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Authorizing Legislation

Statutory Basis for the 2021 Homekey Legislative Report

Assembly Bill No. 83 (Chapter 15, Statutes of 2020) created the statutory basis for the Homekey Program by adding section 50675.1.1 to the Health and Safety Code (HSC). Specifically, HSC Section 50675.1.1(f) requires the Department, in coordination with BCSH, to report to the chairs of each fiscal committee and each relevant policy committee of the Legislature on the use of Homekey funds. The report must include the following:

1. The amount of funds expended for the uses described in this section.
2. The location of any properties for which the funds are used.
3. The number of useable housing units produced, or planned to be produced, using the funds.
4. The number of individuals housed, or likely to be housed, using the funds.
5. The number of units, and the location of those units, for which operating subsidies have been, or are planned to be, capitalized using the funds.
6. An explanation of how funding decisions were made for acquisition, conversion, or rehabilitation projects, or for capitalized operating subsidies, including what metrics were considered in making those decisions.
7. Any lessons learned from the use of the funds.

HCD Mission, Vision, and Core Values

Mission

Promote safe, affordable homes and vibrant, inclusive, sustainable communities for all Californians.

Vision

Every California resident can live, work, and play in healthy communities of opportunity.

Core Values

INNOVATION: Empowered to apply creative solutions

PROFESSIONALISM: Demonstrate a willing attitude, open-mindedness, competence, and respect at all levels

ACCOUNTABILITY: Responsible, thoughtful ownership and acknowledgement of actions and performance

MISSION-DRIVEN: Determined and focused on achieving HCD’s purpose

INTEGRITY: Direct, honest, transparent, and ethical in every action

DIVERSITY: Support, strengthen, and foster diversity and inclusive teams, programs, and partnerships
In a matter of months and in the midst of a pandemic, we did what many said was impossible—California created over 6,000 new units, on-time and under budget, helping thousands of homeless Californians move out of cars and tents and into permanent housing. Homekey is possible because of federal support to slow the spread of COVID-19 and partnership from the legislature and local leaders who didn’t settle for excuses and instead got to work to do something historic.”

– CA Governor Gavin Newsom

Executive Summary

Homekey has played a pivotal role in the state’s response to COVID-19. People experiencing homelessness and those at risk of homelessness are disproportionately impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic; they have a lower average life expectancy, limited ability to follow hygiene recommendations such as frequent handwashing, and are at higher risk of infectious and chronic illness. One study found that individuals experiencing homeless were 75 percent more likely to die due to the illness than housed individuals. When people remain homeless and unable to quarantine or follow safety precautions like social distancing and hand-washing, transmission-rates increase across the community.

The COVID-19 pandemic has exacerbated both health and housing inequities. Homelessness is disproportionately experienced by people of color, disabled individuals, and other protected classes. One study estimates that the COVID-19-related economic recession will cause homelessness to increase by 68 percent in California. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention also found disproportionate impacts by race and ethnicity for COVID-19 hospitalization and death.

Homekey was created as an opportunity for local public agencies to purchase motels and other housing types to increase their communities’ capacity to respond to the COVID-19 pandemic. The target population was individuals and families who are experiencing homelessness or at risk of homelessness. By targeting this population, the Homekey program serves those with heightened risk for severe illness from COVID-19.

On July 16, 2020, the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD or Department) made available $550 million in federal Coronavirus Relief Funds (CRF), $50 million in state General funds (GF), and later, $46 million in philanthropic funds for cities, counties, or other local public entities, including housing authorities or federally recognized Native American governments within California. An additional $200 million was later announced on October 7, 2020, totaling $750 million in CRF and $50 million in General Fund monies.

Funds were awarded to purchase and rehabilitate housing, including hotels, motels, vacant apartment buildings, and other buildings, and convert them into interim or permanent, long-term housing.

The Department encouraged expediency, and supported rapid solutions to address homelessness and protect those most at risk of complications of COVID-19. The Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA), which advertised the availability of the funds, defined and prioritized funding awards to Tier One projects that could be substantially occupied within 90 days from the date of acquisition. Tier One projects were of three types:

1) Permanent housing
2) Interim housing expected to be developed into permanent housing at a later date
3) Interim housing with a coordinated exit strategy adopted by the Continuum of Care (CoC).

The Department expedited Homekey’s design and implementation to meet Federal requirements and respond quickly to the health crisis. For the abbreviated timeline, the Department re-assigned existing staff from diverse teams and innovated new processes, such as “pre-application consultations.” Projects also benefited from the ability to avail themselves of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and local land use exemptions. The speed of implementation was largely successful in most cases, but lessons are still emerging about how the Department can replicate successful innovations from Homekey while avoiding unintended consequences of rapid fund dispersal and expenditure.

By December 2020, 94 awards had been made to 51 jurisdictions with a total of 120 unique sites created.

Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>Total Award (CRF + GF)</th>
<th>Overall Percentage of Homekey Funds Awarded</th>
<th>Overall Percentage of Homeless Population (PIT-2019)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area</td>
<td>$274,505,179</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>24.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California</td>
<td>$65,949,089</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>10.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Coast</td>
<td>$22,679,661</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>4.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin Valley</td>
<td>$63,246,531</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>5.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento Area</td>
<td>$38,627,493</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Area</td>
<td>$268,374,750</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>39.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Area</td>
<td>$37,690,283</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>5.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of State</td>
<td>$25,927,014</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>5.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$797,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Homekey Program At-A-Glance

94 Contracts Executed
6,050 Doors Converted
5,911 Useable Units Created
8,264 Individuals Housed

51 Jurisdictions Awarded

Useable Units Created
Balance of State 233
Bay Area 1,627
Central Coast 217
Los Angeles County 1,814
Sacramento Area 331
San Diego County 322
San Joaquin Valley 765
Southern California 592
Grand Total 5,911

120 Unique Project Sites

“Homekey has secured more than 6,000 units for individuals who would otherwise experience homelessness or be at risk of homelessness. Homekey has already started to change lives for the better in many communities by placing individuals on a path to long-term stable housing with services.”
– Secretary Lourdes M. Castro Ramírez, Business, Consumer Services and Housing Agency

Approximately 86 percent of CRF funds were awarded to acquisition or rehabilitation of motels, hotels, hostels and other types of buildings. Approximately 8,264 individuals, of which at least 1,207 are seniors, are housed or will be housed in 2021 within the nearly 6,000 units created by this first round of Homekey. In addition, there are as many as 24 of the awarded projects (25 percent of the total number of projects), that have or intend to house Transitional Age Youth (TAY) residents between the ages of 18-24 who are at risk of or experiencing homelessness.

Since the program entailed purchasing and rehabilitating existing housing, such as motels and vacant apartment buildings, it was extremely cost-effective and efficient. According to a 2019 analysis by the Terner Center for Housing Innovation, the typical cost per unit to develop new housing in California ranges from roughly $380,000-$570,000. By comparison, the average CRF funds expended per door acquired was $129,254. When broken down by geographic region, the Bay Area had the highest average costs per door acquired at $155,294, while projects in the San Joaquin Valley had the lowest average costs at $79,188 per door acquired.

The program used innovative approaches, such as converting temporary non-congregate housing, including hotels, motels, vacant apartment buildings and other properties, into permanent long-term housing for people experiencing or at risk of experiencing homelessness. Of the 6,050 doors acquired, project sponsors were able to create 5,911 useable housing units. Through Homekey, more of our most vulnerable neighbors have moved or will move off the streets and into a place they can call home. Together, this program supported housing for:

- At-risk and former foster youth
- LGBTQ+ youth
- People living with HIV
- Essential farmworkers
- Native American communities
- Vulnerable seniors
- People experiencing racial and economic disparities
- Women and children escaping unsafe housing situations
- Families
- Veterans
- People with disabilities
- And hundreds of people experiencing homelessness

“With equity and inclusion built into Homekey, communities and Californians too often overlooked will benefit, including at-risk and former foster youth, LGBTQ+ youth, people living with HIV, essential farmworkers, vulnerable seniors, veterans, people with disabilities, and women escaping domestic violence. I applaud Governor Newsom, California’s state and local elected officials who supported Homekey and its projects, and the philanthropic organizations who contributed critical operations funding to stand up and operate these lifesaving developments.”
– Director Gustavo Velasquez, Department of Housing and Community Development

Cost Efficiency
Average Cost Per Unit
Homekey $129,254
California New Construction $380,000-$570,000
Introduction

The purpose of the Homekey program was to provide grant funding to eligible applicants and facilitate a partnership between the state and local governments to quickly acquire, rehabilitate or master lease a variety of housing types to assist one of the most vulnerable populations impacted by COVID-19.

On July 16, 2020, the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) made available $550 million in federal CRF, $50 million in state General Fund (GF), and, later, $46 million in philanthropic funds for cities, counties, or other local public entities, including housing authorities or federally recognized Native American governments within California. An additional $200 million was later announced on October 7, 2020 bringing the total to $750 million in CRF and $50 million in GF. These funds were targeted for the purpose of providing permanent housing, or interim housing that connects to permanent housing, or facilitates a partnership between the state and local governments to quickly acquire, rehabilitate or master lease a variety of housing types to assist one of the most vulnerable populations impacted by COVID-19.

People experiencing homelessness or who are at risk homelessness were considered inherently “impacted by COVID-19,” as they are most likely to have a lower life expectancy, be at a higher risk of infectious and chronic illness, and suffer from substance abuse and poor health. The target population is also highly likely to have the same underlying medical conditions that result in increased risk for severe illness from COVID-19.

The Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) defined the acceptable Homekey eligible uses and detailed priority of awards. Prioritization was given to projects that could be occupied quickly. This allowed the Department to encourage expediency as a critical response to the unfolding pandemic and support rapid solutions to address homelessness.

To that end, the NOFA defined and prioritized Tier One projects. Tier One projects are those that could be substantially occupied within 90 days from the date of acquisition and are permanent housing or would result in permanent housing. The process is detailed below.

Program Timeline

Homekey had a highly abbreviated timeline due to the requirement to spend all CRF dollars by December 30, 2020. The December 30 expenditure deadline not only meant the Department needed to allocate the funding, but also that Homekey had a highly abbreviated timeline due to the requirement to spend all CRF dollars by December 30, 2020. The December 30 expenditure deadline was later extended by Congress, that extension did not occur until the very end of the calendar year, by which time all funded projects had closed. The abbreviated timeline demanded that the Department take a number of bold actions to set the program up for success, including redirecting a large number of staff to implement the program, providing robust technical assistance, and innovating the award and standard agreement process. These actions are described in greater detail under “Program Innovations,” later in the report.

The Department required all applicants to engage in a pre-application consultation with HCD prior to submitting an application. The consultation allowed the prospective applicant to discuss the proposed project, along with other applicable programmatic considerations, including those related to application requirements, site acquisition, land use, and long-term financing approaches. Before the final application deadline, the Department completed 101 pre-application consultations with cities, counties, Native American governments and public housing authorities.

Homekey funds were initially available to eligible applicants on an over-the-counter basis, meaning applications were accepted at any time until the specified closing date or until available funds are exhausted. The NOFA was released July 16, 2020 and applications were accepted beginning July 22, 2020 until the final application due date of September 29, 2020. The NOFA announced $550 million in Coronavirus Relief Funds (CRF) and $50 million in General Fund (GF).

On September 29, 2020 Governor Newsom announced his proposal for an additional $200 million in CRF to Homekey, pending conversations with the legislature. On October 7, 2020 the Joint Legislative Budget Committee approved the request for additional funding. With the additional CRF allocation to Homekey, HCD continued awarding funds for waitlisted applicants that could close escrow in early December.

Award announcements began in August 2020 and were issued through October 2020. The Department began redeploying unused funds in November 2020 until funds were fully awarded. From the award announcement to the issuance of Standard Agreements, Department staff worked with applicants to ensure those with conditional awards reached their milestones. HCD worked with applicants to refine budgets and update application materials. The waitlist remained dynamic, updated as new information or applications were submitted. Additional reservations were made from the waitlist when funding was made available.

From October to December, HCD issued Standard Agreements and disbursed awarded funds to awardees. HCD worked through the Standard
In addition to the activities mentioned, HCD worked with Enterprise Community Partners to coordinate on projects that received awards from the $46 million philanthropic fund. These funds from Kaiser Permanente, Blue Cross/Blue Shield of California, and the Chan Zuckerberg Initiative were used for operating subsidies.

Program Background

Funding Tier Prioritization

The NOFA defined the acceptable Homekey eligible uses, which are discussed in the Eligible Uses section on the following page. Priority was given to projects that could be occupied quickly. This allowed the Department to encourage expediency and support rapid solutions to address homelessness. To that end, the NOFA defined and prioritized Tier One projects that could be substantially occupied within 90 days from the date of acquisition and are permanent housing or would result in permanent housing.

Other Tier One projects include those that could be occupied within 90 days and used for interim housing, provided the project was expected to be developed into permanent housing at a later date, or interim housing with a coordinated exit strategy of the target population. Other project types and uses were considered tier two projects, including housing that would be used for interim only with no expectation of development into permanent housing.

For projects received within the priority application period, the Department awarded Tier One projects meeting the program requirements on a rolling basis, up to the regional cap, on a first-come, first-served basis. Other projects meeting program requirements were waitlisted and awarded funding based on rating and ranking as funds became available.

Scoring Criteria

Applications were required to meet the minimum program requirements, such as being an eligible applicant and using the funds for eligible uses.

Agreement process in the order of escrow close dates, accelerating the process as much as possible. This required ongoing coordination with HCD staff and awardees. By December, 94 awards were made to 51 jurisdictions with a total of 120 unique sites.

As part of the Program requirements, the first Grantee Expenditure and Program Report was due to the Department on February 1, 2021. The Department received 100 percent of these required reports. This report contains information provided by awardees on their outcomes to date. Additional grantee reports will be due on July 31, 2021, January 31, 2022, and July 31, 2022, to confirm expenditures and compliance of the GF awards used for operating subsidies.

A wide range of activities were performed during the limited amount of time allotted, as evidenced in the Figure 1.1. The effort, output, and level of partnership between the state and local partners was unprecedented.

“Homekey is not a shelter; it is a home.”
— Mendocino County
Applicants meeting those minimum requirements then had to receive a minimum score of 110 points to be eligible for funding. This is known as “rating and ranking.” Scores were based on the following evaluation criteria:

• The ability to expend funds by December 30, 2020 (up to 50 points),
• Demonstration of the development team’s experience and capacity to acquire and operate the project (up to 40 points),
• A demonstration of how the project will address racial equity, other systemic inequities, state and federal accessibility requirements, and serve members of the target population (up to 25 points), and
• The extent to which the eligible applicant can demonstrate the Project’s community impact and site selection (up to 45 points).

Eligible Uses

Funds were awarded to provide housing for individuals and families who were experiencing homelessness or at risk of experiencing homelessness and who were impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. The list of eligible uses for the CRF allocation and the state GF allocation is as follows:

• Acquisition or rehabilitation of motels, hotels, or hostels.
• Master leasing of properties.
• Acquisition of other sites and assets, including purchase of apartments or homes, adult residential facilities, residential care facilities for the elderly, manufactured housing, and other buildings with existing residential uses that could be converted to permanent or interim housing.
• Conversion of units from nonresidential to residential in a structure with a certificate of occupancy as a motel, hotel, or hostel.
• The purchase of affordability covenants and restrictions for units.
• Relocation costs for individuals who are being displaced as a result of rehabilitation of existing units.
• Capitalized operating subsidies for units purchased, converted, or altered with funds provided pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 50675.1.1.²

Eligibility Criteria

Scores were based on the following evaluation criteria:

• The demonstration of how the project will address racial equity, other systemic inequities, state and federal accessibility requirements, and serve members of the target population (up to 40 points),
• Capitalized operating subsidies for units purchased, converted, or altered with funds provided pursuant to Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 50675.1.1.²

Equity and Accessibility

COVID-19, Homelessness, and Inequality

The COVID-19 pandemic has exacerbated existing inequities among race, gender, age, economic status and health. As of June 12, 2020 the Center for Disease Control reported that age-adjusted hospitalization rates are highest among non-Hispanic American Indian or Alaska Native (5 times white persons) and non-Hispanic Black persons (5 times white persons), followed by Hispanic or Latino persons (4 times white persons).³ The disparate impact of COVID-19 on African Americans, Latinos and Native Americans is reflected in California counties’ hospitalization and mortality rates as well.

In many communities, homelessness was already experienced disproportionately by race and other protected classes. According to the National Alliance to End Homelessness in their July 2020 report to Congress, “Measured as the number of people experiencing homelessness on a given night per 10,000 people in the population, Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders have the highest rate of homelessness. American Indians/Alaska Natives have the second highest rate, followed by African Americans, people who identify as two or more races, and Hispanics.”⁴ Persons experiencing homelessness are at increased risk of infection and death from COVID-19 due to exposure to elements, barriers to medical access, and limited ability to socially distance in a shelter environment.

Given that persons experiencing homelessness are at increased risk of infection and death due to COVID-19, Homekey’s target population is individuals and families who are experiencing or at risk of homelessness. In doing so, Homekey inherently benefits people in protected classes who have been disproportionately impacted by COVID-19. However, Homekey recognized that more was needed to respond to ongoing racial inequities illuminated by both COVID-19 case rates and homeless counts, and encouraged eligible Homekey applicants to develop strategies to address disparate impacts according to the needs in their own communities.

Homekey program designers wanted applicants to contemplate further how equity could be included as a part of project design. The Homekey application process incorporated equity and accessibility considerations as additional incentive in the scoring criteria for grantees to address racial and systemic inequities, and equitably distribute resources within the target population.

Local Efforts

Homekey applicants included response plans to address inequities in their respective communities. While all applicants included a general statement of non-discrimination in their response plan, some provided additional program design components to help their projects reach populations disproportionately impacted by COVID-19.

“Homekey funds have helped promote social, racial and health equity in Oakland by providing permanent supportive housing to residents experiencing homelessness.”

– City of Oakland Staff
Program design components included:

- Implicit Bias and Cultural Competency training for all staff, allowing for a more tolerant, understanding and informed support team.
- Use of local and statewide data to identify disparities and target funding to those most impacted by homelessness and the COVID-19 pandemic.
- Unit set-asides for residents with mobility disabilities and hearing or vision disabilities.
- Community engagement and townhall meetings to hear from the target populations directly and develop plans based on community participation rather than assumptions.
- Promoting lived experience hiring practices, which allow for unique perspectives and problem solving when working with program participants.
- Use of racial equity frameworks to identify the needs of those suffering from multiple forms of inequity.
- Creation of Racial Equity Surveys and opportunities for the community to submit comments anonymously.
- Needs assessments, individual service planning, monitoring and trauma-informed care to help support the participant regardless of their needs.
- Examples from specific applicants include:
  - Los Angeles County is incorporating into their Homekey project an agenda to “Establish an Antiracist Los Angeles County Policy Agenda,” affirming the ongoing work of their Ad Hoc Committee on Black People Experiencing Homelessness. Los Angeles received $271,566,750 for 28 sites throughout the jurisdiction.
  - Fresno Housing and its Continuum of Care partners will implement processes to ameliorate disparities in services and housing in their community utilizing strategies including use of data to examine the Coordinated Entry System (CES) for bias in the process, and a revised CES prioritization tool is being developed with both race/ethnicity and medical/other vulnerabilities to COVID-19 in mind, and multilingual assistance.
  - South Lake Tahoe will utilize the local Coordinated Entry System database to identify individuals who scored highest in vulnerability and target them for proactive outreach, screening, and move-in supports. Their project eligibility and screening criteria outlines several threshold requirements including homeless status and very low household income. They also plan to include preferences for Veterans and people with disabilities.

**Geographic Distribution**

COVID-19 impacts people who are experiencing or who are at risk of homelessness throughout California. As such, the Department ensured local agencies throughout the state had an equitable opportunity to apply for Homekey funds to protect the health and safety of their most vulnerable residents.

### TABLE 1.1 CRF AND GF ALLOCATIONS BY GEOGRAPHIC REGION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic Regions</th>
<th>PIT Count</th>
<th>Severely Rent-burdened ELI</th>
<th>CRF Allocation</th>
<th>GF Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>58,936</td>
<td>415,970</td>
<td>$161,572,217</td>
<td>$14,688,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Bay Area</td>
<td>35,028</td>
<td>213,910</td>
<td>$91,134,470</td>
<td>$8,284,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California</td>
<td>15,360</td>
<td>200,095</td>
<td>$55,577,540</td>
<td>$5,052,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin Valley</td>
<td>10,271</td>
<td>105,370</td>
<td>$32,987,450</td>
<td>$2,998,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Coast</td>
<td>8,439</td>
<td>38,395</td>
<td>$20,025,927</td>
<td>$1,820,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento Area</td>
<td>8,381</td>
<td>73,780</td>
<td>$25,125,077</td>
<td>$2,284,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County</td>
<td>8,102</td>
<td>94,480</td>
<td>$27,690,283</td>
<td>$2,517,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of State</td>
<td>7,254</td>
<td>32,140</td>
<td>$17,087,036</td>
<td>$1,553,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>151,771</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,174,140</strong></td>
<td><strong>$431,200,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$39,200,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To this end, the Department divided the state into eight regions, as outlined in Figure 1.2. The regions are largely aligned with the various Councils of Government (COGs).

Each region had funding reserved of the original $550 million in CRF on a time-limited basis during the priority application period. Each region’s share of the Homekey allocation, as outlined in the table below, was calculated based on its proportionate share of persons experiencing homelessness of both the sheltered and unsheltered 2019 Homeless Point-in-Time (PIT) counts and extremely low-income (ELI) renter households that were paying more than 50 percent of their income for rent. The Department temporarily held twenty percent (20 percent) of the funds to ensure there was adequate flexibility to issue awards expeditiously.

The remaining 20 percent, which was initially held back for flexibility, plus the additional $200 million that was later authorized, was not awarded based on geography, but rather through rating and ranking of the applications.
TABLE 1.2 CRF AND GF AWARD DISTRIBUTIONS BY GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>Total Award (CRF + GF)</th>
<th>Awarded CRF</th>
<th>CRF Percent</th>
<th>Awarded General Fund (GF)</th>
<th>GF Percent</th>
<th>Overall Homeless Population (PIT-2019)</th>
<th>PIT Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area</td>
<td>$274,505,179</td>
<td>$257,022,711</td>
<td>34.41%</td>
<td>$17,482,468</td>
<td>34.96%</td>
<td>$37,195</td>
<td>24.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California</td>
<td>$65,949,089</td>
<td>$64,399,823</td>
<td>8.62%</td>
<td>$1,549,266</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>$15,360</td>
<td>10.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Coast</td>
<td>$22,679,661</td>
<td>$22,679,661</td>
<td>32.13%</td>
<td>$28,353,200</td>
<td>56.71%</td>
<td>7,320</td>
<td>4.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin Valley</td>
<td>$38,627,493</td>
<td>$38,405,349</td>
<td>5.14%</td>
<td>$222,144</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
<td>6,833</td>
<td>4.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento Area</td>
<td>$63,246,531</td>
<td>$61,546,531</td>
<td>8.24%</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>8,948</td>
<td>5.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Area</td>
<td>$268,374,750</td>
<td>$240,021,550</td>
<td>32.13%</td>
<td>$28,353,200</td>
<td>56.71%</td>
<td>59,351</td>
<td>39.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Area</td>
<td>$37,690,283</td>
<td>$37,690,283</td>
<td>5.05%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>8,102</td>
<td>5.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of State</td>
<td>$25,927,014</td>
<td>$25,234,092</td>
<td>3.38%</td>
<td>$692,922</td>
<td>1.39%</td>
<td>8,169</td>
<td>5.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$797,000,000</td>
<td>$747,000,000</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>$50,000,000</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>151,278</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Geographic Region and Legislative District Outcomes

By setting aside funding by geographic region, Homekey ensured that each region of California was given an equitable opportunity to receive funding. The table above depicts the outcome of how all of the $797 million in CRF and GF was distributed, of which $3 million was used by the Department as a set-aside for administration of the Program. Note, that while this table shows the HCD awards, many of the projects also benefited from $46 million in philanthropic dollars for operating subsidies.

The site locations map in Figure 1.3 illustrates the awarded sites throughout the state, and Figures 1.4 and 1.5 on the following page demonstrate the amount of funding and resulting sites awarded by State Senate District and Assembly District (see Appendix A for a full list of property locations).
CRF Expenditures

CRF funds were originally required to be expended by December 30, 2020. This date, however, was extended to December 31, 2021, by section 1001 of Division N of the Consolidated Appropriations Act 2021, Pub. L. No. 116-260 (Dec. 27, 2020). Proof of expenditures and supporting documentation were required with the Grantee Expenditure and Program Report, which was due to the Department on February 1, 2021.

Of the $747 million of CRF awarded, $5,167,772 remains unexpended as of the date of this report. The unexpended funds are attributable to two project sites. Due to the extended expenditure deadline of December 31, 2021, the Department continues to work with these sponsors to ensure all funds are appropriately expended by the deadline.

Of the CRF expenditures made to date:
• Approximately 91 percent of funds were expended on rehabilitation and acquisition of motels, hotels, hostels and the like. Of the amount expended on rehabilitation and acquisition, approximately $107,897,056 (16 percent) was used for rehabilitation and the remaining $570,161,919 (8 percent) was used for acquisition.
• Approximately 7 percent of funds were spent on acquisition of other types of sites.
• Approximately 2 percent of funds were expended in any of the other eligible categories including master leasing, conversion from non-residential to residential purposes, purchase of affordable covenants and relocation costs.

Operating Subsidy Expenditures

Of the $800 million in Homekey grant funds, $50 million was derived from the state’s GF and utilized to secure operating subsidies for units. Operating subsidies are a set-aside of funds to address project operating deficits attributable to the assisted units and help to ensure the long-term success of the projects. The Homekey program provides up to 24 months of operating subsidy funding, not to exceed $1,000 per month per unit.

In addition to the $50 million in GF, another $46 million in philanthropic funds were provided by Kaiser Permanente, Blue Cross/Blue Shield of California, and the Chan Zuckerberg Foundation, were used to augment the GF initial operating subsidies for Homekey sites.

As of February 1, 2021, $599,785 of the $50 million in operating subsidies has been expended. Future expenditures will be reviewed for compliance during each bi-annual report due to HCD. These reports are due on July 31, 2021, January 31, 2022, and July 31, 2022, to confirm expenditures and compliance with operating subsidy eligible expenses.
trusted housing and service providers supporting our homeless Californians.

Figure 1.8 shows the number of units that are and will continue to be supported by the GF. Operating Subsidy by geographic region. A total of 2,289 units are receiving operating subsidy funding from the GF in 32 projects and an additional 45 projects received philanthropic operating subsidy funding to support an additional 2,366 units.

**Project Site and Type Outcomes**

Ninety-four percent of the project sites (113 out of 120) funded by Homekey were acquired with an existing structure on site, such as a hotel, motel or commercial building, that was converted into a useable housing facility. For those projects that will undergo a future conversion, the number of units may end up smaller than the number of doors acquired, as some units may require expansion of a traditional hotel room to accommodate kitchenettes, multiple bedrooms and other amenities.

For reporting purposes, Homekey differentiates “doors” and “units,” whereby “doors” refer to the number of units at the time of the acquisition before any rehabilitation has taken place and “units” refer to the livable spaces created after the project is completed which are made available for operations.

Figure 1.6 shows how many project sites and doors were acquired per geographic region.

**Project Roomkey vs. Homekey Sites**

Project Roomkey was established in March 2020 as part of the state response to the COVID-19 pandemic. The purpose of Project Roomkey was to provide non-congregate shelter options for people experiencing homelessness, protect human life, and minimize strain on the health care system. The program leveraged Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) funds to offset the cost of hotel rooms for individuals experiencing homelessness. By late June 2020, approximately 10,644 hotel rooms with individuals experiencing homelessness were filled. The initiative offered a short-term, emergency measure, non-congregate shelter option for those experiencing homelessness who otherwise could not quarantine from COVID-19. Despite the success of Project Roomkey, more was needed to continue the momentum as COVID-19 cases continued to surge throughout the state during the Fall of 2020 and into the winter months when persons experiencing or at-risk of homelessness are most vulnerable.

Homekey built off the success of Project Roomkey and secured 24 of the sites (1,820 doors) that had been originally utilized through the Project Roomkey initiative, creating 1,798 new units of permanent housing.

**Homekey Eligible Project Types**

Homekey applicants were able to target the emergency hotel shelter sites that had been acquired through Homekey’s predecessor program, Project Roomkey, though most opted to pursue other existing but underutilized sites with their Homekey funding. The list of eligible projects shown in Figure 1.10 is not exhaustive, and the Department welcomed other forms of housing as eligible projects:

- Non-residential structures with a certificate of occupancy as a motel, hotel, or hostel.
- Adult residential facilities, residential care facilities for the elderly, manufactured housing, and other buildings with existing residential uses.
- Multifamily rental housing projects with five or more housing units.
- Shared housing or scattered site housing as long as the housing had common ownership, financing, and property management, and each household signed a lease.

**Figure 1.6 Sites and Total Doors**

**Figure 1.9 Roomkey and Non-Roomkey Project Sites by Geographic Region**

“Homekey is recognized as a once-in-a-generation opportunity from the State to accelerate and catalyze our collective vision for the much-needed transformation.”

– Fresno County
HOMEKEY DEFINED – PERMANENT VS. INTERIM HOUSING

Permanent housing projects require a local covenant restricting the use and eligible tenant or target population for 55 years. These projects must have a plan to cover operations and service costs with specific funding sources (government/philanthropic/private) for five years and have demonstrated a path to the ultimate use of the site for ten years.

Interim housing projects are projects with no plan for conversion to permanent housing. These projects have a plan to cover operations and service costs with specific funding sources, including government, philanthropic, or private, for five years and have demonstrated a path to the ultimate use of the site for ten years.

Regardless of the project type, applicants were required to restrict units to individuals and families who are experiencing homelessness or at risk of homelessness (as defined in Section 578.3 of Title 24 of the Code of Federal Regulation) for no fewer than 20 years. Additionally, each awarded project was required to have a plan to cover operations and service costs with specific funding sources (government/philanthropic) for the awarded projects for five years and have demonstrated a path to the ultimate use of the site for ten years.

Most Homekey projects created units that began as interim housing but will convert to permanent housing. Ultimately, 4,862 total permanent units will be brought online throughout California through the first round of the Homekey program (permanent units created + interim to permanent conversions).

Most Homekey projects created units that began as interim housing but will convert to permanent housing. Ultimately, 4,862 total permanent units will be brought online throughout California through the first round of the Homekey program (permanent units created + interim to permanent conversions).

Regardless of the project type, applicants were required to restrict units to individuals and families who are experiencing homelessness or at risk of homelessness (as defined in Section 578.3 of Title 24 of the Code of Federal Regulation) for no fewer than 20 years. Additionally, each awarded project was required to have a plan to cover operations and service costs with specific funding sources (government/philanthropic) for the awarded projects for five years and have demonstrated a path to the ultimate use of the site for ten years.

Most Homekey projects created units that began as interim housing but will convert to permanent housing. Ultimately, 4,862 total permanent units will be brought online throughout California through the first round of the Homekey program (permanent units created + interim to permanent conversions).
**Unit and Tenant Outcomes**

**Cost Efficiency and Unit Outcomes**

The Department recognized that some acquisitions would have a higher per-door appraised value in certain high-cost areas and some properties may also have a higher per-door value because they need less upfront work and already have the necessary amenities to support a permanent housing solution. For example, a hotel featuring rooms with kitchenettes would likely take less upfront investment than a commercial office space. To support these efforts, the Department accepted requests from Tier One projects — those able to convert to permanent supportive housing within 90 days — for up to $200,000 per door. However, for this $200,000 per door maximum, a local funding match was required as detailed below.

The average CRF cost per door acquired was $129,254. When broken down by geographic region, the Bay Area had the highest average cost per door acquired at $155,294, while projects in the San Joaquin Valley had the lowest average cost per door at $79,188.

Since the program entailed purchasing and rehabilitating existing housing, such as motels and vacant apartment buildings as opposed to new construction, it was extremely cost-effective and efficient. Even at the high end average cost per door, this was an extremely cost-efficient way to rapidly secure, sustain and expand the inventory of housing for those that need it most.

---

**Table 1.3 Match Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligible Applicant Contribution</th>
<th>Total Per Door</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First $100,000</td>
<td>No Match Required $100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next $50,000</td>
<td>1:1 up to $50,000 $200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next $50,000</td>
<td>2:1 $350,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1.4 Average Cost Per Door/Unit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homekey</th>
<th>NPLH*</th>
<th>VHHP*</th>
<th>MHP*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$129,254 per door</td>
<td>$528,769 per unit</td>
<td>$542,011 per unit</td>
<td>$578,398</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Average cost per unit = total estimated development costs/number of units

NPLH figures are based on Round 2 Balance of State Awards

VHHP figure based on average cost per unit for rounds 3, 4, and 5

MHP figure based on average cost per unit for rounds 1, 2, and 3 funded through Proposition 1

Table 1.4 compares the average cost to acquire a Homekey door to the average per unit cost from the Department’s multifamily new construction No Place Like Home and Veterans Housing and Homelessness Prevention programs.

Of the 6,050 doors acquired, project sponsors were able to create 5,911 useable housing units. As of February 1, 2021, 8,264 individuals at risk of or experiencing homelessness have been or are likely to be housed in 2021. In a matter of months, over 5 percent of the 2019 homeless population (per PIT count) have been helped with the Homekey program.
Tenant Outcomes

Together, the Homekey program supported housing for:
- At-risk and former foster youth
- LGBTQ+ youth
- People living with HIV
- Essential farmworkers
- Native American communities
- Vulnerable seniors
- People experiencing racial and economic disparities
- Women and children escaping unsafe housing situations
- Families
- Veterans
- People with disabilities
- And hundreds of people experiencing homelessness

Among the sub-groups, 1,207 seniors were reported housed. In addition, as many as 24 projects dedicated a portion of units, or anticipated housing, to Transitional Age Youth (TAY) ages 18-24 resulting in a projected 201 TAY individuals housed and served with Homekey funds. For example:

- Alameda County Health Care Services will serve a total of 40 TAY individuals within two of their Homekey projects.
- The City of El Centro’s project, Lotus Living Rise Above Resilient Community, has dedicated all of its 26 units to TAY individuals.
- The Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles is projected to house 22 TAY individuals.

At least 333 minor children are anticipated to be provided housing between all 94 projects. Specifically, Grantees reported the following:

- Alameda County Health Care Services anticipates housing a total of 42 minor children out of the 640 individuals served between two of their projects.

Lessons Learned

The Homekey Program worked to prevent further devastating effects and harm to people experiencing homelessness and used innovative approaches to create housing opportunities for California’s most vulnerable populations, acquiring nearly 6,000 units of affordable housing in a matter of months. The required pace to ensure both quality and expediency, however, required quick problem solving and innovative solutions both by the Department and its local jurisdictional partners.

Lessons Learned as Reported from Awardees

Through the required Grantee Expenditure and Program Report, awardees expressed their gratitude to HCD and Governor Newsom’s office for facilitating the availability of Homekey funds, as the majority of funded projects were only possible because of Homekey. While a significant number reported that it was too soon to evaluate the success of the program, some awardees reported barriers they had to overcome or are continuing to encounter. The two most commonly reported barriers are summarized below.

- Grantees reported that the time limitations of the Program made reaching “substantial occupancy” difficult by the deadline required by the Department. For the purposes of Homekey, substantial occupancy is defined as having at least 50 percent of the acquired units occupied. Causes of delays in achieving substantial occupancy included, but are not limited to, the following:
  - relocation of existing tenants;
  - extended construction/rehabilitation timeframes;
  - backorder of materials, including backorder of mobilehomes;
  - unforeseen rehabilitation work; and
  - building code requirements.

For any serious non-compliance issues, the Department may require possible repayment of funds and/or ineligibility of additional rounds of program funds.

“As a former foster youth and a single mother, I cannot express how grateful I am.”

– Imperial County Resident

FIGURE 1.16 SUB-GROUP INDIVIDUALS HOUSED BY GEOGRAPHIC REGION
- The timelines to close on properties resulted in a less thorough vetting process and atypical due diligence. The physical needs assessments (PNAs), appraisals and financial feasibility analyses were rushed and did not always capture a complete assessment of the rehabilitation work needed which resulted in unforeseen repairs, and increased costs.

**Programmatic Innovations**

The Department stretched resources and innovated in order to be able to receive applications and rate, rank, and award without its normal processes and procedures, or the typical staff and office capacity.

One key to success was redirecting a large number of existing staff, from an array of teams, to help implement the program. These staff participated in required “pre-application consultations” for each and every prospective applicant, to help ensure a mutual understanding of the program as well as the project particulars.

Other staff were assigned as Homekey “ambassadors,” serving as single points of contact from the pre-application consultation through the closing of escrow. This helped ensure applicants could get their questions promptly answered by staff familiar with project details. Ambassadors also served as liaisons to Homekey leadership and raised important policy questions as they emerged. Their direct and frequent engagement with applicants generated goodwill and creative problem solving and made an accelerated timeline achievable. Additionally, technical assistance was provided from inside the Department on financing, data analysis, and fair housing, as well as from external partners such as the Department of General Services to support real property analysis and acquisition.

Other program implementation activities were achieved via implementing concurrent, rather than sequential, processes. For example, the NOFA had to be developed in a matter of weeks, and the program application had to be developed, to the extent possible, on a parallel track. Normally, these would be developed sequentially because the content of an application is dependent on the program requirements, as laid out in the NOFA.

The abbreviated timeline also required the Department to employ an innovative award process, whereby program applications were submitted with various documents still pending. For example, applications were submitted with site locations, a project vision, and other key information, as required in the NOFA, but applicants meeting program requirements received a preliminary award (or “reservation of funding”) with documents like appraisals and inspections to follow later. This process was necessary to provide certainty to applicants and ensure CRF dollars were effectively utilized within the short expenditure timeline.

Finally, the Department also prioritized the execution of awardee standard agreements, ensuring Homekey projects received a prompt internal review so projects could close escrow by the federal expenditure deadline. A further innovation with standard agreements was that certain performance milestones were permitted to be delivered to the Department after the execution of the Standard Agreement, for example relocation plans and affordability covenants. Such items would normally be required beforehand, but in light of the abbreviated timeline, the Department allowed for flexibility.

With additional time in any future iteration of the program, the Department will utilize and seek additional stakeholder input on program requirements and the program application; hire dedicated staff and comprehensively train redirected staff; and gain community and political support.

“We all have hope again.”

- Sutter County Resident
Appendices

Appendix A: Definitions

Below are the definitions for purposes of the Homekey program:

• “Applicant” or “Eligible Applicant” means a city, county, or other “local public entity,” as that term is defined at the HSC section 50079, applying to be a Development Sponsor either on its own or with another entity (such as a for-profit or nonprofit corporation, or another local public entity).

• “Area Median Income” or “AMI” means the most recent applicable county median family income published by the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) or the Department.

• “Assisted Unit” means a residential housing unit that is subject to rent, occupancy or other restrictions associated with a Homekey site.

• “At Risk of Homelessness” has the same meaning as defined in Section 578.3 of Title 24 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

• “City” means a city or county that is legally incorporated to provide local government services to its population. A city can be organized either under the general laws of this state or under a charter adopted by the local voters.

• “Chronic Homelessness” means a person who is chronically homeless, as defined in 578.3 of Title 24 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

• “Continuum of Care” means the same as defined by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development at Section 578.3 of Title 24 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

• “Department” means the Department of Housing and Community Development.

• “Development Sponsor” or “Sponsor”, as defined in Section 50675.2 of the HSC and subdivision (c) of Section 50669 of the HSC, means any individual, joint venture, partnership, limited partnership, trust, corporation, cooperative, local public entity, duly constituted governing body of an Indian reservation or rancheria, or other legal entity, or any combination thereof, certified by the Department as qualified to own, manage, and rehabilitate a rental housing development. A Development Sponsor may be organized for profit, limited profit or be nonprofit, and includes a limited partnership in which the Development Sponsor or an affiliate of the Development Sponsor is a general partner.

• “Doors” refer to the number of units at the time of the acquisition before any rehabilitation has taken place.

• “Grantee” means an Eligible Applicant that has been awarded funds under the program.

• “Homeless” has the same meaning as defined in Section 578.3 of Title 24 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Department of Housing and Community Development

• “Housing First” has the same meaning as in Welfare and Institutions Code Section 8255, including all of the core components listed therein.

• “HUD” means the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

• “Interim Housing” or “Transitional Housing” or “Congregate Shelter” means any facility whose primary purpose is to provide a temporary shelter for the Homeless in general or for specific populations of the Homeless, and which does not require occupants to sign leases or occupancy agreements.

• “Local Public Entity” means any county, city, city and county, the duly constituted governing body of an Indian reservation or rancheria, tribally designated housing entity as defined in Section 4103 of Title 25 of the United States Code and Section 50104.6.5, redevelopment agency organized pursuant to Part 1 (commencing with Section 33000) of Division 24, or housing authority organized pursuant to Part 2 (commencing with Section 34200) of Division 24, and also includes any state agency, public district, or other political subdivision of the state, and any instrumentality thereof, that is authorized to engage in or assist in the development or operation of housing for persons and families of low or moderate income. “Local public entity” also includes two or more local public entities acting jointly.

• “NOFA” means a Notice of Funding Availability.

• “Permanent Supportive Housing” has the same meaning as “supportive housing,” as defined in Section 50675.14 of the HSC, except that “Permanent Supportive Housing” shall include associated facilities if used to provide services to housing residents.

• “Permanent Housing” means a housing unit where the landlord does not limit length of stay in the housing unit, the landlord does not restrict the movements of the tenant, and the tenant has a lease and is subject to the rights and responsibilities of tenancy.

• “Project” means a multifamily structure or set of structures providing housing with common financing, ownership, and management.

• “Program Award” means the portion of program funds available for a Grantee to expend toward eligible program uses.

• “Point-in-Time Count” means a count of sheltered and unsheltered Homeless persons on a single night conducted by Continuums of Care as prescribed by HUD.

• “Rural Area” means an area defined in HSC section 50199.21.

• “Target Population” means members of the target population identified in HSC section 50675.1.1(a) are individuals and families who are experiencing homelessness or who are at risk of homelessness defined in Section 578.3 of Title 24 of the Code of Federal Regulation and who are impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

• “Unit” refers to the livable spaces created after the project is completed which are made available for operations and means a residential unit that is used as a primary residence by its occupants, including individual units within the project.

Appendix B: List of Awarded Properties

The following is a list of all Homekey funded project sites. The list is sorted by Geographic Region as detailed on page 16 of the report and includes sponsor information, location, funds awarded, doors acquired and ultimate units created as reported by grantees as of February 1, 2021. Additionally, the number of units receiving an ongoing operating subsidy GF allocation is identified. Philanthropic dollars awarded to projects for the purposes of ongoing operating subsidies are not identified but it is assumed these funds will provide operating subsidy for the identified units created.

Please Note: previous publications of the award list may indicate that the number of doors acquired varies slightly from what was reported by grantees. This is due to further inspection of sites post acquisition and resulting repairs that may have impacted total units created.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Name</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>CDF $ Awarded</th>
<th>LF $ Awarded</th>
<th>Philanthropic $ Awarded</th>
<th>Project County</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Created Units</th>
<th>Acquired Units</th>
<th>Total Subsidy</th>
<th>Project Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt County and Providence Health &amp; Services</td>
<td>Providence Eureka Housing</td>
<td>$3,795,405</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$579,000</td>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1140 4th Street, Eureka, CA 95501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yurok Tribe and Arcata House Partnership</td>
<td>APFHPA Eureka Homeless Housing Project</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$490,000</td>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1856 4th Street, Humboldt, CA 95501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Tehama</td>
<td>Sale House</td>
<td>$2,200,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$142,000</td>
<td>Tehama</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Project address withheld because of the population served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shasta County Health and Human Services Agency</td>
<td>Square One Homes</td>
<td>$1,950,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$312,000</td>
<td>Shasta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4748 Bonneville Street, Shasta Lake CA; 4234 Williams Street, Shasta Lake CA; 3774 Laurel Street Shasta Lake CA; 2879 Couser D’Alene Avenue Shasta Lake CA; 2542 Shavannah Drive, Anderson CA 96019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotts Valley Band of Pomo Indians</td>
<td>Multifamily Acquisition Project</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2061 Lakeshore Blvd, Lakeport, CA 95453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventist Health Clear Lake</td>
<td>Hope Center for Transformation Project</td>
<td>$1,852,759</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$480,000</td>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3400 Emerson St, Clearlake, CA 95422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Mendocino</td>
<td>Mendocino County Transitional Housing Facility</td>
<td>$8,325,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,344,000</td>
<td>Mendocino</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>555 South Orchard Ave, Ukiah, CA 95482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Nevada</td>
<td>Nevada County Homekey Coach and Four Project</td>
<td>$2,269,750</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$529,000</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>828 S. Auburn Street, Grass Valley, CA 95949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Del Norte</td>
<td>Homekey Del Norte</td>
<td>$1,940,026</td>
<td>$189,822</td>
<td>$694,354</td>
<td>Del Norte</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>165 S. Street, Crescent City, CA 95531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County and Jamboree Housing Corporation</td>
<td>Hikewi Court</td>
<td>$29,320,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1000 Hikewi Ct, Milpitas, CA 95035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Francisco and Episcopal Community Services</td>
<td>Granada Hotel</td>
<td>$42,334,920</td>
<td>$5,520,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1006 Sutter St, San Francisco, CA 94109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Marin</td>
<td>Towno Place Suites</td>
<td>$18,048,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1000 Tustin Dolphin Dr, Redwood City, CA 94065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Jose</td>
<td>Bottom West - Sure Stay</td>
<td>$18,068,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,085,474</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1490 North 1st St, San Jose, CA 95112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Marin</td>
<td>Bottom Value Motel</td>
<td>$3,240,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$432,000</td>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1591 Casa Buena Dr, Corte Madera, CA 94925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa County</td>
<td>East County CARE Center</td>
<td>$17,400,000</td>
<td>$4,176,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>2101 Laveridge Rd, Pittsburg, CA 94565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alford Housing</td>
<td>Santa Clara County Homekey 2</td>
<td>$8,903,333</td>
<td>$624,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2186 The Alameda, San Jose, CA 95136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Name</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>CDF $ Awarded</th>
<th>LF $ Awarded</th>
<th>Philanthropic $ Awarded</th>
<th>Project County</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Created Units</th>
<th>Acquired Units</th>
<th>Total Subsidy</th>
<th>Project Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burbank Housing</td>
<td>Napa County Homekey</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$39,000</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2561-2315 Adrian Street, Napa, CA 94558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LifeMoves and City of Mountain View</td>
<td>Homekey Mountain View</td>
<td>$11,950,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2566 Lighthouse St, Mountain View, CA 94043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Mateo</td>
<td>Pacific Inn</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>$835,000</td>
<td>$965,000</td>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dano Communities</td>
<td>Oakland Homekey # 4</td>
<td>$3,156,000</td>
<td>$340,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Marin</td>
<td>3301 Karner</td>
<td>$5,985,046</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Francisco and Episcopal Community Services</td>
<td>San Francisco Homekey 2</td>
<td>$26,900,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kashia Band of Pomo Indians and Burbank Housing</td>
<td>Kashia Homekey Project</td>
<td>$2,550,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$134,824</td>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>Clifton Hall</td>
<td>$9,583,333</td>
<td>$538,948</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td>Hotel Azura</td>
<td>$8,800,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,156,000</td>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td>Sebastopol Inn</td>
<td>$6,200,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area Community Services Housing Coop</td>
<td>Project Reclamation</td>
<td>$8,502,777</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$188,000</td>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Health Care Services Agency</td>
<td>Days Hotel</td>
<td>$15,100,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Health Care Services Agency</td>
<td>Amedica County Comfort Inn</td>
<td>$11,997,500</td>
<td>$2,448,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority of the City of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>Paso Robles Motel 6 Conversion</td>
<td>$13,900,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,140,113</td>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Housing Authority of the County of Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Homekey SBC</td>
<td>$2,614,601</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$329,383</td>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Name</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>CDF $ Awarded</th>
<th>GF $ Awarded</th>
<th>Philanthropic $ Awarded</th>
<th>Project County</th>
<th>Applicant State</th>
<th>Units with GF Operating Subsidy</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Awarded</th>
<th>CDF Subsidy</th>
<th>CDF Awarded</th>
<th>GF Subsidy</th>
<th>GF Awarded</th>
<th>Project Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>County of Los Angeles Housing Authority</td>
<td>$17,000,000</td>
<td>$3,240,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1131 Atlantic Ave, Long Beach</td>
<td>90813</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Los Angeles</td>
<td>Metal 6 Hacienda Heights</td>
<td>$12,450,000</td>
<td>$3,244,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1172 South 7th Ave, Hacienda Heights</td>
<td>90150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>Metal 6 Baldwin Park</td>
<td>$7,100,000</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>16510 Gary Ave, Baldwin Park</td>
<td>90006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>15200 Parthenia St, Los Angeles</td>
<td>$8,200,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15200 Parthenia St, North Hills</td>
<td>91343</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>1641 S. Martel, Los Angeles</td>
<td>$2,200,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1641 Martel, Los Angeles</td>
<td>90046</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>1710 W 7th St, Los Angeles</td>
<td>$10,761,186</td>
<td>$1,691,680</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1710 7th St, Los Angeles</td>
<td>90017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Long Beach</td>
<td>Homekey Project Long Beach</td>
<td>$15,195,660</td>
<td>$2,448,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1705 Long Beach Blvd, Long Beach</td>
<td>90804</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>18060 Normandie Ave, Los Angeles</td>
<td>$6,519,430</td>
<td>$725,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17015 Normandie Ave, Los Angeles</td>
<td>90049</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Los Angeles</td>
<td>Willow Tree Inn</td>
<td>$8,438,520</td>
<td>$2,496,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1019 West Artusia Blvd, Compton</td>
<td>90220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>21600 Devonshire Street LA</td>
<td>$12,214,925</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>21600 Devonshire St, Los Angeles</td>
<td>90049</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>253 S. Hoover St, Los Angeles</td>
<td>$5,704,217</td>
<td>$744,150</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>253 S. Hoover St, Los Angeles</td>
<td>90034</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>3601 S. Western Ave, Los Angeles</td>
<td>$4,011,365</td>
<td>$562,950</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3901 South Western Ave, Los Angeles</td>
<td>90018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>4701 W. Adams Blvd, Los Angeles</td>
<td>$3,155,043</td>
<td>$403,894</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4701 W Adams Blvd, Los Angeles</td>
<td>90016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>5553 Huntington Dr North LA</td>
<td>$9,865,958</td>
<td>$896,250</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5553 Huntington Dr, Los Angeles</td>
<td>90002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>Metal 6 Long Beach</td>
<td>$5,615,000</td>
<td>$1,032,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5965 East 7th Street, Long Beach</td>
<td>90804</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>7432 Roseda Blvd</td>
<td>$7,987,223</td>
<td>$1,361,250</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>7432 Roseda Blvd, Los Angeles</td>
<td>90525</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>Super 8 Canoga Park HK Project</td>
<td>$8,257,393</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7631 Topanga Canyon Blvd, Canoga Park, CA</td>
<td>91304</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Los Angeles</td>
<td>Studio 6 Los Angeles</td>
<td>$11,758,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>830 West Slauson Ave, Commerce, CA</td>
<td>90040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Los Angeles</td>
<td>Metal 6 Harbor City</td>
<td>$6,501,967</td>
<td>$1,389,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>830 West Sepulveda Blvd, Harbor City, CA</td>
<td>90710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Name</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>CRF $ Awarded</td>
<td>GF $ Awarded</td>
<td>Philanthropic $ Awarded</td>
<td>Project County</td>
<td>Senate District</td>
<td>Doors Acquired*</td>
<td>Units Created</td>
<td>Units with GF Operating Subsidy</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Assembly District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulare County and UP Holdings California, LLC and RH Community Builders LP</td>
<td>The Sequoia</td>
<td>$4,700,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>Tulare</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1400 S. Mooney Blvd, Visalia, CA 93277</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority of the City of Fresno</td>
<td>Parkside Inn</td>
<td>$3,759,124</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1415 W Olive Avenue, Fresno, CA 93728</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Stockton</td>
<td>Town Center Studies</td>
<td>$2,409,091</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$680,044</td>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1604 N. Wilson Way, Stockton, CA 95205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority of the County of Kern</td>
<td>Milestone</td>
<td>$13,300,554</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,437,806</td>
<td>Kern</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1301 Chester Ave, Bakersfield, CA, 93301; 1622 Union Ave, Bakersfield, CA, 93305; 1131 Water Street, Bakersfield, CA, 93305; 1411 E. 11th Street, Bakersfield, CA, 93307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno County and RH Community Builders and Up Holdings California, LLC</td>
<td>Crossroads Village</td>
<td>$14,818,701</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,701</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3737 N Blackstone Ave, Fresno, CA 93728</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority of the City of Fresno</td>
<td>Welcome Inn</td>
<td>$5,306,163</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>707 N Parkway Drive, Fresno, CA 93726</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings County and UP Holdings California, LLC and RH Community Builders LP</td>
<td>The Stardust</td>
<td>$2,200,000</td>
<td>$504,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Kings</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8995 Lacey Boulevard, Hesperia, Hesperia, CA 92345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Orange</td>
<td>Tahiti Motel</td>
<td>$8,380,402</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,824,000</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>450 N. G St, San Bernardino, CA 92410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura County and Community Development Partners and Merz House CHDO, Inc. and Merz House Living Centers</td>
<td>Vagabond - Ventura County Homeway</td>
<td>$10,898,333</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,680,000</td>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1245 N. Oswald Blvd, Oxnard, CA 93035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority of the City of San Bernardino</td>
<td>Pacific Village</td>
<td>$3,450,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,460,000</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2626 Pacific Street, San Bernardino, CA 92406</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Oakland Project Reclamation Sites include the following: 6922 Weld Street, 3229 Delaware Street, 2002 9th Avenue, 2700 79th Street, 1078 Pippin Street, 2244 109th Street, 924 71st Avenue, 1708 55th Street, 1240 72nd Avenue, 2500 83rd Avenue, 1716 96th Street, 10034 Volante Avenue, 1345 99th Avenue, 1659 46th Avenue., 2927 Filber Avenue.
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COVID-19 will cause twice as much homelessness as Great Recession, researchers say. Projects seeking capitalized operating subsidies for units purchased, converted, or altered were awarded with funds from the state General Fund allocation. The CRF is not permitted to be used for this purpose.
