

Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report

FY 2015-2016

Housing and Community Development Services

Todd Henderson, Director

September 13, 2016



Table of Contents

Executive Summary	2
CR-05 - Goals and Outcomes	4
CR-10 - Racial and Ethnic composition of families assisted.....	11
Describe the families assisted (including the racial and ethnic status of families	11
CR-15 - Resources and Investments 91.520(a).....	11
CR-20 - Affordable Housing 91.520(b).....	18
CR-25 - Homeless and Other Special Needs 91.220(d, e); 91.320(d, e); 91.520(c).....	20
CR-30 - Public Housing 91.220(h); 91.320(j)	24
CR-35 - Other Actions 91.220(j)-(k); 91.320(i)-(j)	25
CR-40 - Monitoring 91.220 and 91.230.....	28
CR-45 - CDBG 91.520(c)	29
CR-50 - HOME 91.520(d).....	30
CR-60 - ESG 91.520(g) (ESG Recipients only)	30
CR-65 - Persons Assisted	33
CR-70 – ESG 91.520(g) - Assistance Provided and Outcomes.....	35
CR-75 – Expenditures	36

Executive Summary

San Diego County Region

The San Diego County region (region) is comprised of 18 incorporated cities and 26 unincorporated communities. The region is over 4,000 square miles in area with 75 miles of coastline. The terrain rises from sea level to 6,535 feet on Hot Springs Mountain. In 2012, as reported by the U.S. Census, Population Division, the region's population was almost 3.2 million.

The County of San Diego

The County of San Diego (County) has over 17,000 employees and an annual operating budget of over \$5 billion. The County's mission is "to efficiently provide public services that build strong and sustainable communities" and its stated core values are "integrity, stewardship, commitment."

The context for all strategic and operational planning is provided by the County's vision of "a region that is Building Better Health, Living Safely and Thriving – Live Well San Diego." Strategic Initiatives focus the County's priorities in order to advance the County's vision. The 2015-2020 Strategic Initiatives are Healthy Families, Safe Communities, Sustainable Environments, and Operational Excellence.

Consolidated Plan

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requires cities, counties, and states that receive federal block grant funding to prepare consolidated plans. The federal block grant programs addressed in the County of San Diego Consortium 2015-19 Consolidated Plan (Consolidated Plan) are:

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) - CDBG funds may be used for certain activities that serve low and moderate income residents, as specified by the program regulations.

HOME Investment Partnership (HOME) - HOME funds may be used for housing activities that serve low and moderate income residents, as specified by the program regulations.

Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) - ESG funds may be used for the prevention of homelessness and homeless assistance, as specified by the program regulations.

The Consolidated Plan covers the jurisdictions within the County of San Diego Consortium. This includes areas known as the Urban County and HOME Consortium:

The Urban County – The Urban County is composed of the County unincorporated area and the CDBG participating cities of Coronado, Del Mar, Imperial Beach, Lemon Grove, Poway and Solana Beach.

The HOME Consortium - The HOME Consortium includes the Urban County and the participating cities of Carlsbad, Encinitas, La Mesa, San Marcos, Santee and Vista.

The County Housing and Community Development Services (HCDS) is the lead agency responsible for the preparation of the Consolidated Plan and related Annual Action Plan (hereafter referred to as “Annual Funding Plans”) and Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Reports (CAPERs). The Consolidated Plan was prepared in accordance with Title 24, Part 91 of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The main purpose of the Consolidated Plan is:

- To identify the grantee’s housing and community development (including neighborhood and economic development) needs, priorities, goals and strategies and
- To specify funding allocation priorities for housing and community development activities.

CAPER

This annual performance report describes activities that were undertaken during Fiscal Year (FY) 2015-16, using Federal funds granted to the County of San Diego Consortium by HUD for the CDBG, HOME, and ESG Programs. The City of San Diego is the entitlement jurisdiction for the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) Program and, by agreement with the City, the County administers the HOPWA Program. The City of San Diego 2015-16 annual performance report will provide relevant information pertaining to the HOPWA Program.

SUMMARY OF THE OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOMES IDENTIFIED IN THE PLAN

The Consolidated Plan addresses the needs, priorities, goals, and allocation strategies for CDBG, HOME, and ESG funding for the period between July 1, 2015 and June 30, 2020. References are also made to the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) Program, which the County administers on behalf of the region’s HOPWA grantee, the City of San Diego.

All activities carried out by the County must conform to its mission, values, and the ‘Live Well San Diego’ vision. The County has determined to direct its funding to two objectives:

Consolidated Plan Objective 1: **Provide suitable living environments for our region’s residents**

Consolidated Plan Objective 2: **Enhance the quality of life for residents by encouraging decent and affordable housing**

These objectives are to be achieved by the following three strategic goals:

Goal 1 - Housing and Supportive Services - Affordable, Livable, Supportive

Goal 2 - Public Improvements - Quality, Safety, Accessibility, Walkability

Goal 3 - Homeless Shelters and Services - Accessible, Available, Supportive

More details on the three strategic goals are described in Section CR-05 Goals and Outcomes of the CAPER attachment.

In May 2012, HUD's Office of Community Planning and Development (CPD) introduced the eCon Planning Suite, a collection of online tools to help grantees create market-driven, leveraged housing and community development plans. These tools are designed to help grantees with the needs analysis and strategic decision making required for the Consolidated Plan.

One of these tools, the Consolidated Plan Template is now required for all Consolidated Plans and subsequent Action Plans and CAPERs. Commencing with the 2015 CAPER, the CAPER must be submitted electronically through HUD's Integrated Disbursement and Information System (IDIS). A copy of the CAPER, which will be submitted via IDIS, follows in this attachment.

CR-05 - Goals and Outcomes

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

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

Goal Description

1. **Goal Name:** Housing and Supportive Services – Affordable, Livable, Supportive
Goal Description: Increase the availability of affordable, supportive, and livable housing.

Objectives and Goal Outcome Indicators:

- Provided homeowner rehabilitation – Goal: 20 households to be assisted. Results: 42 low-income households (below 80 percent AMI) were assisted using \$414,603 in HOME funds and \$369,889 in CDBG funds.
- Funded homebuyer assistance – Goal: 20 households to be assisted. Results: 86 low income households were provided financial assistance to purchase their home. Total HOME funds disbursed for homebuyer assistance is \$2,859,563.
- Provided funding for housing services- Goal: Provide funding for 10 shared housing clients, 400 social service referral clients, and 300 fair housing client referrals. Results: Provided funding for 10 shared housing clients, 1,075 social service referral clients and 468 fair housing client referrals were assisted. All 10 shared housing clients are moderate-income or low-income (below 80 percent AMI). All 1,075 social services referral clients are low or moderate-income (below 80 percent AMI). Of the total 468 fair housing client referral clients, 453 are extremely-low, low-moderate, or moderate-income (below 80 percent AMI). Total CDBG funds expended for these public service activities is \$198,016.

- Administered Tenant-Based Rental Assistance- Goal: Assist 109 households. Results: 212 extremely-low and low-income households were provided rental assistance using a total of \$652,664 in HOME funds.
- Pursued and supported Rental Housing Development- Goal: Pursue and support 41 units of affordable housing to be constructed. Results: Construction of 41 affordable units is currently underway. Of the 41 units, 11 are HOME-assisted (three at below 50 percent AMI and eight at 60 percent of AMI). A total of \$1,940,000 in HOME funds was provided, of which \$1,252,143 has been disbursed.

2. **Goal Name:** Public Improvements - Quality, Safety, Accessibility, Walkability

Goal Description: Improve the quality, safety, accessibility, and walkability of communities by pursuing public facility improvement and ADA Improvement projects.

Objectives and Goal Outcome Indicators:

- Funded ADA improvements – Goal: Fund four ADA projects. Based on CDBG regulations, it is presumed that all four ADA projects will benefit low-income severely disabled adults. Results: A total of six ADA projects, including four that were funded in previous program years and two of the four that were funded in program year 2015, for a total of \$256,464, were completed during program year 2015.
- Funded fire facilities and Equipment- Goal: Fund three projects. All three projects qualified based on the low to moderate-income Census Block Group data and project service area (area benefit). Results: A total of seven fire station equipment projects, including four that were funded in program year 2014 and the three that were funded in program year 2015, for a cumulative total of \$1,439,389 in CDBG funds, were completed during this reporting period.
- Funded public facilities and improvements- Goal: Fund nine projects. All nine projects either: 1) qualify based on the low to moderate income Census Block Group data and project service area (area benefit) or 2) qualify based on the low to moderate income clientele population served (limited clientele). Results: Overall, a total of 32 projects (16 funded in program year 2015 and 16 funded in previous program years) with CDBG for a total of \$2,376,344, including the seven fire equipment projects and the six ADA projects mentioned above, were completed during this reporting period. The total amount of CDBG funds disbursed for public facilities projects, including open projects during this reporting period is \$2,750,384.

3. **Goal Name:** Homeless Shelters and Services - Accessible, Available, Supportive

Goal Description: Increase and maintain accessible, available, and supportive homeless shelters and services.

Objectives and Goal Outcome Indicators:

- Provided Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Rehousing assistance- Goal: Assist 100 persons. Results: Provided assistance to 251 persons who are extremely low-income (below 30 percent AMI). A total of \$410,820 in ESG funds was expended to support

these activities.

- Provided funding for Emergency Shelters- Goal: Assist 200 persons. Results: Provided assistance to 238 persons who are extremely low-income (below 30 percent AMI). A total of \$63,281 in ESG funds was expended to support Emergency Shelter activities.
- Supported Homeless Management Information System- Goal: Support 10,000 database clients. Results: Supported 44,299 database clients who are extremely low-income (below 30 percent AMI). A total of \$34,573 in CDBG funds was expended to support HMIS activities.
- Funded winter shelter programs- Goal: Assist 400 persons. Results: Assisted 677 persons who are extremely low-income (below 30 percent AMI). Total CDBG funds expended for the winter shelter program is \$90,230.

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

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

Goal	Category	Source / Amount	Indicator	Unit of Measure	Expected – Strategic Plan	Actual – Strategic Plan	Percent Complete	Expected – Program Year	Actual – Program Year	Percent Complete
Housing & Services-Affordable, Livable, Supportive	Affordable Housing Non-Homeless Special Needs	CDBG: \$ 74,249/ HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	2,500	503	20.12%	750	503	67.07%
Housing & Services-Affordable, Livable, Supportive	Affordable Housing Non-Homeless Special Needs	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Rental units rehabilitated or constructed	Household Housing Unit	100	0	0.00%	41	0	0.00%
Housing & Services-Affordable, Livable, Supportive	Affordable Housing Non-Homeless Special Needs	CDBG: \$369,889 / HOME: \$414,603 / ESG: \$	Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	100	25	25.00%	20	42	125.00%

Housing & Services-Affordable, Livable, Supportive	Affordable Housing Non-Homeless Special Needs	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$2,859,563 / ESG: \$	Direct Financial Assistance to Homebuyers	Households Assisted	100	86	86.00%	50	86	172.00%
Housing & Services-Affordable, Livable, Supportive	Affordable Housing Non-Homeless Special Needs	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$652,664 / ESG: \$	Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing	Households Assisted	400	212	53.00%	109	212	194.50%
Pub. Imp.-Quality, Safety, Accessible, Walkable	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$2,750,384 / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	435,000	43,348	9.97%	96,956	43,348	44.71%
Shelter & Services-Accessible, Available & Support	Homeless	CDBG: \$34,573 / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	50,000	44,299	88.60%	10,000	44,299	442.99%
Shelter & Services-Accessible, Available & Support	Homeless	CDBG: \$90,230 / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Homeless Person Overnight Shelter	Persons Assisted	2,000	677	33.85%	400	677	169.25%

Shelter & Services-Accessible, Available & Support	Homeless	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$63,281	Overnight/Emergency Shelter/Transitional Housing Beds added	Beds	1,000	238	23.80%	200	238	119.00%
Shelter & Services-Accessible, Available & Support	Homeless	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$410,819	Homelessness Prevention/Rapid Rehousing	Persons Assisted	500	251	50.20%	100	251	251.00%

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

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

CDBG funds are used to develop viable communities by providing safe and affordable housing, suitable living environments, and expanded economic opportunities.

Proposals were solicited from CDBG participating cities, residents, community groups, and County departments. CDBG cities also carried out their own public notice and participation processes and forwarded proposals for eligibility confirmation and approval. Eligible requests were referred to County departments for feasibility, cost estimates and, if appropriate, submission of department applications. Proposal review occurred in accordance with HUD requirements and Board approved policies and practices.

Recognizing that resources are limited to help the underserved, HCDS targeted CDBG, HOME and ESG funds to meet gaps in service and housing. CDBG funds supported housing and supportive services, public improvements and homeless shelters and services.

HOME Consortium funds were used for:

- Tenant-based rental assistance (TBRA).
- Acquisition, rehabilitation, or construction of affordable housing.
- Homebuyer Assistance.

As noted in the 2015-19 Consolidated Plan rental gaps analysis, the County has a significant unmet need in the provision of affordable rental units to extremely low-income, very low-income and special needs populations. HCDS offered HOME TBRA's to help reduce those gaps.

ESG funds were used to: engage homeless on the street; improve the number and quality of shelters; operate shelters; provide essential services; rapidly re-house; and, prevent homelessness.

HCDS consulted with the Regional Continuum of Care Council (RCCC) serving as the CoC in establishing ESG program prioritization and use, developing performance standards, evaluating outcomes and developing policies and procedures for the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). ESG funds supported projects within or serving the Urban County and were made available via a Notices of Funding Availability (NOFA) process. NOFA solicitation includes placement on the HCDS website and distribution to CoC providers. The obstacles facing the homeless population closely mirror obstacles to obtaining affordable housing in the San Diego region, yet in many ways the need is greater. The 2016 Point-in-Time count found 8,692 homeless persons with 4,940 unsheltered and 3,752 sheltered. There was an 18.9 percent increase in the number of unsheltered homeless and an 18.2 percent decrease in persons staying in shelters from 2015 to 2016.

HOPWA funds were used to assist persons with HIV/AIDS and their families by funding the following activities: housing, supportive services, housing information services, technical assistance, and administrative expenses. HCDS consulted with stakeholders in determining HOPWA allocation priorities. HCDS administers the HOPWA program on behalf of the City of San Diego, the HOPWA grantee.

HCDS intends to continue its collaborative efforts with County departments, non-profit and for-profit organizations, governmental agencies, state agencies, and other stakeholders to address issues within its jurisdiction and the region. These efforts will include discussions of effective policies and procedures, leveraging of resources, sharing of knowledge and expertise and potential collaborative efforts to address community needs.

CR-10 - Racial and Ethnic composition of families assisted

Describe the families assisted (including the racial and ethnic status of families assisted). 91.520(a)

	CDBG	HOME	ESG*
White	45,375	833	0
Black or African American	10,924	182	0
Asian	1,960	30	0
American Indian or American Native	1,053	11	0
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	872	13	0
Total	60,184	1,069	0
Hispanic	21,047	497	0
Not Hispanic	39,137	572	0

Table 2 – Table of assistance to racial and ethnic populations by source of funds

***Please refer to Section CR-65 for ESG information.**

Narrative

HCDS collects data on racial and ethnic composition throughout the annual action plan year. Data is collected in various formats including: sub-recipient CAPERs, approval of individual applications for entitlement funds, semi-annual and quarterly sub-recipient reports.

CR-15 - Resources and Investments 91.520(a)

Identify the resources made available

Source of Funds	Source	Resources Made Available	Amount Expended During Program Year
CDBG	Public/Federal	8,953,260	4,361,415
HOME	Public/Federal	5,815,099	4,340,206
ESG	Public/Federal	1,364,802	564,557

Table 3 - Resources Made Available

Narrative

CDBG:

The CDBG entitlement for FY 2015-16 was \$3,631,629. In addition, FY 2015-16 CDBG program income was estimated at \$250,000; actual program income received (which was derived from the City of Poway Residential Rehabilitation Program, the Urban County Residential Rehabilitation Program, the Mobile home Occupancy Assistance Program and Housing Development Loan Payments/Residual Receipts), totaled \$754,619. The total amount of funds committed for all CDBG activities in FY 2015-16, including prior-year carryover funds, was \$8,694,125. The total expenditures (drawn and accrued) for FY 2015-16 were \$4,361,415.

Of the \$4,361,415 expended in FY 2015-16, \$754,619 was from program income. Therefore, net expenditures for FY 2015-16 were \$3,606,796.

CDBG funds are distributed throughout the Urban County, which consists of the unincorporated area of the County, as well as the cities of Coronado, Del Mar, Imperial Beach, Lemon Grove, Poway, and Solana Beach. Each year an effort is made to distribute CDBG funds across the Urban County. No specific census tracts received a concentration of the CDBG funds

HOME:

HUD allocated \$2,169,331 in HOME funds to HCDS for FY 2015-16. \$1,000,000 was allocated to the HOME Consortium Down Payment and Closing Costs Assistance Program, \$460,000 was allocated to support continued tenant-based rental assistance activities, \$492,398 was reserved to fund rental housing development activities and approximately 10% (\$216,933) was allocated to administer the program. FY 2015-16 HOME program income was estimated at \$300,000; actual program income received totaled \$3,114,280.

The total amount of funds committed for all HOME activities in FY 2015-16, including prior-year carryover funds, was \$5,815,099, as of June 30, 2016. The total net expenditures for FY 2015-16 were \$2,902,788. During FY 2015-16, \$3,114,280 was received from program income derived from affordable rental housing development and recaptured homebuyer assistance loans. A total of \$1,940,000 in prior year HOME funds was allocated to partially finance construction of the Eastgate Family Affordable Housing Development. This mixed-use 42-unit development, including 11 HOME-assisted units, is located in the City of San Marcos (Census Tract 200.26) and is expected to be completed in December 2016.

ESG:

During FY 2015-16, HCDS received \$320,225 in ESG funding. No program income was generated under the ESG Program. The total amount of funds allocated for all ESG activities in FY 2015-16, including prior-year carryover funds, was \$579,942 (inclusive of \$27 in FY 2014-15 unspent ESG administration). \$24,016 was allocated for ESG program administration. Total ESG expenditures for FY 2015-16 were \$564,557. ESG funds were allocated in contracts, as follows: South Bay Community Services received \$143,850 for a Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-housing Program; the Interfaith Shelter Network of San Diego County (ISNSDC) received \$82,868 for emergency shelter operations and street outreach for a regional rotational shelter program; Community Resource Center (CRC) received \$51,450 for Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-housing Programs; Interfaith Community Services received \$216,662 for Street Outreach and Rapid Re-housing programs and the Housing Authority of the County of San Diego received \$61,069 for the VASH Security Deposit and Utility Deposit Assistance Program for eligible homeless veterans.

Identify the geographic distribution and location of investments

Target Area	Planned Percentage of Allocation	Actual Percentage of Allocation	Narrative Description

Table 4 – Identify the geographic distribution and location of investments

Narrative

Not applicable. The County has not designated specific geographic areas within its jurisdiction

to target or direct assistance. Entitlement funds are available throughout the Urban County for eligible CDBG and ESG activities, throughout the Consortium for eligible HOME activities and throughout the region for eligible HOPWA activities.

Leveraging

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

The County is highly engaged in the implementation and refinement of the Coordinated Assessment and Housing Placement (CAHP) system. This effort is focused on developing a homeless coordinated system to housing people experiencing homelessness. Other active members include philanthropy, private industry, local governments, Public Housing Authorities, non-profits and other stakeholders. These entities are aligning public and private resources to permanently house homeless person(s). During this reporting period, County staff participated in leadership roles on the: Opening Doors Leadership Committee, CoC Board, in addition to serving on the CAHP Advisory Committee.

The CoC Board, which includes HCDS staff and multiple County leaders, is tasked with enhancing the capacity to coordinate and leverage resources for various community sectors of the region.

County staff routinely emphasize to applicants the need to leverage Federal funds with local funds in order to stretch the benefit of the Federal dollars. These efforts have been fruitful and projects funded under CDBG, HOME, and ESG have substantially exceeded accomplishments that could be achieved from Federal funds alone. ESG requires a dollar-for-dollar match, which is yearly matched far in excess of the required minimum amount. Although there is no official match requirement in the CDBG program, in many cases other funds, such as private funds received through donors or fundraising activities, commercial loans, gas tax funds, and Park Lands Dedication Ordinance funds, are used to supplement and defray project costs. The HOME Match Report is included as an appendix to this CAPER (Appendix 5).

Fiscal Year Summary – HOME Match	
1. Excess match from prior Federal fiscal year	\$36,093,957
2. Match contributed during current Federal fiscal year	\$11,911,291
3. Total match available for current Federal fiscal year (Line 1 plus Line 2)	\$48,005,248
4. Match liability for current Federal fiscal year	\$507,665
5. Excess match carried over to next Federal fiscal year (Line 3 minus Line 4)	\$47,497,583

Table 5 – Fiscal Year Summary - HOME Match Report

Match Contribution for the Federal Fiscal Year								
Project No. or Other ID	Date of Contribution	Cash (non-Federal sources)	Foregone Taxes, Fees, Charges	Appraised Land/Real Property	Required Infrastructure	Site Preparation, Construction Materials, Donated labor	Bond Financing	Total Match
2864	07/01/2015	35,055	0	0	0	0	0	35,055
2865	07/02/2015	35,000	0	0	0	0	0	35,000
2866	07/06/2015	22,356	0	0	0	0	0	22,356
2874	07/27/2015	6,900,000	0	0	0	0	4,500,000	11,400,000
2895	10/28/2015	30,650	0	0	0	0	0	30,650
2896	10/30/2015	35,075	0	0	0	0	0	35,075
2911	11/25/2015	28,592	0	0	0	0	0	28,592
2912	11/22/2015	35,075	0	0	0	0	0	35,075
2914	11/24/2015	35,050	0	0	0	0	0	35,050
2916	11/30/2015	25,550	0	0	0	0	0	25,550
2919	12/11/2015	35,075	0	0	0	0	0	35,075
2950	03/04/2016	35,099	0	0	0	0	0	35,099
2951	03/08/2016	34,698	0	0	0	0	0	34,698
2952	03/16/2016	34,556	0	0	0	0	0	34,556
2954	03/28/2016	35,075	0	0	0	0	0	35,075
2955	04/04/2016	35,075	0	0	0	0	0	35,075
2956	04/15/2016	4,675	0	0	0	0	0	4,675
2960	04/29/2016	14,635	0	0	0	0	0	14,635

Table 6 – Match Contribution for the Federal Fiscal Year

HOME MBE/WBE Report

Program Income – Enter the program amounts for the reporting period				
Balance on hand at begin-ning of reporting period \$	Amount received during reporting period \$	Total amount expended during reporting period \$	Amount expended for TBRA \$	Balance on hand at end of reporting period \$
0	3,144,280	2,971,521	453,289	142,759

Table 7 – Program Income

Minority Business Enterprises and Women Business Enterprises – Indicate the number and dollar value of contracts for HOME projects completed during the reporting period						
	Total	Minority Business Enterprises				White Non-Hispanic
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	
Contracts						
Dollar Amount	\$497,740	0	\$494,740	0	0	\$3,000
Number	3	0	2	0	0	1
Sub-Contracts						
Number	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dollar Amount		0	0	0	0	0
	Total	Women Business Enterprises	Male			
Contracts						
Dollar Amount	\$464,280	\$464,280	0			
Number	2	2	0			
Sub-Contracts						
Number	0	0	0			
Dollar Amount	0	0	0			

Table 8 – Minority Business and Women Business Enterprises

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

Table 9 – Minority Owners of Rental Property

Relocation and Real Property Acquisition – Indicate the number of persons displaced, the cost of relocation payments, the number of parcels acquired, and the cost of acquisition		
Parcels Acquired	0	0
Businesses Displaced	0	0

Nonprofit Organizations Displaced	0	0
Households Temporarily Relocated, not Displaced	0	0

Households Displaced	Total	Minority Property Enterprises				White Non-Hispanic
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	
Number	N/A	0	0	0	0	0
Cost	N/A	0	0	0	0	0

Table 10 – Relocation and Real Property Acquisition

CR-20 - Affordable Housing 91.520(b)

Evaluation of the jurisdiction's progress in providing affordable housing, including the number and types of families served, the number of extremely low-income, low-income, moderate-income, and middle-income persons served.

	One-Year Goal	Actual
Number of homeless households to be provided affordable housing units		
Number of non-homeless households to be provided affordable housing units		
Number of special-needs households to be provided affordable housing units		
Total		

Table 11 – Number of Households

	One-Year Goal	Actual
Number of households supported through rental assistance	109	212
Number of households supported through the production of new units	41	(construction underway)
Number of households supported through the rehab of existing units	20	42
Number of households supported through the acquisition of existing units	20	86
Total	190	340

Table 12 – Number of Households Supported

Discuss the difference between goals and outcomes and problems encountered in meeting these goals.

It is not possible to delineate annual affordable housing goals by population type as requested in the two tables above. Per HUD requirements, the total for Table 11 must match Table 12, yet Table 12 program types do not capture all relevant activities. For example, some homeless population housing needs are supported through overnight shelters. This program type is not listed as an option in Table 12.

A detailed discussion of how HUD entitlements were used to support affordable housing needs and meet goals and outcomes is provided in Section CR-05, with the number of households assisted itemized by program activity.

Discuss how these outcomes will impact future annual action plans.

In addition to funding rental housing and homeownership programs, HCDS funds various

housing programs that are designed to maintain low-income families, seniors and disabled persons in their homes. CDBG and HOME funds are the primary source of funds for these program activities. The continued success of the Urban County Home Repair Program is an ideal example of using strategic planning in developing an annual action plan. The Urban County Home Repair Program provides low-interest deferred loans and grants to low-income homeowners and mobile home owners for comprehensive home repairs related to the health and safety of the homeowner. This program helps to maintain and upgrade the housing stock. HCDS will continue its efforts to upgrade and preserve existing affordable housing stock through its rehabilitation and rental housing development activities.

Future annual action plans will continue to focus on funding projects such as the Urban County Home Repair Program that promote the County’s strategic goal of Housing and Supportive Services – Affordable, Livable, Supportive. The goal is measured by increasing the availability of affordable, supportive, and livable housing opportunities.

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

Number of Persons Served	CDBG Actual	HOME Actual
Extremely Low-income	7	192
Low-income	8	123
Moderate-income	10	0
Total	25	315

Table 13 – Number of Persons Served

Narrative Information

HCDS collects data on racial and ethnic composition throughout the annual action plan year. Data is collected in various formats including: the use of HOME Program Activity Set-up and Completion forms, sub-recipient CAPERs, approval of individual applications for entitlement funds, semi-annual and quarterly sub-recipient reports. Data collected includes the number of owner and renter households served which are either extremely low-income, low-income or moderate-income.

“Worst-case housing needs” are defined as low-income renter households who pay more than half of their income for rent, live in seriously substandard housing, which includes homeless people, or have been involuntarily displaced. HCDS efforts to address “Worst case needs”, as well as the housing needs of persons with disabilities, are covered in Section CR-05 which also includes an evaluation of progress made in providing affordable housing assistance to these populations.

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

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

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

The County has consistently served as a key regional leader with the RCCC, serving on the CoC Board. Four of the 28 occupied seats are filled by County representatives. States, local governments, private non-profit organizations, and other eligible applicants compete for HUD grant funds through a national selection process. Eligible activities include leasing of facilities to serve the homeless, operating costs, supportive services, planning and coordinated entry. Certain activities require local matching funds. Grants are competitive and applications must meet strict HUD requirements. In the 2016 HUD NOFA funding cycle, the RCCC received \$17.8 million, including \$1.9 million for nine permanent housing programs administered by HCDS. Awards funded 59 programs; 47 renewals and 11 new projects.

The County will continue its work with the RCCC to create regional, collaborative approaches to connect the most acute homeless residents with the housing and services that fit their individual needs through the implementation of Coordinated Assessment and Housing Placement (CAHP).

The RCCC Governance Board acts on behalf of the CoC and represents relevant stakeholders, including multiple County representatives. The Board is responsible for regional planning, performance monitoring, fundraising and establishing policies. Current RCCC strategic objectives are outlined below:

Objective 1: Create new permanent housing beds for chronically homeless individuals.

Objective 2: Increase percentage of homeless persons staying in permanent housing over six months to at least 92 percent.

Objective 3: Increase percentage of homeless persons moving from transitional housing to permanent housing to at least 70 percent.

Objective 4: Increase percentage of persons employed at program exit to at least 24 percent.

Objective 5: Decrease the number of homeless households with children.

Addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

HCDS funds the winter shelter voucher program with CDBG funding and provides ESG funding for emergency shelters and homelessness prevention and rapid rehousing programs.

Helping low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless,

especially extremely low-income individuals and families and those who are: likely to become homeless after being discharged from publicly funded institutions and systems of care (such as health care facilities, mental health facilities, foster care and other youth facilities, and corrections programs and institutions); and, receiving assistance from public or private agencies that address housing, health, social services, employment, education, or youth needs

Viable employment opportunities are central to the prevention of homelessness. Local agencies, governments and higher education institutions coordinated training and employment services, including services for the general homeless, veterans, youth and disabled. Various one-stop centers offer free training and job placement. Many agencies provided job assistance to the homeless through coordinated case management.

Housing Authorities played a pivotal role assisting with housing challenges by providing rental assistance, first-time homebuyer programs and housing rehabilitation. Section 8 Programs and special-needs TBRA Programs linked individuals and families to various supportive programs and resources. Numerous pamphlets and information sheets were distributed to individuals and agencies that serve the homeless. This assisted in the prevention of homelessness by providing reliable resources for securing housing opportunities.

RCCC providers coordinated regional efforts to improve communication and provide accurate resources information. Liaisons assisted in coordinating the efforts of the RCCC with other local efforts. The RCCC advised local providers of available resources and continues to engage in efforts to preserve affordable housing units.

The Housing Authority of the County of San Diego (HACSD) has an MOU with the RCCC and other non-profit case management partners to house vulnerable homeless individuals and families. The MOU allowed participating organizations to refer eligible homeless persons to be assigned Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers.

Efforts to develop comprehensive policies and plans for discharge from public systems of care are being pursued strategically and include:

Foster Care

The Foster Care System discharge planning protocol included the following:

- A transitional independent living plan is developed for each youth at the age of 16.
- Review of reports about the youth's dependency case, including family and placement histories and the whereabouts of any siblings who are in the juvenile court;
- Anticipated termination date of court jurisdiction;
- Assessment of health care plans (if not already covered by Medi-Cal);
- Preparation of a legal document portfolio: Social Security card, birth certificate, driver's license and/or DMV I.D. card, copies of parent(s) death certificate(s), and proof of citizenship/residence status;

- Creation of a housing plan including referral to transitional housing or assistance in securing other housing;
- Employment or other financial support plans, and;
- Educational/vocational plans including financial aid, where appropriate.

The Department of Social Services, Independent Living Program Policy Unit, Child and Youth Permanency Branch protocol contains the process identified by the State. When appropriate, youth exit foster care with assistance. Independent living skills and subsidized housing programs assist transition-age youth.

Health Care

The County's Health and Human Services Agency (HHSA) is an integrated health and social services entity. On July 1, 2016, Housing and Community Development Services joined HHSA, as the County recognized that someone cannot be healthy if they do not have a home. HHSA has been actively involved with the RCCC and the community to improve behavioral and public health services to individuals who are experiencing homelessness in the areas of mental health, substance abuse treatment, for individuals who have HIV/AIDS or Tuberculosis, for youth transitioning out of foster care, and for teen mothers who do not have a stable home, among others. Services are provided throughout the region, including the City of San Diego and the 17 other cities within the County, as well as the unincorporated area.

HHSA has worked collaboratively with community partners, including community clinics and Medi-Cal managed care plans to implement and sustain "Project 25," which provides intensive wrap-around case management and treatment services to individuals who are high utilizers of public systems and homeless. The project provides housing paired with services tailored to the individual's unique needs.

Mental Health

Behavioral Health Services (BHS) are funded through the Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) which has provisions to serve homeless persons with serious mental illness who may have a co-occurring disorder. Treatment and an array of supportive housing services are provided in Full Service Partnerships/Assertive Community Treatment (FSP/ACT) programs. Supportive housing includes; short term, transitional and permanent supported housing. In addition homeless person can access multiple BHS services to include Alcohol and Drug Services, Emergency services, Acute Care and Long Term Care. Since April of this year, BHS began implementation of "Project One for All", which is a homeless program for persons with serious mental illness. This program will be a countywide service for 1,250 homeless persons with serious mental illness over the next three years. Treatment services will be paired with housing subsidies from different housing entities to include HCDS.

Corrections

HCDS collaborates with the San Diego Sheriff's Department (SDSD) in providing housing information in the community. SDSD has Correctional Counselors and Mental Health Clinicians

who provide reentry information to inmates upon release which includes housing, medical, mental health and substance abuse treatment in the community. During the booking process when people are admitted to the detention facilities, housing questions are asked and the data is collected. SDDS staff also encourage people to use 211 as an information source when they are in the community.

Helping homeless persons (especially chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth) make the transition to permanent housing and independent living, including shortening the period of time that individuals and families experience homelessness, facilitating access for homeless individuals and families to affordable housing units, and preventing individuals and families who were recently homeless from becoming homeless again

As outlined previously and in the Consolidated Plan, the County participated in the regional development of the Coordinated Assessment and Housing Placement system. Staff roles included active participation in both leadership and advisory capacities. The initiative is focused on developing a homeless coordinated assessment and housing placement system region-wide. Other active members included philanthropy, private industry, the City of San Diego, local non-profits and other stakeholders. These entities worked to align public and private resources to permanently house homeless person(s).

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

Actions taken to address the needs of public housing

Introduction:

The HACSD owns and administers four public housing rental complexes located in the City of Chula Vista, totaling 121 units, which include four units (one for each complex) set aside for managers. These units are available to low-income families, senior citizens, and/or disabled persons:

- *Dorothy Street Manor (22 family units located in Chula Vista)*
- *L Street Manor (16 family units located in Chula Vista)*
- *Melrose Manor Apartments (24 family units located in Chula Vista)*
- *Towncentre Manor (59 senior units located in Chula Vista)*

HACSD received \$154,906 in Capital Funds in FY 2015-16 for the modernization and operation of the four public housing developments. HACSD procured the services of a property management company through the Request for Proposals process and entered into a new contract effective September 2015. The property management company carried out property management, routine maintenance and tenant eligibility activities.

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

In 2002, the HACSD established a Public Housing Resident Advisory Board (RAB) for the four public housing developments. The RAB meets twice a year to discuss HACSD program issues and recommendations, as well as public housing capital plans. The RAB is comprised of public housing and Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program participants. Applications to become a member of the RAB are included with annual eligibility packets and are publicized in the semi-annual HACSD newsletters. In addition to the RAB meetings, a special capital plan meeting open to all public housing residents is held once a year. The HACSD currently has two tenant commissioners (appointed on June 1, 2015), who are participants of the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program. The two tenant commissioners each serve two-year terms on the HACSD Board of Commissioners.

Since 2003, the HACSD has been awarded several Resident Opportunities and Self-Sufficiency (ROSS) grants providing families, seniors and persons with disabilities with employment, education and support services that foster dignity, promote independent living, coordinate life skills workshops, improve financial literacy, and encourage education, training and self-sufficiency. The most recent award in August 2012 was a 3-year ROSS Service Coordinators grant. Service coordinators organize supportive services and other activities designed to help public housing residents attain economic and housing self-sufficiency. The program provides supportive services to families residing in the four public housing

developments. Program services include individual case management meetings, referrals to local resources and educational planning.

The HACSD continues to offer scholarships to public housing residents who are attending two or four-year colleges or vocational training. For school year 2015-16, six students were awarded a total of \$5,000 in scholarships.

The Consortium's First-Time Homebuyer Program is available to qualified residents of public and manufactured housing and other families assisted by public agencies. HOME funds that are used for this program are intended to provide homeownership assistance for such residents, tenants and families. The homebuyer education component of the program helped assisted families to attain and maintain homeownership.

Actions taken to provide assistance to troubled PHAs

Not applicable. The HACSD is a High Performing Agency and is not a troubled PHA.

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

Actions taken to remove or ameliorate the negative effects of public policies that serve as barriers to affordable housing such as land use controls, tax policies affecting land, zoning ordinances, building codes, fees and charges, growth limitations, and policies affecting the return on residential investment. 91.220 (j); 91.320 (i)

The County and individual cities have little influence over market constraints, but can provide incentives or assistance to overcome the impacts of market constraints. Major governmental constraints to affordable housing development include land use policies governed by the Land Use Element of each jurisdiction's General Plan; zoning and development codes; development and planning fees imposed by the County and individual cities; and, growth management policies.

The County's Housing Element was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on April 24, 2013, pursuant to State Housing Element Law. This Housing Element was written to provide long-range policy direction consistent with the General Plan Planning Horizon, combined with short-term implementation of programs for the current housing element cycle. The County's 2011 General Plan update provided for the adoption of zoning to implement the land use designations assigned by the Housing Element. The Housing Element is a dynamic document that is reviewed annually and periodically updated to respond to changing community needs.

The County's Housing Element contains an inventory of vacant residential sites in the unincorporated area, along with the property's assigned density and zoning. The Housing Element shows that there is adequate housing capacity to meet the unincorporated County's share of the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA).

As part of the update to the General Plan, new direction in land use policies adds flexibility to

existing regulations. The flexibility applies to projects located in “Village” areas, where developers strive to achieve maximum yield. The Housing Element supports density bonus programs, as well as mechanisms to promote the production of housing for lower-income, moderate-income and special-needs populations, which includes alternative affordable housing options, such as the development of farm worker housing, second dwelling units, manufactured or mobile homes, shared housing and employee workforce housing.

Housing Element Goals include the following:

- Housing Development and Variety of Housing, Tenancy Types and Prices.
- Neighborhoods that Respect Local Character.
- Housing Affordability for all Economic Segments.
- Affordable Housing Preservation.
- (Limit) Governmental Constraints.
- Delivery of Housing Services.

The County will continue to collaborate with non-profit organizations in the development of affordable housing. In order to achieve this objective, County Housing Element policies have been recommended to make financial resources available to non-profit entities. The 2013-20 Housing Element can be obtained from the County’s Department of Planning and Development Services’ website at <http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us/pds/generalplan.html>.

In 2015, the County updated its expedited permitting policy (A-68) to encourage affordable housing development by providing expedited permitting for eligible developments that provide housing units that are affordable to those earning 80 percent or below the Area Median Income.

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

CDBG funds were primarily used to address public facility deficiencies in lower-income neighborhoods and for services related to housing and homelessness support/prevention. Proposals for community improvements were received from citizens, community-based organizations and County departments. The highest priority proposals were recommended for inclusion in the Annual Funding Plan. The County facilitated community revitalization meetings on a regular basis to discuss community needs and problem-solve their resolutions. In addition, HCDS’s annual community meeting and interactive presentations offered residents the opportunity to submit requests for public improvements to be funded through the CDBG program. The main obstacle to meeting all the identified community needs is limited funding. Given the funding challenge, HCDS plans to continue the above actions in order to best address underserved needs.

Actions taken to reduce lead-based paint hazards. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)

HCDS continued to support lead-based paint hazard control efforts in compliance with lead-based paint reduction requirements in all housing activities covered by Sections 1012 and 1013

of the Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992, as well as the Lead-Safe Housing Rule under 24 CFR Part 35. During the years since the regulations took effect, the Urban County Home Repair Program and HCDS's Affordable Housing Development Program have carried out lead assessment and reduction practices as required. Any property built prior to 1978 must undergo lead paint testing and, if lead hazards are found, those hazards must be eliminated as a requirement for participation in the programs.

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

The HACSD administered a Family-Self-Sufficiency (FSS) Program for Housing Choice Voucher Program participants. Participating families sign five-year contracts of participation and work with program staff to develop employment-related goals. As the families achieve their goals, increase their incomes and pay more of their rents, the HACSD saves money by subsidizing less rent. The savings are set aside in escrow accounts for the families. If the families reach their goals, they are eligible to receive that money. Participating families receive referrals and resource information to assist them in meeting their goals. The FSS Program also offers scholarships to participants who are attending two- or four-year colleges, participating in vocational training or working toward their GEDs. At the end of FY 2015-16, 91 families were actively participating in the FSS program. Three families successfully met their goals in FY 2015-16 and received an average escrow payout of \$7,515.

The HACSD offers scholarships to FSS program participants and public housing residents who are attending two- or four-year colleges or vocational training. For school year 2015-16, 17 students received a total of \$15,250 in scholarships. It is estimated that 18 students will receive scholarships in FY 2016-17.

HCDS is committed to continuing its Urban County Home Repair Program, which assists low-income homeowners with health and safety repairs to their residences. This program provides assistance to homeowners, many living in poverty, to help enable them to remain in their homes. While this program does not directly increase incomes, it contributes additional resources necessary for stable housing, which is often critical in allowing low-income families to seek educational and employment opportunities vital in attaining economic self-sufficiency.

HCDS is committed to continuing its tenant-based rental assistance programs to assist, in partnership with HHSA, foster youth who are aging out of the system and families who have developed the necessary skills and stability to reunite with their children and maintain stable households. Also, HCDS intends to continue to fund the Cold Weather Voucher Program, which provides temporary shelter during times of inclement weather and offers services to achieve stability and permanent housing.

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

The institutional structure identified in the Consolidated Plan included a coalition of various agencies of local government, non-profits and private entities involved in carrying out a range of housing and supportive services programs. HCDS continued to play a significant role in regional housing and homeless issues. HCDS participated in intergovernmental activities that

include the Regional Task Force on the Homeless, City/County Reinvestment Task Force, San Diego Regional Alliance For Fair Housing, Regional Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) (formerly Assessment of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice), Joint City/County HIV Housing Committee, HIV Planning Council, Urban County CDBG Program, CoC Governance Board, CoC general membership, CoC Governance sub-committee, 25 Cities Leadership and Design Team, and HOME Consortium. HCDS will continue to work with partner agencies to address the region's issues.

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

As discussed above, HCDS participated in various intergovernmental activities that include multiple partnerships. HCDS plans to continue the coordination efforts in FY 2016-17.

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

As discussed above, HCDS participated in various intergovernmental activities that include the Regional Task Force on the Homeless, City/County Reinvestment Task Force, San Diego Regional Alliance For Fair Housing, Regional Assessment of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice, Fair Housing testing (which included testing categories identified by the aforementioned Regional Assessment of Impediments), Joint City/County HIV Housing Committee, Ryan White Planning Council, Urban County CDBG Program, CoC Governance Board, CoC general membership, CoC Governance sub-committee, 25 Cities Leadership and Design Team, and HOME Consortium. HCDS plans to continue the coordination efforts in FY 2016-17.

CR-40 - Monitoring 91.220 and 91.230

Describe the standards and procedures used to monitor activities carried out in furtherance of the plan and used to ensure long-term compliance with requirements of the programs involved, including minority business outreach and the comprehensive planning requirements

HCDS's Compliance and Monitoring team conducted a yearly risk assessment prior to the commencement of the past fiscal year. The risk assessment process began with a review of factors such as a contractor or sub-recipient being new to federal programs, turnover in key staff positions, past compliance or performance problems, undertaking multiple federally-funded activities for the first time and not submitting timely reports. HCDS developed a monitoring plan as a result of the risk assessment process, which included a combination of desk and on-site monitoring. Federal programs monitored include CDBG, HOME, HOPWA, ESG, Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP), in addition to local programs such as Redevelopment and Density Bonus.

HCDS ensures long term compliance with program requirements by providing monitoring result letters to the contractors and sub-recipients. Corrective action measures were implemented with proof of satisfactory completion necessary to close out the annual monitoring process.

These actions were undertaken to ensure overall compliance during the affordability period and/or were undertaken to ensure compliance during the contract term.

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

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

As outlined in the Consolidated Plan, HCDS carried out extensive efforts to encourage and broaden citizen participation of English and Spanish speaking residents, lower-income residents, and those with special needs through a variety of media including flyers, announcements, emails, letters, meetings, web-based presentations, and the distribution of English and Spanish-language surveys.

County HCDS took a number of actions in order to broaden and maximize citizen participation in the development of the FY 2016-17 Annual Funding Plan. After public notification through electronic and written mailings, Facebook announcements, a web-site email notification (web-blast), and a press release, one citizen participation meeting was held and a new interactive presentation was made available on-line to interested residents and stakeholders. In addition, participating cities held their own citizen participation activities. Citizens and stakeholders had the opportunity to comment at a public hearing during plan preparation and at a public hearing held to approve the proposed plan. At the beginning of each of the two 30-day public comment periods, notices were published in English and Spanish languages in the Union Tribune and La Prensa general circulation publications.

Any comments received from citizens via public meetings, public hearings and surveys were evaluated in light of information contributed by other stakeholders and objective data derived from sources such as HUD's CPD maps, the U.S. Census Bureau and 2-1-1 San Diego. In its totality, along with the County's own priority goals and initiatives, as well as limitations posed by factors outside of the County's control, a solid strategic framework was established for the planning and implementation elements of the Consolidated Plan. It was determined that information received from citizens was generally consistent with other data sources.

CR-45 - CDBG 91.520(c)

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

HCDS did not change its program objectives as a result of its experiences. HCDS remains committed to its Consolidated Plan Objectives which are: 1) Provide suitable livable environments for our region's residents; and 2) Enhance the quality of life for residents by encouraging decent and affordable housing.

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

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

Non Applicable.

CR-50 - HOME 91.520(d)

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

All affordable housing properties underwent Housing Quality Standards (HQS) Inspections and all units passed or were brought into compliance once repairs were completed. In addition, all projects underwent annual on-site monitoring or desk monitoring for the year. Most common examples of monitoring results include late submission of Annual Performance Reports and over charging rent of rent-restricted units to the low-income public.

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

As part of the monitoring process, all projects are required to demonstrate that they are administering their property in compliance with all Fair Housing Laws and free from discrimination. Verification of compliance includes copies of management plans and vacancy listings that contain language notifying the public that all operations will be administered without discrimination against any protected class.

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

During program year 2015, a total of \$3,114,280 in program income was received from affordable rental housing developments and recaptured homebuyer assistance loans. Program income was utilized as follows: \$1,844,626 for homebuyer assistance provided to 42 low-income households; \$453,289 for tenant-based rental assistance provided to 212 low-income households, 185 of which are extremely low-income; \$348,546 for rental housing development of a 42-unit low-income apartment complex that is currently under construction; \$65,895.00 for homeowner rehabilitation assistance to four low-income households.

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

All actions undertaken by HCDS under the HOME Program are listed in Section CR-05 of this report.

CR-60 - ESG 91.520(g) (ESG Recipients only)

ESG Supplement to the CAPER in e-snaps

For Paperwork Reduction Act

1. Recipient Information—All Recipients Complete

Basic Grant Information

Recipient Name	SAN DIEGO COUNTY
Organizational DUNS Number	009581646
EIN/TIN Number	956000934
Identify the Field Office	LOS ANGELES
Identify CoC(s) in which the recipient or sub-recipient(s) will provide ESG assistance	San Diego CoC

ESG Contact Name

Prefix	Ms.
First Name	Kelly
Middle Name	
Last Name	Salmons
Suffix	
Title	Acting Chief

ESG Contact Address

Street Address 1	3989 Ruffin Rd.
Street Address 2	
City	San Diego
State	CA
ZIP Code	92123-1815
Phone Number	8586944806
Extension	0
Fax Number	0
Email Address	Kelly.Salmons@sdcounty.ca.gov

ESG Secondary Contact

Prefix	
First Name	
Last Name	
Suffix	
Title	
Phone Number	
Extension	
Email Address	

2. Reporting Period—All Recipients Complete

Program Year Start Date	07/01/2015
Program Year End Date	06/30/2016

3a. Sub-recipient Form – Complete one form for each sub-recipient

Sub-recipient or Contractor Name: COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO HOUSING AUTHORITY

City: San Diego

State: CA

Zip Code: 92123, 1815

DUNS Number: 0948336466

Is sub-recipient a victim services provider: N

Sub-recipient Organization Type: Unit of Government

ESG Sub-grant or Contract Award Amount: \$61,069

Sub-recipient or Contractor Name: COMMUNITY RESOURCE CENTER

City: Encinitas

State: CA

Zip Code: 92024, 3560

DUNS Number: 193789690

Is sub-recipient a victim services provider: N

Sub-recipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Sub-grant or Contract Award Amount: \$51,450

Sub-recipient or Contractor Name: INTERFAITH COMMUNITY SERVICES

City: Escondido

State: CA

Zip Code: 92025, 1643

DUNS Number: 625463468

Is sub-recipient a victim services provider: N

Sub-recipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Sub-grant or Contract Award Amount: \$216,662

Sub-recipient or Contractor Name: INTERFAITH SHELTER NETWORK OF SAN DIEGO

City: San Diego

State: CA

Zip Code: 92108, 1746

DUNS Number: 964841621

Is sub-recipient a victim services provider: N

Sub-recipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Sub-grant or Contract Award Amount: \$82,868

Sub-recipient or Contractor Name: SOUTH BAY COMMUNITY SERVICES
City: Chula Vista
State: CA
Zip Code: 91910, 3711
DUNS Number: 113407779
Is sub-recipient a victim services provider: N
Sub-recipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Sub-grant or Contract Award Amount: \$143,850

CR-65 - Persons Assisted

ESG recipients are directed by HUD not to enter data in these tables. Beginning with Federal Fiscal Year 2015 grant, ESG recipients must use the ESG CAPER Annual Reporting Tool (e-CART) which is a special CSV export submitted via the Integrated Disbursement and Information System-IDIS).

4. Persons Served

4a. Complete for Homelessness Prevention Activities

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	
Children	
Don't Know/Refused/Other	
Missing Information	
Total	

Table 14 – Household Information for Homeless Prevention Activities

4b. Complete for Rapid Re-Housing Activities

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	
Children	
Don't Know/Refused/Other	
Missing Information	
Total	

Table 15 – Household Information for Rapid Re-Housing Activities

4c. Complete for Shelter

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	
Children	
Don't Know/Refused/Other	
Missing Information	
Total	

Table 16 – Shelter Information

4d. Street Outreach

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	
Children	
Don't Know/Refused/Other	
Missing Information	
Total	

Table 17 – Household Information for Street Outreach

4e. Totals for all Persons Served with ESG

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	
Children	
Don't Know/Refused/Other	
Missing Information	
Total	

Table 18 – Household Information for Persons Served with ESG

5. Gender—Complete for All Activities

	Total
Male	
Female	
Transgender	
Don't Know/Refused/Other	
Missing Information	
Total	

Table 19 – Gender Information

6. Age—Complete for All Activities

	Total
Under 18	
18-24	
25 and over	
Don't Know/Refused/Other	
Missing Information	
Total	

Table 20 – Age Information

7. Special Populations Served—Complete for All Activities

Number of Persons in Households

Subpopulation	Total	Total Persons Served – Prevention	Total Persons Served – RRH	Total Persons Served in Emergency Shelters
Veterans				
Victims of Domestic Violence				
Elderly				
HIV/AIDS				
Chronically Homeless				
Persons with Disabilities:				
Severely Mentally Ill				
Chronic Substance Abuse				
Other Disability				
Total (unduplicated if possible)				

Table 21 – Special Population Served

CR-70 – ESG 91.520(g) - Assistance Provided and Outcomes

10. Shelter Utilization

Number of New Units - Rehabbed	0
Number of New Units - Conversion	0

Total Number of bed-nights available	10,440
Total Number of bed-nights provided	8,725
Capacity Utilization	83.57%

Table 22 – Shelter Capacity

11. Project Outcomes Data measured under the performance standards developed in consultation with the CoC(s)

HCDS collaborates with the RCCC and other local ESG entitlement jurisdictions to continue to build upon the assessment and evaluation instruments developed by the region for the ESG Program. The RCCC, as the CoC entity, is responsible for assisting with the evaluation of ESG project performance. This is accomplished through the RCCC's HMIS lead during the compiling of data for the Annual Housing Inventory Count, as well as through HCDS's monitoring of monthly claims in comparison with quarterly reports.

HCDS monitors grant activities to ensure compliance with program requirements by conducting onsite monitoring visits and desk reviews in conformance with HUD monitoring guidelines. All ESG contracts specify reporting requirements. Quarterly and Annual Progress Reports that include project accomplishments, expenditures, anticipated goals and accomplishments, activities underway, information on families assisted and project outcomes are reviewed to ensure programs are producing effective measurable results and to ensure compliance with program regulations. In addition, HCDS provides ongoing technical assistance throughout the year, and works with the providers, as well as the local HMIS lead, to ensure accurate data collection.

CR-75 – Expenditures

11. Expenditures

11a. ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program		
	2013	2014	2015
Expenditures for Rental Assistance	16,080	108,640	92,659
Expenditures for Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services - Financial Assistance	52,619	18,681	25,813
Expenditures for Housing Relocation & Stabilization Services - Services	19,789	4,660	5,000
Expenditures for Homeless Prevention under Emergency Shelter Grants Program	0	0	0
Subtotal Homelessness Prevention	88,488	131,981	123,472

Table 23 – ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention

11b. ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2013	2014	2015
Expenditures for Rental Assistance	21,008	74,699	98,748
Expenditures for Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services - Financial Assistance	39,827	6,751	114,723
Expenditures for Housing Relocation & Stabilization Services - Services	21,894	9,650	73,876
Expenditures for Homeless Assistance under Emergency Shelter Grants Program	0	0	0
Subtotal Rapid Re-Housing	82,729	91,100	287,347

Table 24 – ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing

11c. ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2013	2014	2015
Essential Services	0	0	0
Operations	28,419	27,800	63,281
Renovation	0	0	0
Major Rehab	0	0	0
Conversion	0	0	0
Subtotal	28,419	27,800	63,281

Table 25 – ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

11d. Other Grant Expenditures

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2013	2014	2015
HMIS	10,855	15,187	15,037
Administration	18,831	21,410	23,971
Street Outreach	3,950	3,950	51,448

Table 26 - Other Grant Expenditures

11e. Total ESG Grant Funds

Total ESG Funds Expended	2013	2014	2015
1,047,339	233,302	291,428	564,557

Table 27 - Total ESG Funds Expended

11f. Match Source

	2013	2014	2015
Other Non-ESG HUD Funds	10,350	106,523	139,657
Other Federal Funds	68,438	0	211,230
State Government	0	26,614	23,792
Local Government	36,900	102,399	74,040
Private Funds	156,653	111,012	103,783
Other	531,147	51,450	247,743
Fees	0	0	0
Program Income	0	0	0
Total Match Amount	803,488	397,998	800,245

Table 28 - Other Funds Expended on Eligible ESG Activities

11g. Total

Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities	2013	2014	2015
3,049,070	1,036,790	689,426	1,364,802

Table 29 - Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities