

File No. 230412

Committee Item No. 11

Board Item No. 27

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Budget and Finance Committee Date April 26, 2023

Board of Supervisors Meeting Date May 2, 2023

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 type="checkbox"/> | <input 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"/> | Forms 126 – Ethics Commission - Five |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Award Letter |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input 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"/> | Grant Allocations |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Expenditure Schedule |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Budget vs. Actual for Matching ESG |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | MOHCD Environmental Review Record 2023-2024 |
| <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: Brent Jalipa Date April 20, 2023

Completed by: Brent Jalipa Date April 27, 2023

1 [Apply for, Accept, and Expend Grant - U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
2 Emergency Solutions Grants Program - \$1,602,414 - FY2023-2024]

3 **Resolution approving the Fiscal Year (FY) 2023-2024 Emergency Solutions Grants**
4 **(ESG) Program; and authorizing the Mayor, on behalf of the City and County of San**
5 **Francisco, to apply for, accept, and expend the City's FY2023-2024 ESG Program**
6 **entitlement from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, in the**
7 **amount of \$1,602,414 for an unspecified period starting July 1, 2023.**

8
9 WHEREAS, Under the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act and Cranston
10 Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act of 1990, the Secretary of the U.S. Department of
11 Housing and Urban Development (HUD) is authorized to make a grant to the City and County
12 of San Francisco under the Emergency Solutions Grants Program (ESG); and

13 WHEREAS, The City and County of San Francisco anticipates receiving \$1,602,414 in
14 Fiscal Year (FY) 2023-2024 ESG Program funds from HUD; and

15 WHEREAS, The Citizen's Committee on Community Development (CCCD) has
16 prepared recommendations for ESG funding as set forth in a proposed Expenditure Schedule,
17 a copy of which is located in Clerk of the Board of Supervisors File No. 230412; and

18 WHEREAS, The ESG Program funds will be used to provide for the payment of certain
19 operating and social service expenses in connection with emergency shelters and for
20 homeless prevention activities; and

21 WHEREAS, The proposed grant does not require an Annual Salary Ordinance
22 amendment; and

23 WHEREAS, The funding agency (HUD) does not allow use of the grant on indirect
24 costs; now, therefore, be it
25

1 RESOLVED, That the Mayor of the City and County of San Francisco is hereby
2 authorized to apply for, accept, and expend the City's FY2023-2024 ESG Program entitlement
3 from HUD in accordance with the purposes and goals for the funding as generally set forth in
4 the 2020-24 Five-Year Consolidated Plan and the Expenditure Schedule; and, be it

5 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors does hereby approve the
6 purposes and goals for FY2023-2024 ESG Program funding as set forth in the Expenditure
7 Schedule for recipient agencies and departments; and, be it

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

10 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Mayor is hereby authorized to enter into and execute
11 agreements between the City and County of San Francisco and various agencies consistent
12 with the ESG Program and the Expenditure Schedule; and, be it

13 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Mayor is hereby authorized to submit documentation
14 and certifications as may be requested or required by HUD, and to take such additional
15 actions as may be required to apply for, accept and expend the ESG funds consistent with
16 this Resolution and the goals of the ESG Program and all applicable legal requirements, and
17 any such actions are solely intended to further the purposes of this Resolution, and are
18 subject in all respect to the terms of this Resolution, and any such action cannot increase the
19 risk to the City, or require the City to expend any resources, and that the Mayor shall consult
20 with the City Attorney prior to execution and provided that within 30 days of the agreements
21 approved by this Resolution being executed by all parties, such final documents (showing
22 marked changes, if any) shall be provided to the Clerk of the Board, for inclusion in the official
23 file, together with a brief explanation of any actions from the date of the adoption of this
24 Resolution; and, be it
25

1 FURTHER RESOLVED, That all actions heretofore taken by the officers of the City
2 with respect to the application for, or the acceptance or expenditure of, ESG funds, as
3 consistent with the documents herein and this Resolution, are hereby approved, confirmed
4 and ratified.

1 Recommended:

2
3 /s/
Eric D. Shaw, Director

4
5 Approved:

6
7 /s/
London N. Breed, Mayor

/s/
Ben Rosenfield, Controller

File Number: 230412
(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: Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG)

2. Department: Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

3. Contact Person: Benjamin McCloskey Telephone: 628-652-5956

4. Grant Approval Status (check one):

☐ Approved by funding agency

☒ Not yet approved

5. Amount of Grant Funding Approved or Applied for: \$1,602,414

6a. Matching Funds Required: One-to-one match required for funds going to subrecipients.

b. Source(s) of matching funds (if applicable): Local funds identified in subrecipients' budgets that total \$1,602,414. The match requirement is \$1,602,414. All CCSF homeless services and shelter funding qualifies. Dept: 203646; Fund: 10020; Authority: 17129; Project: 10031196

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, 2023

End-Date: 2 years from date of grant agreement between HUD and CCSF, or a later date if approved by HUD

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 14.231

****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 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:

Gloria Woo

(Name)

Director of Data, Evaluation and Compliance

(Title)

Date Reviewed: 3/20/2023 | 12:44 PM PDT

DocuSigned by:

Gloria Woo

(Signature Required)

Department Head or Designee Approval of Grant Information Form:

Eric D. Shaw

(Name)

Director

(Title)

Date Reviewed: 3/20/2023 | 1:06 PM PDT

DocuSigned by:

Eric Shaw

(Signature Required)



City and County of San Francisco

Draft 2023-2024 Action Plan

**For Public Review and Comment Between
March 13, 2023 and April 11, 2023**

**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 2023-2024 Action Plan.

NOTES FOR PUBLIC REVIEW and COMMENT:

- 1) This draft document is available for public review and comment between March 13 and April 11, 2023.
- 2) Members of the public who wish to provide feedback on this draft document, which includes funding recommendations, may do so at the March 21st public hearing. For more information on the public hearing, please click [here](#).
- 3) Staff also 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 document, if appropriate.
- 4) The close of the public comment period is April 11, 2023 at 5:00 p.m.
- 5) Thank you in advance for your participation in this process.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|--------|
| Executive Summary..... | 2 |
| AP-05 Executive Summary – 24 CFR 91.200(c), 91.220(b)..... | 2 |
| PR-05 Lead & Responsible Agencies – 24 CFR 91.200(b)..... | 4 |
| AP-10 Consultation – 91.100, 91.200(b), 91.215(l)..... | 5 |
| AP-12 Participation – 91.105, 91.200(c) | 16 |
| Expected Resources | 18 |
| AP-15 Expected Resources – 91.220(c)(1,2) | 18 |
| Annual Goals and Objectives | 24 |
| AP-20 Annual Goals and Objectives | 24 |
| Projects | 26 |
| AP-35 Projects – 91.220(d)..... | 26 |
| AP-50 Geographic Distribution – 91.220(f) | 45 |
| Affordable Housing | 49 |
| AP-55 Affordable Housing – 91.220(g)..... | 49 |
| AP-60 Public Housing – 91.220(h)..... | 50 |
| AP-65 Homeless and Other Special Needs Activities – 91.220(i)..... | 52 |
| AP-70 HOPWA Goals– 91.220 (l)(3) | 57 |
| AP-75 Barriers to affordable housing – 91.220(j) | 58 |
| AP-85 Other Actions – 91.220(k)..... | 63 |
| Program Specific Requirements..... | 76 |
| AP-90 Program Specific Requirements – 91.220(l)(1,2,4) | 76 |
| Appendix A: Citizen Participation Comments Attachment | |
| Appendix B: SF-424, 424B and 424D Forms and Certifications | |

Executive Summary

AP-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. San Francisco's current Consolidated Plan is a five-year strategic plan that covers the time period of July 1, 2020 through June 30, 2025.

The 2023-2024 Action Plan addresses the goals established in the 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan and represents the annual implementation plan for the fourth year of the 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan. The Action Plan identifies specific programs and projects that have been recommended for funding for the 2023-2024 program year with CDBG, ESG, HOME and HOPWA funds, as well as projects that are supported by resources other than the four federal funding sources. These additional projects are included because they are directly related to the needs that were identified in the 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan.

The Action Plan is submitted to HUD annually and constitutes an application for funds under the four federal funding sources. Please refer to the 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan for background information, including a demographic profile of San Francisco, an analysis of community development and housing needs, and San Francisco's strategic plan for community development and housing.

2. Summarize the objectives and outcomes identified in the Plan

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 in each of the City's Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Reports (CAPERs) show how the City performed against the goals that were set in the five-year strategic plan and the one-year action plan. The comparison of accomplishment data to goals indicate that the Consolidated Plan activities made a positive impact on the identified needs. However, due to the complexity and extent of the needs in the City, the identified needs are still significant.

4. Summary of citizen participation process and consultation process

As part of the strategic planning process for the 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan, MOHCD, OEWD and HSH conducted a thorough needs assessment, collecting data from a variety of city stakeholders. In addition

to providing forums, focus groups and online surveys for residents to comment on housing and community needs for the next five years, MOHCD, OEWD and HSH consulted with public and private agencies.

During the development of the 2023-2024 Action Plan, MOHCD, OEWD and HSH convened public hearings to receive public input. MOHCD, OEWD and HSH continue to meet and consult with City departments and community-based organizations in an effort to better coordinate and deliver services.

5. Summary of public comments

In preparation for the 2023-2024 program year, the CCCD, MOHCD, OEWD and HSH conducted public meetings to solicit feedback and ideas from residents and the community at large concerning the five-year Consolidated Plan. MOHCD conducted three simultaneous online public meetings in different languages (English-Filipino, Cantonese, and Spanish) on December 2, 2022 to collect input on needs. Notes from the December 1, 2022 community needs meetings can be found in the Citizen Participation Comments Attachment.

The Draft 2023-2024 Action Plan, which includes the preliminary funding recommendations for the 2023-2024 CDBG, ESG, HOME and HOPWA programs, is available to the public for review and comment between March 13, 2023 and April 11, 2023. The City posted a notice on the MOHCD, OEWD and HSH websites informing the public of the availability of the draft document for review and comment. The notice was also emailed to MOHCD's list of interested parties. In addition, the notice was published in neighborhood and community newspapers that are used by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors for outreach purposes. The draft document is available electronically on the MOHCD, OEWD and HSH websites.

MOHCD, OEWD and HSH will hold four simultaneous in-person and virtual public meetings in English, Filipino, Cantonese, and Spanish, on March 21, 2023 to receive comments on the preliminary funding recommendations and Draft Action Plan for program year 2023-2024. Persons who can not attend the public meetings or who do not want to speak at the public meetings are encouraged to provide written comments to MOHCD. Notes from the March 21, 2023 public meetings, and a summary of written comments received will be included in the Citizen Participation Comments Attachment.

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

Not applicable

7. Summary

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

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

1. Agency/entity responsible for preparing/administering the Consolidated Plan

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
(628) 652-5941

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

1. Introduction

As part of the strategic planning process for the 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan, MOHCD, OEWD and HSH conducted a thorough needs assessment, collecting data from a variety of city stakeholders. In addition to providing forums, focus groups and online surveys for residents to comment on housing and community needs for the next five years, MOHCD, OEWD and HSH consulted with public and private agencies.

During the development of the 2023-2024 Action Plan, MOHCD, OEWD and HSH convened public hearings to receive public input. MOHCD, OEWD and HSH continue to meet and consult with City departments and community-based organizations in an effort to better coordinate and deliver services.

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 Port of San Francisco’s senior staff, the San Francisco Housing Authority, Mayor’s Housing Advisor, 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 (DBI, San Francisco Fire Department, Planning, and other permitting agencies), 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, the Controller’s Office of Public Finance, the San Francisco Housing Authority (when appropriate) 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, adults, seniors, people requiring supportive services, etc.), while

RFQs or RFPs are generally issued for specific development sites. Staff develops funding and general policy recommendations for the Loan Committee.

The directors of MOHCD and HSH meet every other month 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 regular convenings provide a consistent 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. Additionally, MOHCD works with other City agencies, such as the San Francisco Unified School District and the Port of San Francisco, about development of housing on their sites as opportunities arise.

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 membership slots that represent a variety of consumers, advocates and service providers (non-profit and public) as well as City departments and meets bi-monthly.

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), the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), and the Department of Children, Youth and Their Families (DCYF). This consolidated department has a singular focus on 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 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 for and evaluate outcomes of projects and activities assisted by ESG funds, and develop funding, policies and procedures for the operation and 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 HSH senior management during the creation of the Consolidated Plan to solicit input into homeless and homeless prevention objectives and strategies and convened regular meetings of 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 the HMIS system as the Online Navigation and Entry (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 manages all ESG programs in the ONE System and partners with them to ensure that data standards are clearly understood and met in preparation for annual reporting.

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

Table 2 – Agencies, groups, organizations who participated

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | 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. |
| Economic Recovery Task Force Report | Mayor, Board of Supervisors | This plan focuses on economic recovery, 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? |
|---|--------------------------|--|
| Digital Equity Strategic Plan 2019 - 2024 | MOHCD | This plan focuses on digital equity for low-income communities, which is aligned with Consolidated Plan goals. |
| HIV Housing Five-Year Plan, 2020 - 2025 | MOHCD | This plan focuses on housing for the HIV community, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals. |
| HIV Housing Five-Year Plan, 2016–2020 | MOHCD | This plan focuses on housing for the HIV community, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals. |
| Economic Strategic Plan 2014 Update | OEWD | This plan focuses on economic development strategies, which overlap with Consolidated Plan goals. |
| 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. |

| Name of Plan | Lead Organization | How do the goals of your Strategic Plan overlap with the goals of each plan? |
|--|---|--|
| Community Health Needs Assessment | DPH | This plan includes healthcare for the HIV community, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals. |
| Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) 3-year integrated Plan, 2017–2020 | DPH | This plan includes healthcare for the HIV community, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals. |
| MHSA Annual Update, 2018/2019 | DPH | This plan includes healthcare for the HIV community, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals. |
| MHSA Community Program Planning Report, 2017 | DPH | This plan includes healthcare for the HIV community, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals. |
| Whole Person Care DHCS application, 2016 | DPH | This plan includes healthcare for the HIV community, which overlaps with Consolidated Plan goals. |
| 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 the Housing Choice Voucher program and 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. |
| 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. |

| Name of Plan | Lead Organization | How do the goals of your Strategic Plan overlap with the goals of each plan? |
|--|-----------------------------|---|
| 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. |

Narrative (optional)

AP-12 Participation – 91.105, 91.200(c)

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

In preparation for the 2023-2024 program year, the CCCD, MOHCD, OEWD and HSH conducted public meetings to solicit feedback and ideas from residents and the community at large concerning the five-year Consolidated Plan. MOHCD conducted three simultaneous online public meetings in different languages (English-Filipino, Cantonese, and Spanish) on December 2, 2022 to collect input on needs. Notes from the December 1, 2022 community needs meetings can be found in the Citizen Participation Comments Attachment.

The Draft 2023-2024 Action Plan, which includes the preliminary funding recommendations for the 2023-2024 CDBG, ESG, HOME and HOPWA programs, is available to the public for review and comment between March 13, 2023 and April 11, 2023. The City posted a notice on the MOHCD, OEWD and HSH websites informing the public of the availability of the draft document for review and comment. The notice was also emailed to MOHCD's list of interested parties. In addition, the notice was published in neighborhood and community newspapers that are used by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors for outreach purposes. The draft document is available electronically on the MOHCD, OEWD and HSH websites.

MOHCD, OEWD and HSH will hold four simultaneous in-person and virtual public meetings in English, Filipino, Cantonese, and Spanish, on March 21, 2023 to receive comments on the preliminary funding recommendations and Draft Action Plan for program year 2023-2024. Persons who can not attend the public meetings or who do not want to speak at the public meetings are encouraged to provide written comments to MOHCD. Notes from the March 21, 2023 public meetings, and a summary of written comments received will be included in the Citizen Participation Comments Attachment.

Citizen Participation Outreach

Table 4 – Citizen Participation Outreach

| Sort Order | Mode of Outreach | Target of Outreach | Summary of response/ attendance | Summary of Comments received | Summary of comments not accepted and reasons | URL (If applicable) |
|------------|---|--|---|---|--|---------------------|
| 1 | Community Needs Public Meetings 12/2/2023 | 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 |

| Sort Order | Mode of Outreach | Target of Outreach | Summary of response/ attendance | Summary of Comments received | Summary of comments not accepted and reasons | URL (If applicable) |
|------------|--|--|---|---|--|---------------------|
| 2 | Public Meetings on Draft Action Plan and Preliminary Funding Recommendations for 2023-2024 3/21/2023 | 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 |

Expected Resources

AP-15 Expected Resources – 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, housing impact fees, revenue from former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency housing assets, a general obligation bond for affordable housing and OCII (Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure) housing development funds.

Anticipated Resources

Table 5 – Anticipated Resources

| Program | Source of Funds | Uses of Funds | Expected Amount Available in Year 4 | | | | Remaining year Total | Narrative Description |
|---------|------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|--|
| | | | 2023-2024 Annual Allocation | 2023-2024 Program Income | 2023-2024 Prior Year Resources | 2023-2024 Total | | |
| CDBG | public - federal | Acquisition Admin and Planning Economic Development Housing Public Services | \$18,808,788 | \$6,275,000 | \$0 | \$25,083,788 | \$18,800,000 | Assumes flat funding 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 | \$1,602,414 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,602,414 | \$1,500,000 | Assumes flat funding and no additional program income in future years. |

| Program | Source of Funds | Uses of Funds | Expected Amount Available in Year 4 | | | | Remaining year Total | Narrative Description |
|--------------------------|------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|---|
| | | | 2023-2024 Annual Allocation | 2023-2024 Program Income | 2023-2024 Prior Year Resources | 2023-2024 Total | | |
| HOME | public - federal | Acquisition Multifamily rental new construction Multifamily rental rehab | \$5,261,293 | \$2,000,000 | \$0 | \$7,261,293 | \$5,100,000 | Assumes flat funding and no additional program income in future years. |
| HOPWA | public - federal | Permanent housing in facilities Permanent housing placement Short term or transitional housing facilities STRMU Supportive services TBRA | \$7,410,761 | \$352,000 | \$2,365,000 | \$10,127,761 | \$7,000,000 | Assumes flat funding and no additional program income in future years. |
| General Fund | public - local | Grants to CBOs for services and rental assistance predominantly serving low and moderate income residents. | \$67,500,000 | \$0 | \$10,000,000 | \$77,500,000 | \$77,000,000 | General Fund grants to CBOs, not including project-based rental subsidies. Including Our City, Our Home Fund. |
| Local Housing Trust Fund | public - local | Affordable housing related services and loans | \$44,480,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$44,480,000 | \$47,280,000 | Full HTF allocation, including portion spent on administration. Excludes repayment of FY21-22 advance |
| LMI Housing Asset Fund | public - local | Affordable housing related and loans | \$3,000,000 | \$0 | \$18,400,000 | \$21,400,000 | \$3,000,000 | Assumes flat revenue rate each year. |

| Program | Source of Funds | Uses of Funds | Expected Amount Available in Year 4 | | | | Remaining year Total | Narrative Description |
|---------------------|-----------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|---|
| | | | 2023-2024 Annual Allocation | 2023-2024 Program Income | 2023-2024 Prior Year Resources | 2023-2024 Total | | |
| Housing Impact Fees | public - local | Affordable housing related loans | \$10,000,000 | \$0 | \$110,200,000 | \$120,200,000 | \$162,140,000 | Housing impact fees based on projections tied to actual projects which have been assessed fees. |
| GO Bond | public - local | Affordable housing related capital expenditures | \$0 | \$0 | \$141,000,000 | \$141,000,000 | \$0 | Anticipated spending of 2019 Affordable Housing GO Bond |
| OCII | public - local | Affordable housing related capital expenditures | \$116,005,901 | \$0 | \$0 | \$116,005,901 | \$0 | 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 residents facing eviction and for immigrants; revitalization efforts in public housing, including HOPE SF and the City's RAD public housing conversion projects; increased support for neighborhood-based services; support for general civil legal services; increased support for immigrant and other low-income communities seeking additional training in foundational life skills and transitions to self-sufficiency; digital equity programming, including digital skills training and broadband adoption; and community planning efforts with residents in low-income communities. 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.

The Hotel Tax Fund provides funding to support the City's cultural district programming. [The program's aim is to support specific cultural communities or ethnic groups that historically have been discriminated against, displaced, and oppressed.](#)

In addition to CDBG workforce dollars, OEWD leverages WIOA and local funds to execute local workforce development strategies. WIOA 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 and other local sources to support HSH's emergency shelter, homelessness prevention, and rapid rehousing programs that receive ESG funding. In its programming, HSH braids ESG funding with dollars from other sources to ensure the delivery of comprehensive services to program participants.

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.

OEWD receives funds from the Small Business Administration (SBA) and the Governor's Office of Business and Economic Development to fund the San Francisco Small Business Development Center, a program developed to help existing and aspiring entrepreneurs start and expand businesses.

San Francisco expects to leverage remaining HUD CARES Act funding with local General Fund, Our City, Our Home funds, local philanthropic funds, and federal funds from FEMA.

If appropriate, describe publicly owned land or property located within the jurisdiction that may be used to address the needs identified in the plan

San Francisco currently leverages publicly owned land to strategically deliver essential services when possible.

For example, the City directly owns three emergency congregate shelters and a Navigation Center serving transitional aged youth. As part of its COVID pandemic response, the City opened several Safe Sleep sanctioned tent sites on publicly owned land. HSH also operates a trailer park on for people experiencing homelessness and a Navigation Center on Port of San Francisco property, and in early 2022 the department opened an RV park for vehicularly housed persons on State Park land.

In addition, a number of social service hubs are operated out of City-owned buildings that are master-leased to community-based organizations. 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, the Port of San Francisco and the Public

Utilities Commission. This took the form of the Public Lands for Housing initiative launched in 2014 and led by the Planning Department and the Office of Economic and Workforce Development in partnership with MOHCD.

Discussion

San Francisco will continue to leverage local, state, federal and private philanthropic dollars to maximize the effectiveness of HUD funds. The City strategically seek out other governmental funding opportunities such as Choice Neighborhood, Byrne, Promise Neighborhood, and other sources that support its integrated inter-departmental strategies of community revitalization. The City also utilizes its own property as appropriate to support the needs of the Consolidated Plan. In particular, the City has prioritized all appropriate surplus property to be dedicated first to affordable housing development, demonstrating the strong commitment the City has towards providing housing for its neediest residents.

Annual Goals and Objectives

AP-20 Annual Goals and Objectives

Goals Summary Information

Table 4– 2020-2024 Five-Year Funding and Indicators of Success Table

At the time that this Draft 2023-2024 Action Plan is available for public review and comment, the City’s budgeting process for local funds has not been completed. The funding table and indicators of success will be included in the final 2023-2024 Action Plan that is submitted to HUD.

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 90 extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income families will be provided affordable housing rental housing during 2023–2024 time period using HOME funds and an additional approximately 1,339 affordable rental units will be built during this same time period using non-HOME sources.

Projects

AP-35 Projects – 91.220(d)

Introduction

The proposed projects are listed by funding source (i.e., CDBG, ESG, HOPWA, HOME). Please note that at the time that this Draft 2023-2024 Action Plan is available for public review and comment, the City's budgeting process for local funds has not been completed, and this section does not include funding recommendations with fiscal year 2023-2024 General Fund, Housing Trust Fund and other local funding sources.

| City Department | Program Area | Strategy | Agency Name | Project Name | Project Description | 2023-2024 CDBG Total | 2023-2024 ESG Total | 2023-2024 HOPWA Total | 2023-2024 HOME Total | 2023-2024 Total Federal Funds |
|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|---|--|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| HSH | Homeless Services | Homeless Services | Catholic Charities CYO of the Archdiocese of San Francisco | Homelessness Prevention | Prevention for individuals | \$0 | \$212,943 | \$0 | \$0 | \$212,943 |
| HSH | Homeless Services | Homeless Services | Compass Family Services | Compass Family Shelter | Emergency shelter services and case management | \$0 | \$96,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$96,000 |
| HSH | Homeless Services | Homeless Services | Compass Family Services | Homelessness Prevention | Prevention and rapid rehousing for families | \$0 | \$53,944 | \$0 | \$0 | \$53,944 |
| HSH | Admin/PD | Admin/PD | Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing | General ESG administration pool | General ESG administration pool | \$0 | \$90,136 | \$0 | \$0 | \$90,136 |
| HSH | Admin/PD | Admin/PD | Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing | HMIS | HMIS | \$0 | \$58,517 | \$0 | \$0 | \$58,517 |
| HSH | Homeless Services | Homeless Services | Dolores Street Community Services, Inc. | Dolores Shelter Program | Case management for shelter residents | \$0 | \$55,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$55,000 |
| HSH | Homeless Services | Homeless Services | Episcopal Community Services of San Francisco | Episcopal Community Services of SF | Emergency Shelter Services | \$0 | \$217,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$217,000 |
| HSH | Homeless Services | Homeless Services | Episcopal Community Services of San Francisco | Rapid Rehousing | Rapid rehousing for adults | \$0 | \$53,943 | \$0 | \$0 | \$53,943 |
| HSH | Homeless Services | Homeless Services | Hamilton Families | Hamilton Family Residences and Emergency Center | Emergency shelter services and case management | \$0 | \$55,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$55,000 |
| HSH | Homeless Services | Homeless Services | Hamilton Families | Rapid Rehousing | Rapid rehousing for families | \$0 | \$191,943 | \$0 | \$0 | \$191,943 |

| City Department | Program Area | Strategy | Agency Name | Project Name | Project Description | 2023-2024 CDBG Total | 2023-2024 ESG Total | 2023-2024 HOPWA Total | 2023-2024 HOME Total | 2023-2024 Total Federal Funds |
|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|---|--|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| HSH | Homeless Services | Homeless Services | Homeless Children's Network | Case Management for Homeless Families and Individuals | Case management for shelter residents | \$0 | \$55,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$55,000 |
| HSH | Homeless Services | Homeless Services | La Casa de las Madres | Domestic Violence Shelter & Drop In Center | Emergency shelter services and case management | \$0 | \$165,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$165,000 |
| HSH | Homeless Services | Homeless Services | Larkin Street Youth Services | Lark-Inn for Youth | Emergency shelter services and case management | \$0 | \$112,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$112,000 |
| HSH | Homeless Services | Homeless Services | Mission Area Health Associates | Mission Neighborhood Health Center/Mission Neighborhood Resource Center | Prevention for individuals | \$0 | \$55,943 | \$0 | \$0 | \$55,943 |
| HSH | Homeless Services | Homeless Services | Providence Foundation of San Francisco | Homeless Services | Emergency shelter services and case management | \$0 | \$50,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$50,000 |
| HSH | Homeless Services | Homeless Services | The San Francisco Particular Council of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, dba St. Vincent de Paul Society of San Francisco | Emergency Shelter - Shelter Operations | Emergency shelter services and case management | \$0 | \$50,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$50,000 |
| | | | | | HSH Total | \$0 | \$1,572,369 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,572,369 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |

| City Department | Program Area | Strategy | Agency Name | Project Name | Project Description | 2023-2024 CDBG Total | 2023-2024 ESG Total | 2023-2024 HOPWA Total | 2023-2024 HOME Total | 2023-2024 Total Federal Funds |
|-----------------|--|---|--|---|--|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| MOHCD | Access to Opportunity | Housing Place-Based Services | Bayview Hunters Point Multipurpose Senior Services, Inc. | HOPE SF Housing Retention and Case Management | Housing stabilization services and short-term case management, primarily for residents of Alice Griffith | \$102,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$102,000 |
| MOHCD | HIV Supportive Housing | Rental Subsidies and Supportive Services | Catholic Charities CYO of the Archdiocese of San Francisco | Assisted Housing and Health - Tenant Based Rental Subsidies | Housing stability services for long-term rental subsidy households | \$0 | \$0 | \$313,541 | \$0 | \$313,541 |
| MOHCD | Public Services - Supportive Housing for PLWHA | | Catholic Charities CYO of the Archdiocese of San Francisco | Partial rental subsidy program for people with HIV/AIDS - Formula | Partial rental subsidy program for people with HIV/AIDS | \$0 | \$0 | \$300,000 | \$0 | \$300,000 |
| MOHCD | HIV Supportive Housing | RCFCI Operating Costs and Supportive Services | Catholic Charities CYO of the Archdiocese of San Francisco | Peter Claver Community RCFCI | Residential care facility for persons with HIV/AIDS | \$0 | \$0 | \$762,114 | \$0 | \$762,114 |
| MOHCD | Eviction Prevention and Housing Stabilization | Tenant Counseling and Education | Causa Justa :: Just Cause | Citywide and Mission District Eviction Prevention through Tenant Counseling and Education | Tenant counseling and education, primarily for Latinx residents citywide | \$558,450 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$558,450 |
| MOHCD | Access to Opportunity | Housing Place-Based Services | Chinatown Community Development Center, Inc. | Service Connection to Residents of SRO Hotels | Service connection, primarily for API residents of single room occupancy | \$148,750 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$148,750 |

| City Department | Program Area | Strategy | Agency Name | Project Name | Project Description | 2023-2024 CDBG Total | 2023-2024 ESG Total | 2023-2024 HOPWA Total | 2023-2024 HOME Total | 2023-2024 Total Federal Funds |
|-----------------|---|---|--|--|--|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | hotels (SROs) in Chinatown | | | | | |
| MOHCD | Organizational Capacity Building | Organizational Capacity Building | Community Vision Capital & Consulting | Technical Assistance for Capital Projects | Asset management planning for CDBG/HOPWA-eligible facilities | \$87,815 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$87,815 |
| MOHCD | HIV Supportive Housing | RCFCI Operating Costs and Supportive Services | Dolores Street Community Services, Inc. | Richard M. Cohen Residence | Residential care facility for persons with HIV/AIDS | \$0 | \$0 | \$399,481 | \$0 | \$399,481 |
| MOHCD | Access to Opportunity | Community-Based Services | Episcopal Community Services of San Francisco | Next Steps Center (NSC) | Skill building, primarily for homeless residents of District 6 | \$64,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$64,000 |
| MOHCD | Eviction Prevention and Housing Stabilization | Tenant Right to Counsel | Eviction Defense Collaborative, Inc. | Tenant Right to Counsel Lead Partner | Tenant Right to Counsel partners providing full-scope legal representation for residents facing eviction | \$1,372,272 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,372,272 |
| MOHCD | Access to Opportunity | Community-Based Services | Good Samaritan Family Resource Center of San Francisco | 2-Gen Education Program | ESL training, primarily for Latinx immigrant residents of the Mission | \$52,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$52,000 |
| MOHCD | Access to Opportunity | Community-Based Services | Gum Moon Residence Hall | Employment Training for API Survivors of Domestic Violence, Sexual Assault and Human Trafficking | Employment training for primarily API survivors of domestic violence, sexual assault and human trafficking | \$23,405 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$23,405 |

| City Department | Program Area | Strategy | Agency Name | Project Name | Project Description | 2023-2024 CDBG Total | 2023-2024 ESG Total | 2023-2024 HOPWA Total | 2023-2024 HOME Total | 2023-2024 Total Federal Funds |
|-----------------|------------------------|---|---|--|---|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| MOHCD | Access to Opportunity | Housing Place-Based Services | Gum Moon Residence Hall | Skill-building and Service Connection for Gum Moon SRO Residents | Skill-building and service connection, primarily for Gum Moon SRO residents | \$29,256 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$29,256 |
| MOHCD | Access to Opportunity | Community-Based Services | Gum Moon Residence Hall | Skill-building and Service Connection in Richmond and Sunset Neighborhoods | Skill-building and service connection, primarily for residents of the Richmond and Sunset neighborhoods | \$27,255 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$27,255 |
| MOHCD | HIV Supportive Housing | RCFCI Operating Costs and Supportive Services | Larkin Street Youth Services | Assisted Care | Residential care facility for persons with HIV/AIDS | \$0 | \$0 | \$197,044 | \$0 | \$197,044 |
| MOHCD | HIV Supportive Housing | RCFCI Operating Costs and Supportive Services | Maitri Compassionate Care | Maitri Compassionate Care | Residential care facility for persons with HIV/AIDS | \$0 | \$0 | \$492,167 | \$0 | \$492,167 |
| MOHCD | Capital Projects | Rehabilitation | Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development | Capital grant pool | Capital grant pool | \$97,047 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$97,047 |
| MOHCD | Capital Projects | Rehabilitation | Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development | Capital grant pool - HOPWA | Capital grant pool - HOPWA | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,122,774 | \$0 | \$1,122,774 |
| MOHCD | Admin/PD | Admin/PD | Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development | General ESG administration pool | General ESG administration pool | \$0 | \$30,045 | \$0 | \$0 | \$30,045 |

| City Department | Program Area | Strategy | Agency Name | Project Name | Project Description | 2023-2024 CDBG Total | 2023-2024 ESG Total | 2023-2024 HOPWA Total | 2023-2024 HOME Total | 2023-2024 Total Federal Funds |
|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|---|---|---|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| MOHCD | Admin/PD | Admin/PD | Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development | General HOME administration pool | General HOME administration pool | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$526,129 | \$526,129 |
| MOHCD | Admin/PD | Admin/PD | Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development | General HOPWA administration pool | General HOPWA administration pool | \$0 | \$0 | \$195,967 | \$0 | \$195,967 |
| MOHCD | Access to Housing | Homeownership Pre-Purchase | Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development | Homeownership Pre- and Post-Purchase | Homeownership education and counseling citywide | \$126,316 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$126,316 |
| MOHCD | Housing Development | Construction/Rehabilitation | Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development | Housing development grants pool for CHDOs | Housing development grants pool for CHDOs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$150,000 | \$150,000 |
| MOHCD | Housing Development | Rehabilitation | Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development | Housing development pool (Multi-Family) | Housing development pool (Multi-Family) | \$11,499,594 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$11,499,594 |
| MOHCD | Housing Development | Construction/Rehabilitation | Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development | Housing development pool (Multi-Family) | Housing development pool (Multi-Family) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$6,585,164 | \$6,585,164 |
| MOHCD | Admin/PD | Admin/PD | Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development | Housing info and referral pool | Housing info and referral pool | \$0 | \$0 | \$48,000 | \$0 | \$48,000 |
| MOHCD | Admin/PD | Admin/PD | Mayor's Office of Housing and | Housing program delivery pool | Housing program delivery pool | \$675,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$675,000 |

| City Department | Program Area | Strategy | Agency Name | Project Name | Project Description | 2023-2024 CDBG Total | 2023-2024 ESG Total | 2023-2024 HOPWA Total | 2023-2024 HOME Total | 2023-2024 Total Federal Funds |
|-----------------|------------------------|--|--|--|---|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | Community Development | | | | | | | |
| MOHCD | HIV Supportive Housing | Rental Subsidies and Supportive Services | Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development | Long term rental subsidy and housing advocacy program for persons with HIV/AIDS | Long term rental subsidy and housing advocacy program for persons with HIV/AIDS | \$0 | \$0 | \$3,153,166 | \$0 | \$3,153,166 |
| MOHCD | Admin/PD | Admin/PD | Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development | PS IT program delivery for direct services pool | PS IT program delivery for direct services pool | \$45,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$45,000 |
| MOHCD | Admin/PD | Admin/PD | Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development/Office of Economic and Workforce Development | General CDBG administration and planning pool | General CDBG administration and planning pool | \$3,761,757 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$3,761,757 |
| MOHCD | HIV Supportive Housing | Transitional Housing | Mercy Housing California XVII, A California Limited Partnership | Derek Silva | Transitional housing facility for persons with HIV/AIDS | \$0 | \$0 | \$50,000 | \$0 | \$50,000 |
| MOHCD | Financial Capability | Financial Capability Services | Mission Economic Development Agency | Financial Capability Coaching Program for San Francisco's LMI, Latino and Immigrant Families | Financial capability services, primarily for Latinx residents of the Mission | \$52,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$52,000 |

| City Department | Program Area | Strategy | Agency Name | Project Name | Project Description | 2023-2024 CDBG Total | 2023-2024 ESG Total | 2023-2024 HOPWA Total | 2023-2024 HOME Total | 2023-2024 Total Federal Funds |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|---|---|--|---|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| MOHCD | Access to Housing | Homeownership Pre-Purchase | Mission Economic Development Agency | Pre- and Post-Purchase Workshop and Counseling Services for San Francisco's LMI and Latino residents | Homeownership Workshop and Counseling Services for San Francisco's LMI and Latino residents | \$114,005 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$114,005 |
| MOHCD | Access to Opportunity | Community-Based Services | Mission Neighborhood Centers, Inc. | Educational Support Services | Academic skill building and GED preparation, primarily for Latinx residents citywide | \$52,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$52,000 |
| MOHCD | HIV Supportive Housing | RCFCI Operating Costs and Supportive Services | PRC | Leland House | Residential care facility for persons with HIV/AIDS | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,065,000 | \$0 | \$2,065,000 |
| MOHCD | HIV Supportive Housing | Transitional Housing | Rafiki Coalition for Health and Wellness | Brandy Moore House | Transitional housing facility for persons with HIV/AIDS | \$0 | \$0 | \$150,000 | \$0 | \$150,000 |
| MOHCD | Access to Housing | Homeownership Post-Purchase | San Francisco Housing Development Corporation | Homeownership Pre- and Post-Purchase | Homeownership education and counseling citywide | \$31,579 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$31,579 |
| MOHCD | Organizational Capacity Building | Organizational Capacity Building | San Francisco Study Center, Incorporated, fiscal sponsor of AND Architecture + Community Planning | ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES FOR COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING | Architectural design services for community facilities | \$38,951 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$38,951 |

| City Department | Program Area | Strategy | Agency Name | Project Name | Project Description | 2023-2024 CDBG Total | 2023-2024 ESG Total | 2023-2024 HOPWA Total | 2023-2024 HOME Total | 2023-2024 Total Federal Funds |
|-----------------|---|----------------------------------|---|--|---|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| MOHCD | Eviction Prevention and Housing Stabilization | Tenant Counseling and Education | San Francisco Study Center, Incorporated, fiscal sponsor of the Housing Rights Committee of San Francisco | Tenant Outreach Education and Counseling and Anti-Displacement Coalition | Tenant counseling and education citywide | \$564,034 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$564,034 |
| MOHCD | HIV Supportive Housing | San Mateo HOPWA Program | San Mateo County | San Mateo HOPWA Program | San Mateo HOPWA program | \$0 | \$0 | \$878,507 | \$0 | \$878,507 |
| MOHCD | Access to Civil Justice | Benefits Advocacy | Swords to Plowshares: Veterans Rights Organization | Securing VA Benefits for Low-Income and Homeless Veterans | Legal representation and advocacy for VA benefits, primarily for homeless and low-income veterans | \$65,811 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$65,811 |
| MOHCD | Eviction Prevention and Housing Stabilization | Tenant Right to Counsel | Tenderloin Housing Clinic, Inc. | Tenant Right to Counsel | Tenant Right to Counsel partner providing full-scope legal representation for residents facing eviction | \$992,720 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$992,720 |
| MOHCD | Organizational Capacity Building | Organizational Capacity Building | The Community Design Center | COMMUNITY DESIGN CENTER | TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR PLANNING & OWNER REPRESENTATIVE | \$50,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$50,000 |
| MOHCD | Access to Opportunity | Community-Based Services | Wu Yee Children's Services | Service Connection for the API Community | Service connection, primarily for API residents citywide | \$96,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$96,000 |

| City Department | Program Area | Strategy | Agency Name | Project Name | Project Description | 2023-2024 CDBG Total | 2023-2024 ESG Total | 2023-2024 HOPWA Total | 2023-2024 HOME Total | 2023-2024 Total Federal Funds |
|-----------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|---|---|---|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| MOHCD | Access to Opportunity | Housing Place-Based Services | Young Community Developers, Inc. | 100% College Prep - Alice Griffith Education Liaison Project | Academic skill building and short-term case management, primarily for Alice Griffith youth | \$50,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$50,000 |
| MOHCD | Access to Opportunity | Housing Place-Based Services | Young Men's Christian Association of San Francisco (Bayview Branch) | Services for Hunters View and Sunnysdale Housing Developments | Community engagement and service connection, primarily for residents of Hunters View and Sunnysdale-Velasco | \$313,521 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$313,521 |
| MOHCD | Access to Opportunity | Housing Place-Based Services | Young Men's Christian Association of San Francisco (Chinatown Branch) | Community Center for SRO Families in Chinatown | Community engagement and service connection, primarily for API families in single room occupancy hotels (SROs) in Chinatown | \$47,352 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$47,352 |
| MOHCD | Access to Opportunity | Community-Based Services | Young Men's Christian Association of San Francisco (Chinatown Branch) | Comprehensive Service Connection and Core Skills Development | Skill building, ESL training and service connection, primarily for API residents of Chinatown | \$212,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$212,000 |
| MOHCD | Access to Opportunity | Community-Based Services | Young Men's Christian Association of San | Service Connectors - API Citywide | Service connection, primarily for API residents citywide | \$120,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$120,000 |

| City Department | Program Area | Strategy | Agency Name | Project Name | Project Description | 2023-2024 CDBG Total | 2023-2024 ESG Total | 2023-2024 HOPWA Total | 2023-2024 HOME Total | 2023-2024 Total Federal Funds |
|-----------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|--|---|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | Francisco (Urban Services Branch) | | | | | | | |
| MOHCD | Access to Opportunity | Community-Based Services | Young Men's Christian Association of San Francisco (Urban Services Branch) | Service Connectors - District 11 | Service connection, primarily for residents of District 11 | \$120,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$120,000 |
| | | | | | MOHCD Total | \$21,589,890 | \$30,045 | \$10,127,761 | \$7,261,293 | \$39,008,989 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| OEWD | Admin/PD | Admin/PD | Office of Economic and Workforce Development | Workforce development program delivery pool | Workforce development program delivery pool | \$90,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$90,000 |
| OEWD | Economic Development | TA to Small Businesses | ASIAN, Inc. | SF Multilingual Small Business and Micro-Enterprise Technical Assistance Project | Technical assistance for multilingual small businesses and microenterprises | \$38,869 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$38,869 |
| OEWD | Economic Development | Commercial Corridors | Bay Area Community Resources (fiscal sponsor to Portola Neighborhood Association) | Portola Neighborhood Association | Portola San Bruno Avenue commercial corridor revitalization | \$100,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$100,000 |
| OEWD | Economic Development | TA to Microenterprises | Children's Council of San Francisco | 9-week Homebased Childcare Entrepreneurship | Technical assistance in Spanish for home-based childcare microentrepreneurs | \$55,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$55,000 |

| City Department | Program Area | Strategy | Agency Name | Project Name | Project Description | 2023-2024 CDBG Total | 2023-2024 ESG Total | 2023-2024 HOPWA Total | 2023-2024 HOME Total | 2023-2024 Total Federal Funds |
|-----------------|----------------------|------------------------|---|---|--|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | | Training for Spanish Speakers | | | | | | |
| OEWD | Economic Development | Commercial Corridors | Excelsior Action Group | Excelsior Action Group | Excelsior commercial corridor revitalization | \$100,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$100,000 |
| OEWD | Economic Development | TA to Microenterprises | La Cocina, Inc. | La Cocina Business Incubator | Kitchen incubator and technical assistance for food-based microentrepreneurs | \$70,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$70,000 |
| OEWD | Economic Development | TA to Small Businesses | Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights of the San Francisco Bay Area | Legal Services for Entrepreneurs | Legal services for entrepreneurs | \$100,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$100,000 |
| OEWD | Economic Development | Access to Capital | Main Street Launch | Commercial Loans: San Francisco Revolving Loan Fund and Emerging Business Loan Fund | Revolving loan fund | \$300,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$300,000 |
| OEWD | Economic Development | TA to Microenterprises | Main Street Launch | Comprehensive Business Workshops for African American Business Owners | Technical assistance for African American business owners and microentrepreneurs | \$30,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$30,000 |
| OEWD | Economic Development | TA to Microenterprises | Mission Asset Fund | Expanding Small Business Loans and Financial Coaching | Building credit and access to capital for microentrepreneurs | \$70,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$70,000 |

| City Department | Program Area | Strategy | Agency Name | Project Name | Project Description | 2023-2024 CDBG Total | 2023-2024 ESG Total | 2023-2024 HOPWA Total | 2023-2024 HOME Total | 2023-2024 Total Federal Funds |
|-----------------|----------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| OEWD | Economic Development | TA to Microenterprises | Mission Economic Development Agency | Business Development Program | Technical assistance in English and Spanish for microentrepreneurs | \$75,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$75,000 |
| OEWD | Economic Development | TA to Microenterprises | Mission Economic Development Agency | Business Technical Assistance Services for LMI Latino and Immigrant Entrepreneurs on the Bernal Heights Business, Mission-Bernal, and Mission Street Corridors | Technical assistance for Latino and immigrant business owners and microentrepreneurs in the Bernal Heights commercial corridor | \$50,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$50,000 |
| OEWD | Economic Development | Commercial Corridors | Mission Economic Development Agency | Mission Street/Outer Mission/Excelsior Commercial Corridors | Excelsior/Outer Mission commercial corridor revitalization | \$35,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$35,000 |
| OEWD | Economic Development | Commercial Corridors | North of Market/Tenderloin Community Benefit Corporation | Tenderloin Business Retention and Outreach | Tenderloin commercial corridor technical assistance | \$80,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$80,000 |
| OEWD | Economic Development | Commercial Corridors | North of Market/Tenderloin Community Benefit Corporation | Tenderloin Merchant Association Technical Assistance | Tenderloin commercial corridor technical assistance | \$20,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$20,000 |

| City Department | Program Area | Strategy | Agency Name | Project Name | Project Description | 2023-2024 CDBG Total | 2023-2024 ESG Total | 2023-2024 HOPWA Total | 2023-2024 HOME Total | 2023-2024 Total Federal Funds |
|-----------------|----------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| OEWD | Economic Development | Commercial Corridors | Ocean Avenue Association | Ocean Avenue Small Business Assistance Program | Ocean Avenue commercial corridor revitalization and technical assistance | \$40,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$40,000 |
| OEWD | Economic Development | TA to Microenterprises | Renaissance Entrepreneurship Center | Technical Assistance for Emerging and Established Entrepreneurs in Bayview Hunters Point Community | Technical assistance for Bayview small businesses | \$40,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$40,000 |
| OEWD | Economic Development | TA to Microenterprises | Renaissance Entrepreneurship Center | Technical Assistance for Entrepreneurs provided by Renaissance SoMa | Technical assistance for microentrepreneurs | \$75,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$75,000 |
| OEWD | Economic Development | TA to Microenterprises | Renaissance Entrepreneurship Center | Technical Assistance in English and Spanish to Women Entrepreneurs provided by Renaissance SoMa | Technical assistance in English and Spanish to women entrepreneurs | \$40,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$40,000 |
| OEWD | Economic Development | Commercial Corridors | Renaissance Entrepreneurship Center | Technical Assistance to Bayview Third Street and Lower Fillmore Corridor Businesses | Lower Fillmore commercial corridor technical assistance | \$40,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$40,000 |

| City Department | Program Area | Strategy | Agency Name | Project Name | Project Description | 2023-2024 CDBG Total | 2023-2024 ESG Total | 2023-2024 HOPWA Total | 2023-2024 HOME Total | 2023-2024 Total Federal Funds |
|-----------------|----------------------|------------------------|---|--|--|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| OEWD | Economic Development | TA to Microenterprises | San Francisco Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender Community Center | Small Business Services | Technical assistance, credit building microloans, workshops and mentorship | \$70,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$70,000 |
| OEWD | Economic Development | TA to Small Businesses | San Francisco Small Business Development Center | Small Business Development Center | Technical assistance to microenterprises | \$200,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$200,000 |
| OEWD | Economic Development | TA to Small Businesses | Self-Help for the Elderly | Neighborhood Commercial Revitalization | Small business revitalization | \$15,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$15,000 |
| OEWD | Economic Development | TA to Small Businesses | SFMade, Inc. | Manufacturing Incubation and Accelerator Program | Technical assistance for local manufacturers | \$65,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$65,000 |
| OEWD | Economic Development | TA to Small Businesses | Southeast Asian Community Center | apiBIS - Small Business Technical Assistance for Sunset, Tenderloin, Central Market, SoMa, and Vis Valley Corridor Merchants | Technical assistance for small businesses in Visitacion Valley | \$55,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$55,000 |
| OEWD | Economic Development | TA to Small Businesses | Southeast Asian Community Center | apiBIS - Technical Assistance for Small Businesses | Technical assistance in English and Chinese for small businesses citywide | \$75,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$75,000 |

| City Department | Program Area | Strategy | Agency Name | Project Name | Project Description | 2023-2024 CDBG Total | 2023-2024 ESG Total | 2023-2024 HOPWA Total | 2023-2024 HOME Total | 2023-2024 Total Federal Funds |
|-----------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|--|--|--|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| OEWD | Economic Development | TA to Microenterprises | Wu Yee Children's Services | Family Child Care Small Business Development Program | Technical assistance for child care businesses | \$100,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$100,000 |
| OEWD | Workforce Development | Neighborhood Access Point | Central City Hospitality House | Neighborhood Access Point | Neighborhood access point | \$335,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$335,000 |
| OEWD | Workforce Development | Workforce Development | Chinese for Affirmative Action | Specialized Job Center | To provide individualized culturally competent employment services to the AAPI community | \$100,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$100,000 |
| OEWD | Workforce Development | Workforce Development | Collective Impact, DBA Mo' Magic | Young Adult Job Center | To provide individualized employment services and career/educational exploration to young adults | \$100,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$100,000 |
| OEWD | Workforce Development | Workforce Development | Homebridge, Inc. | Occupational Skills Training - Health Care | Occupational skills training in health care | \$200,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$200,000 |
| OEWD | Workforce Development | Workforce Development | Mission Language and Vocational School | Health Care Occupational Skills Training | To provide clinical health care training (Medical Assistant and Phlebotomy) to local residents. | \$100,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$100,000 |
| OEWD | Workforce Development | Specialized Access Point | PRC | Specialized Access Point (Disability) | Disability-focused, specialized access point | \$100,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$100,000 |

| City Department | Program Area | Strategy | Agency Name | Project Name | Project Description | 2023-2024 CDBG Total | 2023-2024 ESG Total | 2023-2024 HOPWA Total | 2023-2024 HOME Total | 2023-2024 Total Federal Funds |
|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| OEWD | Workforce Development | Workforce Development | Young Community Developers | Neighborhood Access Point - IPO | Neighborhood access point - IPO | \$430,029 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$430,029 |
| OEWD | Workforce Development | Workforce Development | Young Men's Christian Association of San Francisco (Bayview Branch) | Young Adult Job Center | To provide individualized employment services and career/educational exploration to young adults | \$100,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$100,000 |
| | | | | | OEWD Total | \$3,493,898 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$3,493,898 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | GRAND TOTAL | \$25,083,788 | \$1,602,414 | \$10,127,761 | \$7,261,293 | \$44,075,256 |

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-50 Geographic Distribution – 91.220(f)

Description of the geographic areas of the entitlement (including areas of low-income and minority concentration) where assistance will be directed

Assistance will be directed in HUD-designated Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas (NRSAs); HUD-defined areas of low- and moderate-income concentration and areas of minority concentration; and City designated Invest in Neighborhoods Commercial Districts, Community Benefit Districts, Opportunity Neighborhoods, and Cultural Districts. HUD funds will be primarily directed in NRSAs and in areas of low- and moderate-income and minority concentration. See Map 1 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.

HUD has approved the City's request for renewal of all six of the current NRSA designations in San Francisco's 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan.

Areas of Low- and Moderate-Income Concentration

HUD calculates low- and moderate-income concentration by census block groups. See Map 1 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 1.

Community Economic Development

Community Economic Development (CED) formerly known as Invest In Neighborhoods is a division within OEWD that implements programs focused on neighborhood commercial district planning, management, safety, and vibrancy. The strategies deployed are intended to advance opportunities for all. The division implements programs and services with the support of community partners to increase quality of life and economic opportunities within neighborhoods and commercial corridors. CED 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. CED programs and services are intended to maximize impact within five strategic areas: small businesses, storefronts and buildings, commercial corridors, public spaces and neighborhoods. A comprehensive approach to stabilization of neighborhoods and commercial districts is best aligned with our neighborhood strategic area of impact.

Services provided under the impact area for neighborhoods are streamlined under three programs: Community Benefit Districts, Opportunity Neighborhoods and Cultural Districts.

Community Benefit Districts

The Community Benefit District (CBD) Program provides technical assistance for management plan and engineer's report development, district establishment, and operational support to improve the overall quality of life in targeted commercial districts and mixed-use neighborhoods through partnerships between the City and local communities.

OEWD oversees 18 local community benefit districts in the City. Each CBD is managed by a non-profit agency. Community Benefit Districts are required to complete an annual report that outlines the year's achievements and financials including income, expense, asset, liabilities, new assets, and carry over which are reviewed by OEWD and heard by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors' Government Audit and Oversight Committee. OEWD's annual report shares the Department's accomplishments and financials from that fiscal year.

Some CBDs tailor services specific to the neighborhood's needs. For example, the Tenderloin CBD manages the Safe Passage Program, which is a coalition of Corner Captains who are trained to respond to different emergencies in the neighborhood and maintain a daily positive presence for children and youth walking on the sidewalks. The Lower Polk CBD hosts a Tenant-Landlord Clinic designed to help prevent homelessness by keeping people housed in their current homes.

Opportunity Neighborhoods

The Opportunity Neighborhood's program targets neighborhoods that have experienced historic divestment and have an economic development strategy that promotes diversity, equity and inclusion. These neighborhoods have an assigned project manager that works closely with community stakeholders and other city departments to strategically disburse investments including funds and services and support an economic development strategy.

The opportunity neighborhoods include:


- Bayview
- Central Market/Tenderloin
- Chinatown
- Excelsior
- Lower Fillmore
- Mission (24th and Mission Streets)

Cultural Districts

OEWD is a key partner to MOHCD in the implementation of the Cultural District program whose focus is on advancing equitable and shared prosperity for San Franciscans by growing sustainable jobs, supporting businesses of all sizes, creating great places to live and work, and helping everyone achieve economic self-sufficiency. Staff supports and leverages economic resources to ensure that there is alignment and a comprehensive approach to each district's economic development strategies. In addition, our division coordinates with our neighborhood project managers where the districts overlap with our programs.

Customized economic interventions for each neighborhood are selected from a broad-ranging suite of tools aimed at supporting small businesses and their surrounding commercial districts. OEWD utilizes CDBG along with General Fund dollars to provide these programs and services, and leverages them with resources and efforts from other City agencies and often private partners.

Map 1 – NRSAs, Areas of Low- and Moderate-Income Concentration, Areas of Minority Concentration and Invest In Neighborhoods Commercial Districts



Geographic Distribution

Table 5 – Geographic Distribution

| Target Area | Percentage of Funds |
|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Tenderloin | 10 |
| Chinatown | 10 |
| South of Market | 10 |
| Mission | 10 |
| Bayview Hunters Point | 10 |
| Visitation Valley | 10 |

Rationale for the priorities for allocating investments geographically

See discussion above.

Discussion

See discussion above.

Affordable Housing

AP-55 Affordable Housing – 91.220(g)

Introduction

Approximately 2,647 individuals and households will receive rental assistance in 2023–2024 through the City’s Local Operating Subsidy Program. MOHCD intends to provide tenant-based rental assistance to approximately 643 individuals and households through grants provided to community-based organizations offering tenant counseling and eviction prevention services.

Approximately 1,315 new units will be produced. Additionally, the acquisition and/or rehabilitation of approximately 114 existing housing units for preservation as affordable housing through MOHCD’s Small Sites Program or Existing Nonprofit Housing Notice of Funding Availability.

Table 8 – One Year Goals for Affordable Housing by Support Requirement

| One Year Goals for the Number of Households to be Supported | |
|---|-------|
| Homeless | 2,647 |
| Non-Homeless | 1,324 |
| Special-Needs | 4 |
| Total | 3,975 |

Table 9 – One Year Goals for Affordable Housing by Support Type

| One Year Goals for the Number of Households Supported Through | |
|---|-------|
| Rental Assistance | 2,647 |
| The Production of New Units | 1,315 |
| Rehab of Existing Units | 41 |
| Acquisition of Existing Units | 73 |
| Total | 4,076 |

Discussion

See discussion above.

AP-60 Public Housing – 91.220(h)

Introduction

MOHCD will continue to work closely with the SFHA to support the disposition and conversion of all remaining public housing in San Francisco either through rehabilitation or new construction. San Francisco has utilized the RAD program and the Section 18 Disposition program to repair, preserve and reposition these important resources. The City's HOPE SF program rebuilds and revitalizes four large public housing communities.

Actions planned during the next year to address the needs of public housing

Currently the only public housing left in SF Housing Authority's portfolio are 193 units at Plaza East (a HOPE VI project for which revitalization planning is underway) and xx units at North Beach Plaza. The COVID 19 crisis delayed by 18 months the conversion of the final public housing units at Sunnysdale and Potrero to the Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program. The completion of this project at the end of 2022 will facilitate the preservation, rehabilitation and rebuilding of these valuable units. In 2022, 157 units of public housing replacement at Potrero HOPE SF were under construction; in 2023, 118 units of public housing replacement and new tax credit affordable will be under construction at Hunters View, and 170 units of public housing replacement and new tax credit. Also, in 2022, construction began on 70 scattered site public housing units that converted to HCV and are undergoing 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 was in large part phased out by late 2022, 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 down payment using the HCV subsidy funds. In partnership with MOHCD's Homeownership programs, HopeSF and HCV holders will have priority for down payment assistance creating a continuum of housing options from public to below market rate and market rate housing.

If the PHA is designated as troubled, describe the manner in which financial assistance will be provided or other assistance

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

SFHA has also implemented new controls to track projected monthly housing assistance payment expenses and average monthly budget authority at any time.

On October 1, 2020, as a result of these positive developments, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) notified the Authority that it had cured its default.

Discussion

MOHCD's work with SFHA to address SFHA's dilapidated housing stock either through the Section 18, 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 (HRS) 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 who are newly experiencing homelessness or who are at-risk of homelessness. 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 individuals experiencing chronic homelessness and next to help them gain care for chronic conditions and to find permanent housing through the following three lines of service:

Stabilization Care: This SFHOT service line provides short-term stabilization care management for high-risk homeless individuals (those experiencing homelessness for more than three years, experiencing complex medical, psychiatric, and substance abuse tri-morbidity, using a high number of urgent/emergent care services, and unable 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/Single Room Occupancy, (2) Remove personal barriers to attaining permanent housing (ex: attain benefits, primary care linkage, behavioral health care linkage, IDs, legal aid, etc.); (3) Secure and place into permanent housing; and (4) Assess and serve as care coordinators for SF Health Network members who are high-risk/high-cost individuals.

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 respond to requests from 311, Care Coordinators, Police, Fire, and Urgent/Emergent facilities (hospitals, San Francisco 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 High Users of Multiple Systems (HUMS) and other high-risk individuals experiencing homelessness as

identified by 311 and health care coordinators. Once found, First Responders perform wellness checks and attempt to engage individuals into services and other resources as identified by community care plans. First Responders assess and refer the highest risk individuals 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 library patrons who are experiencing homeless, marginally housed, and/or mentally ill. She also facilitates education sessions for library staff in order to improve their understanding of behaviorally vulnerable library patrons. 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 part-time Health and Safety Associates (HaSAs) who are selected from a group of library patrons experiencing homelessness who are served by SFHOT's case management function. HaSAs assist the team by using their life experiences and learned engagement skills to reach out to other patrons experiencing homelessness, 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 Department of Public Health Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor.

Addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

In 2017, HSH published its first 5-Year Strategic Framework which identifies clear goals with benchmarks that include reducing chronic homelessness by 50%, ending homelessness for families with minor children, ending unsheltered family homelessness, and reducing homelessness among Transition Aged Youth (TAY) by 50% by 2023.

In San Francisco, Shelter programs give people experiencing homelessness a temporary place to stay while accessing services and looking for permanent housing opportunities. These programs fall under the HUD definition of emergency shelter. As of 2023, HSH has a Temporary Shelter system capacity of over 2,700 beds. Each year, HSH continues to expand its Temporary Shelter and Navigation Center portfolio. Navigation Centers are low-barrier shelters with flexible hours and mealtimes which provide services geared to navigate people to housing. Guests can enter with partners, pets, and property. Although permanent housing is the primary goal for people experiencing homeless, temporary shelter and transitional housing continue to be necessary interventions to reduce unsheltered homelessness until the stock of affordable housing increases. HSH continues to work to make shelter and transitional housing safe and accessible with access to case management, housing, and treatment services.

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 residents experiencing long-term homelessness who are often fearful of accessing traditional shelter and services. HSH subsequently opened eight Navigation Centers.

San Francisco's Navigation Center model is being replicated nationally; locally, San Francisco is building on this best practice by developing and opening 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 Homeless 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/>

From the launch of Navigation Centers in 2015 through the end of 2018, 46 percent of Navigation Center exits were either to permanent housing or reunifications with family or friends through the Homeward Bound program. Over 5,000 clients were served at Navigation Centers from 2015 to November 2019. Navigation Centers and SAFE Navigation Centers do not accept walk-ins. All individuals and couples who enter have been selected by the San Francisco Homeless Outreach Team or a centralized referral system. Because Navigation Centers operate 24/7, 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 experiencing 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 must sleep on the streets. Interim housing should be safe and easily accessible and should 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 linking people with housing and services that promote ongoing stability. In addition, to ensure that people experiencing homelessness are willing to access these facilities, emphasis should continue to be placed on guest safety and respectful treatment of guests 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 individuals experiencing 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 to successfully access and maintain permanent housing. Sub-populations that have been found to benefit from treatment housing include: people suffering from 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 youth and youth experiencing homelessness. 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 setbacks. To be effective, treatment housing must offer culturally competent programs designed to meet the needs of the specific population served.

Strategies 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 experiencing homeless or who are at-risk, particularly those 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 experiencing homeless and need help to regain housing. 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 to promote long-term housing stability while in custody/care; and expansion of housing options for people being discharged.

For people experiencing 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 a lack of ongoing health care and homelessness, diversion strategies should be used that focus on addressing housing, treatment, and service needs to prevent both recurring homelessness and repeat offenses, and to support health outcomes.

"Respite" beds with appropriate medical care, medication and care supplies are needed by individuals experiencing homelessness to recuperate post-hospitalization. These beds with care do not prevent nor end homelessness; however, 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.

To ensure the effectiveness of discharge planning efforts, data on 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 (HRS). Problem Solving provides opportunities to prevent people from entering the HRS 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, family reunification, mediation, move-in assistance, and flexible grants to address issues related to housing and employment.

HSH and MOHCD's homelessness and homelessness prevention programs, which were scaled up in the past year due to federal and local funds, align with the City's 5-Year 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.

Discussion

See above.

AP-70 HOPWA Goals– 91.220 (I)(3)

Table 10 – 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 | 180 |
| 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 | 531 |

AP-75 Barriers to affordable housing – 91.220(j)

Introduction:

The City of San Francisco's housing agencies work diligently to ensure that barriers to affordable housing are addressed. MOHCD submitted its Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing (AI) to HUD to guide this work in the coming years. Numerous programs and policies implemented by the City of San Francisco aim to uphold fair housing rights. Below is a description of programs, policies, and directions the City will pursue to reduce barriers to housing access and barriers to affordable housing production.

Actions it planned to remove or ameliorate the negative effects of public policies that serve as barriers to affordable housing such as land use controls, tax policies affecting land, zoning ordinances, building codes, fees and charges, growth limitations, and policies affecting the return on residential investment

Addressing Barriers to Housing Access

Improve access to knowledge about rental housing

When certain groups have unequal access to information about their housing options, it can become a fair housing issue. MOHCD requires all affordable housing developers to adhere to strict affirmative marketing strategies to ensure that information about available units reaches the general public. The City and County of San Francisco requires its grantees to advertise the availability of housing units and services to individuals and families from all race/ethnic and economic backgrounds. MOHCD requires its partners to advertise in all forms of local media including community newspaper, radio and TV (when necessary). MOHCD will also post information on the availability of housing and services on its website. In site visits with the grantees, MOHCD monitors the grantee's marketing efforts and discusses the organization's method for reaching clients.

To further inform the public about affordable housing opportunities, MOHCD explains local policies and programs that address affordable housing through our website and Annual Housing Report. Together, the MOHCD website and Annual Housing Report serve to orient the general public on basic issues such as the difference between public housing and other affordable housing.

Additionally, MOHCD publishes unit availability on its website and provides weekly email alerts to a list of service providers and community members. Email alerts list newly posted rental units in the Below Market Rate (BMR) rental and homeownership programs.

Finally, MOHCD funds community-based organizations to provide counseling for renters who are at risk of eviction, have recently been evicted, or are urgently in need of housing. Among low-income people, individuals with barriers to housing, such as those with disabilities or limited English fluency, are prioritized. Housing counselors help clients navigate public housing, affordable housing, and market rate housing (when appropriate) by guiding them to rental opportunities and assisting with the application process. Counseling agencies also support seniors, younger adults with disabilities, and other clients with specific needs in finding service-enriched housing.

Improve access to knowledge about homeownership opportunities

MOHCD supports community-based organizations in providing education and financial training programs that assist first time homebuyers to navigate the home purchase and financing opportunities available to them. Homebuyer education is a crucial component of all of the first-time homebuyer programs in the City. Several HUD approved non-profit counseling agencies are supported by the City to provide culturally sensitive homebuyer workshops and counseling in several languages for free throughout the City. All City supported agencies utilize the standard Neighborworks America approved curriculum for homebuyer education, and make up HomeownershipSF, a collaborative membership organization that is a Neighborworks affiliate. The homebuyer curriculum requires 6-8 hours of in-class education, and individual one-on-one counseling is encouraged before a certificate is issued. In addition to the ongoing workshops and counseling, the City-supported counseling agencies organize a yearly homeownership fair in the fall. The fair brings together counselors, lenders, and agencies dedicated to providing opportunities for low-income first-time homebuyers. The homeownership fair is attended by an average of 3,000 people every year and targeted outreach is done to draw from the diverse San Francisco communities. The fair has workshops, in several languages, on credit income, first-time homebuyers.

Eliminate discriminatory practices

MOHCD requires MOHCD-funded affordable housing developers and management companies to comply with fair housing law and does not allow for discrimination against any protected class. MOHCD's loan documents include the following clause "Borrower agrees not to discriminate against or permit discrimination against any person or group of persons because of race, color, creed, national origin, ancestry, age, sex, sexual orientation, disability, gender identity, height, weight, source of income or acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS) or AIDS related condition (ARC) in the operation and use of the Project except to the extent permitted by law or required by any other funding source for the Project. Borrower agrees not to discriminate against or permit discrimination against Tenants using Section 8 certificates or vouchers or assistance through other rental subsidy programs"

In addition to working actively with MOHCD-funded affordable housing management to ensure compliance with fair housing requirements, MOHCD also funds community-based organizations to provide counseling on Fair Housing law to ensure renters across the City know their rights regarding discrimination issues, reasonable accommodation requests, and other fair housing issues.

Addressing Barriers to Housing Production¹

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

¹ The following section on Addressing Barriers to Housing Production is cited from the June 2010 Draft Housing Element. The role of the Housing Element is to provide policy background for housing programs and decisions and broad directions towards meeting the City's housing goals. However, parameters specified in the Zoning Map and Planning Code can only be changed through a community process and related legislative process. Thus, not all strategies identified in the Housing Element are certain to be implemented. The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development will explore recommendations of the Housing Element as they pertain to findings from the 2011 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing (this report is currently in progress).

developed neighborhood specific housing plans to accommodate the majority of new housing needs anticipated.

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

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

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

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

Secondary Units

Secondary units (in-law or granny units) are smaller dwellings within a structure that contains a much larger unit, using a space that is surplus to the primary dwelling. Secondary units represent a simple and cost-effective method of expanding the housing supply. Such units can be developed to meet the needs of seniors, people with disabilities, and others who, because of modest incomes or lifestyles, prefer or need small units at relatively low rents. Within community planning processes, the City may explore where secondary units can occur without adversely affecting the neighborhood.

Smaller Units

Density standards in San Francisco have traditionally encouraged larger units by setting the number of dwelling units in proportion to the size of the building lot. However, in some areas, the City may consider using the building envelope to regulate the maximum residential square footage. This will encourage smaller units in neighborhoods where building types are well suited for increased density.

Moreover, the Planning Department allows a density bonus of twice the number of dwelling units when the housing is specifically designed for and occupied by senior citizens, physically or mentally disabled persons.

Rental Units

In recent years the production of new housing has yielded primarily ownership units, but low-income and middle-income residents are usually renters. The City encourages the continued development of rental housing, including market-rate rentals that can address moderate and middle income needs. Recent community planning efforts have explored incentives such as fee waivers and reductions in inclusionary housing requirements in return for the development of deed-restricted, long-term rental housing. The Planning Department will monitor the construction of middle income housing under new

provisions included within the inclusionary requirements of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans and consider expanding those provisions Citywide if they are successful.

Identify and Implement Creative Financing Strategies

Due to the high cost of housing subsidies required to provide a unit to low and very low income households (subsidy of \$170,000-\$200,000 required per unit), financing is amongst the most challenging barriers to affordable housing production. In addition, several Federal and State programs that historically have supported affordable housing development are at risk. The current recession has impacted government coffers as well as financial institutions, reducing the capital available for development. For example, the Federal Low Income Housing Tax Credit program (LIHTC) has, in years past, financed about 90% of affordable housing. In this economic climate and with the elimination of redevelopment agencies and their required commitment of 20% of their tax increment to affordable housing, the City of San Francisco is seeking creative solutions to finance affordable housing production and preservation.

Jobs-Housing Linkage Program

New commercial and other non-residential development increase the City's employment base and thereby increase the demand for housing. The City's Jobs-Housing Linkage Program, which collects fees for affordable housing production from commercial developments, will continue to be enforced and monitored.

Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credits

Planning and OEWD will promote the use of the Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credits to help subsidize rental projects, and continue to provide information about such preservation incentives to repair, restore, or rehabilitate historic resources towards rental housing in lieu of demolition.

Citywide Inclusionary Housing Program

Planning and MOHCD will continue to implement the Citywide Inclusionary Housing Program, which requires the inclusion of permanently affordable units in housing developments of 10 or more units. MOHCD is also looking to expand the program to allow developers to target higher incomes than what is currently allowed under the Inclusionary Housing Program in exchange for more affordable housing units to be built.

Tax Increment Financing

Tax Increment dollars in the major development projects of Mission Bay, Hunters Point Shipyard and Transbay will continue to be set aside for affordable housing as required by the development agreements for those major development projects and subject to the State Department of Finance's approval.

Housing Trust Fund

San Francisco voters approved Proposition C in November 2012, which amended the City's charter to enable creation of the Housing Trust Fund. It is a fund that shall exist for 30 years payable from set-asides from the City's general fund and other local sources. MOHCD is implementing housing programs or modifying existing programs to account for this new funding source and began using funds from the Housing Trust Fund in July 2013.

Reduce Regulatory Barriers

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

The City is also exploring mechanisms that maintain the strength of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and its use as a tool for environmental protection while eliminating aspects of its implementation that are not appropriate and unnecessarily delay proposed projects. For instance, the Planning Department will continue to prioritize projects that comply with CEQA requirements for infill exemptions by assigning planners immediately upon receipt of such applications. Other improvements to CEQA implementation are underway. For example, a recent Board of Supervisors report studied how to meaningfully measure traffic impacts in CEQA.

Address NIMBYISM

Neighborhood resistance to new development, especially affordable housing development, poses a significant barrier. However, NIMBYism can be reduced by engaging neighbors in a thorough and respectful planning process. In order to increase the supply and affordability of housing, the City has engaged in significant planning for housing through Area Plans and other processes that respect community voice and neighborhood character. In general, the Planning Department's review of projects and development of guidelines builds on community local controls, including Area plans, neighborhood specific guidelines, neighborhood Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CC&R's) and other resident-driven standards for development.

Public education about the desirability and necessity of affordable housing is also an ongoing effort. Planning, DBI and other agencies will continue to provide informational sessions at Planning Commission Department of Building Inspection Commission and other public hearings to educate citizens about affordable housing.

Discussion:

As one of the most expensive cities in the United States to live, the need for affordable housing is more acute than elsewhere in the country. Consequently, the need to remove barriers to the production or preservation of affordable housing has become an even more important priority for MOHCD. MOHCD is working closely with other City departments to revisit the City regulations that may serve one public purpose, such as increasing indoor air quality in residential buildings near major roadways, but is becoming a barrier to affordable housing production by increasing the development cost of affordable housing by requiring more expensive mechanical ventilation systems. MOHCD will also continue to work with other City departments to improve City process improvements that will help expedite the production of affordable housing be it with the Planning or Building Inspection departments.

AP-85 Other Actions – 91.220(k)

Introduction:

Actions planned to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs

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

Due to high housing costs, economic conditions, poverty and unemployment, a significantly large number of low-income San Franciscans are not economically self-sufficient. The limited resources that are available to support programs and services that help individuals and families to become self-sufficient are inadequate. The situation is made worse by reductions in funding at the federal, state and local government levels at the same time as needs are increasing due to the weak economy. To minimize the impact of the City's limited resources, MOHCD, HSH and OEWD have increased our strategic coordination with other City departments in an effort to avoid duplication of services and to maximize the leveraging of federal, state and local dollars.

Another major set of obstacles are language barriers. San Francisco has historically been a haven for immigrants. Language barriers impact immigrants' abilities to access necessities such as employment, healthcare, and police protection. Many adult immigrants and refugees are not necessarily literate in their own native languages, and struggle to master the complexities of English. In particular, sophisticated transactions such as legal issues or governmental forms may be confusing. Of all San Franciscans over the age of five, 42% speak a language other than English at home, with the largest language groups being Chinese, Spanish, and Filipino. Fifty-five 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." At the individual level, about 19% of all San Franciscans in the 2019 ACS one-year survey indicated that they did not speak English "very well."

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

Another action that will be taken will be granting those households displaced by Ellis Act evictions, owner move-in evictions, fire damage, and former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency displacement first preference to any affordable housing under MOHCD's purview. These households were forcibly displaced from their homes so the San Francisco Board of Supervisors deemed them to have higher priority to be screened for eligibility for MOHCD's affordable housing stock. In order to qualify for this housing, these households must be certified by MOHCD that they meet specific displacement criteria, such as having lived in their residence for at least 10 years (or 5 years if they were seniors or disabled) prior to receiving an eviction notice under the State Ellis Act. MOHCD will also certify if a household was living in the Western Addition or Hunters Point area during the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency's large-scale displacement of residents from those areas under its 1960s urban renewal policies. Should these households be certified that they were displaced by an Ellis Act eviction or by the Redevelopment

Agency and given a certificate of preference, then these households would be prioritized for eligibility screening for MOHCD's affordable housing. These certificate of preference holders must meet the housing's eligibility criteria, such as income and household size, for the housing they applied to.

Actions planned to foster and maintain affordable housing

The maintenance and preservation of existing affordable housing is a key housing activity for San Francisco given the age of its affordable housing stock. To this end San Francisco periodically issues Notice of Funding Availability for addressing the most pressing capital needs of existing affordable housing, especially those that impact the health and safety and ultimately the long-term livability of the properties.

Actions planned to reduce lead-based paint hazards

The City's response system is comprised of several City agencies and non-profit partners to address the problem of lead poisoning, prohibited nuisances code enforcement and dilapidated housing. Over the past 20 years, MOHCD has been part of a highly collaborative infrastructure of City agencies and non-profit organizations working to address childhood lead poisoning, lead hazards, and other health conditions stemming from poor quality housing in low-income communities. DPH collaborates with the Family Childcare Association, the Children's Council, the San Francisco Head Start Program, and other private preschools serving low-income families – to ensure families are educated on lead poisoning prevention and timely lead blood level testing of children under the age of six. As a result, low-income children attending targeted preschools are regularly tested for lead blood content as a commitment to a healthy educational start. Children with a detectable lead blood level are case managed by DPH.

Fundamental to the response system, the DPH code enforcement unit has the legislative authority to cite property owners with a notice of violation whenever there is visibly deteriorated paint in the exterior or interior of a pre-1978 building where children under six may be exposed to the lead hazard. Any housing built before 1978 that are or could be occupied by families are eligible to be rehabilitated with MOHCD's financial assistance and are assessed for lead-based paint hazards by DPH. Should lead-based paint hazards be found, remediation becomes part of the rehabilitation scope of work.

In addition, MOHCD requires funded tenant and homeowner counseling and other non-profit housing related agencies to provide lead poisoning prevention education to tenant families with young children, information on the Federal Lead Hazard Disclosure Law, and information on MOHCD's Home Rehab program.

Actions planned to reduce the number of poverty-level families

Coordinated Entry

In August 2016, Mayor Edwin M. Lee launched HSH to fundamentally change the way the City and County of San Francisco addresses homelessness. HSH—relying on guidance from people experiencing homelessness, service providers, and other stakeholders in San Francisco—developed a Five-Year Strategic Framework outlining specific goals for HSH's vision to make homelessness a rare, brief, and one-time event with the overall aim of significant, sustained reductions in homelessness. To accomplish this goal, HSH will coordinate alignment of all programs into a Homelessness Response System (HRS) that treats homelessness as an emergency to be responded to quickly and effectively. Please note that

the Homelessness Response System covers the entire geographic region defined as the San Francisco CoC.

Coordinated Entry (CE) is a key component of this response system. CE is a consistent, community wide intake process to match people experiencing homelessness to available community resources that are the best fit for their situation. CE includes a clear set of entry points, a standardized method to assess and prioritize people needing assistance, and a streamlined process for rapidly connecting people to a housing solution. All homeless individuals and families in San Francisco are encouraged to 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 also uses the Online Navigation and Entry (ONE) System—San Francisco's implementation of the Homeless Management and Information System (HMIS).

HSH has launched Adult Coordinated Entry, Family Coordinated Entry and Coordinated Entry for Youth and their Community Access Points as well as services for survivors of violence.

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, the Board of Supervisor's introduced legislation that created Healthy Retail SF, which is led by OEWD's Community Development 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. In 2020, to assist homeowners with loss of income due to the COVID-19 Pandemic, MOHCD created the COVID-HELP program to provide one-time funds for large forbearance payments and back HOA dues as part of COVID recovery.

HELP Funds may be used for:

- Past due mortgage Payments
- Past due HOA monthly dues
- Past due property taxes
- HOA Special Assessments (renovation costs distributed among all owners)
- BMR homeowners in need of financial assistance to complete necessary repairs in order to sell property

HOPE SF

HOPE SF is an ambitious cross-sector initiative to transform San Francisco's most distressed public housing sites into vibrant and healthy communities.

It began with a study. In 2005, the HSA released an analysis of at-risk families known as the "Seven Street Corners Study." The study came out of an effort to create a consolidated youth database with data from the child welfare and juvenile justice systems. When the data was walking distance of just seven street corners in the city — street corners that overlapped with obsolete public housing sites where families were living geographically, socially, and economically cut off from San Francisco's robust resources.

In response, Mayor Gavin Newsom set a bold vision of rebuilding dilapidated public housing developments into thriving mixed-income communities that integrated holistic family services, high quality schools, new businesses, public transportation, and green buildings. HOPE SF drew on more than 15 years of learning from HUD's HOPE VI housing revitalization program. However, unlike the HUD projects in which only a small percentage of residents returned to redeveloped housing sites, San Francisco committed to the principle that families would not be displaced.

In 2007, the mayor and Board of Supervisors secured \$95 million in local bond funding, an amount that eclipsed the nationwide HOPE VI funding for that year, to launch HOPE SF. From the beginning, the initiative brought together expertise from the public, nonprofit, and philanthropic sectors, working together to improve the lives of public housing residents and break the cycle of poverty.

Today, the City and County of San Francisco, the San Francisco Foundation, and Enterprise Community Partners collaborate on HOPE SF with the involvement of many organizations and longtime residents.

HOPE SF will rebuild four housing developments in three southeastern San Francisco neighborhoods: Hunters View and Alice Griffith in the Bayview, Potrero Terrace and Annex in Potrero Hill, and Sunnydale-Velasco in Visitacion Valley. Located in isolated and mostly undeveloped areas, these sites were originally built to temporarily house shipyard workers during and after World War II.

By tripling density, HOPE SF will replace 1,900 public housing units one-for-one and add low-income and market-rate units, ultimately building more than 5,300 homes at multiple levels of affordability. Construction is phased so that residents can remain on site and take part in the transformation of their communities.

Alice Griffith

Originally built in 1962 adjacent to the now-demolished Candlestick Park, Alice Griffith received a \$30.5 million HUD Choice Neighborhood Award in 2012 and is part of the Hunters Point Shipyard/Candlestick Point Neighborhood Development plan. In 2019, all original residents had been rehoused, achieving nearly 90% retention. Two more affordable projects, including 30 public housing replacement units, will be constructed in 2024-2025. Five Point, the Master developer, is responsible for developing market rate, inclusionary and workforce units. When completed, there will be expanded transit, retail and office space, a research and development campus, and over 300 acres of open space. The proposed total number of units will be 1,150.

Hunters View

Hunters View, originally built in 1956, was the first HOPE SF site to undergo revitalization. Perched on a grassy hill above the old naval shipyard, it has spectacular views of the San Francisco Bay. Of the original families, 70% were retained through the transition between public housing and mixed-income development. Amenities include open spaces, a community center, a childcare facility, a wellness center, a sound studio, and playgrounds. The Phase 3 — affordable and the first two phases of market-rate homes will break ground in 2020. The proposed total number of units will be 600.

Potrero Terrace and Annex

Home to nearly 1,300 people, Potrero Terrace and Potrero Annex — together known as Potrero — are two of the oldest public housing developments in San Francisco. Located at the southeastern edge of the Potrero Hill neighborhood, they were hastily constructed in 1941 and 1955. HOPE SF will rebuild both sections of the 38-acre site into a unified mixed-income development with buildings of varying heights and a park. Phase 1 — construction of the first 72 units was completed in February 2019. The proposed total number of units will be 1,400-1,600.

Sunnydale/Velasco

Sunnydale, San Francisco's largest public housing community, is undergoing a transformation into a mixed-income development of new affordable and market rate housing, street and utility infrastructure, and open spaces. Located at the foot of McLaren Park, the 50-acre site will also include an exciting neighborhood hub and the city's first recreation center in decades, a Boys & Girls Club, and early childhood education centers. The proposed total number of units will be 1,400-1,770.

Opportunities for All

Opportunities for All is a mayoral initiative to address economic inequality by ensuring that all young people can be a part of San Francisco's thriving economy. The initiative serves thousands of high

school-aged youth who are ready and interested in working, as well as provides opportunities for youth who might need additional support, as part of Mayor Breed's efforts to provide paid internships for youth in San Francisco.

Opportunities for All connects young people to employment, training and post-secondary opportunities. Youth work an average of four weeks and earn \$17 per hour for up to 20 hours a week, receive mentorship, and visit local businesses to help them identify careers of interest and begin to plan for their future. Opportunities for All builds on existing work-based learning programs and funding. Across the globe, work-based programs are celebrated for preparing young people for work, keeping them engaged in school and promoting self-efficacy.

Opportunities for All works with the SFUSD, OEWD and DCYF to align efforts and recruit youth participants. This initiative also develops a framework where non-profit service providers and employers have shared understanding and language around work expectations for youth, track youth progress, and provide tools that help youth plan for their future.

Our Children Our Families Initiative

In November 2014, San Francisco voters approved Proposition C, the Children and Families First Initiative, which created the OCOF Council with the purpose of aligning strategies across City agencies, the School District, and community partners to improve the lives of children, youth, and their families. Prop C outlines OCOF's mandates in addition to extending the Public Education Enrichment Fund and the Children's Fund for another 25 years respectively.

The 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, all sectors must work in partnership. OCOF strategies involve a collective impact approach, working 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 collaboration across the City, District and Community.

Data and Research

Data and research is at the heart of OCOF's work. Data informs all decision making for OCOF's work and the Council works to encourage and promote the use of data across all child and family serving systems.

Focus Areas:

- Convene a Data and Research Advisory Group: The purpose of this group will be to serve as an advisory body to OCOF around measuring the outcomes in the framework, as well as identifying data and research projects that align with OCOF outcomes.
- Monitoring outcomes measures: Develop a plan for monitoring the measures in the Outcomes Framework and informing policy and practice change.
- Support use of shared data for policy and program development: OCOF will use targeted data sharing across the city, school district and community to improve research, policy and/or practice. Work with various experts and stakeholders to develop policies and protocols that facilitate data sharing, as well as identifying existing shared data projects across the city that align and advance OCOF outcomes.

Training and Capacity Building

Strengthening the existing workforce and developing a strong pipeline of new employees across San Francisco through curriculum designed to build capacity and skills of the workforce to understand the impact of trauma on the lives of children, youth and families and develop the skills to build resilience and connection is critical to impacting the outcomes we seek to improve.

Focus Areas:

- Develop curriculum and pilot implementation plans: Develop implementation plans for 5 Training and Capacity Building pillars with a primary focus on a Healing City and a Welcoming City.
- Establish an evaluation plan for each pilot: Along with each pilot plan, the development of an evaluation plan will be necessary to demonstrate the challenges and successes for each pilot. This will inform the scaling and sustainability of the pilot.

Service Delivery System Improvement

Service delivery system improvement is at the heart of much of OCOF's mission. The activities for this strategy will focus on changes to systems in addition to service delivery and programs.

Focus Areas:

- Advance strategies that support service navigation: The goals of the service navigation focus area are to identify gaps and redundancies in services and to help families and service providers easily access available services from all agencies. Within this focus area, there are two components: a service inventory for system navigators and a family friendly service navigating website – www.sffamilies.org.
- Coordinating budgets to achieve shared outcomes: The goal of ultimately coordinating budgets across systems is so that efforts are coordinated to generate additional funding and blended resources are integrated into budget planning. An integral part of achieving coordinated budgets will be the Citywide Spending Analysis, which will determine where resources are spent on child and family serving programs. This will include a landscape of services that link the identified spending categories to specific services.
- Identify and support family friendly City policies and protocols: The goal of advancing protocols and policies that designate San Francisco a "Family Friendly City" is so that families are put at the center of decision making across the city, school district and community.
- Improve Citywide service coordination: The goal of this focus area is to identify gaps and redundancies across various collective impact efforts working with vulnerable children, youth and families in order to improve connections and eliminate duplication of efforts. OCOF will lead and participate in efforts that bring together key decision makers to develop strategies to address service overlap and gaps related to service coordination within San Francisco.

San Francisco Financial Justice Project

The San Francisco Financial Justice Project is the nation's first effort embedded in government to assess and reform fines and fees that have a disproportionate and adverse impact on low-income residents and communities of color. Since its inception in 2016, the Project has worked with partners to eliminate or adjust dozens of fines and fees, and to lift millions of dollars in debt off of tens of thousands of low-income people. Housed in the Office of the San Francisco Treasurer, the Financial Justice Project has two main goals: First, to listen to community groups and local residents to identify fine and fee pain points. Second, to identify and implement doable solutions for government and the courts. Over the last few

years, The Financial Justice Project has worked with dozens of community partners, city departments and the courts to enact a range of reforms such as eliminating administrative fees charged to people exiting jail and the criminal justice system; expanding access to free transit for people experiencing homelessness; allowing people struggling with homelessness to clear “quality of life” citations by receiving social services; and making it easier for lower-income people to pay traffic court fines and fees by basing them on people’s ability to pay.

Sector Based Approach to Workforce Development

The Workforce Development Division of OEWD 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.

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). This is especially true in 2020-2021, due to the COVID-19. Because the health care sector encompasses occupations in such a wide variety of settings and requires various levels of education and skill, it presents excellent opportunities for a broad spectrum of local jobseekers.

The HealthCare Academy engages with industry partners to identify key needs of the industry, including skill requirements, vetting and approving a programmatic framework, review of training curriculum, identifying partnership opportunities, and providing programmatic oversight of any workforce programs related to the health care sector. Collaborative partners include the San Francisco Hospital Council, the DPH (and affiliated hospitals), SEIU-UHW West, UC Berkely's Center for the Public Health Practice, California Health Workforce Initiative, and industry employers: California Pacific Medical Center, Dignity Health, Kaiser Permanente, San Francisco Community Clinics Consortium, Chinese Hospital and Homebridge.

Hospitality Training Program

The Hospitality Initiative, launched in 2011, was designed to effectively coordinate training and employment resources that support the growth of a diverse and well-qualified hospitality sector workforce in San Francisco. In support of this goal are the following objectives: To prepare San Francisco residents for training and employment opportunities in the hospitality sector; to fulfill hiring needs of hospitality sector employers with qualified candidates that are job ready, possess the skills and abilities to perform job duties, and hold knowledge and passion for the industry; to educate workforce system service providers and jobseekers about the hospitality industry and to provide them with relevant and current information on connecting to jobs, careers, and/or relevant training.

Industry partnerships play a critical role in establishing sector programming. Collaborative partners include San Francisco Hotel Council (and affiliated members), Golden Gate Restaurant Association (and affiliated members), San Francisco Travel, Moscone Center, City College of San Francisco, SFUSD, Unite Here Local 2, and community-based organizations and industry employers.

Technology Training Program

Launched in 2012, TechSF is an initiative of OEWD designed to provide education, training and employment assistance to locals who are interested in landing a job within San Francisco's tech sector. TechSF is committed to:

- Providing tech training, free of charge, to San Francisco residents who are interested in landing a job in a tech occupation;
- Partnering with educators, training organizations and employers to ensure our participants have opportunities to skill up and land in a job;
- Ensuring our trainings meet local employer demand; and
- Ensuring our participants are trained not only in in-demand technical skills, but also receive career readiness supports.

TechSF aims to ensure that a highly-skilled and diverse talent pool connects to, and thrive in, opportunities in tech while meeting industry talent needs. Careers in tech are not solely isolated to the tech sector. TechSF believes that the skills learned in TechSF training programs can open doors to working in a tech job in many different industries.

TechSF provides opportunities for anyone interested in a career in technology. From the exploratory tech learner to the well-versed programmer who is looking to gain a competitive edge, TechSF has opportunities to step outside your comfort zone.

The TechSF Apprenticeship Accelerator offers job seekers the unique opportunity to acquire essential experience and training to get established in a career in tech.

TechSF provides the opportunity to connect directly with Tech Sector employers through exposure and networking events.

Smart Money Coaching Program

The Smart Money Coaching program by the Office of Financial Empowerment provides free, confidential, one-on-one, personalized financial guidance. A certified financial coach helps households to address financial challenges and goals, including reducing debt, establishing and improving credit score, opening a safe and affordable bank account, and increasing savings. Smart Money Coaching has locations throughout San Francisco and is available to anyone living, working or receiving services in San Francisco. This initiative is funded through MOHCD, HSA, DAAS, and the Treasurer's Office. These services are available at over twenty sites on a regular basis, including HOPE SF and RAD housing sites, the San Francisco Main Library, and at nonprofit partners of MOHCD and other city departments.

Tenant Right to Counsel: San Francisco's Eviction Defense System

San Francisco voters passed the "No Eviction Without Representation Act of 2018," then-known as Proposition F, on June 5, 2018. This local law went into effect on July 11, 2019. It establishes a policy that all residential tenants facing eviction have a right to legal representation, known as a tenant right to counsel.

During the first six months of implementation (July 1, 2019 – December 31, 2019), MOHCD reported that two-thirds of tenants facing eviction at court received full-scope legal representation and that their outcomes were significantly more successful than those who had received less than full-scope legal representation. Full-scope legal representation means that an attorney provides legal representation to a tenant for the entire legal process. This is the highest level of legal assistance. Less than full-scope legal representation means that a tenant received help with their initial court papers, legal advice, and legal representation during a single day at court (limited-scope legal representation).

Through the City's budget process, the Mayor and Board of Supervisors have significantly increased funding for the TRC program since its passage. In Fiscal Year 21-22 (July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022), MOHCD allocated more than \$17 million to the TRC program – a funding increase of seventy percent.

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. Program-level data and other relevant studies suggest that full-scope legal representation get far superior results for clients than less than full-scope legal representation. 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 less than full-scope legal representation.

Actions planned to develop institutional structure

The large number of non-profit organizations serving low-income communities in San Francisco is both an asset and a challenge. With a long history of serving the community, the sheer number of non-profits leads to increased competition for limited resources. Conversely, the benefits of a rich variety of social service organizations often translates to more community-based and culturally competent services for low-income residents. Lack of organizational capacity of non-profits is another gap in institutional structure. In response, the City is engaged in an ongoing effort to work with non-profits in organizational and programmatic capacity building to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of service delivery.

It is the City's policy to coordinate community development and housing activities among its departments. Because this work involves many City departments, coordination and information sharing across the various departments are challenges. City staff meets on a regular and as-needed basis with colleagues from other City departments to overcome gaps in institutional structure. For example, MOHCD participates with OEWD and the Arts Commission in a regular working group focused on the issues of nonprofit displacement through a number of OEWD-funded initiatives to stabilize nonprofits.

In the June, 2014, new local legislation was passed to coordinate and align workforce development services, establishing the Committee on City Workforce Alignment ("Alignment Committee") comprised of department heads across City departments and the Workforce Community Advisory Committee (WCAC), comprised of leadership from community-based organizations with deep specialization in community development.

The Alignment Committee includes one member designated by the Mayor, one member of the Board of Supervisors or a City employee designated by the Board, and the department heads of the following City departments: OEWD; HSA; DCYF; Public Utilities Commission; Public Works, Department of Human Resources, and Human Rights Commission. The Director of Workforce Development and Director of the Human Rights Commission co-chair the Alignment Committee.

The Alignment Committee and WCAC are charged with developing and submitting a Citywide Workforce Development Plan to the WISF for its review and comment, which was submitted and approved in late 2017. The five-year plan includes an assessment of the City's anticipated workforce development needs and opportunities and a strategy to meet the identified needs, which influences the City and County of San Francisco's CDBG decision-making around resource allocation. The plan also includes 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 Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act Plan approved by WISF.

The Alignment Committee and WCAC legislation sunset in 2019, and all members agreed to continue the work under good faith effort until the legislation is reauthorized.

In addition, staff of MOHCD and OEWD uses the Consolidated Plan/Action Plan development process as an opportunity to engage other departments in a dialogue about the current developments and priorities. This dialogue aids the City in being more strategic in the investment of Consolidated Plan dollars.

Actions planned to enhance coordination between public and private housing and social service agencies

The Director of MOHCD meets weekly to discuss affordable and market-rate housing development issues citywide with the Director of Planning, the Director of Building Inspection, the Mayor's Director of Housing Delivery, the Port of San Francisco's senior staff, the San Francisco Housing Authority, Mayor's Housing Advisor, 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 (DBI, San Francisco Fire Department, Planning, and other permitting agencies), 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, the Controller's Office of Public Finance, the San Francisco Housing Authority (when appropriate) 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, adults, seniors, people requiring supportive services, etc.), while RFQs or RFPs are generally issued for specific development sites. Staff develops funding and general policy recommendations for the Loan Committee.

The directors of MOHCD and HSH meet every other month 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 regular convenings provide a consistent 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. Additionally, MOHCD works with other City agencies, such as the San Francisco Unified School District and the Port of San Francisco, about development of housing on their sites as opportunities arise.

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 membership

slots that represent a variety of consumers, advocates and service providers (non-profit and public) as well as City departments, and meets bi-monthly.

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

Discussion:

See above.

Program Specific Requirements

AP-90 Program Specific Requirements – 91.220(I)(1,2,4)

Introduction:

Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG) Reference 24 CFR 91.220(I)(1)

Projects planned with all CDBG funds expected to be available during the year are identified in the Projects Table. The following identifies program income that is available for use that is included in projects to be carried out.

| | |
|--|------------------|
| 1. The total amount of program income that will have been received before the start of the next program year and that has not yet been reprogrammed | 6,275,000 |
| 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: | 6,275,000 |

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 System Project 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 MOHCD in consultation with local CoC staff and with community-based organizations that serve individuals and families experiencing homelessness and those who are at imminent risk of homelessness.

These 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 experiencing homelessness or who are at risk of 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-recipient programs reflect the diversity of the individuals and families experiencing homelessness or who are at risk of homelessness and thus 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 that connects program participants to the broader health and human services 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 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 percent of 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 if not for 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 Rehousing 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 that 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 rehousing 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 including:

- 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; and
- A description of essential services to 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 rehousing programs.

If diversion is not possible and emergency shelter is appropriate, clients will be referred to emergency shelter. During the ongoing pandemic, San Francisco has allowed unlimited stays in adult emergency shelter programs. No persons facing or who suspect that they may face a threat of violence will be discharged into an unsafe situation. Emergency shelter workers 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 in danger of a violent crime or feel they may be will be entered into a secure database 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 provided discharge paperwork as applicable or upon request.

Individuals and families with the highest barriers to housing – due to myriad 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 at risk of 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 Entry (CE) system. It is expected that the CE 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 regarding referrals and service delivery with staff from other agencies to ensure that services are not duplicated and that clients can access appropriate services.
- Ensure that ESG sub-recipient staff participate in CoC trainings related to improving coordination among CoC members and to the implementation of the CE 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 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 experiencing 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 program and the population served.

Homelessness Prevention program participants are recertified for continued eligibility every three months. Rapid Re-Housing program participants are 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, staff ascertain the amount that the household can 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% 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 unit owner indicating the amount of the program participant's contribution toward rent/utilities and duration of assistance (not required if only providing rental arrears 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 assesses 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 they 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 six 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 taken into consideration during the initial commitment are the participant's ability to pay rent in immediate and subsequent months, such as anticipated income changes, 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, case managers may contact them to assess their need for continued assistance, depending on the design of the 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 and 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 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, accounting for relevant considerations (ex: current/expected income, expenses, and other public/private assistance for which the program participant is likely to receive, etc.).

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 six 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 participant eligibility and 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 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/expected income and expenses, and other public/private assistance for which the program participant will be eligible for and is likely to receive.

2. If the Continuum of Care has established centralized or coordinated assessment system that meets HUD requirements, describe that centralized or coordinated assessment system.

The Coordinated Entry (CE) system covers the entire CoC (San Francisco city/county) through accessible access points and outreach teams. Numerous dedicated access points for families and adults exist to facilitate targeted services. Five youth-dedicated access points opened in 2019 with strategic placement in underserved areas and locations where youth frequent. Targeted services for youth members of the LGBTQ+ community are also available. Those presenting at an access point for a different subpopulation also receive an immediate referral to one that will better assist them.

The CE system can be accessed through the local 311 hotline, in ADA-compliant sites, and at access points located centrally and in underserved neighborhoods. These placements help to reach those who are linguistically and/or culturally isolated. Multilingual mobile outreach teams target those unlikely to seek services for assessments on the 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 systems, and healthcare services ensure referrals across systems. To ensure hard to reach adults are located, the CE team conducted an "assessment blitz" from August through October 2018.

Those who are prioritized as most vulnerable through initial assessment for eligibility/safety are offered flexible problem-solving interventions like reunification, eviction prevention, and connection to mainstream services/benefits. Further assessment uses San Francisco CoC-specific tools weighing factors like current living situation, length/episodes of homelessness, use of crisis services, trauma, and other vulnerabilities. The dynamic housing list identifies those with the 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 case managers act as the coordinating entities within the City's shelter system. The City also partners with the San Francisco Department of Public Health to provide behavioral health services within shelter geared toward a broad spectrum of interlinked areas of mental health, substance abuse, and related medical conditions that individuals and families experiencing homelessness 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 the following four federal funding sources: CDBG, ESG, HOME and HOPWA funds for community development and housing activities.

In accordance with HUD and City and County of San Francisco 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 provide eligible activities within the ESG Program. The ESG Program interim rules require coordination and collaboration between CoCs 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 Homeless 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 to 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 perspectives of individuals experiencing homelessness and of those with lived experience are integrated into the goals and objectives of the Consolidated Plan. MOHCD will incorporate this input 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; and
- Number and percentage of individuals/households who completed 75% of goals of their individualized service plan.

Per HUD, ESG activities and performance indicators should complement the activities of the Continuum of Care Program and support Housing First practices, which are evidence-based that support the following tenets:

1. Targeting those who need the assistance most;
2. Reducing the number of people living on the streets or in emergency shelters;
3. Shortening the length of 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 CoC programs.

The CoC System Performance Measures measure these seven performance standards:

1. Length of homelessness: This measures the change in the average and median length of time persons experience homelessness when in emergency shelter and transitional housing programs;
2. Returns to homelessness: This measures guests who exit emergency shelter, transitional housing, street outreach, and permanent housing programs to permanent housing destinations, and 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 Count, but is pulled from HMIS and is consistently 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: This measures number of persons entering the HRS through emergency shelter and transitional housing programs for the first time in the HMIS database;
6. Homeless Prevention Measures (TBD); and
7. Successful placements (percent of those exiting to permanent housing destinations): This measures positive movement out of the HRS and is divided into three tables: (1) Street Outreach; (2) movement into Permanent Housing situations from emergency shelter, transitional housing, and rapid rehousing; and (3) retention or exits to permanent housing situations.

Discussion:

Identify the method for selecting HOPWA project sponsors.

The method for selecting HOPWA project sponsors is outlined below:

- In partnership with the Citizens' Committee on Community Development (CCCD), MOHCD, OEWD and HSH conduct multiple public hearings to solicit citizen input on community needs for allocating funds from four federal sources, including HOPWA;
- MOHCD issues a Request for Proposals and holds technical assistance workshops for interested non-profit organizations to provide information on the application and the review process;
- MOHCD staff review all of the applications that are submitted by non-profit organizations and make funding recommendations to the CCCD;
- CCCD makes funding recommendations to the Mayor for specific projects that will be implemented by non-profit organizations;
- In partnership with the CCCD, MOHCD, OEWD and HSH conduct a public hearing to solicit input on the preliminary recommendations;
- Funding recommendations for specific projects that will be implemented by non-profit organizations go through the San Francisco Board of Supervisors review process;
- The Board of Supervisors and the Mayor approve the funding recommendations; and
- MOHCD submits annual Action Plan application for HUD consideration.

Appendix A: Citizen Participation Comments Attachment

Notes from December 1, 2022 Virtual Community Needs Meeting

English-speaking Group

What are the most important things for your community?

How would you prioritize them?

Notes from speakers

Yolanda Lewis, on behalf of Anti Domestic Violence Coalition

- Standardization among organizations on metrics (I.e., performance-based metric – equity, diversity) so they can get to the same outcome
- To address underlying issues: for those who haven't been displaced, prevent them from being displaced; for those who have been displaced, look at unlawful detainer (UD) process, UD process has been abused and UD makes it difficult for people to rent again, it's on their record, and need to have 3x rent to find housing, can lead to homelessness.
- Need to look at homeless and Clean Water Act

Lydia Vincent-White

- Bayview neighborhood housing crisis
- Elders passing away, families aren't able to hold onto the housing
- Families don't have money to rehab the housing
- Would like to be able to rehab the properties and rent them, or sell them to working people who can afford the units (not \$1M+, something more attainable to workers)
- New homes need to be built, but existing homes need to be preserved

Luke Barnesmoore, Director of Strategy – Homematch program

- Grateful to MOHCD and HSH for funding
- Happy to help anyone looking to rent a room

Fay Darmawi, Founder and Executive Director of SF Urban Film Fest

- Advocate for Cultural Districts as Cultural Districts do their work
- People really connect to story-telling and can use this to connect Cultural Districts and housing

Andrew Broderick, SF Tech Council

- For older residents, have been doing more pop-up events (can bring smart phones, tablets, etc.); residential locations are good places to do events; impactful for older residents to get technical support

David Woo, SOMA Filipinas

- Need to have aggressive land banking strategy that is developed/supported by MOHCD, especially with state-mandated goal of 40,000 units; strategy needs to map out sites
- In SOMA have seen sites grabbed up, especially after upzoning
- Small Sites Program: make sure the program works for specific neighborhoods, and what those neighborhoods need (I.e., 3-4 unit buildings in SOMA)

- Build capacity of culturally competent organizations to do site acquisition
- Help folks get into housing
- Better understand barriers that people are facing (I.e., Gran Oriente – SSP – but no Filipino got housing)
- Seniors – how to get seniors and multi-generation into housing, and how to prioritize these groups to get into housing

Angelica Cabande

- For her and tenants that she works with, all the goals and program areas resonate, especially stabilization, healthy physically, businesses reflect their culture, communities at risk of displacement – have difficulty paying rent and reaching out to apply for rental assistance
- Important to have tenant counseling available for immigrants (language access)
- Doesn't agree with how Small Sites Program is being run, not equitable. Would like to see more in SOMA. Would like to see MOHCD be more flexible to help vulnerable populations and districts so can retain long-term residents and units.
- Would like to see City more proactive with community to identify buildings that can be turned into housing (I.e., Panorama); would like to see City do more of that since now seeing more vacancies due to tech leaving/doing more remote work.

Pablo Solares, Director of MEDA

- Agrees with the goals that MOHCD has identified
- Mission community families and business are getting displaced
- Provide housing and business infrastructure resonates with MEDA and Mission community

Alexis Laing

- Community needs more affordable housing
- Process to get units built more efficiently and quickly is needed

Notes from Zoom Q&A/Chat

- Would you please describe MOHCD's plan for rolling out shallow rent subsidies? Many of older adults we work with live on a low-fixed income and are being priced out of even affording a bedroom in their communities. Home Match sees shallow rent subsidies as an essential tool for preventing homelessness and displacement in older adult communities and we'd like to hear more about the plan for increasing shallow rent subsidies in SF.

Filipino-speaking Group

What are the most important things for your community?
How would you prioritize them?

Ramon Bonifacio

- Advocating for a stable housing for the families
- Tagalog translation services to be provided for Filipinos in order to better understand the services available to them

Silay Kintanar

- Affordable housing, as there are threats of eviction because of too expensive rental costs
- Advocating for Filipinos who are homeless (e.g., an old man who sleeps in buses every night)
- Emergency shelter to be available for seniors and are physically disabled
- The rental property has many rats that affect the health of those who are living in it
- Broken elevators of the rental property, which makes it so hard for seniors and those who are physically disabled to walk up the stairs, e.g., 6th floor.
- Years of having to be on a wait-list for affordable housing

Lolita Kintanar

- 79-year old living in Union City, but works in San Francisco
- Application to DAHLIA since 2015, but has not been successful in the lottery
- Requesting for shelter for seniors

Cantonese-speaking Group

What are the most important things for your community?
How would you prioritize them?

No speakers.

Spanish-speaking Group

What are the most important things for your community?
How would you prioritize them?

No speakers

Summary of Written Comments Received Regarding Community Needs

No written comments.

Notes from March 21, 2023 Hybrid Public Hearing on Draft 2023-2024 Action Plan and Funding Recommendations

Notes from the March 21, 2023 public hearings will be included here.

Summary of Written Comments Received on Draft 2023-2024 Action Plan and Funding Recommendations

A summary of any written comments will be included here.

| FY 2023 Community Planning and Development Formula Program Allocations | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|--------------|-----|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------|----------|
| NAME | STA | CDBG | RHP | HOME | ESG | HOPWA | KEY | CNSRTKEY |
| State of California | CA | \$31,050,303 | \$0 | \$48,140,496 | \$12,412,939 | \$5,020,123 | 069999 | |
| San Francisco | CA | \$18,808,788 | \$0 | \$5,261,293 | \$1,602,414 | \$7,410,761 | 063228 | |

https://www.hud.gov/program_offices/comm_planning/budget/fy23

2023-2024 ESG Proposed Expenditure Schedule

The following is a list of proposed expenditures for the 2023-2024 ESG 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 1C: Prevent and Reduce Homelessness

- Goal 1Cvi: Expand services to prevent homelessness and stabilize housing for formerly homeless households and those at risk of homelessness

| Agency Name | Project Description | ESG Funding Amount |
|--|--|--------------------|
| Catholic Charities CYO of the Archdiocese of San Francisco | Prevention for individuals | \$212,943 |
| Compass Family Services | Emergency shelter services and case management | \$96,000 |
| Compass Family Services | Prevention and rapid rehousing for families | \$53,944 |
| Dolores Street Community Services, Inc. | Case management for shelter residents | \$55,000 |
| Episcopal Community Services of San Francisco | Rapid rehousing for adults | \$53,943 |
| Episcopal Community Services of San Francisco | Emergency Shelter Services | \$217,000 |
| Hamilton Families | Emergency shelter services and case management | \$55,000 |
| Hamilton Families | Rapid rehousing for families | \$191,943 |
| Homeless Children's Network | Case management for shelter residents | \$55,000 |
| La Casa de las Madres | Emergency shelter services and case management | \$165,000 |
| Larkin Street Youth Services | Emergency shelter services and case management | \$112,000 |
| Mission Area Health Associates | Prevention for individuals | \$55,943 |
| Providence Foundation of San Francisco | Emergency shelter services and case management | \$50,000 |
| The San Francisco Particular Council of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, dba St. Vincent de Paul Society of San Francisco | Emergency shelter services and case management | \$50,000 |
| | Subtotal | \$1,423,716 |

2023-2024 ESG Proposed Expenditure Schedule

Administration Costs

| Agency Name | Project Description | ESG Funding Amount |
|---|---------------------------------|--------------------|
| Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing | HMIS | \$58,517 |
| Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing | General ESG administration pool | \$90,136 |
| Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development | General ESG administration pool | \$30,045 |
| | Subtotal | \$178,698 |

TOTAL 2023-2024 ESG: \$1,602,414

ESG Matching Chartfields

Budget Vs Actuals by Selected Dimension

Actual Amounts are from the PeopleSoft GL Module. Click on
Time run: 3/24/2023 10:58:55 AM

| Type | Account Lvl 5 Code | Account Lvl 3 Description | Original Budget | Supplemental Budget | Transfer & Other Budget | Carryforward Budget | Budget Correction | Revised Budget | GL Actual | Encumbrance | Pre- Encumbrance | Surplus/Savings (Shortfall/Overspe nding) | Reserves | Available Balance |
|------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------|---|----------|-------------------|
| Uses | 5010 | Salaries | \$350,163 | \$0 | \$0 | \$243,676 | \$0 | \$593,839 | \$120,215 | \$0 | \$0 | \$473,623 | \$0 | \$473,623 |
| | 5060 | Programmatic Projects | \$0 | \$0 | (\$171,718) | \$14,920,403 | \$0 | \$14,748,685 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$14,748,685 | \$0 | \$14,748,685 |
| | 5130 | Mandatory Fringe Benefits | \$150,243 | \$0 | \$0 | \$146,973 | \$0 | \$297,216 | \$38,365 | \$0 | \$0 | \$258,851 | \$0 | \$258,851 |
| | 5200 | Overhead and Allocations | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$270,000 | \$0 | \$270,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$270,000 | \$0 | \$270,000 |
| | 5210 | Non-Personnel Services | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | (\$6,333,922) | \$0 | (\$6,333,922) | \$2,328,705 | \$407,738 | \$0 | (\$9,070,365) | \$0 | (\$9,070,365) |
| | 5380 | City Grant Program | \$16,953,212 | \$0 | \$0 | \$20,571,650 | \$0 | \$37,524,862 | \$19,513,293 | \$22,322,190 | \$0 | (\$4,310,622) | \$0 | (\$4,310,622) |
| | 5400 | Materials & Supplies | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | (\$55,941) | \$0 | (\$55,941) | \$29,311 | \$71,634 | \$0 | (\$156,886) | \$0 | (\$156,886) |
| | 5600 | Capital Outlay | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$16,191 | \$0 | \$16,191 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$16,191 | \$0 | \$16,191 |
| | 5810 | Services Of Other Depts | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$14,359 | \$0 | \$14,359 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$14,359 | \$0 | \$14,359 |
| Uses Total | | | \$17,453,618 | \$0 | (\$171,718) | \$29,793,388 | \$0 | \$47,075,288 | \$22,029,889 | \$22,801,562 | \$0 | \$2,243,837 | \$0 | \$2,243,837 |

Department Group Code is equal to **HOM**

and CONCAT(CONCAT(Project Code, '-'), Project Name) contains any **10031196**

and CONCAT(CONCAT(Authority Code, '-'), Authority Description) contains any **17129**

and Time Filter

and Budget Period is equal to **2023**

City and County of San Francisco



**MAYOR'S OFFICE OF HOUSING AND
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**
Environmental Review Record for
Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG) Program
Grant Activities subject to 24 CFR
Part 58

2023-2024

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: City and County of San Francisco 2023-2024 Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG) Program

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:

Preparer: Lorena Guadiana

Certifying Officer Name and Title: Brian Cheu, Deputy Director (MOHCD)

Consultant (if applicable):

Project Location: City and County of San Francisco Various Locations:
See attached Appendices A-D

Description of the Proposed Project [24 CFR 58.32; 40 CFR 1508.25]:

The project consists of overall non-construction costs for the Emergency Solutions Grant Program (ESG). The San Francisco ESG program will improve the quality of existing emergency shelters for the homeless; provide additional emergency shelters; help meet the costs of operating emergency shelters; and provide essential social services to homeless individuals. The program also funds preventive programs and activities that will reduce the number of people who become homeless.

Level of Environmental Review Determination:

- ☒ Activity/Project is Exempt per 24 CFR 58.34(a), (3)
- ☒ Activity/Project is Categorically Excluded Not Subject To §58.5 per 24 CFR 58.35(b)(2)

Funding Information

| Grant Number | HUD Program | Funding Amount |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------|
| E-22-MC-06-0016 | ESG | \$1,602,414 |

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount: \$1,602,414

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)]: \$1,602,414

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 is not within 15,000 feet of a military airport or 2,500 feet of a civilian airport. The project does not lie within an Airport Clear Zone or Accident Potential Zone. Source Documents: 1. City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County, 2012 (November). Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of San Francisco International Airport. Available at https://ccag.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/SFO-AIA-B.pdf (Prepared by Jacobs Consultancy, and Clarion.) |
|--|---|---|

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| 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 |
| | | 2. Google Earth Pro, Distance to SFO, March 24, 2023 |
| 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"/> | The project is not located in a coastal barrier resource area. Source Document: 1. 16 USC §3501(a)(1) which defines the locations of coastal barrier resource areas. The Pacific Coast of the Continental United States is not included in that definition. |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Flood Insurance</p> <p>Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 and National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994 [42 USC 4001-4128 and 42 USC 5154a]</p> | <p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>This project does not involve mortgage insurance, refinance, acquisition, repairs, rehabilitation, or construction of a structure, mobile home, or insurable personal property. The program sites are not located in a FEMA-designated Special Flood Hazard Area.</p> <p>Source Documents:</p> <p>1. City and County of San Francisco Interim Floodplain Map. Internet Web Site: https://sfgsa.org/san-francisco-floodplain-management-program</p> <p>Accessed on March 23, 2023.</p> <p>2. United States Federal Emergency Management Administration. FEMA Issued Flood Maps, San Francisco County. Internet Web Site: https://msc.fema.gov</p> |
|--|---|--|

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 |
|---------------------------|--------------------|
| NA | |

Preparer Signature: Lorena Guadiana Digitally signed by Lorena Guadiana
DN: cn=Lorena Guadiana, o=San Francisco City and County, ou=Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development,
email=Lorena.Guadiana@sfgov.org, c=US
Date: 2023.03.24 12:37:50 -07'00' Date: March 23, 2023

Name/Title/Organization: **Lorena Guadiana, Compliance Coordinator, MOHCD**

Responsible Entity Agency Official Signature: Brian Cheu 3/24/2023 | 3:18 PM PDT
Date: _____

Name/Title: **Brian Cheu, Deputy Director, SF 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).

Appendix A: List of Various ESG Projects

| 2023-2024 ESG Administrative Projects Level of Review: 24 CFR 58.34(a)(3) Administrative and Management Activities | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Agency Name | Project | Project Address | Project City | Project Zip | Project Description | ESG Funding Amount |
| Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing | General ESG administration pool | 1650 Mission Street | San Francisco | 94103 | General ESG administration pool | \$90,136 |
| Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development | General ESG administration pool | 1 South Van Ness Avenue | San Francisco | 94103 | General ESG administration pool | \$30,045 |
| Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing | HMIS | 1650 Mission Street | San Francisco | 94103 | HMIS | \$58,517 |
| Total ESG Administrative | | | | | | \$178,698 |


| 2023-2024 Supportive Services ESG Projects Level of Review: 24 CFR §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 | Project | Project Address | Project City | Project Zip | Project Description | ESG Funding Amount |
| Catholic Charities CYO of the Archdiocese of San Francisco | Homelessness Prevention | 990 Eddy Street | SF | 94109 | Prevention for individuals | \$212,943 |
| Compass Family Services | Compass Family Shelter | 626 Polk Street | SF | 94102 | Emergency shelter services and case management | \$96,000 |
| Compass Family Services | Homelessness Prevention | 626 Polk Street | SF | 94102 | Prevention and rapid rehousing for families | \$53,944 |
| Dolores Street Community Services, Inc. | Dolores Shelter Program | 938 Valencia Street | SF | 94110 | Case management for shelter residents | \$55,000 |
| Episcopal Community Services of San Francisco | Rapid Rehousing | 201 8th Street | SF | 94103 | Rapid rehousing for adults | \$53,943 |
| Episcopal Community Services of San Francisco | Episcopal Community Services of SF | 201 8th Street | SF | 94103 | Emergency Shelter Services | \$217,000 |
| Hamilton Families | Hamilton Family Residences and Emergency Center | 255 Hyde Street | SF | 94102 | Emergency shelter services and case management | \$55,000 |
| Hamilton Families | Rapid Rehousing | 255 Hyde Street | SF | 94102 | Rapid rehousing for families | \$191,943 |
| Homeless Children's Network | Case Management for Homeless Families and Individuals | 3450 Third Street | SF | 94124 | Case management for shelter residents | \$55,000 |
| La Casa de las Madres | Domestic Violence Shelter & Drop In Center | 1663 Mission Street, Suite 225, | SF | 94103 | Emergency shelter services and case management | \$165,000 |
| Larkin Street Youth Services | Lark-Inn for Youth | 134 Golden Gate Avenue | SF | 94102 | Emergency shelter services and case management | \$112,000 |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------------|----|-------|--|--------------------|
| Mission Area Health Associates | Mission Neighborhood Health Center/Mission Neighborhood Resource Center | 165 Capp Street | SF | 94110 | Prevention for individuals | \$55,943 |
| Providence Foundation of San Francisco | Homeless Services | 1218 Mendell Street | SF | 94124 | Emergency shelter services and case management | \$50,000 |
| Total ESG Supportive Services | | | | | | \$1,423,716 |


Distance of funded ESG projects in relation to SFO is:

~41,713.23

Appendix B



Legend


 San Francisco International Airport (SFO)


5 mi

Google Earth

Data SIO, NOAA, U.S. Navy, NGA, GEBCO
Data CSUMB SFML, CA OFC

San Francisco International Airport (SFO)
San Francisco International Airport





Appendix C

- LEGEND**
- Boundary for Airport Influence Area B
 - Outer Boundary of Safety Zones
 - CNEL Contour, 2020 Forecast
 - 14 CFR Part 77 Conical Surface
 - Outer Boundary of TERPS Approach and OEI Departure Surfaces
 - Airport Property
 - BART Station
 - CALTRAIN Station
 - Municipal Boundary
 - Railroad
 - Freeway
 - Road
 - Local Park, Golf Course, Cemetery
 - Regional Park or Recreation Area
 - Open Space


Sources:

100:1 FAA Notification Zone: Ricondo & Associates, Inc. and Jacobs Consultancy, based on 14 CFR Part 77, Subpart B, Section 77.9.

Outer Boundary of TERPS Approach and OEI Departure Surfaces: San Francisco International Airport, Jacobs Consultancy, and Planning Technology Inc., 2009

Safety Compatibility Zones: Jacobs Consultancy Team, 2009; Ricondo & Associates, Inc., 2011

Noise Contour: URS Corporation and BridgeNet International. Draft Environmental Assessment, San Francisco International Airport Proposed Runway Safety Area Program, June 2011



Appendix D

SF MOHCD FY 2023-24 ESG Grant Locations

Locations are based on project addresses.



FEMA Flood Hazards



ESG Grants

FEMA Flood Hazard

0.2% Annual Chance Flood Hazard

1% Annual Chance Flood Hazard

Regulatory Floodway

N





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 #: 230412

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

original

DATE OF ORIGINAL FILING (for amendment only)

AMENDMENT DESCRIPTION – Explain reason for amendment

2. CITY ELECTIVE OFFICE OR BOARD

OFFICE OR BOARD

Board of Supervisors

NAME OF CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER

Members

3. FILER'S CONTACT

NAME OF FILER'S CONTACT

Angela Calvillo

TELEPHONE NUMBER

415-554-5184

FULL DEPARTMENT NAME

office of the clerk of the Board

EMAIL

Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

4. CONTRACTING DEPARTMENT CONTACT

NAME OF DEPARTMENTAL CONTACT

Dolly Sithounnolat

DEPARTMENT CONTACT TELEPHONE NUMBER

415-701-5500

FULL DEPARTMENT NAME

MYR Mayor's Office of Housing & Comm. Dev.

DEPARTMENT CONTACT EMAIL

commdevRFP@sfgov.org

| 5. CONTRACTOR | |
|--|--|
| NAME OF CONTRACTOR Catholic Charities CYO of the Archdiocese of SF | TELEPHONE NUMBER (415) 972-1200 |
| STREET ADDRESS (including City, State and Zip Code) 990 Eddy St. San Francisco, CA 94109 | EMAIL moreinfo@catholiccharitiessf.org |

| 6. CONTRACT | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--|
| DATE CONTRACT WAS APPROVED BY THE CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER(S) | ORIGINAL BID/RFP NUMBER | FILE NUMBER (If applicable) 230412 |
| DESCRIPTION OF AMOUNT OF CONTRACT \$212,943 | | |
| NATURE OF THE CONTRACT (Please describe) \$212,943 - ESG funds for Homelessness Prevention for individuals (Project ID: HSH1) | | |

| 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 | Hammerle | Ellen | CEO |
| 2 | Ewers | Cheryl | CFO |
| 3 | Cordileone | Salvatore | Board of Directors |
| 4 | Boerio | Joe | Board of Directors |
| 5 | Booromeo | Ted | Board of Directors |
| 6 | Gorgan | Kathleen | Board of Directors |
| 7 | Bojorquez | Diana | Board of Directors |
| 8 | Clark | Philip | Board of Directors |
| 9 | Dahik | Adriana | Board of Directors |
| 10 | O'Brien Frimel | Susie | Board of Directors |
| 11 | Ghilotti | Michael | Board of Directors |
| 12 | Gonzalez | Eleanor | Board of Directors |
| 13 | Hultman | David | Board of Directors |
| 14 | Ikeda | Lisa | Board of Directors |
| 15 | Kearney | Philip | Board of Directors |
| 16 | Landis | Scott | Board of Directors |
| 17 | Leupp | Jay Paul | Board of Directors |
| 18 | McInerney | Maureen | Board of Directors |
| 19 | Mirek | Lori | 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 | Nascimento | Daniel | Board of Directors |
| 21 | Pohlman | Jack | Board of Directors |
| 22 | Reyes | Remund | Board of Directors |
| 23 | Renaud | Louis | Board of Directors |
| 24 | Sangiacomo | Jim | Board of Directors |
| 25 | Smith | Barbara | Board of Directors |
| 26 | woody | Patrick | Board of Directors |
| 27 | Bowen | Thomas | Board of Directors |
| 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.

| | |
|---|--------------------|
| SIGNATURE OF CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER OR BOARD SECRETARY OR CLERK | DATE SIGNED |
| BOS Clerk of the Board | |



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 #: 230412

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 |
| Arata Goto | 415-701-5500 |
| FULL DEPARTMENT NAME | DEPARTMENT CONTACT EMAIL |
| MYR Mayor's Office of Housing & Comm. Dev. | commdevRFP@sfgov.org |

| 5. CONTRACTOR | |
|--|---|
| NAME OF CONTRACTOR Episcopal Community Services of San Francisco | TELEPHONE NUMBER 415-487-3300 ext. 7000 |
| STREET ADDRESS (including City, State and Zip Code) 165 8th St., San Francisco, CA 94103 | EMAIL |

| 6. CONTRACT | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--|
| DATE CONTRACT WAS APPROVED BY THE CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER(S) | ORIGINAL BID/RFP NUMBER | FILE NUMBER (If applicable) 230412 |
| DESCRIPTION OF AMOUNT OF CONTRACT \$217,000 | | |
| NATURE OF THE CONTRACT (Please describe) \$217,000 - ESG funds for Emergency Shelter Services (Project ID: HSH9) | | |

| 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 | Larra | Eric | CFO |
| 2 | Stokes | Beth | CEO |
| 3 | Handley Andrus | Marc | Board of Directors |
| 4 | Bond | Doug | Board of Directors |
| 5 | Clayter | Todd | Board of Directors |
| 6 | Geeslin | Keith | Board of Directors |
| 7 | Ho | Heidi | Board of Directors |
| 8 | Jones | Martin | Board of Directors |
| 9 | Ketcham | Susan | Board of Directors |
| 10 | Martinez | Alejandro | Board of Directors |
| 11 | McTiernan | Megan | Board of Directors |
| 12 | Metoyer | Eric | Board of Directors |
| 13 | Rodriguez | Jonathan | Board of Directors |
| 14 | Shah | Tajel | Board of Directors |
| 15 | Silveira | Dara | Board of Directors |
| 16 | Singer | Susanna | Board of Directors |
| 17 | Solomon | Barbara | Board of Directors |
| 18 | Springwater | Richard | Board of Directors |
| 19 | Tatsuno | Yvonne | 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 | Zaidi | Hassan | Board of Directors |
| 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.

| | |
|---|--------------------|
| SIGNATURE OF CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER OR BOARD SECRETARY OR CLERK | DATE SIGNED |
| BOS Clerk of the Board | |



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 #: 230412

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 |
| Arata Goto | 415-701-5500 |
| FULL DEPARTMENT NAME | DEPARTMENT CONTACT EMAIL |
| MYR Mayor's Office of Housing & Comm. Dev. | COMMDEVRFPSFGOV.ORG |

| 5. CONTRACTOR | |
|---|--|
| NAME OF CONTRACTOR Hamilton Families | TELEPHONE NUMBER (415) 321-2612 ext. 131 |
| STREET ADDRESS (including City, State and Zip Code) 273 9th St, San Francisco, CA 94103 | EMAIL |

| 6. CONTRACT | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--|
| DATE CONTRACT WAS APPROVED BY THE CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER(S) | ORIGINAL BID/RFP NUMBER | FILE NUMBER (If applicable) 230412 |
| DESCRIPTION OF AMOUNT OF CONTRACT \$191,943 | | |
| NATURE OF THE CONTRACT (Please describe) \$191,943 - ESG Funds for Rapid rehousing for families (Project ID: HSH12) | | |

| 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 | Buck | Paige | Board of Directors |
| 2 | Bernstein | Ruth | Board of Directors |
| 3 | Basler | Julian | Board of Directors |
| 4 | Bloom | Marissa | Board of Directors |
| 5 | Florendo | Lauren | Board of Directors |
| 6 | Goldin | David | Board of Directors |
| 7 | Jackson | Rebecca | Board of Directors |
| 8 | Kurtze | DJ | Board of Directors |
| 9 | Lane | Jessica | Board of Directors |
| 10 | Maidenberg | Ted | Board of Directors |
| 11 | Moreno | Karina | Board of Directors |
| 12 | Boutiette | Dale | Board of Directors |
| 13 | Scott | Mary | Board of Directors |
| 14 | Toland | Susan | Board of Directors |
| 15 | Noon | Kyriell | CEO |
| 16 | Kim | Kenneth | COO |
| 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.

SIGNATURE OF CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER OR BOARD SECRETARY OR CLERK

DATE SIGNED

BOS Clerk of the Board



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 #: 230412

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 |
| Hanna Blanton | 415-701-5500 |
| FULL DEPARTMENT NAME | DEPARTMENT CONTACT EMAIL |
| MYR Mayor's Office of Comm. Dev. | hanna.blanton@sfgov.org |

| 5. CONTRACTOR | |
|---|---|
| NAME OF CONTRACTOR La Casa de las Madres | TELEPHONE NUMBER 415-503-0500 |
| STREET ADDRESS (including City, State and Zip Code) 1269 Howard Street, San Francisco, CA 94103 | EMAIL |

| 6. CONTRACT | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--|
| DATE CONTRACT WAS APPROVED BY THE CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER(S) | ORIGINAL BID/RFP NUMBER | FILE NUMBER (If applicable) 230412 |
| DESCRIPTION OF AMOUNT OF CONTRACT \$165,000 | | |
| NATURE OF THE CONTRACT (Please describe) \$165,000 - ESG funds for Emergency shelter services and case management (Project ID: HSH14) | | |

| 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 | Black | Kathy | CEO |
| 2 | Zauss | Michelle | Board of Directors |
| 3 | Sanchez | Carmen | Board of Directors |
| 4 | Ortler | Carolyn | Board of Directors |
| 5 | Escson | Austin | Board of Directors |
| 6 | Hale | Katie | Board of Directors |
| 7 | Jolivet | Melantie | Board of Directors |
| 8 | McCurtis | Kiesha | Board of Directors |
| 9 | Miller Creary | Betty | Board of Directors |
| 10 | Steel | Shawn | Board of Directors |
| 11 | Tucker | Nanci | Board of Directors |
| 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.

| | |
|---|--------------------|
| SIGNATURE OF CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER OR BOARD SECRETARY OR CLERK | DATE SIGNED |
| BOS Clerk of the Board | |



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 #: 230412

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 |
| Arata Goto | 415-701-5500 |
| FULL DEPARTMENT NAME | DEPARTMENT CONTACT EMAIL |
| MYR Mayor's Office of Housing & Comm. Dev. | commdevRFP@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 Ave, San Francisco, CA 94102 | EMAIL |

| 6. CONTRACT | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--|
| DATE CONTRACT WAS APPROVED BY THE CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER(S) | ORIGINAL BID/RFP NUMBER | FILE NUMBER (If applicable) 230412 |
| DESCRIPTION OF AMOUNT OF CONTRACT \$112,000 | | |
| NATURE OF THE CONTRACT (Please describe) \$112,000 - ESG funds for Emergency shelter services and case management - Project ID: HSH15 | | |

| 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 | Roos | Eric | Board of Directors |
| 2 | Shapiro | Sally | Board of Directors |
| 3 | Valentine | D | Board of Directors |
| 4 | Moise | Adam | Board of Directors |
| 5 | Cameron | Cecily | Board of Directors |
| 6 | Elias | Marcie | Board of Directors |
| 7 | Grossman | Blake | Board of Directors |
| 8 | Obaro | Bambo | Board of Directors |
| 9 | Adams | Sherilyn | CEO |
| 10 | Barnett | Fiona | Board of Directors |
| 11 | Berg | Siri | Board of Directors |
| 12 | Brahm | Jennifer | Board of Directors |
| 13 | Cohen | Andy | Board of Directors |
| 14 | Foo | Catherine | Board of Directors |
| 15 | Hoecker | Anne | Board of Directors |
| 16 | Horn | Tim | Board of Directors |
| 17 | Johnson | Eric | Board of Directors |
| 18 | Kerzic | Richard | Board of Directors |
| 19 | Liss | Patrick | 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 | Hatvany Kitchen | Natalie | Board of Directors |
| 21 | Lindner | Marcus | Board of Directors |
| 22 | Matlock | Michael | Board of Directors |
| 23 | Modi | Kunal | Board of Directors |
| 24 | Ogan | Heather | Board of Directors |
| 25 | Perkins | Edward | Board of Directors |
| 26 | Viola | John | Board of Directors |
| 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.

SIGNATURE OF CITY ELECTIVE OFFICER OR BOARD SECRETARY OR CLERK

DATE SIGNED

BOS Clerk of the Board

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: March 17, 2023

SUBJECT: Accept and Expend Resolution for Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG)

GRANT TITLE: Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG)

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
- X Ethics Form 126
- _N/A_ Grant application
- N/A Grant award letter from funding agency
- _N/A_ Grant agreement
- X Other (Explain): Environmental Review

Departmental representative to receive a copy of the adopted resolution:

Name: Benjamin McCloskey
Phone: 415-701-5575
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).