

File No. 130492

Committee Item No. 2

Board Item No. _____

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Budget and Finance Sub-Committee

Date: 06/05/2013

Board of Supervisors Meeting

Date: _____

Cmte Board

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Motion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>	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 type="checkbox"/>	Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	MOU
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	Form 126 – Ethics Commission
<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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____

Completed by: Victor Young

Date May 31, 2013

Completed by: Victor Young

Date _____

1 [Apply for, Accept, and Expend Grant - Community Development Block Grant - FY2013-2014
2 - \$23,167,505]

3 **Resolution approving the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program**
4 **authorizing the Mayor, on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco, to apply for,**
5 **accept, and expend the City's FY2013-2014 CDBG Program entitlement from the U.S.**
6 **Department of Housing and Urban Development in the amount of \$16,204,214 and to**
7 **expend program income and reprogrammed funds in the amount of \$6,963,291 for a**
8 **combined total of \$23,167,505 beginning July 1, 2013, without an expiration date.**

9
10 WHEREAS, Under Title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as
11 amended, and related Federal Regulations, the City and County of San Francisco is eligible to
12 apply for and receive a Community Development Block Grant (CDBG); and,

13 WHEREAS, The City and County of San Francisco anticipates receiving approximately
14 \$16,204,214 in FY2013-2014 CDBG Program funds from HUD, and has approximately
15 \$1,600,000 in anticipated Program Income and \$5,363,291 from previous CDBG grants and
16 program income from prior years, for a combined total of approximately \$23,167,505; and,

17 WHEREAS, The Citizen's Committee on Community Development (CCCD) has
18 prepared recommendations for FY2013-2014 CDBG funding as set forth in a proposed
19 Expenditure Schedule, a copy of which is located in Board File No. 130492; and,

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

22 WHEREAS, The funding agency (HUD) does not allow use of grant on indirect costs;
23 and,

24 WHEREAS, An Environmental Review Record has been prepared by the Mayor's
25 Office of Housing (MOH) and approved by the Certifying Officer for the proposed projects and

1 activities set forth in the Expenditure Schedule with the National Environmental Policy Act
2 (NEPA) and other applicable statutes and authorities, in particular those cited in 24 CFR Part
3 58 §§5 and 6, a copy of which is located in Board File No. 130492; and,

4 WHEREAS, The Certifying Officer shall follow the provisions of NEPA to confirm and
5 ensure that all projects funded under the CDBG Program are in compliance with applicable
6 federal regulations and requirements; now, therefore, be it

7 RESOLVED, That the Mayor of the City and County of San Francisco is hereby
8 authorized to apply for, accept, and expend the City's 2013 CDBG Program funds from HUD
9 and expend an estimated \$6,963,291 in Program Income and Reprogrammed funds, all in
10 accordance with the purposes and goals for the funding as generally set forth in 2010-14 Five
11 Year Consolidated Plan and the Expenditure Schedule; and, be it

12 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors does hereby approve the
13 purposes and goals for FY2013-2014 CDBG Program funding as set forth in the Expenditure
14 Schedule for recipient agencies and departments, as well as provisions in the Expenditure
15 Schedule for adjusting two expenditure line items to correspond to the final entitlement
16 amount received from HUD; and, be it

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


19 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Mayor is hereby authorized to enter into and execute
20 agreements between the City and County of San Francisco and various agencies consistent
21 with FY2013-2014 CDBG Program and the Expenditure Schedule; and, be it

22 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Mayor is hereby authorized to submit documentation
23 and certifications as may be requested or required by HUD, and to take such additional
24 actions as may be required to apply for, accept and expend the FY2013-2014 CDBG funds
25

1 consistent with this Resolution and the goals of the FY2013-2014 CDBG Program and all
2 applicable legal requirements; and, be it

3 FURTHER RESOLVED, That all actions heretofore taken by the officers of the City
4 with respect to the application for, or the acceptance or expenditure of, FY2013-2014 CDBG
5 funds, Program Income and Reprogrammed funds are hereby approved, confirmed and
6 ratified.

7
8 Recommended:

9 

10 Olson Lee, Director

11
12 Approved:

13 

14 Edwin M. Lee, Mayor

15 

16 For Ben Rosenfield, Controller

**MAYOR'S OFFICE OF HOUSING
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**



EDWIN M. LEE
MAYOR

OLSON LEE
DIRECTOR

TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
FROM: Benjamin McCloskey, Chief Financial Officer
DATE: May 17, 2013
SUBJECT: Accept and Expend Resolution
GRANT TITLE: Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)

Attached please find the original and 2 copies of each of the following:

- ☒ Proposed resolution, signed
- ☒ Grant information forms
- ☒ Grant Expenditure Schedules
- ☒ Ethics Form 126
- ☐ Grant Application
- ☐ Grant award letter from funding agency
- ☐ Grant Agreement
- ☒ Other (Explain): Environmental Programmatic Review

Departmental representative to receive a copy of the adopted Resolution:

Name: Benjamin McCloskey **Phone:** 701-5575
Interoffice Mail Address: 1 South Van Ness, 5th Floor
Certified copy required: No.

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

Grant Resolution Information Form
(Effective July 2011)

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

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

1. Grant Title: Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)

2. Department: Mayor's Office of Housing

3. Contact Person: Benjamin McCloskey

Telephone: 415-701-5575

4. Grant Approval Status (check one):

☐ Approved by funding agency

☒ Not yet approved

5. Amount of Grant Funding Approved or Applied for: \$16,204,214, plus \$1,600,000 in estimated program income and \$5,363,291 in reprogrammed funds

6a. Matching Funds Required: \$0

b. Source(s) of matching funds (if applicable): N/A

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, 2013

End-Date: When all funds are expended – HUD does not require an end date

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): HUD allows up to 20% of the grant to be used for administrative expenses

c2. If no indirect costs are included, what would have been the indirect costs?

12. Any other significant grant requirements or comments: Grant detail MOCD14, CFDA 14.218

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

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

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

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


Comments:

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

Eugene Flannery
(Name)

Environmental Compliance Manager
(Title)

Date Reviewed: 5-17-13



(Signature Required)

Department Head or Designee Approval of Grant Information Form:

Olson Lee
(Name)

Director
(Title)

Date Reviewed: 5-20-13


(Signature Required)

**MAYOR'S OFFICE OF HOUSING
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
LEVEL OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW (Form 2011)**

Grant number, Project Name / Description PROJECT NAME:

2013 CDBG Program Administration; Capital Projects; Economic Development and Microenterprise Assistance; Workforce Development; Emergency Solutions Grants; Planning and Capacity Building; Public Services, and Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS.

AMOUNT: \$21,688,100

DESCRIPTION: The project consists of overall non-construction costs for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) HOME Investment Partnership (HOME) and Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) Programs.

The resources of the CDBG program will be used by the City and County of San Francisco to develop flexible, locally designed community development strategies to address the program's primary objective, which is the development of viable urban communities. San Francisco's CDBG program revitalizes neighborhoods by funding local programs that develop workforces, economic development, housing and improved community facilities and services.

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.

The City and County will use HOME funds for rehabilitation, new construction, acquisition of affordable housing.

HOPWA program funds will be used to prevent homelessness of persons with HIV/AIDS and to meet the housing needs of persons with HIV/AIDS, including lease/rental assistance, shared housing arrangements, apartments, single room occupancy (SRO) dwellings and community residences. Supportive services may also be included in the program.

All costs addressed in this Level of Environmental Review are limited to non-construction activities. These costs include but are not limited to Architectural, Design and Engineering Services for Capital Projects; Program Administration; Housing Program Administration; Technical Assistance; Planning, and Public Services including but not limited to: vocational training, legal, fair housing, children's and health services, business and educational counseling programs for low/moderate income households and qualifying businesses. The project also includes Community Economic Development activities that lead to the employment of low-income persons. A large number of sub-recipient organizations as well as City agencies are involved in the listed activities. (See attached Table 2.)

LEVEL OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW DETERMINATION – The activities of this project are all either Exempt Activities per 24 CFR §58.34 or Categorically Excluded not subject to 24 CFR §58.5 per 24 CFR § 58.35. (See attached Table 2).

DATE: May 16, 2013

STATUTES and REGULATIONS listed at 24 CFR 58.6

FLOOD DISASTER PROTECTION ACT

1. Does the project involve the acquisition, construction or rehabilitation of structures buildings or mobile homes?

☒ No; flood insurance is not required. **(The review of this factor is completed.)**

☐ Yes; continue.

2. Is the structure(s) or part of the structure(s) located in a FEMA designated Special Flood Hazard Area?

☐ No. Source Document: None of the projects is located in a floodplain per FEMA maps. FEMA has not mapped or identified flood hazard areas within the City and County of San Francisco. <http://www.msc.fema.gov>

Source Documents

http://msc.fema.gov/webapp/wcs/stores/servlet/MapSearchResult?storeId=10001&catalogId=10001&langId=-1&userType=G&panelIDs=&Type=pbp&nonprinted=&unmapped=UNMAPPED_060298|060298|SAN+FRANCISCO%2CCTY%2FSAN+FRANCISC Site last accessed on March 26, 2012.

City and County of San Francisco Interim Floodplain Map. Internet Web Site:
<http://sfgsa.org/index.aspx?page=828>. Accessed on March 26, 2013.

(The review of this factor is completed).

☐ Yes; Source Document: _____

If yes, proceed to Question 3.

3. Is the community participating in the National Insurance Program (or has less than one year passed since FEMA notification of Special Flood Hazards)?

☐ Yes (Flood Insurance under the National Flood Insurance Program must be obtained and maintained for the economic life of the project, in the amount of the total project cost. A copy of the flood insurance policy declaration must be kept on file).

☐ No (Federal assistance may not be used in the Special Flood Hazards Area).

(The review of this factor is completed)

COASTAL BARRIERS RESOURCES ACT

1. Is the project located in a coastal barrier resource area? (See www.fema.gov/nfip/cobra.shtm.)

☒ No. The City and County of San Francisco is not listed in the Coastal Barrier Resource System and no maps of the area are maintained by FEMA. If project activities take place in the San Francisco Bay conservation Zone, they will be in pre-existing, licensed facilities. Source Documentation: **Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972**, as amended through Public Law 109-58, the Energy Policy Act of 2005. 16 USC Sections 1451 - 1465

(The review of this element is completed).

☐ Yes - Federal assistance may not be used in such an area.

AIRPORT RUNWAY CLEAR ZONES AND CLEAR ZONES DISCLOSURES

1. Does the project involve the sale or acquisition of existing property within a Civil Airport's Runway Clear Zone, Approach Protection Zone or a Military Installation's Clear Zone?

☒ No; the City and County of San Francisco does not lie within an Airport Clear Zone or Accident Potential Zone. Source Documentation – San Francisco International Airport Master Plan. Adopted 1992. Project complies with 24 CFR 51.303(a)(3).

Project complies with 24 CFR 51.303(a)(3).


☐ Yes; **Disclosure statement must be provided** to buyer and a copy of the signed disclosure must be maintained in this Environmental Review Record.

Eugene T. Flannery
Preparer Name


Preparer Signature

May 16, 2013
Date

Brian Cheu,
Director of Community Development
Division, Mayor's Office of Housing
Responsible Entity Official Name


Signature

May 16, 2013
Date

**MAYOR'S OFFICE OF HOUSING
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
LEVEL OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW (Form 2011)**

TABLE I SUMMARY OF LEVEL OF REVIEW BY PROGRAM AREA			
PROGRAMS	ACTIVITIES	ALLOCATION	LEVEL OF FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW DETERMINATION
ADMINISTRATION – Table II A	Salaries and Overhead, Department Telecom Information Systems for MOH & MOEWD, Environmental Review – MOH & MOEWD, Controller for MOH & MOEWD, Planning Dept for MOH & MOEWD, City Attorney for MOH & MOEWD, IT/Data Processing, Salaries and Overhead, Planning Dept for MOH & MOEWD, IT/Data Processing – MOH & MOEWD.	\$3,771,591	Exempt per 24 CFR §58.34(a)(3) – Administrative and management activities

TABLE I SUMMARY OF LEVEL OF REVIEW BY PROGRAM AREA			
PROGRAMS	ACTIVITIES	ALLOCATION	LEVEL OF FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW DETERMINATION
NON-HOUSING CAPITAL PROJECTS AND PUBLIC SPACE IMPROVEMENTS - TABLE II B	Fund non-construction costs for capital and public space improvement projects including architectural, design and engineering services. Site-specific environmental reviews will be completed prior to entering into Grant Agreements.	\$542,200	LEVEL OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW: Exempt Activities - 24 CFR §58.34 (a) 1. Environmental and other studies, resource identification and the development of plans and strategies; 8. Engineering or design costs; 9. Technical assistance and training; Categorically Excluded - Converts to Exempt 58.35(b)(7): Approval of supplemental assistance (including insurance or guarantee) to a project previously approved under this part, if the approval is made by the same responsible entity that conducted the environmental review on the original project and re-evaluation of the environmental findings is not required under Sec. 58.47
HOUSING PROGRAM GRANTS TABLE II C	Funding for administrative and management costs for non-profit agencies to develop and rehabilitate single and multi-family housing units for low-income persons.	\$734,470	Exempt Activities: 24 CFR 58.34(a)(1): Environmental and other studies, resource identification and the development of plans and strategies Exempt Activities: 24 CFR §58.34(a)(8) - Engineering and Design Costs Categorical Exclusions: 24 CFR §58.35(b)(6) Affordable housing pre-development costs including legal, consulting, developer and other costs related to obtaining site options, project financing, administrative costs and fees for loan commitments, zoning approvals, and other related activities which do not have a physical impact.

TABLE I SUMMARY OF LEVEL OF REVIEW BY PROGRAM AREA			
PROGRAMS	ACTIVITIES	ALLOCATION	LEVEL OF FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW DETERMINATION
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT & MICROENTERPRISE ASSISTANCE- TABLE II D	Fund community economic development activities to support job creation and employment for low-income persons. Provide technical assistance to small businesses for soft costs such as training and loan support.		Exempt Activities
			24 CFR §58.34(a)(2) Information and Financial Services
			24 CFR §58.34(a)(4) Public services that will not have a physical impact or result in any physical changes, including but not limited to services concerned with employment, crime prevention, child care, health, drug abuse, education, counseling, energy conservation and welfare or recreational needs
			24 CFR §58.34(a)(9) Technical Assistance and Training
PLANNING AND CAPACITY BUILDING ACTIVITIES - TABLE II E	Funding to support neighborhood planning and capacity building activities.	\$3,790,327	Categorical Exclusions not subject to 24 CFR §58.5.
			24 CFR 58.35(b)(3) Operating costs including maintenance, security, operation, utilities, furnishings, equipment, supplies, staff training and recruitment and other incidental costs;
			24 CFR §58.35(b)(4) Economic Development Activities, including but not limited to, equipment purchase, inventory financing, interest subsidy, operating expenses and similar costs not associated with construction or expansion of existing operations.
		\$194,000	Exempt per 24 CFR §58.34(a)(1): Environmental and other studies, resource identification and the development of plans and strategies.

TABLE I
SUMMARY OF LEVEL OF REVIEW BY PROGRAM AREA

PROGRAMS	ACTIVITIES	ALLOCATION	LEVEL OF FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW DETERMINATION
PUBLIC SERVICES TABLE II F	Fund direct services for low and moderate-income persons.	\$3,554,500	Exempt per 24 CFR §58.34(a)(4) - Public Services that will not have a physical impact or result in any physical changes, including but not limited to services concerned with employment, crime prevention, child care, health, drug abuse, education, counseling, energy conservation and welfare or recreational needs.
EMERGENCY SOLUTIONS GRANTS - TABLE II - G			<p>Exempt Activities</p> <p>§58.34(a)(4) Public Services that will not have a physical impact or result in any physical changes, including but not limited to services concerned with employment, crime prevention, child care, health, drug abuse, education, counseling, energy conservation and welfare or recreational needs.</p> <p>Categorical Exclusions:</p> <p>24 CFR §58.35(b)(1). Tenant-based rental assistance;</p> <p>24 CFR §58.35(b)(2). Supportive services including, but not limited to, health care, housing services, permanent housing placements, 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;</p> <p>24 CFR §58.35(b)(6) Affordable housing pre-development costs including legal, consulting, developer and other costs related to obtaining site options, project financing, administrative costs and fees for loan commitments, zoning approvals, and other related activities which do not have a physical impact.</p>
		\$1,405,000	

TABLE I
SUMMARY OF LEVEL OF REVIEW BY PROGRAM AREA

PROGRAMS	ACTIVITIES	ALLOCATION	LEVEL OF FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW DETERMINATION
HOPWA TABLE II - H	Rental Assistance Program, supportive services and operating subsidies, project sponsor administration expenses		<p>Exempt Activities 24 CFR §58.34</p> <p>(a)(1): Environmental and other studies, resource identification and the development of plans and strategies</p> <p>(a)(3) Administrative and management activities</p> <p>(a)(4) Public Services that will not have a physical impact or result in any physical changes, including but not limited to services concerned with employment, crime prevention, child care, health, drug abuse, education, counseling, energy conservation and welfare</p> <p>Categorical Exclusions 24 CFR §58.35(b)</p> <p>(1) Tenant-based rental assistance;</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(3) Operating costs including maintenance, security, operation, utilities, furnishings, equipment, supplies.</p>
		\$7,696,012	

**MAYOR'S OFFICE OF HOUSING
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
LEVEL OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW (Form 2011)**

**TABLE II – A – ACTIVITIES AND SUB-RECIPIENT ORGANIZATIONS
ADMINISTRATION (ADM) – GENERAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION**

Salaries and Overhead, Department Telecom Information Systems for MOH, Environmental Review – MOH, Controller for MOH, Planning Dept for MOH, City Attorney for MOH, IT/Data Processing, Salaries and Overhead, Planning Dept for MOH, IT/Data Processing - MOH.

SUBTOTAL: \$3,771,591

LEVEL OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW: 24 CFR §58.34(a)(3) - Exempt activities - Administrative and Management Activities.

Mayor's Office of Housing	General ESG administration	\$114,663
Mayor's Office of Housing	General HOPWA administration	\$243,442
Mayor's Office of Housing	HMIS	\$9,189
Mayor's Office of Housing and Office of Economic and Workforce Development	General CDBG administration	\$3,404,297

TABLE II – B
ACTIVITIES AND SUB-RECIPIENT ORGANIZATIONS
Non-Housing Capital Projects and Public Space Improvements

Funding for non-construction costs for Public Facilities and Improvements including Neighborhood Facilities, Community Centers, Child Care Centers, Employment Centers, Health Facilities, Play Areas, Vocational Learning Centers, Day and Residential Treatment Centers. For those activities which include construction, the dollar amount allocated to the program activity represents approximately 10 percent of the total project cost, which is an estimate of the cost of non-construction costs. The actual amount of non-construction costs may vary slightly from the estimate. Construction costs, if any, have not yet been cleared for the project activities identified in this Table II – B. No funds for construction activities under this CDBG allocation may be expended or committed until such time as an Environmental Review Record has been prepared for the project activities.

Subtotal: \$542,200

LEVEL OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

Exempt Activities – 24 CFR §58.34 (a)

1. Environmental and other studies, resource identification and the development of plans and strategies;
8. Engineering or design costs;
9. Technical assistance and training;

Categorically Excluded – Converts to Exempt

58.35(b)(7): Approval of supplemental assistance (including insurance or guarantee) to a project previously approved under this part, if the approval is made by the same responsible entity that conducted the environmental review on the original project and re-evaluation of the environmental findings is not required under Sec. 58.47.

Subrecipient and Site Address	Amount	Project Activity	Level of Review
Arriba Juntos 49 Julian Avenue	\$3,500	Replace roof and install HVAC unit in an occupation training and employment development facility.	58.34(a)(1)
Asian Neighborhood Design 1245 Howard Street	\$35,000	Technical architectural support services for MOH/CD capital grantees.	58.34(a)(8); (9)
Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center 515 Cortland Avenue	\$3,300	Repair of leaks to roof and skylight and siding replacements at a multi-purpose community center.	58.34(a)(1)
Board of Trustees of the Glide Foundation 434 Ellis Street	\$3,000	Install new roof at a family, youth and childcare center.	58.34(a)(1)
Booker T. Washington Community Service Center 800 Presidio Avenue	\$150,000	Interior improvements as part of construction of a new community center.	58.35(b)(7)
Brava! for Women in the Arts 2781 24 th Street	\$10,000	Construction of the storefronts adjacent to the Brava Theater to create office space and dressing rooms for the main stage.	58.34(a)(1)
Community Design Center 5 Thomas Mellon Circle	\$35,000	Technical support for MOH/CD capital grantees.	58.34(a)(8); (9)
Community Youth Center-San Francisco (CYC-SF) 1038 Post Street	\$9,000	Renovation of roof and HVAC and installation of a wall divider in youth training facility.	58.34(a)(1)
Dolores Street Community Services 1050 South Van Ness Avenue	\$14,000	Upgrades to homeless shelter including removal of asbestos and installation of fire sprinklers.	58.34(a)(1)

TABLE II – B
ACTIVITIES AND SUB-RECIPIENT ORGANIZATIONS
Non-Housing Capital Projects and Public Space Improvements

Funding for non-construction costs for Public Facilities and Improvements including Neighborhood Facilities, Community Centers, Child Care Centers, Employment Centers, Health Facilities, Play Areas, Vocational Learning Centers, Day and Residential Treatment Centers. For those activities which include construction, the dollar amount allocated to the program activity represents approximately 10 percent of the total project cost, which is an estimate of the cost of non-construction costs. The actual amount of non-construction costs may vary slightly from the estimate. Construction costs, if any, have not yet been cleared for the project activities identified in this Table II – B. No funds for construction activities under this CDBG allocation may be expended or committed until such time as an Environmental Review Record has been prepared for the project activities.

Subtotal: \$542,200

LEVEL OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

Exempt Activities – 24 CFR §58.34 (a)

1. Environmental and other studies, resource identification and the development of plans and strategies;
8. Engineering or design costs;
9. Technical assistance and training;

Categorically Excluded – Converts to Exempt

58.35(b)(7): Approval of supplemental assistance (including insurance or guarantee) to a project previously approved under this part, if the approval is made by the same responsible entity that conducted the environmental review on the original project and re-evaluation of the environmental findings is not required under Sec. 58.47.

Subrecipient and Site Address	Amount	Project Activity	Level of Review
Donaldina Cameron House 920 Sacramento Street	\$6,600	Repair roof and cornice flashing of multi-service community facility serving primarily the Asian community.	58.34(a)(1)
Friends of the Urban Forest	\$4,000	Planting of 270 trees for a healthier urban forest as part of San Francisco's green infrastructure in BV-HP, Excelsior, Portola and Visitacion Valley.	58.34(a)(1)
Friends of the Urban Forest Various Locations	\$4,000	Planting of 270 trees for a healthier urban forest as part of San Francisco's green infrastructure in BV-HP, Excelsior, Portola and Visitacion Valley.	58.34(a)(1)
HealthRight 360 815 Buena Vista West	\$7,800	Renovate portions of existing elevator in behavioral health facility serving youth, adults, and families.	58.34(a)(1)
Homeless Prenatal Program, Inc. 2500 18 th Street	\$9,000	Removal of carpeting and installation of marmoleum at facility where prenatal education, counseling, financial and training are provided to homeless and low-income families.	58.34(a)(1)
Independent Living Resource Center of SF 825 Howard Street	\$10,000	Accessibility upgrades to a replacement site that will provide independent living services for people with disabilities.	58.34(a)(1)
Larkin Street Youth Services 869 Ellis Street	\$17,000	Renovate bathroom and flooring in homeless transition age youth shelter.	58.34(a)(1)

TABLE II – B
ACTIVITIES AND SUB-RECIPIENT ORGANIZATIONS
Non-Housing Capital Projects and Public Space Improvements

Funding for non-construction costs for Public Facilities and Improvements including Neighborhood Facilities, Community Centers, Child Care Centers, Employment Centers, Health Facilities, Play Areas, Vocational Learning Centers, Day and Residential Treatment Centers. For those activities which include construction, the dollar amount allocated to the program activity represents approximately 10 percent of the total project cost, which is an estimate of the cost of non-construction costs. The actual amount of non-construction costs may vary slightly from the estimate. Construction costs, if any, have not yet been cleared for the project activities identified in this Table II – B. No funds for construction activities under this CDBG allocation may be expended or committed until such time as an Environmental Review Record has been prepared for the project activities.

Subtotal: \$542,200

LEVEL OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

Exempt Activities – 24 CFR §58.34 (a)

1. Environmental and other studies, resource identification and the development of plans and strategies;
8. Engineering or design costs;
9. Technical assistance and training;

Categorically Excluded – Converts to Exempt

58.35(b)(7): Approval of supplemental assistance (including insurance or guarantee) to a project previously approved under this part, if the approval is made by the same responsible entity that conducted the environmental review on the original project and re-evaluation of the environmental findings is not required under Sec. 58.47.

Subrecipient and Site Address	Amount	Project Activity	Level of Review
Mission Neighborhood Centers 1245 Alabama Street	\$15,000	Upgrades to a facility, including ADA ramp, ADA bathroom, gates and flooring, that will be used to relocate a Head Start pre-school program.	58.34(a)(1)
Nihonmachi Little Friends 1830 Sutter Street	\$10,000	Installation of a three-story elevator in an adjacent expansion site, allowing the building addition and the existing building to be ADA accessible, at a childcare center.	58.34(a)(1)
North of Market/Tenderloin Community Benefit Corporation Location to be determined	\$8,000	Installation of an attended, portable (permanently placed) multiple-toilet facility in the Tenderloin.	58.34(a)(1)
Northern California Community Loan Fund 870 Market Street	\$150,000	Asset management planning for CDBG/HOPWA facilities.	58.34(a)(1)
Renaissance Entrepreneurship Center 275 5 th Street	\$14,000	Rebuild and renovate elevator in a facility providing entrepreneurship training.	58.34(a)(1)
San Francisco Conservation Corps 1242 Appleton Street	\$10,000	Installation of stationary high tech recycling equipment to increase efficiency and safety at a recycling facility that trains and employs low income youth.	58.34(a)(1)
San Francisco Parks Alliance/Mission Community Market Bartlett Street between 21 st and 22 nd Streets	\$4,000	Installation of storm water planter drains, trenches and planter beds; and planting of trees at a new public marketplace and open space in the Mission.	58.34(a)(1)

TABLE II – B
ACTIVITIES AND SUB-RECIPIENT ORGANIZATIONS
Non-Housing Capital Projects and Public Space Improvements

Funding for non-construction costs for Public Facilities and Improvements including Neighborhood Facilities, Community Centers, Child Care Centers, Employment Centers, Health Facilities, Play Areas, Vocational Learning Centers, Day and Residential Treatment Centers. For those activities which include construction, the dollar amount allocated to the program activity represents approximately 10 percent of the total project cost, which is an estimate of the cost of non-construction costs. The actual amount of non-construction costs may vary slightly from the estimate. Construction costs, if any, have not yet been cleared for the project activities identified in this Table II – B. No funds for construction activities under this CDBG allocation may be expended or committed until such time as an Environmental Review Record has been prepared for the project activities.

Subtotal: \$542,200

LEVEL OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

Exempt Activities – 24 CFR §58.34 (a)

1. Environmental and other studies, resource identification and the development of plans and strategies;
8. Engineering or design costs;
9. Technical assistance and training;

Categorically Excluded – Converts to Exempt

58.35(b)(7): Approval of supplemental assistance (including insurance or guarantee) to a project previously approved under this part, if the approval is made by the same responsible entity that conducted the environmental review on the original project and re-evaluation of the environmental findings is not required under Sec. 58.47.

Subrecipient and Site Address	Amount	Project Activity	Level of Review
The Janet Pomeroy Center 207 Skyline Boulevard	\$10,000	Roof renovation in facility providing recreation and vocational opportunities for people with disabilities	58.34(a)(1)

**TABLE II – C - ACTIVITIES AND SUB-RECIPIENT ORGANIZATIONS
HOUSING PROGRAM GRANTS**

SUBTOTAL: \$734,470

LEVEL OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

Exempt Activities: 24 CFR 58.34(a)(1): Environmental and other studies, resource identification and the development of plans and strategies

Exempt Activities: 24 CFR §58.34(a)(8) - Engineering and Design Costs

Categorical Exclusions: 24 CFR §58.35(b)(6) Affordable housing pre-development costs including legal, consulting, developer and other costs related to obtaining site options, project financing, administrative costs and fees for loan commitments, zoning approvals, and other related activities which do not have a physical impact.

Name	Description of Activity	Amount	Citation
Asian Neighborhood Design, 1245 Howard Street, 94103	Design technical assistance to support rehabilitation of affordable housing	\$53,000	24 CFR §58.34(a)(1) and (a)(8)
Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center, 3101 Mission Street	Project management activities associated with rehabilitation of affordable housing	\$70,000	24 CFR §58.35(b)(6)
Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center, 1000 Tompkins Avenue	Project management activities associated with rehabilitation of affordable housing	\$45,000	24 CFR §58.35(b)(6)
Chinatown Community Development Center, 1820 Post Street	Project management activities associated with rehabilitation of affordable housing	\$16,612	24 CFR §58.35(b)(6)
Chinatown Community Development Center, Various Locations	Project management activities associated with rehabilitation of affordable housing	\$109,271	24 CFR §58.35(b)(6)
Chinatown Community Development Center, 1303 Larkin Street	Project management activities associated with rehabilitation of affordable housing	\$36,117	24 CFR §58.35(b)(6)
Community Housing Partnership, 835 O'Farrell Street	Project management activities associated with rehabilitation of affordable housing	\$60,000	24 CFR §58.35(b)(6)
Community Housing Partnership, 5 th and Harrison Streets	Project management activities associated with rehabilitation of affordable housing	\$49,000	24 CFR §58.35(b)(6)
Dolores Street Community Services, Marty's Place	Project management activities associated with rehabilitation of affordable housing	\$32,470	24 CFR §58.35(b)(6)
Mission Housing Development Corporation, 3048 16 th Street	Project management activities associated with rehabilitation of affordable housing	\$30,000	24 CFR §58.35(b)(6)
Rebuilding Together San Francisco Various Locations	Project management activities associated with rehabilitation of affordable housing	\$30,000	24 CFR §58.35(b)(6)

**TABLE II – C - ACTIVITIES AND SUB-RECIPIENT ORGANIZATIONS
HOUSING PROGRAM GRANTS**

SUBTOTAL: \$734,470

LEVEL OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

Exempt Activities: 24 CFR 58.34(a)(1): Environmental and other studies, resource identification and the development of plans and strategies

Exempt Activities: 24 CFR §58.34(a)(8) - Engineering and Design Costs

Categorical Exclusions: 24 CFR §58.35(b)(6) Affordable housing pre-development costs including legal, consulting, developer and other costs related to obtaining site options, project financing, administrative costs and fees for loan commitments, zoning approvals, and other related activities which do not have a physical impact.

Name	Description of Activity	Amount	Citation
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation, Various Sites	Project management activities associated with rehabilitation of affordable housing	\$86,000	24 CFR §58.35(b)(6)
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation, Various Sites	Project management activities associated with rehabilitation of affordable housing	\$117,000	24 CFR §58.35(b)(6)

**TABLE II - D - ACTIVITIES AND SUB-RECIPIENT ORGANIZATIONS
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES
WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT & MICROENTERPRISE ASSISTANCE**

**Fund community economic development activities to support job creation and employment for low-income persons.
Provide technical assistance to small businesses for soft costs such as training and loan support.**

**SUBTOTAL: \$3,790,327
LEVELS OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

Exempt Activities

24 CFR §58.34(a)(2) Information and Financial Services

24 CFR §58.34(a)(4) Public services that will not have a physical impact or result in any physical changes, including but not limited to services concerned with employment, crime prevention, child care, health, drug abuse, education, counseling, energy conservation and welfare or recreational needs

24 CFR §58.34(a)(9) Technical Assistance and Training

Categorical Exclusions not subject to 24 CFR §58.5.

24 CFR §58.35(b)(3) Operating costs including maintenance, security, operation, utilities, furnishings, equipment, supplies, staff training and recruitment and other incidental costs;

24 CFR §58.35(b)(4) Economic Development Activities, including but not limited to, equipment purchase, inventory financing, interest subsidy, operating expenses and similar costs not associated with construction or expansion of existing operations.

Subrecipient	Amount	Activity	Citation
Asian Neighborhood Design	\$86,827	Architectural services and technical assistance for businesses in low- and moderate-income commercial neighborhood corridors	24 CFR §58.34(a)(9)
Bayview Hunter's Point Center for Arts & Technology	\$75,000	Young Adult Bridge services	24 CFR §58.34(a)(4)
CCSF Small Business Development Center	\$140,000	Entrepreneurial training, consultation, and support for businesses citywide with emphasis in the Chinatown and Mission neighborhoods.	24 CFR §58.34(a)(9), 24 CFR §58.35(b)(3)
Central City Hospitality House	\$100,000	Neighborhood Access Point	24 CFR §58.34(a)(4)
Collective Impact (dba Mo' Magic)	\$70,000	Neighborhood Access Point and Young Adult WorkLink Services	24 CFR §58.34(a)(4)
Community Center Project of S.F dba The San Francisco LGBT Community Center	\$40,000	Business technical assistance primarily for new and existing lesbians, gay, bisexual and transgender-owned micro-enterprises	24 CFR §58.34(a)(9), 24 CFR §58.35(b)(3)

**TABLE II - D - ACTIVITIES AND SUB-RECIPIENT ORGANIZATIONS
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES
WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT & MICROENTERPRISE ASSISTANCE**

**Fund community economic development activities to support job creation and employment for low-income persons.
Provide technical assistance to small businesses for soft costs such as training and loan support.**

**SUBTOTAL: \$3,790,327
LEVELS OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

Exempt Activities

24 CFR §58.34(a)(2) Information and Financial Services

24 CFR §58.34(a)(4) Public services that will not have a physical impact or result in any physical changes, including but not limited to services concerned with employment, crime prevention, child care, health, drug abuse, education, counseling, energy conservation and welfare or recreational needs

24 CFR §58.34(a)(9) Technical Assistance and Training

Categorical Exclusions not subject to 24 CFR §58.5.

24 CFR 58.35(b)(3) Operating costs including maintenance, security, operation, utilities, furnishings, equipment, supplies, staff training and recruitment and other incidental costs;

24 CFR §58.35(b)(4) Economic Development Activities, including but not limited to, equipment purchase, inventory financing, interest subsidy, operating expenses and similar costs not associated with construction or expansion of existing operations.

Subrecipient	Amount	Activity	Citation
Community Center Project of S.F dba The San Francisco LGBT Community Center	\$120,000	Neighborhood Access Point	24 CFR §58.34(a)(4)
Community Initiatives/EAG	\$63,000	One-on-one assistance for businesses to economically stabilize and strengthen neighborhood business districts in the Excelsior	24 CFR §58.34(a)(9), 24 CFR 58.35(b)(3)
Community Initiatives/PNSC	\$63,000	One-on-one assistance to businesses to economically stabilize and strengthen neighborhood business districts in the Portola	24 CFR §58.34(a)(9), 24 CFR 58.35(b)(3)
Compass Family Services	\$75,000	Neighborhood Access Point	24 CFR §58.34(a)(4)
Episcopal Community Services	\$100,000	Vocational skills Training in the hospitality sector.	24 CFR §58.34(a)(4)
Goodwill Industries of San Francisco, San Mateo and Marin Counties	\$125,000	Criminal justice and re-entry services in support of the One Stop system	24 CFR §58.34(a)(4)
Hearing and Speech Center of Northern California	\$42,500	Neighborhood Access Point and Young Adult WorkLink Services	24 CFR §58.34(a)(4)

**TABLE II – D - ACTIVITIES AND SUB-RECIPIENT ORGANIZATIONS
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES
WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT & MICROENTERPRISE ASSISTANCE**

**Fund community economic development activities to support job creation and employment for low-income persons.
Provide technical assistance to small businesses for soft costs such as training and loan support.**

**SUBTOTAL: \$3,790,327
LEVELS OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

Exempt Activities

24 CFR §58.34(a)(2) Information and Financial Services

24 CFR §58.34(a)(4) Public services that will not have a physical impact or result in any physical changes, including but not limited to services concerned with employment, crime prevention, child care, health, drug abuse, education, counseling, energy conservation and welfare or recreational needs

24 CFR §58.34(a)(9) Technical Assistance and Training

Categorical Exclusions not subject to 24 CFR §58.5.

24 CFR 58.35(b)(3) Operating costs including maintenance, security, operation, utilities, furnishings, equipment, supplies, staff training and recruitment and other incidental costs;

24 CFR §58.35(b)(4) Economic Development Activities, including but not limited to, equipment purchase, inventory financing, interest subsidy, operating expenses and similar costs not associated with construction or expansion of existing operations.

Subrecipient	Amount	Activity	Citation
In Home Support Services Consortium of San Francisco, Inc.	\$50,000	Vocational skills training in the health care sector	24 CFR §58.34(a)(4)
Japanese Community Youth Council (JCYC)/Japantown Task Force	\$40,000	One-on-one assistance to businesses to economically stabilize and strengthen neighborhood businesses primarily targeting microenterprises in the Japantown commercial core area	24 CFR §58.34(a)(9), 24 CFR 58.35(b)(3)
La Cocina	\$50,000	Commercial kitchen and business incubator that supports the development of microenterprises	24 CFR §58.34(a)(9), 24 CFR 58.35(b)(3)
Mission Asset Fund	\$50,000	Access to capital services, primarily targeting low-income micro-entrepreneurs	24 CFR §58.35(b)(4)
Mission Economic Development Agency	\$125,000	Business technical assistance program that provides a continuum of services in English and Spanish to support the growth and success of micro-enterprises	24 CFR §58.34(a)(9), 24 CFR 58.35(b)(3)
Mission Economic Development Agency	\$100,000	Neighborhood Access Point	24 CFR §58.34(a)(4)

**TABLE II – D - ACTIVITIES AND SUB-RECIPIENT ORGANIZATIONS
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES
WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT & MICROENTERPRISE ASSISTANCE**

**Fund community economic development activities to support job creation and employment for low-income persons.
Provide technical assistance to small businesses for soft costs such as training and loan support.**

**SUBTOTAL: \$3,790,327
LEVELS OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

Exempt Activities

24 CFR §58.34(a)(2) Information and Financial Services

24 CFR §58.34(a)(4) Public services that will not have a physical impact or result in any physical changes, including but not limited to services concerned with employment, crime prevention, child care, health, drug abuse, education, counseling, energy conservation and welfare or recreational needs

24 CFR §58.34(a)(9) Technical Assistance and Training

Categorical Exclusions not subject to 24 CFR §58.5.

24 CFR 58.35(b)(3) Operating costs including maintenance, security, operation, utilities, furnishings, equipment, supplies, staff training and recruitment and other incidental costs;

24 CFR §58.35(b)(4) Economic Development Activities, including but not limited to, equipment purchase, inventory financing, interest subsidy, operating expenses and similar costs not associated with construction or expansion of existing operations.

Subrecipient	Amount	Activity	Citation
Mission Hiring Hall	\$100,000	Vocational skills training in the health care sector.	24 CFR §58.34(a)(4)
Mission Language and Vocational School	\$100,000	Vocational skills training in the hospitality sector.	24 CFR §58.34(a)(4)
North of Market Neighborhood Improvement Corp.	\$70,000	Provide capacity building support to existing and new businesses seeking to locate in Central Market	24 CFR §58.34(a)(9), 24 CFR 58.35(b)(3)
Ocean Avenue Association	\$30,000	One-on-one assistance to businesses to economically stabilize and strengthen neighborhood business districts in the Ocean Merced Ingleside	24 CFR §58.34(a)(9), 24 CFR 58.35(b)(3)
Opportunity Fund Northern California	\$50,000	Increase access to capital services, primarily targeting low-income micro-entrepreneurs	24 CFR §58.34(a)(9), 24 CFR 58.35(b)(3)
Pacific Community Ventures	\$50,000	Business technical assistance and access to capital for small businesses	24 CFR §58.34(a)(9), 24 CFR 58.35(b)(3)
Positive Resource Center	\$50,000	Neighborhood Access Point	24 CFR §58.34(a)(4)

**TABLE II – D - ACTIVITIES AND SUB-RECIPIENT ORGANIZATIONS
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES
WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT & MICROENTERPRISE ASSISTANCE**

**Fund community economic development activities to support job creation and employment for low-income persons.
Provide technical assistance to small businesses for soft costs such as training and loan support.**

**SUBTOTAL: \$3,790,327
LEVELS OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

Exempt Activities

24 CFR §58.34(a)(2) Information and Financial Services

24 CFR §58.34(a)(4) Public services that will not have a physical impact or result in any physical changes, including but not limited to services concerned with employment, crime prevention, child care, health, drug abuse, education, counseling, energy conservation and welfare or recreational needs

24 CFR §58.34(a)(9) Technical Assistance and Training

Categorical Exclusions not subject to 24 CFR §58.5.

24 CFR 58.35(b)(3) Operating costs including maintenance, security, operation, utilities, furnishings, equipment, supplies, staff training and recruitment and other incidental costs;

24 CFR §58.35(b)(4) Economic Development Activities, including but not limited to, equipment purchase, inventory financing, interest subsidy, operating expenses and similar costs not associated with construction or expansion of existing operations.

Subrecipient	Amount	Activity	Citation
Renaissance Entrepreneurship Center	\$100,000	Entrepreneurial consultation, training, and support for small business owners and entrepreneurs primarily targeting the Bayview Hunters Point, Potrero Hill and Visitacion Valley neighborhoods	24 CFR §58.34(a)(9), 24 CFR 58.35(b)(3)
Renaissance Entrepreneurship Center	\$100,000	Entrepreneurial training, consultation, and support for individuals starting micro-enterprises	24 CFR §58.34(a)(9), 24 CFR 58.35(b)(3)
SF Made	\$65,000	Entrepreneurial consultation, training, and support for small business owners and entrepreneurs primarily targeting the eastern neighborhoods in the manufacturing sector	24 CFR §58.34(a)(9), 24 CFR 58.35(b)(3)
South of Market Foundation	\$100,000	Entrepreneurial consultation, training, and support for small business owners and entrepreneurs primarily targeting Sixth Street in the South of Market.	24 CFR §58.34(a)(9), 24 CFR 58.35(b)(3)
Southeast Asian Community Center	\$120,000	Entrepreneurial consultation and support for Asian and Pacific Islander small business owners	24 CFR §58.34(a)(9), 24 CFR 58.35(b)(3)

**TABLE II - D - ACTIVITIES AND SUB-RECIPIENT ORGANIZATIONS
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES
WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT & MICROENTERPRISE ASSISTANCE**

**Fund community economic development activities to support job creation and employment for low-income persons.
Provide technical assistance to small businesses for soft costs such as training and loan support.**

**SUBTOTAL: \$3,790,327
LEVELS OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

Exempt Activities

24 CFR §58.34(a)(2) Information and Financial Services

24 CFR §58.34(a)(4) Public services that will not have a physical impact or result in any physical changes, including but not limited to services concerned with employment, crime prevention, child care, health, drug abuse, education, counseling, energy conservation and welfare or recreational needs

24 CFR §58.34(a)(9) Technical Assistance and Training

Categorical Exclusions not subject to 24 CFR §58.5.

24 CFR 58.35(b)(3) Operating costs including maintenance, security, operation, utilities, furnishings, equipment, supplies, staff training and recruitment and other incidental costs;

24 CFR §58.35(b)(4) Economic Development Activities, including but not limited to, equipment purchase, inventory financing, interest subsidy, operating expenses and similar costs not associated with construction or expansion of existing operations.

Subrecipient	Amount	Activity	Citation
Toolworks	\$55,000	Neighborhood Access Point	24 CFR §58.34(a)(4)
Upwardly Global	\$75,000	Neighborhood Access Point	24 CFR §58.34(a)(4)
Vietnamese Youth Development Center	\$60,000	Young Adult Bridge services	24 CFR §58.34(a)(4)
Women's Initiative for Self Employment	\$40,000	Business technical assistance primarily for new and existing low-income women-owned micro-enterprises	24 CFR §58.34(a)(9), 24 CFR 58.35(b)(3)
Wu Yee Children's Services	\$45,000	Business technical assistance primarily for new and existing child care providers	24 CFR §58.34(a)(9), 24 CFR 58.35(b)(3)
Young Community Developers	\$65,000	Neighborhood Access Point and Young Adult WorkLink Services	24 CFR §58.34(a)(4)

TABLE II – E ACTIVITIES AND SUB-RECIPIENT ORGANIZATIONS
PLANNING AND CAPACITY BUILDING ACTIVITIES

Funding to support neighborhood planning and capacity building activities.

SUBTOTAL: \$194,000.00
 LEVEL OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

Exempt Activities:

§58.34(a)(1): Environmental and other studies, resource identification and the development of plans and strategies.

Name	AMOUNT	DESCRIPTION of Activity
Compasspoint Nonprofit Services, 731 Market Street, 94103	\$60,000	Technical assistance, consultation and workshop vouchers for CDBG-funded agencies
Earned Assets Resource Network/Office of the Treasurer	\$14,000	Capacity building for financial education practitioners as well as streamline access to financial education for low-income San Franciscans
HomeownershipSF, 275 5 th Street, 94103	\$30,000	Training and Capacity Building for Homebuyer Education Providers
Mission Asset Fund, 2301 Mission Street, 94110	\$20,000	Training and capacity building for community organizations to use a new online screening and referral tool that connects people to services
Richmond District Neighborhood Center, 741 30 th Avenue, 94121	\$30,000	Organizational capacity building for CDBG-funded neighborhood centers through participation in SF Neighborhood Centers Together, which offers training and peer support to Executive Directors.
San Francisco School Alliance, 1390 Market Street, 94102	\$20,000	Organizational capacity building for community based organizations through participation in the FES Certification Program, which offers training and peer support to nonprofit benefits providers
Vietnamese Youth Development Center	\$20,000	Strategic planning for four agencies serving primarily the Southeast Asian population

**TABLE II - F - ACTIVITIES AND SUB-RECIPIENT ORGANIZATIONS
PUBLIC SERVICES**

SUB-TOTAL: \$3,554,500

LEVEL OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW: Exempt activities. §58.34(a)(4) Public Services that will not have a physical impact or result in any physical changes, including but not limited to services concerned with employment, crime prevention, child care, health, drug abuse, education, counseling, energy conservation and welfare or recreational needs.

Subrecipient Name	Amount	Activity
AIDS Legal Referral Panel of the SF Bay Area	\$82,000	Legal services for low-income residents, primarily those with HIV and/or AIDS
APA Family Support Services	\$45,000	Service connection for Sunnydale public housing residents, including referral, case management and family advocacy services
Arab Cultural and Community Center	\$50,000	Case management in immigration, health referrals, employment readiness services, domestic violence and other services
Asian Law Caucus	\$52,000	Legal services for low-income residents, primarily recent immigrants
Asian Pacific American Community Center	\$57,000	Multi-services, including information and referrals, primarily for low-income Asian immigrants in Visitacion Valley and Bayview
Asian, Inc.	\$50,000	Pre- and post-purchase homebuyer education and counseling services
Bay Area Legal Aid	\$65,000	Legal assistance and representation for residents of subsidized housing
Bay Area Legal Aid	\$40,000	Legal representation for low-income domestic violence victims
Booker T. Washington Community Service Center	\$40,000	Academic support, technology training, life skills and coaching for transitional age youth
Bridge Housing Corporation	\$155,000	Community building primarily for Potrero Terrace/Annex public housing residents
Causa Justa :: Just Cause	\$38,000	Eviction prevention and housing counseling services
Central American Resource Center (CARECEN)	\$80,000	Legal services for immigrants
Central City Hospitality House	\$65,000	Shelter beds for homeless men
Chinatown Community Development Center	\$50,000	Tenant counseling for primarily monolingual Chinese households
Community Center Pjt of S.F dba The San Francisco LGBT Community Center	\$50,000	Pre-purchase homebuyer education and counseling services
Community Youth Center-San Francisco (CYC-SF)	\$50,000	Culturally competent and linguistically appropriate services for primarily Asian residents in the Bayview

**TABLE II – F - ACTIVITIES AND SUB-RECIPIENT ORGANIZATIONS
PUBLIC SERVICES**

SUB-TOTAL: \$3,554,500

LEVEL OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW: Exempt activities. §58.34(a)(4) Public Services that will not have a physical impact or result in any physical changes, including but not limited to services concerned with employment, crime prevention, child care, health, drug abuse, education, counseling, energy conservation and welfare or recreational needs.

Subrecipient Name	Amount	Activity
Community Youth Center-San Francisco (CYC-SF)	\$50,000	Academic assistance, life skills building and support for at-risk, underserved young adults to enhance their educational/career outlook
Conscious Youth Media Crew	\$40,000	Media production training
Dolores Street Community Services	\$44,000	Legal services for immigrants
Dolores Street Community Services	\$35,000	Shelter beds and case management services primarily for homeless men
Donaldina Cameron House	\$50,000	ESL conversational classes and individualized support and resources for monolingual and limited English speaking immigrants; and case management services for domestic violence victims
Filipino American Development Foundation/Pin@y Educational Partnerships (PEP)	\$50,000	Academic support and college credits in Ethnic Studies for high school students
Filipino-American Development Foundation: Filipino Community Center	\$70,000	Multi-services primarily for the Filipino community
Hearing and Speech Center of Northern California	\$38,000	One-on-one or group counseling, psychosocial support for isolation due to hearing loss, family support and advocacy for adults and older adults with hearing loss
Independent Living Resource Center of SF	\$55,000	Housing stabilization and tenant education services
Instituto Laboral de la Raza	\$60,000	Legal services for low-income immigrant workers
La Raza Centro Legal	\$50,000	Legal services for immigrants
La Raza Community Resource Center	\$80,000	Legal services for immigrants
Lavender Youth Rec. & Info. Ct.(LYRIC)	\$50,000	Youth advocacy, case management support services and connection to critical services for LGBTQ youth
Legal Assistance to the Elderly	\$30,000	Legal services focused on housing, primarily for low-income seniors and adults with disabilities
Mercy Housing California	\$65,000	Outreach, referrals and wrap-around support primarily for Sunnydale public housing residents

**TABLE II – F - ACTIVITIES AND SUB-RECIPIENT ORGANIZATIONS
PUBLIC SERVICES**

SUB-TOTAL: \$3,554,500

LEVEL OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW: Exempt activities. §58.34(a)(4) Public Services that will not have a physical impact or result in any physical changes, including but not limited to services concerned with employment, crime prevention, child care, health, drug abuse, education, counseling, energy conservation and welfare or recreational needs.

Subrecipient Name	Amount	Activity
Mission Asset Fund	\$65,000	Financial education, coaching and access to peer lending circles (loans); and technical assistance/support to train three partner agencies to implement the Lending Circles Model
Mission Economic Development Agency	\$155,000	Pre- and post-purchase homebuyer education and counseling services
Mission Economic Development Agency	\$35,000	Financial education, counseling and coaching services to enable clients to reach a broad continuum of financial goals
Mission Neighborhood Centers	\$50,000	Evening program and multi-services for transitional age youth
Mission Neighborhood Health Center	\$39,000	Leadership development for homeless individuals at a drop-in day shelter program
Mission SF Community Financial Center	\$50,000	Financial services, including credit building loans and repair counseling, to reduce and eliminate barriers to asset-building for extremely low- and low-income asset poor individuals
Nihonmachi Legal Outreach	\$75,000	Culturally and linguistically competent social and legal services primarily for the API community, including legal representation, counseling and referrals in a wide range of civil legal issues
Northeast Community Federal Credit Union	\$50,000	Financial services, including credit building and repair counseling, primarily for the un-banked population
Opportunity Impact (dba Collective Impact)	\$40,000	Case management and multi-services for transitional age youth
Providence Foundation	\$45,000	Shelter beds and services for homeless persons
Samoan Community Development Center	\$40,000	Case management, information, referral and translation services in nutrition, immigration and housing issues primarily targeting Samoan families in the Southeast sector
San Francisco Community Land Trust	\$36,000	Education and technical assistance for residents and Boards of existing co-ops
San Francisco Conservation Corps	\$50,000	Academic support for transitional age youth
San Francisco Housing Development Corporation	\$60,000	Pre- and post-purchase homebuyer education and counseling services, including foreclosure prevention
San Francisco Study Center - Housing Rights Committee of San Francisco	\$85,000	Tenant counseling and eviction prevention services

**TABLE II – F - ACTIVITIES AND SUB-RECIPIENT ORGANIZATIONS
PUBLIC SERVICES**

SUB-TOTAL: \$3,554,500

LEVEL OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW: Exempt activities. §58.34(a)(4) Public Services that will not have a physical impact or result in any physical changes, including but not limited to services concerned with employment, crime prevention, child care, health, drug abuse, education, counseling, energy conservation and welfare or recreational needs.

Subrecipient Name	Amount	Activity
Self-Help for the Elderly	\$50,000	Tenant counseling and advocacy and eviction prevention assistance primarily for elderly renters
Sunset District Comm. Develop. Corp.	\$50,000	Intensive case management for youth at risk or involved with the juvenile justice system
Swords to Plowshares Veterans Rights Organization	\$81,000	Legal counseling and representation for veterans
Tenderloin Housing Clinic, Inc.	\$87,500	Legal counseling and representation for tenants threatened with eviction
The Arc Of San Francisco	\$50,000	Eviction prevention and housing counseling services for adults with developmental disabilities
Together United Recommitted Forever (T.U.R.F.)	\$50,000	Case management and multi-services primarily for transitional age youth living in Sunnydale
Together United Recommitted Forever (T.U.R.F.)	\$50,000	Community building primarily for Sunnydale public housing residents
United Playaz	\$55,000	Case management for transitional age youth
Urban Services YMCA	\$70,000	Multi-services and case management for transitional age youth
Vietnamese Community Center of SF	\$55,000	Information and referral and ESL instruction primarily for Vietnamese immigrants
YMCA of San Francisco (Bayview)	\$245,000	Service connection and community building primarily for Hunters View public housing residents
YMCA of San Francisco (Bayview)	\$50,000	Day shelter for homeless individuals
YMCA of San Francisco (Bayview)	\$50,000	Case management for transitional age youth

**TABLE II - G - ACTIVITIES AND SUB-RECIPIENT ORGANIZATIONS
EMERGENCY SOLUTIONS GRANTS**

SUBTOTAL: \$1,405,000
LEVEL OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

Exempt Activities

§58.34(a)(4) Public Services that will not have a physical impact or result in any physical changes, including but not limited to services concerned with employment, crime prevention, child care, health, drug abuse, education, counseling, energy conservation and welfare or recreational needs.

Categorical Exclusions:

24 CFR §58.35(b)(1). Tenant-based rental assistance;

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;

24 CFR §58.35(b)(6) Affordable housing pre-development costs including legal, consulting, developer and other costs related to obtaining site options, project financing, administrative costs and fees for loan commitments, zoning approvals, and other related activities which do not have a physical impact.

Agency Name	Project Description	2013 ESG	Program Area	Citation
AIDS Housing Alliance	Homeless and eviction prevention services primarily for persons with HIV/AIDS	\$150,000	Tenant Counseling/ Eviction Prevention	24 CFR §58.34(a)(4)
Asian Women's Shelter	Intensive case management, counseling, advocacy and emergency shelter services primarily for Asian and Pacific Islander battered women and their children	\$102,000	Domestic Violence Services	24 CFR §58.34(a)(4)
Bar Assoc. of SF Volunteer Legal Services	Legal representation in eviction cases for indigent clients at immediate risk of becoming homeless	\$90,000	Tenant Counseling/ Eviction Prevention	24 CFR §58.34(a)(4)
Catholic Charities CYO	Tenant based rental assistance	\$180,860	Tenant Counseling/ Eviction Prevention	24 CFR §58.35(b)(1).
Community Awareness & Treatment Services	Shelter beds and services for homeless women	\$50,000	Homeless Services	24 CFR §58.35(b)(2); 24 CFR §58.34(a)(4)
Compass Family Services	Shelter beds and services for families	\$87,000	Homeless Services	24 CFR §58.35(b)(2).

**TABLE II – G - ACTIVITIES AND SUB-RECIPIENT ORGANIZATIONS
EMERGENCY SOLUTIONS GRANTS**

SUBTOTAL: \$1,405,000
LEVEL OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

Exempt Activities

§58.34(a)(4) Public Services that will not have a physical impact or result in any physical changes, including but not limited to services concerned with employment, crime prevention, child care, health, drug abuse, education, counseling, energy conservation and welfare or recreational needs.

Categorical Exclusions:

24 CFR §58.35(b)(1). Tenant-based rental assistance;

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;

24 CFR §58.35(b)(6) Affordable housing pre-development costs including legal, consulting, developer and other costs related to obtaining site options, project financing, administrative costs and fees for loan commitments, zoning approvals, and other related activities which do not have a physical impact.

Agency Name	Project Description	2013 ESG	Program Area	Citation
Compass Family Services	Homeless and eviction prevention services and housing counseling for individuals and families	\$40,000	Tenant Counseling/ Eviction Prevention	24 CFR §58.34(a)(4)
Episcopal Community Services of SF	Shelter beds for homeless men and women	\$65,000	Homeless Services	24 CFR §58.35(b)(2).
Eviction Defense Collaborative, Inc.	Counseling and emergency legal assistance for tenants threatened with eviction	\$60,000	Tenant Counseling/ Eviction Prevention	24 CFR §58.34(a)(4)
Friendship House Association of American Indians	Life skills and case management primarily for Native American adults	\$42,000	Homeless Services	24 CFR §58.34(a)(4)
Gum Moon Residence Hall	Transitional housing program for primarily Asian immigrant women who are victims of domestic violence	\$55,000	Domestic Violence Services	24 CFR §58.35(b)(2).
Hamilton Family Center, Inc	Tenant based rental assistance and housing counseling for individuals and families	\$171,140	Tenant Counseling/ Eviction Prevention	24 CFR §58.35(b)(1), 24 CFR §58.34(a)(4)
Hamilton Family Center, Inc	Shelter beds and case management services primarily for families	\$50,000	Homeless Services	24 CFR §58.35(b)(2); 24 CFR §58.34(a)(4)

**TABLE II – G - ACTIVITIES AND SUB-RECIPIENT ORGANIZATIONS
EMERGENCY SOLUTIONS GRANTS**

SUBTOTAL: \$1,405,000

LEVEL OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

Exempt Activities

§58.34(a)(4) Public Services that will not have a physical impact or result in any physical changes, including but not limited to services concerned with employment, crime prevention, child care, health, drug abuse, education, counseling, energy conservation and welfare or recreational needs.

Categorical Exclusions:

24 CFR §58.35(b)(1). Tenant-based rental assistance;

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;

24 CFR §58.35(b)(6) Affordable housing pre-development costs including legal, consulting, developer and other costs related to obtaining site options, project financing, administrative costs and fees for loan commitments, zoning approvals, and other related activities which do not have a physical impact.

Agency Name	Project Description	2013 ESG	Program Area	Citation
La Casa de las Madres	Shelter beds and case management for survivors of domestic violence	\$150,000	Domestic Violence Services	24 CFR §58.34(a)(4)
Larkin Street Youth Services	Life skills and case management for homeless transitional age youth	\$58,000	Homeless Services	24 CFR §58.34(a)(4)
Larkin Street Youth Services	Shelter beds and services to homeless youth	\$54,000	Homeless Services	24 CFR §58.35(b)(2).

**TABLE II – H - ACTIVITIES AND SUB-RECIPIENT ORGANIZATIONS
HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PERSONS WITH AIDS PROGRAM GRANTS**

SUBTOTAL: \$7,696,012

LEVEL OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

Exempt Activities 24 CFR §58.34

(a)(1): Environmental and other studies, resource identification and the development of plans and strategies

(a)(3) Administrative and management activities

(a)(4) Public Services that will not have a physical impact or result in any physical changes, including but not limited to services concerned with employment, crime prevention, child care, health, drug abuse, education, counseling, energy conservation and welfare

Categorical Exclusions 24 CFR §58.35(b)

(1) Tenant-based rental assistance;

(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;

(3) Operating costs including maintenance, security, operation, utilities, furnishings, equipment, supplies.

Agency Name	Project Description	Amount	Citation
Catholic Charities CYO	Housing advocacy program for people with HIV/AIDS	\$265,724	24 CFR 58.35(b)(2)
Catholic Charities CYO	Partial rental subsidy program for people with HIV/AIDS	\$150,000	24 CFR 58.35(b)(1)
Catholic Charities CYO (Leland House)	Supportive services, facility operating costs and project sponsor administration at a RCF-CI (Residential Care Facility for the Chronically Ill) for people with HIV/AIDS	\$1,683,973	24 CFR 58.35(b)(2)
Catholic Charities CYO (Peter Claver)	Supportive services, facility operating costs and project sponsor administration at a RCF-CI (Residential Care Facility for the Chronically Ill) for people with HIV/AIDS	\$758,187	24 CFR 58.35(b)(2)
Dolores Street Community Services	Supportive services, facility operating costs and project sponsor administration at a RCF-CI (Residential Care Facility for the Chronically Ill) for people with HIV/AIDS	\$479,350	24 CFR 58.35(b)(2)
Human Services Agency	Administration of tenant-based rental assistance program for people with HIV/AIDS	\$3,139,897	24 CFR 58.34(a)(3)
Larkin Street Youth Services	Supportive services, facility operating costs and project sponsor administration at a RCF-CI (Residential Care Facility for the Chronically Ill) for people with HIV/AIDS	\$348,144	24 CFR 58.35(b)(2)

**TABLE II – H - ACTIVITIES AND SUB-RECIPIENT ORGANIZATIONS
HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PERSONS WITH AIDS PROGRAM GRANTS**

SUBTOTAL: \$7,696,012

LEVEL OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

Exempt Activities 24 CFR §58.34

(a)(1): Environmental and other studies, resource identification and the development of plans and strategies

(a)(3) Administrative and management activities

(a)(4) Public Services that will not have a physical impact or result in any physical changes, including but not limited to services concerned with employment, crime prevention, child care, health, drug abuse, education, counseling, energy conservation and welfare

Categorical Exclusions 24 CFR §58.35(b)

(1) Tenant-based rental assistance;

(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;

(3) Operating costs including maintenance, security, operation, utilities, furnishings, equipment, supplies.

Maitri Compassionate Care	Supportive services, facility operating costs and project sponsor administration at a RCF-CI (Residential Care Facility for the Chronically Ill) for people with HIV/AIDS	\$492,167	24 CFR 58.35(b)(2)
Mayor's Office of Housing	General HOPWA administration	\$243,442	24 CFR 58.34(a)(3)
Mayor's Office of Housing - Transitional Care Facility for People with HIV/AIDS	Supportive services, facility operating costs and project sponsor administration for a transitional care facility for people with HIV/AIDS	\$50,000	24 CFR 58.35(b)(2)
Mercy Housing California	Supportive services, facility operating costs and project sponsor administration at an independent living facility for people with HIV/AIDS	\$50,000	24 CFR 58.35(b)(2)

SOURCE DOCUMENTATION LIST

March 2013

City and County of San Francisco

1. City and County of San Francisco. **Programmatic Agreement by and among the City and County of San Francisco, the California State Historic Preservation Officer, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Regarding Historic Properties Affected by Use of Revenue from the Department of Housing and Urban Development Part 58 Programs.** January 19, 2007.
2. City of San Francisco Planning Department. **San Francisco General Plan.** Internet Website: http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/General_Plan/index.htm Accessed March 26, 2013.
3. *Environmental Impact Report for the San Francisco International Airport Master Plan*, Earth Metrics Inc. and Jefferson Associates, prepared for the city of San Francisco and California State Clearinghouse (1989) Adopted 1992.
4. City of San Francisco Assessor. *Assessor's Property Records.* Current to 2010-2011 Tax Year.

Regional Agencies

5. Bay Area Air Quality Management District. **BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines.** June 2010. Internet site: <http://www.baaqmd.gov/Divisions/Planning-and-Research/CEQA-GUIDELINES.aspx> Accessed March 26, 2013.
6. San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission. **San Francisco Bay Plan.** Adopted in 1968. Reprinted in January 2007. Internet site: http://www.bcdc.ca.gov/laws_plans/plans/sfbay_plan.shtm Accessed March 26, 2013.

State of California

7. Air Resources Board. **Proposed State Strategy for California's 2007 State Implementation Plan.** April 26, 2007. Internet site: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/planning/sip/2007sip/2007sip.htm> . Accessed March 26, 2013.
8. State of California Department of Conservation, **Urbanization and Important Farmlands, 1984 - 2004.** Internet Website: ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/urban_change/bayarea_urban_change1984_2004.pdf . Accessed March 26, 2013.
9. California Code of Regulations, **Title 8, Section 1529. Asbestos.**


United States Government

10. United States Department of Agriculture. **7 CFR Part 658.2 (a) Farmland Protection Policy Act.**
11. United States Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. **36 CFR Part 800 Protection of**

Historic Properties.

12. United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. **Web Soil Survey**. Internet Website: <http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/> Accessed March 26, 2013.
13. United States Fish and Wildlife Service, **National Wild and Scenic Rivers System**. Internet Website: <http://www.rivers.gov/wildriverslist.html#ca> Accessed March 26, 2013.
14. United States Department of Housing and Urban Development. **Siting of HUD-Assisted Projects Near Hazardous Facilities: Acceptable Separation Distances from Explosive and Flammable Hazards**. Office of Community Planning and Development, Office of Environment and Energy. Washington, DC. September 1996.
15. United States Department of Housing and Urban Development. **The Noise Guidebook**. Environmental Planning Division, Office of Environment and Energy. September 1991.
16. United States Department of Housing and Urban Development. **Environmental Criteria and Standards**. 24 CFR Parts 51 and 58.
17. United States Environmental Protection Agency. **Sole Source Aquifers subject to HUD-EPA Memorandum of Understanding**, dated April 30, 1990.
18. United States Environmental Protection Agency. **Sole Source Aquifers in Region 9**. Internet Website: <http://www.epa.gov/region09/water/groundwater/ssa.html> and <http://www.epa.gov/region09/water/groundwater/ssa-pdfs/ssafact.pdf> Accessed March 26, 2013.
19. United States Federal Emergency Management Administration. **Public Flood Map**. Internet Website: http://msc.fema.gov/webapp/wcs/stores/servlet/MapSearchResult?storeId=10001&catalogId=10001&langId=-1&userType=G&panelIDs=&Type=pbp&nonprinted=&unmapped=UNMAPPED_060298|060298|SAN+FRANCISCO%2CCCTY%2FSAN+FRANCISC Accessed March 26, 2013.
20. United States Federal Emergency Management Administration. **FEMA Issued Flood Maps, San Francisco County**. Internet Website: http://www.msc.fema.gov/webapp/wcs/stores/servlet/CategoryDisplay?storeId=10001&catalogId=10001&langId=-1&categoryId=12001&parent%20category%20rn=12001&type=CAT_MAPPANEL&stateId=13011&countyId=57120&communityId=338360&stateName=CALIFORNIA&countyName=SAN+FRANCISCO+COUNTY&communityName=SAN+FRANCISCO%2CCCTY%2FSAN+FRANCISC&dfirm_kit_id=&dfirmCatId=12009&isCountySelected=&isCommSelected=&userType=G&urlUserType=G&sfc=0&cat_state=13011&cat_county=57120&cat_community=338360 Accessed March 26, 2013.
21. United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Habitat and Resource Conservation. **Wetlands Geodatabase**. Internet Website: http://wetlandsfws.er.usgs.gov/imf/imf.jsp?site=NWI_CONUS Accessed March 26, 2013.

22. United States Department of Labor. **OSHA Technical Manual: Section V: Chapter 3, Controlling Lead Exposure in the Construction Industry: Engineering and Work Practice Controls.** Internet Website: http://www.osha.gov/dts/osta/otm/otm_v/otm_v_3.html
Accessed March 26, 2013.



2013-2014 CDBG Proposed Expenditure Schedule

The following is a list of proposed expenditures for the 2013-2014 CDBG program. The list of recommended projects is organized by five-year goals and objectives that are in the 2010-2014 Consolidated Plan. While a recommended project may meet more than one objective, it is only listed under its primary objective.

Goal 1: Families and individuals are healthy and economically self-sufficient

Objective 1: Remove barriers to economic opportunities and create economic stability through enhanced access to and utilization of social services

Agency Name	Project Description	2013-2014 Funding Recommendation
AIDS Legal Referral Panel of the SF Bay Area	Legal services for low-income residents, primarily those with HIV and/or AIDS	\$82,000
Arab Cultural and Community Center	Case management in immigration, health referrals, employment readiness services, domestic violence and other services	\$50,000
Asian Law Caucus	Legal services for low-income residents, primarily recent immigrants	\$52,000
Asian Pacific American Community Center	Multi-services, including information and referrals, primarily for low-income Asian immigrants in Visitacion Valley and Bayview	\$57,000
Bay Area Legal Aid	Legal representation for low-income domestic violence victims	\$40,000
Central American Resource Center (CARECEN)	Legal services for immigrants	\$80,000
Community Youth Center-San Francisco (CYC-SF)	Culturally competent and linguistically appropriate services for primarily Asian residents in the Bayview	\$50,000
Dolores Street Community Services	Legal services for immigrants	\$44,000
Donaldina Cameron House	ESL conversational classes and individualized support and resources for monolingual and limited English speaking immigrants; and case management services for domestic violence victims	\$50,000
Filipino-American Development Foundation: Filipino Community Center	Multi-services primarily for the Filipino community	\$70,000
Hearing and Speech Center of Northern California	One-on-one or group counseling, psychosocial support for isolation due to hearing loss, family support and advocacy for adults and older adults with hearing loss	\$38,000
Instituto Laboral de la Raza	Legal services for low-income immigrant workers	\$60,000
La Raza Centro Legal	Legal services for immigrants	\$50,000
La Raza Community Resource Center	Legal services for immigrants	\$80,000
Mayor's Office of Housing	Program delivery for direct services	\$45,000

*The difference between the projected and actual 2013-2014 CDBG entitlement amount that San Francisco receives from HUD will proportionally increase or decrease these two expenditure line items.

2013-2014 CDBG Proposed Expenditure Schedule

Agency Name	Project Description	2013-2014 Funding Recommendation
Nihonmachi Legal Outreach	Culturally and linguistically competent social and legal services primarily for the API community, including legal representation, counseling and referrals in a wide range of civil legal issues	\$75,000
Samoan Community Development Center	Case management, information, referral and translation services in nutrition, immigration and housing issues primarily targeting Samoan families in the Southeast sector	\$40,000
Swords to Plowshares Veterans Rights Organization	Legal counseling and representation for veterans	\$81,000
Vietnamese Community Center of SF	Information and referral and ESL instruction primarily for Vietnamese immigrants	\$55,000
	Subtotal	\$1,099,000

Objective 2: Support the healthy development of families and individuals
No CDBG-recommended projects primarily meet this objective.

Objective 3: Increase families' savings and assets to assist them in moving from poverty/public assistance to stability and self-sufficiency

Agency Name	Project Description	2013-2014 Funding Recommendation
Mission Asset Fund	Financial education, coaching and access to peer lending circles (loans); and technical assistance/support to train three partner agencies to implement the Lending Circles Model	\$65,000
Mission Economic Development Agency	Financial education, counseling and coaching services to enable clients to reach a broad continuum of financial goals	\$35,000
Mission SF Community Financial Center	Financial services, including credit building loans and repair counseling, to reduce and eliminate barriers to asset-building for extremely low- and low-income asset poor individuals	\$50,000
Northeast Community Federal Credit Union	Financial services, including credit building and repair counseling, primarily for the un-banked population	\$50,000
	Subtotal	\$200,000

*The difference between the projected and actual 2013-2014 CDBG entitlement amount that San Francisco receives from HUD will proportionally increase or decrease these two expenditure line items.

2013-2014 CDBG Proposed Expenditure Schedule

Objective 4: Improve the responsiveness of the workforce system to meet the demands of sustainable and growing industries, providing employers with skilled workers and expanding employment opportunity for San Francisco residents

Agency Name	Project Description	2013-2014 Funding Recommendation
Community Housing Partnership	Vocational skills training in the hospitality sector	\$75,000
Episcopal Community Services of SF	Vocational skills training in the hospitality sector	\$100,000
In-Home Supportive Services Consortium of San Francisco, Inc.	Vocational skills training in the health care sector	\$50,000
Mission Hiring Hall	Vocational skills training in the hospitality sector	\$100,000
Mission Language and Vocational School	Vocational skills training in the health care sector	\$100,000
Subtotal		\$425,000

Objective 5: Re-engage youth disconnected from the education system and labor market to achieve academic credentials, transition to post-secondary education, and/or secure living wage employment

Agency Name	Project Description	2013-2014 Funding Recommendation
Bayview Hunter's Point Center for Arts & Technology	Young Adult Bridge services	\$75,000
Booker T. Washington Community Service Center	Academic support, technology training, life skills and coaching for transitional age youth	\$40,000
Collective Impact (dba Mo' Magic)	Case management and multi-services for transitional age youth	\$40,000
Community Youth Center-San Francisco (CYC-SF)	Academic assistance, life skills building and support for at-risk, underserved young adults to enhance their educational/career outlook	\$50,000
Conscious Youth Media Crew	Media production training	\$40,000
Filipino American Development Foundation/Pin@y Educational Partnerships (PEP)	Academic support and college credits in Ethnic Studies for high school students	\$50,000
Lavender Youth Rec. & Info. Ct.(LYRIC)	Youth advocacy, case management support services and connection to critical services for LGBTQQ youth	\$50,000
Mission Neighborhood Centers	Evening program and multi-services for transitional age youth	\$50,000
San Francisco Conservation Corps	Academic support for transitional age youth	\$50,000
Sunset District Comm. Develop. Corp.	Intensive case management for youth at risk or involved with the juvenile justice system	\$50,000
Together United Recommitted Forever (T.U.R.F.)	Case management and multi-services primarily for transitional age youth living in Sunnydale	\$50,000

*The difference between the projected and actual 2013-2014 CDBG entitlement amount that San Francisco receives from HUD will proportionally increase or decrease these two expenditure line items.

2013-2014 CDBG Proposed Expenditure Schedule

Agency Name	Project Description	2013-2014 Funding Recommendation
United Playaz	Case management for transitional age youth	\$55,000
Urban Services YMCA	Multi-services and case management for transitional age youth	\$70,000
Vietnamese Youth Development Center	Young Adult Bridge services	\$60,000
YMCA of San Francisco (Bayview)	Case management for transitional age youth	\$50,000
Subtotal		\$780,000

Objective 6: Increase access to workforce services for populations underserved by the workforce development system

Agency Name	Project Description	2013-2014 Funding Recommendation
Central City Hospitality House	Neighborhood Access Point	\$100,000
Collective Impact (dba Mo' Magic)	Neighborhood Access Point and Young Adult WorkLink Services	\$70,000
Community Center Pjt of SF (dba the San Francisco LGBT Community Center)	Neighborhood Access Point	\$120,000
Compass Family Services	Neighborhood Access Point	\$75,000
Goodwill Industries of San Francisco, San Mateo & Marin Counties	Criminal justice and re-entry services in support of the One Stop system	\$125,000
Hearing and Speech Center of Northern California	Neighborhood Access Point and Young Adult WorkLink Services	\$42,500
Mayor's Office of Housing	Workforce development and service connection for HOPE SF residents	\$137,839
Mission Economic Development Agency	Neighborhood Access Point	\$100,000
Positive Resource Center	Neighborhood Access Point	\$50,000
Toolworks	Neighborhood Access Point	\$55,000
Upwardly Global	Neighborhood Access Point	\$75,000
Young Community Developers	Neighborhood Access Point and Young Adult WorkLink Services	\$65,000
Subtotal		\$1,015,339

Objective 7: Improve the quality of services available to businesses through the workforce system to promote hiring San Francisco job seekers

No CDBG-recommended projects primarily meet this objective.

*The difference between the projected and actual 2013-2014 CDBG entitlement amount that San Francisco receives from HUD will proportionally increase or decrease these two expenditure line items.

2013-2014 CDBG Proposed Expenditure Schedule

Objective 8: Establish, enhance, and retain small businesses and micro-enterprises

Agency Name	Project Description	2013-2014 Funding Recommendation
Asian Neighborhood Design	Architectural services and technical assistance for businesses in low- and moderate-income commercial neighborhood corridors	\$86,827
CCSF Small Business Development Center	Entrepreneurial training, consultation and support for businesses citywide with emphasis in the Chinatown and Mission neighborhoods	\$140,000
Community Center Pjt of S.F dba The San Francisco LGBT Community Center	Business technical assistance primarily for new and existing lesbians, gay, bisexual and transgender-owned micro-enterprises	\$40,000
La Cocina	Commercial kitchen and business incubator that supports the development of micro-enterprises	\$50,000
Mission Asset Fund	Access to capital services, primarily targeting low-income micro-entrepreneurs	\$50,000
Mission Economic Development Agency	Business technical assistance program that provides a continuum of services in English and Spanish to support the growth and success of micro-enterprises	\$125,000
Office of Economic and Workforce Development	Section 108 repayment contingency	\$262,308
Opportunity Fund Northern California	Access to capital services, primarily targeting low-income micro-entrepreneurs	\$50,000
Pacific Community Ventures	Business technical assistance and access to capital for small businesses	\$50,000
Renaissance Entrepreneurship Center	Entrepreneurial training, consultation and support for individuals starting micro-enterprises	\$100,000
SF Made	Entrepreneurial consultation, training and support for small business owners and entrepreneurs primarily targeting the eastern neighborhoods in the manufacturing sector	\$65,000
South of Market Foundation	Entrepreneurial consultation, training and support for small business owners and entrepreneurs primarily targeting Sixth Street in the South of Market	\$100,000
Southeast Asian Community Center	Entrepreneurial consultation and support for primarily Asian and Pacific Islander small business owners	\$120,000
Women's Initiative for Self Employment	Business technical assistance primarily for new and existing low-income women-owned micro-enterprises	\$40,000
Wu Yee Children's Services	Business technical assistance primarily for new and existing child care providers	\$45,000
	Subtotal	\$1,324,135

*The difference between the projected and actual 2013-2014 CDBG entitlement amount that San Francisco receives from HUD will proportionally increase or decrease these two expenditure line items.

2013-2014 CDBG Proposed Expenditure Schedule

Goal 2: Neighborhoods and communities are strong, vibrant and stable

Objective 1: Improve the infrastructure and physical environment of San Francisco neighborhoods, especially in those neighborhoods with high concentrations of low and moderate-income residents

Agency Name	Project Description	2013-2014 Funding Recommendation
Arriba Juntos	Replace roof and install HVAC unit in an occupation training and employment development facility	\$35,000
Asian Neighborhood Design	Technical architectural services for MOH capital grantees	\$35,000
Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center	Repair of leaks to roof and skylight and siding replacements at a multi-purpose community center	\$32,931
Board of Trustees of the Glide Foundation	Install new roof at a family, youth and childcare center	\$30,000
Booker T. Washington Community Service Center	Interior improvements as part of construction of a new community center	\$150,000
Brava! for Women in the Arts	Construction of the storefronts adjacent to the Brava Theater to create office space and dressing rooms for the main stage	\$100,000
Community Design Center	Technical support for MOH capital grantees	\$35,000
Community Youth Center-San Francisco (CYC-SF)	Renovation of roof and HVAC and installation of a wall divider in a youth training facility	\$90,000
Dolores Street Community Services	Upgrades to a homeless shelter including removal of asbestos and installation of fire sprinklers	\$136,571
Donaldina Cameron House	Repair roof and cornice flashing of a multi-service community facility serving primarily the Asian community	\$66,000
Friends of the Urban Forest	Planting of 270 trees for a healthier urban forest as part of San Francisco's green infrastructure in Bayview Hunters Point, Excelsior, Portola and Visitacion Valley	\$40,000
HealthRight 360	Renovate portions of existing elevator in a behavioral health facility serving youth, adults and families	\$78,700
Homeless Prenatal Program, Inc.	Removal of carpeting and installation of marmoleum at a facility where prenatal education, counseling, financial assistance and job training are provided to homeless and low-income families	\$90,000
Independent Living Resource Center of SF	Accessibility upgrades to a replacement site that will provide independent living services for people with disabilities	\$100,000
Larkin Street Youth Services	Renovate bathroom and flooring in a homeless shelter for transition age youth	\$175,000

*The difference between the projected and actual 2013-2014 CDBG entitlement amount that San Francisco receives from HUD will proportionally increase or decrease these two expenditure line items.

2013-2014 CDBG Proposed Expenditure Schedule

Agency Name	Project Description	2013-2014 Funding Recommendation
Mayor's Office of Housing	Capital development pool	\$2,000,000*
Mayor's Office of Housing	Capital and Public Space Improvement program delivery	\$300,000
Mission Neighborhood Centers	Upgrades to a facility, including ADA-ramp, ADA bathroom, gates and flooring, that will be used to relocate a Head Start pre-school program	\$150,000
Nihonmachi Little Friends	Installation of a three-story elevator in an adjacent expansion site, allowing the building addition and the existing building to be ADA accessible, at a childcare center	\$100,000
North of Market/Tenderloin Community Benefit Corporation	Installation of an attended, portable (permanently placed) multiple-toilet facility in the Tenderloin	\$80,000
Northern California Community Loan Fund	Asset management planning for CDBG/HOPWA-eligible facilities	\$150,000
Renaissance Entrepreneurship Center	Rebuild and renovate elevator in a facility providing entrepreneurship training	\$140,000
San Francisco Conservation Corps	Installation of stationary high tech recycling equipment to increase efficiency and safety at a recycling facility that trains and employs low income youth	\$100,000
San Francisco Parks Alliance/Mission Community Market	Installation of storm water planter drains, trenches and planter beds; and planting of trees at a new public marketplace and open space in the Mission	\$40,000
The Janet Pomeroy Center	Roof renovation in a facility providing recreation and vocational opportunities for people with disabilities	\$100,000
Subtotal		\$4,354,202

Objective 2: Promote the development of social capital and sustainable healthy communities through leadership development and civic engagement activities
 No CDBG-recommended projects primarily meet this objective.

Objective 3: Improve the social service delivery system that leads to self-sufficiency and healthy sustainable outcomes for low-income individuals and families

Agency Name	Project Description	2013-2014 Funding Recommendation
Compasspoint Nonprofit Services	Technical assistance, consultation and workshop vouchers for CDBG-funded agencies	\$60,000

*The difference between the projected and actual 2013-2014 CDBG entitlement amount that San Francisco receives from HUD will proportionally increase or decrease these two expenditure line items.

2013-2014 CDBG Proposed Expenditure Schedule

Agency Name	Project Description	2013-2014 Funding Recommendation
Earned Assets Resource Network/Office of the Treasurer	Capacity building for financial education practitioners as well as streamline access to financial education for low-income San Franciscans	\$14,000
HomeownershipSF	Training and capacity building for homebuyer education providers	\$30,000
Mayor's Office of Housing	Consolidated Planning	\$117,000
Mission Asset Fund	Training and capacity building for community organizations to use a new online screening and referral tool that connects people to services	\$20,000
Richmond District Neighborhood Center	Organizational capacity building for CDBG-funded neighborhood centers through participation in SF Neighborhood Centers Together, which offers training and peer support to Executive Directors	\$30,000
San Francisco School Alliance	Organizational capacity building for community based organizations through participation in the Family Economic Success Certification Program, which offers training and peer support to nonprofit benefits providers	\$20,000
Vietnamese Youth Development Center	Strategic planning for four agencies serving primarily the Southeast Asian population	\$20,000
	Subtotal	\$311,000

Objective 4: Strengthen commercial corridors in low- and moderate-income neighborhoods and increase corridor potential for providing jobs, services, and opportunities for residents

Agency Name	Project Description	2013-2014 Funding Recommendation
Bay Area Community Resource/Excelsior Action Group	One-on-one assistance for businesses to economically stabilize and strengthen neighborhood business districts in the Excelsior	\$63,000
Bay Area Community Resource/Portola Neighborhood Association	One-on-one assistance for businesses to economically stabilize and strengthen neighborhood business districts in the Portola	\$63,000
Japanese Community Youth Council (JCYC)/Japantown Task Force	One-on-one assistance for businesses to economically stabilize and strengthen neighborhood businesses primarily targeting microenterprises in the Japantown commercial core area	\$40,000
North of Market Neighborhood Improvement Corp.	Provide capacity building support to existing and new businesses seeking to locate in Central Market	\$70,000
Ocean Avenue Association	One-on-one assistance for businesses to economically stabilize and strengthen neighborhood business districts in the Ocean Merced Ingleside	\$30,000

*The difference between the projected and actual 2013-2014 CDBG entitlement amount that San Francisco receives from HUD will proportionally increase or decrease these two expenditure line items.

2013-2014 CDBG Proposed Expenditure Schedule

Agency Name	Project Description	2013-2014 Funding Recommendation
Renaissance Entrepreneurship Center	Entrepreneurial consultation, training and support for small business owners and entrepreneurs primarily targeting the Bayview Hunters Point, Potrero Hill and Visitacion Valley neighborhoods	\$100,000
	Subtotal	\$366,000

Goal 3: Formerly homeless individuals and families are stable, supported and live in permanent housing

Objective 1: Decrease the incidence of homelessness by avoiding tenant evictions and foreclosures and increasing housing stability

Agency Name	Project Description	2013-2014 Funding Recommendation
Bay Area Legal Aid	Legal assistance and representation for residents of subsidized housing	\$65,000
Causa Justa :: Just Cause	Eviction prevention and housing counseling services	\$38,000
Chinatown Community Development Center	Tenant counseling for primarily monolingual Chinese households	\$50,000
Independent Living Resource Center of SF	Housing stabilization and tenant education services	\$55,000
Legal Assistance to the Elderly	Legal services focused on housing, primarily for low-income seniors and adults with disabilities	\$30,000
San Francisco Study Center - Housing Rights Committee of San Francisco	Tenant counseling and eviction prevention services	\$85,000
Self-Help for the Elderly	Tenant counseling and advocacy and eviction prevention assistance primarily for elderly renters	\$50,000
Tenderloin Housing Clinic, Inc.	Legal counseling and representation for tenants threatened with eviction	\$87,500
The Arc Of San Francisco	Eviction prevention and housing counseling services for adults with developmental disabilities	\$50,000
	Subtotal	\$510,500

Objective 2: Stabilize homeless individuals through outreach, services and residency in emergency and transitional shelters that lead to accessing and maintaining permanent housing

Agency Name	Project Description	2013-2014 Funding Recommendation
Central City Hospitality House	Shelter beds for homeless men	\$65,000

*The difference between the projected and actual 2013-2014 CDBG entitlement amount that San Francisco receives from HUD will proportionally increase or decrease these two expenditure line items.

2013-2014 CDBG Proposed Expenditure Schedule

Agency Name	Project Description	2013-2014 Funding Recommendation
Dolores Street Community Services	Shelter beds and case management services primarily for homeless men	\$35,000
Mission Neighborhood Health Center	Leadership development for homeless individuals at a drop-in day shelter program	\$39,000
Providence Foundation	Shelter beds and services for homeless persons	\$45,000
YMCA of San Francisco (Bayview)	Day shelter for homeless individuals	\$50,000
	Subtotal	\$234,000

Objective 3: Promote long-term housing stability and economic stability through wraparound support services, employment services, mainstream financial entitlements, and education
No CDBG-recommended projects primarily meet this objective.

Objective 4: Create and maintain supportive housing
No CDBG-recommended projects primarily meet this objective.

Goal 4: Families and individuals have safe, healthy and affordable housing

Objective 1: Create and maintain permanently affordable rental housing through both new construction and acquisition and rehabilitation programs for individuals and families earning 0-60% of AMI

Agency Name	Project Description	2013-2014 Funding Recommendation
Asian Neighborhood Design	Architectural technical assistance services	\$53,000
Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center	Expand youth center, install solar panels for common area electrical usage, and shift water lines	\$70,000
Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center	Build 3,000 sq. ft. of crawlspace into a community room	\$45,000
Chinatown Community Development Center	Waterproofing, repairs of heating system and sewer/plumbing	\$16,612
Chinatown Community Development Center	Exterior waterproofing, common area improvements, and unit improvements to 5 properties	\$109,271
Chinatown Community Development Center	Exterior waterproofing and unit improvements	\$36,117
Community Housing Partnership	Update building needs assessment and develop rehab scope of work	\$60,000
Community Housing Partnership	Make building fully accessible by installing an elevator and retrofitting units to meet ADA standards	\$49,000

*The difference between the projected and actual 2013-2014 CDBG entitlement amount that San Francisco receives from HUD will proportionally increase or decrease these two expenditure line items.

2013-2014 CDBG Proposed Expenditure Schedule

Agency Name	Project Description	2013-2014 Funding Recommendation
Dolores Street Community Services	Rehab will address any conditions that represent violations of safety, seismic, building or health codes based on findings from upcoming CAN	\$32,470
Mayor's Office of Housing	Housing Development Pool	\$5,826,562*
Mission Housing Development Corporation	Rehabilitation of the elevator at the Altamont Hotel	\$30,000
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation	Refinance and re-syndication of 13 buildings, totaling 1,309 units	\$86,000
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation	Rehabilitate 12 projects under their Capital Improvement Program that will include end-of-life replacements of building systems, such as roofing and heating; as well as projects to enhance safety and security	\$117,000
	Subtotal	\$6,531,032

Objective 2: Create and maintain permanently affordable ownership housing opportunities through both new construction and acquisition and rehabilitation programs for individuals and families earning up 120% of AMI

Agency Name	Project Description	2013-2014 Funding Recommendation
Rebuilding Together San Francisco	Critical repairs on 25 homes and 25 community facilities through Rebuilding Day events	\$30,000
	Subtotal	\$30,000

Objective 3: Reduce the barriers to access housing affordable to low and moderate-income individuals

Agency Name	Project Description	2013-2014 Funding Recommendation
Asian, Inc.	Pre- and post-purchase homebuyer education and counseling services	\$50,000
Community Center Pjt of S.F dba The San Francisco LGBT Community Center	Pre-purchase homebuyer education and counseling services	\$50,000
Mayor's Office of Housing	Housing information and referral	\$72,000
Mission Economic Development Agency	Pre- and post-purchase homebuyer education and counseling services	\$155,000
San Francisco Community Land Trust	Education and technical assistance for residents and Boards of existing co-ops	\$36,000

*The difference between the projected and actual 2013-2014 CDBG entitlement amount that San Francisco receives from HUD will proportionally increase or decrease these two expenditure line items.

2013-2014 CDBG Proposed Expenditure Schedule

Agency Name	Project Description	2013-2014 Funding Recommendation
San Francisco Housing Development Corporation	Pre- and post-purchase homebuyer education and counseling services, including foreclosure prevention	\$60,000
	Subtotal	\$423,000

Objective 4: Provide both services and permanently affordable, supportive housing opportunities for people with specific needs

No CDBG-recommended projects primarily meet this objective.

Objective 5: Meet the need for affordable and accessible housing opportunities for our aging population and people with physical disabilities

No CDBG-recommended projects primarily meet this objective.

Objective 6: Reduce the risk of lead exposure for low-income renters and homeowners, especially families with children under 6 years old

No CDBG-recommended projects primarily meet this objective.

Objective 7: Provide energy efficiency rehabilitation programs to meet high green standards, preserve affordability, and extend the useful life of aging housing stock

No CDBG-recommended projects primarily meet this objective.

Goal 5: Public housing developments that were severely distressed are thriving mixed-income communities

Objective 1: Replace obsolete public housing within mixed-income developments

No CDBG-recommended projects primarily meet this objective.

Objective 2: Improve social and economic outcomes for existing public housing residents

Agency Name	Project Description	2013-2014 Funding Recommendation
APA Family Support Services	Service connection for Sunnysdale public housing residents, including referral, case management and family advocacy services	\$45,000
Bridge Housing Corporation	Community building primarily for Potrero Terrace/Annex public housing residents	\$155,000
Mercy Housing California	Outreach, referrals and wrap-around support primarily for Sunnysdale public housing residents	\$65,000
Together United Recommitted Forever (T.U.R.F.)	Community building primarily for Sunnysdale public housing residents	\$50,000

*The difference between the projected and actual 2013-2014 CDBG entitlement amount that San Francisco receives from HUD will proportionally increase or decrease these two expenditure line items.

2013-2014 CDBG Proposed Expenditure Schedule

Agency Name	Project Description	2013-2014 Funding Recommendation
YMCA of San Francisco (Bayview)	Service connection and community building primarily for Hunters View public housing residents	\$245,000
	Subtotal	\$560,000

Objective 3: Create neighborhoods desirable to individuals and families of all income levels
 No CDBG-recommended projects primarily meet this objective.

Program Income Funded Activities

Agency Name	Project Description	2013-2014 Funding Recommendation
Mayor's Office of Housing	Community Housing Rehabilitation Loan Program	\$1,175,000
Mayor's Office of Housing – Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure	Capital improvements to the Yerba Buena Gardens Child Development Center	\$175,000
Office of Economic and Workforce Development	Small business loans	\$250,000
	Subtotal	\$1,600,000

General Administration

Agency Name	Project Description	2013-2014 Funding Recommendation
Mayor's Office of Housing and Office of Economic and Workforce Development	General CDBG administration	\$3,404,297
	Subtotal	\$3,404,297

TOTAL CDBG: \$23,167,505

*The difference between the projected and actual 2013-2014 CDBG entitlement amount that San Francisco receives from HUD will proportionally increase or decrease these two expenditure line items.

City and County of San Francisco

**2010-2014
Five-Year
Consolidated Plan**

**Mayor's Office of Housing
Office of Economic & Workforce Development
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Office of Community Planning and Development (CPD) of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requires that jurisdictions consolidate goals for all of its CPD programs into one strategic plan, called the Consolidated Plan. The four federal grant programs included in this Plan are 1) the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program, 2) the Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG) program; 3) the HOME Investment Partnerships program (HOME) and 4) the Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS (HOPWA) program. A strategic plan must be submitted to HUD at least once every five years. This Consolidated Plan covers the time period of July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2015.

The Consolidated Plan serves the following purposes:

- A planning document for San Francisco's community development and affordable housing activities;
- A submission for federal funds under HUD CPD formula grant programs;
- A strategy to be followed in carrying out the four HUD programs; and
- A management tool for assessing performance and tracking results.

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

While San Francisco is widely considered one of the strongest urban markets in the county, with solid long-term prospects, economists also generally agree that the current recession hit the City later than the rest of the country and will similarly result in a later recovery for San Francisco compared to other parts of the nation and the state. This recession only intensifies the challenges that the City's low- and moderate-income residents are already facing. San Francisco has identified eight overarching challenges that have a widespread effect on the well-being of its residents. Some are common to urban cities and counties. Some are especially significant for San Francisco. The eight challenges are:

- Concentrated poverty;
- Income disparity;
- Linguistic and cultural isolation;
- Homelessness;
- Lack of access to middle income/middle skill jobs;
- Lack of asset building opportunities;
- Struggling small businesses and commercial corridors; and
- High housing costs

Creating opportunity for socially and economically isolated San Franciscans requires a multifaceted and comprehensive approach. San Francisco has determined that the optimum way to address the City's priority challenges is to work towards a set of five interconnected, multidisciplinary goals that cross program areas and utilize leveraged strategies both internally and across multiple City departments. Funding for these strategies will be coordinated across City departments, so that HUD funds can be maximized in those areas that are both of highest priority to MOH/OEWD and where HUD funds can provide the maximum benefit in terms of unmet needs and scarce resources.

These five goals are:

- Goal 1: Families and individuals are healthy and economically self-sufficient
- Goal 2: Neighborhoods and communities are strong, vibrant and stable
- Goal 3: Formerly homeless individuals and families are stable, supported and live in long-term housing
- Goal 4: Families and individuals have safe, healthy and affordable housing
- Goal 5: Public housing developments that were severely distressed are thriving mixed-income communities

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

Highlighted below are some of the key facts regarding San Francisco's low- and moderate-income residents that illustrates the challenges described above:

Although San Francisco's median income (AMI) is relatively high (\$67,750 for a single individual) the City's income polarization results in few households actually earn in the middle-income range. More households are either at the low income or high income ends of the spectrum. In fact, over a quarter of San Francisco's population earns under 50% of AMI. At this income level, an affordable rent for a family of three would be \$1,089 per month. San Francisco's average monthly rent is more than double that amount at \$2,388.

San Francisco is amongst the highest-cost housing markets in the nation and a large proportion of residents must pay over 30% of their income on rent. Many of these households represent San Francisco's working families, so the lack of affordable housing can create problems for San Francisco employers attempting to attract and retain employees. Market rents in San Francisco impose a particularly severe cost burden on low-income renters, particularly seniors, low-income families, and persons with disabilities. Ninety-six percent of the households with an extreme rent burden earn less than 50% of the area median income. In addition, San Francisco's homes are amongst the most expensive in the nation. Less than 23% of San Franciscans can afford to buy a home without assistance and only 34% of San Francisco residents are homeowners.

Given the high cost of housing it is not surprising that homelessness remains a primary challenge for San Francisco. The total number of homeless persons counted in the City and County of San Francisco on January 27, 2009 was 6,514, roughly the same as the 2007 count. Although the number has not decreased from 2007 to 2009, the relatively stable size of the homeless population obscures the significant progress that the City has made in getting individuals into needed treatment programs and transitioning individuals out of homelessness and into stable housing, which has dramatically improved many lives. In addition, job prospects and the presence of a support network of family and friends draw sizable numbers of already homeless persons to San Francisco. The availability of homeless services in the City may also attract additional homeless persons and persons on the verge of becoming homeless.

San Francisco's high cost of housing in conjunction with its rising unemployment rate creates significant barriers for many families and individuals in the city. In January 2010, San Francisco's unemployment rate reached 10.4%, the highest in 25 years. Individuals with limited English skills or low educational attainment are especially at risk for unemployment or underemployment. Immigrants often fall within these categories, and San Francisco has historically been a haven for immigrants. In the 2000 Census, San Francisco ranked fifth of the 68 large cities (cities with over 250,000 residents), with the highest percentage of foreign born-residents in the nation. Currently 37% of San Francisco's estimated 808,976 residents are immigrants. San Francisco has an estimated 76,986 legal permanent residents and 41,546 undocumented immigrants, with approximately 48,937 legal immigrants who are eligible to naturalize and 57,851 adults that have been naturalized.

Language barriers impact immigrants' abilities to access necessities such as employment, healthcare, and police protection. Of all San Franciscans over the age of five, 46% speak a language other than English at home, with the largest language groups being Chinese, Spanish, Tagalog and Russian. Fifty percent of the Asian population are of limited English proficiency (LEP), meaning that they speak English less than "very well." Thirty percent of Asian

children are identified as LEP. Fourteen percent of San Francisco households are “linguistically isolated” with no one in the household over the age of 14 indicating that they speak English “well” or “very well”. Among Asian households, that number increases to 35%. At the individual level, about 25% of all San Franciscans in the 2008 survey indicated that they did not speak English “very well”, which is the third highest percentage in the state of California, and the 10th highest percentage of any county in the United States.

San Francisco is racially and ethnically diverse city. However, racial disparities in income are wider in San Francisco than they are nationally. Moreover, in contrast to national trends of converging income between whites and African-Americans and between whites and Asians, racial income disparities in San Francisco became wider during the 1990s. Given San Francisco's focus on advanced professional and technical service jobs, which generally require a four-year degree, disparities in educational attainment closely track disparities in income. According to the Census Bureau's 2004 American Community Survey, 63% of San Francisco whites have at least a bachelor's degree, but only 21% of African-Americans, 38% of Asians, and 25% of Latinos. There are also significant income gaps between men and women in San Francisco. According to the 2000 Census, men earn an average of 25% more than women do, across all races.

People with disabilities also are at greater risk for living poverty. According to the 2007 American Community Survey, nearly 100,000 San Franciscans have at least one disability. Disability prevalence is highest among seniors, with 45% of seniors reporting one or more disabilities, but the total number of younger adults ages 21 to 64 with a disability is approximately the same as the number of seniors with disabilities. It is estimated that 14% of the people who live in San Francisco have disabilities. Fifteen percent of people age 65 or older with disabilities (7,149), and 33% of all younger adults with disabilities (13,280) in San Francisco are living in poverty, given that the maximum Supplemental Security Income (SSI) payment for a single adult over 65 with little or no income is \$845.

Another population with significant barriers are transitional age youth. There are currently 80,000 youth ages 16 through 24 living in San Francisco. An estimated 5,000 to 8,000 of these youth are not making a smooth transition to become successful independent young adults. These disconnected transitional age youth face many barriers and are at risk for a number of negative outcomes, including substantial periods of unemployment, homelessness, involvement with the criminal justice system and poverty.

In San Francisco, 30.7% of the city's residents are asset poor compared to 10.7% who are income poor. A 10.7% income poverty level means that one out of ten residents does not have enough money to afford basic living expenses. A 30.7% asset poverty percentage shows that close to one in three residents does not have enough savings to live for three months above the poverty level if income stopped. The City's extreme asset poverty rate is 21.9% representing the percentage of households that have zero or negative net worth. This means that one in five residents have liabilities that exceed all his/her assets. The race of the household also affects poverty rates because non-whites are twice as likely as whites to become asset poor. In San Francisco, African Americans have the highest rates in both asset and income poverty. White, Latino, and Asian groups are less vulnerable to being income poor, but Latinos are nearly as vulnerable to asset poverty as African Americans.

The national recession also has negatively affected San Francisco's business community. There are approximately 30,500 businesses located in San Francisco. Of those, about 26,000, or 85%, employ fewer than twenty workers. These businesses account for approximately 25% of all employment in San Francisco. Nearly 95% of businesses in the City have fewer than fifty workers; these businesses account for over 42% of all jobs in San Francisco. Small business has become increasingly important to the San Francisco economy. However, small businesses are struggling. Consumers refrain from shopping, and retailers, reeling from dropping sales and rising rent, are forced to close up shop. The vacancy rate in the low-income neighborhoods served by the City's Neighborhood Marketplace Initiative program increased from 5.41% in 2008 to 8.18% in 2009. Merchants along these commercial corridors are struggling to keep their businesses going, and only a small portion reported having grown during the past year.

When examining all San Francisco's challenges, it is clear that these issues if left unaddressed could jeopardize the City's future competitiveness and overall economic stability. The role of government is to intervene where the market fails society's most vulnerable populations, the City's poorest residents. At the neighborhood level, the

City's policy levers include investing public funds to counteract policies at other levels of government that disadvantage a geographic area, promote localized economic development, create jobs, and increase the provision of goods and services. Because most nonprofits lack the economies of scale to construct infrastructure, and private actors have little incentive to invest in reweaving the frayed social fabric, government through a strategic public-private partnership is uniquely positioned to create the required innovative infrastructure to eradicate poverty. This infrastructure facilitates policy development, the formation of equitable redevelopment, enhanced service access and social capital in areas of concentrated poverty.

In April 2007, the Center for American Progress issued a report, *From Poverty to Prosperity: A National Strategy to Cut Poverty in Half*, which was the result of the Center convening a diverse group of national experts and leaders to examine the causes and consequences of poverty in America and to make recommendations for national action. In the report, the Center's Task Force on Poverty calls for a national goal of cutting poverty in half in the next 10 years and proposes a strategy to reach the goal.

In order to cut poverty in half over the next 10 years, the Task Force on Poverty recommended that strategies should be guided by four principles:

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

San Francisco's anti-poverty strategy embodies all of these guiding principles in its five-year strategic goals. The City considers monitoring its performance to be as important as identifying its goals. Its aim is to ensure that the City and its partners are marshaling its limited resources in an effective and coordinated way to create change in San Francisco's low-income communities. When establishing the 2010-2014 strategic goals and outcomes, San Francisco ensured that the plan adhered to the following four principles: 1) to set goals and measurable outcomes that address critical issues for the next five years; 2) the strategic plan is properly align the plan with the mission of both agencies and our partners; 3) prioritize goals and establish clear timelines; and, 4) clearly describe an approach and distinct activities to achieve its goals.

To be effective, San Francisco has designed a simplified monitoring process to ensure that community development and housing activities align with the Consolidated Plan's strategic goals. Using the program matrix as a guide, San Francisco will consistently measure performance towards program outcomes and provide ongoing feedback, adjustments, or sanction protocol as needed. This will assure that San Francisco's five-year plan, guided by its anti-poverty framework, will successfully serve as the roadmap to address its significant challenges through the implementation of its strategic goals and objectives.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	
	A. Background and Purpose	8
	B. Consolidated Plan Program Descriptions	8
	C. Lead Agency	9
	D. Consultation Process	9
	E. Citizen Participation	10
	F. Consolidated Plan Vision	11
	G. Consolidated Plan Principles	11
II.	SAN FRANCISCO DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE	
	A. Population and Demographics	12
	B. Employment	28
	C. Income	31
III.	COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT NEEDS ANALYSIS AND STRATEGIC PLAN	
	A. Challenges Facing San Francisco	36
	B. Vulnerable Populations	56
	C. Five-Year Goals	68
	D. Program Areas	70
	E. Outline of Community Development Goals, Objectives and Strategies	81
	F. Anti-Poverty Strategy	87
	G. Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas	92
IV.	HOUSING NEEDS ANALYSIS AND HOUSING STRATEGIC PLAN	
	A. Market Trends	97
	B. Affordable Housing	121
	C. Outline of Housing Goals, Objectives and Strategies	140
V.	PERFORMANCE MEASURES	
	A. HUD CPD Outcomes and Objectives	143
	B. Five-Year Performance Measures Matrix	145
VI.	INSTITUTIONAL PARTNERS AND COORDINATION	
	A. Community Development Service Delivery System	156
	B. Housing Development Delivery System	158
	C. Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS (HOPWA) Delivery System	163
	D. Other Institutional Partners	165
VII.	MONITORING STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES	
	A. Managing CDBG, ESG and HOME Grants	166
	B. Managing HOPWA Grants	167
	C. Tracking Progress Towards the Consolidated Plan's Five-Year Goals	167
VIII.	REQUIRED HUD TABLES	
	HUD Table 1A: Homeless and Special Needs Populations	45
	HUD Table 2B: Priority Community Development Needs	79
	HUD Table 2A: Priority Housing Needs/Investment Plan Table	113
	HUD Table 1B: Special Needs (Non-Homeless) Populations	117
	HUD Tables 1C and 2C: Summary of Specific Housing/Community Development Objectives	143

IX.	APPENDICES	
Appendix A	Summary of Public Comments from September-November 2009 Communities Needs Hearings	168
Appendix B	Public Notices Announcing September-November 2009 Community Needs Hearings	195
Appendix C	Summary of Public Comments on the Consolidated Plan	206
Appendix D	MOH Neighborhood Definitions	208

Listing of Tables, Figures and Maps

Tables

Table 1. Population Trends and ABAG Projections, San Francisco, 1990-2030	12
Table 2. Population Age Groups, San Francisco, 2000 and 2008	13
Table 3. Population Trends by Race and Ethnicity, San Francisco, 1980-2007	14
Table 4. Areas of Minority Concentration	16
Table 5. Household Growth Trends and Projections, San Francisco, 1990-2030	20
Table 6. Family and Non-Family Households, San Francisco, 1990 and 2000	20
Table 7. Changes in Household Size, San Francisco, 1980-2000	21
Table 8. Child Population by San Francisco Neighborhood, 2000	24
Table 9. Pay Gap by Educational Attainment, San Francisco, 2006	26
Table 10. Pay Gap by Race, San Francisco, 2006	27
Table 11. Single Female Headed Families Living Below Poverty Level	27
Table 12. Household and Family Income, San Francisco, 1990-2007	31
Table 13. Household and Family Income in Constant Dollars, San Francisco, 1990-2007	31
Table 14. Household Income by Household Type, Tenure and Race and Ethnicity, San Francisco, 2000	32
Table 15. HUD Income Level Chart for San Francisco for FY2009	33
Table 16. 2009 Homeless Counts Results and Comparisons with 2007, 2005, and 2002	42
Table 17. 2009 Sheltered and Unsheltered Count Results and Comparisons with 2007 and 2005	43
Table 18. Number of People with Disabilities by Age Group, San Francisco, 2007	57
Table 19. Type of Disabilities for Persons Age 16 and Over, San Francisco, 2007	57
Table 20. Race/Ethnicity of Persons Living with HIV/AIDS	58
Table 21. Persons Living with HIV/AIDS by Gender	58
Table 22. Persons Living with HIV/AIDS by Age Group	58
Table 23. Jail and Parole Population By Gender and Race/Ethnicity, 2008	63
Table 23. The Self-Sufficiency Standard by Select Household Characteristics, San Francisco, 2007	69
Table 24. MOH and OEWD Program Areas	70
Table 25. HUD Table 2B: Priority Community Development Needs	79
Table 26. "On-Ramp" Programs to Address City Goals	88
Table 27. San Francisco Rental Market: Types of Units and Average Prices	98
Table 28. Percentage of Households Overpaying Housing Costs, San Francisco 2005-2007	100
Table 29. Severity of Overcrowding in San Francisco, 2008	101
Table 30. Number of Overcrowded Households by Ethnicity	102
Table 31. Disproportionate Housing Needs of Racial/Ethnic Minorities	103
Table 32. Age of San Francisco Housing Stock	106
Table 33. Housing Units Lacking Kitchen or Plumbing Facilities, 2005-2007	107
Table 34. Health and Building Code Violations, 2008	107
Table 35. Estimated Multifamily Development Costs Per Unit, San Francisco, 2007	111
Table 36. Regional Housing Needs Assessment for San Francisco, 2007-June 2014	112
Table 37. New Affordable Housing Construction by Income Level, 2005-2009	112
Table 38. San Francisco Household Sizes and Unit Sizes	116
Table 39. Condominium Conversions Recorded By DPW by Building Type, 2005-2009	119
Table 40. Number of Units per SRO, by Neighborhood	119
Table 41. Changes in Residential Hotel Stock, 2005-2009	120
Table 42. Objective 1 Five-Year Performance Targets For HOPE SF	137
Table 43. Objective 2 Five-Year Performance Targets For HOPE SF	138
<i>City and County of San Francisco</i>	
<i>2010-2014 Consolidated Plan</i>	

Table 44. Objective 3 Five-Year Performance Targets For HOPE SF	139
Table 45. Neighborhood Boundary Definitions	208

Figures

Figure 1. Population Trends and ABAG Projections, San Francisco, 1990-2030	13
Figure 2. Race and Ethnic Composition, San Francisco, 2007	14
Figure 3. Children and Youth by Age, San Francisco, 2006	22
Figure 4. Child Poverty By Race/Ethnicity Compared to Child Population, San Francisco, 2006	22
Figure 5. Public and Private School Enrollment, San Francisco, 2000-2008	22
Figure 6. Median Earnings by Sex and Educational Attainment, San Francisco, 2006	26
Figure 7. Employment by Industry, San Francisco, 2008	29
Figure 8. Employment by Occupation, San Francisco, 2008	30
Figure 9. Income Categories by Supervisorial District, San Francisco, 2000	33
Figure 10. Household Income Distribution in San Francisco, 1990 and 2000	38
Figure 11. Household Income Gini Coefficient, San Francisco and Peer Cities and Counties, 1990-2000	39
Figure 12. Per Capita Income of Non-White Racial and Ethnic Groups	40
Figure 13: Primary Event/Condition that Led to Homelessness	44
Figure 14: Distribution of Wages in SF Metro Area Compared to National, 2006	46
Figure 15. Domestic in/Out Migration According to Educational Attainment, 2000	47
Figure 16. Asset and Income Poverty by Race, in San Francisco	51
Figure 17. Commercial Loans to Businesses with Revenues Less than \$1Million, in San Francisco Tracts with Median Income Less Than 100% AMI, 2004-2008	53
Figure 18. San Francisco Jail Population by Controlling Offense, 2008	64
Figure 19. Controlling Offense of San Francisco Parolees, 2007	64
Figure 20. San Francisco Average Market Rate Rental Housing Cost	97
Figure 21. Average Asking Rent, San Francisco 2000-2008	98
Figure 22. Percentage of Severely Cost Burdened Households who are Low-Income	99
Figure 23. Number of Households Overpaying Housing Costs	99
Figure 24. Renter Households Examined By Number of Occupants per Room, San Francisco and California	101
Figure 25. Median Home Prices in San Francisco 1990-2009	105
Figure 26. Percentage of Households That Can Afford Median Priced Homes	105
Figure 27. Year of Construction for SRO's	120
Figure 28. Objectives Goals for HOPE SF Initiative	135

Maps

Map 1. Areas of Minority Concentration	15
Map 2. Areas of African American Concentration	17
Map 3. Areas of Asian and Pacific Islander American Concentration	18
Map 4. Areas of Hispanic Concentration	19
Map 5. Map of San Francisco With Supervisorial District Boundaries	34
Map 6. Areas of Low- and Moderate-Income Concentration	35
Map 7. Poverty Rate by Census Tract, 2000	37
Map 8. Need for Workforce Services	50
Map 9. Proportion of Households Living in Overcrowded Conditions	102
Map 10. Proportion of Owner Occupied Housing	104
Map 11. Rate of Code Violations for Housing and Habitability	108
Map 12. San Francisco: Elevated Blood Lead Levels & Pre 1940 Housing	109
Map 13. San Francisco Neighborhood Boundaries	209

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background and Purpose

The Office of Community Planning and Development (CPD) of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requires that jurisdictions consolidate goals for all of its CPD programs into one strategic plan, called the Consolidated Plan. The four federal grant programs included in this Plan are 1) the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program, 2) the Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG) program; 3) the HOME Investment Partnerships program (HOME) and 4) the Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS (HOPWA) program. A strategic plan must be submitted to HUD at least once every five years. This Consolidated Plan covers the time period of July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2015.

The Consolidated Plan serves the following purposes:

- A planning document for San Francisco's community development and affordable housing activities;
- A submission for federal funds under HUD CPD formula grant programs;
- A strategy to be followed in carrying out the four HUD programs; and
- A management tool for assessing performance and tracking results.

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

B. Consolidated Plan Program Descriptions

Community Development Block Grant Program

Title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-383) created the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program. Reauthorized in 1990 as part of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, local communities can use the resources of the CDBG program to develop flexible, locally designed community development strategies to address the program's primary objective, which is "... *development of viable urban communities, by providing decent housing and suitable living environments and expanding economic development opportunities principally for persons of low- and moderate-income.*"

The CDBG program is directed toward neighborhood revitalization through the funding of local programs that support the empowerment of low-income households through workforce development initiatives, economic development, housing and the provision of improved community facilities and services. Through the CDBG program, cities are allowed to develop their own programs and funding priorities, but are limited to activities that address one or more of the national objectives of the program. The national objectives include benefiting low- and moderate-income persons, aiding in the prevention or elimination of blight and addressing other urgent community development needs.

Emergency Shelter Grant Program

The Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG) program, part of the McKinney Homeless programs, is designed with four primary objectives: 1) improve the quality of existing emergency shelters for the homeless; 2) provide additional emergency shelters; 3) help meet the costs of operating emergency shelters; and 4) provide certain essential social

services to homeless individuals. The program is also intended to fund preventive programs and activities that will help reduce the number of people who become homeless.

HOME

The HOME Investment Partnerships, introduced in the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act of 1990, provides funding that can be used for rehabilitation, new construction, acquisition of affordable housing and tenant-based rental assistance.

Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS

The Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS (HOPWA) program allocates funds to assist all forms of housing designed to prevent homelessness of persons with HIV/AIDS and to meet the housing needs of persons with HIV/AIDS, including lease/rental assistance, shared housing arrangements, apartments, single room occupancy (SRO) dwellings and community residences. Supportive services may also be included in the program.

C. Lead Agency

In San Francisco, the Mayor's Office of Housing (MOH) 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. MOH administers the housing activities of the CDBG program and all HOME activities. Under its Community Development Division, MOH also administers CDBG public facility, non-workforce development public service and organizational planning/capacity building activities, and all ESG activities. The Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) is responsible for economic development and workforce development activities of the CDBG program. The San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (SFRA) is the lead agency for the three-county HOPWA program that serves San Francisco, San Mateo and Marin Counties.

D. Consultation Process

Two of the formal objectives of the consolidated plan are to 1) promote citizen participation in the development of local priority needs and objectives; and 2) encourage consultation with public and private agencies to identify shared needs and solutions to persistent community problems. In addition to providing forums for the public to comment on housing and community needs for the next five years, MOH, OEWD and SFRA also reviewed reports and policy documents and consulted directly with representatives from City departments, agencies and commissions.

In developing this Consolidated Plan, MOH reviewed more than 100 relevant planning and policy documents and compiled a summary of the documents. The literature review included documents issued by City departments, community-based organizations and policy groups. The reports that were reviewed include the 2009 Draft Housing Element, Five-Year Strategic Plan of the San Francisco Local Homeless Coordinating Board, HOPE SF: Rebuilding Public Housing and Restoring Opportunity for Its Residents, San Francisco Housing Authority's Five-Year Plan, OEWD's Workforce Strategic Plan, OEWD's San Francisco Economic Strategy and area plans developed by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency. A summary of all of the reports that were reviewed can be found on MOH's website.

To inform planning for the economic development program area, OEWD conducted a Small Business Needs Assessment. Nearly 200 entrepreneurs and small business owners were surveyed about their priorities and needs. Approximately thirty key informants – including merchants, business advocates, chamber of commerce leaders, academics, private lenders, and relevant government officials and staff members – were interviewed and queried about the most pressing needs of businesses and recent trends and development affecting the small business climate. Focus groups were conducted with service providers in an attempt to identify lessons from the experiences of those individuals and organizations working directly to meet the needs of entrepreneurs and small business owners. Finally, data from a wide variety of sources – including the Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector, the Small Business Assistance Center, and the Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation Reports – were analyzed to

identify trends in the activities and needs of small businesses in San Francisco. A report on the Small Business Needs Assessment can be found on MOH's website.

In developing a Citywide Workforce Development Strategic Plan, OEWD conducted an environmental scan to hear from San Francisco residents, businesses and workforce development professionals to understand the capacity and gaps of the existing workforce system. The process included a survey of over 150 businesses and over 300 residents, a survey of over 160 workforce service providers, 7 focus groups with employers and 10 focus groups with residents. The Workforce Development Strategic Plan and Environmental Scan can be found on the MOH website.

MOH and OEWD staff consulted directly with representatives from other City departments including but not limited to: San Francisco Redevelopment Agency; Human Services Agency; Department of Aging and Adults Services; Department of Children, Youth and their Families; First Five Commission; Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs; Office of Small Business, Department on the Status of Women; Mayor's Office of Criminal Justice; Department of Public Health; Planning Department; Mayor's Office on Disability; San Francisco Housing Authority; and the Department of Public Works. Additionally, City staff conferred with representatives from state and adjacent local governmental agencies, including the California Department of Rehabilitation, California Employment Development Department, California Department of Housing and Community Development and Marin County Community Development Agency. SFRA worked closely with staff from San Mateo and Marin counties in developing strategies for addressing the needs of persons with HIV/AIDS. City staff also consulted with numerous other stakeholders, both individual and organizational.

In order to gather input specifically from community-based organizations (CBOs) that provide services to populations targeted by the Consolidated Plan, MOH conducted an online survey of CDBG- and ESG-funded CBOs. The focus of the survey was to understand from the CBOs' perspective 1) the most effective strategies for achieving organizational goals, 2) their greatest needs (other than a need for more funding) and 3) how MOH can best support CBOs. Of the approximately 150 organizations that were invited to participate in the survey, MOH received responses from 88 organizations, a response rate of more than 50%.

The most frequent responses for effective strategies were collaboration with partner organizations, effective and proactive outreach and efforts to provide comprehensive services. In terms of needs, the most cited obstacles were lack of qualified staff, lack of coordination and lack of organizational capacity related to physical space and operational infrastructure and systems. Many respondents also listed lack of affordable housing in San Francisco and the current economic conditions as obstacles to achieving agency goals. As for how MOH can support CBOs in achieving their goals, the top response was more/continued funding, followed by convening service providers in order to share best practices and to better coordinate services and providing training and technical assistance. See MOH's website for a full compilation of the survey results.

E. Citizen Participation

Public Input on Needs

In preparation for the development of this Consolidated Plan, during the fall of 2009, MOH, along with OEWD and SFRA, convened 10 public hearings in key neighborhoods, including each of the six HUD-approved Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas, to collect more detailed public input on specific community needs. In addition, a separate hearing was convened specifically with homeless providers and individuals to receive comments specifically on homeless strategies. All locations were accessible to persons with disabilities, and translation services were made available to the public. Appendix A summarizes the comments received during the public hearings.

Notice of the hearings was published in the San Francisco Examiner, in neighborhood-based newspapers, and on MOH's website. MOH also sent out a mass mailing of the public notice. The mailing list consisted of more than 1,000 non-profit organizations, neighborhood-based groups and public agencies, including the San Francisco Housing Authority. The notice was translated into Chinese and Spanish and was distributed to public libraries and to other neighborhood organizations that serve low-income and hard-to-reach residents. Persons who did not want to

speakers at a public hearing were encouraged to provide written comments to MOH. Copies of the public notice can be found in Appendix B.

Public Input on the Draft 2010 Five-Year Consolidated Plan and Draft 2010-2011 Action Plan

The Draft 2010 Five-Year Consolidated Plan and Draft 2010-2011 Action Plan were available to the public for review and comment between March 22, 2010 and April 20, 2010. The City published a notice in the San Francisco Chronicle on March 15, March 31 and April 14, 2010 informing the public of the availability of the two documents for review and comment. Notices were also published in several neighborhood newspapers regarding the availability of both documents for review. The public had access to review the documents at the Main Branch of the Public Library and at the offices of MOH, OEWD and SFRA. The documents were also posted on the MOH, OEWD and SFRA websites.

The Draft 2010 Five-Year Consolidated Plan and Draft 2010-2011 Action Plan were available to the public for review and comment between March 22, 2010 and April 20, 2010. The City published a notice in the San Francisco Chronicle on March 15, March 31 and April 14, 2010 informing the public of the availability of the two documents for review and comment. Notices were also published in several neighborhood newspapers regarding the availability of both documents for review. The public had access to review the documents at the Main Branch of the Public Library and at the offices of MOH, OEWD and SFRA. The documents were also posted on the MOH, OEWD and SFRA websites. No written comments were received regarding the 2010-2011 Action Plan. A total of 17 public comments were received regarding the 2010-2014 Consolidated Plan. See Appendix C for a summary of the comments received and the City's responses for each of the comments.

The public was invited to provide comments on the Draft 2010-2014 Consolidated Plan and Draft 2010-2011 Action Plan at the regular monthly meeting of the CCCD on April 20, 2010. The City received a total of two comments related to the Consolidated Plan and Action Plan. One comment was by a newly-funded agency that described its work and thanked the City for its support. No response is necessary. The other comment underscored the importance of housing for the lowest income residents, such as those on disability, SSI or who are disabled or HIV+. The Consolidated Plan includes strategies to address the needs of persons with disabilities and HIV+ persons.

F. Consolidated Plan Vision

The vision of the 2010-2014 Consolidated Plan is to create healthy, vibrant, safe and stable neighborhoods and communities that have a dynamic system of affordable housing and businesses; working infrastructure; healthy and economically self-sufficient families and individuals; community-driven leadership; open space; and sustainable and effective social services.

G. Consolidated Plan Principles

In developing goals, objectives and strategies to meet the City's community development and housing needs, San Francisco has the following underlying principles:

- Creation of economic opportunity
- Community and environmental sustainability
- Community based partnerships
- Community change driven by strategic vision
- Culturally and linguistically relevant services

I. SAN FRANCISCO DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

San Francisco continues to grow and has now surpassed its population peak of the 1950s. More than 800,000 people call San Francisco home. A slight shift in the City's racial composition was noted in the U.S. Census Bureau's 2007 American Community Survey (ACS) but San Francisco continues to be a culturally and racially diverse place. San Francisco households are generally better off economically and median incomes are rising. According to the 2007 ACS, San Francisco's median income was \$65,520. San Francisco's population is also growing older. The median age of San Francisco residents has been rising since 1990, especially as the baby-boom generation ages. In 2007, the estimated median age was 39.5 years. Families with children constitute a small portion of San Francisco households. Only 12% of the City's total population is 14-years- old and younger, giving San Francisco the distinction of having the fewest children of all major U.S. cities.

A. Population and Demographics

Population Change

San Francisco has seen an increase in population and job growth in recent years. The 2000 Census counted over 776,730 San Franciscans while the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) estimated 634,430 jobs in the City. While the numbers in population and employment dropped in the early part of the decade, these numbers have returned to a healthy level of growth. Accounts differ but San Francisco has definitely more people now than in 2000.


ABAG projects continued population growth to 857,200 by 2020 or an overall increase of approximately 55,000 people over the next 12 years (Table 1 and Figure 1).

Table 1
Population Trends and ABAG Projections, San Francisco, 1990-2030

	1990	2000	2010 *	2020 *	2030 *
Total Population	723,959	776,733	808,700	857,200	922,600
Population Change		52,774	31,967	48,500	65,400
% Population Change		7.3%	4.1%	6.0%	7.6%
Household Population	699,330	756,976	787,800	835,900	900,800
% HH Population Change		8.2%	4.1%	6.1%	7.8%
Households	305,584	329,700	348,330	367,430	386,680
Households Change		24,116	18,630	19,100	19,250
% Households Change		7.9%	5.7%	5.5%	5.2%

SOURCES: Census Bureau, ABAG, *Projections 2007*

Figure 1
Population Trends and ABAG Projections, San Francisco, 1940-2030



SOURCES: Census Bureau, ABAG Projections 2007

Age

San Francisco's population, in line with national trends, is getting older as the baby boom generation ages. The median age for San Francisco was estimated to be 40.4 years old in 2008, an increase from 36.5 in 2000. Table 2 shows recent population trends by age group.

San Francisco also has the distinction of having the fewest number of children of all major American cities. The number of youngest San Franciscans (under five years old), however, grew significantly between 2000 and 2008. The 0-5 age group grew 33%, the highest growth rate of any group in the population for that period.

The population of older San Franciscans (65 years and over) grew by almost 13% and adults between ages 25 to 64 grew at a rate that was proportional to the city-wide growth rate of approximately 4%. The age group that experienced the largest decrease in population between 2000 and 2008 was the 15-to-24 age group. The 5- to-14 age group also experienced a decrease.

Table 2
Population Age Groups, San Francisco, 2000 and 2008

Age Group	2000	2008	% Change
Under 5 years	31,633	42,192	33.4%
5 to 14 years	62,377	59,754	-4.2%
15 to 24 years	89,388	79,088	-11.5%
25 to 64 years	487,224	508,467	4.4%
65 years and over	106,111	119,475	12.6%
Total	776,733	808,976	4.2%
Median age (years)	36.5	40.4	

Source: Census Bureau, 2000 Census and 2008 ACS

Race and Ethnicity


San Francisco's population is ethnically diverse (Table 3 and Figure 2) despite a slight shift since the 2000 Census. Since 2000, the percentage of San Franciscans identifying as white increased 6%, totaling nearly 56% of the City's population according to the 2007 American Community Survey (ACS). San Francisco's African-American population continues to decline, dropping from 11% in 2000 to just 7% in 2007. San Franciscans of Chinese origin grew from 19.6% of the total population in 2000 to 20.7% by 2007. The proportion of San Franciscans identifying with Hispanic origins (of any race) has remained stable at about 14%.

Table 3
Population Trends by Race and Ethnicity, San Francisco, 1980-2007

Race	1980	1990	2000	2007
White	59.2%	53.6%	49.7%	55.5%
Black	12.7%	10.9%	7.8%	7.0%
American Indian	0.5%	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%
Japanese	1.8%	1.6%	1.5%	1.4%
Chinese	12.1%	18.1%	19.6%	20.7%
Filipino	5.7%	5.7%	5.2%	5.1%
Other Non-White	7.9%	9.7%	15.8%	9.0%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Hispanic Origin	12.4%	13.3%	14.1%	14.0%

SOURCE: Census Bureau

Figure 2
Race and Ethnic Composition, San Francisco, 2007




SOURCE: Census Bureau

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 that 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 2000 Census, 56.4% of the City's population is identified as being composed of minorities, and therefore any census tract in which 76.4% of the population is classified as minority would qualify as an Area of Minority Concentration. Using this figure, San Francisco has a total of 45 census tracts that meet the definition of Minority Concentration. These tracts are identified in Map 1, and are located within the following neighborhoods: Bayview Hunters Point (BVHP), Bernal Heights, Chinatown, Excelsior, Mission, Oceanview Merced Ingleside (OMI), Portola, Visitacion Valley and Western Addition. See Appendix C for MOH neighborhood definitions.

Map 1
Areas of Minority Concentration



Source: Census Bureau, 2000 Census

Table 4 shows that when the analysis of minority concentration is extended beyond individual census tracts, to consider the minority concentration of an *entire* neighborhood, all nine of these neighborhoods have a minority percentage that is higher than the citywide average of 56.4%. However, for six of these neighborhoods (Bayview Hunters Point, Chinatown, Excelsior, Oceanview Merced Ingleside, Portola and Visitacion Valley), the minority percentage is greater than 76.4%. Therefore, these six *entire neighborhoods* are considered areas of minority concentration.

Table 4
Areas of Minority Concentration

	City-wide	BVHP	Bernal Heights	Chinatown	Excelsior	Mission	OMI	Portola	Visitacion Valley	Western Addition
Hispanic or Latino	14.1%	16.3%	33.4%	1.9%	32.5%	50.1%	17.5%	21.3%	18.0%	6.7%
Black or African American	7.6%	45.3%	6.6%	0.9%	2.1%	3.0%	19.5%	7.3%	19.5%	33.2%
American Indian and Alaska Native	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%	0.1%	0.2%	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%
Asian	30.7%	26.3%	16.9%	85.6%	44.7%	11.0%	46.5%	50.6%	49.5%	18.0%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	0.5%	3.3%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%	3.3%	0.2%
Some other race	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%	0.1%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.4%
Two or more races	3.0%	2.7%	3.5%	1.5%	2.7%	2.4%	2.7%	2.8%	2.4%	4.3%
All Minority Groups	56.4%	94.3%	61.5%	90.1%	83.0%	67.5%	87.1%	82.8%	93.1%	63.1%

Source: Census Bureau, 2000 Census

Areas of Racial/Ethnic Group Concentration

San Francisco defines an area of concentration for a specific racial/ethnic group as any census tract in which the population for that group is 10 percentage points greater than the Citywide percentage for that segment of the population.

Areas of American Indian Concentration


The American Indian population constitutes a small percentage (0.3%) of the City's population. There are no census tracts that meet the 10.3% criterion for an American Indian concentration. Areas that have the highest proportion of American Indian populations are located in the Outer Richmond, South of Market, Tenderloin and Mission neighborhoods.

Areas of African American Concentration

Based on the 2000 Census, African Americans comprise 7.6% of San Francisco's overall population. Therefore an area of concentration for African American individuals will be census tracts in which more than 17.6% of the population is identified as African American. Map 2 illustrates the 20 San Francisco census tracts that meet the definition of African American concentration. Neighborhoods with areas of African American concentration are Bayview Hunters Point, Oceanview Merced Ingleside, Potrero Hill, South of Market, Visitacion Valley and Western Addition.

Map 2

Areas of African American Concentration




Source: Census Bureau, 2000 Census

Areas of Asian and Pacific Islander American Concentration

The Asian Pacific Islander American (API) population is 30.7% of the City's total population. Using this figure, census tracts with an API population of 40.7% or more would be considered areas of concentration. As depicted in Map 3, 49 census tracts located in the following neighborhoods qualify as areas of API concentration: Bayview Hunters Point, Chinatown, Excelsior, Oceanview Merced Ingleside, Portola, Richmond, Sunset and Visitacion Valley.

Map 3

Areas of Asian and Pacific Islander American Concentration




Source: Census Bureau, 2000 Census

Areas of Hispanic Concentration

The overall percentage of the Hispanic population in the City is 14.1%. As indicated in Map 4, there are 31 census tracts that qualify as areas of Hispanic concentration (24.1%). The neighborhoods that include these census tracts are Bayview Hunters Point, Bernal Heights, Excelsior, Mission and Visitacion Valley.

Map 4

Areas of Hispanic Concentration



Source: Census Bureau, 2000 Census

Household Characteristics

According to the 2000 Census, the number of San Francisco households grew from 305,584 in 1990 to 329,700, an increase of over 24,100 new households or about 7.9% growth (Table 5). ABAG's *Projections 2007* estimates that the number of total households will continue to increase, growing to 348,330 by 2010 and to 386,680 by 2030 or an annual average of 1,900 new San Francisco households in 20 years.

Table 5
Household Growth Trends and Projections, San Francisco, 1990-2030

	1990	2000	2010 *	2020 *	2030 *
Number of Households	305,584	329,700	348,330	367,430	386,680
Growth	6,626	24,116	18,630	19,100	19,250
Average Annual Growth	663	2,412	1,863	1,910	1,925
Percent Change	2.2%	7.9%	5.7%	5.5%	5.2%
Average Household Size	2.29	2.30	2.26	2.27	2.33
Average Household Size (Bay Area)	2.61	2.69	2.69	2.69	2.69

SOURCES: Census Bureau; * ABAG, *Projections 2007*

As shown in Table 5, the average household size in San Francisco has been relatively constant, hovering at 2.3 persons, and tending to be smaller than the Bay Area average. ABAG also projects that the number of persons per Bay Area household will be leveling off in the next 20 years.

San Francisco continues to have a comparatively small number of family households and this proportion is shrinking. According to the 2000 Census, family households comprised just 44% of all households in San Francisco (Table 6), compared to over 46% in 1990. This decline does not necessarily indicate that families are leaving, as there were over 3,000 more family households in 2000; rather it indicates that non-family households are increasing at a much more rapid rate. At the time of the American Community Survey in 2007, the estimated proportion of family households in San Francisco remained steady at 44%. This is considerably less than the percentage for the entire Bay Area, where approximately 65% of all households are family households. Average family households are also likely to be larger than non-family households. The 2007 American Community Survey estimates these numbers to be 3.3 persons and 2.3 persons, respectively.

Table 6
Family and Non-Family Households, San Francisco, 1990 and 2000

Household Characteristic	1990	2000
All Households	305,584	329,700
Family Households	141,790	145,186
As Percent of All Households	46.4%	44.0%
Bay Area Family Households as Percentage of All Households	65.5%	64.7%

SOURCES: Census Bureau; ABAG

In 2000, almost 70% of all households in the City were comprised of one or two people and household sizes are expected to remain proportionally about the same as the previous decades (Table 7). The 2007 ACS, however, shows that the proportion of single person households is growing. In 2007, they made up over 42% of all households, compared to 39% seven years earlier. The expected growth in households and the composition of these new households present specific housing needs.

Table 7
Changes in Household Size, San Francisco, 1980-2000

Household Size	1980		1990		2000	
	No.	% of Total	No.	% of Total	No.	% of Total
1	123,915	41.4%	120,047	39.2%	127,380	38.6%
2	90,681	30.3%	91,894	30.0%	101,781	30.9%
3	36,554	12.2%	38,158	12.5%	41,831	12.7%
4	23,321	7.8%	26,532	8.7%	28,563	8.7%
5	12,335	4.1%	14,504	4.7%	14,293	4.3%
6+	12,150	4.1%	14,849	4.9%	16,002	4.9%
TOTAL	298,956	100.0%	305,984	100.0%	329,850	100.0%

SOURCE: Census Bureau


Children and Youth

San Francisco is home to an estimated 110,000 children and youth ages 0 through 17. Children are currently present in about one out of every five households and account for less than 15% of the city's estimated 744,041 residents, the lowest percentage in the country. San Francisco has had a declining percentage of families with children since the 1960s, a trend largely attributed to education, housing, and high cost of living.

Following decades of decline in the number of families with children, Census data suggest that a plateau may have been reached. Today, there are an estimated 63,000 families with children in San Francisco. Family households are predominately headed by married couples with an estimated 21% headed by single mothers and 8% headed by single fathers. One in seven children lives with a relative other than his or her parent and at least 10% live in a home with two parents of the same gender.

San Francisco's children and youth are a variety of ages, with the largest numbers represented by early childhood, ages 0 to 5; and early adulthood, ages 18 to 24. Each year since 2000 an average of 8,500 children have been born in San Francisco.


Figure 3
Children and Youth by Age, San Francisco, 2006



Source: Census Bureau, 2006 ACS

Children of color experience San Francisco's poverty rate disproportionately. While African American children comprise only 10% of the child population, they account for 30% of children living in poverty. Hispanics comprise 19% of the child population but 30% of children living in poverty. Conversely, white children comprise 27% of the child population, but only 15% of children living in poverty, and Asians comprise 35% of the child population, but only 22% of children living in poverty. The overall poverty rate is low compared to other urban areas. For example, the child poverty rate in San Francisco was 14% as compared to 23% of children in Los Angeles County and 19% of children statewide.


Figure 4
Child Poverty By Race/Ethnicity Compared to Child Population, San Francisco, 2006



Source: Census Bureau, 2006 ACS and California County Data Book, Children Now, 2007

School is central to a child's life and San Francisco's young people attend a variety of schools. San Francisco's historic trend of high private school enrollment continues today (see Figure 5). It is believed that San Francisco's public school system disproportionately serves children in poverty. As indicated in the figure above, 60% of those children are African American and Hispanic.

Figure 5
Public and Private School Enrollment, San Francisco, 2000-2008



Source: California Dept of Education, 2008

Children live in all neighborhoods of San Francisco, with the largest percentages represented in the southeast area of the City, including the Mission, Excelsior, Ingleside, Bayview Hunters Point, Visitacion Valley, followed by the southwest areas of the Sunset and Parkside.

Table 8
Child Population by San Francisco Neighborhood, 2000

Neighborhood	Number	Percent
Outer Mission/Excelsior/Ingleside	15,241	13.5%
Inner Mission/Bernal Heights	13,147	11.7%
Bayview/Hunters Point	10,042	8.9%
Visitacion Valley	9,523	8.4%
Sunset	8,060	7.1%
Parkside/Forest Hill	7,496	6.6%
Outer Richmond/Sea Cliff	6,256	5.5%
Inner Richmond/Presidio/Laurel	5,356	4.7%
Stonestown/Lake Merced	4,094	3.6%
Russian Hill/Nob Hill	3,864	3.4%
West Portal/St. Francis Wood	3,663	3.2%
Western Addition	3,659	3.2%
Twin Peaks/Diamond Heights/Glen Park	3,388	3.0%
Hayes Valley/Tenderloin	3,090	2.7%
North Beach/Telegraph Hill	2,919	2.6%
Haight/Western Addition/Fillmore	2,778	2.5%
South of Market	2,611	2.3%
Castro/Noe Valley	2,190	1.9%
Potrero Hill	1,904	1.7%
Marina/Cow Hollow	1,534	1.4%
Chinatown	1,265	1.1%
Presidio	355	0.3%
Embarcadero/Gateway	144	0.1%
Treasure Island	139	0.1%
Downtown	43	0.04%
Financial District	41	0.04%

Source: Census Bureau, Census 2000

Abused and Neglected Children and Youth

As of October 2007, there were over 1,700 children and youth in San Francisco's foster care system. Minorities are disproportionately represented: 60% of these children are African American, 17% Hispanic/Latino, 9% white and 7% Asian Pacific Islander. Almost one half (42%) has been in the foster care system for over five years. Approximately 200 youth emancipate from the San Francisco foster care system each year.

Children of Immigrants

There are an estimated 70,000 children and youth ages 0 through 17 who are either foreign born or have at least one foreign-born parent. They represent 64% of the San Francisco child population. This population is reflected in the growing number of English Language Learners (ELL) identified in the San Francisco Unified School District. They accounted for almost 30% of the student body and represented 45 languages in the 2007-2008 school year. The most commonly spoken language was Spanish (40% of ELLs) followed by Cantonese (36% of ELLs). 54% of children under the age of six in San Francisco live in immigrant families where at least one parent was born abroad. In 42% of San Francisco households, a language other than English is spoken in the home.

Homeless and Marginally Housed Children and Youth

The San Francisco Unified School District identified over 1,700 students as being homeless or marginally housed in the 2006-2007 school year. Almost one out of three is also an English Language learner and 10% have a disability. In 2002, the Citywide Families in SROs Collaborative conducted a census of families in Single Room Occupancy residences (SROs) and discovered that there were over 450 families and 760 children in this living arrangement. The average family was comprised of 3.4 people and had lived in their ten by ten foot room for over four years. The majority (85%) of families was monolingual immigrants and reported that insufficient income and lack of affordable housing prevented them from moving into more stable, safe housing. Service providers working with SROs report an increasing number of families with children living in SROs since the census was conducted.

Children and Youth that are Incarcerated and Involved in the Juvenile Justice System

In 2006, over 3,000 youth were referred to the San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department and, of these, 61% were admitted to Juvenile Hall. Youth of color are overrepresented in the system with African American youth accounting for over 50% of admitted youth. Latinos and Asian Pacific Islander youth are also disproportionately represented. While young men are more likely to be arrested, young women represented 38% of misdemeanor and 19% of felony arrests in 2006. Many youth come from neighborhoods with high rates of poverty and crime, namely Bayview Hunters Point, Visitacion Valley, Western Addition and Mission.

Children and Youth that are Living in Public Housing and MOH-Assisted Affordable Housing

San Francisco Housing Authority provides a safety net of affordable housing for more than 9,300 individuals. While children comprise only 15% of the total San Francisco population, children represent 31% of San Francisco's public housing residents. Almost half (45%) of San Francisco's public housing residents are African American, compared with 7% citywide. In 2009, the average income for families living in public housing was \$13,640, just below the 2009 federal poverty level for a family of two (\$14,570).

MOH-assisted affordable housing projects provide more than 6,000 units to approximately 12,000 residents, of which 20% are children. In 2007, the average income for households living in MOH-assisted affordable housing units was \$19,078, less than 30% of the 2007 area median income for San Francisco.

Children and Youth with Special Needs and Disabilities

The High Risk Interagency Council estimates that there are between 5,637 and 7,406 children younger than age 5 with special needs or disabilities living in San Francisco. There is an estimated 3,882 children and youth ages 5 through 20 years living with one or more type of disability. The San Francisco Unified School District enrolled 6,500, or 11% of its students, into the Special Education program in 2007.


Truant Students

In the 2007-2008 school year, there were nearly 5,500 habitual or chronic truants, or 10% of the total student body. Nearly 2,500 (44%) were elementary school students. Two thirds of habitually and chronically truant students in San Francisco are African American or Latino.

Women

The wage gap in San Francisco remains significant. In 2006, the median earnings for the average male worker (25 years and over) were \$50,408 and for the average female worker were \$39,356. Women, on average, earned 78% of men's earnings in San Francisco, a pattern that is mirrored nationally. The following chart compares women's and men's earnings based on educational attainment. This data represents the population 25 years and older and includes both full-time and part-time workers.

Figure 6
Median Earnings by Sex and Educational Attainment, San Francisco, 2006



Source: Census Bureau, 2006 ACS

The pay gap is the largest for those women with graduate or professional degrees, with these women earning 66% of men's earnings.

Table 9
Pay Gap by Educational Attainment, San Francisco, 2006

Educational Attainment	Women's Earnings as a Percentage of Men's Earnings
Total	78%
Less than high school graduate	74%
High school graduate	70%
Some college or associate's degree	78%
Bachelor's degree	78%
Graduate or professional degree	66%

Source: Census Bureau, 2006 ACS

The pay gap also differs by race, widening tremendously for women of color. For the population 15 years and over, the median earnings for males were \$46,327 and for females were \$35,455. White women earn 88% of the average man's earnings, which constitutes a smaller gap than that faced by the average (77%). However, the earnings of women of color as a percentage of men drop dramatically. Asian women earn 63% of men's earnings, while Black or African American women earn 58%, and Hispanic or Latina women earn only 52% of men's earnings. The average man earns approximately double the salary of the average Latina woman.

Table 10
Pay Gap by Race, San Francisco, 2006

Race	Median Annual Earnings	Percentage of Men's Earnings
White Women	\$40,846	88%
Asian Women	\$29,082	63%
Black or African American Women	\$26,654	58%
Hispanic or Latina Women	\$23,894	52%

Source: Census Bureau, 2006 ACS

San Francisco has a disproportionate number single female headed families living in poverty. Single female headed families comprise 19% of the City's families, but 40% of families living below the poverty level in 2008. Additionally, single female headed families are over-represented in public housing and MOH-assisted affordable housing, representing 27% of public housing families in 2009 and 40% of MOH-assisted affordable housing households in 2007.

Table 11
Single Female Headed Families Living Below Poverty Level

	San Francisco Total	Living Below Poverty Level
Total Number of Families	139,344	8,573
# of Single Female Headed Families	26,367	3,443
% of Total Families	19%	40%

Source: Census Bureau, 2008 ACS

B. Employment

In January 2010, San Francisco's unemployment rate reached 10.4%, the highest in 25 years. Despite this short-term compression in the labor market, San Francisco's unemployment rate is quite low compared to rest of the state—ranking 5th lowest compared to all other counties. The statewide unemployment rate is 13.2% as of January 2010. Neighboring Alameda County recorded an unemployment rate of 11.9% while Santa Clara country registered at 12.1%.


There are two compounding factors that are driving the increase in the unemployment rate. The first factor is job loss, defined as San Francisco residents who were working, but who have lost their jobs. From March 2008-March 2009, 10,700 people lost their jobs.

The second factor is an increase in the number of people who are entering into the labor force, but who have not yet found work. From March 2008-March 2009, an additional 10,000 residents have entered into the labor force, but have not yet found work. OEWD can speculate that the increase in the labor force is in part caused by an in-migration of unemployed individuals into San Francisco to look for work and an increase in the number of college and high school graduates.

The upside of this picture is that San Francisco's labor market is shedding relatively fewer jobs than the rest of the state during the current economic climate. However, those who are out-of-work will face steeper competition because more unemployed individuals are coming to San Francisco while many residents are losing their jobs.

According to the American Community Survey in 2008, for the employed population 16 years and older, the leading industries in San Francisco were Educational services, health care and social assistance (20%) and professional, scientific, management, administrative and waste management services (19%) (Figure 7).

Figure 7
Employment by Industry, San Francisco, 2008




Source: Census Bureau, 2008 ACS

Among the most common occupations for the employed population 16 years and older in San Francisco were: Management, professional, and related occupations (52 %); Sales and office occupations (21%); and Service occupations (17%) (Figure 8).

78% of the people employed were private wage and salary workers; 13% was federal, state or local government workers; and 9 % was self-employed in own not incorporated business workers.

Figure 8
Employment by Occupation, San Francisco, 2008



Source: Census Bureau, 2008 ACS

C. Income

The 2000 Census noted San Francisco's median household income at \$55,221. This represents a nominal increase of about 65% in the 10 years between Census counts (Table 12). Table 8 also shows that median and mean family incomes tend to be higher than that of non-family households. The 2007 American Community Survey (ACS) estimates the median household income at \$65,519, a 19% increase from 2000 to 2007. Table 13, however, shows these same incomes adjusted for inflation, where median household and median non-family household incomes have remained largely flat.

Table 12
Household and Family Income, San Francisco, 1990-2007

	1990	2000	2007 ACS
Median Household Income	\$33,414	\$55,221	\$65,519
Mean Household Income			\$95,457
Median Family Household Income	\$38,443	\$63,545	\$81,136
Mean Family Household Income			\$117,136
Median Non-Family Household Income		\$46,465	\$53,966
Mean Non-Family Household Income			\$76,364

SOURCE: Census Bureau

Table 13
Household and Family Income in Constant Dollars, San Francisco, 1990-2007

Income Category	1990 (1999 Dollars)	2000 (1999 Income)	2007 (1999 Dollars)
Median Household Income	\$44,024	\$55,221	\$54,126
Median Family Income	\$53,440	\$63,545	\$65,634
Median Non-Family Household Income	\$35,696	\$46,457	\$43,424
Per Capita Income	\$25,949	\$34,556	\$34,489

SOURCE: Census Bureau

Table 14 below shows household incomes by household type, tenure and race and ethnicity in 2000. In addition to the difference between median family income and median non-family income, disparities exist between home-owning households and renters, and amongst race and ethnic groups.

Table 14
Household Income by Household Type, Tenure and Race and Ethnicity, San Francisco, 2000

Characteristic	# of Households	Median Income	% of San Francisco Median Household Income (\$55,221)
HOUSEHOLD TYPE			
Family Household	147,186	\$63,545	115.1%
Non-Family Household	182,664	\$46,457	84.1%
TENURE			
Owner Occupied Household	115,315	\$77,917	141.1%
Renter Occupied Household	214,385	\$45,275	82.0%
RACE/ETHNICITY			
White	199,898	\$63,227	114.5%
African American	24,273	\$29,640	53.7%
American Indian/Alaska Native	1,321	\$30,994	56.1%
Asian	78,922	\$49,596	89.8%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	843	\$33,750	61.1%
Other Race	12,743	\$47,651	86.3%
Two or More Race	11,850	\$49,040	88.8%
Hispanic or Latino*	31,874	\$46,883	84.9%


*People who identify themselves as Hispanic or Latino also identify themselves as a particular race.

Source: Census Bureau, 2000 Census

Areas of Low- and Moderate-Income Concentration

According to HUD's most recent income data, approximately half of San Francisco's population was considered to be low- and moderate-income. Supervisorial Districts 3, 6 and 10 had rates of more than 40% extremely low and low-income (Figure 9). See Table 15 for definitions of HUD income levels for extremely low, low- and moderate-income. These three districts make up the entire eastern part of the City. See Map 5 on next page.

Figure 9
Income Categories by Supervisorial District, San Francisco, 2000




Source: HUD Income Data

Table 15
HUD Income Level Chart for San Francisco for FY2009


Family of:	1 person	2 persons	3 persons	4 persons	5 persons	6 persons	7 persons	8 persons
Extremely Low Income Limits	\$23,750	\$27,150	\$30,550	\$33,950	\$36,650	\$39,400	\$42,100	\$44,800
Low Income Limits	\$39,600	\$45,250	\$50,900	\$56,550	\$61,050	\$65,600	\$70,100	\$74,650
Moderate Income Limits	\$63,350	\$72,400	\$81,450	\$90,500	\$97,700	\$104,950	\$112,200	\$119,450

Map 5
Map of San Francisco With Supervisorial District Boundaries



When using Supervisorial Districts as the geographical boundaries, Districts 3, 6, 9, 10 and 11 meet the definition of primarily low- and moderate-income, where more than 51% of the residents are considered low- and moderate-income according to HUD's definition. HUD calculates low- and moderate-income concentration by census block groups. See Map 6 for what HUD considers as areas of low- and moderate-income concentration in San Francisco.

Map 6
Areas of Low- and Moderate-Income Concentration



Source: HUD 2000 Income Data

II. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT NEEDS ANALYSIS AND STRATEGIC PLAN

A. Challenges Facing San Francisco

While San Francisco is widely considered one of the strongest urban markets in the county, with solid long-term prospects, economists also generally agree that the current recession hit the City later than the rest of the country and will similarly be late in leaving San Francisco compared to some other parts of the nation. This recession only intensifies the challenges that the City's low- and moderate-income residents are already facing. San Francisco has identified eight overarching challenges that have a widespread effect on the well-being of its residents. Some are common to urban cities and counties. Some are especially significant for San Francisco. The eight challenges are:

- Concentrated poverty;
- Income disparity;
- Linguistic and cultural isolation;
- Homelessness;
- Lack of access to middle income/middle skill jobs;
- Lack of asset building opportunities;
- Struggling small businesses and commercial corridors; and
- High housing cost (discussed in Section IV).


Concentrated Poverty

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

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

In San Francisco, population shifts are changing the neighborhoods where low-income persons live. The following map shows which census tracts have the highest number of persons living in poverty. The Bayview Hunters Point area continues to have a high rate of poverty, but the Tenderloin now has more total individuals living in poverty.

Map 7
Poverty Rate by Census Tract, 2000




Income Disparity

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

Using individual-level data from the Census Public Use Microdata Series, comparable (inflation-adjusted) income distributions were created for San Francisco households in 1990 and 2000. This analysis was conducted with data that consists of households that live in San Francisco, not those having a member that works in San Francisco. The results are quite clear: the percentage of San Francisco households earning less than \$50,000 a year declined significantly during the 1990s, and the percentage earning over \$100,000 increased significantly (Figure 10). The percentage of households with between \$75,000 and \$100,000 annual household income effectively remained the same. Given San Francisco's increases in high-wage jobs during this time period, this trend is not surprising, and there is no way to distinguish between San Franciscans who became wealthier during this time period and the effects of migration. It is clear, however, that both in-migration and out-migration accelerated during the late 1990s, the time of the greatest job growth, suggesting Figure 10 is associated with an out-flow of lower-income households, and an influx of upper-income households.

Figure 10

Household Income Distribution in San Francisco, 1990 & 2000




Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Income inequality within an area is most commonly measured by the Gini Coefficient, a number ranging from zero (complete equality) to one (total inequality). Gini coefficients were calculated using comparable 1990 and 2000 data for San Francisco and several peer cities, so that changes over time could be evaluated (Figure 11). The most clear and important trend is the increase in income inequality in every city during the 1990s. San Francisco's increase was significant, but New York, Washington, Austin, and Seattle experienced comparable or greater increases.

Figure 11


Household Income Gini Coefficient, San Francisco and Peer Cities and Counties, 1990-2000



Race and gender are significant parts of the story of income inequality in San Francisco and nationally. Figure 12 below illustrates the racial disparities in income, by expressing the per capita income of different racial and ethnic groups as a percentage of the per capita income of whites, for San Francisco and for the United States as a whole.

Figure 12

**Per Capita Income of Non-White Racial and Ethnic Groups,
As a Percentage of Per Capita Income of Whites:
San Francisco and the United States, 1989**



Racial disparities in income are wider in San Francisco than they are nationally. Moreover, in contrast to national trends of converging income between whites and African-Americans and between whites and Asians, racial income disparities in San Francisco became wider during the 1990s. Given San Francisco's focus on advanced professional and technical service jobs, which generally require a four-year degree, disparities in educational attainment closely track disparities in income. According to the Census Bureau's 2004 American Community Survey, 63% of San Francisco whites have at least a bachelor's degree, but only 21% of African-Americans, 38% of Asians, and 25% of Latinos.

There are also significant income gaps between men and women in San Francisco. According to the 2000 Census, men earn an average of 25% more than women do, across all races.

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

Linguistic and Cultural Isolation

San Francisco has historically been a haven for immigrants. In the 2000 Census, San Francisco ranked fifth of the 68 large cities (cities with over 250,000 residents), with the highest percentage of foreign born-residents in the nation. Currently 37% of San Francisco's estimated 808,976 residents are immigrants. San Francisco has an estimated 76,986 legal permanent residents and 41,546 undocumented immigrants, with approximately 48,937 legal immigrants who are eligible to naturalize and 57,851 adults that have been naturalized.

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

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

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

Homelessness

Homelessness remains a primary challenge for San Francisco. The total number of homeless persons counted in the City and County of San Francisco on January 27, 2009 was 6,514. This constituted a 25% decrease from 2002. The following chart provides a comparison of the results of the 2009, 2007, 2005, and 2002 counts. It is important to note, however, that the counts prior to 2007 did not employ the citywide enumeration method. Comparing the 2007 and 2009 results, on the surface it appears that there has been minimal or no change in San Francisco's homeless population over the past two years. However, the relatively stable size of the homeless population obscures the significant progress that has been made in getting individuals into needed treatment programs and transitioning individuals out of homelessness and into stable housing, which has dramatically improved many lives. In the past few years, San Francisco has applied more innovation and resources to ending homelessness than any time in its history. From January 2004 to February 2009, 5,497 single homeless adults were placed in permanent supportive housing through Care Not Cash Housing, Housing First, Direct Access to Housing, Shelter Plus Care, and the Local Operating Subsidy Program. During this time span, another 3,646 homeless individuals left San Francisco to be reunited with friends or family members in other parts of the country through the City's Homeward Bound Program. In addition, 705 individuals on public assistance secured housing on their own. From 2004 through February 2009, a total of 9,143 individuals exited homelessness through various initiatives.

Table 16

2009 Homeless Count Results and Comparisons with 2007, 2005, and 2002

	Single Adults 2009	Persons in Families 2009	Family Status Unknown 2009	Single Adults 2007	Persons in Families 2007	Family Status Unknown 2007	2009 Totals	2007 Totals	2005 Totals	2002 Totals
Street	1,269	25	1,415	1,935	66	770	2,709	2,771	2,655	4,535
Emergency Shelter	1,206	310	0	1,175	322	0	1,516	1,497	1,754	2,308
Transitional Housing & Treatment Centers	1,047	210	0	1,076	190	0	1,257	1,266	1,141	1,365
Resource Centers & Stabilization	540	0	0	321	0	0	540	321	192	331
Jail	394	0	0	400	0	0	394	400	415	Not reported
Hospitals	94	4	0	122	0	0	98	122	91	101
Total	4,550	549	1,415	5,029	578	770	6,514	6,377	6,248	8,640

Source: San Francisco Human Services Agency, *2009 San Francisco Unsheltered Homeless Count*, 2009. San Francisco Human Services Agency and Abbott Little Consulting, *San Francisco 2007 Homeless Count*, 2007.

San Francisco remains a destination for homeless persons from other areas, inhibiting the City's progress toward reducing the overall homeless population. Thirty-eight percent (38%) of homeless individuals surveyed reported that they first became homeless outside of San Francisco or were relative newcomers, having lived in the City for three months or less. The most prevalent primary reason for coming to San Francisco, among those who became homeless outside of the City, was "for a job / seeking work" (24%). The next most common primary reasons for coming to the City among this group were "my family and / or friends are here" and "I visited and decided to stay" (15% each). In addition, 12% of these respondents indicated that they came to San Francisco "to access homeless services." The 2009 count demonstrated that the City's continued progress in reducing homelessness since late-2002 has been sustained, through the many programs and efforts discussed. As previously stated, in 2009, homelessness was 25% lower overall than in 2002, and the street homeless population was reduced by 40%.

There were 1,659 persons visually identified on the streets, 111 people in 74 cars, 550 people in 250 vans, campers, or RVs, and 389 people in 160 makeshift structures and encampments in San Francisco during the point-in-time count, totaling 2,709 unsheltered, or “street,” homeless persons. In addition, 3,805 persons were counted in the point-in-time shelter and institution count. The total combined count was 6,514 homeless persons. Compared to the 2007 count, the overall number of homeless persons enumerated increased slightly (2%), from 6,377 to 6,514. However, the number of homeless persons counted on the street decreased 2% (from 2,771 to 2,709), while the number of sheltered homeless persons increased 6% (from 3,606 to 3,805). The increase in the shelter population may be explained, in part, by the addition of approximately 150 rooms to the stock of stabilization rooms since 2007 and the inclusion of the Oshun Women’s Drop In Center in the 2009 count.

Of the 1,243 unsheltered homeless persons whose gender could be visually identified by enumerators, approximately 83% were male, 16% were female, and less than 1% were transgendered. Due to the limits of observation, more than half (54%) of those counted were identified as unknown gender – this includes those sleeping in vehicles, structures, and encampments. The largest group of sheltered homeless persons were those who stayed in emergency shelters (1,516 persons), comprising 40% of the total sheltered population. Transitional housing residents (964 persons) represented 25% of the overall sheltered homeless population.

Table 17: 2009 Sheltered and Unsheltered Count Results and Comparisons to 2007 and 2005

	Single Adults 2009	Person in Families 2009	Family Status Unknown 2009	2009 Totals	2007 Totals	2005 Totals
Emergency Shelter	1,206	310	0	1,516	1,497	1,754
Transitional Housing	785	179	0	964	1,062	1,141
Treatment Centers	262	31	0	293	204	
Resource Centers	233	0	0	233	182	192*
Stabilization Rooms	307	0	0	307	139	
Jail	394	0	0	394	400	415
Hospitals	94	4	0	98	122	91**
Sheltered Count Total	3,281	524	0	3,805	3,606	3,593
Street Total	1,269	25	1,415	2,709	2,771	2,655
Unsheltered and Sheltered Total	4,550	549	1,415	6,514	6,377	6,248

Source: San Francisco Human Services Agency, 2009 *San Francisco Unsheltered Homeless Count*, 2009. San Francisco Human Services Agency, 2009 *San Francisco Sheltered Homeless Count*, 2009. San Francisco Human Services Agency and Abbott Little Consulting, *San Francisco 2007 Homeless Count*, 2007.

* Stabilization rooms were not included in the 2005 count.

** The 2005 count included numbers only from San Francisco General Hospital.


Reasons for Homelessness

In addition to understanding the characteristics of the homeless population, it is important to understand the causes of homelessness. This is an important distinction because of the interrelationships of many of these issues. In a survey of 532 homeless individuals conducted in 2009, homeless survey respondents self-reported a number of reasons for their condition. It should be noted that these are self-defined reasons, which do not necessarily reflect the order of the events leading to their homelessness.

Primary Causes of Homelessness

The loss of a job was the most frequently cited response (25%) for the causation of homelessness. Unemployment was similarly the most common response in 2007. Fifteen percent of survey respondents identified alcohol or drug use as the primary cause of their homelessness; 5% of survey respondents cited incarceration as the primary event that led to their homelessness; 3% reported that mental health issues had precipitated their homelessness; and 3% of survey respondents indicated that they became homeless due to family /domestic violence.

Figure 13: Primary Event / Condition that Led to Homelessness



N = 532; Source: Applied Survey Research, 2009 San Francisco Homeless Count Survey, 2009.

* Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, or Transgender.

The required HUD Table 1A is presented below, indicating housing beds/unit needs for the homeless population in San Francisco. The data is drawn from the most recent McKinney application, prepared in 2009. It is important to note that this set of unmet needs also emphasizes the permanent supportive housing needs of San Francisco's chronically homeless and other homeless/at-risk of homelessness populations.

HUD Table 1A – Homeless and Special Needs Populations

	Current Inventory	Under Development	Unmet Need/Gap
Individuals			
	<u>Beds/Units</u>	<u>Beds/Units</u>	<u>Beds/Units</u>
Emergency Shelter	1,081	0	68
Transitional Shelter	404	70	22
Permanent Housing	3,613	710	999
Total	5,098	780	1,089

Persons in Families with Children			
	<u>Beds/Units</u>	<u>Beds/Units</u>	<u>Beds/Units</u>
Emergency Shelter	280	0	512
Transitional Shelter	255	0	0
Permanent Housing	1,062	345	999
Total	1,597	345	1,511

Homeless Population	Sheltered		Unsheltered	Total
	Emergency	Transitional		
Families with Children (Family Households)	113	73	8	194
Persons in Families with Children	322	190	20	532
Single Individuals and Persons in Households Without Children	1,496	392	2,751	4,639
Total	1,818	582	2,771	5,171


Homeless Subpopulations	Sheltered	Unsheltered	Total
Chronically Homeless	738	997	1,735
Seriously Mentally Ill	753		
Chronic Substance Abuse	746		
Veterans	223		
Persons with HIV/AIDS	66		
Victims of Domestic Violence	143		
Unaccompanied Youth (Under 18)	26		

Source: 2009 Consolidated McKinney Application; San Francisco Department of Human Services

Lack of Access to Middle Income/Middle Skill Jobs

When compared to the rest of the nation, San Francisco has fewer middle-wage/middle skill jobs. This presents a number of challenges particularly for disadvantaged residents. When looking at the economy as a whole, the job prospects are either inaccessible (the skill/education requirements are too high), or the pay is too low to sustain a family. The figure below demonstrates that there is a “squeeze” in the middle, and fewer middle-wage jobs are available.

Figure 14




Source: BLS OES May 2006

Highly educated persons and those with little education are coming to San Francisco, while adults who have only a high school degree are leaving. The figure below illustrates the inward and outward migration of San Francisco adults by education level between 1990 and 2000. Today 50% of San Franciscan adults have four or more years of college education, compared to 29% statewide and 27% nationwide. Seventy-one percent have some college education, compared to 57% of Californians, and 54% of U.S. citizens. The presence of so many more educated workers may be explained by the wealth of opportunities in the Bay Area’s knowledge economy. It may also be intertwined with the high cost of living in San Francisco: better educated workers command higher salaries. As such, their higher salaries contribute to the high cost of living, making it more difficult for persons without a college degree to survive in the city. It is also likely that the labor market has become more competitive, as persons with some college compete for jobs that used to be held by workers with high school degrees.

Figure 15

Domestic In / Out Migration for the Bay Area of Adults over 18 According to Educational Attainment: 2000



Source: SF Economic Plan Analysis of PUMS Data 2000

Figure 15 also shows an increase in persons with less than a high school degree. Additionally, immigration and economic data shows a loss of middle-income jobs offset by growth in well-paid professional and low-paid service jobs. The chart suggests San Francisco might be attracting immigrants who are at the high and low ends of the education continuum, whereas out-migration occurs in the middle.

In contrast, clients that utilize City services such as those at the Human Services Agency have relatively low levels of education. Through programs like CalWORKs, which serves families, and Personal Assisted Employment Services (PAES), which serves single adults, the Agency connects low-income persons with the labor market. The Agency assesses almost all CalWORKs and PAES clients as a first step in providing employment services. Over half of these clients read at the eighth grade level or less, and 83% of their clients tested at an eighth grade level or less in terms of math skills. At HSA's drop-in One-Stop Employment Center, which provides job-seeking resources to the general community, 35% of the job-seekers had no high school diploma and another 35% had only a high school degree. Finding employment for these clients, much less helping them increase their wages, is extremely challenging in San Francisco's competitive labor market.

Middle skill/middle wage jobs are traditionally viewed as providing opportunity for disadvantaged individuals to achieve a reasonable standard of living. These jobs are generally accessible with a moderate amount of training and/or education.

While the economy as a whole may be "squeezing" the middle skill/wage jobs, the same is not true in every industry. The Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) has identified seven industries that have the greatest opportunity to provide accessible, higher paying jobs. These industries include Biotechnology, Construction, Health Care, Hospitality, Information Technology/Digital Media, Retail and Transportation/Logistics. OEWD selected these seven industries based on the four following criteria:

- Are vital to the economic health of the local economy and have a capacity to generate a significant number of jobs
- Are accessible to low- and middle-skilled individuals
- Have career ladder opportunities where workers can move up with additional training and skill development
- Provide access to living wage and family-sustaining jobs

By focusing on priority industries, San Francisco's workforce system can make a targeted impact on critical industries—improving the competitiveness of business while maximizing employment potential for residents. The recent downturn in the economy has constricted the labor market in the short term, and has created a number of new challenges for low-skilled disadvantaged residents. Despite the recent bleak news, there is still opportunity in the short and long term to prepare residents to meaningfully engage in the labor market. This section discusses the nature of the recent recession and its impact on the local labor market.

Unemployment During the Recession

In March 2009, San Francisco's unemployment rate reached 9%, the highest in 25 years. Despite this short-term compression in the labor market, San Francisco's unemployment rate is low compared to rest of the state—ranking 7th lowest compared to all other counties. The statewide unemployment rate is 11.5% as of March 2009. Neighboring Alameda County recorded an unemployment rate of 10.5% while Santa Clara country registered at 10.8%.

There are two compounding factors that are driving the increase in the unemployment rate. The first factor is job loss, defined as San Francisco residents who were working, but who have lost their jobs. From March 2008-March 2009, 10,700 people have lost their jobs.

The second factor is an increase in the number of people who are entering into the labor force, but who have not yet found work. From March 2008-March 2009, an additional 10,000 residents have entered into the labor force, but have not yet found work. OEWD can speculate that that increase in the labor force is in part caused by an immigration of unemployed individuals into San Francisco to look for work and an increase in the number of college and high school graduates.

The upside of this picture is that San Francisco's labor market is shedding relatively fewer jobs than the rest of the state during the current economic climate. However, those who are out-of-work will face steeper competition because more unemployed individuals are coming to San Francisco while many residents are losing their jobs.

Impact of the Recession on the Seven Priority Sectors

In the short term, San Francisco has seen a constriction in several of the priority industries. Of the priority sectors, the hardest hit is construction, retail, and hospitality. Despite the downturn a few indicators suggest some signs of stabilization and recovery.

In 2008, the Department of Building Inspection reported only a 10.5% decrease in permits, suggesting that there is only a slight decrease in the projects are in the pipeline for new construction. Further, federal economic stimulus funding will provide some stabilization for construction employment. Several of the stimulus funded projects are the largest valued construction projects in San Francisco: Doyle Drive, the Hunter's View Shipyard rebuild, the Mission Bay campus and the Transbay Terminal.

In the hospitality industry, there is a decrease in daily room rates and hotel room occupancy. Further, in February 2009, San Francisco experienced its first drop in domestic air travel. However, the San Francisco Convention and Visitors Bureau remains optimistic that the hospitality industry will be buttressed by the strength of the convention sector, which represents a third of all travel and hotel bookings in San Francisco and continues to stay the course during the recession.¹

In the retail industry, the greatest job loss was realized in automotive sales, comprising almost a half of the 7,000 jobs lost since March 2008. There is some evidence that job loss is leveling off in clothing retail and food and beverage retail, with no additional job losses between February 2009 and March 2009.

Despite the recession, two of the priority industries continue to add jobs; Health Care added 500 jobs (a 1.4% increase) and Computer Design and Related Services added 1,300 jobs (a 4.2% increase).

¹ <http://www.bizjournals.com/sanfrancisco/stories/2008/11/24/story5.html>

Implications for Long-Term Workforce Planning

While the recession has slowed employment growth in the short term, it has not fundamentally shifted the structure of the economy or the local labor market. Relative to the rest of the labor market, the seven priority industries remain the most viable options to target for workforce development activity. During this period of recession, the workforce system has the opportunity to focus on building a career pipeline for key industries in preparation for an up-turn in the economy.

Barriers that Prevent San Franciscans from Getting Good Jobs

While, compared to the rest of the country, San Franciscans are highly educated and have higher paying jobs, many San Francisco residents face barriers to employment. These include low educational attainment, limited English proficiency, low-literacy, disability status, and prior criminal history. Further many residents lack child care and transportation that are necessary to succeed in finding and securing employment. Below is a snapshot of the barriers that San Franciscans face in finding employment.

- Nearly 30% of San Francisco residents have a high school diploma or less.²
- Nearly 24% of San Francisco residents have limited English proficiency³.
- About 17% of San Franciscans have some form of developmental or physical disability.⁴
- On average up to 8,000 San Francisco adults are on probation at any given time and in 2006, about 2071 youth were referred to probation.⁵
- Licensed child care is available for only 42% of children with parents in the labor force, and costs nearly \$1,000 per month.⁶

Concentrated Pockets of Need

Geographically, the need for workforce services is highly concentrated in certain neighborhoods throughout San Francisco. OEWD conducted a geographic analysis on the profile of needs across San Francisco. This analysis included the incidence rate of each of the following characteristics.

- High School Diploma/GED attainment
- Number of hours worked per week
- Household income
- Residents receiving Food Stamps
- Residents receiving CalWORKS assistance
- Residents having Internet access at home

Map 8 shows the “pockets of need” distributed throughout San Francisco. The shading in gray identifies need at the zip code level, darker shades indicating incidence rates of the above characteristics. The pink shading indicates incidence rates at the block level.

² 2006 American Community Survey

³ *ibid*

⁴ San Francisco Economic Plan, 2007


⁵ San Francisco Violence Prevention Plan

⁶ 2007 Children Services Allocation Plan, Department of Children Youth and their Families

City and County of San Francisco

2010-2014 Consolidated Plan

Map 8
Need for Workforce Services



This analysis indicates that “pockets of need” are interspersed throughout the City. In some areas, such as in the Southeast, entire neighborhoods or zip codes have a high incidence rate of need. However, there are some concentrated clusters, such as in the Richmond District, where pockets of need are surrounded by more affluent neighborhoods.

The analysis indicates that the Bayview, Excelsior, Visitacion Valley, South of Market, Chinatown and Tenderloin zip codes have the incidence rates of the above indicators.


Lack of Asset Building Opportunities

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

In San Francisco, 30.7% of the city's residents are asset poor compared to 10.7% who are income poor. A 10.7% income poverty level means that one out of ten residents does not have enough money to afford basic living expenses. A 30.7% asset poverty percentage translates to one in three residents, if income stopped, does not have enough savings to live for three months above the poverty level. The City's extreme asset poverty rate is 21.9% representing the percentage of households that have zero or negative net worth. This means that one in five resident's liabilities exceed all of one's assets.

The race of the household also affects poverty rates because non-whites are twice as likely as whites to become asset poor. In San Francisco, African Americans have the highest rates in both asset and income poverty (see Figure 16). White, Latino, and Asian groups are less vulnerable to being income poor, but Latinos are nearly as vulnerable to asset poverty as African Americans.

Figure 16



Source: Asset Policy Initiative, California

Economic security is only achieved when families save and build assets. Yet low-income families often lack asset building opportunities that middle-income families take for granted. In San Francisco, an estimated 40,000 households (11%) are un-banked. Check cashing companies, pawnshops, and payday lenders are among the alternative financial services to the formal financial sector for lower-income households. Low- and moderate-income people see these banking alternatives as more convenient and accessible than conventional sources; unfortunately, they are associated with high fees and do not enable families to build long-term, sustainable asset wealth.

Another barrier to asset building opportunities is having a low credit score. Residents with low credit scores cannot open a financial services account or borrow money to build equity. In San Francisco, 40.7% of consumers have a sub-prime credit score. This is the percentage of consumers with a TransRisk score that is below or equal to 700 on a scale of 150-934.


Across the nation, homeownership is a key wealth-building strategy for many families. Owning a home and building home equity presents benefits derived from the savings required of mortgage payments, the ability to borrow against the property, and potential capital appreciation. However, housing affordability remains a widespread problem. In San Francisco, only 39% are homeowners compared to 57% in California and 67% nationwide. For more information on high housing costs, refer to Chapter IV in this document.

Another asset-building opportunity is growing business equity. Owning a small business or micro-enterprise is a traditional route into the middle class for a large number of households, including low-income families and immigrants. For example, micro-enterprises, defined as businesses with five or fewer employees, could participate in ownership with a small infusion of capital, and develop a start-up with a modest cost. Micro-enterprise can supplement entry-level employment opportunities, reduce a family's reliance on public assistance, and provide families with a way to save and build up their asset base.

Businesses take an average of five years from start-up date to show a profit. During this time, businesses need capital assistance to sustain or grow. In other cities, business owners tap into their home equity for funding, but in San Francisco, due to the very low home ownership rate, this is rarely an option for new business owners. Alternatively, businesses in San Francisco seek out loans from conventional financial institution and community lenders.

However, recent economic times have made it more difficult for businesses to grow, expand, and build business equity. The FDIC recently released the 2009 bank industry data that showed a 7.4% contraction in lending, the largest since 1942. In 2007 according to the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, commercial banks made 30,482 loans to small businesses in San Francisco with gross revenues of less than \$1million. In 2008, that figure dropped by 36% to only 19,515 such loans (see Figure 17 below). In a fall 2009 survey of 175 San Francisco small business owners and entrepreneurs, 85% cited a need for additional access to small business loans. Startup and existing businesses face difficulties accessing capital. According to the City's Treasurer and Tax Collector, the number of new businesses that opened in the City dropped from 14,806 in 2008 to 13,872 in 2009. As regulations have put pressure on financial institutions to limit risk, and community banks, which are major small business lenders, have closed across the nation, small businesses are hard-pressed to find ways to support their start-up and expansion projects.

Figure 17



Source: Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, Community Reinvestment Act Reports

Struggling Small Businesses and Commercial Corridors

According to the Treasurer and Tax Collector that administers all business registrations for the City, there are approximately 80,000 businesses in San Francisco in 2009. This number includes and employs a majority of the City's workers in San Francisco. Small business has indeed become increasingly important to the San Francisco economy. According to analysis conducted by ICF International for the 2007 San Francisco Economic Strategy, the percentage of San Francisco jobs held by companies with greater than 1,000 employees has fallen by almost half since 1977.

However, small businesses are struggling. The number of new businesses that opened in the City dropped from 14,806 in 2008 to 13,872 last year. The number of business closures has jumped from 6,100 in 2008 to 9,899 in 2009. Consumers refrain from shopping, and retailers, reeling from dropping sales and rising rent, are forced to close up shop. The vacancy rate in the low-income neighborhoods served by the City's Neighborhood Marketplace Initiative program increased from 5.41% in 2008 to 8.18% in 2009. Merchants along these commercial corridors are struggling to keep their businesses going, and only a small portion reported having grown during the past year.

In order to determine how to best assist the entrepreneurs and small business owners of San Francisco, OEWD conducted a needs assessment in late 2009. Information was gathered in a variety of ways, including a business survey, interviews of key stakeholders, focus groups of service providers and community residents, and analysis of business and economic data.⁷ Based on this information, OEWD analyzed the effectiveness of core economic development activities, and identified potential improvements and expansions of the CDBG economic development program. The findings are summarized below.

⁷ For more information, please refer to the complete text of the needs assessment available at <http://www.oewd.org>

Challenges

1. Accessibility to technical assistance services

- *Strategy: Conduct more outreach to established businesses, and provide assistance at the business site whenever possible.*

Of the various types of businesses that receive economic development services, existing businesses—those businesses that have been established for at least one year—are the most chronically underserved (as compared to pre-startups, which have not yet been launched, and startups, which have been active for less than a year). This group of businesses can be difficult to serve; in some cases, these business owners are unwilling to even admit that they need help. Often the business owners dedicate all of their time to the operation of their business, and are unwilling to spend time traveling to the office of a service provider to receive technical assistance.

2. Expanding technical assistance services

- *Strategy: Establish physical incubator spaces for targeted business sectors.*

An incubator that provides not only physical space but also comprehensive technical assistance and networking opportunities for startup businesses can be a powerful economic development tool. A successful incubator should target a specific industry (e.g., food production, neighborhood retail), define standards for the type of assistance provided, and plan for its tenants to ‘graduate’ to other spaces.

- *Strategy: Provide prompt and responsive legal assistance and lease negotiation services.*

Business owners sometimes contact the Small Business Assistance Center or one of the neighborhood economic development organizations with an urgent legal issue or problem with their lease. However, existing legal assistance services for entrepreneurs tend to take several weeks (during which the client is matched with a pro bono attorney) before the actual provision of services. OEWD will encourage the establishment of a program that is more capable of a rapid response and can contribute to the stability of small businesses and neighborhoods.

- *Strategy: Increase support for production, distribution, and repair (PDR) businesses, and other export sector firms.*

By focusing more resources on small businesses and supply chain firms in the export sector (e.g., artisan manufacturing, biotech) OEWD can provide access to more higher-quality jobs—jobs that pay higher wages and build more skills while simultaneously improving the overall economic health of San Francisco.

3. Lack of access to mid-sized loans and capital

- *Strategy: Increase access to mid-sized small business loans.*

Small businesses sometimes have difficulty securing access to mid-sized loans (ranging from \$50,000 to \$500,000), which hampers their ability to expand and create jobs in San Francisco. OEWD will develop programs and partnerships that make new financial products such as HUD Section 108 available to businesses in need.

4. Lack of commercial corridor investments and increasing vacancies

- *Strategy: Increase investments in the physical infrastructure of neighborhoods.*

As commercial corridors in low- and moderate-income neighborhoods struggle with vacancies and underinvestment, the physical condition of the corridor degrades and discourages future investment and economic activity. This trend has been exacerbated by the 2009 recession. OEWD will invest in capital improvements—including public artwork, real estate, infrastructure, and beautification projects—that increase the economic viability of commercial corridors in low- and moderate-income areas.

- *Strategy: Assist in the creation of Community Benefit Districts.*

Community Benefit Districts (also known as Business Improvement Districts) provide a steady source of income for neighborhood improvement, strengthening commercial corridors, and strategic economic development activities. OEWD will support activities to provide technical assistance to merchants in low- and moderate-income neighborhoods to determine whether a CBD would be plausible and beneficial.

- *Strategy: Coordinate efforts to track and fill vacancies*
OEWD can work with service providers and corridor managers to establish a formal system for them to contribute information about vacancies and local retail needs.

Additionally, OEWD will pursue administrative changes that allow us to strengthen and hold increasingly accountable the organizations and resources made available to small businesses through CDBG support. These strategies include the following:

5. Lack of coordinated technical assistance efforts and services
 - *Strategy: Strengthen the network of economic development service providers.*
Each of the neighborhood economic development organizations in San Francisco has different strengths that should be leveraged by the various other service providers in the City's economic development network. Additionally, small business owners report that one of the greatest barriers to starting a business is the complexity of the permitting process; the Small Business Assistance Center in City Hall was founded to help entrepreneurs navigate that process, but many entrepreneurs are still unaware that the center exists. OEWD must continue to foster increased collaboration between the Small Business Assistance Center, technical assistance providers, commercial corridor programs, and small business lenders, so that entrepreneurs and business owners have prompt access to all of the services that they need.
 - *Strategy: Focus technical assistance on specific populations and outcomes.*
OEWD has identified distinct types of technical assistance: (1) Startup training for entrepreneurs who have not yet launched their business (including the development of a business plan, financial projections, and other skills). (2) Technical assistance linked to capital, for business startups and existing businesses that are applying for a loan or need post-loan counseling. (3) Technical assistance that meets the specific needs of existing businesses, such as marketing, merchandising, and industry-specific issues (e.g., programs serving the particular needs of restaurants).

Each technical assistance provider should have a clear understanding of and plan for which type(s) of technical assistance they will provide, and the specific populations and outcomes they will target.

- *Strategy: Establish standard tools and protocols for technical assistance.*
By encouraging providers to utilize quality tools and protocols—such as a high-quality intake form, a resource guide, and minimum standards for business planning and loan packaging—OEWD can help improve the experiences and outcomes for clients.

B. Vulnerable Populations

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

- Seniors;
- Persons with disabilities;
- Persons with HIV/AIDS;
- Disconnected transitional age youth;
- Victims/survivors of violence and family violence;
- Re-entry population;
- Public housing residents; and
- Disconnected LGBT individuals.

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

Seniors

According to 2000 census data, San Francisco was home to more than 136,000 seniors, defined as adults at least 60 years of age. Seniors made up a higher proportion of the City's population (17.6%) than they did statewide or nationally (14% and 16.5%). Mid-Census estimates suggest that the senior population has grown to over 145,000 as of 2007. San Francisco's senior population is also tremendously more diverse. The majority (56%) of San Francisco's seniors are non-White, compared to only 30 % statewide.

Asians and Pacific Islander are more likely than other demographic groups to be over 60. They are 31 % of the City's total population, but 37% of its seniors. Latinos, however, tend to be younger. While they are 14% of the City's total population, Latinos comprise 22% of its children and just 9% of its seniors. Relatively high life expectancy rates among Chinese and Latino San Franciscans is likely to contribute to a relative growth in their share of the overall senior population in coming years.

The older a person is, the more likely he or she is living in poverty. Almost one in three people age 75 or older in San Francisco lives in poverty. Furthermore, the population of older seniors is projected to grow in coming years. In line with national trends, San Francisco's population is getting older as the baby boom generation ages.

Asian, African American, and Latino seniors are more likely to be poor. 15% of Latinos and African American seniors are low-income, compared with 12% of Asians and 8% of Whites. In absolute numbers, however, Asians have the most low-income seniors, with three times as many as other minority groups.

Census 2000 data estimate that 30,301 (28%) of San Francisco seniors speak English "not well" or "not at all," a much higher rate than that for individuals age 18 to 64 (12%). Nearly three quarters of those seniors speak Asian or Pacific Island languages. As Chinese seniors make up by far the largest number of Asian/Pacific Islander seniors overall (71%), it is likely that the majority of these individuals are Cantonese-or Mandarin-speaking.

Diversity in San Francisco goes beyond race, ethnicity and language. San Francisco is also home to a large population of LGBT seniors. A 2002 report from the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force Foundation estimates that three to eight percent of all seniors nationwide are lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender. It is difficult to estimate the exact size of this population in San Francisco, especially because older adults are more likely than their younger peers to remain closeted. However, local service providers estimate that as high as 17% of San Francisco's older adults may be LGBT.

Persons with Disabilities

According to the 2007 American Community Survey, nearly 100,000 San Franciscans have at least one disability. Disability prevalence is highest among seniors, with 45% of seniors reporting one or more disabilities, but the total number of younger adults ages 21 to 64 with a disability is approximately the same as the number of seniors with disabilities.

As indicated in Table xx, 14% of the people who live in San Francisco have disabilities. According to the 2007 American Community Survey, 15% percent of people age 65 or older with disabilities (7,149), and 33% of all younger adults with disabilities (13,280) in San Francisco are living in poverty. This is unsurprising, since the maximum SSI payment for a single adult over 65 with little or no income is \$845.

Table 18
Number of People with Disabilities by Age Group, San Francisco, 2007

Age	Total number of people	Number with one or more type of disability	% in this age group with a disability
5 to 15	59,121	2,701	5%
16 to 20	33,522	2,467	7%
21 to 64	519,167	44,958	9%
65 and older	109,508	49,598	45%
Total	721,318	99,724	14%

Source: Census Bureau, 2007 ACS

The table below compares the types of disabilities and their frequencies for persons age 16 to 64 and for age 65 and over in San Francisco. More than 60,000 adults have physical disabilities. In absolute numbers, more young persons have mental disabilities than do seniors. Among persons between the ages of 16 and 64, over 27,000 (5%) have two or more disabilities. Among persons 65 or older, nearly a third, or over 34,000 have two or more disabilities.

Table 19
Type of Disabilities for Persons Age 16 and Over, San Francisco, 2007

Age	Total Population	Physical	Mental	Sensory
16 to 64	552,689	23,691	22,081	10,031
65 and older	109,508	38,952	19,972	20,621

Source: Census Bureau, 2007 ACS

2007 estimates show that Whites and Asians have the highest numbers of younger persons (age 16 to 64) with disabilities (20,771 and 9,929 respectively), compared to 7,673 African Americans and 7,172 Latinos. African Americans have the highest rate of disability, as 23% of African Americans in this age range have a disability, compared to just 8% of Whites, 6% of Asians and 9% of Latinos.

Diversity within the disability community goes well beyond traditional demographic issues. Adults with disabilities have tremendously diverse experiences and stigmas depending on factors such as the type of the disability they have (e.g., physical, mental, developmental, etc.); whether the person was born with the disability or it was acquired in mid- or later life; whether the disability results from or is complicated by an accompanying chronic illness; or the stigma that the person may experience due to the way that his or her disability is viewed in society as a whole or in his or her ethnic or cultural community.

Persons with HIV/AIDS

A review of the demographic profile of those living with HIV/AIDS presents a comprehensive representation of the epidemic. Presented in the following tables is the demographic profile of those living with HIV/AIDS in San Francisco in 2008 by race/ethnicity, gender and age categories.

Race/Ethnicity

While there have been yearly increases since 1997 in the proportion of living cases among African Americans and Latinos, AIDS remains a disease predominantly of Caucasians in San Francisco.

Table 20
Race/Ethnicity of Persons Living with HIV/AIDS

Race/Ethnicity	2008	
	Number	Percent
Caucasian	10,043	64%
African American	2,212	14%
Latino	2,397	15%
Asian/Pacific Islander/Native American	870	6%
Other/Unknown	235	1%
Total	15,757	100%

Source: Status of HIV/AIDS Epidemic: San Francisco; DPH, March 2008

Gender

In San Francisco, the proportion of women living with AIDS has almost doubled since 1997, but remains small compared to national cumulative cases.

Table 21
Persons Living with HIV/AIDS by Gender

Gender	2008	
	Number	Percent
Male	14,501	92%
Female	916	6%
Transgender	340	2%
Total	15,757	100%

Source: Status of HIV/AIDS Epidemic: San Francisco; DPH, March 2008

Age

Those who are 50 years of age and over have been the fastest growing age category of persons living with HIV/AIDS, rising from 30% - 40% between 2004 and 2008.

Table 22
Persons Living with HIV/AIDS by Age Group

Age	2008	
	Number	Percent
13-29	653	4%
30-49	8858	57%
50 and over	6246	40%
Total	15,757	101%

Source: Status of HIV/AIDS Epidemic: San Francisco; DPH, March 2008

Disconnected Transitional Age Youth

There are currently 80,000 youth ages 16 through 24 living in San Francisco. An estimated 5,000 to 8,000 of these youth are not making a smooth transition to become successful independent young adults. These disconnected transitional age youth face many barriers and are at risk for a number of negative outcomes, including substantial periods of unemployment, homelessness, involvement with the criminal justice system and poverty.

More than 800 teenage youth are living in foster placements because their parent could not provide adequate care. Each year, over two hundred of these youth turn 18 (when most youth lose services) while still in foster care. More than 800 youth enter the juvenile justice system each year; many will be on probation when they turn 18. Approximately 2200 18 through 24 year olds are on adult probation; nearly 300 are in the county jail at any given time. Transitional age youth often lack basic education, have minimal employment opportunities, and have been subject to traumatic events throughout their lives. Approximately 18% of women aged 18 – 24 report having experienced forced sexual intercourse at least once in their lives. Over 1000 18 through 24-year-old men and women receive either general assistance or support from CalWorks each month. Approximately 5000 18 – 24 year old San Franciscans lack a high school degree. The SFUSD currently has approximately 1800 students currently enrolled that are 18 or older and have fewer than half of the credits necessary to graduate from high school. 5000 18-24 year old San Franciscans lack a high school degree. Homelessness is also a major destabilizing factor in these young people's lives. An estimated 1600 youth ages 12 through 24 are homeless at any given time, and an estimated 4500 to 6800 youth are homeless or marginally housed annually.

Many of these youth overlap. An estimated 28% of foster care youth are on probation and an estimated 37% of youth on probation are in foster care. The Transitional Age Youth Task Force estimates that between five to eight thousand young people ages 16 through 24, up to 10% of this age group, are disconnected from education, employment and social support systems. For transitional age youth of color, these figures are even more dramatic. African American and Latino youth are significantly more likely to leave high school without a degree. African-American youth are substantially over-represented in San Francisco's foster care, juvenile justice, homeless and adult incarcerated systems. Over half of African-American males aged 18 through 24 were unemployed in 2005.

The top needs identified by the Task Force include the following: finding affordable and safe housing, health care and its costs, issues of eligibility and coverage, and testing for HIV and sexually transmitted diseases; employment, academic support; mental services to help in coping with feeling of stress, anxiety, peer pressure, and the negative consequences of living in unsafe neighborhoods; and safety and violence issues. Few city contracts, grants, or public funded programs appear to focus specifically on the unique needs of vulnerable, disconnected transitional age youth, or offer a comprehensive set of services to meet the varied needs of youth. The Task Force specifically called for increased outreach and awareness efforts, comprehensive neighborhood-based multi-service centers for disconnected youth, increased access to training and employment opportunities, expanded housing opportunities for homeless or marginally housed youth, a residential treatment program for youth with significant mental health issues, and expanded availability of safe recreational and social activities for transitional age youth. It is crucial that a holistic community development strategy recognize the specialized needs of transitional age youth and support high quality services to reach out to this vulnerable population.

Victims/Survivors of Violence and Family Violence

Violence

While some progress has been made in combating violence, the City still saw violent crime rise 7% from 2005 to 2007 and homicides reached a decade high. Data from San Francisco General Hospital indicate firearm violence is rising. Police data also shows a dramatic increase in the use of knives. Violence is often concentrated in specific neighborhoods and linked to public housing sites. The 2005 DPH report titled, "Local Data for Local Violence Prevention," found that the majority of homicides and assault injuries occurred in five of San Francisco's 24 zip codes encompassing Bayview/Hunters Point, Western Addition, Visitacion Valley, Mission, and Tenderloin neighborhoods. A majority of the City's public housing units are concentrated in these neighborhoods. Over the past decade, a significant number of violent incidents were linked to public housing. Nationally, public housing residents are twice as likely to be affected by violence as people paying market rate rent.

Violence is highly correlated with poverty and unemployment. Poverty is a widely accepted indicator of risk for an individual's involvement with violence as a victim, perpetrator, or both. A recent study on homicide victims and perpetrators found nearly every victim from 2004 to 2005 lived in high poverty census tracts. Victims and survivors of domestic violence and child abuse are also more likely to live in San Francisco's low-income neighborhoods. Not surprisingly, the unemployment rate in San Francisco's violence-prone neighborhoods is more than double the citywide unemployment rate. Research suggests victims and perpetrators are likely to be underemployed or unemployed. Studies also suggest there is an increased likelihood of probationer and parolee subsequent involvement with violence as a result of inadequate education and elevated rates of unemployment.

African Americans are consistently and disproportionately overrepresented across all forms of violence. African Americans are more likely to be victims of serious injury due to assault or homicide, and more likely to be identified as victims of child abuse, hate crime, domestic violence, and elder abuse than persons in any other ethnic group. Although African Americans represent less than 8% of San Francisco's population, they account for 39% of hospitalizations due to assaults; almost 35% of domestic violence incidents reported to police; 54% of homicide victims, 53% of racially motivated hate crime victims, and nearly half (46%) of all children in San Francisco's child welfare system.

Emancipated and transitional age youth are at heightened risk for becoming victims and perpetrators of violence particularly gun violence. Children and youth in the child welfare system are at greater risk for involvement in the criminal justice system. Over the next 3 years, approximately 150 transitional age youth will emancipate from foster care. These youth are at high risk for unemployment, homelessness and involvement with the criminal justice system. It is estimated as many as 28% of these youth are already involved in the justice system. These youth are also at increased risk for involvement with gun violence. A 2006 study of homicide victims found that nearly a quarter of homicide victims had been in foster care at some point in their lives. Almost an equal number of homicide suspects were involved in the foster care system as well.

Children who witness violence are more likely to perpetuate violence later in life. Some estimates suggest between 5,000 and 11,000 children and youth are exposed to domestic violence each year in San Francisco. When school based violence and community violence are factored in, this number is dramatically increased. There is a strong correlation between children who witness violence and later involvement in violence and/or crime. Some estimates report as many as 87% of adult perpetrators of violent crime witnessed violence in the home as children.

Women and girls are particularly vulnerable to becoming victims of violence and are increasingly perpetrators themselves. In 2006, the WOMAN Inc. Crisis Line received more than 14,000 domestic violence related calls. Almost 20% of the calls were from non-English speakers, particularly Latina callers. During the same year, more than 4,300 calls were placed to 911. African American callers placed a large proportion of these calls. Nearly 40% of domestic violence acts are perpetrated by an intimate partner. These kinds of incidences rarely occur as an isolated event. One report found that an estimated 33% of police responses to domestic violence calls were repeat visits to the same location. Emerging trends and patterns indicate women and girls are increasingly the perpetrators of violence. The number of girls referred to the Juvenile Probation Department rose 17% from 2006 to 2007 and half of the girls in juvenile hall are there for a violent offense.

Probationers and parolees are at high risk for violence without support. At any given time there are up to 8,000 San Francisco residents on adult probation. A large portion of these probationers are violent offenders. A recent audit of probationers living in the Western Addition area revealed the severity of support needs of this population: 68% had identified substance abuse issues, 65% were unemployed, 48% lacked a high school diploma or GED and 42% had children. Without sufficient support, this population is at enormous risk for returning to custody. For offenders paroled to San Francisco in 2006, more than 60% had been in custody more than once. Offenders are also at extremely high risk for being victims or perpetrators of violence. A recent study of non-fatal shootings found that 73.8% of suspects in shooting incidents were previously known to the criminal justice system, as were 53.4% of the victims. About half of both victims and offenders had been to jail or prison, and about three quarters were currently or had, in the past, been on probation. In 2006 nearly 2,071 youth were referred to probation; 53% of these youth were African American. More than 60% of these youth were transitional aged, 73% had prior contact with juvenile probation, and 43% were booked for violent related crimes.

The LGBTQ community is at greater risk for violent hate crime victimization than other victims of hate crimes. Statewide statistics show that the great majority of hate crime is violent. Close to three-quarters (74.8%) of hate crime offenses occur against people rather than property. Race/ethnic origin of victim is the biggest motivation for hate crime in California, but hate crime due to sexual orientation is more prevalent in San Francisco than statewide. Different hate crime motivations result in different types of violent crime. Hate crime targeting religious and ethnic groups typically involve damage to property, while hate crime targeted at the LGBTQ community is usually violence against the person.

Gang affiliation increases risk for involvement with violence. Researchers estimate San Francisco has 1,200 to 1,700 gang members. Approximately 48% of the homicides in 2004, 2005, and 2006 were reportedly gang-related. This demonstrates a small portion of the population is responsible for a significant portion of San Francisco homicides. A 2002 report on gangs in San Francisco found that young people were most likely to join between 12 and 14 years of age. Their reasons for joining included money, protection, a friend was in a gang, fun, and to get respect. 52% of males indicated gang affiliation made them safer, 80% of gang members indicated a primary benefit of gang affiliation was access to guns/weapons and 34% of respondents indicated they had attacked someone with a weapon.

Seniors are vulnerable to abuse due to cultural, physical, and linguistic isolation – white elders affected most. There are approximately 106,000 seniors living in San Francisco, representing nearly 14% of the city's population. The senior population is expected to increase substantially over the next 10-20 years. Many of San Francisco seniors are vulnerable to abuse due to cultural, physical, and linguistic isolation. Over half of the seniors in San Francisco reside alone, and nearly 30% are linguistically isolated. In 2006, there were 2,613 reports of elder abuse. Roughly 60% of those reports were substantiated.

Family Violence

In Fiscal Year 2007-2008 (FY07-08), 911 dispatchers fielded 6,583 domestic violence calls. Dispatchers labeled over half of these calls (52%) with the 418DV code, indicating a fight or dispute with no weapons involved. Another 35% of domestic violence calls received the 240DV code, indicating an assault of some type occurred. The remaining 9% of calls (525) were dispersed across 11 other domestic violence call types, including aggravated assault, attack with weapons, threats, and break-ins.

There are three emergency shelters for victims of domestic violence and their children in San Francisco, with a combined total of approximately 75 beds. In FY07-08, the City supported 5,927 bednights at the 3 emergency shelters. These bednights were used by 117 women and 111 children. The 3 shelters turned 630 women and children away, often for lack of space. The three domestic violence shelters and the W.O.M.A.N., Inc. domestic violence crisis line responded to a total of 24,632 hotline calls during FY07-08, of which 4,437 were crisis calls, and 2,690 were informational calls. Additionally, victims may use other access points for services not specific to domestic violence. Many victims never access services at all.

Adult Protective Services (APS) is administered by DAAS, and is charged with responding to allegations of abuse for seniors and adults 18 to 64 who are dependent or have disabilities. APS receives approximately 6,000 calls to the reporting hotline in a year.¹³ In FY07-08, a review of the 6,000 calls received led to investigations of a total of 4,893 of the reports. 3,278 or 67% of these reports were substantiated. Considering the issue of underreporting,

where national statistics indicate only 1 in 5 cases are reported, national data would indicate that in addition to the 3,278 substantiated reports of elder abuse and neglect, an estimated 16,390 cases never came to light.

Re-entry Population

Introduction

People who have previously been incarcerated face many problems including homelessness, joblessness, mental illness and substance abuse, all of which can contribute to recidivism and hinder positive integration into the community. Approximately 40% of people entering San Francisco county jails have previous arrests in San Francisco, and 70% of California state parolees are rearrested within three years of their release from prison.⁸

The majority of offenders come from economically disadvantaged neighborhoods, and they return there upon release. Failure to serve this population could result in increased drug addiction, homelessness, joblessness, and violence in already struggling communities.⁹ Furthermore, the public cost of re-arrest and return to prison is enormous.¹⁰

Demographics

Information on San Francisco's re-entry population originates from administrative data held by criminal justice departments. Key terms for understanding the re-entry population demographics are explained below.

Jail vs. Prison

People who are sentenced to incarceration in California may serve time in either local jail or state prison, depending upon the severity of the crime and other factors. In general, if someone is sentenced to 12 months or less, s/he serves that time in county jail. If someone is sentenced to more than 12 months, s/he serves that time in state prison. Further, violations of parole result in a return to prison, and violations of probation may result in a return to prison or jail.

People awaiting trial may also be held in jail if they are considered high-risk or cannot meet bail. The San Francisco county jails have an average daily population of between 2,100 and 2,200 people. Of this population, about 75% have not yet been sentenced.¹¹

Probation vs. Parole

Upon release from jail, most individuals are assigned to a probation officer for supervision for 2-5 years. Upon release from prison, most individuals are assigned to a parole officer for supervision for 1 year. San Francisco currently has approximately 9,500 adults on parole and probation.¹²

The goals of probation and parole supervision are similar- to reduce likelihood of a repeat crime through surveillance (enforcement of terms of release and legal obligations) as well as support (information and referral assistance). Unfortunately, often, parole and probation departments suffer from limited funding and caseloads are quite large, making it challenging to meet the complex needs of individuals under supervision. San Francisco probation department caseloads for 18-25 year old probationers average 166/officer, and officers supervising many other types of probationers have even larger caseloads.¹³ Due to high caseloads in the parole department, most parolees only see their officer for two 15-minute, face to-face contacts per month and parole agents in California reportedly lost track of about one-fifth of the parolees they were assigned to in 1999.¹⁴

⁸ Assessing Need for Reentry Services Among Probationers & Parolees in San Francisco, Allen, Joan, May 2008

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Making the Case for Reentry Supportive Services: A Review of the Data, Corporation for Supportive Housing

¹¹ Assessing Need for Reentry Services Among Probationers & Parolees in San Francisco, Allen, Joan, May 2008

¹² Ibid.

¹³ San Francisco Adult Probation Department Fiscal Year 2007-2008 Annual Report

¹⁴ When Prisoners Return to the Community: Political, Economic, and Social Consequences, Petersilia, Joan, Nov 2000

Gender and Parental Status

Thirteen percent of the jail population and 6% of the parole population are female (Table XX).¹⁵ Nationally, women on probation or in prison/jail were approximately 50% more likely to have a mental illness and more than twice as likely to have had a major depressive episode than men.¹⁶ Additionally, women who have been incarcerated are more likely to have been victims of sexual assault or other abuse than are women who have not been incarcerated.¹⁷

Among imprisoned men nationwide, more than half are fathers of minor children. For female inmates the percentage is larger—about two-thirds have minor children. On average, women inmates have two dependent children.¹⁸

Table 23
Jail and Parole Population By Gender and Race/Ethnicity, 2008

		Jail Population	Parole Population	General Population
Gender	Male	87%	94%	51%
	Female	13%	6%	49%
Race/Ethnicity	African American	58%	60%	7%
	Hispanic/Latino	15%	7%	14%
	White (non-Hispanic)	18%	25%	45%
	Asian/Other/Unknown	9%	8%	31%

Race/Ethnicity

African-Americans are grossly overrepresented in the San Francisco parole and probation populations, while Asians and non-Hispanic whites are underrepresented (Table XX).

Age

The average age of California state prisoners has increased substantially over the past 20 years. Today, the average age of state parolees released to San Francisco is 38.6 years old and the average age for individuals entering San Francisco county jails is 33.9 years.¹⁹

Age is an important consideration in policymaking for re-entry because older former prisoners are more likely to have extensive health problems, but are less likely to recidivate than younger former prisoners.

Type of Offense Charged or Convicted

Figure 18 shows a breakdown of San Francisco's jail population by the offense charged or convicted of. The data includes both pre-trial and post-trial detainees. The largest number (42%) of people in jail were accused or convicted of a drug offense, but substantial numbers (29%) were accused or convicted of a violent offense.²⁰

Figure 19 shows the controlling offense- the most severe crime for which the individual was sent to prison, of San Francisco parolees. Three quarters served time for a nonviolent offense.

¹⁵ Assessing Need for Reentry Services Among Probationers & Parolees in San Francisco, Allen, Joan, May 2008

¹⁶ When Prisoners Return to the Community: Political, Economic, and Social Consequences, Petersilia, Joan, Nov 2000

¹⁷ Assessing Need for Reentry Services Among Probationers & Parolees in San Francisco, Allen, Joan, May 2008

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Assessing Need for Reentry Services Among Probationers & Parolees in San Francisco, Allen, Joan, May 2008

²⁰ Assessing Need for Reentry Services Among Probationers & Parolees in San Francisco, Allen, Joan, May 2008

Figure 18
San Francisco Jail Population by Controlling Offense, 2008





Figure 19
Controlling Offense of San Francisco Parolees, 2007



Populations in Need

In considering housing, services, and community supports for the re-entry population, it is useful to focus on two distinct groups within the re-entry population: (1) those very recently released from jail and prison (within the past two weeks) and (2) individuals who are living with a criminal record.

Challenges Facing Those Recently Released

People released from prison remain largely uneducated and unskilled and usually have little in the way of a solid family support system. Mental illness and substance abuse are common. To these challenges are added negative,

even scarring experiences in prison, and the unalterable fact of their prison record. Not surprisingly, most parolees fail and do so quickly: Most re-arrests occur in the first 6 months after release. Fully two-thirds of all parolees are rearrested within 3 years.²¹

- 70 to 85 percent of State prisoners need drug treatment; however, just 13 percent receive it while incarcerated.²²
- Nearly 1 in 5 inmates in U.S. prisons reports having a mental illness.²³ Prisons and jails treat more people with mental illness than hospitals and residential treatment facilities combined, making our jails and prisons the primary provider of mental health care in the U.S.²⁴
- More than one in three jail inmates report a disability.
- Most parolees in California are released at the nearest bus station to their prison with \$200, no belongings, and no ID. It may be as long as 72 hours before they meet their parole officer for guidance and an ID.²⁵

Challenges Facing People with a Criminal Record: Disproportionate Impacts

People who serve time in either jail or prison will have a felony record that creates barriers to housing, employment, and services for the rest of their lives. Both unjustified discrimination and pragmatic caution on the part of service providers and employers makes successful integration challenging for even the most determined ex-offenders. People of color are doubly impacted- barriers as a result of their criminal record are coupled with racial discrimination.

- One in five adult Californians has a State criminal record.²⁶
- A young black man aged 16 in 1996 had a 29-percent chance of spending time in prison at some time in his life. The comparable figure for white men was 4 percent.²⁷
- A recent survey in five major U.S. cities revealed that 65 percent of all employers said they would not knowingly hire an ex-offender (regardless of the offense), and 30 to 40 percent said they had checked the criminal records of their most recent hires.²⁸
- One study found that white parolees receive a call back after interviewing with potential employers 17% of the time, while black parolees receive a call only 5% of the time.²⁹
- As of 1998, 1.4 million African American men—13 percent of all black men— were unable to vote because they had been convicted of a felony.³⁰

²¹ When Prisoners Return to the Community: Political, Economic, and Social Consequences, Petersilia, Joan, Nov 2000

²² Ibid

²³ Ibid

²⁴ Getting Out with Nowhere to Go: The Case for Reentry Supportive Housing, Corporation for Supportive Housing, 2009

²⁵ The First 72 Hours of Reentry: Seizing the Moment of Release, Stanford Law School, 2008

²⁶ Criminal Records and Employment: Data on the Disproportionate Impact on Communities of Color, Madeline Neighly, Margaret Stevenson, National Employment Law Project, 2009

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ When Prisoners Return to the Community: Political, Economic, and Social Consequences, Petersilia, Joan, Nov 2000

²⁹ Criminal Records and Employment: Data on the Disproportionate Impact on Communities of Color, Madeline Neighly, Margaret Stevenson, National Employment Law Project, 2009

³⁰ Ibid.

- People who have been convicted of a violent offense are ineligible for most affordable housing and many re-entry services because they sometimes pose higher risks for program staff and other program participants.³¹

The Result

San Francisco, a City that prides itself on overall excellence in our public services, still has large gaps in service for our re-entry population, with troubling consequences.

- Ninety-four percent of mentally ill parolees in California will return to prison within 24 months.³²
- In urban areas such as San Francisco, the rate of homelessness amongst parolees is as high as 30% to 50%.³³
- Rates of shelter use are higher for people exiting prison than for people exiting mental hospitals.³⁴
- One year after release, as many as 60% of former inmates are not employed in the legitimate labor market.³⁵

Disconnected LGBT Individuals

Lack of economic empowerment threatens the LGBT community's goals of independence and stability. Declining economic stability is pushing vulnerable segments of the LGBT community out of San Francisco and destroying the diversity and tolerance for which the city is known. The community is economically diverse, and its income levels fall along the same spectrum as those of the heterosexual community. The economic development of the LGBT community is impeded by widespread societal homophobia, transphobia, and discrimination. Despite the lack of formal research, it is clear that the LGBT community faces unique economic challenges. Discrimination has an economic impact on the LGBT community because it erects barriers to finding and retaining employment and housing, and accessing health care and education. Isolation and the lack of support experienced by many LGBT persons exacerbate existing economic challenges. One example of how discrimination affects the economic status of the LGBT community is the denial of the right to marry. Data from the 1990 U.S. Census indicate that there are over 400,000 same-sex couples living in California alone. These couples and hundreds of thousands of others across the United States are denied access to over 1,000 federal and state rights and benefits that come with marriage. Many of these rights have clear economic ramifications.

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer and questioning (LGBTQQ) youth are vulnerable economically because they face societal discrimination alone; these youth often lack the family support that provides stability in the form of housing, sustenance, and spiritual grounding. LGBTQQ youth often become homeless when they come out to their families. The discrimination, homophobia, and transphobia in the home environment means many youth are thrown out of or forced to leave home. This lack of family support, financial and otherwise, makes LGBT youth particularly vulnerable.

LGBT immigrants find themselves in special circumstances that create serious economic difficulties; they face additional barriers because of a lack of documentation, safety, and family support. Immigrants often have difficulty obtaining social security numbers, drivers' licenses, and bank accounts. Immigrants may avoid reporting crimes to the police both because of a fear of discrimination and of problems with the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

³¹ Assessing Need for Reentry Services Among Probationers & Parolees in San Francisco, Allen, Joan, May 2008

³² CSH, The Case For Reentry Supportive Housing

³³ When Prisoners Return to the Community: Political, Economic, and Social Consequences, Petersilia, Joan, Nov 2000

³⁴ Getting Out with Nowhere to Go: The Case for Reentry Supportive Housing, CSH, 2009

³⁵ When Prisoners Return to the Community: Political, Economic, and Social Consequences, Petersilia, Joan, Nov 2000

LGBT immigrants often live alone because they cannot bring families and relatives to the United States because they are legal strangers.

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

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

There is a particular need for affordable housing for LGBT senior citizens. It is estimated that 24,000 LGBT people over the age of 60 live in San Francisco and that half of those people live alone. The income of half of LGBT seniors fall under \$25,000 a year and qualify them for affordable housing. LGBT seniors often have no family to turn to and have faced familial and societal rejection throughout their lives.

C. Five-Year Goals

San Francisco has determined that the optimum way to address the City's priority problem areas is to work towards a set of five interconnected, multidisciplinary goals that cross program areas and utilize leveraged strategies both internally and across multiple city departments. Funding for these strategies will be coordinated across City departments, so that HUD funds can be maximized in those areas that are both of highest priority to MOH/OEWD and where HUD funds can provide the maximum benefit in terms of unmet need and resource scarcity. These five goals are:

- Goal 1: Families and individuals are healthy and economically self-sufficient
- Goal 2: Neighborhoods and communities are strong, vibrant and stable
- Goal 3: Formerly homeless individuals and families are stable, supported and live in long-term housing
- Goal 4: Families and individuals have safe, healthy and affordable housing (discussed in Section IV)
- Goal 5: Public housing developments that were severely distressed are thriving mixed-income communities (discussed in Section IV)

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

Economic Self-Sufficiency

San Francisco uses as its basis for economic self-sufficiency the Family Economic Self-Sufficiency Standard (Self-Sufficiency Standard), which measures how much income is needed for a family of a certain composition living in a particular county to adequately meet its minimal basic needs. It is based on the costs families face on a daily basis – housing, food, childcare, out-of-pocket medical expenses, transportation, and other necessary spending – and provides a complete picture of what it takes for families to make ends meet. Calculated for 156 different family compositions in all 58 California Counties (and 35 other states), the Family Standard is based on credible, publicly available data sources, including:

- Housing costs: US Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Fair Market Rents and National Low-Income Housing Coalition (NLIHC)
- Childcare costs: California Department of Education (CDE)
- Food costs: US Department of Agriculture (USDA) low-cost food plan and ACCRA Cost of Living Index
- Health insurance costs: Medical Expenditure Panel Survey (MEPS)
- Transportation costs: U.S. Census and the National Association of Insurance Commissioners.

As stated by Diana Pearce in the Methodology Appendix for the Self Sufficiency Standard for California 2008, "Economic self-sufficiency cannot necessarily be achieved by wages alone. Public work supports (e.g., MediCal) are often necessary, even critical, for some families to meet the high costs of necessities in California, including housing, childcare, and health care. True self-sufficiency requires access to education, training, and jobs that provide skill development and career advancement over the long-term, rather than a specific job with a certain wage and benefits at one point in time. Being "self-sufficient", however, does not imply that any family at any income should be completely self-reliant and independent of one another or the community-at-large. Indeed, it is through interdependence among families and community institutions (such as schools or religious institutions), as well as informal networks of friends, extended family, and neighbors that many families are able to meet both their non-economic and economic needs."

Research based on 2007 ACS data by the Insight Center for Community Economic Development shows that of San Francisco's 243,307 households, 18.8% are living below the self-sufficiency standard. Among communities of color, the numbers are even worse – 43.7% of African American households fall below that standard, 35.6% of Latino households and 25.7% of Asian and Pacific Islander households. 31.2% of all foreign-born families fail to

meet that standard. In households in which the head of household does not have a high school diploma, an astounding 62.8% fail to meet the self-sufficiency standard.

Table 23
The Self-Sufficiency Standard by Select Household Characteristics, San Francisco, 2007

Table C-38. The Self-Sufficiency Standard by
Select Household Characteristics: San Francisco County, California 2007

	TOTAL	PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLDS	PERCENT BELOW SELF-SUFFICIENCY STANDARD	PERCENT ABOVE SELF-SUFFICIENCY STANDARD
TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS IN COUNTY	243,307	100.0%	18.8%	81.2%
RACE AND ETHNICITY OF HOUSEHOLDS				
Asian and Pacific Islander	57,819	23.8%	25.7%	74.3%
Black or African American	14,984	6.2%	43.7%	56.3%
Latino ¹	26,324	10.8%	35.6%	64.4%
White	140,573	57.6%	9.9%	90.1%
NATIVITY OF HOUSEHOLDER				
Foreign-born	74,620	30.7%	31.2%	68.8%
Native-born	168,687	69.3%	13.3%	86.7%
GENDER OF HOUSEHOLDER				
Male	134,097	55.1%	17.4%	82.6%
Female	109,210	44.9%	20.4%	79.6%
HOUSEHOLD TYPE				
Households without children	183,783	75.5%	14.8%	85.2%
1 or More Children	59,524	24.5%	31.2%	68.8%
Single mother	12,955	5.3%	47.0%	53.0%
Single father	4,359	1.8%	46.0%	54.0%
Married couple with children	42,210	17.3%	24.8%	75.2%
EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF HOUSEHOLDER				
Less than high school	16,301	6.7%	62.8%	37.2%
High school diploma	27,283	11.2%	40.9%	59.1%
Some college	46,554	19.1%	26.1%	73.9%
Bachelor's degree or higher	153,169	63.0%	7.9%	92.1%
NUMBER OF WORKERS IN HOUSEHOLD				
None	11,261	4.6%	74.7%	25.3%
One	120,918	49.7%	19.1%	80.9%
Two+	111,128	45.7%	12.8%	87.2%
WORK STATUS OF HOUSEHOLDER				
Not Working	19,752	8.1%	57.2%	42.8%
Full time (year round and part year)	162,662	66.9%	12.6%	87.4%
Part time (year round and part year)	60,893	25.0%	22.7%	77.3%
HOUSEHOLD HAS FOOD STAMP USE IN HOUSEHOLD IN LAST 12 MONTHS				
No	240,435	98.8%	18.2%	81.8%
Yes	2,872	1.2%	68.4%	31.6%
SNAP FOOD STAMP USE IN HOUSEHOLD IN LAST 12 MONTHS				
No	238,836	98.2%	17.5%	82.5%
Yes	4,471	1.8%	87.3%	12.7%
TOP OCCUPATIONS OF HOUSEHOLDERS BELOW THE SELF-SUFFICIENCY STANDARD				
1	Office and Administrative Support	13.7%		
2	Sales	9.5%		
3	Transportation and Material Moving	8.7%		
4	Food Preparation and Serving	7.3%		
5	Construction and Extraction	6.5%		
TOP OCCUPATIONS OF HOUSEHOLDERS ABOVE THE SELF-SUFFICIENCY STANDARD				
	Management	17.3%		
	Sales	10.9%		
	Business and Financial Operations	10.1%		
	Office and Administrative Support	9.8%		
	Computer and Mathematical	6.6%		

See footnotes and source information at end of Appendix C

D. Program Areas

MOH and OEWD will work to achieve these goals through eight distinct program areas: affordable housing; community facility capital improvements; economic advancement for families and individuals; economic development; homelessness and homeless prevention; organizational capacity building and technical assistance; and workforce development. Each program area supports one or more goals as portrayed below in the chart.

Table 24	MOH and OEWD Program Areas						
	Affordable Housing	Community Facility Capital Improvements	Economic Advancement for Families and Individuals	Economic Development	Homelessness/Homeless Prevention	Organizational Capacity Building and Technical Assistance	Workforce Development
Goals							
Goal 1: Families and individuals are healthy and economically self-sufficient			X	X			X
Goal 2: Neighborhoods and communities are strong, vibrant and stable		X	X	X		X	
Goal 3: Formerly homeless individuals and families are stable, supported and live in permanent housing	X		X		X		
Goal 4: Families and individuals have safe, healthy and affordable housing	X		X		X		
Goal 5: Public housing developments that were severely distressed are thriving mixed-income communities	X	X	X			X	X

MOH and OEWD are organized to achieve the goals and strategies identified above through grants, loans, public policy development, resource leveraging and technical support. The following condensed descriptions of these program areas are intended to provide additional context to improve the community's understanding of MOH and OEWD's programs.

Community Facility Capital Improvements and Public Space Improvements

MOH is the primary City agency that funds the rehabilitation or new construction of non-profit facilities that predominantly serve low-income families and individuals. The other sources of funds which non-profits typically access to finance the cost of construction or rehabilitation of facilities come primarily from private foundations. Because of the scarcity of funding for this kind of support, and given the priority many non-profits and funders place on supporting programs rather than capital improvements, MOH is committed to continuing to use CDBG funds to fill this particular gap through its community facility capital improvements program. These funds have been used to cover the cost of tenant improvements that allow service providers to expand existing services, and to construct new facilities. In addition to protecting and expanding services, capital funds are used to ensure that these facilities are accessible to all and meet health and safety standards.

Over the next five years, MOH will focus facility program funds primarily on the following types of facilities:

- public facilities where services and supports will be co-located and coordinated;
- neighborhood multi-service centers;
- constituency-focused multi-service centers;
- City-designated workforce one-stop centers;
- City-designated family resource centers;
- City-designated comprehensive senior centers;
- community centers located within or near affordable housing developments; and
- licensed child care facilities.

These priority facilities have been selected to maximize Citywide impact by supporting facilities with multiple departmental investments and/or facilities that play important roles in a department(s) strategic planning.

As with community facilities, MOH is one of very few City agencies that can allocate funding for public space improvements, if the improvements will directly benefit low-income residents. To address this need, MOH created the public space improvement program. In general, MOH funds improvements that will enhance the quality of outdoor space in neighborhoods and public housing developments where blighted conditions exist. The public space improvement program is designed to provide a double benefit. In addition to improving public space, the funded projects themselves are often designed as a job-training program for the individuals participating in the improvement projects.

Economic Advancement for Families and Individuals

MOH's economic advancement program brings together legal services, case management, adult educational support, support for transitional age youth, financial literacy and asset building, social capital development, and strategic linkages through neighborhood and community centers to maximize individual and family economic self-sufficiency. Priority is given to those services which help individuals and families overcome barriers and enable them to access services, often those services which other City departments have also prioritized.

Case management services are supported that target the community's most vulnerable populations, including survivors of domestic violence, homeless residents, immigrants, veterans, and transitional age youth. Educational support is also offered to transitional age youth and adults who need assistance to receive their GED, need English as a Second Language classes, develop life skills, and receive technology training.

Financial literacy and asset building is also crucial element of this program. Financial literacy is a bundle of skills that have to be learned continuously throughout one's life. As a person's overall money management tasks become more and more complicated, we as consumers must understand not only how to do the basics, but also understand and master more complex financial transactions. This range of needed money management knowledge includes:

- Opening a credit account – knowing about personal credit reports and “FICO” personal credit scores.
- Setting up a household – basic budget management, checking accounts, electronic banking (such as direct deposits).

- Buying or leasing a car – choice of new or used car, lease or purchase, insurance, registration.
- Purchasing a home – obtaining one or more mortgages, insurance, prime/sub-prime (rate) loans, closing costs.
- Investing your money to build wealth – Certificate of Deposits, saving accounts, money market accounts, investing in mutual funds, or individual retirement accounts (IRAs).
- Protecting yourself against fraud – and the predators that practice predatory lending, pay day lending, identity theft.

Legal problems faced by California's low-income community involve very basic issues of housing, family, safety, and employment— problems often caused by or exacerbated by the family's lack of resources. Legal service organizations receive daily requests for critical assistance, such as:

- Victims of domestic violence who need legal assistance to separate themselves from abusive partners
- Veterans who need legal assistance to obtain services and resources they have earned
- Elderly persons who need legal help to escape abuse or neglect by a family member or caregiver, or to undo an illegal foreclosure resulting from home improvement fraud or identity theft
- Families facing a medical emergency who cannot obtain health care
- Individuals transitioning from welfare to work who need legal assistance to reinstate a driver's license needed for employment, or to ensure access to child care that enables them to work
- Immigrants, who are particularly vulnerable and may need assistance to address unfair and deceptive business practices such as fraud in the purchase and sale of a used automobile, deceptive insurance sales, predatory fringe lending, or illegal debt collection practices
- Families in unsafe housing who need advocacy to obtain critical repairs.

A focused approach to transitional age youth is also needed. Service providers need to develop a set of minimum standards similar to what has been developed for children and youth to ensure consistency across outcomes, improved evaluation, and strategic services.

Finally, social capital is also valued as leveraging the strengths within a community or neighborhood that accrue exponentially to each individual and family within that group. Meaningful economic advancement needs to include the development of social capital as an asset within the communities served. John Putnam has described social capital as "connections among individuals – social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them...Social capital calls attention to the fact that civic virtue is most powerful when embedded in a...network of reciprocal social relations. A society of many virtuous but isolated individuals is not necessarily rich in social capital." Putnam went on to say that social capital serves a number of specific functions, including allowing citizens to resolve collective problems more easily; greasing the wheels that allow communities to advance smoothly; and widening our awareness of the many ways in which our fates are linked. The networks that constitute social capital can also serve as conduits for the flow of helpful information that facilitates achieving goals. Neighborhood and community centers are seen as a crucial focal point to build social capital, so priority has been given to strengthen those organizations which serve as gathering places, information forums, and community organizing locations.

Economic Development

Introduction: Economic Development in San Francisco

Economic development can be broadly defined as activities that increase the overall wealth of the community by coordinating our various human, financial, and physical resources to generate marketable goods and services and create jobs. Given this definition, a wide variety of San Francisco public agencies are engaged in activities that can be characterized as economic development, including Mayor's Office of Housing, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, the Planning Department, and even the Department of Public Works. The Office of Economic & Workforce Development (OEWD) is responsible for providing citywide leadership and coordination of these activities. OEWD uses the San Francisco Economic Strategy, adopted in 2007, as a guide in its pursuit of goals that support the economic vitality of the City and its citizens: creating job opportunities to promote overall economic growth;

ensuring inclusion and equity in job opportunities, with an aim at reducing inequality; and ensuring a sound fiscal footing for the City.

OEWD utilizes Community Development Block Grants to provide support to businesses that are either owned by, provide employment opportunities to, or serve low- and moderate-income people. We achieve a variety of outcomes related to the wellbeing of this population: through the promotion and enabling of microenterprise business ownership, low- and moderate-income people build assets and achieve self-sufficiency; through the establishment, expansion, and retention of small businesses, low- and moderate-income people secure steady employment and build skills; and through the strengthening of commercial corridors in neighborhood strategic revitalization areas, low- and moderate-income people have increased access to goods, services, and economic opportunity and small businesses in these areas have the chance to grow and produce jobs.

In San Francisco, CDBG-funded economic development activities are both people-based and place-based. Many service providers cater to any business, citywide, that is owned by or provides employment opportunities to low- and moderate-income people. Sometimes these providers target specific demographic groups by offering culturally aware and/or multilingual services. Other service providers take a place-based approach: they target the merchants in a particular neighborhood or on a particular commercial corridor in a low- or moderate-income area. Thus, place-based programs serve both the business owners (who are often of low- or moderate-income status themselves) as well as the low- and moderate-income people of the surrounding community. OEWD aims to coordinate and support these various people- and place-based programs in order to create a rich ecosystem of economic development programs for the disadvantaged people and neighborhoods of San Francisco.

Core Economic Development Activities

San Francisco's use of Community Development Block Grants to support economic development activities has evolved over time. The current core activities fall into two general categories.

- *Support for Small Businesses and Entrepreneurs*
Community Development Block Grants are utilized to provide a variety of support for small businesses and entrepreneurs in San Francisco. Central to this support is technical assistance for entrepreneurs who want to establish a new microenterprise or small business, and for owners who seek to strengthen or expand their existing small business. Technical assistance (TA) exists in a variety of forms, and covers a range of contents. OEWD's needs assessment indicates that the most important types of TA for San Francisco entrepreneurs include the development of financial projections, business planning, startup training, and marketing and branding assistance.

Coupled with technical assistance is another key ingredient for entrepreneurship: access to financial capital. The business owners surveyed through OEWD's needs assessment indicated that increasing access to capital is the single most important type of economic development service that the City could provide. San Francisco's small business revolving loan program provides microenterprise loans of up to \$50,000 to qualified entrepreneurs; the needs assessment found significant community support for this program. Additionally, Community Development Block Grants are utilized to provide loan packaging services; grantee organizations help business owners and entrepreneurs identify potential sources of capital, including banks and alternative lenders, and enable their clients to complete loan applications.

- *Support for Commercial Corridors*
Community Development Block Grants are also utilized to strengthen commercial corridors in low- and moderate-income areas. OEWD has partnered with community-based organizations to develop specific, neighborhood-level plans in low- and moderate-income areas; commercial corridor programs are designed to respond to the particular issues that have been raised by those plans. Activities include filling vacancies on corridors; attracting businesses that will provide employment opportunities and access to goods and services; strengthening and beautifying the physical infrastructure of the corridors; providing focused technical assistance to small businesses on the corridors; community planning, and the formation of merchant associations and business improvement districts; and other activities that improve quality of life and economic opportunity in low- and moderate-income areas.

Economic Development Objectives for 2010-2014

In San Francisco, we enjoy the presence of many capable organizations dedicated to economic developments. There exists a wealth of strategies that have proven effective at strengthening businesses, creating jobs, and improving commercial corridors. Over the next five years we will continue to innovate as we strive to create and support programming that most effectively and efficiently improves the economic health of San Francisco's low- and moderate-income people and neighborhoods. Additionally, we will continuously evaluate our program areas and the impact of our grantee organizations to ensure that the most effective strategies and programs are maximized, and ineffective programs are improved or phased out. Our biggest challenge will be prioritizing our strategies to best meet the needs of our citizens. To this end, we have identified two objectives for the CDBG economic development program that best support the overarching goals of this consolidated plan:

- Establish, enhance, and retain small businesses and micro-enterprises.
- Strengthen commercial corridors in low- and moderate-income neighborhoods and increase corridor potential for providing jobs, services, and opportunities for residents.

Homelessness and Homeless Prevention

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

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

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

MOH's homeless and homeless prevention programs align with the City's 5-Year Homeless Strategic Plan to achieve the following objectives:

- Increase the supply of permanent housing that is subsidized as required to be affordable to people who are experiencing homelessness, that is accessible and that offers services to achieve housing stability.
- Prevent homelessness by supporting the transition from incarceration, foster care and hospitals into permanent housing, and by intervening to avoid evictions from permanent housing.
- Provide interim housing in shelters to support access to permanent housing until such time as permanent housing is available.
- Improve access points and provide wraparound support services that promote long-term housing stability for those in permanent housing, transitional housing settings and for those yet to be housed.
- Increase economic stability through employment services, mainstream financial entitlements and education.
- Ensure coordinated Citywide action to end homelessness respectful of the needs and rights of people who are homeless.

Eviction Prevention and Intervention

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. 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.

Permanent Supportive Housing

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

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

This housing must be deeply subsidized so that it is affordable to people who have extremely low or no incomes at all. In addition, for virtually all people who are homeless, in particular those who are repeatedly homeless and/or suffering from a disabling condition, the housing must be linked with services. This model is known as “permanent supportive housing” and it ensures that people have access to the full array of health, mental health, addiction, benefits, employment and other services they need to achieve long-term residential stability.

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

Emergency Shelters

Although permanent housing is the primary goal for people who are homeless, interim housing is a necessity until the stock of housing affordable to people with extremely low incomes can accommodate the demand. Interim housing should be available to all those who do not have an immediate option for permanent housing, so that no one is forced to sleep on the streets. Interim housing should be safe and easily accessible and should be structured to provide services that assist people in accessing treatment in a transitional housing setting or permanent housing as quickly as possible. In order to provide the interim housing needed in the City, existing shelters must be restructured so that they are not simply emergency facilities, but instead focus on providing services that link people with housing and services that promote ongoing stability. In addition, to ensure that people who are homeless are willing to access these facilities, emphasis should continue to be placed on client safety and respectful treatment of clients by staff, including respect for cultural differences. The shelter system should provide specialized facilities or set-aside sections to meet the diversity of need, including safe havens, respite care beds, and places for senior citizens.

Increasing Economic Stability

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

Some people who are homeless struggle with serious health, mental health or addiction disabilities that interfere with their ability to hold employment, and they must depend upon government benefits programs, including CalWORKs, General Assistance, Food Stamps, Social Security Administration programs (SSA/SSDI/SSI) and MediCal and Medicare. However, the application processes and requirements for these programs are complicated and intimidating and many people need assistance with filling out applications, obtaining supporting documentation and keeping appointments in order to successfully obtain these benefits.

Strategies to facilitate greater economic stability for homeless people include: 1) increasing homeless access to mainstream education and workforce development programs; 2) supporting homeless-targeted employment and training services; 3) increasing homeless access to benefits programs; and 4) assisting homeless children, homeless parents, homeless individuals and homeless unaccompanied youth in accessing public education services, specialized vocational training and higher education counseling.

Wrap-Around Support Services

Most people who are homeless not only need housing but access to services to foster ongoing housing stability, improved health and maximum self-sufficiency. Depending on the individual, these services may be transitional, needed just long enough to help respond to the immediate crisis, or they may be needed on an ongoing, long-term basis. In all cases, the services should be:

- Focused on and linked to either obtaining or maintaining housing;
- Comprehensive so they address the full range of needs;
- Individualized to meet the particular needs of each client; and
- Integrated so that care is provided in a coordinated manner that facilitates maximum effectiveness.

This is what is meant by “wraparound” care. Clients are provided all the services they need to support housing acquisition and ongoing retention through an integrated approach. This includes case management; health care; mental health services; substance abuse treatment; legal services; benefits advocacy; education, training and employment services; life skills and others. Strategies to facilitate the provision of wrap-around care for people experiencing homelessness and to prevent recurrence of homelessness must include expanding the accessibility and availability of treatment and support services; enhancing cross-system and cross-agency service integration; improving homeless access to mainstream services and benefits; and ensuring that all service provision prioritizes housing acquisition and retention.

Organizational Capacity Building and Technical Assistance

Nonprofits play a major role in City service delivery. The City and County of San Francisco contracts with nonprofits for a substantial percentage of its services. In fact, the City disbursed over \$483 million to 804 nonprofit vendors in fiscal year 2007-2008, approximately 500 of which provide health and human services. The City and County of San Francisco and the nonprofits that inhabit the city are mutually dependent upon one another. City contracts at times comprise substantial proportions of some nonprofits’ revenue, while at the same time the City relies upon these organizations to deliver a broad range of culturally appropriate and accessible services to local residents.

Nonprofits offer competitive advantages with respect to service delivery. The City and County of San Francisco recognizes the ability and expertise of the nonprofit sector to deliver responsive and effective housing and social services to local residents, particularly those made vulnerable by poverty and other factors. Nonprofits are recognized for their ability to provide culturally competent and geographically accessible services. They provide greater flexibility than City agencies in program implementation, are able to leverage funding in innovative ways, can often scale up programming more quickly than the City, and can experiment and take risks to achieve social change that the City cannot.

San Francisco’s nonprofit service providers are currently facing immense financial challenges. When surveyed in early 2008, substantial proportions of San Francisco nonprofits were unsure about their ability to meet 2008 budgets and raise enough operating support. The sector has endured further cuts since that time, as foundation, city and state

support has diminished further. The city and state budgets will continue to shrink for some time. The negative impact of the economic recession has raised deep concerns about the vulnerabilities of the sector.

Nonprofits also face staffing challenges. Many nonprofit and City leaders note that maintaining qualified and high performing staff members is a challenge in a city with a high cost of living. As nonprofits develop staff talent, staff members frequently leave for higher paying jobs with the City. One benefit of this is that City department leaders with nonprofit backgrounds bring new perspectives and ideas to government work as well as an in-depth understanding of nonprofit governance and service delivery issues. At the same time, nonprofits experience a sense of leadership lost and a desire for the City to return the favor by becoming a leadership training ground for future nonprofit leaders.

Through this program resources are strategically leveraged to strengthen the capacity of grantee organizations and their staff, to foster increased cooperation, collaboration, efficiency and the sharing of best practices among groups of service providers, and to facilitate neighborhood and community planning by networks of service providers.

Through grants to technical assistance providers grantee organizations are able to access the expertise of consultants, attorneys, and experts in nonprofit management through workshops and trainings, direct technical assistance, consulting, and other formats. Access to this expertise is key to building the capacity of nonprofit staff, strengthening the systems and infrastructure of organizations, increasing compliance with federal and city mandates and ensuring that high-quality services are delivered to clients.

By funding collaboratives that bring together organizations that share common interests and needs, such as neighborhood centers or homeownership counseling programs, the program is able to foster increased cooperation, collaboration, efficiency and the sharing of best practices among groups of service providers. These funds are also highly leveraged, as they help establish structures through which the participating nonprofits build each other's own capacities and resources.

Finally, through facilitated neighborhood planning processes, planning grants also allow for nonprofits, city government, residents and key stakeholders within low-income neighborhoods to all work together to map the assets in a community, better coordinate the delivery of essential services, foster increased collaboration between all the organizations working within that community, and to build a sustainable infrastructure and institutional framework to ensure that high quality services will be delivered to its residents in the future.

Workforce Development

San Francisco's workforce development programs serve as a bridge between employers and job seekers, offering services tailored to the needs of job-seekers, particularly those with barriers to employment, as well as providing a skilled and ready workforce for local businesses. The goal of the workforce development system is to align workforce investments with economic development strategies to ensure that jobseekers are prepared for and can access living wage employment in growth industries in San Francisco.

The Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) oversees workforce development program and policy in San Francisco. The goal of OEWD is to:

- Provide information about employment and training opportunities to City residents
- Work with other City departments and stakeholders to develop a pipeline of qualified, skilled job candidates
- Coordinate workforce and economic development efforts to support San Francisco's workers and industries

OEWD is designated to administer and oversee Workforce Investment Act (WIA) funded programs that are designed to provide job seeker and training services that lead to employment in the labor market. In this capacity, OEWD's workforce strategies and policies are governed by the Workforce Investment San Francisco (WISF) Board that is a federally mandated body charged with oversight over local WIA funded programs.

From 2008-2009 conducted an assessment of San Francisco's Labor Market and workforce development system. The "environmental scan" was a comprehensive community based assessment process that included

Resident Feedback:

- 10 neighborhood focus groups with over 350 residents participating
- A phone survey with over 300 residents participating

Community Based Organization Feedback:

- Two focus groups with executive directors
- Two focus groups with “line staff”

Employers:

- 7 Industry specific focus groups with over 100 employers participating
- A phone survey with over 100 employers participating

Government Stakeholders

- Two focus groups with key workforce agencies

In the environmental scan, OEWD identified six “realities” the local labor market and workforce development system:

1. The workforce system lacks the appropriate oversight, strategic priorities, policy and administration to effectively implement an effective and comprehensive workforce development system
2. The workforce system is largely disconnected from economic development—and cannot keep up with dynamic economic trends that influence the city’s labor market.
3. Workforce and education programs are not closely linked with real career opportunities, career ladders or career advancement.
4. There is a scarcity of resources and developmentally appropriate opportunities targeted toward older “transition-age.”
5. The existing workforce system is out of step with the demands of the labor market—for both employers and residents.
6. Relatively few San Francisco employers and residents are knowledgeable of the workforce system, or perceive the quality of its services to be lacking.

Further, in 2007, OEWD approved and published its Economic Plan that outlined 7 key industries that were growing, accessible to entry level workers, provide career ladder opportunities, and offered self-sufficiency wages. These industries include Biotechnology, Construction, Digital Media/IT, Health Care, Hospitality, Retail, Transportation and Logistics,

To respond to the opportunities available in the labor market identified in the Economic plan and to respond to the conditions found in the labor market, OEWD proposed strategic recommendations that were approved by the WISF in 2009. The strategic recommendations were integrated into this consolidated plan through an extensive inter-agency planning process that included the Mayor’s Office of Housing.

HUD Table 2B: Community Development Needs

Table 2B presents a broad range of non-housing community development activities that are generally recognized by HUD and other Federal agencies as activities that are potentially eligible for some form of federal funding. HUD requires local governments to complete this table, and recognizes this table as an "inventory" of community development needs, which can be shared with the United States Congress. While this table is supposed to represent all possible needs that a City may have, the prioritization of the needs is based upon whether or not San Francisco will allocate CDBG and/or funding to the activities listed in Table 2B. Therefore, the activities with the high and medium priority need designation are those to which the City will allocate CDBG and/or ESG resources over the next five years. While a certain activity may be prioritized as medium or low, it does not necessarily mean that the City considers the activity a low priority. Activities with a low priority designation will not receive CDBG or ESG funding, because more than likely there is an alternate, more appropriate source of funding for such activities. For example, while there is a need for children and youth services in San Francisco, the City has a significant amount of local General Fund dedicated for these services. Therefore, this type of activity is considered of a low priority for CDBG and ESG funding.

For performance measures for each type of activity, see Five-Year Performance Measure Matrix in Section V.

HUD Table 2B: Priority Community Development Needs

Priority Need	Priority Need Level	Unmet Priority Need	Dollars to Address Need	5 Yr Goal Plan/Act	Annual Goal Plan/Act	Percent Goal Completed
Acquisition of Real Property	Low					
Disposition	Low					
Clearance and Demolition	Low					
Clearance of Contaminated Sites	Low					
Code Enforcement	Low					
Public Facility (General)	High					
Senior Centers	High					
Handicapped Centers	Medium					
Homeless Facilities	Medium					
Youth Centers	High					
Neighborhood Facilities	High					
Child Care Centers	High					
Health Facilities	High					
Mental Health Facilities	High					
Parks and/or Recreation Facilities	Medium					
Parking Facilities	Low					
Tree Planting	High					
Fire Stations/Equipment	Low					
Abused/Neglected Children Facilities	Medium					
Asbestos Removal	Low					
Non-Residential Historic Preservation	Low					
Other Public Facility Needs						
Infrastructure (General)	Low					
Water/Sewer Improvements	Low					
Street Improvements	Low					
Sidewalks	Low					
Solid Waste Disposal Improvements	Low					
Flood Drainage Improvements	Low					

Priority Need	Priority Need Level	Unmet Priority Need	Dollars to Address Need	5 Yr Goal Plan/Act	Annual Goal Plan/Act	Percent Goal Completed
Other Infrastructure	Low					
Public Services (General)	High					
Senior Services	Medium					
Handicapped Services	Medium					
Legal Services	High					
Youth Services	High					
Child Care Services	Low					
Transportation Services	Low					
Substance Abuse Services	Low					
Employment/Training Services	High					
Health Services	Low					
Lead Hazard Screening	Low					
Crime Awareness	Low					
Fair Housing Activities	Low					
Tenant Landlord Counseling	High					
Other Services						
Economic Development (General)						
C/I Land Acquisition/Disposition	Low					
C/I Infrastructure Development	Low					
C/I Building Acq/Const/Rehab	Medium					
Other C/I						
ED Assistance to For-Profit	High					
ED Technical Assistance	High					
Micro-enterprise Assistance	High					
Other						

E. Outline of Community Development Goals, Objectives and Strategies

The following information provides a more detailed view of the community development strategic plan. Below each goal are objectives and strategies.

Goal 1: Families and individuals are healthy and economically self-sufficient

Objective 1: Remove barriers to economic opportunities and create economic stability through enhanced access to and utilization of social services

Strategies

1. Stabilize vulnerable populations through data-driven strategies that achieve multiple goals for families and individuals, such as integrated case management that connects individuals and families to interdepartmental safety net services; vocational programs with educational support; and legal services that reduce discriminatory wage practices, maximize access to housing and employment opportunities, and ensure mandated language access to services
2. Provide families and individuals living in areas of highly concentrated poverty with services that address multiple systems involvement, economic opportunities, public safety, and community building linked with neighborhood improvement planning efforts
3. Promote long-term housing stability and economic stability for homeless individuals and families with wraparound support services, employment services, mainstream financial entitlements and education
4. Provide victims, survivors and potential perpetrators of violence and their children with career paths, safe and affordable housing, quality and effective education, successful re-entry for those exiting the criminal and juvenile justice system, strengthened youth development and empowerment opportunities, strengthened family support and senior support, trauma reduction services, and improved social connectedness and resident involvement
5. Provide disconnected transitional age youth with high quality training and paid employment opportunities, expanded housing opportunities, residential treatment for youth with significant mental health issues, expanded safe recreational and social activities, individualized support to prepare them for transition out of or among service systems, and comprehensive neighborhood-based service centers to provide high quality services
6. Provide community-based systems of services to seniors, individuals with severe disabilities and persons living with AIDS that support their independence and quality of life, especially those who are isolated, in need of protective services, and who are living in poverty
7. Stabilize and support individuals and families who are linguistically and culturally isolated through societal integration support and culturally competent services, especially language-appropriate service delivery
8. Support access to services at neighborhood-based multi-service, multi-generational centers that provide families and individuals one-stop access to family support, youth and senior services, leadership opportunities, and access to wellness information and financial literacy
9. Provide support to multi-service centers that provide support citywide to vulnerable communities, e.g. citywide communities related by culture, language, age, ethnicity, disability, sexual orientation
10. Support access to affordable housing information and accessibility, including affordable homeownership opportunities for underserved low- and moderate-income populations

Objective 2: Support the healthy development of families and individuals

Strategies

1. Ensure that children and youth are healthy, ready to learn, succeeding in school, and contribute to the growth, development and vitality of San Francisco
2. Ensure support for children and families that are system involved, under housed, and/or experiencing obstacles or challenges putting them at risk of experiencing negative outcomes

3. Ensure that families have access to resources and opportunities, build their own capacity and improve family functioning
4. Ensure that parents/caregivers have the knowledge, skills, strategies and support to parent effectively, even in times of stress

Objective 3: Increase families' savings and assets to assist them in moving from poverty/public assistance to stability and self-sufficiency

Strategies

1. Integrate peer learning and reduce social isolation to increase efficacy of social and financial programs
2. Support asset-building opportunities, including training to use financial and legal tools to maintain and protect individual and/or family assets
3. Build the capacity of workforce development, micro-enterprise programs, and private, public and non-profit employers to expand uptake of income supports, tax credits, and financial education
4. Support citywide public and non-profit agencies to coordinate family economic support

Objective 4: Improve the responsiveness of the workforce system to meet the demands of sustainable and growing industries, providing employers with skilled workers and expanding employment opportunity for San Francisco residents

Strategies

1. Create Sector Committees that engage multiple employers within an industry, education & training providers, public agencies, labor organizations and social service providers to create responsive solutions, ensuring the workforce system is able to quickly adapt to dynamic changes in the labor market
2. Focus on employer outreach in key industries to gauge their workforce needs and market the services available through the workforce system
3. Produce high quality labor market intelligence that the workforce system and workforce providers can use to design and retool workforce strategies to target key industries
4. Launch Sector Academies that integrate skill development, support services, and job development that prepare and place low-to-high skilled individuals for a range of jobs within a targeted industry
5. Integrate necessary supportive services, barrier removal and other pre-employment services that assist a range of job seekers to complete training and retain employment within targeted sectors

Objective 5: Re-engage youth disconnected from the education system and labor market to achieve academic credentials, transition to post-secondary education, and/or secure living wage employment

Strategies

1. Create "on-ramp" and "bridge" programs --programs that assist low skilled youth to meet the skills and education requirements for entry into post-secondary education and/or existing vocational training programs that otherwise would not meet the participation pre-requisites
2. Develop a continuum of services that reengage and assist at-risk youth to achieve an academic credential, attain postsecondary education and credentials if appropriate, complete vocational training and secure an employer recognized credential/competency, and secure living wage employment
3. Build the capacity of One Stop Career Link Centers that appeal to youth ages 16-24, connecting them to age-appropriate workforce services, training and youth-employment opportunities

Objective 6: Increase access to workforce services for populations underserved by the workforce development system

Strategies

1. Expand One Stop Career Link Services geographically to high need neighborhoods by establishing neighborhood-based and Satellite One Stop Service Centers

2. Launch “navigator” initiatives that customize existing workforce services provided through the One-Stop Career Link Centers to be more responsive to the needs of specific underserved populations
3. Fund new services and coordinate with existing programs to focus intensively on targeted hard-to-serve populations
4. Develop “on-ramp” programs that incorporate intensive basic skills training, remedial math and language, life skills training, and intensive “wrap-around” supportive services
5. Integrate intensive comprehensive case management to support workforce clients through job training and employment
6. Customize workforce services to support under-employed workers to participate in skills training while employed

Objective 7: Improve the quality of services available to businesses through the workforce system to promote hiring San Francisco job seekers

Strategies

1. Recognize the “dual-customer” nature of the workforce system by promoting the utilization of services that both reduce the personnel-related operating costs of employers and support the professional development and economic conditions of their employees
2. Strengthen the enforcement of local hiring policies, and improve the workforce system's capacity to assist employers in meeting their local hiring requirements by providing qualified candidates
3. Provide a single point of contact for employers' staffing needs, utilizing tools and technologies that provide effective candidate screening, appropriate matching with available employment opportunities, and efficient referral to employer partners
4. Utilize business feedback and standardized marketing efforts to position the San Francisco workforce development system as the “first choice” in local staffing services

Objective 8: Establish, enhance, and retain small businesses and micro-enterprises

Strategies

1. Provide technical assistance and consulting services to small business owners and entrepreneurs
2. Provide businesses with access to capital by identifying sources of capital, completing loan applications, and providing capital through the City's Revolving Loan Fund and Section 108 loans
3. Support the establishment of incubator spaces with focused services, specific target markets, and effective strategies for business ‘graduation’
4. Provide commercial real estate support such as location identification, contract review, and lease negotiation
5. Ensure broad access to technical assistance and financial resources by providing services that are culturally and linguistically relevant
6. Provide assistance that is customized to meet the specific needs of businesses with fast growth potential in industries with particular promise to create jobs for low-to-moderate income persons and to expand into new markets
7. Build a strong, interconnected network of economic development service providers to improve small businesses' access to relevant information about financial services, incentives, technical assistance, merchants associations, networking opportunities, market opportunities, and other opportunities and resources
8. Leverage the Small Business Assistance Center to ensure that business owners and entrepreneurs are able to navigate the permits and licensing processes, and have access to any relevant city services

Goal 2: Neighborhoods and communities are strong, vibrant and stable

Objective 1: Improve the infrastructure and physical environment of San Francisco neighborhoods, especially in those neighborhoods with high concentrations of low- and moderate-income residents

Strategies

1. Rehabilitate and construct neighborhood and constituency-focused multi-service centers
2. Rehabilitate and construct city-designated workforce one-stop centers and other sites that provide key elements of the City's workforce development strategy as designated by Office of Economic and Workforce Development
3. Rehabilitate and construct neighborhood based and population focused family resource centers as designated by City's First Five San Francisco
4. Rehabilitate and construct Aging and Disability Resource Centers and Out Stations as designated by City's Department of Aging and Adult Services
5. Rehabilitate and construct key health and mental health community facilities in consultation with City's Department of Public Health
6. Rehabilitate and construct key youth development facilities in consultation with City's Department of Children, Youth and their Families
7. Rehabilitate and construct community centers located within or near public and affordable housing developments
8. Rehabilitate and construct licensed child care facilities, in consultation with City's Childcare Facilities Interagency Group
9. Improve public spaces and upgrade outdoor-oriented facilities, including school sites, child development centers, and areas with little greenery, especially in areas of high concentration of low- and moderate-income residents, especially through landscaping, tree planting, and installation of play structures
10. Promote green standards and energy efficiency in community facilities, especially those with low energy efficiency

Objective 2: Promote the development of social capital and sustainable healthy communities through leadership development and civic engagement activities

Strategies

1. Support community building in public housing facilities, especially HOPE SF sites
2. Support leadership development efforts for transitional age youth, especially in areas of high violence
3. Promote resident involvement in community stewardship activities
4. Coordinate and convene community organizations to promote neighborhood community building, maximize sharing of information and resources and promote sustainability
5. Coordinate and leverage city resources to better address the needs of low-income residents citywide

Objective 3: Improve the social service delivery system that leads to self-sufficiency and healthy sustainable outcomes for low-income individuals and families

Strategies

1. Support place-based centers that provide neighborhood support, convening opportunities, and leadership opportunities to neighborhood residents
2. Support neighborhood-based capacity building efforts that bring together community stakeholders to map assets, encourage strategic collaboration, and develop leadership
3. Use resources to create better alignment between the needs of residents in targeted neighborhoods and social services
4. Strengthen community partners by supporting their infrastructure and staff capacity, sharing best practices, providing tools and resources, and supporting them to focus on organizational development, fiscal management and strategic planning

5. Provide a wide range of direct technical assistance to community based organizations, including training, coaching, peer mentoring and other methods of technical assistance
6. Support innovative and effective collaborative planning efforts to address collective needs, leverage capacities to deliver programs, and create pathways to success by avoiding duplication and addressing gaps in services
7. Develop neighborhood-wide and uniform intake, assessment, planning, and tracking tools when appropriate
8. Support business technical assistance providers to create a strong, interconnected network

Objective 4: Strengthen commercial corridors in low- and moderate-income neighborhoods and increase corridor potential for providing jobs, services, and opportunities for residents

Strategies

1. Support the attraction, retention, expansion, and relocation of locally owned small businesses by building the capacity of neighborhood business districts to launch, maintain, and grow local-serving retailers and services
2. Provide access to technical assistance including business assessment, referral to other business support organizations, business planning, and access to capital
3. Provide technical assistance to assist businesses and commercial corridors in the development of marketing plans, branding, and engaging in neighborhood and citywide marketing campaigns
4. Engage in beautification activities—such as façade improvement, public art, tenant improvement, and graffiti abatement—that highlight local identity and neighborhood character
5. Enhance public spaces in neighborhoods
6. Maintain and improve the neighborhood quality of life, such as safety and cleanliness, to attract desirable businesses and industries
7. Build partnerships between residents, merchants, property owners, and community groups to sustain these districts over the long-term
8. Enhance and encourage neighborhood corridors to be commercial, cultural, and entertainment centers that attract a diverse and multigenerational population

Goal 3: Formerly homeless individuals and families are stable, supported and live in permanent housing

Objective 1: Decrease the incidence of homelessness by avoiding tenant evictions and foreclosures and increasing housing stability

Strategies

1. Support the transition from incarceration, foster care and hospitals into permanent housing
2. Provide legal assistance and counseling services to help avoid eviction
3. Provide short-term rental support, including rental subsidies, move-in costs, first and last month's rent, and wraparound services to address underlying issues threatening housing stability
4. Increase outreach and education about eviction prevention resources and tenant rights laws
5. Prevent foreclosures and assist those impacted by foreclosures

Objective 2: Stabilize homeless individuals through outreach, services and residency in emergency and transitional shelters that lead to accessing and maintaining permanent housing

Strategies

1. Support appropriate outreach through the Homeless Outreach Team
2. Support community partnerships to provide services through Project Homeless Connect
3. Support the general operation of culturally competent emergency shelters that meet the standards for safety, health and hygiene, including shelters that accommodate diverse needs such as the elderly, domestic

- violence victims, immigrants, teenagers, respite beds, and people in crisis needing an unstructured low-threshold shelter
- 4. Support services in shelters and transitional housing that lead to accessing and maintaining permanent housing
- 5. Promote service coordination with other community service providers and between departments

Objective 3: Promote long-term housing stability and economic stability through wraparound support services, employment services, mainstream financial entitlements, and education

Strategies

- 1. Provide case management services within transitional housing programs appropriate to address individualized needs and emphasize economic stability
- 2. Improve linkages to mainstream benefits
- 3. Provide a comprehensive range of support services aimed at facilitating acquisition and retention of permanent housing
- 4. Maintain and expand employment-related services targeted to homeless people to increase job readiness, training, placement and retention

Objective 4: Create and maintain supportive housing

Strategies

- 1. Provide capital financing to non-profit developers and property owners for the purpose of acquiring and rehabilitating existing housing or constructing new permanently affordable service-enriched housing
- 2. Underwrite all permanently affordable housing for low and very low income persons and families to include supportive housing units for formerly homeless persons in mixed income developments
- 3. Provide on-going financial support to community-based organizations for the purposes of entering into long-term master-leases with private landlords for service-enriched units in market-rate housing
- 4. Provide funding for services that support the varying needs of people experiencing homelessness, such as transitional age youth, seniors, immigrants, families, and chronically homeless singles, including wrap-around supportive services, socialization opportunities, and case management
- 5. Maximize leveraging of state and federal operating and rent subsidies such as MHSA, McKinney Act subsidies or project-based Section 8 subsidies to support long-term operation of permanently supportive housing
- 6. Provide local operating subsidies when necessary
- 7. Conduct annual monitoring and site visits to ensure that existing supportive housing is safe, healthy, and affordable to extremely low-income formerly homeless people
- 8. Provide financing for capital improvements when necessary to maintain the habitability or affordability of supportive housing

F. Anti-Poverty Strategy

All San Franciscans deserve to live in safety and prosperity. But today, not all San Franciscans do. In truth, while we are one City, united in name and government, we remain separate communities. In neighborhoods with concentrated poverty, there is a San Francisco that is a community apart, separated by geography, violence, and decades of neglect. According to the U.S. Census Bureau's 2008 American Community Survey, more than 88,000, or 11%, of San Francisco's residents live in poverty. This, in the context of a growing yet fragile city economy with a \$6 billion budget presents a unique opportunity for monumental change.

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

In April 2007, the Center for American Progress issued a report, *From Poverty to Prosperity: A National Strategy to Cut Poverty in Half*, which was the result of the Center convening a diverse group of national experts and leaders to examine the causes and consequences of poverty in America and to make recommendations for national action. In the report, the Center's Task Force on Poverty calls for a national goal of cutting poverty in half in the next 10 years and proposes a strategy to reach the goal.

In order to cut poverty in half over the next 10 years, the Task Force on Poverty recommended that strategies should be guided by four principles:

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

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

Smart Government

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

Table 26
“On-Ramp” Programs to Address City Goals

Policy area	Homelessness	Asset Building/Homeownership	Employment	Youth/Education
Goal	To end chronic homelessness	Asset building for low- and moderate-income residents	Living-wage jobs with opportunities for career advancement Seven Sectors have been identified by OEWD as having high growth potential for our city. Job training and development programs are aligned around those sectors	All students graduate high school and have the ability to go to college SF Promise guarantees college financial assistance for SF students who do well in school and graduate high school
City strategy	Housing First is a successful program that places homeless individuals into permanent supportive housing with wrap around services	City’s First Time Homebuyers’ Program helps low-income residents afford to own in San Francisco		
“On-Ramp”	Project Homeless Connect reaches out to homeless individuals every other month and provides a one-stop shop of health and human services for them	Bank on San Francisco is an award winning national model program which allows families dependent on high-cost check-cashers to easily open a starter bank account with mainstream financial institutions Working Families Credit (WFC) program provides a local 10% match to the federal Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) for low-income San Francisco families Individual Development Accounts (IDAs) work with residents to develop saving plans and good financial management habits and then match their savings 2:1 for use to buy a home, go to school or start a business	Employment On-Ramp Program takes elements from the City’s job readiness program and from work in public housing nationwide and combines it with the removal of barriers to work such as obtaining GEDs, expunging criminal records and securing drivers licenses Single Stop/Benefits Screening uses technology and personal assistance to work with residents to ensure they receive all the benefits they are entitled to, including child care and financial supports that are critical to maintaining a job.	The City’s Family Resource Center Initiative brings national and local best practices in parent education and family support to high need communities. The program has tracks for parents of new babies, preschoolers and young kids. It provides support for all parents so they can help each other in the knowledge that it “takes a village”. Gateway to College is a nationally recognized dropout recovery program that helps young adults get both their GED and Associates Degree in a community college setting.

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

Community Voice

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

Shared Data and Goals

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

Coordinated Case Management

Shared data will also allow for more coordinated case management. Currently caseworkers across agencies each develop a treatment plan for their clients in isolation. The Department of Public Health may create a substance abuse treatment plan for the mother that calls for different actions than the employment plan created by her CalWorks caseworker. The teenager in the house may be involved with the Juvenile Probation Department, and their case plan may not fit well with that of the mother. Families in the deepest crisis often have multiple case plans which, even when they were not at odds, made it confusing for the family to understand what overall was expected of them and why. By being able to share treatment plans across agencies, caseworkers will be able to create holistic plans for the family that reinforce each other rather than at best act independently of each other and at worst are at odds. A new initiative called SF CAN DO will work with both City agencies and community partners to develop and implement a plan for providing coordinated case management. Family Justice will be providing technical assistance based on the internationally acclaimed approach they developed in New York.

Sector Based Approach to Workforce Development

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

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

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

efforts or using leverage with industry contacts to negotiate with educational institutions, organizations either led or were involved in efforts that brought about significant changes to systems—changes that had the potential to benefit less-educated workers throughout the targeted sector.³⁶

The key characteristics of San Francisco's Sector Based Approach include

- Identified 7 priority industries based upon employment growth, job accessibility to moderately skilled workers, career ladder opportunities, and providing self sufficiency wages.
- Align skill development and occupational skills training to meet the workforce needs of these priority industries.
- Identify intermediaries who can engage industries serve as a bridge to social service providers that work intensively with disadvantaged participants.
- Integrate intensive case management into skill development and job training programs
- Implement and enforce policies that generate employment opportunities for San Francisco workers.

Serious Collaboration

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

Economic Development

For the first time since the closing of the Hunters Point Ship Yard real investment, nearly \$1 billion, is slated for the surrounding communities. From major public investment such as the redevelopment of public housing and the new 3rd Street light rail, to significant private investment such as the development at the old Ship Yard and the Schlage Lock site, renewed activity in the southeast sector brings jobs, revitalizes buildings and neighborhoods and has the potential to transform communities.

One challenge is helping residents to get ready for such economic development. Many of the jobs that are available require different skill levels than most residents have. The City has been working with planning and contracting groups to try and forecast employment needs further out to give more time to prepare residents with the right skills. When there are many steps in the process, it is difficult to get the whole pipeline running smoothly. City departments, including MOH, OEWD and SFRA, are working closely to develop systems that make this process more seamless.

Nonprofit Collaboration

The City cannot do this work alone. There are hundreds of nonprofit organizations that provide critical services, reach out to residents and advocate for change. Without these organizations the social service delivery system simply will not work. However, through surveys and focus groups, we heard from residents that the quality of services was uneven. We also heard from nonprofits themselves that they lacked access to the kind of training and capacity building they believed they needed in order to reach their full potential. The City is working with community-based organizations (CBOs) through its CBO Task Force to develop new capacity building supports and deeper partnerships.

Private Investment

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

³⁶ Roder, Anne; Clymer, Carol; Wyckoff, Laura; *Targeting Industries, Training Workers and Improving Opportunities*; Public Private Ventures 2010

The City sees foundations playing several roles:

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

G. Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas

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).

MOH has made investments in each of these areas that correspond to the key principles of the original Enterprise Community Program, including 1) economic opportunity; 2) sustainable community development; 3) community based partnerships; and 4) strategic visions for change. The strategic plans for these neighborhoods provide substantive detail regarding community priorities such as economic development and job training; safe and affordable housing; public safety; neighborhood beautification; education; child care and public service support.

MOH respectfully requests renewal for all six of the current NRSA designations as provided for at 24 CFR 91.215 (e) (2) and CPD Notice 96.01.

MOH compliance with HUD criteria:

- **Boundaries:** MOH has provided census tract boundaries to specifically define each neighborhood according to year 2000 census data;
- **Demographic Criteria:** Each of the designated neighborhoods meets or exceeds the requirement that it be primarily residential and contain a percentage for low- and moderate-income residents that is equal to the "upper quartile percentage" (as computed by HUD pursuant to 24 CFR 570.208(a)(1)(ii) or 70%, whichever is less, but not less than 51%);
- **Consultation:** Strategic plans were developed for all six neighborhoods in consultation with the area's key stakeholders, including residents, owners/operators of businesses and financial institutions, non-profit organizations, and community groups that are in or serve the neighborhood;
- **Assessment:** Each strategic plan includes an assessment of the economic situation in each area and economic development improvement opportunities and problems likely to be encountered;
- **Economic Empowerment:** MOH has a realistic development strategy and implementation plan to promote the area's economic progress focusing on activities to create meaningful jobs for the unemployed and low- and moderate-income residents of the area as well as activities to promote the substantial revitalization of the neighborhood; and
- **Performance Measurement:** MOH has developed a program matrix that identifies reliable indicators including physical improvements, social initiatives and economic development activities, which are measurable over time.

In addition to the HUD guidelines, MOH has taken the additional step of reviewing each of the neighborhood strategic plans and is committed to achieving very specific outcomes over the next five years. The following outline provides a supplemental snapshot of neighborhood assets, persistent needs and five-year goals for each neighborhood. Please note that these needs are *in addition* to the core, urgent needs that were previously stated for public safety, affordable housing and increased economic development.

1) Bayview Hunter's Point

Recent Key Advances:

- Improved commercial corridor, including new MUNI T Line
- Newly constructed Boys and Girls Club
- Invested in renovations at Malcolm X School
- Constructed Alice Griffith Opportunity Center
- Promoted jobs on the 3rd Street light-rail project – 271 residents hired

- Partnered with Wells Fargo Bank to launch a façade improvement program to stimulate commercial revitalization
- Expanded banking services of the Northeast Community Federal Credit Union (NECFCU) to mitigate the need for check cashing services
- Launched the Bayview Business Resource Center to provide technical assistance and access to capital]
- Four recently constructed mixed-use developments which provide affordable housing opportunities and commercial retail spaces
- Completed 9 façade and tenant improvements
- Attracted 10 new locally owned businesses to start up community serving business on Third Street Commercial Corridor

Persistent Needs:

- Services for senior housing
- Job training initiatives
- Crime prevention and violence prevention efforts
- Services for growing immigrant population
- Family support for CalWorks families
- Services for transitional age youth
- Services for families facing the loss of a home to foreclosure
- Continued development of the retail corridor
- Development at publicly owned parcels at Third and Oakdale
- Improved access to healthy food options
- Accessibility to technical assistance and access to capital for small business development

Five-Year Goals:

- Stimulate development for one grocery store to open
- Strengthen service provision capacity – this includes increasing culturally competent programming in a diversifying neighborhood, and supporting the development of fiscally sustainable organizations that provide needed services
- Encourage development of farmer's market
- Revitalize Southeast One-Stop Career Link Center
- Leverage improvements to Bayview Opera House in order to stimulate cultural and economic development programming of underutilized community facilities
- Develop new mixed-income housing being developed at Hunters View
- Connect public housing residents to family supports and access to social services
- Support the Renaissance Bayview and Third Street Corridor Program's on-going efforts to provide technical assistance and access to capital

2) Visitacion Valley

Recent Key Advances:

- Significant capital improvements to two Visitacion Valley community centers
- Expanded banking services of a credit union (NECFCU) to mitigate the need for check cashing services
- Leland Avenue Streetscape Project construction initiated, expected completion Fall 2010
- New Visitacion Valley Library construction on new site, expected completion Winter 2011
- Completed 5 façade improvements along the Leland Avenue Commercial Corridor
- Opening of a satellite One Stop Career Link Center to increase access and referrals to workforce services.
- Adopted plan for Schlage Lock site

Persistent Needs:

- Additional services providing counseling on immigration, legal, and housing rights
- More youth programming, including programs for transitional age youth
- Additional support for local organizations to increase organization capacity, collaboration and leadership within the community

- ESL services and develop Chinese language capacity at organizations
- Crime prevention efforts
- Family support services for CalWorks families
- More effective workforce development strategies
- Continued strengthening of the Leland Avenue Commercial Corridor, while being cognizant of the Schlage Lock development

Five-Year Goals:

- Support retail development along Leland Avenue corridor
- Provide intensive capacity building to community based organizations, including ability to serve increasingly diverse population
- Develop One-Stop Satellite
- Develop new mixed-income housing being developed at Sunnydale
- Connect public housing residents to family supports and access to social services
- Engage public housing residents in community building processes working towards sustainability and safety
- Improve access to public park at Sunnydale
- Develop new community resources—convert the old Schlage Lock office building to a civic use and bring new programming to fit the needs of the local population

3) Chinatown

Recent Key Advances:

- Increased capacity to deliver food, through capital investment in community based organization
- Strengthened culinary workforce training program through capital investment in commercial kitchen at community based organization
- Creation of youth center on Chinatown public housing property
- Supported creation of Chinatown coalition of organizations collaboratively working on family economic self sufficiency
- Public space improvements to two playgrounds
- Investments in Asian and Pacific Islander business assistance and asset building activities
- Wentworth Alleyway Streetscape Improvement completed as part of Chinatown Alleyway Master Plan,
- Arts Programming (Arts in the Alleys and Art in Storefronts Pilot Program) paired with alleyway improvements
- Opening of a Chinatown Career Link Center to increase workforce services provided in the area

Persistent Needs:

- Closer partnerships with health centers, clinics and hospitals providing language specific health care and dental care for Chinese residents
- Increased access to affordable housing
- Shortage of vocational English as a second language classes, targeting high growth sectors with high wage jobs
- Information to residents about the range of opportunities in these growing sectors: Healthcare, Financial Services, Construction, Hotel and Dining and Retail Trade,
- Affordable childcare
- Cleaning, greening, and safety improvements programming of alleyways in Chinatown
- Increased small business technical and economic development assistance

Five-Year Goal:

- Reduce language barriers to accessing social services and affordable housing
- Support commercially viable commercial corridor with diverse businesses
- Improve and activate Chinatown alleyways, by programming cultural activities and providing microenterprise opportunities

- Support on-site business technical assistance services and coordinate efforts with City College to provide programs for business development

4) Tenderloin

Recent Key Advances:

- Created ADA-accessible rooftop space on emergency shelter for additional client program space
- Expanded program space and other capital improvements for youth center
- Helped launch homeless women's drop-in center
- Assisted in rehabilitation of long term vacancy along Taylor Street, and assisted in the attraction of a cultural organization to fill space
- Launched façade improvement program to stimulate commercial revitalization
- Enhanced Public Art Programming throughout the community, by supporting Wonderland Exhibit and implementing Art in Storefronts Pilot Program
- Assisted in the reprogramming of liquor store to community serving grocery store

Persistent Needs:

- Improve banking and small business assistance
- Need to address over concentration of social services
- Increased supply of permanent housing for seniors, immigrants and homeless populations
- Strategies to reduce homelessness
- Increased economic stability through employment services, mainstream financial entitlements and education.
- ESL and vocational ESL programs for limited-English speaking immigrants
- Too few open space and recreational areas
- Increased crime prevention efforts, especially in regards to drug-related activities
- Reduction of blight and filling vacancies in the Tenderloin and Mid-Market areas.

Five-Year Goal:

- Support homeless prevention efforts and efforts to move homeless individuals into more stable housing
- Increase coordination of Tenderloin social service organizations
- Utilization of various resources to stimulate development in Tenderloin and Mid-Market areas
- Continue to recruit art and cultural entities as a means to stimulate retail growth and create workforce development in the community

5) Mission

Recent Key Advances:

- Supported development of multi-tenant building to house asset-building organization and construction of retail incubation space
- Supported development of new Valencia Gardens public housing
- Supported the coordination of service delivery for immigrant communities
- Supported the One-Stop Employment Center
- Launched a façade improvement program to stimulate commercial revitalization
- Increased homeownership training and education

Persistent Needs:

- More affordable housing opportunities for low- and moderate-income households, including homeownership counseling
- Eviction prevention services
- Support for asset building and financial education for individuals and families
- Increased investment in services for immigrant youth and unaccompanied minors at/in risk of violence
- Space for youth activities
- Staff training and professional development in violence prevention strategies

- Investment in job training programs
- Increased access to extended hours of childcare and to out-of-school programs for children and youth grades K-12
- Improved accessibility of senior services, including increased meal provision, recreational activities, and transportation services for frail elders
- Support culturally and linguistically relevant programs for increasingly diverse communities
- Strong and stable small businesses

Five-Year Goal:

- Support commercial district revitalization
- Develop retail incubation program
- Support coordination of services at new community hub
- Coordinate with other city departments that support youth and seniors to address identified needs

6) South of Market

Recent Key Advances:

- Supported youth center providing violence prevention and youth leadership development
- Built out after school space within a larger studio and theater
- Improved business technical assistance and recent façade improvements
- Stimulated development of the Harvest Urban Market
- Supported Six on Sixth Commercial Revitalization – small business development and facade improvement plan
- Engaged in the development of revitalization plans for 7th Street corridor
- Opened a South of Market/Civic Center One Stop Career Link Center to increase workforce services provided in the area.

Persistent Needs:

- Stronger community networks and infrastructure through projects/events aimed at multiple populations and encouragement of civic engagement
- Increased residents' job readiness, placement and retention through: education, job training, assistance to immigrants on obtaining proper documentation, re-entry programs for formerly incarcerated individuals, affordable childcare
- Financial education and literacy programs for low income individuals and families to help them build savings/assets
- Increased affordable housing opportunities through rehabilitation and construction
- Increased availability of community facilities and improvement of public spaces/outdoor facilities
- ESL, employment, art, education, and youth programming to address needs of low income and immigrant communities
- Neighborhood childcare services near affordable housing/mixed-use developments

Five-Year Goals:


- Increase coordination of services between community based organizations
- Support eviction prevention efforts
- Support financial education and asset building programs
- Support community-serving businesses by providing incentives to hire residents and improving access to services/affordable business space
- Support Six on Sixth Commercial Revitalization – small business development and facade improvement plan

IV. HOUSING NEEDS ANALYSIS AND HOUSING STRATEGIC PLAN

A. Market Trends

Although San Francisco's area median income (AMI) is relatively high (\$67,750 for a single individual)³⁷, the City's income polarization means few households actually earn in the middle-income range. More households are either at the low income or high income ends of the spectrum. In fact, over a quarter of San Francisco's population earns under 50% of AMI³⁸. At this income level, an affordable rent for a family of three would be \$1,089³⁹. San Francisco's average monthly rent is more than double that amount at \$2,388⁴⁰. Figure 20 below shows average market rate rents for different types of apartments in 2009, as compared to the rent affordable for households at 50% and 30% of AMI.

Figure 20
San Francisco Average Market Rate Rental Housing Cost



Although home prices have dropped over the last two years, homeownership is still out of reach for the vast majority of residents. A median-priced home in San Francisco is \$706,214⁴¹, which only 23% of households could afford to purchase at this price. In contrast, nationally, 60%⁴² of households could afford a home in their area.

Due to the City's overall high housing costs, San Francisco is a city of renters- 62% of all households rent⁴³. And despite the economic recession and declining home prices, rental prices continue to rise⁴⁴. Figure 21 shows the average asking rents in San Francisco since 2000, and Table 27 shows a comparison of San Francisco rental prices

³⁷ American Community Survey, 2007

³⁸ San Francisco General Plan Housing Element, 2009.

³⁹ 50% of 2009 AMI for a family of 3 is \$43,550 (Mayor's Office of Housing). 30% of monthly income comes to \$1,089

⁴⁰ RealFacts, 4Q 2008

⁴¹ Rosen Consulting Group


⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ American Community Survey, 2007

⁴⁴ RealFacts is a private data vendor that tracks larger complexes' rental patterns over time. Its database of more than 16,000 units indicates an overall increase in market rents from 2006 to 2008.

with average rents in Northern California. Households who have lost jobs and income in the recession will likely continue to face rising rent costs.

Figure 21
Average Asking Rent, San Francisco 2000-2008



Source: RealFacts, 2008

Table 27
San Francisco Rental Market: Types of Units and Average Prices

Unit Type	Number	SF Average Rent	Northern CA Average Rent*
All	17,121	\$2,185	\$1,264
Loft/Studio	3,973	\$1,520	\$1,074
1bd	6,643	\$1,936	\$1,127
2bd	4,693	\$2,657	\$1,336
3bd	1,609	\$3,458	\$1,805
4bd	203	\$2,400	\$2,236

Source: Realfacts, Q4 2009

* Northern California is used to benchmark San Francisco's average rents

Cost Burden

San Francisco's supply of rental housing fails to meet the demand- the need for low cost housing far exceeds its availability. As a result, many households are "cost burdened", i.e. paying more than they can comfortably afford on housing. "Cost burdened" is defined by HUD as paying more than 30% of household income towards gross rent, or for mortgage payments, utilities, taxes, and insurance on an owned home. Cost burden creates a trap that impedes financial growth when households are stretched thin financially and have few resources to invest in asset-building opportunities or professional development opportunities. Thus, poverty alleviation and economic development strategies are more challenging to implement in cost-burdened communities.

In San Francisco, over 36% of all households were considered cost burdened in 2005-2007 (Table 28), and cost burdens have risen, especially for San Francisco home-owners, since 2000. The most recent data indicate that 16%

of renters are severely cost burdened, paying more than 50% of their income on rent and lower income groups are far more likely to be severely cost burdened. 26,510 households earning between 16% and 30% AMI and 11,510 households between 31% and 50% bear a severe cost burden. These data underscore the affordable housing crisis for San Francisco's lowest income households. In order to make production of rental housing for the lowest income levels economically feasible, the City will continue to subsidize housing development chiefly for extremely low and very low-income renters (Table 2A).

Figure 22
Percentage of Severely Cost Burdened Households who are Low-Income




Figure 23
Number of Households Overpaying Housing Costs




Table 28
Percentage of Households Overpaying Housing Costs, San Francisco 2005-2007

Tenure	Household Income Level	Cost Burdened Households		Severely Cost Burdened Households	
		Number of Households	Percent of Households in Tenure/Income Category	Number of Households	Percent of Households in Tenure/Income Category
Owner	<=30% AMI	1,700	15%	5,835	53%
	30.1-50% AMI	1,325	12%	4,010	38%
	50.1-60% AMI	1,205	23%	1,880	36%
	60.1-80% AMI	2,575	22%	3,180	28%
	80.1-95% AMI	1,895	21%	2,070	23%
	>95% AMI	16,365	21%	4,945	6%
All Owner Households		25,065	20%	21,920	18%
Renter	<=30% AMI	7,590	15%	20,675	40%
	30.1-50% AMI	7,730	31%	7,500	30%
	50.1-60% AMI	4,305	43%	1,225	12%
	60.1-80% AMI	7,685	35%	1,475	7%
	80.1-95% AMI	3,610	27%	445	3%
	>95% AMI	4,365	6%	410	1%
All Renter Households		35,285	18%	31,730	16%
All Households		60,350	19%	53,650	17%

Source: 2009 CHAS
 Cost Burdened= Housing Cost \geq 30% & <50% of Gross Income
 Severely Cost Burdened= Housing Cost \geq 50% of Gross Income

Overcrowding

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

Census data from 2008 indicate that 17,274 or 5.3 % of San Francisco households are overcrowded (Table 29). This represents a large decrease from overcrowding levels in 2000, when over 40,900 or 12% of all San Francisco households were overcrowded. Renter households are more likely to be overcrowded than home-owning households, and overall, overcrowding is less common in San Francisco than it is statewide (5.3% as opposed to 7.9%).

While the overall prevalence of overcrowded conditions is low citywide, certain communities have a high concentration of overcrowded housing- specifically the Chinatown, Tenderloin, South of Market and Mission neighborhoods. Southeastern neighborhoods have a smaller total number of overcrowded households, but have a higher *proportion* of overcrowded households (Map 9). Corresponding to the demographic representation of these

neighborhoods, certain ethnic groups are more likely to live in overcrowded conditions. White households are less likely to be overcrowded than other ethnicities, particularly Hispanic/Latino headed households and Asian headed households (Table 30).


Table 29
Severity of Overcrowding in San Francisco, 2008

Household Tenure	Occupants Per Room	Percent of Households	
		California	San Francisco
Owner Occupied	0.50 or less	67.9%	70.3%
	0.51 to 1.00	28.0%	25.7%
	1.01 to 1.50	3.0%	2.3%
	1.51 to 2.00	0.8%	0.9%
	2.01 or more	0.3%	0.9%
Renter Occupied	0.50 or less	48.2%	60.2%
	0.51 to 1.00	38.9%	33.6%
	1.01 to 1.50	7.5%	1.6%
	1.51 to 2.00	3.4%	2.8%
	2.01 or more	2.0%	1.8%
All	1.01 or more (any overcrowding)	7.9%	5.3%

Source: 2008 ACS

* shaded area indicates overcrowded households


Figure 24
Renter Households Examined By Number of Occupants per Room, San Francisco and California



Source: CHAS 2009

Map 9

Proportion of Households Living in Overcrowded Conditions



Sources: San Francisco Department of Public Health, Census 2000

Table 30
Number of Overcrowded Households by Ethnicity

Household Ethnicity	Number of Households	Percent of Households
White	9,452	4.70%
African American	2,495	10.50%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	168	12.90%
Asian	21,452	27.10%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	358	39.60%
Other Race	5,046	39.40%
Two or More Races	1,950	16.50%
Hispanic/Latino	9,472	30.10%
All Households	40,921	12.40%

Source: Census 2000

Table 31

Disproportionate Housing Needs of Racial/Ethnic Minorities

Household Income	Percent Households with Any Housing Problems (a) (b)						
	All	Asian	Black	Latino/ Hispanic	Native American	Pacific Islander	White
Less than 30% MFI	75.4%	74.4%	71.0%	82.3%	75.8%	73.1%	75.8%
30% to 50% MFI	72.7%	76.8%	56.4%	76.0%	93.9%	72.6%	72.5%
50% to 80% MFI	54.3%	62.7%	39.7%	63.3%	38.3%	45.1%	49.5%
More than 80% MFI	22.0%	34.5%	17.7%	35.1%	22.6%	36.4%	17.1%
Total Households	42.9%	54.5%	47.2%	58.2%	55.3%	57.8%	34.5%

a) "Any housing problems" is defined by HUD to be cost burden > 30 percent of MFI and/or overcrowding and/or without complete kitchen or plumbing facilities.

b) is disproportionate need for ethnic/minority group in this income category, defined by HUD as 10% or more above citywide percentage for all households.

Source: HUD State of the Cities Data Systems: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Data, BAE 2005.

Ownership Housing Market Trends

San Francisco is consistently ranked as one of the most expensive for-sale housing markets in the country (Figure 25). In 2009, San Francisco had an estimated median sale price of \$706,214⁴⁵. Although this is a decline from peak prices during the "housing bubble" of 2007 of \$913,979, San Francisco's for-sale market has suffered less from the national mortgage crisis than other parts of the state and nation (Figure 25). While the strength of San Francisco's Housing Market is positive in many respects, it also means that few households can afford to buy (Figure 26).

Many homeowners in San Francisco bought their homes many years ago and could not afford to buy today. For that reason, neighborhoods with high homeownership rates are not necessarily high-income communities. Bayview, Excelsior, and Visitation Valley house many of San Francisco's lowest-income communities, yet they also have some of the highest homeownership rates in the City. Conversely, some high-income communities such as the Marina and Russian Hill have low ownership rates (Map 10).

⁴⁵ Rosen Consulting Group

Map 10
Proportion of Owner Occupied Housing




Figure 25
Median Home Prices in San Francisco 1990-2009





Figure 26
Percentage of Households That Can Afford Median Priced Homes



Substandard Housing

San Francisco has an older housing stock, with 53% of all units built before 1940. This is the largest concentration of older housing stock in the State; only 10% of the occupied housing in California was build before 1940.

New construction since 2000 accounts for just under 4% of the City's total housing stock and housing added in the last 30 years represents only 12% of all units (Table 32). Most of the housing stock is in sound condition, however, there are significant substandard housing challenges, particularly with lead paint and seismic retrofit needs in certain areas of San Francisco and particular building types.

Table 32
Age of San Francisco Housing Stock

Year Built	All Units	No.
2000 and later	3.7%	12,821
1980-1999	8.5%	29,455
1960 – 1979	14.6%	50,593
1940 – 1959	20.0%	69,305
1939 or earlier	53.3%	184,699
Total	100%	346,874

Source: San Francisco Housing Element 2009

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

Lack of Kitchen and Plumbing Facilities

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

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

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

Table 33
Housing Units Lacking Kitchen or Plumbing Facilities, 2005-2007

	Lack Kitchen Facilities	Lack Plumbing Facilities	Lack Kitchen and/or Plumbing Facilities (unduplicated)
Number of Units	10,725	5,601	11,480

Sources: 2005-2007 ACS, 2009 CHAS

Health and Building Code Violations

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

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

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

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


In 2008, there were 6,669 examples of health and building code violations in San Francisco (Table 34). The highest concentration of violations were, again, in those low-income, high density neighborhoods near downtown San Francisco, including Chinatown, Tenderloin, Civic Center, and the Financial District. Data also indicate a high rate of violations in the Inner Mission, Hayes Valley, and Upper Market/Castro neighborhoods (Map 11).

Table 34
Health and Building Code Violations, 2008

Health Code Violations	Building Code Violations	Total Code Violations	Total Violations per 1,000
819	5,850	6,669	9.2

Sources: SF Dept. of Health, SF Dept. of Building Inspection

Map 11
Rate of Code Violations for Housing and Habitability



Sources: San Francisco Department of Public Health, 2007 American Community Survey


Presence of Lead Based Paint

Lead was added to paint prior to 1978 to make it more durable. All of San Francisco's neighborhoods were fully developed by the end of World War II; 94% of our housing units were built prior to the 1978 ban on residential lead-based paint – 68% (235,874 units) of the housing stock is pre-1950, which is considered the time frame when paint contained the greatest concentration of lead. There are approximately 22,000 housing units in San Francisco with lead-based paint hazards that are occupied by low-and moderate-income families.

Map 12 shows that most children with elevated blood levels detected 200-2006 were living in low-income communities with older housing stock.

Map 12

San Francisco: Elevated Blood Levels and Pre 1940 Housing



Sources: San Francisco Department of Public Health, Census 2000

City Activity

Housing restoration, remodeling and maintenance is an on-going activity throughout the City. Renovation projects completed between 2000 and 2007 improved 18,900 units, with an average cost of \$25,000 per unit. Over 92% of the permits for residential improvements are for one and two unit buildings. Considerable rehabilitation is also needed in many lower income multi-unit buildings and residential hotels. This important stock of more affordable housing does not always receive adequate attention to maintenance needs.

Buildings At-Risk from Seismic Activity

Seismic retrofitting is a unique concern in many California cities, including San Francisco. In the early 1990s, there were approximately 400 unreinforced masonry residential hotels and apartment buildings (UMB), most of which are occupied by low-income households. Since then, the City has worked closely with building owners and invested in

improvements to ensure they comply with seismic safety requirements. On average, it takes \$45,000 per unit in public subsidies to rehabilitate and seismically upgrade these buildings and still maintain their low-income rent structure. As of August 2008, only five apartment buildings with 84 units and one residential hotel with 18 units have yet to comply with the City's retrofit requirements. In addition to the unreinforced masonry buildings, much of San Francisco's older housing stock is in need of some type of seismic upgrading such as foundation bolting and structural reinforcement.

Barriers to Affordable Housing Production

Housing development in California is a complex and lengthy process. San Francisco in particular is one of the more challenging environments to build housing. Factors including high land and construction costs, protracted entitlement and permitting processes, and organized opposition from neighbors pose real obstacles to developing housing in San Francisco.

Barriers to construction of affordable housing include:

- Strong for-sale housing demand, leading to high land values and the ability of property owners to command high land sale prices
- Limited developable parcels
- High construction costs
- Lengthy permitting process, due in part to environmental review and resident concerns over growth
- Lack of sufficient federal, state, and local funding to meet projected demand for affordable housing

The table below summarizes the unusually high costs of multifamily housing development in San Francisco: The City and County of San Francisco has worked to reduce potential barriers to affordable housing production over the past few years. Examples of initiatives to create additional affordable housing include: ⁴⁶

- Ballot measure attempted in November, 2004 to create a new \$200 million funding program using local bond financing
- Ballot measure attempted in November, 2002 to create a new \$250 million funding program using local bond financing
- Better Neighborhoods Planning program
- Adoption of Inclusionary Housing Ordinance (2002) and subsequent increase of inclusionary requirements (2006)
- New Land Use Element to the General Plan re-designates former industrial lands to housing and mixed-use sites

⁴⁶ For a fuller discussion of nongovernmental and governmental constraints to housing productions, please see the Housing Element of the General Plan, pages 69-79, available at: [http://housingelement2009.sfplanning.org/docs/Housing_Element_Part_I_4.22.09.pdf].

Table 35
Estimated Multifamily Development Costs Per Unit, San Francisco, 2007

	Cost Categories	Costs	% of Total Costs
DIRECT CONSTRUCTION COSTS	Land Cost	\$110,000	21.6%
	Building Construction	\$247,900	48.8%
	Parking Space Construction	\$20,000	3.9%
	Total Direct Costs	\$377,900	74.4%
INDIRECT CONSTRUCTION COSTS	Planning and Building Entitlement Fees	\$9,893	1.9%
	School Impact Fees	\$2,072	0.4%
	Developer Project Management, Architecture, Engineering and other "Soft" Costs	\$92,500	18.2%
	Construction Financing	\$25,900	5.1%
	Total Indirect Costs	\$130,365	25.6%
TOTAL DEVELOPMENT COST		\$508,265	100.0%

Source: SF Planning Department

Creation of Affordable Housing and Preservation of Existing Low-Income Housing

Creation of Affordable Housing

"Affordable housing", as compared to "market rate" housing, is required by government to be priced less expensively for lower income people to afford.

The Mayor's Office of Housing (MOH) and the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (SFRA) create affordable housing by providing financing for the development, rehabilitation and purchase of affordable housing in San Francisco. MOH administers a variety of programs to finance the development of affordable housing by non-profit and for-profit developers.

2005-2009 were extraordinary years for both affordable housing and market rate housing development. 12,129 new homes were completed, of which 3,607 (30%) were restricted as affordable to low- and moderate-income households. Importantly, many of the new affordable units reached deep levels of affordability, meaning their prices are manageable for even our lowest-income residents, s seniors living on social security or homeless families.

Overcoming Barriers

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

Recognizing the need to increase efficiency and help developers better navigate approval processes, Mayor Newsom made several key changes in 2007. First, he brought in new leadership to reform the Planning and Building Inspection departments. Second, he launched an ambitious Business Process Reengineering (BPR) initiative to

streamline the City's development approval process. The BPR initiative has ensured reduced costs and improved customer service to developers and citizens alike by:

- eliminating redundant, unnecessary reviews, approvals, and regulations
- ensuring faster turnaround times for plan review and submitted permit applications
- creating a much-needed integrated permit tracking system

The 2004 Housing Element provides additional detail on policies and implementation actions to increase the supply of affordable housing by producing additional units while also conserving existing supply at risk of conversion to market rate, or from rental to for-sale units.

Permanent Affordable Housing Needs

Table 36
Regional Housing Needs Assessment for San Francisco, 2007-June 2014

Household Income Category	No. of Units	% of Total	Annual Production Goal
Extremely Low (<30% AMI)	3,294	10.50%	439
Very Low (31-50% AMI)	3,295	10.60%	439
Low (51-80% AMI)	5,535	17.70%	738
Moderate (81-120% AMI)	6,754	21.70%	901
Above Moderate (over 120% AMI)	12,315	39.50%	1,642
Total Units	31,193	100.00%	4,159

Source: The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG)

Two governmental bodies, The State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), set San Francisco's "fair share of the regional housing need"- the amount of new housing that should be built in order to house increasing numbers of residents. This Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) process also establishes the number of units that should be affordable to lower income households. The 2004 Housing Element suggested that the total number of housing units allocated to San Francisco by the RHNA process was not realistic. The goal for new housing production outlined for the 2007-2014 planning period (31,193) is two and a half times San Francisco's production from 2005-2009 (12,129). Furthermore, funds available for new affordable housing construction, rehabilitation and supportive service provision in 2008 totaled about \$48.1 million and the estimated additional capital subsidies needed to meet the City's regional housing share would have required over 300% more in funding.

Table 37
New Affordable Housing Construction by Income Level, 2005-2009

Household Income Category	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	Total
Extremely Low (<30% AMI)	66	260	0	134	0	460
Very Low (31-50% AMI)	387	56	412	247	550	1,652
Lower (51-60% AMI)	236	5	100	81	0	422
Low (51-80% AMI)	0	12	20	0	140	172
Moderate (81-120% AMI)	110	158	203	361	256	1,088
Total Affordable Units	799	491	735	823	946	3,607
Total New Units	1,872	1,675	2,197	3,019	3,366	12,129

Source: San Francisco Planning Department, 2009 Housing Element

In prioritizing affordable housing activities, the City will continue to focus on financing affordable rental housing for the lowest income and most vulnerable populations to the extent possible. To make limited resources stretch as far as possible, home-ownership programs will continue to focus on people who earn over 50% of median but who are still in the low-income range (HUD Required Table 2A).

HUD Table 2A⁴⁷

**Priority Housing Needs/Investment Plan Table
Affordable Housing Needs, San Francisco 2000**

	Unmet Need ⁴⁸	Priority
Renters		
<u>Elderly (1 & 2 members)</u>		
0 - 30% MFI	12,541	H
31 - 50% MFI	3,613	H
51 - 80% MFI	2,029	M
<u>Small Related (2-4 members)</u>		
0 - 30% MFI	7,019	H
31 - 50% MFI	5,628	H
51 - 80% MFI	5,590	M
<u>Large Related (5+ members)</u>		
0 - 30% MFI	2,464	H
31 - 50% MFI	2,100	H
51 - 80% MFI	3,140	M
<u>All Other</u>		
0 - 30% MFI	15,757	H
31 - 50% MFI	9,493	H
51 - 80% MFI	11,213	M
Total	80,586	
Owners		
<u>Elderly (1 & 2 members)</u>		
0 - 30% MFI	3,959	M
31 - 50% MFI	1,575	M
51 - 80% MFI	1,517	H
<u>Small Related (2-4 members)</u>		
0 - 30% MFI	1,400	M
31 - 50% MFI	1,594	M
51 - 80% MFI	3,484	H
<u>Large Related (5+ members)</u>		
0 - 30% MFI	534	M
31 - 50% MFI	1,298	M
51 - 80% MFI	2,450	H

⁴⁷ HUD's required Table 2A focuses on HUD-selected subcategories of unmet needs from 0% to 80%AMI, specifically small elderly households, small related households, large related households, and "all other." These categories are not well matched to the demographics of San Francisco, which tends to have substantial numbers of unrelated households per HUD definitions.

⁴⁸ Unmet Need is defined by HUD as all households who suffer from "any housing problem." Housing problems considered by HUD include overcrowding, severe overcrowding, cost burden, severe cost burden, lack of kitchen facilities, and lack of plumbing facilities.

All Other		
0 - 30% MFI	1,208	M
31 - 50% MFI	837	M
51 - 80% MFI	2,105	H

Total **21,962**

Source: CHAS 2000 Databook⁴⁹

The permanent affordable housing needs of specific population groups are summarized below. These categories are not intended to be comprehensive, but rather represent groups for whom San Francisco is able to prioritize affordable housing construction over the next five years.

Very Low Income Seniors

The 2000 Census counted 136,369 or 18% of San Francisco's population as 60 years or older. San Francisco's elderly population is expected to grow to 173,200 by 2010 and to 279,800 by 2030; this growth is consistent with national trends. The recent Census also estimated that 24% of all San Francisco households have one or more persons over 65 years old. About 32,300 elderly householders, representing about 10% of all households in 2000, lived alone.

Fifty-three percent of San Francisco's seniors are 75 years old or older⁵⁰, and advances in medical technology will likely increase the relative size of this "older old" population as life expectancies increase in the future. This segment of the population is more likely to be poor and in need of fully accessible housing to maintain their quality of life. There will also be a growing population of people with cognitive impairment and dementia in San Francisco between 2010 to 2020.⁵¹ Due to a reduction in custodial care for older adults at hospitals and in nursing facilities, housing opportunities that include dementia care are a growing need.⁵²

Over half (52%) of the City's seniors 65 and over are homeowners.⁵³ Many of these homeowners bought their home decades ago, and now own them outright. As a result, senior homeowners today are somewhat shielded from high housing costs. However: (a) San Francisco baby boomers (adults born between 1936 and 1964) are dramatically less likely to own their homes than are baby boomers nationally or statewide; (b) younger baby boomers are less likely than older baby boomers to own their homes, and; (c) both groups are less likely to own their homes than seniors age 65 or older.⁵⁴ (d) baby boomers with disabilities represent an important demographic, as they will face distinct challenges to remaining stably housed as they age.

Since the city's historically high cost of houses has been prohibitive to many baby boomers, San Francisco is largely a city of renters when it comes to the baby boomer population⁵⁵ and there is a large unmet need for accessible, low-cost rental housing in the private market. As the generation of baby-boomer renters reaches retirement age, their incomes will decline, and the need for accessible low-cost rental housing and affordable senior housing will rise.

Senior citizens have different housing needs especially as they develop health problems or experience decreased mobility. The 2000 Census estimated that 23% of persons 65 and over have mobility or self-care limitations. The Long-Term Care Pilot Project Task Force estimates that the City must develop a minimum of 1,500 units of affordable supportive housing. Older and disabled adults who require long-term care have a need for a broad range of on-site and off-site services including central dining, transportation services, limited or complete medical care, recreational and other services. For seniors living independently, there is a need for small, safe, easily maintained

⁴⁹ More recent data meeting HUD requirements for Table 2A are unavailable.

⁵⁰ American Community Survey, 2007

⁵¹ Alzheimer's/Dementia Expert Panel, 2009

⁵² Dementia Care Revisions to Housing Element

⁵³ American Community Survey, 2007

⁵⁴ DAAS 2006 Community Needs Assessment

⁵⁵ San Francisco Baby Boomers- A Breed Apart?, July 2008.

dwelling units. The maximum SSI payment for a single adult over 65 with little or no income is \$845⁵⁶, and the average rent for a one-bedroom in San Francisco is \$2,388⁵⁷.

Persons with Severe Mental Illness

De-institutionalization of the state's mental healthcare system in the late 1970s left the charge and housing of psychiatrically disabled residents to private board and care facilities. In 1977 there were 1,278 board and care beds. By 1999, licensed board and care facilities in San Francisco managed just 525 beds for San Francisco's mentally ill. The growing costs of patient care may further reduce out-patient service. At current supplemental security subsidy levels, operators are finding the provision of board and care for the mentally ill financially unsustainable.

According to the 2000 Census, almost 39,120 San Franciscans identify as having a mental illness; about 94% are over the age of 16. Not everyone with a mental illness has special housing needs. The Department of Public Health's Division of Mental Health estimates there is a need for 2,000 supportive housing units for San Francisco's mentally ill.

Households with a mentally ill individual require close proximity to appropriate services, including not only health support services but grocery stores, everyday goods and services, and nearby transit, to enable the transition to independent living where possible. While large scale supportive housing is a cost-effective way of meeting these households' housing needs, advocates working with special needs groups emphasize the need to balance large-scale development with small site development and rehabilitation of units within existing neighborhoods, to enable people to live within their neighborhood of origin wherever possible, and to avoid geographic concentration that often hinders the transition to independent living.

A survey conducted by the San Francisco Mental Health Association indicated an overwhelming desire on the part of mentally disabled persons to live alone or with one to two friends in apartments with support services as needed. The absence of affordable housing linked to supportive services, however, sends many of the City's mentally ill through a never-ending loop of short-term acute care and homelessness.

Persons with Disabilities

Almost one-fifth of the San Francisco population has a disability (18.8% according to the 2000 census; 19.4% according to a 1999 State Independent Living Council Survey). A strong correlation between disability and poverty exists; people with disabilities not only have much higher unemployment than the general population, but those who work also earn less than their counterparts in the general population. Fifteen percent of people age 65 or older (7,149), and 33% of all younger adults with disabilities (13,280) in San Francisco are living in poverty⁵⁸. Many rely on federal disability benefits (SSI) as their sole source of income, which is \$750 per month. San Francisco is one of nine counties in the U.S. where the rent for a one-bedroom apartment is 50% greater than an entire SSI payment.

People with accessibility needs such as wheelchair accessible entrances, wide interior spaces for wheelchair circulation, accessible bathing facilities, adjustable heights for counters and cabinets, and other amenities needs face particular challenges obtaining appropriate housing. Over three-quarters of San Francisco's housing stock was built before 1950 without these accommodations in mind. Most housing is difficult to convert to accessible standards. Although disability rights laws require that a landlord allow accessibility modifications in rental units, the burden of paying for such modifications is on the tenants themselves, who as noted, are frequently living in poverty.⁵⁹

The application process for housing can also discriminate against people with disabilities when landlords use a

⁵⁶ www.socialsecurity.gov

⁵⁷ DAAS 2006 Community Needs Assessment

⁵⁸ 2007 American Community Survey

⁵⁹ San Francisco Department of Aging and Adult Services, Community Needs Assessment, 2006.

“First Come First Serve” basis. This process requires applicants to wait in line for hours at a time and people with disabilities often cannot withstand a long wait, especially as many are dependent on attendants to help them get ready in the morning and can’t physically be out of the house until after 9:00 a.m.⁶⁰ Nonprofit housing developers as well as private landlords vary greatly in how well they market open units, waitlists, or new buildings to people with disabilities.

Housing options for people with disabilities range from acute care in an institution, to supportive housing, to living independently. Institutional living not only costs government many times more than other housing options, it also provides the most restricted and limited environment for people with disabilities.

Very Low-Income Families with Children

Approximately 54,700 or 38% of family households include children. Many of these children are in low-income households in ethnic communities that tend to be poorer than the rest of the City. About 20% of all family households, roughly 29,000, have five persons or more. San Francisco has too few large affordable units to accommodate the needs of these families, and as a result, larger families are more likely to live in overcrowded conditions than smaller households.

Table 38 also shows the limited number of suitable accommodations available for larger families and/or households.

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

Table 38
San Francisco Household Sizes and Unit Sizes

Household Size	% Total Households	Unit	% Total Housing Units
1-person	40%	Studio	18%
2-person	31%	1-bedroom	28%
3-person	13%	2-bedrooms	30%
4-person	9%	3-bedrooms	17%
5-person	4%	4-bedrooms	5%
6-person or more	5%	5-bedrooms or more	2%

Source: San Francisco Planning Department, 2009 Housing Element

⁶⁰ Application Do’s and Don’ts For Housing Providers.

HUD Required Table 1B
Housing for Specific Needs Populations: Needs and Goals

	Unmet Need	Priority Need (High, Medium, Low, No Such Need)	Multi-year Goals (g)
Population			
Elderly (65 years +)	19,795	High	637
Severe Mental Illness (b)	2,000	High	40
Persons with Disabilities (c)	10,550	High	35
Families with Children (d)	17,000	High	910
Transitional Age Youth (e)	5,700	High	107
Public Housing Residents (f)	2,500		142

NOTES:

(a) CHAS 2009- Includes Elderly & "Extra Elderly Renters under 50% AMI with Any Housing Problem

(b) San Francisco Planning Element 2009. Only includes need for Supportive Housing

(c) CHAS 2009, Includes Renters with Disabilities under 50% AMI with Any Housing Problem

(d) CHAS 2000, Includes Small and Large Renter Families under 50% AMI with Any Housing Problem, San Francisco Housing Element 2009

(e) Housing for Transitional Age Youth Work Plan and Recommendations, 2007-2012. Includes both homeless and marginally housed TAY

(f) Number of units in 8 severely dilapidated Public Housing sites selected for redevelopment

(g) Multiyear goals include the following types of housing: Homeless Supportive, Non-Homeless Supportive, Affordable Non-Supportive

Preservation of Housing That Serves Low-Income Populations

Public Housing

Background

Established in 1938, the San Francisco Housing Authority (referred to as "the Authority" or SFHA) manages 6,156 units of public housing stock in 50 developments scattered throughout the city. It is one of the largest public housing agencies in the nation, serving 5,583 public housing and 20,868 Section 8 eligible residents.

The mission of the San Francisco Housing Authority is to provide safe, sanitary, affordable, and decent housing to very low-income families, senior citizens and persons with disabilities. Over 2,000 units of the Authority's public housing portfolio are designated specifically for senior or disabled households, and the remainder are designated for families. The Authority houses very low-income families, and without its assistance, many of San Francisco's residents, who come from many different ethnic backgrounds and who create the city's unique flavor, would be forced to live elsewhere.

Overarching Goals

The Authority's primary goal during 2010-2015 will be to continue to provide affordable housing for nearly 12,000 public housing residents and approximately 21,000 Section 8 participants, while improving housing and economic opportunities for residents and maintaining high standards of property management, fiscal management and service delivery. The Authority will continue to target all income levels under 30% of the AMI for public housing and 50% to 80% of the AMI for other units. There are 21,773 households on the public housing waiting list and 14,830 households on the Section 8 waiting list. The average households on both of these lists require two and three bedroom units.

Physical Needs and Plans

The 2007 Comprehensive Physical Needs Assessment performed by the SFHA indicated that there is a backlog of immediate physical rehabilitation needs that will cost \$269 million. An additional \$26 million a year is needed to forestall physical deterioration in SFHA housing. The SFHA has identified projects totaling \$2.54 billion to comprehensively address all of the physical problems that currently exist.

The City of San Francisco is helping to address the physical deterioration of public housing and serve families living in severely dilapidated housing. HOPE SF will build upon the successes of HOPE VI in San Francisco and transform the City's most distressed public housing into thriving, mixed income communities.

Since the HOPE SF rebuilding process will take years, the City and SFHA will also take steps to address urgent infrastructure and rehabilitation needs at public housing sites. In prior years, MOH, SF Redevelopment Agency, and the SFPUC have partnered with the Housing Authority and invested in repairs that have the greatest effect on safety, security, and health issues impacting their residents' quality of life. A snapshot of repairs completed in 2008 include the installation of new entry gates and security cameras, fire alarm systems, sewer system improvements, repairs to elevators and improvements to lighting in stairwells and on walkways. In total, recent programs have rehabilitated 1,149 units of new and affordable housing with 2,607 bedrooms. Two new City-funded projects for needed boiler and water replacement are currently under construction.

In coming years, coordination with City efforts and collaborations with other public and private entities will continue to be emphasized. In part due to these partnerships, SFHA does not expect to lose any public housing units from the inventory.

Improving Resident Opportunities

The Authority is seeking ways to address the growing needs of working families for affordable housing and homeownership opportunities. New affordable homes will be built as part of the HOPE SF rebuilding process and existing public housing residents will be prioritized for these homes. Additionally, first-time homebuyer counseling and Individual Investment Accounts (IDA's) will be available to HOPE SF residents interested in preparing for homeownership opportunities. Finally, the HOPE SF Academy, a 15 week leadership course for public housing residents includes a home ownership trainings session each year.

The Authority will continue to prioritize resident opportunities to become involved with public housing management through "resident management corporations" and targeted staff positions. Some housing developments have "resident management corporations" in lieu of tenant associations. Members of resident management corporations receive training and are involved with the management of their site. The Housing Authority targets some property management staff positions specifically for resident employment.

Rent-Controlled Apartments

Barrett, Hyacinth

From: CMMS@sfgov.org
Sent: Friday, May 31, 2013 10:48 AM
To: Barrett, Hyacinth
Subject: Service Request # 423823 (Supervisor Yee - Room 260 - Hang paintings) has been SUBMITTED

Thank you for submitting Service Request # 423823 for 1-DRCARLTONBG00DLETTPL-SF

Service Order #: 423823

Request Description: Supervisor Yee - Room 260 - Hang paintings

Reported By: HBARRETT

In order to check the status of your request, please log into cmms.sfdpw.org

FORM SFEC-126:
NOTIFICATION OF CONTRACT APPROVAL
(S.F. Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code § 1.126)

City Elective Officer Information (Please print clearly.)	
Name of City elective officer(s): Members, Board of Supervisors	City elective office(s) held: Members, Board of Supervisors

Contractor Information (Please print clearly.)	
Name of contractor: See attached list of contractors	
Please list the names of (1) members of the contractor's board of directors; (2) the contractor's chief executive officer, chief financial officer and chief operating officer; (3) any person who has an ownership of 20 percent or more in the contractor; (4) any subcontractor listed in the bid or contract; and (5) any political committee sponsored or controlled by the contractor. Use additional pages as necessary.	
See attached	
Contractor address: See attached	
Date that contract was approved: (By the SF Board of Supervisors)	Amount of contracts: \$9,402,499
Describe the nature of the contract that was approved: CDBG grants to nonprofit organizations to serve low and moderate income persons.	
Comments: Attached form includes requested information.	

This contract was approved by (check applicable):

☐ the City elective officer(s) identified on this form

☒ a board on which the City elective officer(s) serves: San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Print Name of Board

☐ the board of a state agency (Health Authority, Housing Authority Commission, Industrial Development Authority Board, Parking Authority, Redevelopment Agency Commission, Relocation Appeals Board, Treasure Island Development Authority) on which an appointee of the City elective officer(s) identified on this form sits

Print Name of Board

Filer Information (Please print clearly.)	
Name of filer: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board	Contact telephone number: (415) 554-5184
Address: City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl., San Francisco, CA 94102	E-mail: Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org

Signature of City Elective Officer (if submitted by City elective officer)

Date Signed

Signature of Board Secretary or Clerk (if submitted by Board Secretary or Clerk)

Date Signed

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
AIDS Legal Referral Panel of the SF Bay Area	1663 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94103	\$82,000	Legal services for low-income residents, primarily those with HIV and/or AIDS	Bill Hirsh			Cathy Blackstone
							Jennifer Brown
							Mark Delgado
							Felicia Draper
							Sara Givan
							Matthew Gray
							Cecilia Han
							Hailey Hibler
							Jeffrey Jacobi
							Kris Kaiser
							Robb McFadden
							Maria Medina
							Robert Millar
							Vincent Novak
							Matthew Richards
							Michelle Roberts
							Amanda Schapel
							Austin Schwing
							David Sims
							Michael Stevens
							Alexander Trimble
							David Tsai
							James Wood
							Bill Chan
APA Family Support Services	10 Nothingham Place, San Francisco, CA 94133	\$45,000	Service connection for Sunnydale public housing residents, including referral, case management and family advocacy services	Amor Santiago			
							Mai Sie Chan
							Cary Chen
							Cheng-Ling Chen
							Eddie Chin
							Rose Chung
							Van Diep
							Herbert Dong
							Jackie Huie
							Stephen Koh

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
							Amy Lee
							Valerie Lee
							Vic Leung
							Amor Santiago
							Kyle Schirmer
							Susan Sung
							Joyce Tso
							Julie Wong
							Dean Yao
Arab Cultural and Community Center	2 Plaza Street, San Francisco, CA 94116	\$50,000	Case management in immigration, health referrals, employment readiness services, domestic violence and other services	Loubna Qutami			Rabab Abdulhadi
							Tayeb Abdulrahman
							Fuad Ateyeh
							Rami Aweh
							Jamie Elmasu
							Jess Ghannam
							Tala Ghanous
							Hakam Ibrahim
							Kamel Karajah
							Rena Kharbat
							Samir Mahboub
							Loubna Qutami
							Wasim Samara
Arriba Juniors	1850 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94103	\$35,000	Replace roof and install HVAC unit in occupation training and employment development facility	Dalia Almunada	John Phillips		David Bracker
							Arminda Calixto
							Jim Kennedy,
							Secretary
							Daniel Kingsley
							Steve Lewey, Chair
							John Phillips,
							Treasurer
							Ivan Ruiz

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
Asian Law Caucus	55 Columbus Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94111	\$52,000	Legal services for low-income residents, primarily recent immigrants	Hyeon-Ju Rho		Christopher Punongbayan	S. Raj Chatterjee
							Edwin Eng
							Marjorie Fujiki
							Laura Ho
							Kiran Jain
							Khurshid Khoja
							Karen Korenatsu-Haigh
							William Kwong
							Euni Lee
							Larry Lowe
							Aiko Pandorf
							Hina Shah
							Quyen Ta
							Cecilia Wang
							Jorge Colunga
Asian Neighborhood Design	1245 Howard Street, San Francisco, CA 94103	\$86,827	Architectural services and technical assistance for businesses in low- and moderate-income commercial neighborhood corridors	Steven Suzuki	Diane Katz		
							DeLynda DeLeon
							Jelena Djordjevic (secretary)
							Eron Ersch (President)
							April Fujimoto (treasurer)
							Mike Hilliard
							Esther Marks
							Caroline Nassif
							Edwin Oshika
							Sonya Park
							Tom Untana (vice-president)
Asian Neighborhood Design	1245 Howard Street, San Francisco, CA 94103	\$35,000	Technical support services for MOH capital grantees	Steven Suzuki	Diane Katz		Jorge Colunga

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
							Del ynda DeLeon Jelena Djordjevic (secretary) Eron Ersch (President)
							April Fujimoto (treasurer) Mike Hilliard Esther Marks Caroline Nassif Edwin Oshika Sonya Park Tom Untama (vice-president) Jorge Colunga
Asian Neighborhood Design	1245 Howard Street, San Francisco, CA 94103	\$53,000	Architectural technical assistance services	Steven Suzuki	Diane Katz		Del ynda DeLeon Jelena Djordjevic (secretary) Eron Ersch (President)
							April Fujimoto (treasurer) Mike Hilliard Esther Marks Caroline Nassif Edwin Oshika Sonya Park Tom Untama (vice-president)
							David Chan
Asian Pacific American Community Center	2442 Bayshore Blvd, San Francisco, CA 94134	\$57,000	Multi-services, including information and referrals, primarily for low-income Asian immigrants in Vistacion Valley and Bayview	Tony Huang	Chito Lam		Christina Chen Myriam Chen

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
							Pearl Chen
							Derek Chu
							Paul Giusti
							Tony Huang
							Keith Jackson
							Alex Ku
							Chi Ho Lam
							Mabel Seto
							Rex Tabora
							Roy Tan
							James Wong
							Richard Cerbatos
Asian, Inc.	1167 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94103	\$50,000	Pre- and post-purchase homebuyer education and counseling services	Michael Chan	Don Li		Steve Doi
							Frank Fung
							Jonathan Leong
							Greg Marutani
							Shirley Tam
							Bryan Breckinridge
Bay Area Community Resource/Excelsior Action Group	171 Carlos Drive, San Rafael, CA 94903	\$63,000	One-on-one assistance for businesses to economically stabilize and strengthen neighborhood business districts in the Excelsior	Martin Weinstein	Cathleen Campbell	Mary Jo Williams	
							Bob Davissou
							Lissa Franklin
							Benedict Hur
							Christina Lee
							David Lilienstein
							Nancy McEvers
							Anderson
							Rob Ness
							Bud Travers
							Monica Vaughn
							Shannon Vincent

2013-2014 CDBG Proposed Expenditures - Form 126 Attachment

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
Bay Area Community Resource/Portola Neighborhood Association	171 Carlos Drive, San Rafael, CA 94903	\$63,000	One-on-one assistance for businesses to economically stabilize and strengthen neighborhood business districts in the Portola	Martin Weinstein	Cathleen Campbell	Mary Jo Williams	Bryan Breckinridge
							Bob Davison
							Lissa Franklin
							Benedict Hur
							Christina Lee
							David Littenstein
							Nancy McEvers
							Anderson
							Rob Ness
							Bud Travers
							Monica Vaughn
							Shannon Vincent
							William Alderman
Bay Area Legal Aid	1735 Telegraph Avenue, Oakland, CA 94612	\$40,000	Legal representation for low-income domestic violence victims	Ramon P. Atlas	Mohammad Sleikh		
							Anyta Archer
							Louise Boccione
							John Dwyer
							Fred Feller
							William Gagen Jr.
							Robert Goodin
							Arlene Hipp
							Christopher Hockett
							Geoffrey Howard
							Michael Huega
							Hazel King
							Theodora Lee
							David McClain
							David Murphy
							Wassim Nassif
							Robert Planthold
							Marvin Pree
							Dirk Schenkan
							Susan Schweigman

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
							Rick Simons
							George Speir
							David Steuer
							Joseph Tabacco
							Anthony Trepel
							Robert Van Nest
							William Alderman
Bay Area Legal Aid	1735 Telegraph Avenue, Oakland, CA 94612	\$65,000	Legal assistance and representation for residents of subsidized housing	Ramon P. Arias	Mohammad Sheikh		Anyia Archer
							Louise Boccone
							John Dwyer
							Fred Feller
							William Gagen Jr.
							Robert Goodin
							Arlene Hipp
							Christopher Hockett
							Geoffrey Howard
							Michael Huega
							Hazel King
							Theodora Lee
							David McClain
							David Murphy
							Wassim Nassif
							Robert Planthold
							Marvin Pree
							Dirk Schenkkan
							Susan Schwegman
							Rick Simons
							George Speir
							David Steuer
							Joseph Tabacco
							Anthony Trepel
							Robert Van Nest
							Blake Boznanski
Bayview Hunter's Point Center for Arts & Technology	2415 Third Street, San Francisco, CA 94107	\$75,000	Young Adult Bridge services	Villy Wang			Douraghy Cameron

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
							Joe DeLuca
							Ryan Dunn
							Herbie Hancock
							Todd High
							Keith Kappmeyer
							Brian Murphy
							Charles Patton
							Eric Pearson
							Linda Pettus
							Luke Raimondo
							Julius Robinson
							Melissa Tidwell
							Diana Alegre
Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center	515 Cortland Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94110	\$70,000	Expand youth center, install solar panels for common area electrical usage, and shift water lines	Rachel Eboora	Justine Lauderback	Justine Lauderback	Jennifer Burden
							Beth Byrne
							Elizabeth Hewson
							Tina Nguyen
							Kimberly Ravadero
							Clark Reyes
							Sara Rohlfing
							Carren Shagley
							Johanna Silva
Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center	515 Cortland Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94110	\$45,000	Build 3,000 sq. ft. of crawlspace into a community room	Rachel Eboora	Justine Lauderback	Justine Lauderback	Jennifer Burden
							Beth Byrne
							Elizabeth Hewson
							Tina Nguyen
							Kimberly Ravadero
							Clark Reyes
							Sara Rohlfing
							Carren Shagley
							Johanna Silva

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center	515 Cortland Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94110	\$32,931	Upgrades to the Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center at 515 Cortland Avenue, including repair of leaks to roof and skylight and siding replacements	Rachel Ebor	Justine Lauderback	Justine Lauderback	Diana Alegre
							Jennifer Burden
							Beth Byrne
							Elizabeth Hewson
							Tina Nguyen
							Kimberly Ravadero
							Clark Reyes
							Sara Rohlfing
							Carren Shagley
							Johanna Silva
							Richard Blum
Board of Trustees of the Glide Foundation	330 Ellis Street, San Francisco, CA 94102	\$30,000	New roof for Glide's Family, Youth and Childcare Center at 434 Ellis Street	Kristen Growney Yamamoto	Kristen Growney-Yamamoto		Warner Brown
							John Coghlan
							Charles Cordes
							Mary Coughlin
							Lars Dalgaard
							Stephen Davis
							Catherine Dodd
							Amy Errett
							Erby Foster
							Nicole Harris
							Phyllis Kaplan
							Mike Kim
							Christopher Lord
							Janice Mirikitani
							Craig Ramsey
							Donald Tamaki
							Jerry Valley
							Michael Warren
							Cecil Williams
							Philip Zackler

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
Booker T. Washington Community Service Center	800 Presidio Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94115	\$40,000	Academic support, technology training, life skills and coaching for transitional age youth	Patricia Scott	Stone Phillip		Toby Eastman
							Andrea Hayes
							Griffin Lawrence
							Carliss Le Roy
							Carlos Reed
							Phillip Stone
Booker T. Washington Community Service Center	800 Presidio Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94115	\$150,000	Interior improvements as part of construction of a new community center	Patricia Scott	Stone Phillip		Toby Eastman
							Andrea Hayes
							Griffin Lawrence
							Carliss Le Roy
							Carlos Reed
							Phillip Stone
							Xochitl Carrion
Bravai for Women in the Arts	2781 24th Street, San Francisco, CA 94110	\$100,000	Completion of upgrades to storefronts including restrooms and water issues	Anastacia Powers Cuellar			Brigitte Davila
							Karina Muniz
							Jacqueline Omolade
							Anastacia Powers
							Cuellar
Bridge Housing Corporation	345 Spear Street, San Francisco, CA 94105	\$155,000	Community building primarily for Potrero Terrace/Annex public housing residents	Cynthia Parker			Daniel Vasquez
							Douglass Abbey
							Richard Bender
							Ray Carlisle
							Kent Colwell
							Harry Haigood
							Richard Holliday
							Mary King
							Ron Nahas
							Dennis O'Brian
							Peter Palmisano
							Lynn Sedway
							Alan Stein

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
Causa Justa :: Just Cause	2301 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94110	\$38,000	Eviction prevention and housing counseling services	Maria Poblet			Paul Stein Phil Tagami Ernesto Vasquez Clark Wallace Susanne Wilson Jim Wunderman Joseph George
							Gilda Haas Gordon Mar Maria Poblet
CCSF Small Business Development Center	300 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, CA 94104	\$140,000	Entrepreneurial training, consultation and support for businesses citywide with emphasis in the Chinatown and Mission neighborhoods	Chancellor Pamela Fisher	John Bilmont	Peter Goldstein	Natalie Berg
							Anita Grier Don Griffin Chris Jackson Milton Marks, III Steven Ngo John Rizzo Lawrence Wong
Central American Resource Center (CARECEN)	3101 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94110	\$80,000	Legal services for immigrants	Lariza Dugan-Cuadra	Ronald Munoz	Laura Sanchez	Jose Artiga Elena Asturias Xiomara Castro Carmen Flores Priscilla Marquis Alberto Perez Rendon Jorge Rivera Roberto Ariel Vargas Katie Begell
Central City Hospitality House	290 Turk Street, San Francisco, CA 94102	\$65,000	Shelter beds for homeless men	Jackie Jenks	Eric Sullivan		Mara Blitzer David Golden Marinella Goncalves

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
							Joanne Lee
							Ben Ng
							Dan Nguyen-Tan
							Diana Pang
							Nils Rosenquest
							Gloria So
							Fei Tsen
							Susie Wong
							Carmen Ye
							Pamela Calloway
Chinatown Community Development Center	1525 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94133	\$16,612	Waterproofing, repairs of heating system and sewer/plumbing	Norman Fong	Karen Gausen	Anna Yee	Patsy Chan
							Christabel Cheung
							Gregory Chin
							Phil Chin
							Amy Chung
							Ben Golvin
							Mary Ann Hori
							Jian Guang Ji
							Margaret Jung
							Keith Kamisugi
							Jimmy Kwan
							Gladys Lam
							Chang Jok Lee
							Joanne Lee
							Ben Ng
							Dan Nguyen-Tan
							Diana Pang
							Nils Rosenquest
							Gloria So
							Fei Tsen
							Susie Wong
							Carmen Ye
							Pamela Calloway
Chinatown Community Development Center	1525 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94133	\$109,271	Exterior waterproofing, common area improvements, and unit improvements to 5 properties	Norman Fong	Karen Gausen	Anna Yee	

2013-2014 CDBG Proposed Expenditures - Form 126 Attachment

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
							Patsy Chan
							Christabel Cheung
							Gregory Chin
							Phil Chin
							Amy Chung
							Ben Golvin
							Mary Ann Hori
							Jian Guang Ji
							Margaret Jung
							Keith Kamisugi
							Jimmy Kwan
							Gladys Lam
							Chang Jok Lee
							Joanne Lee
							Ben Ng
							Dan Nguyen-Tan
							Diana Pang
							Nils Rosenquest
							Gloria So
							Fel Tsen
							Susie Wong
							Carmen Ye
Chinatown Community Development Center	1525 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94133	\$36,117	Exterior waterproofing and unit improvements	Norman Fong	Karen Gansen	Anna Yee	Pamela Calloway
							Patsy Chan
							Christabel Cheung
							Gregory Chin
							Phil Chin
							Amy Chung
							Ben Golvin
							Mary Ann Hori
							Jian Guang Ji
							Margaret Jung
							Keith Kamisugi
							Jimmy Kwan
							Gladys Lam

AgencyName	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
							Chang Jok Lee
							Joanne Lee
							Ben Ng
							Dan Nguyen-Tan
							Diana Pang
							Nils Rosenquest
							Gloria So
							Fei Tsen
							Susie Wong
							Carmen Ye
Collective Impact (dba Mo' Magic, dba Opportunity Impact)	PO Box 156853, San Francisco, CA 94102	\$40,000	Case management and multi-services for transitional age youth	Sheryl Davis	Pam Pradachith		Christian Anderson
							Tony Conrad
							Mike Heffernan
							Jennifer Mahoney
Collective Impact (dba Mo' Magic, dba Opportunity Impact)	PO Box 156853, San Francisco, CA 94102	\$70,000	Neighborhood Access Point and Young Adult WorldLink Services	Sheryl Davis	Pam Pradachith		Christian Anderson
							Tony Conrad
							Mike Heffernan
							Jennifer Mahoney
							Michael Albert
Community Center Pjt of S.F dba The San Francisco LGBT Community Center	1800 Market Street, San Francisco, CA 94102	\$50,000	Pre-purchase homebuyer education and counseling services	Rebecca Rolfe			Masen Davis
							Wade Estey
							Mark Hancock
							Michael Hickcox
							Amanda Ketton
							Theresa Lee
							Athena Maikish
							Rafael Mandelman
							Terry Micheau
							Bob Michitarian
							Mariko Pitts
							David Rak
							Alex Randolph
							Vanessa Schneider

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
Community Center Pjt of S.F dba The San Francisco LGBT Community Center	1800 Market Street, San Francisco, CA 94102	\$40,000	Business technical assistance primarily for new and existing lesbians, gay, bisexual and transgender-owned micro-enterprises	Rebecca Rolfe			Andrea Shorter Kathryn Snyder Allison Sparks Patrick Strick Willy Wilkinson Michael Albert
							Masen Davis
							Wade Esley
							Mark Hancock
							Michael Hickcox
							Amanda Keton
							Therese Lee
							Athena Malkish
							Rafael Mandelman
							Terry Michau
							Bob Michitarian
							Mariko Pitts
							David Rak
							Alex Randolph
							Vanessa Schneider
							Andrea Shorter
							Kathryn Snyder
							Allison Sparks
							Patrick Strick
							Willy Wilkinson
							Michael Albert
Community Center Pjt of S.F dba The San Francisco LGBT Community Center	1800 Market Street, San Francisco, CA 94102	\$120,000	Neighborhood Access Point	Rebecca Rolfe			Masen Davis
							Wade Esley
							Mark Hancock
							Michael Hickcox
							Amanda Keton
							Therese Lee
							Athena Malkish

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
							Rafael Mandelman
							Terry Micheau
							Bob Michitarian
							Mariko Pitus
							David Rak
							Alex Randolph
							Vanessa Schneider
							Andrea Shorter
							Kathryn Snyder
							Allison Sparks
							Patrick Strieck
							Willy Wilkinson
							Carol Corr
Community Design Center	5 Thomas Mellon Circle, San Francisco, CA 94134	\$35,000	Technical support for MOH capital grantees	Charles B. Turner, Jr.			Thomas Gwyn
							Michael Harris
							Helen La Mar
							Toye Moses
							Andrew Sun
							Alfred Williams
							Lydia Blumberg
Community Housing Partnership	20 Jones Street, San Francisco, CA 94102	\$75,000	Vocational skills training in the hospitality sector	Gail Gilman	Eric Broque	Elizabeth Hewson	Steve Bowdry
							Brian Carr
							Sean Charpentier
							Ramie Dare
							Nicolaas de Ruijg
							Michael Gause
							Jackie Jenks
							Sarah Karlinsky
							Keith Kemp
							David Elliot Lewis
							Joel Lipski
							Ali Riker
							Michael Santero
							Chuck Turner

2013-2014 CDBG Proposed Expenditures - Form 126 Attachment

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
Community Housing Partnership	20 Jones Street, San Francisco, CA 94102	\$60,000	Update building needs assessment and develop rehab scope of work	Gail Gilman	Eric Broque	Elizabeth Hewson	Steve Wolmark Malcolm Yeung Lydia Blumberg
							Steve Bowdry
							Brian Carr
							Sean Charpentier
							Ramie Dare
							Nicolas de Ruijg
							Michael Gause
							Jackie Jenks
							Sarah Karlinsky
							Keith Kemp
							David Elliot Lewis
							Joel Lipski
							Ali Riker
							Michael Santero
							Chuck Turner
							Steve Wolmark
							Malcolm Yeung
							Lydia Blumberg
Community Housing Partnership	20 Jones Street, San Francisco, CA 94102	\$49,000	Make building fully accessible by installing an elevator and retrofitting units to meet ADA standards	Gail Gilman	Eric Broque	Elizabeth Hewson	Steve Bowdry
							Brian Carr
							Sean Charpentier
							Ramie Dare
							Nicolas de Ruijg
							Michael Gause
							Jackie Jenks
							Sarah Karlinsky
							Keith Kemp
							David Elliot Lewis
							Joel Lipski
							Ali Riker
							Michael Santero

AgencyName	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
							Chuck Turner
							Steve Wolmark
							Malcolm Yeung
							Benjamin Lau
Community Youth Center-San Francisco (CYC-SF)	1038 Post Street, San Francisco, CA 94109	\$50,000	Academic assistance, life skills building and support for at-risk, underserved young adults to enhance their educational/career outlook	Sarah Wan			
							Hanna Leung
							Nelson Lum
							Victoria Lyuber
							Jaynry Mak
							Joseph Subbiondo
							Mary Tsui
							May Ann Wong
							Benjamin Lau
Community Youth Center-San Francisco (CYC-SF)	1038 Post Street, San Francisco, CA 94109	\$50,000	Culturally competent and linguistically appropriate services for primarily Asian residents in the Bayview	Sarah Wan			
							Hanna Leung
							Nelson Lum
							Victoria Lyuber
							Jaynry Mak
							Joseph Subbiondo
							Mary Tsui
							May Ann Wong
							Benjamin Lau
Community Youth Center-San Francisco (CYC-SF)	1038 Post Street, San Francisco, CA 94109	\$90,000	Renovation of roof and HVAC and installation of a wall divider in youth training facility	Sarah Wan			
							Hanna Leung
							Nelson Lum
							Victoria Lyuber
							Jaynry Mak
							Joseph Subbiondo
							Mary Tsui
							May Ann Wong
							Jeff Cain
Compass Family Services	49 Powell Street, San Francisco, CA 94102	\$75,000	Neighborhood Access Point	Erica Kisch			

2013-2014 CDBG Proposed Expenditures - Form 126 Attachment

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
							Lisa Cardone
							Lisa Christensen
							Robert Daoro
							Tracy Ericson
							Nancy Field
							Beth Gassel
							James Gassel
							Elizabeth Gerstung
							Dennis Gibbons
							Doug Goelz
							Sloan Klein
							Kimberly Kraemer
							Michael McCarthy
							Brian McInerney
							Rosalind Navarro
							Solon
							Lisa Odyniec
							Anne Parish
							Katie Traina
							Christopher Wagner
							Nancy Westcott
							Stephanie Zeppa
							Ron Brown
Compasspoint Nonprofit Services	731 Market Street, San Francisco, CA 94103	\$60,000	Technical assistance, consultation and workshop vouchers for CDBG-funded agencies	Jeanne Bell			Paul Buddenhagen
							Chuck Greene
							Seth Kaplan
							Colin Lacon (Chair)
							Kathy Linn Ko (Secretary)
							Vincent Pan
							Cari Pang Chen
							Tom Sino, CPA (Treasurer)
							Paul Susman

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
Conscious Youth Media Crew	1230 Howard Street, San Francisco, CA 94103	\$40,000	Media production training	Debra Koffler			Ray Balberan
							Kevin Epps
							Jennifer Golub
							Debra Koffler
							Noreen Morioka
							Jake Scott
							Chelsea Boilard
Dolores Street Community Services	938 Valencia Street, San Francisco, CA 94110	\$44,000	Legal services for immigrants	Wendy Phillips			Kevin Bundy
							Lisa Gutierrez
							Lauren Hall
							Rosha Jones
							Alvaro Sanchez
							Don Soto
							Armando Vasquez
							Lisa Weisman-Ward
							Chelsea Boilard
Dolores Street Community Services	938 Valencia Street, San Francisco, CA 94110	\$35,000	Shelter beds and case management services primarily for homeless men	Wendy Phillips			Kevin Bundy
							Lisa Gutierrez
							Lauren Hall
							Rosha Jones
							Alvaro Sanchez
							Don Soto
							Armando Vasquez
							Lisa Weisman-Ward
							Chelsea Boilard
Dolores Street Community Services	938 Valencia Street, San Francisco, CA 94110	\$32,470	Rehab will address any conditions that represent violations of safety, seismic, building or health codes based on findings from upcoming CAN	Wendy Phillips			Kevin Bundy
							Lisa Gutierrez
							Lauren Hall
							Rosha Jones
							Alvaro Sanchez

2013-2014 CDBG Proposed Expenditures - Form 126 Attachment

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
Dolores Street Community Services	938 Valencia Street, San Francisco, CA 94110	\$136,571	Upgrades to homeless shelter including removal of asbestos and installation of fire sprinklers	Wendy Phillips			Don Soto Armando Vasquez Lisa Weisman-Ward Chelsea Boilard
							Kevin Bundy Lisa Gutierrez Lauren Hall Roshia Jones Alvaro Sanchez Don Soto Armando Vasquez Lisa Weisman-Ward John Anderson
Donalidia Cameron House	920 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, CA 94108	\$50,000	ESL conversational classes and individualized support and resources for monolingual and limited English speaking immigrants; and case management services for domestic violence victims	Yulanda Kwong	Moony Tong		Scott Barlow Nancy Chee Ed Chin Carole Chinn-Morales Carlos Fong Jonathan Hee Jeannette Huie Charlene Jung Francis Lau Gordon Lee Yeongsun Lee Thomas Pong Debbie Sue Wellington Wong Karina Woo

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
Donaldina Cameron House	920 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, CA 94108	\$66,000	Repair roof and cornice flashing of multi-service community facility serving primarily the Asian community	Yulanda Kwong	Moony Tong		John Anderson Scott Barlow Nancy Chee Ed Chin Carole Chinn-Morales Carlos Fong Jonathan Hee Jeannette Huie Charlene Jung Francis Lau Gordon Lee Yeongshim Lee Thomas Pong Debbie Sue Wellington Wong Karina Woo
Earned Assets Resource Network/Office of the Treasurer	235 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, CA 94104	\$14,000	Capacity building for financial education practitioners as well as streamline access to financial education for low-income San Franciscans	Ben Mangan	Judy Thomas	Judy Thomas	Jose Arce Eugene Chan Nick Eaton Ken Ebanks Linda Harrison Mina Kim Taek Kwon Alissa Lee Ray Mertens Martin Skea Flody Suarez Joe Vassallo Marion Weinreb
Episcopal Community Services of SF	165 8th Street, San Francisco, CA 94103	\$100,000	Vocational skills training in the hospitality sector	Kenneth J. Reggio	Melanie Johnson	Karen Gruneisen	Marc Andrus

2013-2014 CDBG Proposed Expenditures - Form 126 Attachment

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
							Paul Burrows
							Ted Chambers
							Andrea Clay
							Todd Claytor
							David Cooke
							Cort Cortez
							Sedge Dienst
							Alan Fox
							Richard Gill
							William Harris
							Christine Hoberg
							Mary Hudak
							Martin Jones
							Frederic Knapp
							Gordon Leong
							Kenneth Regio
							Joseph Sawyer, Jr.
							Alexander Senchak
							Richard Springerwater
							Margaret Trezevant
							Philip Woods
							Raymond Buenaventura
Filipino American Development Foundation/Fin@y Educational Partnerships (PEP)	1010 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94103	\$50,000	Academic support and college credits in Ethnic Studies for high school students	Bernadette Sy			Michelle Ferrer
							Bunice Mae Lee
							Dawn Mabalon
							Allyson Tintiangco-Cubales
							Joan Vitorelo
							Claire Zamora
Filipino American Development Foundation: Filipino Community Center	1010 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94103	\$70,000	Multi-services primarily for the Filipino community	Bernadette Sy			Ligaya Avenida
							Martine Bamba
							Fred Bitanga
							Erwin Bonilla

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
							Benadette Borja Sy
							Richard Cerbatos
							Chito Desusado
							Lourdes Tancinco
							Jon Braslav
Friends of the Urban Forest	PO Box 29456, San Francisco, CA 94129	\$40,000	Planting of 270 trees for a healthier urban forest as part of San Francisco's green infrastructure in BV-HP, Excelsior, Portola and Visitacion Valley	Dan Flanagan	Tom Courtney		Eliza Brown
							David Covell
							Jeanne Darrah
							Jim DeGolia
							Karen Donovan
							John Farnham
							Marjorie Fochtman
							Jay Murphy
							Laura Tam
							Patricia Wilson
							Michelle Banaugh
Goodwill Industries of San Francisco, San Mateo & Marin Counties	1500 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94103	\$125,000	Criminal justice and re-entry services in support of the One Stop system	Gary Grellman	Gary Grellman	Gary Grellman	Jenny Cheng
							Suzanne DiBianca
							Lynda Grose
							Michael Joseph
							Kathy Salzmanowitz
							Lateefah Simon
							Michael Stajer
							Jane Vaughan
							Michael Weir
							Frank Williams
							Kenneth Wong
							Steven Bach
HealthRight 360	1735 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94103	\$78,700	Renovate portions of existing elevator in behavioral health facility serving youth, adults, and families	Vitka Eisen	David Crawford		Deborah Broyles
							Marilyn Cabak

2013-2014 CDBG Proposed Expenditures - Form 126 Attachment

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
							Ellen Chaitin
							Tom Christian
							Richard Coffey
							Eric Flowers
							Mindy Flynn Craig
							Harlan Grossman
							Graham Gunst
							Kathryn Holmes
							Jennifer Ilenstine
							John Kahler
							Harold Lowe
							Tamara Mason-Williams
							Ronetta Morgan
							Victor Ortiz
							Peter Sullivan
							Jeanne Woodford
							Roger Boas
Hearing and Speech Center of Northern California	1234 Divisadero Street, San Francisco, CA 94115	\$38,000	One-on-one or group counseling, psychosocial support for isolation due to hearing loss, family support and advocacy for adults and older adults with hearing loss	Darragh Kennedy	Patrick Gibbons		John Callander
							Jim Carby
							Paola Casey
							Thomas Engel
							Susan Hambrecht
							James Jones
							Karl Keeling
							Helen Lucy
							Larry Lustig
							William Mackey
							Tom Marlow
							Jan Minar
							Mike Simmons
							Leela Srinivasan

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
Hearing and Speech Center of Northern California	1234 Divisadero Street, San Francisco, CA 94115	\$42,500	Neighborhood Access Point and Young Adult WorkLink Services	Darragh Kennedy	Patrick Gibbons		Roger Boas
							John Callander
							Jim Canty
							Paola Casey
							Thomas Engel
							Susan Hambrecht
							James Jones
							Karl Keesling
							Helen Lucy
							Larry Lustig
							William Mackey
							Tom Marlow
							Jan Minar
							Mike Simmons
							Leela Srinivasan
Homeless Prenatal Program, Inc.	2500 18th Street, San Francisco, CA 94110	\$90,000	Removal of carpeting and installation of marmoleum at facility where prenatal education, counseling, financial and training are provided to homeless and low-income families	Martha Ryan			Beverly Ashworth
							Tom Coyne
							Mildred Crear
							Linda Giffith
							Shelly Groves
							Mary Johnson
							Barbara Kimport
							Deborah Landres
							Barry Lipman
							Daniel Moreno
							Cindi Nicolas
							David Prowler
							Martha Ryan
							Catherine Stefani
HomeownershipSF	275 Fifth Street, San Francisco, CA 94103	\$30,000	Training and capacity building for homebuyer education providers	Kristy Koberna			Scott Burry

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
							Marco Chavarin
							Carren Connelly
							Jean Dunn
							Rick Harper
							Myrna Melgar
							Rafael Morales
							Alexis Nerguizian
							Johnny Oliver
							Pov Oum
							Keith Rockmael
							Shannon Way
							Daisy Ambia
Independent Living Resource Center of SF	649 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94105	\$55,000	Housing stabilization and tenant education services	Jessie Lorenz			Linda Casson
							Marti Goddard
							Elizabeth Grigsby
							Nikolai Kirienko
							Arnie Lerner
							Julia Ling
							Charles McNulty
							Karna Quick
							Helen Zane
Independent Living Resource Center of SF	649 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94105	\$100,000	Accessibility upgrades to replacement site recently leased from TODCO that serves 500 disabled clients annually with services that enhance independent living	Jessie Lorenz			Linda Casson
							Marti Goddard
							Elizabeth Grigsby
							Nikolai Kirienko
							Arnie Lerner
							Julia Ling
							Charles McNulty
							Karna Quick
							Helen Zane

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
In-Home Supportive Services Consortium of San Francisco, Inc.	1390 Market Street, San Francisco, CA 94102	\$50,000	Vocational skills training in the health care sector	Margaret Baran	Mark Burns	Mark Burns	Margaret Baran Mark Burns Robert Carlson Gail Fivis Andrew Gaines Gay Kaplan Ben Kutnik Richard Levy Forrest Malakoff Clare Murphy Jessica Pitt Nancy Rasch Art Wolf Earl Averette
Instituto Laboral de la Raza	2947 16th Street, San Francisco, CA 94103	\$60,000	Legal services for low-income immigrant workers	Sarah Shaker	Sarah Shaker	Sarah Shaker	Oscar De La Torre Jaime Gonzalez Rudy Gonzalez Frank Martin Del Campo Brian McWilliams Laurie Mesa Samuel Robinson Dan Rush Freddy Sanchez John Ulrich Oliver Dunlap
Japanese Community Youth Council (JCYC)/Japantown Task Force	2012 Pine Street, San Francisco, CA 94115	\$40,000	One-on-one assistance for businesses to economically stabilize and strengthen neighborhood businesses primarily targeting microenterprises in the Japantown commercial core area	Jon Osaki	Jean Ijichi		Dave Jung Ronald Kobata Angus MacDonald Peter Managna

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
La Cocina	2948 Folsom Street, San Francisco, CA 94110	\$50,000	Commercial kitchen and business incubator that supports the development of micro-enterprises	Caleb Zigas			Amy Sujishi Evan Wayne Michelle Branch
							Maleta Chavez
							Alec Hughes
							Larry Louie
							Michelle Magat
							Monica Morse
							Judy Patrick
							Tannis Reinbertz
							Kristin Rubin
							Jane Segal
La Raza Centro Legal	474 Valencia Street, San Francisco, CA 94103	\$50,000	Legal services for immigrants	Genevieve Gallegos			Angelina Cheney
							Bob Erickson
							Julio Loyola
							David Lunas
							Hector Martinez
							Robert Shen
							Mariano Contreras
La Raza Community Resource Center	474 Valencia Street, San Francisco, CA 94103	\$80,000	Legal services for immigrants	Melba Maldonado			Frank Fernandez
							Annette Goldman-Mosqueda
							Bob Hernandez
							Sal Morales
							Enrique Ramirez
							Martin Seidman
							Bernardo Silva
							Rene Velazquez
Larkin Street Youth Services	701 Sutter Street, San Francisco, CA 94109	\$175,000	Renovate bathroom and flooring in homeless transition age youth shelter	Sherilyn Adams			Chris Brahm
							Connie Curran
							Charles Dicke

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
							Mark Edmunds
							Amie Ellicott
							Philip Estes
							Conor Famulener
							Art Fatum
							Anita Feiger
							Julie Harkins
							Nina Hatvany
							Jim Henry
							Victoria (Honey) Johnson
							Blake Jorgensen
							Terry Kramer
							Laura Powell
							Mary Prehal
							Philip Schlein
							Aaron Schwartz
							Christopher Tatum
							Christine Tsingos
							Carla Washington
							John Whiting
							Charles Wibbelsman
							Victoria Willock
							Linda Wood
							Allison Wysocki
Lavender Youth Rec. & Info. Ct.(LYRIC)	127 Collingwood Street, San Francisco, CA 94114	\$50,000	Youth advocacy, case management support services and connection to critical services for LGBTQ youth	Jodi Schwartz			Jamie Lee Brandi
							Lorenzo Herrera Y Lozano
							Macio Kendrick
							Mark Sanchez
							Alexander Tran
							John Viet
							Tracy Zhu

2013-2014 CDBG Proposed Expenditures - Form 126 Attachment

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
Legal Assistance to the Elderly	995 Market Street, San Francisco, CA 94103	\$30,000	Legal services focused on housing, primarily for low-income seniors and adults with disabilities	Howard Levy			Mary Foran
							Deborah Fox
							Richard Hurlburt
							Ed Illumin
							Patricia Lavin
							Roger Levin
							Adam Lewis
							Tom Weathered
Mercy Housing California	1360 Mission Street, Suite 300 Street, San Francisco, CA 94103	\$65,000	Outreach, referrals and wrap-around support primarily for Sunnydale public housing residents	Doug Shoemaker	Valerie Agostino	Jane Graf	Valerie Agostino
							Lloyd Dean
							Vince Dodds
							Jamet Falk
							Anita Feiger
							Renee Franken
							Jane Graf
							Edie Heilman
							Andrea Jones
							Marilyn Lacey, RSM
							first last
							Howard Levine
							Timothy O'Brien
							Diane Olmstead
							Craig Reigel
							Susan Wang Wade
							Gregory Wolkom
Mission Asset Fund	2301 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94110	\$20,000	Training and capacity building for community organizations to use a new online screening and referral tool that connects people to services	Jose Quinonez		Daniela Salas	Oscar Grande
							Anamaria Loya
							Mona Masri
							Ian McLeod

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
							Haydee Moreno Sam Ruiz Manuel Santamaria
Mission Asset Fund	2301 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94110	\$65,000	Financial education, coaching and access to peer lending circles (loans); and technical assistance/support to train three partner agencies to implement the Lending Circles Model	Jose Quinonez		Daniela Salas	Oscar Grande
							Anamaria Loya Mona Masri Ian McLeod Haydee Moreno Sam Ruiz Manuel Santamaria Oscar Grande
Mission Asset Fund	2301 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94110	\$50,000	Access to capital services, primarily targeting low-income micro-entrepreneurs	Jose Quinonez		Daniela Salas	Anamaria Loya Mona Masri Ian McLeod Haydee Moreno Sam Ruiz Manuel Santamaria My Do
Mission Economic Development Agency	2301 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94110	\$35,000	Financial education, counseling and coaching services to enable clients to reach a broad continuum of financial goals	Luis Granados			Jane Duong Karoleen Feng Jenny Flores Susan Harper Jabari Herbert Jesse Martinez William Ortiz Leigh Phillips Kevin Stein Michelle Yun

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
Mission Economic Development Agency	2301 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94110	\$135,000	Pre- and post-purchase homebuyer education and counseling services	Luis Granados			My Do Jane Duong Karoleen Feng Jenny Flores Susan Harper Jabari Herbert Jesse Martinez William Ortiz Leigh Phillips Kevin Stein Michelle Yun My Do
Mission Economic Development Agency	2301 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94110	\$125,000	Business technical assistance program that provides a continuum of services in English and Spanish to support the growth and success of micro-enterprises	Luis Granados			Jane Duong Karoleen Feng Jenny Flores Susan Harper Jabari Herbert Jesse Martinez William Ortiz Leigh Phillips Kevin Stein Michelle Yun My Do
Mission Economic Development Agency	2301 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94110	\$100,000	Neighborhood Access Point	Luis Granados			Jane Duong Karoleen Feng Jenny Flores Susan Harper Jabari Herbert Jesse Martinez William Ortiz Leigh Phillips

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
							Kevin Stein
							Michelle Yun
Mission Hiring Hall, Inc.	288 7th Street, San Francisco, CA 94103	\$100,000	Vocational skills training in the hospitality sector	Don Marcos			Carlota del Portillo
							Mark Farrar
							Kent Lim
							Charles "Rick" Moore
							Susana Razo
							Jaime Rossi
							Holli Thier
							Shanna Trujillo
							Bill Wong
Mission Housing Development Corporation	474 Valencia Street, San Francisco, CA 94103	\$30,000	Rehabilitation of the elevator at the Altamont Hotel	Larry Del Carlo	Cindy Fung		Gloria Bonilla
							Pete Gallegos
							Ramon Hernandez
							Toby Levine
							Viola Maestas
							Rosalina Tolentino
							Shirley Wang
Mission Language and Vocational School, Inc.	2929 19th Street, San Francisco, CA 94110	\$100,000	Vocational skills training in the health care sector	Rosario Anaya			Paul Alvarado
							Esther Casco
							Jose Chapa
							Eurania Lopez
							Carlos Rodriguez
							Eva Royale
							Diane Verdugo
Mission Neighborhood Centers	362 Capp Street, San Francisco, CA 94110	\$50,000	Evening program and multi-services for transitional age youth	Santiago E. Ruiz	Michael Brown	Maria Bermudez	Sebastian Alioto
							Chris Collins
							Zonia Lei
							Michael Lester
							Pablo Marull
							Kimberly Pikul
							Tiffany Rasmussen

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
							Dr. Liliana Rossi
							Gladys Sandlin
							Daniel Windome
							Sebastian Alloto
Mission Neighborhood Centers	362 Capp Street, San Francisco, CA 94110	\$150,000	Upgrades to facility owned by Archdiocese of SF that will be used to relocate 100 Head Start children from their current location on 24th Street at Harrison Street	Santiago E. Ruiz	Michael Brown	Maria Bermudez	
							Chris Collins
							Zonia Lei
							Michael Lester
							Pablo Marull
							Kimberly Pikul
							Tiffany Rasmussen
							Dr. Liliana Rossi
							Gladys Sandlin
							Daniel Windome
							George Bach-y-Rita
Mission Neighborhood Health Center	240 Shotwell Street, San Francisco, CA 94110	\$39,000	Leadership development for homeless individuals at a drop-in day shelter program	Brenda Storey	Sylvia Siu	Patty Caplan	
							Tracy Brown
							Brad Kittredge
							Karla Magana
							Maria Molinero
							Charles Moser
							Lynette Peralta-Haynes
							Francisco Sanchez
							Ricardo Wohler
							Leslie Chard
Mission SF Community Financial Center	3269 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94110	\$50,000	Financial services, including credit building loans and repair counseling, to reduce and eliminate barriers to asset-building for extremely low- and low-income asset poor individuals	Margaret Libby			
							Gerald Richards
							Jeanette Tevis

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
Nihonmachi Legal Outreach	1121 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94103	\$75,000	Culturally and linguistically competent social and legal services primarily for the API community, including legal representation, counseling and referrals in a wide range of civil legal issues	Dean Ito Taylor			Jerry Weitz Shaamini Babu
							Jesiros "Don" Bautista
							Brian Budds
							Komal Chokshii
							Claire Choo
							Charles Jung
							Donna Kotake
							Minette Kwok
							Deanna Kwong
							Koji Oka
							Myron Okada
							Avantika Shastri
							Janel Thamkul
							Lelah Adler
Nihonmachi Little Friends	2031 Bush Street, San Francisco, CA 94115	\$100,000	Half the cost of a 3-story elevator in an expansion site adjacent to NLF's building at 1830 Sutter Street allowing 56 new preschoolers (92 total) and rooftop play area	Cathy Inamasu			
							Sena Chun
							Peter Herzstein
							Victor Hwang
							John Lei
							Curtis Lowe
							Kathy Michihira
							Jaime Monroy
							Joyce Oishi
							Adrienne Shiozaki-Woo
							Ken Sogabe
							Rae Tokushige

Agency/Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
North of Market Neighborhood Improvement Corp.	PO Box 420483, San Francisco, CA 94142	\$70,000	Provide capacity building support to existing and new businesses seeking to locate in Central Market	Elvin Padilla			Cecelia Vollaro Dai Yoshida Terrance Alan
							Byron Chung Seamus Doughlon Art Evans Carmela Gold Jo Licata David Seward Deanna Sison Paul Sussman Steven Bernard
North of Market/Tenderloin Community Benefit Corporation	134 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102	\$80,000	Installation of an attended, portable (permanently placed) multiple-toilet facility in the Tenderloin	Dina Hilliard			Pam Coates Emilio Graudobit Ron Hicks Clint Ladine Kathy Looper Sarvinder Multani Nilesh Patel Kate Robinson Simon Sin Gayle Wood Michael Chan
Northeast Community Federal Credit Union	683 Clay Street, San Francisco, CA 94111	\$50,000	Financial services, including credit building and repair counseling, primarily for the unbanked population	Lily Lo	Lily Lo	Lily Lo	Cecilia Eng Johnson Hor Tommy Huie Sophie Karet Linda Rochelle Joanne Yee

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
Northern California Community Loan Fund	870 Market Street, San Francisco, CA 94102	\$150,000	Asset management planning for CDBG/HOPWA facilities	Mary Rogier	C. Lea Salem		Elizabeth Boardman
							Linda Boessenecker
							Ann Cameron
							Moy Eng
							Patricia Gopaul
							Andy Madeira
							Amy Rassen
							Ilana Schatz
							John Sedlander
							Margaret (Peg) Stone
							Lydia Tan
							Kirke Wilson
							Anna Yee
Ocean Avenue Association	1728 Ocean Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94112	\$30,000	One-on-one assistance for businesses to economically stabilize and strengthen neighborhood business districts in the Ocean Merced Ingleside	Daniel Weaver	Henry Kevane	Howard Chung	Dale Allendar
							Howard Chung
							Walee Gon
							Reverend Gordon
							Hossam Kaddoura
							Henry Kevane
							Shirley Lima
							Bridget Miller
							Roger Seto
							Dan Weaver
Opportunity Fund Northern California	111 West St. John Street, San Jose, CA 95113	\$50,000	Access to capital services, primarily targeting low-income micro-entrepreneurs	Eric Weaver	Candice Balmaceda	Zuri Ruiz	Michael Gallagher
							Susan Harper
							Steven Kaufhold
							Pat Krackov
							David Krimm
							Ash McNeely
							Nancy Ragey
							Marc Rand

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
Pacific Community Ventures	51 Federal Street, San Francisco, CA 94107	\$50,000	Business technical assistance and access to capital for small businesses	Beth Snull	Carolyn Clarke		Yolanda Ruiz Robert Shoffner Ralph Clark
							Bud Colligan
							Judith Goldkrand
							Linda Graebner
							Mathilda Khabbez
							Paul Levitan
							Zander Laurie
							Lisa Maibach
							William Pace
							Teresa Pahl
							Beth Snull
Positive Resource Center	785 Market Street, San Francisco, CA 94103	\$50,000	Neighborhood Access Point	Brett Andrews	Mathew Bandiera	Pat Riley	Alex Khoo
							Laura Lee
							Robert Mason
							Bill Matheson
							Jacques Michaels
							Kent Roger
							Marko Sarian
							L. Julius M. Turman
Providence Foundation	4601 Third Street, San Francisco, CA 94124	\$45,000	Shelter beds and services for homeless persons	Helen LaMar			Bernadetta Anthony
							Clifford Bell
							James Blanding
							Alpha Buie
							Jason Butler
							Linnie Carrington
							Christopher Collins
							Julian Eison
							Arlana Spikener
Rebuilding Together San Francisco	Pier 28 The Embarcadero Blvd, San Francisco, CA 94105	\$30,000	Critical repairs on 25 homes and 25 community facilities through Rebuilding Day events	Karen Nemsick			Genevieve Cadwalader

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
							Lucia Casaravilla
							Tim Dupre
							Egan Hill
							Marcia Kadanoff
							William Lock
							Susan Saltgaver
							Richard Schimbor
							Kevin Skiles
							Diana Stauffer-
							Ramirez
Renaissance Entrepreneurship Center	275 5th Street, San Francisco, CA 94103	\$100,000	Entrepreneurial training, consultation and support for individuals starting micro- enterprises	Sharon Miller			Gerry Baranano
							Robert Chan
							Faith Cromwell
							George de Bruin
							Jonathan Dreyfus
							Ben Emmrich
							Feleciai Favroth
							Craig Jacoby
							Katy L. Johnson
							Lisa Joyner
							James Keefe
							Don Kinney
							Beth Peterson
							Arun Shekar
							Sandor Straus
							Beth Taska
							Kirsty Traill
							Feliciano Zavala
Renaissance Entrepreneurship Center	275 5th Street, San Francisco, CA 94103	\$100,000	Entrepreneurial consultation, training and support for small business owners and entrepreneurs primarily targeting the Bayview Hunters Point, Potrero Hill and Vistacion Valley neighborhoods	Sharon Miller			Gerry Baranano
							Robert Chan

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
							Faith Cromwell
							George de Bruin
							Jonathan Dreyfus
							Ben Ennrich
							Felecia Favroth
							Craig Jacoby
							Katy L. Johnson
							Lisa Joyner
							James Keefe
							Don Kinney
							Beth Peterson
							Arun Shekar
							Sandor Straus
							Beth Taska
							Kirsty Traill
							Feliciano Zavala
							Gerry Baranano
Renaissance Entrepreneurship Center	275 5th Street, San Francisco, CA 94103	\$140,000	Rebuild and renovate elevator in facility providing entrepreneurship training to economically diverse women and men from indigenous communities	Sharon Miller			
							Robert Chan
							Faith Cromwell
							George de Bruin
							Jonathan Dreyfus
							Ben Ennrich
							Felecia Favroth
							Craig Jacoby
							Katy L. Johnson
							Lisa Joyner
							James Keefe
							Don Kinney
							Beth Peterson
							Arun Shekar
							Sandor Straus
							Beth Taska
							Kirsty Traill

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
Richmond District Neighborhood Center	741 30th Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94121	\$30,000	Organizational capacity building for CDBG-funded neighborhood centers through participation in SF Neighborhood Centers Together, which offers training and peer support to Executive Directors	Patricia Kaussen			Feliciano Zavala Jeffrey Holloman
							Steven Leder
							Bonnie Levitt
							Anne Liang
							Eileen Louie
							Joanne Low
							Jonathan Lyens
							Peter Mansfield
							Viola Morris
							Lelia Mozingo
							Jamie Tate-Choy
							Anthony Zeller
							Angeli Fitch
Samoan Community Development Center	2055 Sunnydale Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94134	\$40,000	Case management, information, referral and translation services in nutrition, immigration and housing issues primarily targeting Samoan families in the Southeast sector	Patsy Tito			
							Douglas Fitch
							Rena Ilasa
							Meritiana Li
							Suhulagi Palega
							Julio Suisala
							Maioa Suisala
							Maina Tuimavave
							Louise Winterstein
San Francisco Community Land Trust	PO Box 420982, San Francisco, CA 94142	\$36,000	Education and technical assistance for residents and Boards of existing co-ops	Tracy Parent			Luis Barahona
							Omar Calimbias
							Kori Chen
							Hana Hardy
							Yu Chiu Kwan

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
							Lorenzo Listana
							Val Sinekler
							Kirby Ung
							Ken Wang
							Stephan Woo
San Francisco Conservation Corps	241 Fifth Street, San Francisco, CA 94103	\$50,000	Academic support for transitional age youth	Ann Cochrane	Karyn Knoel	Janet Gomes	Burt Butch
							Charles Castillo
							William M.
							Fleishacker
							Maurice Guillen
							Eleanor Johns
							Laurie A. Kahn
							Michael Kim
							Gerry Klein
							Celia W. Lee
							Sandra Mcubbin
							Bob Molineaux
							Kevin Murphy
							Noel Obiora
							Shawn Smith
							Start Spangler
San Francisco Conservation Corps	241 Fifth Street, San Francisco, CA 94103	\$100,000	Installation of stationary high tech recycling equipment to increase efficiency and safety at recycling facility that trains and employs low income youth	Ann Cochrane	Karyn Knoel	Janet Gomes	Burt Butch
							Charles Castillo
							William M.
							Fleishacker
							Maurice Guillen
							Eleanor Johns
							Laurie A. Kahn
							Michael Kim
							Gerry Klein
							Celia W. Lee
							Sandra Mcubbin

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
							Bob Molineaux
							Kevin Murphy
							Noel Obiora
							Shawn Smith
							Starr Spangler
							Eve Combs
San Francisco Housing Development Corporation	4439 3rd Street, San Francisco, CA 94124	\$60,000	Pre- and post-purchase homebuyer education and counseling services, including foreclosure prevention	Stephen Maduli- Williams			
							Shirley Hamilton
							Jabari Herbert
							Leah Pimentel
							Darnell Robinson
							Chuck Turner
							Dorris Vincent
							Eddie Walker
San Francisco Parks Alliance/Mission Community Market	2101 Folsom Street, San Francisco, CA 94110	\$40,000	Mercado Plaza with DPW and food & craft micro entrepreneurs to set up street stalls, canopies, to provide culturally competent information for family nutrition, reduce obesity	Jeremy Shaw	John Stoner		Phil Arnold
							Rosemary Cameron
							Nancy Conner
							Christine Gardner
							Connie Goodyear
							Baron
							Steven Gwozdz
							Veronica Humnicutt
							L. Jasmine Kim
							Courtney Klinge
							Fran Martin
							Mary McCue
							Jonathan Rewers
							Mollie Ward Brown
							Marcel Wilson

AgencyName	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
San Francisco School Alliance	114 Sansome Street, San Francisco, CA 94104	\$20,000	Organizational capacity building for community based organizations through participation in the Family Economic Success Certification Program, which offers training and peer support to nonprofit benefits providers	Terry Bergeson	Fred Tse	Justin Schleifer	Milton Chen
							Adam Cioth
							Nancy Greenen
							Ann Greenlee Cairo
							Rich Gunn
							Phil Halperin
							Larry Kane
							Eric McDonnell
							Hydra Mendoza
							Sophie Middlebrook
							Hayward
							Lisbet Sunshine
							John Burks
San Francisco Study Center - Housing Rights Committee of San Francisco/Hous	944 Market Street, San Francisco, CA 94102	\$85,000	Tenant counseling and eviction prevention services	Geoff Link			Herb Chao Gunther
							Libby Denebeim
							Ben Fong Torres
							Reiko Homma True, Phd.
							Richard Livingston
							Sas Margaritis
							James D. McWilliams, Esq.
							Edgar Mercado
Self-Help for the Elderly	407 Sansome Street, San Francisco, CA 94111	\$50,000	Tenant counseling and advocacy and eviction prevention assistance primarily for elderly renters	Anni Chung	Anthony Tam	Andy Bryant	Anni Chung
							Gladys Hu
							Rosalyn Koo
							Janie Kuang
							Beverly Lee

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
							Jerry Lee
							Katrina Lee Bong
							Billy Leung
							Dominic Li
							Joanna Lin
							Patricia Mar
							William Schulte
							Philip Tam
							May Wong
							Sebastian Wong
							Susan Woo
SFMade	2617 19th Street, San Francisco, CA 94110	\$65,000	Entrepreneurial consultation, training and support for small business owners and entrepreneurs primarily targeting the eastern neighborhoods in the manufacturing sector	Kate Sofis	Kate Sofis	Janet Lees	Alicia Allbin
							John Dannerbeck
							Mark Dwight
							Maureen Futtner
							Peter Goetze
							Gary Groff
							Jeff Gustafson
							Robin McRoskey- Azevedo
							Maggie Mui
							Scott Smith
							Kate Sofis
							Malaika Thorne
							Wenli Wang
South of Market Foundation	1083 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94103	\$100,000	Entrepreneurial consultation, training and support for small business owners and entrepreneurs primarily targeting Sixth Street in the South of Market	Jenny McNulty			Chris Jennings
							Leslie Keil
							Sheryl Koga
							Benson Lai

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
							Kathy Mates
							Paula Mattisonsterra
							Mark Rennie
							Mercy Ringelmann
							Tieytnas Stephenson
							Will Thacher
							Richard Allman
South East Asian Community Center	875 O'Farrell Street, San Francisco, CA 94109	\$120,000	Entrepreneurial consultation and support for primarily Asian and Pacific Islander small business owners	Philip T. Nguyen	Michelle Pan		Richard Allman
							Mudbhary Blue
							Haseeb Chaudhry
							Channon Chhim-Reeves
							Tho Thi Do
							Brian Larkin
							Anh Tuan Le
							Paul Reeves
							Kelly Costa
Sunset District Comm. Develop. Corp.	3918 Judah Street, San Francisco, CA 94122	\$50,000	Intensive case management for youth at risk or involved with the juvenile justice system	Dawn Stueckle			Tom Giles
							Keith Hitchcock
							Dawn Stueckle
							Donald Williams
							Jenny Yung
							Paul Cox
Swords to Plowshares Veterans Rights Organization	1060 Howard Street, San Francisco, CA 94103	\$81,000	Legal counseling and representation for veterans	Michael Blecker	John Beem	Leon Winston	Alexandra Crichtlow
							Rick Houlberg
							Maceo May
							Peter McCorkell
							Stephen Plath
							Larry Rosenberger
							Ian Sharpe
							Steve Snyder

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
							Joanette Sorkin
							Stacey Sprenkel
							Javier Tenorio, Jr.
							Robert Trevorrow
							Townsend Walker
							Ken Brophy
							Pamela Coates
							Otto Duffy
							Phillip Morgan
							Dean Preston
							Chris Tiedeman
							Randy Wilson
							Noreen Beiro
							Dr. Deborah Bremond
							Donald Falk
							Saul Feldman
							Hydeh Ghaffari
							John Hamilton
							Dina Hilliard
							Dave Kroot
							Burni Lee
							Dick McNeil Jr.
							Josh Mukhopadhyay
							Patrick Murcia
							Elizabeth Orlin
							Brad Paul
							Jan Peters
							Ascanio Pionelli
							Samia Rashed
							Nicole Rivera
							John Rogers
							Loren Sanborn
							Margaret Schrand
Tenderloin Housing Clinic, Inc.	126 Hyde Street, San Francisco, CA 94102	\$87,500	Legal counseling and representation for tenants threatened with eviction	Randy Shaw			
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation	201 Eddy Street, San Francisco, CA 94102	\$86,000	Refinance and re-syndication of 13 buildings, totaling 1,309 units	Donald S. Falk	Paul Sussman	Liz Orlin	

2013-2014 CDBG Proposed Expenditures - Form 126 Attachment

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation	201 Eddy Street, San Francisco, CA 94102	\$117,000	Rehabilitate 12 projects under their Capital Improvement Program that will include end-of-life replacements of building systems, such as roofing and heating, as well as projects to enhance safety and security	Donald S. Falk	Paul Sussman	Liz Orlin	Ed Schultz Tom Sebekos Dave Seiler Paul Sussman Elizabeth Tracey Noreen Betto
							Dr. Deborah Bremont Donald Falk Saul Feldman Hydeth Chaffari John Hamilton Dina Hilliard Dave Kroot Bumi Lee Dick McNeil Jr. Josh Mukhopadhyay Patrick Murcia Elizabeth Orlin Brad Paul Jan Peters Ascanio Piomelli Samia Rasheed Nicole Rivera John Rogers Loren Sanborn Margaret Schrand Ed Schultz Tom Sebekos Dave Seiler Paul Sussman Elizabeth Tracey

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
The Arc Of San Francisco	1500 Howard Street, San Francisco, CA 94103	\$50,000	Eviction prevention and housing counseling services for adults with developmental disabilities	Glenn Motola	Brian Wiegman	Alan Fox	Gary Bong
							Dan Cousins
							Spencer DeBella
							Liz Elmore
							Jim Emerich
							Cary Fulbright
							Todd Janzen
							Mark Marshall
							Larry Melillo
							Kirsten Mellor
							Christine Ouano
							Margaret Rosegay
							Karen Schneider
							Jonathan Strober
							Julie Teryheden
							George Dolim
The Janet Pomeroy Center	207 Skyline Blvd, San Francisco, CA 94132	\$100,000	Roof renovation in facility providing recreation and vocational opportunities for people with disabilities	John McCue			
							Mary Flynn
							Clara Giannini
							Richard G. Kampmann
							Earl A. Lawrence, Jr.
							Davin McAndrews
							Tom McGraw
							Matthew Miller
							Edward J. Reidy
							John J. Ring
							Amanda J. Sargison
							Marie Norton Simpson
							Walter Slater

2013-2014 CDBG Proposed Expenditures - Form 126 Attachment

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
Together United Recommitted Forever (T.U.R.F.)	1652 Sunnydale Street, San Francisco, CA 94134	\$30,000	Case management and multi-services primarily for transitional age youth living in Sunnydale	Kim Mitchell			Diane Frappier
							Al Norman
							Mitchell Salazar
							Shelly Tatum
							Diane Frappier
Together United Recommitted Forever (T.U.R.F.)	1652 Sunnydale Street, San Francisco, CA 94134	\$50,000	Community building primarily for Sunnydale public housing residents	Kim Mitchell			Al Norman
							Mitchell Salazar
							Shelly Tatum
							Steven Crabiel
Toolworks	25 Kearny Street, San Francisco, CA 94108	\$55,000	Neighborhood Access Point	Steven Crabiel	Jamie Schaffner	Stefan Lazar	Arthur Eidelhoeh
							Lynn Holman
							Barbara Lawson
							Stefan Lazar
							Philip Meza
							Jack Nathanson
							Alice Nemon, Ph.D.
							Marjorie Qualey
							Jamie Schaffner
							Bruce Wecker
							Carl Whitaker
							Lauren Bell
United Playaz	1038 Howard Street, San Francisco, CA 94103	\$55,000	Case management for transitional age youth	Rudy Corpuz	Carolyn Caldwell	Carolyn Caldwell	Glendon Hyde
							John Kelly
							Vajra Obolu
							Misha Olivas
							Jessica Phyto
							Bob Twomey
							Wyatt Woo
Upwardly Global	582 Market Street, San Francisco, CA 94104	\$75,000	Neighborhood Access Point	Nikki Ciccerani			Sabina Ahmed
							Adam Edwards

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
							Jennifer Engerman
							Martha Gallo
							Jennifer Geissel-Zervigon
							Bob Glass
							Todd Harding
							Hope Hardison
							Kevin Kelly
							Peter Lee
							Jane Len
							Kevin McCabe
							Roger Nelson
							Wendy Zimmerman
Urban Services YMCA	1426 Fillmore Street, San Francisco, CA 94115	\$70,000	Multi-services and case management for transitional age youth	Wesley Rich	Kathy Cheng	Terri Teixeira	Mark Bley
							Colin Burke
							Roger Dickerson
							Kay Fitzpatrick
							Amy Lehman
							Kojo Mintia
							Ryan Ott
							Baillie Parker
							Sunny Potter
							Colt Sandler
							Luke Sikora
							Racheal Turner
							Roger Weinman
							Kyle Winkler
Vietnamese Community Center of SF	766 Geary Blvd, San Francisco, CA 94109	\$55,000	Information and referral and ESL instruction primarily for Vietnamese immigrants	Lan Le	HongNgoc Ngo	Thuy Doan	Julie Hoang
							Thien Huynh
							Luong Le
							Raymond Ly
							Chung Duc Nguyen
							Hoang Nguyen

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
							Lien Nguyen
							Mai Thy Nguyen
							Sieng Nguyen
							Tam Nguyen
							Hung Do Pham
							Christine Tran
							Tien Vo
Vietnamese Youth Development Center	166 Eddy Street, San Francisco, CA 94102	\$20,000	Strategic planning for four agencies serving primarily the Southeast Asian population	Judy Young			Jeni Bui
							Lily Chan
							Christie Dang
							Khoa Keith Nguyen
							Han Pham
							Wilson Song
							Toubi Sourichone
							Amy Tran
							Christine Tran
Vietnamese Youth Development Center	166 Eddy Street, San Francisco, CA 94102	\$60,000	Young Adult Bridge services	Judy Young			Jeni Bui
							Lily Chan
							Christie Dang
							Khoa Keith Nguyen
							Han Pham
							Wilson Song
							Toubi Sourichone
							Amy Tran
							Christine Tran
Women's Initiative for Self Employment	1398 Valencia Street, San Francisco, CA 94110	\$40,000	Business technical assistance primarily for new and existing low-income women-owned micro-enterprises	Nicole Levine	Audrey Agustin-Kirk		Deborah Barber
							Mark Brandemuhl
							Tracy Brophy Watson
							Julie Castro Abrams
							Lynne Crawford

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
							Alison Davis
							Joan Dea
							Elizabeth Fisher
							Nancy Green
							Naureen Hassan
							Rita Steel
							Lynn Sullivan
Wu Yee Children's Services	831 Broadway Street, San Francisco, CA 94133	\$45,000	Business technical assistance primarily for new and existing child care providers	Monica Walters			Debbie Chang
							Karen Lai
							Ki Lau
							Rebecca Lubens
							Roy Ng
							Bill Shen
							Suki Toguchi
							Neill Tseng
YMCA of San Francisco (Bayview)	631 Howard Street, San Francisco, CA 94105	\$50,000	Case management for transitional age youth	Gina Fromer	Kathy Cheng	Terri Texeira	Sophia Alvarez
							Jack Bair
							Bret Balonick
							Cliff Bell
							Theria Boyd
							Kimberly Brandon
							J. Alton Byrd
							Juliana Choy
							Rufus Davis
							Olivia Herriford
							Kathy Jamison
							Russell L. Jones
							Patti Lee
							Eric Prosnitz
							Bob Shokes
							Greg Suhr
							Lynette Sweet
							Derek Tolliver
							Jennifer Yelton

2013-2014 CDBG Proposed Expenditures - Form 126 Attachment

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
YMCA of San Francisco (Bayview)	50 California Street, San Francisco, CA 94111	\$245,000	Service connection and community building primarily for Hunters View public housing residents	Gina Fromer	Kathy Cheng	Terri Teixeira	Jed York Sophia Alvarez
							Jack Bair
							Bret Balonick
							Cliff Bell
							Theria Boyd
							Kimberly Brandon
							J. Alton Byrd
							Juliana Choy
							Ruth Davis
							Olivia Herford
							Kathy Jamison
							Russell L Jones
							Patti Lee
							Eric Prosnitz
							Bob Shokes
							Greg Suhr
							Lynette Sweet
							Derek Toliver
							Jennifer Yellon
							Jed York
YMCA of San Francisco (Bayview)/United Council/United Council of Human Serv	631 Howard Street, San Francisco, CA 94105	\$50,000	Day shelter for homeless individuals	Gina Fromer	Cheng Kathy	Terri Teixeira	Malene Curry-Lucky
							Joe Johnson
							Phyllia Peterson
							Fredrick Shumate
							Emma Stewart
							Margie Stokes
							Mary Thomas
							Richard Wood
Young Community Developers, Inc.	1715 Yosemite Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94124	\$65,000	Neighborhood Access Point and Young Adult WorkLink Services	Shamann Walton		Dion-Jay Brooker	A. Neal Bailey
							Claude Everhart
							Manny Flores

Agency Name	Agency Address	2013-2014 Funding Amount	Project Description	Chief Executive Officer	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Operating Officer	Board Members
							Dwayne Jones
							Shirley Jones
							DeWitt Lacy
							Sonya Merritt
							Toye Moses
							Sedrick Spencer
							Carol Tatum
							Mike Theriault
							Charles Turner
		\$9,402,499					

