital devices						
	# of clients who receive training in digital skills, including basic digital literacy, online safety, privacy, information						

Goal ID	Indicator	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
	literacy, and advanced education or employment related skills						
	# of clients in affordable housing with increased access to high-speed internet						
2Ci	# of clients receiving a limited legal service	545	123	1,025	130	661	322
	# of clients receiving an extended legal service	325	73	610	77	394	192
	# of clients who have their civil legal issue successfully resolved	260	58	488	62	315	153
2Di	# of clients receiving information and referral, service connection and case coordination services	329	343	479	239	514	225
	# of clients engaged in case management, including development of Individual Service Plan	123	129	180	90	193	84
	# of clients who complete at least 50% of the goals from their Individual Service Plan	82	86	120	60	129	56
3Ai	# of facilities receiving capital improvements						
	# of facilities receiving capital needs assessments						
3Aii	# of communities facing increased housing density receiving community amenities						
3Bi	# of startup businesses assisted	22	30	43	34	20	10
	# of existing businesses assisted	67	90	130	75	50	10
	# of businesses engaged in a language other than English	6	90	30	5	10	5
	Total dollar amount value of loans accessed	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	50,000
	# of loans funded	4	4	30	10	10	5
	Total dollar amount value of equity invested	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	50,000
	# of jobs retained via business technical assistance	20	20	45	20	25	5
	# of jobs created via business technical assistance	20	20	45	20	25	5
	# of new businesses established via technical assistance provided	7	10	20	5	5	2
# of leases strengthened and businesses stabilized	1	5	5	5	5	2	

Goal ID	Indicator	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
3Bii	# of SF Shines façade applications completed	1	1	1	1	3	1
	# tenant improvements completed	1	1	1	1	3	1
	# of jobs created via business technical assistance	13	5	10	11	14	5
	# of training workshops offered via business technical assistance	5	4	5	7	9	4
3Ci	# of community-generated planning processes that lead to measurable benefits for the neighborhood	2	0	4	7	2	0
	# of nonprofit organizations that will produce cultural events, arts, cultural activities, and public place keeping projects	4	0	2	7	1	2
	# of businesses assisted as part of a community-driven comprehensive strategy (Cultural Districts, neighborhood strategy)	0	0	0	0	0	8
	# of jobs created via business technical assistance as part of a community-driven comprehensive strategy	0	0	0	0	0	8
	# of jobs retained via business technical assistance as part of a community-driven comprehensive strategy	0	0	0	0	0	8
3Cii	# of community-driven reports completed	1	0	1	2	1	0
3Di	# of organizations receiving capacity building and technical assistance	10	10	15	10	10	5
	# of organizations who successfully achieved at least one of their capacity building goals, as measured by pre- and post-assessment	2	2	3	2	2	1
4Ai	# of residents who access affordable housing through lottery preference programs						
	# of "Mixed Status Families" stabilized via support services and subsidies						
4Aii	# of commercial spaces created in MOHCD's affordable housing developments						
4Aiii	# of tenants receiving emergency rental assistance to stabilize their housing (also in 1Di)	202	0	4	163	6	4

Goal ID	Indicator	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
	# of tenants facing eviction able to stay in their current unit (also in 1Di)	250	0	5	201	7	5
	# of households receiving tenant education and counseling	250	0	5	201	7	5
	# of households receiving full-scope eviction defense	499	1	10	403	15	11
	# of households receiving other eviction defense services	277	0	5	224	8	6
	# of households whose housing crisis was resolved with emergency rental assistance	202	0	4	163	6	4
	# of existing businesses assisted						
	# of eligible Legacy Businesses assisted						
	# existing leases strengthened and businesses stabilized						
4Bi	# of activities or projects completed that sustained a neighborhood's art, culture, tradition, way of life, history or overall ecosystem	4	0	6	11	3	0
	# of participants who receive job readiness services in HOPE SF and RAD sites						
4Biii	# of participants who are placed in jobs at HOPE SF and RAD sites						
	# of outreach and community input activities provided by City Departments to communities	3	0	4	7	2	1
5Ai	# of plans developed to address stabilization and economic growth needs in communities and neighborhoods	2	0	4	5	2	0
	# of City staff who attend GARE training workshops						
	# of staff trained in trauma informed systems and self-care activities						
	Execution of racial equity analysis in MOHCD RFQ/RFP selection criteria						

Goal ID	Indicator	Year 1 Bayview Hunters Point	Year 1 Chinatown	Year 1 Mission	Year 1 South of Market	Year 1 Tenderloin	Year 1 Visitacion Valley
	Creation of MOHCD community outreach strategies that address racial disparities, historically underserved populations, cultural competency, and cultural humility						
5Bi	# of partner staff trained in implicit bias, cultural competency, trauma informed systems and equity trainings						
	# of HIV-specific education seminars and trainings						
	# of trainings for community partners hosted by MOHCD and OEWD						
5Bii	Execute MOHCD Racial Equity plan						
5Biii	Execute MOHCD Racial Equity plan						
	Implement changes to MOHCD internal policies						
	Inclusion of Trauma Champions, Catalysts, and Leaders in MOHCD's Racial Equity Working group						

Estimate the number of extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income families to whom the jurisdiction will provide affordable housing as defined by HOME 91.315(b)(2)

MOHCD estimates approximately ____ extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income families will be provided affordable housing rental housing during 2020–2024 time period using HOME funds and an additional approximately _____ affordable rental units will be built during this same time period using non-HOME sources.

SP-50 Public Housing Accessibility and Involvement – 91.215(c)

Need to Increase the Number of Accessible Units (if Required by a Section 504 Voluntary Compliance Agreement)

Under the RAD conversion and the HOPE SF revitalization programs, all former public housing units will meet or exceed the accessibility requirements of Section 504, providing a minimum of 5% mobility units and 4% vision- and hearing-impaired units.

Activities to Increase Resident Involvements

The RAD and HOPE SF revitalization programs increase tenant engagement activities and tenant services substantially. A framework for the RAD tenant engagement work follows. At HOPE SF properties, this level of connection is exceeded, with deep case management services available to many residents, as further described below.

RAD Community Engagement

Establish trust; Map assets and identify needs; Begin community activities; Build resident base; Develop neighborhood partnerships

Foundational and ongoing work with residents and community members of Housing Developments by all service providers or those who conduct work there.

Community Building – Community organizing and events; Increased information and opportunities; Deeper resident and neighborhood partnerships; Implement peer leadership activities; Development of Health and Wellness, Educational, and Economic Mobility activities

Deeper foundational and ongoing work that builds upon Community Engagement. As residents and community members become accustomed to providers then work can include recruiting peers and engaging them in leadership and skills building activities. This then establishes them as part of the team.

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

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

Resident Engagement and RAD

➤ What is the goal?

- To ease transition of residents to RAD
- To help residents understand what RAD is and how it will affect them
- To engage them in development of scope of work
- To engage them in development of documents and processes such as:

- Grievances
 - House rules
 - Leases
 - Services
 - To introduce residents to new owners and management entities and personnel
 - To provide continuity and evolution of tenant associations
 - To build systems to support housing stability
- **Why monthly meetings with residents at large are required?**
- Regular meetings message that development team is here to stay – trust building
 - Provide regular opportunity for asking questions, getting updates and providing feedback
 - Provide on-going opportunity for development teams and property management and residents to get to know each other
 - To ensure ongoing communication between tenants, property management, and services

All meetings include making FAQs available and appropriate translation. Teams always reiterate that there will be no permanent relocation due to RAD and that rents will be calculated in the same way that they are now. Other important message is that SFHA retains ownership of the land, which means that the buildings will be for people with low incomes forever.

Below are the roles each partner is playing in the RAD Engagement process:

SFHA: Identify existing resources for resident engagement that are effective and affordable. Establish partnerships with Developers, the City and Community Partners to communicate and engage with residents. Implement a Communication Plan including formal and informal communication milestones.

MOHCD: MOHCD coordinates the real estate transition from SFHA to developer team and will be a project lender. MOHCD will also coordinate the resident services model and its implementation at each site. Lastly MOHCD is leading the creation of clear and consistent dialogue, documentation and communication about RAD between all partners and residents.

Development Teams: Developer teams will implement the rehabilitation programs and own the buildings. They are committed to support resident involvement in all phases of the conversion and implementation.

Tenant Advocates: Tenant Advocates (Housing Rights Committee, National Housing Law Project, Bay Area Legal Aid) work with residents and stakeholders to promote greater understanding of resident rights

HOPE SF Community Engagement

Resident Services and Community Building Overview

Each of the four HOPE SF sites will continue to integrate intensive resident services and community building activities, executed by lead on-site service providers in collaboration with neighboring CBOs and city-wide programming. Services teams will focus their efforts towards preparing HOPE SF site residents for the transition to non-profit management, continuing to stabilize the tenant populations, and developing pathways towards economic mobility. They will achieve this through service connection and on-site programming in areas of economic mobility, public safety, health and wellness, and education.

All four HOPE SF sites have completed construction of a subset of replacement and affordable housing units. Residents will continue to be included in community space planning efforts across all four sites, managed by the non-profit developers. The Mayor's Office will work with on-site service providers to coordinate the training and placement of residents in construction jobs occurring on site. On-site service providers will be preparing residents for relocation and placement in the units. Additionally, services and programming assisting with the transition to non-profit management will be ramped up, such as those related to financial literacy, workforce development, and tenant education. Community building activities -- such as senior, teen & family programming, community gardening, and community-wide celebrations -- will also continue to be executed at each of the four HOPE SF sites.

Lead HOPE SF Resident Services Agencies:

<u>Site</u>	<u>Lead Service Provider</u>
Alice Griffith	Bayview Senior Services
Hunters View	Bayview YMCA
Potrero Terrace and Annex	Bridge Housing and Shanti Project
Sunnydale	Mercy Housing

At Hunters View, the Bayview Y has worked to prepare residents to keep their housing stable. The Bayview Y has also focused on barrier removal, career development support, health and wellness activities, family support programming, educational activities, and employment soft and hard skills.

At Alice Griffith, the Bayview Senior Services team, in conjunction with the Bayview Y, continues to link residents with senior programs, family support programming, youth programming, afterschool activities, health and wellness activities, and workforce development opportunities.

At Potrero Annex/Terrace, Bridge Housing continues to provide community building activities and foster individual participation in planning sessions. These activities included leadership development and safety workshops, gardening/sustainability programs, and social activities. Shanti Project is continuing to provide housing stabilization services on site to residents and working with households affected by Accelerated Conversion to ensure successful conversion.

At Sunnydale, Mercy Housing and the Bayview Y work collaboratively to provide outreach, family support, service connections, health and wellness, and educational activities and community convenings to Sunnydale residents.

Choice Neighborhood Grants

Planning Grants

Both Sunnydale and Potrero Annex and Terrace received HUD Choice Neighborhood Initiative Planning Grants in 2012 to support ongoing revitalization efforts and completed planning in 2014. Both of these communities continue to engage residents, city agencies, and other stakeholders in the implementation of the resulting plans.

The South Potrero Neighborhood Transformation Plan supported the development of a coordinated blueprint for improving Potrero Annex and Terrace, and the surrounding neighborhood. At Potrero Terrace and Annex, the work has been focused on establishing quality services in the community, and connecting residents to the greater neighborhood and services.

Implementation Grants

Urban Strategies completed their cycle of the Choice Neighborhoods Implementation Grant at Alice Griffith in 2017 in partnership with residents, city agencies, community organizations, and other stakeholders. Additionally, key neighborhood revitalization and construction projects continue to come online in the surrounding district which will provide opportunities for training and placement.

The Sunnydale team is exploring the feasibility of a 2021 Implementation Grant application.

Is the public housing agency designated as troubled under 24 CFR part 902?

By a letter from HUD to the Authority dated March 7, 2019, HUD determined that the SFHA was in default under its HCV Consolidated Annual Contributions Contract (“HCV ACC”) and its Low Rent Public Housing Consolidated Annual Contributions Contract (“LRPH ACC”). After a determination of default, HUD has the authority to take possession of all or a part of the Authority or require the Authority to make other arrangements consistent with HUD requirements that are in the best interests of the public housing residents and families assisted by HUD.

Plan to remove the ‘troubled’ designation

Under the Default Letter, HUD determined that it is in the best interests of the Authority’s public housing residents and assisted families to allow the Authority the opportunity to cure the SFHA Default as follows: (i) the City’s assumption of responsibility of the programmatic and financial functions under the HCV ACC and LRPH ACC, including financial management, program management, wait list and admissions, inspections, eligibility determinations, and lease and grievance procedures, and (ii) outsourcing programmatic and financial administration of the HCV program and LRPH program, including continued outsourcing of Authority’s financial management.

The City approved a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between SFHA and the City in December 2019, and reviewed by HUD, outlining the preliminary terms of the City's assumption of Housing Authority functions as shown below:

Labor Relations: SFHA gave notice to its existing employees on the reduction in Housing Authority staffing, resulting from the City's assumption of and contracting out of SFHA functions, as required by HUD. SFHA developed severance packages for employees who were impacted and is partnering with the City to assist with finding City jobs for these employees when possible.

Restructuring of the Housing Authority: The MOU provided a preliminary restructuring plan that included:

- Appointment of City staff to provide executive management oversight of Housing Authority functions;
- Plan to contract out the Housing Authority's public housing and HCV programs; and
- Development of a specific timeline to integrate the Housing Authority's systems, processes, and the policies with the City for financial oversight, information technology, human resources, real estate, purchasing, and legal oversight. The MOU further provided for the parties (HUD, Housing Authority, City) to commit to the capital funding necessary to redevelop the public housing under HOPE SF; and to continue to convert the public housing units to project based vouchers.

Shortfall Funding: HUD maintains a fund to annually augment local housing authorities' budgets that have a shortfall in their housing voucher programs. HUD provided \$10 million in shortfall funding to the Housing Authority in 2018. According to the MOU, the Housing Authority will apply for HUD's shortfall funding annually, or as frequently as needed.

Executive Management and Shared Services:

- The City will provide executive management staff to the Housing Authority, including a chief executive officer reporting to the Mayor or the Mayor's designee.
- The Housing Authority will integrate with City services over time, including information technology, human resources, purchasing, real estate, financial systems, and other services. The timing and process of integration will be developed in consultation with MOHCD, Controller, and General Services Agency. Administration and Oversight
- The annual Housing Authority budget will be submitted to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors, who may accept or reject the budget. The budget submission will be consistent with City procedures and HUD timelines and requirements.
- Administration of the HCV program and public housing will be contracted to third parties, as required by HUD and discussed above. The Housing Authority will work with the City to procure third-party contractors, but the contracting process must conform to HUD requirements. Contracts for property transactions will be subject to third-party appraisal with the exception of properties conveyed for development of affordable housing.
- Financial management of the Housing Authority will be contracted to a third party with expertise and experience in HUD financial Introduction Budget and Legislative Analyst's Office 10 reporting and requirements. Currently, the Housing Authority contracts with BDO USA LLP for financial management and reporting.
- Issuance of debt by the Housing Authority must be approved by the Authority and the Board of Supervisors.

- Any material amendment to the MOU is subject to prior approval by the Board of Supervisors. Housing Authority Commission
- The Housing Authority Commission is authorized by state law to have seven members, appointed by the Mayor, two of whom must be Housing Authority residents. Under the proposed MOU, the Mayor would appoint four members directly, and three members recommended by motion at the sole discretion of the Board of Supervisors. Of the Mayor's four appointments, at least one must be a Housing Authority resident. Of the Board's three appointments, at least one must be a Housing Authority resident 62 years of age or older.

Non-Housing Assets

- The Housing Authority will (a) inventory non-housing assets, including the building at 1815 Egbert Street, vehicles, and other assets; (b) identify which assets are needed for ongoing operations; and (c) plan disposition of surplus assets in accordance with HUD requirements. Loans made by the City to the Housing Authority will be repaid from surplus funds from the disposition of assets, subject to HUD requirements.

SP-55 Barriers to affordable housing – 91.215(h)

Barriers to Affordable Housing

Based on the 2011 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing submitted to HUD, the following have been found to be barriers to affordable housing:

<i>Impediments to Affordable Housing Development</i>
City funding alone cannot cover costs for affordable housing development. Affordable housing developers depend on a variety of federal, state, and local funding sources. Unfortunately, Federal, State and local funding sources are vulnerable to the budgeting process and economic conditions.
Infrastructure costs sometimes pose an impediment to affordable development as in the case of HOPE SF developments where a large portion of development costs will be infrastructure costs such as new roads and sewers.
Most of the city is housed in smaller buildings (75% of the building stock is comprised of buildings with fewer than 20 units) Deterioration, TIC (Tenant in Common) conversions, condominium conversions, and demolitions all threaten to remove these units from the rental stock. However, Tax credit programs, the principle funding source for affordable housing rental development, have traditionally been difficult to use for scattered site developments.
<i>Impediments to Utilization of Assisted Housing Programs</i>
Affordable housing and public housing are predominantly located in low-income neighborhoods and neighborhoods with low-achieving schools.
A disproportionate number of voucher holders live in low-income neighborhoods like Bayview, SOMA, and the Western Addition.
Information about affordable housing is complex and non-centralized.
Applications can involve a large amount of paperwork and require households to provide records for income verification. In some cases, short application time frames and submittal requirements (e.g., by fax) create additional challenges. These requirements present obstacles for particular populations such as those with mental health issues or limited literacy.
Strict screening standards can have the effect of restricting access on the basis of race or disability status to the extent that screening criteria such as criminal history correlate with protected factors.
<i>Impediments to Healthy Living in Low-Cost Market Rate Housing and SROs</i>
Some renters in San Francisco, particularly recently arrived immigrants, people with limited English proficiency, low levels of education, or disabilities, are not aware of their rights to healthy, habitable housing under City Code.
Single Room Occupancy Hotels are amongst the oldest building in the City, and buildings continue to deteriorate.
Tenants who suffer from mental or psychiatric disabilities, or who have hoarding and cluttering behavior, can have difficulties vacating their room for building managers to do needed improvements.
Some buildings have elevators that break frequently and require special parts for repairs. Senior and disabled tenants in SRO buildings who need an elevator can become trapped in their units. Furthermore, a majority of SRO buildings lack elevators entirely.
Unlike nonprofit staff, who specialize in working with high-need populations, hotel staff in privately owned SROs seldom know how to approach persons with mental illness or in crisis.
<i>Impediments to Reducing Direct Discrimination</i>

Based upon reported incidents, alone, it is impossible to know the true prevalence of housing discrimination because many people experiencing discrimination do not make a formal report.
Impediments Facing Seniors and Adults with Disabilities
5% of older adults and 9% of disabled adults need, but cannot access home repair and modifications programs
Because the Planning Department does not have a single, uniform procedure for reasonable accommodations requests, some persons in need of a reasonable accommodation may slip through the cracks. For instance, staff may not always recognize a “reasonable accommodations request” when it is not phrased in that terminology.
Accessibility issues in affordable housing could often be avoided if parties involved with affordable housing development and oversight—MOH, DPH, HSA, and developers, had improved communication and coordination with representatives from the disability community.
The application and wait-list process can make it difficult to “match” people with specific impairments to a suitable unit.
People with disabilities who need live-in care have exceptional difficulty accessing City-supported affordable housing if there are too few 2 bedroom units available, or because these units are financially out of reach
MOH does not collect complete data on the disability status of residents in City supported housing.
Security deposit assistance programs primarily focus on families at risk of homelessness.
<i>Impediments Due to Race/Ethnicity</i>
Low-income families often lack asset building opportunities. In San Francisco, an estimated 40,000 households (11%) are un-banked.
A large share of this most recent wave of foreclosures was precipitated by subprime and predatory lending that often targeted racial/ethnic and linguistic minorities
Foreclosure counselors in neighborhoods that are hard hit by foreclosures are having difficulty keeping up with the need for their assistance, and can no longer provide intensive one-on-one guidance.
The Office of the Assessor-Recorder has taken a leadership role in addressing foreclosures in San Francisco. However, the office has limited capacity to address a full range of policy and legislative issues related to the foreclosure crisis. In particular, little is known about the prevalence of foreclosures in rental buildings.
Criminal background checks, credit checks, and eviction history are commonly used to help judge applicant qualifications. However, these methods may result in disproportionate refusal of African American and Latino/a applicants.
Consistent underrepresentation of Latino/a and Hispanic households in City-supported rental housing
Applicants to BMR housing do not reflect the demographic mix of qualified San Francisco residents. Latino/a, African American and white applicants are under-represented relative to Asian applicants.
Multiple steps and requirements for BMR home purchase result in many drop-outs and disqualifications. Almost 10 applicants begin the process for every one that succeeds. As a general trend, Asian and white households appear to be more successful in making it through the process.
<i>Impediments Facing People with a Criminal Record</i>
Barriers to housing and work, in particular, hinder their ability to establish a healthy productive lifestyle. Housing discrimination on the basis of a criminal record is a Fair Housing issue as disproportionate numbers of African Americans, Latino/as, and people with a disability have had criminal justice system involvement.

Housing managers are under pressure to fill units quickly so it is important that applicants have a timely opportunity to offer corrections, evidence of mitigating circumstances, evidence of rehabilitation, and requests for reasonable accommodation.
Most landlords are not adequately informed about laws regarding private criminal background checks and violate them unknowingly in an attempt to identify the best possible tenants
Some transitional housing programs bar those with a criminal background from enrollment.
For those who do not struggle with addiction or mental illness, the current stock of transitional housing is not a good fit, as most transitional housing includes a treatment regime. However, even those with an employment history and in-demand skills, when released without a home, need a transitional housing program to get back on their feet.
SFHA considers a wide range of criminal allegations and convictions, but does not call for blanket exclusions except those required by HUD for registered sex offenders and methamphetamine production. Some have voiced concern about the unpredictable nature of a broadly discretionary policy.
<i>Impediments Facing Immigrants and People with Limited English Proficiency</i>
City residents can safely access City-sponsored housing, regardless of their immigration status, but fear of deportation remains a significant barrier; many families and individuals opt for substandard or overcrowded conditions rather than become known to government staff or programs.
Housing-related transactions that might be easy for a high-school educated native-born American, such as filling out an application forms, can pose a substantial barrier to entry for anyone who cannot speak, write or read English.

Strategy to Remove or Ameliorate the Barriers to Affordable Housing

Addressing Barriers to Affordable Housing

The City of San Francisco’s housing agencies work diligently to ensure that barriers to affordable housing are addressed. The Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development submitted its Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing (AI) to HUD to guide this work in the coming years. Numerous programs and policies implemented by the City of San Francisco aim to uphold fair housing rights. Below is a description of programs, policies, and directions the City will pursue to reduce barriers to housing access and barriers to affordable housing production.

Addressing Barriers to Housing Access

Improve access to knowledge about rental housing

When certain groups have unequal access to information about their housing options, it can become a fair housing issue. MOHCD requires all affordable housing developers to adhere to strict affirmative marketing strategies to ensure that information about available units reaches the general public. The City and County of San Francisco requires its grantees to advertise the availability of housing units and services to individuals and families from all race/ethnic and economic backgrounds. MOHCD requires its partners to advertise in all forms of local media including community newspaper, radio and TV (when necessary). MOHCD will also post information on the availability of housing and services on its website. In site visits with the grantees, MOHCD monitors the grantee’s marketing efforts and discusses the organization’s method for reaching clients.

To further inform the public about affordable housing opportunities, the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development explains local policies and programs that address affordable housing through our website and Annual Housing Report. Together, the MOHCD website and Annual Housing Report serve to orient the general public on basic issues such as the difference between public housing and other affordable housing.

Additionally, MOHCD publishes unit availability on its website and provides weekly email alerts to a list of service providers and community members. Email alerts list newly posted rental units in the Below Market Rate (BMR) rental and homeownership programs.

Finally, MOHCD funds community-based organizations to provide counseling for renters who are at risk of eviction, have recently been evicted, or are urgently in need of housing. Among low-income people, individuals with barriers to housing, such as those with disabilities or limited English fluency, are prioritized. Housing counselors help clients navigate public housing, affordable housing, and market rate housing (when appropriate) by guiding them to rental opportunities and assisting with the application process. Counseling agencies also support seniors, younger adults with disabilities, and other clients with specific needs in finding service-enriched housing.

Improve access to knowledge about homeownership opportunities

MOHCD supports community-based organizations in providing education and financial training programs that assist first time homebuyers to navigate the home purchase and financing opportunities available to them. Homebuyer education is a crucial component of all of the first time homebuyer programs in the City. Several HUD approved non-profit counseling agencies are supported by the City to provide culturally sensitive homebuyer workshops and counseling in several languages for free throughout the City. All City supported agencies utilize the standard Neighborworks America approved curriculum for homebuyer education, and make up HomeownershipSF, a collaborative membership organization that is a Neighborworks affiliate. The homebuyer curriculum requires 6-8 hours of in-class education, and individual one-on-one counseling is encouraged before a certificate is issued. In addition to the ongoing workshops and counseling, the City-supported counseling agencies organize a yearly homeownership fair in the fall. The fair brings together counselors, lenders, and agencies dedicated to providing opportunities for low-income first-time homebuyers. The homeownership fair is attended by an average of 3,000 people every year and targeted outreach is done to draw from the diverse San Francisco communities. The fair has workshops, in several languages, on credit income, first-time homebuyers.

Eliminate discriminatory practices

MOHCD requires MOHCD-funded affordable housing developers and management companies to comply with fair housing law and does not allow for discrimination against any protected class. MOHCD's loan documents include the following clause "Borrower agrees not to discriminate against or permit discrimination against any person or group of persons because of race, color, creed, national origin, ancestry, age, sex, sexual orientation, disability, gender identity, height, weight, source of income or acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS) or AIDS related condition (ARC) in the operation and use of the Project except to the extent permitted by law or required by any other funding source for the Project. Borrower agrees not to discriminate against or permit discrimination against Tenants using Section 8 certificates or vouchers or assistance through other rental subsidy programs"

In addition to working actively with MOHCD-funded affordable housing management to ensure compliance with fair housing requirements, MOHCD also funds community-based organizations to

provide counseling on Fair Housing law to ensure renters across the City know their rights regarding discrimination issues, reasonable accommodation requests, and other fair housing issues.

Addressing Barriers to Housing Production¹⁵¹

Identify Sites Appropriate for Housing Development

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

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

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

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

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

Secondary Units

Secondary units (in-law or granny units) are smaller dwellings within a structure that contains a much larger unit, using a space that is surplus to the primary dwelling. Secondary units represent a simple and cost-effective method of expanding the housing supply. Such units can be developed to meet the needs of seniors, people with disabilities, and others who, because of modest incomes or lifestyles, prefer or need small units at relatively low rents. Within community planning processes, the City may explore where secondary units can occur without adversely affecting the neighborhood.

Smaller Units

Density standards in San Francisco have traditionally encouraged larger units by setting the number of dwelling units in proportion to the size of the building lot. However, in some areas, the City may

¹⁵¹ The following section on Addressing Barriers to Housing Production is cited from the June 2010 Draft Housing Element. The role of the Housing Element is to provide policy background for housing programs and decisions and broad directions towards meeting the City's housing goals. However, parameters specified in the Zoning Map and Planning Code can only be changed through a community process and related legislative process. Thus, not all strategies identified in the Housing Element are certain to be implemented. The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development will explore recommendations of the Housing Element as they pertain to findings from the 2011 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing (this report is currently in progress).

consider using the building envelope to regulate the maximum residential square footage. This will encourage smaller units in neighborhoods where building types are well suited for increased density.

Moreover, the Planning Department allows a density bonus of twice the number of dwelling units when the housing is specifically designed for and occupied by senior citizens, physically or mentally disabled persons.

Rental Units

In recent years the production of new housing has yielded primarily ownership units, but low-income and middle-income residents are usually renters. The City encourages the continued development of rental housing, including market-rate rentals that can address moderate and middle income needs. Recent community planning efforts have explored incentives such as fee waivers and reductions in inclusionary housing requirements in return for the development of deed-restricted, long-term rental housing. The Planning Department will monitor the construction of middle income housing under new provisions included within the inclusionary requirements of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans and consider expanding those provisions Citywide if they are successful.

Identify and Implement Creative Financing Strategies

Due to the high cost of housing subsidies required to provide a unit to low and very low income households (subsidy of \$170,000-\$200,000 required per unit), financing is amongst the most challenging barriers to affordable housing production. In addition, several Federal and State programs that historically have supported affordable housing development are at risk. The current recession has impacted government coffers as well as financial institutions, reducing the capital available for development. For example, the Federal Low Income Housing Tax Credit program (LIHTC) has, in years past, financed about 90% of affordable housing. In this economic climate and with the elimination of redevelopment agencies and their required commitment of 20% of their tax increment to affordable housing, the City of San Francisco is seeking creative solutions to finance affordable housing production and preservation.

Jobs-Housing Linkage Program

New commercial and other non-residential development increase the City's employment base and thereby increase the demand for housing. The City's Jobs-Housing Linkage Program, which collects fees for affordable housing production from commercial developments, will continue to be enforced and monitored.

Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credits

Planning and OEWD will promote the use of the Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credits to help subsidize rental projects, and continue to provide information about such preservation incentives to repair, restore, or rehabilitate historic resources towards rental housing in lieu of demolition.

Citywide Inclusionary Housing Program

Planning and MOHCD will continue to implement the Citywide Inclusionary Housing Program, which requires the inclusion of permanently affordable units in housing developments of 10 or more units. MOHCD is also looking to expand the program to allow developers to target higher incomes than what is currently allowed under the Inclusionary Housing Program in exchange for more affordable housing units to be built.

Tax Increment Financing

Tax Increment dollars in the major development projects of Mission Bay, Hunters Point Shipyard and Transbay will continue to be set aside for affordable housing as required by the development agreements for those major development projects and subject to the State Department of Finance's approval.

Housing Trust Fund

San Francisco voters approved Proposition C in November 2012, which amended the City's charter to enable creation of the Housing Trust Fund. It is a fund that shall exist for 30 years payable from set-asides from the City's general fund and other local sources. MOHCD is implementing housing programs or modifying existing programs to account for this new funding source and began using funds from the Housing Trust Fund in July 2013.

Reduce Regulatory Barriers

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

The City is also exploring mechanisms that maintain the strength of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and its use as a tool for environmental protection while eliminating aspects of its implementation that are not appropriate and unnecessarily delay proposed projects. For instance, the Planning Department will continue to prioritize projects that comply with CEQA requirements for infill exemptions by assigning planners immediately upon receipt of such applications. Other improvements to CEQA implementation are underway. For example, a recent Board of Supervisors report studied how to meaningfully measure traffic impacts in CEQA.

Address NIMBYISM

Neighborhood resistance to new development, especially affordable housing development, poses a significant barrier. However, NIMBYism can be reduced by engaging neighbors in a thorough and respectful planning process. In order to increase the supply and affordability of housing, the City has engaged in significant planning for housing through Area Plans and other processes that respect community voice and neighborhood character. In general, the Planning Department's review of projects and development of guidelines builds on community local controls, including Area plans, neighborhood specific guidelines, neighborhood Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CC&R's) and other resident-driven standards for development.

Public education about the desirability and necessity of affordable housing is also an ongoing effort. Planning, DBI and other agencies will continue to provide informational sessions at Planning Commission Department of Building Inspection Commission and other public hearings to educate citizens about affordable housing.

SP-60 Homelessness Strategy – 91.215(d)

Describe how the jurisdiction's strategic plan goals contribute to:

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

Street Outreach is a Core Component of the Homeless Response System in the HSH Strategic Framework. Coordinated Entry replaces single program waitlists and entry procedures that encourage people to get on as many lists as possible and then wait for assistance. A person experiencing homelessness or at risk of homelessness may go to an Access Point, such as a Resource Center. They may also be approached by a Street Outreach worker and be immediately assessed, using the standard assessment for all programs. Problem Solving assistance is offered to all, especially those newly homeless or at-risk. If homelessness can be prevented by returning to a safe place, that will be facilitated. If not, clients will be offered Temporary Shelter.

The San Francisco Homeless Outreach Team (SFHOT) was formed in May 2004 as part of a Mayor's Office, health, social services, and community initiative. Ten years later, SFHOT continues to evolve to meet various population needs. Over 3,000 chronically homeless severely disabled individuals have been care managed by SFHOT, with nearly 50% securing permanent housing. SFHOT works collaboratively in small teams first to engage and stabilize chronically homeless individuals and next to help gain care for chronic conditions and find permanent housing via three lines of service, as follows:

Stabilization Care: This SFHOT service line provides short-term stabilization care management for high risk homeless individuals (homeless more than three years, experiencing complex medical, psychiatric, and substance abuse tri-morbidity, using a high number of urgent/emergent care services, and not able to navigate health and human services system on their own. Care Managers accept referrals from SFHOT First Responders and high user treatment programs. Within six to twelve months, the goals are to: (1) Stabilize individuals from the street into shelter/SRO, (2) Remove personal barriers to attaining permanent housing; e.g., attain benefits, primary care linkage, behavioral health care linkage, IDs, legal aid, etc., (3) Secure and place into permanent housing, (4) Assess and serve as care coordinators for SF Health Network members who are high risk / high cost individuals and are unable to engage into the system.

First Responders and Street Medicine Staff: This SFHOT service line provides outreach, engagement and warm-handoffs from the street to (or between) urgent/ emergent institutions. First Responders operate 24/7 and responds to requests from 311, Care Coordinators, Police, Fire, and Urgent/Emergent facilities (hospitals, SF Sobering Center, Psych Emergency Services, and Dore Psych Urgent Care) for street outreach/intervention and therapeutic transports. The goals are to, within two hours, respond and determine if the individual can be cleared for transport and provide warm-handoff to and/or from urgent/emergent facilities. In addition, the First Responders provide targeted search and outreach of HUMS (High Users of Multiple Systems) and other high-risk homeless individuals as identified by 311 (citizens) and health care coordinators and, once found, performs wellness checks and attempts to engage individuals into services and other resources as identified by community care plans. First Responders assess and refer the highest risk to the Care Management teams.

San Francisco Public Library: This SFHOT service line includes a Psychiatric Social Worker situated at the Civic Center Main Branch who conducts outreach and offers referrals to homeless, marginally housed and/or mentally ill patrons of the library. She also facilitates education sessions in group or individual settings for library staff, in order to improve understanding of behaviorally vulnerable patrons of the library. Her goal is to help library staff serve this group of patrons according to their needs, while helping to decrease the number and severity of incidents that require intervention from Library security staff. This social worker also supervises four 15-hours/week Health and Safety Associates (HaSAs) who are selected from a group of homeless library patrons being served by SF HOTS case management function. HaSAs assist the team by using their life experiences and learned engagement skills to reach out to other homeless patrons, in order to persuade them to accept case management and other services. In the process, HaSAs gain employment and job-seeking skills, through their supervision by the Psychiatric Social Worker, as well as an associated DPH Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor.

Addressing the emergency and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

Emergency Shelters and Transitional Housing programs will be used for those who cannot be diverted from the homeless system and who cannot immediately be placed in permanent housing. The primary purpose of emergency shelters and transitional housing programs will be to equip persons to move into appropriate forms of permanent housing as soon as possible. While in shelter or transitional housing programs, staff will provide clients with or make referrals to services such as intensive case management, childcare, education, employment assistance, job training, legal, mental health, substance abuse treatment, transitional housing, permanent or permanent supportive housing, transportation, and services for special populations utilizing evidence-based or best practices.

Shelters have been made more accessible is that homeless persons can make 90-day shelter reservations by calling the City's 311 System. This process makes it easier for seniors, persons with disabilities, and non-English speakers to access the emergency shelter system by eliminating the need to wait in line and instead using the 311 system's 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year translation capability. By making it as convenient as possible for homeless adults to access safe, clean emergency shelters when needed, more time is available them to seek employment, to engage with vital services, and to find permanent housing. Providing better access to the emergency shelter system enables the City to maximize the number of beds that are used every night, leaving fewer people on the street at night.

The City has placed a high priority on assisting people who are homeless to access permanent housing as quickly as possible, without requiring "housing readiness" or participation in services or transitional programs as a prerequisite. This strategy has been found to be effective with most populations, including people who are chronically homeless. However, for some people, access to treatment (either treatment in a clinical sense or mental health and/or substance abuse services) in a transitional housing setting can be beneficial; it provides a necessary steppingstone enhancing their ability to successfully access and maintain permanent housing. Particular sub-populations that have been found to benefit from treatment housing include: people suffering from a serious mental illness, people with chronic substance abuse problems, recently discharged offenders, people suffering from trauma (domestic violence, former sex workers, youth experiencing homelessness, veterans), and emancipated foster and homeless youth. For these populations, treatment housing provides a supportive, transitional environment that facilitates the stability necessary for future housing retention and provides treatment in a setting that offers immediate support against relapse and other potential set-backs.

Strategies necessary to effectively meet the need for treatment housing include: 1) evaluation of existing treatment/transitional housing in the City to determine which facilities to maintain and which to transform into permanent supportive housing; 2) appropriate assessment of the population that will benefit from treatment housing; 3) development of intensive case management and service packages for specific populations; and 4) creation of stronger linkages to facilitate movement between treatment programs and permanent housing.

Street Outreach connects those living outside with the Homelessness Response System. This includes outreach and engagement (SF HOT), encampment resolution (ERT), care coordination, Access Points, and Resource Centers.

Helping homeless persons (especially chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth) make the transition to permanent housing and independent living, including shortening the period of time that individuals and families experience homelessness, facilitating access for homeless individuals and families to affordable housing units, and preventing individuals and families who were recently homeless from becoming homeless again.

Many people who are homeless or at-risk, in particular those who are suffering from a disabling condition, are in touch with one or more of the City's public institutions and systems of care, including hospitals, mental health programs, detoxification and treatment programs, foster care and the criminal justice system. As such, these institutions have an important role to play in identifying people who need assistance to maintain their housing or who are homeless and need help regaining it. Through comprehensive transition, or "discharge" planning, these individuals, upon release, can be linked with the housing, treatment and services they need to facilitate ongoing stability and prevent future homelessness.

Key aspects of effective discharge planning include: assessment of housing and service related needs at intake; development of comprehensive discharge plans and assignment of a discharge planner/case manager to oversee plan implementation; provision of services that will promote long-term housing stability, while in custody/care; and expansion of housing options for people being discharged.

For people who are homeless involved with the criminal justice system whose crimes are non-violent petty misdemeanors, and for repeat, frequent users of the hospital system occasioned by lack of ongoing health care and homelessness, diversion strategies should be used that focus on addressing housing, treatment and service needs so as to prevent both recurring homelessness as well as repeat offenses and to support health outcomes.

"Respite" beds with appropriate medical care, medication and care supplies are needed by people who are homeless to recuperate post-hospitalization. These beds with care do not prevent homelessness nor end homelessness; but until sufficient permanent housing is available, they are necessary to support recovery. Coupled with other supportive services, they also can provide a link to other community services and housing opportunities.

In order to ensure the effectiveness of discharge planning efforts, data on the permanent housing outcomes of those discharged should be collected and included as part of ongoing evaluations of these public institutions.

Help low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless, especially extremely low-income individuals and families who are likely to become homeless after being discharged from a publicly funded institution or system of care, or who are receiving assistance from public and private agencies that address housing, health, social services, employment, education or youth needs

The HSH Strategic Framework endorses Problem Solving as a Core Component of the Homeless Response System. Problem Solving provides opportunities to prevent people from entering the Homelessness Response System and to redirect people who can resolve their homelessness without the need for ongoing support. It may offer a range of one-time assistance, including eviction prevention, legal services, relocation programs (Homeward Bound), family reunification, mediation, move in assistance, and flexible grants to address issues related to housing and employment

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

- Prevent homelessness by intervening to avoid evictions from permanent housing that lead to homelessness. Increase outreach and education about eviction-prevention resources, including financial assistance and tenant rights laws. Provide short-term rental support and wraparound services to address underlying issues threatening housing stability and to prevent eviction. Increase the provision of legal services for individuals and families at risk of eviction. Provide rehousing support.

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

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

To address the myriad challenges of homelessness, homeless response services and prevention program is grant-based and aligns CDBG, ESG and Housing Trust Fund funding to support homeless prevention and eviction prevention programs, operating support for emergency and transitional shelters, direct services for homeless individuals and families, and supportive housing. This program coordinates closely with other City Departments, in particular the HSA and DPH, to align its strategies.

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

SP-65 Lead based paint Hazards – 91.215(i)

Actions to address LBP hazards and increase access to housing without LBP hazards

MOHCD requires CDBG funded housing, tenant rights, and other non-profit housing related agencies to provide lead poisoning prevention education to tenant families with young children, information on the Federal Lead Hazard Disclosure Law, and information on MOHCD's Home Rehab program.

How are the actions listed above related to the extent of lead poisoning and hazards?

MOHCD response system is comprised of several City agencies and non-profit partners to address the problem of lead poisoning, prohibited nuisances code enforcement and dilapidated housing. Fundamental to the response system, the San Francisco DPH code enforcement has the legislative authority to cite property owners with a notice of violation whenever there is visibly deteriorated paint in the exterior or interior of a pre-1978 building where children under six may be exposed to the lead hazard. These violations become direct referrals to MOHCD, which provides lead remediation services of lead hazards as part of its single-family home rehab loan program.

In addition, the DPH works with the Family Childcare Association, the Children's Council, the San Francisco Head Start Program, and other private preschools serving low-income families - to ensure families are educated on lead poisoning prevention and timely lead blood level testing of children under the age of six. As a result, low-income children attending targeted preschools are regularly tested for lead blood content as a commitment to a healthy educational start. Children with a detectable lead blood level are case managed by the San Francisco DPH.

How are the actions listed above integrated into housing policies and procedures?

Any housing built before 1978 that are or could be occupied by families and will be rehabilitated with MOHCD's financial assistance is required to be assessed for lead-based paint hazards. Should lead-based paint hazards be found then remediation becomes part of the rehabilitation scope of work.

SP-70 Anti-Poverty Strategy – 91.215(j)

Jurisdiction Goals, Programs and Policies for reducing the number of Poverty-Level Families

Tenant Right to Counsel: San Francisco’s Eviction Defense System

San Francisco voters passed the “No Eviction Without Representation Act of 2018,” then-known as Proposition F, on June 5, 2018. This local law went into effect on July 11, 2019. It establishes a policy that all residential tenants facing eviction have a right to legal representation, known as a tenant right to counsel. The ballot initiative that brought about the local law did not create a revenue source to fund the Tenant Right to Counsel (TRC) program. However, through the City’s budget process, the Mayor and Board of Supervisors have significantly increased funding for the TRC program since its passage. MOHCD allocated \$9.6 million in Fiscal Year 2019-2020 (July 1, 2019-June 30, 2020) to the TRC program.

Legal representation is provided by a network of nine City-funded legal services organizations (with a combined 47 attorneys supported by social workers & paralegals) and is subject to availability. During the first six months of implementation (July-December 2019), the TRC program provided the mandated full-scope legal representation to approximately two-thirds of all tenant households who availed themselves of assistance. The remaining one-third received limited legal services, including *pro per* assistance with completing the prescribed court form that must be filed at the court within five calendar days of being served with the eviction lawsuit in order to assert their defense, and limited-scope representation during the mandatory, pre-trial settlement conference.

The TRC program is providing full-scope legal representation to an unprecedented number of tenants facing eviction. Program-level data and other relevant studies suggest that full-scope legal representation get far superior results for clients than limited legal services. In San Francisco, approximately 67% of clients receiving full-scope legal representation stay in their homes, as compared to less than 40% of clients receiving limited-scope legal representation.

Coordinated Entry

In August 2016, Mayor Edwin M. Lee launched the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH) to fundamentally change the way the City and County of San Francisco addresses homelessness. HSH—relying on guidance from people experiencing homelessness, service providers, and other stakeholders in San Francisco—developed a Five-Year Strategic Framework outlining specific goals for HSH’s vision to make homelessness a rare, brief, and one-time event with the overall aim of significant, sustained reductions in homelessness. To accomplish this goal, HSH will coordinate alignment of all programs into a Homelessness Response System (HRS) that treats homelessness as an emergency to be responded to quickly and effectively. Please note that the Homelessness Response System covers the entire geographic region defined as the San Francisco CoC.

Coordinated Entry (CE) is a key component of this response system. CE is a consistent, community wide intake process to match people experiencing homelessness to available community resources that are the best fit for their situation. CE includes a clear set of entry points, a standardized method to assess and prioritize people needing assistance, and a streamlined process for rapidly connecting people to a housing solution. All homeless individuals and families in San Francisco will complete a standardized assessment process that considers the household’s situation and identifies the best type of housing intervention to address their needs. Permanent housing programs—including permanent supportive housing (PSH) and rapid rehousing (RRH)—will fill spaces in their programs from a community pool of

eligible households generated from the standard assessment process. CE will also fully integrate into the Online Navigation and Entry (ONE) System—San Francisco’s implementation of the Homeless Management and Information System (HMIS). The assessment will build upon the standard intake and be entered directly into ONE and referrals to transitional and permanent housing will be made through the ONE System. This coordinated process will dramatically reduce the burden placed on people experiencing homelessness by removing the necessity to seek assistance from every provider separately and instead streamline access to all the resources in our Homelessness Response System.

HSH has launched Adult Coordinated Entry, Family Coordinated Entry and Coordinated Entry for Youth and their Community Access Points.

Healthy Retail SF

The grassroots activism to provide healthy food options in the Bayview District and the Tenderloin has led to institutional change within city government. In 2013, Supervisor Eric Mar introduced legislation that created Healthy Retail SF, which is led by OEWD’s Invest in Neighborhoods division, in conjunction with the DPH. San Francisco has about 1,150 food retail stores, about 1,000 are corner stores. This program supports these mom-and-pop businesses while providing healthy and affordable food access, especially to underserved neighborhoods.

In certain parts of the City, there is a lack of quality full-service neighborhood markets with fresh produce, and an overabundance of corner stores selling alcohol, tobacco, and highly processed foods that are high in salt, fat, and sugar and low in nutrients. In communities that lack supermarkets, families depend on corner stores for food purchases, and the choices at those stores are often limited to packaged food and very little, if any, fresh produce. For example, a 2011 assessment of 19 corner stores in the City’s Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood found that 20% of the stores stocked a variety of fresh fruits and vegetables, only 11% stocked whole grain bread, and only 37% stocked low-fat milk. The presence of a large number of stores selling low quality foods in a community can undermine public efforts to promote health and send a message that normalizes the use of unhealthy products in that neighborhood, placing these communities at greater risk for obesity and chronic disease. A high number of convenience stores per capita is associated with higher rates of mortality, diabetes, and obesity. Proximity to convenience stores within a neighborhood is associated with higher rates of obesity and diabetes. The impact of convenience stores on health is even greater in low-income neighborhoods.

Healthy Retail SF created an expert healthy retail advisory group, designed program structures and tools, and implements neighborhood wide outreach meetings with store owners. Each participating store receives an assessment and tailored 13-page Individualized Development Plan (IDP) that outlines activities, timelines, persons responsible and budget in three areas: business operations, physical changes to the store, and community engagement and marketing. Community Food Advocates called Food Guardians and Food Justice Leaders are a critical element of the model.

Healthy Retail SF provides funds for participating businesses to make improvements based on their IDP. Improvements include installation of equipment, community engagement and marketing support, technical assistance with sustainable business practices, and store space redesign. Participating businesses commit 35% of its selling area to fresh produce, whole grains, lean proteins, and low-fat dairy products, while limiting the sale of tobacco and alcohol to 20% of the selling space.

Homeowner Emergency Loan Program (HELP)

The purpose of the MOHCD HELP program is to assist San Francisco homeowners in need of a one-time emergency financial assistance loan due to an unforeseen financial hardship.

HELP Funds may be used for:

- Past due mortgage Payments
- Past due HOA monthly dues
- Past due property taxes
- Special assessments (e.g.p renovation costs passed down to residents)
- BMR homeowners in need of financial assistance to complete necessary repairs in order to sell property

HOPE SF

HOPE SF is an ambitious cross-sector initiative to transform San Francisco’s most distressed public housing sites into vibrant and healthy communities.

It began with a study. In 2005, the HSA released an analysis of at-risk families known as the “Seven Street Corners Study.” The study came out of an effort to create a consolidated youth database with data from the child welfare and juvenile justice systems. When the data was walking distance of just seven street corners in the city — street corners that overlapped with obsolete public housing sites where families were living geographically, socially, and economically cut off from San Francisco’s robust resources.

In response, Mayor Gavin Newsom set a bold vision of rebuilding dilapidated public housing developments into thriving mixed-income communities that integrated holistic family services, high quality schools, new businesses, public transportation, and green buildings. HOPE SF drew on more than 15 years of learning from the Department of Housing and Urban Development’s (HUD’s) HOPE VI housing revitalization program. However, unlike the HUD projects in which only a small percentage of residents returned to redeveloped housing sites, San Francisco committed to the principle that families would not be displaced.

In 2007, the mayor and Board of Supervisors secured \$95 million in local bond funding, an amount that eclipsed the nationwide HOPE VI funding for that year, to launch HOPE SF. From the beginning, the initiative brought together expertise from the public, nonprofit, and philanthropic sectors, working together to improve the lives of public housing residents and break the cycle of poverty.

Today, the City and County of San Francisco, the San Francisco Foundation, and Enterprise Community Partners collaborate on HOPE SF with the involvement of many organizations and longtime residents.

HOPE SF will rebuild four housing developments in three southeastern San Francisco neighborhoods: Hunters View and Alice Griffith in the Bayview, Potrero Terrace and Annex in Potrero Hill, and Sunnydale-Velasco in Visitacion Valley. Located in isolated and mostly undeveloped areas, these sites were originally built to temporarily house shipyard workers during and after World War II.

By tripling density, HOPE SF will replace 1,900 public housing units one-for-one and add low-income and market-rate units, ultimately building more than 5,300 homes at multiple levels of affordability. Construction is phased so that residents can remain on site and take part in the transformation of their communities.

Alice Griffith

Originally built in 1962 adjacent to the now-demolished Candlestick Park, Alice Griffith received a \$30.5 million HUD Choice Neighborhood Award in 2012 and is part of the Hunters Point Shipyard/Candlestick Point Neighborhood Development plan. In 2019, all original residents had been rehoused, achieving nearly 90% retention. Two more affordable projects, including 30 public housing replacement units, will be constructed in 2024-2025. Five Point, the Master developer, is responsible for developing market rate, inclusionary and workforce units. When completed, there will be expanded transit, retail and office space, a research and development campus, and over 300 acres of open space. The proposed total number of units will be 1,150.

Hunters View

Hunters View, originally built in 1956, was the first HOPE SF site to undergo revitalization. Perched on a grassy hill above the old naval shipyard, it has spectacular views of the San Francisco Bay. Of the original families, 70% were retained through the transition between public housing and mixed-income development. Amenities include open spaces, a community center, a childcare facility, a wellness center, a sound studio, and playgrounds. The Phase 3 — affordable and the first two phases of market-rate homes will break ground in 2020. The proposed total number of units will be 600.

Potrero Terrace and Annex

Home to nearly 1,300 people, Potrero Terrace and Potrero Annex — together known as Potrero — are two of the oldest public housing developments in San Francisco. Located at the southeastern edge of the Potrero Hill neighborhood, they were hastily constructed in 1941 and 1955. HOPE SF will rebuild both sections of the 38-acre site into a unified mixed-income development with buildings of varying heights and a park. Phase 1 — construction of the first 72 units was completed in February 2019. The proposed total number of units will be 1,400-1,600.

Sunnydale/Velasco

Sunnydale, San Francisco's largest public housing community, is undergoing a transformation into a mixed-income development of new affordable and market rate housing, street and utility infrastructure, and open spaces. Located at the foot of McLaren Park, the 50-acre site will also include an exciting neighborhood hub and the city's first recreation center in decades, a Boys & Girls Club, and early childhood education centers. The proposed total number of units will be 1,400-1,770.

Our Children Our Families Initiative

In November 2014, San Francisco voters approved Proposition C, the Children and Families First Initiative, which created the OCOF Council with the purpose of aligning strategies across City agencies, the School District, and community partners to improve the lives of children, youth, and their families. Prop C outlines OCOF's mandates in addition to extending the Public Education Enrichment Fund and the Children's Fund for another 25 years respectively.

OCOF Council knows that the challenges facing our children, youth and families; safety, housing stability, economic security, health, education, and employment, are interconnected and cannot be addressed in isolation. In order to achieve the impact we seek, we must work in partnership across all sectors. Our strategies involve a collective impact approach, where we work together in three key areas: data and research, training and capacity building and service delivery system improvement. These strategies will serve as a roadmap for our collaboration across the City, District and Community.

Data and Research

Data and research is at the heart of OCOF's work. We aim to use data to inform all decision making for OCOF's work but also to encourage and promote the use of data across all child and family serving systems.

Focus Areas:

- Convene a Data and Research Advisory Group: The purpose of this group will be to serve as an advisory body to OCOF around measuring the outcomes in the framework, as well as identifying data and research projects that align with OCOF outcomes.
- Monitoring outcomes measures: Develop a plan for monitoring the measures in the Outcomes Framework and informing policy and practice change.
- Support use of shared data for policy and program development: OCOF will use targeted data sharing across the city, school district and community to improve research, policy and/or practice. Work with various experts and stakeholders to develop policies and protocols that facilitate data sharing, as well as identifying existing shared data projects across the city that align and advance OCOF outcomes.

Training and Capacity Building

Strengthening the existing workforce and developing a strong pipeline of new employees across San Francisco through curriculum designed to build capacity and skills of the workforce to understand the impact of trauma on the lives of children, youth and families and develop the skills to build resilience and connection is critical to impacting the outcomes we seek to improve.

Focus Areas:

- Develop curriculum and pilot implementation plans: Develop implementation plans for 5 Training and Capacity Building pillars with a primary focus on a Healing City and a Welcoming City.
- Establish an evaluation plan for each pilot: Along with each pilot plan, the development of an evaluation plan will be necessary to demonstrate the challenges and successes for each pilot. This will inform the scaling and sustainability of the pilot.

Service Delivery System Improvement

Service delivery system improvement is at the heart of much of OCOF's mission. The activities for this strategy will focus on changes to systems in addition to service delivery and programs.

Focus Areas:

- Advance strategies that support service navigation: The goals of the service navigation focus area are to identify gaps and redundancies in services and to help families and service providers easily access available services from all agencies. Within this focus area, there are two components: a service inventory for system navigators and a family friendly service navigating website – www.sffamilies.org.
- Coordinating budgets to achieve shared outcomes: The goal of ultimately coordinating budgets across systems is so that efforts are coordinated to generate additional funding and blended resources are integrated into budget planning. An integral part of achieving coordinated budgets will be the Citywide Spending Analysis, which will determine where resources are spent on child and family serving programs. This will include a landscape of services that link the identified spending categories to specific services.

- Identify and support family friendly City policies and protocols: The goal of advancing protocols and policies that designate San Francisco a “Family Friendly City” is so that families are put at the center of decision making across the city, school district and community.
- Improve Citywide service coordination: The goal of this focus area is to identify gaps and redundancies across various collective impact efforts working with vulnerable children, youth and families in order to improve connections and eliminate duplication of efforts. OCOF will lead and participate in efforts that bring together key decision makers to develop strategies to address service overlap and gaps related to service coordination within San Francisco.

Opportunities for All

Opportunities for All is a mayoral initiative to address economic inequality by ensuring that all young people can be a part of San Francisco's thriving economy. The initiative serves thousands of high school-aged youth who are ready and interested in working, as well as provides opportunities for youth who might need additional support, as part of Mayor Breed’s efforts to provide paid internships for youth in San Francisco.

Opportunities for All connects young people to employment, training and post-secondary opportunities. Youth work an average of four weeks and earn \$15 per hour for up to 20 hours a week, receive mentorship, and visit local businesses to help them identify careers of interest and begin to plan for their future. Opportunities for All builds on existing work-based learning programs and funding. Across the globe, work-based programs are celebrated for preparing young people for work, keeping them engaged in school and promoting self-efficacy.

Opportunities for All works with the SFUSD, Office of Economic and Workforce Development and the DCYF to align efforts and recruit youth participants. This initiative also develops a framework where non-profit service providers and employers have shared understanding and language around work expectations for youth, track youth progress, and provide tools that help youth plan for their future.

San Francisco Financial Justice Project

The [San Francisco Financial Justice Project](#) is the nation’s first effort embedded in government to assess and reform fines and fees that have a disproportionate and adverse impact on low-income residents and communities of color. Since its inception in 2016, the Project has worked with partners to eliminate or adjust dozens of fines and fees, and to lift millions of dollars in debt off of tens of thousands of low-income people. Housed in the Office of the San Francisco Treasurer, the Financial Justice Project has two main goals: First, to listen to community groups and local residents to identify fine and fee pain points. Second, to identify and implement doable solutions for government and the courts. Over the last three years, The Financial Justice Project has worked with dozens of community partners, city departments and the courts to enact a range of reforms. Read more [here](#) about The Financial Justice Project’s reforms; and [here](#) is a list of fine and fee discounts for low-income San Franciscans.

Sector Based Approach to Workforce Development

The Workforce Development Division of OEED connects job seekers in San Francisco with employment opportunities in growing industries such as Technology, Health Care, Hospitality and Construction. We provide industry aligned job training and access to job search assistance at community-based neighborhood access points throughout the City, to help provide employers with skilled workers. See

Construction Training Programs

The CityBuild Academy (CBA)

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

Construction Administration & Professional Service Academy (CAPSA)

The Construction Administration and Professional Service Academy (CAPSA) is a semester-long program offered at the City College of San Francisco, Mission Campus. The program prepares San Francisco residents for entry-level careers as professional construction office administrators.

CityBuild Women's Mentorship Program

The CityBuild Women's Mentorship Program is a volunteer program that connects women construction leaders with experienced professionals and student-mentors who offer a myriad of valuable resources: professional guidance; peer support; life-skills coaching; networking opportunities; and access to community resources.

Health Care Training Program

Launched in January 2010, the HealthCare Academy falls under OEWD's sector strategy and is designed to improve the responsiveness of the workforce system to meet the demands of the growing industry. Through a dual customer approach, the HealthCare Academy provides employers with skilled workers while expanding employment opportunities for local residents.

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

The HealthCare Academy engages with industry partners to identify key needs of the industry, including skill requirements, vetting and approving a programmatic framework, review of training curriculum, identifying partnership opportunities, and providing programmatic oversight of any workforce programs related to the health care sector. Collaborative partners include the San Francisco Hospital Council, the DPH (and affiliated hospitals), SEIU-UHW West, UC Berkeley's Center for the Public Health Practice, California Health Workforce Initiative, and industry employers: California Pacific Medical Center, Dignity Health, Kaiser Permanente, San Francisco Community Clinics Consortium, Chinese Hospital and Homebridge.

Hospitality Training Program

The Hospitality Initiative, launched in 2011, was designed to effectively coordinate training and employment resources that support the growth of a diverse and well-qualified hospitality sector workforce in San Francisco. In support of this goal are the following objectives: To prepare San Francisco residents for training and employment opportunities in the hospitality sector; to fulfill hiring needs of hospitality sector employers with qualified candidates that are job ready, possess the skills and abilities

to perform job duties, and hold knowledge and passion for the industry; to educate workforce system service providers and jobseekers about the hospitality industry and to provide them with relevant and current information on connecting to jobs, careers, and/or relevant training.

Industry partnerships play a critical role in establishing sector programming. Collaborative partners include San Francisco Hotel Council (and affiliated members), Golden Gate Restaurant Association (and affiliated members), San Francisco Travel, Moscone Center, City College of San Francisco, SFUSD, Unite Here Local 2, and community based organizations and industry employers.

Technology Training Program

Launched in 2012, TechSF is an initiative of the San Francisco's Office of Economic and Workforce Development, designed to provide education, training and employment assistance to locals who are interested in landing a job within San Francisco's tech sector. TechSF is committed to:

- Providing tech training, free of charge, to San Francisco residents who are interested in landing a job in a tech occupation;
- Partnering with educators, training organizations and employers to ensure our participants have opportunities to skill up and land in a job;
- Ensuring our trainings meet local employer demand; and
- Ensuring our participants are trained not only in in-demand technical skills, but also receive career readiness supports.

TechSF aims to ensure that a highly-skilled and diverse talent pool connects to, and thrive in, opportunities in tech while meeting industry talent needs. Careers in tech are not solely isolated to the tech sector. TechSF believes that the skills learned in TechSF training programs can open doors to working in a tech job in many different industries.

TechSF provides opportunities for anyone interested in a career in technology. From the exploratory tech learner to the well-versed programmer who is looking to gain a competitive edge, TechSF has opportunities to step outside your comfort zone.

The TechSF Apprenticeship Accelerator offers job seekers the unique opportunity to acquire essential experience and training to get established in a career in tech.

TechSF provides the opportunity to connect directly with Tech Sector employers through exposure and networking events.

Smart Money Coaching Program

The Smart Money Coaching program by the Office of Financial Empowerment provides free, confidential, one-on-one, personalized financial guidance. A certified financial coach helps households to address financial challenges and goals, including reducing debt, establishing and improving credit score, opening a safe and affordable bank account, and increasing savings. Smart Money Coaching has locations throughout San Francisco and is available to anyone living, working or receiving services in San Francisco. This initiative is funded through the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development, San Francisco HSA, Department of Disability and Aging Services, and the Treasurer's Office. These services are available at over twenty sites on a regular basis, including HOPE SF and RAD housing sites, the San Francisco Main Library, and at nonprofit partners of MOHCD and other city departments.

How are the Jurisdiction poverty reducing goals, programs, and policies coordinated with this affordable housing plan

All of San Francisco's anti-poverty efforts are dependent on availability of affordable housing to make the City's programs successful. Housing First to address homelessness must have housing units in which to place homeless households. First-time homebuyer programs must have homes affordable to those homebuyers to purchase, even with down payment or mortgage credit certificate assistance from the City. San Francisco's low-income labor force needs affordable housing near or within a reasonable commuting distance to be able participate in Four Sector employment programs offered by the City. Furthermore, safe, sanitary, stable and affordable living situations are critical to student success if they are involved in the SF Promise initiative or other education-focused systems. San Francisco knows it cannot thrive if it does not address the high housing cost and low housing supply challenges so MOHCD continues to work collaboratively with other City departments, nonprofit agencies, philanthropy and community stakeholders to interweave affordable housing in all of the various plans, programs or initiatives.

SP-80 Monitoring – 91.230

Describe the standards and procedures that the jurisdiction will use to monitor activities carried out in furtherance of the plan and will use to ensure long-term compliance with requirements of the programs involved, including minority business outreach and the comprehensive planning requirements

Monitoring for Community Development Activities

Managing Grants and Loans

The Community Development Division of MOHCD will administer CDBG public facility, non-workforce development public service and organizational planning/capacity building activities and HOPWA rental assistance and supportive services programs. MOHCD's Housing Division will administer the housing activities of the CDBG and HOPWA programs; and all HOME activities. The Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) will administer CDBG economic development and workforce development activities. The Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH) will administer the ESG program.

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

MOHCD, HSH and OEWD will provide fiscal and programmatic monitoring of each project that receives CDBG, ESG and/or HOPWA funds. Monitoring will include both internal and on-site reviews. In addition, through a work order with MOHCD, the City's Office of Labor Standards and Enforcement will monitor construction projects for labor standards compliance related to the Davis-Bacon regulations. The City's Contract Monitoring Division will monitor for non-discrimination and Small Business Enterprise (SBE) requirements in contracting. MOHCD will monitor for access requirements related to Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act and the Americans With Disabilities Act.

Since program year 2006-2007, MOHCD has been part of the steering committee for the City's Joint Fiscal and Compliance Monitoring Task Force, which serves to consolidate fiscal and compliance monitoring among various City departments. This consolidation effort increases communication among city departments, reduces multiple fiscal and compliance site visits to a single joint site visit or self-assessment, and decreases the administrative burden on both non-profit entities and City departments.

For CDBG, ESG and HOPWA Grants

Each agency receiving a CDBG, ESG and/or HOPWA grant will enter into a grant agreement that stipulates the conditions upon which the grant was awarded, the performance outputs and program outcomes to be met, and the budget. Regular program performance reports will be required of grant recipients, along with financial reports. Program site visits will be conducted to determine client eligibility, compliance with Federal and local requirements and program progress. Since most CDBG Public Services grants will qualify as limited clientele activities, recipient organizations will have to demonstrate that they are verifying income eligibility for their clients to MOHCD and OEWD grant coordinators/community builders at site visits.

For each grant, a MOHCD/HSH/OEWD grant coordinator/community builder will be responsible for providing technical assistance, reviewing progress reports, conducting on-site visits when appropriate, and evaluating performance outputs and program outcomes. The MOHCD/HSH/OEWD grant coordinator/community builder will also be responsible for reviewing monthly expenditure reports and monitoring for fiscal compliance with regulations and accounting policies.

For CDBG-Assisted Business Loans

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

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

MOHCD, OEWD and HSH will continue to invest in the training of its staff to build internal capacity so that MOHCD, OEWD and HSH can better assist its delegate agencies on both organizational and programmatic development. Organizational capacity building needs of delegate agencies include financial management, human resource management, technical assistance with compliance with federal and local regulations, Board of Directors development and program evaluation. HSH will train MOHCD, OEWD and all stakeholders on Housing First and coordinated entry. Service coordination cross CCSF departments, nonprofits, community-based organizations, etc. is essential in maximizing resources and funding to have make progress in reducing and ending homelessness.

Monitoring for Housing Activities

Single Family (Owner-Occupied) Properties

MOHCD will continue to monitor single-family owner-occupied CDBG funded properties to ensure ongoing compliance with the program regulations and requirements. Monitoring activities will be carried out to ensure that owners of CDBG-assisted owner-occupied properties continue to reside in the property; that they retain title to the property; and that property taxes are current.

Multifamily Properties

MOHCD will continue to monitor CDBG- and HOME-funded multifamily rental housing projects to ensure compliance with program requirements. Monitoring activities will include review of: (1) tenant income and rent schedules; (2) management and maintenance reports; and (3) income and expense statements, including financial statements and use of program income. MOHCD will continue to work with rental property owners and their property management agents to ensure ongoing compliance with tenant income and rent restrictions as well as HUD housing quality standards and local code.

The multi-family monitoring encompasses a wide range of housing types, including family and senior housing; housing for people with special needs; housing for people with AIDS/HIV; permanent housing for the homeless and those at risk of becoming homeless; and transitional housing for homeless families and individuals.

MOHCD will continue to inspect HOME-funded properties.

Tracking Progress Towards the Consolidated Plan's Five-Year Targets

MOHCD, HSH and OEWD consider monitoring performance to be as important as identifying their goals. The aim is to ensure that the City and its partners are marshaling its limited resources in an effective and coordinated way to create change in San Francisco’s low-income communities. To be effective, MOHCD, HSH and OEWD have designed a performance measures matrix to ensure that community development and housing activities align with the Consolidated Plan’s strategic goals. A five-year performance measures matrix will be used to assess investment outcomes and outputs across the 2020–2024 timeframe of the Consolidated Plan. Performance under each measure will be tracked against a five-year goal and a one-year goal. Using the program matrix as a guide, MOHCD, HSH and OEWD will consistently measure performance towards program outcomes and provide ongoing feedback, adjustments, or sanction protocol as needed. This will ensure that the five-year Consolidated Plan will successfully serve as the roadmap to address its significant challenges through the implementation of its strategic goals and objectives.

Action Plan

AP-15 Expected Resources – 91.220(c)(1,2)

Introduction

Please see SP-35 Anticipated Resources Section

Anticipated Resources

Table 82 - Expected Resources – Priority Table

Please see SP-35 Anticipated Resources Section

Explain how federal funds will leverage those additional resources (private, state and local funds), including a description of how matching requirements will be satisfied

Please see SP-35 Anticipated Resources Section

If appropriate, describe publically owned land or property located within the jurisdiction that may be used to address the needs identified in the plan

Please see SP-35 Anticipated Resources Section

Discussion

Please see SP-35 Anticipated Resources Section

Annual Goals and Objectives

AP-20 Annual Goals and Objectives

Goals Summary Information

Table 83 – Goals Summary

Please see SP-45 Goals Summary Section

Goal Descriptions

Table 84 – Goal Descriptions

Please see SP-45 Goals Summary Section

Projects

AP-35 Projects – 91.220(d)

Introduction

San Francisco’s 2020–2021 proposed projects are listed in AP-38 Project Summary.

Describe the reasons for allocation priorities and any obstacles to addressing underserved needs

Allocation priorities are driven by the needs as determined by needs assessments, focus groups, resident surveys, input from community-based organizations, and analyses of existing investments by the City. MOHCD consults with the executive leadership of other City departments to coordinate funding and programmatic strategies to ensure maximum leverage. Given MOHCD’s limited resources, priorities are given to those areas which maximize MOHCD’s expertise in affordable housing and advancing economic opportunities.

Many of our residents are disenfranchised based on their limited income, disability status, cultural or language barriers, or other characteristics that make it difficult for them to adequately access services. Through a comprehensive needs assessment process, San Francisco has identified a number of cross-cutting community needs and concerns that span neighborhoods and constituencies. These include:

- Among the concerns identified during community engagement, San Francisco stakeholders are most frequently concerned about displacement, increasing housing prices, the overall cleanliness and safety of their neighborhoods, and transit accessibility.
- Participants in MOHCD’s community engagement identified that services to support self-sufficiency and stability are as important as the need for housing itself.
- Many stakeholders expressed a prominent need for culturally inclusive and culturally-specific services.
- Participants expressed a need for greater awareness of, navigation of, and access to available services, including both housing and other supportive services.
- Stakeholders expressed a desire for more inclusive and relaxed standards around affordable housing eligibility.
- Many community members voiced the need for more opportunities to provide input on the City’s housing eligibility policies as well as participate in the development of affordable housing programs.
- Stakeholders asked for more streamlined services, improved inter-agency collaboration, and stronger cross-agency communication to support the delivery of both housing and supportive services.

AP-38 Project Summary

Project Summary Information

The proposed projects are listed by funding source (i.e., CDBG, ESG, HOPWA, HOME, General Fund, Housing Trust Fund, Other Funding Sources) and then by Consolidated Plan goals. Proposed projects that are funded by more than one funding source will be listed separately under each of the funding sources.

Please note that the preliminary funding recommendations for the 2020-2021 program year were made available for public review and comment in early February 2020. Those preliminary funding recommendations are still in the process of being reviewed and will be finalized before the submission of the Consolidated Plan/Action Plan to HUD.

AP-50 Geographic Distribution – 91.220(f)

Description of the geographic areas of the entitlement (including areas of low-income and minority concentration) where assistance will be directed

Please see SP-10 Geographic Priorities

Geographic Distribution

Table 85 - Geographic Distribution

Target Area	Percentage of Funds

Rationale for the priorities for allocating investments geographically

Please see SP-10 Geographic Priorities

Discussion

Please see SP-10 Geographic Priorities

Affordable Housing

AP-55 Affordable Housing – 91.220(g)

Introduction

Table 86 – One Year Goals for Affordable Housing by Support Requirement

One Year Goals for the Number of Households to be Supported	
Homeless	
Non-Homeless	
Special-Needs	
Total	

Table 87 – One Year Goals for Affordable Housing by Support Type

One Year Goals for the Number of Households Supported Through	
Rental Assistance	
The Production of New Units	
Rehab of Existing Units	
Acquisition of Existing Units	
Total	

Discussion

Approximately ____ individuals and households will receive rental assistance in 2020–2024. MOHCD intends to provide tenant-based rental assistance to approximately ____ individuals and households through grants provided to community-based organizations offering tenant counseling and eviction prevention services.

Approximately ____ units will be produced with ____ units for homeless families, ____ units for special needs populations of transition-age youth or veterans, and ____ units produced for low-income families earning less than 60% of area median income. Additionally, the rehabilitation of ____ existing units will occur along with the acquisition of approximately ____ existing housing units for preservation as affordable housing through MOHCD’s Small Sites Program.

AP-60 Public Housing – 91.220(h)

Introduction

MOHCD will continue to work closely with the SFHA to support the disposition and conversion of all remaining public housing in San Francisco either through rehabilitation or new construction. San Francisco has utilized the RAD program and the Section 18 Disposition program to repair, preserve and reposition these important resources. The City's HOPE SF program rebuilds and revitalizes four large public housing communities.

Actions planned during the next year to address the needs to public housing

By mid-2021, the SFHA's remaining 1,911 units of public housing will be converted to HCV (HCV) units in order to facilitate the preservation, rehabilitation and rebuilding of these valuable units. In 2020, two HOPE VI projects will convert under RAD. In 2021, 167 units of public housing replacement and new affordable units at Sunnydale HOPE SF will complete construction; 157 units of public housing replacement at Potrero HOPE SF will be under development; and 115 units of public housing replacement and new tax credit affordable will be under construction at Hunters View. Also in 2021, 70 scattered site public housing units will convert to HCV and undergo substantial rehabilitation using funds leveraged under HCV.

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

Because public housing is being phased out by mid-2021, and the public housing staff are either being phased out or transferred to other SFHA divisions, there are little to no opportunities for resident placement in management jobs. However, in the new HOPE SF developments, MOHCD and OEWD track the new owners' adherence with workforce requirements including construction placement and other employment opportunities for residents. SFHA continues to administer its homeownership program for HCV households, which allows households to accrue funds toward a downpayment using the HCV subsidy funds.

If the PHA is designated as troubled, describe the manner in which financial assistance will be provided or other assistance

Please see SP-50 Public Housing Accessibility and Involvement

Discussion

MOHCD's work with SFHA to address SFHA's dilapidated housing stock either through the RAD or HOPE SF programs will preserve or rebuild some of the most important housing for San Francisco's poorest residents. More importantly resident engagement under both programs will provide the public housing residents input on the rehabilitation or reconstruction and keep them informed of other important changes in their housing management.

AP-65 Homeless and Other Special Needs Activities – 91.220(i)

Introduction

Describe the jurisdictions one-year goals and actions for reducing and ending homelessness including

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

Street Outreach is a Core Component of the Homeless Response System in the HSH Strategic Framework. Coordinated Entry replaces single program waitlists and entry procedures that encourage people to get on as many lists as possible and then wait for assistance. A person experiencing homelessness or at risk of homelessness may go to an Access Point, such as a Resource Center. They may also be approached by a Street Outreach worker and be immediately assessed, using the standard assessment for all programs. Problem Solving assistance is offered to all, especially those newly homeless or at-risk. If homelessness can be prevented by returning to a safe place, that will be facilitated. If not, clients will be offered Temporary Shelter.

The San Francisco Homeless Outreach Team (SFHOT) was formed in May 2004 as part of a Mayor's Office, health, social services, and community initiative. Ten years later, SFHOT continues to evolve to meet various population needs. Over 3,000 chronically homeless severely disabled individuals have been care managed by SFHOT, with nearly 50% securing permanent housing. SFHOT works collaboratively in small teams first to engage and stabilize chronically homeless individuals and next to help gain care for chronic conditions and find permanent housing via three lines of service, as follows:

Stabilization Care: This SFHOT service line provides short-term stabilization care management for high risk homeless individuals (homeless more than three years, experiencing complex medical, psychiatric, and substance abuse tri-morbidity, using a high number of urgent/emergent care services, and not able to navigate health and human services system on their own. Care Managers accept referrals from SFHOT First Responders and high user treatment programs. Within six to twelve months, the goals are to: (1) Stabilize individuals from the street into shelter/SRO, (2) Remove personal barriers to attaining permanent housing; e.g., attain benefits, primary care linkage, behavioral health care linkage, IDs, legal aid, etc., (3) Secure and place into permanent housing, (4) Assess and serve as care coordinators for SF Health Network members who are high risk / high cost individuals and are unable to engage into the system.

First Responders and Street Medicine Staff: This SFHOT service line provides outreach, engagement and warm-handoffs from the street to (or between) urgent/ emergent institutions. First Responders operate 24/7 and responds to requests from 311, Care Coordinators, Police, Fire, and Urgent/Emergent facilities (hospitals, SF Sobering Center, Psych Emergency Services, and Dore Psych Urgent Care) for street outreach/intervention and therapeutic transports. The goals are to, within two hours, respond and determine if the individual can be cleared for transport and provide warm-handoff to and/or from urgent/emergent facilities. In addition, the First Responders provide targeted search and outreach of HUMS (High Users of Multiple Systems) and other high-risk homeless individuals as identified by 311 (citizens) and health care coordinators and, once found, performs wellness checks and attempts to

engage individuals into services and other resources as identified by community care plans. First Responders assess and refer the highest risk to the Care Management teams.

San Francisco Public Library: This SFHOT service line includes a Psychiatric Social Worker situated at the Civic Center Main Branch who conducts outreach and offers referrals to homeless, marginally housed and/or mentally ill patrons of the library. She also facilitates education sessions in group or individual settings for library staff, in order to improve understanding of behaviorally vulnerable patrons of the library. Her goal is to help library staff serve this group of patrons according to their needs, while helping to decrease the number and severity of incidents that require intervention from Library security staff. This social worker also supervises four 15-hours/week Health and Safety Associates (HaSAs) who are selected from a group of homeless library patrons being served by SF HOT's case management function. HaSAs assist the team by using their life experiences and learned engagement skills to reach out to other homeless patrons, in order to persuade them to accept case management and other services. In the process, HaSAs gain employment and job-seeking skills, through their supervision by the Psychiatric Social Worker, as well as an associated DPH Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor.

Addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

As of February 2014, homeless persons can make 90-day shelter reservations by calling the City's 311 System. The new process makes it easier for seniors, persons with disabilities, and non-English speakers to access the emergency shelter system by eliminating the need to wait in line and instead using the 311 system's 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year translation capability. By making it as convenient as possible for homeless adults to access safe, clean emergency shelters when needed, more time is available them to seek employment, to engage with vital services, and to find permanent housing. Providing better access to the emergency shelter system enables the City to maximize the number of beds that are used every night, leaving fewer people on the street at night.

Further since 2016, San Francisco has created and rapidly expanded the SAFE Center and Navigation Center portfolio in San Francisco.

The Navigation Center Model

San Francisco's first Navigation Center opened in March 2015 and was a successful pilot serving San Francisco's highly vulnerable and long-term unhoused neighbors who are often fearful of accessing traditional shelter and services. HSH subsequently opened 8 Navigation Centers and currently has 6 in operation. For more information, [click here](#).

San Francisco's Navigation Center model is being replicated nationally and, here in San Francisco, we are building on this best practice by developing SAFE Navigation Centers.

The SAFE Navigation Center Model

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

SAFE Navigation Centers are essential to reducing unsheltered homelessness and connecting guests to services and housing assistance. SAFE Navigation Centers build off of the best aspects of Navigation Centers while making them more scalable, sustainable, and effective. The City is looking to expand SAFE

Navigation Centers in neighborhoods across the city to respond to the homelessness crisis and has reviewed over 100 potential sites. For information on proposed Navigation Centers, visit: <http://hsh.sfgov.org/overview/notices/>

Effective

From the launch of Navigation Centers in 2015 through the end of 2018, 46% of Navigation Center exits were either to permanent housing or reunifications with family or friends through the Homeward Bound program. Over 5,000 clients have been served at Navigation Centers from 2015 to November 2019.

Access-Controlled

Navigation Centers and SAFE Navigation Centers do not accept walk-ins. All individuals and couples who enter have been selected by the SF Homeless Outreach Team or a centralized referral system. Because Navigation Centers operate 24x7, there are no lines outside in the evening, and guests are not exited onto the street in the morning.

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

In order to provide the interim housing needed in the City, existing shelters must be restructured so that they are not simply emergency facilities, but instead focus on providing services that link people with housing and services that promote ongoing stability. In addition, to ensure that people who are homeless are willing to access these facilities, emphasis should continue to be placed on client safety and respectful treatment of clients by staff, including respect for cultural differences. The shelter system should provide specialized facilities or set-aside sections to meet the diversity of need, including safe havens, respite care beds, and places for senior citizens.

The City has placed a high priority on assisting people who are homeless to access permanent housing as quickly as possible, without requiring “housing readiness” or participation in services or transitional programs as a prerequisite. This strategy has been found to be effective with most populations, including people who are chronically homeless. However, for some people, access to treatment (either treatment in a clinical sense or mental health and/or substance abuse services) in a transitional housing setting can be beneficial; it provides a necessary steppingstone enhancing their ability to successfully access and maintain permanent housing. Particular sub-populations that have been found to benefit from treatment housing include: people suffering from a serious mental illness, people with chronic substance abuse problems, recently discharged offenders, people suffering from trauma (domestic violence, former sex workers, youth experiencing homelessness, veterans), and emancipated foster and homeless youth. For these populations, treatment housing provides a supportive, transitional environment that facilitates the stability necessary for future housing retention and provides treatment in a setting that offers immediate support against relapse and other potential set-backs. In order to be effective, treatment housing must offer culturally competent programs designed to meet the needs of the specific population being served.

Strategies necessary to effectively meet the need for treatment housing include: 1) evaluation of existing treatment/transitional housing in the City to determine which facilities to maintain and which to

transform into permanent supportive housing; 2) appropriate assessment of the population that will benefit from treatment housing; 3) development of intensive case management and service packages for specific populations; and 4) creation of stronger linkages to facilitate movement between treatment programs and permanent housing.

Helping homeless persons (especially chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth) make the transition to permanent housing and independent living, including shortening the period of time that individuals and families experience homelessness, facilitating access for homeless individuals and families to affordable housing units, and preventing individuals and families who were recently homeless from becoming homeless again

Many people who are homeless or at-risk, in particular those who are suffering from a disabling condition, are in touch with one or more of the City's public institutions and systems of care, including hospitals, mental health programs, detoxification and treatment programs, foster care and the criminal justice system. As such, these institutions have an important role to play in identifying people who need assistance to maintain their housing or who are homeless and need help regaining it. Through comprehensive transition, or "discharge" planning, these individuals, upon release, can be linked with the housing, treatment and services they need to facilitate ongoing stability and prevent future homelessness.

Key aspects of effective discharge planning include: assessment of housing and service related needs at intake; development of comprehensive discharge plans and assignment of a discharge planner/case manager to oversee plan implementation; provision of services that will promote long-term housing stability, while in custody/care; and expansion of housing options for people being discharged.

For people who are homeless involved with the criminal justice system whose crimes are non-violent petty misdemeanors, and for repeat, frequent users of the hospital system occasioned by lack of ongoing health care and homelessness, diversion strategies should be used that focus on addressing housing, treatment and service needs so as to prevent both recurring homelessness as well as repeat offenses and to support health outcomes.

"Respite" beds with appropriate medical care, medication and care supplies are needed by people who are homeless to recuperate post-hospitalization. These beds with care do not prevent homelessness nor end homelessness; but until sufficient permanent housing is available, they are necessary to support recovery. Coupled with other supportive services, they also can provide a link to other community services and housing opportunities.

In order to ensure the effectiveness of discharge planning efforts, data on the permanent housing outcomes of those discharged should be collected and included as part of ongoing evaluations of these public institutions.

Helping low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless, especially extremely low-income individuals and families and those who are: being discharged from publicly funded institutions and systems of care (such as health care facilities, mental health facilities, foster care and other youth facilities, and corrections programs and institutions); or, receiving assistance from public or private agencies that address housing, health, social services, employment, education, or youth needs

The HSH Strategic Framework endorses Problem Solving as a Core Component of the Homeless Response System. Problem Solving provides opportunities to prevent people from entering the Homelessness Response System and to redirect people who can resolve their homelessness without the need for ongoing support. It may offer a range of one-time assistance, including eviction prevention, legal services, relocation programs (Homeward Bound), family reunification, mediation, move in assistance, and flexible grants to address issues related to housing and employment.

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

- Prevent homelessness by intervening to avoid evictions from permanent housing that lead to homelessness. Increase outreach and education about eviction-prevention resources, including financial assistance and tenant rights laws. Provide short-term rental support and wraparound services to address underlying issues threatening housing stability and to prevent eviction. Increase the provision of legal services for individuals and families at risk of eviction. Provide rehousing support.

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

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

To address the myriad challenges of homelessness, homeless response services and prevention program is grant-based and aligns CDBG, ESG and Housing Trust Fund funding to support homeless prevention and eviction prevention programs, operating support for emergency and transitional shelters, direct services for homeless individuals and families, and supportive housing. This program coordinates closely with other City Departments, in particular the HSA and DPH, to align its strategies.

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

Discussion

See above.

AP-70 HOPWA Goals– 91.220 (I)(3)

Table 88 – HOPWA Goals

One year goals for the number of households to be provided housing through the use of HOPWA for:	
Short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance to prevent homelessness of the individual or family	93
Tenant-based rental assistance	187
Units provided in permanent housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	232
Units provided in transitional short-term housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	28
Total	540

AP-75 Barriers to affordable housing – 91.220(j)

Introduction:

San Francisco continues to work to address how to remove barriers to the development of affordable housing be it through its land use policies or improving city procedures to expedite affordable housing production such as priority permit processing for affordable housing projects.

Actions it planned to remove or ameliorate the negative effects of public policies that serve as barriers to affordable housing such as land use controls, tax policies affecting land, zoning ordinances, building codes, fees and charges, growth limitations, and policies affecting the return on residential investment

Addressing Barriers to Housing Production¹⁵²

Objective 10: Ensure a streamlined, yet thorough, and transparent decision-making process

Policy 10.1 Create certainty in the development entitlement process, by providing clear community parameters for development and consistent application of these regulations

Policy 10.2 Implement planning process improvements to both reduce undue project delays and provide clear information to support community review

¹⁵² The following section on Addressing Barriers to Housing Production is cited from the 2014 Housing Element. The role of the Housing Element is to provide policy background for housing programs and decisions and broad directions towards meeting the City's housing goals. However, parameters specified in the Zoning Map and Planning Code can only be changed through a community process and related legislative process. Thus, not all strategies identified in the Housing Element are certain to be implemented. The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development will explore recommendations of the Housing Element as they pertain to findings from the 2011 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing and 2020 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing (this report is currently in progress).

Policy 10.3 Use best practices to reduce excessive time or redundancy in local application of CEQA

Policy 10.4 Support state legislation and programs that promote environmentally favorable projects

Discussion:

As one of the most expensive cities in the United States to live, the need for affordable housing is more acute than elsewhere in the country. Consequently, the need to remove barriers to the production or preservation of affordable housing has become an even more important priority for MOHCD. MOHCD is working closely with other City departments to revisit the City regulations that may serve one public purpose, such as increasing indoor air quality in residential buildings near major roadways, but is becoming a barrier to affordable housing production by increasing the development cost of affordable housing by requiring more expensive mechanical ventilation systems. MOHCD will also continue to work with other City departments to improve City process improvements that will help expedite the production of affordable housing be it with the Planning or Building Inspection departments.

AP-85 Other Actions – 91.220(k)

Introduction:

Actions planned to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs

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

Due to high housing costs, economic conditions, poverty and unemployment, a significantly large number of low-income San Franciscans are not economically self-sufficient. The limited resources that are available to support programs and services that help individuals and families to become self-sufficient are inadequate. The situation is made worse by reductions in funding at the federal, state and local government levels at the same time as needs are increasing due to the weak economy. To minimize the impact of the City's limited resources, MOHCD HSH and OEWD have increased our strategic coordination with other City departments in an effort to avoid duplication of services and to maximize the leveraging of federal, state and local dollars.

Another major set of obstacles are language barriers. San Francisco has historically been a haven for immigrants. Language barriers impact immigrants' abilities to access necessities such as employment, healthcare, and police protection. Many adult immigrants and refugees are not necessarily literate in their own native languages, and struggle to master the complexities of English. In particular, sophisticated transactions such as legal issues or governmental forms may be confusing. Of all San Franciscans over the age of five, 43% speak a language other than English at home, with the largest language groups being Chinese, Spanish, and Filipino. Fifty-seven percent of the population that speak an Asian language at home are of limited English proficiency (LEP), meaning that they speak English less than "very well." Thirty percent of Asian children are identified as LEP. Twelve percent of San Francisco households are "linguistically isolated" as of 2015 with no one in the household over the age of 14 indicating that they speak English "well" or "very well." Among Asian households, that number increases to 35%. At the individual level, about 21% of all San Franciscans in the 2018 ACS five-year survey indicated that they did not speak English "very well."

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

Another action that will be taken will be granting those households displaced by Ellis Act evictions, owner move-in evictions, fire damage, and former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency displacement first preference to any affordable housing under MOHCD's purview. These households were forcibly displaced from their homes so the San Francisco Board of Supervisors deemed them to have higher priority to be screened for eligibility for MOHCD's affordable housing stock. In order to qualify for this housing, these households must be certified by MOHCD that they meet specific displacement criteria, such as having lived in their residence for at least 10 years (or 5 years if they were seniors or disabled) prior to receiving an eviction notice under the State Ellis Act. MOHCD will also certify if a household was

living in the Western Addition or Hunters Point area during the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency's large-scale displacement of residents from those areas under its 1960s urban renewal policies. Should these households be certified that they were displaced by an Ellis Act eviction or by the Redevelopment Agency and given a certificate of preference, then these households would be prioritized for eligibility screening for MOHCD's affordable housing. These certificate of preference holders must meet the housing's eligibility criteria, such as income and household size, for the housing they applied to.

Actions planned to foster and maintain affordable housing

The maintenance and preservation of existing affordable housing is a key housing activity for San Francisco given the age of its affordable housing stock. To this end San Francisco periodically issues Notice of Funding Availability for addressing the most pressing capital needs of existing affordable housing, especially those that impact the health and safety and ultimately the long-term livability of the properties.

Actions planned to reduce lead-based paint hazards

Over the past 20 years, MOHCD has developed a highly collaborative infrastructure of City agencies and non-profit organizations to address childhood lead poisoning, lead hazards, and other health conditions stemming from poor quality housing in low-income communities. The DPH collaborates with the Family Childcare Association, the Children's Council, the San Francisco Head Start Program, and other private preschools serving low-income families – to ensure families are educated on lead poisoning prevention and timely lead blood level testing of children under the age of six. As a result, low-income children attending targeted preschools are regularly tested for lead blood content as a commitment to a healthy educational start. Children with a detectable lead blood level are case managed by the San Francisco DPH.

MOHCD response system is comprised of several City agencies and non-profit partners to address the problem of lead poisoning, prohibited nuisances code enforcement and dilapidated housing. Fundamental to the response system, the San Francisco DPH code enforcement has the legislative authority to cite property owners with a notice of violation whenever there is visibly deteriorated paint in the exterior or interior of a pre-1978 building where children under six may be exposed to the lead hazard. These violations become direct referrals to MOHCD, which provides lead remediation services of lead hazards as part of its single-family home rehab loan program. Any housing built before 1978 that are or could be occupied by families and will be rehabilitated with MOHCD's financial assistance is required to be assessed for lead-based paint hazards. Should lead-based paint hazards be found then remediation becomes part of the rehabilitation scope of work.

In addition, MOHCD requires CDBG funded housing, tenant rights, and other non-profit housing related agencies to provide lead poisoning prevention education to tenant families with young children, information on the Federal Lead Hazard Disclosure Law, and information on MOHCD's Home Rehab program.

Actions planned to reduce the number of poverty-level families

Please see SP-70 Anti-Poverty Strategy

Actions planned to develop institutional structure

The large number of non-profit organizations serving low-income communities in San Francisco is both an asset and a challenge. With a long history of serving the community, the sheer number of non-profits leads to increased competition for limited resources. Conversely, the benefits of a rich variety of social service organizations often translates to more community-based and culturally competent services for low-income residents. Lack of organizational capacity of non-profits is another gap in institutional structure. In response, the City is engaged in an ongoing effort to work with non-profits in organizational and programmatic capacity building to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of service delivery.

It is the City's policy to coordinate community development and housing activities among its departments. Because this work involves many City departments, coordination and information sharing across the various departments are challenges. City staff meets on a regular and as-needed basis with colleagues from other City departments to overcome gaps in institutional structure. For example, MOHCD participates with OEWD and the Arts Commission in a regular working group focused on the issues of nonprofit displacement through a number of OEWD-funded initiatives to stabilize nonprofits.

In the June, 2014, new local legislation was passed to coordinate and align workforce development services, establishing the Committee on City Workforce Alignment ("Alignment Committee") comprised of department heads across City departments and the Workforce Community Advisory Committee (WCAC), comprised of leadership from community-based organizations with deep specialization in community development.

The Alignment Committee includes one member designated by the Mayor, one member of the Board of Supervisors or a City employee designated by the Board, and the department heads of the following City departments: OEWD; HSA; DCYF; Public Utilities Commission; Public Works, Department of Human Resources, and Human Rights Commission. The Director of Workforce Development and Director of the Human Rights Commission co-chair the Alignment Committee.

The Alignment Committee and WCAC are charged with developing and submitting a Citywide Workforce Development Plan to the WISF for its review and comment, which was submitted and approved in late 2017. The five-year plan includes an assessment of the City's anticipated workforce development needs and opportunities and a strategy to meet the identified needs, which influences the City and County of San Francisco's CDBG decision-making around resource allocation. The plan will also include goals and strategies for all Workforce Development Services in San Francisco and a projection of the funding needed to achieve the goals, consistent with the Strategic Plan for Economic Development approved by the Board of Supervisors and the Local Plan approved by WISF.

The Alignment Committee and WCAC legislation sunset in 2019, and all members agreed to continue the work under good faith effort until the legislation is reauthorized.

In addition, staff of MOHCD and OEWD uses the Consolidated Plan/Action Plan development process as an opportunity to engage other departments in a dialogue about the current developments and priorities. This dialogue aids the City in being more strategic in the investment of Consolidated Plan dollars.

Actions planned to enhance coordination between public and private housing and social service agencies

The Director of MOHCD meets on a weekly basis with the Director of Planning and the Director of Development for the Office of Economic and Workforce Development to discuss affordable and market-rate housing development issues citywide. In addition, the director of MOHCD, the director of DCYF, and the director of the Human Rights Commission meet on a monthly basis with the Mayor.

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

The City agencies also coordinate in the decision-making at the project level on affordable housing developments in the City, including at the level of individual project funding decisions. The Citywide Affordable Housing Loan makes funding recommendations to the Mayor for affordable housing development throughout the City or to the OCII Commission for affordable housing under their jurisdiction. Committee Members consist of the directors or the director's representative from the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development, OCII as successor to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, and the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (DHS). MOHCD also works closely with OCII and DHS to issue requests for qualifications (RFQs) or 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 and DHS also meets 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 and Community Development, SFHA, and the Municipal Railway, plus one non-voting slot to enable representation of the Mayor's Office. The LTCCC evaluates how service delivery systems interact to serve people, and recommends ways to improve service

coordination and system interaction. Workgroups responsible for carrying out the activities in the plan provide periodic progress reports through presentations to the LTCCC.

Discussion:

See above.

Program Specific Requirements

AP-90 Program Specific Requirements – 91.220(I)(1,2,4)

Introduction:

**Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG)
Reference 24 CFR 91.220(I)(1)**

Projects planned with all CDBG funds expected to be available during the year are identified in the Projects Table. The following identifies program income that is available for use that is included in projects to be carried out.

1. The total amount of program income that will have been received before the start of the next program year and that has not yet been reprogrammed	6,550,000
2. The amount of proceeds from section 108 loan guarantees that will be used during the year to address the priority needs and specific objectives identified in the grantee's strategic plan.	0
3. The amount of surplus funds from urban renewal settlements	0
4. The amount of any grant funds returned to the line of credit for which the planned use has not been included in a prior statement or plan	0
5. The amount of income from float-funded activities	0
Total Program Income:	6,550,000

Other CDBG Requirements

1. The amount of urgent need activities	0
2. The estimated percentage of CDBG funds that will be used for activities that benefit persons of low and moderate income. Overall Benefit - A consecutive period of one, two or three years may be used to determine that a minimum overall benefit of 70% of CDBG funds is used to benefit persons of low and moderate income. Specify the years covered that include this Annual Action Plan.	99.00%

**HOME Investment Partnership Program (HOME)
Reference 24 CFR 91.220(I)(2)**

1. A description of other forms of investment being used beyond those identified in Section 92.205 is as follows:

HOME funds are only being used for those eligible activities identified in 24 CFR 92.205. In addition to the HOME funds, MOHCD is also using local funds to supplement the HOME funds for HOME-eligible

activities, namely funds from San Francisco's Housing Trust Fund or from housing or job-linkage fees collected by the City and County of San Francisco.

2. A description of the guidelines that will be used for resale or recapture of HOME funds when used for homebuyer activities as required in 92.254, is as follows:

An account and a reuse account are established in the City and County of San Francisco's Financial System Project (FSP) accounting system. An exclusive account is set-up for the HOME ADDI program which is segregated from other funding sources.

The City and County of San Francisco's Financial Accounting Management Information System is used to track and report expenditures and income for each HOME ADDI loan to a program qualified borrower; including information related to the individual borrower detail such as borrower name and address.

All HOME ADDI loan repayments including loan principal and share of appreciation is deposited into the reuse account. Funds in the account and reuse account are expended in accordance with the HOME ADDI program guidelines.

3. A description of the guidelines for resale or recapture that ensures the affordability of units acquired with HOME funds? See 24 CFR 92.254(a)(4) are as follows:

MOHCD does not use HOME funds to acquire property that would be resold, such as single-family homes. MOHCD may use HOME funds to acquire multifamily properties. Any property receiving HOME funds will have a declaration of restrictions recorded against the property, which will specify the affordability requirements of the HOME funds. The declaration of restrictions and its affordability restrictions remain recorded on the property even if the HOME funds are repaid before the end of the declaration of restriction's term. Furthermore the HOME loan agreement includes the form of MOHCD's annual monitoring report that sub-recipients of HOME funds must submit to MOHCD on an annual basis. This report includes the rent schedule that MOHCD crosschecks against the HOME affordability restrictions.

4. Plans for using HOME funds to refinance existing debt secured by multifamily housing that is rehabilitated with HOME funds along with a description of the refinancing guidelines required that will be used under 24 CFR 92.206(b), are as follows:

If MOHCD loans HOME funds to multifamily projects that require refinancing and rehabilitation then MOHCD requires the project to meet its underwriting guidelines as well as extend the affordability term for an additional 55 years. Those guidelines include but are not limited to: the requirement that the rehabilitation must be a certain per unit threshold if any existing MOHCD financing is being requested to be refinanced; specify if the HOME funds will be used to maintain the number of existing affordable units or whether the funds will help create new HOME-assisted units; require that the underwriting must be done in conjunction with MOHCD's annual monitoring of the operations of the property to ensure the rehabilitation is not a result of poor ongoing maintenance of the property; demonstrate that the long term needs of the project can be met and including serving the targeted population over an extended affordability; state whether the HOME funds are being used in a NRSA; and explicitly inform the project sponsor that HOME funds cannot be used to refinancing other Federally-funded loans such as CDBG.

**Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG)
Reference 91.220(l)(4)**

1. Include written standards for providing ESG assistance (may include as attachment)

The following standards have been developed by the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development in consultation with local CoC staff and with community-based organizations that serve individuals and families experiencing homelessness and those who are at imminent risk of experiencing homelessness.

These standards are intended to serve as broad standards through which San Francisco's various ESG sub-recipients may incorporate additional requirements, limits, etc. into their respective ESG programs to more effectively serve diverse populations who are experiencing homelessness or who are at risk of experiencing homelessness. It is anticipated that as San Francisco's highly coordinated CoC and its broader system of health and human service providers build a more integrated service delivery infrastructure, these ESG standards may also become more standardized and the delivery of ESG assistance more uniform. Currently however, ESG sub-recipients' programs reflect the diversity of the individuals and families experiencing homelessness or who are at risk of experiencing homelessness and thusly do not use a one-size-fits-all approach to address and prevent homelessness.

ESG sub-recipients include, but are not limited to: victim service providers, legal service providers, family shelter providers, youth shelter providers, etc. ESG sub-recipients have designed ESG programming that is responsive to the needs of their respective clientele and connects ESG program participants to the broader health and human service system, which includes mainstream benefits and services, and permanent supportive housing.

Standard policies and procedures for evaluating individuals' and families' eligibility for assistance under ESG

Individuals and families seeking assistance must receive at least an initial consultation and eligibility assessment with a case manager or other authorized representative who can determine eligibility and the appropriate type of assistance needed. ESG sub-recipients shall ensure that all program participants, at the time of intake, meet the definition of *homeless* or *at risk of homelessness* (including meeting the two threshold criteria – annual income below 30% area median income and lacking immediate resources to attain housing stability) and shall document accordingly, consistent with recordkeeping and reporting requirements at 24 CFR 576.500.

With regard to the need for Homelessness Prevention Assistance, there are many San Franciscans who are housed and have great need but would not experience homelessness if they did not receive assistance. To be eligible for Homelessness Prevention Assistance, programs must assess and document that the household would experience homelessness but for the ESG assistance. In other words, a household would require emergency shelter or would otherwise become literally homeless in the absence of ESG assistance. A household that is at risk of losing their present housing may be eligible if it can be documented that their loss of housing is imminent, they have no appropriate subsequent housing options, and they have no other financial resources and support networks to assist with maintaining current housing or obtaining other housing.

Additionally, ESG sub-recipients shall document the following prior to providing ESG Homelessness Prevention or Rapid Re-Housing Rental Assistance:

- Ensure rents do not exceed the lesser of current fair market rent (San Francisco, CA HUD Metro FMR Area) or the rent reasonableness standard at 24 CFR 982.507. If the gross rent for the unit exceeds either, ESG sub-recipients are prohibited from using ESG funds for any portion of the rent, even if the household is willing and/or able to pay the difference. The FMR and rent reasonableness standard requirement does not apply when a program participant receives only Financial Assistance or Services under Housing Stabilization and Relocation Services. This includes rental application fees, security deposits, an initial payment of last month's rent, utility payments/deposits, and/or moving costs, housing search and placement, housing stability case management, landlord-tenant mediation, legal services, and credit repair. (Note: last month's rent may not exceed the rent charged for any other month; security deposits may not exceed two months' rent.)
- Ensure units meet lead-based paint remediation and disclosure requirements, as well as ESG's minimum habitability standards at 24 CFR 576.403(a) and 576.403(c), respectively.
- See "standards for determining what percentage or amount of rent and utilities costs each program participant must pay while receiving homelessness prevention or rapid re-housing assistance" that are listed below for additional requirements.

ESG sub-recipients will either develop internal documentation forms or utilize standard forms distributed by MOHCD or HUD as available and appropriate.

Standards for targeting and providing essential services related to street outreach

San Francisco does not fund ESG Street Outreach. However, any agency seeking ESG funds for Street Outreach would be required to develop a written standard developed in consultation with the local CoC. The agency would be required to design an outreach plan that details targeting strategies for specific populations/subpopulations:

- A listing of the targeted population(s)/subpopulation(s), including recent data that estimates their numbers and location(s)
- Barriers to connecting targeted population(s)/subpopulation(s) to appropriate services, including service gaps
- Strategies to eliminating or mitigating these barriers
- A description of essential services that would be provided

Policies and procedures for admission, diversion, referral and discharge by emergency shelters assisted under ESG, including standards regarding length of stay, if any, and safeguards to meet the safety and shelter needs of special populations, e.g., victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; and individuals and families who have the highest barriers to housing and are likely to be homeless the longest

Admission to ESG Emergency Shelter facilities will be limited to those who meet the federal definition of *homeless* at 24 CFR 576.2. Upon initial contact at the point-of-entry, individuals and families will be screened by intake staff to determine appropriate response. Responses may range from immediate case management assistance in determining available and unutilized resources, to referrals for existing homelessness prevention and/or rapid re-housing programs.

If diversion is not possible and emergency shelter is appropriate, the maximum length of stay will be no longer than 6 months, unless ESG sub-recipient determines, on a case-by-case basis, that a longer stay is appropriate. No persons who are facing or suspect they may face a threat of violence will be discharged into an unsafe condition. Emergency shelter workers will work in collaboration with appropriate victim service providers to arrange safe accommodations for those who are or may be facing a threat of violence. Those who are in danger of a violent crime or feel they may be will be entered into a secure database system that is comparable to the HMIS. All other Emergency Shelter admissions will be entered into HMIS.

All persons discharged from Emergency Shelter facilities will have their exit status entered into either HMIS or a comparable database, and will be provided discharge paperwork as applicable or upon request.

Individuals and families who are determined to have the highest barriers to housing – due to a myriad of factors including discrimination, dual-diagnosis, chronic homelessness, etc. – will be prioritized for existing housing resources and paired with existing supportive services to increase the likelihood of staying successfully housed consistent with the local CoC’s Coordinated Assessment system and other local permanent supportive housing systems (e.g., serving veterans, families, TAY, etc.)

Policies and procedures for assessing, prioritizing, and reassessing individuals’ and families’ needs for essential services related to emergency shelter

Persons seeking Essential Services related to Emergency Shelter will have access to case management, at a minimum. Other ESG-funded Essential Services that may be available in San Francisco include: childcare, education services, employment assistance and job training, outpatient health services, legal services, life skills training, mental health services, substance abuse treatment services, transportation, and services for special populations. These types of essential services are typically funded by other local, state, and federal sources and provided by many health and human service providers. At a minimum, ESG-funded case management will be designed to connect program participants to other essential services, housing resources, and mainstream programs.

Continued assistance at re-assessment will vary according to intensity and duration of Essential Services.

Policies and procedures for coordination among emergency shelter providers, essential services providers, homelessness prevention, and rapid re-housing assistance providers, other homeless assistance providers, and mainstream service and housing providers (see §576.400(b) and (c) for a list of programs with which ESG-funded activities must be coordinated and integrated to the maximum extent practicable).

To the extent that the local CoC is designed to coordinate among these providers to more effectively and efficiently serve persons experiencing homelessness and those who are at risk of experiencing homelessness, ESG sub-recipients will be required to participate in the local CoC. To meet these goals, the local CoC requires that all ESG sub-recipients:

- Participate in the Coordinated Assessment system. It is expected that the Coordinated Assessment system will provide a standardized means for clients to access emergency shelter (including essential services), homelessness prevention and rapid re-housing programs, etc., including a common assessment tool for client information related to identification of needs, barriers, risk factors, etc. and a process for referral to other appropriate assistance, especially mainstream and housing resources.
- Ensure that ESG sub-recipient staff coordinate as needed regarding referrals and service delivery

with staff from other agencies in order to ensure that services are not duplicated and clients can more easily access appropriate services.

- Ensure that ESG sub-recipient staff participate in any CoC trainings related to improving coordination among CoC members and to the implementation of the Coordinated Assessment system.

Policies and procedures for determining and prioritizing which eligible families and individuals will receive homelessness prevention assistance and which eligible families and individuals will receive rapid re-housing assistance

ESG Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing assistance (including Rental Assistance, Financial Assistance and other Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services) will be provided based on the chronological order in which eligible individuals and families seek assistance and on the extent of their need. Need is determined by the presence of risk factors, such as: unlawful detainer proceedings, veteran status, survivor of domestic violence status, families with dependent children, chronic homelessness, persons living with HIV/AIDS, etc.

Based upon San Francisco's high rental costs and extremely low vacancy rates, it may be necessary for ESG program participants to secure housing outside of San Francisco if at the time of intake the participant is living in San Francisco.

The diverse composition of San Francisco's ESG sub-recipient portfolio reflects the diverse groups who experience homelessness or at risk of experiencing homelessness. These groups include: families, TAY, survivors of domestic violence, persons living with HIV/AIDS, etc. As a result, ESG sub-recipients collectively address the needs of these diverse groups. Internal policies and procedures for determining and prioritizing which individuals and families will receive assistance will vary according to the core competency of the ESG and the population served.

Homelessness Prevention program participants shall be recertified for continued eligibility every three months. Rapid Re-Housing program participants will be recertified annually.

Standards for determining what percentage or amount of rent and utilities costs each program participant must pay while receiving homelessness prevention or rapid re-housing assistance

Each ESG sub-recipient will be responsible for determining annual income as a basis of eligibility for services when applicable. As part of this income determination, the relevant staff person will ascertain the amount that the household is able to contribute toward Rental and other Financial Assistance, if any, depending on the ESG sub-recipient's internal Rental/Financial Assistance program policy. ESG sub-recipients may provide shallow subsidies (payment of a portion of the rent), payment of 100 percent of the rent, a set dollar amount, or graduated or declining subsidies.

Regardless, when providing Rental Assistance, ESG sub-recipients shall document the following:

- Ensure that a written lease agreement is in place; (not required if only providing rental arrears assistance)
- Enter into a rental assistance agreement with the owner of the unit; (not required if only providing rental arrears assistance). This agreement must indicate the amount of the program participant's contribution toward rent and utilities, as well as the duration of assistance.
- Rental assistance cannot be provided if program participant is also receiving rental assistance from another public source during the same period.

- ESG rental and other financial assistance may be administered by ESG sub-recipients as a grant or may be repaid by program participant. If repaid, funds shall be treated as program income pursuant to 24 CFR 85.25. Program income also includes any amount of a security or utility deposit returned to the ESG sub-recipient.
- See “standard policies and procedures for evaluating individuals’ and families’ eligibility for assistance under ESG” listed above for additional requirements.

As the overall goal the ESG program is to help individuals and families maintain housing independently, it is important that each ESG sub-recipient properly assess potential program participants to ensure that they are a good match for the program, and to refer them to more extensive supports as available if the individual or family is not likely to maintain housing independently.

Standards for determining how long a particular program participant will be provided with rental assistance and whether and how the amount of that assistance will be adjusted over time

Each ESG sub-recipient may set a maximum number of months that a program participant may receive rental assistance, or a maximum number of times that a program participant may receive rental assistance. The total period for which any program participant may receive ESG assistance shall not exceed 24 months in three years. However, no program participant may receive more than a cumulative total of 18 months of Rental Assistance, including up to 6 months of Rental Arrears.

Each ESG sub-recipient will conduct an initial screening to determine the number of months that a program participant will initially receive a commitment of Rental Assistance, including Rental Arrears. This initial commitment will be in writing and signed by an ESG sub-recipient representative and the program participant. Factors to take into consideration during the initial commitment are the program participant’s ability to pay rent in the immediate month and subsequent months such as anticipated change in income, time necessary to recover from unexpected expenses, etc.

- Conflicts of Interest
 - Organizational: ESG assistance may not be conditioned on an individual’s or family’s acceptance or occupancy of emergency shelter or housing owned by the City and County of San Francisco or the ESG sub-recipient offering the assistance. No ESG sub-recipient may, with respect to individuals or families occupying housing owned by the ESG sub-recipient, carry out the initial screening required under or administer Homelessness Prevention assistance.
 - Individual: No person who is an employee, agent, consultant, officer, or elected or appointed official of the City and County of San Francisco or the ESG sub-recipient who exercises or has exercised any functions or responsibilities with respect to activities assisted under the ESG program, or who is in a position to participate in a decision-making process or gain inside information with regard to activities assisted under the program, may obtain a financial interest or benefit from an assisted activity; have a financial interest in any contract, subcontract, or agreement with respect to an assisted activity; or have a financial interest in the proceeds derived from an assisted activity, either for him or herself or for those with whom he or she has family or business ties, during his or her tenure or during the one-year period following his or her tenure.
 - ESG sub-recipient staff conducting the initial screening and authorizing assistance will be required to certify in a form that complies with these guidelines that a conflict of interest does not exist.

As the program participant is nearing the end of their initial commitment of assistance, the case manager may contact the program participant to assess their need for continued assistance – depending on the design of the ESG sub-recipient’s Rental Assistance program. If continued assistance is necessary and the potential assistance is within the period of recertification (i.e., every three months for Homelessness Prevention assistance and every twelve months for Rapid Re-Housing assistance), the ESG sub-recipient may provide more assistance. Otherwise, the ESG sub-recipient is required to recertify program participant eligibility, as well as perform the necessary requirements for the unit (e.g., habitability standards, rent reasonableness standard, FMR, lease agreement, etc.)

While providing Homelessness Prevention or Rapid Re- Housing assistance to a program participant, ESG sub-recipients shall:

- Require the program participant to have monthly contact, which may include phone/email, with a case manager to assist the program participant in ensuring long-term housing stability.
 - Note: ESG sub-recipients that are victim service providers are exempt from meeting with a case manager if the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 or the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act prohibits the ESG sub-recipient from making its shelter or housing conditional on the participant’s acceptance of services.
- Develop a plan to assist the program participant to retain permanent housing after the ESG assistance ends, taking into account all relevant considerations, such as the program participant’s current or expected income and expenses and other public or private assistance for which the program participant will be eligible and likely to receive.

Standards for determining the type, amount, and duration of housing stabilization and/or relocation services to provide a program participant, including the limits, if any, on the homelessness prevention or rapid re-housing assistance that each program participant may receive, such as the maximum amount of assistance; maximum number of months the program participant may receive assistance; or the maximum number of times the program participant may receive assistance.

Each ESG sub-recipient may set a maximum number of months that a program participant may receive Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing assistance, or a maximum number of times that a program participant may receive such assistance. The total period for which any program participant may receive ESG assistance shall not exceed 24 months in three years. However, no program participant may receive more than a cumulative total of 18 months of Rental Assistance, including up to 6 months of Rental Arrears.

Each ESG sub-recipient will conduct an initial screening to determine the number of months that a program participant will initially receive a commitment of ESG assistance, including Rental/Utility Payment Arrears. This initial commitment will be in writing and signed by an ESG sub-recipient representative and the program participant.

As the program participant is nearing the end of their initial commitment of ESG assistance, the case manager may contact the program participant to assess their need for continued assistance – depending on the design of the ESG sub-recipient’s ESG-funded program. If continued assistance is necessary and the potential assistance is within the period of recertification (i.e., every three months for Homelessness Prevention assistance and every twelve months for Rapid Re-Housing assistance), the ESG sub-recipient may provide more assistance. Otherwise, if continued assistance is needed, the ESG sub-recipient is required to recertify program participant eligibility, as well as perform the necessary requirements for the unit (e.g., habitability standards, rent reasonableness standard, FMR, lease agreement, etc.)

While providing Homelessness Prevention or Rapid Re- Housing assistance to a program participant, ESG sub-recipients shall:

- Require the program participant to have monthly contact, which may include phone/email, with a case manager to assist the program participant in ensuring long-term housing stability.
 - Note: ESG sub-recipients that are victim service providers are exempt from meeting with a case manager if the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 or the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act prohibits the ESG sub-recipient from making its shelter or housing conditional on the participant's acceptance of services.
- Develop a plan to assist the program participant to retain permanent housing after the ESG assistance ends, taking into account all relevant considerations, such as the program participant's current or expected income and expenses and other public or private assistance for which the program participant will be eligible and likely to receive.

2. If the CoC has established centralized or coordinated assessment system that meets HUD requirements, describe that centralized or coordinated assessment system.

COVERAGE: CE system covers entire CoC (SF city/county) through accessible access points and outreach teams. Numerous dedicated access points for families and adult individuals exist to facilitate targeted services. 5 youth-dedicated access points opened in 2019 with strategic placement in underserved areas and locations where youth frequent. Targeted services for youth LGBTQ+ are also available. Those presenting at an access point for a different subpopulation receive an immediate referral to one that will better assist them.

LEAST LIKELY TO APPLY: Access to CE through 311 hotline and in ADA-compliant sites, centrally located and in underserved neighborhoods, reach the linguistically/culturally isolated. Multilingual mobile outreach teams target those unlikely to seek services for assessments on streets and in shelters, hospitals, and jails. In May 2019, the Homeless Outreach Team made 1,095 outreach attempts, had 830 successful engagements, made 1,264 referrals, and linked 423 individuals to services. Partnerships with schools, criminal justice, healthcare ensure referrals across systems. To ensure most hard to reach adults are located, CE team conducted an "assessment blitz" from August through October 2018.

PRIORITIZATION: Most vulnerable prioritized through initial assessment for eligibility/safety and offered flexible problem-solving interventions like reunification, eviction prevention, and connection to mainstream services/benefits. Further assessment uses SF CoC-specific tools weighing factors like current living situation, length/episodes of homelessness, use of crisis services, trauma, other vulnerabilities. Dynamic housing list identifies those with highest needs and prioritizes them for most intensive and immediate housing and services. As described above under the Written Standards for Emergency Shelter Activities section, all City-funded shelters for single adults are accessed through HSH Access Points.

Also, as described under the Written Standards for Essential Services Related to Emergency Shelter section, the City's embedded information and referral specialists/case managers act as the coordinating entities within the City's shelter system. The City also centralized the behavior health services within the SF START structure so that one entity offers city-wide services throughout the broad spectrum of interlinked areas of mental health, substance abuse and related medical conditions that homeless individuals and families often exhibit.

3. Identify the process for making sub-awards and describe how the ESG allocation available to private nonprofit organizations (including community and faith-based organizations).

In San Francisco, MOHCD is the lead agency responsible for allocating four federal funding sources, Community Development Block Grant, Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG), HOME Investment Partnership and Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS funds for community development and housing activities.

In accordance to HUD and CCSF procurement processes, ESG subaward allocations are selected by solicitation through competitive bids from eligible entities. HSH issues a request for qualifications (RFQs) to invite applications from qualified applicants to provide ESG eligible activities in outreach, shelter, prevention, rapid rehousing and data collection.

HSH completes the Minimum Qualification and Evaluation Panel review of applications submitted by providers seeking to become qualified to provide eligible activities of the Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Program. The ESG Program interim rules require coordination and collaboration between Continuums of Care (CoC) and ESG recipients in order to ensure recipients effectively strategize about the systems of assistance needed to address homelessness and how their respective funding streams can support provision of that assistance. As such, HSH is required to take into consideration existing ESG services in the Homelessness Response System (HRS) as part of the coordination and collaboration requirement.

Panelists reviewed each application, RFQ materials, and rating guide, and assigned a rating to each application per service component. Based on the review from the Minimum Qualification and Evaluation Panel, funding recommendations are made to either award grants or augment existing grants. Funding recommendations for specific projects that will be implemented by non-profit organizations go through the San Francisco Board of Supervisors review process. The Board of Supervisors and the Mayor approve the funding recommendations.

4. If the jurisdiction is unable to meet the homeless participation requirement in 24 CFR 576.405(a), the jurisdiction must specify its plan for reaching out to and consulting with homeless or formerly homeless individuals in considering policies and funding decisions regarding facilities and services funded under ESG.

MOHCD staff currently coordinates with HSH staff and the LHCb to ensure that the perspective of homeless and formerly homeless individuals and families are integrated into the goals and objectives of the Consolidated Plan. MOHCD will be incorporating input from these individuals and families through hearings held in partnership with the LHCb, neighborhood hearings, focus groups with providers, and surveys conducted with both providers and residents.

5. Describe performance standards for evaluating ESG.

Consistent with 24 CFR 91.220(1)(4)(vi) and 91.320(k)(3)(v), San Francisco utilizes the following outputs to monitor ESG activities:

- Number of individuals/households served by homelessness prevention and rapid re-housing activities
- Number of individuals/households served by emergency shelter activities
- Number and percentage of individuals/households stably housed after 3 and 6 months from the time of initial homelessness and rapid re-housing assistance
- Number and percentage of individuals/households who avoided eviction
- Number and percentage of individuals/households who transitioned to permanent housing
- Number and percentage of individuals/households who completed 75% of goals of individualized service plan

Per HUD, ESG activities and performance indicators should complement the activities of the Continuum of Care Program and supports Housing First which are evidence-based practices that support the following tenets:

1. Targeting those who need the assistance most;
2. Reducing the number of people living on the streets or emergency shelters;
3. Shortening the time people spend homeless; and
4. Reducing each program participant's housing barriers or housing stability risks.

Performance targets will be developed for each ESG program component and put in place for the 2020 funding cycle. These performance standards will closely align to System Performance Standards required for Continuum of Care programs.

The CoC System Performance Measures measure these seven performance standards:

1. Length of homelessness: measures the change in the average and median length of time persons are homeless when in emergency shelter and transitional housing programs
2. Returns to homelessness: measures clients who exited emergency shelter, transitional housing, street outreach, and permanent housing programs to permanent housing destinations, measures how many of them returned to homelessness for up to 2 years' post-exit
3. Number of people served: specifically, this measure is related to the Point in Time, but also pulled from HMIS and this will consistently be a measure of data collected for all ESG programs
4. Employment and Income (maintaining and increasing income): This includes six tables capturing employment and non-employment income changes for those maintaining in programs and for those exiting programs
5. Number of persons becoming homeless for the first time: measures number of persons entering the homeless system through emergency shelter and transitional housing programs for the first time in the HMIS database
6. Homeless Prevention Measures (TBD)
7. Successful placements (percent of those exiting to permanent housing destinations): This one measures positive movement out of the homeless system and is divided into three tables, (1) Street Outreach, (2) movement into Permanent Housing situations from emergency shelter, transitional housing and rapid rehousing and (3) retention or exits to permanent housing situations

Glossary of Terms

Terms:

ADA (Americans with Disability Act) – a civil rights law enacted in 1990 that prohibits discrimination based on disability; used in this context to refer to units with special mobility or communication features

AMI (Area Median Income) – the midpoint household income for a given metropolitan area (half of households earn more and half earn less). AMIs are published for household sizes from one to nine persons.

Certificate of Preference – a housing lottery preference granted to persons displaced by specific actions of the former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency in the 1960s through 1980s

Coordinated Entry – a centralized assessment and prioritization system for the placement of homelessness resources

Cultural Districts – a City program with designated community-defined areas intended to celebrate and strengthen the unique cultural identities of San Francisco and to coordinate resources to assist in stabilizing communities facing, or at risk of, displacement

DAHLIA (Database of Affordable Housing Listings, Information and Application) – an online tool to help households find and apply for affordable housing

DALP (Down Payment Assistance Loan Program) – a down payment loan program that helps households bid on a property within the open market

Development Agreements – contracts entered into by the City and County of San Francisco and a developer that define a development project's rules, regulations, commitments, and policies for a specific period of time

GARE: Government Alliance on Race and Equity (GARE) is a national network of government working to achieve racial equity and advance opportunities for all

HOA (Home Owners Association) – an organization of homeowners of a housing development, the purpose of which is to preserve, maintain, and enhance homes and their value

HOPE SF – An initiative that seeks to transform four of San Francisco's most distressed public housing sites (Hunters View, Alice Griffith, Sunnyside-Velasco and Potrero Terrace and Annex) into vibrant, thriving communities through holistic revitalization

HOPWA (Housing Opportunity for People With AIDS) – a federal program that helps people living with HIV/AIDS to obtain and maintain their housing through rental subsidies and other housing supports

Inclusionary (Housing Program) – a City program that requires market-rate housing developers to provide affordable housing units, as required by Section 415 of the San Francisco Planning Code

Legacy Business – a business that has operated in San Francisco for 30 or more years, with no break in San Francisco operations exceeding two years. The business has contributed to the neighborhood's history and/or the identity of a particular neighborhood or community.

Local Hire – a San Francisco policy that promotes the hiring of local residents for locally-sponsored construction projects

Local Operating Subsidy Program – a San Francisco subsidy program designed to address gaps between the amount of rent formerly homeless residents can pay and the cost to operate housing for homeless persons

Mortgage Credit Certificate Program – a program of the California Housing Finance Agency that allows low to moderate income first-time homebuyers to convert a portion of their annual mortgage interest payment into a tax credit

PBV (Project-based Voucher) – a rental subsidy from the Housing Authority attached to a particular unit, not to a tenant

Plus Housing – the primary MOHCD program that places housing units and subsidies with HIV+ households

RAD (Rental Assistance Demonstration) – an initiative that rehabilitates and transitions public housing properties to Section 8 project based voucher properties with long term affordability

RFQ (Request for Qualifications)/RFP (Request for Proposal) – two standard types of public sector methods used to solicit vendors or agencies to bid on services or provide a proposal for services

SRO (Single Room Occupancy) – a type of housing unit typically where certain facilities such as bathroom and kitchen are shared among a number of units

Technical Assistance: Support activity that improves the overall economic viability of a business

Tenant Improvement – changes made to the interior of a commercial or industrial property by its owner to accommodate the needs of a tenant such as floor and wall coverings, ceilings, partitions, air conditioning, fire protection, and security.

Tenant Right to Counsel – an initiative approved by voters that provides full legal representation to households facing eviction

Acronyms and Abbreviations

By full name:

American Community Survey (ACS)

Area Median Income (AMI)

Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG)

Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART)

Catholic Charities (CC)

City & County of San Francisco (City)

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)

Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS)

Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Reports (CAPERs)

Continuum of Care (CoC)

Department of Aging and Adult Services (DAAS)

Department of Children, Youth and Their Families (DCYF)

Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH)

Department of Public Health (DPH)

Department of Public Works (DPW)

Department on the Status of Women (DOSW)

Dignity Fund Community Needs Assessment (DFCNA)

Eligible Metropolitan Area (EMA)

Emergency Medical Services Authority (EMSA)

Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG)

Healthy Streets Operations Center (HSOC)

HOME Investment Partnerships program (HOME)

Homeless Management Information System (HMIS)

Housing Choice Voucher (HCV)

Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS (HOPWA)

Housing Urban Development Area Median Family Income (HAMFI)

Human Services Agency (HSA)

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer or questioning, intersex, allies (LGBTQ+)

Long-Term Care Coordinating Council (LTCCC)

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

Men who have sex with men (MSM)

Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area (NRSA)

notice of funding availability (NOFA)

Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII)

Office of Community Planning and Development (OCPD)

Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD)

Our Children Our Families (OCOF)

People living with HIV/AIDS (PLWHA)

persons who inject drugs (PWID)

Point-in-Time (PIT)

Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD)

Request for Proposals (RFP)

Residential Care Facilities for the Chronically III (RCFCI)

Resource Development Associates (RDA)

San Francisco AIDS Foundation (SFAF)

San Francisco Continuum of Care (CoC)
San Francisco Homeless Outreach Team (SFHOT)
San Francisco Housing Authority (SFHA; Authority)
San Francisco Local Homeless Coordinating Board (LHCB)
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA)
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (SFRA)
San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD)
Single-Room Occupancy (SRO)
State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)
Theory of Change (ToC)
Transitional Age Youth (TAY)
Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA)
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS)
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)

By acronym or abbreviation:

(ABAG) Association of Bay Area Governments
(ACS) American Community Survey
(AMI) Area Median Income
(BART) Bay Area Rapid Transit
(CAPERs) Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Reports
(CC) Catholic Charities
(CDBG) Community Development Block Grant
(CHAS) Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy

(City)	The City & County of San Francisco
(CoC)	Continuum of Care
(CPD)	Office of Community Planning and Development
(DAAS)	Department of Aging and Adult Services
(DFCNA)	Dignity Fund Community Needs Assessment
(DCYF)	Department of Children, Youth and Families
(DPH)	Department of Public Health
(DOSW)	Department on the Status of Women
(DPW)	Department of Public Works
(EMA)	Eligible Metropolitan Area
(EMSA)	Emergency Medical Services Authority
(ESG)	Emergency Solutions Grant
(HAMFI)	Housing Urban Development Area Median Family Income
(HCV)	Housing Choice Voucher
(HHS)	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
(HMIS)	Homeless Management Information System
(HOME)	HOME Investment Partnerships program
(HOPWA)	Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS
(HSA)	Human Services Agency
(HSOC)	Healthy Streets Operations Center
(HUD)	U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
(LHCB)	San Francisco Local Homeless Coordinating Board
(LGBTQ+)	Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer or questioning, intersex, allies
(LTCCC)	Long-Term Care Coordinating Council

(MOHCD)	Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development
(MSM)	Men who have sex with men
(NOFA)	notices of funding availability
(NRSA)	Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area
(OCII)	Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure
(OCOF)	Our Children Our Families
OCPD	Office of Community Planning and Development
(OEWD)	The Office of Economic and Workforce Development
(PIT)	Point-in-Time
(PLWHA)	people living with HIV/AIDS
(PWID)	persons who inject drugs
(RAD)	Rental Assistance Demonstration
(RCFCIs)	Residential Care Facilities for the Chronically Ill
(RDA)	Resource Development Associates
(RFP)	Request for Proposal
(RHNA)	Regional Housing Needs Allocation
(SFAF)	San Francisco AIDS Foundation
(SFHA)	San Francisco Housing Authority
(SFHOT)	San Francisco Homeless Outreach Team
(SFILEN)	San Francisco Immigrant Legal & Education Network
(SFMTA)	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
(SFRA)	San Francisco Redevelopment Agency
(SFUSD)	San Francisco Unified School District
(SRO)	Single-Room Occupancy

(TAY)	Transitional Age Youth
(TIDA)	Treasure Island Development Authority
(ToC)	Theory of Change

Appendix

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 20, 2019
Dr. George W. Davis Senior Center (Bayview Hunters Point/District 10)

Table of Contents

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups.....	1
Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups.....	6
Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups	11
Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups	15

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups

Session #1

1. What's important to you that brought you here tonight?

- Familiarize with process
- Shrinkage of affordable housing (less)
- Affordable housing income bands too restrictive, does not serve low-income or moderate
- Challenges of using COP. Looking for more information/resources
- To hear & listen

Station 1 – Neighborhood Change and Choice

2. Based on the maps and your personal experience, what are the most important or noteworthy changes in this neighborhood in the past 5 years?

- Shrinking number of African Americans
- Homeownership prices have increased
- Do not see diversity within our community- socially
- African American culture not visible in fullness anymore/ fewer churches
- Reduced sense of community
- Cost of housing increased

3. What do you think has caused or contributed to those changes in your neighborhood?

- Increased cost of living
- Increase in homelessness
 - No mental health support
 - No housing
- Lack of accountability for sites serving homeless
 - Drug example
- Increase resources to ensure empathy possible
 - See that people just doing their jobs – cycling

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development

Wednesday, February 20, 2019

Dr. George W. Davis Senior Center (Bayview Hunters Point/District 10)

- Anxiety because people don't know where they will live/ get second chance job opportunities / options not affordable

4. If money were not object, where would you choose to live (top 3 desirable places) and where would you choose to not live (top 3 least desirable places)?

- Most desirable places to live per map – Bayview (11), Portola (2), Brisbane, Dogpatch (3), Potrero Hill (2), Mission (3), Twin Peaks, St. Francis Woods (3), Haight-Ashbury, Buena Vista Heights, Seacliff (2), Outer Richmond, Inner Richmond (2), Marina (2), Hayes Valley, Duboce Triangle (2), South of Market, Marin County (3), Healdsburg, Brisbane, Woodside (2)
- Least desirable places to live per map – Outer Richmond (4), Outer Sunset (2), Excelsior, Crocker Amazon, Visitacion Valley, Bayview (2), Bayshore, South of Market (2), Western Addition, Marina, City of Richmond, East Palo Alto (2), East Oakland (3)

5. What makes a neighborhood a desirable place to live?

- Views
- Family
- Weather
- Home
- Transportation
- History
- Character
- Jobs – new ones!
- Education
- Safety
- Parks
- Shopping
- Access to travel
- Good services – gas stations
- Healthy, quality foods (rest & grocery)
- Business opportunities
- Entertainment
- Churches
- Community Fairs/ Activities

6. Do you feel like you have a choice in where you live? And where do you live now (zip code)?

No choice			A lot of choice
x	x	x	
94124	94124	94124	

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 20, 2019
Dr. George W. Davis Senior Center (Bayview Hunters Point/District 10)

7. What makes you feel like you have a choice or don't have a choice?

- No longer feel like we belong
- Effect of system
- Effect of gang injunctions/ records
- Cost
- Exploitive financial products

Station 2 – Access to Opportunity

8. What are the most pressing challenges to getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood?

- Education in SF because less favored by recruiters
- Insufficient educational showing/ testing for college

9. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or a keep a job?

- Community building/ capacity to leverage

10. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in accessing public transportation?

- [no answers given]

11. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in accessing public transportation?

- [no answers given]

12. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in living in or creating more healthy neighborhoods?

- [no answers given]

13. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in live in or create healthy neighborhoods?

- [no answers given]

Station 3: Fair Housing Violations

14. Have you or a member of your household experienced a violation of your fair housing protections?

- [no answers given]

15. What did you do/Who did you go to for support? How helpful was it?

- [no answers given]

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 20, 2019
Dr. George W. Davis Senior Center (Bayview Hunters Point/District 10)

Session #2

1. What's important to you that brought you here tonight?

- Future of Bayview
- Affordable housing for African Americans
- Hearing the policies about fair housing
- Feeling disconnected & trying to decide whether to stay or leave
- Challenges for families to get housing with children
- Cost of housing/ occupancy STD's
- Learn about housing issues here

Station 1 – Neighborhood Change and Choice

2. Based on the maps and your personal experience, what are the most important or noteworthy changes in this neighborhood in the past 5 years?

- African Americans leaving – elders pass & families move
- A lot of development – for newcomers
- Types of businesses have changed, catering to newcomers
 - Though most avoid 3rd street
- Fewer familiar faces/ names changing without regard to history
- Few legacy residents shop on 3rd/ Fight for what should be on 3rd street

3. What do you think has caused or contributed to those changes in your neighborhood?

- Lack of appropriate law enforcement
- Lack of response by city for public SVC's
- Media coverage – bias
- Impact of development of nearby areas (Dogpatch/ UCSF)
- Dot Com Boom
- Availability of land in southeast sector
 - Increase of density in Bayview
- Mental illness
- Lack of funding for youth, homeless, mental health programs
- Cost of rent
- Impact of policies (Health Dept., Planning, etc.)
- Poorly performing schools
 - Families moving away

4. If money were not object, where would you choose to live (top 3 desirable places) and where would you choose to not live (top 3 least desirable places)?

- [no answers given]

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 20, 2019
Dr. George W. Davis Senior Center (Bayview Hunters Point/District 10)

5. What makes a neighborhood a desirable place to live?

- Amenities – groceries, community centers, churches
- Sense of community
- Weather
- Transportation
- Walkability
- View
- Feel connected
- Institutions
- Parks & Open Space
- QUALITY food sources

6. Do you feel like you have a choice in where you live? And where do you live now (zip code)?

No choice							A lot of choice
x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
94110	94110	94110	945019	94110	94124	94124	

7. What makes you feel like you have a choice or don't have a choice?

- Discrimination – racism
- Access to capital
 - Ability to qualify
- Family property ownership

Station 2 – Access to Opportunity

8. What are the most pressing challenges to getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood?

- [no answers given]

9. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or a keep a job?

- [no answers given]

10. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in accessing public transportation?

- [no answers given]

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 20, 2019
Dr. George W. Davis Senior Center (Bayview Hunters Point/District 10)

- 11. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in accessing public transportation?**
 - [no answers given]
- 12. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in living in or creating more healthy neighborhoods?**
 - [no answers given]
- 13. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in live in or create healthy neighborhoods?**
 - [no answers given]

Station 3: Fair Housing Violations

- 14. Have you or a member of your household experienced a violation of your fair housing protections?**
 - [no answers given]
- 15. What did you do/Who did you go to for support? How helpful was it?**
 - [no answers given]

Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

- 1. What is important to you that brought you here tonight?**
 - People origin/ current situation
 - Know more what people think about Bayview Plans
 - Increase services, Asian population help
 - Place to live/housing – upgrade and make room for others that are coming in
 - Developer – Help community better
 - Have providers, but don't have people to be heard
 - Homelessness/services
 - Seniors need to be in their home- hope to developed
 - Close down business to build homes, but still empty spaces.
- 2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?**
 - Mental Health
 - Job services – living wage jobs for both young adults and adults
 - Senior services – good access here, couldn't hurt to have more
 - Financial
 - More shelters
 - Homeless – jobs, started doing community work

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 20, 2019
Dr. George W. Davis Senior Center (Bayview Hunters Point/District 10)

3. How would you find out about these services?

- Community centers
- YMCA → the same information/resources
- Churches

- Children centers can come in to do homework watch TV/ After school program
- More programs before / After school
- Services – health, housing, seniors
- Outreach – radio, workshop

4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?

- Outreach- word of mouth
- Access services/ information
- Reference
- Outside the network
- Mass produce information/ centralized information
- More tabling/ Basic info flyering
- Transportation
- Language

5. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?

- Familiar places
- 1 Stop Shop information
- Multilingual
- Language
- Safety
- Fear
- Educate people about community
- Community Building Program
- Improving service
- Unpaid job program – difficult
- Pad job training/ internship
-

6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?

- Homelessness – where to find resources/ services local senior housing
- Local senior housing
- Multilingual services to find housing
- SBO connection?

7. What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?

- Veterans

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development

Wednesday, February 20, 2019

Dr. George W. Davis Senior Center (Bayview Hunters Point/District 10)

- Locked up/second chances – Employers
- Job programs – language translations /EAS
- Service local neighborhood
- Additional case management/ support
- Skills-training

8. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?

- [no answers given]

9. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?

- Specific employment pathways
- GED Completion
- City college
- Partnership
- Platform/ Job fairs
- Hire Bayview residents/ local hiring
- Employer accounting how many people they hire from job fairs

10. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?

- [no answers given]

11. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?

- [no answers given]

12. What do you like most and least about your neighborhood shopping area?

- [no answers given]

13. What are things that would build your sense of community?

- [no answers given]

Session #2

1. What is important to you that brought you here tonight?

- Any family in need – asking
- Toxic contamination in the Bayview
- Killing of young men of color
- Gentrification – people of color in Bayview Housing
- Territorial Block by block
- Don't know how to write
- No skills
- Financial services

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 20, 2019
Dr. George W. Davis Senior Center (Bayview Hunters Point/District 10)

- Getting people to utilize, do not trust institution
- 2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?**
- Finding employment/ Job services
 - Positive Community Affairs
 - Child Care
 - Safety
 - Activities for the youth/ Positive apartments, affordable, trips
 - Mental Health, Substance abuse
 - Community Support
 - Longevity Jobs
 - Outsiders reap the benefits
 - No fruits or fruits/vegetables/ affordable/ accessible
 - Facilities in neighborhood that delivers outside the community
 - Housing, homelessness shelter/ multi-floors
 - Inadequate shelter
- 3. How would you find out about these services?**
- City department has to communicate better with each other
 - Share network
 - Information out
 - Offer places they can go outside neighborhood
 - Better communication/ Follow-up
 - Training
 - Positive Community Affairs
 - Cultural Sensitivity
- 4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?**
- Financing to help residence
 - Racism
 - Rudeness / other race
 - Transportation
 - Mental Health
- 5. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?**
- T-Train – more than one train / can run more frequently to Bayview
 - Living wage jobs
 - Local hiring
 - Loss of basic institutions, pharmacy, banks
 - Better awareness from police
- 6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?**

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 20, 2019
Dr. George W. Davis Senior Center (Bayview Hunters Point/District 10)

- [no answers given]
- 7. What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?**
- More access to free education
 - On the job training
 - Pay fees
 - Entrepreneurship opportunities
 - Incarcerated jobs/ hard to find/Re-enter job market
 - Professional development
 - Mentorship
 - NEW Business person mentored by seasoned business person
 - Creative job hubs/ Incubators
- 8. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?**
- [no answers given]
- 9. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?**
- Access to education
 - Job training
 - Practice test for City jobs
 - Credit for experiences in place of Degrees
 - Minimum qualifications
 - Wages for housework/ Expand
 - Pay foster parents double, but not pay parents
 - Local hiring
- 10. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?**
- Affordable housing – REAL affordable housing!
 - Substantial living
 - System/ Rent control accountability basic standard of living
 - Strong department of DBI
 - Policing is very threatening – problem with law enforcement need attention – police accountability
 - Wealth education/ management
 - Financial literacy
 - Community involvement
 - Health First – good food, restaurants
 - Water contamination in Bayview/ Toxic
 - Liquor store closing early
- 11. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
- City department denying problems

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development

Wednesday, February 20, 2019

Dr. George W. Davis Senior Center (Bayview Hunters Point/District 10)

- Health/Contamination sponsorship of the poison approved building in the toxic land, refuse to do EIR.

12. What do you like most and least about your neighborhood shopping area?

- [no answers given]

13. What are things that would build your sense of community?

- [no answers given]

Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

1. What is important to you that brought you here tonight?

- Small, inadequate housing, negatively impacting health, wants to stay in the community
- Need immediate housing, SRO (too small) wants housing in Bayview community
- In desperate need of housing, doesn't want to stay in a shelter
- Information about homeownership, or about MOHCD rental program (wants to stay/live in Bayview/Dogpatch)
- Needs adequate housing, is on multiple housing lists, in immediate need, elderly/ senior, health issues, the City system is like a run-around, paying more than 70% of income on rent.
- Son was on housing list, couldn't renew, needs housing
- Works for City, sees inadequate conditions like mold, and other unhealthy environmental issues, people need affordable housing, SRO's aren't suitable for families.

2. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?

- Housing authority list is too long, some people get housed faster than others (out of order), system needs to be improved
- Supports for women of color to get housing, issues with criminal records of family members
- Racial inequities throughout the housing system
- SRO environment is toxic, deaths in the building, drug users etc. → needs access to better housing, has been on Section 8 list for 5 years.
- Credit, good jobs, (not just SSI) are needed to get housing.
- SSI & disabled don't make enough to stay in housing and even SRO's

3. In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?

- Housing authority renewal issues → if someone leaves the household, can all the others stay? Changes in household should not disqualify for housing.
- Section 8 list is full, I need housing now
- Vouchers here (Section 8) you cannot stay in San Francisco
- People who grew up in San Francisco, people of color, do not get enough housing opportunity

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 20, 2019
Dr. George W. Davis Senior Center (Bayview Hunters Point/District 10)

- 4. Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities.**
 - Farther up 3rd street, the housing has onsite gyms, big part of good health (mental & physical), clean environment
 - You have to spend time going to multiple locations, you need access to online & telephone
 - We need more 3 & 4 bedroom housing for young people to grow into and build a family, with playgrounds.
 - People live stressful lives, overcrowded, family housing
 - Build family housing
 - Challenges for formerly incarcerated to access housing in the system

- 5. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified would you prefer?**
 - Email, text, phone call.
 - Mail
 - Newspaper → Examiner
 - Flyers (on street poles) (Posted in businesses)
 - Community facilities (like YMCA's etc.)
 - DAHLIA (this is good, email alerts)
 - Hard copies take too long in the mail
 - For homeownership, there might be a fear of applying, fear of unknown, think you will not get it.
 - How do you know if something is a scam? \$0 down, etc. offers online
 - If you come to meetings & show up, you aren't guaranteed any housing. That should change.

- 6. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?**
 - [no answers given]

- 7. What are the kinds of things that help people move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?**
 - [no answers given]

- 8. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
 - Clean up the streets, there is trash everywhere
 - Add containers on the streets for recycling
 - Places for trash that are not dumping grounds
 - Clean up human waste on streets, access to public bathrooms. Streets are filthy.
 - Facilities for people to shower (public access)
 - Outdoor exercise activities
 - Spaces for youth, speakers for them etc.
 - Spaces for food donation, giveaway

- 9. What are things that would build your sense of community?**

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 20, 2019
Dr. George W. Davis Senior Center (Bayview Hunters Point/District 10)

- Gentrification concerns, high income vs. low income
 - Include all people, not just some
- Art programs (inclusive)
- Adopt-a-neighbor

Session #2

1. What is important to you that brought you here tonight?

- Family has been in Bayview & Fillmore, homeless & drug-use is up. People need help; also TAY (18-24) transitioning out of systems have challenges; older adults who lost housing have troubles; people coming out of services (rehab for drug/alcohol) have trouble accessing services after.
- Problems with landlord, medical costs are half my check, so it's hard to pay other bills, need affordable housing (family, members with disabilities)
- Have section 8 voucher that landlords will not accept.
- Need for shelter beds in the Bayview
 - 1,200 homeless in District 10
 - 125 (2) shelter beds in District 10
 - Is active church
 - There is a Nav. Center (Bayshore)
- Needs for homeless seniors, come here to Dr. Davis

2. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?

- More money (rental subsidy)
- LIHTC rents are too high, SSI benefits is not enough money.
- People stay where they can stay, they don't go anywhere,; need more shelter beds & housing for low-income in the Bayview (homeless, undocumented)
- Affordable housing is not low-income housing
- Medical costs, dialysis vs. bills/rent) are unsustainable
- Mental health supports
- Medical program to check on people (once a week, make sure they) are taking meds.

3. In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?

- Funding commitments from City change
- If you do not have certain amount of years as homeless, then you cannot qualify for housing.
 - Need to prove sleep in car, street, etc. but not shelter
- System relies on individual interviewers (subjective)
- Seniors have trouble navigating the housing system
 - The seniors have children in home who's drug etc. can jeopardize their housing
 - Need a lawyer to navigate housing authority

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 20, 2019
Dr. George W. Davis Senior Center (Bayview Hunters Point/District 10)

- Seniors → DAHLIA is good, but seniors do not have access to internet or people to do the applications for them.
 - Seniors → need supportive housing, are frail, the independent housing isn't good enough for them, (health declines and they die)
- 4. Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities.**
- Case management for vulnerable populations in the housing system
 - Seems like certain groups get favored under the new, changing priorities (vets, mental health etc.)
 - Preferences means everyone fights over limited housing
 - Case management for homeless, not just in housing system.
 - Mother Brown's should be expanded, help keep up with their paperwork.
 - DAHLIA should have housing for families (2,3, 4 bedrooms, not 1, or studios)
- 5. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified would you prefer?**
- Email (gets DAHLIA alerts)
 - but chances are so low
 - Text (youth and others)
 - Phone call (seniors)
 - Word of mouth, from trusted person
- 6. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?**
- Homeownership is expensive for everyone, but if you aren't even stable, it is very out of reach.
 - First time home buyers programs are ok but do not work in San Francisco.
- 7. What are the kinds of things that help people move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?**
- [no answers given]
- 8. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
- Existing parks are good, but could be more family friendly, beautify (help homeless & move them away from parks with services)
 - Parks should look clean and be nice
 - Parks should serve people in the community
 - Parks with open public restrooms
- 9. What are things that would build your sense of community?**
- Community hire
 - When new businesses come in, they do not have employees from the community with skills for these jobs
 - When seniors and children feel safe to walk the streets, that is when the community thrives

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 20, 2019
Dr. George W. Davis Senior Center (Bayview Hunters Point/District 10)

- The people who live here (generational, legacy) get to stay here → community thrives

Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups

Notes for the Long Range Housing Planning break-out groups will be synthesized and posted on the Planning Department's website after all of the forums have taken place.

**A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 3, 2018
Eureka Valley Recreation Center (District 7 and District 8)**

Table of Contents

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups..... 1

Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups..... 4

Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups 8

Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups 11

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups

Sessions #1 and #2

Neighborhood Change and Choice

1. What is the most important or noteworthy change in this neighborhood in the last 5 years?

- Long-time residents moved away (3 dots)
- Fewer families with children live here
- Far fewer LGBT people live here (3)
- Many more strollers (1)
- Local businesses are closing
- Way many vacant storefronts
- Far less LGBTQ people in the area, soon there will be Pride flags hanging, but no LGBTQ people working under them
- Increased rents (4)
- More evictions (2)
- Harder for long-term HIV survivors to afford to live here (2)
- More seniors, few younger families (D7)
- More Asian-American (D7)
- Less seniors are living in the Castro as they don't own many buildings. So younger "Tech" industry workers take up the vacant spaces, further increasing the rent.
- Loss of creative people who are priced-out

2. What has caused changes in your neighborhood?

- Housing costs have gone up (5)
- Homeowners more reluctant to rent out homes/units (1)
- "Upgrading residential properties(2)
- Immigration patterns/development of more middle/upper class in Asia
- Lack of new housing
- The "Tech" industry has allowed far more youth to relocate to the neighborhood
- Increased rent, not enough housing to allow low-income citizens to live in the area (1)

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 3, 2018
Eureka Valley Recreation Center (District 7 and District 8)

- Priced out of option to renew lease; rising rental rates (2)
- Short term rentals (1)
- High retail costs (rental of space) (1)
- Evictions (2)
- Loss of units from people passing from HIV/AIDS (2)
- Lack of housing for people with HIV/AIDS – losing housing because they don't have ability to pay
- City paying companies/organizations to do things that aren't necessary. No oversight. Not housing people

3. Where would you choose to live and where would you choose not to live?

- Most desirable places to live per maps – Castro (6), Duboce Triangle (2), Mission, Glen Park, St Francis Woods, West Portal, Inner Sunset (2), Seacliff, Presidio, Lone Mountain (2), Haight Ashbury, Marina, Nob Hill, South of Market (2), Marin County (2), Walnut Creek, Lafayette, Danville, Oakland (2), South San Francisco, Palo Alto
- Least desirable places to live per maps – Outer Sunset (2), Outer Richmond, Pacific Heights, Marina, Tenderloin (4), South of Market (3), Dogpatch (4), Bayview (4), Parkmerced (3), Daly City, South San Francisco, San Mateo, San Jose, Pinole, Pittsburg

4. What attributes/characteristics/features make a neighborhood a desirable place to live?

- Access to parks (3)
- Access to good public transit (5)
- Gay people/Queer people (3)
- Safe walkability (4)
- Access to local businesses
- Biodiversity of plants, animal, people (3)
- X Affordability! (3)
- Community/queers
- Libraries (1)
- Ethnic racial diversity
- Walkability (1)
- Stores/restaurants/bars (1)

5. Do you feel like you have a choice in where you live?

No notes – see flipchart

6. What makes you feel like you have a choice or don't have a choice?

- I'm queer and my family is multiply marginalized – safer in #s (1)
- Can't afford market rates, need to keep rent control (1)
- Money (3)
- I cannot afford to live in the area I want because I do not make enough money (3)
- If we had access to affordable higher education in order to produce enough income to live in this place and work in this place, I think we would have more choice.
- Moving would mean giving up the benefit of rent control (1)
- Older building not ADA-accessible. Seniors can't move

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 3, 2018
Eureka Valley Recreation Center (District 7 and District 8)

Access to Opportunity

- 7. What are the most pressing challenges to getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood?**
 - Access to mass transit to South Bay where tech jobs are
 - Transit to my job in Bayview terrible (especially after 7 pm)
 - Parking
- 8. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or keep a job?**
 - Easy to drive to work
 - Incentive for a more diverse population which lead to wider perspectives, more challenges met
- 9. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in accessing public transportation?**
 - Terrible sidewalks
 - Needing to transfer makes transit way more complex, so all of area off BART MUNI train lines (such as my neighborhood Chinatown) require transfer, waiting, missed connection
- 10. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in accessing public transportation?**
 - Lots of lines converge here
 - Buses come more often
- 11. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in living in or creating more healthy neighborhoods?**
 - Trash, rubbish and filth on the sidewalks, FREE NEEDLES
 - Mediocre transit/poor transit to some areas
 - Crime
 - Accessibility for elderly/disabled people
- 12. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood to live in or create healthy neighborhoods?**
 - Parks
 - Not filth in streets/sidewalks
 - More incentive for community involvement towards improvement

Fair Housing Violations

- 13. Have you or a member of your household experienced a violation of your fair housing protections?**
 - YES – 3 green dots (Very Helpful)
 - NO – 1 green dot (Very Helpful) and 1 red dot (Not Helpful)
- 14. What did you do/Who did you go for support?**
 - California Department of Fair Employment and Housing
 - Human Rights Commission

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 3, 2018
Eureka Valley Recreation Center (District 7 and District 8)

- Bay Area Legal Aid
- SF Tenant's Union (2 Yellow dots – Somewhat Helpful) and 1 green dot (Very Helpful)

15. How helpful was it?

See answers of Question 14

16. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

No flipchart for this question

Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

1. Let's list the non-housing needs that are most important for you and/or your family.

- Childcare
 - Culturally competent (same sex parenting)
- Food
 - Income challenged
 - Lower income limits
- Access to info for non-English speakers
- Advertising resources we have now to navigate application processes
- Awareness about resources
- Quality healthcare
- Staff/language diversity

2. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?

- Sharing relatable experiences
- Physical outreach
- Multi-cultural marketing material
- Art + Culture engagement
- Website, but make easy to navigate (ask the community)
- Doctor's office for social worker
 - Online too impersonal
 - More personal referral
- Family + friends even more important to communities of color
- One stop shop

3. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services that would meet those needs?

- Stigma (social)
- Language barriers
- Transportation:
 - Great to group things

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 3, 2018
Eureka Valley Recreation Center (District 7 and District 8)

- Frequency, convenience
 - Physical/mental challenge
 - Lack of cultural competence
- 4. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?**
- More queer pol staff/diversity
 - After hours times for people who work days
 - (including now to publish this)
 - Application process simplified + provide next steps, what to expect, etc.
 - Glossary of terms
- 5. What are the biggest challenges getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood? What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or keep a job?**
- Challenges:
- Age discrimination
 - Transportation
 - Lack of opportunities
 - Lack of training/experience
 - Small businesses squeezed by economic factors
 - Undocumented
- Helps:
- Community resources with jobs listing
 - Opportunities in your neighborhood
 - Employers – offered training
 - Focus on mental health awareness
- 6. If you (or someone you know) needed help advancing your career, what services and supports would you look for?**
- One-stop career center
 - Online certification/accreditation (CDC sessions should be open to public)
 - CBO-based employment services
 - Jobs clubs
 - Temporary employment agencies
 - Internship programs for university students (paid)
- 7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?**
- Increase hoop access points
 - Create one for LGBT community, Polly Amory, Leather, etc., cultural districts
 - D.O.R. collaboration with C.B.O. (Federal money)
 - Equal opportunity for underserved communities
- 8. What do you like most and least about your local commercial corridor?**

**A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 3, 2018
Eureka Valley Recreation Center (District 7 and District 8)**

Most:

- LGBT-owned
- All in walking distance
- Convenience

Least:

- 2-3 business only
- Too much bar scene, not safe for youth
- Expensive restaurant
- Needs more small businesses
- Needs more diverse businesses

9. What are things that would build your sense of community?

- Block events to encourage communities
- Something to bring people together from different background
- Bring together younger generation
- Encourage sex positivity

**10. Which programs or services need to be offered in a language other than English?
(Phone translation is a barrier)**

- Everything
- Safe injection facilities
- Needle exchange
- STIs/STDs treatment
- Health services (preventive)

11. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- Ageist perspective
- Gender ID issues
- Sex positivity
 - bath houses in San Francisco
 - support for healthy options
- Asset building – build financial security

Session #2

1. Let's list the non-housing needs that are most important for you and/or your family.

- Cleaner city – sidewalks, people on streets + more...
- Reduce barriers to services – what's keeping you from making the next step?
- Creating spaces for community – too many barriers to use
- General safety

2. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?

“Where would you go?”

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 3, 2018
Eureka Valley Recreation Center (District 7 and District 8)

- Internet – but for most in need don't have that
 - Library use/resource
 - Navigation centers
- 3. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services that would meet those needs?**
- Mental stability/ability to get through the process
 - Have a representative go to them and see what they need
 - Being home-bound limits access
 - Each provider has to have their own outreach efforts – too decentralized
 - No investment in helping community
 - Understand what's out there
- 4. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?**
- Coordinated database of services
 - Provider portal of broadcast services – calendar, flyer, etc.
- 5. What are the biggest challenges getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood? What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or keep a job?**
- Challenges:
- Trauma makes work place hard
 - Education lack
 - Mental health services
 - How to balance mind/body/soul
- Help:
- Practice skills, self-soothing
- 6. If you (or someone you know) needed help advancing your career, what services and supports would you look for?**
- Training for new skill (EDD) – post disability
 - (how to) integrate wellness into your life
 - Paid well ness benefits
 - Child care
 - transportation
- 7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?**
- “What's a good job?”
 - Paying SF rent
 - It's not \$15/hour
 - What is the continuum of job experience/career building
 - Continue to support free city course
 - Subsidize childcare + transportation
 - Requirements on computer (especially tech companies, etc)

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 3, 2018
Eureka Valley Recreation Center (District 7 and District 8)

8. What do you like most and least about your local commercial corridor?

Most

- new business energy
- wider Castro sidewalk

Least

- eliminating people who have been there a long time
- missing daily clean teams
- not affordable eating places
- increasing policing
- vacant storefronts

9. What are things that would build your sense of community?

- Neighborhood watch – helps get to know neighbors
- More Sunday streets/Block parties
 - Including safe events for younger people
 - More housing
- Teach about wellness
- Neighborhood groups talking about eviction prevention, neighbor support

10. Which programs or services need to be offered in a language other than English?

- All
- Eviction prevention
- Workforce development
- Mental health
- Not just language, but also cultural competency

11. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- What have you experienced been with accessing MOHCD services?
- Eviction record impact – makes things worse
- Credit matters also impact situations

Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

1. Let's list the types of housing-related needs that are most important for you and/or your family.

- Evictions
 - rent-related
 - Speculation-driven
 - Ellis Act, OMI
 - Prevention services needed: back rent, legal services, credit repair, lack of info re: eviction process + rights

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 3, 2018
Eureka Valley Recreation Center (District 7 and District 8)

- Relocation Assistance
- Homelessness
- Vacant buildings that need rehab.
- New projects needed in Fillmore

2. In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?

- City spends too much \$ on problems, not solutions.
- “There are no housing services!”
- “Too much overhead, too little services”

More notice for community meeting needed

3. What supports do you or your family need in order to be able to *get* an apartment?

- No vacancy control
- Waiting lists are all closed
- At-risk OMI tenants need immediate assistance
- Up front housing costs - \$ for deposits, 1st month rent, relocation assistance

4. What services do you need to *stay* in your apartment?

- Legal representation- “adequate attorneys”
- More notice for OMI & Ellis evictions
- Where to find new housing – affordable immediate, temporary housing
- Earlier intervention with legal services

5. In your experience, what supports or services do specific groups need to be able to rent apartments?

- Assistance clearing eviction and back-rent record

6. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified you prefer?

- Flyer, especially for seniors/disabled
- Email

7. Aside from the high cost, what are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?

- How to prevent eviction?
- At-risk tenants should automatically be put on lists
- Help finding affordable housing with no waiting lists

8. What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?

9. What are things that would build your sense of community?

10. Which programs or services need to be offered in a language other than English?

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 3, 2018
Eureka Valley Recreation Center (District 7 and District 8)

11. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

Session #2

1. **Let's list the types of housing-related needs that are most important for you and/or your family.**
 - Stabilizing rents of non-rent controlled units
 - Knowing legal rights + resources for tenants
 - Help overcoming barriers, e.g. legal
 - Affordability – paying monthly

2. **In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?**
 - Tenants union is accessible, info hard to get appt. for seniors
 - Info re tenants' rights not so accessible
 - Rent Board info + services fairly accessible
 - Lack of info re/ housing services + programs
 - Better outreach + marketing

3. **What supports do you or your family need in order to be able to *get* an apartment?**
 - Higher income, lower rent
 - Financial education re credit score + impact on housing

4. **What services do you need to *stay* in your apartment?**
 - Financial education e.g. money management
 - Legal services, free or low cost
 - Better + more info regarding these services. E.g. Housing fairs, "Project Homeless Connect" model

5. **In your experience, what supports or services do specific groups need to be able to rent apartments?**
 - Housing "buddy" or "ambassador"
 - Seniors with low-tech experience or not tech. access
 - Translation for non-English speakers
 - Incentives for owners to not raise rents to market upon vacancy (rent stab. Housing)

6. **If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified you prefer?**
 - Social media
 - Public radio
 - Email blasts
 - Flyers, notices in shops
 - Text messages

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 3, 2018
Eureka Valley Recreation Center (District 7 and District 8)

- 7. Aside from the high cost, what are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?**
 - Lottery – neighborhood preference is barrier
 - HOA dues too high!
 - Incentives/assistance to new owners/existing tenants to help maintain tenancy when building is sold
 - Allowing TIC ownership for larger building

- 8. What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?**
 - Ask homeless people what they need
 - Lack of beds in shelters
 - More navigation centers as entry point to permanent housing
 - Job resources/placement to increase income for permanent housing

- 9. What are things that would build your sense of community?**
 - Stability – housing. Places to cook and eat. Community kitchens
 - Community forums
 - Farmers’ markets
 - Neighborhood events
 - Neighborhood blogs/info

- 10. Which programs or services need to be offered in a language other than English?**
 - All
 - Based on demographics + need

- 11. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?**
 - Concern re: people displaced by fire

Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups

Notes for the Long Range Housing Planning break-out groups will be synthesized and posted on the Planning Department’s website after all of the forums have taken place.

**A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 19, 2019
Chinatown YMCA (Chinatown/District 3 and District 2)**

[Table of Contents](#)

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups..... 1

Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups..... 5

Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups 8

Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups 10

[Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups](#)

Session #1

1. What’s important to you that brought you here tonight?

- Stay in rent-control apt
- 3rd eviction
- Cheap landlord
- Lack of property maintenance

Station 1 – Neighborhood Change and Choice

2. Based on the maps and your personal experience, what are the most important or noteworthy changes in this neighborhood in the past 5 years?

- Not enough infrastructure
- Park issues- more traffic
- Not enough housing (more TICS)
- Small dwellings but unaffordable
- Evictions-unlawful detainer
- No interaction with landlord

3. What do you think has caused or contributed to those changes in your neighborhood?

- Developments
- Real Estate

4. If money were not object, where would you choose to live (top 3 desirable places) and where would you choose to not live (top 3 least desirable places)?

- Most desirable places to live per map - North Beach, Haight Ashbury, Western Addition, Laurel Heights
- Least desirable places to live per map – Visitacion Valley, South San Francisco, Excelsior, Mount Davidson, Outer Sunset, Tenderloin

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 19, 2019
Chinatown YMCA (Chinatown/District 3 and District 2)

5. What makes a neighborhood a desirable place to live?

- Green Space
- Transportation
- Farmer's market/ hospitals/ food/ coffee
- safety

6. Do you feel like you have a choice in where you live? And where do you live now (zip code)?

- No choice: 94108, 94115
- A lot of choice: 94115

7. What makes you feel like you have a choice or don't have a choice?

-

Station 2 – Access to Opportunity

8. What are the most pressing challenges to getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood?

-
-

9. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or a keep a job?

-
-

10. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in accessing public transportation?

-
-

11. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in accessing public transportation?

-
-

12. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in living in or creating more healthy neighborhoods?

- Challenges: Small room (district 3)

13. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in live in or create healthy neighborhoods?

- Assets: Convenient to stores, people/ community

Station 3: Fair Housing Violations

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 19, 2019
Chinatown YMCA (Chinatown/District 3 and District 2)

14. Have you or a member of your household experienced a violation of your fair housing protections?

- Yes: 2
- No: 0

15. What did you do/Who did you go to for support? How helpful was it?

-

Session #2

1. What's important to you that brought you here tonight?

- Families with children
- Not all housing opportunities in DHALIA, especially senior housing
- No neighborhood preference in Chinatown
- Hard to get selected by lottery
- More housing for disable people
- No access to fill out paper applications
- More senior housing
- Need more info about subletting rent a room for small landlords
- Income restrictions/ language discrimination

Station 1 – Neighborhood Change and Choice

2. Based on the maps and your personal experience, what are the most important or noteworthy changes in this neighborhood in the past 5 years?

- Higher rent for both business and housing
- Cannot afford affordable housing rent is too high
- More tech people live in SRO's
- SRO's are only marketed in English, targeted to certain groups of people

3. What do you think has caused or contributed to those changes in your neighborhood?

- Too little housing in certain neighborhood marketing in English

4. If money were not object, where would you choose to live (top 3 desirable places) and where would you choose to not live (top 3 least desirable places)?

-

5. What makes a neighborhood a desirable place to live?

-

6. Do you feel like you have a choice in where you live? And where do you live now (zip code)?

- No choice: 94108 = 9 people, 94112= 1 person, 94133= 1 person, 94111, 94104

**A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 19, 2019
Chinatown YMCA (Chinatown/District 3 and District 2)**

7. What makes you feel like you have a choice or don't have a choice?

-

Station 2 – Access to Opportunity

8. What are the most pressing challenges to getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood?

-

9. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or a keep a job?

-

10. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in accessing public transportation?

-

11. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in accessing public transportation?

-

12. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in living in or creating more healthy neighborhoods?

-

13. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in live in or create healthy neighborhoods?

-

Station 3: Fair Housing Violations

14. Have you or a member of your household experienced a violation of your fair housing protections?

- Yes: 4 people
- No: 0 people

15. What did you do/Who did you go to for support? How helpful was it?

- Do: Contact MOHCD – No help
- Where went for help? Private attorney, Tenderloin neighborhood

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 19, 2019
Chinatown YMCA (Chinatown/District 3 and District 2)

Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

- 1. What is important to you that brought you here tonight?**
 -

- 2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?**
 - Job programs- to support & raise their families immigration policies- get access & info & legal services
 - More public services & community organizations funding for training specifically social workers
 - More info. To run for public office I.E. education commissioner
 - Funding for TAY programs- workforce training & school/education
 - Language, vocational training & English courses
 - Case Management for TAY youth 18-24 non-school age
 - Vocational training for special needs individuals
 - Funding for community building

- 3. How would you find out about these services?**
 - Local newspaper- Tsing Tao
 - Radio
 - YMCA/senior centers will language capacity
 - CCDC

- 4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?**
 - Language barriers-YMCA/ senior Center needs
 - Job training/ programs- insufficient, minimum funding, needs language capacity, needs bilingual
 - Staff, lower English proficiency
 - Neighborhood needs a building or community facilities

- 5. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?**
 -

- 6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?**
 -

- 7. What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?**
 - MOHCD look at neighborhood & community holistically to determine needs
 - API counseling
 - Provide stability for nonprofits; assistance for staff to retain housing in the City
 - Needs assistance for small business; businesses are closing and many store fronts are vacant
 - Homeless population- MOHCD needs a plan to assist the homeless population

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 19, 2019
Chinatown YMCA (Chinatown/District 3 and District 2)

- Childcare- parents work night shift; no childcare available at night times
 - Sanitary concerns- City provide more facilities
- 8. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?**
-
- 9. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?**
-
- 10. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?**
-
- 11. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
- Provide more bathroom facilities to eliminate public urination and waste
 - More shelters to decrease overcrowding
 - More street lights/ lighting in alley ways
 - Fund more nonprofits and community agencies
 - Chinatown & funding to clean up and repair Stockton tunnel
 - Keep households in their homes; provide funding for nonprofits for homeowner assistance and other programs
- 12. What do you like most and least about your neighborhood shopping area?**
-
- 13. What are things that would build your sense of community?**
-

Session #2

- 1. What is important to you that brought you here tonight?**
- Housing affordability
 - Housing rental assistance
- 2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?**
- Needs more languages assistance; find non-profits & community agencies to support language capacity
 - Need rental assistance programs; funding for rental assistance programs
 - Housing expenses are higher than income; wants more funding for renter assistance
 - Self-help for the elderly is very important to the community. It has a long history & provides many programs/ for seniors, the organizations is very good
 - The City needs to provide more funding to this organizations; it provides info and resources. Community will support organizations

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 19, 2019
Chinatown YMCA (Chinatown/District 3 and District 2)

- Rental housing increase to 4% (ccdc)
- 3. How would you find out about these services?**
 - Community centers nonprofits to disperse information & resources to the public
 - Flyers in multiple languages is important. Flyers at public spaces, non-profits organizations
 - Public libraries- for internet access but availability is limited
 - Broadcast on Chinese radio
 - Newspaper- Tsing Tao
 - Senior housing information online is brief, needs more information
 - 4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?**
 -
 - 5. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?**
 - Improve 911 – services took 30 minutes.
 - Improve sanitary conditions; add waste/recycling bins in front of business
 - Accessibility in SROS –elevators
 - Improve communication/ marketing- radio, newspapers, flyers, non-profit organization; enlist the help of non-profits & community centers; enlist the help on small neighborhood businesses to check on community members during disasters, etc.
 - Make sure community use 311 to report non-emergency
 - Childcare for SRO occupants
 - Support youth in community; encourage youth to connect with seniors
 - Meal programs
 - Make signs to discourage throwing trash, spitting in street
 - 6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?**
 -
 - 7. What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?**
 -
 - 8. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?**
 -
 - 9. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?**
 -
 - 10. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?**
 -
 - 11. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
 -

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 19, 2019
Chinatown YMCA (Chinatown/District 3 and District 2)

12. What do you like most and least about your neighborhood shopping area?

-

13. What are things that would build your sense of community?

-

Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

1. What is important to you that brought you here tonight?

- Applicants fee for lottery. We pointed that for City sponsored projects, no fee
- 415 701-5500
- Fund nonprofits to help with application work
- DHALIA doesn't give feedback about application
- Many and empty properties not rented out
- Education about new immigration laws that affect affordable housing

2. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?

-

3. In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?

-

4. Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities.

-

5. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified would you prefer?

-

6. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?

-

7. What are the kinds of things that help people move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?

-

8. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?

-

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 19, 2019
Chinatown YMCA (Chinatown/District 3 and District 2)

9. What are things that would build your sense of community?

-

Session #2

1. What is important to you that brought you here tonight?

- Allow TIC
- Eviction prevention
- Down payment assistance
- Housing too small
- More affordable senior housing
- Help paying rental subsidies for affordable housing
- Affordable housing for 62*65 year olds low income
- More housing
- Family housing
- Support organizations like self-help elderly
- More rental subsidies
- Update technology to be more responsive to applicants
- Elevators in older building especially SRO's
- Single parent household
- Make it clear that you don't need ssn to live in housing

2. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?

- Rent for seniors keep rising
- Need more indoor community center in Chinatown
- Space for seniors and children
- Preference for affordable lottery for 1st time applicants for families with children
- More housing subsidies like section 8 and get more landlords to accept section 8
- List of properties/ landlords that accept section 8
- Increase funds for senior services
- Well-funded small sites program. Affordable housing preservation should be priority

3. In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?

-

4. Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities.

-

5. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified would you prefer?

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 19, 2019
Chinatown YMCA (Chinatown/District 3 and District 2)

-
- 6. **If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?**
 -
- 7. **What are the kinds of things that help people move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?**
 -
- 8. **What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
 -
- 9. **What are things that would build your sense of community?**
 -

Written Statement Received:

My name is Chang Jok Lee, I'm the president of the Ping Yuen Residents Improvement Association. Our mission is to strive for better living conditions for nearly 1,000 residents that are residing at Ping Yuen and North Ping Yuen. Since the establishment in 1968, the leadership has continuously working with our security measure. One successful example of getting security improvement was back 1978 where we organized the first Public Housing rent strike in the city after a brutal rape and murder of a young girl at North Ping Yuen. Nowadays Ping infrastructure upgrades because of resident's support and collaboration during the Rental Assistance Demonstration conversation and renovation. With all the additional resident services funding, we are able to focus on breaking through isolation by connecting residents through community building work. Residents feel closer to their neighbors and start building a sense of belonging to the community. This is not something we can achieve in a blink of an eye. It takes time, resources and a lot of work. The work must continue, so residents feel welcome to their community to increase their interests in participating in the service programs. When they build the sense of community ownership, they will become more socialize and active which will help improved their health and wellness overall. Thus, I strongly urge the MOHCD to allocate more funding for community building, so that we can continue the work on building a healthier and solidarity community.

Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups

Notes for the Long Range Housing Planning break-out groups will be synthesized and posted on the Planning Department's website after all of the forums have taken place.

**A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)**

Table of Contents

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups.....	1
Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups.....	9
Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups	14
Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups	20

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups

Session #1

Station 1 – Neighborhood Change and Choice

1. Based on the maps and your personal experience, what are the most important or noteworthy changes in this neighborhood in the past 5 years?

- Lots of new development, restaurants, apartments
- + Vacancies – including brand new retail
- + Stalled constructions
 - Mission and Prussia, cable car
- Too long to get a permit
- Upsizing existing housing – move SF
- Less owner occupied
- Prices increase to rent and buy
- Safeway services not keeping up
- Trash problem not effective
- Boarded up store fronts around Randolph
- Families leaving
- Street dumping
- Lots of business turnover
- Takes long time to open a new business
- Locals can't economically support new business
- Less variety of commercial options especially basics
- New shops taking business away from existing
- Less info-sharing amongst community groups

2. What do you think has caused or contributed to those changes in your neighborhood?

- Incomes higher
- Profit-driven development needs certain return on investment
- Lack of city commitment to AH for existing residents

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

- Chains (ex: CVS)
- Housing as investment / global re: market drives up prices
- Lack of legislative protection
- City not investing in creating working class jobs (+ converse) investing too much in high wage jobs

3. If money were not object, where would you choose to live (top 3 desirable places) and where would you choose to not live (top 3 least desirable places)? And why?

- Most desirable places to live per map – Excelsior (14), Outer Mission (5), Oceanview/Ingleside (14), Parkmerced, St Francis Woods, Bernal Heights, Mission (9), Noe Valley, Haight Ashbury, Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset (2), Seacliff, Inner Richmond, Western Addition, Tenderloin, Bayview, Berkeley, Palo Alto
- Least desirable places to live per map – Parkmerced, Ingleside, Visitacion Valley, Excelsior, Marina (2), Pacific Heights (2), Presidio, Western Addition, Tenderloin (3), Chinatown, South of Market (3), Dogpatch, Bayview (12), Treasure Island, Oakland

4. What makes a neighborhood a desirable place to live?

- + (Positive)
 - Public transit access
 - Good schools
 - Cultural corridors – ex: Calle 24, SOMA Pilipinas
 - Family-friendly – walkable
- - (Negative)
 - Crime
 - Cars (speeding cars)
 - Inaccessible to transit
 - Trash
 - Lack of long term residents / speculators
 - Lack of walkable services

5. Do you feel like you have a choice in where you live? And where do you live now (zip code)?

- No notes; see flipchart for graph.

6. What makes you feel like you have a choice or don't have a choice?

- Money
- School location
- Competition for resources
- Lack of affordable housing even that is called “affordable,” lack of different income levels served

Station 2 – Access to Opportunity

7. What are the most pressing challenges to getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood?

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

- Challenges
 - Fair pay and benefits
 - Lack of resources / variety of retail

- 8. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or a keep a job?**
 - Assets
 - Public transit (Bart and Muni)
 - Colleges

- 9. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in accessing public transportation?**
 - Challenges
 - Depends – Ingleside on Hill
 - Cost
 - Safety (ped safety)
 - Frequency of bus
 - Reliability of bus schedule
 - Slow speed for long distance
 - Lines to wait
 - Limited ADA

- 10. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in accessing public transportation?**
 - Assets
 - No answer

- 11. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in living in or creating more healthy neighborhoods?**
 - Challenges
 - Knowing where to get help

- 12. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in live in or create healthy neighborhoods?**
 - Assets
 - No answer

Station 3: Fair Housing Violations

- 13. Have you or a member of your household experienced a violation of your fair housing protections?**

- 14. What did you do/Who did you go to for support? How helpful was it?**

Other Question

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

15. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

Session #2

Station 1 – Neighborhood Change and Choice

1. Based on the maps and your personal experience, what are the most important or noteworthy changes in this neighborhood in the past 5 years?

- Asian and Latino pop grown
- Increasingly unaffordable to working class
- Increased rents, more Tech employees
- Displacement
- Speculation
- More density / more people per house

2. What do you think has caused or contributed to those changes in your neighborhood?

- Not enough resources
- Wages level while housing increases
- Very high income pop
- Not strong enough tenant protections vs harassment
- Increased rent leads to homelessness

3. If money were not object, where would you choose to live (top 3 desirable places) and where would you choose to not live (top 3 least desirable places)?

- See map
- + (Positive)
 - Raising family / community
 - Safe
 - Schools
 - Everything here / long residents
 - Work
 - Transit
 - Affluent community
 - Health care
 - Grew up here
 - Nature and green connections
 - Friendly people
- - (negative)
 - Affluence
 - Ped safety

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

- Air pollution
- Earthquake safety of soil
- Danger
- Access – bad reputation

4. What makes a neighborhood a desirable place to live?

- No notes

5. Do you feel like you have a choice in where you live? And where do you live now (zip code)?

- No notes; see flipchart for graph.

6. What makes you feel like you have a choice or don't have a choice?

- Have a choice
 - Parental help
- Don't have a choice
 - Money
 - Can't afford – prices and income
 - Race
 - Lots of requirements for A.H.

Station 2 – Access to Opportunity

7. What are the most pressing challenges to getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood?

- Transit slow on some lines
- Language access
- Immigration status
- Lack of training to advance to higher-paying jobs

8. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or a keep a job?

- Transit in some areas

9. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in accessing public transportation?

- Not going downtown
- Frequency
- Reliability
- Crowding
- Pedestrian or bike safety
- Lack of place to sit and wait or bus shelter
- 14R stops at 7pm

10. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in accessing public transportation?

- Towards downtown

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

11. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in living in or creating more healthy neighborhoods?

- Noise pollution
- Trash (especially on Mission)
- Human waste / feces

12. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in live in or create healthy neighborhoods?

- Local produce markets
- Parks access

Station 3: Fair Housing Violations

13. Have you or a member of your household experienced a violation of your fair housing protections?

14. What did you do/Who did you go to for support? How helpful was it?

Other Question

15. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- Many people don't know where to go
- HRC – needs evidence so that is a challenge
- Lack of follow-thru office filing
- APS – limits on penalties

Submitted Written Responses

Station 1 – Neighborhood Change and Choice

1. Based on the maps and your personal experience, what are the most important or noteworthy changes in this neighborhood in the past 5 years?

- More homeless people in the neighborhood. Especially since the Superbowl was in S.F. and many homeless were pushed out of downtown area.
- New buildings
- JHSF
- Real estate interest in D11 as last bastion of affordability in SF

2. What do you think has caused or contributed to those changes in your neighborhood?

- See above.
- Real estate pressures.

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

- 3. If money were not object, where would you choose to live (top 3 desirable places) and where would you choose to not live (top 3 least desirable places)? And why?**
 - Aside from the obvious wealthy classic S.F. neighborhoods, I think SF needs to develop neighborhoods that are balanced and diverse for a range of incomes. Neighborhoods like along Irving St. have a healthy commercial corridor, access to park/open space and transit, yet it feels like a neighborhood. It's what makes Noe Valley, the Castro, Glen Park work and attractive as places to live.
 - SF
 - NYC
 - Hong Kong
 - Texas
 - North

- 4. What makes a neighborhood a desirable place to live?**
 - Comfortable adequate housing for mixed incomes. Not too dense or overcrowded, with a safe and clean environment.
 - Parks and green space

- 5. Do you feel like you have a choice in where you live? And where do you live now (zip code)?**
 - Yes – 94112
 - No – pushed out of west side due to student institutional growth taking housing up!

- 6. What makes you feel like you have a choice or don't have a choice?**
 - More affordable home ownership opportunities within the community.
 - Don't have choices; rent vs. buy; need alternatives for affordable housing creation.

Station 2 – Access to Opportunity

- 7. What are the most pressing challenges to getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood?**
 - Educational opportunities
 - Long term jobs – Ex: Lowe's eliminates local hires. People did not want to pay wage increases. Long term viability. Jobs.

- 8. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or a keep a job?**
 - CCSF public services

- 9. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in accessing public transportation?**
 - Public transit in S.F. works generally well for distance, but is not good within neighborhoods. Many people, families with children, people with disabilities, find it difficult to travel by public transit all the time.
 - Linkage across city
 - Lack of equity in investment
 - Lack of long term transit planning

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

- Overcrowding of systems
- Improve access from t to

10. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in accessing public transportation?

- Not much is being done to address the concerns I've cited above. Smaller public transit vehicles that help you get up and down from the hills within neighborhoods would encourage more people to travel by public transit.
- Balboa Park station as a hub and central major North to South and East to West transit hub.

11. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in living in or creating more healthy neighborhoods?

- Lack of appropriate public transit. Unfriendly and poorly designed public spaces/commercial corridors.
- Retail lacking empty storefronts
- Lack of teen and youth centers, play and evening spaces safe!
- Public plazas meeting large groups in building

12. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in live in or create healthy neighborhoods?

- Libraries – access to arts within the community. Public open spaces and parks. More greening in neighborhood.
- Excelsior planning group
- Improves parks/schools/pools
- Libraries needed more of

Station 3: Fair Housing Violations

13. Have you or a member of your household experienced a violation of your fair housing protections?

- No.
- Yes, displaced by SFSU/CSU growth and enrollment increases, gentrification. Parkmerced Apts. Stonestown Apts.

14. What did you do/Who did you go to for support? How helpful was it?

- N/A
- Fair housing complaint was not helpful, not investigated
- Focus of developer to rent to students over families, protected class in SF

Other Question

15. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- Housing density and building height in particular. I don't think that more than 4 or 5 stories are appropriate within our outer neighborhoods. People have chosen to live there because of the qualities of the neighborhoods.
- Focus on transit long range planning in D11
- Balboa Park station as intermodal hub, linking J-K-T-M lines.

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

- Geneva Harney Line as LRV vehicle link to Balboa Park Station
- Access to HSR at Bayshore
- Overcrowded transit/schools/pools
- Infrastructure needs not being addressed in district equitable vs. downtown!!!!

Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

1. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?

- Jobs
 - Job training support
 - ESL Classes – more opportunities and community support
 - Jobs for mono lingual
 - Providing monetary support while learning
 - Age 16-24 and seniors
 - Opportunities for seniors
- Education
 - Computer skills
 - Financial literacy
 - Consumer protection
- Senior centers
 - Nutrition - transportation
 - Education - connecting to Department of Aging services
 - Physical center - larger

2. How would you find out about these services?

- Google
- Word of mouth
- Multi-lingual websites
- Nextdoor.com
- Newspaper
- Library
- Sunday street fair and other events
- Organization networks

3. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?

- Issues with paratransit
- Language barriers
- Capacity to address crisis cases
- Technology barriers
- Internet

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

- Access to library (hours)
 - Fear (sfrebuildingtogether)
- 4. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?**
- Having Saturday hours (funding)
 - Programs working with each other
 - Data
 - Library longer hours (funding)
- 5. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?**
- Legal services
 - Immigration
 - Tenant rights
 - Assisted living facilities
 - Gathering spaces for community (free / low cost)
- 6. What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?**
- Community Connector Program
 - Ongoing coaching for those who get a job
 - Language accessible
 - Mentoring
 - Programs for all ages
 - Volunteer opportunities
 - Barrier removal funds (example: clipper card)
- 7. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?**
- 8. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?**
- 9. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?**
- 10. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
- 11. What do you like most and least about your neighborhood shopping area?**
- 12. What are things that would build your sense of community?**

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

13. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

Session #2

1. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?

- Transportation
 - Public
- Early childhood education (affordable)
- Financial services for new families (young)
- Implementation of Prop C (Both)
- Small business services
- Access city services
- Disaster preparedness
- Access to learning new technology

2. How would you find out about these services?

- Creating community engaging strategy
- Personal networks
- Web access
- Google
- Calling the Mayor's office

3. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?

- Business hours accessible for working families
- Transportation
- Trust
- Language barriers
- Unfamiliar with online information
- Broken communication with city and community

4. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?

- Community engaging strategies / outreach
- Improve connection / relationship with city
- Let the community know about services

5. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?

- Housing the homeless
- Advocacy from city
- Accountability to voter initiative

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

- Case management services
 - Mental health services
 - Better access to support groups
 - Public gathering spaces
- 6. What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?**
- Supported employment
 - Transportation
 - Expressway to get to downtown faster
 - Continue with free city college
 - Flexible schedules / family-friendly environment
 - Centers to deal with stress
- 7. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?**
- Word of mouth
 - 311
- 8. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?**
- Utilizing vacant spaces for employment training
 - Mentorship
 - Hiring people from the community
 - Community training / leadership development
- 9. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?**
- Financial literacy – in schools
 - Credit education / understanding
 - Knowledge on how to use credit
 - Protecting community from financial predators
 - Student debt counseling
- 10. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
- 11. What do you like most and least about your neighborhood shopping area?**
- 12. What are things that would build your sense of community?**
- 13. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?**

Submitted Written Responses

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

- 1. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?**
 - Financial education assistance. Particularly for youth and families.
 - Transit
 - Schools
 - Pools
 - Parks

- 2. How would you find out about these services?**
 - City websites

- 3. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?**
 - Lack of large scale public transit improvements (links, loops, connections)
 -

- 4. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?**
 - Transit linkages outside downtown
 - Improve connectivity between areas

- 5. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?**
 - Libraries with enough seating and space
 - Parks with wildlife protection
 - Transit that gets to all major points in City. East-West. North-South.
 - Public pools large enough for populations proposed

- 6. What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?**
 - \$ Pay

- 7. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?**
 - City websites
 - Local community boards/meetings and organizations

- 8. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?**
 - More outreach in district at major intersections; not just online

- 9. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?**
 - More financial planning and counseling opportunities for all ages. Especially youth and seniors.
 - Rental income from ADU unit
 - Too many hurdles

- 10. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
 - More open spaces – green spaces with art.
 - Public plaza

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

- Green spaces
- Spaces for kids/teens age groups and seniors
- Benches seating improves sidewalks!

11. What do you like most and least about your neighborhood shopping area?

- The lack of diverse retail. Not easy to shop along the Mission and Geneva corridors. Not much there. Too many of the same things. Parking is difficult too.
- Dirty. Lack trees
- Empty retail spaces.

12. What are things that would build your sense of community?

- Clean and safe commercial corridor with a good variety of businesses and pedestrian friendly activities for a range of age groups and families.
- Larger public community meeting space
- Arts/culture/film center in Excelsior for 500+ people

13. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- Transit lacking equity
- Need to link and connect systems. Treat Balboa Park station as major transit hub.

Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?

- Housing for households earning <25% AMI
- More units with 3+ bedrooms
- Stronger protections for tenants (harassment)
- Relocation assistance
- More 100% A.H. for people in certain neighborhoods
- Solutions to habitability (mold) problems
- Housing in this neighborhood to protect against displacement
- Housing for households up to 120% AMI
- Anti-gentrification policy + program
- Access to higher paying jobs
- Language services / translation
- Access + eviction program to affordable housing for families with children and the elderly
- Help with BMR application process
- More monitoring or BMR program
- End to discrimination against families
- End to discrimination against special needs households
- More housing for seniors, immediately

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

- 2. In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?**
 - Speculation / eviction protections
 - DAHLIA doesn't provide enough listings for HHS with AMIs under 25%
 - New Section 8-style voucher program for HHS who have been displaced
 - More training on BMR process + more clarity
 - Improvements to BMR program
 - More supervision + monitoring
 - Language capability
 - End to discrimination
 - Limited information for housing seekers
 - People don't know about DAHLIA
 - Inclusionary model doesn't work because of limited supply
 - More housing that isn't linked to market rate
 - Eviction is not a solution to substandard housing

- 3. Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities.**
 - Seniors (ADA)
 - Persons with disability (ADA)
 - Battered / domestic violence
 - Support to stay in homes
 - Seniors: moratorium on eviction
 - Victims of predatory lending (owners)
 - Renters: limits on rent increases, harassment
 - Single moms who don't qualify for BMRs
 - People with below credit scores
 - Single people
 - Purchase by affordable housing companies not speculators

- 4. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified would you prefer?**
 - Community outreach / face to face
 - Language-competent CBOs
 - Strategies that don't rely on internet access
 - Hire neighborhood residents to help get the word out about opportunities
 - TV ads
 - Text alerts

- 5. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?**

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

6. **What are the kinds of things that help people move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?**

7. **What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**

8. **What are things that would build your sense of community?**

9. **Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?**

Session #2

1. **What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?**
 - Stable employment to afford housing
 - Rental assistance – short term and long term
 - Eviction defense and prevention support
 - Relocation help
 - Affordable child care
 - Better transportation (public transit)
 - Accommodations for disabled and seniors
 - Better / more realistic definitions of “low income”
 - More targeting to lower income HHS
 - More funds and commitment to housing for existing residents
 - Rental support and subsidy for families who are undocumented

2. **In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?**
 - More support for families with a disabled member
 - Better coordination of social workers with housing opportunities
 - More training on DAHLIA
 - More services for HHS who aren’t homeless yet are at risk
 - Deeper affordability
 - Not enough opportunities in DAHLIA
 - Not enough affordable housing
 - More community facilities / central location for services
 - Multi-language access to programs and to housing opportunities

3. **Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities.**
 - People with disabilities and seniors need stable, affordable housing, not SROs
 - Undocumented people inhabiting illegal units
 - Opportunities to legalize units

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

- Eliminating barriers for undocumented people
 - Help with security deposits / 1st and last month's rent
 - Deeper affordability
 - Safety accommodations for senior renters – no fear of retaliation
 - Protections for seniors
 - Housing for people earning minimum wage
 - Support for seniors to stay in their homes safely – renters and owners (repairs) (budgeting)
 - Preserve housing occupied by seniors
- 4. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified would you prefer?**
- Newspapers
 - Emails
 - CBOs, churches, schools
 - Language – culture-specific CBOs (e.g., Chinese in this area)
 - All
- 5. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?**
- Down payment assistance for co-ops and other “in between” housing (e.g., limited equity co-ops)
 - More creative approaches
 - Limited monthly maintenance / HOA fees
 - Assistance with these fees
 - Help with improving credit scores
- 6. What are the kinds of things that help people move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?**
- More funding for services to prevent homelessness and more locations
 - Stable jobs
 - Local hire programs with better monitoring
 - Vocational training that prepares for high-paying jobs
 - Paid training opportunities
 - Mental health care
 - Financial counseling especially for DV victims
 - On-site supports for TAY and others in housing
 - Holistic, wrap around supports for families and individuals – long term
 - Program policies that create barriers and limit opportunity; inflexible income limits, requirements for
 - Transition supports for people leaving homelessness
 - Family shelters that are safe and comfortable
- 7. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
- More non-commercial community space

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

- More open space
- Larger public libraries and pools
- More cultural activities for Chinese residents
- Free or low cost community meeting spaces

8. What are things that would build your sense of community?

9. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

Submitted Written Responses

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?

- Retired homeowner on a fixed income struggling with property tax increases. On social security it is difficult to pay almost \$10,000 in property taxes.
- Income, rent from ADUs on property
- Better transit options
- Access to good public infrastructure/jobs
- I really need house myself or can let me buy cheap house
- Current market is inaccessible for my family (2 SFUSD teachers with 2 children, 5yo and 7yo) both for homebuying and renting. There may be programs that may help us access affordable housing options but finding them seems overly complicated and not broadcasted enough.
- For my students living in District 11, they are concerned about the same thing, feel that info about services and programs isn't reaching them and their families or is overly complicated to access.
- How can you partner more closely with community agencies, schools, neighborhood organizations, etc. to make sure info about services, support programs, community meetings, etc. is readily available, so residents feel more that reaching them is priority #1.
- Public schools could be a great way to reach people, but partnership is needed to ensure that materials and channels of communication are appropriate / fine tuned to reach students and their families.

2. In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?

- No. Nothing is being done to address this situation.
- No. Have to go downtown to get services. Many not locally focused enough for those working 9-5 jobs. Need weekend and evening hours.

3. Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities.

- While housing is in short supply – even more unavailable are programs to assist people to become homeowners. Workforce housing to accommodate people we want to keep in our neighborhoods like teachers and other working middle income earners.
- Flexibility in ownership. Ex: Senior wants increased income but not manage sub-rental

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

- Residents in the neighborhood have senior household members. When the young people are out for work, no one watches seniors. We hope that there will have more senior daycare centers in the neighborhood helping us taking care of seniors. This way, seniors can have places to do activities and won't be lost, and then the young people can pick up them after work.
- 4. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified would you prefer?**
- Email/flyers
 - Meetings in districts
- 5. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?**
- In District 11 in particular, not enough housing is being built that can be purchased. We need more opportunities for people to be able to invest in their futures.
 - \$ - downpayments
 - Base # for affordable
 - Buy-in or purchase
- 6. What are the kinds of things that help people move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?**
- Rent control that is too strict.
 - More counseling is needed to address the root causes that create homeless populations and shelter populations.
- 7. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
- More open/green space along the commercial corridors of Mission Street and Geneva Avenue.
 - Don't have community large gathering space along corridor
 - Plazas and parks along Mission
 - Meeting at Balboa H.S.
- 8. What are things that would build your sense of community?**
- A more livable commercial corridor that is safe, clean and has a range of businesses and services
 - Public city feature to excelsior
 - Plaza central meeting space
- 9. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?**
- Transportation large scale changes and improvements
 - Public infrastructure
 - Pools – no deep public pools large enough
 - Libraries too small
 - Gas/water/electric

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
Balboa High School (District 11)

Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups

Notes for the Long Range Housing Planning break-out groups will be synthesized and posted on the Planning Department's website after all of the forums have taken place.

**A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 13, 2019
St. John Episcopal Church (Mission District 9)**

Table of Contents

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups..... 1

Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups..... 6

Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups 11

Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups 13

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups

Session #1

1. What’s important to you that brought you here tonight?

- Racism
- Transphobia
- Stigma with Section 8, difficult to use
- More info on tenant rights
- Living conditions in SRO
- Have organizations supporting low-income people
- Definition of affordable not necessarily affordable
- Clarify concept of affordable - affordable to whom?
- Make more affordable
- Displacement
- Access when hard to prove income and immigration status

Station 1 – Neighborhood Change and Choice

2. Based on the maps and your personal experience, what are the most important or noteworthy changes in this neighborhood in the past 5 years?

- Gentrification
- More coffee and laptops
- More Caucasians fewer Latinos
- More expensive buildings and restaurants
- Rich vs everybody
- More buildings on Market pushing others out
- Favorite stores closed
- Higher rents for housing in business
- Fewer families, more young people, less connection to community

3. What do you think has caused or contributed to those changes in your neighborhood?

- Corporations moving in and building new

**A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
 Wednesday, February 13, 2019
 St. John Episcopal Church (Mission District 9)**

- Vacancy decontrol
- Groups like Core(?) magazine leaving
- Big companies - they discriminate versus Latinos
- Proposed monster in the mission
- People think it's safer
- No Burger King
- Change in city philosophy to bigger economic star at expense of cultural id
- Greed, trickles down across neighborhood
- Disinvestment / no investment in mission for 10 years

4. If money were not object, where would you choose to live (top 3 desirable places) and where would you choose to not live (top 3 least desirable places)?

- Most desirable places to live per map – Mission (17), Dolores Park (3), Eureka Valley (3), Twin Peaks (4), Glen Park (2), Excelsior, Visitacion Valley, Outer Sunset, Inner Sunset (2), Haight Ashbury (2), Duboce Triangle, Hayes Valley (3), South of Market (3), North Beach (3), Pacific Heights (2)
- Least desirable places to live per map – Outer Richmond (3), Outer Sunset (6), Inner Sunset, Lakeside, Parkmerced, Daly City, Bayview (6), Silver Terrace, Mission, Dolores Park, South of Market (3), Tenderloin (7), North Beach, Russian Hill, Pacific Heights (3), Marina (3)

5. What makes a neighborhood a desirable place to live?

- Transportation
- Parks
- Safety
- Safe spaces for LGBTQ elderly
- Affordable food
- Cultural activities
- Schools for Hispanics
- Rehab centers
- Hospitals
- Churches, police, fire
- Organizations that help families
- Housing for all income levels

6. Do you feel like you have a choice in where you live? And where do you live now (zip code)?

No choice

X X
94110 94110
94109 94103
94103

A lot of choice

X
94801
94601
94103

7. What makes you feel like you have a choice or don't have a choice?

- High rents

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 13, 2019
St. John Episcopal Church (Mission District 9)

- No place to shower or cook
- Can go to school or work more
- Willing to live farther / travel to work / friends, etc.
- Not adequate representation
- Choice in East Bay but not in San Francisco
- Get less space for your dollar
- Few Lottery opportunities / competition
- Section 8 not accepted everywhere
- Obstacles - Mission fees, difficult to apply via Lottery

8. What are the most pressing challenges to getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood?

9. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or a keep a job?

Challenges

- Commute
- Transit access in some parts of neighborhood
- Highest rents
- Language barrier
- Documentation status

Assets

- Transit access
- Best salaries

Station 2 – Access to Opportunity

[questions 10-13 not asked]

Station 3: Fair Housing Violations

14. Have you or a member of your household experienced a violation of your Fair Housing protections?

- Yes – 8
- Difficult to know
- No - 0

15. What did you do / who did you go to for support? How helpful was it?

- Hud - 3
- Tenants Union
- Causa Justa

Session #2

1) What is important to you that brought you here tonight?

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 13, 2019
St. John Episcopal Church (Mission District 9)

- New buildings - the Monster in the Mission
- Want more small sites and preservation for San Francisco Community Land Trust

Station 1 – Neighborhood Change and Choice

2) Based on the maps in your personal experience, what are the most important or noteworthy changes in this neighborhood in the past 5 years?

- More vacant ground floors
- Racial demographic change
- Traffic
- “Feces crescent”
- More homeless visible, compression due to development
- Less neighborhood services - example Valencia
- Less cohesive, less friendly, harder to talk with strangers
- Less MUNI, more ride service
- More doubling up, living in cars, visible homeless
- Higher incomes and services available
- Loss of long-term businesses available to lower-income

3) What do you think has caused or contributed to those changes in your neighborhood?

- Luxury condos
- Capitalism
- More tech workers - higher incomes, speed of change increased
- Economic tsunami
- Lack of building new affordable housing
- Lack of upkeep of current housing stock
- Lack of city investment besides / services - not equitable investment in district 6, district 9, district 10 eastside

4) If money were no object, where would you choose to live (top 3 most desirable places) and where would you choose to not live (top three least desirable places)?

5) What makes a neighborhood a desirable place to live?

- Transit
- Life services, walking distance, flat journey
- Community feeling
- Not fecal present
- Cultural diversity
- Near ocean or open space big parks
- Garden ability, light

6) Do you feel like you have a choice in where you live now? What is your zip code?

No choice

A lot of choice

**A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 13, 2019
St. John Episcopal Church (Mission District 9)**

X 94110	X 94110 94103	X 94102 94122
------------	---------------------	---------------------

7) What makes you feel like you have a choice or don't have a choice?

- Ability to sell versus opportunity to buy again
- Housing is stable
- Good relationship with landlord
- Money
- If move, would need to leave Bay Area
- Hostility to people with long-term connections to neighborhood

Station 2 – Access to Opportunity

8) What are the most pressing challenges to getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood?

9) What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or a keep a job?

Challenges

- MUNI less reliable
- Turnover of businesses
- Affordability, effect of part time jobs

Assets

- Bike access
- BART
- Walkability
- Mix of jobs at different income levels

10) What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in accessing public transportation?

11) What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in accessing public transportation?

Challenges

- TNC / rideshare congestion
- No direct to Caltrain
- Mission red lanes fewer stops, hard for business
- Rideshare makes less bikeable

Assets

- BART
- Bikes / flat
- # 33 bus
- # 22 bus

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 13, 2019
St. John Episcopal Church (Mission District 9)

12) What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in living in or creating more healthy neighborhoods?

13) What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in live in or create healthy neighborhoods?

Challenges

- Dangers from rideshare drivers
- Random violence at 16th and mission
- Cleanliness of streets – “fecal crescent”
- Needles

Assets

- Noise low in sunset
- Groceries
- Walkability
- Navigation center at 20th and South Van Ness

Station 3: Fair Housing Violations

14) Have you or a member of your household ever experienced a violation of your Fair Housing protections?

- Yes - 2
- No - 4

15) What did you do / where did you go for support? How helpful was it?

- HRC referral
- Legal Services referral
- Larkin Street Youth
- SF Bar Association
- Balance, EDC, Tenants Union

Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

1) What's important to you that brought you here tonight?

- Current legislation
- Jobs
- Community engagement should be core to the plan

2) Other than housing services, what are the services that are according to you and or your family?

- Healthcare
- Outreach to tenants where they are informing of Rights and support
- Welfare
- Immigration Services

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 13, 2019
St. John Episcopal Church (Mission District 9)

- Community Education
- Programs for youth
- Eviction prevention
- Legal Services
- Advertising in passive spaces regarding services and opportunities
- Get dollars or job for seniors
- Connect these services to housing needs (for example downtown streets)

3) How would you find out about these services?

- Bus ad
- Flyers
- Library
- Resource fairs trusted community organizations
- Schools
- City-run social media
- Word of mouth
- Phone calls

4) What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?

- Your age if senior
- Scheduling / hours of availability
- Language access
- Transportation
- Technological barriers
- Not knowing that service exists
- Childcare
- Eligibility
- Fear based on immigration status

5) If there are services that you use and think need to be improved need to be improved?

- More outreach
- Proximity to where you live
- Improve compliance with language access ordinance
- Expand number of languages in which services are available
- Fund services and organizing - these are complementary
- Fund training for most vulnerable populations (job language career coaching)
- How to get people without right-to-work status a job

6) What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?

- Childcare
- Legal services for labor rights - need more attorneys
- Orientation to the universe of all the different types of housing assistance
- Need additional follow-through tech assistance after initial housing applications

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 13, 2019
St. John Episcopal Church (Mission District 9)

7) What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?

- Training, mentorship (paid)
- Immediate, temporary job - especially for formerly incarcerated
- Connection between community and jobs
- Relationships with employers for mentorship
- Include domestic workers
- Fair enforcement of labor law
- Protection for undocumented workers, especially when they are advocating for their rights

8) How would you find out about services that those need?

- Receipt from the store which is hiring
- Community organizations
- Trusted organizations
- Friends - they text you / word-of-mouth
- Flyer in laundromat

9) What, if any, suggestions do you have for the city to improve access to good jobs?

- Clarification about what the good jobs are - how do you know
- Connect trusted organizations - "need a job, ask me how" sticker
- Phone number
- Campaign / promote jobs - similar to how politicians campaign for jobs
- Where are the access points?
- Engage community organizers to spread the word
- Raise minimum wage
- Make existing job a good job example of domestic workers
- Planning for jobs city invest in sector jobs
- Job fairs like farmers markets - regular and open

10) What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and or to be able to build wealth?

- Money
- Lower rent
- Financial literacy, build credit
- Public bank local investments, especially for retirement accounts
- Connect financial literacy to job access

11) What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?

- Use public spaces for affordable housing
- Landbank
- For example, Balboa Reservoir should have been 100% of affordable not market rate
- Maker spaces

12) What do you like most and least about your neighborhood shopping area?

- Need more grocery stores

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 13, 2019
St. John Episcopal Church (Mission District 9)

- Diverse mom and pop shops
- Need more affordable fast food
- Need locally owned stores so well stays in community
- Affordable places flip to become expensive boutiques

13) What are things that would build your sense of community?

- no answers-

Session #2

1) What's important to you that brought you here tonight?

- I usually come
- Learning
- I'm part of this community
- We want more info about housing
- Hearing what is going on
- We want to express ourselves
- Become informed

2) Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and or your family?

- Health services
- Recreation centers for kids
- Services for homeless
- Educational services for kids

3) How would you find out about the services?

- Women's collective
- Online but hard to find
- Rumor / Word of mouth

4) What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?

- Transportation - especially for elders or disabled - come on site
- Low income makes it hard
- Discrimination
- Not knowing enough about what agencies do what
- Distance / Location

5) If there are services that you use and you think need to be improved how do they need to be improved?

- More organized and unified
- Get information out through churches / schools
- Paratransit is terrible - lots of complaints

6) What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 13, 2019
St. John Episcopal Church (Mission District 9)

- Express lane - don't want to wait
- People to visit socially isolated / elderly - especially assisted living
- Funds for educating house workers / house cleaners, capacity building

7) What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?

- Training - paid
- Child care. Want to get paid enough to afford childcare
- Benefits
- Respect for house cleaners

8) How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?

- Need resources / funding for training- for example CPR training, especially for child care providers

9) What, if any, suggestions do you have for the city to improve access to good jobs?

- Good pay
- Trainings for employee rights and how to negotiate

10) What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and or to be able to build wealth?

- Work and good pay
- Resources for work - knowledge about where the work is
- Save money - balance between wants and needs
- Financial education and budgeting
- How to save
- Banks with low or no fees
- Be independent
- Consumer advocates

11) What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?

- Community gathering places
- Homeless leave trash around
- Graffiti
- Security
- Clean streets
- Earthquake safety / preparedness
- Light and air access

12) What do you like most and least about your neighborhood shopping area?

Most

- Culture
- Food
- Transportation
- Hospital

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 13, 2019
St. John Episcopal Church (Mission District 9)

- Everything is closed

Least

- Need social security number to work
- Paint / business facade improvement and interior improvement - low interest loans

13) What are things that would build your sense of community?

- Information fair in Spanish
- Flyers
- Neighborhood directories of services available
- Lawyers - free and good

Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

1) What's important to you that brought you here tonight?

- Housing - learn more about
- Addressing homelessness
- Affordability and access to housing - how much housing gets built for families
- How much do we need to make to qualify for affordable housing

2) What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?

- Expansion of BMR and ease of applications - increase percentage of condos in program
- 20 - 50% AMI - large families needing housing
- Ellis acted out - not on lease - what are options?
- More resources for those facing evictions

3) In your opinion, do you feel that existing Housing Services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?

- Similar services for homeless for the housing insecure - expand definition of homeless
- Telephone access services, services more available

4) Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities

- Families are invisible children under school age, 0 through 5 - this demographic not getting attention
- Do people know about the housing available, ie. homeless men in their 40s - 50s

5) If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified would you prefer?

- Sign up for email notification
- Phone call
- La Colectiva de Mujeres - learn about housing at meetings
- More public campaigns - BART, buses, other public areas

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 13, 2019
St. John Episcopal Church (Mission District 9)

- Receive phone call to know where to apply
- Guest speakers at community colleges, immigrant groups, smart money network

6) If home ownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?

- Price of houses
- Down payment assistance - hard to compete with DALP
- Maybe city could provide low-interest loans
- Need incentives for sellers
- Credit scoring
- Not enough inventory
- Association dues for condos - capped for inclusionary buyers
- What are demographics for BMRs?

7) What are the kinds of things that help people move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?

- Would like to have knowledge of opportunities to pass on to those less fortunate. Is there availability?
- Child care for parents in temporary housing
- Security deposit - move-in costs
- Long waitlist out of shelters and into housing
- SROs should not be considered permanent for family - should be considered navigation center
- Latino families are sent to 3rd street - would like to stay in the mission

8) What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?

- More green space
- Pool facilities
- Good neighbors
- Need permanent housing - living in school that turns into shelter at night
- Franklin Park - needs better clean up, too much trash
- More public seating at muni stops

9) What are things that would build your sense of community?

- More space
- More spacious bedrooms
- More cross-cultural experiences with the goal of helping each other

Session #2

1) What's important to you that brought you here tonight?

- Housing counselor works with people in the mission
- SFMTA
- Section 8 discrimination
- Increase subsidies for seniors

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, February 13, 2019
St. John Episcopal Church (Mission District 9)

- Native San Franciscan forced out
- Immigrants having hard time with housing and are afraid
- Student housing - need more
- Housing Advocate concerned about access to housing - should have more homeless preference
- Displaced by fire, has DTHP certificate, now over income, still can't afford
- Commission over instead of MOHCD
- Prioritize small site acquisition for Community Land Trust over new construction
- Local preference 40% percent to 60%

2) What do you and your family to get or stay in housing?

- Discrimination - needing papers for all members of household
- Lenders more flexible where good credit but not willing to lend - discrimination?
- Master list of homeowners willing to rent to Section 8
- Need help navigating the process of finding housing, applying for housing - a housing helper
- Too many different agencies - bureaucracy
- Not enough housing below 30% AMI
- Need more immediate housing now - simplify process
- Increased wages
- Cap on rent

3) In your opinion, do you feel that existing Housing Services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?

- Have owners commit to renting to people with Section 8 vouchers
- Lottery system doesn't take into account people who really need housing
- Existing preferences to housing are inadequate
- Educating owners about Section 8, ending stigma
- Get the word out more about housing

4) Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay and housing? Groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities

- Need more housing for persons with disabilities and seniors and more long-term subsidies for those groups
- Get folks out of SROs and into more acceptable housing
- Have housing available to undocumented immigrants
- Lots of obstacles - husband qualified for mortgage with bank - only willing to make loan for less than what qualified for; more banks need to work with city
- Only one out of 20 banks accept ITIN

-No additional questions answered in this session-

Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups

Notes for the Long Range Housing Planning break-out groups will be synthesized and posted on the Planning Department's website after all of the forums have taken place.

**A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 5, 2019
Bayanihan Center (South of Market/District 6)**

Table of Contents

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups..... 1

Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups..... 6

Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups 13

Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups 18

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups

Session #1

Station 1 – Neighborhood Change and Choice

1. Based on the maps and your personal experience, what are the most important or noteworthy changes in this neighborhood in the past 5 years?

- More homeless
- Displaced long term residents
- Loss of Filipino business
- More dramatic income inequality
- SRO’s used by tourists more
- Conversion of long term housing to short term
- More traffic

2. What do you think has caused or contributed to those changes in your neighborhood?

- Rent is going up
- Too much development in small area
- Influx of tech industry : twitter, tax break
- Increase in jobs not paired with increase in Housing
- Real estate speculation
- Lack of code enforcement
- Cost of living going up

3. If money were not object, where would you choose to live (top 3 desirable places) and where would you choose to not live (top 3 least desirable places)?

- Most desirable places to live per map – SOMA (6), Outer Sunset (3), Inner Sunset, Inner Richmond, Mission (3), Excelsior, Silver Terrace, Bayview, Castro, Haight Ashbury, Pacific Heights, Marina, North Beach, all of San Francisco (generally)
- Least desirable places to live per map - Marina, Treasure Island/ Yerba Buena Island, Tenderloin (2), Potrero Hill, Bayview, Excelsior, Parkmerced, Outer Sunset

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 5, 2019
Bayanihan Center (South of Market/District 6)

- 4. What makes a neighborhood a desirable place to live?**
 - Access to stores, services, parks
 - Family friendly
 - Cultural richness + street life
 - Fresh air, light
 - PED friendly / safe

- 5. Do you feel like you have a choice in where you live? And where do you live now (zip code)?**
 - No choice: 94117, 94103, 94116, 94117
 - A lot of choice:

- 6. What makes you feel like you have a choice or don't have a choice?**
 - Cost (rent control in current place)
 - Payment to paycheck
 - Salary can't keep up with rising rent
 - Not enough range of affordable housing
 - Credit rating

Station 2 – Access to Opportunity

- 7. What are the most pressing challenges to getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood?**

Challenges:

 - low paying jobs
 - seasonal jobs
 - fluctuating incomes
 - More job placement for homeless
 - Loss of PDR jobs

- 8. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or a keep a job?**

Assets:

 - There are jobs available
 - Employment center
 - Higher education jobs (tech)

- 9. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in accessing public transportation?**

Challenges:

 - Unreliable muni
 - Congested travel times

- 10. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in accessing public transportation?**

Assets:

 - Lots of buses
 - Muni

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 5, 2019
Bayanihan Center (South of Market/District 6)

- Bart
- Group connection to other neighborhoods

11. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in living in or creating more healthy neighborhoods?

-
-

12. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in live in or create healthy neighborhoods?

-

Station 3: Fair Housing Violations

13. Have you or a member of your household experienced a violation of your fair housing protections?

-

14. What did you do/Who did you go to for support? How helpful was it?

- Was helpful language barrier

Other Question

15. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

-

Session #2

Station 1 – Neighborhood Change and Choice

1. Based on the maps and your personal experience, what are the most important or noteworthy changes in this neighborhood in the past 5 years?

- Lack of family housing
- Conversation of family housing to live/ work
- Influx of big tech to 94103
- Costs of legally businesses
- Empty storefronts in new buildings
- More big tall buildings
- Not corresponding rise in parks/ public space (popo's not enough, not really for community)

2. What do you think has caused or contributed to those changes in your neighborhood?

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 5, 2019
Bayanihan Center (South of Market/District 6)

- High rent/ low income
 - White collar jobs
 - Policy not focused on low income
 - Twitter tax break
 - Jobs going up much faster than housing
 - Lack of transparency in development process, both in building and things like scooters/bikes
- 3. If money were not object, where would you choose to live (top 3 desirable places) and where would you choose to not live (top 3 least desirable places)?**
-
- 4. What makes a neighborhood a desirable place to live?**
- Pedestrian safety + general safety
 - Accessibility to parks, night life, shops, etc
 - Sense of community/ belonging
 - Transit
 - Proximity to schools, community spaces
 - weather
- 5. Do you feel like you have a choice in where you live? And where do you live now (zip code)?**
- No choice: 94124, 94122, 94117, 94103
 - A lot of choice:
- 6. What makes you feel like you have a choice or don't have a choice?**
- Golden handcuffs of rent controller apartments
 - Home owners might be locked in (generation)

Station 2 – Access to Opportunity

- 7. What are the most pressing challenges to getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood?**
- Challenges:
- P.D.R. jobs decrease
 - Lack of growth opportunities, blue collar jobs
 - Lack of neighborhood preference
- 8. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or a keep a job?**
- Assets:
- High tech jobs increasing
 - Lots of nonprofessional jobs
- 9. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in accessing public transportation?**
- Challenges:
- Traffic at freeway on off ramps

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 5, 2019
Bayanihan Center (South of Market/District 6)

- Poor transit planning
- Redirecting traffic from Market to Mission
- Chase center, Oracle park, Mission Bay Hospital convergence
- Crime on transit
- Scooter/ bike rentals

10. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in accessing public transportation?

Assets:

- Lots of transit of all kinds

11. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in living in or creating more healthy neighborhoods?

Challenges:

- Poop!
- Needles
- Air pollution
- Lack of shelter beds (waiting list)
- Drug dealing
- Police station promised but never arrived
- Homeless encampments
- Traffic
- Mental health services wait until crisis
- Affordability for services
- Lack of gathering spaces

12. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in live in or create healthy neighborhoods?

Assets:

- Health clinic sense of community
- Non professional
- Senior services
- Pit stop
- Cultural assets
- Churches

Station 3: Fair Housing Violations

13. Have you or a member of your household experienced a violation of your fair housing protections?

- Yes: 0
- No: 1

14. What did you do/Who did you go to for support? How helpful was it?

- Ca. Dept of Fair Housing + employment: Yes (employment)
- Human Rights Commission: yes

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 5, 2019
Bayanihan Center (South of Market/District 6)

Other Question

15. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- We should be having displacement benefit for market forces like we did for urban renewal projects like the lower Fillmore
- We should talk about overcrowding within individual residencies & people displaced by landlords cracking down on sub-leasing
- Airbnb and SIM hurt term conversions (S.R.G. conversion)
- General question about stories people can tell about encountering barriers
- A.M.I. levels of housing net aligned with need of people

Participant Worksheets

4. What makes a neighborhood a desirable place to live?

- Sunny parks/open space

8. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or a keep a job?

- n/a – we have jobs but also massive student loan debt

Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

1. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?

- Sports in Alleys!
- Culturally competent counseling
- Mental health/ multilingual
- Filipino language access
- Tenants
- Food security
- Employment training
- Housing- homeless support, job readiness, process help, worker rights, advocacy, after school support, education support new immigrants
- Other languages: Spanish, Arabic
- Seniors employment or activities
- Incorporate behavioral analysts

2. How would you find out about these services?

- Word of mouth
- Case workers
- Community outreach- events/forums, mtgs
- More agencies needed

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 5, 2019
Bayanihan Center (South of Market/District 6)

- Senior outreach is needed
 - CBO's- need improvements in digital
- 3. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?**
- Language access i.e. multilingual flyers
 - Mental health stigma
 - Neighborhood newsletter is needed
 - Fear especially in undocumented community
 - CBO's capacity is limited
 - Clients are busy working during CBO hours
 - Intimidation at agencies front door- needs to welcome (invite with food)
- 4. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?**
- Workforce
 - More forums to identify needs
 - Increase community engagement
 - More collaboration with case managers
 - Fund more for case workers= more support to clients
 - Public school teachers at Bessie need more support
 - Inter-generational activities
 - Citizenship immigration legal support + process help
- 5. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?**
- Legal help
 - Multilingual assist for digital divide- filling out online apps
 - Senior Housing information is not centralized
- 6. What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?**
- Priority to SOMA residents
 - Diversify industries OEWD focuses on
 - Job training/ coaching
 - Jobs near transportation
 - More outreach to residents to fill City jobs
 - Fund CBO's enough to pay staff a good wage
 - Bridge program
 - Workshops in community- resume, how to apply, navigate process,
 - Youth jobs
 - Entry level require support
 - Paid on the job training, apprenticeship
 - Pipeline pathway
- 7. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?**
- Flyers

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 5, 2019
Bayanihan Center (South of Market/District 6)

- Word of mouth
- 8. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?**
- Provide professional clothing for parents @ Bessie
 - Job interviews
 - Use schools- network
 - Direct placement for residents at major bus. in area
 - Training programs that lead to a real job
- 9. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?**
- Land grants
 - Lower rent
 - Make enough to buy a home
 - Citizenship support, access services
 - Financial literacy- culturally competent
 - Systemic racism needs to be addressed
- 10. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
- More trash cans
 - Gateway identifiers
 - Cultural identifiers
 - Parks
 - Privately owned public space access – these are hidden
 - Fund community to activate Popos
 - Park stewardship
 - BBQS/ events for community
 - Safety and street cleaning include
 - Lights in alleys
 - Homeless shelters with services
- 11. What do you like most and least about your neighborhood shopping area?**
-
- 12. What are things that would build your sense of community?**
-
- 13. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?**
-

Session #2

- 1. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?**

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 5, 2019
Bayanihan Center (South of Market/District 6)

- Job training
- Priority for residents
- Entry level jobs at small business
- Building capacity at small business to hire local

2. How would you find out about these services?

- Internet
- Newspaper
- School- Bessie C.
- CBO's / case managers, increase awareness
- Somcan, hospitality house
- More outreach of services
- Word of mouth
- Radio
- Need job fair in SOMA
- Work where you live
- Send mail to homes

3. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?

- Lack of awareness
- Need public posts
- Under staffed CBO's
- SRO residents need more education
- Re: community resources
- Too many steps + places to obtain help
- Too much trauma with retelling personal story
- Need more community mtgs.
- Re: resources + info + process help

4. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?

- Streamline process
- More outreach especially in SRO's + public housing
- More education : Housing rights + resources by the City
- Meet people where they are, give options
- Healthcare options education of public
- Improve access of healthcare
- Improve sharing of right education

5. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?

- Mental health service especially for youth
- Housing especially for seniors
- Laundromats. There is only 1
- Public parks in district 6

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 5, 2019
Bayanihan Center (South of Market/District 6)

- SOMA only has 1
 - More schools + more after school programs
 - Need to fund facilities
 - Daycare
 - More restrooms 24/7
- 6. What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?**
- More awareness on available jobs
 - Skills training update skills
 - Childcare for working parents
 - Driver License
 - Know your rights at work
 - Reporting process
- 7. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?**
- Access centers
 - Internet, newspaper
 - Somcan
- 8. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?**
- More funds for jobs
 - Outreach in media
 - Job lists to case workers
 - Language programs for translation + interpretation that residents can do
 - Manufacturing jobs attract business + new industries
 - Local hire policies
- 9. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?**
- Investment guidance –real estate
 - Food security is a challenge because of high rent
 - More grocery stores + pantry options
 - Affordable healthy food
 - Liquor stores are expensive
 - Financial literacy education re: basic skills i.e. banking, credit building, saving
 - Community based banks or credit union
 - Remittance budgeting help
- 10. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
- Need a Filipino grocery store
 - Too crowded
 - People have to go to Y.B. to enjoy public space
 - Public space

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 5, 2019
Bayanihan Center (South of Market/District 6)

11. What do you like most and least about your neighborhood shopping area?

- Need a Filipino grocery store
- Too crowded
- People have to go to Y.B. to enjoy public space
- Public space
- Reopen Filipino grocery store
- Lighting for safety
- Cultural identifiers
- Cleaner streets (relate to housing)
- Reduce feces + needles
- Programs to activate alleys + 6th street to be family friendly
- 6th street improved but can be better
- Accessible bus stops
- Cross walks for disabled
- More trees - greenery

12. What are things that would build your sense of community?

- More space to unify community
- More forums/ events
- City needs to work closely with community members
- Organizing, promotion
- Commercial corridor that addresses community needs
- Serve the community like Chinatown
- Family events- intergenerational

13. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

-

Participant Worksheets

1. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?

- Funded community coalitions help bridge community members
- Proximity to health care and education
- Sanitary and well-lit streets
- Balanced law enforcement
- Job training
- Priority for residents
- Language access
- Healthcare access
- Employment support
- Entry-level jobs at small businesses

2. How would you find out about these services?

- CBOs/non-profits

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 5, 2019
Bayanihan Center (South of Market/District 6)

- Word-of-mouth
 - School
 - Internet
- 3. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?**
- Understaffed CBOs
 - More clinics needed, more often
 - Too many steps & places to obtain help – trauma in retelling story just to get services!
- 4. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?**
- Streamlining communication!
 - More outreach!
- 5. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?**
- Childcare
 - Employment services
 - Parks
 - Public restrooms!
- 6. What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?**
- job training -> mobility
 - workers rights
 - DMV/Drivers license
- 7. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?**
- CBOs
 - Word-of-mouth
 - Internet
 - Social network/family
 - SOMCAN
- 8. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?**
- Provide job lists/availability
 - Pipeline for interpreters/multi-lingual people
 - More outreach
 - local hire strengthening
- 9. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?**
- Sustainable jobs with greater-than-living-wages. Nonprofit workers are some of the most exploited and wage range – they get burnt out for non-competitive wages – perpetuate the cycle of poverty
 - Food security

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 5, 2019
Bayanihan Center (South of Market/District 6)

- Investment guidance
- “financial literacy” -> workshops on how to build credit, apply for grants, etc.
- Community-based banks
- Support for families sending remittance

10. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?

- PARKS
- Lighting
- Cleaner streets/public restrooms
- Crossing times
- Cultural landmarks (SOMA Pilipinas)

11. What do you like most and least about your neighborhood shopping area?

- More options please!
- Unaffordable -> no grocery stores

12. What are things that would build your sense of community?

- Community gatherings, promotion, family events (age-appropriate)
- SOMA Pilipinas commercial corridor!
- More clinics for services, more often

Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?

- Drop in assistance with housing application
- Explanation of DAHLIA plus make it more user friendly
- Eviction defense
- Tenant counseling- know your rights
- More housing- lots of applicants
- Outreach in building, ESR SRO's
- Definition of affordability- limited option for people on fixed income
- Long waitlist for family disabled plus senior housing
- Fear of eviction
- Median income set for SF

2. In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?

- Elevators break down a lot, building conditions not adequate
- Language access-D6- (Filipino)
- Needed- barriers to asking- need to outreach to find + encourage people to connect- ex clinics, interpreters
- CBO's need space + technology to deliver services – ex Somcan survey, SOMA Pilipinas

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 5, 2019
Bayanihan Center (South of Market/District 6)

- More counselors, tenant outreach, more training for counselor especially in SRO's on 6th & TI limited counselors
 - Most services not immediate, long waitlists
 - Fear to get a raise if might lose housing
- 3. Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities.**
- Language
 - Fix building for access
 - Rental subsidy
 - Support services for seniors with disabilities
 - Veterans, including homeless, preference?
 - Middle household income
 - Neighborhood preference + protections for N. residents like neighborhood
 - Youth – 2500 in SFUSD
- 4. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified would you prefer?**
- Clinic/ workshops in every neighborhood
 - Ongoing + regular
 - Website
 - Flow chart of how application process works
 - Tenant counselor, direct to assistance
 - Letters for those without computers
 - Generally make easier, TV news approach to language
 - HUD has clinic to take
- 5. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?**
- Price
 - Availability
 - Qualification- ex credit history
 - Environmental conditions of sites like HV + TI
 - Allow groups to buy multi-FAM building to prevent evictions
- 6. What are the kinds of things that help people move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?**
- Adequate job training
 - Local hire priority
 - Mental health + rehab services, especially as alternative to policing people (as opposed to conservatorship)
 - How do we prevent homelessness? Focus on housing up front
 - More permanent supportive housing

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 5, 2019
Bayanihan Center (South of Market/District 6)

- Housing ladder, especially for SRO's
 - Like skills classes
 - More flexibility with shelter rules to facilitate employment
7. **What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
-
8. **What are things that would build your sense of community?**
-
9. **Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?**
-

Session #2

1. **What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?**
- Affordable housing
 - Family- size housing stock
 - More than minimum wage job
 - For low income / that people can afford
 - Especially 20% AMI, senior people on fixed income
 - Take on roommates
 - Landlord know their responsibilities
 - Rental subsidies beyond a few MOS
 - Senior housing without long waitlist
 - Flexible rules for occupancy, ex seniors with families/ grandchildren who need to stay
 - Clarity about what renters can ask a landlord to do
 - Housing application assistance, especially languages
 - More options across all income spectrum
 - clinics
2. **In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?**
- Service for immigrant newcomers is lacking
 - Should ask about quality + access of services
 - Need empathy + compassion
 - Education for providers needed
 - More counselors with bilingual skills needed
 - To increase quality of services, pay more \$ to staff, make careers more sustainable
 - Make sure BMR units are not in basement
 - Make process less stressful
3. **Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities.**

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 5, 2019
Bayanihan Center (South of Market/District 6)

- So many challenges
 - Teachers- match opportunities with pay scale
 - Seniors
 - Newcomers + people with language access needs, especially Filipino in SOMA
 - Use church + cultural art + school to outreach, create safe space to ask for help
 - Use cultural district
 - San Franciscans, perhaps by seniority
 - Use SFUSD definition of homelessness, work with SFUSD
- 4. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified would you prefer?**
- Outsource to private company
 - Electronically
 - Use existing community
 - Ex school, teachers, community
 - Create jobs for outreach
 - More CBO capacity
 - In person outreach
 - Church, cultural districts, relationships
- 5. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?**
- Credit, financial literacy
 - Income inequality
 - Down payment size, FICO score, flex on co-signer
 - Income VS. house price
 - Teachers pay
- 6. What are the kinds of things that help people move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?**
- Income vs. rents
 - Choices limited on lower salary/income
 - Rents term too high
 - Need so many resources to meet needs
 - Overcoming eviction
 - Also issue to more street shelter, relates to quality of services
 - Should observe services like "HOT" being provided
 - Streamlined path
- 7. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
- Parks- make more, make more child friendly
 - In SOMA, lots of popos but not child or senior friendly ex. Playground, pathway for easy access, don't require ID to access, label them (maps)
 - State park + bike paths that are safe

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 5, 2019
Bayanihan Center (South of Market/District 6)

- Pedestrian safety- ex lights + pedestrian lights
- No poop + no needles
- Connect with SFMTA efforts

8. What are things that would build your sense of community?

-

9. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

-

Participant Worksheets

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?

- “drop-in” assistance with housing applications
- Tenant counseling/tenant rights education
- Eviction defense
- More housing units/lots of applications
- People with needs aren’t even applying!!
- Outreach in buildings
- Definition of affordability must be refined (most of community don’t qualify)
- Need more user-friendly DAHLIA
- Long waitlists??? ☹

2. In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?

- Fear of asking for raises because = losing housing
- Elevators breaking down, buildings in bad condition
- Need to improve language access
- Hesitant to ask! Need the City to outreach to find where these families are (ex. Clinics, interpreters)
- Lack of space for CBOs! (eg. SOMCAN survey, SOMA Pilipinas)
- More tenant counselors, maintenance of buildings!
- Training counselors especially for SROs on 6th Street, Tenderloin, limited accountability
- MOHCD is not addressing immediate, long waitlists

3. Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities.

- Language access
- Rental subsidies
- Veterans/senior veterans
- Moderate income
- Neighborhood preference
- 2500 SFUSD homeless youth

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 5, 2019
Bayanihan Center (South of Market/District 6)

4. **If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified would you prefer?**
 - Email
 - Mailers to home address
 - Clinic/workshop
 - Website
 - Filing out application with client; reminders of requirements
 - Tenant-counselor with direct assistance
 - Mailing rather than computers
 - Generally easier/more accessible terminology

5. **If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?**
 1. Limited stock of range of income and housing lost brackets 80-120% AMI
 2. Can new buildings be split into tiers with some only for 60-80%, 80-100%, 100-120% AMI, etc. instead of broadly all below 100% AMI?
 3. PRICE
 4. AVAILABILITY!! Need MORE!!
 5. Requirements (credit, insurance, history, etc.)
 6. Environmental conditions of sites (Tenderloin, Bayview/Hunters Points)
 7. Allow CBO/nonprofit to buy buildings to prevent eviction

6. **What are the kinds of things that help people move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?**
 - Adequate job training
 - Local hire priority
 - Mental health and rehab services ESPECIALLY as alternative to policing
 - Homeless prevention rather than management/rehab centralization
 - More permanent supportive housing!!
 - Housing mobility (eg. Why are people living in SROs for 40 years)

7. **What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
 - Protected bike lanes
 - More open space – on-grade, rooftop, anything, open space all the time
 - Green space
 - No shadows on parks!
 - More public parks, not Privately Owned Public Open Space (POPOS)

Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups

Notes for the Long Range Housing Planning break-out groups will be synthesized and posted on the Planning Department's website after all of the forums have taken place.

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 10, 2018
Ortega Public Library (District 1 and District 4)

[Table of Contents](#)

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups..... 1

Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups..... 3

Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups 7

Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups 11

[Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups](#)

Sessions #1 and #2

Neighborhood Change and Choice

1. Based on the maps and your personal experience, what are the most important or noteworthy changes in this neighborhood in the past 5 years?

- Inner Richmond – decrease in African American demo (6 dots)
- Outer Sunset – fewer families with young kids, more wealthy families
- Richmond – More younger adults, especially on Geary, less friendly; tech buses, younger demographic
- Sunset – groups keep to themselves; Housing prices and rents (4 dots); high AirBNB presence – esp. beach (one dot); more renting to individuals to maximize income; more unstably housed college students; more market rate development newly created, less middle; house rich – cash poor seniors
- Parkside – City policy that overrides neighborhood wishes (ex. L) (4 dots); loss of street parking affected businesses (one dot); lack of sensitivity to neighborhood issues (one dot)

2. What do you think has caused or contributed to those changes in your neighborhood?

- Sunset & Richmond – Maximizing income from rent (one dot); real estate speculation; number of people (increase in population); increase in income inequality; transit changes; park and rec changes; not enough community input; twitter tax break/business focus; development without community investment; YIMBY rhetoric about “should”.

3. If money were not object, where would you choose to live (top 3 desirable places) and where would you choose to not live (top 3 least desirable places)?

- Most desirable places to live per map – Outer Sunset (5), Inner Sunset (2), Twin Peaks (2), Mission, Glen Park (2), Silver Terrace, Western Addition (2), Pacific Heights (4), Outer Richmond (7), Inner Richmond (2), Seacliff (3), Pacific Heights (6), South of Market
- Least desirable places to live per map – Outer Sunset (2), Bayview (6), Dogpatch, South of Market, Tenderloin (2), Financial District, North Beach

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 10, 2018
Ortega Public Library (District 1 and District 4)

4. What makes a neighborhood a desirable place to live?

- Accessible transit (one dot and one check mark)
- Low crime rate
- Clean
- Views
- Sunny/weather
- Less traffic congestion
- Schools (public) – esp. high schools
- Community involvement
- Character of neighborhood/quality of housing
- Shopping (neighborhood)
- Open space (one dot)
- Opposite/less desirable: toxins, homeless, too far west
- International communities
- Multi-cultural
- History/family connection
- People know each other, check on each other
- Thriving small business in neighborhood
- Excellent transit
- Multi-generational
- Sense of community
- Variety of architecture
- Gardens and open space and small parks
- Big parks
- Street trees
- Safety, lighting, no trash

5. Do you feel like you have a choice in where you live? And where do you live now (zip code)?

See flip chart

6. What makes you feel like you have a choice or don't have a choice?

Choice		No Choice
Ownership		Cost
Wealth		Affordability
Support network		
	Rent control	

Access to Opportunity

7. What are the most pressing challenges to getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood?

- Richmond - N/S transit

**A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 10, 2018
Ortega Public Library (District 1 and District 4)**

- 8. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or keep a job?**
- Richmond – transit E/W
- 9. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in accessing public transportation?**
- N/S direction
 - Wait times
 - Heavy traffic on return to neighborhood on N
 - Transfers and frequency
 - N + 19th turnaround/switchback
 - L Taraval Communication
 - N unreliable
- 10. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in accessing public transportation?**
- E/W direction
 - Richmond– can get anywhere
 - Great system
- 11. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in living in or creating more healthy neighborhoods?**
- No answers
- 12. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood to live in or create healthy neighborhoods?**
- Sunset – low pollution

Fair Housing Violations

- 13. Have you or a member of your household experienced a violation of your fair housing protections?**
- Yes – race
 - Yes – Source of income (Section 8)
 - Yes – subtle / not documented
- 14. What did you do/Who did you go for support? How helpful was it?**
- SF HRC (human rights commission) very helpful
 - SF Housing rights committee
- 15. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?**

Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 10, 2018
Ortega Public Library (District 1 and District 4)

- 1. Let's list the non-housing needs that are most important for you and/or your family.**
 - Lighting for safety/security
 - More senior service facilities
 - Senior education needs: computers, ESL, citizenship classes, legal services
 - Safety: many car break-ins

- 2. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?**

Friends, neighbors, Self-help for the elderly Senior Center in West Portal and Chinatown, social workers, newspaper

- 3. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services that would meet those needs?**
 - Language access, more bilingual services
 - Facilities, more permanent facilities.

- 4. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?**
 - Permanent location for senior center

- 5. What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?**
 - No workforce services/center on West side of city
 - More staff for existing programs

- 6. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?**
 - Mostly seniors in this group
 - Those who need the service travel to Chinatown to obtain

- 7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?**
 - Improve public transit
 - Work with employers to incentivize them to hire people with high barriers to entry
 - Improve street safety
 - Too many applicants for few jobs

- 8. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?**
 - Estate planning
 - More financial education for youth
 - Increases in property/public taxes make saving harder

- 9. What do you like most and least about your local commercial corridor?**
 - Dislike marijuana shops, high opposition to marijuana stores
 - Dislike many empty commercial lots. Small businesses squeezed out. High cost like including minimum wage
 - Dislike small business need to pay surcharges which they pass to consumers.

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 10, 2018
Ortega Public Library (District 1 and District 4)

- Like – Clement street had holiday stroll, need more community building events
- Like – small business planning help

10. What are things that would build your sense of community?

- Seeing more instances of houses without occupants
- More policing for sense of safety in sunset/Richmond district
- Permanent place for senior center
- GHW should be pedestrian only, new Sunday streets events
- Continue outreach for traffic safety (speeding, etc.)
- More open spaces
- Need places to shower and get clean at beach

11. Which programs or services need to be offered in a language other than English?

No responses

12. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

No response

Session #2

1. Let's list the non-housing needs that are most important for you and/or your family.

- Permanent senior center
- Commercial rents high; prevents expansion of services, city needs to help senior center with rent and property acquisition
- Public transit late
- Paratransit
- IHSS more outreach

2. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?

- Internet, need more resources for outreach events, word of mouth, libraries.

3. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services that would meet those needs?

- Lack of information
- Language access, bilingual staff hard to find. City should help nonprofits with language access.

4. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?

- Permanent location for senior center

5. What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?

- Hard to find stable jobs, jobs with benefits
- City funded programs to help people understand new ways of job search (Linkedin, etc.)

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 10, 2018
Ortega Public Library (District 1 and District 4)

- 6. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?**
 - Direct outreach for schools
 - Outreach for senior centers

- 7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?**
 - Same suggestions as in break out group one
 - City can subsidize jobs that require bilingual skills

- 8. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?**
 - More financial education
 - Warn about scams, payday loans

- 9. What do you like most and least about your local commercial corridor?**
 - Dislike – lack of parking, some corridors have bad public transit, too much construction increases travel time
 - Sidewalks should be wider, different types of stores, vibrancy/diversity of Irving corridor

- 10. What are things that would build your sense of community?**
 - ESL classes, newcomer services
 - More volunteer opportunities
 - Health fitness/outdoor activities

- 11. Which programs or services need to be offered in a language other than English?**
 - Housing website needs to be multilingual, many times only main page of city website is multilingual
 - Alert SF messages only in English

- 12. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?**
 - Commercial corridor too spread out

Submitted Written Responses

Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- There is a very big tree with huge roots next to my house. The roots have grown through and punctured the pipe underneath my house and have cost me a few thousand dollars to fix. Can the government help me cut off the tree so that it will not puncture my pipe again? It is located right by my house on the street.

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 10, 2018
Ortega Public Library (District 1 and District 4)

Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

- 1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?**
 - Affordability – higher wage, lower priced housing, down payment assistance especially at higher income limits/levels;
 - More 100 percent affordable housing units to be built for median or lower-income households;
 - Getting to and from home – transportation;
 - Parking – difficult;
 - Access to medical/hospitals.

- 2. In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?**
 - Internet access to utilize DAHLIA;
 - No contact to real person, multiple persons contacted but get different answers;
 - No response/confirmation to applications
 - Low income housing unbalanced compared to outer sunset;
 - Access to affordable childcare;
 - More childcare;
 - Free, low-cost afterschool care;
 - Access to sport related materials for children/youth;
 - Playgrounds/Parks – staff until dark
 - Legal access | access to nature, gardens, outdoor spaces, smaller parks, dog parks, neighborhood parks;
 - Education about tenant rights;
 - Greater density in Sunset;
 - Not thoroughly planned infrastructure

- 3. Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities.**
 - TAY
 - Mental Health
 - Non-English Speaking ESL
 - New immigrants
 - Service for modifications for seniors as owners age Age in place
 - Reliable source for contractors
 - City wide connect seniors with students, etc., who want to rent with extra rooms

- 4. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being**

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 10, 2018
Ortega Public Library (District 1 and District 4)

notified you prefer?

- Text
- News
- Senior Centers
- Community based organizations
- 5-7 minute videos social media
- Newspapers
- Free community newspapers
- Postcards
- Flyers in library
- Facebook

5. **Aside from the high cost, what are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?**
 - Credit Score
 - Minimum income ((\$3,000) not usable for TAY
 - Knowing the steps of homeownership
 - How Tos homebuying
 - Dispersing information on homebuying on newspapers

6. **What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?**
 - Jobs
 - Households with vouchers relocate outside SF
 - Try to comeback but won't get preference because they are no longer SF residents

7. **What are things that would build your sense of community?**
 - Small business and commercial rent control
 - Creating stable housing creates stable communities
 - Low income housing and senior housing
 - Not a lot of multi-cultural presence in neighborhoods
 - More affordable housing may bring diversity
 - Economic diversity
 - Neighborhoods gentrified
 - Community Centers with various activities, events, etc.
 - Music, movie nights

8. **Which programs or services need to be offered in a language other than English?**
 - Data to support languages
 - SFHA can't get actual person to help
 - No language assistance

9. **Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?**
 - Red zone areas increasing throughout the city; affects small businesses
 - Small business support; more parking

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 10, 2018
Ortega Public Library (District 1 and District 4)

- Bus stops eliminated needs to stop
- Senior Housing

Session #2

- 1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?**
 - Eviction forgiveness
 - Senior rehabilitation of housing
 - Lower rents
 - Eviction protection
 - Resources
 - Deposit assistance for low to moderate income tenants
 - Teachers need more housing
 - Job availability for youth or younger population
 - Housing and job programs for displaced or homeless individuals/families
 - Encourage corporations to move to San Francisco to assist in building housing
 - Access to available benefits
 - Educate/incentives for owners to avoid eviction
 - Affordable housing too expensive

- 2. In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?**
 - Need to promote services via social media; general lack of knowledge where to get services, what services are available
 - Public assistance programs are intimidating
 - Need more human interactions, access to more case workers
 - Language accessibility
 - Consider innovative, multi-use housing, use existing spaces, higher density housing
 - Keep information updated at community organizations, senior centers
 - More access to interpretation
 - More community clinics, social work, housing, employment fairs

- 3. Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities.**
 - Undocumented population need legal access
 - Housing subsidies, target for specific populations
 - Housing people with mental health issues, function limitations
 - Support services
 - Plan for populations with different needs
 - Increase, create more housing for teachers
 - Rental assistance programs, subsidies
 - Housing rehabilitation programs
 - Section 8 programs

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 10, 2018
Ortega Public Library (District 1 and District 4)

- 4. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified you prefer?**
 - Email
 - Advertisements
 - Tsing Tao/World Journal
 - Chronicle, Examiner Newspapers
 - Senior Centers
 - Flyers
 - Public Radio
 - Text

- 5. Aside from the high cost, what are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?**
 - Lack of homes being built
 - Lower property taxes, lower interest rates
 - Down payment assistance, cheaper, bigger loans
 - Incentives to sell vacant homes
 - More student housing
 - Areas where homes can be store fronts

- 6. What are the kinds of things that help folks move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?**
 - Safer shelters
 - More case managers at shelters
 - Housing ladder – match populations to appropriate units
 - Credit and eviction history assistance
 - Subsidize housing, rent or employment assistance, employment subsidies
 - Provide more jobs for income, better access to housing

- 7. What are things that would build your sense of community?**
 - Art – artist housing
 - Art shows, concerts in the park
 - Opera in the park
 - More information about events
 - More events for children, families
 - More playgrounds
 - Flea market events
 - Exercise facilities at parks, accessible for everyone
 - More town hall meetings/community meetings

- 8. Which programs or services need to be offered in a language other than English?**
 - Need more languages to be represented in community organizations to close gaps
 - Public benefit forms, documents, applications in various languages
 - Access to language for lease agreements and other rental documents

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Monday, December 10, 2018
Ortega Public Library (District 1 and District 4)

- Start at senior centers and provide language assistance and program forms in various languages
- Advocacy programs for those who need more hand holding

9. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- Rent is too high
- Help former SF residents move to more affordable housing in other areas/cities
- Senior population is growing, more senior housing.

Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups

Notes for the Long Range Housing Planning break-out groups will be synthesized and posted on the Planning Department's website after all of the forums have taken place.

**A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, January 22, 2019
Kelly Cullen Community (Tenderloin/District 6)**

Table of Contents

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups..... 1

Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups..... 4

Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups 9

Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups 12

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups

Sessions #1 and #2

Station 1 – Neighborhood Change and Choice

1. Based on the maps and your personal experience, what are the most important or noteworthy changes in this neighborhood in the past 5 years?

- Super Gentrification (2 dots)
- Higher income, white, young residents (2 dots)
- Racial tensions because of pitting races against each other
- Displacement of long-time residents (1 dot)
- More violence
- Lack of information about applying
- Price discrimination
- Disappearance of SRO’s
- SRO and other building upkeep declining
- Exploitation by landlords
- Not enough units – no place to go for tenants as their income increases
- Increased drug use
- Empty store fronts
- Decline of “care not cash”
- Businesses for higher income households (1 dot)
- Open drug dealing (1 dot)
- Streets getting dirty
- More pets & mess (1 dot)
- More tents & cardboard homes street sleeping

2. What do you think has caused or contributed to those changes in your neighborhood?

- Capitalism
- Tech industry
- Current Federal Government

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, January 22, 2019
Kelly Cullen Community (Tenderloin/District 6)

- Drug addiction (1 dot)
- Lack of sense of urgency for policy makers
- City policies that caused changes police more people
- Lack of accountability of City for quality services
- Limited contracts & funding for services
- Lack of resident input for quality control
- Discrimination
- Lack of affordable units
- Lack of police
- Tenderloin resources and services attract people from other neighborhood

3. If money were not object, where would you choose to live (top 3 desirable places) and where would you choose to not live (top 3 least desirable places)?

- Desirable locations per map – Outer Richmond, Seacliff (2), Presidio, Inner Richmond (2), Marina, North Beach (3), Nob Hill (4), Tenderloin (5), South of Market (7), Mission (2)
- Least desirable locations per map – Outer Sunset (4), Inner Sunset, Twin Peaks, Mission (4), Western Addition, Tenderloin (3), Potrero Hill, McLaren Park, Candlestick Point, Brisbane, Daly City (2)

4. What makes a neighborhood a desirable place to live?

- Open spaces social tolerance (1 dot)
- Safety (2 dots)
- Near the water (1 dot)
- Cleanliness (2 dots)
- Things to do (3 dots)
- Transportation (2 dots)
- Diversity (1 dot)
- Shopping (1 dot)
- Affordable (1dot)
- Schools (2 dots)
- Church (1 dot)
- Parks
- Social services (1 dot)
- Seniors, children, tenant advocacy, youth services
- Convenience
- Language access
- Hospitals
- Healthy food
- Laundry services
- Public restroom
- Police station ccc tv

5. Do you feel like you have a choice in where you live? And where do you live now (zip code)?

- More people have less choice in 94102 (1 dot) and 94103 (1 dot)

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, January 22, 2019
Kelly Cullen Community (Tenderloin/District 6)

- Some choice in 94133
- More choice in 94103 with voucher
- More choice in 94103 with lottery

6. What makes you feel like you have a choice or don't have a choice?

- Income (4 dots)
- Not enough
- Housing prices (3 dots)
- Racism (1 dot)
- Nimbys (1 dot)
- yimby

Station 2 – Access to Opportunity

7. What are the most pressing challenges to getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood?

Challenges:

- Transportation costs
- Pay not enough for high cost city (1 dot)
- Employment discrimination in hiring practices (1 dot)
- Age discrimination (1 dot)
- Lack of training/education for job opportunities (1 dot)
- Development takes away parking

8. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or a keep a job?

Assets

- Jobs
- Non-profit agencies

9. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in accessing public transportation?

Challenges:

- Limited routes in certain areas (2 dots)
- Not enough parking
- Parking unaffordable
- Sleeping in bus shelter
- Buses don't run on schedule
- Dirty bus stops
- Impatient drivers
- Scooters!

10. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in accessing public transportation?

Assets:

- We have great public transportation (2 dots)

**A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, January 22, 2019
Kelly Cullen Community (Tenderloin/District 6)**

- Library system

11. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in living in or creating more healthy neighborhoods?

Challenges:

- Lack of trees
- Dirty streets (1 dot)
- Lack of public restrooms (1 dot)
- Homeless outreach team (HOT team) don't stop in the Tenderloin

12. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in live in or create healthy neighborhoods?

Assets:

- Health clinics (1 dot)
- Healthy food choices (1 dot)
- Food bank & farmers market (1 dot)
- Cleaning crews
- Bodekker Park
- Good schools
- Churches

Station 3: Fair Housing Violations

13. Have you or a member of your household experienced a violation of your fair housing protections?

- Disability discrimination
- Source of income
- Section 8 voucher
- No translation of housing documents

14. What did you do/Who did you go to for support? How helpful was it?

- No notes

Other Question

15. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- Harassment by real estate companies to get people out

Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

1. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?

- Lack of intersectionality, outreach specialist are v. focused on one issue

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, January 22, 2019
Kelly Cullen Community (Tenderloin/District 6)

- Lack of nonprofit space
- More programs to keep those newly placed in housing, housed -> psychological, emotional
- Services targeted to assist
- Hoarding and cluttering
- Mental health + substance use
- Public bathroom 24 hours!

2. How would you find out about these services?

- I don't. Lack of communication
- Not enough case managers who know services; not enough counselors
- Project Homeless Connect
- Listening on the street -> need street outreach. Not aggressive outreach. Need to be culturally comp.

3. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?

- Medical issues + access to Medical or other insurance
- Lack of communication/information, need shared info source among case managers. Coordination between case managers.
- Remote locations + restricted hours for services
- Stigma – esp. around mental health
- Help with initial connection: transit, social phobias
- Hoarding + cluttering
- Lack of signage on street or generic signage -> need descriptions + language diversity

4. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?

- More counselors, more \$, more cultural specialists
- All can be improved
- More accessibility -> physical space
- Some people claustrophobic or have other traumas which makes it hard to meet in an enclosed office. Alternate meeting locations; mobile service locations
- More support for homeless connect
- Warm hand off to doctors apt.
- Give counselors smaller caseload

5. What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?

- Reliable MUNI service. More drivers
- Help getting there the first 1-3 times
- Bus pass for first 2 weeks
- Training for youth; City College options
- Apprenticeship program -> better job matching -> needs to be paid internship
- Job finders
- Job coach
- Targeted services for recent immigrants

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, January 22, 2019
Kelly Cullen Community (Tenderloin/District 6)

6. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?

- Fliers
- Word of mouth
- Nonprofits
- Central City SRO
- Social media (facebook, twitter, insta)
- Radio
- Bay Area Video Coalition

7. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?

- Public postings – physical job boards, not just electronic
- Help with resumes
- Intentional training, individualized support to get high paying jobs
- Interview skills
- Subsidized training – software engineers
- Develop skills in the community
- Hire in the community
- Find out barriers to participating in programs

8. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?

- Jobs that pays more - more than just enough to cover rent
- Lower rents
- Local hiring – work where live
- Low-income housing -> BMR
- Childcare; elder/companion care
- Home care

9. What do you like most and least about your neighborhood shopping area?

- Most: Good, affordable food.
- Diversity: people, food, community services
- Give incentives to businesses, esp. small bus.
- Least: Develop more clear commercial corridors -> community – serving retail. Van Ness to Union Square
- Businesses must have toilets for customers + non-customers
- Overcharge women + homeless (eg banana)
- Need more healthy + affordable food options

10. What are things that would build your sense of community?

- Craft/arts street fair
- Free food truck festival for people who can't afford
- Community events: music + food trucks, picnics
- International/friendship day. July 30

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, January 22, 2019
Kelly Cullen Community (Tenderloin/District 6)

- Tenderloin Flea Market – Shannon Ally?
- Bodecker Park tree lightning/holiday celebrations
- Dance classes – public, a wide variety

11. Which programs or services need to be offered in a language other than English?

- Spanish: program/forum to inform about services; opportunity fair (also in Russian)
- More restaurants with menus in Spanish, Chinese
- Filipino/Tagalog, Arabic (need more translators), Farsi, Hindi (need more translators)
- All services

12. Is there anything important to you that we should have asked?

- Rental assistance -> more outreach + information about what is available. More \$
- Listing of social services
- Services for children in community esp. for ages 11-17. Year around. Gender-specific program

Session #2

1. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?

- Legal services for veterans, access to income + barrier removal (housing)
- Eviction prevention
- More Vietnamese + SE Asian services
- Immigration services, esp. Vietnamese
- Food services, esp. Cal Fresh. Counseling for those services
- Senior services
- Citizenship classes
- Access to good jobs that pay living wages
- More intensive case mgmt., esp. for formerly homeless, esp. for jobs
- Language issues but still need pathways to employment
- In hope support services in other language

2. How would you find out about these services?

- Community – SE Asian, word of mouth
- Case managers
- Community centers VYDC

3. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?

- Capacity: more demand than supply
- Not enough income -> income eligibility (eg. Medical)
- Transportation/cost of
- Childcare/cost of
- Language barrier – orgs lack capacity in the language or lack capacity in area of need
- Organizational capacity/staff capacity & knowledge; staff passion
- Take into account clientele b/f determining program intake requirements

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, January 22, 2019
Kelly Cullen Community (Tenderloin/District 6)

- Cleanliness of streets
 - Homeless challenges
- 4. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?**
- Employment: discrimination. Improve access to jobs; access/support to those who experience discrimination
 - Publish who is on housing list for temporary housing
 - Synthesize DAHLIA & other services
 - City staff provide presentations about availability of services. Provide points of contacts w/in org. (Long-term solutions for homeless)
 - Promote services
 - More stops for HOT (Homeless Outreach Team) accessible, visible
 - Safety + cleanliness of streets impact how services are provided. Esp. after dark
 - Mobile beds for homeless
- 5. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?**
- Services for homeless – short + long term
 - Mental health + substance use
 - Legal services – comprehensive + free /low-cost
 - Child support services -> difficult to afford housing if someone has child support payments
 - Citizenship + naturalizations, esp. for Vietnamese
- 6. What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?**
- High school diploma is a barrier. Are there options for those wo do not have that or who don't have language skills
 - Apprenticeship programs for those who don't have education/language skills
 - Priority /for San Franciscans in jobs/hiring preference
 - Balance the above with recent immigrants needs
 - Vocational rehabilitation
 - Equity – race, disability -> how can those barriers be removed
 - Educate employees about diverse workforce. Hold people accountable
- 7. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?**
- See Q2
 - Cal Fresh office
 - hospital
- 8. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?**
- City job employment application. City workers needs to be improved. Language barriers
 - Classes about how to find + apply for jobs, digital library
 - Nonprofits should be able to pay their employees a living wage

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, January 22, 2019
Kelly Cullen Community (Tenderloin/District 6)

- 9. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?**
 - Not live in SF
 - Balance day-to-day expenses + long term needs
 - Need to take classes, but need child care to do so (esp. language classes)
 - Affordable housing = income
 - Affordable housing => needs to be safe neighborhood
 - Fear of losing benefits with higher income

- 10. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
 - Cleanliness, safety, lights
 - Mini-mobile home for homeless
 - Safe needle disposal
 - Quicker response time -> police, cleanliness

- 11. What do you like most and least about your neighborhood shopping area?**
 - No notes

- 12. What are things that would build your sense of community?**
 - No notes

- 13. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?**
 - No notes

Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

- 1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?**
 - Need more BMR units
 - Higher paying jobs
 - Limit rent increases
 - More rent control
 - Ability to age in place – ADA – aging veterans
 - City needs to take action
 - Eviction protections
 - ADA-friendly units (affordable)

- 2. In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?**
 - BMR units too expensive. Rent increases make housing inaccessible
 - DALP not competitive for market-rate unit
 - Language line should provide Vietnamese

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, January 22, 2019
Kelly Cullen Community (Tenderloin/District 6)

- Rent board hardship – advocate required ROSA@thclinic.org
 - Need more org's to serve Vietnamese/non English speaking groups
 - Need centralized & coordinated resources
- 3. Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities.**
- Family-sized units
 - Teacher housing... for teachers & our kids' futures
 - ADA/senior units
- 4. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified would you prefer?**
- Email, in our language
 - Community-based organizations
 - Text messages
 - Flyers in our building
 - Bus ads
- 5. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?**
- HOA fees too high
- 6. What are the kinds of things that help people move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?**
- Navigating the systems
 - Criminal background (barrier)
 - Credit issues (barrier)
 - Instability in shelter – time limits, etc. - stairs all over
 - Oversight for programs – to ensure efficiency, success for people
 - Consistency in resource communication – especially for domestic violence survivors
- 7. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
- No notes
- 8. What are things that would build your sense of community?**
- No notes
- 9. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?**
- No notes

Session #2

- 1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?**
- Higher wages

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, January 22, 2019
Kelly Cullen Community (Tenderloin/District 6)

- Affordable rents
 - Creative ways to pay rent (payment plan)
 - Rent control across the board
 - Eviction protections
 - Reliable transportation
 - Tenant protections
 - More BMR units – rental + ownership
 - BMR's that target lower –incomes 40-60% AMI
 - Improved mobility features to allow residents to age in place (elevator, stair lifts) – funding stream for ADA improvements
- 2. In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?**
- BMR units still not affordable to very low income (30% AMI)
 - Poor credit is large barrier to access
 - Need funding for first/last/security deposit
 - More housing for seniors + veterans on fixed incomes
- 3. Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities.**
- Child care
 - More support for single parents
 - Support for individuals with acquired disabilities – workforce training or re-entry assistance
 - Mental health resources – workforce training or re-entry assistance
 - Ongoing support & services
 - Social workers, community building activities
- 4. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified would you prefer?**
- Case managers
 - Text messages
 - Library
 - Bulletin boards
 - In-person assistance – not everyone has access or are internet savvy
 - Outreach workers
 - In-house supportive services
- 5. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?**
- No notes
- 6. What are the kinds of things that help people move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?**
- Social workers to assist in transition

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, January 22, 2019
Kelly Cullen Community (Tenderloin/District 6)

- Central location to access resources + information
- Housing option to help people move from transitional -> supportive -> permanent

7. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?

- Monitor pricing at corner bodegas
- More access to grocery stores, fresh food
- Accessible fitness opportunities in parks @ rec & park facilities
 - More variety of options, times, activities
 - For people with physical challenges
 - On-site managers
- More seating in parks, @ bus stops

8. What are things that would build your sense of community?

- No notes

9. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- No notes

Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups

Notes for the Long Range Housing Planning break-out groups will be synthesized and posted on the Planning Department's website after all of the forums have taken place.

**A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 26, 2019
Visitacion Valley Elementary (Visitacion Valley/District 10)**

Table of Contents

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups..... 1

Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups..... 5

Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups 9

Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups 11

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups

Session #1

1. What’s important to you that brought you here tonight?

-

Station 1 – Neighborhood Change and Choice

2. Based on the maps and your personal experience, what are the most important or noteworthy changes in this neighborhood in the past 5 years?

-
-

3. What do you think has caused or contributed to those changes in your neighborhood?

-
-

4. If money were not object, where would you choose to live (top 3 desirable places) and where would you choose to not live (top 3 least desirable places)?

-

5. What makes a neighborhood a desirable place to live?

-
-

6. Do you feel like you have a choice in where you live? And where do you live now (zip code)?

-
-

7. What makes you feel like you have a choice or don’t have a choice?

-
-

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 26, 2019
Visitacion Valley Elementary (Visitacion Valley/District 10)

Station 2 – Access to Opportunity

8. What are the most pressing challenges to getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood?
 -
 -
9. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or a keep a job?
 -
 -
10. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in accessing public transportation?
 -
 -
11. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in accessing public transportation?
 -
 -
12. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in living in or creating more healthy neighborhoods?
 -
 -
13. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in live in or create healthy neighborhoods?
 -

Station 3: Fair Housing Violations

14. Have you or a member of your household experienced a violation of your fair housing protections?
 -
15. What did you do/Who did you go to for support? How helpful was it?
 -

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 26, 2019
Visitacion Valley Elementary (Visitacion Valley/District 10)

Session #2

1. What's important to you that brought you here tonight?

- Resources for “the forgotten Valley”
- Equity & justice
- Understanding housing landscape
- Needs for youth and families
- Understanding how lottery system works

Station 1 – Neighborhood Change and Choice

2. Based on the maps and your personal experience, what are the most important or noteworthy changes in this neighborhood in the past 5 years?

- Displacement of African American population
- Multiple families living in same house
- Slow development (Sunnydale, schlage lock)
- Sub-standard schools
- Loss of businesses
- Loss of job-centers/ anchor
- Income growth hasn't kept up with rest of City

3. What do you think has caused or contributed to those changes in your neighborhood?

- Global capitalism
- Housing prices increasing
- Ability to make living wages decreasing
- Over incarceration of African-Americans “war on drugs”
- Racial discrimination in housing and employment
- Lottery system not prioritizing long-term residents
- Influx of tech workers

4. If money were not object, where would you choose to live (top 3 desirable places) and where would you choose to not live (top 3 least desirable places)?

-

5. What makes a neighborhood a desirable place to live?

- Good schools
- Good transportation
- Walkable to stores, social spaces, etc
- Economic stability
- Parks / open space
- Good, clean sidewalks, safe places to walk
- Safety
- Sense of community

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 26, 2019
Visitacion Valley Elementary (Visitacion Valley/District 10)

- 6. Do you feel like you have a choice in where you live? And where do you live now (zip code)?**
 - No choice: 94114, 94102, 94110, 94134
 - A lot of choice: 94601
- 7. What makes you feel like you have a choice or don't have a choice?**
 - No choice: money, available housing options, property taxes, number of people in households, pets, community distance to work
 - Choice: money, multiple income in household

Station 2 – Access to Opportunity

- 8. What are the most pressing challenges to getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood?**
 - Challenges: Transportation more routes, high ER, education and training, Language barriers, Need more high quality childcare
- 9. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or a keep a job?**
 - Assets: community ties/network, childcare (Felton), transportation (8 to bart)
- 10. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in accessing public transportation?**
 - Challenges: T-line, elimination of 15, too slow, infrequent
- 11. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in accessing public transportation?**
 - Assets: 8 direct to downtown, ride share is accessible
- 12. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in living in or creating more healthy neighborhoods?**
 - Challenges: lack of grocery stores, safety, lack of medical services, no rec center, gyms, dirty streets need more DPW services, need O.E.W.D. outreach, Pedestrian safety "little village", liquor store selling to underage, drug / alcohol use
- 13. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in live in or create healthy neighborhoods?**
 - Assets: McLarson park, green way

Station 3: Fair Housing Violations

- 14. Have you or a member of your household experienced a violation of your fair housing protections?**
 - Yes- 3 people
 - No- 0 people
- 15. What did you do/Who did you go to for support? How helpful was it?**

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 26, 2019
Visitacion Valley Elementary (Visitacion Valley/District 10)

- Do: moved on, kept looking
- Go for help: HUD, CA Dept. of Fair Housing and Employment, Human Rights Commission

Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

1. What is important to you that brought you here tonight?

- City know our needs in Vis. Valley
- Development Board Base Neighborhood (Diverse)
- Needs & service in the City for Vis. Valley
- Access to services in Vis. Valley language, childcare, transportation
- Services in this area (Vis. Valley)

2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?

- Employment
- Workforce Development
- Education (2)-K through Adults and outdoor education
- Remedial reading
- Robust afterschool program
- Local newspaper in Vis Valley
- Other ways folks can be informed and involved
- Action plan. Neighborhood safety
- Program draw on senior and elders in neighborhood
- Farmers Market

3. How would you find out about these services?

- Large monitors in senior center, grocery outlet throughout Vis. Valley
- Multiple languages newspaper
- No current access to this information now
- Social media
- "page" for this neighborhood
- Communicate in all languages (Cantonese)
- 311 improve, not responsive
- Website specific or app for Vis. Valley
- Resources available
- Different attitudes from the city- take action when they get a request

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 26, 2019
Visitacion Valley Elementary (Visitacion Valley/District 10)

4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?

- Language
- Money!!
- Funding
- Digital Divide
- Lack of advertisement
- Town Hall meeting, bring back!
- Transportation
- Completing priorities, who they are working for
- Language services, barriers, information not provided to elders, and immigrants
- What can SF do for SF folks

5. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?

- Transportation
- **Muni planners need to work with community, increase of crime, more lighting & safety “police patrol” more and better retail in neighborhood
- Leland nor, more business
- More lighting of transportation, safety or shelter (7-11 location Arletta & Bayshore)
- Services for homelessness
- Better access to McLarson Park, feel blocked out, nor welcome entrance
- Feel for safety with homeless in area neighborhood
- Local pantry
- Homeless in neighborhood, refuse service and help
- Mental health, sewer lines too small and causing backup

6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?

- Homeless
- Safety lighting
- Teach prevention and intervention
- Basketball HUB and new neighborhood parking
- Police patrol, more patrols
- More police
- Assist business, empty store fronts along Leland
- Pay attention to Vis Valley “NOT FORGETTEN NEIGHBORHOOD”
- More resources, need attention
- Equity and justice policies (Sunnydale Housing)

7. What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?

- ESL classes in District 10
- Vocational education
- Career teen education in Vis. Valley
- Chinese as second language

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 26, 2019
Visitacion Valley Elementary (Visitacion Valley/District 10)

- Workforce Development
- Different ethnic group classes
- Robust reentry programs
- Amnesty program (license)

8. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?

- Word of mouth
- Electronic divide (digital divide)
- Bayview neighborhood jobs not vis valley
- Need to advertise in different language (college classes, vocational)
- Realistic outreach
- Program to assist families with children and parents. Services for parents to be able to communicate with children

9. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?

- Create pathway to trades electrical, carp, and plumbing
- Communicate, advertise, posting, classes in our neighborhood
- Recruit and outreach
- Re-entry
- Homelessness
- Easier access to City jobs
- Multi-language
- Come to Vis. Valley for assistance
- Funding its graduates to go to college (more funding)
- Housing- teachers and first responders
- Families moving out of the City

10. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?

-

11. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?

-

12. What do you like most and least about your neighborhood shopping area?

-

13. What are things that would build your sense of community?

-

Session #2

1. What is important to you that brought you here tonight?

- Working on Sunnydale- wanted to hear what the community had to say

**A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 26, 2019
Visitacion Valley Elementary (Visitacion Valley/District 10)**

2. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?
 -
3. How would you find out about these services?
 -
4. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?
 -
5. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?
 -
6. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?
 -
7. What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?
 -
8. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?
 -
 -
9. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?
 -
10. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?
 -
11. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?
 -
12. What do you like most and least about your neighborhood shopping area?
 -
13. What are things that would build your sense of community?
 -

**A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 26, 2019
Visitacion Valley Elementary (Visitacion Valley/District 10)**

Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

- 1. What is important to you that brought you here tonight?**
 - Homeless & community activist looking for housing
 - Resources for section 8 vouchers

- 2. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?**
 - Housing voucher (stepping stone to get back on her feet)
 - Housing for dependent too, so senior housing. Not an option

- 3. In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?**
 - Section 8 housing is difficult to apply (requires computer literacy)
 - Not as easy to access
 - No family units available (senior only)

- 4. Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities.**
 - Seniors
 - Young ladies with children
 - Transition from shelter to housing

- 5. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified would you prefer?**
 - A lot of homeless people are not computer literate
 - Word of mouth from outreach, teams or community members
 - A lot of people don't have phones
 - In person communication

- 6. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?**
 - Credit (lack of)
 - Lack of programs (for info and build credit)

- 7. What are the kinds of things that help people move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?**
 - Counseling
 - To know all the steps to quality
 - Information on housing opportunities

- 8. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
 - Recreation center- brings community together

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 26, 2019
Visitacion Valley Elementary (Visitacion Valley/District 10)

- activities
- events
- kids programs
- senior programs
- food
- outings
- Fun activities to bring community together

9. What are things that would build your sense of community?

- Community Center
- Live music Brings cultures together and pushes out negativity
- theater

Session #2

1. What is important to you that brought you here tonight?

- New immigrants and parents that lost jobs and affects their growth
- Applying for BMR for multiple tears
- Community of folks that need Housing now and support
- See pregnant patients that are assigned public housing out of SF and no resources
- Need to be sensitive of homeless students in school
- Concern about choices City is making

2. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?

- More BMR opportunities (ex)
- Difficult to find a good job
- Due to language barrier
- Limited housing options
- Difficult to access information

3. In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?

- Website not easy to access
- Outreach when new opportunities come up
- City contact list of people
- Information is only presented online, mention on a news broadcast or social media
- Concerns about housing will affect benefits (i.e. medical)
- Undocumented individuals not accessing services in fear of immigration
- Need to simplify processes, be more transparent
- Through media broadcast differently information
- Disconnect with City to community

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 26, 2019
Visitacion Valley Elementary (Visitacion Valley/District 10)

- 4. Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities.**
 - Parents with children
 - Immigrants
 - Expecting mothers (shouldn't be offered at 3rd trimester, but sooner)
 - College graduate
 - First time homeowners
 - Young people building careers

- 5. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified would you prefer?**
 - Media
 - Direct outreach to communities
 - One on one interaction
 - Social media (i.e. Facebook)
 - Explicit about application process
 - Schools- youth translate for families
 - Targeted outreach to communities
 - Unclear about housing qualifications
 - Language is a barrier. Allocate funds to translate application
 - Prove strategies on how to survive and adjust. Better linkage between community and City
 - Direct outreach to other City departments improved communication (i.e. reach out to schools)
 - Housing for college grads

- 6. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?**
 -

- 7. What are the kinds of things that help people move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?**
 -

- 8. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
 -

- 9. What are things that would build your sense of community?**
 -

Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups

Notes for the Long Range Housing Planning break-out groups will be synthesized and posted on the

**A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Tuesday, February 26, 2019
Visitacion Valley Elementary (Visitacion Valley/District 10)**

Planning Department's website after all of the forums have taken place.

**A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 31, 2019
Fillmore Heritage Center (District 5)**

Table of Contents

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups..... 1

Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups..... 3

Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups 9

Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups 12

Barriers to Fair Housing Break-out Groups

Session #2 (No attendees in first session)

Station 1 – Neighborhood Change and Choice

1. Based on the maps and your personal experience, what are the most important or noteworthy changes in this neighborhood in the past 5 years?

- Feel pushed out
- Business in Neighborhood serving wealthier residents
- Racist
- Security issues
- High rents
- More expensive here
- Doesn't feel the same
- More homeless on streets
- Not serving the community that was here
- Break-ins
- Parklets taking up parking
- Ford Bikes taking away parking for residents
- Constant construction, parking ,

2. What do you think has caused or contributed to those changes in your neighborhood?

- Tech Industry
- Air BnB impacting housing
- Current president empowered racist white supremacist
- Foreign investment
- Real estate speculation
- REITs

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 31, 2019
Fillmore Heritage Center (District 5)

- 3. If money were not object, where would you choose to live (top 3 desirable places) and where would you choose to not live (top 3 least desirable places)?**
 - Most desirable places to live per map – Mission, Western Addition, Potrero Hill, Outer Sunset, Laurel Heights, Marina, North Beach, Embarcadero
 - Least desirable places to live per map – Marina, Tenderloin, South of Market, Bayview, Daly City (2)

- 4. What makes a neighborhood a desirable place to live?**
 - Safe neighborhood
 - Local businesses
 - Diversity
 - Inclusive
 - Feeling of community connection
 - Access to convenience stores transit, schools, city college, higher learning
 - Healthy
 - Clean fresh air, views, parks
 - Accessibility
 - Affordable for “my community” and other communities
 - Children, age, elders, others

- 5. Do you feel like you have a choice in where you live? And where do you live now (zip code)?**
 - No Choice
 - A lot of choice
 - No notes see flip chart for graph

- 6. What makes you feel like you have a choice or don't have a choice?**
 - Have a choice- Money management over time, \$\$\$, Network
 - Don't have a choice – highly dependent on roommates, compromise, price of housing, rent control

Station 2 – Access to Opportunity

- 7. What are the most pressing challenges to getting or keeping a job for you and for others in your neighborhood?**
 - Tech jobs – contract, temp, no benefits
 - Low paying job for living wage
 - Competition for low wage jobs for commuters
 - Uber

- 8. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood get or a keep a job?**
 - More jobs
 - Uber, Lyft, Post-mates
 - Job placement for youth and TAY

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 31, 2019
Fillmore Heritage Center (District 5)

9. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in accessing public transportation?

- Unsafe buses, unsafe BART
- Clustered transit
- Lines not planned for where people need to go
- Delayed/backup
- Bike and pedestrian infrastructure

10. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in accessing public transportation?

- Free Clipper cards for minors
- Best transit system in the nation

11. What are the most pressing challenges that you or others in your neighborhood face in living in or creating more healthy neighborhoods?

- Lack of Affordable Housing
- Food Choices
- Excess Liquor Stores
- More Fresh Food Markets
- Food Swap
- Homelessness
- Lack of Cleanliness
- Lack of Trash cans

12. What has helped you or others in your neighborhood in live in or create healthy neighborhoods?

Station 3: Fair Housing Violations

13. Have you or a member of your household experienced a violation of your fair housing protections?

- Not so obvious redlining

14. What did you do/Who did you go to for support? How helpful was it?

Other Question

15. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

Community Development/Social Service Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 31, 2019
Fillmore Heritage Center (District 5)

- 1. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?**
 - Seniors/aging health care; i.e., dementia services
 - Mental Health services
 - Drug Rehab Services – need more funding
 - LGBT, HIV aging population support

- 2. How would you find out about these services?**
 - Department of Aging and Adult Services
 - People do not know about these resources
 - Bulletin/Public Boards for information regarding services
 - Mailings work
 - City clinics are great

- 3. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?**
 - No access to technology which is why mailings are helpful
 - Multiple language material
 - Isolation among seniors makes it hard to ask for help
 - Transportation issues: MUNI late
 - User friendly city processes
 - Services need to come to people
 - One stop shop type of access

- 4. If there are services that you use and you think need to be improved, how do they need to be improved?**
 - One stop shop style access
 - Mobile team from City department, i.e., HOT TEAM for elderly
 - Better education provides: culturally competent, depth of knowledge services

- 5. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?**
 - Dementia support
 - Coordination of services need to be better
 - Outreach to veterans, HIV patients

- 6. What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?**
 - Transportation that's reliable
 - Childcare
 - Job counseling/transportable skills
 - Transition with flexible work options, i.e., gig economy
 - Coaching/resume building support
 - Better understanding of seniors' skills

- 7. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?**
 - Department of Aging

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 31, 2019
Fillmore Heritage Center (District 5)

- Bulletin Boards
- Senior Centers
- Public Library
- 311
- Word of mouth social network
- Nextdoor.com

8. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?

- Information on how much can work with social security benefits
- Explanation of insurance options and benefits
- Case management assistance
- Public list of support centers
- Transparency from City
- Overwhelming process

9. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?

- More than minimum wage
- Universal healthcare would solve a lot: can work more, Canadian system I good, nationalized healthcare
- Define financially stable
- More availability of financial literacy/planning support
- Bank access/access to credit
- Moving cost for low income pop if they need to move

10. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?

- Renovate Japantown Peace Plaza
- Fixit crew needs more volunteers
- Sidewalk hazards pose issue esp. for seniors
- Dog park would alleviate dog feces on sidewalk
- Citywide campaign to clean the City

11. What do you like most and least about your neighborhood shopping area?

- Convenience/access
- Safety issues by Saint Francis Square
- Food desert for affordable groceries
- Vacancy issues

12. What are things that would build your sense of community?

- Public space for community events
- Give homeless a platform to voice their needs
- More impactful strategy to assist homeless – issue is the worst it's ever been
- Help keep people in their homes – secure housing

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 31, 2019
Fillmore Heritage Center (District 5)

13. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- Traffic congestion – better infrastructure
- Regulate Uber/Lyft drivers who double park illegally
- People don't seem to care about each other these days

Session #2

1. Other than housing services, what are the services that are most important for you and/or your family?

- Income to pay rent
- Access to healthy affordable food
- Green space
- Clean water
- Mental health
- Language barriers
- Intimidation of undocumented
- No information on how to access support for new arrivals
- Crowded living situations
- Education on resources

2. How would you find out about these services?

- Bus stop ads
- Billboards
- On buses and trains
- Schools, churches, bulletin boards increase 311 awareness
- Facebook
- Radio ads
- TV ads
- Social media
- CBOs
- Public library offices

3. What gets in the way of being able to access or use existing programs and services?

- Stigma/fear especially in immigrant communities
- Misinformation
- Awareness
- Accessibility/long lines
- Language access of social services limited
- Mistreatment of immigrants

4. If there are services that you use and you think needs to be improved, how do they need to be improved?

- Seniors don't use tech – need more in-person outreach
- Hours and location need to be convenient: weekends, later hours

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 31, 2019
Fillmore Heritage Center (District 5)

- 5. What are the services that you need but have been unable to find?**
 - Support for runaways at schools
 - Human trafficking victim support
 - No cultural sensitivity
 - Sexual harassment
 - Emergency housing/shelters for women and children
 - Holistic services for all needs so people don't have to go to different agencies
 - Opioid addiction services from CBOs
 - Culturally competent support
 - Youth development support
 - To be healthy member of society

- 6. What do you and others in your neighborhood need to get, keep and advance in a job?**
 - No discrimination
 - Training for moving up a career ladder
 - Success center support
 - CBO support of undocumented for fair work opportunities
 - Training within job. Coaching, mentorship
 - Investment in workers
 - Internships
 - Navigate health issues/education - eat healthy and why
 - Senior support for accessing support

- 7. How would you find out about services that would meet those needs?**
 - Success centers
 - Church ministers can refer members where to go
 - Schools
 - Grocery stores/gas station
 - Advertising

- 8. What, if any, suggestions do you have for the City to improve access to good jobs?**
 - Value workers more
 - Subsidize/more incentives to keep workers
 - Have seniors/elderly workers around
 - Training programs – soft skills
 - Offer flexibility
 - Encourage more co-ops
 - Commuter benefits
 - Preference to San Francisco residents – 1st Source expansion

- 9. What would you and your family need in order to be financially stable and/or to be able to build wealth?**
 - Access to education
 - Understanding economics of investment (401K)

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 31, 2019
Fillmore Heritage Center (District 5)

- Affordable childcare
- Affordable transportation
- Reliable affordable transportation
- Managing debt support – credit cards, financial literacy
- Pay living wage
- Reasonable, reliable, accessible healthcare

10. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?

- More trees, parks, native plants, water installations, speed bumps
- Space for families to gather
- Community space – peace plaza renovation
- Road maintenance
- Public bathroom access
- Showers for homeless

11. What do you like most and least about your neighborhood shopping area?

- Food desert – unhealthy, not affordable
- High commercial rent
- More business attraction
- More availability/options of goods
- Support of mental health/homeless population would alleviate some blight
- Cleanliness is unattractive
- Parking is hard to find – break ins are an issue; tourists targeted

12. What are things that would build your sense of community?

- Communication to other communities = invite more
- Community centers with events, festivals to bring community together
- Welcome newcomers
- More language accessible
- Marketing of events
- Welcome/information center for neighborhood
- History
- Dog owner event
- Incentives for attending events
- Increase volunteer recruitment = community ambassadors
- Services at community centers

13. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?

- Need more services in general, i.e., youth, young adults
- Awareness of multiculturalism, health
- Empowerment of grassroots community involvement
- Communication on results of this community forum
- Addiction support
- Housing support for long term residents who may face issues re addiction, mental health

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 31, 2019
Fillmore Heritage Center (District 5)

Immediate Housing Needs Break-out Groups

Session #1

1. What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?

- Good credit
- Savings, deposit
- Sufficient income
- Access to credit to take out senior lender (City)
- More affordable housing opportunities
- Help with looking for a place
- Info about lottery
- Lack of status info (phone and email)
- Access by zone/district
- Explanation of how lottery works
- Move apps. To next opportunity
- More access to housing for vets, services targeted to their special needs
- Overcrowded families, new arrivals, language services
- Assistance to fight eviction
- Policies to fight gentrification and displacement
- Inequities re: evictions v.v. housing improvements in Vis Valley
- Information and organizing support re/ land trust formation
- More communal housing

2. In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?

- Info not available/accessible re/ emergency housing for families, esp. new arrivals
- Process is long, arduous
- Income gap, more subsidized housing
- Info is difficult to locate, disjointed

3. Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities.

- Vets – need employment services, support during transition to civilian life; jobs/housing linkage
- Families – disabled members – barriers to employment + \$
- Youth – too young, no credit, emancipated youth, couch surfing
- All comes down to \$ and employment
- Lack of knowledge re/ how to get housing
- Single adults (homeless)

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 31, 2019
Fillmore Heritage Center (District 5)

- Conversion of vacant buildings to affordable housing for homeless (SRO)
 - Teaching folks re/ success in shared housing, e.g., H/P model
 - People with mental illness need other locations than Tenderloin
- 4. If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified would you prefer?**
- Radio – various stations depending upon community
 - Festivals – outreach
 - Social Media – twitter, Facebook, Instagram, snapchat
 - Print Media – neighborhood news, Muni ads, other
 - Text alerts
 - Movie theaters
 - CBOs, schools, churches, community centers
- 5. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?**
- Competition – overbidding, all cash offers, investors
 - Availability – lack of supply
 - Cost – overbidding
 - Short term rentals – restrict supply
 - Access to regional opportunities - relocation
 - Poor transit hours access – barrier to homeownership outside of City
 - Cost of transit
 - FHA loan limits too low
 - Escrow close takes too long
 - Some housing needs repair first
 - Lack of regulation of market
- 6. What are the kinds of things that help people move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?**
- Peer support
 - Communal housing
 - Supportive services – e.g., case workers
 - Rental subsidies – deep or tapering
 - Lack of lottery preference for homeless, esp. folks in transition.
- 7. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
- Grass soccer fields
 - Youth activities
 - Workshop centers for youth
 - More trees, esp. in low income areas
 - More services, public bathrooms
 - Street maintenance, lighting

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 31, 2019
Fillmore Heritage Center (District 5)

8. **What are things that would build your sense of community?**

9. **Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?**

Session #2

1. **What do you and your family need to get or stay in housing?**
 - Money for high rents
 - Services with language access for folks with low-tech skills and experience
 - Assistance with legal status and document
 - Help with background issues: bankruptcies, convictions, evictions
 - Poor credit record – higher deposit
 - Seniors with limited income- maintenance, repairs, accessibility improvements
 - Age in place – services to support this
 - Vacancy rent control, V.V. related
 - Household members not on lease

2. **In your opinion, do you feel that existing housing services that address those needs are accessible to you and your family? Why or why not?**
 - Info hard to find, lack of awareness
 - 311 not promoted
 - Lack of accessibility for hearing impaired, esp. phone communication (TTY)
 - Transit for seniors and disabled to offices for services

3. **Thinking about specific groups of people, what would they need to get or stay in housing? Specific groups may include seniors and persons with disabilities.**
 - People with disabilities (mobility) lack of accessible housing
 - Very low income and cash based income – lack of documentation, creativity needed re/ verification
 - Seniors with dementia- struggle to maintain or get housing
 - Hard to find services info in one place
 - Homeless people – supportive housing with services for mentally ill/substance users

4. **If you wanted to learn about affordable rental or ownership opportunities, what method of being notified would you prefer?**
 - Email
 - Phone calls for people without access to IT or social media
 - Churches
 - Craig's list
 - Local newspaper – foreign language locals
 - Social workers, hospitals, docs, nurses
 - Family friends

A Conversation on Housing and Community Development
Wednesday, January 31, 2019
Fillmore Heritage Center (District 5)

- 5. If homeownership is something that you're considering, what do you feel are the main barriers to purchasing a home in San Francisco?**
 - Down payment
 - Property taxes – ongoing costs
 - Income limits of BMR units – narrow range for eligibility
 - Homebuying process – complicated, overwhelming
 - Cost - astronomical

- 6. What are the kinds of things that help people move on from temporary housing or shelter into more permanent housing? What gets in the way of moving on?**
 - Help/treatment re/ mental illness/addiction
 - Assistance navigating the system, knowing the resources
 - \$ for deposits, first and last month's rent, moving expenses, furniture
 - How to reach people with no address
 - Support folks re/ stigma of homelessness

- 7. What are the public space improvements that you believe are needed in your neighborhood?**
 - More safe spaces for kids and seniors
 - San Francisco is losing its character and diversity
 - Higher development with more green open space through rezoning
 - More healthy grocery stores and other food options
 - Safer streets/paths for cycling

- 8. What are things that would build your sense of community?**
 - Adult education centers – enrichment
 - ESL classes
 - Community/neighborhood events
 - Street closures for recreational activities
 - Promote events/activities at SPL and other venues.

- 9. Is there anything that we should have asked, something that is important to you?**

Long Range Housing Planning Break-out Groups

Notes for the Long Range Housing Planning break-out groups will be synthesized and posted on the Planning Department's website after all of the forums have taken place.



MOHCD Five Year Planning Process: Integrated Needs Analysis

Introduction to this Document

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

MOHCD contracted with Resource Development Associates (RDA) to develop an integrated needs analysis for these three plans and as well as other ongoing efforts led by the Planning Department. This needs analysis includes findings from the community outreach events organized by MOHCD as well as RDA's review of approximately 50 community needs assessments, consolidated plans, and other relevant departmental reports from city and county agencies in San Francisco and the Bay Area. Finally, this document pulls in secondary data from the 2017 American Community Survey (ACS) where appropriate to contextualize data and/or findings.

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

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

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





Methodology and Data Sources

As stated above, this needs analysis integrates findings from community outreach and engagement efforts, an extensive document review, and secondary data from the 2017 ACS. A description of the community outreach and engagement process, including participant demographics, a description of the document review, and a brief overview of secondary data are below. A detailed review of the methodology RDA used to code qualitative data from community meetings is included in Appendix A. Survey data was quantitative and analyzed using summary output reports.

Community Outreach and Engagement

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

Outreach and Engagement Participant Demographics

MOHCD's community outreach process engaged a total of 3,614 participants across community forums, focus groups, and web surveys. About twice as many women as men participated, with this ratio remaining consistent across engagement events. Participants represented a diversity of sexual orientation and racial/ethnic identities, with about one third identifying as LGBTQ+ and two thirds identifying with a race or ethnicity other than white. Tables 1-3 below summarize gender identity, sexual orientation, and race/ethnicity for all community participants who completed a demographic form, either in person or online. All survey participants provided demographic information, but this information was more difficult to capture during in-person events. Although most participants did provide this information, the values in the tables below may under-represent actual participation totals.

Community participation by race/ethnicity as represented in Table 3 below largely reflects San Francisco's population as a whole. In San Francisco, 41% of the population identifies as white, 34% as Asian, 15% as Latino/a or Hispanic, 5% as Black or African American, 4% as multiracial, and 1% as Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander and American Indian or Alaska Native.¹ Groups with disproportionately high engagement across community meetings include Black, African American or African participants, who represented 14% of all participants, and American Indian or Alaska Native participants, who represented 5% of all participants.

¹ American Community Survey, 2017





Table 1: Self-Reported Gender Identity Across Community Outreach Efforts

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

Table 2: Self-Reported Sexual Orientation Across Community Outreach Efforts

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

Table 3: Self-Reported Race/Ethnicity Across Community Outreach Efforts

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

1. Community Forums and Focus Groups

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



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

Table 4: Townhall-Style Community Forums, December 2018 – February 2019

Community Forums	District(s)	Attendees²
Bayview Hunters Point	D10	70
Castro	D7 & D8	29
Chinatown	D2 & D3	165
Excelsior and OMI	D11	79
Mission	D9	54
South of Market	D6	51
Sunset	D1 & D4	55
Tenderloin	D6	85
Visitacion Valley	D10	30
Western Addition	D5	38
Total Participants		656

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



Table 5: Community Focus Groups, December 2018 – February 2019

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



Forum and Focus Group Participant Demographics

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



2. Community Surveys

MOHCD developed two community surveys to capture residents’ housing and non-housing service needs as well as their housing experiences more generally.

Planning Survey

This survey asked respondents what they need to get and stay in housing, which non-housing services are most important for them and their family, how they prefer to access services, their opinions of MOHCD, and other quality of life questions. This survey also included a demographic component where respondents indicated their age, race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, HIV/AIDS status, housing status, disability status, income level, educational attainment, and language preference.

Planning Responses
2,219 total responses
24 responses/day (average)

Program Evaluation Survey

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

Program Evaluation Responses
1,537 total responses
14 responses/day (average)

Survey Respondent Demographics

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

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





Table 6: Planning Survey Responses by Neighborhood of Residence

Neighborhood	#	%
Mission	232	12%
Tenderloin	175	9%
Chinatown	139	7%
South of Market	135	7%
Sunset/Parkside	126	6%
Bayview Hunters Point	121	6%
Castro/Upper Market	79	4%
Western Addition	76	4%
Excelsior	68	3%
Outer Richmond	65	3%
Bernal Heights	57	3%
Haight Ashbury	57	3%
Oceanview/Merced/Ingleside	50	3%
Hayes Valley	47	2%
Outer Mission	44	2%
Inner Sunset	43	2%
Mission Bay	43	2%
North Beach	41	2%
Financial District	38	2%
Inner Richmond	36	2%
Potrero Hill	35	2%
Glen Park	31	2%
Portola	31	2%
Visitacion Valley	29	1%
Pacific Heights	23	1%
Twin Peaks	21	1%
Nob Hill	21	1%
Noe Valley	20	1%
Marina	19	1%
Russian Hill	18	1%
Japantown	16	1%
West of Twin Peaks	15	1%
Lakeshore	13	1%
Golden Gate Park	10	1%
Treasure Island	8	0%
Lone Mountain/USF	7	0%
Presidio	6	0%
Presidio Heights	5	0%
Lincoln Park	4	0%
McLaren Park	3	0%
Seacliff	3	0%
Total Participants Self-Reporting Neighborhood	2,219	100%



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




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





Figure 3: Self-Reported Race/Ethnicity, Planning Survey Respondents³





Document Review

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

Secondary Data

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



Summary of Findings

Cross-cutting Community Needs and Concerns

1. Among the concerns identified during community engagement, San Francisco stakeholders are most frequently concerned about displacement, increasing housing prices, the overall cleanliness and safety of their neighborhoods, and transit accessibility.
2. Participants in MOHCD's community engagement identified that services to support self-sufficiency and stability are as important as the need for housing itself.
3. Many stakeholders expressed a prominent need for culturally inclusive and culturally-specific services.
4. Participants expressed a need for greater awareness of, navigation of, and access to available services, including both housing and other supportive services.
5. Stakeholders expressed a desire for more inclusive and relaxed standards around affordable housing eligibility.
6. Many community members voiced the need for more opportunities to provide input on the City's housing eligibility policies as well as participate in the development of affordable housing programs.
7. Stakeholders asked for more streamlined services, improved interagency collaboration, and stronger cross-agency communication to support the delivery of both housing and supportive services.

Housing Services

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

Social and Supportive Services

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

Economic Self-Sufficiency

1. Participants expressed an overwhelming need for paid job training programs that provide pathways to living-wage, sustainable employment.



2. There is a large need for financial literacy and planning programs as well as financial services, specifically savings and credit counseling services.
3. Residents want San Francisco employers to hire more local residents.

Knowledge of and Access to Services

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

Community Empowerment and Engagement

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

Coordination of Services

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

Housing Access, Perceptions, and Barriers

1. Participants named displacement and increasing housing prices as the top concerns impacting housing access and the ability to remain in housing.
2. Both renters and homeowners express low overall housing choice because they feel "locked in."
3. Participants highlighted barriers to homeownership centering around both housing prices and financing options.
4. Neighborhood forum participants shared the qualities that they believe make a neighborhood desirable, identifying the following characteristics:
5. Participants in community engagement shared multiple experiences of housing discrimination, but overall, their responses reveal that there is not one specific, overt type of discrimination. Their responses indicate a more pervasive and entrenched systemic discrimination that affects people of color and African American communities in particular.



Key Findings

Cross-cutting Community Needs and Concerns

- 1. Among the concerns identified during community engagement, San Francisco stakeholders are most frequently concerned about displacement, increasing housing prices, the overall cleanliness and safety of their neighborhoods, and transit accessibility.**

When asked to describe significant changes in their neighborhood in the past five years, participants in community forums and focus groups emphasized that the rising cost of housing, combined with limited income and insufficient employment and wage opportunities, severely impacts their sense of security and choice related to their living situation. Community engagement activities for other City and County planning processes elicited similar concerns. The recognition of the intersection of health and housing was a common thread throughout the discussions. Across forums and focus groups, as well as other City community engagement processes, participants articulated healthy housing needs with urgency, citing concerns related to “toxic” SRO and Section 8 environments, food deserts, street sanitation, and community violence. Residents experience barriers to transportation, including long wait times, safety, and cost of transportation, which impede access to jobs, medical appointments, and other services.

- 2. Participants in MOHCD’s community engagement identified that services to support self-sufficiency and stability are as important as the need for housing itself.**

It is not a surprise, given the current housing challenges across the entire Bay Area and in San Francisco specifically, that participants in all community forums and in all focus groups (except for the one designated for homeowners) discussed strong needs for more affordable housing options. Similarly, during the prior planning process covering fiscal years 2015-2019, MOHCD identified “increasing affordable housing” as the top priority across all stakeholder groups and data collection formats.³ At the same time, discussions among residents frequently centered on needs for job training, behavioral health supports, language access, financial planning and education, and access to affordable community services such as childcare.

- 3. Many stakeholders expressed a prominent need for culturally inclusive and culturally-specific services.**

Focus groups and forums revealed that while there are many consistent service needs across San Franciscans, there are distinct housing and service needs for vulnerable groups including seniors and persons with disabilities, LGBTQ+ individuals, immigrant communities, and communities of color.

- 4. Participants expressed a need for greater awareness of, navigation of, and access to available services, including both housing and other supportive services.**

³ Increasing affordable housing was consistently identified as the top priority across all stakeholder groups and data collection formats. (pg 20)



Participants across community engagements spoke about a need for service navigation, case management, and coordinated and streamlined service delivery. This need was discussed in relation to housing services as well as broader social and supportive services.

5. Stakeholders expressed a desire for more inclusive and relaxed standards around affordable housing eligibility.

When speaking about affordable housing, many participants expressed that the income requirements are too low, preventing families that also need affordable and subsidized housing from being eligible. In addition, many stakeholders highlighted that immigration status can serve as a barrier to eligibility for these housing opportunities as well as other services.

6. Many community members voiced the need for more opportunities to provide input on the City's housing eligibility policies as well as participate in the development of affordable housing programs.

In particular, many participants expressed a desire for the City to conduct more community outreach and to provide information about and seek input on available services and pending policy developments related to affordable housing.

7. Stakeholders asked for more streamlined services, improved interagency collaboration, and stronger cross-agency communication to support the delivery of both housing and supportive services.

Forum and focus group participants generally agreed that increasing interagency collaboration and streamlining services would decrease barriers to access and facilitate service navigation. Participants would like to see centralized resources such as DAHLIA duplicated across other services as well as increased warm hand-offs between agencies and uniform information across service providers.



Housing Services

1. **Community engagement participants emphasized the need for affordable housing environments at the most vulnerable end of the housing spectrum: shelters and transitional housing for persons experiencing homelessness, accessible housing for seniors and individuals with disabilities, and affordable housing for the lowest-income households.**

Focus groups and forums revealed heightened housing and service needs for vulnerable groups including seniors and persons with disabilities, LGBTQ+ individuals, persons living with HIV, immigrant communities, and communities of color. In community forums, focus groups, and in other City and County planning processes, participants frequently discussed needs for low-income housing, housing for seniors, additional public shelters, and safe places to go and stay.⁴

- Focus groups with the **LGBTQ+ community** highlighted concerns for LGBTQ+ individuals experiencing homelessness. The most frequently discussed need was for safe shelters and transitional housing, with an emphasis on safe environments for transgender individuals.
- A need for housing for **seniors and persons with disabilities** was mentioned in nine out of 10 community forums and multiple focus groups. The most commonly specified needs were for affordable, accessible, and supportive housing that allows them to live as independently as possible and/or age in place. For these populations, supportive services are necessary in order to maintain housing. In the DAAS Community Needs Assessment, this need was amplified in African American and Hispanic/Latino focus groups and community forums.⁵
- **Persons living with HIV/AIDS (PLWHA)** and PLWHA providers pointed out several characteristics that can improve the housing environments for persons living with HIV, including safety, quiet, personal outdoor space, having a liaison between building management and tenants, and management being respectful and knowledgeable about HIV. MOHCD and OEWD also noted that the high number of PLWHA at-risk for experiencing homelessness – 12,344 individuals or 77.6% of San Francisco’s PLWHA population – is more than ten times the number of subsidies currently available.⁶ The Alameda County AIDS Housing Needs Assessment points to an acute a need for increased medical respite. Thousands of persons experiencing homelessness are released from area hospitals onto the streets, exacerbating their health conditions and making re-admittance

The table below highlights the top fifteen housing and housing service needs that participants named across all community engagement events and also across all survey responses.

Affordable housing
Rental assistance/reduced-cost housing
Housing navigation and application assistance
Safe shelter, transitional, and permanent housing environments
More housing protections
Senior and accessible housing
Eviction prevention support
Housing subsidies
Tenant education
Supportive housing
Down-payment assistance
Housing close to employment
Landlord negotiation assistance
Relocation assistance
Mortgage, HOA dues or foreclosure assistance

This section contains qualitative findings synthesized from the ways community members **described** and **contextualized** their needs.

⁴ Department of Public Health, Community Health Needs Assessment, pg 39

⁵ Department of Aging and Adult Services, Dignity Fund Community Needs Assessment

⁶ “At-risk” is based on being low income (at or below 50% AMI) and not receiving any housing support; OEWD 2017-18 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) report





and mortality more likely; still, the City and County only provides 18 medical respite beds for the entire community.⁷

- Community members in seven of the 10 forums raised a need for more youth services. In terms of housing, they recommended affordable housing assistance for **transitional age youth (TAY)**, particularly for homeless TAY and TAY who are in school. In a survey of 229 unaccompanied homeless youth conducted by Applied Survey Research (ASR), forty-three percent (43%) of youth reported that they did not expect to have stable housing within the 12 months following the survey. When asked about barriers to permanent housing, 54% reported that they could not afford rent, followed by 36% who reported not enough income or no job. Twenty-seven percent (27%) reported not enough housing was available, followed by 17% who could not afford moving costs, and 15% who felt the housing process was too difficult.⁸
- Several focus group participants noted the need for emergency/transitional **housing for families**, including accessible housing for families with children who have disabilities.

2. While affordable housing was the most frequently mentioned housing services need, the recognition of the intersection of health and housing was a common thread throughout the discussions, as participants emphasized the need for safe and healthy living environments.

Across forums and focus groups, participants articulated healthy housing needs with urgency, citing concerns related to “toxic” SRO and Section 8 environments, food deserts, street sanitation, and community violence. The need for safer shelters was mentioned in eight of the 10 forums and in most focus groups. In addition to safety, participants named shelter overcrowding as a top concern. Nearly 60% of survey respondents reported a serious health or accessibility concern about where they live. Survey respondents indicated that they would like to see better sidewalks and safer crosswalks, more parks and open spaces, street beautification projects, and increased indoor recreational space in their neighborhoods, among other public space improvements.

Similarly, during community conversations on the “Our Children, Our Families Initiative,” families particularly expressed the importance of maintaining a clean, safe environment in their neighborhoods. Families stressed the critical need for more accessible, affordable, safe and stable housing with safe green spaces and access to healthy food and grocery stores; families additionally expressed a desire for neighborhoods free of drugs, crime and violence for children, youth and families to thrive. City and County plans recommend monitoring fair housing conditions that meet Health Department health and safety codes, including basics such as kitchen and bathroom.⁹ In the Department of Public Health’s Community Health Needs Assessment, residents voiced a desire for a cleaner and safer city—some did not feel safe to exercise in their neighborhood—and suggested more green spaces, community gardens, public parks, and clean public restrooms.¹⁰

⁷ Alameda County AIDS Housing Needs Assessment

⁸ 2017 San Francisco Unique Youth Survey & Count Report

⁹ Department of Children Youth and Families, Our Children, Our Families (OCOF) Five-Year Plan, Year One Report 2016

¹⁰ Department of Public Health, Community Health Needs Assessment, pg 39



The Planning Department notes that families with children are consistently the majority of overcrowded homes in San Francisco. Since 2005, overcrowded households that are families with children comprised about 26,000 of the households in San Francisco or 50% of the total households in the City that are overcrowded.¹¹ In the 2014 Housing Element, the Planning Department particularly identifies Asian-American and Hispanic/Latino households comprise disproportionate numbers of overcrowded households (14%). These households are likely to be larger and have lower incomes, and, in order to afford the cost of housing, many low-income families crowd into smaller units.¹²

3. Community members expressed the need for stronger eviction and tenant supports and protections, including tenant education as well as City policies to prevent unlawful eviction.

In most forums and in all focus groups (but the one designated for homeowners), participants expressed the fear of eviction and a desire for greater protections. For example, in several forums and focus groups, participants observed that community members may hesitate to ask for improvements to their units because they fear the consequences of being seen as a “bad tenant.” Participants identified a need to know where they can go to access information about tenants’ rights, emphasizing a desire for preventive services prior to fair housing violations or unlawful eviction proceedings (e.g., information about what repairs and amenities tenants are entitled to under law). Participants also need assistance available on-demand, and tenant-focused legal services in escalated situations such as landlord harassment.

Community input in the previous Analysis of Impediments reflects that many individuals and landlords remain uninformed about their tenant/landlord rights and fair housing rights and obligations. Stakeholders expressed the need for additional community-based services in this arena, particularly for legal services to prevent eviction.¹³

- In particular, **seniors and older adults** discussed frustration and confusion around their legal rights related to evictions and mistreatment from property managers.¹⁴

In addition to tenant-focused education and services, participants want the City to develop policies and landlord education programs to prevent the types of predatory practices that may lead to displacement. Participants were also asked for suggestions for increasing the number of landlords who accept Section 8 vouchers for their units. Their suggestions included: education and technical support to landlords; liaisons between tenants and landlords (e.g., a voucher manager to help resolve disputes/complaints, required payee services for tenants); funding for habitability standards improvements, repairs, and damages; incentives/tax credits for landlords; payment for vacant units in project-based sites; pre-payment of rent by the City; and permitting Section 8 vouchers for non-traditional housing such as co-ops.

¹¹ Planning Department, Housing for Families with Children (Family Friend Housing White Paper)

¹² Planning Department, San Francisco General Plan 2014 Housing Element

¹³ Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), 2013-2018 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice

¹⁴ Department of Aging and Adult Services, 2018 Dignity Fund Community Needs Assessment



Social and Supportive Services

1. Community members need affordable, targeted support for trauma, PTSD, substance use disorders, and other mental health conditions.

Mental health (MH) and substance use (SU) services together were the most frequently mentioned social and supportive service need across all community meetings. Although participants in some groups mentioned specific needs such as methadone clinics, or particular clinical approaches like trauma-informed care, participants for the most part described a need for general mental health services. Similarly, the previous Consolidated Plan community engagement process found that residents and service providers largely converged on other pressing concerns including: providing mental health and substance use services, addressing homelessness, and supporting transitional age youth (TAY).¹⁵

- Nearly a third (28.9%) of survey **respondents identifying as having a disability** indicated that one of the most important services to them or their family is access to mental health and/or substance use help.
- Nearly a third (27%) of **LGBTQ+** survey respondents reported mental health and/or substance use help as their top need.
- **American Indian or Alaska Native** survey respondents, **Black, African American or African** respondents, and **multiracial** respondents listed mental health and/or substance use help as a top need.

Residents specifically called for accessible and culturally competent mental health services to address the trauma of homelessness. The DCYF Community Needs Assessment also pointed to a need for social-emotional support for those who lack basic housing and/or are facing homelessness.¹⁶ Along these lines, the Homeownership SF assessment, which included focus groups with older adults, adults with disabilities, LGBTQ+ households, persons living HIV, and Asian/Pacific Islander communities, found that multiple housing barriers result in a mental and physical toll on participants. This report noted:

“Many participants mentioned experiencing depression, anxiety and trauma due to housing instability, which was then compounded by institutional barriers they faced during their housing search. Participants commonly cited that the inability to find affordable housing has impacted their health and/or ability to find stable employment. Participants frequently shared that the act of navigating complicated bureaucracies left

The table below highlights the top fifteen social and supportive service needs that participants named across all community engagement events and also across all survey responses.

Benefits assistance (CalWorks, SNAP, Medi-Cal, etc.)
Better access to healthcare
Access to healthy food
Mental health and substance use support
Language support
Knowledge of available services
Support for seniors and people with disabilities
Affordable childcare
Case management
Legal services – consumer/civil rights
Legal services – worker/employment rights
Legal services – immigration support
Access to recreation
Nutrition programs
Neighborhood clean-up and safety programs

This section contains qualitative findings synthesized from the ways community members **described** and **contextualized** their needs.

¹⁵ Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), 2015-2020 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan

¹⁶ DCYF Community Needs Assessment





them feeling hopeless, and restricted their ability to engage in activities or programming to achieve a greater level of self-sufficiency.”¹⁷

2. Compared to housing needs, social and supportive service needs are more intensive and vary by population.

Across all community meetings, participants expressed a need for any type of social or supportive service roughly 860 times. Participants expressed any type of housing-related need 530 times. In addition to being expressed more frequently, social and supportive service needs also varied more by population.

- Nearly half (47.6%) of **TAY** survey respondents list benefits support (SSDI, Section 8, etc.) as the non-housing service that they most need.
- Nearly two-thirds (64.3%) of survey respondents indicate they are experiencing **homelessness** list benefits support (SSDI, Section 8, etc.) as the non-housing service they need most.
- Over half (50.3%) of survey respondents who indicated they are **HIV+** list benefits support (SSDI, Section 8, etc.) as the non-housing service they need most.
- **Participants experiencing homelessness** voiced a need for case management twice as frequently as other groups. The next top needs were for employment support and training, financial assistance including rental assistance and subsidies, and supportive housing.
- A need for supportive services for **seniors and people with disabilities** was mentioned in seven of the 10 community forums and nearly all focus groups. Commonly mentioned needs were related to case management and reducing isolation – including senior centers/hubs, outreach, and transportation.
- Focus groups with **residents in public and subsidized housing** conveyed the highest number of needs out of all forums and focus groups. In these focus groups, the most commonly mentioned need was for mental health services, followed by needs for accessible transportation, employment, and food access. Mental health and substance use services were mentioned by residents of public housing twice as frequently as all other groups. This group was the only forum or focus group in which food access was one of the five most frequently mentioned needs. Other top needs among participants included employment training, financial planning and education services, health and wellness services, senior and disability support, and overall knowledge of available services.
- In seven out of 10 forums, participants spoke about an overall need for social services and assistance for **immigrant communities**. This need was frequently discussed in the Mission and SOMA forums and in focus groups with cultural groups and housing advocates. Several participants also spoke to challenges faced by mixed-status families (e.g., family unification being affected by current immigration policies).
- Participants in focus groups with the **LGBTQ+ community** discussed a need for cultural competence among service providers and a desire for LGBTQ+ specific services, mental health support, and case management.

¹⁷ Homeownership SF report: Results from 2017-2018 Focus Groups. Assessment of Housing Needs and Barriers experienced by Black, Latino and Pacific Islander Communities, LGBT households, Seniors, and Persons with Disabilities



City and County of San Francisco, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
2020-2025 Consolidated Plan & HIV Housing Plan: Community Engagement Key Findings

- Focus group participants with **Black/African American community** members highlighted that racial disparities affect economic opportunities and service access. Consequently, there is a need for culturally relevant services focused on economic empowerment (home ownership, land ownership, business ownership), as well as healing services that address intergenerational trauma. Participants also commented on the need for safe open spaces for families and safety in getting to school/work. Bayview-Hunters Point forum participants shared a need for supportive services specific to the reentry population.
- Focus groups with **persons living with HIV/AIDS** and HIV service providers highlighted the need for services that address the health, mental health, housing, and employment needs that many low-income individuals living with HIV encounter. Financial support was the top need mentioned in HIV-specific focus groups, followed by case management, with discussions focusing on the value of appointment reminders, medication adherence support, and onsite supportive services that vary with degrees of support needed (e.g., appointment escort, drop in counseling, and transportation to appointments). Job training and culturally relevant mental health support also emerged as top needs. The Alameda County AIDS needs assessment observed that, in that County, substance abuse interventions and resources are hard to access, fragmented and not aligned with emerging and best practices for persons experiencing homelessness.¹⁸
- Forum and focus group participants identified a desire for more **services focused on TAY/youth**, including recreation (e.g., afterschool programs, outdoor recreation spaces); leadership development for youth and transition-age youth; and employment support (e.g., summer and afterschool jobs or internships). TAY expressed interest in pathways to upward mobility and mentorship with adults in their communities who have successfully transitioned out of public housing, off public assistance, and into gainful employment and independent living.
- Families living on Treasure Island explained they have limited access to resources, such as children, youth and family programs, transportation, health supports and school choice.¹⁹

¹⁸ Alameda County AIDS Housing Needs Assessment

¹⁹ Department of Children Youth and Families, Our Children, Our Families (OCOF) Five-Year Plan, Year One Report 2016



Economic Self-Sufficiency

1. Participants expressed an overwhelming need for paid job training programs that provide pathways to living-wage, sustainable employment.

Participants mentioned a need for any type of job training 87 times across forums and focus groups, making job training the most frequently raised of *all* needs. This came up in every neighborhood forum and each type of focus group, with the exception of homeowners. Participants emphasized that while there are current job training opportunities, they may not be paid and/or may not link to long-term employment. Community members shared specific suggestions for the types of job training programs and workforce readiness services that would most benefit them:

- Paid apprenticeship programs
- Community “Jobs Market,” based on the Farmers Market model
- City-sponsored English learning, vocational, and technology education programs
- City-sponsored all-ages internship program
- Employment opportunities for youth/TAY
- City-sponsored work permits for youth who are undocumented
- Subsidies for the “start-up costs” of obtaining employment
- Job retraining programs with cultural competency component for recent immigrants
- Community benefit agreements with tech companies
- A practice test for City jobs to allow those with additional barriers to learn more about what to expect from the real exam

Specific populations further nuanced their needs for job training and employment:

- **Asian** survey respondents and **Middle Eastern or North African** respondents listed proximity to employment as a top need.
- **Asian** survey respondents listed access to ESL classes as a top need.
- **American Indian or Alaska Native** and **Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander** survey respondents listed access to GED or high school diploma programs as a top need related to economic self-sufficiency.
- Over 40% of **TAY** survey respondents list employment as a top need related to economic self-sufficiency.

2. There is a large need for financial literacy and planning programs as well as financial services, specifically savings and credit counseling services.

The table below highlights the top fifteen economic self-sufficiency needs that participants named across all community engagement events and also across all survey responses.

Job training
Getting a job
Financial planning and education
Learning new job skills
Access to ESL classes
GED and high school diploma programs
Local hiring
Financing and credit services
Tech access/tech education
Permanent job/career opportunities
Employment coaching
“Working class” jobs
Employer programs
Senior/disability employment
Affordable higher education opportunities

This section contains qualitative findings synthesized from the ways community members ***described*** and ***contextualized*** their needs.



Across forums and focus groups, participants raised two distinct needs related to financial empowerment: 1) financial planning and education services, and 2) banking and credit services. The former was often mentioned during discussions of barriers to homeownership. In addition to significant income barriers, participants felt they lacked the financial planning tools and financial literacy to even start considering the process of homeownership. Participants also raised a need for culturally-competent financial literacy programs for immigrant families that regularly send money back to their home countries.

The latter emerged as a need primarily in focus groups, particularly among residents of public housing and those experiencing homelessness. Both these participants, as well as housing advocates, articulated that there needs to be checking, savings, and credit services availability to this population in order for them to achieve greater self-sufficiency. Overall, community members stressed the important role that financial services and programs play in promoting sustainable economic mobility for City residents and called out this need as a resource barrier for already vulnerable populations.

In the community input sessions, six groups discussed the needs of 14- to 24-year-olds and prioritized the need for youth to develop life skills and independence, with a particular emphasis on financial literacy (e.g., banking, building credit, taxes, and savings). Service providers at the All-Grantee meeting also emphasized the need for developing financial literacy, including debt and debt management, information about student loans, credit building, access to banking, and avoiding check cashers and predatory lenders.²⁰

- Compared to male respondents, **female survey respondents** indicated a higher need for financial budgeting/planning as well as debt management.
- **Black, African American or African** survey respondents and **Latino/a/x or Hispanic** respondents listed financial literacy and budgeting as a top need.

3. Residents want San Francisco employers to hire more local residents.

Employment, with an emphasis on local hiring, was a consistent need across focus groups and forums. Participants in SOMA, Excelsior, and the Tenderloin in particular expressed that policies needed to better incentivize local hiring for permanent, living-wage jobs that lead to careers for residents in need of work. Participants expressed frustration that employers who use City and community resources too often hire employees from outside the region.

Participants carry a nuanced understanding of the impact of hiring practices on very low-income residents. They indicated that incentivizing high-paying employers, who may hire locally for high-wage positions in specific industries, to move to San Francisco does not benefit the residents who most need living-wage jobs.

²⁰ Department of Children Youth and Families, 2016 DCYF Community Needs Assessment



Knowledge of and Access to Services

1. Participants indicated limited knowledge about availability of and eligibility for housing and social services, as well as a need for assistance navigating those services.

Community engagement participants were asked to list the ways in which they find out about available services in San Francisco. While a majority of survey respondents indicated that they are most likely to find out about available services from an internet search, a majority of forum and focus group participants indicated that they find out about services through word of mouth from friends, family members, and/or neighbors. Other methods were flyers, social media, the internet, case managers, and news media. Similarly, focus groups conducted for the Homeownership SF project found that many participants rely on word of mouth and personal networks in order to identify housing opportunities. The report summarized:

*"Participants are and have been utilizing a broad number of city-funded services in their housing search and housing retention efforts. While some work individually with housing counselors or social workers, others use the affordable housing lists available through Episcopal Community Services, and visit community drop-in center such as Glide, for help with their search. Some have applied for units on DAHLIA, and regularly check with Mercy Housing, Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation, Chinatown Community Development Center, and other non-profit housing developers for new opportunities. While many mentioned utilizing websites, such as Craigslist.org or Apartments.com, to look for shared or market-rate housing, many still look for signs on buildings, rely on word of mouth, and ask around their personal network of friends, family, coworkers and community members for leads."*²¹

Forum and focus group conversations emphasized knowledge gaps between populations as far as service availability and eligibility.

- More than other groups, **residents of public housing** (e.g. RAD, HOPE SF) expressed a need for increased awareness of available social services in San Francisco.
- **Cambodian, Latino, and Samoan focus groups** emphasize a need for greater awareness of housing and social services.
- The need for housing navigation services arose across the majority of forums and focus groups, particularly among **racial and cultural groups (e.g. African American, Cambodian, and Vietnamese community focus groups)**. Participants repeatedly described the difficulty of navigating the City's housing process. Participants recognized that DAHLIA is intended to streamline and facilitate this process, though some (e.g. Chinatown forum participants and members of the housing advocates focus group) cautioned that the website was not accessible to those with low technological literacy and those with no or low Internet access.
- Within the Department of Adult and Aging Services (DAAS) Needs Assessment, knowledge surrounding eligibility was the most frequently identified barrier to housing for **older adults**.

²¹ Homeownership SF report: Results from 2017-2018 Focus Groups. Assessment of Housing Needs and Barriers experienced by Black, Latino and Pacific Islander Communities, LGBT households, Seniors, and Persons with Disabilities



Consumers and providers called for greater outreach and awareness efforts to increase consumers' understanding of available SF DAAS services.²²

- The Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH) focuses on the distinct needs reflected by **adults, families with children, and youth that are homeless**. In their 5-year Strategic Framework, HSH notes that pathways from homelessness to housing are unclear and inconsistent. Due to lack of data sharing and no clear resource allocation process, there is little systematic decision making about the most appropriate support for each client. Further, those seeking assistance may not be provided information about what they are eligible for and when they might receive it.
- Through focus groups with older adults, adults with disabilities, LGBTQ+ households, persons living with HIV, and Asian/Pacific Islander communities, the Homeownership SF report found that navigating the housing process posed strong barriers, including uncertainty about how to find housing to apply for and complicated documentation requirements. Many participants, especially seniors and people with disabilities, were unaware of DAHLIA and the preferences and priorities for inclusionary housing. Participants expressed confusion about which housing opportunities are available, who is eligible, and how to apply, emphasizing a need for centralized access to information about housing programs and opportunities.²³

2. In addition to needing greater knowledge of eligibility requirements, stakeholders conveyed that eligibility requirements can be a barrier to accessing services.

When speaking about affordable housing, many focus group and forum participants expressed that the income requirements are too low, preventing families that also need affordable and subsidized housing from being eligible. In contrast, several participants in focus groups conducted by Homeownership SF maintained that the eligibility cutoff for inclusionary housing is too high.²⁴ Parents and community members maintained during their input into the Our Children, Our Families Council that beyond being too expensive, there are "too many requirements to find housing."²⁵

- Immigration status was mentioned as a barrier to obtaining housing or other services. Specifically, participants noted that for **individuals/families that are undocumented**, it is more difficult to find housing, and there are rental assistance programs and emergency assistance/funds for which they are not eligible.
- The Homeownership SF study reported that many **seniors, retirees, families, and people with disabilities** are living on a fixed income below \$15,000 per year, and would need to double or triple their income to qualify for inclusionary and other affordable housing opportunities.²⁶

²² Department of Aging and Adult Services, 2018 Dignity Fund Community Needs Assessment

²³ Homeownership SF report: Results from 2017-2018 Focus Groups. Assessment of Housing Needs and Barriers experienced by Black, Latino and Pacific Islander Communities, LGBT households, Seniors, and Persons with Disabilities

²⁴ Ibid

²⁵ Department of Children Youth and Families, Our Children, Our Families (OCOF) Five-Year Plan, Year One Report 2016

²⁶ Homeownership SF report: Results from 2017-2018 Focus Groups. Assessment of Housing Needs and Barriers experienced by Black, Latino and Pacific Islander Communities, LGBT households, Seniors, and Persons with Disabilities




3. Participants expressed a need for inclusive language support services, in order to promote both knowledge of services and service access, especially for health and housing.

Participants discussed the types of language accessibility services they need, both in response to questions about language services and in more general discussion. Participants noted language translation needs for housing materials, health services, emergency services, and public benefit applications. The most common response to questions about language translation needs was that all housing and social service materials need to account for the linguistic diversity of residents and be culturally inclusive. The need for language support more generally was an overarching theme across the community meetings: outside of their responses to questions about specific translation needs, participants voiced a need for language support 78 times. The previous Analysis of Impediments noted that older adults particularly experience barriers related to language access. Approximately 401% of San Francisco residents over 60 are LEP (speaking English “less than very well”) compared with the 23% of the total City population.²⁷

- The need for language support was highlighted in **Vietnamese and Cambodian** communities, particularly around service navigation and help with filling out applications.
- **Asian** survey respondents listed access to ESL classes as a top need.
- In several forums and focus groups, participants also raised a need for accessible information for **seniors and persons with disabilities**, such as materials in plain language, American Sign Language, and in languages other than English. Members of the senior and older adult communities also demonstrated a need for technology access and education.

The figure below describes the proportion of San Francisco’s population, by race/ethnicity and primary language, that speaks English less than “very well.”²⁸ Overall, this population represents 21% of San

Figure 4: Population 5 Years and Older Who Speak English Less than “Very Well”



²⁷ Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), 2013-2018 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice

²⁸ American Community Survey, 2017





San Francisco's residents. The data shown in the figure echo stakeholders' needs, particularly in the Chinese and Vietnamese communities, for ESL classes.

4. Residents experience several barriers to transportation in San Francisco, including long wait times, safety, and cost of transportation, which impede their access to jobs, medical appointments, and other services.

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

- Participants felt that transportation access is not equitable across the city, less reliable and with fewer bus stops in **certain neighborhoods** (e.g., Bayview, Nob Hill, Potrero Hill, Visitacion Valley, Excelsior, Missouri, Watchman Way, Turner Terrace). Along these lines, several participants noted that affordable housing developments may not be close to transit hubs.
- Many participants emphasized accessibility barriers for **seniors and persons with disabilities**, including bus stops that require walking up steep hills, challenges with Paratransit, unreliable or non-functioning station elevators and escalators, and inconsistently availability seats for older adults and people with disabilities.

Several other City and County planning processes highlighted residents' concerns with existing assisted transportation services, including that they were unreliable (e.g., long wait times and no-shows from Paratransit); inflexible, and expensive, even for individuals receiving subsidized rides.²⁹

- Some middle-income **older adults** with need for mobility accommodations expressed concern that their assisted transportation options were further limited by eligibility requirements. In addition, many older adults and adults with disabilities expressed concern over assisted transportation service providers that do not support getting from the residence to the vehicle.³⁰
- The expansion of proof-of-payment fare enforcement on MUNI has fostered widespread fear of racial discrimination and profiling among working-class **African American, Latino, and Asian and Pacific Islander residents** in east and southeast San Francisco – the same neighborhoods where families spend 21-24% of their total household income on transportation.³¹
- Families living on Treasure Island explained that the bus routes to pre-designated middle schools limit choices for their children. Likewise, they felt without transportation it is difficult for their children to participate in school events, afterschool programs and extracurricular activities, such as sport teams.³²

²⁹ Department of Aging and Adult Services, 2018 Dignity Fund Community Needs Assessment

³⁰ Ibid

³¹ Department of Childen Youth and Families, 2016 DCYF Community Needs Assessment

³² OCOF FIVE-YEAR PLAN, YEAR ONE REPORT 2016



Community Empowerment and Engagement

1. Vulnerable community stakeholders want better relationships and accountability with MOHCD.

Overall, community members were very appreciative to have the opportunity to participate in the forums and focus groups and share their perspectives and suggestions. Participants expressed that they would like MOHCD to continue to hold community meetings like the forums to be able to keep a pulse on community needs, particularly the needs of vulnerable populations. Participants emphasized that, in order to rectify historical inequities, there must be accountability measures in place to which the City can be responsive. Participants would like to see a more robust and transparent accountability system by which City-funded services are evaluated in terms of population-specific outcomes. As one participant said,

“Accountability is an essential part of equity.”

Along these lines, participants in focus groups for the Homeownership SF project reported “a perception of discrimination at the City level, noting that the systems and policies in place effectively maintain the status quo. Some commented that while City leaders and officials say they are concerned about the displacement of underrepresented groups, they have not implemented effective policy to ensure those groups have access.”³³

2. Participants articulated a wide need for culturally-competent and inclusive outreach and community engagement strategies that promote community-building and link residents to services.

Culturally-competent and inclusive community outreach was the most frequently mentioned need related to community engagement. Community members acknowledge that there are current outreach efforts marketing City-sponsored housing and supportive services, but these efforts are not reaching certain communities. Participants felt strongly that using culturally-competent outreach strategies will yield increased awareness of and engagement in services. Similarly, survey respondents indicated that increasing the number of cultural events available to community members would increase their sense of community.

The table below highlights the top fifteen community engagement needs that participants named across all community engagement events and also across all survey responses.

Culturally competency and inclusivity (e.g. cultural events, cultural-based outreach)
Community events (e.g. block parties, holiday events, sports events, farmers markets)
Community space (e.g. recreational space, green space, art space)
Nonprofit support and capacity
Parking
Community planning
Support for small businesses
Volunteer opportunities
Community meetings and outreach
Accountability
Community engagement and communication efforts
Targeted marketing of services
Community-based neighborhood clean-up efforts
Senior services
Better street and outdoor lighting

This section contains qualitative findings synthesized from the ways community members described and contextualized their needs.

³³ Homeownership SF report: Results from 2017-2018 Focus Groups. Assessment of Housing Needs and Barriers experienced by Black, Latino and Pacific Islander Communities, LGBT households, Seniors, and Persons with Disabilities





City and County of San Francisco, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
2020-2025 Consolidated Plan & HIV Housing Plan: Community Engagement Key Findings

- This need was mentioned most frequently in the **LGBTQ+, older adult, and African American** community focus groups. Participants in the **Cambodian, Samoan, and Vietnamese** focus groups raised this need as well.

Participants emphasized the importance of diversity among program staff when it comes to successful service delivery, stating that trust is more easily built when service providers share a marginalized identity with clients (e.g. LGBTQ+). Participants would like to see a greater bilingual and bicultural presence among the City and nonprofit workforce, more intentional outreach to people with disabilities, and an investment in culturally-appropriate warm hand-offs (e.g. peer-led outreach and hand-offs).

Plans including the DAAS Needs Assessment and the MHSA Community Program Planning Report (2017) recorded interest from consumers in seeing innovative strategies for increasing service awareness and engagement. One frequently cited example was the use of peer service navigators or ambassadors, who can listen to individual consumers' needs and connect them to appropriate resources.³⁴

³⁴ DAAS Dignity fund community needs assessment 2018; MHSA Community Program Planning Report (2017)



Coordination of Services

1. Stakeholders asked for more streamlined services, improved interagency collaboration, and stronger cross-agency communication to support the delivery of both housing and supportive services.

Forum and focus group participants generally agreed that increasing interagency collaboration and streamlining services would decrease barriers to access and facilitate service navigation. Multiple participants mentioned DAHLIA as an example of a centralized resource for a particular type of service, but cautioned that the website was not accessible to those with low technological literacy and those with no or low Internet access. Participants would like to see this type of centralized resource duplicated across other services as well as increased warm hand-offs between agencies and uniform information across service providers.

Several other community planning documents recorded frustrations and concerns from stakeholders in navigating what they perceive as a large and often complicated service system. For example, in the DAAS needs assessment, consumers discussed the time it takes to navigate the system and to determine what services are available, where they are located, and whether they meet eligibility requirements. As an example of the complications associated with navigating the system, many consumers from different groups cited an extensive amount of paperwork, which is often redundant across different services or programs.³⁵ Planning documents similarly discussed fragmentation among the many county-wide providers who care for persons experiencing homelessness. Participants in the Homeownership SF focus groups shared stories about being referred from one agency to another, only to find they are ineligible for housing services from the referred agency. Additionally, they expressed frustration toward working with multiple agencies and providers in order to determine eligibility and availability of services.³⁶ Participants observed limited citywide coordination and information, expressing that the San Francisco can improve by centralizing the range of housing resources, as well as the outreach, information and services that connect individuals to housing resources.³⁷

The Alameda County AIDS Housing Needs Assessment observed that persons experiencing homelessness interact with hospitals, social service agencies, HMO payers, nursing, criminal justice system, city outreach staff, outpatient clinics, free clinics, shelters and service providers, without sufficient coordination or adequate resource-sharing.³⁸ Similarly, in their feedback about the MHSA Community Program Planning Report, community members maintaining that the City's Family Resource Centers are not connected to SF BHS and MHSA programming in a meaningful way, and suggested that a partnership between BHS and these centers could improve access to mental/behavioral health services.³⁹

³⁵ Department of Aging and Adult Services, 2018 Dignity Fund Community Needs Assessment

³⁶ Homeownership SF report: Results from 2017-2018 Focus Groups. Assessment of Housing Needs and Barriers experienced by Black, Latino and Pacific Islander Communities, LGBT households, Seniors, and Persons with Disabilities

³⁷ Ibid

³⁸ Alameda County, Alameda County AIDS Housing Needs Assessment

³⁹ Department of Public Health, MHSA Community Program Planning Report (2017)



Documents cited the importance of building capacity to collaborate as a whole community, aligning San Francisco's many touch-points into a single eco-system of supports for target populations, and the need and opportunity to pool and leverage resources to advance shared outcomes.⁴⁰ Community members expressed an interest in innovative strategies for integrating language services. For instance, a respondent to the AI request for public input pointed out that "the City could maximize the effectiveness of reaching non-English speakers by collaborating with housing advocacy and community groups that already conduct trainings and disseminate fair housing information to specific populations."⁴¹

2. Community members that participated in forums and focus groups asked for more financial and capacity-building support for nonprofit organizations and other service providers, including changes to contracting rules.

Stakeholders including service providers and their clients shared that the economic landscape in San Francisco provides challenges for case management, continuity of care, client-provider relationships, and general service delivery. Nonprofit organizations have difficulty hiring and retaining high-qualified candidates due to their inability to pay competitive salaries and provide needed employee benefits that ameliorate stress and trauma from ongoing front-line work. As a result, staff turnover impacts client engagement and successful completion of programs.

Additionally, nonprofits are being pushed out due to rising rents that are becoming increasingly unaffordable. Participants noted that when a nonprofit that was previously a centralized location for community meetings and outreach is displaced due to rising rents, this affects community engagement and service delivery to the community. Service providers echoed this, adding that the City will only give money for direct services and not to subsidize rent and utility costs (specifying that maintenance and building improvement cannot be built into contracts) but stressed that nonprofits cannot provide services without appropriate space. Providers emphasized that available funding for nonprofit displacement needs to be better-funded and preventative in focus. Community members would also like to see nonprofit capacity-building that allows service providers to track and maintain outcome metrics and engage in a higher degree of robust data collection and data transparency overall.

⁴⁰ Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, 2014-2019 Local Homeless Coordinating Board Strategic Plan Framework, 2014-2019

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



Housing Access, Perceptions, and Barriers

Housing concerns

1. Participants named displacement and increasing housing prices as the top concerns impacting housing access and the ability to remain in housing.

Participants in MOHCD community engagement tied fears of displacement to their experiences of gentrification and the effects of the presence of tech companies. For example, in several forums and focus groups, participants observed the closing of local businesses, spoke about feeling less of a sense of community than in previous years, and noted instances where SROs are now used for tech company employees or tourists.

Top Housing Concerns
Displacement
Increasing housing prices
Gentrification
Presence of tech companies/workers
Vacant buildings
Lack of housing
Homelessness
Short-term rental market
Cost of living
Income inequality
Overcrowding

Discussions about displacement in several community forums and focus groups raised concerns about the decreasing sense of community as a result of changes in their neighborhoods. As discussed below in relation to residents’ perceptions of desirable neighborhoods, having a strong community was one of the top qualities of a desirable neighborhood. The impact of the housing market on residents’ community connectedness emerged in other City planning processes as well. While some community members had an opportunity to be relocated to public housing outside of the city, the location and availability of services and resources were a concern. Participants stressed the need to define and build communities, especially for the homeless and people in transitional housing. The older population was cited as being especially vulnerable.”⁴²

The 2013-2018 Analysis of Impediments found that market rate asking prices in empty rental housing in San Francisco are generally unaffordable to extremely low-, very low-, and low-income households regardless of household size. Other City and County planning processes heard similar concerns from residents. During 11 public meetings with 127 San Francisco residents across a variety of backgrounds and neighborhoods, the San Francisco Department of Public Health identified the cost of housing as a prominent concern during the meetings.⁴³

- As part of 20 focus groups conducted by the Our Children Our Families Council, Both **Latino and African American** community members expressed a sentiment of “stop kicking/pushing us out of

⁴² Department of Public Health, Community Health Needs Assessment, p. 39

⁴³ Ibid






the City of San Francisco.” African American parents in the Bayview voiced their frustration at witnessing the transformation of their neighborhoods with the growing presence of tech companies, yet their children are not benefiting from the internships and jobs with these companies.⁴⁴

The figures below provide additional context around concerns related to displacement and evictions across San Francisco and which neighborhoods are disproportionately affected.

Figure 5: Displacement Typologies in the Bay Area




⁴⁴ Department of Children Youth and Families, Our Children, Our Families (OCOF) Five-Year Plan, Year One Report 2016

⁴⁵ Urban Displacement Project, UC Berkeley



Figure 6: Eviction Density in San Francisco⁴⁷



Housing choice

2. Both renters and homeowners express low overall housing choice because they feel “locked in.”

Neighborhood forum participants were asked to describe the level of housing choice they felt they have and to list factors that they believe affect their housing choice. Forum participants listed over 20 factors (see below).⁴⁶ The top five most frequently raised factors were cost, rent control, limited housing/housing competition, racism, and proximity to schools. Participants shared a nuanced understanding of rent control in particular.

Many participants expressed feeling “locked in” to a housing unit due to rent control policies and the reality of generational homeownership. In the case of generational homeowners, they expressed that they felt like any opportunity to sell was not matched by the opportunity to buy a home somewhere else in San Francisco. The majority of survey respondents (64.5%) reported feeling that they have little-to-no choice in where they live due to cost of housing, limited housing stock, rent control, family size, and/or proximity to their job, family, or school. Similarly, in focus groups for the Homeownership SF project, many participants agreed that when applications open for multi-family housing, they are priced as high as inclusionary housing, and many applications are for waitlist slots; this leaves many feeling discouraged.⁴⁷

⁴⁶ Chinatown forum notes did not include responses to housing choice questions.

⁴⁷ Homeownership SF report: Results from 2017-2018 Focus Groups. Assessment of Housing Needs and Barriers experienced by Black, Latino and Pacific Islander Communities, LGBT households, Seniors, and Persons with Disabilities



City and County of San Francisco, Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development
 2020-2025 Consolidated Plan & HIV Housing Plan: Community Engagement Key Findings

- HUD data on housing problems confirm that San Francisco’s high-cost housing market has the effect of disproportionately limiting housing choices for **people and households of color**. HUD data examine “housing problems” that result from a market where much of the housing stock is unaffordable, and find that Hispanic households, black households, and Asian households are all more likely to have housing problems than white households.⁴⁸
- For **seniors with disabilities**, the availability of senior-specific housing designed to accommodate the needs and preferences of older adults, is a significant factor in determining location of residence.⁴⁹ **Seniors and people with disabilities** living in SROs cited difficulties finding a permanent housing option. They described feeling stuck in a perpetual state of housing insecurity because they do not foresee their income changing.⁵⁰

Figure 7: Responses to “What makes you feel like you have a choice or don’t have a choice in where you live?”

Factor Affecting Housing Choice	MOHCD Community Forums - Factors Affecting Housing Choice										Total	
	Mission/ District 9	Excelsior & OMI/ District 11	Bayview Hunters Point/ District 10	Castro/ Districts 7 & 8	South of Market/ District 6	Visitacion Valley/ District 10	Tenderloin / District 6	Western Addition/ District 5	Sunset/ Districts 1 & 4	Chinatown/ Districts 2 & 3		
Cost/Affordability											Chinatown forum notes did not include responses to housing choice questions.	8
Rent Control												4
Limited Housing/Housing Competition												4
Racism												3
Proximity to School												3
Generational Homeowner												2
Job Availability												2
Safety Concerns												2
Commuting Distance												1
Credit Rating												1
Dependent on Roommates												1
Lack of Childcare												1
Need ADA Accessibility												1
NIMBY Community												1
Property Taxes												1
Loss of Community/ Displacement												2
Criminal Record												1
Exploitative Financial Products												1
Few Lottery Opportunities												1
Limited Section 8												1
Requirements for Affordable Housing											1	
Total Barriers	7	6	5	5	5	5	4	3	2		1	

⁴⁸ Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), 2013-2018 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice. HUD defines a “housing problem” as any one of the following conditions: spending more than 30 percent of household income on housing, living in an overcrowded situation, or living in a housing unit that lacks complete kitchen or plumbing facilities.

⁴⁹ Ibid

⁵⁰ Homeownership SF report: Results from 2017-2018 Focus Groups. Assessment of Housing Needs and Barriers experienced by Black, Latino and Pacific Islander Communities, LGBT households, Seniors, and Persons with Disabilities





Barriers to homeownership

3. Participants highlighted barriers to homeownership centering around both housing prices and financing options.

In 2010, only 39 percent of households in San Francisco owned the homes in which they lived. In comparison, approximately 58 percent of households in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area own their homes. At nearly 79 percent, Ingleside had the highest homeownership rate. Other outlying neighborhoods— including Excelsior, Twin Peaks, and the Sunset—mirrored this trend, all with homeownership rates of 60 percent or greater. By contrast, only ten percent of Downtown households were homeowners, while neighborhoods surrounding the downtown core—including North Beach, the Western Addition, and the Marina—all featured homeownership rates below 30 percent.⁵¹ In the 2013-2018 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing choice, MOHCD found that market-rate ownership housing remains out of reach for most low-income households in San Francisco. As of September 2010, the maximum price that a low-income household could afford for a single-family home was \$354,500. Of the homes sold that month, only nine percent fell below this price point. In addition to housing affordability, credit accessibility and uncertainty in the job market were cited as challenges for potential homebuyers.

Neighborhood forum and community focus group participants were asked to describe the barriers that prevent them from buying a home in San Francisco. Across forums and focus groups, participants listed the following barriers: credit score, income, limited housing stock, cost, down payment, HOA dues, financing, lack of financial literacy, housing lottery system, loan qualification, Tenancy in Common, competitive market, and rental history.

- **RAD and HOPE SF focus group participants** mentioned homeownership barriers with the greatest frequency, followed by participants of cultural focus groups. These groups mentioned barriers to homeownership at a rate more than twice that of the average across all focus groups.
- **SOMA forum participants** listed the greatest number of homeownership barriers, with Chinatown, Bayview-Hunters Point, and Visitacion Valley residents reporting the fewest.
- MOHCD’s assessment examining housing equity for **African Americans** highlighted issues of access and opportunity for homeownership for Black San Francisco residents. The report demonstrated progress toward transforming the conditions in public housing and substantial Black representation in MOHCD programming, but found gaps in Black representation in MOHCD programming for Inclusionary/BMR Homeownership Units and Down Payment Assistance Loans.⁵²

Neighborhood desirability

4. Neighborhood forum participants shared the qualities that they believe make a neighborhood desirable, identifying the following characteristics:

Participants were asked to list which San Francisco neighborhoods they would consider “desirable” and “undesirable.” The results of these discussions are shown in the table below and

⁵¹ Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), 2013-2018 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice

⁵² Examining Housing Equity for African Americans In San Francisco: Prepared for the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development Tia Hicks, Community Development Intern





illustrated in **Error! Reference source not found.**⁵³ Green-colored boxes indicate that participants of a given forum listed a neighborhood as “desirable.” Red-colored boxes indicate that participants of a given forum listed a neighborhood as “undesirable.” Yellow-colored boxes indicate that participants listed a neighborhood as both “desirable” and “undesirable.” The neighborhoods with a majority “desirable” vote (with five or more forums indicating they are desirable communities) are the Mission, Haight Ashbury, Inner Sunset, North Beach, and Inner Richmond.

Desirable Neighborhood Characteristics	Frequency (among forums)
Public transit	10/10
Green space	9/10
Safety	8/10
Community	7/10
Commercial options	7/10
Schools	7/10
Walkability	7/10
Access to services	5/10
Cleanliness	5/10
Views	4/10
Air quality	3/10
Low traffic	3/10
Community engagement	2/10
Weather	2/10
Jobs	2/10
Police relationships	1/10

The neighborhoods with a majority “undesirable” vote (with at least three or more forums listing them as undesirable) are the Tenderloin, Outer Sunset, Bayview-Hunters Point, and South of Market. Tenderloin had the most undesirable votes, with nearly 67% of respondents stating the neighborhood to be undesirable. It should be noted the only desirable rankings for both the Tenderloin and Bayview-Hunters Point are from their own residents.

⁵³ Visitacion Valley forum notes did not include responses to neighborhood desirability questions.



Figure 8: If money were no object, where would you choose to live (top 3 desirable places) and where would you choose to not live (top 3 least desirable places)?

Ranked Neighborhood	Castro/ District 8 and District 7	Sunset/ District 4 and District 1	Excelsior & OMI/ District 11	Tenderloin / District 6	Western Addition/ District 5	South of Market/ District 6	Mission/ District 9	Chinatown / Districts 2 & 3	Bayview Hunters Point/ District 10	Visitacion Valley/ District 10	Total (Yes)	Total (No)
Mission											7	1
Haight Ashbury											6	0
Inner Richmond											5	0
Inner Sunset											5	1
North Beach											5	1
Seacliff											5	0
Glen Park											4	0
Outer Sunset											4	5
Castro											3	0
Duboce Triangle											3	0
Twin Peaks											3	1
Western Addition											3	2
Excelsior											2	2
Laurel Heights											2	0
Marina											2	2
Nob Hill											2	0
Outer Richmond											2	3
Pacific Heights											2	3
Potrero Hill											2	2
Presidio											2	1
Silver Terrace											2	1
South of Market											2	4
St. Francis Woods											2	0
Bayview											1	5
Bernal Heights											1	0
Dolores Park											1	0
Embarcadero											1	0
Lone Mountain											1	0
Noe Valley											1	0
Oceanview/Ingleside											1	0
Outer Mission											1	0
Tenderloin											1	7
Visitacion Valley											1	3
West Portal											1	0
Candlestick Point											0	1
Chinatown											0	1
Dogpatch											0	4
Financial District											0	1
Ingleside											0	1
McLaren Park											0	1
Mount Davidson											0	1
Parkmerced											0	3
Russian Hill											0	1
Treasure Island											0	2

Visitacion Valley forum notes did not include responses to neighborhood desirability



Fair housing and discrimination

5. Participants in community engagement shared multiple experiences of housing discrimination, but overall, their responses reveal that there is not one specific, overt type of discrimination. Their responses indicate a more pervasive and entrenched systemic discrimination that affects people of color and African American communities in particular.

While the forums and focus groups participants did not tend to speak about fair housing violations, a number of participants did perceive bias or discrimination on the part of landlords (e.g., strict, sometimes unlawful renting criteria). One-quarter of survey respondents said that they have experienced housing discrimination in San Francisco. Among survey respondents who reported making a fair housing complaint, 44% said that they were harassed or experienced retaliation for making the complaint. This speaks to participants' common desire for greater tenant education and protections, described earlier. The following illustrate the specific forms of discrimination experienced by forum and focus group participants:

Age-based discrimination

- Some individuals in forums and focus groups commented that they perceived ageism on the part of some landlords and are afraid to ask for modifications to units for fear of eviction or displacement.
- “[There is an] ageist perspective.” – Castro forum participant
- “[Need to] prevent SROs from kicking out the elderly to make more money.” –Long-term Care Coordinating Council focus group participant
- In the DAAS Community Needs Assessment, adults with disabilities shared stories of property managers failing to make reasonable accommodations to make housing compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).⁵⁴

LGBTQ discrimination

- “There are many forms of discrimination. There are issues of internalized transphobia.” – Transgender focus group participant
- “There are barriers steering LGBT applicants away from housing opportunities.” – LGBT focus group participant

Race-based discrimination

- “There are racial inequities throughout the housing system.” – Bayview-Hunters Point forum participant
- “Redlining? Yes. This neighborhood.” – Western Addition forum participant

Disability discrimination

- “There is discrimination against people with disabilities, especially mental health disabilities.” – Long-term Care Coordinating Council focus group participant

⁵⁴ Department of Aging and Adult Services, Dignity Fund Community Needs Assessment



- “Yes, because of my disability. I didn’t file because I knew I had been violated and had rights.” – Tenderloin forum participant

Section 8 discrimination

- “There is no housing stock that would [take] Section 8. I can’t find owners that would deal with this type of client.” – Homeless focus group participant

Language discrimination

- “I asked that the housing application be translated into Spanish and they said no, it would be too much money.” – Tenderloin forum participant

Employment discrimination

- “Employment discrimination is subtle and pervasive. The City needs to come up with ways to improve access to jobs.” – Tenderloin forum participant

Discrimination based on family size

- “[People need to] end discrimination against larger families.” – Mission forum participant

The above findings are reflected in other City and County reports as well:

- According to the responses of four community-based organizations reported in the Budget and Legislative Analyst’s Report regarding Tenant Displacement in San Francisco, **people living below federal poverty guidelines, minorities, the elderly, and people with disabilities** are disproportionately being evicted.⁵⁵
- In their 2012 Eviction report, San Francisco’s Eviction Defense Collaborative (EDC) found that while **African Americans** make up 6% of the City’s population, African Americans represented 29% of all those evicted in that year.⁵⁶
- During 11 public meetings with 127 San Francisco residents across a variety of backgrounds and neighborhoods, some felt discriminated against (sex offenders, people with dependencies) in the housing market.⁵⁷
- Discrimination was one of the most common concerns and challenges mentioned in focus groups for the Homeownership SF project. Participants reported that discrimination relating to race, ethnicity, age, LGBTQ+ status, immigration status, criminal record, or class status has been a barrier to housing access in the past and currently.⁵⁸

⁵⁵ Stanford Law School, Tenant Right To Counsel Analyses

⁵⁶ EDC 2012 Eviction Report, p. 4 (quoting US Census data).

⁵⁷ Department of Public Health, Community Health Needs Assessment, p. 39

⁵⁸ Homeownership SF report: Results from 2017-2018 Focus Groups. Assessment of Housing Needs and Barriers experienced by Black, Latino and Pacific Islander Communities, LGBT households, Seniors, and Persons with Disabilities



Violations of San Francisco Police Code 33 consistently emerged as the most commonly violated ordinance. From 2007 to 2010, 57 percent of complaints and technical assistance requests fell within this category.^{59 60}

- Fair housing violations surrounding **disability** were by far the most common basis for complaint or technical assistance request, consistent with the FHEO and State DFEH data.
- **Race, family status, and age** surfaced as other common bases, again showing general consistency with federal and state fair housing data.⁶¹

Among survey respondents, certain population reported experiencing housing discrimination in San Francisco at rates double that of the general population, as represented in survey responses.

- Over half (52%) of survey respondents who identified as **transgender** indicated that they have experienced housing discrimination in San Francisco. This is double the rate of the general population of all survey respondents.
- Over half (52%) of survey respondents who indicated they were experiencing **homelessness** reported that they have experienced housing discrimination in San Francisco. This is double the rate of the general population of all survey respondents.

⁵⁹ Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), 2013-2018 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice

⁶⁰ Prohibits discrimination based on race, color, ancestry, national origin, place of birth, sex, age religion, creed, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity, weight, source of income, and height.

⁶¹ Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), 2013-2018 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice



Appendix A: Qualitative Data Analysis Methodology

Summary

The project research team took an adapted grounded theory approach to qualitative data analysis using the ATLAS.ti software program. Grounded theory is a well-established method of data collection that combines inductive and deductive coding of data to ensure that participants' concerns drive findings while also allowing researchers to answer specific questions.⁶² The "open" coding process is inductive, intended to allow themes to emerge from participants without being predetermined by the research questions. The "closed" coding process is deductive and seeks to answer specific questions. However, because the questions posed to participants in community sessions were quite structured by design and necessity—precluding a fully inductive analytical process—the research team adapted the grounded theory approach, utilizing an open coding scheme as much as possible within the forum and focus group format in order to adapt the question that grounded theory seeks to answer—What did people say?—to: What did people say about housing needs? What did people say about non-housing needs? etc.

Using this approach in ATLAS.ti, the research team developed the following code "families" for each forum and focus group (some of these families relied on open coding more than others, as some were targeted questions for which MOHCD asked participants to generate a list):

- City-Community Relationship
- Collaboration
- Neighborhood Desirability
- Discrimination
- Housing Barriers
- Housing Choice
- Housing Services (needs and concerns)
- Language Accessibility
- Neighborhood Change
- Non-housing Services (needs and concerns)
- Community Engagement

The research team then used ATLAS.ti's frequency codes function to assess the frequency with which individual codes and code families occurred both in individual forums and focus groups as well as among larger populations (e.g. members of the LGBTQ population). By running the codes function by document group (i.e. forum or focus group), the research team derived findings based on the frequency of a code overall as well as the distribution of a code across populations.

⁶² Charmaz, K. 2003. Grounded Theory. The SAGE Encyclopedia of Social Science Research Methods. 2003. SAGE Publications.



Qualitative Coding Scheme

The following is a summary of the five-step process utilized for the above methodologic process:

Step 1: All forum and focus groups transcripts were read and coded thematically to identify concepts based on common themes across respondents. Each coded passage received a prefix code that identified whether the quotation indicated a general need, general concern, or addressed a specific question “type” posed by facilitators (e.g. experiences of discrimination, housing barriers, etc.). The data analysts kept running lists of codes generated to facilitate consistent use of coding schemes across transcripts. During this step, each transcript was simultaneously labeled and assigned to a primary document group that referenced the neighborhood community or specific focus group population.

Step 2: Once a comprehensive list of initial codes was generated, the codes were organized into “families” or groupings of similar codes. For example, codes related to financial literacy needs and codes related to mental health services needs were grouped into a family of non-housing service needs.

Based on this scheme, if a participant in the SOMA forum discussed the need of individuals who are undocumented to obtain immigration-related legal services, the passage would receive the following codes:

- the prefix and substantive code pairing, “need-legal-services;”
- the prefix and substantive code pairing, “need-immigration-assistance;”
- the substantive family code, “non-housing services;”

And be grouped into the following primary document group:

- SOMA neighborhood forum

Step 3: Once transcript coding was completed, focus groups with similar participant populations were assigned secondary document groups that allowed the data analysts to report out on the needs and concerns of these community members both by specific focus group and in terms of the larger population they belong to. For example, transcripts from focus groups with residents of public and subsidized housing were each assigned to their own primary document group and all assigned to the secondary document group “Public Housing.”

Step 4: RDA then used ATLAS.ti’s frequency codes function to assess the frequency with which individual codes and code families occurred both in individual forums and focus groups, among larger populations, and between forums and focus groups. By running the frequency function for each individual code and code family both by primary and secondary document groups, the research team could derive findings.

Step 5: The project team used ATLAS.ti’s quotation reports function to generate full quotation reports for certain codes. These quotation reports, taken together with the frequency counts, allowed us to generate nuanced findings informed by quantitative distribution but grounded in participants’ own words.



Appendix B: Document Review Methodology

Table 7: 48 Documents reviewed, 23 instances of recorded Community Participation

	Document Name	Recorded Community Participation
Alameda County	1. AIDS Housing Needs Assessment 2014	✓
DAAS	2. DAAS Dignity Fund Community Needs Assessment 2018	✓
DCYF	3. Community Needs Assessment 2016	✓
	4. Services Allocation Plan 2018-2023	
DPH	5. 2017–2021 Integrated HIV Prevention and Care Plan	✓
	6. 2017–2021 Integrated HIV Prevention and Care Plan	
	7. AOT Annual Report 2017	✓
	8. Community Health Needs Assessment	✓
	9. MHSA 3-year integrated plan 2017-2020	✓
	10. MHSA Annual Update 18/19	✓
	11. MHSA Community Program Planning Report 2017	✓
	12. Whole Person Care DHCS application (2016)	
	13. Whole Person Care Update 2018	
	Housing Authority	14. Housing Authority Annual Administrative Plan
HSH	15. HSH Strategic Framework	✓
	16. Larkin St Youth Services Report on Youth Homelessness 2018	
	17. Local Homeless Coordinating Board Strategic Plan Framework, 2014-2019	
	18. Youth Homelessness Demonstration Project Plan	
MOHCD	19. 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan	✓
	20. Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice	✓
	21. Annual Progress Report 16/17	
	22. Examining Housing Equity for African Americans in San Francisco	
	23. Five-Year Strategic Plan 2016-2020	
	24. HIV Housing Five-Year Plan 2016-2020	✓
OCOF	25. OCOF Five-Year Plan, Year One Report 2016	✓
OEWD	26. Economic Strategic Plan 2014 Update	✓
	27. Workforce Alignment 2016 Update	
Other	28. 2009 Report of the SF Mayor's Task Force on African-American Out-Migration	✓
Planning	29. Annual Eviction Reports	
	30. Central SOMA Plan	✓
	31. Central Waterfront/Dogpatch Public Realm	✓
	32. Citywide Planning Division Five-Year Work Program 2014-2019	
	33. Civic Center Public Realm Plan	✓
	34. General Plan 2014 Housing Element	✓
	35. Housing Balance Reports	
	36. Housing for Families with Children (Family Friend Housing White Paper)	
	37. Hub Area Plan update	✓



	Document Name	Recorded Community Participation
	38. Mission Action Plan 2020	✓
	39. Southeast Framework	
	40. Sustainable Chinatown	
Other	41. Tenant Right To Counsel Analyses	
	42. Standards of Care, LA County Commission on HIV	
	43. Housing Standards of Care	
	44. Assessment of Housing Needs and Barriers Experienced by Black, Latino and Pacific Islander Communities, LGBT households, Seniors, and Persons with Disabilities	✓
Cannot identify/still in production	45. Black San Francisco Existing Conditions Study	
	46. Latino Needs Assessment	
	47. Racial and Ethnic Equity Action Plan	
	48. SPARC report of housing disparities (Future Publication)	
	49. Tenderloin Community Data Project	
	50. Google Civic Bridge Project	

Table 8: 23 Instances of recorded Community Participation

Agency	Document Name	Description of CP methods and outreach
Alameda County	1. AIDS Housing Needs Assessment 2014	Consumer, provider, and developer focus groups; online surveys for providers, consumers, and developers. Targeted outreach to low-income consumers.
DAAS	2. DAAS Dignity Fund Community Needs Assessment 2018	Focus groups, public forums, and surveys. Targeted outreach to vulnerable populations.
DCYF	3. Community Needs Assessment 2016	Surveys, interviews, focus groups, and public forums. Targeted outreach to vulnerable populations.
	4. OCOF Five-Year Plan, Year One Report 2016	District-level public forums and community meetings. Targeted outreach to vulnerable populations.
DPH	5. AOT Annual Report 2017	Surveys and interviews
	6. Community Health Needs Assessment	Public forums, focus groups, and community meetings. Targeted outreach and translation for v-pops.
	7. MHSA 3-year integrated plan 2017-2020	Interviews and community engagement
	8. MHSA Annual Update 18/19	Public meetings, focus groups, interviews
	9. MHSA Community Program Planning Report 2017	Community engagement meetings, surveys



City and County of San Francisco, Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development
 2020-2025 Consolidated Plan & HIV Housing Plan: Community Engagement Key Findings

Agency	Document Name	Description of CP methods and outreach
	10. 2017–2021 Integrated HIV Prevention and Care Plan	Public input sessions, focus groups with providers, focus groups with consumers, planning council meetings, and work group meetings. Targeted outreach to v-pops. - Participation results minimally documented
Housing Authority	11. Housing Authority Annual Administrative Plan	Public comment
Homeownership SF	12. Assessment of Housing Needs and Barriers experienced by Black, Latino and Pacific Islander Communities, LGBT households, Seniors, and Persons with Disabilities	Three focus groups that are underrepresented in the application pool for inclusionary housing
HSH	13. HSH Strategic Framework	Client and provider focus groups and surveys. - Participation results minimally documented
	14. San Francisco Coordinated Community Plan to Prevent and End Youth Homelessness	Public meetings, leadership meetings, advisory council meetings, community planning sessions.
MOHCD	15. Consolidated Plan	Steering committee meetings, focus groups, public forums, online participatory exercises and feedback.
	16. Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice	Outreach not clearly recorded. - Only formal public comment included
	17. HIV Housing Five-Year Plan 2016-2020	Steering committee meetings with providers, developers, and advocates.
	18. 2009 Report of the SF Mayor's Task Force on African-American Out-Migration	Interviews: target population, qualitative data review
OEWD	19. Economic Strategic Plan 2014 Update	Outreach to sector-specific stakeholders. - Description/notes not available
	20. State of the Retail Sector	Limited interviews with merchants and property owners in the Mission only.



City and County of San Francisco, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
 2020-2025 Consolidated Plan & HIV Housing Plan: Community Engagement Key Findings

Agency	Document Name	Description of CP methods and outreach
	21. WIOA Local Plan 2017-2020	Survey and presentations at standing meetings.
Planning	22. Central SOMA Plan	Extensive process including public hearings, CBO meetings, public meetings, walking tours, popup event, and surveys.
	23. Central Waterfront/Dogpatch Public Realm	26 presentations at public meetings, - Community prioritization sessions, - Public workshop,
	24. Civic Center Public Realm Plan	Community workshops, open house. - Topics provided but no summary of feedback
	25. General Plan 2014 Housing Element	- Only formal written comments included
	26. Hub Area Plan update	public workshops
	27. Mission Action Plan 2020	Extensive community-driven process including public forums and community meetings

City and County of San Francisco



**MAYOR'S OFFICE OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT
Environmental Review Record
2020 Part 58 Programs**



**MAYOR'S OFFICE OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
LEVEL OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW (2015)**

**Environmental Review for Activity/Project that is Exempt or Categorically Excluded Not Subject to Section 58.5
Pursuant to 24 CFR Part 58.34(a) and 58.35(b)**

Project Information

Project Name: 2020 City and County of San Francisco CDBG; ESG, HOPWA; HOME Programs

Responsible Entity: City and County of San Francisco, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)

Grant Recipient (if different than Responsible Entity):

State/Local Identifier: 070384255

Preparer: Eugene T. Flannery

Certifying Officer Name and Title: Daniel Adams, Acting Director, MOHCD

Consultant (if applicable):

Project Location: City and County of San Francisco

Description of the Proposed Project [24 CFR 58.32; 40 CFR 1508.25]:

The project consists of overall non-construction costs for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), Emergency Shelter Grants (ESG), HOPWA and HOME Programs. The resources of these programs will be used by the City and County of San Francisco to develop flexible, locally designed community development strategies to address the program's primary objective, which is the development of viable urban communities. San Francisco's Part 58 programs revitalize neighborhoods by funding local programs that develops workforces, economic development, housing and improved community facilities and services.

All costs addressed in this Level of Environmental Review are limited to non-construction activities. These costs include but are not limited to Program Administration; Housing Program Administration; Technical Assistance; Planning, and Public Services. The project also includes Community Economic Development activities that lead to the employment of low-income persons.

Level of Environmental Review Determination: See Individual Tables

Funding Information

Grant Number	HUD Program	Funding Amount
B-20-MC-06-0016	CDBG	13,449,700
E-20-MC-06-0016	ESG	1,595,423
M20-MC060213	HOME	690,344
CAH20F003	HOPWA	6,446,172
Total		22,181,639

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount: \$22,181,639

This project anticipates the use of funds or assistance from another Federal agency in addition to HUD in the form of (if applicable): NA

Estimated Total Project Cost (HUD and non-HUD funds) [24 CFR 58.32(d)]: \$

Compliance with 24 CFR §50.4 and §58.6 Laws and Authorities

Record below the compliance or conformance determinations for each statute, executive order, or regulation. Provide credible, traceable, and supportive source documentation for each authority. Where applicable, complete the necessary reviews or consultations and obtain or note applicable permits of approvals. Clearly note citations, dates/names/titles of contacts, and page references. Attach additional documentation as appropriate.

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR 50.4 and 58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determinations
STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR §58.6		
Airport Runway Clear Zones and Accident Potential Zones 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The project site is not within 15,000 feet of a military airport or 2,500 feet of a civilian airport. The City and County of San Francisco is more than 26,000 feet from the nearest airport. The project is in compliance with Airport Hazards requirements.
Coastal Barrier Resources Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 [16 USC 3501]	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	San Francisco is located on the Pacific Coast of the continental United States which is not included in the definition of Coastal Barrier Resource Areas. 16 USC §3501(a)(1)
Flood Insurance Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 and National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994 [42 USC 4001-4128 and 42 USC 5154a]	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	FEMA has not completed a study to determine flood hazard for the selected location; therefore, a flood map has not been published at this time. However, the project is not within a flood plain as indicated by the preliminary Flood Insurance Rate Map prepared for the City and County of San Francisco on September 21, 2007. The project would not involve either direct or indirect support of development in a floodplain.

Mitigation Measures and Conditions [40 CFR 1505.2(c)]

Summarize below all mitigation measures adopted by the Responsible Entity to reduce, avoid, or eliminate adverse environmental impacts and to avoid non-compliance or non-conformance with the above-listed authorities and factors. These measures/conditions must be incorporated into project contracts, development agreements, and other relevant documents. The staff responsible for implementing and monitoring mitigation measures should be clearly identified in the mitigation plan.

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure

Preparer Signature: Eugene T. Flannery Date: March 10, 2020

Name/Title/Organization: Eugene T. Flannery, Environmental Compliance Manager, MOHCD

Responsible Entity Agency Official Signature:

Daniel Adams Date: March 10, 2020

Name/Title: Daniel Adams Acting Director, MOHCD

This original, signed document and related supporting material must be retained on file by the Responsible Entity in an Environmental Review Record (ERR) for the activity/project (ref: 24 CFR Part 58.38) and in accordance with recordkeeping requirements for the HUD program(s).

Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
City and County of San Francisco



London N. Breed
Mayor

Daniel Adams
Acting Director

August 16, 2019

Ms. Kimberly Nash
Community Planning and Development
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
San Francisco Regional Office
1 Sansome Street, Suite 1200
San Francisco, CA 94104

Re: Certifying Official for Environmental Reviews that are Exempt of Categorically Excluded Not Subject to Section 58.5

Dear Ms. Nash:

Effective August 16, 2019, I am authorizing Mr. Eugene Flannery, Environmental Compliance Manager of the San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing to sign as Agency Official for Environmental Reviews that are Exempt of Categorically Excluded Not Subject to Section 58.5

If you have any questions, please contact Eugene T. Flannery, Environmental Compliance Manager, at 701-5598.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Daniel Adams".

Daniel Adams
Acting Director



U.S. Department of Housing and Urban
Development
451 Seventh Street, SW
Washington, DC 20410
www.hud.gov
espanol.hud.gov

**Environmental Review
for Activity/Project that is Exempt or
Categorically Excluded Not Subject to Section 58.5
Pursuant to 24 CFR 58.34(a) and 58.35(b)**

Project Information

Project Name: CDBG—2020-Admin—MOHCD

HEROS Number: 900000010120715

State / Local Identifier:

Project Location: 1 South Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94103

Additional Location Information:

N/A

Description of the Proposed Project [24 CFR 50.12 & 58.32; 40 CFR 1508.25]:

Housing Program Delivery, Program Delivery for Direct Services and General CDBG Administration and Planning

Level of Environmental Review Determination

Activity / Project is Exempt per 24 CFR 58.34(a):

58.34(a)(3)

Funding Information

Grant Number	HUD Program	Program Name
B20MC060016	Community Planning and Development (CPD)	Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) (Entitlement)

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount: \$4,450,617.00

Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a) (5)]: \$4,450,617.00

Mitigation Measures and Conditions [CFR 1505.2(c)]:

Summarized below are all mitigation measures adopted by the Responsible Entity to reduce, avoid or eliminate adverse environmental impacts and to avoid non-compliance or non-conformance with the above-listed authorities and factors. These measures/conditions must be incorporated into project

contracts, development agreements and other relevant documents. The staff responsible for implementing and monitoring mitigation measures should be clearly identified in the mitigation plan.

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure or Condition	Comments on Completed Measures	Complete
---------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------

Preparer Signature: Eugene T Flannery

Date: 03/06/2020 Name / Title/ Organization: Eugene Flannery / / SAN FRANCISCO

Responsible Entity Agency Official Signature: _____ Date: _____

Name/ Title: _____

This original, signed document and related supporting material must be retained on file by the Responsible Entity in an Environment Review Record (ERR) for the activity / project (ref: 24 CFR Part 58.38) and in accordance with recordkeeping requirements for the HUD program(s).



U.S. Department of Housing and Urban
Development
451 Seventh Street, SW
Washington, DC 20410
www.hud.gov
espanol.hud.gov

**Environmental Review
for Activity/Project that is Exempt or
Categorically Excluded Not Subject to Section 58.5
Pursuant to 24 CFR 58.34(a) and 58.35(b)**

Project Information

Project Name: CDBG---2020---Admin---OEWD

HEROS Number: 900000010120731

State / Local Identifier:

Project Location: 1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett Pl, San Francisco, CA 94102

Additional Location Information:

N/A

Description of the Proposed Project [24 CFR 50.12 & 58.32; 40 CFR 1508.25]:
Workforce development program delivery

Level of Environmental Review Determination
Activity / Project is Exempt per 24 CFR 58.34(a):
58.34(a)(3)

Funding Information

Grant Number	HUD Program	Program Name
B20MC060016	Community Planning and Development (CPD)	Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) (Entitlement)

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount: \$90,000.00

Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a) (5)]: \$90,000.00

Mitigation Measures and Conditions [CFR 1505.2(c)]:

Summarized below are all mitigation measures adopted by the Responsible Entity to reduce, avoid or eliminate adverse environmental impacts and to avoid non-compliance or non-conformance with the above-listed authorities and factors. These measures/conditions must be incorporated into project contracts, development agreements and other relevant documents. The staff responsible for implementing and monitoring mitigation measures should be clearly identified in the mitigation plan.

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure or Condition	Comments on Completed Measures	Complete
---------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------

Preparer Signature: Eugene T Flannery Date: 03/06/2020

Name / Title/ Organization: Eugene Flannery / / SAN FRANCISCO

Responsible Entity Agency Official Signature: _____ Date: _____

Name/ Title: _____

This original, signed document and related supporting material must be retained on file by the Responsible Entity in an Environment Review Record (ERR) for the activity / project (ref: 24 CFR Part 58.38) and in accordance with recordkeeping requirements for the HUD program(s).

2020-2021 CDBG Projects

2020-2021 CDBG Projects			
Level of Review: 58.34(a)(1) Administrative and Management Activities			
Agency Name	Address	Project Description	CDBG Funding Amount
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	One South Van Ness Avenue 94103	Housing program delivery	\$675,000
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	One South Van Ness Avenue 94103	Program delivery for direct services	\$45,000
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	One South Van Ness Avenue 94103	General CDBG administration and planning	\$3,730,617
Office of Economic and Workforce Development	1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place 94102	Workforce development program delivery	\$90,000
Total CDBG Administrative			\$4,540,617.00 =



U.S. Department of Housing and Urban
Development
451 Seventh Street, SW
Washington, DC 20410
www.hud.gov
espanol.hud.gov

**Environmental Review
for Activity/Project that is Exempt or
Categorically Excluded Not Subject to Section 58.5
Pursuant to 24 CFR 58.34(a) and 58.35(b)**

Project Information

Project Name: CDBG---2020---PUBLIC-SERVICES---MOHCD

HEROS Number: 900000010120739

State / Local Identifier:

Project Location: 1 S Van Ness Ave, San Francisco, CA 94103

Additional Location Information:

N/A

Description of the Proposed Project [24 CFR 50.12 & 58.32; 40 CFR 1508.25]:

Public services that will not have a physical impact or result in any physical changes, including but not limited to services concerned with employment, housing, crime prevention, child care, health, drug abuse, education, counseling, and welfare or recreational needs;

**Level of Environmental Review Determination
Activity / Project is Exempt per 24 CFR 58.34(a):
58.34(a)(4)**

Funding Information

Grant Number	HUD Program	Program Name
B15MC060016	Community Planning and Development (CPD)	Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) (Entitlement)

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount: \$3,256,076.00

Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a) (5)]: \$3,256,076.00

Mitigation Measures and Conditions [CFR 1505.2(c)]:

Summarized below are all mitigation measures adopted by the Responsible Entity to reduce, avoid or eliminate adverse environmental impacts and to avoid non-compliance or non-conformance with the above-listed authorities and factors. These measures/conditions must be incorporated into project

contracts, development agreements and other relevant documents. The staff responsible for implementing and monitoring mitigation measures should be clearly identified in the mitigation plan.

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure or Condition	Comments on Completed Measures	Complete
---------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------

Preparer Signature: Eugene T Flannery Date: 03/06/2020

Name / Title/ Organization: Eugene Flannery / / SAN FRANCISCO

Responsible Entity Agency Official Signature: _____ Date: _____

Name/ Title: _____

This original, signed document and related supporting material must be retained on file by the Responsible Entity in an Environment Review Record (ERR) for the activity / project (ref: 24 CFR Part 58.38) and in accordance with recordkeeping requirements for the HUD program(s).

2020-2021 CDBG Projects

Level of Review: 58.34(4). Public services that will not have a physical impact or result in any physical changes, including but not limited to services concerned with employment, crime prevention, child care, health, drug abuse, education, counseling, energy conservation and welfare or recreational needs;

Agency Name	Address	Project Description	CDBG Funding Amount
America Works of California, Inc.	344, Harriet St Unit 205, 94103	Reentry-focused Specialized Access Point	\$150,000
Bayview Hunters Point Multipurpose Senior Services, Inc.	1753 Carroll Street 94124	Housing retention and case management services at HOPE SF sites	\$202,000
Central City Hospitality House	290 Turk Street 94102	Neighborhood Access Point	\$200,000
Central City Hospitality House	290 Turk Street 94102	Job Readiness Services	\$100,000
Chinatown Community Development Center, Inc.	663 Clay Street 94111	Service connection for residents of single room occupancy hotels	\$148,750
Community Housing Partnership	1010 Market Street 94102	Job Readiness Services	\$75,000
Community Housing Partnership	1010 Market Street 94102	Occupational Skills Training for the	\$56,250
Compass Family Services	37 Grove Street 94102	Job Readiness Services	\$75,000
Episcopal Community Services of San	165 8th Street 94103	Occupational Skills Training for the	\$56,250
Episcopal Community Services of San	165 8th Street 94103	Skills training, service connection, short-	\$64,000
Five Keys Schools and Programs	70 Oak Street 94107	Job Readiness Services	\$70,000
Good Samaritan Family Resource	1294 Potrero Avenue 94110	ESL training, early childhood education,	\$52,000
Gum Moon Residence Hall	940 Washington Street 94108	Service connection and skill-building for residents of single room occupancy	\$80,000
Homebridge, Inc.	1035 Market Street 94103	Occupational Skills Training for the Health Care Sector	\$60,000
Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights	131 Steuart Street #400 94105	Legal services for entrepreneurs	\$100,000
Mercy Housing California	1256 Market Street 94102	Activities and field trips for Sunnysdale youth	\$48,000
Mission Economic Development Agency	Mission Street 94110	Financial capability services for low- income, Latinx and immigrant families	\$52,000
Mission Neighborhood Centers, Inc.	362 Capp Street 94110	Educational support for TAY and adult	\$52,000
PRC	170 9th Street 94103	Disability-focused Specialized Access Point	\$100,000

2020-2021 CDBG Projects

Level of Review: 58.34(4). Public services that will not have a physical impact or result in any physical changes, including but not limited to services concerned with employment, crime prevention, child care, health, drug abuse, education, counseling, energy conservation and welfare or recreational needs;

San Francisco Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender Community Center	1800 Market Street 94102	Job Readiness Services	\$110,000
The Arc San Francisco	1500 Howard Street 94103	Disability-focused Specialized Access Point	\$75,000
Upwardly Global	582 Market St #1015 94104	Immigrant-focused Specialized Access	\$7,500
Wu Yee Children's Services	888 Clay Street 94108	Service connection for low-income	\$96,000
Young Community Developers, Inc.	1715 Yosemite Avenue 94124	College preparation and academic skill- building for Alice Griffith youth	\$50,000
Young Community Developers, Inc.	200 Broad Street 94112	Neighborhood Access Point	\$330,029
Young Men's Christian Association of San Francisco (Bayview Branch)	1601 Lane Street 94124	Service connection and case management for residents of Hunters View and Sunnydale	\$346,297
Young Men's Christian Association of San Francisco (Chinatown Branch)	855 Sacramento Street 94108	Service connection for residents of single room occupancy hotels	\$48,000
Young Men's Christian Association of San Francisco (Chinatown Branch)	855 Sacramento Street 94108	Service connection for Chinese immigrants	\$212,000
Young Men's Christian Association of San Francisco (Urban Services Branch)	1426 Fillmore Street 94115	Service connection and case management for API residents of District 11 and citywide	\$240,000
Total CDBG Public Services			\$3,256,076.00



U.S. Department of Housing and Urban
Development
451 Seventh Street, SW
Washington, DC 20410
www.hud.gov
espanol.hud.gov

**Environmental Review
for Activity/Project that is Exempt or
Categorically Excluded Not Subject to Section 58.5
Pursuant to 24 CFR 58.34(a) and 58.35(b)**

Project Information

Project Name: CDBG---2020---MOHCD---Engineering

HEROS Number: 900000010120749

State / Local Identifier:

Project Location: 1 S Van Ness Ave, San Francisco, CA 94103

Additional Location Information:

N/A

Description of the Proposed Project [24 CFR 50.12 & 58.32; 40 CFR 1508.25]:

Architectural services for beautification of tow commercial corridors: SoMa Mission Street and Tenderloin.

Level of Environmental Review Determination

Activity / Project is Exempt per 24 CFR 58.34(a):

58.34(a)(8)

Funding Information

Grant Number	HUD Program	Program Name
B19MC060016	Community Planning and Development (CPD)	Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) (Entitlement)

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount: \$63,570.00

Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a) (5)]: \$63,570.00

Mitigation Measures and Conditions [CFR 1505.2(c)]:

Summarized below are all mitigation measures adopted by the Responsible Entity to reduce, avoid or eliminate adverse environmental impacts and to avoid non-compliance or non-conformance with the above-listed authorities and factors. These measures/conditions must be incorporated into project contracts, development agreements and other relevant documents. The staff responsible for implementing and monitoring mitigation measures should be clearly identified in the mitigation plan.

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure or Condition	Comments on Completed Measures	Complete
------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------------	----------

Preparer Signature: Eugene T Flannery Date: 03/06/2020

Name / Title/ Organization: Eugene Flannery / / SAN FRANCISCO

Responsible Entity Agency Official Signature: _____ Date: _____

Name/ Title: _____

This original, signed document and related supporting material must be retained on file by the Responsible Entity in an Environment Review Record (ERR) for the activity / project (ref: 24 CFR Part 58.38) and in accordance with recordkeeping requirements for the HUD program(s).

2020-2021 CDBG Projects
Level of Review: 58.34(a)(8) - Engineering or design costs

Agency Name	Address	Project Description	CDBG Funding Amount
Kultivate Labs	967 Mission Street 94103	SoMa Mission Street commercial corridor beautification – architectural services	\$31,785
North of Market/Tenderloin Community Benefit Corporation	25 Taylor Street 94102	Tenderloin commercial corridor beautification – architectural	\$31,785
Total CDBG Engineering and Design			\$63,570.00



U.S. Department of Housing and Urban
Development
451 Seventh Street, SW
Washington, DC 20410
www.hud.gov
espanol.hud.gov

**Environmental Review
for Activity/Project that is Exempt or
Categorically Excluded Not Subject to Section 58.5
Pursuant to 24 CFR 58.34(a) and 58.35(b)**

Project Information

Project Name: CDBG---2020---Technical-Assistance---MOHCD

HEROS Number: 900000010120765

State / Local Identifier:

Project Location: 1 S Van Ness Ave Fl 5, San Francisco, CA 94103

Additional Location Information:

N/A

Description of the Proposed Project [24 CFR 50.12 & 58.32; 40 CFR 1508.25]:

Technical assistance and training to small businesses,

Level of Environmental Review Determination

Activity / Project is Exempt per 24 CFR 58.34(a):

58.34(a)(9)

Funding Information

Grant Number	HUD Program	Program Name
B20MC060016	Community Planning and Development (CPD)	Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) (Entitlement)

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount: \$1,148,869.00

Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a) (5)]: \$1,148,869.00

Mitigation Measures and Conditions [CFR 1505.2(c)]:

Summarized below are all mitigation measures adopted by the Responsible Entity to reduce, avoid or eliminate adverse environmental impacts and to avoid non-compliance or non-conformance with the above-listed authorities and factors. These measures/conditions must be incorporated into project contracts, development agreements and other relevant documents. The staff responsible for implementing and monitoring mitigation measures should be clearly identified in the mitigation plan.

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure or Condition	Comments on Completed Measures	Complete
------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------------	----------

Preparer Signature: Eugene T Flannery Date: 03/06/2020

Name / Title/ Organization: Eugene Flannery / / SAN FRANCISCO

Responsible Entity Agency Official Signature: _____ Date: _____

Name/ Title: _____

This original, signed document and related supporting material must be retained on file by the Responsible Entity in an Environment Review Record (ERR) for the activity / project (ref: 24 CFR Part 58.38) and in accordance with recordkeeping requirements for the HUD program(s).

2020-2021 CDBG Projects

Level of Review: 58.34(a)(9). Technical assistance and training;

Agency Name	Address	Project Description	CDBG Funding Amount
ASIAN, Inc.	1167 Mission Street, 4th Floor 94103	Technical assistance for multilingual small businesses and microenterprises	\$38,869
Children's Council of San Francisco	1341 Evans Avenue 94124	Home-based training for Spanish-speaking childcare entrepreneurs	\$55,000
La Cocina, Inc.	2948 Folsom Street 94110	Kitchen incubator and technical assistance for food-based microentrepreneurs	\$70,000
Main Street Launch	2101 Webster St #1200, Oakland, CA 94612	Workshops for African American business owners in Bayview	\$15,000
Main Street Launch	2101 Webster St #1200, Oakland, CA 94612	Workshops for African American business owners in Lower Fillmore	\$15,000
Mission Economic Development Agency	2301 Mission Street 94110	Technical assistance for Mission Street (16th-25th) commercial corridor businesses	\$30,000
Mission Economic Development Agency	2301 Mission Street 94110	Technical assistance for Bernal Heights commercial corridor businesses	\$20,000
Mission Economic Development Agency	2301 Mission Street 94110	Technical assistance in English and Spanish for microentrepreneurs	\$75,000
Renaissance Entrepreneurship Center	275 5 th Street 94103	Technical assistance for microentrepreneurs	\$75,000
Renaissance Entrepreneurship Center	275 5 th Street 94103	Technical assistance in English and Spanish to women entrepreneurs	\$40,000
Renaissance Entrepreneurship Center	275 5 th Street 94103	Technical assistance to entrepreneurs in Bayview Hunters Point	\$40,000

2020-2021 CDBG Projects

Level of Review: 58.34(a)(9). Technical assistance and training;

Renaissance Entrepreneurship Center	275 5th Street 94103	Technical assistance to businesses on Bayview Third Street corridor	\$20,000
San Francisco Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender Community Center	1800 Market Street 94102	Technical assistance, credit-building microloans, workshops and mentorship	\$70,000
San Francisco Small Business Development Center	1650 Mission Street #101 94103	Technical assistance for small businesses	\$200,000
Self-Help for the Elderly	601 Jackson Street 94133	Neighborhood commercial revitalization services	\$15,000
SFMade, Inc.	150 Hooper Street 94107	Technical assistance for local manufacturers	\$65,000
Southeast Asian Community Center	875 O'Farrell Street 94105	Technical assistance for Sunset commercial corridor businesses	\$20,000
Southeast Asian Community Center	875 O'Farrell Street 94105	Technical assistance in English and Chinese for small businesses citywide	\$75,000
Southeast Asian Community Center	875 O'Farrell Street 94105	Technical assistance in English and Chinese for small businesses in Visitacion Valley	\$15,000
Southeast Asian Community Center	875 O'Farrell Street 94105	Technical assistance for Tenderloin, Central Market and SoMa commercial corridor businesses	\$20,000
Start Small Think Big Inc	1000 Broadway, Suite 290 Oakland, CA 94607	Technical assistance for small businesses	\$55,000
Wu Yee Children's Services	888 Clay Street 94108	Technical assistance for childcare businesses	\$100,000

2020-2021 CDBG Projects

Level of Review: 58.34(a)(9). Technical assistance and training;

North of Market Neighborhood Improvement Corporation	25 Taylor Street 94102	Technical assistance to the Tenderloin Merchant Association	\$20,000
Total CDBG technical assistance			\$1,148,869.00



U.S. Department of Housing and Urban
Development
451 Seventh Street, SW
Washington, DC 20410
www.hud.gov
espanol.hud.gov

**Environmental Review
for Activity/Project that is Exempt or
Categorically Excluded Not Subject to Section 58.5
Pursuant to 24 CFR 58.34(a) and 58.35(b)**

Project Information

Project Name: CDBG---2020---MOHCD---Supportive-Services

HEROS Number: 900000010120789

State / Local Identifier:

Project Location: 1 S Van Ness Ave Fl 5, San Francisco, CA 94103

Additional Location Information:

N/A

Description of the Proposed Project [24 CFR 50.12 & 58.32; 40 CFR 1508.25]:

Supportive Services including tenant counseling, legal advice and representation, pre- and post-purchase home-ownership counseling

Level of Environmental Review Determination:

Activity / Project is Categorically Excluded Not Subject to per 24 CFR 58.35(b):
58.35(b)(2)

Funding Information

Grant Number	HUD Program	Program Name
B20MC060016	Community Planning and Development (CPD)	Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) (Entitlement)

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount: \$4,039,138.00

Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a) (5)]: \$4,039,138.00

Mitigation Measures and Conditions [CFR 1505.2(c)]:

Summarized below are all mitigation measures adopted by the Responsible Entity to reduce, avoid or eliminate adverse environmental impacts and to avoid non-compliance or non-conformance with the above-listed authorities and factors. These measures/conditions must be incorporated into project

contracts, development agreements and other relevant documents. The staff responsible for implementing and monitoring mitigation measures should be clearly identified in the mitigation plan.

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure or Condition	Comments on Completed Measures	Complete
---------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------

Preparer Signature: Eugene T Flannery Date: 03/06/2020

Name / Title/ Organization: Eugene Flannery / / SAN FRANCISCO

Responsible Entity Agency Official Signature: _____ Date: _____

Name/ Title: _____

This original, signed document and related supporting material must be retained on file by the Responsible Entity in an Environment Review Record (ERR) for the activity / project (ref: 24 CFR Part 58.38) and in accordance with recordkeeping requirements for the HUD program(s).

2020-2021 CDBG Projects

Level of Review: 58.35(b)(2) - Supportive services including, but not limited to, health care, housing services, permanent housing placement, day care, nutritional services, short-term payments for rent/mortgage/utility costs, and assistance in gaining access to local, State, and Federal government benefits and services

Agency Name	Address	Project Description	CDBG Funding Amount
Causa Justa:: Just Cause	2301 Mission Street 94110	Tenant counseling and education services	\$558,450
Eviction Defense Collaborative, Inc	1338 Mission St. 4th Floor 94103	Legal advice and representation for all San Franciscans facing eviction	\$1,581,337
Mission Economic Development Agency	2301 Mission Street 94110	Pre-purchase homeownership counseling and information and referral services	\$150,000
Mission Economic Development Agency	2301 Mission Street 94110	Post-purchase homeownership counseling and information and referral services	\$34,520
San Francisco Housing Development Corporation	4439 Third Street 94124	Pre-purchase homeownership counseling and information and referral services	\$150,000
San Francisco Study Center, Incorporated, fiscal sponsor of the Housing Rights Committee of San Francisco	1663 Mission St. Suite 504 94103	Tenant counseling and education services	\$569,500

2020-2021 CDBG Projects

Level of Review: 58.35(b)(2) - Supportive services including, but not limited to, health care, housing services, permanent housing placement, day care, nutritional services, short-term payments for rent/mortgage/utility costs, and assistance in gaining access to local, State, and Federal government benefits and services

Tenderloin Housing Clinic, Inc.	126 Hyde Street 94102	Legal advice and representation for all San Franciscans facing eviction	\$995,331
Total CDBG Technical Assistance			\$4,039,138.00



U.S. Department of Housing and Urban
Development
451 Seventh Street, SW
Washington, DC 20410
www.hud.gov
espanol.hud.gov

**Environmental Review
for Activity/Project that is Exempt or
Categorically Excluded Not Subject to Section 58.5
Pursuant to 24 CFR 58.34(a) and 58.35(b)**

Project Information

Project Name: CDBG---2020---OEWD---Econ-Dev

HEROS Number: 900000010120793

State / Local Identifier:

Project Location: 1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett Pl, San Francisco, CA 94102

Additional Location Information:

N/A

Description of the Proposed Project [24 CFR 50.12 & 58.32; 40 CFR 1508.25]:

Economic Development activities including revolving loan funds, small business loans, and commercial corridor revitalization.

Level of Environmental Review Determination:

Activity / Project is Categorically Excluded Not Subject to per 24 CFR 58.35(b):
58.35(b)(4)

Funding Information

Grant Number	HUD Program	Program Name
B20MC060016	Community Planning and Development (CPD)	Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) (Entitlement)

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount: \$401,430.00

Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a) (5)]: \$401,430.00

Mitigation Measures and Conditions [CFR 1505.2(c)]:

Summarized below are all mitigation measures adopted by the Responsible Entity to reduce, avoid or eliminate adverse environmental impacts and to avoid non-compliance or non-conformance with the above-listed authorities and factors. These measures/conditions must be incorporated into project

contracts, development agreements and other relevant documents. The staff responsible for implementing and monitoring mitigation measures should be clearly identified in the mitigation plan.

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure or Condition	Comments on Completed Measures	Complete
---------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------

Preparer Signature: Eugene T Flannery Date: 03/06/2020

Name / Title/ Organization: Eugene Flannery / / SAN FRANCISCO

Responsible Entity Agency Official Signature: _____ Date: _____

Name/ Title: _____

This original, signed document and related supporting material must be retained on file by the Responsible Entity in an Environment Review Record (ERR) for the activity / project (ref: 24 CFR Part 58.38) and in accordance with recordkeeping requirements for the HUD program(s).

2020-2021 CDBG Projects

Level of Review - 58.35(b)(4). Economic development activities, including but not limited to, equipment purchase, inventory financing, interest subsidy, operating expenses and similar costs not associated with construction or expansion of existing operations;

Agency Name	Address	Project Description	CDBG Funding Amount
Main Street Launch	2101 Webster St #1200, Oakland, CA 94612	Revolving Loan Fund and Emerging Business Loan Fund	\$39,869
Mission Asset Fund	3269 Mission Street 94110	Small business loans and financial coaching	\$70,000
Bay Area Community Resources, Inc., fiscal sponsor of Portola Neighborhood Association	2555 San Bruno Avenue 94134	Portola San Bruno Avenue commercial corridor revitalization - The PNA will maintain and run green education and community building programs	\$70,000
Excelsior Action Group	35 San Juan Avenue 94112	Excelsior Small Business Resiliency Project	\$46,561
Mission Economic Development Agency	2301 Mission Street 94110	Excelsior/Outer Mission commercial corridor revitalization	\$20,000
Mission Economic Development Agency	2301 Mission Street 94110	Mission Street commercial corridor revitalization	\$15,000
North of Market Neighborhood Improvement Corporation	25 Taylor Street 94102	Tenderloin commercial corridor revitalization	\$80,000
Ocean Avenue Association	1728 Ocean Ave #154, 94112	Ocean Avenue commercial corridor revitalization and technical assistance	\$40,000
Renaissance Entrepreneurship Center	275 5 th Street 994103	Technical assistance to Lower Fillmore commercial corridor small businesses	\$20,000

Total CDBG Economic Development Activities			\$401,430
--	--	--	-----------



U.S. Department of Housing and Urban
Development
451 Seventh Street, SW
Washington, DC 20410
www.hud.gov
espanol.hud.gov

**Environmental Review
for Activity/Project that is Exempt or
Categorically Excluded Not Subject to Section 58.5
Pursuant to 24 CFR 58.34(a) and 58.35(b)**

Project Information

Project Name: ESG--2020-MOHCD/HSA-Admin

HEROS Number: 900000010120795

State / Local Identifier:

Project Location: 1 S Van Ness Ave, San Francisco, CA 94103

Additional Location Information:
N/A

Description of the Proposed Project [24 CFR 50.12 & 58.32; 40 CFR 1508.25]:
Administrative costs for ESG progrms

Level of Environmental Review Determination
Activity / Project is Exempt per 24 CFR 58.34(a):
58.34(a)(3)

Funding Information

Grant Number	HUD Program	Program Name
E20MC060016	Community Planning and Development (CPD)	Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG) Program

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount: \$171,707.00

Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a) (5)]: \$171,707.00

Mitigation Measures and Conditions [CFR 1505.2(c)]:

Summarized below are all mitigation measures adopted by the Responsible Entity to reduce, avoid or eliminate adverse environmental impacts and to avoid non-compliance or non-conformance with the above-listed authorities and factors. These measures/conditions must be incorporated into project contracts, development agreements and other relevant documents. The staff responsible for implementing and monitoring mitigation measures should be clearly identified in the mitigation plan.

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure or Condition	Comments on Completed Measures	Complete
---------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------

Preparer Signature: Eugene T Flannery Date: 03/10/2020

Name / Title / Organization: Eugene Flannery / / SAN FRANCISCO

Responsible Entity Agency Official Signature: _____ Date: _____

Name / Title: _____

This original, signed document and related supporting material must be retained on file by the Responsible Entity in an Environment Review Record (ERR) for the activity / project (ref: 24 CFR Part 58.38) and in accordance with recordkeeping requirements for the HUD program(s).

2020-2021 ESG Projects

2020-2021 ESG Projects			
Level of Review: 58.34(a)(1) Administrative and Management Activities			
Agency Name	Address	Project Description	ESG Funding Amount
Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing	25 Van Ness Avenue 94102	General ESG administration	\$81171
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	1 South Van Ness Avenue 94103	General ESG administration	\$29914
Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing	25 Van Ness Avenue 94102	HMIS	\$60622
Total ESG Administrative		Subtotal	\$171707.00



U.S. Department of Housing and Urban
Development
451 Seventh Street, SW
Washington, DC 20410
www.hud.gov
espanol.hud.gov

**Environmental Review
for Activity/Project that is Exempt or
Categorically Excluded Not Subject to Section 58.5
Pursuant to 24 CFR 58.34(a) and 58.35(b)**

Project Information

Project Name: ESG---2020---Programs

HEROS Number: 900000010120797

State / Local Identifier:

Project Location: 1 S Van Ness Ave, San Francisco, CA 94103

Additional Location Information:

N/A

Description of the Proposed Project [24 CFR 50.12 & 58.32; 40 CFR 1508.25]:

Emergency Solutions programs including homelessness prevention, emergency shelter operations, and rapid rehousing services.

Level of Environmental Review Determination

Activity / Project is Exempt per 24 CFR 58.34(a):

58.34(a)(4)

Funding Information

Grant Number	HUD Program	Program Name
E20MC060016	Community Planning and Development (CPD)	Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG) Program

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount: \$1,423,716.00

Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a) (5)]: \$1,423,716.00

Mitigation Measures and Conditions [CFR 1505.2(c)]:

Summarized below are all mitigation measures adopted by the Responsible Entity to reduce, avoid or eliminate adverse environmental impacts and to avoid non-compliance or non-conformance with the above-listed authorities and factors. These measures/conditions must be incorporated into project

contracts, development agreements and other relevant documents. The staff responsible for implementing and monitoring mitigation measures should be clearly identified in the mitigation plan.

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure or Condition	Comments on Completed Measures	Complete
---------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------

Preparer Signature: Eugene T Flannery Date: 03/06/2020

Name / Title/ Organization: Eugene Flannery / / SAN FRANCISCO

Responsible Entity Agency Official Signature: _____ Date: _____

Name/ Title: _____

This original, signed document and related supporting material must be retained on file by the Responsible Entity in an Environment Review Record (ERR) for the activity / project (ref: 24 CFR Part 58.38) and in accordance with recordkeeping requirements for the HUD program(s).

2020-2021 ESG Projects

Level of Review: 58.34(a)(4). Public services that will not have a physical impact or result in any physical changes, including but not limited to services concerned with employment, crime prevention, child care, health, drug abuse, education, counseling, energy conservation and welfare or recreational needs;

Agency Name	Address	Project Description	ESG Funding Amount
Catholic Charities CYO of the Archdiocese of San Francisco	990 Eddy Street 94109	Homelessness prevention services	\$212,943
Central City Hospitality House	290 Turk Street 94102	Emergency shelter essential services	\$73,000
Community Awareness & Treatment Services, Inc.	1171 Mission Street 94103	Emergency shelter essential services	\$55,000
Compass Family Services	37 Grove Street 94102	Emergency shelter essential services	\$96,000
Compass Family Services	37 Grove Street 94102	Homelessness prevention services	\$53,944
Dolores Street Community Services, Inc.	938 Valencia Street 94110	Emergency shelter essential services	\$55,000
Episcopal Community Services of San Francisco	201 8 th Street 94103	Emergency shelter operations	\$89,000
Episcopal Community Services of San Francisco	165 8 th Street 94103	Rapid rehousing services	\$53,943
Hamilton Families	260 Golden Gate Avenue 94102	Emergency shelter essential services	\$55,000
Hamilton Families	273 9 th Street 94103	Rapid rehousing services	\$191,943
Homeless Children's Network	3450 3rd Street #1c, 94124	Emergency shelter essential services	\$55,000
La Casa de las Madres	1269 Howard Street 94103	Emergency shelter essential services	\$165,000

2020-2021 ESG Projects

Level of Review: 58.34(a)(4). Public services that will not have a physical impact or result in any physical changes, including but not limited to services concerned with employment, crime prevention, child care, health, drug abuse, education, counseling, energy conservation and welfare or recreational needs;

Larkin Street Youth Services	129 Hyde Street 94106	Emergency shelter essential services	\$112,000
Mission Area Health Associates, dba Mission Neighborhood Health Center	240 Shotwell St #1323 94110	Homelessness prevention services	\$55,943
Providence Foundation of San Francisco	4601 3rd Street 94124	Emergency shelter essential services	\$50,000
The San Francisco Particular Council of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, dba St. Vincent	525 5th Street 94107	Emergency shelter operations	\$50,000
Total ESG Public Service			\$1,423,716.00



U.S. Department of Housing and Urban
Development
451 Seventh Street, SW
Washington, DC 20410
www.hud.gov
espanol.hud.gov

**Environmental Review
for Activity/Project that is Exempt or
Categorically Excluded Not Subject to Section 58.5
Pursuant to 24 CFR 58.34(a) and 58.35(b)**

Project Information

Project Name: HOPWA---2020-

HEROS Number: 900000010120799

State / Local Identifier:

Project Location: 1 S Van Ness Ave, San Francisco, CA 94103

Additional Location Information:

N/A

Description of the Proposed Project [24 CFR 50.12 & 58.32; 40 CFR 1508.25]:

Housing information and referral project for HOPWA clients

Level of Environmental Review Determination

Activity / Project is Exempt per 24 CFR 58.34(a):

58.34(a)(2)

Funding Information

Grant Number	HUD Program	Program Name
B20MC060016	Community Planning and Development (CPD)	Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS (HOPWA)

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount: \$48,000.00

Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a) (5)]: \$48,000.00

Mitigation Measures and Conditions [CFR 1505.2(c)]:

Summarized below are all mitigation measures adopted by the Responsible Entity to reduce, avoid or eliminate adverse environmental impacts and to avoid non-compliance or non-conformance with the above-listed authorities and factors. These measures/conditions must be incorporated into project contracts, development agreements and other relevant documents. The staff responsible for implementing and monitoring mitigation measures should be clearly identified in the mitigation plan.

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure or Condition	Comments on Completed Measures	Complete
---------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------

Preparer Signature: Eugene T Flannery Date: 03/06/2020

Name / Title/ Organization: Eugene Flannery / / SAN FRANCISCO

Responsible Entity Agency Official Signature: _____ Date: _____

Name/ Title: _____

This original, signed document and related supporting material must be retained on file by the Responsible Entity in an Environment Review Record (ERR) for the activity / project (ref: 24 CFR Part 58.38) and in accordance with recordkeeping requirements for the HUD program(s).

2020-2021 HOPWA Projects

2020-2021 HOPWA Projects			
Level of Review: 58.34(a)(2) - Information and financial services;			
Agency Name	Address	Project Description	HOPWA Funding Amount
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	1 South Van Ness Avenue 94102	Housing information and referral project	\$48,000
Total HOPWA Information Services			\$48,000



U.S. Department of Housing and Urban
Development
451 Seventh Street, SW
Washington, DC 20410
www.hud.gov
espanol.hud.gov

**Environmental Review
for Activity/Project that is Exempt or
Categorically Excluded Not Subject to Section 58.5
Pursuant to 24 CFR 58.34(a) and 58.35(b)**

Project Information

Project Name: HOPWA--2020--Admin

HEROS Number: 900000010120907

State / Local Identifier:

Project Location: 1 S Van Ness Ave, San Francisco, CA 94103

Additional Location Information:
N/A

Description of the Proposed Project [24 CFR 50.12 & 58.32; 40 CFR 1508.25]:
General HOPWA Administration

Level of Environmental Review Determination
Activity / Project is Exempt per 24 CFR 58.34(a):
58.34(a)(3)

Funding Information

Grant Number	HUD Program	Program Name
CAH20F003	Community Planning and Development (CPD)	Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS (HOPWA)

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount: \$187,654.00

Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a) (5)]: \$187,654.00

Mitigation Measures and Conditions [CFR 1505.2(c)]:

Summarized below are all mitigation measures adopted by the Responsible Entity to reduce, avoid or eliminate adverse environmental impacts and to avoid non-compliance or non-conformance with the above-listed authorities and factors. These measures/conditions must be incorporated into project contracts, development agreements and other relevant documents. The staff responsible for implementing and monitoring mitigation measures should be clearly identified in the mitigation plan.

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure or Condition	Comments on Completed Measures	Complete
---------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------

Preparer Signature: Eugene T Flannery Date: 03/10/2020

Name / Title/ Organization: Eugene Flannery / / SAN FRANCISCO

Responsible Entity Agency Official Signature: _____ Date: _____

Name/ Title: _____

This original, signed document and related supporting material must be retained on file by the Responsible Entity in an Environment Review Record (ERR) for the activity / project (ref: 24 CFR Part 58.38) and in accordance with recordkeeping requirements for the HUD program(s).

2020-2021 HOPWA Projects

Level of Review: 58.34(a)(3). Administrative and management activities;

Agency Name	Address	Project Description	HOPWA Funding Amount
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development		General HOPWA administration	\$187,654
Total HOPWA Administrative			\$187,654.



U.S. Department of Housing and Urban
Development
451 Seventh Street, SW
Washington, DC 20410
www.hud.gov
espanol.hud.gov

**Environmental Review
for Activity/Project that is Exempt or
Categorically Excluded Not Subject to Section 58.5
Pursuant to 24 CFR 58.34(a) and 58.35(b)**

Project Information

Project Name: HOPWA---2020-Supportive-Services

HEROS Number: 900000010120958

State / Local Identifier:

Project Location: 1 South Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94103

Additional Location Information:

N/A

Description of the Proposed Project [24 CFR 50.12 & 58.32; 40 CFR 1508.25]:

Services associated with HIV/AIDS Long-term rental subsidy program, RCF-CI for people with HIV/AIDS, transitional housing for people with HIV/AIDS

Level of Environmental Review Determination:

Activity / Project is Categorically Excluded Not Subject to per 24 CFR 58.35(b):
58.35(b)(2)

Funding Information

Grant Number	HUD Program	Program Name
CAH20F003	Community Planning and Development (CPD)	Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS (HOPWA)

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount: \$2,715,352.00

Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a) (5)]: \$2,715,352.00

Mitigation Measures and Conditions [CFR 1505.2(c)]:

Summarized below are all mitigation measures adopted by the Responsible Entity to reduce, avoid or eliminate adverse environmental impacts and to avoid non-compliance or non-conformance with the above-listed authorities and factors. These measures/conditions must be incorporated into project

contracts, development agreements and other relevant documents. The staff responsible for implementing and monitoring mitigation measures should be clearly identified in the mitigation plan.

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure or Condition	Comments on Completed Measures	Complete
---------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------

Preparer Signature: Eugene T Flannery Date: 03/09/2020

Name / Title/ Organization: Eugene Flannery / / SAN FRANCISCO

Responsible Entity Agency Official Signature: _____ Date: _____

Name/ Title: _____

This original, signed document and related supporting material must be retained on file by the Responsible Entity in an Environment Review Record (ERR) for the activity / project (ref: 24 CFR Part 58.38) and in accordance with recordkeeping requirements for the HUD program(s).

2020-2021 HOPWA Projects

Level of Review: 58.35(b)(2). Supportive services including, but not limited to, health care, housing services, permanent housing placement, day care, nutritional services, short-term payments for rent/mortgage/utility costs, and assistance in gaining access to local, State, and Federal government benefits and services;

Agency Name	Address	Project Description	HOPWA Funding Amount
Catholic Charities CYO of the Archdiocese of San Francisco	990 Eddy Street 94109	Services Associated with HIV/AIDS Long-Term Rental Subsidy Program	\$261,016
Catholic Charities CYO of the Archdiocese of San Francisco	141 Leland Avenue	RCF-CI (Residential Care Facility for the Chronically Ill) for people with HIV/AIDS	\$326,488
Catholic Charities CYO of the Archdiocese of San Francisco	1340 Golden Gate Avenue	RCF-CI (Residential Care Facility for the Chronically Ill) for people with HIV/AIDS	\$758,187
Dolores Street Community Services, Inc.	201 Dolores Street	RCF-CI (Residential Care Facility for the Chronically Ill) for people with HIV/AIDS	\$479,350
Larkin Street Youth Services	134 Golden Gate Avenue	RCF-CI (Residential Care Facility for the Chronically Ill) for people with HIV/AIDS	\$348,144
Maitri Compassionate Care	401 Duboce Avenue	RCF-CI (Residential Care Facility for the Chronically Ill) for people with HIV/AIDS	\$492,167
Rafiki Coalition for Health and Wellness		Transitional housing for persons with HIV/AIDS	\$50,000
Total HOPWA Supportive Services			\$2,715,352.00



U.S. Department of Housing and Urban
Development
451 Seventh Street, SW
Washington, DC 20410
www.hud.gov
espanol.hud.gov

**Environmental Review
for Activity/Project that is Exempt or
Categorically Excluded Not Subject to Section 58.5
Pursuant to 24 CFR 58.34(a) and 58.35(b)**

Project Information

Project Name: HOPWA---2020---Operating-Costs

HEROS Number: 900000010120972

State / Local Identifier:

Project Location: 1 S Van Ness Ave, San Francisco, CA 94103

Additional Location Information:

N/A

Description of the Proposed Project [24 CFR 50.12 & 58.32; 40 CFR 1508.25]:

Operating costs for a residence for persons with HIV/AIDS

Level of Environmental Review Determination:

Activity / Project is Categorically Excluded Not Subject to per 24 CFR 58.35(b):

58.35(b)(3)

Funding Information

Grant Number	HUD Program	Program Name
CAH20F003	Community Planning and Development (CPD)	Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS (HOPWA)

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount: \$50,000.00

Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a) (5)]: \$50,000.00

Mitigation Measures and Conditions [CFR 1505.2(c)]:

Summarized below are all mitigation measures adopted by the Responsible Entity to reduce, avoid or eliminate adverse environmental impacts and to avoid non-compliance or non-conformance with the above-listed authorities and factors. These measures/conditions must be incorporated into project contracts, development agreements and other relevant documents. The staff responsible for implementing and monitoring mitigation measures should be clearly identified in the mitigation plan.

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure or Condition	Comments on Completed Measures	Complete
------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------------	----------

Preparer Signature: Eugene T Flannery Date: 03/09/2020

Name / Title/ Organization: Eugene Flannery / / SAN FRANCISCO

Responsible Entity Agency Official Signature: _____ Date: _____

Name/ Title: _____

This original, signed document and related supporting material must be retained on file by the Responsible Entity in an Environment Review Record (ERR) for the activity / project (ref: 24 CFR Part 58.38) and in accordance with recordkeeping requirements for the HUD program(s).

2020-2021 HOPWA Projects

Level of Review: 58.35(b)(3) - Operating costs including maintenance, security, operation, utilities, furnishings, equipment, supplies, staff training and recruitment and other incidental costs;

Agency Name	Address	Project Description	HOPWA Funding Amount
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	1 South Van Ness Avenue 94102	Operating costs for a residence for persons with HIV/AIDS	\$50,000
Total HOPWA operating Costs			\$50,000.00



U.S. Department of Housing and Urban
Development
451 Seventh Street, SW
Washington, DC 20410
www.hud.gov
espanol.hud.gov

**Environmental Review
for Activity/Project that is Exempt or
Categorically Excluded Not Subject to Section 58.5
Pursuant to 24 CFR 58.34(a) and 58.35(b)**

Project Information

Project Name: HOPWA---2020---MOHCD---Rental-Subsidy

HEROS Number: 900000010120946

State / Local Identifier:

Project Location: 1 S Van Ness Ave, San Francisco, CA 94103

Additional Location Information:

N/A

Description of the Proposed Project [24 CFR 50.12 & 58.32; 40 CFR 1508.25]:

Long term rental subsidy and housing advocacy program for person with HIV/AIDS

Level of Environmental Review Determination:

Activity / Project is Categorically Excluded Not Subject to per 24 CFR 58.35(b):

58.35(b)(1)

Funding Information

Grant Number	HUD Program	Program Name
CAH20F003	Community Planning and Development (CPD)	Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS (HOPWA)

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount: \$3,453,166.00

Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a) (5)]: \$3,453,166.00

Mitigation Measures and Conditions [CFR 1505.2(c)]:

Summarized below are all mitigation measures adopted by the Responsible Entity to reduce, avoid or eliminate adverse environmental impacts and to avoid non-compliance or non-conformance with the above-listed authorities and factors. These measures/conditions must be incorporated into project contracts, development agreements and other relevant documents. The staff responsible for implementing and monitoring mitigation measures should be clearly identified in the mitigation plan.

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure or Condition	Comments on Completed Measures	Complete
---------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------

Preparer Signature: Eugene T Flannery Date: 03/10/2020

Name / Title/ Organization: Eugene Flannery / / SAN FRANCISCO

Responsible Entity Agency Official Signature: _____ Date: _____

Name/ Title: _____

This original, signed document and related supporting material must be retained on file by the Responsible Entity in an Environment Review Record (ERR) for the activity / project (ref: 24 CFR Part 58.38) and in accordance with recordkeeping requirements for the HUD program(s).

2020-2021 HOPWA Projects
Level of Review: 58.35(b)(1) . Tenant-based rental assistance;

Agency Name	Address	Project Description	HOPWA Funding
Catholic Charities CYO of the Archdiocese of San Francisco	990 Eddy Street 94109	Partial rental subsidy program for people with HIV/AIDS	\$300,000
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	1 South Van Ness Avenue 94102	Long term rental subsidy and housing advocacy program for persons with HIV/AIDS	\$3,153,166
Total HOPWA Tenant Based Rental Assistance			\$3,453,166.00



U.S. Department of Housing and Urban
Development
451 Seventh Street, SW
Washington, DC 20410
www.hud.gov
espanol.hud.gov

**Environmental Review
for Activity/Project that is Exempt or
Categorically Excluded Not Subject to Section 58.5
Pursuant to 24 CFR 58.34(a) and 58.35(b)**

Project Information

Project Name: HOME---2020---Admin

HEROS Number: 900000010120984

State / Local Identifier:

Project Location: 1 S Van Ness Ave, San Francisco, CA 94103

Additional Location Information:

N/A

Description of the Proposed Project [24 CFR 50.12 & 58.32; 40 CFR 1508.25]:

General HOME Administration

Level of Environmental Review Determination

Activity / Project is Exempt per 24 CFR 58.34(a):

58.34(a)(3)

Funding Information

Grant Number	HUD Program	Program Name
M20MC060213	Community Planning and Development (CPD)	HOME Program

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount: \$690,344.00

Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a) (5)]: \$690,344.00

Mitigation Measures and Conditions [CFR 1505.2(c)]:

Summarized below are all mitigation measures adopted by the Responsible Entity to reduce, avoid or eliminate adverse environmental impacts and to avoid non-compliance or non-conformance with the above-listed authorities and factors. These measures/conditions must be incorporated into project contracts, development agreements and other relevant documents. The staff responsible for implementing and monitoring mitigation measures should be clearly identified in the mitigation plan.

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure or Condition	Comments on Completed Measures	Complete
---------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------

Preparer Signature: Eugene T Flannery Date: 03/10/2020

Name / Title/ Organization: Eugene Flannery / / SAN FRANCISCO

Responsible Entity Agency Official Signature: _____ Date: _____

Name/ Title: _____

This original, signed document and related supporting material must be retained on file by the Responsible Entity in an Environment Review Record (ERR) for the activity / project (ref: 24 CFR Part 58.38) and in accordance with recordkeeping requirements for the HUD program(s).

2020-2021 HOME Projects

2020-2021 HOME Projects			
Level of Review: 58.34(a)(3). Administrative and management activities			
Agency Name	Address	Project Description	HOME Funding Amount
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	1 South Van Ness Avenue 94102	General HOME administration	\$540,344
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	1 South Van Ness Avenue 94102	Housing Development Grants for CHDOs	\$150,000
Total HOME Administrative			\$690,344.00

2020-2021 HOPWA Proposed Expenditure Schedule

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

San Francisco HOPWA Projects

The following is a list of proposed expenditures for the 2020-2021 HOPWA program. The list of recommended projects is organized by five-year objectives, priority needs and goals that are described in the 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan. While a recommended project may meet more than one goal, it is only listed under its primary goal.

Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed

- **Priority Need 1B: Make Housing More Affordable**
 - **Goal 1Bii. Increase affordability of rental housing**

Agency Name	Project Description	CDBG Funding Amount
Catholic Charities CYO of the Archdiocese of San Francisco	Services Associated with HIV/AIDS Long-Term Rental Subsidy Program	\$261,016
	Subtotal	\$261,016

Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed

- **Priority Need 1D: Provide Services to Maintain Housing Stability**
 - **Goal 1Diii. Provide support for other affordable housing residents to ensure success in their housing placement**

Agency Name	Project Description	HOPWA Funding Amount
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	Housing information and referral project	\$48,000
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	Long term rental subsidy and housing advocacy program for persons with HIV/AIDS	\$3,153,166
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	Operating costs for a residence for persons with HIV/AIDS	\$50,000
Rafiki Coalition for Health and Wellness	Transitional housing for persons with HIV/AIDS	\$50,000
	Subtotal	\$3,301,166

Objective 1: Families and Individuals are Stably Housed

- **Priority Need 1D: Provide Services to Maintain Housing Stability**
 - **Goal 1Div. Increase collaboration between healthcare and housing systems by increasing mobility between levels of care (high to low acuity) in residential settings for HIV+ households**

Agency Name	Project Description	HOPWA Funding Amount
Catholic Charities CYO of the Archdiocese of San Francisco	RCF-CI (Residential Care Facility for the Chronically Ill) for people with HIV/AIDS	\$326,488
Catholic Charities CYO of the Archdiocese of San Francisco	RCF-CI (Residential Care Facility for the Chronically Ill) for people with HIV/AIDS	\$758,187

2020-2021 HOPWA Proposed Expenditure Schedule

Agency Name	Project Description	HOPWA Funding Amount
Catholic Charities CYO of the Archdiocese of San Francisco	Partial rental subsidy program for people with HIV/AIDS (includes \$100,000 in HOPWA reprogrammed funds)	\$100,000
Dolores Street Community Services, Inc.	RCF-CI (Residential Care Facility for the Chronically Ill) for people with HIV/AIDS	\$479,350
Larkin Street Youth Services	RCF-CI (Residential Care Facility for the Chronically Ill) for people with HIV/AIDS	\$348,144
Maitri Compassionate Care	RCF-CI (Residential Care Facility for the Chronically Ill) for people with HIV/AIDS	\$492,167
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	Capital pool - HOPWA (includes \$1,200,000 in HOPWA program income and \$1,900,000 in HOPWA reprogrammed funds)	\$3,200,992
	Subtotal	\$5,705,328

Administration Costs

Agency Name	Project Description	HOPWA Funding Amount
Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	General HOPWA administration	\$187,654
	Subtotal	\$187,654

TOTAL 2020-2021 SAN FRANCISCO HOPWA: \$9,455,164

San Mateo HOPWA Projects

Agency Name	Project Description	HOPWA Funding Amount
San Mateo: Mental Health Association of San Mateo	Housing information referrals and assistance with locating affordable/appropriate housing units for very low-income persons living with HIV/AIDS	\$28,350
San Mateo: Mental Health Association of San Mateo	Project sponsor administrative expenses	\$ 43,679
San Mateo: Mental Health Association of San Mateo	HUD-defined move-in costs (e.g., deposits) for very low-income persons living with HIV/AIDS	\$25,000
San Mateo: Mental Health Association of San Mateo	Short-term housing subsidies, including pre- and post-placement housing advocacy services for very low-income persons living with HIV/AIDS	\$ 565,654
San Mateo: San Mateo County STD/HIV Program	Comprehensive case management and community-based services for very low-income persons with HIV/AIDS	\$149,382
	Subtotal	\$812,065

TOTAL 2020-2021 SAN MATEO HOPWA: \$812,065

2020-2021 HOPWA Proposed Expenditure Schedule

TOTAL 2020-2021 HOPWA: \$10,267,229

Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
City and County of San Francisco



London N. Breed
Mayor

Eric D. Shaw
Director

TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: Benjamin McCloskey, Deputy Director Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

DATE: April 27, 2020

SUBJECT: Accept and Expend Resolution for Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) Grant

GRANT TITLE: Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) Grant

Attached please find the original and 2 copies of each of the following:

- X Proposed resolution; original signed by Department, Mayor, Controller
- X Grant information form
- X Grant budget
- N/A Ethics Form 126
- N/A Grant application
- N/A Grant award letter from funding agency
- N/A Grant agreement
- N/A Other (Explain):

Departmental representative to receive a copy of the adopted resolution:

Name: Benjamin McCloskey
Phone: 701-5575
Interoffice Mail Address: Benjamin.McCloskey@sfgov.org
Certified copy required Yes No

(Note: certified copies have the seal of the City/County affixed and are occasionally required by funding agencies. In most cases ordinary copies without the seal are sufficient).

From: [Peacock, Rebecca \(MYR\)](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Kittler, Sophia \(MYR\)](#); [Chan, Amy \(MYR\)](#); [Duning, Anna \(MYR\)](#); [Kirkpatrick, Kelly \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: Mayor -- [Resolution] -- [Apply for, Accept, and Expend Grant - U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development - Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS Program - \$10,267,229 - FY2020-2021]
Date: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 5:27:13 PM
Attachments: [2. Cover Memo.pdf](#)
[3. Grant Information Form.pdf](#)
[4. Grant Expenditure.pdf](#)
[5. Environmental Review Record 2020 Part 58 Programs.pdf](#)
[FW FY 2020-21 HUD Funding Resolutions request.msg](#)
[FW FY 2020-21 HUD Funding Resolutions request.msg](#)
[1a. 20-21 HOPWA BOS Resolution.docx](#)
[1b. Signed HOPWA Resolution.pdf](#)

Attached for introduction to the Board of Supervisors is a **resolution approving the FY2020-2021 Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (“HOPWA”) Program; and authorizing the Mayor, on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco, to apply for, accept, and expend the City’s FY2020-2021 HOPWA Program entitlement from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development in the amount of \$7,067,229 and to expend program income and reprogrammed funds in the amount of \$3,200,000 for a combined total of \$10,267,229 for the period of July 1, 2020 through June 30, 2025.**

Eric Shaw’s and Jocelyn Quintos’ approvals are attached.

[@Kirkpatrick, Kelly \(MYR\)](#), can you “reply-all” with your approval? Thanks!

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Rebecca Peacock ([they/she](#))
(415) 554-6982 | Rebecca.Peacock@sfgov.org
Office of Mayor London N. Breed
City & County of San Francisco

*** I am working remotely. Please call me at 267-663-8648 with any questions ****

Agency Name	2020-2021 HOPWA
Catholic Charities CYO of the Archdiocese of San Francisco	\$ 758,187.00
Catholic Charities CYO of the Archdiocese of San Francisco	\$ 326,488.00
Catholic Charities CYO of the Archdiocese of San Francisco	\$ 261,016.00
Catholic Charities CYO of the Archdiocese of San Francisco	\$ 100,000.00
Dolores Street Community Services, Inc.	\$ 479,350.00
Larkin Street Youth Services	\$ 348,144.00
Maitri Compassionate Care	\$ 492,167.00
Rafiki Coalition for Health and Wellness	\$ 50,000.00

\$ 2,815,352



San Francisco Ethics Commission

25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220, San Francisco, CA 94102

Phone: 415.252.3100 . Fax: 415.252.3112

ethics.commission@sfgov.org . www.sfethics.org

Received On:

File #: 200461

Bid/RFP #:

Notification of Contract Approval

SFEC Form 126(f)4

(S.F. Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code § 1.126(f)4)

A Public Document

Each City elective officer who approves a contract that has a total anticipated or actual value of \$100,000 or more must file this form with the Ethics Commission within five business days of approval by: (a) the City elective officer, (b) any board on which the City elective officer serves, or (c) the board of any state agency on which an appointee of the City elective officer serves. For more information, see: <https://sfethics.org/compliance/city-officers/contract-approval-city-officers>

1. FILING INFORMATION

TYPE OF FILING	DATE OF ORIGINAL FILING (for amendment only)
Original	
AMENDMENT DESCRIPTION – Explain reason for amendment	

2. CITY ELECTIVE OFFICE OR BOARD

OFFICE OR BOARD	NAME OF CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER
Board of Supervisors	Members

3. FILER'S CONTACT

NAME OF FILER'S CONTACT	TELEPHONE NUMBER
Angela Calvillo	415-554-5184
FULL DEPARTMENT NAME	EMAIL
office of the clerk of the Board	Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

4. CONTRACTING DEPARTMENT CONTACT

NAME OF DEPARTMENTAL CONTACT	DEPARTMENT CONTACT TELEPHONE NUMBER
Michael King	415-701-4228
FULL DEPARTMENT NAME	DEPARTMENT CONTACT EMAIL
MYR Mayor's Office of Housing and Comm Dev	michael.king@sfgov.org

5. CONTRACTOR	
NAME OF CONTRACTOR Catholic Charities CYO of the Archdiocese of SF	TELEPHONE NUMBER 415-972-1211
STREET ADDRESS (including City, State and Zip Code) 990 Eddy Street, San Francisco, CA 94109	EMAIL jmeneses@CatholicCharitiesSF.org

6. CONTRACT		
DATE CONTRACT WAS APPROVED BY THE CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER(S)	ORIGINAL BID/RFP NUMBER	FILE NUMBER (If applicable) 200461
DESCRIPTION OF AMOUNT OF CONTRACT \$1,445,691		
NATURE OF THE CONTRACT (Please describe) \$100,000 HOPWA grant for partial rental subsidy program for people with HIV/AIDS \$261,016 HOPWA grant for housing stability services for long-term rental subsidy households \$326,488 HOPWA grant for a residential care facility for persons with HIV/AIDS \$758,187 HOPWA grant for a residential care facility for persons with HIV/AIDS		

7. COMMENTS

8. CONTRACT APPROVAL	
This contract was approved by:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	THE CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER(S) IDENTIFIED ON THIS FORM
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A BOARD ON WHICH THE CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER(S) SERVES Board of Supervisors
<input type="checkbox"/>	THE BOARD OF A STATE AGENCY ON WHICH AN APPOINTEE OF THE CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER(S) IDENTIFIED ON THIS FORM SITS

9. AFFILIATES AND SUBCONTRACTORS

List the names of (A) members of the contractor's board of directors; (B) the contractor's principal officers, including chief executive officer, chief financial officer, chief operating officer, or other persons with similar titles; (C) any individual or entity who has an ownership interest of 10 percent or more in the contractor; and (D) any subcontractor listed in the bid or contract.

#	LAST NAME/ENTITY/SUBCONTRACTOR	FIRST NAME	TYPE
1	Molinelli	Stephen	Board of Directors
2	McEligot	Kathleen	Board of Directors
3	McCarthy Allen	Sharon	Board of Directors
4	Bennett	Paula	Board of Directors
5	Boerio	Joe	Board of Directors
6	Borromeo	Theodore	Board of Directors
7	Brigham	Martha	Board of Directors
8	Bullian	Gregory	Board of Directors
9	Cardinal	Kathleen	Board of Directors
10	Connors	Timothy	Board of Directors
11	Gelt	Jerilyn	Board of Directors
12	Grogan	Kathleen	Board of Directors
13	Hultman	David	Board of Directors
14	Kane	Steven	Board of Directors
15	Kostelni	Hugo	Board of Directors
16	Leupp	Jay Paul	Board of Directors
17	Markus	Maura	Board of Directors
18	McGrath	Robert	Board of Directors
19	McInerney	Maureen	Board of Directors

9. AFFILIATES AND SUBCONTRACTORS

List the names of (A) members of the contractor's board of directors; (B) the contractor's principal officers, including chief executive officer, chief financial officer, chief operating officer, or other persons with similar titles; (C) any individual or entity who has an ownership interest of 10 percent or more in the contractor; and (D) any subcontractor listed in the bid or contract.

#	LAST NAME/ENTITY/SUBCONTRACTOR	FIRST NAME	TYPE
20	Mirek	Lori	Board of Directors
21	Regan	D. Paul	Board of Directors
22	Selfridge	Mike	Board of Directors
23	Sundby	George	Board of Directors
24	Theodore	Pierre	Board of Directors
25	Westray	Kenneth	Board of Directors
26	Whitney	Lori	Board of Directors
27	Wilch	Peter	Board of Directors
28	Cordileone	Salvatore	Board of Directors
29	Miller	Ann Gray	Board of Directors
30	Foedisch	Herbert	Board of Directors
31	Pautler	Michael	Board of Directors
32	Meneses	Jilma	CEO
33	Spindle	Keith	CFO
34			
35			
36			
37			
38			

9. AFFILIATES AND SUBCONTRACTORS

List the names of (A) members of the contractor’s board of directors; (B) the contractor’s principal officers, including chief executive officer, chief financial officer, chief operating officer, or other persons with similar titles; (C) any individual or entity who has an ownership interest of 10 percent or more in the contractor; and (D) any subcontractor listed in the bid or contract.

#	LAST NAME/ENTITY/SUBCONTRACTOR	FIRST NAME	TYPE
39			
40			
41			
42			
43			
44			
45			
46			
47			
48			
49			
50			

Check this box if you need to include additional names. Please submit a separate form with complete information. Select “Supplemental” for filing type.

10. VERIFICATION

I have used all reasonable diligence in preparing this statement. I have reviewed this statement and to the best of my knowledge the information I have provided here is true and complete.

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

<p>SIGNATURE OF CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER OR BOARD SECRETARY OR CLERK</p> <p>BOS Clerk of the Board</p>	<p>DATE SIGNED</p>
---	---------------------------



San Francisco Ethics Commission

25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220, San Francisco, CA 94102

Phone: 415.252.3100 . Fax: 415.252.3112

ethics.commission@sfgov.org . www.sfethics.org

Received On:

File #: 200461

Bid/RFP #:

Notification of Contract Approval

SFEC Form 126(f)4

(S.F. Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code § 1.126(f)4)

A Public Document

Each City elective officer who approves a contract that has a total anticipated or actual value of \$100,000 or more must file this form with the Ethics Commission within five business days of approval by: (a) the City elective officer, (b) any board on which the City elective officer serves, or (c) the board of any state agency on which an appointee of the City elective officer serves. For more information, see: <https://sfethics.org/compliance/city-officers/contract-approval-city-officers>

1. FILING INFORMATION

TYPE OF FILING	DATE OF ORIGINAL FILING (for amendment only)
Original	
AMENDMENT DESCRIPTION – Explain reason for amendment	

2. CITY ELECTIVE OFFICE OR BOARD

OFFICE OR BOARD	NAME OF CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER
Board of Supervisors	Members

3. FILER'S CONTACT

NAME OF FILER'S CONTACT	TELEPHONE NUMBER
Angela Calvillo	415-554-5184
FULL DEPARTMENT NAME	EMAIL
office of the clerk of the Board	Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

4. CONTRACTING DEPARTMENT CONTACT

NAME OF DEPARTMENTAL CONTACT	DEPARTMENT CONTACT TELEPHONE NUMBER
Michael King	415-701-4228
FULL DEPARTMENT NAME	DEPARTMENT CONTACT EMAIL
MYR Mayor's Office of Housing and Comm Dev	michael.king@sfgov.org

5. CONTRACTOR	
NAME OF CONTRACTOR Dolores Street Community Services, Inc.	TELEPHONE NUMBER 415-282-6209
STREET ADDRESS (including City, State and Zip Code) 938 Valencia Street, San Francisco, CA 94110	EMAIL laura@dscs.org

6. CONTRACT		
DATE CONTRACT WAS APPROVED BY THE CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER(S)	ORIGINAL BID/RFP NUMBER	FILE NUMBER (If applicable) 200461
DESCRIPTION OF AMOUNT OF CONTRACT \$479,350		
NATURE OF THE CONTRACT (Please describe) HOPWA grant for a residential care facility for persons with HIV/AIDS		

7. COMMENTS

8. CONTRACT APPROVAL	
This contract was approved by:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	THE CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER(S) IDENTIFIED ON THIS FORM
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A BOARD ON WHICH THE CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER(S) SERVES Board of Supervisors
<input type="checkbox"/>	THE BOARD OF A STATE AGENCY ON WHICH AN APPOINTEE OF THE CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER(S) IDENTIFIED ON THIS FORM SITS

9. AFFILIATES AND SUBCONTRACTORS

List the names of (A) members of the contractor's board of directors; (B) the contractor's principal officers, including chief executive officer, chief financial officer, chief operating officer, or other persons with similar titles; (C) any individual or entity who has an ownership interest of 10 percent or more in the contractor; and (D) any subcontractor listed in the bid or contract.

#	LAST NAME/ENTITY/SUBCONTRACTOR	FIRST NAME	TYPE
1	Regan	Monica	Board of Directors
2	Avila	Rocio	Board of Directors
3	Leonard-wookey	Anat	Board of Directors
4	Beinart	Amy	Board of Directors
5	Winn	Michael	Board of Directors
6	Bhakta	Chirag	Board of Directors
7	Lauderback	Justine	Board of Directors
8	Penfold	Ward	Board of Directors
9	Valdez	Laura	CEO
10	Jeffrys	Mason	CFO
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			

9. AFFILIATES AND SUBCONTRACTORS

List the names of (A) members of the contractor’s board of directors; (B) the contractor’s principal officers, including chief executive officer, chief financial officer, chief operating officer, or other persons with similar titles; (C) any individual or entity who has an ownership interest of 10 percent or more in the contractor; and (D) any subcontractor listed in the bid or contract.

#	LAST NAME/ENTITY/SUBCONTRACTOR	FIRST NAME	TYPE
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
29			
30			
31			
32			
33			
34			
35			
36			
37			
38			

9. AFFILIATES AND SUBCONTRACTORS

List the names of (A) members of the contractor’s board of directors; (B) the contractor’s principal officers, including chief executive officer, chief financial officer, chief operating officer, or other persons with similar titles; (C) any individual or entity who has an ownership interest of 10 percent or more in the contractor; and (D) any subcontractor listed in the bid or contract.

#	LAST NAME/ENTITY/SUBCONTRACTOR	FIRST NAME	TYPE
39			
40			
41			
42			
43			
44			
45			
46			
47			
48			
49			
50			

Check this box if you need to include additional names. Please submit a separate form with complete information. Select “Supplemental” for filing type.

10. VERIFICATION

I have used all reasonable diligence in preparing this statement. I have reviewed this statement and to the best of my knowledge the information I have provided here is true and complete.

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

<p>SIGNATURE OF CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER OR BOARD SECRETARY OR CLERK</p> <p>BOS Clerk of the Board</p>	<p>DATE SIGNED</p>
---	---------------------------



San Francisco Ethics Commission

25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220, San Francisco, CA 94102

Phone: 415.252.3100 . Fax: 415.252.3112

ethics.commission@sfgov.org . www.sfethics.org

Received On:

File #: 200461

Bid/RFP #:

Notification of Contract Approval

SFEC Form 126(f)4

(S.F. Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code § 1.126(f)4)

A Public Document

Each City elective officer who approves a contract that has a total anticipated or actual value of \$100,000 or more must file this form with the Ethics Commission within five business days of approval by: (a) the City elective officer, (b) any board on which the City elective officer serves, or (c) the board of any state agency on which an appointee of the City elective officer serves. For more information, see: <https://sfethics.org/compliance/city-officers/contract-approval-city-officers>

1. FILING INFORMATION

TYPE OF FILING	DATE OF ORIGINAL FILING (for amendment only)
Original	
AMENDMENT DESCRIPTION – Explain reason for amendment	

2. CITY ELECTIVE OFFICE OR BOARD

OFFICE OR BOARD	NAME OF CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER
Board of Supervisors	Members

3. FILER'S CONTACT

NAME OF FILER'S CONTACT	TELEPHONE NUMBER
Angela Calvillo	415-554-5184
FULL DEPARTMENT NAME	EMAIL
office of the clerk of the Board	Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

4. CONTRACTING DEPARTMENT CONTACT

NAME OF DEPARTMENTAL CONTACT	DEPARTMENT CONTACT TELEPHONE NUMBER
Michael King	415-701-4228
FULL DEPARTMENT NAME	DEPARTMENT CONTACT EMAIL
MYR Mayor's Office of Housing and Comm Dev	michael.king@sfgov.org

5. CONTRACTOR	
NAME OF CONTRACTOR Larkin Street Youth Services	TELEPHONE NUMBER 415-673-0911
STREET ADDRESS (including City, State and Zip Code) 134 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102	EMAIL sadams@larkinstreetyouth.org

6. CONTRACT		
DATE CONTRACT WAS APPROVED BY THE CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER(S)	ORIGINAL BID/RFP NUMBER	FILE NUMBER (If applicable) 200461
DESCRIPTION OF AMOUNT OF CONTRACT \$348,144		
NATURE OF THE CONTRACT (Please describe) HOPWA grant for a residential care facility for persons with HIV/AIDS		

7. COMMENTS

8. CONTRACT APPROVAL	
This contract was approved by:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	THE CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER(S) IDENTIFIED ON THIS FORM
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A BOARD ON WHICH THE CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER(S) SERVES Board of Supervisors
<input type="checkbox"/>	THE BOARD OF A STATE AGENCY ON WHICH AN APPOINTEE OF THE CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER(S) IDENTIFIED ON THIS FORM SITS

9. AFFILIATES AND SUBCONTRACTORS

List the names of (A) members of the contractor's board of directors; (B) the contractor's principal officers, including chief executive officer, chief financial officer, chief operating officer, or other persons with similar titles; (C) any individual or entity who has an ownership interest of 10 percent or more in the contractor; and (D) any subcontractor listed in the bid or contract.

#	LAST NAME/ENTITY/SUBCONTRACTOR	FIRST NAME	TYPE
1	Kramer	Terry	Board of Directors
2	Fatum	Art	Board of Directors
3	Hatvany	Nina	Board of Directors
4	Alexander	Suzi	Board of Directors
5	Avenier	Jeremy	Board of Directors
6	wysocki	Allison	Board of Directors
7	Berg	Siri	Board of Directors
8	Brahm	Jennifer	Board of Directors
9	Cameron	Cecily	Board of Directors
10	Cody	Daniel	Board of Directors
11	Famulener	Conor	Board of Directors
12	Grossman	Blake	Board of Directors
13	Henry	Jim	Board of Directors
14	Hicks	John	Board of Directors
15	Hoecker	Anne	Board of Directors
16	Johnson	Eric	Board of Directors
17	Kerzic	Rick	Board of Directors
18	Moise	Adam	Board of Directors
19	Newton Jr.	willis	Board of Directors

9. AFFILIATES AND SUBCONTRACTORS

List the names of (A) members of the contractor's board of directors; (B) the contractor's principal officers, including chief executive officer, chief financial officer, chief operating officer, or other persons with similar titles; (C) any individual or entity who has an ownership interest of 10 percent or more in the contractor; and (D) any subcontractor listed in the bid or contract.

#	LAST NAME/ENTITY/SUBCONTRACTOR	FIRST NAME	TYPE
20	Roos	Eric	Board of Directors
21	Schlein	Phil	Board of Directors
22	Schwartz	Aaron	Board of Directors
23	Shapiro	Sally	Board of Directors
24	Viola	John	Board of Directors
25	wibbelsman	Chuck	Board of Directors
26	Powell	Laura	Board of Directors
27	Garellick	Jeff	Board of Directors
28	Adams	Sherilyn	CEO
29	Hunter	Carol	CFO
30			
31			
32			
33			
34			
35			
36			
37			
38			

9. AFFILIATES AND SUBCONTRACTORS

List the names of (A) members of the contractor’s board of directors; (B) the contractor’s principal officers, including chief executive officer, chief financial officer, chief operating officer, or other persons with similar titles; (C) any individual or entity who has an ownership interest of 10 percent or more in the contractor; and (D) any subcontractor listed in the bid or contract.

#	LAST NAME/ENTITY/SUBCONTRACTOR	FIRST NAME	TYPE
39			
40			
41			
42			
43			
44			
45			
46			
47			
48			
49			
50			

Check this box if you need to include additional names. Please submit a separate form with complete information. Select “Supplemental” for filing type.

10. VERIFICATION

I have used all reasonable diligence in preparing this statement. I have reviewed this statement and to the best of my knowledge the information I have provided here is true and complete.

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

<p>SIGNATURE OF CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER OR BOARD SECRETARY OR CLERK</p> <p>BOS Clerk of the Board</p>	<p>DATE SIGNED</p>
---	---------------------------



San Francisco Ethics Commission

25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220, San Francisco, CA 94102

Phone: 415.252.3100 . Fax: 415.252.3112

ethics.commission@sfgov.org . www.sfethics.org

Received On:

File #: 200461

Bid/RFP #:

Notification of Contract Approval

SFEC Form 126(f)4

(S.F. Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code § 1.126(f)4)

A Public Document

Each City elective officer who approves a contract that has a total anticipated or actual value of \$100,000 or more must file this form with the Ethics Commission within five business days of approval by: (a) the City elective officer, (b) any board on which the City elective officer serves, or (c) the board of any state agency on which an appointee of the City elective officer serves. For more information, see: <https://sfethics.org/compliance/city-officers/contract-approval-city-officers>

1. FILING INFORMATION

TYPE OF FILING	DATE OF ORIGINAL FILING (for amendment only)
Original	
AMENDMENT DESCRIPTION – Explain reason for amendment	

2. CITY ELECTIVE OFFICE OR BOARD

OFFICE OR BOARD	NAME OF CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER
Board of Supervisors	Members

3. FILER'S CONTACT

NAME OF FILER'S CONTACT	TELEPHONE NUMBER
Angela Calvillo	415-554-5184
FULL DEPARTMENT NAME	EMAIL
office of the clerk of the Board	Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

4. CONTRACTING DEPARTMENT CONTACT

NAME OF DEPARTMENTAL CONTACT	DEPARTMENT CONTACT TELEPHONE NUMBER
Michael King	415-701-4228
FULL DEPARTMENT NAME	DEPARTMENT CONTACT EMAIL
MYR Mayor's Office of Housing and Comm Dev	michael.king@sfgov.org

5. CONTRACTOR	
NAME OF CONTRACTOR Maitri Compassionate Care	TELEPHONE NUMBER 415-558-3000
STREET ADDRESS (including City, State and Zip Code) 401 Duboce Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94117	EMAIL rsmith@maitrisf.org

6. CONTRACT		
DATE CONTRACT WAS APPROVED BY THE CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER(S)	ORIGINAL BID/RFP NUMBER	FILE NUMBER (If applicable) 200461
DESCRIPTION OF AMOUNT OF CONTRACT \$492,167		
NATURE OF THE CONTRACT (Please describe) HOPWA grant for a residential care facility for persons with HIV/AIDS		

7. COMMENTS

8. CONTRACT APPROVAL	
This contract was approved by:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	THE CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER(S) IDENTIFIED ON THIS FORM
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A BOARD ON WHICH THE CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER(S) SERVES Board of Supervisors
<input type="checkbox"/>	THE BOARD OF A STATE AGENCY ON WHICH AN APPOINTEE OF THE CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER(S) IDENTIFIED ON THIS FORM SITS

9. AFFILIATES AND SUBCONTRACTORS

List the names of (A) members of the contractor's board of directors; (B) the contractor's principal officers, including chief executive officer, chief financial officer, chief operating officer, or other persons with similar titles; (C) any individual or entity who has an ownership interest of 10 percent or more in the contractor; and (D) any subcontractor listed in the bid or contract.

#	LAST NAME/ENTITY/SUBCONTRACTOR	FIRST NAME	TYPE
1	King	James	Board of Directors
2	wong-Smith	Jane	Board of Directors
3	williams	Patrick	Board of Directors
4	Sallot	Jeffrey	Board of Directors
5	Vigna	William	Board of Directors
6	LaPointe	Ray	Board of Directors
7	Neimeyer	Michael	Board of Directors
8	Casado	Johannes	Board of Directors
9	Smith	Rusty	CEO
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			

9. AFFILIATES AND SUBCONTRACTORS

List the names of (A) members of the contractor's board of directors; (B) the contractor's principal officers, including chief executive officer, chief financial officer, chief operating officer, or other persons with similar titles; (C) any individual or entity who has an ownership interest of 10 percent or more in the contractor; and (D) any subcontractor listed in the bid or contract.

#	LAST NAME/ENTITY/SUBCONTRACTOR	FIRST NAME	TYPE
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
29			
30			
31			
32			
33			
34			
35			
36			
37			
38			

9. AFFILIATES AND SUBCONTRACTORS

List the names of (A) members of the contractor’s board of directors; (B) the contractor’s principal officers, including chief executive officer, chief financial officer, chief operating officer, or other persons with similar titles; (C) any individual or entity who has an ownership interest of 10 percent or more in the contractor; and (D) any subcontractor listed in the bid or contract.

#	LAST NAME/ENTITY/SUBCONTRACTOR	FIRST NAME	TYPE
39			
40			
41			
42			
43			
44			
45			
46			
47			
48			
49			
50			

Check this box if you need to include additional names. Please submit a separate form with complete information. Select “Supplemental” for filing type.

10. VERIFICATION

I have used all reasonable diligence in preparing this statement. I have reviewed this statement and to the best of my knowledge the information I have provided here is true and complete.

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

<p>SIGNATURE OF CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER OR BOARD SECRETARY OR CLERK</p> <p>BOS Clerk of the Board</p>	<p>DATE SIGNED</p>
---	---------------------------



San Francisco Ethics Commission

25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220, San Francisco, CA 94102

Phone: 415.252.3100 . Fax: 415.252.3112

ethics.commission@sfgov.org . www.sfethics.org

Received On:

File #: 200461

Bid/RFP #:

Notification of Contract Approval

SFEC Form 126(f)4

(S.F. Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code § 1.126(f)4)

A Public Document

Each City elective officer who approves a contract that has a total anticipated or actual value of \$100,000 or more must file this form with the Ethics Commission within five business days of approval by: (a) the City elective officer, (b) any board on which the City elective officer serves, or (c) the board of any state agency on which an appointee of the City elective officer serves. For more information, see: <https://sfethics.org/compliance/city-officers/contract-approval-city-officers>

1. FILING INFORMATION

TYPE OF FILING	DATE OF ORIGINAL FILING (for amendment only)
Original	
AMENDMENT DESCRIPTION – Explain reason for amendment	

2. CITY ELECTIVE OFFICE OR BOARD

OFFICE OR BOARD	NAME OF CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER
Board of Supervisors	Members

3. FILER'S CONTACT

NAME OF FILER'S CONTACT	TELEPHONE NUMBER
Angela Calvillo	415-554-5184
FULL DEPARTMENT NAME	EMAIL
office of the clerk of the Board	Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

4. CONTRACTING DEPARTMENT CONTACT

NAME OF DEPARTMENTAL CONTACT	DEPARTMENT CONTACT TELEPHONE NUMBER
Michael King	415-701-4228
FULL DEPARTMENT NAME	DEPARTMENT CONTACT EMAIL
MYR Mayor's Office of Housing and Comm Dev	michael.king@sfgov.org

5. CONTRACTOR	
NAME OF CONTRACTOR Rafiki Coalition for Health and Wellness	TELEPHONE NUMBER 415-615-9945
STREET ADDRESS (including City, State and Zip Code) 601 Cesar Chavez Street, San Francisco, CA 94124	EMAIL mlesarre@rafikicoalition.org

6. CONTRACT		
DATE CONTRACT WAS APPROVED BY THE CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER(S)	ORIGINAL BID/RFP NUMBER	FILE NUMBER (If applicable) 200461
DESCRIPTION OF AMOUNT OF CONTRACT \$50,000		
NATURE OF THE CONTRACT (Please describe) HOPWA grant for a transitional housing facility for persons with HIV/AIDS		

7. COMMENTS

8. CONTRACT APPROVAL	
This contract was approved by:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	THE CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER(S) IDENTIFIED ON THIS FORM
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A BOARD ON WHICH THE CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER(S) SERVES Board of Supervisors
<input type="checkbox"/>	THE BOARD OF A STATE AGENCY ON WHICH AN APPOINTEE OF THE CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER(S) IDENTIFIED ON THIS FORM SITS

9. AFFILIATES AND SUBCONTRACTORS

List the names of (A) members of the contractor's board of directors; (B) the contractor's principal officers, including chief executive officer, chief financial officer, chief operating officer, or other persons with similar titles; (C) any individual or entity who has an ownership interest of 10 percent or more in the contractor; and (D) any subcontractor listed in the bid or contract.

#	LAST NAME/ENTITY/SUBCONTRACTOR	FIRST NAME	TYPE
1	Elawar	May	Board of Directors
2	Williams	Lisa	Board of Directors
3	Franke	Kevin	Board of Directors
4	Oertel	Diana	Board of Directors
5	Prince	Cynthia	Board of Directors
6	Strong	Shirley	Board of Directors
7	Moats	Phyllis	Board of Directors
8	Washington	Robert	Board of Directors
9	LeSarre	Monique	CEO
10	Brown	David	CFO
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			

9. AFFILIATES AND SUBCONTRACTORS

List the names of (A) members of the contractor’s board of directors; (B) the contractor’s principal officers, including chief executive officer, chief financial officer, chief operating officer, or other persons with similar titles; (C) any individual or entity who has an ownership interest of 10 percent or more in the contractor; and (D) any subcontractor listed in the bid or contract.

#	LAST NAME/ENTITY/SUBCONTRACTOR	FIRST NAME	TYPE
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
29			
30			
31			
32			
33			
34			
35			
36			
37			
38			

9. AFFILIATES AND SUBCONTRACTORS

List the names of (A) members of the contractor’s board of directors; (B) the contractor’s principal officers, including chief executive officer, chief financial officer, chief operating officer, or other persons with similar titles; (C) any individual or entity who has an ownership interest of 10 percent or more in the contractor; and (D) any subcontractor listed in the bid or contract.

#	LAST NAME/ENTITY/SUBCONTRACTOR	FIRST NAME	TYPE
39			
40			
41			
42			
43			
44			
45			
46			
47			
48			
49			
50			

Check this box if you need to include additional names. Please submit a separate form with complete information. Select “Supplemental” for filing type.

10. VERIFICATION

I have used all reasonable diligence in preparing this statement. I have reviewed this statement and to the best of my knowledge the information I have provided here is true and complete.

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

<p>SIGNATURE OF CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER OR BOARD SECRETARY OR CLERK</p> <p>BOS Clerk of the Board</p>	<p>DATE SIGNED</p>
---	---------------------------