State of California

2015-2020 Federal Consolidated Plan

Table of Contents

ES-05 Executive Summary - 91.300(c), 91.320(b) 4

The Process 6

PR-05 Lead & Responsible Agencies 24 CFR 91.300(b) 6

PR-10 Consultation - 91.110, 91.300(b); 91.315(l) 7

PR-15 Citizen Participation - 91.115, 91.300(c) 10

Needs Assessment 11

NA-05 Overview 11

NA-10 Housing Needs Assessment - 24 CFR 91.305 (a,b,c) 13

NA-15 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Problems - 91.305 (b)(2) 23

NA-20 Disproportionately Greater Need: Severe Housing Problems – 91.305(b)(2) 27

NA-25 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens – 91.305 (b)(2) 29

NA-30 Disproportionately Greater Need: Discussion – 91.305 (b)(2) 30

NA-35 Public Housing – (Optional) 32

NA-40 Homeless Needs Assessment – 91.305(c) 36

NA-45 Non-Homeless Special Needs Assessment – 91.305 (b,d) - 38

NA-50 Non-Housing Community Development Needs - 91.315 (f) 46

Housing Market Analysis 48

MA-05 Overview 48

MA-10 Number of Housing Units – 91.310(a) 50

MA-15 Cost of Housing – 91.310(a) 55

MA-20 Condition of Housing – 91.310(a) 58

MA-25 Public and Assisted Housing – (Optional) 61

MA-30 Homeless Facilities – 91.310(b) 62

MA-35 Special Needs Facilities and Services – 91.310(c) 64

MA-40 Barriers to Affordable Housing – 91.310(d) 66

MA-45 Non-Housing Community Development Assets -91.315(f) 67

MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion 74

Strategic Plan 75

SP-05 Overview 75

SP-10 Geographic Priorities – 91.315(a)(1) 76

SP-25 Priority Needs – 91.315(a) 77

SP-30 Influence of Market Conditions – 91.315(b) 82

SP-35 Anticipated Resources - 91.315(a)(4)--91.320(c)(1,2) 83

SP-40 Institutional Delivery Structure – 91.315(k) 90

SP-45 Goals Summary – 91.315(a)(4) 94

SP-50 Public Housing Accessibility and Involvement – 91.315(c) 99

SP-55 Barriers to affordable housing – 91.315(h) 100

SP-60 Homelessness Strategy – 91.315(d) 105

SP-65 Lead based paint Hazards – 91.315(i) 110

SP-70 Anti-Poverty Strategy – 91.315(j) 111

SP-75 Colonias Strategy – 91.315 113

SP-80 Monitoring – 91.330 115

Expected Resources 117

AP-15 Expected Resources – 91.320(c)(1,2) 117

Annual Goals and Objectives 124

AP-25 Allocation Priorities – 91.320(d) 128

AP-30 Methods of Distribution – 91.320(d)&(k) 131

AP-35 Projects – (Optional) 148

AP-38 Project Summary 149

AP-40 Section 108 Loan Guarantee – 91.320(k)(1)(ii) 150

AP-45 Community Revitalization Strategies – 91.320(k)(1)(ii) 151

AP-48 Method of Distribution for Colonias Set-aside – 91.320(d)&(k) 152

AP-50 Geographic Distribution – 91.320(f) 156

Affordable Housing 157

AP-55 Affordable Housing – 24 CFR 91.320(g) - 157

AP-60 Public Housing - 24 CFR 91.320(j) 158

AP-65 Homeless and Other Special Needs Activities – 91.320(h) 159

AP-70 HOPWA Goals – 91.320(k)(4) 161

AP-75 Barriers to affordable housing – 91.320(i) 162

AP-80 Colonias Actions – 91.320(j) 164

AP-85 Other Actions – 91.320(j) 165

Program Specific Requirements 169

Appendices

A: Eligibility List 173

B: Interested Parties List ..... See Separate Excel File

C: ESG Written Standards Checklist 183

D: State Resources and Plans 185

E: Housing Rehabilitation Needs in Colonias within the Unincorporated Area of Imperial County 187

F: Activities Following the SAMHSA Policy Academy to Reduce Chronic Homelessness 188

G: Public Notices 191

Executive Summary

ES-05 Executive Summary - 91.300(c), 91.320(b)

1. Introduction

The State of California 2015-2020 Consolidated Plan (ConPlan) outlines the State's current federal funding priorities and strategies to address housing and community development needs over the next five years, using funds from the following five programs funded through the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD:)

- Community Development Block Grant (CDBG),
- HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME),
- Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG),
- Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA), and the
- Lead Hazard Control Program (LHCP).

This ConPlan describes projected funding levels for these programs to be provided to State nonentitlement areas for FY 2015-16, as well as a cumulative estimate of funds available through 2020. The report also discusses other federal and State sources that may leverage these dollars, program operation schedules, the year's goals, and planned operations.

These State-administered federal funds are available, with exceptions, only to nonurban and rural cities and counties ("non-entitlement" jurisdictions) that do not receive funds for these programs directly from HUD. The jurisdictions which are eligible for these State-administered funds are identified on *Appendix A, Eligible Jurisdictions*.

The format of this document including but not limited to paragraph and table numbering, is consistent with HUD's ConPlan format in Integrated and Disbursement information System (IDIS).

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

Based on the Plan's Needs Assessment, the State of California 2015-2020 ConPlan Housing and Community Development Goals for low-income households and communities are as follows:

- Increase the supply of affordable rental housing
- Expand homeownership opportunities and improve existing housing
- Provide homeless assistance and prevention services
- Increase economic development opportunities
- Maintain or increase public services
- Maintain or increase public facilities

Specific objectives related to each goal are discussed in Sections SP 45 and AP 20.

3. Evaluation of past performance

See the Department's most recent Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation Report (CAPER) which discusses outcomes for the CDBG, HOME, ESG, HOPWA, and LHCP Programs located at: http://www.hcd.ca.gov/policy-research/plans-reports/index.shtml.

Because this is the first year of the HTF program, there is no previous outcome data for HTF.

4. Summary of citizen participation process and consultation process

This ConPlan is subject to federal Citizen Participation requirements which are listed in the State's 2012-2013 Annual Plan Update, pages 8-11 (available at http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/hrc/rep/fed/). To meet these requirements, HCD solicits input from public, private and nonprofit organizations and other State agencies in the preparation of the ConPlan and AP Updates. Public notices describing the draft documents, inviting comments and announcing public hearings, are routinely emailed to local governments, other interested parties and depository libraries, published in legal newspapers of record, and placed on the Department of Housing and Community Development's (HCD) website at http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/hrc/rep/fed/.Paper copies of notices and draft documents are available by written request.

The original draft ConPlan was available for comment from all interested parties for a 30-day period from April 1 through April 30, 2015. Public hearings were held in Sacramento (April 21), in Redding (April 22), and in Riverside (April 23). For details see the public notices in *Appendix G*. Public comments received are summarized below, along with the State's responses.

2016 Substantial Amendment

This Substantial Amendment is part of the HTF Allocation Plan, and was available for comment from all interested parties for a 30-day period from August 4 through September 3, 2016. Public hearings were held on August 18 in Riverside and August 22 in Sacramento. For details, see the HTF Public Notice documents in the Grantee Unique Appendices.

2019 Substantial Amendment

The substantial amendment to this ConPlan will be available for public comment for a 30-day period from September 11, 2019 through October 11, 2019. A public hearing will be held in Sacramento on September 24, 2019.

Disclaimer: The new CDBG MOD for the 2019 program year will only be described in section SP-10 and the addendum attached to this substantial amendment. References to the CDBG MOD outside of these sections are not updated and are referencing the previous MOD process applicable to program years 2015-2018.

5. Summary of public comments

a-1) The HTF amendment comment period held two public hearings, on August 18, 2016 in Riverside and August 22, 2016 in Sacramento. A cumulative total of eight persons attended these hearings.

b-1) Eleven commenters submitted comments via email during the HTF amendment comment period.

Appendix H-1 summarizes all the comments directly related to the HTF Amendment and includes the actual comments.

a) A State consultation meeting on the Consolidated Plan was held on January 29, 2015. The comments received centered abound improvements to the HOME and CDBG programs in the areas of rental and homeownership housing.

Most suggestions will be considered by the applicable program, with the exception of suggestions contrary to HUD guidance or requirements, or issues for which the program is lacking the necessary information to accept the recommendation at this time.

For a complete list of recommendations and responses, see Appendix H.

b) Ten public comments were received via e-mail during the public comment period on the Draft ConPlan (April1-April 30). Below is a summary of the comments with responses. The full text of each comment is located in Appendix H.

Summary: The first commenter voiced concern that Section 8 public housing resources are not being fairly distributed. The commenter requested that Section 8 be made available only on a first-come first-served basis, and not by preference to seniors and families. The commenter also asked that the State use eminent domain to take over properties for use by households on Section 8 waiting lists, and to make it unlawful to refuse to rent to a Section 8 tenant for any reason.

Response: The programs covered by the State's Consolidated Plan do not have authority to administer public housing resources; however, the State appreciates the concerns expressed by the commenter. The State will continue to direct resources to expand the supply of affordable housing so that households in need of rental assistance have more opportunities to utilize this assistance as it becomes available.

Summary: The second commenter requested that programs allow applicants to submit one proposal/application for eligible activities within multiple eligible jurisdictions.

Response: Where currently permitted by HUD, the State either allows, or is considering changes

to its program requirements to allow, eligible applicants to submit applications for services which will cover a multi-jurisdictional area. For example, the State CDBG program currently permits its eligible applicants (cities and counties) to submit an application for activities covering multiple eligible jurisdictions. The State HOME Program currently allows tenant-based rental assistance secured under a single application to be provided to all State HOME-eligible jurisdictions within a county. The State HOPWA program does not prohibit service providers from submitting a single application to provide services in multiple eligible cities within an eligible county, and the State ESG program is considering changes to its program to permit and encourage applications covering a multi-city or multi-county area. Note: eligibility in all of these programs is limited to geographic areas that are not eligible to receive these funds directly from HUD or their county (nonentitlement areas). See Appendix A for more information.

Additional comments summarized below.

2019 Substantial Amendment

To be completed at the end of the public comment period.

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

See Appendix H.

See appendix H-1 for comments related to the HTF Amendment.

2019 Substantial Amendment

To be completed at the end of the public comment period.

7. Summary

Additional Comments: More background on the HTF comments can be found in Appendix H-1.

Additional Comments: Comment letters on the draft Annual Plan were received from the following tribal entities throughout the State: Nevada California Indian Housing Association; Northern Circle Indian Housing Authority; United Native Housing Development Corporation; Hoopa Valley Housing Authority; All Mission Indian Housing Authority; Karuk Tribe Housing Authority; Sherwood Valley Band of Pomo Indians; Guidiville Indian Rancheria. These entities expressed a desire to work with the Department to ensure "remediates the chronic underutilization of State housing resources by Indian Tribes by providing information and context to the Department on Native housing needs and solutions …"

Commenters stated the draft Consolidated Plan "reflects a widespread lack of information, knowledge and understanding regarding the distinct nature of Native American housing needs. The letters identify key area of concern with the aim of strengthening the plan as follows: (1) Engage Native American Tribes and organizations to provide input and guidance in incorporating tribal housing needs into the State plan; (2) Recognize and document Tribal housing needs as distinct and do not subsume them into larger categories of housing need in

which they do not fit; (3) Incorporate within the Market Analysis section a tribal sub-market housing analysis to the distinct Native context, processes and conditions under which tribal hosing is provided. (4) Identify how the current structure of State housing programs act as policy impediments to tribal access to badly needed affordable housing resources; (5) Require housing elements, RHNAs and other relevant local and regional planning processes to engage tribes and incorporate tribally generated data into the processes; (6) Establish carefully targeted tribal housing goals that are aligned with dedicated resource and programs to deliver them; (7) Adapt and change the key housing delivery programs to be more accessible to tribes; (8) Establish culturally competent outreach and technical support services needed to increase effective tribal utilization of these key housing resource delivery programs (9) Monitor utilization of State housing programs by tribes during the Plan's duration and make adjustments as needed.

2019 Substantial Amendment

To be completed at the end of the public comment period.

The Process

PR-05 Lead & Responsible Agencies 24 CFR 91.300(b)

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

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

Agency Role	Name	Department/Agency
Lead Agency	CALIFORNIA	
CDBG Administrator		Housing and Community Development
HOPWA Administrator		Department of Public Health
HOME Administrator		Housing and Community Development
ESG Administrator		Housing and Community Development
HOPWA-C Administrator		

Table 1 – Responsible Agencies

Narrative

The California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) prepares and submits the State's ConPlan, Annual Plan (AP) Updates, and CAPER to HUD. The programs administered by HCD are *CDBG, HOME, and ESG*. The California Department of Public Health/Office of AIDS (CDPH/OA) administers *HOPWA*. The California Department of Community Services and Development administers LHCP. All these programs are implemented at the local level by agencies of eligible city and county governments, non-federally recognized Indian tribes, and/or private organizations, including nonprofit corporations.

Consolidated Plan Public Contact Information

For contact by mail: Department of Housing and Community Development Division of Financial Assistance PO Box 952054 Sacramento, CA 94252-2054 Attention: Christina DiFrancesco. For contact by e-mail or phone: Christina.DiFrancesco@hcd.ca.gov; 916-263-0415.

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

PR-10 Consultation - 91.110, 91.300(b); 91.315(l)

1. Introduction

Provide a concise summary of the state's activities to enhance coordination between public and assisted housing providers and private and governmental health, mental health and service agencies (91.215(l))

HCD engages in ongoing efforts to enhance coordination between housing providers and private and governmental health, mental health and service agencies. For FY 2015-16, the Department will continue ongoing meetings with program stakeholders regarding program design and implementation. Each of these efforts requires ongoing collaboration between local and State affordable housing agencies, housing providers, and public and private agencies offering other needed services to low-income residents, Specific efforts will include, but are not limited to: planned CDBG regulation changes, implementation of the anticipated National Housing Trust Fund (NHTF), ESG redesign focused around HEARTH Act requirements and goals, and continued implementation of the Veterans Housing and Homeless Assistance Program (VHHP), the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC) Program, the Section 811 Project Rental Assistance Program (PRA), as well as other new federal and State initiatives.

Regarding HOPWA activities, CDPH/OA, as the state agency responsible for administering statewide HIV/AIDS programs and activities, ensures that all HIV/AIDS service programs, including housing assistance, are coordinated at state and local levels. CDPH/OA emphasizes inclusion of representatives of various HIV/AIDS service agencies, other state departments (such as Corrections, Housing, Rehabilitation, Mental Health, Developmental Services and Alcohol and Drug Programs), local health departments, California HIV/AIDS Research Program (CHRP), and others, in information gathering, research and decision-making processes.

CDPH/OA conducts the Statewide Comprehensive Statement of Need (SCSN) and California's Integrated HIV Surveillance, Prevention and Care Plan (IP) in collaboration with multiple state and local agencies, and consumer/citizen participation. CDPH/OA convenes the California Planning Group (CPG) that serves as advisory to CDPH/OA in this process, and CPG monitors the completion of the SCSN and IP. CPG is comprised of HIV care and prevention stakeholders including county health department staff, local HIV service organizations, and consumers with various expertise in HIV/AIDS care and prevention treatment. CPG members identify best approaches to addressing unmet housing needs for PLWHA. CPG is integral to gaining access and engaging local consumer/citizens in the planning process, and provides an opportunity for citizen participation around HIV/AIDS issues, including housing.

For further discussion of efforts to enhance coordination between public and assisted housing providers and private and governmental health, mental health and service agencies, see Section AP 85.

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

See response below

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

ESG interacts with each of the State's CoC jurisdictions on an ongoing basis in a variety of ways. Each of the State's CoCs is assigned an ESG Program Representative who serves as their primary point of contact for HCD's ESG Program. The ESG Program Representative provides technical assistance on ESG Program requirements, and represents HCD at local CoC activities, meetings, roundtables, and other forums. By participating at the local level in this way, HCD expands the exposure of its ESG Program and, conversely, gains critical knowledge, perspective, and insight into implementation of the program at the local level.

In addition, HCD solicits participation of the State's CoCs in determining the "Need for Funds" Rating Criteria portion of its Application, worth 100 out of 785 total points. The CoC evaluates and determines the priority ranking of Applications received from each County within their respective service area(s). The CoC assigns points based on two criteria, "Leverage of Funds" and "Project Alignment with CoC Priorities", and provides HCD with their local ranking of Applications based on their local need for funds. HCD then applies the CoC scoring in its Rating and Ranking process. Future State ESG regulations will give a greater role to CoCs or their partner public agencies in selecting ESG-funded projects and administering ESG funds.

The State of California does not administer a statewide Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). However, the State requires each of its Applicants to ensure that data on all persons served and all activities assisted under ESG are entered into the applicable community-wide HMIS in the area in which those persons and activities are located, or a comparable database in accordance with HUD's standards on participation, data collection, and reporting.

HOPWA: All HOPWA project sponsors are encouraged to participate in local Continuum of Care Planning Groups to ensure representation of the HIV/AIDS community in the housing continuum. By federal regulation, homeless service agencies that receive HOPWA funding must include HOPWA clients in the local Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). State HOPWA includes this requirement in the HOPWA program guidance and contract scope of work, and assists project sponsors in accessing local HMIS.

Provide a concise summary of the state's activities to enhance coordination with local jurisdictions serving Colonias and organizations working within Colonias communities.

See Section AP 48.

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

To be completed at the end of the Public Comment process

Table 2 – Agencies, groups, organizations who participated

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

There has been no intentional or known exclusion of any type of public agency, private entity, stakeholder or interested party from consultation and comment on these programs. State agency actions described in this ConPlan are publicized, primarily by email, to all interested parties who have requested this information, or whose participation is needed. Through the public review process, the State's ConPlan, AP and CAPER are open for comment. During each plan year (PY), opportunities for feedback such as meetings, webinars, and posted announcements are offered to enlist, encourage and improve the essential participation of local agencies and other potential implementing entities. In these events, feedback from participants is encouraged, noted and analyzed for what the State programs can learn. For lists of organizations that were emailed the public notice for this plan, see *Appendix B*.

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

To be completed at the end of the Public Comment process

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

Table 3 – Other local / regional / federal planning efforts

Describe cooperation and coordination among the State and any units of general local government, in the implementation of the Consolidated Plan (91.315(l))

The State housing programs will continue to work with other State agencies, and units of general local government in nonentitlement areas to utilize CDBG, HOME, ESG, HOPWA, and LHCP funds. (See Appendix A for a list of nonentitlement jurisdictions for each program.) HCD will also continue to work with other State agencies and local government entities statewide to utilize funds provided through its State-funded housing programs.

Narrative (optional):

PR-15 Citizen Participation - 91.115, 91.300(c)

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

To be completed at the end of the Public Comment process

Summarize citizen participation process and how it impacted goal-setting

To be completed at the end of the Public Comment Process

Citizen Participation Outreach

Sort Order	Mode of Outreach	Target of Outreach	Summary of response/attendance	Summary of comments received	Summary of comments not accepted and reasons	URL (If applicable)

Table 4 – Citizen Participation Outreach

Needs Assessment

NA-05 Overview

Needs Assessment Overview

Living in decent, affordable, and reasonably located housing is one of the most important determinants of well-being for every Californian. More than just basic shelter, housing affects our lives in other important ways, determining our access to work, education, recreation, and shopping. The cost and availability of housing also matters for the state's economy, affecting the ability of businesses and other employers to hire and retain qualified workers and influencing their decisions about whether to locate, expand, or remain in California.

California's population experienced substantial growth in the past decade between and 2000 and 2011, increasing by more than 3 million to a total population of 36,969,200. The State's population is expected to grow to by approximately 370,473 individuals each year. If present trends continue, California's population will likely exceed 40 million by 2020.

The State had a total of 12,433,172 households based on 2007-2011 American Community Survey (ACS) 3-Year Estimate data of which 57 percent were owner households and 43 percent renter households. Statewide, the overall rate of homeownership in California generally has remained constant between 1990 and 2010 2007. In 1990 the total percent of homeownership in California was 55.6 percent. Ten years later (2000), the rate was 56.9 percent and by 2010, the rate was 55.9 percent, a slight increase of 0.3 percent from the 1990 figure.

Living in decent, affordable, and reasonably located housing is vitally important to every Californian. Unfortunately, housing in California is extremely expensive and, as a result, many households are forced to make serious trade-offs in order to live here. While many factors have a role in driving California's high housing costs, the most important is the significant shortage of affordable housing. California's supply of housing has not kept pace with demand to live in the state and housing costs have grown faster than the rest of the country.

A recent study by the California Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO), *California's High Housing Cost s : Causes and Consequences* analyzed the historic supply shortage of housing, which when combined with declining income has led to situations of higher cost burden for many California households, particularly those lower-income households.

According to the LAO study, as of early 2015, the typical California home cost $437,000, more than double the typical U.S. home ($179,000). California renters also face higher costs. In 2013, median monthly rent in California was $1,240, nearly 50 percent more than the national average. California's high housing costs force many households to make serious trade-offs. In most instances, these trade-offs are particularly challenging for households with low incomes. Notable and widespread trade-offs include (1) spending a greater share of their income on housing, (2) postponing or foregoing homeownership, (3) living in more crowded housing, (4) commuting further to work each day, and (5) in some cases, choosing to work and live elsewhere.

According to 2007-2011 CHAS data, 43 percent of all households are low-income (80 percent of median income and below). This includes 26 percent of renter households. Among all lower income households, (renter and owner households earning 80 percent of median income and below), 32.4 percent had identified housing problems.

According to the 2007-2011 CHAS data, more than 54 percent of all California households were "cost burdened" with housing costs exceeding 30 percent of their income. Of lower-income households, 30 percent paid greater than 30 percent of their incomes for housing – 18 percent of which paid more than 50 percent of their income toward housing. The existence of overpayment situations is greatest among lower-income renter households with 19 percent experiencing overpayment problems.

Not surprisingly, the lower the income, the greater the housing problems those households experience. The 2007-2011 CHAS data shows that 17.9 percent of all renter households in California are very low income (>30-50 percent of median income) and 20 percent are low income (>50-80 percent of median income). Among very low income renter households, 87.8 percent experienced housing problems and 82.4 percent paid greater than 30 percent of their income towards housing costs. Low income renter households had lower housing problems and lower housing cost burden than very low income renters, 67.8 percent experienced housing problems while 55.9 percent paid greater than 30 percent of their income towards housing costs.

According to 2007-2011 CHAS data, 24 percent of all renter households in California are extremely low income (ELI), making 30 percent or less of area median income. Of these ELI households, 83.2 percent experienced housing problems and 81.2 percent paid greater than 30 percent of their income towards housing costs. ELI housing needs require specific housing solutions such as deeper income targeting for subsidies, housing with supportive services, single-room occupancy (SRO's) and/or shared housing, and rent subsidies. The State has recognized this deeper affordability need by expanding the housing element update process through Government Code (GC) Section 65583(a) to require quantification and analysis of existing and projected housing needs of ELI households.

Trends and factors contributing to California's continuing housing supply shortage and affordability problems include the following:

- **Affordability worsens**, particularly impacting lower income renters, as falling incomes lag behind spiking rents, and homeowners continue to face tight lending standards that impede access to housing financing.
- **Housing supply shortage in growth areas persists**, as new construction is sluggish, and as significant shift from ownership units to rentals continues to occur.
- **Innovative partnering to preserve the affordable housing stock is critical**, as tens of thousands of affordable rental units are at-risk of converting to market rates within five years, squeezing out vulnerable renters.
- **Aging baby boomers and young millennials are drivers of housing demand** over the next decade, with a preference and/or need for a variety of housing types, tenure and locations.
- **Delayed effects of the housing bust become more evident**, as more households face difficulties to rent or take jobs due to credit issues, or inadequate access to education, jobs, health services, and economic opportunity.

NA-10 Housing Needs Assessment - 24 CFR 91.305 (a,b,c)

Summary of Housing Needs

Data tabulated for State CDBG and HOME-eligible jurisdictions is shown in red.

Demographics	Base Year: 2000	Most Recent Year: 2011	% Change
Population	33,871,648	36,969,200	9%
Households	11,512,020	12,433,172	8%
Median Income	$47,493.00	$61,632.00	30%

Table 5 - Housing Needs Assessment Demographics ***NOTE: Figures are not adjusted for inflation***

Data Source: 2000 Census (Base Year), 2007-2011 ACS (Most Recent Year)

Number of Households Table - Statewide

	0-30% HAMFI	>30-50% HAMFI	>50-80% HAMFI	>80-100% HAMFI	>100% HAMFI
Total Households *	1,778,310	1,569,280	2,081,345	1,220,095	5,784,145
Small Family Households *	579,130	590,315	834,215	520,060	3,033,070
Large Family Households *	197,320	237,120	337,885	185,240	621,945
Household contains at least one person 62-74 years of age	303,125	282,780	377,025	220,290	1,034,725
Household contains at least one person age 75 or older	285,985	259,470	268,115	128,815	410,285
Households with one or more children 6 years old or younger *	367,590	352,380	439,130	237,550	666,690
* the highest income category for these family types is >80% HAMFI					

Table 6 - Total Households Table

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

	0-30% HAMFI	>30-50% HAMFI	>50-80% HAMFI	>80-100% HAMFI	>100% HAMFI
Total Households *	554,563	586,421	812,435	488,010	2,446,471
Small Family Households *	182,423	210,073	314,137	209,006	1,294,894
Large Family Households *	61,584	81,818	128,017	74,504	278,744
Household contains at least one person 62-74 years of age	95,671	115,725	165,770	99,543	498,821
Household contains at least one person age 75 or older	86,293	109,837	125,046	59,088	191,291
Households with one or more children 6 years old or younger	120,746	131,116	173,998	97,733	397,858
* the highest income category for these family types is >80% HAMFI					

Table 7 - Total Households Table –State CDBG and HOME Non-Entitlement Jurisdictions Only

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

Housing Needs Summary Tables

1. Housing Problems (Households with one of the listed needs)

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS										
Substandard Housing - Lacking complete plumbing or kitchen facilities	49,465	25,775	24,555	9,540	109,335	5,950	5,135	6,580	3,240	20,905
Severely Overcrowded - With >1.51 people per room (and complete kitchen and plumbing)	91,465	70,900	59,530	19,515	241,410	5,895	10,145	18,570	10,090	44,700
Overcrowded - With 1.01-1.5 people per room (and none of the above problems)	115,145	109,605	102,825	39,195	366,770	13,350	32,870	58,560	33,825	138,605
Housing cost burden greater than 50% of income (and none of the above problems)	710,720	342,775	114,745	14,730	1,182,970	279,365	252,490	307,215	137,290	976,360
Housing cost burden greater than 30% of income (and none of the above problems)	109,280	295,285	427,890	144,685	977,140	58,025	103,125	225,525	199,060	585,735
Zero/negative Income (and none of the above problems)	86,860	0	0	0	86,860	46,490	0	0	0	46,490

Table 8 – Housing Problems Table (Statewide)

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS										
Substandard Housing - Lacking complete plumbing or kitchen facilities	9,930	7,565	8,018	3,134	28,647	3,246	2,492	3,319	1,336	10,393
Severely Overcrowded - With >1.51 people per room (and complete kitchen and plumbing)	16,841	17,546	15,567	5,079	55,033	2,009	3,075	6,105	3,712	14,901
Overcrowded - With 1.01-1.5 people per room (and none of the above problems)	30,210	32,350	34,553	13,254	110,367	5,266	12,272	21,288	13,358	52,184
Housing cost burden greater than 50% of income (and none of the above problems)	204,241	122,714	43,773	5,918	376,646	115,065	103,081	125,830	59,198	403,174
Housing cost burden greater than 30% of income (and none of the above problems)	233,321	214,749	188,731	58,409	695,210	140,124	154,263	226,173	144,634	665,194
Zero/negative Income (and none of the above problems)	25,763	0	0	0	25,763	21,388	0	0	0	21,388

Table 9a – Housing Problems Table – State CDBG and HOME Non-Entitlement Jurisdictions Only

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

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

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS										
Having 1 or more of four housing problems	966,795	549,055	301,650	82,985	1,900,485	304,560	300,640	390,920	184,440	1,180,560
Having none of four housing problems	239,245	412,550	774,545	455,980	1,882,320	134,355	307,035	614,230	496,685	1,552,305
Household has negative income, but none of the other housing problems	86,860	0	0	0	86,860	46,490	0	0	0	46,490

Table 8 – Housing Problems 2 - Statewide

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

3. Cost Burden > 30%

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS								
Small Related	402,845	348,640	259,890	1,011,375	94,465	135,595	250,465	480,525
Large Related	145,895	119,395	67,375	332,665	33,320	69,120	124,290	226,730
Elderly	212,475	117,090	67,780	397,345	166,430	142,750	134,335	443,515
Other	288,970	206,805	206,695	702,470	62,470	44,735	74,145	181,350
Total need by income	1,050,185	791,930	601,740	2,443,855	356,685	392,200	583,235	1,332,120

Table 9 – Cost Burden > 30% - Statewide

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS								
Small Related	114,258	115,623	94,625	324,506	38,957	54,403	100,227	193,587
Large Related	41,672	40,131	28,435	110,238	13,019	23,901	45,346	82,266
Elderly	50,498	43,055	28,191	121,744	67,108	69,194	67,187	203,489
Other	77,565	59,350	58,621	195,536	28,602	19,617	30,986	79,205
Total need by income	283,993	258,159	209,872	752,024	147,686	167,115	243,746	558,547

Table 9a – Cost Burden > 30% State CDBG and HOME Non-Entitlement Jurisdictions Only

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

4. Cost Burden > 50%

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS								
Small Related	351,510	157,060	46,550	555,120	85,220	106,985	149,820	342,025
Large Related	122,160	43,055	9,455	174,670	29,700	50,155	61,415	141,270
Elderly	160,440	64,305	20,505	245,250	125,285	84,695	68,955	278,935
Other	262,555	119,775	45,220	427,550	55,345	35,125	47,505	137,975
Total need by income	896,665	384,195	121,730	1,402,590	295,550	276,960	327,695	900,205

Table 10 – Cost Burden > 50% - Statewide

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS								
Small Related	101,581	58,863	17,922	178,366	34,537	41,027	59,476	135,040
Large Related	35,895	16,419	4,808	57,122	11,593	17,028	21,767	50,388
Elderly	39,187	23,829	9,149	72,165	50,286	38,333	32,708	121,327
Other	70,002	37,077	15,136	122,215	24,771	14,996	19,435	59,202
Total need by income	246,665	136,188	47,015	429,868	121,187	111,384	133,386	365,957

Table 10a – Cost Burden > 50% State CDBG and HOME Non-Entitlement Jurisdictions Only

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

5. Crowding (More than one person per room)

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS										
Single family households	185,920	149,995	124,765	44,060	504,740	14,855	29,325	48,675	25,510	118,365
Multiple, unrelated family households	20,300	28,605	32,980	12,640	94,525	4,435	13,845	28,950	18,600	65,830
Other, non-family households	7,280	7,250	8,645	3,520	26,695	345	320	460	225	1,350
Total need by income	213,500	185,850	166,390	60,220	625,960	19,635	43,490	78,085	44,335	185,545

Table 11 – Crowding Information – 1/2 - Statewide

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS										
Single family households	42,296	41,966	39,762	14,124	138,148	5,732	10,961	18,347	10,317	45,357
Multiple, unrelated family households	4,767	7,879	9,589	3,835	26,070	1,643	4,543	9,246	6,869	22,301
Other, non-family households	1,314	1,433	1,973	828	5,548	190	160	131	70	551
Total need by income	48,446	51,251	51,355	18,757	169,809	7,564	15,654	27,716	17,245	68,179

Table 11a – Crowding Information –State CDBG and HOME Non-Entitlement Jurisdictions Only

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

Households with Children Present	9,655,142
Average household size-Owner Occupied	2.98
Average Household size – Renter Occupied	2.88

Table 12 – Crowding Information – Statewide
Data Source: 2009-2013 ACS and 2005 ACS

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

It is difficult to determine the number of single person households in need of housing assistance as data on household income by household size is not readily available. However, extremely low income households experiencing housing problems – particularly cost-burdened households, represent 83.2 percent of all extremely low income renter households in California who experienced housing problems; 81.2 percent paid greater than 30 percent of their income towards housing costs. These households are often identified as those most at risk of homelessness.

In addition, the most recent Point In Time (PIT) Estimates of Homelessness indicated 90,765 homeless persons experiencing homelessness in 2014. Though no record of whether these are single person households or not, generally, the majority would be single individuals. Of those, there were 24,857 sheltered homeless individuals and 65,908 who were unsheltered. The PIT indicates that there were 28,200 individuals classified as chronically homeless.

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

There was no data estimating the number and type of families in need of housing assistance who are disabled; however according to 2009-2011 ACS data 9.3 percent of the state's population is disabled. Of this disabled population 19.5 percent had an income in the past 12-months below poverty level.

Crime statistics can be found on the State of California Department of Justice website http://oag.ca.gov/cjsc/pubs

What are the most common housing problems?

The most common problems in California are housing cost burden and overcrowding. Recent California Federal Rent Assistance Facts by the Center on Budget Policy Priorities reports that out of 5.6 million renters in California, only 475,200 low-income households are federally assisted and can afford modest housing at an affordable cost. About 61 percent of these households are headed by people who are elderly or have disabilities; approximately 30 percent are families with children that are headed by people younger than 62 and do not have disabilities. According to the table above in California, 1,402,590 low-income renter households pay more than half their monthly cash income for housing costs. When housing costs consume more than half of household income, low-income families are at greater risk of becoming homeless. The 2014 Point-in-time survey suggests that at least 113,952 people (homeless individuals and homeless people in families) are homeless in California.

The housing needs table above indicates that 221,895 low income households renters (0-50% AMI) in California live in severely overcrowded conditions. A shift in tenure due to foreclosures tightened the rental markets and will likely result in increased rents. As the foreclosure crisis continues, the demand for rental housing will likely increase as owners of foreclosed units move into rental units and potential homebuyers, facing tighter credit and increased unemployment, postpone home buying. If this increased demand is not met with an adequate increase in rental supply, rents will rise, leading to further decline in affordability.

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

The above tables indicate that extremely low income (0-30% AMI) households and the elderly are the primary population/household types most affected with the typical housing challenges. According to 2007-2011 CHAS data, 24 percent of all renter households in California are extremely low income (ELI), making 30 percent or less of area median income. Of these ELI households, 83.2 percent experienced housing problems and 81.2 percent paid greater than 30 percent of their income towards housing costs. ELI housing needs require specific housing solutions such as deeper income targeting for subsidies, housing with supportive services, single-room occupancy (SRO's) and/or shared housing, and rent subsidies. The State has recognized this deeper affordability need by expanding the housing element update process through Government Code (GC) Section 65583(a) to require quantification and analysis of existing and projected housing needs of ELI households.

California's elderly population is growing rapidly with the aging baby boomer generation. Nearly 2.3 million elderly households reside in California and over 33% of these elderly households had a housing burden of greater than 30%. Approximately 52% of elderly renter households pay greater than 30 percent of their income on housing costs and of the approximately 1.7 million elderly homeowner households, 27% had a housing burden.

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

Most individuals and families that are low income use a higher portion of their income on basic needs. 30.4 percent of California's total lower-income (0-80% AMI) households pay in excess of 30 percent of their income on housing costs 896,665 or 69.4% of California's extremely low income renter households (0-30% AMI) pay in excess of 50% of their income on housing costs. The extremely low income category of homeowners differentiated from renters in that there were fewer households with 295,550 or 60.9% paying in excess of 50% of their income on housing costs. Households that fall into these categories often struggle to make ends meet and are at a higher risk of homelessness.

Rapid re-housing has become an increasingly important tool in a community's response to homelessness. The model has shown success on the individual level helping households exit homelessness and not return to shelter. Additionally, it has helped communities decrease the number of people experiencing homelessness and the amount of time households spend homeless.

Rapid re-housing places a priority on moving a family or individual experiencing homelessness into permanent housing as quickly as possible, ideally within 30 days of a client becoming homeless and entering a program. The funds under this strategy are intended to target individuals and families who would be homeless but for this assistance. The funds provide for a variety of assistance, including: short-term or medium-term rental assistance and housing relocation and stabilization services, including such activities as mediation, credit counseling, security or utility deposits, utility payments, moving cost assistance, and case management. Although the duration of financial assistance may vary, many programs find that, on average, four to six months of financial assistance is sufficient to stably re-house a household.

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

The state does not have estimates of the at-risk populations and therefore cannot include a description of the operational definition.

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

Housing cost burden greater than 30 percent and housing with one or more severe housing problems are linked to instability and an increased risk of homelessness.

Discussion

NA-15 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Problems - 91.305 (b)(2)

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

Introduction

See narrative discussion in Section NA-30 below. Data tabulated for State CDBG and HOME-eligible jurisdictions is shown in red.

0%-30% of Area Median Income

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	1,343,144	201,232	111,145
White	516,740	100,105	52,035
Black / African American	150,923	19,286	12,126
Asian	143,094	27,453	22,036
American Indian, Alaska Native	8,927	1,782	824
Pacific Islander	3,846	419	305
Hispanic	493,352	48,175	21,847

Table 13 - Disproportionally Greater Need 0 - 30% AMI - Statewide

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

**The four severe housing problems are: 1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4.Cost Burden over 50%*

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	441,003	69,482	44,250
White	212,245	39,975	26,223
Black / African American	26,725	2,925	2,665
Asian	26,555	4,682	5,146
American Indian, Alaska Native	5,664	1,556	672
Pacific Islander	782	69	100
Hispanic	158,297	18,862	8,455

Table 10 - Disproportionally Greater Need 0 - 30% AMI State CDBG and HOME Non-Entitlement Jurisdictions Only

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

**The four severe housing problems are: 1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4.Cost Burden over 50%*

30%-50% of Area Median Income

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	1,185,786	324,831	0
White	445,215	182,107	0
Black / African American	92,821	20,493	0
Asian	110,852	26,781	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	6,409	2,308	0
Pacific Islander	3,271	556	0
Hispanic	507,486	87,886	0

Table 14 - Disproportionally Greater Need 30 - 50% AMI - Statewide

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

**The four severe housing problems are: 1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4.Cost Burden over 50%*

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	444,336	142,084	0
White	213,247	88,460	0
Black / African American	17,817	3,685	0
Asian	24,145	6,646	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	3,847	1,714	0
Pacific Islander	1,201	194	0
Hispanic	175,393	38,756	0

Table 11 - Disproportionally Greater Need 30 - 50% AMI State CDBG and HOME Non-Entitlement Jurisdictions Only

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

**The four severe housing problems are: 1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4.Cost Burden over 50%*

50%-80% of Area Median Income

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	1,271,552	719,149	0
White	529,245	377,161	0
Black / African American	89,949	44,233	0
Asian	125,491	60,335	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	6,305	4,212	0
Pacific Islander	4,800	1,810	0
Hispanic	493,781	218,832	0

Table 15 - Disproportionally Greater Need 50 - 80% AMI - Statewide

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

**The four severe housing problems are: 1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4.Cost Burden over 50%*

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	503,689	308,746	0
White	251,042	187,714	0
Black / African American	22,265	8,091	0
Asian	31,936	13,998	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	3,459	3,818	0
Pacific Islander	1,381	441	0
Hispanic	183,290	89,540	0

Table 15a - Disproportionally Greater Need 50 - 80% AMI State CDBG and HOME Non-Entitlement Jurisdictions Only

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

**The four severe housing problems are: 1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4.Cost Burden over 50%*

80%-100% of Area Median Income

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	611,396	615,995	0
White	284,295	333,573	0
Black / African American	34,926	41,858	0
Asian	73,037	60,094	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	2,751	3,478	0
Pacific Islander	2,312	1,805	0
Hispanic	203,384	163,612	0

Table 16 - Disproportionally Greater Need 80 - 100% AMI - Statewide

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

**The four severe housing problems are: 1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4.Cost Burden over 50%*

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	242,846	245167	0
White	131,829	150233	0
Black / African American	9,149	7660	0
Asian	18,287	14534	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	1,876	2602	0
Pacific Islander	703	471	0
Hispanic	76,249	65519	0

Table 16a - Disproportionally Greater Need 80 - 100% AMI – State CDBG and HOME Non-Entitlement Jurisdictions Only

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

**The four severe housing problems are: 1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4.Cost Burden over 50%*

NA-20 Disproportionately Greater Need: Severe Housing Problems – 91.305(b)(2)

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

Introduction

See narrative discussion in Section NA-30 below.

0%-30% of Area Median Income

Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	1,176,911	367,486	111,145
White	445,516	171,159	52,035
Black / African American	130,914	39,304	12,126
Asian	122,360	48,174	22,036
American Indian, Alaska Native	7,610	3,077	824
Pacific Islander	3,621	653	305
Hispanic	443,540	97,874	21,847

Table 12 – Severe Housing Problems 0 - 30% AMI - Statewide

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

**The four severe housing problems are: 1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4.Cost Burden over 50%*

30%-50% of Area Median Income

Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	795,256	715,301	0
White	288,987	338,423	0
Black / African American	57,868	55,488	0
Asian	76,226	61,515	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	3,796	4,919	0
Pacific Islander	2,071	1,773	0
Hispanic	353,250	242,175	0

Table 18 – Severe Housing Problems 30 - 50% AMI - Statewide

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

**The four severe housing problems are: 1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4.Cost Burden over 50%*

50%-80% of Area Median Income

Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	653,380	1,337,184	0
White	234,151	672,291	0
Black / African American	36,460	97,696	0
Asian	67,714	118,071	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	2,748	7,740	0
Pacific Islander	2,520	4,117	0
Hispanic	300,271	412,400	0

Table 19 – Severe Housing Problems 50 - 80% AMI - Statewide

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

**The four severe housing problems are: 1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4.Cost Burden over 50%*

80%-100% of Area Median Income

Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	268,406	958,843	0
White	99,007	518,806	0
Black / African American	13,623	63,162	0
Asian	36,306	96,854	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	1,135	5,103	0
Pacific Islander	1,408	2,697	0
Hispanic	113,096	253,911	0

Table 20 – Severe Housing Problems 80 - 100% AMI - Statewide

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

**The four severe housing problems are: 1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4.Cost Burden over 50%*

NA-25 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens – 91.305 (b)(2)

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

Introduction

See narrative discussion in Section NA-30 below. Data tabulated for State CDBG and HOME-eligible jurisdictions is shown in red.

Housing Cost Burden

Housing Cost Burden	<=30%	30-50%	>50%	No / negative income (not computed)
Jurisdiction as a whole	6,638,282	2,865,109	2,562,933	120,533
White	3,916,054	1,406,723	1,142,473	54,099
Black / African American	340,575	201,683	229,127	13,131
Asian	750,026	319,090	280,268	24,455
American Indian, Alaska Native	34,036	13,762	13,293	915
Pacific Islander	17,477	9,175	7,841	325
Hispanic	1,466,738	863,132	842,097	25,557

Table 21 – Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens AMI - Statewide

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

Housing Cost Burden	<=30%	30-50%	>50%	No / negative income (not computed)
Jurisdiction as a whole	2,751,308	1,116,852	972,704	47,164
White	1,812,111	641,002	524,731	27,013
Black / African American	79,411	45,643	51,002	2,835
Asian	186,309	78,819	67,036	5,639
American Indian, Alaska Native	22,421	8,217	8,817	704
Pacific Islander	5,461	3,010	2,561	100
Hispanic	599,126	316,926	296,922	9,862

Table 21a – Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens AMI – State CDBG and HOME Non-Entitlement Jurisdictions Only

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

NA-30 Disproportionately Greater Need: Discussion – 91.305 (b)(2)

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

Statewide

According to HUD, disproportionately greater need exists when the percentage of persons in a category of need who are members of a particular racial or ethnic group is at least ten percentage points higher than the percentage of persons in the category as a whole. Data provided in Sections NA-15, 20 and 25 above, do indicate some instances within a certain income category where a racial or ethnic group has disproportionately greater need – or is disproportionally represented - than the needs or representation of that income category as a whole.

In the 80%-100% income category, the Pacific Islander ethnic group has disproportionately greater need than the needs of that income category as a whole in severe housing problems, as 34% of households in that income category and ethnic group have one or more of four severe housing problems compared to 22% of households in the jurisdiction as a whole.

Black/African American households also have disproportionately greater representation in housing cost burden as 55% of households in that racial group experience cost burden compared with 45% of households in the State as a whole.

Non-Entitlement Portion of the State

The alternate data included in Tables 13, 14, 15, 16, and 21 calculates similar data for the State CDBG and HOME-eligible non-entitlement portion of the State. Those tables have been used to calculate disproportionately greater need for these portions of the State. According to these calculations and similar to the outcomes detailed above for the State as a whole, a disproportionately greater need exists in the State CDBG and HOME-eligible non-entitlement portion of the State for households in the Pacific Islander and Black/African American racial and ethnic groups in several income categories.

According to the alternate data for Table 14, in the State CDBG and HOME-eligible non-entitlement portion of the State, in the 30-50% income category, the Pacific Islander ethnic group has a disproportionately greater need in housing problems as 86% percent of households in that ethnic group and income category have one or more housing problems compared to 76% of households in the 30-50% income category in the State CDBG and HOME-eligible non-entitlement portion of State as a whole.

According to the alternate data for Table 15, in the State CDBG and HOME-eligible non-entitlement portion of the State in the 50-80% income category, the Black/African American and Pacific Islander racial or ethnic groups have a disproportionately greater need in housing problems as 73% of percent of households in the Black/African American racial group in the 50-80% income category and 76% of households in the Pacific Islander ethnic group in the 50-80% income category have one or more housing problems compared to 62% of households in the 50-80% income category in the State CDBG and HOME-eligible non-entitlement portion of State as a whole.

According to the alternate data for Table 16, Pacific Islander households in the State CDBG and HOME-eligible non-entitlement portion of the State also have a disproportionately greater need in housing

problems in the 80%-100% income category as 60% of households in that ethnic group and income category have one or more housing problems compared to 50% of households in the 80%-100% income category in the State CDBG and HOME-eligible non-entitlement portion of the State as a whole.

According to the alternate data for Table 21, in the State CDBG and HOME-eligible non-entitlement portion of the State, Black/African American households have disproportionately greater need in housing cost burden as 54% of households in that racial group experience cost burden compared with 43% of households in the State CDBG and HOME-eligible non-entitlement portion of the State as a whole.

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

Not applicable

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

This Consolidated Plan is for a State grantee. California is diverse in its racial and ethnic composition, and there are numerous areas across the state with concentrated populations, including Hispanic, African American, Asian, Pacific Islander, and others. The State's method of distribution selects projects and proposals targeted at meeting priority local needs and takes steps to affirmatively further fair housing during implementation.

NA-35 Public Housing – (Optional)

The State of California does not administer any public housing funds. The data below autofills into the ConPlan from HUD and is incomplete.

Totals in Use

	Program Type								
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers					
				Total	Project -based	Tenant -based	Special Purpose Voucher		
							Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
# of units vouchers in use	0	0	0	807	0	807	0	0	0

Table 22 - Public Housing by Program Type
***includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition**
Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Characteristics of Residents

	Program Type							
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers Total	Project -based	Tenant -based	Special Purpose Voucher	
							Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

# Homeless at admission	0	0	0	5	0	5	0	0
# of Elderly Program Participants (>62)	0	0	0	194	0	194	0	0
# of Disabled Families	0	0	0	335	0	335	0	0

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

Program Type								
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers				
				Total	Project -based	Tenant -based	Special Purpose Voucher	
							Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program
# of Families requesting accessibility features	0	0	0	807	0	807	0	0
# of HIV/AIDS program participants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
# of DV victims	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 13 – Characteristics of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Race of Residents

Program Type									
Race	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers					
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Special Purpose Voucher		
							Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
White	0	0	0	723	0	723	0	0	0
Black/African American	0	0	0	32	0	32	0	0	0
Asian	0	0	0	9	0	9	0	0	0
American Indian/Alaska Native	0	0	0	39	0	39	0	0	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	0	4	0	4	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
*includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition									

Table 24 – Race of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

Ethnicity of Residents

Program Type									
Ethnicity	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers					
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Special Purpose Voucher		
							Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
Hispanic	0	0	0	70	0	70	0	0	0
Not Hispanic	0	0	0	737	0	737	0	0	0

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

Table 25 – Ethnicity of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

Section 504 Needs Assessment:

Describe the needs of public housing tenants and applicants on the waiting list for accessible units?

The State does not own or operate public housing. Public housing is administered directly through local Public Housing Authorities (PHAs). Therefore, the State has no involvement with public housing residents.

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

This data is not readily available, and is not required to be provided in the State's Consolidated Plan.

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

This data is not readily available, and is not required to be provided in the State's Consolidated Plan.

Discussion:

Local public housing agencies (PHAs) are the primary administrators of housing choice vouchers and therefore play an essential role in the delivery of housing assistance. The PHAs receive federal funds from HUD to administer the voucher program. In California, there are 107 PHAs that administer voucher programs. A listing of participating PHAs is available at http://www.hud.gov/offices/pih/pha/contacts/states/ca.cfm.

By law, a PHA must provide 75 percent of its vouchers to applicants whose incomes do not exceed 30 percent of the area median income." Median income levels are published by HUD and vary by location and family size. PHAs are required to verify family composition, income, employment, and assets. Vouchers are in high demand. Often, PHAs have long waiting lists of eligible families for program participation. Each PHA must establish waiting list procedures, and some have preferences to allow for homeless families, families paying more than 50% of their income for rent, or families involuntarily displaced to receive vouchers first.

NA-40 Homeless Needs Assessment – 91.305(c)

Introduction:

Homelessness encompasses a broad range of housing needs arising from residential instability. Residential instability encompasses both those who are literally homeless and those who are precariously housed. The literally homeless include those who temporarily live in emergency shelters or transitional housing as well as those who sleep in places not meant for human habitation, such as streets and unconverted garages. In contrast, the precariously housed are persons on the brink of homelessness. Typically, this category is used to describe those doubling up with family and friends, and those paying an extremely high percentage of their income on housing. While the literally and precariously housed are defined slightly differently, persons experiencing either of the two circumstances commonly lack a stable and regular night-time residence, making it difficult to count and survey this population.

The issues of affordable housing and homelessness are intricately connected. While circumstantial factors vary, homelessness occurs when people or households are unable to acquire and/or maintain housing they can afford. The chief cause of homelessness in the United States is the scarcity of affordable homes. But this is not the only cause of homelessness as seen by many providers of housing services in California. Medical condition, criminal record, lack of job skills, legal issues, and low-to-no income are all factors typically contributing to homelessness and need to be resolved if an individual or household wants to break the cycle of homelessness.

Nature and Extent of Homelessness: (Optional)

Race:	**Sheltered:**	**Unsheltered (optional)**
White	0	0
Black or African American	0	0
Asian	0	0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0
Pacific Islander	0	0
Ethnicity:	**Sheltered:**	**Unsheltered (optional)**
Hispanic	0	0
Not Hispanic	0	0

Data Source Comments:

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

As of 2014 there were an estimated 23,187 homeless people in families. Of those 17,658 were sheltered and 5,529 were unsheltered. With approximately 63 percent of California's total homeless population unsheltered, California ranks the highest out of eight states where there are higher portions of homeless populations unsheltered than sheltered.

Approximately 20 percent of the homeless are families. In 2014, nearly 14,000 youth and children experienced homelessness. Although there were no statistics available for families of veterans there was an estimated 12,096 homeless veterans in 2014. Of those 4,457 were sheltered and 7,639 were unsheltered.

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

Homelessness information by Racial and Ethnic Group was not available.

Describe the Nature and Extent of Unsheltered and Sheltered Homelessness.

The 2014 total Point-in-Time (PIT) estimate for homelessness in California was 113,952. There were 42,515 sheltered homeless and 71,437 unsheltered homeless. While this count only minimally estimates homelessness due to difficulties in identifying and counting persons in unsheltered locations, it ranks California among the top four states with the largest concentration of homeless individuals and families.

However, the PIT report indicated that, between 2011 and 2014, California's homeless population decreased by approximately 9 percent. Additionally, the percentage of the homeless that are unsheltered was estimated to have decreased by about 4 percent in the last four years.

Every county in California has homeless populations, but for rural areas of the state it becomes more difficult to provide estimates because the 2014 PIT counts by Continuum of Care (CoC) and some of the CoC's are only partly and not entirely rural. Rural counties may experience homelessness more severely in some categories than in urban areas. Rural counties may have much higher percentages of female homelessness and persons homeless due to domestic violence, higher number of persons homeless for longer than one year, and slightly higher unemployment rates when compared to urban areas. Although housing costs in rural areas are lower, wages are significantly lower as well. Many rural residents are at risk of becoming homeless because they cannot make sufficient income to meet housing costs. Elderly on small, fixed incomes and those with sporadic and seasonal employment, such as farmworkers, are particularly vulnerable to homelessness.

Discussion:

See above.

NA-45 Non-Homeless Special Needs Assessment – 91.305 (b,d) -

Special needs populations include some of the most vulnerable groups including persons with alcohol or drug addiction, the physically and mentally disabled, the elderly and persons with HIV/AIDS who require specific supportive services such as counseling, physical therapy, transportation services, medical treatment and assistance with routine daily living activities.

A more complete list of identified special needs populations is located on page 44; however, the table below estimates the number of people in some of the identified special needs populations. Providing supportive services as part of housing services is one means of addressing the needs of the whole person instead of dealing with the need for shelter separately from the person's other needs. Where the person has multiple needs, not just a need for affordable and or accessible housing, this approach can be an excellent system for delivering needed services.

Special Needs Populations Households in Need of Supportive Housing *Note: Information provided below reflects the most recently available data from a variety of sources*	
	Number
Frail Elderly (> 65 years) [1]	Population: 4,446,865 Households: 2,569,439
Severe Mental Illness [2]	Adults – 1,175,000 Children – 422,000
Developmentally Disabled [3]	670,571
Disabled [4]	3,762,239
Persons with Alcohol/Drug Addiction [5]	Drug use estimate: 3,222,000 Binge Alcohol use estimate: 6,486,000
Persons with AIDS/ HIV [6]	Reported AIDS cases – 15,912 PLWH – 117.643
Farmworkers [7]	448,183
Prevalence of Rape, Physical Violence and/or Stalking by Intimate Partner – Women [8]	4,563,000

1 American Community Survey S0103 2009-2013, 5 year estimates
2 National Alliance on Mental Illness, State Statistics: California, 2010. See also *California Mental Health Prevalence Estimates* and *California Healthcare Foundation, Mental Health in California*
3 California State Council on Developmental Disabilities, 2014-15 State Plan Amendment, page 13
4 American Community Survey S1810 2009-2013, 5 year estimates, population with a disability
5 Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMSA)
6 HOPWA
7 United States Department of Agriculture, Census of Agriculture, 2007
8 United States Center for Disease Control, National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey, Table 7.4, Lifetime Prevalence of Rape, Physical Violence, and/or Stalking by an Intimate Partner by state of residence – Women.

An important part of promoting suitable living conditions for those with special needs is the provision of appropriate supportive services. The State of California has an extensive ongoing system of social services administered by various State and local agencies and departments to provide institutional care, client-based community or residential services and housing-based supportive services to those in need.

Elderly and Frail Elderly

The fit elderly are individuals, over 65 years of age, living independently at home or in sheltered accommodation. They are freely ambulant and without health problems and do not receive regular prescribed medication.

The frail elderly are generally categorized as individuals, over 65 years of age, dependent on others for activities of daily living, and often in institutional care. They are not independently mobile and may require regular prescribed drug therapy.

Since 2000, California's population of persons 60 and older has grown rapidly. Between 1950 and 2000, the number of older adults in the State grew from 1.6 million to 4.7 million, an increase of 194 percent. This trend will continue as the number of people age 60 and over grows to 13.9 million by 2050, an increase of 128 percent from 2010. By 2050, it is estimated that over 25 percent of Californians will be 60 or older. While approximately 607,000 Californians are 85 or older today, by 2050 an estimated 2.49 million individuals will be in this age group, a dramatic 310 percent increase. This rapid growth has many implications for individuals, families, communities, and government. The 85 year and over group have a significantly higher rate of functional limitations.

Characteristic	**2005-2009, 2010**
Living in a nursing home	1.7%
Below poverty level	9.8%
Medi-Cal beneficiaries	19.1%
Limited English proficiency	20.3%
Poor or near poor (0-199% of poverty)	28%
Living alone	22.5%
Women age 60+ living alone	45%
Percent with any disability	43%
Homeowners	77%
Number of grandparents responsible for basic needs of grandchildren	119,103

Source: CA State Plan on Aging, pg. 10

California's older population will also continue to grow more racially, ethnically, and culturally diverse. While 62 percent of older adults were White/Non-Hispanic in 2010, by 2050 the majority of older adults will be from a number of racial, ethnic, and cultural groups. Racial, ethnic, and cultural diversity has enriched California, fostered new innovations, and encouraged an appreciation of the State's multicultural traditions and the values and priorities we hold in common. Nonetheless, because some groups have been historically deprived of opportunities, or are now faced with the challenges of life in a new culture, diversity may translate into health and economic disparities that

must be addressed. California is home to more than six million individuals in this age group. In a little over a decade, that number will increase by over 56 percent.

Persons with Developmental Disabilities

Affordable and accessible housing is a cornerstone to individuals with developmental disabilities residing in their local communities. The term developmental disability refers to severe and chronic disability attributable to a mental or physical impairment, such as mental retardation, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, or autism that begins before individuals reach adulthood (Welfare and Institutions Code, Section 4512). The Department of Developmental Services (DDS) is the State agency responsible for assisting children and adults with developmental disabilities. DDS contracts with 21 nonprofit regional centers throughout California to coordinate and provide ongoing services and support in such areas as independent living, personal care, mobility, behavior and socialization (visit www.dds.ca.gov for more information).

According to a recent update by the California State Council on Developmental Disabilities' 2014-15 State Plan Amendment, 3.8% of the population aged 5 to 17 years were identified as having a developmental disability, 8.1% aged 18 to 64 years and 36.7 percent of the population 65 years and older. Of these 66.8% are at or above 150 percent of the poverty level.

To live in the least restrictive community settings, many individuals with developmental disabilities require deeply subsidized housing. However, as increasing numbers of individuals choose to live in the community, or move from large institutional settings, there exists a shortage of affordable and accessible housing to meet the needs of these individuals. As a result, individuals who might otherwise live independently in the community are often forced to live in more restrictive community care facilities and smaller institutional settings.

As one of its highest priorities, DDS actively pursues projects that will increase the capacity and construction of affordable and accessible housing in the least restrictive community settings.

Farmworkers

According to USDA's Census of Agriculture for 2007, California farm employment totaled 448,183 employees working on 29,661 operating farms. This represents a 16 percent decrease from the figures presented in the 2002 Census. Of the total for 2007, 57 percent worked less than 150 days annually reflecting the seasonal nature of the work. The following is a comparison of several county farmworker populations according to the 2007 Census of Agriculture.

California's 2007 Farmworker Population				
	Total Farms	Total Workers	Days Worked	
			150 +	< 150
California Statewide	29,661	448,183	191,438	256,745
Fresno County	2,825	52,727	14,873	37,854
Kern County	858	29,283	13,607	15,676
Riverside County	1,197	16,069	7,945	8,124
San Joaquin County	1,541	23,037	7,529	15,508
Tulare County	2,103	24,978	12,549	12,429

Source: USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service, 2007 Census of Agriculture

Approximately 50 percent of farmworkers are accompanied by a spouse, child or parent. The median number of children in families of farmworker parents is two, but 40 percent of farmworker parents are reported to have between three to seven children in the household. Farmworkers and their families cope with substandard housing conditions fraught with serious health and sanitation problems. To avoid harassment, they often live out of sight in undeveloped canyons, fields, squatter camps and back houses.

Privately owned employee housing (licensed by the State of California) has been steadily diminishing. In 2000, employers owned 1000 employee housing developments sheltering an estimated 23,000 farmworker households. In 2010, the year for which the most accurate totals are available, there were approximately 743 licensed employee housing developments with capacity for 16,378 farmworker households. By comparison, in 2008 the State had a total of 794 licensed developments with capacity for 19,818 farmworker households.

Lead-Based Paint Hazards

The Consumer Product Safety Commission banned the use of lead-based paint in housing in 1978. According to the National Safety Council, approximately 38 million US homes contain lead paint. Any housing built prior to 1979 is considered to be at risk of containing some amount of lead-based paint. Older housing is more likely to have lead-based paint and the amount of lead pigment in the paint tends to increase with the age of the housing. In particular, housing units constructed prior to 1950 have been found to have some of the highest levels of lead-based paint. The lead paint becomes a hazard when it is chewed, begins to peel, chip or flake or turn to dust due to abrasion or the hazardous material become exposed and/or airborne.

As reported in the HUD's Comprehensive and Workable Plan for the Abatement of Lead-Based Paint in Privately Owned Structures report to Congress, lead-based paint is widespread in housing. The revised estimate is that 64 million homes of the privately owned housing units built before 1980, have lead-based paint somewhere in the building. Twelve million of these homes are occupied by families with

children under the age of seven years old. An estimated 49 million privately owned homes have lead-based paint in their interiors.[1]

According to 2000 Census data, California had a total of 8,071,841 housing units built prior to 1978, 25 percent of which were constructed prior to 1950. Of these, 4,420,232 (55 percent) are owner occupied and 3,651,609 (45 percent) are renter occupied.

Lead hazards can pose a risk for all people who are exposed; however, children under the age of six are most at risk. Lead interrupts the cognitive development that normally occurs in a child's early years causing a range of problems from Attention Deficit Disorder and loss of IQ points to coma and even death. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), about 1.6% of children living in the United States between the ages of one and five years have an unacceptably high level of lead in their blood (i.e., 10 micrograms or more of lead per deciliter of blood), which may result in learning disabilities, reduced intellectual ability, or other problems.[2] This rate of elevated blood-lead levels is much less than it was only a few years ago, between 1991 and 1994, when CDC estimated that 4.4% of such children had elevated lead levels. The drop in blood-lead levels resulted, at least in part, from the success of federal programs aimed at reducing childhood exposure to house dust containing lead-based paint (LBP) from deteriorated or abraded surfaces of walls, door jambs, and window sashes. It is not necessary for a child to eat paint chips to become poisoned: normal hand-to-mouth behavior in a lead-contaminated home can deliver enough lead to damage the developing nervous system of a child under the age of seven years. Poor children are at special risk because inadequate nutrition increases lead absorption by the body.

In *2003, the California Department of Health Services (DHS) data indicated that approximately 4,000 children throughout the State were identified as having elevated blood lead levels.* Additional information on the needs of these families is included in the LEAD program narrative beginning on page 63.

Persons Living with HIV/AIDS (PLWHA) Housing consistently ranks as one of the top five unmet needs for PLWHA in California. Studies show that housing assistance enables PLWHA to achieve housing stability, improve health outcomes, and reduce overall public costs. Housing is also identified as a strategic point of intervention to address HIV/AIDS and overlapping vulnerabilities (such as age, race, mental illness, drug use, or chronic homelessness).

U.S. Department of Housing, Report to Congress, Comprehensive and Workable Plan for the Abatement of Lead-Based Paint in Privately Owned Structures, 1999.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, *Third National Report on Human Exposure to Environmental Chemicals*, National Center for Environmental Health, July 2005, p. 41,

http://www.cdc.gov/exposurereport/pdf/thirdreport.pdf, visited November 29, 2007.

The following HIV/AIDS surveillance data depicted in the *HOPWA Surveillance Data* table below may be used as a benchmark for assessing the number of PLWHA in the State HOPWA jurisdictions. The data reported in the *HIV Housing Need (HOPWA Grantees Only)* table below represents the number of households reported to be waiting for housing assistance per assistance type. These totals are based on project sponsors that maintained waiting lists and reported to CDPH/OA in the FY 2013-14 HOPWA Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) and Beneficiary Worksheet.

HOPWA SURVEILLANCE DATA

Current HOPWA formula use:	
Cumulative cases of AIDS reported	17,476
Area incidence of AIDS	240
Number of new cases prior year (3 years of data)	912
Rate per population	3
Rate per population (3 years of data)	4
Current HIV surveillance data:	
Number of Persons living with HIV (PLWH)	12,221
Area Prevalence (PLWH per population)	149
Number of new HIV cases reported last year	529

*All of the estimates in this table reflect the HOPWA non-EMSA counties for 2012 as reported by December 23, 2014.
**OA rate is average rate over three years from 2009-2011
***Population Denominator Source: U.S. Census Bureau. Population estimates [entire data set]. http://www.census.gov/popest/data/. Updated July 1, 2014. Accessed March 4, 2015.

Data Source: California Department of Public Health, Office of AIDS, Surveillance Section. Data as of December 23, 2014

HIV Housing Need (HOPWA Grantees Only)

Type of HOPWA Assistance	**Estimates of Unmet Need***
TBRA	24
STRMU	75
Facility Based Housing (Permanent, short-term or transitional)	8

Data Source: HOPWA CAPER and HOPWA Beneficiary Verification Worksheet FY 2013-14

Describe the characteristics of special needs populations in your community:

See narrative description above related to the characteristics of some of the following special need populations in the State:

- Elderly
- Frail Elderly
- Individuals with Severe Mental Illness
- Developmentally Disabled

- Physically Disabled
- Persons with Alcohol/Drug Addiction
- Persons with AIDS/HIV
- Farmworkers
- Women Experiencing Psychological or Physical Domestic Violence
- Victims of Federal, State, or Locally-declared disasters

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

General

Aside from adaptations to their units to allow them to live independently and specialized health services based on disability, the average special needs individual or family has the same needs as all low-moderate income family - affordable housing that is decent, safe and sanitary near required amenities.

HOPWA-Specific

California has the third highest housing costs in the nation, and most PLWHA are below federal poverty level, indicating a need for TBRA, STRMU, housing placement assistance, and/or more affordable housing options.

State HOPWA determines unmet housing and supportive service needs of PLWHA through collaboration with the Ryan White Part B (HCP) program at both the state and local level. HOPWA project sponsors are encouraged to participate in the development of local HIV/AIDS needs assessment and service delivery plans that often identify unmet housing needs.

In addition, State HOPWA encourages providers to participate in local Continuum of Care Planning Groups to ensure representation of the HIV/AIDS community, and to utilize the local Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) when applicable by regulation. Local HMIS is another means of identifying the number of PLWHA that are homeless or at risk of homelessness in a community.

CDPH/OA is currently engaged in a process to conduct a statewide needs assessment that will include epidemiology data, resource inventory, assessment of needs, and unmet needs/service gaps, including housing.

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

State HOPWA does not serve EMSA's. State HOPWA provides funds to HIV, housing, and homeless service providers in the 41 non-Eligible Metropolitan Statistical Areas (EMSA), Fresno and Bakersfield EMSAs.

Surveillance data reported to CDPH/OA through its electronic HIV/AIDS Reporting System in December 2014 indicates there were 12,596 people living with HIV/AIDS in the California non-EMSAs in 2013 (including those in prison). Whites represent the largest racial/ethnic group living with HIV/AIDS, at 49%. Latinos represent 31%, African Americans represent 15% percent, and 5% other race/ethnicities.

Limited data collected through the HOPWA funded contractors for individuals who received housing assistance indicate 68% had incomes at or below 30% of Area Median Income (AMI), 17% were at or below 50% of AMI, and 15% were at or below 80% of AMI which demonstrates a high poverty rate among PLWHA.

Discussion:

PLWHA of low income, and minority populations, are often underserved, unstably housed, and have a higher risk of becoming homeless and experiencing poorer health outcomes than those who are stably housed. State HOPWA distributes funds to all 41 non-EMSA counties under its jurisdiction based on reported HIV and AIDS cases, and low-income PLWHA are eligible to apply for assistance. The State HOPWA allocation is not sufficient to establish TBRA programs in every community; however, STRMU is made available to reduce the risk of homelessness for all eligible clients. HIV and housing providers must rely on collaboration with other housing and service agencies to assist clients with long term housing needs.

HIV/AIDS service providers report that HOPWA often serves as a safety net for households that are ineligible for mainstream housing and supportive service programs.

NA-50 Non-Housing Community Development Needs - 91.315 (f)

Community and economic development needs vary widely across the State. The extreme diversity in infrastructure, housing, public facilities, and the population itself means the need for community and economic development funding is high. HCD addresses priority needs, and distributes CDBG Program funds to the neediest eligible jurisdictions with the capacity to implement the awarded activities. Below are specific non-housing community development needs as determined by the Department

Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Facilities:

The need percentage for Public Facilities is based on the amount requested for these activities under the 2014 NOFA. In 2014, the amount requested for Public Facilities accounted for about 23 percent of total funds requested. The majority of Public Facilities requested were for senior centers, and a few for homeless facilities, youth facilities, and neighborhood centers.

How were these needs determined?

The State has determined the extent of Public Facilities need is based on the demand for these activities under the 2014 NOFA.

Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Improvements:

Non-entitlement jurisdictions' need for Public Improvements is based on requested activities in the CDBG NOFA applications under the 2014 NOFA.

The majority of Public Improvement activities requested in the 2014 NOFA were for water or sewer improvements and a few for streets and sidewalks. Public Improvement activities awarded reflected about 35 percent of the total funds requested.

How were these needs determined?

The State has determined the extent of Public Improvements need is based on 2014 NOFA demand for these activities.

Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Services:

Non-entitlement jurisdictions need for Public Services are based on requested activities in the CDBG NOFA applications under the 2014 NOFA

In 2014, approximately 8 percent of CDBG funds were requested for Public Services such as senior services, youth and childcare services, homeless services, and code enforcement services.

How were these needs determined?

The State has determined the extent of Public Services need is based on 2014 NOFA demand for these activities.

Based on the needs analysis above, describe the State's needs in Colonias

The CDBG Colonia set-aside funding helps subsidize Public Improvement projects to improve failing water and sewage issues, as well as Housing Rehabilitation projects prior to the housing market downturn. Each Colonia has unique characteristics and some have more needs than others. All can use Housing Rehabilitation funding, but not all need the water, sewer, and infrastructure funding. A major issue with Housing Rehabilitation funding is for communities to be comfortable with doing grants instead of loans to make these programs viable in most Colonia communities.

The State's needs analysis under Public Facilities, Public Improvements, and Public Services above is not necessarily a good indicator of the needs for Colonias because the State did not receive applications from any of the fifteen Colonias in 2013 and 2014. The State did receive an application from Imperial County on behalf of the Colonias from the County's jurisdiction for the CDBG 2012 NOFA which resulted in an award for Public Improvement and Public Services. However, based on the 2013 Master Plan Colonia Update report for Imperial County, the State's need in the Colonias is Housing Rehabilitation.

Community development requires an analysis of the community as a whole to achieve the goal of community integration and opportunity for all Colonia. This includes crucial areas such as economic development, employment opportunities, capacity building and workforce development; however, under the current federal rules regarding eligible activities and funding, the State is not able to assist with these needs.

Housing Market Analysis

MA-05 Overview

Housing Market Analysis Overview:

The housing market in California varies significantly by region. The State experienced a significant impact related to foreclosures during the housing crisis of 2008-2009 and housing markets have not returned to a normal state of operation.

California's economic recovery in 2014, while ahead of the nation, was uneven with nuanced growth in coastal zones, and inland areas lagging behind. Drought conditions have added to the challenges that California must overcome for a full rebound of the economy in general, and of the housing market in particular, especially in hard-hit communities. Some of the construction jobs have rebounded helping to reduce the State's unemployment rate to 7 percent as of December 2014, which is still higher than the nationwide rate. Regional differences between coastal and inland areas are likely to continue. This uneven and slow rebound delays the economic multiplier benefits of more robust new housing construction to the state and regional economies.

Additional factors influencing California's housing market include[3]:

- *California's Home Prices and Rents Higher Than Just About Anywhere Else.* Housing in California has long been more expensive than most of the rest of the country. Beginning in about1970, however, the gap between California's home prices and those in the rest country started to widen. Between 1970 and 1980, California home prices went from 30 percent above U.S. levels to more than 80 percent higher. This trend has continued. Today, an average California home costs $440,000, about two-and-a-half times the average national home price ($180,000). Also, California's average monthly rent is about $1,240, 50 percent higher than the rest of the country ($840 per month).

- *Building Less Housing Than People Demand Drives High Housing Costs.* California is a desirable place to live. Yet not enough housing exists in the state's major coastal communities to accommodate all of the households that want to live there. In these areas, community resistance to housing, environmental policies, lack of fiscal incentives for local governments to approve housing, and limited land constrains new housing construction. A shortage of housing along California's coast means households wishing to live there compete for limited housing. This competition bids up home prices and rents. Some people who find California's coast unaffordable turn instead to California's inland communities, causing prices there to rise as well. In addition to a shortage of housing, high land and construction costs also play some role in high housing prices.

- *High Housing Costs Problematic for Households and the State's Economy.* Amid high housing costs, many households make serious trade-offs to afford living here. Households with

[3] California Legislative Analyst Office, California's High Housing Costs: Causes and Consequences, March 2015.

low incomes, in particular, spend much more of their income on housing. High home prices here also push homeownership out of reach for many. Faced with expensive housing options, workers in California's coastal communities commute 10 percent further each day than commuters elsewhere, largely because limited housing options exist near major job centers. Californians are also four times more likely to live in crowded housing. And, finally, the state's high housing costs make California a less attractive place to call home, making it more difficult for companies to hire and retain qualified employees, likely preventing the state's economy from meeting its full potential.

The need for affordable housing has not been met by the existing housing market. Given the extensive geographic area of the State, the Department instructs its grantees to assess and analyze local housing markets in developing project applications.

MA-10 Number of Housing Units – 91.310(a)

Introduction

In the last decade, the State's residential building permits peaked in 2004 at 212,960, and then spiraled down by 84 percent in 2009 to just over 36,000, the lowest level in 55 years of historical records. Multifamily permits decreased by 80 percent, from 62,000 in 2004 to just over 11,000 in 2009. While on the rebound, 2013 housing activities continued to lag behind, at 83,725 permits or 40 percent of the 2004 peak level. The trend of the highest proportion of multifamily permits in total permits statewide continued into 2013, when the multifamily sector comprised more than half of all the residential permits for the year, while typically strong single-family development areas continued to lag.

Chart 1
California Housing Growth and New Permits, 2000-2013



Source: Highlights of the State of Housing in California, California HCD, April 2014

Between 2000 and 2010, the number of building permits for single family development has outpaced those for multifamily development. Since 2011 multi-family development is occurring at a higher rate than single-family development. This type of development is more likely to be on infill sites and will likely serve renters rather than owners.

As the State's housing deficit continues to deepen, it delays the economic multiplier benefits of new housing construction. The recent drought cast over California adds to the challenges that the State must overcome in its trajectory, especially in the rural communities. Some of the construction jobs have been regained and regional differences between coastal and inland likely to continue, yet California continues to experience a high unemployment rate, at 8 percent in 2014, the highest in the nation.

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)



Source: Construction Industry Research Board/California Homebuilding Foundation and DOF 2014

With tens of millions of acres of developable land and an abundance of potential infill sites, California is not built out. In order to forecast where growth will occur during the term of the plan and beyond, HCD administered surveys to a panel of subject matter experts known as the Technical and Research Advisory Committee (TRAC). The panel members' responses were split between infill multi-family growth in the San Francisco and Los Angeles metropolitan areas and single-family growth in the inland portion of the state. This information will be used to inform the development of the Department Statewide Housing Plan update during the 2015-16 fiscal year.

All residential properties by number of units

Property Type	Number	%
1-unit detached structure	7,929,196	58%
1-unit, attached structure	961,035	7%
2-4 units	1,104,271	8%
5-19 units	1,556,300	11%
20 or more units	1,534,077	11%
Mobile Home, boat, RV, van, etc	546,250	4%
Total	***13,631,129***	***100%***

Table 26 – Residential Properties by Unit Number - Statewide

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Property Type	Number	%
1-unit detached structure	3,378,433	69.0%
1-unit, attached structure	254,330	5.2%
2-4 units	327,370	6.7%
5-19 units	330,521	6.7%
20 or more units	243,805	5.0%
Mobile Home, boat, RV, van, etc	363,794	7.4%
Total	4,898,253	100.0%

Table 14 – Residential Properties by Unit Number –State CDBG and HOME-eligible Non-Entitlement Jurisdictions Only

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

According to the table above, 13,631,129 units of housing of a variety of types are available in California. 65% of these units take the form of a 1-unit detached or attached structure while 30% appear in multi-unit structures. 4% of units are mobile but are often stationed in mobile home or RV parks or placed on a permanent foundation on an individual lot.

Unit Size by Tenure

	Owners		Renters	
	Number	%	Number	%
No bedroom	32,399	0%	360,202	7%
1 bedroom	192,033	3%	1,528,569	28%
2 bedrooms	1,358,625	19%	2,086,525	39%
3 or more bedrooms	5,472,585	78%	1,402,234	26%
Total	***7,055,642***	***100%***	***5,377,530***	***100%***

Table 27 – Unit Size by Tenure - Statewide

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

	Owners		Renters	
	Number	%	Number	%
No bedroom	11,594	0.4%	53,382	3.5%
1 bedroom	69,595	2.5%	315,633	20.7%
2 bedrooms	523,126	18.9%	605,795	39.7%
3 or more bedrooms	2,162,795	78.2%	551,341	36.1%
Total	2,767,110	100.0%	1,526,151	100.0%

Table 15 – Unit Size by Tenure - State CDBG and HOME-eligible Non-Entitlement Jurisdictions Only

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

According to the "Unit Size by Tenure" table, 56% of the units are occupied by homeowners while 45% are occupied by renters.

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

California's population of approximately 37 million is housed in approximately 13.5 million dwellings of which close to 5,761,000 are rental apartments. Of this number, approximately 150,000 are subsidized and regulated by HUD, 18,700 are subsidized by the US Department of Agriculture (USDA), 300,000 have Housing Choice Vouchers funded by HUD through local housing authorities, 44,000 are public housing units, and 204,000 have received allocations of Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC), in addition to units which have received funding through local HOME, CDBG, redevelopment and State or local programs without relying on any of the above programs. The potential loss of these units from the State's affordable housing stock could potentially have a direct impact on the State's ability to further fair housing choice.

Over half of California's privately owned federally assisted stock is Section 8 housing. Subsidized by HUD, Section 8 provides landlords with market rents while ensuring that residents pay no more than 30% of their incomes toward their rent.

Where data is available, the mapping tool below tracks the number, and when possible, the targeting, of units assisted by the HUD Multifamily, Low-Income Housing Tax Credit, Public Housing, and USDA Rural Development Multifamily sites: http://www.chpc.net/preservation/MappingWidget.html.

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

According to the January 2014 report at the hyperlink below, 57,000 of 116,744 privately owned, federally assisted apartments in 705 properties are at-risk of conversion to market rate from 2014 through 2019. Their analysis includes units currently subsidized by Section 8, Section 201/811, Section 515, Section 236, Section 221(d)(3), PRAC/202, and/or PRAC/811 programs. The full report is available at the following web address: http://www.chpc.net/dnld/HPN_StateRiskSummary_01312014.pdf.

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

With a shortage of affordable and available rental units for households with incomes below 80% of AMI, the available housing units do not meet the needs of the population. According to the National Low Income Housing Coalition, there are 71 affordable and available units per 100 lower income California households, 30 affordable and available units per 100 very low income California households, and 21 affordable and available units per 100 extremely low income California households (State Housing Profile: California, National Low Income Housing Coalition, March 2015).

Describe the need for specific types of housing:

Accessible housing with supportive services is needed to meet the needs of vulnerable groups including the elderly, persons with physical and mental disabilities, persons with alcohol or drug addiction, and persons with HIV/AIDS who require specific supportive services such as counseling, physical therapy, transportation services, medical treatment and assistance with routine daily living activities. The State of California has an extensive ongoing system of social services administered by various State agencies and

departments to provide institutional care, client-based community or residential services, and housing-based supportive services to those in need.

Discussion

See above.

MA-15 Cost of Housing – 91.310(a)

Introduction

Cost of Housing

	Base Year: 2000	Most Recent Year: 2011	% Change
Median Home Value	198,900	421,600	112%
Median Contract Rent	677	1,083	60%

Table 28 – Cost of Housing - Statewide

Data Source: 2000 Census (Base Year), 2007-2011 ACS (Most Recent Year)

Rent Paid	Number	%
Less than $500	625,926	11.6%
$500-999	1,837,591	34.2%
$1,000-1,499	1,672,057	31.1%
$1,500-1,999	798,528	14.9%
$2,000 or more	443,428	8.3%
Total	***5,377,530***	***100.0%***

Table 29 - Rent Paid - Statewide

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Rent Paid	Number	%
Less than $500	197,931	13.7%
$500-999	594,217	41.1%
$1,000-1,499	386,712	26.7%
$1,500-1,999	176,717	12.2%
$2,000 or more	90,765	6.3%
Total	1,446,342	100%

Table 29a - Rent Paid – State CDBG and HOME-eligible Non Entitlement Jurisdictions Only

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Housing Affordability

% Units affordable to Households earning	Renter	Owner
30% HAMFI	269,330	No Data
50% HAMFI	788,605	220,900
80% HAMFI	2,704,490	602,235
100% HAMFI	No Data	1,014,515
Total	***3,762,425***	***1,837,650***

Table 30 – Housing Affordability - Statewide

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

% Units affordable to Households earning	Renter	Owner
30% HAMFI	183,529	N/A
50% HAMFI	227,612	306,647
80% HAMFI	747,940	297,307
100% HAMFI	N/A	260,735
Total	1,159,081	864,689

Table 30a – Housing Affordability – – State CDBG and HOME-eligible Non Entitlement Jurisdictions Only

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

Monthly Rent (Not Applicable to State Grantees)

Monthly Rent ($)	Efficiency (no bedroom)	1 Bedroom	2 Bedroom	3 Bedroom	4 Bedroom
Fair Market Rent	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
High HOME Rent	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Low HOME Rent	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

Table 31 – Monthly Rent - Statewide

Data Source: HUD FMR and HOME Rents

Is there sufficient housing for households at all income levels?

There is not sufficient housing for households at all income levels. California's private housing market is not providing an adequate number of homes affordable to low- and moderate-income households. New housing construction has been slow to rebound, with residential permitting activity at less than half of the 2004 peak level. The existing housing stock is far from being adequate to meet the emerging needs and preferences of housing demand, the for-sale and shadow inventory is in decline and the affordable housing stock is aging with a larger portion in dire need of preservation within the next five years.

The 2007-11 CHAS data provides the number of vacant-for-sale units affordable to households at each income level (Table 14A), the number of vacant-for-rent units affordable to households at each income level (Table 14B), the number of renter occupied housing units affordable to households at each income level (Table 15C), and the number of owner occupied housing units affordable to households at each income level (Table 15C). The 2007-11 CHAS data also provides the number of owner and renter households. The process to establish the response involved subtracting the sum of the number of vacant and occupied units affordable to each income level from the number of households at that income level for each income level.

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

If trends in home values, rents, and incomes continue, the affordability of housing is likely to decrease. According to **Table 30** (Source: 2007-2011 ACS), home values have increased 112% and rents have increased 60% between 2000 and 2011. According to **Table 5**, incomes increased 30% between 2000 and 2011. The process for determining the response involved defining affordability as a comparison of incomes to home values and/or rents. Based on that definition, if home values and/or rents increase faster than incomes, affordability decreases. Since the data source shows incomes increasing more slowly than home values and rents, affordability decreased between 2000 and 2011. Therefore, if home values, rents, and incomes change at the same rate in the future, affordability of housing is likely to decrease.

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

This question is not applicable to State Consolidated Plans.

Discussion

See above.

MA-20 Condition of Housing – 91.310(a)

Introduction:

California's housing stock includes 8,551,980 or 62.7% of existing units built prior to 1970 according to 2007-11 ACS Data. Many of these homes are well maintained and add character to the communities they are, but many fall into disrepair due to the aging owner, loss of income, absentee landlord or abandonment. The following analysis includes information on the condition of the State's owner and rental occupied units. "Standard Condition" means a dwelling unit which meets all state and local codes. "Substandard Condition" is defined in California State Health and Safety Code Section 17920.3. http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=HSC&sectionNum=17920.3

Condition of Units

Condition of Units	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Number	%	Number	%
With one selected Condition	2,879,070	41%	2,629,418	49%
With two selected Conditions	152,175	2%	447,152	8%
With three selected Conditions	8,423	0%	25,169	0%
With four selected Conditions	721	0%	4,289	0%
No selected Conditions	4,015,253	57%	2,271,502	42%
Total	***7,055,642***	***100%***	***5,377,530***	***99%***

Table 32 - Condition of Units - Statewide

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Year Unit Built

Year Unit Built	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Number	%	Number	%
2000 or later	876,540	12%	495,513	9%
1980-1999	1,927,203	27%	1,304,957	24%
1950-1979	3,223,906	46%	2,601,109	48%
Before 1950	1,027,993	15%	975,951	18%
Total	***7,055,642***	***100%***	***5,377,530***	***99%***

Table 16 – Year Unit Built - Statewide

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

Risk of Lead-Based Paint Hazard

Risk of Lead-Based Paint Hazard	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Number	%	Number	%
Total Number of Units Built Before 1980	4,251,899	60%	3,577,060	67%
Housing Units build before 1980 with children present	526,635	7%	439,875	8%

Table 17 – Risk of Lead-Based Paint - Statewide

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS (Total Units) 2007-2011 CHAS (Units with Children present)

Vacant Units

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

Table 35 - Vacant Units - Statewide

Need for Owner and Rental Rehabilitation

The need for owner and rental rehabilitation varies across the State of California. California State Housing Element law requires local jurisdictions to analyze and document housing stock condition. This includes an estimate of units in need for owner and rental rehabilitation and replacement. Jurisdictions obtain this estimate from windshield survey or sampling, estimates from the local building department, knowledgeable builders/developers in the community, nonprofit housing developers or organizations and redevelopment agencies. Electronic copies of local Housing Elements are available at the following web address: http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/hrc/plan/he/element_docs.xlsx

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

Units built before 1980 can be assumed to have a risk of LBP hazards. According to Table 17, the 4,251,899 Owner-Occupied units (or 60% of the Owner-Occupied housing stock) and 3,577,060 Renter-Occupied units (or 67% of the Renter-Occupied housing stock) that were built before 1980 can then be assumed to have LBP Hazards, for a total of 7,828,959 units (or 63% of the total housing stock) with LBP Hazards.

Housing Units built before 1980 with children present can be assumed to have a higher risk of LBP hazards since lead presents additional hazards for children. According to Table 17, the 526,635 Owner-Occupied units (or 7% of the Owner-Occupied housing stock) and 439,875 Renter-Occupied units (or 8% of the Renter-Occupied housing stock) that were built before 1980 can then be assumed to have

additional LBP Hazards for the children present, for a total of 963,510 units (or 8% of the total housing stock) with additional LBP Hazards for the children present.

According to the data in Table 6, 43.7% of all households in California are Low or Moderate Income Families. If housing units with LBP Hazards are occupied by Low and Moderate Income Families at the same rate as all housing units, 43.7% of the 7,834,959 units with LBP Hazards, or 3,423,877 units with LBP Hazards can be estimated to be occupied by Low or Moderate Income families. Similarly, if housing units with LBP Hazards and children present are occupied by Low and Moderate Income Families at the same rate as all housing units, 652,504 units can be estimated to be occupied by low or moderate income families with LPB Hazards and children present.

Discussion:

For more information on lead based paint hazards in housing units built before 1980 please see the following report from US EPA:

http://www2.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2013-11/documents/steps_0.pdf

MA-25 Public and Assisted Housing – (Optional)

Introduction:

The State of California does not administer any public housing funds. The data below autofills into the ConPlan from HUD and is incomplete.

Totals Number of Units

Program Type									
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers					
				Total	Project -based	Tenant - based	Special Purpose Voucher		
							Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
# of units vouchers available						300,000	0	0	0
# of accessible units			44,000						
*includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition									

Table 36 – Total Number of Units by Program Type - Statewide

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Describe the supply of public housing developments:

Not required for State Consolidated Plans.

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

Not required for State Consolidated Plans.

Describe the Restoration and Revitalization Needs of public housing units in the jurisdiction:

Not required for State Consolidated Plans.

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

Not required for State Consolidated Plans.

Discussion:

MA-30 Homeless Facilities – 91.310(b)

Introduction

In 2014, it is estimated through the annual Point-In-Time count that there were approximately 113,952 homeless people in the state. The analysis below details services and facilities available to address the needs of homeless individuals and families in the State.

Facilities Targeted to Homeless Persons

	Emergency Shelter Beds		Transitional Housing Beds	Permanent Supportive Housing Beds	
	Year Round Beds (Current & New)	Voucher / Seasonal / Overflow Beds	Current & New	Current & New	Under Development
Households with Adult(s) and Child(ren)	6,424	6750	13,315	14,412	n/a
Households with Only Adults	11,065	n/a	12,582	31,167	n/a
Chronically Homeless Households	n/a	n/a	n/a	12,226	n/a
Veterans	743	n/a	3,456	11,442	n/a
Unaccompanied Youth	589	n/a	1,232	321	n/a

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

Low income PLWHA that are homeless are assisted through State HOPWA with PHP, TBRA, housing information and referral services, hotel/motel voucher or other short term housing assistance, and supportive services including case management, meal assistance, and transportation vouchers. At intake to a State HOPWA program, a client service plan (mainstream services, such as health, mental health, and employment services) is prepared, and the client is referred to other agencies for services not provided by the HOPWA project sponsor. The level of HOPWA-funded homeless services provided to PLWHA varies from county to county depending on funding availability.

See SP-60 for a description of services funded through other ConPlan programs that are targeted to homeless persons.

List and describe services and facilities that meet the needs of homeless persons, particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their

families, and unaccompanied youth. If the services and facilities are listed on screen SP-40 Institutional Delivery Structure or screen MA-35 Special Needs Facilities and Services, describe how these facilities and services specifically address the needs of these populations.

As discussed on screen SP-40, approximately 80% of the annual HOPWA allocation is used for homeless and homeless prevention services for PLWHA, including the chronically homeless, families with children, and veterans. These services include TBRA, STRMU, PHP, facility based housing operational subsidies, hotel/motel voucher assistance, housing information and referral services. Additionally, by making available case management, employment and employment training, benefits counseling, personal assistance, life skills management, mental health or substance abuse services, transportation, and food and nutrition services, these services meet chronically homeless individuals and families' need for supporting services that assist in removing potential barriers to permanent housing placement that contribute chronic homelessness. The level of HOPWA-funded homeless services provided to PLWHA varies from county to county depending on funding availability. Other supportive services are funded through the Ryan White Act and other local, State, or federal sources. State HOPWA facilitates the integration of HOPWA project sponsors and resources with HCP service agencies, homeless service providers, and other mainstream services through its HOPWA funding application process and through technical assistance, to maximize the services made available to homeless persons and persons with HIV.

State ESG funds are going to be increasingly targeted to Rapid Rehousing programs and crisis response services that provide low barrier access, and emphasize Housing First approaches; therefore, while many communities offer supportive services targeted to homeless people, more funded programs may be providing these in housing funded with Rapid Rehousing assistance, rather than in shelter or transitional housing, with supportive services funded through non-ESG sources. This approach not only aims to prevent chronic homelessness but also meets the needs of homeless families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth that often cannot be fully accommodated in shelters or transitional housing.

In 2013, AB 639 (Chapter 727, Statutes of 2013, Pérez) restructured the Veteran's Bond Act of 2008 authorizing $600 million in existing bond authority to fund multifamily housing for Veterans. With the approval of Proposition 41 by California voters on June 3, 2014; HCD, in collaboration with CalHFA and CalVet, is in the process of designing, developing, and administering a veteran multifamily housing program pursuant to AB 639 (Chapter 727, Statutes of 2013, Pérez)—the Veterans Housing and Homelessness Prevention (VHHP) Program. Approximately $545,000,000 will be made available over a period of several years. Approximately $75 million will be made available under an initial Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA), to be released late December 2014 or early January 2015. To be eligible to receive funding, projects must restrict occupancy for at least 45 percent of Assisted Units to Extremely Low Income Veterans, with rents not exceeding the 30 percent of 30 percent of Area Median Income (AMI), calculated in accordance with TCAC regulations and procedures. At least 50 percent of the funds awarded shall serve veteran households with extremely low-incomes. Of those units targeted to extremely low-income veteran housing, 60 percent shall be supportive housing units.

MA-35 Special Needs Facilities and Services – 91.310(c)

Introduction

HOPWA Assistance Baseline Table

Type of HOWA Assistance	Number of Units Designated or Available for People with HIV/AIDS and their families
TBRA	87
PH in facilities	0
STRMU	950
ST or TH facilities	125
PH placement	74

Table 38 – HOPWA Assistance Baseline

Data Source: HOPWA CAPER and HOPWA Beneficiary Verification Worksheet FY 2013-14.

To the extent information is available, describe the facilities and services that assist persons who are not homeless but who require supportive housing, and programs for ensuring that persons returning from mental and physical health institutions receive appropriate supportive housing

PLWHA entering into HCP or State HOPWA HIV service programs, including those exiting from an institution, are screened for housing needs at intake and receive supportive services from a case manager, which include a comprehensive housing plan and linkage to healthcare and support. Some State HOPWA project sponsors own or operate transitional supportive housing for PLWHA, including PLWHA exiting institutions.

In addition, the State's Homelessness Policy Academy, Section 811 Project Rental Assistance Demonstration Program, and Mental Health Services Act Housing Program all have as a primary goal developing policies and/or dedicated resources to assist individuals exiting publically funded systems of care, and prevent homelessness by providing access to affordable housing with support services. For a discussion of each of these initiatives, see AP-85.

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

HOPWA does not provide vouchers for, or have dedicated supportive housing for, persons exiting mental and physical health institutions. However, PLWHA entering into a State HOPWA or HCP program, including those exiting a mental or physical health institution, are screened for housing and service needs, and linked to available housing and service agencies.

As discussed above, the State's Homelessness Policy Academy, Section 811 Project Rental Assistance Demonstration Program, and Mental Health Services Act Housing Program all have as a primary goal developing policies and/or dedicated resources to assist individuals exiting publically funded systems of care, and prevent homelessness by providing access to affordable housing with support services. For a discussion of each of these initiatives, see AP-85.

The Veteran's Housing and Homelessness Program, discussed in screen MA-30 also helps ensure that current and returning veterans receive necessary and appropriate supportive housing by requiring that 60 percent of units targeted to extremely low-income veteran housing be supportive housing units and including requirements for supportive service provision in projects that contain supportive housing units.

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

In FY 15-16, the State CDBG, HOME, ESG, HOPWA and LHCP programs will assist an estimated 9,339 households to access or maintain permanent housing, including an estimated 8,021 households who will receive short-term rent and/or utility assistance. Please refer to the program specific sections of the Annual Plan for further information on these programs.

During the next year, HOPWA project sponsors will continue activities to address the housing and supportive needs for PLWHA, both homeless and not homeless, such as TBRA, STRMU, PHP, hotel/motel voucher assistance, housing information services and supportive services.

The estimated 1,165 Special Needs households will be assisted through HOPWA. See AP 70 for a breakdown of this number by type of HOPWA assistance projected. Other Special Needs households are anticipated to be served through the other ConPlan programs. These are not separately estimated, but the number of persons assisted who are not homeless but have other special needs are estimated in the Non-Homeless category shown on AP-55.

MA-40 Barriers to Affordable Housing – 91.310(d)

Negative Effects of Public Policies on Affordable Housing and Residential Investment

State law requires each city and county to adopt a general plan containing at least seven mandatory elements including housing. Unlike the other general plan elements, the housing element, required to be updated every five to eight years, is subject to detailed statutory requirements and mandatory review by HCD. The housing element has many similar requirements to the federally-mandated ConPlan in that it requires a thorough assessment of housing needs and the adoption of a comprehensive implementation action plan to address those needs.

The housing element contains information about the availability of sites and infrastructure to accommodate new housing needs and requires an analysis of governmental constraints to the production and preservation of housing. This includes the negative effects of public policies on affordable housing and residential investment as the element must identify and analyze potential and actual governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, or development of housing for all income levels, including housing for persons with disabilities. The analysis identifies the specific standards and processes and evaluates their impact, including cumulatively, on the supply and affordability of housing. This evaluation includes land use controls, zoning ordinances, building codes, fees and charges, and growth limits. The analysis also determines whether local regulatory standards pose an actual constraint and must additionally demonstrate local efforts to remove constraints that hinder a jurisdiction from meeting its housing needs. Cities and counties are required by housing element law to have land-use plans and regulatory policies which facilitate the development of a range of housing types to meet the needs of all income groups. The housing element which must be developed with public input and participation, serves as the basis for land-use and assistance programs to address local, regional and state housing needs.

Public policies such as tax policy affecting land and other property, land use controls, zoning ordinances, building codes, fees and charges, growth limits, and policies that affect the return on residential investment create negative effects on affordable housing by limiting its supply and affordability. Descriptions of these local-level policies, analyses of their impacts, and programs to mitigate them are available in local jurisdiction's housing elements, many of which are available in electronic form on HCD's website at: http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/hrc/plan/he/element_docs.xlsx.

As of February 25, 2015, 431 of the State's 538 jurisdictions (80 percent) were found to comply with housing element law. This is on track for record high compliance rate compared to other housing element cycles once all elements have been reviewed. All 538 jurisdictions will be required to update their housing element by the end of 2015. Due dates by Council of Governments (COG) for the 5th planning period are available on HCD's website at http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/hrc/plan/he/housing-element-update-schedule.pdf.

Please refer to Section SP-55 for additional information on housing elements and their role in State's Strategy to Remove or Ameliorate the Barriers to Affordable Housing.

MA-45 Non-Housing Community Development Assets -91.315(f)

Introduction

Significant characteristics of the State's housing markets include such aspects as the supply, demand, and condition and cost of housing.

Supply

As the California Housing Partnership Corporation's 2014 report finds, California's private housing market is not providing an adequate number of homes affordable to low- and moderate-income households. New housing construction is slow to rebound, with residential permitting activity at less than half of the 2004 peak level. The existing housing stock is far from being adequate to meet the emerging needs and preferences of housing demand, the for-sale and shadow inventory is in decline, and the affordable housing stock is aging with a larger portion in dire need of preservation within the next five years. According to the Construction Industry Research Board's *California Construction Review, i*n the last decade, the State's residential building permits peaked in 2004 at 212,960, and then spiraled down by 84 percent in 2009 to just over 36,000, the lowest level in 55 years of historical records. Multifamily permits decreased by 80 percent, from 62,000 in 2004 to just over 11,000 in 2009. While on the rebound, 2013 housing activities continued to lag behind, at 83,725 permits or 40 percent of the 2004 peak level. The trend of the highest proportion of multifamily permits in total permits statewide continued into 2013, when the multifamily sector comprised more than half of all the residential permits for the year, while typically strong single-family development areas continued to lag. As the State's housing deficit continues to deepen, it delays the economic multiplier benefits of new housing construction. The recent drought cast over California adds to the challenges that the State must overcome in its trajectory, especially in the rural communities. Some of the construction jobs have been regained and regional differences between coastal and inland likely to continue, yet California continues to experience a high unemployment rate, at 8 percent in 2014, the highest in the nation, according to Public Policy Institute of California's 2014 report *California's Future: Economy* . Regionally, residential permit activity mirrors the bifurcated economy. The coastal areas of Southern California and Bay Area, followed by San Diego show faster recovery than the inland regions which experience a much slower rebound.

Demand

According to the California Department of Finance, the State is projected to continue to experience steady population gains of approximately 330,000 persons annually to 2020, dominated primarily by children of immigrants over the next decade, a more moderate growth rate than in the past, but considered to be at "normal" levels.

The 2010 Census revealed that most of the significant growth in the prior decade occurred in the Hispanic and Asian populations, at 28 percent and over 31 percent, respectively, a trend that is likely to continue in the coming decade. The Department of Finance projects that while the Non-Hispanic White group will grow less than one percent by 2020, the Hispanic group is projected to grow by 21 percent, and the Asian group by 11 percent. Geographically, inland areas will experience particularly high growth rates.

According to the March 2013 report Immigrant Contributions to Housing Demand in the United States, prepared for the Research Institute for Housing America by Dowell Myers, and John Pitkin, in the current decade, foreign-born ownership demand is projected to remain a majority of the growth in demand in California, at 71 percent of total growth in the State. Foreign-born rental demand is expected to slow down from 53.5 percent in the last decade to just over 38 percent during the current decade, due to upward mobility of immigrant households. But the two dominant forces on the housing market will continue to be the aging baby-boomers and the younger Generation Y. Their mix of preferences and needs of the State's diverse population will be drivers for more diverse housing demand in decades to come.

Condition

Many households experiencing foreclosure or economic downturn resorted to doubling up with family and friends often resulting in overcrowded living arrangements. The American Community Survey showed an overall increase in shared households, from 17 to 18.7 percent of total households between 2007 and 2012, relating household sharing to economic strain. The 2012 American Community Survey also reported over 1 million households living in overcrowded conditions of which three quarters were renter households and the remaining quarter were homeowners. A third of these overcrowded households were severely overcrowded, with 1.5 persons per room. Overcrowding varies across income levels. Almost one in three overcrowded households in the low income category is due to doubling up, with more than one family living in the same housing unit. Surprisingly, only one in ten extremely low-income households living in overcrowded conditions is doubling up. This could be attributed to the fact that many of these households are in need of assistance and temporarily may turn to other family and friends, or they may just use shelters and/or live on the streets before assistance becomes available. On the other hand, a higher share of doubling up in the upper brackets of low income households could indicate that these households combine incomes to make ends meet during economic downturn. Once economic circumstances improve, many of these families in doubled up households or in overcrowded conditions may adjust their living arrangements to live on their own, while young adults living with their parents may also begin forming new households and start looking for their own affordable housing, leading to a boost in demand for a diversified assortment of housing by type, tenure, size, and locations.

Cost

Renters' wages have not kept up with spiking rents. Cumulatively between 2005 and 2013, the two-bedroom fair market rents increased by 17 percent, while renters' median incomes increased by only 5 percent. The rent affordable to median renter income earner was $935 in 2013, which could not even cover the fair market rent of $1,046 for one-bedroom apartment. According to the National Low Income Housing Coalition's 2013 Report, "Out of Reach", The lower income households, of which a third are headed by elderly or people with disabilities, and more than a third are families with children, are most impacted by the tight rental market.

More often than not, lower income households cannot afford increasing rents to secure affordable, adequate, and stable housing for their families, and are being squeezed out of the rental market by middle and upper income households seeking better affordability. This is a significant trend for the State's rental market, as lower income households comprise almost two thirds of all renter households, and the extremely low-income households represent a quarter of the total renters. These lower income households bear heavy housing cost burdens, often paying more than half of their incomes toward rents.

The latest American Community Survey data shows that while 57 percent of all renters pay more than 30 percent of their income for housing (overpaying), the share of lower income households overpaying is much larger, at 78 percent. And it is a statewide problem, without exception, as one in two lower income households are overpaying for housing in 43 counties, and three in four lower income renters are cost-burdened in 14 counties.

Paycheck to Paycheck 2013 by the Center for Housing Policy reports that full wages earned by police workers, auto mechanics, nurses, teachers, and others are not enough to afford typical rents or housing prices in most metropolitan areas in the nation. Four out of five metropolitan area least affordable rental markets nationwide continue to be in California, only surpassed by Honolulu. Bakersfield, the least expensive metropolitan area for California, ranked 122 out of a total of 206 metropolitan areas analyzed nationwide. According to the National Low Income Housing Coalition's 2013 Report, *Out of Reach* in 2013, a person working full time at minimum wage must work 129 hours to afford a two-bedroom rental, which was the second highest after New York/New Jersey area. The 2013 Housing Landscape report from the Center for Housing Policy also shows that California had the largest share of working households paying more than half of their income toward housing in the nation, at 33.8 percent. Contributing to the tightening of the rental market is the increased number of middle-income households choosing or finding it necessary to rent, as lending standards have tightened and inventory has declined. Homeownership rates continue to decline resulting in a shift in housing tenure from homeownership to renting that is significant enough to further fuel rental housing demand and drive increases in rents, further limiting housing options for renters in general, and for lower income renters in particular. The National Center for Housing finds that for every 100 very low income renter households there were only 87 affordable units in 2010. For every 100 extremely low income renters (ELI), there were only 56 units affordable, making it very difficult for these renters to secure adequate housing for their families.

Economic Development Market Analysis

Business Activity

Business by Sector	Number of Workers	Number of Jobs	Share of Workers	Share of Jobs %	Jobs less workers
Agriculture, Mining, Oil & Gas Extraction	370,146	705389	2.2%	4.2%	97%
Arts, Entertainment, Accommodations	1,563,669	1909600	9.4%	11.3%	100%
Construction	1,087,881	694816	6.6%	4.1%	-114%
Education and Health Care Services	3,409,551	3299214	20.5%	19.5%	-32%
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	1,120,432	855778	6.7%	5.0%	-77%
Information	488,366	625410	2.9%	3.7%	40%
Manufacturing	1,694,975	1343173	10.2%	7.9%	-102%
Other Services	877,768	925603	5.3%	5.5%	14%

Business by Sector	Number of Workers	Number of Jobs	Share of Workers	Share of Jobs %	Jobs less workers
Professional, Scientific, Management Services	2,049,341	2716321	12.3%	16.0%	193%
Public Administration	780,872	675575	4.7%	4.0%	-30%
Retail Trade	1,831,603	1840808	11.0%	10.9%	3%
Transportation & Warehousing	783,588	619429	4.7%	3.7%	-48%
Wholesale Trade	545,225	737565	3.3%	4.4%	56%
Grand Total	16,603,417	16,948,681	100%	100%	100%

Table 39 - Business Activity - Statewide

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS (Workers), 2011 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (Jobs)

Labor Force

Total Population in the Civilian Labor Force	1,342,346
Civilian Employed Population 16 years and over	1,184,090
Unemployment Rate	11.79
Unemployment Rate for Ages 16-24	26.19
Unemployment Rate for Ages 25-65	6.96

Table 40 - Labor Force - Statewide

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Occupations by Sector	Number of People
Management, business and financial	245,253
Farming, fisheries and forestry occupations	54,579
Service	125,040
Sales and office	278,680
Construction, extraction, maintenance and repair	178,344
Production, transportation and material moving	68,793

Table 41 – Occupations by Sector - Statewide

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Travel Time

Travel Time	Number	Percentage
< 30 Minutes	730,316	68%
30-59 Minutes	248,859	23%
60 or More Minutes	97,906	9%
Total	***1,077,081***	***100%***

Table 18 - Travel Time - Statewide

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Education

Educational Attainment by Employment Status (Population 16 and Older)

Educational Attainment	In Labor Force		
	Civilian Employed	Unemployed	Not in Labor Force
Less than high school graduate	145,417	27,900	118,347
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	213,263	30,007	120,303
Some college or Associate's degree	360,672	35,698	147,606
Bachelor's degree or higher	256,460	13,452	62,908

Table 43 - Educational Attainment by Employment Status - Statewide

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Educational Attainment by Age

	Age				
	18–24 yrs	25–34 yrs	35–44 yrs	45–65 yrs	65+ yrs
Less than 9th grade	10,828	33,395	40,141	73,513	46,154
9th to 12th grade, no diploma	45,659	43,884	41,648	59,153	37,954
High school graduate, GED, or alternative	94,189	93,407	87,613	183,477	106,602
Some college, no degree	105,666	96,975	91,054	220,883	95,945
Associate's degree	12,382	26,703	29,572	82,156	26,538
Bachelor's degree	10,853	47,313	55,161	126,356	51,764
Graduate or professional degree	580	13,160	22,466	69,787	36,419

Table 44 - Educational Attainment by Age - Statewide

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Educational Attainment – Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months

Educational Attainment	Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months
Less than high school graduate	19,323
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	29,073
Some college or Associate's degree	37,621
Bachelor's degree	55,210
Graduate or professional degree	77,294

Table 45 – Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months - - Statewide
Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

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

The major employment sectors within the state are: Education and Health Care Services (19.5%), Professional, Scientific, Management Services (16.0%), Arts, Entertainment, Accommodations (11.3%), Professional, Scientific, Management Services (16.0%), and Retail Trade (10.9%).

Describe the workforce and infrastructure needs of business in the state.

The California Workforce Investment Board's "Shared Strategy for a Shared Prosperity: California's Strategic Workforce Development Plan: 2013-17", accessed at the following link, describes the workforce needs of business in the state by economic sector:

http://www.cwib.ca.gov/res/docs/state_plans/State%20Strategic%20Workforce%20Dev.%20Plan/CWIB%20State%20Strategic%20Workforce%20Development%20Plan%202013-2017.pdf

California's 2015 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan, accessed at the following link, describes the infrastructure needs in the State:

http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/2015-Infrastructure-Plan.pdf

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

The California High Speed Rail is a major public and private sector investment that may affect job and business growth opportunities during the planning period. Beginning in 2014, the project is projected to create 20,000 jobs annually during the first five years of construction (CHSRA). These jobs will be created primarily in the construction trades and may require additional training and workforce development. The Fresno Workforce Investment Board is connecting people with pre-apprenticeship programs and labor and trade organizations to develop the necessary workforce for the first phase of this project.

Another major public investment that may affect job and business growth opportunities during the planning period is the 2014 Water Bond passed by California Voters through Proposition 1. This bond issue will raise $7.545 billion to invest in water projects and programs. These will likely create thousands of jobs in construction, conservation, and other industries while supporting existing jobs in fisheries and agriculture. These changes may create additional needs for workforce development to train workers for jobs in these industries.

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

The local workforce is unable to meet the needs of the local economy in multiple sectors. Table 1 – Business Activity suggests that there are surpluses of workers in the Construction (-114%); Manufacturing (-102%); Finance, Insurance and Real Estate (-77%); Transportation & Warehousing (-48%); Education and Health Care Services (-32%); and Public Administration (-30%) sectors. Table 1 also suggests shortages of qualified workers in the Professional, Scientific, Management Services (193%); Arts, Entertainment, Accommodations (100%); Agriculture, Mining, Oil & Gas Extraction (97%); Wholesale Trade (56%); Information (40%); Other Services (14%); and Retail Trade (3%) sectors. The skills and education of the current workforce does not necessarily correspond to employment opportunities as the sectors with the largest labor surpluses (Construction and Manufacturing) often require high school graduation while the sectors with the largest labor shortages (Professional, Scientific, Management Services and Arts, Entertainment, Accommodations) often require a post-secondary degree such as an Associate's, Bachelor's, Graduate or professional degree.

Describe current workforce training initiatives supported by the state. Describe how these efforts will support the state's Consolidated Plan.

The California Workforce Investment Board's "Shared Strategy for a Shared Prosperity: California's Strategic Workforce Development Plan: 2013-17", accessed at the following link, describes current workforce training initiatives supported by the state:
http://www.cwib.ca.gov/res/docs/state_plans/State%20Strategic%20Workforce%20Dev.%20Plan/CWIB%20State%20Strategic%20Workforce%20Development%20Plan%202013-2017.pdf

Describe any other state efforts to support economic growth.

The California Infrastructure and Economic Development Bank (iBank) provides a variety of programs to non-profits, public agencies, and businesses. The following link provides detailed descriptions of these programs: http://www.ibank.ca.gov/programs_overview.htm

The Governor's Office of Business and Economic Development (GO-Biz) serves at California's single point of contact for economic development and job creation efforts offering business development, permit streamlining, small business assistance, innovation promotion, and support on issues relating to international trade. The following link provides detailed descriptions of the programs available at GO- Biz: http://www.business.ca.gov/AboutUs.aspx

Discussion:

MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion

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

The state has multiple and varying housing and non-housing challenges. These challenges vary substantially from region to region. Projects, proposals, and activities funded through the State's method of distribution are selected to meet local market needs and the State's Consolidated Plan goals and strategies. In implementing these goals, the State also seeks to affirmatively further fair housing.

The Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing, available at the following link, details the goals related to achieving Fair Housing for all Californians:

http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/hrc/rep/fed/state_of_ca_analysis_of_impediments_full%20report0912.pdf

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

Each region of California has some concentration of populations in need (defined as a census tract with 10-percent or more differential from the county share of a given race/ethnicity category), however these populations and their needs vary based on the region. The State's methods of distribution are designed to be flexible enough to address the needs specific to each local market. The State also monitors minority concentration in the implementation of its HOME activities. See the 2013-14 CAPER and previous CAPERs for more information, http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/hrc/rep/fed/

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

Market characteristics in these areas/neighborhoods vary across areas and neighborhoods.

Are there any community assets in these areas/neighborhoods?

Community assets can consist of the skills and resources of local residents, groups, and institutions and exist in virtually all areas and neighborhoods.

Are there other strategic opportunities in any of these areas?

Strategic opportunities for housing, infrastructure, and energy conservation exist in almost all areas of the State.

Based on the needs analysis above, describe the State's needs in Colonias

Most of California's non-entitlement Colonias have sewer and potable water systems, and housing rehabilitation is the only major remaining activity. To improve on the slow demand for housing rehabilitation loans, HCD has encouraged Imperial County to serve Colonias in its new housing rehabilitation grant program.

Strategic Plan

SP-05 Overview

Strategic Plan Overview

This Strategic Plan discusses the State's priority-needs, five year goals, and projected outcomes for the CDBG, HOME, ESG, HOPWA and LHCP Programs. It also discusses the State's current efforts and five-year strategy for increasing affordable housing production, alleviating homelessness and poverty, reducing lead-hazards in housing, and improving the overall condition of existing housing stock, including improvements in the State's Colonias.

SP-10 Geographic Priorities – 91.315(a)(1)

Geographic Area

Table 19 - Geographic Priority Areas

General Allocation Priorities

Describe the basis for allocating investments geographically within the jurisdiction (or within the EMSA for HOPWA)

CDBG, HOME, ESG, and HOPWA funds are typically made available to nonentitlement jurisdictions across the State. Lists of eligible jurisdictions for these programs are provided in Appendix A. Changes in CDBG, HOME, or ESG eligible jurisdictions may occur annually if jurisdictions join or withdraw from a CDBG Urban County Agreement or HOME Consortium. State HOPWA provides funds to HIV, housing, and homeless service providers in the 41 non-EMSAs that do not receive funds directly from HUD, and Fresno and Bakersfield EMSAs. By excluding HUD-funded EMSAs, the State HOPWA $3.35 million annual allocation is available to assist PLWHA in the underserved, outlying regions of California.
Eligible jurisdictions for LHCP are listed in AP 30, along with their Method of Distribution

Each program's individual Method of Distribution sets forth allocation methods or application rating criteria which may directly or indirectly impact the geographic distribution of program funds. See AP 30 for more information.

2019 Substantial Amendment

Community Development Block Grant - The 2019-2020 program year will be the first year under CDBG guidelines and a new Method of Distribution (MOD).

The guidelines add flexibility to the program administration by removing fixed rating and ranking criteria and other static evaluation processes. Instead, the guidelines align with HUD's program management tools. By deferring to the HUD-required 5-Year Consolidated Plan and the Annual Action Plan as implementation tools, the guidelines allow for flexibility to better identify specific community needs and priorities and to adjust the method of funding distribution and the funding application criteria to meet those needs and priorities.

Changes to the new MOD are intended to improve the CDBG program's low expenditure rate, reduce high unspent program income balances, and streamline program processes to reduce the administrative burden for grantees and HCD staff. The new MOD introduces project tiering that rewards projects that are ready to begin construction immediately with project activity funding, and funnels projects that are less ready into other funding streams intended to improve readiness so that they can re-apply for activity funding.

In previous program years, the bulk of the program funds were available via a competitive application processes and only certain Economic Development activities could apply for funding through the over the counter (OTC) process. The new MOD will include an OTC application process for Community Development capital improvement projects, including economic development, public infrastructure, public infrastructure in support of housing, multifamily housing rehabilitation, and public facilities that focuses on project

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

readiness as a funding threshold, and includes predevelopment grants intended to help communities create a shovel ready project pipeline. Programs such as single-family housing assistance and economic development programs, public services, as well as planning grants will still participate in the competitive application process, with clear eligibility thresholds and transparent scoring criteria.

Disclaimer: The new CDBG MOD for the 2019 program year will only be described in this section (SP-10) and the addendum attached to this substantial amendment. References to the CDBG MOD outside of these sections are not updated and are referencing the previous MOD process applicable to program years 2015-2018.

SP-25 Priority Needs – 91.315(a)

Priority Needs

1	**Priority Need Name**	Affordable rental housing
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Low Large Families Families with Children Elderly Rural Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families Victims of Domestic Violence
	Geographic Areas Affected	
	Associated Goals	Increase the supply of affordable rental housing

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

	Description	Activities to address this goal may include CDBG rental rehabilitation, CDBG infrastructure projects in support of rental housing, HOME rental new construction and rental rehabilitation projects and LHCP rental rehabilitation activities. (HOME Tenant-Based Rental Assistance (TBRA) activities are discussed with homelessness assistance below.) CDBG Planning and Technical Assistance Grants associated with rental activities may also be eligible. For CDBG, "Moderate Income" does not exceed 80% AMI.
	Basis for Relative Priority	
2	**Priority Need Name**	Affordable homeownership and home rehabilitation
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Low Moderate Large Families Families with Children Elderly Rural Individuals Families with Children Elderly
	Geographic Areas Affected	
	Associated Goals	Expand homeownership and improve existing housing
	Description	Activities to address this goal may include: CDBG housing acquisition projects and housing rehabilitation projects; CDBG infrastructure projects in support of housing; HOME first-time homebuyer new construction, acquisition with or without rehabilitation, and owner-occupied rehabilitation, and LHCP homeowner rehabilitation. CDBG Planning and Technical Assistance grants associated with this activity may also be eligible. For CDBG, "Moderate Income" does not exceed 80% AMI.
	Basis for Relative Priority	

3	**Priority Need Name**	Homeless assistance and prevention services
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Large Families Families with Children Elderly Rural Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families Victims of Domestic Violence
	Geographic Areas Affected	
	Associated Goals	Provide homeless assistance & prevention services
	Description	Activities to address this goal may include all homeless assistance and prevention activities eligible under the State ESG and HOPWA programs, as well as HOME tenant-based rental assistance activities.
	Basis for Relative Priority	
4	**Priority Need Name**	Economic Development Opportunities

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Low Moderate Rural Non-housing Community Development
	Geographic Areas Affected	
	Associated Goals	Increase economic development opportunities
	Description	Activities to address this goal will include assistance to local businesses and low-income microenterprise owners to create or preserve jobs for low-income workers in rural communities, as well as planning and evaluation studies related to any activity eligible for these allocations.. "Moderate Income" for CDBG does not exceed 80% AMI
	Basis for Relative Priority	
5	**Priority Need Name**	Public Services
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Low Moderate Rural Non-housing Community Development
	Geographic Areas Affected	
	Associated Goals	Maintain or increase public services
	Description	Activities to address this goal will include public service activities supported with State CDBG funds. For CDBG, "Moderate Income" does not exceed 80% AMI.

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

	Basis for Relative Priority	
6	**Priority Need Name**	Public Facilities
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Low Moderate Rural Non-housing Community Development
	Geographic Areas Affected	
	Associated Goals	Maintain or increase public facilities
	Description	Activities to address this goal will include public facilities' acquisition, construction, or rehabilitation supported with State CDBG funds, and general community infrastructure projects. For CDBG, "Moderate Income" does not exceed 80% AMI. Planning and Technical Assistance Grants associated with this activity may also be eligible
	Basis for Relative Priority	

Table 20 – Priority Needs Summary

Narrative (Optional)

At this time, there has been no determination made about the relative prioritization of the above goals among HCD's various programs, and the programs of DPH/OA and the Department of Community Services and Development (CSD); however, federal or State statute or regulation may set minimums or maximums that can be allocated to individual activities within these goals. (See AP 30 for more information.) Applicant demand relative to each eligible activity area also dictates how much is available for award among the various goals. This is largely reflected in the estimated funding percentages by goal found in AP-25. Among the housing goals, these percentages are generally consistent with the relative need for these activities as discussed in the Needs Assessment.

SP-30 Influence of Market Conditions – 91.315(b)

Influence of Market Conditions

Affordable Housing Type	Market Characteristics that will influence the use of funds available for housing type
Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA)	Market conditions influencing use of funds available for TBRA include: • Housing costs that exceed 30% of Income for any income group • High vacancy rates • Adequate housing conditions • High construction costs (Subsidy required to make new unit production affordable for lower income groups exceeds the cost of TBRA) • Declining funds for TBRA such as the HCV program at the federal level
TBRA for Non-Homeless Special Needs	Market conditions influencing use of funds available for Non-Homeless Special Needs housing include: • Supply of Non-Homeless Special Needs housing not adequate to meet the need • Non-Homeless Special Needs housing available but at housing costs that exceed 30% of household income for households in the Non-Homeless Special Needs group
New Unit Production	Market conditions influencing use of funds available for New Unit Production include: • Housing costs that exceed 30% of Income for any income group • Shortage of adequate housing that accepts tenants' TBRA for rent at or below the FMR
Rehabilitation	Market conditions influencing use of funds available for Rehabilitation include: • Inadequate housing stock conditions
Acquisition, including preservation	Market conditions influencing the use of funds available for Acquisition include: • Shortage of affordable rental units • High levels of vacant, abandoned, and REO units

Table 21 – Influence of Market Conditions

SP-35 Anticipated Resources - 91.315(a)(4), 91.320(c)(1,2)

Introduction

This is the first year of the 2015-2020 ConPlan cycle. Below are the FY 15-16 annual allocation amounts, and the four-year remainder estimate available to the State's eligible CDBG, HOME, ESG, HOPWA, and LHCP jurisdictions. The annual allocation amounts for **HOME** include the allocations for the entitlement jurisdictions of Gardenia, Lancaster, and Torrance that have returned these funds to HUD for re-allocation to the State in order for those jurisdictions to participate in the State HOME program. The annual allocation estimates for **HOPWA** include the allocation for the EMSA of Bakersfield, which has historically relinquished grantee responsibilities to State HOPWA. Anticipated resources also include prior year State HOPWA funds for the EMSA of Fresno that will be committed to projects in the FY 2015-16 program year. Effective FY 2015-16, the City of Fresno will assume grantee responsibilities for Fresno EMSA, and the 2015 Fresno allocation will not be included in the State's grant agreement. The PI estimates for **HOME** are based on PI estimates from State-held loans and from local State recipient loans during FY 2014

Anticipated Resources

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan $	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: $	Program Income: $	Prior Year Resources: $	Total: $		
CDBG	public - federal	Acquisition Admin and Planning Economic Development Housing Public Improvements Public Services	28,434,562	0	6,000,000	34,434,562	125,728,488	

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan $	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: $	Program Income: $	Prior Year Resources: $	Total: $		
HOME	public - federal	Acquisition Homebuyer assistance Homeowner rehab Multifamily rental new construction Multifamily rental rehab New construction for ownership TBRA	28,671,677	2,000,000	5,000,000	35,671,677	151,877,857	The amounts shown do not include deductions for program administration.

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan $	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: $	Program Income: $	Prior Year Resources: $	Total: $		
HOPWA	public - federal	Permanent housing in facilities Permanent housing placement Short term or transitional housing facilities STRMU Supportive services TBRA	3,350,624	0	533,609	3,884,233	3,884,233	The State HOPWA allocation is $2,967,485 and the Bakersfield EMSA allocation is $383,139 for a total of $3,350,624.Prior Year Resources include uncommitted FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 funding for Fresno EMSA of $405,609, and $128,000 for all other eligible jurisdictions as of June 30, 2014. Kern County (Bakersfield EMSA) may carry over additional funds to this fiscal year if not spent in FY 2014-15.

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan $	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: $	Program Income: $	Prior Year Resources: $	Total: $		
ESG	public - federal	Conversion and rehab for transitional housing Financial Assistance Overnight shelter Rapid re-housing (rental assistance) Rental Assistance Services Transitional housing	11,651,365	0	0	11,651,365	40,000,000	

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan $	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: $	Program Income: $	Prior Year Resources: $	Total: $		
Other	public - federal	Homeowner rehab Multifamily rental rehab	2,937,234	0	0	2,937,234	462,766	LHCP is the fourth of our HUD CPD Programs. The State Department of Community Services and Development (CSD) is the administrative agency for LHCP. In September 2014, HUD awarded $3.4 million to CSD for a new 36-month program (Round 20). Approximately $3.0 million of the award will be used to provide lead hazard reduction services and approximately $400,000 of Healthy Homes supplemental funding will be used for other related home hazards for 195 privately owned housing units. This grant will cover 2014-2017.

Table 22 - Anticipated Resources

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

Explain how federal funds will leverage those additional resources (private, state and local funds), including a description of how matching requirements will be satisfied

CDBG -Funds available are often insufficient to fully support most Community Development or Economic Development projects and programs, so CDBG is generally used as gap financing in conjunction with other Federal, State and local funds. CDBG is used in conjunction with USDA funding and other grant funding to local governments. CDBG matching requirements for FY 15-16 will be met by State General Funds in the amount of $2,177,000.

HOME - In HOME, the largest source of leverage is Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) used with rental new construction projects. Other sources of leverage include private bank loans, State funds, other federal funds, and local funds for both rental and homebuyer activities. Local funds have diminished in many communities due to loss of Redevelopment Agency revenue and other local revenue. State funds have also diminished due to the allocation of nearly all available State housing bonds through Propositions 46 and 1C. In FY 14-15, HOME leveraged over $171 million from other sources. State funds as leverage are expected to increase in the coming years if the new MHP, VHHP, and AHSC funds are used in nonentitlement (predominately rural) communities.

ESG - ESG Match is provided by its Subrecipients on a dollar for dollar basis. Specific sources of match are identified at the time of application and must comply with 24 CFR 576.201. The primary sources of match identified in the most recent funding round for ESG are (1) Local match funding including cities and counties,; (2) Private match funding including fundraising, cash; (3) Federal government match funding including CDBG, SHP, and HOME Tenant-Based Rental Assistance (TBRA); in addition to (4) donated goods, volunteers, building value or lease**.**

HOPWA - There is no federal match requirement for HOPWA; however, project sponsors report leveraged funds. On an annual basis, CDPH/OA allocates funding through the HCP for HIV/AIDS care and treatment services to California counties. Based on prior year data, CDPH/OA anticipates approximately $2.8 million in leveraged funds by HOPWA project sponsors including Ryan White Part B (payer of last resort) and other federal, state, local, and private resources for the provision of HIV/AIDS housing and services to HOPWA clients.

LHCP - To ensure that community based organizations (CBOs) meet HUD's required 10 percent match for $3.4 million award**,** the CBOs are required to match larger percentages of the net $2,537,234 provided to them: The match amount is based on $3.0 million of the award. Match activities must be specifically dedicated to supporting and remediating lead-hazard activities from non-federal resources such as State, local,

charitable, nonprofit or for-profit entities, in-kind contributions, private donations, Petroleum Violation Escrow Account (PVEA), and owner's contribution. The only federal funds that may be considered part of the match requirement are CDBG funds. In 2015-16, LHCP anticipates a minimum of $33,332 in match contributions. CBOs are also required to leverage 5% percent of their grant allocation from various federal sources such as (1) Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, Department of Energy Weatherization Assistance Program, Community Services Block Grant, or other federally funded programs; (2) State, local, charitable, nonprofit or for-profit entities; and (3) in-kind contributions, private donations and PVEA. In 2015-16, LHCP anticipates a minimum of $13,652 in leveraging contributions.

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

Discussion

The State ConPlan cannot identify *specific* projects or property to be developed or supported since local entities must first apply for and secure funding for these projects.

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

SP-40 Institutional Delivery Structure – 91.315(k)

Explain the institutional structure through which the jurisdiction will carry out its consolidated plan including private industry, non-profit organizations, and public institutions.

Responsible Entity	Responsible Entity Type	Role	Geographic Area Served
CALIFORNIA	Government	Economic Development Homelessness Non-homeless special needs Ownership Planning Rental public facilities public services	State
California	Government	Homelessness	State
State Community Services and Development	Government	Ownership Rental	State

Table 23 - Institutional Delivery Structure

Assess of Strengths and Gaps in the Institutional Delivery System

As discussed in the Executive Summary, there are three State agencies which administer the ConPlan programs. It does not reflect individual State subrecipients or grantees. The primary strength of the institutional delivery structure in California is the wide array of entities, both public and private, which we fund to provide housing and services

State HOPWA has established sound partnerships with its project sponsors that ensure ongoing and seamless housing and supportive services to PLWHA.; however, the allowable HOPWA grant administration fee only funds one full-time staff position, which has impacted grantee oversight, prevented State HOPWA from expanding HIV housing activities, and delayed HIV/AIDS housing-related planning and integration activities. In addition, project sponsors have reduced their level of participation in the HOPWA program, due in part, to the low sponsor administration fee.

Assess the strengths and gaps in the institutional delivery system working within the Colonias

There are currently fifteen (15) Colonia designated communities located in Imperial County, including nine located in the unincorporated area of the county , (Bombay Beach, Heber, Niland, Ocotillo, Poe,

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

Palo Verde, Salton Sea, Seeley & Winterhaven), and six located in incorporated cities within the county, including: Brawley (Brawley Colonia), Calexico (C.N. Perry Colonia and Kloke Colonia), City of Imperial (South Colonia and East Colonia), and El Centro (the City is an Entitlement jurisdiction with one Colonia named, El Dorado Colonia). The CDBG Colonia set-aside funding helps subsidize Public Infrastructure projects to improve failing water and sewage issues, as well as housing rehabilitation projects. Each Colonia has unique characteristics and some have more needs than others. All can use Housing Rehabilitation funding, but not all need the water, sewer, and infrastructure funding. Available funds set aside for Colonia communities are often undersubscribed which means money is available if Colonia community applies. However, due to constraints on eligible uses of funds, Colonia communities are unable to use Colonia set-aside funds each year. Constraints on eligible uses of Colonia funding have impeded funding to needed infrastructure by the Colonia community. Specifically, the Colonia jurisdictions and the Department consider the following as major concerns due to constraints on eligible uses: (1) Storm drainages, sidewalks, curbs and gutters, (2) Street lighting, (3) Abandoned, blighted structures, (4) Neighborhood blight: abandoned cars, furniture, and trash, (5) Lack of economic investment; (6) Lack of services (both commercial and social), (7) Lack of medical services; and (8) Lack of new housing development, affordable to residents (especially in the unincorporated areas of the Colonia)

In addition, the following other problems exist: (a) many properties are suitable for the Housing Rehabilitation fund but many property owners owe more on their loans than the property is worth, and do not want any more loans (b) the Colonia cities have varying levels of capacity and are unable to compete for available funding. (c) Fundamental knowledge of CDBG eligibility requirements is often missing. This requires a great deal of pre-review by the State to ensure federal overlays are complied with and that the project will be completed with beneficiaries.

Availability of services targeted to homeless persons and persons with HIV and mainstream services

Homelessness Prevention Services	Available in the Community	Targeted to Homeless	Targeted to People with HIV
Homelessness Prevention Services			
Counseling/Advocacy	X	X	X
Legal Assistance	X	X	X
Mortgage Assistance	X		X
Rental Assistance	X	X	X
Utilities Assistance	X	X	X
Street Outreach Services			
Law Enforcement	X	X	X
Mobile Clinics	X	X	X

Street Outreach Services			
Other Street Outreach Services	X	X	X
Supportive Services			
Alcohol & Drug Abuse	X	X	X
Child Care	X	X	X
Education	X	X	X
Employment and Employment Training	X	X	X
Healthcare	X	X	X
HIV/AIDS	X	X	X
Life Skills	X	X	X
Mental Health Counseling	X	X	X
Transportation	X	X	X
Other			
Basic Telephone Svcs	X	X	X

Table 24 - Homeless Prevention Services Summary

Describe the extent to which services targeted to homeless person and persons with HIV and mainstream services, such as health, mental health and employment services are made available to and used by homeless persons (particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families and unaccompanied youth) and persons with HIV within the jurisdiction

Approximately 80% of the annual HOPWA allocation is used for homeless and homeless prevention services for PLWHA, including sub-populations of the chronically homeless, families with children, and veterans. These services include TBRA, STRMU, PHP, facility based housing operational subsidies, hotel/motel voucher assistance, housing information and referral services. Additionally, case management, employment and employment training, benefits counseling, personal assistance, life skills management, mental health or substance abuse services, transportation, and food and nutrition services are made available. The level of HOPWA-funded homeless services provided to PLWHA varies from county to county depending on funding availability. State HOPWA facilitates the integration of HOPWA project sponsors and resources with HCP service agencies, homeless service providers, and other mainstream services through its HOPWA funding application process and through technical assistance, to maximize the services made available to homeless persons and persons with HIV.

State ESG funds are going to be increasingly targeted to Rapid Rehousing programs and crisis response services that provide low barrier access, and emphasize Housing First approaches; therefore, while many communities offer supportive services targeted to homeless people, more funded programs may be providing these in housing funded with Rapid Rehousing assistance, rather than in shelter or transitional housing, with supportive services funded through non-ESG sources.

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

Describe the strengths and gaps of the service delivery system for special needs population and persons experiencing homelessness, including, but not limited to, the services listed above

At the local level, most HOPWA project sponsors are either an HCP service provider or have established a partnership with HCP service providers to ensure PLWHA are screened at initial intake and linked to the appropriate agencies for healthcare, housing, and other services. At the state level, CDPH/OA has initiated collaborative measures between the HIV/AIDS Prevention and Care Branches to improve timeliness in identifying newly diagnosed clients and linking to health care, and services. In addition, CDPH/OA is initiating measures to improve data collection to identify PLWHA who are out-of-care or newly diagnosed, including those who are homeless.

Specific gaps in services vary by county, with nonentitlement areas, and rural areas in particular having fewer health, education/employment and transportation services available to assist their low-income populations generally, or homeless or chronically homeless household in particular. This may impact a jurisdiction's ability to provide permanent supportive housing, or service-enriched Rapid Rehousing.

Provide a summary of the strategy for overcoming gaps in the institutional structure and service delivery system for carrying out a strategy to address priority needs

CDPH/OA is integrating HCP and HOPWA grant oversight and compliance activities to streamline internal systems, maximize existing staff, and ensure coordination of HIV/AIDS services.

The statewide HIV/AIDS needs assessment will include epidemiology data, resource inventory, assessment of needs and unmet needs/service gaps, which will assist in prioritizing use of HOPWA funds.

Through the VHHP, AHSC, and Section 811 PRA programs, HCD will continue to work with other State Departments to assist housing providers serving homeless and other low income household to access supportive services offered or funded through these agencies to address gaps in services in particular communities. See http://www.hcd.ca.gov/fa/ for more information on VHHP and AHSC, and http://www.calhfa.ca.gov/multifamily/section811/index.htm for more information on the Section 811 PRA program.

SP-45 Goals Summary – 91.315(a)(4) -

Goals Summary Information

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
1	Increase the supply of affordable rental housing	2015	2019	Affordable Housing		Affordable rental housing	CDBG: $24,303,529 HOME: $103,152,243 Lead Hazard Control Program: $2,330,000	Rental units constructed: 851 Household Housing Unit Rental units rehabilitated: 1612 Household Housing Unit
2	Expand homeownership and improve existing housing	2015	2019	Affordable Housing		Affordable homeownership and home rehabilitation	CDBG: $61,726,491 HOME: $56,264,860 Lead Hazard Control Program: $850,000	Homeowner Housing Added: 329 Household Housing Unit Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated: 3142 Household Housing Unit Direct Financial Assistance to Homebuyers: 785 Households Assisted

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
3	Provide homeless assistance & prevention services	2015	2019	Homeless		Homeless assistance and prevention services	HOPWA: $17,286,719 HOME: $28,132,430 ESG: $51,651,365	Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing: 16424 Households Assisted Homeless Person Overnight Shelter: 66515 Persons Assisted Homelessness Prevention: 19200 Persons Assisted HIV/AIDS Housing Operations: 175 Household Housing Unit
4	Increase economic development opportunities	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development		Economic Development Opportunities	CDBG: $15,578,021	Jobs created/retained: 115650 Jobs Businesses assisted: 1000 Businesses Assisted

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
5	Maintain or increase public services	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development		Public Services	CDBG: $10,488,218	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 680550 Persons Assisted Public service activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 77 Households Assisted
6	Maintain or increase public facilities	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development		Public Facilities	CDBG: $37,293,665	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 1446900 Persons Assisted Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 2742050 Households Assisted

Table 25 – Goals Summary

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

Goal Descriptions

1	**Goal Name**	Increase the supply of affordable rental housing
	Goal Description	Activities to address this goal may include: CDBG rental rehabilitation, CDBG infrastructure projects in support of rental housing, HOME rental new construction and rental rehabilitation projects and LHCP rental rehabilitation activities. (HOME Tenant-Based Rental Assistance (TBRA) activities are discussed with homelessness assistance below.) CDBG Planning and Technical Assistance Grants associated with rental activities may also be eligible. For CDBG, "Moderate Income" does not exceed 80% AMI.
2	**Goal Name**	Expand homeownership and improve existing housing
	Goal Description	Activities to address this goal may include the following: CDBG homeowner acquisition and homeowner rehabilitation; CDBG infrastructure projects in support of homeowner housing; HOME low-income first-time homebuyer new construction, acquisition with or without rehabilitation, and owner-occupied rehabilitation, and LHCP homeowner rehabilitation. CDBG Planning and Technical Assistance grants associated with this activity may also be eligible. For CDBG, "Moderate Income" does not exceed 80% AMI.
3	**Goal Name**	Provide homeless assistance & prevention services
	Goal Description	Activities to address this goal may include all homeless assistance and prevention activities eligible under the State ESG and HOPWA programs, as well as HOME tenant-based rental assistance activities.
4	**Goal Name**	Increase economic development opportunities
	Goal Description	Activities to address this goal will include CDBG-funded economic development through assistance to local businesses and low-income microenterprise owners to create or preserve jobs for low-income workers in rural communities, as well as planning and evaluation studies related to any activity eligible for these allocations. Planning and Technical Assistance grants associated with this activity may also be eligible. "Moderate Income" for CDBG does not exceed 80% AMI

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

5	**Goal Name**	Maintain or increase public services
	Goal Description	Activities to address this goal will include public service activities supported with State CDBG funds, and HOPWA Housing Information Services, Supportive Services, and housing placement assistance. For CDBG, "Moderate Income" does not exceed 80% AMI.
6	**Goal Name**	Maintain or increase public facilities
	Goal Description	Activities to address this goal will include public facilities' acquisition, construction, or rehabilitation supported with State CDBG fund, and general community infrastructure projects. For CDBG, "Moderate Income" does not exceed 80% AMI. Planning and Technical Assistance Grants associated with this activity may also be eligible.

Estimate the number of extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income families to whom the jurisdiction will provide affordable housing as defined by HOME 91.315(b)(2)

Over this next five year-Consolidated Plan period, the State estimates providing 6,719 units of affordable rental and homeownership housing through CDBG, HOME, and LHCP. This includes 2,463 units of rental housing, providing either rental new construction or rental rehabilitation assistance, and 4,256 units of homeowner housing, providing either new construction, rehabilitation, or mortgage assistance to purchase existing units. An additional 35,624 households are estimated to receive short-term rental and/or utility assistance to access or maintain housing through ESG, HOPWA, or HOME as permitted under program requirements.

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

SP-50 Public Housing Accessibility and Involvement – 91.315(c)

Need to Increase the Number of Accessible Units (if Required by a Section 504 Voluntary Compliance Agreement)

The State of California is not currently subject to a Section 504 Voluntary Compliance Agreement.

Activities to Increase Resident Involvements

The State currently does not administer any Public Housing Authority (PHA) funds

Is the public housing agency designated as troubled under 24 CFR part 902?

There are currently no PHAs designated as troubled within the State's CDBG nonentitlement jurisdictions.

Plan to remove the 'troubled' designation

Not applicable.

SP-55 Barriers to affordable housing – 91.315(h)

Strategy to Remove or Ameliorate the Barriers to Affordable Housing

The Cranston Gonzales Affordable Housing Act, which guides Federal and State housing policy, recognizes that the best awareness and understanding of housing needs is found at the local level. While the Department concurs that localities should implement specific regulatory reforms related to affordable housing, it is incumbent upon the State to continue to explore avenues for promoting affordable housing that aid those at the local level.

State Housing Element Law

The State mandates local governments (Government Code Section 65580) to address housing needs, including the needs of lower-income households, by requiring all cities and counties to have a housing element in their general plan to guide residential development and direct public investments. The housing element has many similar requirements to the federally-mandated Consolidated Plan in that it requires a thorough assessment of housing needs and the adoption of a comprehensive five-year program to address those needs.

State law requires each city and county to adopt a general plan containing at least seven mandatory elements including housing. Unlike the other general plan elements, the housing element, required to be updated every five to six years, is subject to detailed statutory requirements and mandatory review by the Department. Housing elements have been mandatory portions of local general plans since 1969. This reflects the statutory recognition that housing is a matter of statewide importance, and that cooperation between government and the private sector is critical to attainment of the State's housing goals. The availability of an adequate supply of housing affordable to workers, families, and seniors is critical to the State’s long-term economic competitiveness and the quality of life for all Californians.

Housing element law requires local governments to adequately plan to meet their existing and projected housing needs including their share of the regional housing need. Housing element law is the State’s primary market-based strategy to increase housing supply, affordability and choice. The law recognizes that in order for the private sector to adequately address housing needs and demand, local governments must adopt land-use plans and regulatory schemes that provide opportunities for, and do not unduly constrain, housing development. Cities and counties are required by housing element law to have land-use plans and regulatory policies which facilitate the development of a range of housing types to meet the needs of all income groups. The housing element, which must be developed with public input and participation, serves as the basis for land-use and assistance programs to address local, regional, and state housing needs.

The housing element process begins with the Department allocating a region's share of the statewide housing need to the appropriate Councils of Governments (COG) based on Department of Finance population projections and regional population forecasts used in preparing regional transportation plans. The COG develops a Regional Housing Need Plan (RHNP) allocating the region’s share of the statewide need to the cities and counties within the region. The RHNP is required to promote the following objectives:

(1) Increase the housing supply and the mix of housing types, tenure, and affordability in all cities and counties within the region in an equitable manner;
(2) Promote infill development and socioeconomic equity, the protection of environmental and agricultural resources, and the encouragement of efficient development patterns; and
(3) Promote an improved intraregional relationship between jobs and housing.

Housing element law recognizes the most critical decisions regarding housing development occur at the local level within the context of the periodically updated general plan. The housing element component of the general plan requires local governments to balance the need for growth, including the need for additional housing, against other competing local interests. Housing element law promotes the State's interest in encouraging open markets and providing opportunities for the private sector to address the State's housing demand, while leaving the ultimate decision about how and where to plan for growth at the regional and local levels. While land-use planning is fundamentally a local issue, the availability of housing is a matter of statewide importance. Housing element law and the RHNP process requires local governments to be accountable for ensuring that projected housing needs for all income levels can be accommodated. The process maintains local control over where and what type of development should occur in local communities while providing the opportunity for the private sector to meet market demand.

In general, a housing element must at least include the following components:

- Housing Needs Assessment: The number of households overpaying for housing, living in overcrowded conditions, or with special housing needs (e.g., the elderly, large families, homeless), the number of housing units in need of repair, and assisted affordable units at-risk of converting to market-rate. The Assessment should also include the city or county's share of the regional housing need as established in the RHNP prepared by the COG. The allocation establishes the number of new units needed, by income category, to accommodate expected population growth over the planning period of the housing element. The RHNP provides a benchmark for evaluating the adequacy of local zoning and regulatory actions to ensure each local government is providing sufficient appropriately designated land and opportunities for housing development to address population growth and job generation.

- Sites Inventory and Analysis: The element must include a detailed land inventory and analysis including a site specific inventory listing properties, zoning and general plan designation, size and existing uses; a general analysis of environmental constraints and the availability of infrastructure, and evaluation of the suitability, availability and realistic development capacity of sites to accommodate the jurisdiction’s share of the regional housing need by income level. If the analysis does not demonstrate adequate sites, appropriately zoned to meet the jurisdictions share of the regional housing need, by income level, the element must include a program to provide the needed sites including providing zoning that allows owner-occupied and rental multifamily uses “by-right” with minimum densities and development standards that allow at least 16 units per site for sites.

- Analysis of Constraints on Housing: Includes land-use controls, fees and exactions, on- and off-site improvement requirements, building codes and their enforcement, permit and processing procedures, and potential constraints on the development or improvement of housing for persons with disabilities.

- Housing Programs: Programs are required to identify adequate sites to accommodate the locality's share of the regional housing need; assist in the development of housing for extremely low, lower- and moderate-income households; remove or mitigate governmental constraints; conserve and improve the existing affordable housing stock; promote equal housing opportunity; and preserve the at-risk units identified.

To assist local governments in conducting complete and appropriate analysis of existing land-use controls, zoning and building codes, the State has developed an on-line technical assistance website, the Building Blocks for Effective Housing Elements (http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/housing_element2/index.php).

As of February 25, 2015, 431 of the State's 538 jurisdictions (80 percent) were found to comply with housing element law. This is on track for record high compliance rate compared to other housing element cycles once all elements have been reviewed. All 538 jurisdictions will be required to update their housing element by the end of 2015. Due dates by Council of Governments (COG) for the 5th planning period are available on HCD's website at http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/hrc/plan/he/housing-element-update-schedule.pdf.

Furthering Fair Housing

The State of California is dedicated to the objective of promoting fair housing choice in an affirmative manner. As the lead agency for the administration of HUD's formula block grant programs, the Department's major role is in the coordination, outreach and oversight of fair housing activities by local governments and grantees.

In addition to the implementation and oversight of State Housing Element Law, HCD works very closely with its grantees for CDBG, HOME and ESG funds to ensure barriers to fair housing are addressed.

California Government Code Section 12955 et seq. (The Fair Employment and Housing Act) prohibits all housing providers, including local governments, from discriminating in housing development and all actions related to the provision of housing based on race, color, national origin, ancestry, sex, sexual orientation, religion, mental and physical disability, marital status, familial status, source of income and age.

Additionally, Government Code Section 12955 subdivision (l), specifically prohibits discrimination through public or private land use practices, decisions and authorizations. Discrimination in this regard includes, but is not limited, to restrictive covenants, zoning laws, denials of use permits and other actions authorized under the Planning and Zoning Law (Title 7, commencing with Section 65000), that make housing opportunities unavailable. Government Code Section 12955.8 prohibits land use policies and practices that have a disproportionate impact on persons protected by the fair housing laws unless they are necessary to achieve an important purpose sufficiently compelling to override the discriminatory effect and there is not less restrictive means to achieve the purpose.

Government Code Section 65008 prohibits localities from denying the enjoyment of residence, land ownership, tenancy, or any other land use because of religious beliefs or ethnic origins. It also prohibits localities from preventing or discriminating against any residential development or emergency shelter

because of the method of financing or the race, sex, color, religion, national origin, ancestry, lawful occupation, or age of the owners or intended occupants.

To promote predictability for the development of housing affordable to lower- and moderate-income households, the Housing Accountability Act (Government Code Section 65589.5) prohibits a jurisdiction from disapproving a housing development project, including housing for farmworkers and for very low, low, or moderate-income households, or conditioning approval in a manner that renders the project infeasible for development for the use of very low, low, or moderate-income households, including through the use of design review standards, unless it makes at least one of five specific written findings based on substantial evidence in the record (Government Code Section 65589.5).

Pursuant to the Housing Accountability Act, a local government is prohibited from making the finding regarding zoning and general plan inconsistency (Section 65589.5(d)(5)) to disapprove a development if the jurisdiction identified the site in its general plan (e.g., housing or land-use element) as appropriate for residential use at the density proposed or failed to identify adequate sites to accommodate its share of the regional housing need for all income groups.

In addition, Chapter 671, Statutes of 2001 (SB 520) requires all localities, under State housing element law, to include as part of a governmental constraints analysis, an analysis of potential and actual constraints upon the development, maintenance and improvement of housing for persons with disabilities and demonstrate local efforts to remove any identified constraints that hinder the locality from meeting the need for housing for persons with disabilities. The element must also include programs that remove the constraints or provide reasonable accommodations for housing developed for persons with disabilities.

State housing element law also requires local governments to include programs to promote housing opportunities for all persons regardless of race, religion, sex, marital status, ancestry, national origin, color, familial status, or disability (Government Code Section 65583(c)(5)).

Each local government's housing element should identify program strategies that support and implement State and federal fair housing laws. Such strategies include consultation with fair housing and counseling organizations in the community to document the incidence of housing discrimination and evaluation of the availability of services.

Specifically, a local equal housing opportunity program must provide a means for the resolution of local housing discrimination complaints and should include a program to disseminate fair housing information and information about resources throughout the community. The local program must involve the dissemination of information on fair housing laws, and provide for referrals to appropriate investigative or enforcement agencies. Where appropriate, communities should distribute fair housing information in languages other than English. Sites for display of fair housing information include buses, community and senior centers, local social service offices, and other public locations including civic centers or county administrative offices.

The element must also address any zoning or other land-use laws or practices that either expressly discriminate against a group protected by the fair housing laws or have the effect of discriminating against a protected group (pursuant to Government Code Section 12955.8).

Ongoing efforts to Overcome Barriers to Affordable Housing

HCD will continue to participate in meetings with other State departments, professional associations, including the Council of State Community Agencies, the California Rural Housing Coalition, the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, the Association of California Redevelopment Agencies, the California Association for Micro-Enterprise Opportunity, the California Association for Local Economic Development and a host of other organizations that have an interest in the State's implementation of HUD-funded programs and efforts to identify and remove barriers to the development of housing affordable to lower-income families and workers. These efforts promote program commonalities, maximize resources, integrate eligibility requirements where possible, share "best practices" and promote collaboration efforts at the local level.

SP-60 Homelessness Strategy – 91.315(d)

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

The **State ESG Program** funds some Street Outreach programs which provide individualized assessment to unsheltered homeless persons. Based on 2014 ESG applicant demand, in the coming year, ESG anticipates that up to 5 percent of its awards will go toward Street Outreach Programs.

Addressing the emergency and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

The **ESG Program** funds a number of Emergency Shelter programs which provide short and medium-term shelter and supportive services to homeless individuals and families while affordable, suitable permanent housing is being sought out. Based on 2014 ESG applicant demand, in the coming year, ESG anticipates that 40-60 percent of its awards will go toward emergency Shelter programs.

The State Housing Element continues to be a unique and essential tool in planning for the State's special housing needs population as well as broader planning objectives. Chapter 633 (enacted in 2007 to strengthen requirements in housing element law for local governments to identify sites to accommodate the need for emergency shelter). Specifically, local governments must address all of the following:

- At least one zone shall be identified to permit emergency shelters without a conditional use permit or other discretionary action.
- Sufficient capacity must be identified to accommodate each local government's needs for emergency shelters, including seasonal fluctuations, and at least one year-round emergency shelter.
- Existing or proposed permit procedures and development and management standards must be objective and encourage and facilitate the development of or conversion to emergency shelters.
- Emergency shelters shall only be subject to development and management standards that apply to residential or commercial within the same zone.
- Written and objective standards may be applied as specified in statute, including maximum number of beds, provision of onsite management, length of stay and security.
- Transitional and supportive housing shall be considered a residential use and only subject to those restrictions that apply to other residential uses of the same type in the same zone.
- Denial of emergency shelters, transitional housing or supportive housing is limited by requiring specific findings.

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.

California has an extensive ongoing system of social service organizations that provide institutional care, client-based community or residential services, and housing-based supportive services, including significant mainstream programs and services to prevent homelessness. The State provides funding for homeless services under various programs including, for example, public education, workforce development, Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), Supplemental Security Income (SSI), veteran services, unemployment compensation, workers compensation, foster care, and affordable rental housing. Some programs, such as TANF Homeless Assistance (HA) Program provide assistance to those at imminent risk of becoming homeless. The TANF HA Program also provides non-recurring cash assistance to families who are homeless.

California has received formula grants under the McKinney Projects for Assistance in Transition from Homelessness (PATH) Program administered by the Department of Mental Health (DMH). Each participating county is required to annually develop a service plan and budget. Eligible uses of the funds include housing services and supportive services in residential settings.

In addition, HCD continues to work cooperatively with DMH to develop policy and program guidelines that promote collaborative efforts in the area of supportive housing. The Department and DMH jointly manage the California Statewide Supportive Housing Initiative Act (SHIA), created in 1998 to develop affordable housing linked to accessible mental health, substance addiction, employment and other support services. The intent of this initiative is to provide the incentive and leverage for local governments, the nonprofit sector, and the private sector to invest resources that expand and strengthen supportive housing opportunities.

The **ESG Program** funds Rapid-Rehousing and Homeless Prevention programs which provide short and medium-term rental assistance and supportive services to homeless and individuals and families and those at risk of homelessness so that they can access and maintain affordable, suitable permanent housing. In the coming year, ESG anticipates that approximately 40 percent of its awards will go toward Rapid Rehousing and Homeless Prevention activities. ESG currently provide points in its application rating process to Rapid-Rehousing programs, and to programs that engage in Housing First practices. See AP 30 for more information.

In addition, in February 2015, HCD issued a NOFA to provide funds for rehabilitation/conversion of emergency and transitional housing facilities to permanent supportive housing for homeless individuals and families, as well as those at-risk of homelessness. Approximately $10 million is available through this NOFA.

Help low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless, especially extremely low-income individuals and families who are likely to become homeless after being discharged from a publicly funded institution or system of care, or who are receiving

assistance from public and private agencies that address housing, health, social services, employment, education or youth needs.

In addition to the programs discussed above, of recent note, the State's Homelessness Policy Academy, Section 811 Project Rental Assistance Demonstration Program, and Mental Health Services Act Housing Program all have as a primary goal developing policies and/or dedicated resources to assist individuals exiting publically funded systems of care, and prevent homelessness by providing access to affordable housing with support services. For a discussion of each of these initiatives, see AP-85.

Low income PLWHA that are homeless are assisted through State HOPWA with PHP, TBRA, housing information and referral services, hotel/motel voucher or other short term housing assistance, and supportive services including case management, meal assistance, and transportation vouchers. At intake to a State HOPWA program, a client service plan is prepared, and the client is referred to other agencies for services not provided by the HOPWA project sponsor. The level of HOPWA-funded homeless services provided to PLWHA varies from county to county depending on funding availability.

State Housing Element law has also served as a vehicle for extensive additional commitment to update zoning codes and establish procedures to better address the housing needs of persons with disabilities pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). These commitments range from ensuring that local zoning reflects and accommodates a range of family types to adopting reasonable accommodation procedures to provide zoning exceptions for persons with disabilities.

Chapter 507, Statutes of 2010 (SB 812), which took effect in January 2011, amended housing element law to require the analysis of the housing needs of the disabled, including an evaluation of the special housing needs of persons with developmental disabilities, the number of persons with developmental disabilities, and a discussion of resources.

In accordance with Government Code Section 65583(e), any draft housing element submitted to HCD after March 31, 2011 is required to comply with SB 812. A copy of the legislation can be found on HCD's website at www.hcd.ca.gov, or on the Legislative Counsel's website at http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/09-10/bill/sen/sb_0801-0850/sb_812_bill_20100929_chaptered.pdf. There is more about how to address special housing needs in a housing element on HCD's *Building Blocks for Effective Housing Elements* webpage at http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/housing_element2/HN_SHN_home.php.

Policy Academy To Reduce Chronic Homelessness/Special Populations

In 2013, California was one of four States to participate in the federally-coordinated SAMHSA Policy Academy to Reduce Chronic Homelessness. Led by the Department of Housing and Community Development, the State received technical assistance to help identify key opportunities for State action to impact the number of people experiencing long term homelessness. Conducing over 25 stakeholder interviews, numerous site visits, and through three day-long convenings of Policy Academy members

(including state departments and agencies, federal agencies, local governments, service and housing providers, continuum of care agencies, public housing authorities, and statewide advocacy organizations), the State identified five major goal areas. Accomplishments and future direction under each goal area are highlighted below.

Goal 1: Increasing access to mainstream resources, taking full advantage of opportunities under the Affordable Care Act and through the expansion of Medi-Cal.

State health and housing partnerships have increased since the Policy Academy. In consultation with external experts and practioners, HCD and the State Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) created and distributed "Let's Get Everyone Covered!", a comprehensive tool kit to assist counties, supportive housing and service providers in enrolling persons experiencing homelessness in Medi-Cal and managed care plans. http://www.hcd.ca.gov/LetsGetEveryoneCovered.pdf. Recognizing the expanded MediCal population that now includes single adults experiencing homelessness, the State convened a webinar and in-person housing/services panel for the State's Medi-Cal Managed Care directors in October 2014 on health and housing needs and solutions for persons experiencing long term homelessness. With involvement of State housing agencies and local stakeholders, housing and homeless services providers, DHCS is pursuing an extension of the 1115 Medicaid waiver and the Health Homes option under the Affordable Care Act. Both efforts are exploring strategies to deliver health services to persons experiencing chronic homelessness and other high users of healthcare systems, recognizing stabilized housing as a social determinant of health. For example, under the proposed 1115 waiver, the State would provide access to intensive housing-based care management services and intensive care management to tenants who are meet the target population criteria, which includes individuals who are currently homeless or who will be homeless upon discharge from institutions, such as hospitals or jails. In addition, under the waiver, the State is proposing to incentivize local partnerships among managed care, counties, housing and services providers, hospitals and others, who would be eligible to receive incentive or shared savings payments for housing-based-care management and/or partnership activities to improve access to subsidized housing units. Finally, the State housing and health agencies are jointly administering approximately $12 million in the first 911 Project Rental Assistance Demonstration program targeting housing and Medical services assistance to non-elderly disabled persons leaving long term institutions, such as nursing homes or regional centers for the developmentally disabled, throughout the State. The State's health and housing agencies were recently awarded an additional $12 million to continue this work in Los Angele, expanding the targeted population to include persons experiencing chronic homelessness to stabilize in affordable housing linked to supportive services. The second round will provide rental subsidies in State-financed housing for approximately 283 households in Los Angeles County and, with additional commitments from Los Angeles City and County housing authorities, an additional 150 households will participate in the program.

Goals 2: Increasing access to permanent supportive housing (PSH) in the existing inventory persons experiencing chronic homelessness and the most and Goal 3: Designing new State PSH programs and approaches: In FY 13-14, $50 million in new funding was allocated for new PSH through the MHP-SH program and $600 million was reallocated to the new Veterans Housing and Homelessness Prevention Program (VHHP). MHP-SH program includes targeting to the following populations: Homeless youth, chronically homeless, persons leaving institutions

With Policy Academy lessons, VHHP improvements include: increased targeting to the most vulnerable subset of persons experiencing homelessness and geographically to areas with the highest number of veterans experiencing homelessness and housing instability, providing operating subsidies to reach 0 income households, requiring housing first practices in funded housing, increasing attention on services planning and delivery, and expanded performance reporting and evaluation. The first NOFA of approximately $75 million was announced in early 2015. With broad application to all of HCD's multifamily programs, efforts are underway to change HCD's Uniform Multifamily Regulations to provide more flexibility in project budgets to fund capitalized operating reserves and to allow case management costs as a project operating cost when serving a targeted population, thereby increasing a project's ability to access additional needed subsidy. The California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) has also amended its regulations to enable all projects applying through the Special Needs housing set-aside to access State tax credits, even if they are not located in a Difficult to Develop Area. As a result, TCAC has seen an increase in the number of projects proposing to serve special needs populations.

Funding for two other special populations continue in these State programs: 1) Jointly administered by the California Department of Mental Health and the California Housing Finance Agency on behalf of counties, the Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) Housing Program offers permanent financing and capitalized operating subsidies for the development of permanent supportive housing, including both rental and shared housing, to serve persons with serious mental illness and their families who are homeless or at risk of homelessness; and 2) Administered by the Department of Development Services, Community Placement Plan (CPP) funds develop permanent affordable and accessible homes consistent with the regional centers' authority to conduct resource development as described in Welfare and Institutions Code, Section 4418.25. In collaboration with the regional center, DDS uses CPP funds to develop homes as an alternative for individuals with developmental disabilities to reside in the community instead of institutional settings.

Goal 4: Supporting the redesign of local crisis response systems. Allocated to the State Department of Social Services (DSS) in 2014, $20 million in general fund is being administered by welfare offices in 20 California counties for rapid re-housing and prevention of families receiving CalWORKS assistance. To inform with best practices, the California Welfare Directors Association hosted a technical assistance webinar in July with the National Alliance to End Homelessness and HCD. With assistance from Abt Associates and HUD's technical assistance grant, the State's ESG program is redesigning its programs, increasing its focus on HEARTH outcomes, including shortening stays in homelessness and facilitating quicker exits to permanent housing through rapid re-housing strategies. Some changes were made for 2014 with greater shifts planned in 2015 and beyond. Continuum of Care agencies were surveyed on current capacities and activities, and other state practices inventoried.

Finally, multiple state agencies are working with the California Child Welfare Council to improve housing strategies and programs for families in reunification. HCD has presented housing strategies to the Priority Access to Services and Supports following a statewide convening of local, national and state practioners and experts in the Fall of 2014. Please also refer to Appendix F for additional information on key strategies and initiatives of the Policy Academy.

SP-65 Lead based paint Hazards – 91.315(i)

Actions to address LBP hazards and increase access to housing without LBP hazards

Since 1992, the Department of Community Services and Development (CSD) has managed a continual Lead-Based Paint Hazard Control Program (LBPHC) designed to identify and control lead-based paint hazards in eligible privately owned housing for rental or owner occupants. CSD has successfully managed LBPHC benefiting low-income families through effective program design and implementation, and through cost-effective and fiscally responsible business practices. To date, CSD has made 2,230 lead-safe housing units for eligible families in California. CSD developed a LBPHC design by forming a collaborative partnership between CSD and its network of Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) in the delivery of lead hazard control services to low-income households. The LBPHC CBO's include Community Resource Project (Sacramento, Sutter and Yuba Counties), Community Services and Employment Training (Tulare County), Fresno County Economic Opportunity Commission (Fresno County), Maravilla Foundation (Los Angeles County) and Redwood Community Action Agency (Humboldt County). The CBO's have a long history of serving low-income families as they are locally based and offer a wide range of community service programs. LBPHC is designed to work in conjunction with the California Department of Public Health, Childhood Lead Poisoning Branch, the federally-funded Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) weatherization component, Department of Energy Weatherization Assistance Program (DOE WAP), local health agencies and affordable housing programs such as CDBG and HOME.

How are the actions listed above integrated into housing policies and procedures?

CBOs continue to collaborate with their local housing departments and provide education about LBPHC services and identify lead-hazard at-risk units. CBO's continue to participate in community events, meet with local businesses, housing advocacy groups and neighborhood groups to build the public's understanding on lead-based paint hazards.

SP-70 Anti-Poverty Strategy – 91.315(j)

Jurisdiction Goals, Programs and Policies for reducing the number of Poverty-Level Families

Based on the 2008 Census Estimates, California has the 21st highest poverty rate of all states including the District of Columbia. According to 2013 Census information, 15.9 percent of the statewide population and 22.1 percent of children in California live below the poverty line. This is higher than the national average of 15.4 percent of total population and 21.6 percent of children. Household types most affected by poverty include: female head-of-households, children, ethnic groups (particularly Hispanics and African Americans) and the elderly. High unemployment also contributes to the growing number of persons living in poverty and places added demands on the Department's programs as well as upon many of the human service programs managed by other state agencies. In addition to the serious consequences for families and individuals, unemployment can severely impact a community. The ability to generate taxes and utility revenues and to incur debt is directly related to the resources that a community's citizens have. High numbers of unemployed persons form populations that hinder a community's ability to be self-sufficient.

The cost of energy represents a burden to the majority of low income households, particularly those on a fixed income. The price of energy used for home usage, particularly electricity and LP gas, remains a burden for lower income households. High energy costs, coupled with high unemployment and poverty rates and a dilapidated housing stock, has increased the demand for energy-related service. Inability to pay not only leads to shutoffs, but for many creates health concerns and forces families to abandon their homes.

HCD seeks to reduce the number of families and individuals living in poverty, thereby providing a better future for all Californians. This means (1) continuing to provide long-term solutions to the problems facing people in poverty and (2) targeting resources to those with the greatest need. The State has established several goals to reduce poverty among its population:

- Provide a range of services and activities through its federal and State programs that have a measurable impact on conditions of poverty and homelessness.

- Provide activities through its programs and services to assist low-income participants, including the elderly, to secure and retain employment, gain an adequate education, obtain and maintain affordable/accessible housing, obtain emergency assistance to meet immediate and urgent individual and family needs, including health services and remove obstacles blocking the achievement of self-sufficiency.

- Coordinate and collaborate linkages between governmental and other social service programs to assure the effective delivery of such services to low-income individuals.

- Encourage the private sector to become involved in efforts to alleviate poverty and homelessness. Several State departments administer programs that directly respond to the needs of individuals/families in poverty. These programs, as outlined in Appendix D, are continually assessed to determine their effectiveness and appropriateness in meeting the needs and providing the resources they need to break the cycle of poverty. The goals of these

programs are the acquisition of skills, knowledge, and motivation necessary for California's poor to become self-sufficient.

In addition to CDBG's economic development activities, (discussed in CDBG's Method of Distribution in AP 30), the State ESG and HOPWA programs' funded case management services may help poverty-level households link to mainstream education and employment opportunities to assist them in increasing their income.

Other State housing programs seek to reduce the housing cost burden on families who are considered Extremely Low Income, many of whom have incomes at or below the poverty level, by developing housing units at 30% AMI or below, and/or by providing rent or operating subsidies that will assist families at this income level to afford housing. The MHP Supportive Housing Program, VHHP, Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) the CalWORKs Housing Support Program, and Section 811 PRA program specifically target households at 30% AMI or below. Other State programs such as the MHP General component, HOME, AHSC and the 9% and 4% Tax credit programs provide application rating points and/or additional dollars for providing rents at 30% AMI or below. In 2016, the State hopes to receive funds from the National Housing Trust Fund. By statute, a minimum of 75% of the funds available must be used for ELI units.

Although HCD no longer administers the Enterprise Zone Program, HCD will support the Franchise Tax Board as it implements the New Employee Credit program in Designated Geographic Areas throughout the state, many of which were former enterprise zones. HCD will also continue to verify the eligibility of businesses which claim previously earned hiring tax credits when called upon by the FTB in the performance of its audits.

How are the Jurisdiction poverty reducing goals, programs, and policies coordinated with this affordable housing plan.

The focus of this Consolidated Plan is the State CDBG, HOME, ESG, HOPWA, and LHCP programs; however, communities will leverage these funds with the other affordable housing programs discussed above to target ELI households.

SP-75 Colonias Strategy – 91.315

Describe the State's homeless strategy within Colonias.

Federal law require up to 10 percent of the total amount of CDBG funds shall be made available for Colonia activities. The State has determined that 5 percent of available funds for FY 2015-2016 will be available to benefit Colonia eligible communities.

Colonia eligible communities are those communities located in the US-Mexico border and must be determined by the State or unit of general local government (UGLG) to be a Colonia on the basis of objective criteria, including lack of potable water supply, lack of adequate sewage systems, and lack of decent, safe, and sanitary housing. California's Colonia eligible communities are those fifteen (15) identified by the State located in Imperial County; nine (9) within the unincorporated areas of the County one (1) in Brawley, two (2) in Calexico, two (2) in City of Imperial, and one (1) in the City of El Centro.

CDBG Colonia set aside funds are to be used for eligible activities that meet the needs of the Colonias such as basic infrastructure and housing activities. States and UGLGs are strongly encouraged to use CDBG Colonias set-aside funds for projects addressing the lack of potable drinking water supply, lack of adequate sewage systems, and lack of decent safe and sanitary housing. States should only fund other activities if they are undertaken in conjunction with funding of basic infrastructure or housing activities.

To the Department's knowledge, homelessness in the Colonias is not a substantial issue. In 2013, a Master Plan Colonia Update study was funded by HCD, prepared for Imperial County Community & Economic Development specifically to develop the strategy in giving priority assistance to Colonias having the greatest need for basic infrastructure and housing activities. In this study, each of the nine Colonia communities in the unincorporated area of Imperial County reflected a large percentage of homeownership. The majority of single family homes in the Colonias are mobile homes or modular homes. Housing rehabilitation needs for each Colonia are found in Appendix E.

Describe the barriers to affordable housing in Colonias.

In the 2013 Master Plan Colonia Update study in the unincorporated area of Imperial County, the percentage of owner occupied units is much higher than the average homeownership percentage in the nation despite the higher poverty rate and higher unemployment rate. This is due to the lower land value and housing costs associated with the typical single family homes found in the Colonias

Despite the high percentage of home ownership, the barrier facing Colonias appear to be their inability to take advantage of housing rehabilitation funds. Many of these dwellings are not up to code, and the local jurisdictions are not willing to issue code violations. Because these code violations would have to be addressed as part of the rehab, it would mean that the households may have to be temporarily or permanently relocated. Many of these households refuse to leave their homes. Additionally many homeowners are not willing to take out a loan for the rehab but they would accept a grant.

For further discussion on gaps in institutional delivery system working within the Colonia, see SP 40.

Describe the State's strategy for addressing barriers to affordable housing (including substandard housing) in Colonias.

The State plans to consult with HUD in coming up with a strategy for addressing the substandard housing issues in the Colonias. Subsequently, the State will develop a plan of action which will be shared with the local jurisdiction responsible for the Colonia communities as well as the Advisory Committee.

The State plans to provide technical assistance to the local jurisdiction once an action plan is developed to enable homeowners in these Colonia communities to take advantage of CDBG housing rehabilitation funds.

Describe the State's goals/programs/policies for reducing the number of poverty level families in Colonias.

Community development requires an analysis of the community as a whole to achieve the goal of community integration and opportunity for all Colonia. This includes crucial areas such as economic development, employment opportunities, capacity building and workforce development. Unfortunately, under the current federal rules regarding eligible activities and funding for Colonias, the State is not able to assist with these very critical needs.

Describe how the State's goals/programs/policies for producing and preserving affordable housing in the Colonias will be coordinated with other programs and services.

The CDBG Colonia set-aside funding helps subsidize Public Infrastructure projects to improve failing water and sewage issues, as well as housing rehabilitation projects. Each Colonia has unique characteristics and some have more needs than others. All can use Housing Rehabilitation funding, but not all need the water, sewer, and infrastructure funding.

Available funds set aside for Colonia communities are often undersubscribed which means money is available if Colonia community applies. However, due to constraints on eligible uses of funds, Colonia communities are unable to use Colonia set-aside funds each year.

SP-80 Monitoring – 91.330

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

CDBG - HCD's commitment to the strategic plan includes oversight and monitoring for long-term compliance with Federal and State requirements of the CDBG program. HCD monitoring consists of either an onsite monitoring review or a desk review based on a risk assessment. Through monitoring, HCD assesses program compliance and performance over time. Monitoring provides critical statistical information about a participant's management efficiency and program effectiveness as well as in identifying waste, fraud and abuse. Monitoring is also an opportunity to provide focused, specific technical assistance and guidance based on an evaluation of a jurisdiction's processes and practices.

HCD monitoring may be either an onsite monitoring visit or a desk review. HCD conducts an annual assessment to determine which jurisdictions, projects, program and/or activities are the highest risk and which type of monitoring is applicable.

Whenever possible, deficiencies are rectified through discussion, negotiation, and technical assistance. HCD will continue to use monitoring in its efforts to provide technical assistance to help improve a grantees performance, to help develop capacity, and to help achieve compliance with all regulations governing administrative, financial, and programmatic operations.

HOME - HOME does four primary types of types of monitoring for its funded activities. (1) Close-out monitoring is done for all-funded activities to assess overall compliance with the requirements of the HOME Regulations and Standard Agreement. (2) CHDO Project Long-Term Monitoring is done by the State on rental and homebuyer projects involving CHDOs. On these projects, HCD holds the Note and Deed of Trust. The purpose of this monitoring is to assess ongoing compliance with HOME rent and occupancy requirements, fair housing requirements, and the ongoing physical and financial condition of the project. As part of this assessment, annual review of project rents, operating budgets, and financial statements is performed to check compliance with project rent and operating requirements pursuant to the Department's Uniform Multifamily Regulations and 24 CFR 92.252. Annual Affirmative Marketing Reports and 5-year Affirmative Marketing Plans are also reviewed. Site visits to assess compliance with HOME income limits income verification requirements, rent restrictions and federal Housing Quality Standards are also performed. (UPCS standards will be used when HUD guidance is issued.) Site visits are performed pursuant to the requirements set forth in 92.504 (d). **(3) State Recipient Long-Term Monitoring** is an assessment of performance of the above monitoring activities by local jurisdictions. HOME State Recipients are the lenders for rental and homebuyer new construction and rehabilitation projects where they have applied directly to the State for HOME funds, rather than the CHDO being the recipient of the funds. An office review consists of an Annual Monitoring Report questionnaire and Project Compliance Report, which asks about project financial condition and compliance with other federal HOME requirements, a copy of the project's utility allowance schedule (form HUD-52667); a

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

copy of the State Recipient's last long term monitoring Summary Letter and Clearance Letter to the project's owner/manager, a copy of Physical Conditions report, and a copy of the project's Annual Affirmative Marketing Analysis Report. MBE/WBE and Section 3 goals assessment and outreach activities monitored as part of our grantee Annual Performance Reports. See the Annual Performance Report Form at: http://www.hcd.ca.gov/fa/home/fiscalindex.html for more information.

ESG: The ESG program monitors subgrantee performance primarily through desk monitoring of financial expenditures to ensure that requests for ESG funds comply with the HUD ESG expenditure guide. Other federal requirements are also monitored including, but not limited to, Written Standards requirements and participation in HMIS.

HOPWA staff conducts site visits based on a risk analysis of project sponsors, and monitors program compliance and planning requirements through regular written and verbal communication with project sponsors, such as financial expenditure reviews, progress reports, program guidance, webinars, e-mail and phone conversations, etc. Deficiencies identified during site visits are discussed with project sponsors, and technical assistance is provided to assist in the remediation of identified deficiencies, and to ensure long-term compliance with program requirements.

The HOPWA Request for Application process will include outreach to minority business enterprises, faith-based, and grassroots organizations.

LHCP: CSD conducts on-going monitoring of the CBOs during the course of the grant to ensure objectives and goals are accomplished within 36-months.

CSD conducts an initial planning meeting with the CBOs to discuss programmatic requirements, scheduling, and planning LHCP activities. Thereafter, CSD will convene meetings on at least a quarterly basis for the purpose of program planning, monitoring, and evaluation. On-going monitoring and evaluation will be conducted to ensure that CBOs are meeting the projected benchmark goals by conducting monthly reviews of activity reports and expenditure reports, annual desk review, and on-site monitoring visits.

CSD through the CBOs will implement an outreach plan in collaboration with the local California Lead Poison Prevention Program to develop targeted education and public awareness to improve access to services and information. The CBOs will provide lead hazard awareness and healthy homes education to potential clients during enrollment and inspection process by providing residents/owners with written material on the prevention of lead poisoning, including educational flyers from CDPH and the EPA booklet "Renovate Right": Important Lead Hazard Information for Families, Child Care Providers and Schools", and HUD Booklet, "Help Yourself To A Healthy Home".

Collectively, CBOs will participate in or conduct at least 10 community events in the targeted counties for the general public including minority businesses during the course of this grant to disseminate information to the general public concerning lead hazards. It is estimated that through the community events and during the LBPHC enrollment process CBOs provide lead hazard awareness education to 2,500 individuals.

Expected Resources

AP-15 Expected Resources – 91.320(c)(1,2)

Introduction

The **annual allocation** numbers shown below are the actual formula allocation amounts for the California nonentitlement areas for FY 14-15. The annual allocation amounts for **HOME** include the allocations for the entitlement jurisdictions of Gardenia, Lancaster, and Torrance that have returned these funds to HUD for re-allocation to the State in order for those jurisdictions to participate in the State HOME program. The annual allocation estimates for **HOPWA** include the State non-EMSA allocation and the allocation for the EMSA of Bakersfield, which has historically relinquished grantee responsibilities to State HOPWA. Anticipated resources also include prior year State HOPWA funds for the EMSA of Fresno that will be committed to projects in the FY 2015-16 program year. Effective FY 2015-16, the City of Fresno will assume grantee responsibilities for Fresno EMSA, and the 2015 Fresno allocation will not be included in the State's grant agreement. The PI estimates for **HOME** are based on PI estimates from State- held loans and from local State recipient loans during FY 2014. This is the first year of the 2015-2020 ConPlan cycle.

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

Anticipated Resources

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan $	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: $	Program Income: $	Prior Year Resources: $	Total: $		
CDBG	public - federal	Acquisition Admin and Planning Economic Development Housing Public Improvements						
HOME	public - federal	Public Services Acquisition Homebuyer assistance Homeowner rehab Multifamily rental new construction Multifamily rental rehab New construction for ownership TBRA	28,434,562 28,671,677	0 2,000,000	6,000,000 5,000,000	34,434,562 35,671,677	125,728,488 151,877,857	The amounts shown do not include deductions for program administration.

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan $	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: $	Program Income: $	Prior Year Resources: $	Total: $		
HOPWA	public - federal	Permanent housing in facilities Permanent housing placement Short term or transitional housing facilities STRMU Supportive services TBRA	3,350,624	0	533,609	3,884,233	13,402,496	The State HOPWA allocation is $2,967,485 and the Bakersfield EMSA allocation is $383,139 for a total of $3,350,624.Prior Year Resources include uncommitted FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 funding for Fresno EMSA of $405,609, and $128,000 for all other eligible jurisdictions as of June 30, 2014. Kern County (Bakersfield EMSA) may carry over additional funds to this fiscal year if not spent in FY 2014-15.

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan $	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: $	Program Income: $	Prior Year Resources: $	Total: $		
ESG	public - federal	Conversion and rehab for transitional housing Financial Assistance Overnight shelter Rapid re-housing (rental assistance) Rental Assistance Services Transitional housing	11,651,365	0	0	11,651,365	40,000,000	

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan $	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: $	Program Income: $	Prior Year Resources: $	Total: $		
Other	public - federal	Homeowner rehab Multifamily rental rehab						LHCP is the fourth of our HUD CPD Programs. The State Department of Community Services and Development (CSD) is the administrative agency for LHCP. In September 2014, HUD awarded $3.4 million to CSD for a new 36-month program (Round 20). Approximately $3.0 million of the award will be used to provide lead hazard reduction services and approximately $400,000 of Healthy Homes supplemental funding will be used for other related home hazards for 195 privately owned housing units. This grant will cover 2014-2017.

2,937,234	0
	0
	2,937,234
	462,766

Table 26 - Expected Resources – Priority Table

Explain how federal funds will leverage those additional resources (private, state and local funds), including a description of how matching requirements will be satisfied

CDBG Funds available to non-entitlement jurisdictions are often insufficient to fully support most Community Development or Economic Development projects and programs, therefore, CDBG funds are generally used as gap financing in conjunction with other federal, State and local funds. CDBG matching requirements for FY 15-16 will be met by State General Funds in the amount of $2,177,000.

HOME - In HOME, the largest source of leverage is Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) used with rental new construction projects. Other sources of leverage include private bank loans, State funds, other federal funds, and local funds for both rental and homebuyer activities. Local funds have diminished in many communities due to loss of Redevelopment Agency revenue and other local revenue. In FY 14-15 HOME leveraged over $171 million from other sources. HOME's leverage typically exceeds its match requirement, allowing HOME to meet its match requirement using excess match that has accumulated over several years.

ESG - ESG Match is provided by its Subrecipients on a dollar for dollar basis. Specific sources of match are identified at the time of application and must comply with 24 CFR 576.201. The primary sources of match identified in the most recent funding round for ESG are (1) Local match funding including cities and counties,; (2) Private match funding including fundraising, cash; (3) Federal match funding including CDBG, SHP, and HOME Tenant-Based Rental Assistance (TBRA); in addition to (4) donated goods, volunteers, building value or lease**.**

HOPWA - There is no federal match requirement for HOPWA; however, project sponsors report leveraged funds. On an annual basis, CDPH/OA allocates funding through the HCP for HIV/AIDS care and treatment services to California counties. Based on prior year data, CDPH/OA anticipates approximately $2.8 million in leveraged funds by HOPWA project sponsors including Ryan White Part B (payer of last resort) and other federal, state, local, and private resources for the provision of HIV/AIDS housing and services to HOPWA clients.

LHCP - To ensure that community based organizations (CBOs) meet HUD's required 10 percent match for $3.4 million award, the CBOs are required to match larger percentages of the net $2,537,234 provided to them: The match amount is based on $3.0 million of the award. Match activities must be specifically dedicated to supporting and remediating lead-hazard activities from non-federal resources such as State, local, charitable, nonprofit or for-profit entities, in-kind contributions, private donations, Petroleum Violation Escrow Account (PVEA), and owner's contribution. The only federal funds that may be considered part of the match requirement are CDBG funds. In 2015-16, LHCP anticipates a minimum of $33,332 in match contributions. CBOs are also required to leverage 5% percent of their grant allocation from various federal sources such as (1) Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, Department of Energy Weatherization Assistance Program, Community Services Block Grant, or other federally funded programs; (2) State, local, charitable, nonprofit or for-profit entities; and (3) in-kind

contributions, private donations and PVEA. In 2015-16, LHCP anticipates a minimum of $13,652 in leveraging contributions.

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

The State ConPlan does not identify specific projects to be developed or supported since local entities must first apply for and secure funding for these projects.

Discussion

See above.

Annual Goals and Objectives

AP-20 Annual Goals and Objectives – 91.320(c)(3)&(e)

Goals Summary Information

Table 27 – Goals Summary

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
1	Increase the supply of affordable rental housing	2015	2019	Affordable Housing		Affordable rental housing	CDBG: $5,225,184 HOME: $19,619,422 Lead Hazard Control Program: $510,000	Rental units constructed: 177 Household Housing Unit Rental units rehabilitated: 295 Household Housing Unit
2	Expand homeownership and improve existing housing	2015	2019	Affordable Housing		Affordable homeownership and home rehabilitation	CDBG: $13,271,005 HOME: $10,701,503 Lead Hazard Control Program: $170,000	Homeowner Housing Added: 64 Household Housing Unit Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated: 590 Household Housing Unit Direct Financial Assistance to Homebuyers: 192 Households Assisted

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

3	Provide homeless assistance & prevention services	2015	2019	Homeless		Homeless assistance and prevention services	HOPWA: $3,884,233 HOME: $5,350,751 ESG: $11,651,365	Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing: 3096 Households Assisted Homeless Person Overnight Shelter: 13303 Persons Assisted Homelessness Prevention: 3760 Persons Assisted
4	Increase economic development opportunities	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development		Economic Development Opportunities	CDBG: $3,349,226	Jobs created/retained: 20750 Jobs Businesses assisted: 250 Businesses Assisted
5	Maintain or increase public services	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development		Public Services	CDBG: $2,254,935	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 213500 Persons Assisted Public service activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 12 Households Assisted
6	Maintain or increase public facilities	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development		Public Facilities	CDBG: $8,018,023	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 253100 Persons Assisted Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 548450 Households Assisted

Goal Descriptions

1	**Goal Name**	Increase the supply of affordable rental housing
	Goal Description	Activities to address this goal may include: CDBG rental rehabilitation, CDBG infrastructure projects in support of rental housing, HOME rental new construction and rental rehabilitation projects and LHCP rental rehabilitation activities. (HOME Tenant-Based Rental Assistance (TBRA) activities are discussed with homelessness assistance below.) CDBG Planning and Technical Assistance Grants associated with rental activities may also be eligible. For CDBG, "Moderate Income" does not exceed 80% AMI.
2	**Goal Name**	Expand homeownership and improve existing housing
	Goal Description	Activities to address this goal may include the following: CDBG homeowner acquisition and homeowner rehabilitation; CDBG infrastructure projects in support of homeowner housing; HOME low-income first-time homebuyer new construction, acquisition with or without rehabilitation, and owner-occupied rehabilitation, and LHCP homeowner rehabilitation. CDBG Planning and Technical Assistance grants associated with this activity may also be eligible. For CDBG, "Moderate Income" does not exceed 80% AMI.
3	**Goal Name**	Provide homeless assistance & prevention services
	Goal Description	Activities to address this goal may include all homeless assistance and prevention activities eligible under the State ESG and HOPWA programs, as well as HOME tenant-based rental assistance activities.
4	**Goal Name**	Increase economic development opportunities
	Goal Description	Activities to address this goal will include CDBG-funded economic development through assistance to local businesses and low-income microenterprise owners to create or preserve jobs for low-income workers in rural communities, as well as planning and evaluation studies related to any activity eligible for these allocations. Planning and Technical Assistance grants associated with this activity may also be eligible. "Moderate Income" for CDBG does not exceed 80% AMI
5	**Goal Name**	Maintain or increase public services
	Goal Description	Activities to address this goal will include public service activities supported with State CDBG funds, and HOPWA Housing Information Services, Supportive Services, and housing placement assistance. For CDBG, "Moderate Income" does not exceed 80% AMI.

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

6	**Goal Name**	Maintain or increase public facilities
	Goal Description	Activities to address this goal will include public facilities' acquisition, construction, or rehabilitation supported with State CDBG fund, and general community infrastructure projects. For CDBG, "Moderate Income" does not exceed 80% AMI. Planning and Technical Assistance Grants associated with this activity may also be eligible.

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

AP-25 Allocation Priorities – 91.320(d)

Introduction:

The percentages below are based on the expected amount of funds that will be awarded by each program in FY 15-16 for eligible activities that fall within that goal. The expected amounts to be awarded are in the "Total Available in Year 1" (FY 15-16) found in AP 20. This total includes any Program Income and prior year resources expected to be awarded in FY 15-16. The expected amounts to be awarded to each goal are typically based on actual applicant demand for activities within that goal from the prior NOFA year. For this reason, in some instances, the percentages below may be under the minimums allowed for a particular activity pursuant to statute or regulation.

Note: the CDBG Colonias percentage is listed below at 5%, but this amount would otherwise be reflected in the amounts available under the housing or infrastructure goals. The 23% projected for public facilities includes general infrastructure projects. Amounts for infrastructure projects connected to a particular housing project ("in support of housing") are reflected in the renter and homeowner goals.

The amount for HOME under "homelessness assistance and prevention" reflects the total amount of HOME TBRA funds projected to be awarded in FY 14-15. For purposes of the goals reflected below, HOME TBRA is considered a homelessness assistance or prevention activity

Funding Allocation Priorities

	Increase the supply of affordable rental housing (%)	Expand homeownership and improve existing housing (%)	Provide homeless assistance & prevention services (%)	Increase economic development opportunities (%)	Maintain or increase public services (%)	Maintain or increase public facilities (%)	Colonias Set-Aside (%)	Total (%)
CDBG	15	39	0	10	8	23	5	**100**
HOME	55	30	15	0	0	0	0	**100**
HOPWA	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	**100**
ESG	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	**100**
Other Lead Hazard Control Program	75	25	0	0	0	0	0	**100**

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

Table 28 – Funding Allocation Priorities

Reason for Allocation Priorities

CDBG - Federal law requires not less than 70 percent of overall CDBG funding over three years, must be used for activities that benefit Low/Mod persons/households with incomes of 80 percent or below the County's Area Median Income, adjusted for family size. In addition, federal law limits the total amount of CDBG funds spent on Public Services to no more than 15 percent and requires up to 10 percent of the total amount of CDBG funds shall be made available for Colonia activities. The State has determined that 5 percent of available funds for FY 2015-2016 will be available to benefit Colonia eligible communities. Colonia eligible communities for State CDBG funds are all located in Imperial County.

Additionally, State Statute require at least 51% of Federal CDBG State allocation must go to housing and housing related activities; no more than 30% of Federal CDBG State allocation shall be set aside for economic development projects and programs; and at least 1.25% of the total amount of federal CDBG State funds shall be set aside for eligible Native American activities benefiting non-federally recognize Native American communities or tribes. Native American activities could be reflected in the ConPlan's housing numbers, which include infrastructure activities.

HOME - HOME's funding allocation priorities are based on demand by program applicants for categories of activities. In addition State HOME regulations establish a minimum allocation of 40 percent for first-time homebuyer (FTHB) mortgage assistance, owner occupied rehabilitation (OOR), and tenant based rental assistance (TBRA) (i.e., program activities), and a 5 percent minimum allocation for FTHB new construction or rehabilitation/conversion activities (i.e., FTHB projects). For FY 2015-16, in the table above, the 55 percent allocation for renters reflects anticipated demand for rental new construction or rehabilitation projects.

The 15 percent for homeless assistance and prevention activities reflects anticipated demand for HOME TBRA activities for 2015 due to HUD now allowing unit inspections and income determinations as eligible project-related soft costs for TBRA, as well as an anticipated increase in the need for TBRA due to loss of other rental assistance, increased focus on Rapid Rehousing strategies for homeless households, or assistance provided as a result of local, state, or federally declared disasters.

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

ESG - All of ESG's funds go to address homelessness. Pursuant to current ESG State regulations, projects in the Northern Region receive a minimum of 33 percent of available funds; Southern Region – 24 percent and Rural Region – 19 percent. New Programs, as defined under State regulation, receive 5 percent and 13 percent is available to unfunded programs under the General allocation set-aside. Federal regulations set the Emergency Shelter/Street Outreach cap at 60 percent, and HCD generally limits the amount that can be received for HMIS per application. HCD is moving toward using more of its ESG funds for Rapid Rehousing. In the current NOFA, 35 percent of the total funds available have been set-aside for Rapid Rehousing activity. Future State regulations may further emphasize this activity.

HOPWA - The regulatory purpose of the HOPWA program is to prevent or alleviate homelessness among PLWHA.

LHCP funding allocations are determined after subtracting 10 percent for State Administration, and 65 percent direct hazard control costs and program set-aside funding is accounted for. The remaining funding is then allocated to the CBOs based on the number of units estimated to be served in each CBO's service area in relation to the total number of units estimated to be served statewide. Any allocations that fall below the minimum funding amount of $200,000 are raised to the minimum funding amount. Agencies above the minimum funding amount are then proportionately adjusted to account for the additional funds provided to the minimum funded agencies

How will the proposed distribution of funds address the priority needs and specific objectives described in the Consolidated Plan?

The proposed distribution of funds address all of our priority need housing areas to the extent that this is driven by applicant demand for these activities and federal and State statutory or regulatory requirements for the use of the funds. In the event that National Housing Trust Fund (NHTF) dollars become available, the State will administer these funds consistent with NHTF program requirements and our Consolidated Plan priority need to increase the supply of rental housing to very low and extremely low-income renters.

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

AP-30 Methods of Distribution – 91.320(d)&(k)

Distribution Methods

Discussion:

Describe the state program addressed by the Method of Distribution.

Please note: The Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program's Method of Distribution (MOD) listed below is applicable to the 2015 program year and was also followed generally for program years 2016-2018.

CDBG

Congress amended the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (HCD Act) in 1981 to give each state the opportunity to administer CDBG funds for non-entitlement areas. Non-entitlement areas include those units of general local government which do not receive CDBG funds directly from HUD as part of the entitlement program (Entitlement Cities and Urban Counties). Non-entitlement areas are cities with populations of less than 50,000 (except cities that are designated principal cities of Metropolitan Statistical Areas), and counties with populations of less than 200,000. The primary objective of the CDBG Program is to provide eligible communities with funds for decent housing, suitable living environments, and to expand economic opportunities principally for persons and families of low and moderate income. Pursuant to federal law (24 CFR, Section 570.484) , not less than 70 percent of the State's CDBG funds must be used for activities that benefit Low/Mod persons/households with incomes of 80 percent or below the County's Area Median Income, adjusted for family size. In addition, federal law limits the total amount of CDBG funds spent on Public Services to no more than 15 percent and requires up to 10% of the total amount of CDBG funds shall be made available for Colonia activities. The State has determined that 5% of available funds for FY 2015-2016 will be available to benefit Colonia eligible communities. Colonia eligible communities for State CDBG funds are located in Imperial County. The State CDBG program uses a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) process where eligible cities and counties competitively or non-competitively apply for funding.

Additionally, State statute requires that at least 51% of Federal CDBG State allocation go to housing and housing related activities; no more than 30% of the allocation shall be set aside for economic development projects and programs; and at least 1.25% of the total amount of funds shall be set aside for eligible Native American activities benefiting non-federally recognize Native American communities or tribes. The State's regulatory authority [25 CCR 7056, 7062.5, and/or 7065.5] allows the Department to release one or more NOFA on an as-needed basis. Specifically, in addition to the annual NOFA, the Department may make program funds available for Emergency Disaster Assistance through the

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

issuance of one or more NOFAs to eligible applicants located in areas covered by a Governor's proclamation of State of Emergency or Local Emergency.

Describe all of the criteria that will be used to select applications and the relative importance of these criteria.

Current scoring criteria for all CDBG activities, including Colonia and Native American, but excluding the Economic Development Over-the-Counter Program, are based upon the following:

Need and Benefit – up to 400 points –The Need and Benefit category will vary depending on whether it is an Economic Development (ED) activity or a Community Development (CD) activity. For CD activities, HCD will assign points based on the severity of the locality's community development needs, extent of the solution and the impact the program will have on those needs. For ED activities, HCD will assign points based on the unemployment rate and market analysis.

Readiness – up to 300 points – The Readiness category will vary depending on the proposed activity. For instance, ED activities will be scored based on program description, and program operator status and qualifications. CD activities will be scored based on readiness of the proposed activity as demonstrated by activity specific operator experience, program guidelines, and site control.

Applicant Capacity/Past Performance – up to 200 points - This criteria is identical for all activities., and assesses the jurisdiction's capacity to implement the proposed activity, as demonstrated by its timely clearance of special conditions, timeliness and accuracy of reporting, and cooperation/compliance in clearing monitoring and/or audit findings.

State Objectives – up to 100 points - HCD may award points for addressing one or more State objectives as identified in the annual CDBG NOFA. The Department's state objectives may be based on one or more of the following: capacity building for unsuccessful applicants in the prior year funding round whose activities meet a national objective,; and public improvement activity for drought- related projects.

If only summary criteria were described, how can potential applicants access application manuals or other state publications describing the application criteria? (CDBG only)

CDBG publishes all application materials, including the NOFA, all appendices, applications and instructions, on HCD's website at http://www.hcd.ca.gov/fa/cdbg/CurrentNOFAs.html. HCD sends out NOFA application announcements, and other state publications to all of its community development and economic development Interested Parties who have requested notification electronically.

Scoring Detail used for CDBG application evaluation is in NOFA Appendix M available on HCD's website listed above.

Describe the process for awarding funds to state recipients and how the state will make its allocation available to units of general local government, and non-profit organizations, including community and faith-based organizations. (ESG only)

See ESG Method of Distribution below

Identify the method of selecting project sponsors (including providing full access to grassroots faith-based and other community-based organizations). (HOPWA only)

See HOPWA Method of Distribution below

Describe how resources will be allocated among funding categories.

Available funds are allocated first based on Federal set-aside requirements, and second based on State set-aside requirements. Federal set- aside requirements include the following: pursuant to 24 CFR 570.489, CDBG funds used for State administrative expenses shall be no more than 3% of the sum of the state's annual grant, annual program income received by non-entitlement jurisdiction regardless of whether it is retained by jurisdiction, and funds reallocated by HUD to the State. Not less than 70 percent of the State's CDBG funds must be used for activities that benefit Low/Mod persons/households with incomes of 80 percent or below the County's Area Median Income, adjusted for family size. In addition, federal law limits the total amount of CDBG funds spent on Public Services to no more than 15 percent and requires that up to 10 percent of the total amount of CDBG funds shall be made available for Colonia activities. The State has determined that 5 percent of available funds for FY 2015-2016 will be available to benefit Colonia eligible communities.

Additionally, State set-aside requirements mandate that at least 51% of the CDBG State allocation must go to housing and housing related activities; no more than 30% of the CDBG State allocation shall be set aside for economic development projects and programs; and at least 1.25% of the total amount of CDBG State funds shall be set aside for eligible Native American activities benefiting non-federally recognize Native American communities or tribes

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

Describe threshold factors and grant size limits.

All threshold requirements in State CDBG regulations must be met at time of application. **1.)** Applicants must be from eligible non-entitlement areas as defined as cities with populations of less than 50,000 (except cities that are designated principal cities of Metropolitan Statistical Areas), and counties with populations of less than 200,000, & jurisdictions not part of an urban county agreement. Currently, there are 162 State CDBG non-entitlement jurisdictions. **2.)** Applications must be in compliance with submission requirements & received by the application deadline noted in the NOFA. **3.)** Applicants must meet the 50% Rule expenditure threshold which requires jurisdictions with open contracts from the 2012 NOFA or later to have expended 50 % of their aggregate total CDBG funding across those contracts to be eligible for additional funding. The Rule applies only to Community Development (CD), Native American and Colonia funding, and Economic Development (ED) Enterprise Fund activity. (This does not include ED OTC, Disaster Recovery Initiative and the Drought Housing Rental Subsidies Program). **4.)** Applicants must be in compliance with submission requirements for their Housing Element, OMB Circular A-133 Single Audit, Public participation requirements, and must not be debarred, suspended or declared ineligible to participate in Federal programs.

Grant size limits: Application maximum = $2,000,000 excluding Colonia, Native American, & ED OTC

Colonia set aside – maximum = $1,292,990, Native American set aside – maximum = $323,247; ED OTC – maximum = $5,000,000 (Limits may vary from year to year depending on annual funding available).

Housing and Housing Related Activities – maximum = $1,000,000 & no more than 1 program and 1 project activity, i.e., Home Ownership Assistance (program) and Housing Rehabilitation (project); vacant land acquisition = no more than $600,000

ED – Micro Enterprise (ME) or Business Assistance (BA) maximum = $300,000 for one, or maximum = $500,000 for combination BA & ME

Public Improvements and Public Improvements in-support-of-Housing-New-Construction maximum = $1,500,000

Public Facilities - maximum = $1,500,000 (one project only); Public Services – maximum = $500,000 (up to three activities only)

Planning & Technical Assistance – maximum = $100,000 for up to two studies (may be CD or ED related)

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

What are the outcome measures expected as a result of the method of distribution?

Based on trends in prior year demand and completion data, in the upcoming fiscal year CDBG estimates rehabilitating 250 rental units and 500 homeowner units, assisting 100 households with direct homebuyer assistance, and helping businesses create or retain over 20,000 jobs. For outcomes related to public services and public facilities or infrastructure see these goals in Section AP 20.

Describe the State Program addressed by the Method of Distribution

HOME The State HOME Program provides funds for Project Activities and Program Activities on a competitive basis through an annual NOFA.

Project activities are activities with an identified site at the time of application for HOME funds. These activities include Rental New Construction or Rehabilitation projects and FTHB New construction or Rehabilitation/Conversion projects. Based on applicant demand, HOME allocates roughly 60 percent of its funds to project activities on an annual basis; 55 percent to rental projects, and 5 percent to FTHB projects. Within the rental project allocation, HOME may offer additional Deep Targeting funds to rental projects to reduce private mandatory debt and facilitate more affordable rents.

Program activities are activities without an identified site at the time of application for HOME funds, meaning that HOME applicants apply for a specified amount of funds, and once awarded, advertise their housing program(s) and provide these funds to individual low-income households that qualify for participation. Eligible program activities for FY 2015-16 include: FTHB acquisition with or without rehabilitation, FTHB infill new construction, OOR, and TBRA. Based on applicant demand, HOME allocates roughly 40 percent of its funds to program activities on an annual basis.

Eligible applicants for HOME funds are local governments that do not receive a direct allocation of HOME funds from HUD (or participate in a HOME Consortium or a CDBG Urban County) and State Certified HOME CHDOs that provide housing in these localities. State HOME regulations require that a minimum of 50 percent of funds go to activities located in rural census tracts. Federal regulations require that a minimum of 15 percent of funds be allocated to CHDOs. HOME funds may be used to assist Indian tribes, and on tribal trust lands consistent with applicable federal and State and requirements.

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

TBRA funds can be used in all HOME-eligible jurisdictions in the county where the funds were awarded, not just in the particular jurisdiction to which the funds were awarded. TBRA tenant leases cannot exceed 24 months, but can be renewed if additional TBRA funds are secured. In California, there are many market conditions that justify the use of HOME funds for TBRA, including tenant income compared to fair market rent and housing cost burden. State Recipients may establish preferences pursuant to federal and State HOME requirements for use of HOME TBRA funds to serve victims of local, State, or federally declared disasters. Preferences for TBRA funds may also be established for tenants displaced if HCD determines that existing rental assistance will not be continued or renewed.

Additional preferences for special needs populations may be approved by the Department consistent with federal and state fair housing laws. Prior to approving any preference in the use of TBRA funds, the Department will determine whether an unmet need exists for which the preference is necessary to narrow the gap in benefits and services received by such persons. Any TBRA preferences must be established under the jurisdiction's HOME TBRA guidelines, and these guidelines must be approved by the Department. Before using HOME TBRA funds, the applicable TBRA requirements at 24 CFR Part 58 must also be met. For any eligible activity, special needs preferences in serving special needs populations with HOME funds may be approved by the Department consistent with federal and State fair housing laws.

Describe all of the criteria that will be used to select applications and the relative importance of these criteria.

Below is a summary of the **HOME** rating criteria. For additional information, see 8212 of the State HOME regulations at http://www.hcd.ca.gov/fa/home. (Note: in a federal, State, or locally-declared emergency, the State may utilize an alternate method of distribution to enable funds to be allocated quickly to impacted areas.)

(1) Housing Element Compliance (50 points) - Provides points to cities or counties with an adopted housing element that has been approved by HCD. CHDOs and newly formed cities receive full points in this rating category. (2) Giving Up Formula Allocation (50 pts.) - HOME entitlement jurisdictions that have given up their HOME formula allocation to compete in the State HOME Program receive additional points. (3) Rural Points (50 pts.) - Activities proposed in rural census tracts receive additional points. (4) State Objectives: (200 pts.) - For 2015-16 HOME may award State Objective points to one or more of the following: (a) applications that provide deeper affordability; (b) activities that can be set up and funded quickly; (c) applications that demonstrate expeditious or efficient use of HOME funds; (d) applications that can be funded in a manner which promotes capacity building and continuity of housing activities; (e) applications that target special needs populations, as permitted under federal and State antidiscrimination and fair housing laws and HOME requirements; (f) applications that serve victims of local, State, or federally declared disasters, (g) applications that promote community revitalization of mobile home parks, (h) applications that promote geographic

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

diversity, (i) applications that address fair housing impediments, and (j) activities that complement other State or federal programs or policy objectives.

Additional Rating Factors for Program Activity Applications – (1) Applicant Capability (250 pts.) - Examines past performance on HOME contracts, as well as experience with other activities. Performance points may be deducted for failure to submit required reports in a timely manner and failure to cooperate with monitoring or contractual requirements identified by HCD in the last five years. (2) Community Need: (250 pts.) - Examines Census data, such as poverty rates, age of housing stock, housing overcrowding, and home sales prices compared to median incomes in the locality. (3) Program Feasibility (100 pts.) – For FTHB programs, this factor examines the financial feasibility of the activity at proposed sales prices, income targets, and assistance levels; for OOR programs, examines feasibility as reflected through need by Census data, such as overcrowding and age of housing stock. For TBRA programs examines, feasibility as reflected through need by Census data, such as renter overpayment for housing.

Additional Rating Factors for Project Applications - Applicant Capability (450 points) - Examines past performance on HOME contracts, as well as experience with other activities. Points may be deducted for any of the following: missing HOME performance deadlines in the last five years; failure to submit required reports in a timely manner; material misrepresentations of fact which jeopardize the HOME investment or put HCD at risk of a serious monitoring finding, and failure to cooperate with monitoring requirements identified by HCD in the last five years. Community Need: (250 points) - Examines Census data, such as poverty rates, vacancy rates, age of housing stock, housing overcrowding, and home sales prices compared to median incomes in the locality. Financial Feasibility: (200 points). Both rental and FTHB projects earn points based on the percentage of HOME-assisted units. Rental projects must demonstrate compliance with HCD¿s Uniform Multifamily Regulations and HOME requirements. FTHB projects must demonstrate the ability of the proposed project to meet HOME requirements, including demonstrating the adequacy of the proposed development budget, the market for the project, and the affordability of the project. Readiness: (300 points) - Examines the project development plan, as well as the status of local government approvals, design progress, and financing commitments.

If only summary criteria were described, how can potential applicants access application manuals or other state publications describing the application criteria? (CDBG only) See CDBG Method of Distribution described above.

Describe the process for awarding funds to state recipients and how the state will make its allocation available to units of general local government, and non-profit organizations, including community and faith-based organizations. (ESG only)

See ESG Method of Distribution described below.

Identify the method of selecting project sponsors (including providing full access to grassroots faith-based and other community-based organizations). (HOPWA only)

See HOPWA Method of Distribution described below

Describe how resources will be allocated among funding categories.

The allocation of funds by funding categories is based upon applicant demand in a given NOFA cycle. However, as described above, pursuant to State HOME regulations, a minimum of 40 percent will be allocated to program-activity applications, (FTHB , OOR, and/or TBRA activities), and 5 percent will be allocated to FTHB projects. Fifty-five (55 percent) of funds are typically available for rental project new construction or rehabilitation projects.

Describe threshold factors and grant size limits.

Grant size limits are in the applicable NOFA and may change as the size of the **HOME** allocation changes. HOME threshold factors are discussed below. For more information, see Sections 8211 and 8212 of the State HOME Regulations, and the current HOME NOFA at http://www.hcd.ca.gov/fa/home/.

To be eligible for funding, an application must be submitted by an eligible applicant by the deadline stated in the applicable NOFA. The total amount requested in an application cannot exceed the amounts specified in the NOFA for the particular eligible activity (ies). Applicants may be held out from competition due to performance problems with current HOME contracts, failure to submit required OMB A-133 audit documentation to the State Controller's Office, or unresolved audit findings.

Applicants for program activity funds with one or more active State HOME contracts must have expended at least 50 percent of the aggregate total of program funds originally awarded under these contracts to be eligible to apply for additional program activity funds. Applicants for projects that miss three project deadlines are currently ineligible to apply under the next project NOFA. However, HCD may waive this holdout penalty if the missed project deadline was clearly outside the control of the applicant, developer, owner, and managing general partner.

Project applications must show adequate evidence of site control and demonstrate financial feasibility. HOME requires certain documents to evaluate feasibility, including but not limited to a market study (or other market information for FTHB development activities), appraisal, and Phase I/Phase II Environmental Site Assessments for new construction projects or lead, asbestos, and mold assessments for rehabilitation projects. Project applications must also certify there are no pending lawsuits preventing implementation of the project as proposed. FTHB projects and all program activities must also submit guidelines governing the allocation of mortgage assistance funds to individual homebuyers. Rental projects must demonstrate compliance with Article XXXIV of the California Constitution, and CHDO applicants must also demonstrate effective project control pursuant to federal and State HOME requirements.

All proposed HOME activities must be evaluated according to underwriting standards addressing federal HOME requirements at 92.250 and 92.254, as applicable. For more information, see Sections 8211 and 8212 of the State HOME Regulations, and the current HOME NOFA at http://www.hcd.ca.gov/fa/home.

What are the outcome measures expected as a result of the method of distribution?

Based on trends in prior year completion data and additional demand for TBRA, in the upcoming fiscal year HOME estimates completing construction on 172 rental and 25 homebuyer units; rehabilitating 75 OOR units, assisting 92 FTHB program activity households, and providing TBRA to 600 households.

ESG

Describe the state program addressed by the Method of Distribution.

ESG provides funds for Street Outreach, Emergency Shelter, Rapid Rehousing, Homeless Prevention, Homeless Management Information Systems (HMIS), and Local Grant Administration as authorized under the federal HEARTH Act and State program requirements. Pursuant to State regulations, 33 percent of available funds go to projects in the Northern CA Region; 24 percent to the Southern CA Region; 19 percent to Rural; 5 percent to New Programs, and 13 percent to unfunded applicants in a General Allocation pool. HCD is moving toward using more of its ESG funds for Rapid Rehousing. In the current NOFA, 35 percent of the total funds available has been set-aside for this activity. Future State

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

regulations may further emphasize this activity. Eligible applicants are local governments and nonprofit corporations located in jurisdictions which either do not receive direct HUD ESG grants or participate in urban county agreements with counties that receive direct HUD grants. For a list of ESG-eligible jurisdictions, see Appendix A.

Describe all of the criteria that will be used to select applications and the relative importance of these criteria. ESG funds are distributed on a competitive basis through an annual NOFA. Current rating categories are: Applicant Capability (300 points); Need for Funds (100 points); Impact and Effectiveness (250 points); Cost Efficiency (100 points); and State Objectives (35 points). In 2014-15, more emphasis was placed on Housing First Practices, exits to permanent housing, and Rapid Rehousing. Coordination with local Continuums of Care continues to be emphasized. Individual rating factors under each of these categories can be found in the current NOFA at http://www.hcd.ca.gov/fa/esg/index.html.

If only summary criteria were described, how can potential applicants access application manuals or other state publications describing the application criteria? (CDBG only)

See CDBG Method of Distribution described above.

Describe the process for awarding funds to state recipients and how the state will make its allocation available to units of general local government, and non-profit organizations, including community and faith-based organizations. (ESG only)

Pursuant to the criteria referenced above, HCD awards ESG funds through each of the regional allocations in descending rank order, by total score; and on a statewide competitive basis through the New Programs Allocation and General Allocation in descending rank order, by total score. Within each of the three regional allocations, the New Programs allocation, and the General allocation, there is a 35% set-aside for Rapid Rehousing programs. Additional Rapid Rehousing programs can also be funded, depending on their application score relative to applications for other ESG activities. ESG Applicants/Subrecipients that are Private Non-Profit Organizations are required to complete and sign the Certification of Religious Compliance.

Identify the method of selecting project sponsors (including providing full access to grassroots faith-based and other community-based organizations). (HOPWA only)

See HOPWA Method of Distribution described below.

Describe how resources will be allocated among funding categories.

Federal ESG regulations cap the amount that can be allocated to eligible projects under the Street Outreach and Emergency Shelter Components at 60 percent of HCD's annual ESG allocation. HCD also limits HMIS awards. HCD is moving toward using more of its ESG funds for Rapid Rehousing. In the current NOFA, 35 percent of the total funds available have been set-aside for this activity. Future State regulations may further emphasize this activity. As discussed in SP 60 above, based on applicant demand, it is anticipated that a minimum of 40 percent of the available funds will go to Rapid Rehousing, and a minimum of 40-45 percent will go to emergency shelter and street outreach activities, not to exceed the federal 60 percent maximum allowed for these activities.

Describe threshold factors and grant size limits.

As set forth above, applications must be submitted by eligible applicants proposing to carry out **ESG**-eligible activities in a State-ESG eligible jurisdiction. Applications must be submitted by the deadline in the applicable NOFA, and be complete pursuant to the terms of the NOFA and Application forms. Grant size limits are established annually in the NOFA. See the current NOFA and Application at http://http://www.hcd.ca.gov/fa/esg/index.html.

What are the outcome measures expected as a result of the method of distribution?

In 2015-16, ESG estimates it will serve 2,936 households with Rapid Rehousing Assistance, 13,253 persons with overnight shelter, and 2,800 households with Homelessness Prevention assistance.

HOPWA

State HOPWA serves counties (including cities within those counties) that do not receive a HOPWA allocation directly from HUD.

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

Describe all of the criteria that will be used to select applications and the relative importance of these criteria.

For project sponsors selected through a Request for Applications (RFA) process, the general criteria evaluated is Program Description, Supportive Service Plan/Client Accessibility to Supportive Services, Program Implementation Plan and Timeline, Agency Capacity and Experience, Program Staffing, and Budget Detail. For project sponsors applying for a renewal to continue operating existing programs or requesting a contract amendment, the application process includes State HOPWA approval of a detailed budget and program work plan, prior to the beginning of the program year 2015-16.

If only summary criteria were described, how can potential applicants access application manuals or other state publications describing the application criteria? (CDBG only)

See CDBG Method of Distribution described above.

Describe the process for awarding funds to state recipients and how the state will make its allocation available to units of general local government, and non-profit organizations, including community and faith-based organizations. (ESG only)

See ESG Method of Distribution above.

Identify the method of selecting project sponsors (including providing full access to grassroots faith-based and other community-based organizations). (HOPWA only)

CDPH/OA has renewed contracts with 28 existing project sponsors through June 30, 2016 to provide housing assistance and supportive service programs to PLWHAs throughout 41-non-EMSAs, Fresno, and Kern EMSAs. Every project sponsor provides direct client services, and some subcontract with other local agencies to provide housing or supportive services.

In the case of loss of a project sponsor or a change in program delivery for a specific county or counties, CDPH/OA solicits project sponsors through an RFA process that allows equal access to all grassroots, faith-based and community-based organizations, and governmental housing agencies in that jurisdiction. Project sponsors that subcontract with other agencies must also use a selection process that provides full access to all grassroots, faith-based and community-based organizations.

The project sponsor selection methodology will be restructured to address the unmet housing need identified in the statewide HIV/AIDS needs assessment in 2016. The restructuring process will include stakeholder and citizen participation.

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

Describe how resources will be allocated among funding categories.

Project sponsors participate in local HIV/AIDS needs and service planning efforts and prioritize the HOPWA allocation to fill local HIV/AIDS housing and supportive service gaps. To address the most urgent needs of PLWHAs, and to assist in meeting the goal of the NHAS that 86% of Ryan White clients will be in stable housing by 2015, project sponsors may select from the following eligible HOPWA activities:

- Tenant based rental assistance
- Short term rent, mortgage and utility assistance
- Facility based housing operations of existing permanent or transitional HIV/AIDS housing programs
- Facility based housing – hotel/motel voucher assistance
- Housing Placement Assistance
- Housing Information Services
- Supportive Services

Project sponsors may also use funds for eligible resource identification activities (if justified in the program work plan), and no more than 7% of the allocation for grant administration.

State HOPWA established the following caps to ensure prioritization of funds for direct client housing assistance:

- 20%of a project sponsor's allocation may be used for supportive service activities.
- 15% of a project sponsor's budget for housing assistance activities may be used for activity delivery costs.
- 5% of supportive service and housing information service budgets may be used for activity delivery costs.

State HOPWA may consider a waiver of the 20% cap on supportive services if the proposed supportive services assist clients in overcoming barriers to housing stability (e.g., intense case management services, mental health or alcohol and substance abuse treatment, consumer credit counseling, employment services and education, etc.).

Pursuant to HOPWA regulation, grantees must identify how the rent standard will be set for a tenant based rental assistance program within a jurisdiction. In most instances, State HOPWA adopts the published Fair Market Rent (FMR) as the rent standard for the grant area. However, for Sonoma County the Housing Authority of Sonoma County Payment Standards set at 110% of FMR, will be adopted, which more accurately reflects reasonable rents.

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

Describe threshold factors and grant size limits.

For FY 2015-16, the HOPWA allocation will be distributed through a formula process based on the reported HIV and AIDS case data.

Effective FY 2011-12, CDPH/OA eliminated prisons numbers from the reported HIV and AIDS case data that resulted in the implementation of a funding stabilization method for counties with prisons. For FY 2015-16, State HOPWA will continue to include a funding stability method using prior year funds to hold those counties harmless at a percentage of their prior year allocation.

Fresno and Bakersfield EMSAs receive an allocation from HUD. However, in prior years they have relinquished grantee responsibilities to State HOPWA. For 2015-16, the City of Fresno will assume grantee responsibilities for the 2015 HOPWA allocation, but State HOPWA remains responsible for allocating and spending prior year uncommitted Fresno funds. The City of Bakersfield will relinquish grant administration responsibilities to State HOPWA and its allocation will be included in the State HOPWA grant agreement with a stipulation that the funds only be used within the Bakersfield EMSA.

What are the outcome measures expected as a result of the method of distribution?

In 2015-16, State HOPWA estimates it will serve 120 households with tenant-based rental assistance; 50 persons with emergency shelter; 960 households with homelessness prevention assistance; 4 transitional housing facilities (which will assist approximately 35 households) with HIV/AIDS housing operations assistance; and 1,835 persons with supportive services, housing information services and housing placement assistance.

LHCP- LHCP is designed to work collaboratively with CSD's network of CBOs in the delivery of lead hazard control services to low-income households. Funds are provided to CBOs that statistically have a high number of children with elevated blood/lead levels in their county and the capacity to successfully carry out the goals by meeting and exceeding LHCP benchmark goals.

The program's primary objectives are to:

(1) provide lead hazard control services to at least 195 pre-1978 housing units occupied by low-income households, targeting households containing lead based paint hazards and other related homes hazards, occupied with children with elevated blood lead levels, children under the age of six, or a child that spends significant time in the home, or a pregnant woman;

(2) provide lead hazard awareness education;

(3) maximize resources by strengthening collaboration with local housing and health departments to increase lead-safe rental opportunities for low-income households, and

(4) expand the lead-safe certified workforce in the local communities and develop lasting lead-safe training resources.

After 10 percent for State Administration, and 65 percent of direct hazard control costs and program set-aside funding are accounted for the remaining is allocated to the CBOs based on the number of units estimated to be served in each CBO's service area in relation to the total number of units estimated to be served statewide. Any allocations that fall below the minimum funding amount of $200,000 are raised to the minimum funding amount. Agencies above the minimum funding amount are then proportionately adjusted to account for the additional funds provided to minimum funded agencies.

Describe all of the criteria that will be used to select applications and the relative importance of these criteria.

An internal evaluation for selection of LHCP contractors is conducted using the following factors: (1) statistics on the number of children with elevated blood/lead levels in each county; (2) past and current LHCP contractor performance under the 2009 and 2012 funding rounds; (3) past and current contractor performance for LIHEAP and DOE programs; and (4) contractor community networking and outreach efforts, and leveraging abilities.

CSD contracts with the following CBOs under the new grant (Round 20) to provide LHCP services in a total of seven targeted counties:

1. Community Resource Project (CRP) in the counties of Sacramento, Sutter, and Yuba.
2. Community Services and Employment Training, Inc. (CSET) in Tulare County
3. Fresno County Economic Opportunities Commission, Local Conservation Corps (FCEOC-LCC) in Fresno County
4. Maravilla Foundation (Maravilla) in Los Angeles County
5. Redwood Community Action Agency (RCAA) in Humboldt County

For more information, see www.csd.ca.gov

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

If only summary criteria were described, how can potential applicants access application manuals or other state publications describing the application criteria? (CDBG only)

See CDBG Method of Distribution described above.

Describe the process for awarding funds to state recipients and how the state will make its allocation available to units of general local government, and non-profit organizations, including community and faith-based organizations. (ESG only)

See ESG Method of Distribution described above.

Identify the method of selecting project sponsors (including providing full access to grassroots faith-based and other community-based organizations). (HOPWA only)

See HOPWA Method of Distribution described above.

Describe how resources will be allocated among funding categories.

Based on prior funding rounds, it is anticipated that at least 75% of LHCP funds will go to renter households and 25% will go to homeowner households.

Describe threshold factors and grant size limits.

An internal evaluation for selection of its LHCP contractors is conducted using the following factors: (1) statistics on the number of children with elevated blood/lead levels in each county; (2) past and current LHCP contractor performance under the 2009 and 2012 funding rounds; (3) past and current contractor performance for LIHEAP and DOE programs; and (4) contractor community networking and outreach efforts, and leveraging abilities.

For more information, see www.csd.ca.gov

What are the outcome measures expected as a result of the method of distribution?

In FY 2015-16 it is anticipated that LHCP will serve 60 households, of which 45 will be renter households and 15 homeowners

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

AP-35 Projects – (Optional)

Introduction:

At this time, the State does not know which projects it will fund in the upcoming Fiscal Year. Local applicants must first apply for and secure the available funds.

#	Project Name

Table 29 – Project Information

Describe the reasons for allocation priorities and any obstacles to addressing underserved needs

The State has no project-specific allocation priorities. For a discussion of HCD's general allocation priorities, see AP 25.

AP-38 Project Summary

Project Summary Information

Not Applicable

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

AP-40 Section 108 Loan Guarantee – 91.320(k)(1)(ii)

Will the state help non-entitlement units of general local government to apply for Section 108 loan funds?

HCD has not issued any Section 108 loan guarantees, and has no immediate plans to do so.

Available Grant Amounts

None at this time.

Acceptance process of applications

None at this time.

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

AP-45 Community Revitalization Strategies – 91.320(k)(1)(ii)

Will the state allow units of general local government to carry out community revitalization strategies?

Not at this time

State's Process and Criteria for approving local government revitalization strategies

The State CDBG Program does not currently have a Community Revitalization Strategies program. CDBG program participants and stakeholders prefer individual activities in specific areas of greatest need.

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

AP-48 Method of Distribution for Colonias Set-aside – 91.320(d)&(k)

Introduction:

Distribution Methods

Table 30 - Distribution Methods by State Program for Colonias Set-aside

1	**State Program Name:**	CDBG
	Funding Sources:	
	Describe the state program addressed by the Method of Distribution.	Pursuant to federal law, up to 10% of the total amount of CDBG funds shall be made available for Colonia activities. The State has determined that 5% of available funds for FY 2015-2016 will be available to benefit Colonia eligible communities. Colonia eligible communities for State CDBG funds are located in the unincorporated area of Imperial County, and in the cities of Brawley, Calexico, Imperial, and El Centro. There are currently 15 Colonia designated communities.
	Describe all of the criteria that will be used to select applications and the relative importance of these criteria.	The Colonias set-aside is typically undersubscribed, meaning that no more funding is requested than is made available in the 5% set-aside. A Colonia activity is eligible for funding if the application is submitted by Imperial County for one or more of the above areas and proposes an eligible activity that meets the needs of the Colonias, such as basic infrastructure and housing activities. States and UGLGs are strongly encouraged to use CDBG Colonias set-aside funds for projects addressing the lack of potable drinking water supply, lack of adequate sewage systems, and lack of decent safe and sanitary housing. States should only fund other activities if they are undertaken in conjunction with funding of basic infrastructure or housing activities.

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

	If only summary criteria were described, how can potential applicants access application manuals or other state publications describing the application criteria? (CDBG only)	See CDBG Method of Distribution in Section AP 30 above.
	Describe the process for awarding funds to state recipients and how the state will make its allocation available to units of general local government, and non-profit organizations, including community and faith-based organizations. (ESG only)	ESG does not operate in Colonias.
	Identify the method of selecting project sponsors (including providing full access to grassroots faith-based and other community-based organizations). (HOPWA only)	HOPWA does not operate in Colonias

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

	Describe how resources will be allocated among funding categories.	Within the 5% Colonias set-aside, funding helps subsidize Public Infrastructure projects to improve failing water and sewage issues, as well as housing rehabilitation projects. Jurisdictions with Colonias determine what it will apply for in a given funding round.
	Describe threshold factors and grant size limits.	See CDBG AP 30 above.
	What are the outcome measures expected as a result of the method of distribution?	Expected outcomes for FY 15-16 are not known since It is not known whether any Colonias funding will be requested in the coming year.

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

Discussion: See above.

AP-50 Geographic Distribution – 91.320(f)

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

For most programs, assistance is made available to all areas of the State. Lists of eligible jurisdictions for CDBG, HOME, ESG and HOPWA are provided in Appendix A. Eligible jurisdictions for LHCP are listed in Section AP 30, along with their Method of Distribution. Changes in CDBG, HOME, or ESG eligible jurisdictions may occur annually if jurisdictions join or withdraw from a CDBG Urban County Agreement, and for HOME only, a HOME Consortium.

Pursuant to HOPWA regulations, changes in eligible jurisdictions for HOPWA may occur if a metropolitan area reaches a population of more than 500,000 and has at least 1,500 cumulative AIDS cases. EMSAs annually receive approximately $36 million in HOPWA funds directly from HUD annually. At the inception of State HOPWA, it was determined that State HOPWA would serve non-EMSAs only. This decision remains in effect with the exception of the cities of Bakersfield and Fresno who became EMSAs, but relinquished their grantee responsibilities to State HOPWA.

Eligible applicants from the jurisdictions listed in Appendix A may apply for and be awarded program funding. See AP 30 for each program's individual Method of Distribution which sets forth allocation methods or application rating criteria which may directly or indirectly impact the geographic distribution of program funds. Since the State does not know at this time which projects it will award funds to in 2015-16, the extent to which these projects will be in areas of low-income and minority concentration is unknown.

Geographic Distribution

Target Area	Percentage of Funds

Table 31 - Geographic Distribution

Rationale for the priorities for allocating investments geographically

The State has no geographic target areas for allocation. See above discussion.

Discussion

See above.

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

Affordable Housing

AP-55 Affordable Housing – 24 CFR 91.320(g) -

Introduction:

One Year Goals for the Number of Households to be Supported	
Homeless	3096
Non-Homeless	5078
Special-Needs	1165
Total	9339

Table 32 - One Year Goals for Affordable Housing by Support Requirement

One Year Goals for the Number of Households Supported Through	
Rental Assistance	8021
The Production of New Units	241
Rehab of Existing Units	885
Acquisition of Existing Units	192
Total	9339

Table 33 - One Year Goals for Affordable Housing by Support Type

Discussion:

In FY 15-16, the State CDBG, HOME, ESG, HOPWA and LHCP programs will assist an estimated 9,339 households to access or maintain permanent housing, including an estimated 8,021 households who will receive short-term rent and/or utility assistance.

The estimated 1165 Special Needs households will be assisted through HOPWA. See AP 70 below for a breakdown of this number by type of HOPWA assistance projected. Other Special Needs households are anticipated to be served through the other ConPlan programs. These are not separately estimated, but are within the Homeless and Non-Homeless categories shown above.

AP-60 Public Housing - 24 CFR 91.320(j)

Introduction:

The State of California does not own or operate public housing. In California, public housing is administered directly through local Public Housing Authorities (PHAs). Pursuant to HUD requirements, PHAs are also not eligible to apply for CDBG, HOME, ESG, HOPWA, or LHCP funds directly. However, PHAs in eligible jurisdictions can work with eligible applicants to plan for the use of program funds to assist low-income tenants in their communities.

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

PHAs in jurisdictions eligible to apply for federally-funded State programs may seek funds for eligible activities through their city or county application development process. There are currently 114 active PHAs in California.

For a list of California PHAs, see http://www.hud.gov/offices/pih/pha/contacts/states/ca.cfm.

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

Since the State does not administer PHA funds, or have any oversight over PHA tenants, it has no actions directed specifically to public housing residents.

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

There are currently no PHAs designated as “troubled” in the State’s CDBG nonentitlement areas.

Discussion:

AP-65 Homeless and Other Special Needs Activities – 91.320(h)

Introduction

Describe the jurisdictions one-year goals and actions for reducing and ending homelessness including

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

The State ESG Program funds some Street Outreach programs which provide individualized assessment to unsheltered homeless persons. Based on 2014 ESG applicant demand, in the coming year, ESG anticipates that up to 5 percent of its awards will go toward Street Outreach Programs.

Addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons.

The ESG Program funds a number of Emergency Shelter programs which provide short and medium-term shelter and supportive services to homeless individuals and families while affordable, suitable permanent housing is being sought out. Based on 2014 ESG applicant demand, in the coming year, ESG anticipates that a minimum of 40 percent of its awards will go toward Emergency Shelter programs, and 13, 253 persons will receive emergency overnight shelter.

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

The ESG Program funds Rapid-Rehousing and Homeless Prevention programs which provide short and medium-term rental assistance and supportive services to homeless and individuals and families and those at risk of homelessness so that they can access and maintain affordable, suitable permanent housing. In the coming year, ESG anticipates that approximately 40 percent of its awards will go toward Rapid Rehousing and Homeless Prevention activities. ESG currently provides points in its application rating process to Rapid-Rehousing programs, and to programs that engage in Housing First practices. See AP 30 for more information. In 2015-16, ESG also anticipates providing 2,936 households with Rapid Rehousing Assistance.

In addition, in February 2015, HCD issued a NOFA to provide funds for rehabilitation/conversion of emergency and transitional housing facilities to permanent supportive housing for homeless , as well as those at-risk of homelessness. Approximately $10 million is available through this NOFA. See

http://www.hcd.ca.gov/fa/ehap/ehapcd.html for the NOFA and Application materials.

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

In addition to the programs discussed above, of recent note, the State's Homelessness Policy Academy, Section 811 Project Rental Assistance Demonstration Program, and Mental Health Services Act Housing Program all have as a primary goal developing policies and/or dedicated resources to assist individuals exiting publically funded systems of care, and prevent homelessness, by providing access to affordable housing with support services. For a discussion of each of these initiatives, see Section AP 85 and Appendix F.

Discussion

In addition to the above activities, HOPWA provides TBRA, STRMU, housing placement assistance, and supportive services to PLWHAs who are homeless or at risk of homelessness. In addition to homelessness prevention, HOPWA funds may be used to provide temporary shelter (emergency shelter or hotel/motel vouchers) to homeless PLWHAs while assisting them to locate stable housing.

Housing assistance and supportive services allow residents to achieve or maintain housing stability. The prevention of homelessness is an essential component of State HOPWA, as housing is increasingly identified as a strategic point of intervention to address HIV/AIDS and overlapping vulnerabilities (such as age, race, mental illness, drug use, or chronic homelessness). The National AIDS Housing Coalition reports that housing assistance has been shown to decrease health disparities while reducing overall public expense and/or making better use of limited public resources.

AP-70 HOPWA Goals – 91.320(k)(4)

One year goals for the number of households to be provided housing through the use of HOPWA for:	
Short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance to prevent homelessness of the individual or family	960
Tenant-based rental assistance	120
Units provided in permanent housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	0
Units provided in transitional short-term housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds (including hotel/motel voucher assistance)	85
Total	1,165

AP-75 Barriers to affordable housing – 91.320(i)

Introduction:

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

Barriers or restrictions affecting affordable housing development in California communities include but are not limited to land-use controls, fees and exactions; processing and permit procedures; and restrictive on/off-site Improvement standards. The cumulative impact of these public policies negatively affect affordable housing and residential investment by limiting the supply and affordability of housing

State law requires each city and county to adopt a general plan containing at least seven mandatory elements including housing. Unlike the other general plan elements, the housing element, required to be updated every five to eight years, is subject to detailed statutory requirements and mandatory review by HCD. The housing element has many similar requirements to the federally-mandated ConPlan in that it requires a thorough assessment of housing needs and the adoption of a comprehensive implementation action plan to address those needs.

The housing element contains information about the availability of sites and infrastructure to accommodate new housing needs and requires an analysis of governmental constraints to the production and preservation of housing. This includes the negative effects of public policies on affordable housing and residential investment as the element must identify and analyze potential and actual governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, or development of housing for all income levels, including housing for persons with disabilities. The analysis identifies the specific standards and processes and evaluates their impact, including cumulatively, on the supply and affordability of housing. The analysis also determines whether local regulatory standards pose an actual constraint and must additionally demonstrate local efforts to remove constraints that hinder a jurisdiction from meeting its housing needs. Cities and counties are required by housing element law to have land-use plans and regulatory policies which facilitate the development of a range of housing types to meet the needs of all income groups. The housing element which must be developed with public input and participation, serves as the basis for land-use and assistance programs to address local, regional and state housing needs.

As of February 25, 2015, 431 of the State's 538 jurisdictions (80 percent) were found to comply with housing element law. This is on track for a record high compliance rate compared to other housing element cycles, once all elements have been reviewed. All 538 jurisdictions will be required to update their housing element by the end of 2015. Due dates by Council of Governments (COG) for the 5th

planning period are available on HCD's website at http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/hrc/plan/he/housing-element-update-schedule.pdf.

Discussion:

See above.

AP-80 Colonias Actions – 91.320(j)

Introduction:

Actions planned to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs

Most of California's Colonias have sewer and potable water systems, and housing rehabilitation is the only major remaining activity. To improve on the slow demand for housing rehabilitation loans, HCD has encouraged Imperial County and other jurisdictions with Colonias to serve Colonias in its new housing rehabilitation grant program. HCD is considering how to design and implement an updated Needs Assessment for Colonias served by the State CDBG Program. HCD will seek input from Imperial County, other jurisdictions with Colonias and the affected Colonias before and during the study.

Actions the state plans to take to reduce the number of poverty-level families

HUD CPD Notice 2012-008 "strongly encourages" States to use Colonias funding only to address the lack of potable drinking water, adequate sewage systems, and decent, safe and sanitary housing. States should only fund other activities if they are undertaken in conjunction with funding of basic infrastructure or housing activities. In light of this guidance, the State has encouraged Imperial County and other jurisdictions with Colonias to address anti-poverty activities in its Colonias and other incorporated areas of the County.

Actions the state plans to take to develop the institutional structure

All of State CDBG-eligible Colonias have good working relationships with Colonia leaders and residents. The State CDBG Program holds Colonia-specific roundtable discussions with Colonia leaders and County administrators to foster an open and ongoing dialogue. The Department supports the idea of a new Needs Assessment for Colonias to better direct the set-asides in an era of reduced demand for basic water, sewer and housing activities. The State CDBG program intends to continue conducting roundtable meetings throughout the next five years to develop various ideas and best practices in developing the institutional structure necessary for its success.

Specific actions the state plans to take to enhance coordination between public and private house and social service agencies

All State CDBG-eligible jurisdictions must follow CDBG citizen participation requirements, including outreach to housing and social service agencies serving the affected jurisdiction. Imperial County and other jurisdictions with Colonias are responsible for ensuring that housing and social service agencies are aware of available State funds to serve Colonias, and can assist agencies in working together to better serve Colonias communities.

Discussion: See above.

AP-85 Other Actions – 91.320(j)

Introduction:

Actions planned to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs

In addition to implementation of eligible activities under the CDBG, HOME, HOPWA, ESG, and LHCP programs discussed throughout this AP, HCD's latest Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing (AI) identifies several actions to address obstacles related to meeting underserved needs. Planned actions under the AI for 2015-16 include, but are not limited to, the following: (1) Continue tracking the minority concentration of HOME projects completed in 2014-15, and make this data available with Annual CAPERs as required by HUD; (2) Continue offering HOME application rating points to projects located outside of areas of minority concentration; (3) Continue implementation of Housing Element Reform efforts; (4) Continue implementation of California's HUD Section 811 PRA Demonstration Program to assist non-elderly disabled who are exiting institutions to access affordable housing with support services. PRA funds awarded to the State in March 2015 will also expand this assistance to homeless persons in LA County who are exiting institutions and other homeless in the County who are high users of emergency medical services for whom permanent supportive housing can help reduce the need for these more costly medical interventions. (5) Continue training efforts related to fair housing and housing element compliance.

Progress on implementation of recommended actions in the AI will be provided annually in future CAPERs.

Actions planned to foster and maintain affordable housing

In addition to implementation of housing assistance activities under the federal CDBG, HOME, HOPWA, ESG, and LHCP programs, HCD has a number of State bond-funded housing programs in place to foster and maintain affordable housing. For a listing of current NOFAs, see http://www.hcd.ca.gov/fa/. Three new initiatives are described below.

(1) In January 2015 HCD issued its first NOFA under the new Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC) Program. Administered by California's Strategic Growth Council, and implemented by HCD, the AHSC Program funds land-use, housing, transportation, and land preservation projects to support infill and compact affordable housing development that reduce greenhouse gas ("GHG") emissions. Funding for the AHSC Program is provided from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF), an account established to receive Cap-and-Trade auction proceeds. See http://www.hcd.ca.gov/fa/ahsc/index.html for more information.

(2) The VHHP bond program, approved by the voters in June 2014, provides $600 million for veterans housing, At least 50 percent of capital development funding must be used for housing

for extremely low income, and that at least 60 percent of the units assisted must be permanent supportive housing. The first VHHP NOFA for $75 million was issued in February 2015. See http://www.hcd.ca.gov/fa/vets/ for more information.

(3) The State of California was also awarded nearly $24 million in HUD five-year renewable project-based Section 8 funds.. Round One funding which was made available to the State in June 2014 provides 5--year renewable rental assistance to affordable housing projects serving Medicaid beneficiaries with disabilities ages 18-61 who have resided in a long-term health care facility for at least 90 days and desire to return to community living, or are at risk of placement in an inpatient facility because of loss of housing. The Round One NOFA was issued in August 2014, and applications are currently being accepted on an over-the counter basis for these funds.

Round Two funds awarded in March 2015 expand this assistance to include homeless persons in LA County who are exiting institutions and other homeless in the County who are high users of emergency medical services for whom permanent supportive housing can help reduce the need for these more costly medical interventions. State Agency partners include: the California Housing Finance Agency (CalHFA), the California Department of Health Care Services (DHCS), HCD, and TCAC. Local partners for Round Two funds include the LA County Continuum of CA, the LA City and County Housing Authorities, the LA County Department of Public Health. (This is a partial list of local partners). For more information, see http://www.calhfa.ca.gov/multifamily/section811/index.htm.

Actions planned to reduce lead-based paint hazards

The LHCP Program is the primary source of funds targeted to lead-hazard reduction in California. The program's primary objectives are to: (1) provide lead hazard control services to at least 195 pre-1978 housing units occupied by low-income households, targeting households containing lead based paint hazards and other related home hazards occupied with children with elevated blood lead levels, children under the age of six, a child that spends significant time in the home, or a pregnant woman; (2) provide lead hazard awareness education; (3) maximize resources by strengthening collaboration with local housing and health departments to increase lead-safe rental opportunities for low-income households, and (4) expand the lead-safe certified workforce in the local communities and develop lasting lead-safe training resources.

LHCP is designed to work in conjunction with the federally-funded Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) weatherization component, Department of Energy Weatherization Assistance Program (DOE WAP), local health agencies, and CDBG. When applicable, the CBOs will integrate LIHEAP and DOE-WAP weatherization funding as a leverage resource to offset LHCP allowable direct lead hazard program costs. For more information, see www.csd.ca.gov.

Actions planned to reduce the number of poverty-level families

In addition to CDBG's economic development activities, (discussed in CDBG's Method of Distribution in Section AP 30), the State ESG and HOPWA programs' funded case management services may help poverty-level households link to mainstream education and employment opportunities to assist them in increasing their income.

Other State housing programs seek to reduce the housing cost burden on families who are considered Extremely Low Income, many of whom have incomes at or below the poverty level, by developing housing units at 30% AMI or below, and/or by providing rent or operating subsidies that will assist families at this income level to afford housing. The MHP Supportive Housing Program, VHHP, Mental Health Services Act (MHSA), CalWORKs Housing Support Program, and the Section 811 PRA program specifically target households at 30% AMI or below. Other State programs such as the MHP General component, HOME, AHSC and the 9% and 4% Tax credit programs provide application rating points and/or additional dollars for providing rents at 30% AMI or below. In 2016, the State hopes to receive funds from the National Housing Trust Fund. By statute, a minimum of 75% of the funds available must be used for ELI units.

Although HCD no longer administers the Enterprise Zone Program, HCD will support the Franchise Tax Board as it implements the New Employee Credit program in Designated Geographic Areas throughout the state, many of which were former enterprise zones. HCD will also continue to verify the eligibility of businesses which claim previously earned hiring tax credits when called upon by the FTB in the performance of its audits.

Actions planned to develop institutional structure

CDPH/OA is integrating HCP and HOPWA grant oversight and compliance activities to streamline internal systems, maximize existing staff, and ensure coordination of HIV/AIDS services.

The statewide HIV/AIDS needs assessment will include epidemiology data, resource inventory, and assessment of needs and unmet needs/service gaps, which will assist in prioritizing use of HOPWA funds.

Through the VHHP, AHSC, and Section 811 PRA programs, HCD will continue to work with other State Departments to assist housing providers serving homeless and other low income household to access supportive services offered or funded through these agencies. See http://www.hcd.ca.gov/fa/ for more information on VHHP and AHSC, and http://www.calhfa.ca.gov/multifamily/section811/index.htm for more information on the Section 811 PRA program.

In addition to the above activities, California continues to develop institutional structure and enhance interagency coordination by pursuing opportunities in all four goal areas identified by the 2013 SAMHSA-sponsored Policy Academy to Reduce Chronic Homelessness. See Appendix F for more detail on these activities.

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

The Section 811 PRA, VHHP, MHSA, and CalWORKs Housing Support Program discussed above all involve actions to enhance coordination between public and private housing and service agencies. The Homelessness Policy Academy actions discussed in Appendix F also involve efforts to enhance partnerships and coordination at the State and local level.

Through implementation of the HOPWA program, CDPH/OA emphasizes inclusion of representatives of various HIV/AIDS service agencies, other state departments (such as Corrections, Housing, Rehabilitation, Mental Health, Developmental Services and Alcohol and Drug Programs), local health departments, California HIV/AIDS Research Program (CHRP), and others, in information gathering, research and decision-making processes.

Project sponsors are required to the extent possible, to participate in local HIV/AIDS planning groups and the HIV/AIDS service delivery and needs assessment processes within their community. Local participation assists project sponsors in linking clients to necessary services and establishing collaborative relationships with other local government and private service agencies

Discussion:

See above.

Program Specific Requirements

AP-90 Program Specific Requirements – 91.320(k)(1,2,3)

Introduction:

Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG)
Reference 24 CFR 91.320(k)(1)

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

1. The total amount of program income that will have been received before the start of the next program year and that has not yet been reprogrammed	0
2. The amount of proceeds from section 108 loan guarantees that will be used during the year to address the priority needs and specific objectives identified in the grantee's strategic plan.	0
3. The amount of surplus funds from urban renewal settlements	0
4. The amount of any grant funds returned to the line of credit for which the planned use has not been included in a prior statement or plan	0
5. The amount of income from float-funded activities	0
Total Program Income:	**0**

Other CDBG Requirements

1. The amount of urgent need activities	0

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

HOME Investment Partnership Program (HOME)
Reference 24 CFR 91.320(k)(2)

1. A description of other forms of investment being used beyond those identified in Section 92.205 is as follows:

   None. HOME funds are allocated in the form of grants and deferred payment loans.

2. A description of the guidelines that will be used for resale or recapture of HOME funds when used for homebuyer activities as required in 92.254, is as follows:

   Pursuant to 24 CFR 92.254(a)(5) and HOME Regulation 8206.1, the State HOME Program will utilize the recapture option in its homeownership programs and projects, but may utilize the resale option for limited equity forms of ownership, such as cooperatives and community land trusts.

   Recapture Loans: Where the local jurisdiction or the CHDO is not imposing its own resale controls, the recapture method used is to recapture the entire amount of the loan to the homebuyer. The assistance provided to the homebuyer may include down-payment assistance, closing costs, and/or the difference between the appraised home sales price and the amount of the first mortgage for which the low-income homebuyer can qualify, plus closing costs. The home sales price cannot exceed the appraised value of the home. If HCD provides funds for homeowner new construction or rehabilitation, and total project costs exceed appraised value, the development subsidy is not subject to recapture.

   Pursuant to 24 CFR 92.254, when recapture is triggered by a sale (voluntary or involuntary) of the housing unit, and there are no net proceeds, or the net proceeds are insufficient to repay the HOME investment due, only the net proceeds can be recaptured, if any. Net proceeds are the sales price minus superior loan repayments (other than HOME funds) and any closing costs. HOME loans made under the recapture option may be assumed by subsequent HOME-eligible purchasers.

   For loans held by State Recipients, the local jurisdiction may impose equity sharing provisions on the appreciation in home value proportionate to the share of the HOME assistance provided, less the homeowner investment in the property. Equity sharing would only apply if the sales price is sufficient to repay the HOME loan, and the loan is not assumed by another HOME-eligible purchaser. The captured appreciation may also be reduced proportionate to the number of years during which the homebuyer has owned the home. The captured appreciation may also be subject to restrictions by other public lenders such as USDA or CalHFA.

   Typically, the appreciation is calculated as follows:

   1) Gross appreciation is calculated by subtracting the original sales price from the current sales

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

price, or the current appraised value if the loan accelerating event is other than sale of the property;

2) Net appreciation is calculated by subtracting the seller's applicable closing costs, seller's cash contribution in the original purchase transaction, the value of seller's sweat equity, if applicable, and the documented value of capital improvements from the gross appreciation amount;

3) The State recipient only claims repayment of the HOME principal and a portion of the net appreciation. That maximum portion of the net appreciation which is claimed by the State Recipient is equal to the percentage of the value of the home financed by the HOME loan. That is, if the loan equals 20 percent of the initial value of the home, a maximum of 20 percent of the net appreciation is claimed by the State Recipient;

Resale Loans: Pursuant to State Regulation 8206.1, HOME loans may be made in the form of resale loans on projects involving limited equity forms of ownership. In other situations, although the HOME loan remains a recapture loan, a State Recipient or CHDO may impose its own resale controls when there is subsidy other than State HOME funds. The subsidy need not be an actual loan; it may be in the form of an inclusionary ordinance which requires homes to sell below fair market value.

Due to reductions in HOME funding and staffing levels, HOME will be unable to administer FTHB activities proposing use of resale controls; therefore no activities proposing use of resale controls will be approved in the coming fiscal year.

3. A description of the guidelines for resale or recapture that ensures the affordability of units acquired with HOME funds? See 24 CFR 92.254(a)(4) are as follows:

   See above.

4. Plans for using HOME funds to refinance existing debt secured by multifamily housing that is rehabilitated with HOME funds along with a description of the refinancing guidelines required that will be used under 24 CFR 92.206(b), are as follows:

   None. The State HOME Program does not use its funds for refinancing of existing HOME debt.

Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG)
Reference 91.320(k)(3)

1. Include written standards for providing ESG assistance (may include as attachment)

   ESG Applicants/Subrecipients are required to complete the ESG Written Standards Checklist and submit their Written Standards. For the State's requirements for written Standards, see Appendix C.

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

   The State ESG Program has over 30 local CoCs among its eligible jurisdictions. All ESG Applicants are required to disclose in the application for ESG funds whether or not they use a Centralized or Coordinated System to initially assess the eligibility and needs of each individual or family who seeks assistance, or describe how they will comply with this requirement.

3. Identify the process for making sub-awards and describe how the ESG allocation available to private nonprofit organizations (including community and faith-based organizations).

   See ESG's Method of Distribution in AP 30 above.

4. If the jurisdiction is unable to meet the homeless participation requirement in 24 CFR 576.405(a), the jurisdiction must specify its plan for reaching out to and consulting with homeless or formerly homeless individuals in considering policies and funding decisions regarding facilities and services funded under ESG.

   ESG Applicants are required to disclose whether their organization involves homeless or formerly homeless persons on the Board of Directors or an Equivalent Policymaking Entity, or describe how they will comply with this requirement.

5. Describe performance standards for evaluating ESG.

ESG currently uses exits to permanent housing, program exits, and length of stay in an ESG-funded program, as its primary performance standards. ESG applicants and recipients also report on program participant gains or increases in employment and non-employment cash income. When new State ESG regulations are developed in 2016, other specific HEARTH performance outcome measures may be utilized.

Discussion:

Appendix A
Eligible Jurisdictions for CDBG, HOME, ESG, HOPWA

Eligible Jurisdictions by Program 2015-16 This table is subject to change. (Any changes will be reflected in program NOFAs and updated in the next Annual Plan Update)				
	CDBG	HOME	ESG	HOPWA
Alameda	None	None	County not Eligible Alameda (city) Fremont Hayward Livermore Pleasanton San Leandro Union City	None
Alpine	Entire County	Alpine County	Entire County Eligible	Entire County Eligible
Amador	Amador County Amador City Ione Jackson Plymouth Sutter Creek	Amador County Amador City Ione Jackson Plymouth Sutter Creek	Entire County Eligible	Entire County Eligible
Butte	Butte County Biggs Gridley Oroville	Butte County Biggs Gridley Oroville Paradise	Entire County Eligible	Entire County Eligible
Calaveras	Calaveras County Angels Camp	Calaveras County Angels Camp	Entire County Eligible	Entire County Eligible
Colusa	Colusa County Colusa Williams	Colusa County Colusa Williams	Entire County Eligible	Entire County Eligible

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

Eligible Jurisdictions by Program 2015-16 This table is subject to change. (Any changes will be reflected in program NOFAs and updated in the next Annual Plan Update)				
	CDBG	HOME	ESG	HOPWA
Contra Costa	None	None	County not Eligible. Antioch Concord Pittsburg Richmond Walnut Creek	None
Del Norte	Del Norte County Crescent City	Del Norte County Crescent City	Entire County Eligible	Entire County Eligible
El Dorado	El Dorado County Placerville South Lake Tahoe	El Dorado County Placerville South Lake Tahoe	Entire County Eligible	None
Fresno	County not eligible Coalinga Firebaugh Fowler Huron Orange Cove Parlier San Joaquin	County not eligible Coalinga Clovis Firebaugh Fowler Huron Orange Cove Parlier San Joaquin	County not Eligible Clovis Coalinga Firebaugh Fowler Huron Orange Cove Parlier San Joaquin	None (effective 2015)
Glenn	Glenn County Orland Willows	Glenn County Orland Willows	Entire County Eligible	Entire County Eligible
Humboldt	Humboldt County Arcata Blue Lake Eureka Ferndale Fortuna Rio Dell Trinidad	Humboldt County Arcata Blue Lake Eureka Ferndale Fortuna Rio Dell Trinidad	Entire County Eligible	Entire County Eligible
Imperial	Imperial County Brawley Calexico Calipatria El Centro *(eligible for Colonias funding only)* Holtville Imperial City Westmorland	Imperial County Brawley Calexico Calipatria El Centro Holtville Imperial Westmorland	Entire County Eligible	Entire County Eligible

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

Eligible Jurisdictions by Program
2015-16

This table is subject to change.
(Any changes will be reflected in program NOFAs and updated in the next Annual Plan Update)

	CDBG	HOME	ESG	HOPWA
Inyo	Inyo County Bishop	Inyo County Bishop	Entire County Eligible	Entire County Eligible
Kern	County not Eligible. Maricopa McFarland Taft Wasco	County not Eligible. Delano Maricopa Taft Wasco	County not Eligible. Delano Maricopa Taft Wasco	Entire County Eligible
Kings	Kings County Avenal Corcoran Lemoore	Kings County Avenal Corcoran Hanford Lemoore	Entire County Eligible	Entire County Eligible
Lake	Lake County Clearlake Lakeport	Lake County Clearlake Lakeport	Entire County Eligible	Entire County Eligible
Lassen	Lassen County Susanville	Lassen County Susanville	Entire County Eligible	Entire County Eligible
Los Angeles	County not Eligible. Hidden Hills Industry Palos Verdes Estates Vernon	County not Eligible. Artesia Carson Cerritos Gardena Glendora Hidden Hills Industry Lakewood Lancaster Palos Verdes Estates Pico Rivera Redondo Beach Santa Clarita Torrance Vernon West Covina	County not Eligible Alhambra Artesia Baldwin Park Bellflower Burbank Carson Downey Gardena Glendora Hawthorne Hidden Hills Huntington Park Industry Inglewood Lakewood Lancaster Lynwood Montebello Monterey Park Norwalk Palmdale Palos Verdes Estates Paramount City Pico Rivera Redondo Beach	None

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

Eligible Jurisdictions by Program 2015-16 This table is subject to change. (Any changes will be reflected in program NOFAs and updated in the next Annual Plan Update)				
	CDBG	HOME	ESG	HOPWA
			Rolling Hills Rosemead Santa Clarita Santa Monica Torrance Vernon West Covina & Whittier	
Madera	Madera County Chowchilla	Madera County Chowchilla Madera	Entire County Eligible	Entire County Eligible
Marin	None	None	Entire County Eligible	Entire County Eligible
Mariposa	Mariposa County	Mariposa County	Entire County Eligible	Entire County Eligible
Mendocino	Mendocino County Fort Bragg Point Arena Ukiah Willits	Mendocino County Fort Bragg Point Arena Ukiah Willits	Entire County Eligible	Entire County Eligible
Merced	Merced County Atwater Dos Palos Gustine Livingston Los Banos	Merced County Atwater Dos Palos Gustine Livingston Los Banos	Entire County Eligible	Entire County Eligible
Modoc	Modoc County Alturas	Modoc County Alturas	Entire County Eligible	Entire County Eligible
Mono	Mono County Mammoth Lakes	Mono County Mammoth Lakes	Entire County Eligible	Entire County Eligible

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

Eligible Jurisdictions by Program 2015-16 This table is subject to change. (Any changes will be reflected in program NOFAs and updated in the next Annual Plan Update)				
	CDBG	HOME	ESG	HOPWA
Monterey	County not Eligible Carmel Greenfield King City Marina Pacific Grove Sand City Soledad	Monterey County Carmel Del Rey Oaks Gonzales Greenfield King City Marina Monterey Pacific Grove Sand City Seaside Soledad	Monterey County and all jurisdictions eligible except for Salinas	Entire County Eligible
Napa	Napa County American Canyon Calistoga St. Helena Yountville	Napa County American Canyon Calistoga Napa St. Helena Yountville	Entire County Eligible	Entire County Eligible
Nevada	Nevada County Grass Valley Nevada City Truckee	Nevada County Grass Valley Nevada City Truckee	Entire County Eligible	Entire County Eligible
Orange	County not Eligible San Juan Capistrano	County not Eligible Buena Park Fountain Valley La Habra Laguna Niguel Lake Forest Mission Viejo Newport Beach Rancho Santa Margarita San Clemente San Juan Capistrano Tustin	County not Eligible Buena Park Costa Mesa Fountain Valley Fullerton Huntington Beach Irvine La Habra Laguna Niguel Lake Forest Mission Viejo Newport Beach Orange (city) Rancho Santa Margarita San Clemente San Juan Capistrano Tustin Westminster	None

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

Eligible Jurisdictions by Program 2015-16 This table is subject to change. (Any changes will be reflected in program NOFAs and updated in the next Annual Plan Update)				
	CDBG	HOME	ESG	HOPWA
Placer	Placer County Auburn Colfax Lincoln Loomis	Placer County Auburn Colfax Lincoln Loomis Rocklin Roseville	Entire County Eligible	None
Plumas	Plumas County Portola	Plumas County Portola	Entire County Eligible	Entire County Eligible
Riverside	County not Eligible Calimesa Indian Wells Rancho Mirage	County not Eligible Calimesa Cathedral City Hemet Indio Lake Elsinore Menifee Palm Desert Palm Springs Perris Rancho Mirage Temecula	County not Eligible Calimesa Cathedral City Corona Hemet Indio Jurupa Valley Menifee Palm Desert Palm Springs Perris Rancho Mirage Temecula	None
Sacramento	None	County not eligible Elk Grove Rancho Cordova	County not Eligible Citrus Heights Elk Grove Rancho Cordova	None
San Benito	San Benito County Hollister San Juan Bautista	San Benito County Hollister San Juan Bautista	Entire County Eligible	None
San Bernardino	None	County Not Eligible Chino Hesperia Redlands Upland	County not Eligible Apple Valley Chino Chino Hills Hesperia Rancho Cucamonga Redlands Rialto Upland Victorville	None

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

Eligible Jurisdictions by Program 2015-16 This table is subject to change. (Any changes will be reflected in program NOFAs and updated in the next Annual Plan Update)				
	CDBG	HOME	ESG	HOPWA
San Diego	None	None	County not Eligible Carlsbad El Cajon Encinitas Escondido La Mesa National City Oceanside San Marcos Santee Vista	None
San Francisco	None	None	None	None
San Joaquin	None	County not eligible Lodi	County not Eligible Lodi	Entire County Eligible
San Luis Obispo	County not Eligible Grover Beach Pismo Beach	County not Eligible Grover Beach Pismo Beach	County not Eligible Grover Beach Pismo Beach	Entire County Eligible
San Mateo	None	None	County not Eligible Daly City Redwood City San Mateo (city) South San Francisco	None
Santa Barbara	County not Eligible Guadalupe	County not Eligible Guadalupe	County not Eligible Goleta Guadalupe Santa Barbara (city) Santa Maria	Entire County Eligible
Santa Clara	None	County not Eligible Gilroy Cupertino City Milpitas Palo Alto	Santa Clara County and all jurisdictions eligible except for San Jose	None
Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz County Capitola Scotts Valley	Santa Cruz County Capitola Scotts Valley Watsonville	Entire County Eligible	Entire County Eligible

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

Eligible Jurisdictions by Program
2015-16

This table is subject to change.
(Any changes will be reflected in program NOFAs and updated in the next Annual Plan Update)

	CDBG	HOME	ESG	HOPWA
Shasta	Shasta County Anderson Shasta Lake	Shasta County Anderson Shasta Lake	Entire County Eligible	Entire County Eligible
Sierra	Sierra County Loyalton	Sierra County Loyalton	Entire County Eligible	Entire County Eligible
Siskiyou	Siskiyou County Dorris Dunsmuir Etna Fort Jones Montague Mount Shasta Tulelake Weed Yreka	Siskiyou County Dorris Dunsmuir Etna Fort Jones Montague Mount Shasta Tulelake Weed Yreka	Entire County Eligible	Entire County Eligible
Solano	Solano County Benicia Dixon Rio Vista Suisun City	Solano County Benicia Dixon Fairfield Rio Vista Suisun City Vacaville	Entire County Eligible	Entire County Eligible
Sonoma	None	County not Eligible Petaluma	County not Eligible Petaluma Santa Rosa	Entire County Eligible
Stanislaus	County not Eligible Riverbank	County not Eligible Riverbank	County not Eligible Riverbank Turlock	Entire County Eligible
Sutter	Sutter County Live Oak	Sutter County Live Oak Yuba City	Entire County Eligible	Entire County Eligible
Tehama	Tehama County Corning Red Bluff Tehama	Tehama County Corning Red Bluff Tehama	Entire County Eligible	Entire County Eligible
Trinity	Trinity County	Trinity County	Entire County Eligible	Entire County Eligible

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

Eligible Jurisdictions by Program 2015-16 This table is subject to change. (Any changes will be reflected in program NOFAs and updated in the next Annual Plan Update)				
	CDBG	HOME	ESG	HOPWA
Tulare	Tulare County Dinuba Exeter Farmersville Lindsay Woodlake	Tulare County Dinuba Exeter Farmersville Lindsay Porterville Tulare Woodlake	Entire County Eligible	Entire County Eligible
Tuolumne	Tuolumne County Sonora	Tuolumne County Sonora	Entire County Eligible	Entire County Eligible
Ventura	None	County not Eligible Camarillo Simi Valley Thousand Oaks	Ventura County and all jurisdictions eligible except for Oxnard	Entire County Eligible
Yolo	Yolo County West Sacramento Winters	Yolo County West Sacramento Winters Woodland	Entire County Eligible	None
Yuba	Yuba County Marysville Wheatland	Yuba County Marysville Wheatland	Entire County Eligible	Entire County Eligible

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

Appendix B
Interested Parties Contact List

This is Appendix is maintained as a separate document. It is posted alongside the 2015-2020 Consolidated Plan at http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/hrc/rep/fed/.

Appendix C
ESG Written Standards Instructions

All ESG Applicants must either: (1) follow the CoC Written Standard(s) for all jurisdictions served, if established; or (2) establish and follow their own Written Standards.

All ESG Applicants complete the ESG Written Standards Checklist, by checking the appropriate Written Standard(s) applicable to their ESG Application. For the Written Standards checked, the ESG Applicant must provide a copy of the Written Standard(s) with their application.

In addition, if the CoC or Applicant Written Standards do not include policies for: (1) Termination and the Appeal Process; (2) Reasonable Accommodation and Disability-Related Grievance Procedures; and (3) Location where Written Standard(s) Program Participant Rules are posted; and/or When Written Standards/Program Participant Rules are posted; and/or When Written Standards/Program Participation Rules are given to Program Participants, the ESG Applicant must provide a copy of those policies as well.

ESG Written Standards Checklist

Please certify below that you have established Written Standards for this program.

☐	**i.** Standard policies and procedures for evaluating individuals' and families' eligibility for assistance under Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG). The policies and procedures must be consistent with the recordkeeping requirements and definitions of "homeless" and "at-risk of homelessness" in the federal ESG regulations at: 24 CFR 576.2 and 24 CFR 576.500 (b-e).
☐	**ii.** Standards for targeting and providing essential services related to street outreach.
☐	**iii.** Policies and procedures for admission, diversion, referral, and discharge by emergency shelters assisted under ESG, including standards regarding length of stay, if any, and safeguards to meet the safety and shelter needs of special populations, (*e.g.*, victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; and individuals and families who have the highest barriers to housing and are likely to be homeless the longest).
☐	**iv.** Policies and procedures for assessing, prioritizing, and reassessing individuals' and families' needs for essential services related to emergency shelter.
☐	**v.** Policies and procedures for coordination among emergency shelter providers, essential services providers, homelessness prevention, and rapid re-housing assistance providers; other homeless assistance providers; and mainstream service and housing providers. The required coordination may be done over an area covered by the Continuum of Care or a larger area.

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

☐	**vi.** Policies and procedures for determining and prioritizing which eligible families and individuals will receive homelessness prevention assistance and which eligible families and individuals will receive rapid re-housing assistance. For homeless prevention, include the risk factors used to determine who would be most in need of this assistance to avoid becoming homeless.
☐	**vii.** Standards for determining what percentage or amount (if any) of rent and utilities costs each program participant must pay while receiving homelessness prevention or rapid re-housing assistance. If the assistance will be based on a percentage of the participant's income, specify this percentage, and how income will be calculated.
☐	**viii.** Standards for determining how long a particular program participant will be provided with rental assistance and whether and how the amount of that assistance will be adjusted over time. One-year lease required for project-based assistance. Annual participant evaluations required with rapid re-housing assistance; three-month evaluations required with homeless prevention assistance. Individual assistance cannot exceed 24 months in a three-year period.
☐	**ix.** Standards for determining the type, amount, and duration of housing stabilization and/or relocation services to provide to a program participant, including the limits, if any, on the homelessness prevention or rapid re-housing assistance that each program participant may receive, such as the maximum amount of assistance, maximum number of months the program participant may receive assistance, or the maximum number of times the program participant may receive assistance. Note: ESG regulations limit this assistance to no more than 24 months in a three-year period. Housing stability case management is limited as specified on pp. 75979-80 of the federal regulations.
☐	**x.** *Participation in HMIS.* The recipient must ensure that data on all persons served and all activities assisted under ESG are entered into the applicable community-wide HMIS in the area in which those persons and activities are located, or a comparable database, in accordance with HUD's standards on participation, data collection, and reporting under a local HMIS.

CERTIFICATION OF WRITTEN STANDARDS	
Printed Name	*Title*
Authorized Signature for Applicant (Authorized by Resolution)	*Date*

Appendix D
State Resources and Plans

Department of Aging	California State Plan on Aging, 2013-2017
	Senior Programs and Services
	California Long-Term Care Ombudsman Program
	Multipurpose Senior Services Program (MSSP)
	Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP)
Department of Community Services & Development	Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP)
	Low-Income Weatherization Program
	Community Services Block Grant Program
Department of Corrections	Residential Multi-Service Centers
Department of Developmental Services	State Developmental Centers
	Regional Centers
	Community Placement Plan Housing
Department of Education	McKinney Homeless Children and Youth Education
Department of Mental Health	California Mental Health Services Act (MHSA)

	Projects for Assistance in Transition from Homelessness (PATH)
Department of Social Services	CalWorks, Women, Infant and Children (WIC) and Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF)
Department of Veteran's Affairs	Homeless Veterans Outreach and Awareness
State Emergency Management Agency	Domestic Violence Assistance Program
State Employment Development Department	Workforce Investment Act (WIA)

Appendix E
Housing Rehabilitation Needs In Colonias within the Unincorporated Area of Imperial County

Colonia Community	Percentage Owner Occupied	Total Housing Units	Percentage of housing units in need of some form of rehab.
Bombay Beach	77.33%	364	97%
Heber	65.52%	198	33%
Niland	63.89%	347	93%
Ocotillo	80.56	169	85%
Seeley	57.84%	368	83%
Palo Verde	68.75%	138	73%
The Poe	92.31%	45	38%
Salton Sea	71.67%	323	93%
Winterhaven	54.26%	102	78%
Average	**72.24%**		**74.78%**

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

Appendix F
Activities Following the SAMHSA Policy Academy to Reduce Chronic Homelessness

California continues to pursue opportunities in all four goal areas identified by the 2013 SAMHSA-sponsored Policy Academy to Reduce Chronic Homelessness

Goal 1: Increasing access to mainstream resources, taking full advantage of opportunities under the Affordable Care Act and through the expansion of Medi-Cal.

2015 and beyond initiatives

1. *Apply for and Implement 1115 Medicaid Waiver*

   Housing Work Group Potential Concepts: http://www.dhcs.ca.gov/provgovpart/Documents/Waiver%20Renewal/Housing4_Concepts.pdf

   Renewal Page: http://www.dhcs.ca.gov/provgovpart/Pages/1115-Waiver-Renewal.aspx

   http://www.dhcs.ca.gov/provgovpart/Documents/Waiver%20Renewal/Initial_Concepts_for_2015_Waiver-July_2014.pdf

2. *Health Homes*

   http://www.dhcs.ca.gov/services/Pages/HealthHomesProgram.aspx

   Background: http://www.csh.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/State_Health_Reform_Summary.pdf

3. *Various forums for continued engagement with Managed Care Organizations to explore collaboration on serving persons experiencing homelessness and other vulnerable populations (e.g., Webinar "serving Members Experiencing Homelessness – Part 1".* http://youtu.be/32xyeUzTqys
4. *Implement 811 Project Rental Assistance Program (Rounds I and II)*
5. *Ongoing: Money Follows the Person/ CA Community Transitions Project*

   http://www.dhcs.ca.gov/services/ltc/Pages/CCT.aspx

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

Goals 2: Increasing access to permanent supportive housing (PSH) in the existing inventory persons experiencing chronic homelessness and the most and Goal 3: Designing new State PSH programs and approaches:

2015 and beyond initiatives

1. *Implement Veteran Housing and Homelessness Prevention Program* http://www.hcd.ca.gov/fa/vets/
2. *Ongoing: Implement MHP and MHP-SH, as funded.* http://www.hcd.ca.gov/fa/docs/SHMHP-NOFA-2014.PDF
   MHP-SH Targeted populations include: Homeless youth, chronically homeless, persons leaving institutions
3. *Ongoing: DDS funds for housing development Community Placement Plan Housing* http://www.dds.ca.gov/AH/CPP.cfm
4. *Ongoing: Implement State MHSA program* http://www.calhfa.ca.gov/multifamily/mhsa/

Goal 4: supporting the redesign of local crisis response systems.

2015 and beyond initiatives

1. *EHAP CD Awards and Implementation: $10 million for capital costs associated with conversion of transitional housing and emergency shelter to permanent supportive housing* http://www.hcd.ca.gov/fa/ehap/ehapcd.html
2. *State Emergency Solutions Grant*
   a. *Ongoing program and awards*
   b. *program redesign underway*
3. *CalWorks Housing Support Program*

   http://www.cdss.ca.gov/calworks/PG3658.htm

4. *Child Welfare Council Priority Access program (areas of effort include housing, employment, behavioral health services)*

   http://www.chhs.ca.gov/Pages/CWC-TaskForceInformation.aspx

5. *Statewide SOAR Steering Committee to increase access to SSI.*

Ongoing Programs/Initiatives

1. *CA Interagency Council on Veterans* https://www.icv.ca.gov/Pages/Home.aspx
   Brad Sutton is HCD official representative.

2. *PATH Homeless Outreach program* http://www.dhcs.ca.gov/services/MH/Pages/PATH.aspx

3. *Youth Homelessness Project* http://cahomelessyouth.library.ca.gov/

4. *Youth Shelter funding*
   http://calyouth.org/resources/california-youth-crisis-line/ *funded by CA EMA*
   http://www.calema.ca.gov/GrantsProcessing/_layouts/DispItem.aspx?List=a0ffeea6%2D5a86%2D4de1%2Db7d8%2D268add1d7015&ID=145&Web=345b2b9e%2D94a0%2D43c4%2Daebb%2Dc89984ba6450

5. *CA Dept of education Homeless youth programs and funding* http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/hs/cy/ *Corrections mental health program (not sure of funding status and not as relevant but helps transition mentally ill parolees)* http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/Parole/Mental-Health-Services-Continuum-Program.html

Appendix G
Public Notices

March 30, 2015

FOR IMMEDIATE POSTING

PUBLIC NOTICE FOR COMMENT

Draft 2015-2020 State of California Consolidated Plan

The State of California, Department of Housing and Community Development (Department), is soliciting public review and comment on the Draft State of California 2015-2020 Consolidated Plan.

This State Consolidated Plan is comprised of a Housing Needs Assessment, Market Analysis, Strategic Plan, and Annual Action Plan submitted to HUD to enable the State to administer approximately $75 million in new federal funds for fiscal year 2015-16 under the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), Home Investment Partnerships Program (HOME), Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG), Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) and Lead-Based Paint Hazard Control Program (LHCP). The Consolidated Plan is primarily applicable to non-entitlement jurisdictions that are eligible to compete for allocation of these funds by the State.

The public review period for this document is 30 days, from **April 1, 2015 through April 30, 2015**.

The Department must receive all comments on this document no later than **5 p.m. on April 30, 2015.**

Written comments can be submitted via (1) electronic mail (caper@hcd.ca.gov), (2) facsimile (916) 263-3394 or (3) mailed to the following address:

Attention: Christina DiFrancesco Department of

Housing and Community Development, Division of

Financial Assistance

P.O. Box 952054

Sacramento, California 94252-2054

Public review of the Draft 2015-2020 Consolidated Plan is available (1) on the Department's website at http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/hrc/rep/fed, (2) at planning departments of counties with at least one non- entitlement jurisdiction, and (3) at the following depository libraries:

California State Library, Government Publications (Sacramento)
California State University, Meriam Library (Chico)
Free Library, Government Publications (Fresno County)
Public Library, Serials Division (Los Angeles)
Public Library (Oakland)
Public Library, Science & Industry Department (San Diego)
Public Library, Government Documents Dept (SF)
Stanford University Libraries, Green Library, Government Docs
University of California, Government Documents Library (Berkeley)
University of California, Shields Library, Government Documents (Davis)
University of California, Research Library (LA)
University of California, Government Documents (San Diego/La Jolla)
University of California, Government Publications (Santa Barbara)

Public Hearings will be held in the following locations:

Location	*Address*	*Date/Time*
Sacramento	**Department of Housing and Community Development** 2020 West El Camino Ave; Room 405 Sacramento, CA 95833 Christina DiFrancesco (916) 263-0415	Tues, April 21 9 - 1 p.m.
Shasta County*	**Department of Housing and Community Development** Division of Codes and Standards Registration and Titling Program 2986 Bechelli Lane, Suite 201 Redding, CA 96002 Shannon Diego (530) 224-4815	Wed, April 22 9 – 1 pm
Riverside County*	**Department of Housing and Community Development** Division of Codes and Standards Registration and Titling Program 3737 Main Street, Suite 400 Riverside, CA 92501 *Jennifer Hackett (951) 782-4431*	Thurs, April 23 9 – 1 pm

* ***These hearings will be staffed by the Division of Codes and Standards. Other program staff will not be present, but will be available by telephone by calling (916) 263-0415.***

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

A limited number of copies of these documents are also available to entities or individuals unable to access one of the above sources.

Questions about access to documents or hearings should be directed to Christina DiFrancesco at (916) 273-0415. For translator or special services needs, please advise the Department within five working days of the public hearing in order to facilitate the request.

CEQA EXEMPT: This proposal has been determined to be EXEMPT from CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21080.10(b)) and CATEGORICALLY EXCLUDED from NEPA (Title 24 Code of Federal Regulations 50.20(o)(2)).

30 de marzo del 2015

PARA PUBLICACIÓN INMEDIATA

AVISO PÚBLICO PARA COMENTARIO

Anteproyecto 2015-2020 del Plan Consolidado del Estado de California

El Estado de California, Departamento de Vivienda y Desarrollo Comunitario (Departamento), está solicitando revisión pública y comentarios sobre el anteproyecto del Plan Consolidado del Estado de California 2015-2020.

Este Plan Consolidado del Estado se compone de una Evaluación de Necesidades de Vivienda, Análisis de Mercado, Plan Estratégico y Plan de Acción Anual sometido a HUD para permitir que el estado administre aproximadamente $75 millones en nuevos fondos federales para el año 2015-16 debajo del Subsidio Colectivo para el Desarrollo Comunitario (CDBG), Programa de Asociación para Inversiones en Vivienda (HOME), Subsidio de Viviendas de Emergencia (ESG), Oportunidades de Vivienda para Personas con SIDA (HOPWA) y Programa para Controlar el Riesgo de la Pintura con Plomo (LHCP). El Plan Consolidado del Estado es aplicable principalmente a jurisdicciones que no reciben fondos directamente de HUD, y cumplen con los requisitos para competir por la asignación de estos fondos del Estado.

El período para comentarios públicos de estos documentos es de 30 días. Dicho período empieza el **1 de abril del 2015 y termina el 30 de Abril del 2015.** El Departamento debe recibir todo comentario sobre estos documentos a más tardar las **5 p.m. el 30 de abril del 2015.**

Los comentarios pueden mandarse por (1) correo electrónico (caper@hcd.ca.gov), (2) fax al

(916) 263-3394, ó (3) por correo a la siguiente dirección:

Attention: Christina DiFrancesco Department of

Housing and Community Development, Division of

Financial Assistance

P.O. Box 952054

Sacramento, California 94252-2054

Informe público sobre el Anteproyecto 2015-2020 del Plan Consolidado esta disponible (1) en el sitio web del Departamento (www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/hrc/rep/fed), (2), en los departamentos de planificación de condados con al menos una jurisdicción que no recibe fondos directamente de HUD, y (3) en las siguientes bibliotecas con acceso a información del gobierno:

Biblioteca del estado de California, publicaciones del gobierno (Sacramento)
Universidad Estatal de California, biblioteca Meriam (Chico)
Biblioteca gratuita, publicaciones del gobierno (Condado de Fresno)
Biblioteca pública, División de publicaciones seriadas (Los Ángeles)
Biblioteca pública (Oakland)
Biblioteca pública, departamento de Ciencia e Industria (San Diego)
Biblioteca pública, departamento de documentos del gobierno (San Francisco)
Bibliotecas de la Universidad de Stanford, biblioteca Green, documentos de gobierno
Universidad de California, biblioteca de documentos de gobierno (Berkeley)
Universidad de California, biblioteca Shields, documentos de gobierno (Davis)
Universidad de California, biblioteca de investigación (Los Ángeles)
Universidad de California, documentos de gobierno (San Diego/La Jolla)
Universidad de California, publicaciones del gobierno (Santa Bárbara)

Se celebrarán **audiencias públicas** en las siguientes localidades:

Ubicación	*Dirección*	*Fecha/Hora*
Sacramento	**Department of Housing and Community Development** 2020 West El Camino Ave; Room 405 Sacramento, CA 95833 Christina DiFrancesco (916) 263-0415	Martes 21 de abril 9 - 1 p.m.
Condado de Shasta*	**Department of Housing and Community Development** Division of Codes and Standards Registration and Titling Program 2986 Bechelli Lane, Suite 201 Redding, CA 96002 Shannon Diego (530) 224-4815	Miércoles 22 de abril 9 – 1 pm
Condado de Riverside*	**Department of Housing and Community Development** Division of Codes and Standards Registration and Titling Program 3737 Main Street, Suite 400 Riverside, CA 92501 Jennifer Hackett (951) 782-4431	Jueves 23 de abril 9 – 1 pm

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)

**** Estas audiencias serán dadas por personal de la División de Códigos y Normas. Personal de otros programas no estarán presentes, pero estarán disponibles por teléfono llamando al (916) 263-0415.***

Un número limitado de copias de estos documentos está a disposición para entidades o individuos que no pueden tener acceso a las fuentes antes mencionadas.

Preguntas sobre el acceso a los documentos o las audiencias deben ser dirigidas a Christina DiFrancesco al (916) 273-0415. Si necesita un intérprete o servicios especiales, por favor informar al Departamento dentro de cinco días laborables antes de la audiencia a fin de facilitar la solicitud.

Se ha determinado que esta propuesta está EXENTA del CEQA (Recursos Públicos Sección del Código 21080.10 (b)) y CATEGÓRICAMENTE EXCLUIDA del NEPA (Título 24, Código de Reglamentos Federales 50.20(o)(2)).