

ATTACHMENT 1

PROPOSED 2014 – 2017 CONSOLIDATED PLAN FOR HOUSING
AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
FOR THE CITY OF SEATTLE, WASHINGTON

Note on formatting

The US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requires recipients of their Consolidated Plan funds to submit the Consolidated Plan electronically, using a template prescribed by HUD. The following Plan is the downloaded version of that electronic template.

Executive Summary

ES-05 Executive Summary - 24 CFR 91.200(c), 91.220(b)

1. Introduction

The 2014 - 2017 Consolidated Plan for Housing and Community Development provides the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) with information on the City of Seattle's intended uses of funds from four of HUD's programs:

- Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)
- Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG)
- Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA)
- HOME Investment Partnership (HOME)

Through a review of housing market, community development, homeless needs, and economic development data and our evaluation of past performance in Consolidated Plan-funded programs, we have concluded that our existing strategies for the use of these funds are still sound and should continue, with refinements. As such, our priorities for these four funds will continue to be

- Support the delivery of emergency shelter and related services for homeless persons and families
- Develop and preserve affordable rental and ownership housing
- Support low- and moderate-income neighborhoods, businesses and business districts with infrastructure and economic development assistance
- Support job training activities as part of an anti-poverty strategy

This last priority appeared in the 2013 Action Plan and responds to the need to ensure lower-income persons are provided the best opportunities to enhance their economic potential.

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

The objectives of our Consolidated Plan funding are to support low- and moderate-income Seattle residents individually (as with homeless shelters) and through business district and neighborhood improvements (as with park improvements). The planned outcomes include the provision of basic shelter for the most vulnerable, employment skills development, thriving small businesses and business districts, and enhanced physical environments for low- and moderate-income neighborhoods.

3. Evaluation of past performance

A review of past consolidated annual performance and evaluation reports reveals a strong record of performance in the use of the Consolidated Plan funds. For instance, in calendar year 2012, in combination with leveraged funds, over 500 new rent-restricted units of rental housing received financial commitments from the City and are currently under development or have been completed. Twenty-one small business loans were committed and 19 business districts received financial and technical support from the City. Over 1,300 families and individuals received homelessness prevention assistance, and 771 homeless households were moved into transitional or permanent housing.

4. Summary of citizen participation process and consultation process

Drafts of the Consolidated Plan were made available for public review on two occasions prior to formal consideration and adoption by the City. A preliminary draft was made available on August 28, 2013 via an announcement in the City's journal of record, the Daily Journal of Commerce; and via the City's Human Services website. A second draft was made available in April of 2014. Public hearings were held on September 11, 2013, and April XX, 2014.

Many components of the Consolidated Plan were built on prior plans and strategies generated by the Human Services Department (for instance, the Communities Supporting Safe and Stable Housing Plan, the Seattle Housing Levy Administration and Finance Plan, the 2012 – 2015 Area Plan on Aging, Seattle Housing Authority's 2011 – 2015 Strategic Plan). Each of these "feeder" plans contain their own public input and comment process.

5. Summary of public comments

No comments were received.

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

N/A

7. Summary

The bulk of public comment and input to this Consolidated Plan come via the processes incorporated into the various plans used to feed the strategies and data in this Plan.

The Process

PR-05 Lead & Responsible Agencies 24 CFR 91.200(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 grant program and funding source.

Agency Role	Name	Department/Agency
Lead Agency	SEATTLE	
CDBG Administrator	SEATTLE	Human Services Department
HOPWA Administrator	SEATTLE	Human Services Department
HOME Administrator	SEATTLE	Office of Housing
ESG Administrator	SEATTLE	Human Services Department
HOPWA-C Administrator		

Table 1 – Responsible Agencies

Narrative

The City of Seattle, Human Services Department, CDBG Administration Unit, is the lead agency for the development of the Consolidated Plan and the administration and management of Community Development Block Grant, Emergency Solutions Grant, and Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS funding. The City's Office of Housing is the lead agency for the administration and management of the HOME Investment Partnership program.

The Consolidated Plan funds are allocated to several City departments for implementation of programs benefitting low- and moderate-income clients and other eligible populations. The Human Services Department utilizes CDBG, ESG, and HOPWA funds to provide public services for homeless and low- and moderate-income persons, for employment training support services to eligible clients, and for minor home repair services to low- and moderate-income homeowners. The Office of Housing (OH) uses CDBG and HOME funds to provide for the preservation and development of affordable housing, assistance to qualifying homeowners in need of home repairs, and assistance benefiting qualifying homebuyers. The Office of Economic Development (OED) uses CDBG funding to promote neighborhood business development, revitalization, and workforce development, and to support small and microenterprise business assistance. The Department of Parks and Recreation uses CDBG funds to improve parks facilities serving low- and moderate-income areas of the City and to improve accessibility of neighborhood parks and facilities for those with mobility impairments. All CDBG-funded projects are reviewed and monitored by the CDBG Administration Unit for compliance with applicable federal rules and regulations.

Consolidated Plan Public Contact Information

Questions concerning the Consolidated Plan may be directed to Michael Look, CDBG Administrator for the City of Seattle. Mr. Look's phone number is 206-615-1717; his mailing address is P.O. Box 34215, Seattle, Washington, 98124-4215. Mr. Look may also be reached via e-mail at michael.look@seattle.gov.

PR-10 Consultation - 91.100, 91.200(b), 91.215(I)

1. Introduction

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

The Human Services Department, which is responsible for the development of the Consolidated Plan, touches many areas of housing and human needs. The Department has a core group of planners consisting of specialists in issues of aging, public health, homelessness and youth and family issues. The lead planner for the Consolidated Plan is a member of this planning team and taps into the expertise of the different planners. The lead Consolidated Plan planner also convenes meetings with planning staff in the Office of Housing and the Seattle Planning Commission. The Seattle Housing Authority also has a staff person on the core team for the development of the Consolidated Plan.

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

The lead planner for the Consolidated Plan also is a contributing planner to the continuum of care effort for the City of Seattle, thus ensuring coordination between the two efforts.

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

The lead planner for the Consolidated Plan also is a contributing planner to the continuum of care effort for the City of Seattle, thus ensuring coordination between the two efforts.

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

1	Agency/Group/Organization	HIV/AIDS Housing Committee
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services-Persons with HIV/AIDS Services-homeless Services-Health Service-Fair Housing Planning organization Civic Leaders
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs HOPWA Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Ongoing advisory body for HOPWA and Ryan White for housing and services for low income people with HIV/AIDS. The Committee meets bimonthly to discuss funding announcements, program coordination on behalf of clients, resources for special issues such as aging, new initiatives, and housing access. Better coordination for housing access and support and were the main outcomes.

Table 2 – Agencies, groups, organizations who participated

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

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

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

Table 3 – Other local / regional / federal planning efforts

Describe cooperation and coordination with other public entities, including the State and any adjacent units of general local government, in the implementation of the Consolidated Plan (91.215(I))

Narrative (optional):

Many other organizations and agencies were consulted or provided input into the needs analyses, data reviews, and barriers and programming options discussed in this Consolidated Plan. Unfortunately, issues with the eConPlan software prevents us from listing all of the consulted parties. We have informed OneCPD about this issue and were not able to obtain a resolution prior to the publication of this Consolidated Plan.

PR-15 Citizen Participation

1. Summary of citizen participation process/Efforts made to broaden citizen participation
Summarize citizen participation process and how it impacted goal-setting

See comments in PR-10.

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

The City of Seattle's Consolidated Plan seeks to connect people with resources and solutions so that everyone can live, learn, work, and take part in strong, healthy communities. The Human Services Department (HSD), Office of Housing (OH), Office of Economic Development (OED), the Parks and Recreation Department and many other divisions and partners like the Seattle Housing Authority (SHA) coordinate to advance this goal.

Specifically, HSD contracts with more than 230 community-based human service providers and administers programs to ensure Seattle residents have food and shelter, productive education and job opportunities, adequate health care, opportunities to gain social and economic independence and success, and many more of life's basic necessities. HSD's Strategic Plan, "Healthy Communities, Healthy Families," identifies a set of goals and actions to position HSD to better serve clients and strengthen the City's overall service delivery system. The strategic plan includes four key goals:

- Create a Proactive, Seamless Service System;
- Strengthen and Expand Partnerships;
- Engage and Partner with the Community; and
- Use Data-Driven Design and Evaluation.

The City of Seattle's annual budget in 2013 is approximately \$4 billion. Of that total, approximately \$148.1 million is set aside for health and human services. The 2014-2018 Consolidated Plan governs expenditure of approximately \$21 million from four federal funds (CDBG/HOME/HOPWA/ESG) that are part of the resources allocated to meet the needs described in the attached Part 1 and 2 below.

NA Overview Part 1

Housing

Findings from the Planning Commission's 2011 *Housing Seattle* report:

- The share of cost-burdened households (i.e., households spending more than 30% of their income on housing) has increased for low and middle-income households as well as, and for households overall.

- Almost two-thirds of households with incomes up to 80% of HUD Area Median Family Income (HAMFI) are cost-burdened. In general, renters are much more likely to be severely cost-burdened (that is, to spend more than 50% of their income) than owners, with a majority severely cost burdened households comprised of renters with extremely low incomes (0-30% of HAMFI).
- Only about 25 percent of the overall rental housing stock is unaffordable for households whose income is 50% of HAMFI or less.
- A larger proportion of rental units are affordable for households up to 80% of HAMFI. Only about 20 percent of market-rate units in large multifamily properties built from 2005 to 2009 were affordable even at 80% of HAMFI.

Further considerations:

- It is important to note that the analysis performed with the 2005-2009 ACS data looks only at renter households who reside in Seattle. **It doesn't factor in households who would like to live in Seattle but who cannot find affordable housing suitable for their household.**
- **Some of the most concerning statistics from the Planning Commission's *Housing Seattle* report relate to the supply of affordable family-size housing.** Housing a greater share of King County's families with children is an explicit goal in Seattle's Comprehensive Plan, but one we are unlikely to meet without more rental units suitable for families. This is an important consideration for RSJI goals as well, since households of color tend to have larger families.
- HUD's affordability standard—that housing is affordable if it requires no more than 30 percent of household income.
- In reality, the **percentage of income that households can afford for housing is likely to vary depending on how much income the households have.**
- The amount that households can affordably spend on housing depends on the amount households need to spend on other basics. These costs can vary tremendously depending on household characteristics and household members stage in life.

For a detailed analysis of Seattle's housing conditions, market trends and impact on housing affordability see the "Housing Seattle" report by the Seattle Planning Commission (Winter 2011). Also note that the City of Seattle is updating its 20-Year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan in 2013. Strategies that support housing affordability and diversity are always integral to the Comprehensive Plan.

NA Overview Part 2

Homelessness

Seattle/King County's 10-Year Plan to End Homelessness has served as a guiding effort to coordinate a system of services across the City and King County that focuses on ending rather than institutionalizing homelessness. The 2011 Annual Report excerpt below documents both progress and continuing needs for homeless families and individuals.

2011 King County-wide Accomplishments:

Creating housing

- **679** Number of homeless housing units opened
- **5,046** Total number of homeless housing units funded through 2011 (53% of our goal of 9,500 units)

Preventing homelessness and moving people rapidly into housing

- **3,072** People moved to permanent housing from emergency shelter or transitional housing
- **930** People moved to permanent housing from service only programs
- **66%** Percent reduction in jail days for “high utilizers” of jail or emergency services after Client Care Coordination placement in supportive housing

But the Need Continues

During the January 2013 Point-In-Time (PIT) count, there were more than **4,693 persons** who were homeless in the City of Seattle. This number included at least **1,989 persons** who were unsheltered, and **2,704 persons** who were in shelters and transitional housing programs. See NA-40 for more detail.

Individuals and families face a variety of challenges that can place them at greater risk of housing instability and homelessness, including mental illness, chemical dependency, histories of trauma, domestic violence, disabling health issues, criminal justice system involvement, immigration status, lack of education, unemployment and financial barriers including credit and landlord histories.

For more detail on the supportive housing needs of other populations, see the plans listed below:

People Living with HIV/AIDS: see HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PERSONS WITH AIDS Investment Plan 2013-2016

Elderly: see 2012-2015 Area Plan on Aging New Partners for New Times

People with disabilities: Based on 2008 - 2012 ACS data, 4.8% of Seattle residents, or just over 27,000, report "ambulatory difficulties." Overall, 24% report some disability.

Public Housing residents: see Bold Plans in the Face of Uncertainty - 2011 to 2015 Strategic Plan - Seattle Housing Authority

Immigrants & Refugees: see Immigrant and Refugee Initiative Action Plan

Survivors of Domestic Violence: see the City's Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Prevention website

Persons with substance abuse addictions: see the City's Public Health Initiatives and Funding website

Youth & Young Adult: see a new [Comprehensive Plan to End Youth and Young Adult Homelessness in King County by 2020](#) is in final draft and anticipated to be completed early in the fall of 2013

NA-10 Housing Needs Assessment - 24 CFR 91.205 (a,b,c)

Summary of Housing Needs

See NA-05 Overview and link to **2011 Housing Seattle report** for details on housing needs.

Demographics	Base Year: 2000	Most Recent Year: 2009	% Change
Population	563,374	594,005	5%
Households	270,524	277,014	2%
Median Income	\$45,736.00	\$58,990.00	29%

Table 5 - Housing Needs Assessment Demographics

Data Source: 2000 Census (Base Year), 2005-2009 ACS (Most Recent Year)

Number of Households Table

	0-30% HAMFI	>30-50% HAMFI	>50-80% HAMFI	>80-100% HAMFI	>100% HAMFI
Total Households *	43,665	31,305	42,285	27,790	
Small Family Households *	7,235	7,185	9,965	66,730	
Large Family Households *	995	1,080	1,395	5,385	
Household contains at least one person 62-74 years of age	6,525	4,095	4,895	2,735	14,055
Household contains at least one person age 75 or older	7,065	4,920	4,870	2,685	7,060
Households with one or more children 6 years old or younger *	3,045	3,200	3,635	20,420	
* the highest income category for these family types is >80% HAMFI					

Table 6 - Total Households Table

Data Source: 2005-2009 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	1,850	740	560	300	3,450	90	40	60	155	345
Severely Overcrowded - With >1.51 people per room (and complete kitchen and plumbing)	510	395	285	180	1,370	10	10	40	55	115
Overcrowded - With 1.01-1.5 people per room (and none of the above problems)	560	410	525	145	1,640	10	195	160	65	430
Housing cost burden greater than 50% of income (and none of the above problems)	20,760	5,045	1,515	165	27,485	5,200	4,310	3,430	2,120	15,060
Housing cost burden greater than 30% of income (and none of the above problems)	4,860	10,510	8,520	2,325	26,215	1,350	1,745	4,670	4,425	12,190

	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
Zero/negative Income (and none of the above problems)	1,630	0	0	0	1,630	500	0	0	0	500

Table 7 – Housing Problems Table

Data 2005-2009 CHAS
Source:

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	23,680	6,590	2,880	790	33,940	5,305	4,555	3,685	2,400	15,945
Having none of four housing problems	10,400	15,230	24,785	14,635	65,050	2,150	4,930	10,935	9,965	27,980
Household has negative income, but none of the other housing problems	1,630	0	0	0	1,630	500	0	0	0	500

Table 8 – Housing Problems 2

Data 2005-2009 CHAS
Source:

Renter Households with ≥ 1 of 4 Severe Housing Problems			
0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI
71%	30%	10%	5%
Owner Households with ≥ 1 of 4 Severe Housing Problems			
0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI
67%	48%	25%	19%

% Renter HH with Severe Hsg Probs

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	5,170	3,325	1,995	10,490	1,065	1,825	2,740	5,630
Large Related	705	325	90	1,120	79	430	640	1,149
Elderly	5,650	2,420	1,290	9,360	3,425	2,400	1,800	7,625
Other	16,245	10,245	6,835	33,325	2,075	1,575	3,060	6,710
Total need by income	27,770	16,315	10,210	54,295	6,644	6,230	8,240	21,114

Table 9 – Cost Burden > 30%

Data 2005-2009 CHAS
Source:

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	3,865	1,035	195	5,095	990	1,615	1,255	3,860
Large Related	595	155	0	750	75	380	275	730
Elderly	3,400	935	455	4,790	2,345	1,185	645	4,175
Other	14,325	3,180	935	18,440	1,890	1,290	1,310	4,490
Total need by income	22,185	5,305	1,585	29,075	5,300	4,470	3,485	13,255

Table 10 – Cost Burden > 50%

Data 2005-2009 CHAS
Source:

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	900	765	520	0	2,185	10	105	165	0	280
Multiple, unrelated family households	30	50	100	0	180	10	110	29	0	149
Other, non-family households	194	120	210	0	524	0	0	4	0	4
Total need by income	1,124	935	830	0	2,889	20	215	198	0	433

Table 11 – Crowding Information – 1/2

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total
Households with Children Present	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 12 – Crowding Information – 2/2

Data Source:
Comments:

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

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.

What are the most common housing problems?

Severe housing cost burden.

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

Extremely low-income renters and owners. It can be inferred from Table 6 that individuals are most likely to be severely housing cost burdened. They are not included in the tabulations, but likely fall into the other category.

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

An estimated 3% of Seattle's extremely low-income renter households with severe housing burdens are large families. Information on the characteristics of individual and families with children who are currently entering the homeless assistance system is gathered through Safe Harbors, the Seattle/King County Continuum of Care HMIS, and from Family Housing Connection (FHC), our coordinated entry and assessment system for households with children who are experiencing and imminent risk of homelessness. A coordinated engagement and assessment for youth/young adults (under the age of 25) is being designed and implemented. A system for individual adults (households without children) will be developed in 2014. *See "Characteristics of LI Families with Children" attached above.*

The most recent reports filed with HUD as part of the Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR) are found on the Safe Harbors webpage (www.safeharbors.org).

Seattle shelters participating in the Safe Harbors HMIS system assisted more than 7,486 people in single individual shelters (households without children) and more than 1,072 persons (households with children) during the 2012 AHAR reporting year (10/1/2011-9/30/2012). The characteristics of the sheltered population indicate that people of color were disproportionately represented in the shelter system, relative to the general population. Households have extremely low-incomes. Many families with children report they are experiencing homelessness for the first time.

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:

A specific definition for "at-risk" has not been defined. City of Seattle, in conjunction with its CoC partners from across King County, are using data from coordinated entry and assessment and homelessness prevention programs, along with national studies and best practices to target resources to households.

The Continuum of Care in Seattle/King County introduced a coordinated entry and assessment system for families with children in April 2012. A coordinated engagement and assessment system for youth/young adults is in design and implementation planning; a system for individual adults (households without children) will be developed in 2014.

The coordinated entry system for families with children who are homeless assesses needs for households who are at-risk of homelessness / losing housing within 14 days. The characteristics of families assessed by FHC are included above (as part of the Additional Narrative answer to the question: “What are the most common housing problems.”)

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

Information from the CoC Safe Harbors, HMIS system and coordinated entry and engagement systems are helping define characteristics for populations at greatest risk of homelessness. Investment and intervention strategies help to prevent homelessness among individuals, families with children and youth. Programs are designed to help households achieve more stable housing, especially those who have a history of being homeless, doubled-up, living in other temporary housing situations due to lack of available, affordable, appropriate shelter and housing.

The coordinated entry system for families with children who are homeless assesses needs for households who are at-risk of homelessness / losing housing within 14 days. The characteristics of families assessed by FHC are included above (as part of the Additional Narrative answer to the question: “What are the most common housing problems.”)

Discussion

NA-15 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Problems – 91.205 (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

Analysis of the 2005-2009 ACS 5-year estimates shows no disproportionately greater housing need among any of the racial or ethnic groups identified below.

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	35,195	6,340	2,130
White	20,615	3,440	1,220
Black / African American	5,645	795	190
Asian	4,890	1,480	505
American Indian, Alaska Native	455	145	40
Pacific Islander	205	0	20
Hispanic	2,300	280	115

Table 13 - Disproportionally Greater Need 0 - 30% AMI

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

*The four housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities,
2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities,
3. More than one person per room,
4. Cost Burden greater than 30%



The four housing problems are: 1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than one person per room, 4. Cost Burden greater than 30%

Table 12 - Disprop Need by Ethnicity 0-30% AMI

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	23,400	7,905	0
White	15,770	5,320	0
Black / African American	2,325	860	0
Asian	2,715	880	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	230	40	0
Pacific Islander	60	115	0
Hispanic	1,480	500	0

Table 14 - Disproportionally Greater Need 30 - 50% AMI

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

*The four housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than one person per room, 4. Cost Burden greater than 30%




Table 13 - Disprop Need by Ethnicity 30-50% AMI

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	19,755	22,530	0
White	14,255	16,040	0
Black / African American	1,165	1,505	0
Asian	2,230	2,370	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	119	325	0
Pacific Islander	10	100	0
Hispanic	1,410	1,230	0

Table 15 - Disproportionally Greater Need 50 - 80% AMI

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

*The four housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities,
2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities,
3. More than one person per room,
4. Cost Burden greater than 30%




Table 14 - Disprop Need by Ethnicity 50-80% AMI

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	9,940	17,850	0
White	7,985	12,815	0
Black / African American	510	1,280	0
Asian	885	1,760	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	45	195	0
Pacific Islander	30	70	0
Hispanic	205	1,000	0

Table 16 - Disproportionally Greater Need 80 - 100% AMI

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

*The four housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities,
2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities,
3. More than one person per room,
4. Cost Burden greater than 30%




Table 15 - Disprop Need by Ethnicity 80-100% AMI

Discussion

Based on HUD’s definition of disparate impact (percent of households with housing problems or \$0 or negative income > 10% than the jurisdiction as a whole for the income category), this data does not reveal disparate impacts on any particular racial or ethnic group, with the exception of extremely low-income Pacific Islanders. However, we would want to examine the severe housing cost burden data by race/ethnicity and income group before taking any conclusions. Please note that the margins of error make the statistics for some categories of households not as reliable as others (e.g. Pacific Islanders; American Indian, Alaska Native).

**NA-20 Disproportionately Greater Need: Severe Housing Problems – 91.205
(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

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	28,985	12,550	2,130
White	17,135	6,920	1,220
Black / African American	4,720	1,710	190
Asian	3,700	2,670	505
American Indian, Alaska Native	330	275	40
Pacific Islander	205	0	20
Hispanic	1,975	605	115

Table 17 – Severe Housing Problems 0 - 30% AMI

Data Source: 2005-2009 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%



*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%

Table 16 - Severe Hsg Prob by Ethnicity 0-30% AMI

Percentage of Low-income Households with Any of 4 Severe Housing Problems*



* 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%

Map % of LI HH - Any Severe Hsg Problem

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	11,145	20,160	0
White	7,440	13,645	0
Black / African American	1,120	2,060	0
Asian	1,325	2,270	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	70	205	0
Pacific Islander	35	140	0
Hispanic	810	1,170	0

Table 18 – Severe Housing Problems 30 - 50% AMI

Data Source: 2005-2009 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%




Table - 17 Severe Hsg Prob by Ethnicity 30-50% AMI

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	6,565	35,720	0
White	4,270	26,025	0
Black / African American	550	2,125	0
Asian	955	3,650	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	0	445	0
Pacific Islander	10	100	0
Hispanic	630	2,015	0

Table 19 – Severe Housing Problems 50 - 80% AMI

Data Source: 2005-2009 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%




Table 18 - Severe Hsg Prob by Ethnicity 50-80% AMI

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	3,190	24,600	0
White	2,265	18,535	0
Black / African American	280	1,515	0
Asian	435	2,210	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	0	240	0
Pacific Islander	30	70	0
Hispanic	85	1,125	0

Table 20 – Severe Housing Problems 80 - 100% AMI

Data Source: 2005-2009 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%




Table 19 Severe Hsg Prob by Ethnicity 80-100% AMI

Discussion

NA-25 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens – 91.205 (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 NA-05 Overview for link to the **2011 Housing Seattle report** for more detail. See also NA-30 Introduction.

Housing Cost Burden

Housing Cost Burden	<=30%	30-50%	>50%	No / negative income (not computed)
Jurisdiction as a whole	170,275	57,325	47,160	2,260
White	131,850	42,300	30,965	1,220
Black / African American	8,255	3,920	5,990	210
Asian	17,085	6,280	5,585	550
American Indian, Alaska Native	1,080	535	290	95
Pacific Islander	655	35	210	20
Hispanic	6,660	2,535	2,735	125

Table 21 – Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens AMI

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS




Table 20 Disprop Need Greater Hsg Cost Burden by Ethnicity ÷ AMI

Discussion:

NA-30 Disproportionately Greater Need: Discussion – 91.205(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?

Almost all non-white racial and ethnic groups that HUD called out for this Plan appear to have disproportionately greater housing needs. Excerpted from "Incidence of Housing Cost Burdens and Related Housing Problems Among Renter Households in Seattle" – 8/26/13 for RSJI Legislative Dept. Change team presentation.

Estimates from the American Community Survey (ACS) indicate that about 4 in 10 (41% of) renter households in Seattle have incomes of no more than 50% of HUD-Adjusted Area Median Family Income (HAMFI).

Breaking down the data into more detailed income categories reveals that:

- Slightly more than one-fourth (26%) of renter households in the city have *extremely* low incomes (0-30% of HAMFI).
- Another 16% have very low incomes (>30% up to 50% of HAMFI).

White households make up the majority of Seattle’s renter as well as owner households. Although households of color are disproportionately likely to rent, most renter households are White. White households make up a small majority of renter households within lower income categories, and a large majority of renter households with incomes over 80% HAMFI.

However, much larger shares of renter households of color than White renter households have very low or extremely low incomes. Roughly 35% of renter households who are White have incomes of no more than 50% of HAMFI, while 54% of renter households of color have incomes this low.

Among renter households, households in each of the major race/ethnic categories of color are more likely than White households to have incomes of 0-50% HAMFI:

- Almost two-thirds (66%) of Black renter households and more than half (55%) of Asian renter households have incomes of no more than 50% of HAMFI.
- Roughly 45% of Hispanic renter households have incomes this low.

HUD considers households spending more than 30% of their income on housing costs to be cost burdened, and households spending more than 50% to be severely cost burdened. (In the charts below, the red part of the bars indicates severe cost burdened households and the orange indicates households who are cost burdened more moderately cost burdened.)

About 42% of renter households in Seattle are cost burdened. About half of these cost-burdened renter households—or 21% of Seattle renter households overall—are severely cost burdened, paying more than 50% of their income for housing.

More than half of the cost-burdened renter households in Seattle are White. However, cost burdens fall disproportionately on households of color.

- Overall about 48% of renter households of color are burdened by unaffordable housing costs compared with 40% of White, non-Hispanic renter households.

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

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

Most of these populations are concentrated in Southeast Seattle neighborhoods. CPD Maps also shows some lesser concentrations of black households in parts of Delridge, Licton Springs, Westwood-Highland Park, and in the NE corner of the city. Hispanics are more scattered throughout the City – White Center, the Central Area, Delridge, Interbay, Westwood-Highland Park as well as some SE Seattle neighborhoods.

NA-35 Public Housing – 91.205(b)

Introduction

Seattle Housing Authority (SHA) provides long-term rental housing and rental assistance to more than 15,000 households through Low Income Public Housing (LIPH) and Housing Choice Vouchers (also referred to as Section 8 or HCV).

SHA's Low Income Public Housing (LIPH) stock totals 6,335 units as of year end 2012, which are located in neighborhoods throughout the City of Seattle (see list of SHA's communities with public housing units attached below).

SHA's public housing stock provides a range of bedroom sizes, as well as opportunities for specific populations, such as the buildings in our Seattle Senior Housing Program (SSHP). While most of SHA's public housing units are located in apartment buildings, some are located in smaller, multi-family buildings and houses in our Scattered Site portfolio.

In accordance with the Section 504 Voluntary Compliance Agreement signed in 2007, SHA has made significant progress towards completing 263 UFAS units and will continue to commit at least five percent of new construction to accessible units. As of year end 2012, 190 UFAS units had already been certified.

The overall condition of SHA's public housing units is good. SHA's average score of 87 percent for 2011 REAC inspections reflects the close scrutiny paid to maintenance and repairs at SHA buildings, a challenge given the fact that many SHA buildings are aging. SHA has also recently added new public housing stock, including an ARRA-funded project at Lake City Village and HOPE VI communities, including High Point, Rainier Vista, and New Holly, all of which are in very good condition. SHA has also begun work to redevelop Yesler Terrace, our oldest housing development, and continuing this work will be essential.

Federal underfunding has resulted in a backlog of capital projects, as well as making it challenging for SHA to maintain operating funding for regular repairs and maintenance. While SHA has been successful in leveraging other resources, including tax credits and bonds, the agency still faces a significant backlog. In the short-term, capital needs in the scattered site portfolio total \$1.8 million within the next year. In the long-term, the majority of SHA's public housing stock will hit the 50 year mark within the next ten years and as a result will require major sewer and electrical work as part of its lifecycle, totaling \$25 to 30 million. Twenty buildings will also need new roofs, at a cost of approximately \$250,000 per roof.

Underfunding places SHA in a difficult position, where in order to maintain the condition of housing stock, the agency must make difficult choices. For example, SHA must consider whether to retain the scattered site portfolio, which is more costly to maintain as it is located in smaller buildings dispersed throughout the city, or dispose of it in favor of more consolidated stock. .

More than 8,000 tenant-based and project-based vouchers are currently in use in Seattle, but demand is much higher than supply. SHA reopened the waiting list for Housing Choice Vouchers in early 2013 and received 24,000 applications.

Waiting lists for public housing units also indicate high demand. As of year end 2012, 6,700 households were waiting for traditional public housing units and the average wait time for new move-ins to public housing was 26 months. Thousands more households were waiting on individual site-based waiting lists for public housing units in HOPE VI communities.

Totals in Use

	Program Type								
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers			Special Purpose Voucher		
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
# of units vouchers in use	0	589	5,037	5,409	2,092	3,077	126	70	44

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)

2. Totals in Use

Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Total: vouchers	Project-based vouchers	Tenant-based vouchers	VASH	FUP	Disabled
0	759	6,335	8,798	2,927	5,871	260	200	75

Source: Moving to Work 2012 Annual Report

Table 21 - SHA MTW 2012 Totals In Use

2013 List of SHA Public Housing Communities

- Aki Kurose
- Ballard House
- Barton Place
- Beacon Tower
- Bell Tower
- Bitter Lake Manor
- Blakeley Manor
- Cal-Mor Circle
- Capitol Park
- Carroll Terrace
- Cedarvale House
- Cedarvale Village
- Center Park
- Center West
- Columbia Place
- Denice Hunt Townhomes
- Denny Terrace
- Fort Lawton Place
- Fremont Place
- Gideon-Mathews Gardens
- Green Lake Plaza
- Harvard Court
- High Point
- Holly Court
- International Terrace
- Island View
- Jackson Park House
- Jackson Park Village
- Jefferson Terrace
- Lake City Court
- Lake City House
- Lictonwood
- Longfellow Court/Westwood Court
- Longfellow Creek Apartments
- Meadowbrook View Apartments
- Michaelson Manor
- Nelson Manor
- NewHolly
- Olive Ridge
- Olmsted Manor
- Olympic West
- Phinney Terrace
- Pinehurst Court
- Pleasant Valley Plaza
- Primeau Place
- Queen Anne Heights
- Rainier Vista
- Reunion House
- Ross Manor
- Roxhill Court Apartments
- Scattered Sites
- Schwabacher House
- Stewart Manor
- Sunrise Manor
- Tamarack Place
- Tri-Court
- University House
- University West
- West Town View
- Westwood Heights
- Wildwood Glen
- Willis House
- Wisteria Court
- Yesler Terrace

|
2013 List of SHA PH Communities

Characteristics of Residents

	Program Type							
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers			Special Purpose Voucher	
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program
Average Annual Income	0	6,689	12,634	10,876	8,902	12,324	9,732	7,559
Average length of stay	0	3	8	4	2	6	0	0
Average Household size	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	2
# Homeless at admission	0	48	1	31	2	7	19	3
# of Elderly Program Participants (>62)	0	98	1,612	1,242	486	724	16	0
# of Disabled Families	0	333	1,763	2,081	927	1,021	98	7
# of Families requesting accessibility features	0	589	5,037	5,409	2,092	3,077	126	70
# 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 23 – Characteristics of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

3. Characteristics of Residents

	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Total: vouchers	Project-based vouchers	Tenant-based vouchers	VASH	FUP	Disabled
Average annual income	0	6,689	12,634	10,876	8,902	12,324	9,732	7,559	12,031
Average length of stay	0	6	8	6	3	7	0	0	8
Average household size	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	2	1
# homeless at admission	0	48	1	31	2	7	19	3	0
# of elderly program participants >62	0	211	2,818	2,231	661	1,570	16	0	16
# of disabled families	0	333	1,763	2,081	927	1,021	98	7	28
# of families requesting accessibility features	0	Unknown	178	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
# of HIV/AIDS participants	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
# of DV victims	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown

Source: Moving to Work 2012 Annual Report; SHA records on LIPH in-unit modification requests; PIC

*Note: Due to Seattle Housing Authority's admission preferences, homeless at admission is only documented if a household does not qualify for an admission preference by being under 30 percent of Area Median Income.

*Note: Seattle Housing Authority does not maintain data on families requesting accessibility features in the voucher programs, as these requests are made to their landlords. Data on accessibility requests in public housing is a four year average of requests for in-unit modifications in the public housing program.

*Note: Seattle Housing Authority does not maintain data on HIV/AIDS or domestic violence status.

Table 22 - SHA Characteristics of Residents by Prog Type (updated)

Race of Residents

Race	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Program Type					
				Vouchers			Special Purpose Voucher		
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
White	0	377	1,998	2,233	1,022	1,094	70	22	25
Black/African American	0	158	1,884	2,458	828	1,528	51	34	17
Asian	0	10	1,031	541	160	372	2	5	2
American Indian/Alaska Native	0	40	104	130	56	63	3	8	0
Pacific Islander	0	4	15	47	26	20	0	1	0
Other	0	0	5	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)

4. Race of Residents

	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Total: vouchers	Project-based vouchers	Tenant-based vouchers	VASH	FUP	Disabled
White	0	375	2,567	3,101	1,255	1,846	70	22	25
Black	0	171	2,075	3,371	1,129	2,242	51	34	17
Asian	0	146	1,172	848	254	594	2	5	2
American Indian, Alaska Native	0	38	123	192	70	122	3	8	0
Pacific Islander	0	3	17	63	32	31	0	1	0
Other	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0

Source: Moving to Work 2012 Annual Report

Table 23 Race of Residents by Prog Type (updated)

Ethnicity of Residents

Ethnicity	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Program Type					
				Vouchers			Special Purpose Voucher		
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
Hispanic	0	44	196	261	99	139	8	12	3
Not Hispanic	0	545	4,836	5,148	1,993	2,938	118	58	41

*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)

5. Ethnicity of Residents

	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Total: vouchers	Project-based vouchers	Tenant-based vouchers	VASH	FUP	Disabled
Hispanic	0	47	287	342	126	216	8	12	3
Not Hispanic	0	686	5,687	7,233	2,614	4,619	118	58	41

Source: Moving to Work 2012 Annual Report

Table 24 Ethnicity of Residents by Prog Type (updated)

Section 504 Needs Assessment: Describe the needs of public housing tenants and applicants on the waiting list for accessible units:

In addition to creating certified UFAS units (190 as of year end 2012), SHA approves and completes approximately 90 unit modifications each year in response to Reasonable Accommodation requests. The needs of tenants and applicants are varied and SHA makes a variety of accommodations to meet them. SHA has established a thorough process to identify and address accessibility needs. During the admissions process, each household is asked about the nature and extent of their needs and those that identify a need related to accessibility proceed with a thorough review process to evaluate what accommodations are needed for their units.

Most immediate needs of residents of Public Housing and Housing Choice voucher holders

Public housing residents and HCV voucher holders have extremely low incomes. As of year-end 2012 their average income was \$13,266. As a result, many need help to build their assets, including targeted sector job training, financial literacy, credit score improvement, and the promotion of savings accounts through Earned Income Tax Credit refunds and other incentive programs. Residents seeking education to improve their financial situation would also benefit from regulatory relief from the student rule in tax credit funding, a funding source used in many of SHA's properties, which makes it difficult for subsidized housing residents to obtain education later in life.

Low income public housing residents and voucher holders clearly also need continued access to housing assistance. The average rent in the Seattle metropolitan area is approximately \$1,500, which would require more than 100 percent of the average monthly income of an SHA resident. Many SHA participants also need help to maintain their stability in housing, including case management and access to mental health and disability services. More than 8,000 of SHA's participants are living with disabilities.

Supporting seniors in SHA housing is also an immediate need that will continue to increase as the population ages. Seniors need supports to age in place in SHA units, which traditionally do not have the supportive services they would need.

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

While the difficult economy poses challenges for many families, needs are generally more acute among SHA participants, as evidenced by the fact that nearly all (97 percent) of SHA households fall below 50 percent of the Area Median Income (AMI). The great majority (85 percent) have extremely low incomes of less than 30 percent of AMI.

Discussion

SHA participants need housing assistance and services that will allow them to maintain their housing stability and increase their income and assets.

NA-40 Homeless Needs Assessment – 91.205(c)

Introduction:

Tables in NA-40 and the attachments describe the nature and extent of homelessness in Seattle using data from the Homelessness Management Information System, Safe Harbors, and our community’s Point-in-Time count, the One Night Count of Persons who are unsheltered in King County.

During the January 2013 Point-In-Time (PIT) count, there were more than 4,693 persons who were homeless in the City of Seattle. This number included at least 1,989 persons who were unsheltered, and 2,704 persons who were in shelters and transitional housing programs. Data in Table 25 represents the participating programs located in Seattle that are participating in the HMIS system only.

Some of the contributing factors to homelessness include high costs for housing and living expenses, extremely low household incomes, declining federal housing subsidies, and limited support systems, including the availability of medical and behavioral health services.

Individuals and families face a variety of personal challenges that can place them at greater risk of housing instability and homelessness, including mental illness, chemical dependency, histories of trauma, domestic violence, disabling health issues, criminal justice system involvement, immigration status, lack of education, unemployment and other financial barriers including credit and landlord histories.

See additional statistical highlights in the "Intro Continued" text attached below the Homeless Needs Assessment table.

Homeless Needs Assessment

Population	Estimate the # of persons experiencing homelessness on a given night		Estimate the # experiencing homelessness each year	Estimate the # becoming homeless each year	Estimate the # exiting homelessness each year	Estimate the # of days persons experience homelessness
	Sheltered	Unsheltered				
Persons in Households with Adult(s) and Child(ren)	0	865	1,859	0	459	0

Population	Estimate the # of persons experiencing homelessness on a given night		Estimate the # experiencing homelessness each year	Estimate the # becoming homeless each year	Estimate the # exiting homelessness each year	Estimate the # of days persons experience homelessness
	Sheltered	Unsheltered				
Persons in Households with Only Children	0	0	149	0	24	0
Persons in Households with Only Adults	0	1,839	8,327	0	530	0
Chronically Homeless Individuals	0	0	2,204	0	55	0
Chronically Homeless Families	0	0	0	0	0	0
Veterans	0	0	1,404	0	135	0
Unaccompanied Child	0	0	124	0	21	0
Persons with HIV	0	0	40	0	9	0

Table 26 - Homeless Needs Assessment

Sheltered Count: The sheltered count is estimated using data from publicly funded emergency shelter and transitional housing programs in Seattle. Data reported on the sheltered count was taken from the 2012 AHAR report point-in-time count for the night of January 25, 2013. On that night, there were at least 2,704 persons sheltered in these programs. The 2013 One Night Count Point-In-Time Count occurred on the night of January 23-24; for all programs in King County (publicly and privately funded), and there were an estimated 6,326 persons who were sheltered that night. Figures from the Seattle/King County Point-In-Time Count are included below. Note: Figures include all of Seattle & King County.

Data Source Comments:

Intro (continued)

Information from the Safe Harbors HMIS 2012 Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR) submitted to HUD; information from shelter / transitional housing provider reports; data from Family Housing Connection, a new coordinated entry system for families with children; and data from the King County Comprehensive Plan to End Youth and Young Adult Homelessness indicate:

For persons in households with only adults:

- More than 7,486 adults without children were served by “single adult” shelter programs in Seattle in 2012.

- Over half (58%) of the individuals in shelters for adults without children report having a disability.
- Chronically homeless individuals represented over 26% of the individuals served in single adult shelters in 2012.
- Over 1/3 (36%) of the individuals served in shelters for adults without children were over the age of 50.

For families with children:

- Many families are experiencing homelessness for the first time.
- Household incomes are extremely low, averaging less than \$700/month.
- There were more than 643 children under the age of 18 served in emergency shelters in Seattle, and over 43% of these were infants, toddlers or pre-schoolers who were less than 5 years old.
- There were more than 542 children under the age of 18 served in transitional housing programs in Seattle, and over 51% were less than 5 years old.
- 38% of the people served in transitional housing programs for families with children were in a household with five or more people.

For Veterans:

- Veterans are over-represented among homeless individuals; over 16% of individual adults in shelters reported they had serviced in the military.
- Of the 1,136 veterans served in single adult emergency shelters, over 36% identified as a person of color. 57% were over the age of 50 years old.
- People of color, particularly Black/African Americans are disproportionately represented among those who are homeless in the shelter/transitional housing system, representing 28% of people served in single adult emergency shelters and 71% of people served in family shelters.

For Unaccompanied Children, homeless youth and young adults:

- In 2012, 5,229 unique youth and young adults participated in a homeless program in Seattle/King County.
- Approximately 2/3 (67%) of youth/young adults in HMIS identified as a person of color.
- In January 2013, during Count Us In, 776 youth/young adults were counted as homeless or unstably housed in King County.

- Of those identified during the 2013 Count Us In, 12% were under the age of 18; 23% identified as LGBTQ; and 60% identified as a person of color.
- The 2013 Count Us In found at least 114 youth and young adults were sleeping outside or in a place not meant for human habitation.
- The majority of clients in the youth/ young adult system (63%) are between the ages of 18 – 21.
- 9% of clients in the youth / young adult system in 2012 met the definition of chronically homeless.

Compared to their stably housed peers, homeless YYA:

- Homeless Youth/Young Adults experience higher rates of substance and alcohol use;
- Have higher rates of mental health symptoms; are 2.5 times more likely to be arrested as adults; and are 50% less likely to have a GED or high school diploma.

Detail on data for experiencing homelessness

Estimating the Number of people *Experiencing* Homelessness each year

Data on the estimated number of people experiencing homelessness in a year included is from the Safe Harbors HMIS 2012 Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR) as submitted to HUD. These numbers represent the total number of single adults, persons in households with children, and unaccompanied youth, served in HMIS-participating emergency shelters and transitional housing programs during the 2012 AHAR period (10/1/2011 – 9/30/2012). A total of 400 programs participate in Safe Harbors HMIS, representing 82% of beds available to single adults and 81% of beds available to families with children in Seattle and King County.

These figures do not capture 100% of the people experiencing homelessness in our communities; it only captures those who were served in an emergency shelter or transitional housing program during the report period. People who did not touch the service system, were served only through day centers or hygiene centers, or those who are “doubled up” are not included in these figures.

Detail on data for becoming Homeless

Estimating the Number of People who *become* homeless each year

The Seattle/King County Continuum of Care does not have a way of estimating the number of people who become homeless each year. Our community is finalizing our HEARTH measure methodology and do not want to provide data on this measure until we have a consistent methodology. We are determining how to account for unidentified data in this measure.

Through the Safe Harbors HMIS system, there is data available on the number of people who enter shelter for the first time (or who have not entered shelter in the last two years), but not on the number of people who become homeless each year. A proportion of people who enter the shelter system do not consent to having information identified in HMIS. The large number of unknown or unidentified records in the HMIS system increases the likelihood that reported numbers are an overcount of those who are “new” to the shelter system.

Coordinated Entry and Engagement: The Seattle/King County Continuum of Care has started to implement coordinated entry, engagement and assessment systems to identify the number of people experiencing homelessness who are seeking shelter/housing assistance. The coordinated entry system for families with children, Family Housing Connection, began implementation in 2012. A coordinated engagement system for youth and young adults will launch in 2013. Plans for a coordinated assessment system for adults without children will be developed in 2014.

After its first full year of operations, the Family Housing Connection program coordinated entry and assessment for homeless families, identified between five (5) and 20 families each month who were “literally” homeless and living in places not meant for human habitation who were seeking shelter throughout King County, not just within the City of Seattle.

A coordinated engagement system for homeless youth and young adults up to age 25 is being developed and will begin implementation in 2013. In addition, special efforts to count youth and young adults have been conducted in King County as part of “Count Us In”. During the PIT, 776 youth and young adults were counted as homeless or unstably housed. This special “Count Us In” project will help us better understand the nature and extent of youth homelessness in our community.

Detail on data for duration and exiting into permanent hsg

Estimating the number of persons *exiting* homelessness each year

Numbers represent the HMIS reported, known exits to permanent living situations from emergency shelter and transitional housing programs. Permanent living situations include the reported/known exits to permanent housing destination; a complete list of destinations considered as “permanent” are complete lists of destinations considered as “permanent” are included below.

- Permanent supportive housing for formerly homeless persons (such as SHP, S+C, or SRO Mod Rehab)
- Rental by client, no ongoing housing subsidy
- Owned by client, no ongoing housing subsidy
- Safe Haven
- Rental by client, VASH Subsidy
- Rental by client, other (non-VASH) ongoing housing subsidy
- Owned by client, with ongoing housing subsidy
- Staying or living with family, permanent tenure
- Staying or living with friends, permanent tenure

This data on those exiting to permanent housing does not capture the total number of households exiting homelessness, just known exits to permanent housing. There is a large percentage of individuals who exit from high volume shelters to "unknown" destinations.

Estimating the number of days that persons experience homelessness


Our Community/Continuum of Care is determining the methodology that will be used for the HEARTH measure, "length of time homeless." An estimate for the number of days that persons experience homelessness is not included until a consistent methodology is adopted.

	Estimate the # of persons experiencing homelessness on a given night in all of Seattle/King County	
	Sheltered (Includes Shelter and Transitional Housing)	Unsheltered
Persons In HHs with Adult(s) and Child(ren)	3,120	-
Persons in HH with Only Children	36	19
Persons in HH with Only Adults	3,170	2,717
Chronically Homeless Individuals	452	367
Chronically Homeless Families	-	-
Veterans	589	93
Unaccompanied Children	-	-
Persons with HIV	62	3

2013 Est of Sheltered and Unsheltered Homeless for Seattle and King Cty

HOW WE MEASURE THIS: Every year in January, the One Night Count enumerates people in and outside shelters to estimate the total number of homeless persons in King County.


One Night Counts of homeless people show little change over time



Data source: One Night Count Reports 2009-2012

Participating shelters track families who are turned away on the One Night Count night because the shelters are full.

Homeless families & children continued to be turned away at full shelters



Data source: One Night Count Family Turn-away surveys 2009-2012

Homelessness Trend and Turn-Aways

Indicate if the homeless population is: Has No Rural Homeless

If data is not available for the categories "number of persons becoming and exiting homelessness each year," and "number of days that persons experience homelessness," describe these categories for each homeless population type (including chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth):

See text detailing experiencing, becoming and duration/exiting into permanent housing attached with Homeless Needs Assessment table above.

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: See attached table attached below. Data source: Safe Harbors, HMIS, 2012 Annual Homeless Assessment Report
Comments: (AHAR).

Race	Persons in Families in Emergency Shelters	Persons in Families in Transitional Housing	Persons in Families in Permanent Supportive Housing*	Individuals in Emergency Shelters	Individuals in Transitional Housing	Individuals in Permanent Supportive Housing
<i>White, non-Hispanic/non-Latino</i>	15%	9%	-	43%	48%	46%
<i>White, Hispanic/Latino</i>	7%	7%	-	5%	3%	4%
<i>Black or African American</i>	51%	71%	-	28%	30%	28%
<i>Asian</i>	2%	1%	-	2%	1%	3%
<i>American Indian or Alaska Native</i>	3%	1%	-	5%	4%	7%
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>	2%	1%	-	1%	1%	0%
<i>Multiple races</i>	12%	4%	-	3%	7%	2%
<i>Unknown</i>	8%	4%	-	13%	6%	8%

**City of Seattle investments currently do not include Permanent Supportive Housing for Families.*

Households for ES, TH, PSH by Race

HOW WE MEASURE THIS: Households that pay 30% or more of income for housing are considered to be in unaffordable housing. They can lose that housing if a job is lost or a medical emergency occurs. In the past 10 years Seattle's percent of households in unaffordable housing has not changed.



Hsg Affordability for Young Adult and Minority HH

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

For families with children:

- Many families are experiencing homelessness for the first time.
- Household incomes are extremely low, averaging less than \$700/month.

- There were more than 643 children under the age of 18 served in emergency shelters in Seattle, and over 43% of these were infants, toddlers or pre-schoolers who were less than 5 years old.
- There were more than 542 children under the age of 18 served in transitional housing programs in Seattle, and over 51% were less than 5 years old.
- 38% of the people served in transitional housing programs for families with children were in a household with five or more people.

For Veterans:

- Veterans are over-represented among homeless individuals; 15% of individual adults in shelters reported they had serviced in the military.
- Of the 1,136 veterans served in single adult emergency shelters, over 36% identified as a person of color. 57% were over the age of 50 years old.
- People of color, particularly Black/African Americans are disproportionately represented among those who are homeless in the shelter/transitional housing system, representing 28% of people served in single adult emergency shelters and 71% of people served in family shelters.

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

People of color are disproportionately represented among the homeless. (See attached continuation of Intro and Households for Emergency Shelter, Transitional Housing and Permanent Supportive Housing by Race table attached to Nature and Extent of Homelessness section above).

Of the 7,486 single adults and 1,072 persons in families served in emergency shelters in 2012, 44% of those in shelters for individual adults and more than 70% of those in shelters for families with children identified as a person of color. In Seattle, African Americans make up approximately 8% of the total city population. However, in the shelter and transitional housing system African Americans are the largest ethnic minority, making up 28% to 30% of homeless individuals and 51% to 71% of persons in families.

Latino/Hispanic individuals represent from 3% to 7% of those receiving shelter or transitional services, more than the approximately 6% within the overall county population.

Native Americans make up less than 1% of the overall population in King County, but among those using Safe Harbors emergency services, they constituted 5% of homeless adults and 3% of persons in homeless families. 5% of single homeless women were Native American.

Describe the Nature and Extent of Unsheltered and Sheltered Homelessness.

See 2013 Estimate of Sheltered & Unsheltered Homeless for Seattle & King County attached to first table above.

Sheltered Count: The sheltered count is estimated using data from publicly funded emergency shelter and transitional housing programs in Seattle. Data reported on the sheltered count was taken from the 2012 AHAR report point-in-time count for the night of January 25, 2013. On that night, there were at least 2,704 persons sheltered in these programs.

The 2013 One Night Count Point-In-Time Count occurred on the night of January 23-24; for all programs in King County (publicly and privately funded), and there were an estimated 6,326 persons who were sheltered that night. Figures for all of **Seattle/King County** Point-In-Time Count are included below.

Safe Harbors is King County's web-based Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). The Safe Harbors HMIS collects information on and the use of services and the characteristics of those who are homeless. Planners, policymakers and service providers are able to use aggregate data from Safe Harbors to quantify the nature and extent of homelessness over time, to identify patterns of service use, and to direct funding and services to those who are most in need.

Safe Harbors is a joint project of the City of Seattle, the King County Department of Community and Human Services, and United Way of King County. The system collects data from a total of 400 programs, representing 82% of beds available to single adults and 81% of beds available to families with children in Seattle and King County.

Unsheltered Count: There were at least 1,989 unsheltered individuals counted in Seattle during our community Point-In-Time (PIT) count, the One Night Count of People Who Are Homeless in King County. The unsheltered count does not estimate numbers of people by population type.

The One Night Count consists of two parts: a street count of people without shelter; and a survey of individuals and families living in emergency shelters and transitional housing programs. The 2013 survey and street count took place over the night of January 23-24, 2013.

While the One Night Count provides a valuable, point in time view of homelessness in King County, it cannot account for all the unsheltered people. Many others in our community are homeless but are not included in this survey.

HIV/AIDS: Our community does not require programs to enter data on HIV/AIDS. A small number of programs reported this information, but it is likely undercounted and not included in Table 25.

Chronically Homeless Individuals and Chronically Homeless Families: The HMIS system calculates chronic homelessness for individuals based on a number of questions. The logic does not include families at this time.

Discussion:

The City of Seattle leverages and coordinates its resources to support community based agencies that provide homelessness **prevention**, homelessness **intervention** services, and **housing stabilization and support** services designed to help meet needs of homeless and formerly homeless individuals and families. For in-depth background and analysis of Seattle's homeless strategies and planned investments see the Human Services Department's Communities Supporting Safe and Stable Housing.

NA-45 Non-Homeless Special Needs Assessment - 91.205 (b,d)

Introduction:

The Human Services Department funds and operates programs and services that meet the basic needs of the most vulnerable people in our community - families and individuals with low incomes, children, domestic violence and sexual assault victims, homeless people, seniors, and persons with disabilities. We invest in programs that help people gain independence and success. In addition to the direct investment of federal CDBG, HOME, HOPWA and ESG funds HSD invested \$148.1 million dollars in health and human services needs for residents and communities. See Overview of Seattle (part 1 & 2) attached to the table below.

HOPWA

Current HOPWA formula use:	
Cumulative cases of AIDS reported	9,171
Area incidence of AIDS	221
Rate per population	9
Number of new cases prior year (3 years of data)	8
Rate per population (3 years of data)	701
Current HIV surveillance data:	
Number of Persons living with HIV (PLWH)	7,463
Area Prevalence (PLWH per population)	282
Number of new HIV cases reported last year	0

Table 27 – HOPWA Data


Data Source: CDC HIV Surveillance

NA-45 - Overview of Seattle and the City Human Services Department (HSD)

The mission of the HSD is to connect people with resources and solutions during times of need so we can all live, learn, work, and take part in strong, healthy communities. HSD contracts with more than 230 community-based human service providers and administers programs to ensure Seattle residents have food and shelter, productive education and job opportunities, adequate health care, opportunities to gain social and economic independence and success, and many more of life's basic necessities. HSD staff is committed to working with the community to provide appropriate, culturally relevant services. HSD's Strategic Plan, "Healthy Communities, Healthy Families," identifies a set of goals and actions to position HSD to better serve clients and strengthen the City's overall service delivery system. The strategic plan includes four key goals:

- Create a Proactive, Seamless Service System;
- Strengthen and Expand Partnerships;
- Engage and Partner with the Community; and
- Use Data-Driven Design and Evaluation.

The City of Seattle's annual budget in 2013 is approximately \$4 billion. Of that total, approximately \$148.1 million is set aside for health and human services. (The following data is excerpted from an April 2013 presentation at the National Human Services Data Consortium conference hosted by Seattle—author Sole Plumacher).



Here are some basic facts about Seattle.


- Largest city in State of Washington—pop. 608,660 (2010 Census)
- Population is diverse
- 54% of adults 25 years+ have Bachelor's degrees
- 47,000 students in Seattle Schools speak 100+ languages at home
- 13% of residents foreign born

Population Breakdown

1. 56% white (Non-Hispanic)
2. 14% Asian (NH)
3. 8% African American (NH)
4. 7% Latino
5. 4% Multiracial (NH)
6. 1% Native American (NH)

Key Data: Median Family Income

Median Family Income by Race/Ethnicity of Householder, Seattle, 2009-2011



Median family income is the best indicator of an "average" value for family income, because the arithmetic average is strongly biased upward by a few high incomes. The median income is the midpoint of the listing of all family incomes: the point at which half of families have incomes that are higher, and half have incomes that are lower. In this chart, "whites" include only whites who are not Hispanic. Points about the data:

- Seattle's median family income (\$91,900) is significantly higher than that of multiracial, Asian, Latino and Black families.
- Median incomes of Native American and Pacific Islander families are lower than the Seattle median income, but these groups are small, and it is hard to estimate their median incomes with precision.

Overview of Seattle - Part 1

Detail on Special Needs Populations— NA 45

People with disabilities

People with disabilities are the King county's largest minority group. One in five King County adults has a disability, a rate that has not changed in the past 10 years. Disability is likely to affect a majority of county residents at some point in their lives. But unlike race or ethnicity that identify other minority groups, disability can vary during a person's life. A person may be born with a disability, acquire it through accident, disease or the process of aging, or have it diminish or be ameliorated. For many people their disability is not a fixed condition, but is changeable over time and with circumstances. The City invests in planning and services for people with disabilities in two key divisions:

First through **Public Health—Seattle & King County**, a matrix of all public health services provided in Seattle including regional core and enhanced services, based on public health data which reveal disparities in health outcomes and risk behaviors based on race, ethnicity, income, immigrant/refugee status, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, health insurance status and neighborhood that are persistent and consistent across many health indicators. The **City's Healthy Communities Initiative Policy Guide** articulates a vision, goals, strategies, and policy framework to broadly guide the City's efforts and investments in public health; and the **Overview of City of Seattle Investments in Public Health Services**, documents a broad range of services and programs, funded out of sources other than the four federal grants governed by the Consolidated Plan, represent a major commitment to addressing the needs of Seattle's non-homeless but vulnerable populations.


Second, the Human Services Department houses the **Aging & Disability Services division** which serves as the **Area Agency on Aging for the Seattle-King County (AAA)** region. The City of Seattle, King County and United Way of King County are the sponsors, and set agency policy. Area Agencies on Aging (AAAs) are local organizations across the nation that develop and promote services and options to maximize independence, quality of life and choice for older people, adults with disabilities, and family caregivers. Key initiatives which serve both the aging and adult persons with disabilities include the **Healthy Aging Partnership**, a coalition of more than 30 nonprofit and government organizations working together to promote healthy aging and **PEARLS** the Program to Encourage Active, Rewarding Lives which is a community-integrated program to treat older adults who have minor depression.

The following is excerpted from 2013 HSD Seattle-King County data presentations—Susan King author


The Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance Survey (BRFSS) disability measure gives an overview of the prevalence of disability in the adult population. Twenty-two percent of King County adults had a disability by this measure.

- Disability was more prevalent in the South, North and Seattle regions than in the East region.
- The South Region disability rate was higher than that of the County as a whole.
- Disability rates in the County and the regions have not changed significantly since data collection began in 2001 (data not shown).

Disability Rate by Region, King County, 2007-2011



Disability Rate by Age, Race/Ethnicity, Gender and Preferred Language, King County, 2007-2011



- Among adults, prevalence of disability increases with age.

Overview of Seattle - Part 2

Detail on Special Needs Populations – NA 45

People with disabilities

People with disabilities are the **King County's** largest minority group. One in five King County adults has a disability, a rate that has not changed in the past 10 years. Disability is likely to affect a majority of county residents at some point in their lives. But unlike race or ethnicity that identify other minority groups, disability can vary during a person's life. A person may be born with a disability, acquire it through accident, disease or the process of aging, or have it diminish or be ameliorated. For many people their disability is not a fixed condition, but is changeable over time and with circumstances. The City invests in planning and services for people with disabilities in two key divisions:


First through **Public Health—Seattle & King County**, a matrix of all public health services provided in Seattle including regional care and enhanced services, based on public health data which reveal disparities in health outcomes and risk behaviors based on race, ethnicity, income, immigrant/refugee status, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, health insurance status and neighborhood that are persistent and consistent across many health indicators. The **City's Health Communities Initiative Policy Guide** articulates a vision, goals, strategies, and policy framework to broadly guide the City's efforts and investments in public health; and the **Overview of City of Seattle Investments in Public Health Services**, documents a broad range of services and programs, funded out of sources other than the four federal grants governed by the Consolidated Plan, represent a major commitment to addressing the needs of Seattle's non-homeless but vulnerable populations.

Second, the Human Services Department houses the **Aging & Disability Services division** which serves as the **Area Agency on Aging for the Seattle-King County (AAA)** region. The City of Seattle, King County and United Way of King County are the sponsors, and set agency policy. Area Agencies on Aging (AAAs) are local organizations across the nation that develop and promote services and options to maximize independence, quality of life and choice for older people, adults with disabilities, and family caregivers. Key initiatives which serve the aging and adult persons with disabilities include the **Healthy Aging Partnership**, a coalition of more than 30 nonprofit and government organizations working together to promote healthy aging and **PEARLS**, the Program to Encourage Active, Rewarding Lives which is a community-integrated program to treat older adults who have minor depression.


The following is excerpted from 2013 HSD Seattle-King County data presentations—Susan King author

The Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance Survey (BRFSS) disability measure gives an overview of the prevalence of disability in the adult population. Twenty-two percent of King County adults had a disability by this measure.

- Disability was more prevalent in the South, North and Seattle regions than in the East region.
- The South Region disability rate was higher than that of the County as a whole.
- Disability rates in the County and the regions have not changed significantly since data collection began in 2001 (data not shown).




Disability Rate by Age, Race/Ethnicity, Gender and Preferred Language, King County, 2007-2011



- Among adults, prevalence of disability increases with age.


People with disabilities - Part 1

- Disability is significantly less prevalent among Asians, Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders and Latinos. These differences are not due to the relatively younger age of these population groups.
- Women report significantly higher disability prevalence than men.
- The relationships between disability and race/ethnicity and gender are unchanged when only working age (18-64) adults are included.



- Disability rates are inversely related to income. The causal direction is not clear. People with lower income are more likely to encounter life conditions that increase their risk of disability. For many adults, disability limits employment and thus income.
- People who completed college have lower disability rates than those with some college or a high school diploma.


- People who are employed or students have significantly lower disability rates than people who are unemployed, retired or unable to work.
- These relationships between income, education and employment are unchanged when only working age (18-64) adults are included.



- People in married or unmarried couples have lower disability rates than those not in relationships. Disability rates are similar only for those under age 30.
- Adults in households with children are less likely to be disabled than are those without children. The difference persists among adults younger than 65, and those younger than 45.

People with disabilities - Part 2

Disability Rate by Veteran Status, Health Status and Sexual Orientation, King County, 2007-2011



Data Source: BRFSS 2007-2011

COMMUNITIES COUNT, 4/2013

- Veterans have a higher disability rate than non-veterans. Only for veterans and non-veterans younger than 45 do disability rates begin to converge.
- LGBT survey respondents had a higher rate of disability than did heterosexuals. This difference in rates persisted for those <65, <45 and <30 years old.

People with disabilities - Part 3

Seniors and the elderly poor

The 2012-2015 Area Aging Plan discusses the following trends for the aging population in Seattle-King County:




The increasing number of elders in King County and the percent of total population, along with the strengths, opportunities, and challenges presented by aging baby boomers.

- The continuing rise in the number of seniors in poverty (since 2000).
- Disparate rates of disability and chronic disease, especially among African Americans, Asian Americans, Hispanic/Latinos, and Native Americans.
- Issues faced by women, who are far more likely to care for aging family members, more likely to live in poverty, and more likely to have physical disabilities and certain chronic conditions.

The City AAA focuses on the needs of all aging residents, not just for those who are in low and moderate income households. However, the 2012-2015 Area Plan on Aging [Draw Partners for New Times](#) clearly defines five goals which would address needs for seniors, regardless of income status. AAA Area Plan goals are:

1. Improve health care quality for older adults and adults with disabilities.
2. Address basic needs.
3. Improve health and well-being.
4. Increase the independence for frail older adults and people with disabilities.
5. Promote aging readiness.

The following data is excerpted from 2013 HSD data presentations—Susan King author



Seniors and Elderly Poor Detail

Survivors of Domestic Violence

Survivors of Domestic Violence

Toward Safety and Justice: Domestic Violence in Seattle the 2008 biennial report states that “domestic violence is an equal opportunity issue – it crosses all ethnic, racial, age, national origin, religious, socioeconomic, and sexual orientation lines. It exists in every neighborhood in Seattle – from Ballard to the Rainier Valley, Maple Leaf to West Seattle. Survivors are our sisters, brothers, daughters, sons, relatives, friends, and neighbors.” Nationally, nearly *one in four women* reports experiencing violence by a current or former spouse or boyfriend at some point in her life. Research accessed in 2010 from the National Law Center on Homelessness and poverty states that domestic violence is a leading cause of homelessness, especially for low income women. Nationally, between 22% -57% of homeless women report that domestic or sexual violence was the immediate cause of their homelessness.

Locally, Group Health Cooperative research indicated in 2008 a high prevalence of women experiencing intimate partner violence in Washington State – as high as 44% or nearly 1 out of 2 women. This could mean that *60,000 -120,000 adult women* in Seattle have experienced domestic violence during their life (*Toward Safety & Justice, p. 12*). However, a July 16, 2013 KOMOnews.com article reported that “between 2009 and 2012, serious assaults fell by 2 percent in Seattle, part of a decade-long downward

trend. But, that trend hasn't carried over to domestic-violence assaults, which are up 60 percent over the same four-year period. And while police don't know why, many believe the economy could be playing a part.”

For more detail on the needs and strategies the City of Seattle has invested in to reduce the incidence and impact of domestic violence on vulnerable population see the City’s Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Prevention website.

Youth and Young Adults

Youth and Young Adults

HSD seeks to provide youth with the skills, knowledge, and support they need to lead healthy and productive lives, through keeping youth in school, improving their academic achievement, helping them learn job skills, and reducing criminal activity and violence, especially for youth facing multiple barriers to success due to poverty and racism. HSD-funded services include: case management; counseling; tutoring; opportunities for work experience; leadership and social skills classes; services for homeless and at-risk LGBTQ youth; and youth violence prevention. Homeless youth are supported through a continuum of care designed to meet emergency needs while also helping to move into stable, permanent housing.

A **coordinated engagement system for homeless youth and young adults** up to age 25 is being developed and will begin implementation in 2013. In addition, special efforts to count youth and young adults have been conducted in King County as part of “Count Us In”, a special project that will help us better understand the nature and extent of youth homelessness in our community.

The Committee to End Homelessness has led a County-wide **Youth and Young Adult Initiative** to prevent and end homelessness among young people. A new [Comprehensive Plan to End Youth and Young Adult Homelessness in King County by 2020](#) is in final draft and anticipated to be completed early in the fall of 2013.

According to the **2013 King County Count Us In Report**, at least 776 youth and young adults (ages 12-25) were homelessness or unstably housed on the night of January 24, 2013. Of these 776 youth, 12% were under the age of 18, 51% were female, and 60% identified as a person of color. Of the 329 youth and young adults who completed a survey, 23% identified as lesbian, gay, bisexual, Transgender, or questioning (LGBTQ).

Immigrants and Refugees

Immigrants and Refugees

Seattle is a diverse, multi-cultural city. According to the 2006-2010 American Community Survey, 17.3% of Seattle's population is foreign born, and 21.3% of the population (ages 5 and up) speak a language other than English at home.

The City Human Services Department funds services specifically for Immigrant & Refugees in certain service areas, including: Family Centers; School Readiness & Preschool; Child care; Citizenship assistance; Food banks; Community Health centers; DV services and prevention; Senior centers & meal sites; and Non-English language information in 28 languages. HSD partners with many agencies across the city to provide culturally relevant assistance to immigrant and refugee families, and to address the special needs and challenges faced by this community.

The City's Immigrants and Refugees Initiative is part of a larger Race and Social Justice Initiative (RSJI), a citywide effort to end institutional racism and race-based disparities in City government. The Seattle Office of Civil Rights (SOCR) oversees the Immigrant and Refugee Initiative, working with City departments to implement the plan. The initiative intends to strengthen how City government serves immigrant and refugee communities living in Seattle, through a broad and comprehensive set of actions promoting the full and active participation of immigrant and refugee communities in Seattle's civic, economic and cultural life. The 2010 update of the Immigrant and Refugee Initiative Action Plan focuses on five major issues:

- Access to services and information
- Protection of civil rights
- Civic engagement
- Workforce and economic development
- Service delivery

In 2012, the Committee to End Homelessness King County (CEHKC) Immigrant and Refugee Task Force released a report providing recommendations on strategies to increase access to housing and supportive services among immigrant and refugees who are homeless or at risk of homelessness. For more information, see the CEHKC Immigrant and Refugee Task Force Recommendations.

HIV Housing Need (HOPWA Grantees Only)

Type of HOPWA Assistance	Estimates of Unmet Need
Tenant based rental assistance	192
Short-term Rent, Mortgage, and Utility	207
Facility Based Housing (Permanent, short-term or transitional)	514

Table 28 – HIV Housing Need

Data Source: HOPWA CAPER and HOPWA Beneficiary Verification Worksheet

HOPWA – Three-Year Anticipated Service by Type of Assistance*

	2013		2014		2015	
	Outputs	Funding	Outputs	Funding	Outputs	Funding
Housing Subsidy Assistance						
Tenant-Based Rental Assistance	30	138,000	22	100,000	22	100,000
Project-Based Rental Assistance	56	271,274	69	335,637	83	408,000
Permanent Housing Operating Subsidy	20	472,096	9	236,048	0	0
Transitional Housing Operating Subsidy	0	0	0	0	0	0
STRMU	0	0	20	40,000	23	46,000
Permanent Housing Placement	10	17,800	10	17,800	18	32,040
TOTAL	116	899,170	130	729,485	146	586,040
Housing Development						
Permanent Housing Capital Investment	0	0	8	300,000	0	0
Transitional Housing Capital Investment	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	8	300,000	0	0
Supportive Services*						
Services with HOPWA-Funded Housing	96	88,405	96	88,405	96	88,405
Services Only	212	324,542	236	393,169	252	433,555
TOTAL	308	412,947	332	481,574	348	521,960
Housing Information Services						
Navigator Services	0	0	10	50,000	20	100,000
Centralized Functions	0	0	10	50,000	20	100,000
Total	0	0	20	100,000	40	200,000
Grant Administration						
Grant Administration	0	94,133	0	96,067	0	98,000
Total	0	94,133	0	96,067	0	98,000
TOTAL		1,406,250		1,407,126		1,406,000

*Funding estimates only – subject to change.

HOPWA - 3-Year Anticipated Services by Type of Assistance

Race-Ethnicity	Percent of Total
White	66%
Black	17%
Hispanic/Latino	11%
Asian	3%
Native Hawaiian	Less than 1%
Native American	1%
Two or More Races	2%
Undetermined	Less than 1%

HOPWA Clients by Race and Ethnicity

Describe the characteristics of special needs populations in your community:

People Living with HIV/AIDS

There are about 6,700 King county residents living with HIV or AIDS, representing only the reported cases that have been diagnosed and reported. An estimated 7,200-7,800 people are living with HIV but may be unaware of their infection. Most are white males, are 30-45 years of age at the time of diagnosis, and reside in Seattle. However, an increasing proportion of cases are among foreign born blacks and residents outside of Seattle.

In Seattle-King County, as in the country as a whole, epidemiological data indicate that HIV and AIDS are disproportionately affecting African Americans and foreign-born black immigrants. Overall, the percent of HIV/AIDS cases among people of color has risen steadily since the early years of the epidemic in King County. Blacks are 4.5 times more likely to be infected with HIV than whites and are the most disproportionately impacted racial group.

Foreign born PLWHA represent 14% of cases. Hispanics constitute 7% of the population of King county and 10% of PLWHA.

Two percent were reported as homeless at the time of diagnosis. Based on surveys of HIV infection among homeless persons in King County and studies across the country, homelessness puts men and women at higher risk for HIV infection. Homeless persons reported with HIV/AIDS in King County were more likely to be persons of color and have a history of mental illness, incarceration, substance abuse, and low income.

FOR DETAIL ON OTHER SPECIAL NEEDS POPULATIONS SEE SERIES OF DESCRIPTIONS ATTACHED ABOVE

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

People Living with HIV/AIDS

The Seattle Human Services Department contracted with the HIV/AIDS epidemiology staff of Public Health – Seattle & King County to gather data about the extent of housing need and demographic and other characteristics of low income and homeless people living with HIV/AIDS in King County. Along with analyzing HIV data bases, staff also interviewed 25 HIV/AIDS medical case managers.

The case managers reported seeing a total of 2,319 clients which is over one-third of all clients living with HIV/AIDS in King County. Of these, 424 of their clients (24%) needed housing assistance and 477 (21%) need a rent subsidy or housing voucher to maintain their current permanent housing. Case managers stated that 212 (9%) clients were currently homeless and 207 of their clients were at risk of becoming homeless. Most clients that needed housing assistance needed placement into the following types of housing:

- Independent permanent housing (n=201)
- Transitional independent housing (n=192)
- Transitional housing with on-site supportive services (n=164)
- Permanent housing with on-site supportive services (n=149)
- Emergency shelters (n=114)

Housing with supportive services ranges along a continuum from 24/7 staffing to providing intensive services to clients with the most complex medical and behavioral needs and barriers to housing. Services may be provided on-site or via mobile teams (with representation in primary care, mental health, and chemical dependency systems) serving clients in multiple locations.

FOR DETAIL ON OTHER SPECIAL NEEDS POPULATIONS SEE SERIES OF DESCRIPTIONS ATTACHED ABOVE

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

As of October 2012, Public Health – Seattle & King County reported 7,079 people living with HIV including AIDS. Of these, 89% are male and 11% female.

Sixty-two percent were between the ages of 30 and 49 at the time of diagnosis. A little more than three-quarters were born in the USA and 17% were foreign-born.

Race and ethnicity break down are shown in the table attached above.

Discussion:

People Living with HIV/AIDS in Seattle

A very strong continuum of housing, services, and funding partnerships has been developed over the last twenty years in Seattle/King County. From the first skilled nursing project in the early 1990's, the HIV/AIDS housing inventory has expanded to more than 400 units with a full range of housing opportunities. HOPWA provides support to the continuum through tenant-based rental assistance, project-based rental assistance, transitional community living residences, services enriched housing, and units developed with HOPWA capital dollars.

Many people living with HIV/AIDS can live independently and need only affordable housing options. However, an increasing proportion of clients have a number of barriers to accessing and retaining housing including homelessness, mental illness, chemical addiction, criminal history, past evictions, bad credit, and problems with immigration status. This has presented a challenge to the existing housing inventory, much of which was developed for individuals and families capable of living independently. The resources available in the system have not been targeted to meet this higher level of need which includes permanent housing with supportive services.

HOPWA funds are able to provide about 500 individuals with housing, rental assistance and services, but there is unmet demand for services for these limited resources.

FOR DETAIL ON OTHER SPECIAL NEEDS POPULATIONS SEE SERIES OF DESCRIPTIONS ATTACHED ABOVE

NA-50 Non-Housing Community Development Needs – 91.215 (f)

Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Facilities:

The City's overall assessment of capital facilities needs and their funding sources are identified in the 2013 - 2018 Adopted Capital Improvement Program (<http://www.seattle.gov/financedepartment/1318adoptedcip/default.htm>). CDBG funds, when available, may be used to meet urgent or vital facilities needs of social services agencies.

How were these needs determined?

See the above-referenced Adopted Capital Improvement Program.

Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Improvements:

Supporting neighborhood business districts, especially those districts serving low- and moderate-income neighborhoods, is an essential tool available to the City as it seeks to revitalize the economy and ensure an equitable development pattern and economic recovery. CDBG funds will be used to fund public improvements that enhance a business district's ability to attract businesses and customers in a sustainable manner. Public improvements such as streetlights, streetscapes, accessibility improvements and sidewalk installation may be funded and will be determined from inquiries by recognized business district organizations.

The Seattle Conservation Corps, operated by the Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation, executes parks improvement projects in low- and moderate-income neighborhoods while at the same time provides training and employment services for formerly homeless adults. Improvements may include new or replacement of worn/unsafe park furniture such as picnic tables, benches, bike racks, etc., and improvements to park access such as trail expansion and enhancements, new stairs, footbridges, walkways etc. Safety improvements include barriers to prevent vehicle access to pedestrian and play areas, landscape changes for line of site crime prevention, and new fencing. Environmental improvements involve such activities as removal of invasive plants, and native planting and new landscape beds and tree planting. The Parks Department has determined that approximately 25 parks will undergo such improvements in 2014 with CDBG funding.

The Parks Department also ensures its assets are available to all segments of the population. To this end the 2013-2018 CIP has authorized \$1.7 million for accessibility improvements at a number of parks facilities. The Department has identified needs such as signage, door closures, restroom fixtures and other features. Of the \$1.7 million, \$400,000 will be 2014 CDBG funding.

How were these needs determined?

Neighborhood business district improvements will be reviewed and funded through a competitive request for proposals process to be conducted by the Office of Economic Development in 2013, for funding in 2014.

Regarding Parks improvements, the Conservation Corps works with a wide variety of Parks staff to identify projects worth pursuing. Parks Resource managers, crew chiefs and gardeners provide input on needs for their parks. These positions have a great deal of contact with the public and will consider requests from the public in their suggestions. SCC also works with parks maintenance staff who are aware of missing or worn out parks features that need to be replaced and with Parks planning and development and design staff who also work closely with the public and have a good overall view of parks mission and design goals. For CDBG funded improvements, parks are also reviewed for service area eligibility.

Parks uses an Asset Management Plan to identify needed capital improvement projects including access improvement projects. Projects are identified through on-going condition assessments, consultant studies, six-year facilities plans, work order analyses, and intradepartmental information sharing of facility maintenance issues and needs.

Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Services:

Three of the four Consolidated Plan funds are used by the Human Services Department to provide public services for eligible clients. CDBG, ESG, and HOPWA are used primarily to prevent homelessness and to provide shelter and rapid rehousing for persons and families currently homeless. The need for homeless services and the City's strategy to address the issues of homelessness are outlined in a recent Request for Investments process which determined the services the City will procure over the next several years with City General Fund, CDBG, and ESG funds. The Communities Supporting Safe and Stable Housing policy and needs document is provided at http://www.seattle.gov/humanservices/documents/hsd_csssh_investment_plan_final_062712.pdf. A HOPWA investment plan (available at http://www.seattle.gov/humanservices/emergencyservices/shelter/hopwa_investment_plan.pdf) has also been produced to guide a Request for Investments process in the last half of 2013.

In response to recent economic and social indicators, the City has decided to invest CDBG dollars into an employment support program. The US Department of Labor states that an important determinate of socio-economic advancement is educational attainment beyond high school. In 2013 CDBG resources in the Human Services Department began supporting a new "Career Bridge" program, a partnership between the Office of Economic Development and HSD. This is designed to prepare people in crisis or facing barriers to employment for the education and training necessary to secure employment that provides greater economic security.

How were these needs determined?

The Communities Supporting Safe and Stable Housing investment policies were designed with extensive community input. The full process for the development of these policies are described in the investment plan at

http://www.seattle.gov/humanservices/documents/hsd_csssh_investment_plan_final_062712.pdf.

Hundreds of people helped create the Communities Supporting Safe & Stable Housing Investment Plan. The Plan was informed by an extensive community engagement process where clients of services, community members, shelter and housing providers, business, faith communities, charitable foundations, schools, local government, and elected officials all contributed to the proposed strategies and priorities for Seattle's homeless service investments.

In particular, client surveys and focus groups provided valuable input. Client-driven solutions to prevent homelessness and support homeless services lead to better investments and lasting outcomes. Families and individuals provide insight and contributions that are improving information, access and delivery of services. Hundreds of people in Seattle who were served by homelessness prevention and homeless assistance services participated in surveys, focus groups and forums to provide feedback and recommendations for ways to improve programs and direct service investments.

In developing the Career Bridge program, OED and HSD held a community focus group in late July 2012 to describe the intent and design of the program and receive feedback. The focus group included 38 people, ages 17-50, who were potential participants. They shared their own stories and gave specific comments about the program's components, outcomes and barriers to sustained employment.

Housing Market Analysis

MA-05 Overview

Housing Market Analysis Overview:

Housing

The Mayor's recently released Seattle Housing Strategy lays out four major housing directions:

1) Optimize investments in affordable housing

- Continue direct investment by renewing the Seattle Housing Levy in 2016
- Strengthen the Multi-Family Tax Exemption program
- Revise the affordable housing zoning incentives city-wide, including adjusting the fee-in-lieu formula

2) Make publicly owned land available for housing

- Continue to identify opportunities to use City-owned properties for affordable housing, engaging neighboring communities early in the development process.
- Work with partner agencies to utilize other public property for housing, including transit oriented development work with Sound Transit.

3) Reduce the cost of developing new housing

- Continue further improvements to the permitting process by better aligning processes across City departments
- Encourage more sustainable housing development that qualifies for the Priority Green Expedited or Facilitated review and permitting processes and expand this program to include upgrades to existing housing.
- Identify strategies to reduce or eliminate redundant or unnecessary processes or requirements

4) Foster an adequate and diverse supply of housing

- Encourage compact development near frequent transit as we work with neighborhoods to consider station area
- plans, urban design frameworks, and zoning proposals
- Explore options for encouraging a wider variety of housing types, particularly to address affordability and family housing.

For a detailed analysis of Seattle’s housing conditions, market trends and impact on housing affordability see the “Housing Seattle” report by the Seattle Planning Commission (Winter 2011). Also note that the City of Seattle is updating its 20-Year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan in 2013. Strategies that support housing affordability and diversity are always integral to the Comprehensive Plan.

Homelessness & Special Needs Populations

Seattle is responding to the needs of persons experiencing homelessness through a coordinated continuum of care and affordable housing. Since 1981 when Seattle voters approved the first a series of local bond and levies to create affordable housing, Seattle has now funded over 10,000 affordable apartments for seniors, low- and moderate-wage workers, and formerly homeless individuals and families, plus provided down-payment loans to more than 600 first-time homebuyers and rental assistance to more than 4,000 households.

The City of Seattle has contributed to the production of **3,312** affordable housing units through construction, preservation, and leasing of housing units dedicated to homeless individuals and families since the community’s Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness was introduced in 2005. More than half (57%) of these units have been created for chronically homeless individuals.

See continuation of the Market Analysis Overview in Part 2 attached below.

MA Overview Part 2

Prevention, Intervention and Housing Placement & Stabilization: The City also contributes to homelessness prevention, intervention, housing stabilization services, including investments in the operations of emergency shelter, transitional housing, and permanent housing support services that to increase health, independence and stability.

A network of facilities in Seattle provides a total year-round capacity of approximately 2,223 emergency shelter beds. Additional shelter, with varying capacity, is provided through emergency voucher programs targeted to assist families with children access individual, temporary shelter units in hotel/motels. During the winter months (October through March), the capacity of the shelter system expands, adding more than 412 beds; additional capacity can be added when there are severe weather conditions. The inventory also includes 2,131 year-round, transitional housing beds for families and individuals.

Seattle continues to work closely with other partners in the Continuum of Care (CoC) including King County, S/KC Public Health, Seattle Housing Authority, United Way, the religious community and private philanthropic agencies to develop multiple funding resources that target resources to **vulnerable special**

population groups. Seattle often “braids” funding with service partners to meet the needs of specific populations. See section NA-45 and MA-35 for more detail.

MA-10 Number of Housing Units – 91.210(a)&(b)(2)

Introduction

See MA-05 Overview for more detail and link to The Mayor’s recently released Seattle Housing Strategy.

For a detailed analysis of Seattle’s housing conditions, market trends and impact on housing affordability see the “Housing Seattle” report by the Seattle Planning Commission (Winter 2011). Also note that the City of Seattle is updating its 20-Year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan in 2013. Strategies that support housing affordability and diversity are always integral to the Comprehensive Plan.

All residential properties by number of units

Property Type	Number	%
1-unit detached structure	277,014	64%
1-unit, attached structure	10,414	2%
2-4 units	22,936	5%
5-19 units	44,652	10%
20 or more units	79,296	18%
Mobile Home, boat, RV, van, etc	1,402	0%
Total	435,714	100%

Table 29 – Residential Properties by Unit Number

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS Data

Table A: History of Residential Permits – By Type of Unit

RESIDENTIAL PERMIT INFORMATION				
Type of Unit	Net Built Units 2005-2012	Net Permitted Units Jan. 2013	TOTAL	%
Single Family	1,685	196	1,881	4.3%
Accessory Dwelling	402	104	506	1.2%
Detached Accessory	102	65	167	0.4%
Multifamily	9,486	1,873	11,359	26.0%
Mixed Use	17,660	11,740	29,740	68.1%
TOTAL	29,335	13,978	43,653	100.0%

Table A: History of Residential Permits by Type of Unit

TABLE B: History of Units Permitted to be demolished

RESIDENTIAL DEMOLITION INFORMATION				
Type of Unit	Net Demolished Units 2005-2012	Net Permitted Demolished Units Jan. 2013	TOTAL	%
Single Family	1,793	56	1,849	41.6%
Accessory Dwelling	15	0	15	0.3%
Detached Accessory	0	0	0	0%
Multifamily	1,507	5	1,512	34.0%
Mixed Use	1,069	3	1,072	24.1%
TOTAL	4,384	64	4,448	100.0%

Table B: History of Units Permitted to be Demolished

TABLE C: WORK DESTINATION REPORT - WHERE WORKERS ARE EMPLOYED WHO LIVE IN THE SELECTION AREA (SEATTLE CITY) - BY PLACES (CITIES, CDPs, ETC.)

	2010	
	Count	Share
Total All Jobs	292,739	100.0%
Jobs Counts by Places (Cities, CDPs, etc.) Where Workers are Employed - All Jobs		
	2010	
	Count	Share
Seattle city, WA	182,983	62.5%
Bellevue city, WA	19,150	6.5%
Redmond city, WA	13,947	4.8%
Tukwila city, WA	5,573	1.9%
Renton city, WA	5,556	1.9%
Everett city, WA	4,373	1.5%
Kirkland city, WA	4,062	1.4%
Kent city, WA	3,917	1.3%
Shoreline city, WA	3,088	1.1%
Tacoma city, WA	3,009	1.0%
All Other Locations	47,081	16.1%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, OnTheMap Application and LEHD Origin-Destination Employment Statistics (Beginning of Quarter Employment, 2nd Quarter 2010).

Table C: Work Destination Report - Census Bur OnTheMap

Unit Size by Tenure

	Owners		Renters	
	Number	%	Number	%
No bedroom	1,162	1%	17,662	13%
1 bedroom	10,784	8%	60,643	43%
2 bedrooms	37,444	27%	42,217	30%
3 or more bedrooms	87,951	64%	19,151	14%
Total	137,341	100%	139,673	100%

Table 30 – Unit Size by Tenure

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS Data

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

Seattle currently has a 2004-2024 Comprehensive Plan growth target of 47,000 new households, of which 62% has been met to date (92% if taking in account permitted residential units). See Urban Center/Urban Village Growth Report, 1st Quarter 2013 (UCUV Growth Report 1st Qtr 2013.pdf attached above as **Table A**).

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

Table B attached above provides a summary of the residential units demolished between 2005 and 2012, plus residential units for which demolition permits have been issued in January 2013.

Demolition of additional single-family units located in multifamily- and commercial-zoned areas of the City is expected. In stronger market areas some older multifamily and mixed use product will also likely be demolished to make way for new construction of higher density residential development.

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

Looking at the survey data for households who are currently housed, it appears that a high proportion of those who are paying over ½ of their household income for housing costs are those who live alone. This would suggest a need for increased supply of affordable small units located near retail, services and frequent transit. The data provided in HUD’s boilerplate needs assessment does not enable easy analysis of housing needs for people who may wish to live in Seattle but are not able to afford housing. According to the U.S. Census Bureau’s OnTheMap application, over 1/3 of Seattle workers live outside of the Seattle city limits. Presumably, a portion of those would choose to live closer to their jobs if affordable housing were available. See **Table C: Work Destination Report** attached above.

Describe the need for specific types of housing:

Seattle needs more affordable, smaller scale ownership housing. The 1st Q 2013 median sale price for new construction housing was \$446,950 (this includes single-family homes and any other non-condominium for-sale product) and \$473,750 for new construction condominiums (\$339,650 for new construction condominiums located outside of NWMLS Area #701, which is Downtown Seattle).

Given the high proportion of low-income households paying over ½ of their income for rent and basic utilities, Seattle clearly also needs a larger supply of affordable rental housing. Analysis of 2005-09 CHAS data shows that only 36 units of rental housing are affordable and available for every 100 extremely low-income households and only 65 units of rental housing are affordable and available for every 100 very low-income households. In addition, Seattle has hundreds of homeless individuals and families living on the streets, in shelters, and other unstable housing situations who are in immediate need of housing.

Discussion

Affordable smaller scale housing is a critical element in providing solutions to Seattle's homelessness problem, and to alleviate threats to homelessness faced by many residents. As mentioned, a high proportion of those paying over ½ of their household income for housing costs live alone.

MA-15 Housing Market Analysis: Cost of Housing - 91.210(a)

Introduction

See MA-05 Overview for more detail and link to The Mayor’s recently released Seattle Housing Strategy.

For a detailed analysis of Seattle’s housing conditions, market trends and impact on housing affordability see the “Housing Seattle” report by the Seattle Planning Commission (Winter 2011). Also note that the City of Seattle is updating its 20-Year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan in 2013. Strategies that support housing affordability and diversity are always integral to the Comprehensive Plan.

Cost of Housing

	Base Year: 2000	Most Recent Year: 2009	% Change
Median Home Value	252,100	446,900	77%
Median Contract Rent	677	849	25%

Table 31 – Cost of Housing

Data Source: 2000 Census (Base Year), 2005-2009 ACS (Most Recent Year)

Rent Paid	Number	%
Less than \$500	20,865	14.9%
\$500-999	72,169	51.7%
\$1,000-1,499	32,644	23.4%
\$1,500-1,999	9,591	6.9%
\$2,000 or more	4,404	3.2%
Total	139,673	100.0%

Table 32 - Rent Paid

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS Data

TABLE D

Seattle Home Sale Prices 2012 All NWMLS Areas Within Seattle City Limits									
		All Residential		Residential New Construction Only		All Condominium		Condo New Construction Only	
Area		Closed Sales	Median	Closed Sales	Median	Closed Sales	Median	Closed Sales	Median
140	West Seattle	1,247	\$328,800	87	\$900,000	200	\$214,000	7	\$799,500
380	Central Seattle SE, Leschi, Mt. Baker, Seward Park	570	\$300,000	65	\$340,000	27	\$150,000	1	\$395,799
385	Central Seattle SW, Beacon Hill	268	\$238,000	14	\$303,500	19	\$160,000	-	
390	Central Seattle, Madison Park, Capitol Hill	694	\$600,000	55	\$568,000	515	\$250,000	27	\$255,100
700	Queen Anne, Magnolia	613	\$565,000	37	\$572,500	337	\$238,000	6	\$282,500
701	Downtown Seattle	1	\$330,000	-		501	\$424,000	185	\$535,000
705	Ballard, Greenwood	1,644	\$425,000	95	\$515,000	358	\$224,000	25	\$268,500
710	North Seattle	1,089	\$442,000	64	\$443,500	212	\$165,000	8	\$242,000
# Sales; Median Sale Price (Weighted Average) =		6,124	\$423,375	417	\$436,875	2,169	\$270,375	259	\$473,750
Percent change vs. previous year stats =		24.4%	8.5%	0.7%	25.6%	36.1%	-2.2%	-17.0%	18.2%
Percent change vs. highest median sale price =		\$483,525	-12.4%	\$446,950	-2.3%	\$323,100	-16.3%	\$473,750	0.0%

Table D Seattle Home Sale Prices 2012

CHART A




Chart A - Avg Seattle Rent

CHART B




Chart B Settle Median Home Prices

Housing Affordability

% Units affordable to Households earning	Renter	Owner
30% HAMFI	No Data	No Data
50% HAMFI	No Data	No Data
80% HAMFI	No Data	No Data
100% HAMFI	No Data	No Data

% Units affordable to Households earning	Renter	Owner
Total	0	0

Table 33 – Housing Affordability

Data Source Comments:

TABLE E

Seattle Lower-Income Renter Households: Affordable and Available Housing Units Per 100 Renter Households and Absolute Shortages/Surpluses								
Affordable Units per 100 Renter Households			Affordable and Available Units per 100 Renter Households			Absolute Shortages/Surpluses of Available and Affordable Units		
0-30% of AMI	0-50% of AMI	0-80% of AMI	0-30% of AMI	0-50% of AMI	0-80% of AMI	0-30% of AMI	0-50% of AMI	0-80% of AMI
51	102	140	36	65	95	(21,755)	(19,500)	(3,805)
Source: CHAS Tables 13C and 14B								

Table E Seattle LI Renter HH Per 100 renters

TABLE F

Seattle Lower-Income Renter Households: Affordable and Available Housing Units Per 100 Owner Households and Absolute Shortages/Surpluses								
Affordable Units per 100 Owner Households			Affordable and Available Units per 100 Owner Households			Absolute Shortages/Surpluses of Available and Affordable Units		
0-30% of AMI	0-50% of AMI	0-80% of AMI	0-30% of AMI	0-50% of AMI	0-80% of AMI	0-30% of AMI	0-50% of AMI	0-80% of AMI
16	20	39	7	12	25	(7,325)	(15,205)	(23,900)
Source: CHAS Tables 15A, 15B and 14A								

Table F Seattle LI Renter HH per 100 owner


Monthly Rent

Monthly Rent (\$)	Efficiency (no bedroom)	1 Bedroom	2 Bedroom	3 Bedroom	4 Bedroom
Fair Market Rent	800	912	1,098	1,551	1,895
High HOME Rent	857	977	1,176	1,433	1,579
Low HOME Rent	760	814	977	1,128	1,258

Table 34 – Monthly Rent

Data Source: HUD FMR and HOME Rents

CHART C



Source: Duane Scott Apartment Advisors, Apartment Vacancy Report, Spring 2013

Chart C Average Rent by Area - Spring 2013

Is there sufficient housing for households at all income levels?

Tables E and F show that Seattle is lacking affordable and available housing (both rental and owner) for extremely low-income, very low-income and low-income households. The most immediate need is for renter housing affordable for households with incomes $\leq 30\%$ of HAMFI.

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

Chart A shows that Seattle's rental housing market is fairly stable. Overall, rental housing costs have gradually increased over time. Average apartment rents, adjusted for inflation, have increased 16% over the past 2 decades (between Spring 2003 and Spring 2013).

Chart B shows that Seattle's for-sale housing market is more vulnerable to market fluctuations. New construction housing prices have been on a steep upward trend since 2011 when the Puget Sound region economy began to rebound from the Great Recession.

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

Average rent for units in larger apartment buildings in Seattle (those with 20+ market rental units) is \$1,298. The average rent exceeds this average only in 5 of Seattle's 14 market areas: Ballard, Green Lake/Wallingford, Downtown/Belltown/South Lake Union, Central, and Queen Anne. However, 45% of

the rental housing stock surveyed by Dupre+Scott Apartment Advisors is located in these high-cost sub-markets.

Discussion

Average rents in Seattle tend to be higher than HUD's allowable Fair Market Rent levels, causing challenges for providers using Consolidated Plan funds to help people stay in their homes or to transition them to the private housing market in this area.

MA-20 Housing Market Analysis: Condition of Housing – 91.210(a)

Introduction

See MA-05 Overview for more detail and link to The Mayor’s recently released Seattle Housing Strategy.

For a detailed analysis of Seattle’s housing conditions, market trends and impact on housing affordability see the “Housing Seattle” report by the Seattle Planning Commission (Winter 2011). Also note that the City of Seattle is updating its 20-Year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan in 2013. Strategies that support housing affordability and diversity are always integral to the Comprehensive Plan.

Definitions

“Substandard condition but suitable for rehabilitation” is a HUD term that the City of Seattle defines as housing for which either (a) a notice of violation based on one or more physical conditions of the housing that has not been corrected has been issued pursuant to Seattle Housing and Building Maintenance Code, subsection 22.206.220 “Notice of Violation,” or (b) a residential rental housing business license has been suspended, denied, or revoked pursuant to the Seattle License Code, SMC Chapter 6.202 “General Provisions” based on one or more physical conditions of the housing that has not been corrected and/or the Residential Rental Business License and Inspection Program, SMC Chapter 6.440; and that could be brought up to standard condition through rehabilitation costing less than 70% of the cost to replace the housing.

Condition of Units

Condition of Units	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Number	%	Number	%
With one selected Condition	46,233	34%	59,198	42%
With two selected Conditions	799	1%	3,482	2%
With three selected Conditions	112	0%	435	0%
With four selected Conditions	0	0%	0	0%
No selected Conditions	90,197	66%	76,558	55%
Total	137,341	101%	139,673	99%

Table 35 - Condition of Units

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS Data

Need for Owner and Rental Rehabilitation



TABLE G

Number of occupied housing units by tenure and year structure built

	Owner	Pct	Renter	Pct	Total	Pct
Built 2000 or later	11,201	8.16%	13,742	9.84%	24,943	9.00%
Built 1980-1999	19,079	13.89%	28,760	20.59%	47,839	17.27%
Built 1950-1979	35,868	26.12%	53,612	38.38%	89,480	32.30%
Built 1949 or earlier	71,193	51.84%	43,559	31.19%	114,752	41.42%
Total	137,341	49.58%	139,673	50.42%	277,014	100%

Source: CPD Maps, 2005-09 American Community Survey, 5-Year Estimates

MA-20 Table G Need for Owner and Rental Rehab

Year Unit Built

Year Unit Built	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Number	%	Number	%
2000 or later	11,201	8%	13,742	10%
1980-1999	19,079	14%	28,760	21%
1950-1979	35,868	26%	53,612	38%
Before 1950	71,193	52%	43,559	31%
Total	137,341	100%	139,673	100%

Table 36 – Year Unit Built

Data Source: 2005-2009 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	107,061	78%	97,171	70%
Housing Units build before 1980 with children present	23,130	17%	15,705	11%

Table 37 – Risk of Lead-Based Paint

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS (Total Units) 2005-2009 CHAS (Units with Children present)

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

TABLE H

Renter Occupied Units	household contains 1 or more children age 6 or younger	household contains no children age 6 or younger	Grand Total
1939 or earlier	2195	31125	33320
greater than 30% but less than or equal to 50% of HAMFI	385	5015	5400
greater than 50% but less than or equal to 80% of HAMFI	430	6425	6855
greater than 80% of HAMFI	1035	12270	13305
less than or equal to 30% of HAMFI	345	7415	7760
between 1940 and 1979	5230	58620	63850
greater than 30% but less than or equal to 50% of HAMFI	1145	9500	10645
greater than 50% but less than or equal to 80% of HAMFI	1115	12780	13895
greater than 80% of HAMFI	1585	21210	22795
less than or equal to 30% of HAMFI	1385	15130	16515
1980 or later	3125	39370	42495
greater than 30% but less than or equal to 50% of HAMFI	660	5115	5775
greater than 50% but less than or equal to 80% of HAMFI	465	6455	6920
greater than 80% of HAMFI	1015	17350	18365
less than or equal to 30% of HAMFI	985	10450	11435
Grand Total	10550	129115	139665

MA-20 Table H Est # of LMI Occupied Units w LBP

Vacant Units

	Suitable for Rehabilitation	Not Suitable for Rehabilitation	Total
Vacant Units	0	0	0
Abandoned Vacant Units	0	0	0
REO Properties	0	0	0
Abandoned REO Properties	0	0	0

Table 38 - Vacant Units

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

Need for Owner and Rental Rehabilitation

See Table G attached above.

The majority of Seattle's housing stock was built before 1979. Based on a CPD Maps search, Census Tracts with the highest percentages of extremely low-income households in substandard housing are located in the International District, Pioneer Square, and University District, and lower, but still high enough concentrations to be of concern in Aurora-Licton Springs, Bitter Lake, Duwamish Valley, Georgetown, and Beacon Hill.

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

See Table H attached above.

Discussion

The "Housing Seattle" report referenced earlier contains our discussion of the condition of housing in Seattle.

MA-25 Public and Assisted Housing – 91.210(b)

Introduction

Seattle Housing Authority (SHA) provides long-term rental housing and rental assistance to more than 15,000 households through Low Income Public Housing (LIPH) and Housing Choice Vouchers (also referred to as Section 8 or HCV).

SHA's Low Income Public Housing (LIPH) stock totals 6,335 units as of year end 2012, which are located in neighborhoods throughout the City of Seattle. See 2013 List of SHA Communities attached below.

SHA's public housing stock provides a range of bedroom sizes, as well as opportunities for specific populations, such as the buildings in our Seattle Senior Housing Program (SSHP). While most of SHA's public housing units are located in apartment buildings, some are located in smaller, multi-family buildings and houses in our Scattered Site portfolio.

In accordance with the Section 504 Voluntary Compliance Agreement signed in 2007, SHA has made significant progress towards completing 263 UFAS units and will continue to commit at least five percent of new construction to accessible units. As of yearend 2012, 190 UFAS units had already been certified.

The overall condition of SHA's public housing units is good. SHA's average score of 87 percent for 2011 REAC inspections reflects the close scrutiny paid to maintenance and repairs at SHA buildings, a challenge given the fact that many SHA buildings are aging. SHA has also recently added new public housing stock, including an ARRA-funded project at Lake City Village and HOPE VI communities, including High Point, Rainier Vista, and New Holly, all of which are in very good condition. SHA has also begun work to redevelop Yesler Terrace, our oldest housing development, and continuing this work will be essential.

Federal underfunding has resulted in a backlog of capital projects, as well as making it challenging for SHA to maintain operating funding for regular repairs and maintenance. While SHA has been successful in leveraging other resources, including tax credits and bonds, the agency still faces a significant backlog. In the short-term, capital needs in the scattered site portfolio total \$1.8 million within the next year. In the long-term, the majority of SHA's public housing stock will hit the 50 year mark within the next ten years and as a result will require major sewer and electrical work as part of its lifecycle, totaling \$25 to 30 million. Twenty buildings will also need new roofs, at a cost of approximately \$250,000 per roof.

Underfunding places SHA in a difficult position, where in order to maintain the condition of housing stock; the agency must make difficult choices. For example, SHA must consider whether to retain the scattered site portfolio, which is more costly to maintain as it is located in smaller buildings dispersed throughout the city, or dispose of it in favor of more consolidated stock.

More than 8,000 tenant-based and project-based vouchers are currently in use in Seattle, but demand is much higher than supply. SHA reopened the waiting list for Housing Choice Vouchers in early 2013 and received 24,000 applications.

Waiting lists for public housing units also indicate high demand. As of yearend 2012, 6,700 households were waiting for traditional public housing units and the average wait time for new move-ins to public housing was 26 months. Thousands more households were waiting on individual site-based waiting lists for public housing units in HOPE VI communities.

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	0	588	5,367	8,810	104	8,706	944	10	620
# of accessible units			890						
*includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition									

Table 39 – Total Number of Units by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

2013 List of SHA Public Housing Communities

- Aki Kurose
- Ballard House
- Barton Place
- Beacon Tower
- Bell Tower
- Bitter Lake Manor
- Blakeley Manor
- Cal-Mor Circle
- Capitol Park
- Carroll Terrace
- Cedarvale House
- Cedarvale Village
- Center Park
- Center West
- Columbia Place
- Denice Hunt Townhomes
- Denny Terrace
- Fort Lawton Place
- Fremont Place
- Gideon-Mathews Gardens
- Green Lake Plaza
- Harvard Court
- High Point
- Holly Court
- International Terrace
- Island View
- Jackson Park House
- Jackson Park Village
- Jefferson Terrace
- Lake City Court
- Lake City House
- Lictonwood
- Longfellow Court/Westwood Court
- Longfellow Creek Apartments
- Meadowbrook View Apartments
- Michaelson Manor
- Nelson Manor
- NewHolly
- Olive Ridge
- Olmsted Manor
- Olympic West
- Phinney Terrace
- Pinehurst Court
- Pleasant Valley Plaza
- Primeau Place
- Queen Anne Heights
- Rainier Vista
- Reunion House
- Ross Manor
- Roxhill Court Apartments
- Scattered Sites
- Schwabacher House
- Stewart Manor
- Sunrise Manor
- Tamarack Place
- Tri-Court
- University House
- University West
- West Town View
- Westwood Heights
- Wildwood Glen
- Willis House
- Wisteria Court
- Yesler Terrace

|
2013 List of SHA PH Communities

2012 Seattle Housing Authority - Total number of units

	Cert- ificate	Mod- Rehab	Public Housing	Total: vouchers	Project- based vouchers	Tenant- based vouchers	VASH	FUP	Disabled
# of units/vouchers available	0	759	6,335	8,798	2,927	5,871	260	200	75
# of accessible units	0	0	890	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Source: MTW 2012 Annual Report

|

Updated 2012 SHA Total Number of Units

Describe the supply of public housing developments:

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:

SHA targets extremely low income households with the great majority of its housing resources. In 2012, SHA served 12,674 extremely low-income households (0-30% AMI) and 1,901 low-income households (30-80% AMI). (These figures exclude port outs, for whom we do not maintain income data, and includes port ins.)

SHA anticipates no long-term or permanent loss of public housing units. However, there will be short-term changes in SHA’s inventory as the agency redevelops Yesler Terrace and repositions its scattered site housing stock. In addition, while maintaining (and when possible increasing) the availability of public housing units is a primary goal for SHA, if funding continues to be insufficient the agency may have to seriously contemplate whether a reduction in inventory may be required.

Public Housing Condition

Public Housing Development	Average Inspection Score
See list of property and 2011 REAC Score attached	0

Table 40 - Public Housing Condition

Condition of public housing units

Property	2011 REAC Score
Bell Tower	96
Cedarvale Village	81
Denny Terrace	94
High Point	77
High Rise Phase 2 Limited Partnership	88
High Rise Phase 3 Limited Partnership	91
High Rise Phase 1 Limited Partnership	90
Holly Court	99
Jackson Park Village	69
Jefferson Terrace	84
Lake City Village and Rainier Vista	95
Longfellow Creek and Roxhill Court	75
New Holly	81
Olive Ridge	83
Scattered Sites	87
Seattle Senior Housing Program (SSHP)	76
Stone View Village	85
Stoneview Phase II (Aki Kurose)	99
Tri-Court	92
Westwood Heights	94
Wisteria Court	89
Yesler Terrace	74

SHA Property 2011 REAC Scores

Describe the restoration and revitalization needs of public housing units in the jurisdiction:

Many SHA buildings are aging, resulting in significant restoration and revitalization needs. SHA has already begun work to redevelop Yesler Terrace, our oldest housing development, and continuing this revitalization effort will be essential.

Federal underfunding has resulted in a backlog of capital projects, as well as making it challenging for SHA to maintain operating funding for regular repairs and maintenance. While SHA has been successful in leveraging other resources, including tax credits and bonds, the agency still faces a significant backlog. In the short-term, capital needs in the scattered site portfolio total \$1.8 million within the next year. In the long-term, the majority of SHA's public housing stock will hit the 50 year mark within the next ten years and as a result will require major sewer and electrical work as part of its lifecycle, totaling \$25 to 30 million. Twenty buildings will also need new roofs, at a cost of approximately \$250,000 per roof.

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

In addition to attention to the physical environment of SHA communities, the agency strives to support personal and community aspects of its properties. Community builders contribute to this by working with interested residents to form and sustain duly-elected resident councils and issue-specific work groups to work with management on issues of common interest. In addition, most communities send representatives to the Joint Policy Advisory Committee, with whom SHA regularly consults on major policy issues. Residents are involved in planning for the use of HUD's Resident Participation Funds.

Discussion:

SHA strives to maintain a safe and healthy living environment for its residents. However, underfunding creates additional challenges in this arena.

MA-30 Homeless Facilities and Services – 91.210(c)

Introduction

Seattle is responding to the needs of persons experiencing homelessness through a coordinated continuum of care and affordable housing.

Since 1981 when Seattle voters approved the first a series of local bond and levies to create affordable housing, Seattle has now funded over 10,000 affordable apartments for seniors, low- and moderate-wage workers, and formerly homeless individuals and families, plus provided down-payment loans to more than 600 first-time homebuyers and rental assistance to more than 4,000 households.

The City of Seattle has contributed to the production of 3,312 affordable housing units through construction, preservation, and leasing of housing units dedicated to homeless individuals and families since the community's Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness was introduced in 2005 (see Annual Production to Meet King Cty 10-Yr Plan End Homelessness Goals attached to table below). More than half (57%) of these units have been created for chronically homeless individuals.

Prevention, Intervention and Housing Placement & Stabilization: The City also contributes to homelessness prevention, intervention, housing stabilization services, including investments in the operations of emergency shelter, transitional housing, and permanent housing support services that to increase health, independence and stability.

A network of facilities in Seattle provides a total year-round capacity of approximately 2,223 emergency shelter beds. Additional shelter, with varying capacity, is provided through emergency voucher programs targeted to assist families with children access individual, temporary shelter units in hotel/motels. During the winter months (October through March), the capacity of the shelter system expands, adding more than 412 beds; additional capacity can be added when there are severe weather conditions. The inventory also includes 2,131 year-round, transitional housing beds for families and individuals.

For a breakdown of Seattle's approach to funding emergency housing and shelter programs among populations see "Seattle's Existing Approach" attached below the table.

Facilities and Housing Targeted to Homeless Households

	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)	509	60	1,389	87	0
Households with Only Adults	1,706	352	720	1,940	310
Chronically Homeless Households	0	0	0	1,072	105
Veterans	65	0	190	318	55
Unaccompanied Youth	8	0	22	0	0

Table 41 - Facilities and Housing Targeted to Homeless Households

Data Source Comments: See notes to Facilities & Hsg Targeted to Homeless HH below table.

Annual Production to Meet King County 10 Year Plan to End Homelessness Goals																					
updated 2005 through December 31, 2012																					
10 Year Plan Target	Cumulative Production Including Pipeline		2005 Units Completed/Operational		2006 Units Completed/Operational		2007 Units Completed/Operational		2008 Units Completed/Operational		2009 Units Completed/Operational		2010 Units Completed/Operational		2011 Units Completed/Operational		2012 Units Completed/Operational		Pipeline		
	Seattle	King County	Seattle	King County	Seattle	King County	Seattle	King County	Seattle	King County	Seattle	King County	Seattle	King County	Seattle	King County	Seattle	King County	Seattle	King County	
Capital Production (Acquisition/Rehab/New Constr)																					
Chronic Homeless Individuals	2,000	1,364	97	303	0	55	0	135	0	18	0	186	43	233	39	58	0	0	0	376	15
Homeless Individuals	1,600	543	129	115	0	39	0	32	0	10	0	28	22	41	23	0	49	10	0	268	35
Homeless Families	875	300	253	28	50	38	0	38	51	6	27	42	8	0	40	89	72	0	0	59	5
Homeless Youth/Young Adults	250	22	66	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	20	16	0	0	0	44
Total Capital Housing Production		2,229	545	446	50	134	0	205	51	34	33	256	73	274	102	167	137	10	0	703	99
Combined Seattle / King County Totals	4,725	2,774		496		134		256		67		329		376		304		10		802	
Use of Operating/Rental Subsidies in Existing Housing																					
Chronic Homeless Individuals	500	514	284	0	0	75	5	40	3	20	2	181	139	123	52	33	35	42	48	0	0
Homeless Individuals	3,200	238	293	0	0	173	5	22	98	43	42	0	93	0	0	0	35	0	20	0	0
Homeless Families	1,025	236	908	0	0	20	2	6	45	18	37	18	274	0	62	174	162	0	326	0	0
Homeless Youth/Young Adults	50	95	82	0	0	0	0	9	3	13	0	10	15	8	15	55	4	0	45	0	0
Total Operating/Rental Subsidies		1,083	1,567	0	0	268	12	77	149	94	81	209	521	131	129	262	236	42	439	0	0
Combined Seattle / King County Totals	4,775	2,650		0		280		226		175		730		260		498		481		0	
Total Units		3,312	2,112	446	50	402	12	282	200	128	114	465	594	405	231	429	373	52	439	703	99
Combined Seattle / King County Totals	9,500	5,424		496		414		482		242		1,059		636		802		491		802	
This report is compiled from housing and service funders participating in the King County Homeless Housing Funders Group. Please provide any corrections or additions to the Seattle Office of Housing by email to lindsay.masters@seattle.gov																					
Note: Annual production numbers represent housing units that are actively funded. Housing units from past projects and programs that are no longer funded are not included.																					

Annual Prod to Meet KC 10-Yr Plan to End Homelessness

Seattle's Existing Approach

City of Seattle Shelter Investments

As part of intervention efforts, HSD invests more than \$6.7 million annually from local and federal funding sources in emergency housing and shelter programs. Seattle has been investing resources to support shelters since the early 1980s.

Population	Funded Beds	% of Seattle Investment	City Investment
Single Adults	1,048 beds	71%	\$ 4,807,084
Families with Children	79 units	18%	\$ 1,215,736
Survivors of Domestic Violence	5 beds for individuals 21 family units	7.40%	\$ 508,000
Youth and Young Adults	33 beds	3.60%	\$ 243,902
Total	1,181 beds/units		\$ 6,774,722

20

While CEH was reviewing priority items, HSD began working on our homelessness investment plan. **Here's what we found.** Over the past eight years: the Homeless population has changed & economic recession/budget cuts have had severe impact on community and human services providers. Yet services and service delivery systems have largely remained the same (excerpted from the April 2013 National Human Services Data Consortium presentation – author Sola Plummer).

2013 - Seattle's Existing Approach to Emerg Hsg

Notes to Facilities Targeted to Homeless HH table

1. The Continuum of Care (CoC) Housing Inventory Chart (HIC) was used to complete Table 40-Facilities Targeted to Homeless Persons. The City of Seattle is part of a countywide CoC which includes eight jurisdictions, including Seattle. The exact number of beds/units excludes a

number of programs operate scattered site transitional housing programs that operate in Seattle, primarily, but are part of countywide geographical HIC coding. These countywide service programs are not included in the figures above, but are predominantly located within the City of Seattle.

2. Within the city of Seattle, emergency shelter and transitional housing programs have the capacity to provide emergency and transitional housing beds year-round to an estimated 4,354 persons each night. Table 40-Facilities and Housing Targeted to Homeless Households indicates the maximum bed-capacity, however programs assisting families with children operate and provide individual “units” for households, based on family size.

3. Permanent Supportive Housing Units represented in Table 40 includes only the projects and units that meet the strict definition of “permanent supportive housing” for persons with disabilities. These figures are part of the CoC HIC that are reported to HUD as part of the annual Continuum of Care application process. Seattle has developed a greater number of supportive housing and service enriched housing programs for chronically homeless individuals. These “chronically homeless” units have adopted a broader definition that is used by HUD. The number of units developed under our Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness is included as an attachment (“Annual Production to Meet King County 10 Year Plan to End Homelessness Goals.”

4. Veterans: The total number of beds for persons in households without children includes the number of beds available for homeless veterans. The number of beds dedicated to Veterans is a subset of the beds included in the total number of beds available for persons in households without children.

Overview of Mainstream Support Services

Healthcare Services: Health protection, health promotion and health provision are among the primary functions of Public Health Seattle & King County. The public health department hosts the Healthcare for the Homeless Network (HCHN), a program that provides “quality, comprehensive health care for people experiencing homelessness in Seattle and King County and provides leadership to help change the conditions that deprive our neighbors of home and health.” Programs are designed to link people into primary health care and help connect them with other vital services, including behavioral health care treatment. HCHN teams operate at shelters, housing program sites, day center programs, and clinics. Street outreach teams are also meeting people where they are, building trusting relationships, reducing harm and helping people identify their needs and make steps toward improving their health.

Behavioral Health (Mental Health, Chemical Addiction & Dependency Services): King County provides publicly funded mental health services to low-income people in need. To qualify for mental health services, an individual must meet both financial and medical necessity criteria. Services are provided by community-based mental health care providers, including a number of social and health service providers that offer specialized programs for homeless individuals, families and youth.

Sobering, detoxification, outpatient treatment, and substance abuse prevention services are the responsibility of King County. The King County Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment delivery system works in partnership with other departments within the county and the City of Seattle, and the Washington State Division of Alcohol and Substance Abuse (DASA) in planning and implementing publicly funded prevention and treatment services. Some of the services provided are county operated programs; however most are provided through contracts with community-based substance abuse prevention and treatment agencies. <http://www.kingcounty.gov/healthservices/MHSA.aspx>

Employment Services: Seattle/King County Continuum of Care partner with the Workforce Development Council of Seattle-King County (WDC), a nonprofit workforce “think tank” and grant-making organization whose mission is to support a strong economy and ensure the ability of each person to achieve self-sufficiency.

The WDC’s Homeless Intervention Project (HIP) has served more than 5,000 homeless adults since 1995. HIP is a HUD-funded consortium of service providers funded by the WDC. HIP is based on intensive case management and housing assistance for each individual, determined by comprehensive assessment of needs, assets and barriers. In addition to occupational skills training, HIP includes assistance in basic skills (reading, math etc.), life skills (e.g. maintaining a budget) and “soft skills” for work. HIP providers work closely with housing providers and others serving the homeless to ensure comprehensive, non-duplicative services that efficiently use resources. <http://www.seakingwdc.org/workforce/homeless-jobseekers.html>.

Homeless Strategy Description - Part 1

Homelessness Prevention program assistance includes:

- Short-term financial assistance (rental assistance and utility assistance), case management, housing access and stabilization services to prevent shelter entrance and promote housing retention
- Services that reestablish healthy connections between individuals and their families, including families of choice

- Legal representation, counseling and advocacy (including assistance to delay or dismiss eviction, in-court representation). Collaboration with homelessness prevention agencies to provide financial assistance and stabilization services.

Homelessness Intervention Services include:

- **Street Outreach Services:** Engagement with people who are not currently connected to community resources outreach services focus on specific populations and/or geographic areas in order to identify and connect people to services and/or housing. Services in Seattle target special needs of chronically homeless, disabled individuals, particularly those with severe mental illness and chronic alcohol and substance abuse disorders.
- **Shelter, Transitional and Interim Housing:** This includes: Overnight shelter and overnight shelter with enhanced services; Shelter with 24-hour accommodation & service, including shelter for families with children, and shelter for youth under 18 years old; Transitional housing for individuals; families with children; and Transitional Living Programs (TLP) for homeless youth and young adults; and Confidential shelter and transitional housing for victims of domestic violence.
- **Day Services (Day Centers, Drop-in Centers, and Hygiene Centers):** Facility-based/site-based services assisting individuals to increase their daytime safety and security, meet their nutritional needs, and access services such as employment assistance, links to mainstream benefits, and access health care and housing resources; and Facilities providing a safe place to meet basic hygiene needs.
- **Food & Meal Programs:** Meal Programs provide meals to low-income and homeless people to help meet minimum nutritional requirements. The sites vary in size and hours of operation. Programs that service night and day shelters are open seven days per week. Food Banks are service sites that provide food and other household supplies to low-income and homeless people. City of Seattle funds 17 food bank sites across Seattle.

Homeless Strategy Description - Part 2

Housing Placement, Stabilization & Support Services: financial assistance (e.g. rental assistance and/or utility deposits) services designed to move a homeless household quickly into permanent, “non time-limited” housing. **Housing focused services:** Case management, housing advocacy, search and placement services for short-term or ongoing support to households to stabilize, move into housing.

Supportive services are provided on-site or co-located with housing or linked to service sites in the community. These services are delivered by housing agencies, by mainstream service or arranged under collaborative agreements between the housing provider and a service provider.

- Mainstream services and resources to increase safety, stability and self-sufficiency, such as healthcare; substance abuse detox and recovery treatment; mental health assessment and treatment; employment training, placement, and retention; housing placement; child care and after-school programs (for programs serving families); legal assistance; removing barriers associated with past felony/criminal conviction; credit counseling; life skills training.
- Case management to connect people with mainstream services, community resources (e.g. churches, philanthropic groups, neighborhood groups), and after-placement services for households entering housing. Services focus on preventing future recurrence of homelessness.
- Financial empowerment: Information, education, planning, counseling and coaching to increase financial stability. These services may include assistance with opening a bank account, preparing a budget, taking a class in money management, developing a plan to save money, receiving one-on-one assistance from a debt/credit specialist, applying for public benefits.
- Child care and parenting support services: Consultation and support for child care, after-school and/or school programs; behavioral health services for children to overcome trauma associated with becoming homeless; and parenting services to strengthen parent-child attachment.

Permanent Supportive Housing and Service Enriched Housing Programs

Rental Assistance Programs (Shelter Plus Care, Rapid Re-housing, and Facility & Tenant Based Rental Assistance Programs)

- The City of Seattle has contributed to the production of 3,312 affordable housing units through construction, preservation, and leasing of housing units dedicated to homeless individuals and families in the last eight years since the community's Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness was introduced in 2005. More than half (57%) of these units have been created for chronically homeless individuals.
- Since 1981 when Seattle voters approved the first a series of local bond and levies to create affordable housing, Seattle has now funded over 10,000 affordable apartments for seniors, low- and moderate-wage workers, and formerly homeless individuals and families, plus provided down-payment loans to more than 600 first-time homebuyers and rental assistance to more than 4,000 households.

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

Some of the mainstream supportive services available to homeless individuals and families in the Seattle are described below. The demand for these services exceeds capacity and available resources. For detail on a sampling of supportive services see "Overview of Mainstream Services" attached to table above.

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.

The City of Seattle leverages and coordinates its resources to support community based agencies that provide homelessness **prevention**, homelessness **intervention** services, and **housing stabilization and support** services designed to help meet needs of homeless and formerly homeless individuals and families (see detail in "Homeless Strategy Description" attached above.) For in-depth background and analysis of Seattle's homeless strategies and planned investments see the Human Services Department's Communities Supporting Safe and Stable Housing at http://www.seattle.gov/humanservices/documents/hsd_csssh_investment_plan_final_062712.pdf.

MA-35 Special Needs Facilities and Services – 91.210(d)

Introduction

Seattle continues to work closely with other partners in the Continuum of Care (CoC) including King County, S/KC Public Health, Seattle Housing Authority, United Way, the religious community and private philanthropic agencies to develop multiple funding resources that target resources to vulnerable special population groups. Seattle often “braids” funding with service partners to meet the needs of specific populations. This section includes links to major reports and initiatives underway in Seattle and King County, to address the need for facilities and services of specific populations identified here.

Seattle is closely monitoring anticipated changes with the implementation of the Affordable HealthCare Act, and will explore potential to leverage services for homeless and special populations in conjunction with supportive services that may come with HCA funding.

Information on special needs facilities and services targeted to specific population groups identified in this section include: the elderly, frail elderly, persons with disabilities (including mental, physical, and developmental), persons with alcohol or other chemical dependency, persons with HIV/AIDS and their families, public housing residents, and youth and young adults.

HOPWA Assistance Baseline Table

Type of HOWA Assistance	Number of Units Designated or Available for People with HIV/AIDS and their families
TBRA	33
PH in facilities	74
STRMU	97
ST or TH facilities	23
PH placement	81

Table 42– HOPWA Assistance Baseline

Data Source: HOPWA CAPER and HOPWA Beneficiary Verification Worksheet

HOPWA – Three-Year Anticipated Service by Type of Assistance*

	2013		2014		2015	
	Outputs	Funding	Outputs	Funding	Outputs	Funding
Housing Subsidy Assistance						
Tenant-Based Rental Assistance	30	138,000	22	100,000	22	100,000
Project-Based Rental Assistance	56	271,274	69	335,637	83	408,000
Permanent Housing Operating Subsidy	20	472,096	9	236,048	0	0
Transitional Housing Operating Subsidy	0	0	0	0	0	0
STRMU	0	0	20	40,000	23	46,000
Permanent Housing Placement	10	17,800	10	17,800	18	32,040
TOTAL	116	899,170	130	729,485	146	586,040
Housing Development						
Permanent Housing Capital Investment	0	0	8	300,000	0	0
Transitional Housing Capital Investment	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	8	300,000	0	0
Supportive Services*						
Services with HOPWA-Funded Housing	96	88,405	96	88,405	96	88,405
Services Only	212	324,542	236	393,169	252	433,555
TOTAL	308	412,947	332	481,574	348	521,960
Housing Information Services						
Navigator Services	0	0	10	50,000	20	100,000
Centralized Functions			10	50,000	20	100,000
Total	0	0	20	100,000	40	200,000
Grant Administration						
Total	0	94,133	0	96,067	0	98,000
TOTAL		1,406,250		1,407,126		1,406,000

*Funding estimates only – subject to change.

HOPWA - 3-Year Anticipated Services by Type of Assistance

Including the elderly, frail elderly, persons with disabilities (mental, physical, developmental), persons with alcohol or other drug addictions, persons with HIV/AIDS and their families, public housing residents and any other categories the jurisdiction may specify, and describe their supportive housing needs

People Living with HIV/AIDS

People living with HIV/AIDS represent a range of needs. Recent planning work points to an increasing proportion of clients in the medical case management system with a number of barriers to accessing and retaining housing including homelessness, mental illness, chemical addiction, criminal history, past evictions, and poor credit.

Housing goals in the next year are aimed at shifting resources to best address individual client needs to support successful housing placement as well as increased emphasis on maintaining that housing. Supportive housing needs will be addressed in a number of ways, including:

- Housing with 24/7 front desk coverage

- On-site case management in permanent housing with individually tailored housing plans
- Services-enriched transitional housing emphasizing the development of life skills and access to mental health and chemical dependency treatment when called for.
- Development of a mobile team which will include expertise in mental health and chemical dependency. This service will be available for people living in permanent housing and will facilitate leveraging more affordable units for higher need people with HIV/AIDS
- Use of peers in the delivery of supportive services

For more detail on the supportive housing needs of other populations called out; please link to the full strategic plans listed below:

Elderly: see 2012-2015 Area Plan on Aging New Partners for New Times

People with disabilities: see Overview of City of Seattle Investments in Public Health Services

Public Housing residents: see Bold Plans in the Face of Uncertainty - 2011 to 2015 Strategic Plan - Seattle Housing Authority

Immigrants & Refugees: see Immigrant and Refugee Initiative Action Plan

Survivors of Domestic Violence: see the City's Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Prevention website

Persons with substance abuse addictions: see the City's Public Health Initiatives and Funding website

Youth & Young Adult: see a new [Comprehensive Plan to End Youth and Young Adult Homelessness in King County by 2020](#) is in final draft and anticipated to be completed early in the fall of 2013

MA – 35: Continuum of Care (CoC) Discharge (the following excerpted from City of Seattle 2012 CoC application materials)

The City of Seattle, through the Seattle-King County Continuum of Care, completed detailed discharge planning for individuals coming from the mental health, health care, foster care, and corrections systems. Please see the summary of this planning attached above as "Discharge Plans".

Mental Health

Describe the efforts that the CoC has taken to ensure that persons are not routinely discharged into homelessness:

The CoC has formal discharge protocols to ensure that persons are not routinely discharged into homelessness. The protocols are implemented by CoC member organizations and led by King County Mental Health Chemical Abuse & Dependency Services (MHCADS) with a written agreement with Western State Hosp (WSH). There is a weekly bed opening/case conference call amongst MHCADS, Western State, local hospitals and mental health providers regarding housing and service needs of patients ready to exit. Three WSH discharge liaisons (and a separate liaison to assist with local facility discharge planning) connect clients to post-release treatment, income supports and housing.

Specifically, identify the stakeholders and/or collaborating agencies that are responsible for ensuring that persons being discharged from a system of care are not routinely discharged into homelessness: King County Mental Health Chemical Abuse & Dependency Services (MHCADS) is the lead entity in charge of Mental Health Services and ensuring that persons being discharged from a mental health institution are not routinely discharged into homelessness. MHCADS contracts with agencies that are responsible for implementation. The agencies include: Community Psychiatric Clinic, Community House Mental Health, Downtown Emergency Services Center (DESC), Navos, Sound Mental Health, Valley Cities Counseling and Consultation, Harborview Medical Center, and Fairfax.

Specifically indicate where persons routinely go upon discharge other than HUD McKinney-Vento funded programs:

King County MHCADS and partner agencies have developed a number of housing resources for persons exiting institutions. Resource include PACT Teams with access to 180 rental subsidies for adults on discharge or identified as high system utilizers; Intensive Case Management provides service enriched housing for 54 adults discharged from Western State Hospital; Standard Supportive Housing Program (SSH) has 170 permanent housing units with daily services for clients discharged from WSH and local psych and residential facilities; Midway SSH provides 22 service enriched units for older adults. An additional 130 clients can be assisted with rental assistance through the FISH (Forensic Intensive Supportive Housing) & PACT (Forensic Assertive Community Treatment) Programs for mentally ill discharged or diverted from jail, mental health and drug courts. MHCADS controls 317 licensed boarding home beds. All of this is non-McKinney funded.

Health Care

Describe the efforts that the CoC has taken to ensure that persons are not routinely discharged into homelessness:

The CoC adopted a written agreement between Harborview Medical Center (HMC) our public/trauma hospital & Public Health - Seattle & King County's Health Care for the Homeless Network to prevent post-hospital discharge to homelessness. The partnership expanded countywide in 2011 adding 7 King County partner hospitals. By agreement, hospital discharge planners refer eligible homeless clients directly to The Edward Thomas House (ETH) Medical Respite program. ETH Medical Respite meets post-hospital recuperative care needs for homeless persons while reducing public costs associated with frequent hospital use. As a person becomes stable for hospital discharge, partner hospitals work through a structured, documented referral process with the ETH Respite referral coordinator. The ETH coordinator screens referrals to assure that incoming respite clients meet the eligibility criteria and are appropriate for the services provided in the program.

Specifically, identify the stakeholders and/or collaborating agencies that are responsible for ensuring that persons being discharged from a system of care are not routinely discharged into homelessness: Harborview Medical Center and 7 partner hospitals throughout King County collaborate to ensure persons are not discharged from these systems of care into homelessness. The ETH Medical Respite program was made possible through a partnership with Seattle Housing Authority to lease space for the program at Jefferson Terrace. One floor was remodeled -34 total beds in 16 rooms. Partners used non-McKinney sources to increase beds, add clinical capacity, and create additional post placement services and housing. While the community support that launched the program is notable, respite is not a reimbursed category of service under Medicaid or Medicare, and a diverse funding mix is critical.

Specifically indicate where persons routinely go upon discharge other than HUD McKinney-Vento funded programs:

If Respite does not have bed space available that day the referral screener will work with hospitals to hold the client for an extra day or two until a Respite bed becomes available. The referral coordinator also works with hospitals to determine if another service is more appropriate. If the client does not need an acute level of care, but requires a place to rest/heal, the coordinator assesses availability of non-HUD funded shelter/housing programs where the client can recover. Additionally, in some cases non-HUD funded nursing homes are an option for temporary housing when respite or shelter is unavailable. The program works very closely with patients to get them into housing. Staff connects them with case management to help negotiate the different systems after discharge. SPC vouchers, multiple units of long term shelter/transitional housing, set-asides in permanent supportive housing, and Project Based Section 8 Certificates create post hospital discharge housing options.

Foster Care

Is the discharge policy in place "State" mandated policy or "CoC" adopted policy?
State Mandated Policy

Youth exiting from foster care are mandated to have a discharge plan. In Seattle King County, this plan is created by the youth, the YMCA, and DSHS along with any other stakeholders the youth wishes to engage to ensure that youth are not discharged to homelessness.

Discharge Plan - Part 1

Describe the efforts that the CoC has taken to ensure that persons are not routinely discharged into homelessness:

The CoC has a formal written agreement/protocol with the State of Washington (DSHS) to ensure youth/young adults exiting foster care are not discharged into homelessness. The protocol outlines dedicated services and stipulates the role/responsibilities/expectations of all parties. The YMCA implements the protocol through a one-stop resource/referral center for housing, employment, education and life skills resources for all Youth/Young Adults (Y/A) ages 15-21 aging out foster care in this CoC. It provides transition planning/case management support and uses the Education & Training Voucher Program, Chafee funds and other non-McKinney funded programs to assist Y/A successfully exit foster care with long term housing in place. In addition to 22 units of permanent housing funded by the State Independent Youth Housing Program, the YMCA also has 42 HUD Family Unification Program vouchers and 114 other housing units accessible to foster youth. The YMCA will be partnering more closely with the state in 2013 to set aside additional units of housing units specifically for foster youth.

Specifically, identify the stakeholders and/or collaborating agencies that are responsible for ensuring that persons being discharged from a system of care are not routinely discharged into homelessness: The YMCA works with a Transition Collaborative, composed of key stakeholders focused on improving opportunities and maximizing coordination on behalf of Y/A leaving foster care. Organizations include the Mockingbird Society, Treehouse, Youthcare, Casey Family Programs, DSHS, and the College Success Foundation. These organizations are either co-located or within blocks of the YMCA resource center.

Specifically indicate where persons routinely go upon discharge other than HUD McKinney-Vento funded programs:

A mix of housing options is available, including cluster housing with support staff and scattered site housing. Individuals may be placed into any one of the nearly 200 units of housing provided by the YMCA none of which are funded by HUD McKinney Vento. The stakeholders in the Transition Collaborative work to maximize these housing opportunities on behalf of these youth to keep them out of homelessness.

Corrections

Describe the efforts that the CoC has taken to ensure that persons are not routinely discharged into homelessness:

Written CoC protocols ensure persons are not routinely discharged from jails/prison to the street. The CoC's Criminal Justice Initiative (CJI) is implemented through written Memorandum of Agreements with King County Adult & Juvenile Detention and 11 municipalities. CJI also has partnership agreements with over 30 agencies to implement jail transition using non-McKinney resources. CJI release/discharge planners target resources to adults with mental illness/co-occurring disorders involved with drug/mental health court and jail connections. Planners ensure critical connections to post-release care, income supports and housing. Bridge Programs with re-entry case management connect persons with community based services/transitional housing; and Specialized Offender Based Treatment Programs provide "housing first" and permanent supportive housing. Services are coordinated to reduce/prevent more acute illness, high-risk behaviors, incarceration and other emergency medical or crisis responses and offer individuals a better chance for successfully returning to their communities.

Specifically indicate where persons routinely go upon discharge are responsible for ensuring that persons being discharged from a system of care are not routinely discharged into homelessness:

CJI is implemented through written Memorandum of Agreements with King County Adult & Juvenile Detention and 11 municipalities and CJI has partnership agreements with more than 30 agencies to implement the jail transition plan using non-McKinney resources. Programs target adults with mental illness or co-occurring mental health/substance use disorders involved with drug/mental health court and jail/corrections, working with King County District Court/Mental Health Court (MHC), the Seattle Municipal MHC, City of Auburn MHC, county/municipal jails. Other CJI partners include W/DVA (WA State Dept of Veteran Affairs), Jail Health Services for in-custody case management, placement in skilled nursing/hospice care, and referral to substance use disorder services; the Offender Re-entry Community Safety Program and the Forensic Integrated Reentry Support & Treatment for offenders released from state prison; and WA State DSHS for food stamps, CO treatment, & Medical.

Specifically indicate where persons routinely go upon discharge other than HUD McKinney-Vento funded programs:

King County's Criminal Justice Initiative (CJI) has partnership agreements with more than 30 agencies to implement jail transition plans in programs that are not funded with McKinney resources. Individuals may be placed into one of 133 permanent housing units or 150 transitional housing units in programs operated by a consortium of housing/service providers such as Community Psychiatric Clinic, Sound Mental Health, Pioneer Human Services, DESC, YWCA, and LHI. An additional 110 clients can be assisted with rental assistance housing vouchers through the FACT (Forensic Assertive Community Treatment) and the FISH (Forensic Intensive Supportive Housing) Programs (a housing first program funded by the King County Veterans and Human Services Levy). A mix of housing options is available, including cluster housing with support staff on-site 24/7, scattered site housing with support services; respite housing is also provided when needed.

Discharge Plan - Part 2

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

The City of Seattle, through the Seattle-King County Continuum of Care, completed detailed discharge planning for individuals coming from the mental health, health care, foster care and corrections systems. Please see the summary of this planning attached above as "Discharge Plans" Parts 1 and 2.

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)

People Living with HIV/AIDS

The Seattle Human Services Department recently completed the 2013-2016 HOPWA Investment Plan. Significant community engagement needs assessment data, and best practices provided the basis for the plan. The two main priorities of the plan are to improve housing access and retention for low income people with HIV/AIDS and significantly expand permanent affordable housing with and without supportive services. The priorities require shifts in funding over the next several years to achieve the priorities. The main activities to be funded through the HOPWA program include:

1. Create a lead agency to coordinate the implementation of a housing continuum that streamlines assessment, intake, and lease up process. The lead agency will provide initial screening, triage, and follow up for housing needs, offer short term rent, mortgage and utility assistance to prevent homelessness, negotiate and manage memoranda of agreement with participating landlords and nonprofit housing organizations, provide supportive services in housing, and manage rental subsidy programs.
2. Create navigator services for refugee and immigrant populations who need housing and supports. Fund a pilot project testing the use of community based agencies which will assist people with HIV/AIDS to secure needed housing through the lead agency.
3. Increase the use of project based rental assistance to secure additional permanent housing units for people with HIV/AIDS.
4. Participate in joint funding opportunities in King County to better leverage HOPWA dollars and create additional units in nonprofit housing projects.

The **Three Year Service by Type of Assistance table** attached above shows changes in funding and goals for outputs for each year from 2013 to 2015. These changes support the priorities in the HOPWA Investment Plan

For entitlement/consortia grantees: 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. (91.220(2))

See AP-20 and AP-35 For Annual goals and Projects description linked to anticipated allocations.

MA-40 Barriers to Affordable Housing – 91.210(e)

Negative Effects of Public Policies on Affordable Housing and Residential Investment

Background

With passage of the Cranston-Gonzales National Affordable Housing Act in 1990, Congress recognized the importance of public policies and processes to the supply of affordable housing. Section 105(b)(4) requires state and local governments to explain as part of their Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS)—now an element of the Consolidated Plan— whether a proposed public policy affects housing affordability and describe the jurisdiction’s strategy to remove or ameliorate negative effects, if any, of such policies (see 24 CFR 91.210(e) and 24 CFR 91.310(d)).

An Advisory Commission headed by HUD Secretary Jack Kemp released a report in 1991 called *Not in My Backyard: Removing Regulatory Barriers to Affordable Housing*. That report estimated that certain policies and procedures directly increase construction or rehabilitation costs by up to 35 percent. According to the George W. Bush Administration, numerous academic studies have confirmed this finding. In addition to direct cost impacts, many policies and processes further exacerbate the problem by constraining overall housing supply with a general deleterious impact upon overall housing affordability. A 35 percent reduction in development costs would allow millions of American families to buy or rent housing that they currently cannot afford.

Congress, in Title XII of the 1992 Housing and Community Development Act, reiterated its interest in this important subject by authorizing grants for regulatory barrier removal and established a Regulatory Barriers Clearinghouse. In the American Homeownership Act of 2000, Congress reauthorized the Clearinghouse and simplified procedures for a barrier removal grant program. In June 2003, HUD announced “America’s Affordable Communities Initiative: Bringing Homes within Reach through Regulatory Reform.” This department-wide initiative worked with state and local governments to address regulatory barriers as well as address how HUD’s own regulations may present barriers to affordable housing.

Since that time, there has been continued recognition that unnecessary, duplicative, excessive or discriminatory public processes often significantly increase the cost of housing development and rehabilitation. Often referred to as “regulatory barriers to affordable housing,” many public statutes, ordinances, regulatory requirements, or processes and procedures significantly impede the development or availability of affordable housing without providing a commensurate or demonstrable health or safety benefit. “Affordable housing” is decent quality housing that low-, moderate-, and middle-income families can afford to buy or rent without spending more than 30 percent of their income. Spending more than 30 percent of income on shelter may require families to sacrifice other necessities of life. (See Part 2 & 3 narrative continued attached below. Also note the cross reference to SP-55 where only the first part of this narrative appears automatically.)

MA-40 Part 2

Addressing these barriers to housing affordability is a necessary component of any overall national housing policy. However, addressing such barriers must be viewed as a complement, not a substitute for other efforts to meet affordable housing needs. For many families, federal, state and local subsidies are fundamental tools for meeting these affordable housing needs. In many instances, however, other sometimes well-intentioned public policies work at cross-purposes with subsidy programs by imposing significant constraints. From exclusionary zoning that keeps out affordable housing, especially multifamily housing, to other regulations and requirements that unnecessarily raise the costs of construction, the need to address this issue is clear. For example, affordable rehabilitation is often constrained by outdated building codes that require excessive renovation. Barrier removal will not only make it easier to find and get approval for affordable housing sites but it will also allow available subsidies to go further in meeting these needs. For housing for moderate-income families, barrier removal can be the most essential component of meeting housing needs.

Negative Effects of Public Policies on Affordable Housing and Residential Investment

Barriers to affordable housing can include land use controls, tax policies affecting land, zoning ordinances, building codes, fees and charges, growth limitations, and policies affecting the return on residential investment. A number of potential regulatory barriers for Seattle, Washington are identified in HUD's Regulatory Barriers Clearinghouse database. All of these are listed below, absent any assessment of validity due to lack of resources to enable meaningful qualitative and quantitative analysis. The City of Seattle, however, does outline in the Strategic Plan section how it is addressing regulatory barriers to affordable housing.

- [City of Seattle Backyard Cottage Ordinance](#) There is implicit recognition that restrictive zoning regulations can decrease the affordable housing supply.
- [Property Tax Exemption for Multifamily Housing](#) It is implied that cost and regulations are barriers to the redevelopment of underutilized buildings that could be developed as affordable housing. It is implied that the development of affordable housing is discouraged by the difficulty of prohibitive costs.
- [Inclusionary Zoning: Can It be an Effective Tool for Providing Affordable Housing in Seattle?](#) Mandatory inclusionary zoning ordinances run the risk of legal challenges and could discourage the development of housing.
- [Backyard Cottages OK'd in Seattle](#) According to this article, zoning regulations in Seattle, Washington prevent development of secondary residential units on lots zoned for single-family use.
- [UW Study: Rules Add \\$200,000 to Seattle Housing Price Tags](#) This article states that Seattle housing prices have significantly increased due to lengthy administrative review processes. This article states that Seattle housing prices have significantly increased due to lengthy administrative

review processes resulting from community opposition. This article states that Seattle housing prices have significantly increased due to excessive impact fees. This article states that Seattle housing prices have significantly increased due to land-use regulations, such as growth restrictions. This article states that Seattle housing prices have significantly increased due to land-use regulations.

- [The Housing Toolkit: Housing Tools and Ideas for Local Jurisdictions](#) (Note: programs of other jurisdictions across the nation were included in this report and the following statements may not apply to Seattle) There is implicit recognition that lengthy administrative procedures can discourage the development of affordable housing. Voluntary inclusionary zoning programs without incentives may not encourage the development of affordable housing.
- [Condos that Leave Out Cars Aim to Promote Mass Transit, Cut Costs](#) Many jurisdictions enforce minimum parking requirements, which can increase the cost of housing.
- [Seattle Council Bill No. 115524](#) Seattle, Washington adopted zoning changes to stimulate the production of affordable housing in downtown. Incentives for affordable housing include: increased height, density, and floor-to-area ratios.
- [Top Ten States and Local Strategies to Increase Affordable Housing Supply](#) (Note: programs of other jurisdictions were included in this report and the following statements may not apply to Seattle) There is implicit recognition that a long approval process could have a negative impact on affordable housing development. There is implicit recognition that impact fees could have a negative impact on affordable housing development. There is implicit recognition that local jurisdictions do not have comprehensive plans to support affordable housing.
- [Taller Skyscrapers on the Horizon](#) Seattle's plans to require developers to pay an affordable housing fee will result in less affordable housing.
- [Broadening Urban Investment to Leverage Transit \(BUILT\) in Cincinnati](#) (Note: Seattle, WA was also included in this report) There is implicit recognition that lengthy planning approval processes may prolong the development of transit-oriented developments (TODs). There is implicit recognition that gentrification can hinder the development or rehabilitation of affordable housing.
- [Siting Green Infrastructure: Legal and Policy Solutions to Alleviate Urban Poverty and Promote Healthy Communities](#) There is implicit recognition that costs for sustainable utility controls can negatively impact housing affordability. The author states that beneficial green infrastructure in poor urban areas will most likely not occur if there are no green infrastructure requirements in place. The author states that introducing green infrastructure could improve the quality of life for the urban poor and facilitate sustainable communities.

MA-40 Barriers Part 2

MA-40 Part 3.

- [Sustainable News](#) (Note: Seattle, WA was also included in this report) There is implicit recognition that incorporating sustainable practices can be restricted by existing codes and standards. There is implicit recognition that imprecise housing design and construction standards or requirements can hinder housing revitalization efforts. There is implicit recognition that producing affordable housing with sustainability principles may be costly, creating a disincentive for developers. The lack of a strong land use and development structure can inhibit a city's ability to coordinate the implementation of sustainability objectives, according to the Regional Plan Association.
- [Zoning the Enemy of Affordable Homes](#) [Topic](#) is implicit recognition that lengthy administrative reviews can slow affordable housing production. There is implicit recognition that residents do not support mixed-use development that promotes affordable housing. There is implicit recognition that excessive development fees can hinder affordable housing development. There is implicit recognition that tax policies do not support affordable housing development. This article states that Seattle city officials are reluctant to increase densities in single-family neighborhoods to promote affordable housing development.
- [Incentive Zoning in Seattle: Enhancing Livability and Housing Affordability](#) There is implicit recognition that restrictive zoning codes can lead to a lack of affordable housing.
- [Help Us Improve Seattle's Housing Choices](#) There is implicit recognition that strict zoning codes can decrease the affordable housing supply.
- [Housing: Don't Sell the City Short](#) There is implicit recognition that zoning policies may not increase the supply of affordable housing.
- [Affordable Housing May Come From Smaller Bigger](#) [Topic](#) is implicit recognition that restrictive building codes may limit the affordable housing supply.
- [Exploring Strategies to Solve Housing Crunch](#) There is implicit recognition that land use regulations may limit the land available for development in Seattle, Washington. There is implicit recognition that tax policies may not encourage maintaining the supply of affordable housing. There is implicit recognition that zoning regulations may not encourage the development of affordable housing.
- [Mayor Shelves Plan for New Parks](#) Open space advocates in Seattle, Washington were concerned that excessive impact fees for park space would discourage the development of affordable housing. There is implicit recognition that excessive zoning requirements in downtown Seattle, Washington may discourage the development of affordable housing.
- [Average Seattle Worker Can't Afford to Live Here](#) There is implicit recognition that tax policies do not encourage the development of affordable housing. There is implicit recognition that zoning regulations may discourage the development of affordable housing.
- [Mayor Signs Historic Bill for Livable, Affordable Center City](#) There is implicit recognition that Seattle's existing legislation does not encourage enough development of affordable housing downtown. There is implicit recognition that land use and zoning ordinances do not encourage the development of affordable housing.

- [Developing New Uses for Low-to-No-Market Brownfields: the Affordable Housing Solution](#) There is implicit recognition that affordable housing in the Southeast is insufficient.
- [Accessory Dwelling Unit Homeowner Packet](#) There was implicit recognition that owners did not know how to create accessory dwelling units.
- [City of Seattle Land Use Code \(Title 23\) \[Topic\]\(#\)](#) is implicit recognition that the zoning code does not provide incentives for development of affordable housing.

MA-40 Barriers Part 3

MA-45 Non-Housing Community Development Assets – 91.215 (f)

Introduction

What is now recognized as the “Great Recession” has had the greatest impact to Seattle’s economy in recent times. While most economists agree that the Great Recession ended nationally June 2009, during the recession Seattle lost 35,000 jobs and widening the income gap.[1] For Washington State and the Seattle metropolitan area, the effects of the recession lagged the nation as a whole, and have since seen an equally long recovery. Unemployment was at its worst in the Seattle Metro area October 2009-January 2010 when it was 9.7%. As of January 2013, unemployment has improved to 6.3%. (Source: Employment Security Department/LMEA; U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Local Area Unemployment Statistics) Since the beginning of 2010, we’ve seen recovery and added 23,600 jobs since end of 2009. The labor market has improved with the US Bureau of Labor Statistics noting that Seattle was fourth in the US for job growth in 2012.

Nearly one in five jobs in Seattle are in the education and health care services sector (19%) followed by arts, entertainment and accommodations (14%) and professional, scientific, and managerial (13%). Over one third of those individuals without a high school diploma or holding only a high school diploma or GED are either not in the workforce or are unemployed. The unemployment rate drops to 20% percent for those holding a BA or higher degree. The statistics are limited in that they do not account for age (retired), nor are they filtered by race and ethnicity. Those with a BA or higher degree earn a median income twice that of high school graduates only. Workforce development needs to concentrate on those populations most prone to not advancing beyond high school.

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	1,242	450	0	0	0
Arts, Entertainment, Accommodations	37,934	35,305	11	14	3
Construction	15,928	10,005	5	4	-1
Education and Health Care Services	79,377	48,397	23	19	-4
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	24,680	25,237	7	10	3
Information	15,388	9,205	4	4	0

Business by Sector	Number of Workers	Number of Jobs	Share of Workers %	Share of Jobs %	Jobs less workers %
Manufacturing	26,529	12,441	8	5	-3
Other Services	18,106	17,474	5	7	2
Professional, Scientific, Management Services	60,078	33,519	17	13	-4
Public Administration	12,070	16,207	3	6	3
Retail Trade	33,565	27,926	10	11	1
Transportation and Warehousing	13,197	5,977	4	2	-2
Wholesale Trade	9,468	9,803	3	4	1
Total	347,562	251,946	--	--	--

Table 43 - Business Activity

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS (Workers), 2010 ESRI Business Analyst Package (Jobs)

Labor Force

Total Population in the Civilian Labor Force	369,375
Civilian Employed Population 16 years and over	347,562
Unemployment Rate	5.91
Unemployment Rate for Ages 16-24	24.67
Unemployment Rate for Ages 25-65	4.07

Table 44 - Labor Force

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS Data

OED's focus is on helping low-income and low-skilled Seattle working age adults complete a professional or technical training program that leads to employment with benefits and opportunities for career advancement. This preserves the most impactful intervention to address social and economic inequity in OED's workforce programs as it is well documented that the single greatest determinant of socio-economic advancement for low-income families is attainment of a degree or credential beyond high school. Fully two-thirds of jobs in Washington will require college-level training, a majority of these at the 2-year level. Yet the fastest growing demographic are most challenged by traditional education and training pathways. The City of Seattle has over 133,000 working-age residents who are living in households at less than 200% of federal poverty level. The majority of these individuals, many of whom are also working, have less than an Associate degree.

Together, the growing underclass of adults unprepared for success in the workplace and the constant demand for more highly skilled workers necessitates more urgent and comprehensive reforms to the way government, employers, and educational partners work together to ensure Seattle has the workforce to compete in the global economy. Mayor McGinn initiated such a response in 2012 by launching the Pathways to Careers initiative, which is described below in Question #5 in more detail.

Small Business Development and Financing

The second CDBG funded strategy used in Seattle to promote economic development is small business development and financing. In an article by the FDIC, it was noted that, "microenterprise development is an effective strategy to help Low/Moderate income, underserved, or otherwise disadvantaged entrepreneurs create or expand small businesses that have significant positive effects on the owner's financial well-being and the community at large."² Micro and small businesses provide job creation, innovation, and wealth creation opportunities and are an important aspect of the economic fabric of our city. Self-employment provides a pathway out of poverty by giving low-income entrepreneurs the means to build assets, generate income and create jobs. Supporting entrepreneurs with appropriate technical support and training as well as access to capital is a critical part of ensuring their growth. The City of Seattle utilizes CDBG funding to support technical assistance and lending that engage immigrant and low-income business owners as a way to ensure shared prosperity.

The City works with several community-based organizations to assist with the development and capacity building of small businesses through entrepreneur training, counseling and by providing access to credit. These organizations provide support the development of micro-enterprises across Seattle, with a special emphasis on low-income communities and entrepreneurs.

In a report released in 2012 by the Partnership for a New America it was noted that immigrants are twice as likely as native born Americans to start a small business.³ Although true, immigrant business owners have special barriers to address in accessing the myriad business services available and benefit greatly from culturally appropriate and linguistically accessible entrepreneurial training and business development support. OED has worked with community based organizations to design curriculum that is tailored to overcome these barriers. This program, funded with CDBG, has served nearly 100 immigrant entrepreneurs annually, who would otherwise not have access to entrepreneurial training.

² Microenterprise Development: A Primer, FDIC Quarterly, Vol 6, No 1, 2011.

³ http://www.fdic.gov/bank/analytical/quarterly/2011_vol6_no1/FDIC_Vol6No1_Article_1.pdf

⁴ Open for business: How immigrants are driving small business creation in the United States. The Partnership for a New American Economy, August 2012. <http://www.renewoureconomy.org/sites/all/themes/one/openforbusiness.pdf>

Increasing access to capital for small businesses has been a critical component of the City's ongoing efforts to foster job creation and economic growth. Community Development Block Grant funding plays an important role as a source of capital for lending. OED partners with Community Development Financial Institutions, as they have the infrastructure and expertise to underwrite otherwise unbankable transactions and provide the necessary support to entrepreneurs to ensure their success.

Neighborhood Revitalization

Seattle's third CDBG funded economic development strategy is neighborhood revitalization. A neighborhood based approach is important, because neighborhood business districts are the places where small businesses thrive, communities engage, and jobs are created. Successful small businesses are the key to creating and preserving vibrant, safe, sustainable districts and businesses are most successful when they are located in neighborhoods with an active street life and healthy sense of community.

The City's Office of Economic Development invests in neighborhood business districts with two goals:

- Allow small businesses to grow and flourish, making a positive contribution to the city's economic health, and
- Reflect the unique character of the neighborhoods where they are located and contribute to their vitality.

This initiative, called *Only in Seattle*, is based on proven methodologies for creating vibrant business districts. There are a set of core building blocks that are the critical components of any successful district. Business districts benefit most from comprehensive approaches that work simultaneously to build the following strategy areas:

- **Business Organization** - Neighborhood organizations, residents, property owners and business owners collaborate and work together toward a common vision for the neighborhood.
- **Business and Retail Development** - Businesses prosper because they are organized, supported by the community and they receive the assistance they need to strengthen and grow their business. New businesses move into the district that complement and improve the business mix.
- **Safety and Cleanliness** - The district is clean and customers feel safe and welcome.
- **Marketing and Promotion** - The district has a positive, consistent image that helps draw more customers to visit it.
- **Appearance and Pedestrian Environment** - the retail and pedestrian environment are attractive, inviting and easily accessible by multiple modes of transportation. Catalyst real estate projects rehabilitate or replace vacant or underutilized spaces, generating a sense of forward momentum and improvement in the district.

About 60% of the funding for the *Only in Seattle* program is targeted to low-income communities and utilizes CDBG. The remaining balance comes from the City's General Fund.


Workforce and Infrastructure Continued

Occupations by Sector	Number of People
Management, business and financial	181,746
Farming, fisheries and forestry occupations	627
Service	51,922
Sales and office	73,642
Construction, extraction, maintenance and repair	16,314
Production, transportation and material moving	23,311

Table 45 – Occupations by Sector

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS Data

Major Occupational Categories Projected to Add New Employment, 2011-2021
Major occupational groups as share of total new jobs



Source: EMSI Complete Employment – 2011.2, TIP Strategies.

2011-2021 Occupations Expected to Add to Employment

Travel Time

Travel Time	Number	Percentage
< 30 Minutes	205,932	64%
30-59 Minutes	98,168	31%
60 or More Minutes	16,665	5%
Total	320,765	100%

Table 46 - Travel Time

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS Data

Education:

Educational Attainment by Employment Status (Population 16 and Older)

Educational Attainment	In Labor Force		Not in Labor Force
	Civilian Employed	Unemployed	
Less than high school graduate	14,568	1,223	7,972
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	28,160	2,839	10,311
Some college or Associate's degree	71,170	4,129	16,554

Educational Attainment	In Labor Force		Not in Labor Force
	Civilian Employed	Unemployed	
Bachelor's degree or higher	181,969	6,935	25,440

Table 47 - Educational Attainment by Employment Status

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS Data

Educational Attainment by Age

	Age				
	18–24 yrs	25–34 yrs	35–44 yrs	45–65 yrs	65+ yrs
Less than 9th grade	1,173	2,102	2,400	5,592	5,815
9th to 12th grade, no diploma	4,491	4,431	3,097	6,141	5,036
High school graduate, GED, or alternative	12,737	12,230	10,233	18,896	16,509
Some college, no degree	28,673	21,712	14,010	28,926	13,031
Associate's degree	4,241	9,954	7,288	10,374	2,133
Bachelor's degree	13,353	54,868	35,430	41,899	12,852
Graduate or professional degree	598	23,822	23,412	35,232	10,156

Table 48 - Educational Attainment by Age

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS Data

Educational Attainment – Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months

Educational Attainment	Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months
Less than high school graduate	19,803
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	26,690
Some college or Associate's degree	34,403
Bachelor's degree	48,509
Graduate or professional degree	59,906

Table 49 – Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS Data

The core elements of this new approach include:

- **Enhanced Job Placement** – to connect individuals with the services needed for basic stabilization before they are placed into a job and/or a training program. The range of services, including housing, sobriety treatment, basic food support, and TANF, are available from other service providers, but have not been previously connected to a skill development model.
- **Skills On-Ramp** – to prepare individuals for enrollment in training programs designed for low-income, low-skilled individuals. The program design would include a focus on soft skills development, career planning, and the expectations and strategies for success. An enhanced component would include an embedded developmental math and/or reading curriculum, which is a significant barrier for many individuals entering and completing a training program.
- **Postsecondary Completion** – to provide individuals with employment navigation and job placement support, including career advising, job placement/job leads along the training pathway, job counseling and information. Ultimate goal is to help an individual complete at least one year of postsecondary education that results in a degree or credential with labor market relevance.

This coordinated approach is Pathways to Careers, a pioneering partnership comprised of businesses, educational institutions, government agencies, nonprofit organizations (including the Workforce Investment Board), and labor. The focus of our partnership is to build educational pathways to middle-wage jobs, and provide the collective capacity to align the many disparate elements noted above. The partnership intends to bring to scale existing education innovations to address the employment and training needs of extremely disadvantaged individuals, focusing on men of color and limited-English speakers, resulting in more individuals directly served. These improvements to work and education readiness bear directly on the success of the City's workforce strategy - preparing individuals through postsecondary education/training for higher-wage, in-demand jobs.

One piece of the overall Pathways to Careers partnership is a CDBG funded program called, Career Bridge. This program prepares individuals for the education pathways most amenable to this target population, including those opportunities in Pathways to Careers. This new program builds and expands on employment & training models to help low-income, low skilled residents access the first step on a career path. The course curricula and components include short-term training as a springboard for participants to a job and/or further college attainment. In addition, essential elements of the Career Bridge program are designed to meet the increased challenges faced by highly disadvantaged individuals with significant barriers to gaining and maintaining employment, more so than similar employment and training efforts aimed at low-income adults. Career Bridge also helps to build support networks at the community level, assuring a talent pipeline is created from small community based organizations that represent the hardest to serve.

Description of WF Training Initiatives continued

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

Puget Sound is home to a mix of mature and emerging industry clusters. Clusters are concentrations of industries that export goods and services that drive job creation and import wealth into the region. They enhance the competitiveness of a region in particular industries by improving economic efficiencies of member firms (e.g., supply chains and technology transfer). They also tend to concentrate workers with

specialized skills and experience within a region. Some of their skills are transferable to multiple industries within and across clusters. In coordination with one of our partners, regional economic development strategies have identified the following clusters as areas where the region has competitive advantage for established and emerging industries. They are: Aerospace, Business Services, Clean Technology, Information Technology & Interactive Media, Life Science & Global Health, Health Care, Maritime & Industrial, and Transportation & Logistics.

The City's grouping of the industry sectors is at a much more discreet level when compared to the business sectors included in the Business Activity table. For that reason a one-to-one comparison of our local analysis to the table proves difficult. For example, in the table, Education & Health Care Services are grouped together with 19% of the jobs, Professional, Scientific; Management Services are grouped together with 13% of the jobs, while Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate are also grouped to show 10% of the jobs. In our model, Business Services includes finance and management services, and while the Table notes Education & Health Care together, our industry sector breaks health care into two groups: Life Science & Global Health and Health Care.

Consistent with the research of local partners such as the Puget Sound Regional Council, Economic Development Council of Seattle and King County and Downtown Seattle Association, the City's Office of Economic Development has prioritized key industries representative of Seattle's local economy. These sectors are more refined than those identified within the Business Activity table. As well, we also have used local data to predict where workforce investments are necessary to meet the current and predicted workforce demands.

Our key sectors of focus include:

- Manufacturing
- Maritime
- Life Sciences
- Information and Communications Technology
- Global Health/Healthcare
- Clean Technology
- Film and Music
- Tourism

Describe the workforce and infrastructure needs of the business community:

The needs for business community support exceed the City's available resources, however Seattle utilizes CDBG funding to pursue three successful economic development strategies. They include: workforce development, small business development and financing and neighborhood revitalization. In the following section we will provide further detail on how each strategy has been developed with the City of Seattle.

Workforce Development

The first economic development strategy implemented by the City is workforce development. Over the coming decade, the occupational groups expected to add the most jobs in the Puget Sound region are business/financial, sales, healthcare practitioners, and computer sciences. The figure below provides additional detail on these projected trends.

Each of these four groups is projected to add somewhere between 18,000 and 23,000 jobs in the four-county region in which Seattle is located, over the next four years. Most of the occupations in these fields (sales is the only exception) will require specific skills and training, and often rigorous educational preparation. These four occupational groups alone represent nearly 40% of the region's anticipated workforce expansion over the next decade. ***See chart "2011-2021 Occupations Expected to Add to Employment" attached to Occupations by Sector table above.***

To address the skills gap, the City's Office of Economic Development (OED), together with the engagement of industry leaders, employers and community colleges, is developing clear and intentional training pathways within four industry sectors with labor market needs. Economic Modeling Specialists Intl (EMSI) avers that these sectors are projected to offer approximately 50,000 job openings accessible to middle-skill and middle-wage job seekers over the next decade. They include:

- Business Occupations
- Manufacturing/Industrial skills
- International Trade/Transportation/Logistics and
- Healthcare

The goal of the Pathways to Careers initiative is to double the number of low-income, low-skilled individuals who achieve the skills and credentials needed for high demand jobs in these sectors within 3 years. In 2013 the initiative's programs began to expand their reach by focusing an increased number of resources on the most difficult to serve low-income residents. Funding will be deployed to provide more integrated services that will connect addressing social service needs with employment skill development. ***See Workforce and Infrastructure Need continued attached above.***

Describe any major changes that may have an economic impact, such as planned local or regional 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.

Industries like construction and manufacturing were hard hit during the recession and are now coming back online with greater strength. In addition, over the next five years Seattle will spend \$5 billion on major capital projects that will renew our infrastructure, enhance our quality of life, and create thousands of good jobs. These include projects to connect Seattle's neighborhoods with high capacity transit, including rail, to provide residents and businesses with an affordable, reliable way to get around

our city. Such projects are important because they contribute to and support the local infrastructure allowing business to be conducted.

Specific to use of federal CDBG funds, the City's partnership with Seattle Housing Authority as they re-develop the Yesler Terrace public housing project will provide both construction and new Section 3 opportunities for hiring. The Yesler project, as well as major regional transportation improvement projects such as completing the waterfront tunnel and Sound Transit east link route should increase the need for skilled labor and materials suppliers.

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

According to local research completed by the Puget Sound Regional Council, 'the greatest challenge confronting virtually all (industry) clusters is access to a skilled workforce. This is true for high tech industries unable to find enough local college graduates in certain engineering, computer, and life science fields. It is also the case for traditional production and transportation industries facing the prospect of an aging workforce with few young people entering critical occupations.[1] Additionally, in a separate 2012 paper, the Puget Sound Regional Council noted that, 'success is not equally shared throughout the region's diverse populations. There is the very real threat of a deepening divide between skilled and unskilled workers.' [2] Though our region is offering more and more jobs with good salaries, the vast majority of these jobs require advanced training that many residents don't have. In a report jointly published in 2011 by the Washington Higher Education Coordinating Board, the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, and Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board, long-range gaps between current degree production and employer demand are projected. This forecast is also consistent with the state's Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education. To address this gap the City is investing in strategies, like Pathways to Careers and Career Bridge, that align education options with labor market demand, and that teach in ways amenable to the needs and competencies levels of local demographics.

Though there are a variety of job readiness training programs offered through nonprofits and government agencies in Seattle, the City's Pathways to Careers Initiative is unique because it is strongly based in the needs of the local industry sectors, with an end goal is overall career development, rather than simple job placement.

Describe any current workforce training initiatives, including those supported by Workforce Investment Boards, community colleges and other organizations. Describe how these efforts will support the jurisdiction's Consolidated Plan.

In the creation of our workforce development strategy, we assessed the current workforce training capacity available and found a balkanized system that lacks scale. Many impactful programs exist, from those serving the lowest skilled (Goodwill industries and Hopelink) to those serving individuals ready to attempt college level training (through Seattle Jobs Initiative, SkillUp Washington, King County Jobs

Initiative, and training funded through the local Workforce Investment Board). Service providers for English language acquisition are especially plentiful but very small scale, and rarely focused on skills acquisition. Our program survey found these programs exist most often in competition with each other, and as such, lacking collective capacity. Rather than add yet one more program to this mix, we felt the greatest impact and scale would be to help align these services along a skills development spectrum.

The path to self sufficiency is not easy, and from the most basic level of service, can take many years to complete. To be impactful, services need to be developmentally sequenced to meet the customer where they are, so that exiting one service 'step' leads directly to the next. Placement in a transitional job does not create sustained or meaningful impact on economic mobility unless it is tied to a potential career pathway. Since progression through a career pathway is a long-term strategy, customers must be given the opportunity for intermediate successes and be able to "step on and off" the pathway with relative ease.

Based on this skill development model, we are recommending an aligned strategy to prepare individuals for entry onto a career pathway and/or enrollment in a training program that is designed for low-income, low-skilled individuals. Support and case management are meant to prepare individuals for skills training and/or job placement.

OED and HSD are collaborating in the expansion of Career Bridge, a new comprehensive approach to serving low-skilled adults, focusing on young men of color and limited English speakers. We are developing, and coordinating early interventions that stabilize an individual, provide them subsistence employment and, if willing and interested, help them prepare for entry into a program that will result in the completion of a credential or degree beyond high school that leads to a better paying job with opportunities for career advancement.

See Description of WF Training Initiatives attached above.

Does your jurisdiction participate in a Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS)?

No

If so, what economic development initiatives are you undertaking that may be coordinated with the Consolidated Plan? If not, describe other local/regional plans or initiatives that impact economic growth.

The City is engaged with the development of local and regional plans to impact our economic growth, such as Washington State's Workforce Training & Education Coordinating Board's 10 Year Strategic Plan for Workforce Development (High Skills, High Wages – Washington's 10 – Year Strategic Plan for Workforce Development), the work published by the Economic Development Council of Seattle and King County, and the 'Regional Economic Strategy' developed by the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC).

The State's Workforce Training & Education's Strategic plan is aligned with the city's approach of working across diverse partnerships, increasing employer engagement with the workforce development system to develop career pathways to connect residents with living-wage careers. As in the City's Career Bridge program, the State's Strategic Plan includes an objective to provide wrap-around support and employment services including special services for diverse populations with multiple barriers to education and training.

Similar to the Economic Development Council of Seattle and King County's work, the PSRC's Regional Economic Strategy is an active blueprint to ensure the region's long term sustainable economic prosperity. It outlines the initiatives of a coalition of more than 300 business, labor, education and community organizations, all working together to build long-term sustainable economic prosperity for Central Puget Sound region, called the Prosperity Partnership. These initiatives are focused on improving the five foundation areas of the economy: education and workforce development, business climate, entrepreneurship and innovation, infrastructure, and quality of life. Each foundation has a set of strategies – there are over two dozen strategies to achieve the region's economic development goals.

Our investments of CDBG funding complement these plans by ensuring that they are used to support business and industry sectors that are both in need of support, either in terms of business development or workforce development.

Discussion

Business infrastructure needs, especially in CDBG-qualifying neighborhoods, center around on local neighborhood business districts ability to retain and capture the buying power existent in their catchment areas and to draw moneys from outside their areas.

In order to do this they must present a clean and safe shopping and pedestrian environment. Especially in areas such as Chinatown /ID, with major regionally-oriented construction underway, businesses need ways to ensure that auto and foot traffic is maintained for the local businesses to survive. This is the great lesson we learned from the City's Southeast Seattle Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area (NRSA) experience, though Chinatown/ID is experiencing a far less disruptive transportation project.

The second major emphasis for the City's economic development efforts is to ensure that workforce development corresponds to future business opportunities. With most of the opportunities occurring in skilled or knowledge-based industries and sectors, obtaining a BA degree is critical to individuals advancing and achieving economic stability. Thus, the importance of Career Bridge type programs which targets serving people who have been historically unsuccessful in competing for the job market due to a complex set of barriers beyond just the need to continue formal education. Career Bridge will attempt to address holistic needs such as housing costs, transportation costs, and other issues associated with poverty and lack of resources.

MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion

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

See NA-10 and MA-20.

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

Most racial or ethnic minority populations are concentrated in Southeast Seattle neighborhoods. CPD Maps also shows some lesser concentrations of black households in parts of Delridge, Licton Springs, Westwood-Highland Park, and in the NE corner of the city. Hispanics are more scattered throughout the City – White Center, the Central Area, Delridge, Interbay, Westwood-Highland Park as well as some SE Seattle neighborhoods.

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

Some of these neighborhoods have experienced historical disinvestment, but with the high cost of housing in Seattle, these areas are experiencing, to one degree or another, development pressures.

Are there any community assets in these areas/neighborhoods?

All of these neighborhoods have access to certain community assets.

Are there other strategic opportunities in any of these areas?

The City's Office of Economic Development uses CDBG and other funds to implement the Only In Seattle program, a set of neighborhood-based initiatives to enhance neighborhoods and neighborhood business districts.

Strategic Plan

SP-05 Overview

Strategic Plan Overview

The City of Seattle's strategic plan is based on our assessment of community needs as identified in this Consolidated Plan, in related plans and policy documents, and on the suitability of the Consolidated Plan and other funds to meet the identified needs. To the extent possible, targeted funds will be used to their maximum extent while resources with more discretionary purposes will be used to address needs without their own targeted funds. For instance, while the development of affordable housing is a critical issue for Seattle, not all Consolidated Plan funds will be used for the creation or preservation of affordable housing. Seattle has a separate source, the Seattle Housing Levy, to specifically meet that need. Not all CDBG funds will therefore be used to address this need since its relative flexibility makes its use in other program areas more valuable.

Within this context, the Consolidated Plan strategic plan calls for the Consolidated Plan funds to focus on

1. Supporting emergency shelter and other services for homeless individuals and families
2. Supporting the development and preservation of affordable rental and ownership housing
3. Supporting low- and moderate-income neighborhoods, business districts, and populations with economic and neighborhood development activities, including physical infrastructure, business district planning and development, small business / microenterprise business technical assistance, and business loans
4. Supporting job training activities as part of an anti-poverty strategy.

SP-10 Geographic Priorities – 91.215 (a)(1)

Geographic Area

Table 50 - Geographic Priority Areas

General Allocation Priorities

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

The City encourages production and preservation of affordable housing throughout the city to maximize choice for low-income residents of Seattle. OH will encourage project locations that afford low-income residents the greatest access to opportunities such as jobs, quality education, parks and open space, and services. OH will encourage housing projects that support focused community development investments that improve the quality of life in low-income communities, and projects in locations where revitalization trends are leading to the displacement of low-income residents. OH will develop criteria to evaluate project locations which will be published in Notice of Fund Availability (NOFA) documents. Access to transit will be a priority, as transportation costs are second only to housing costs for a majority of low-income households and many low-income households do not own a car. The location criteria will be tailored according to the population intended to reside in the housing, for example, schools would not be a consideration for senior housing.

A Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area for Southeast Seattle was in place from 2005 - 2012. This was extended into 2013 as part of the City's request for a one-year extension of the 2009 - 2012 Consolidated Plan into 2013. The City continues to focus revitalization activities in Southeast Seattle, with particular focus on the work of the Rainier Valley Community Development Fund and the Community Cornerstones project funded through a HUD Community Challenge Planning grant. We are requesting an extension of the Southeast Seattle NRSA for 2013 - 2016 based on this planning and implementation work.

SP-25 Priority Needs - 91.215(a)(2)

Priority Needs

1	Priority Need Name	Mitigation of homelessness and related issues
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Large Families Families with Children Elderly Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth
	Geographic Areas Affected	
	Associated Goals	Homelessness Prev., Intervention & Hous Stability
	Description	Support the operating costs of homeless shelters for individuals and families and related services, such as day centers. The ultimate goal of these services is to begin the process of transitioning clients into permanent housing.
	Basis for Relative Priority	It is estimated that over 8,000 adults experience homelessness in any given twelve-month period. The most recent point in time count (One Night Count) of homeless in Seattle shown 1,989 unsheltered adults and 2,704 persons in emergency shelters. The City will continue to support these shelter operations, since the need is clearing in evidence.
	Priority Need Name	Affordable Housing Preservation and Development
	Priority Level	High

	Population	Extremely Low Low Moderate Large Families Families with Children Elderly
	Geographic Areas Affected	
	Associated Goals	Increase Access to Affordable Housing
	Description	Provide loans and other financial assistance for the preservation and creation of affordable rental and ownership opportunities. Policy and regulations guiding the use of federal, state and local funds in City managed housing development, rehabilitation and homeownership programs can be found in the City of Seattle Housing Levy Administrative and Financial Plan.
	Basis for Relative Priority	Thirty-three percent of Seattle households, or over 75,000 households, are experiencing housing cost burdens, and 19%, or 42,000 households are experiencing severe housing cost burdens (housing costs are greater than 50% of their income). These housing cost burdens hamper the ability of these households to invest the time and energy and resources to adequately address their nutritional, medical, and educational / vocational needs.
3	Priority Need Name	Neighborhood Community and Economic Development
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Low Moderate Large Families Families with Children Elderly Persons with Physical Disabilities Non-housing Community Development
	Geographic Areas Affected	
	Associated Goals	Economic and Neighborhood Development

Description	Provide support for public infrastructure and business district improvements to qualifying low- and moderate-income areas and for eligible populations. Included in these activities are facade and parks improvements (including accessibility improvements), and planning efforts to help organized business districts improve the local business environment. Provide direct support to businesses in the form of technical assistance and financial products.
Basis for Relative Priority	In qualifying low- and moderate-income areas, with their related housing cost burdens, local neighborhood business districts are in need of attention to enhance their attractiveness to potential customers from within and without their neighborhood area. Facade, infrastructure and park improvements enhance business environment, while direct assistance enhances the probability that individual businesses survive and grow out of the Great Recession.

Table 51 – Priority Needs Summary

Narrative (Optional)

These strategic priorities reflect carefully chosen enhancement and refinements to the priorities of the most recent Consolidated Plan. The success of the Consolidated Plan funds in meeting the identified needs, and the continued availability of other revenues to meet other needs, suggests that the priorities should not change in any dramatic way in the use of the Consolidated Plan funds.

SP-30 Influence of Market Conditions – 91.215 (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)	
TBRA for Non-Homeless Special Needs	
New Unit Production	
Rehabilitation	
Acquisition, including preservation	

Table 52 – Influence of Market Conditions

SP-35 Anticipated Resources - 91.215(a)(4), 91.220(c)(1,2)

Introduction

A conservative approach is taken in estimating revenues for the next program year. Factors included in estimating or projecting future revenues include the President's proposed 2014 budget and the actual 2013 award.

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	8,804,139	840,000	0	9,644,139	27,000,000	Revenue based on assumptions and available public information regarding the President's proposed 2014 budget in the Spring of 2013; for remainder of ConPlan, assume \$9m per year for the next 3 years

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	2,502,176	1,000,000	0	3,502,176	7,500,000	Revenue estimate based 2013 actual award.
HOPWA	public - federal	Permanent housing in facilities Permanent housing placement Short term or transitional housing facilities STRMU Supportive services TBRA	1,706,482	0	0	1,706,482	5,100,000	Revenue estimate based on 2013 actual award.

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	676,093	0	0	676,093	2,028,000	Revenue estimate based 2013 actual award.

Table 53 - Anticipated Resources

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

The City of Seattle relies on Consolidated Plan funds to provide a foundation for our community and economic development activities. However, they are by no means the only investments the City or the community at large make in programs and services to support low- and moderate-income populations. We anticipate that the pattern of leveraging reported in the 2012 CAPER will continue into the 2014-2018 Consolidated Plan: \$2.52 for every City dollar investment in affordable rental housing preservation and development \$3.53 for every \$1 of HOME funds invested in home-ownership assistance A nearly 1:1 match was achieved in the leveraging of HOPWA dollars to other dollars from the community from a variety of sources.

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 City currently has several buildings which it leases to non-profit entities under "mutually offsetting benefits" arrangements whereby the non-profits provide services to the public in return for its occupancy of the buildings. Most of these are for senior or community center operations.

Discussion

These revenue estimates were developed in the summer of 2013, based on documents outlining the President's proposed 2014 budget for the US Department of Housing and Urban Development and the actual 2013 awards. Program income figures are based on actual experiences and projections for 2013.

SP-40 Institutional Delivery Structure – 91.215(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
Human Services Department - Community Support & Assistance	Government	Homelessness Non-homeless special needs Planning public facilities public services	Jurisdiction

Table 54 - Institutional Delivery Structure

Assess of Strengths and Gaps in the Institutional Delivery System

The City’s organizational structure is designed to focus staff expertise on specific issue areas of importance to City residents. The Human Services Department is positioned to respond the needs of homeless persons and seniors / disabled populations and thus can use CDBG public services funds, ESG and HOPWA funds most effectively. The Office of Housing implements the City’s Housing Levy and is able to use CDBG and HOME funds in conjunction with Levy funds to maximize use of all fund sources within their own statutory and regulatory limitations. The Office of Economic Development employs staff with years of expertise and training in job development and business revitalization and are thus most well-positioned to target CDBG economic development funds. Parks and Recreation staff regularly maintain all of the City’s parks and are intimately familiar with the needs of each facility and location.

A challenge of having Consolidated Plan funds spread out to different City departments is the need to continually train a variety of staff on funding requirements and ensure that all activities are reviewed for eligibility, labor standards, and environmental impact prior to funding and implementation, and to ensure the consistent application of program standards. Data reporting, procurement, and other requirements are also subject to periodic reminders and training.

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	
Mortgage Assistance	X		X
Rental Assistance	X	X	X
Utilities Assistance	X		

Street Outreach Services			
Law Enforcement	X	X	
Mobile Clinics	X	X	X
Other Street Outreach Services	X	X	X
Supportive Services			
Alcohol & Drug Abuse	X	X	X
Child Care	X	X	
Education	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			

Table 55 - Homeless Prevention Services Summary

Describe how the service delivery system including, but not limited to, the services listed above meet the needs of homeless persons (particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth)

The City of Seattle Human Services Department (HSD) is the regional grantee and coordinator of the federally funded Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) Program and works collaboratively with an advisory group composed of government funders, nonprofit housing and services organizations, HIV/AIDS case managers and other interested parties. HOPWA provides funding for housing assistance and related support services that focus on housing stability and homelessness prevention. HOPWA provides funding to community-based agencies and supports a coordinated continuum of dedicated housing units designed to assist people with HIV/AIDS access the most appropriate housing possible, based on assessment of their needs.

HOPWA funds are allocated through competitive Request for Investment processes conducted by HSD every two to three years. The RFI's are based on needs assessments and community planning work that provide guidance for HOPWA investments and support the goals of homelessness prevention and housing stability. Successful applicants in the RFI processes contract with HSD for HOPWA funds, and HSD oversees performance and outcomes for the term of the contract.

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

Strengths of the service delivery system include:

- Networks of experienced and emerging multi-service organizations
- Network of funders who collaboratively support human services
- Local community support (volunteers, voters, elected officials) to provide resources for human services
- Nationally recognized leadership and commitment to best practices, including Housing First models, collaborative funding, and partnerships with public housing authorities, coordinated entry and assessment systems.

Gaps of the service delivery system include:

- Insufficient funding/reductions in funding to behavioral health services (mental health and chemical addiction and dependency treatment) and health care (medical and dental health services). There is limited on-demand access to mental health treatment; lack of access to on-demand drug and alcohol treatment.
- Local mainstream workforce systems are working collaboratively with funders, homeless and housing service providers to increase access by homeless jobseekers to Workforce Investment Act (WIA) services or other sources of workforce funding. The challenge for mainstream programs has been that they are often not structured to meet the complex needs of homeless families seeking employment and training.
- Insufficient affordable housing and housing/rental subsidies; assistance locating and accessing affordable housing. Housing options that provide safety for all – with attention to the unique needs of domestic violence survivors, LGBT individuals, refugees and immigrants, elders, and persons with disabilities; programs for youth and young adults of all ages – under the age of 18, young adults over the age of 22, and for pregnant and parenting young adults and teens; and housing assistance and policy changes including removing barriers to housing related to debts and/or criminal history.
- Community member also acknowledge the need for more shelter and transitional housing.
- Transportation.
- Affordable childcare, trauma informed care services for children and youth.
- Culturally appropriate and linguistically relevant services.

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

Constant staff training and aggressive provision of technical assistance to City staff and subrecipient staff will promote compliance with relevant federal regulations. The institutionalization of data reporting expectations and procedures will continue to ensure IDIS data is maintained in a timely manner.

SP-45 Goals Summary – 91.215(a)(4)

Goals Summary Information

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
1	Homelessness Prev., Intervention & Hous Stability	2013	2018	Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs		Mitigation of homelessness and related issues	CDBG: \$3,652,447 ESG: \$650,668	Homeless Person Overnight Shelter: 30000 Persons Assisted Homelessness Prevention: 1200 Persons Assisted HIV/AIDS Housing Operations: 820 Household Housing Unit

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
2	Increase Access to Affordable Housing	2013	2018	Affordable Housing Public Housing		Affordable Housing Preservation and Development	CDBG: \$1,298,483 HOME: \$3,251,958	Rental units constructed: 225 Household Housing Unit Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated: 3150 Household Housing Unit Direct Financial Assistance to Homebuyers: 60 Households Assisted
3	Economic and Neighborhood Development	2013	2018	Non-Housing Community Development		Neighborhood Community and Economic Development	CDBG: \$2,736,675	Businesses assisted: 2875 Businesses Assisted Other: 15 Other

Table 56 – Goals Summary

Goal Descriptions

1	Goal Name	Homelessness Prev., Intervention & Hous Stability
	Goal Description	The City of Seattle will focus portions the four federal fund sources on public services targeted to homeless families and individuals as guided by the Seattle/King County Ten-Year Plan to end Homelessness and program development strategies described in the 2012-2018 Human Services Investment Plan for Homeless Services "Communitiies Supporting Safe and Stable Housing."
2	Goal Name	Increase Access to Affordable Housing
	Goal Description	Build, acquire and/or rehabilitate, and maintain low-income housing through private non-profit and public housing developers. Policy and regulations guiding the use of federal, state and local funds in City managed housing development, rehabilitation and homeownership programs can be found in the City of Seattle Housing Levy Administrative and Financial Plan.
3	Goal Name	Economic and Neighborhood Development
	Goal Description	Encourage economic development through investment in neighborhood revitalization and infrastructure, and small business development, including small business lending and technical assistance.

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)

See annual action plan data.

SP-50 Public Housing Accessibility and Involvement – 91.215(c)

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

In accordance with the Voluntary Compliance Agreement signed in 2007, SHA will create 263 UFAS units and will continue to commit at least five percent of new construction to accessible units. As of year end 2012, 190 UFAS units had already been certified.

Activities to Increase Resident Involvements

Residents play an active role at SHA. SHA Community Builders work with interested residents to form and sustain duly-elected resident councils and issue-specific work groups to work with management on issues of common interest. In addition, most communities send representatives to the Joint Policy Advisory Committee (JPAC), with whom SHA regularly consults on major policy issues. Residents are involved in planning for the use of HUD's Resident Participation Funds.

SHA also provides programs that encourage and support residents that want to pursue homeownership and have adequate income to sustainably do so. Residents can save toward homeownership through the FSS program, or the new Savings Match Program, which provides a match of savings up to \$4,000 for households ready to leave subsidized housing for homeownership or the private rental market.

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

No

Plan to remove the 'troubled' designation

N/A

SP-55 Barriers to affordable housing – 91.215(h)

Barriers to Affordable Housing

Background

With passage of the Cranston-Gonzales National Affordable Housing Act in 1990, Congress recognized the importance of public policies and processes to the supply of affordable housing. Section 105(b)(4) requires state and local governments to explain as part of their Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS)—now an element of the Consolidated Plan— whether a proposed public policy affects housing affordability and describe the jurisdiction’s strategy to remove or ameliorate negative effects, if any, of such policies (see 24 CFR 91.210(e) and 24 CFR 91.310(d)).

An Advisory Commission headed by HUD Secretary Jack Kemp released a report in 1991 called *Not in My Backyard: Removing Regulatory Barriers to Affordable Housing*. That report estimated that certain policies and procedures directly increase construction or rehabilitation costs by up to 35 percent. According to the George W. Bush Administration, numerous academic studies have confirmed this finding. In addition to direct cost impacts, many policies and processes further exacerbate the problem by constraining overall housing supply with a general deleterious impact upon overall housing affordability. A 35 percent reduction in development costs would allow millions of American families to buy or rent housing that they currently cannot afford.

Congress, in Title XII of the 1992 Housing and Community Development Act, reiterated its interest in this important subject by authorizing grants for regulatory barrier removal and established a Regulatory Barriers Clearinghouse. In the American Homeownership Act of 2000, Congress reauthorized the Clearinghouse and simplified procedures for a barrier removal grant program. In June 2003, HUD announced “America’s Affordable Communities Initiative: Bringing Homes within Reach through Regulatory Reform.” This department-wide initiative worked with state and local governments to address regulatory barriers as well as address how HUD’s own regulations may present barriers to affordable housing.

Since that time, there has been continued recognition that unnecessary, duplicative, excessive or discriminatory public processes often significantly increase the cost of housing development and rehabilitation. Often referred to as “regulatory barriers to affordable housing,” many public statutes, ordinances, regulatory requirements, or processes and procedures significantly impede the development or availability of affordable housing without providing a commensurate or demonstrable health or safety benefit. “Affordable housing” is decent quality housing that low-, moderate-, and middle-income families can afford to buy or rent without spending more than 30 percent of their income. Spending more than 30 percent of income on shelter may require families to sacrifice other necessities of life. (See Part 2 & 3 narrative continued attached below. Also note the cross reference to SP-55 where only the first part of this narrative appears automatically.)

Strategy to Remove or Ameliorate the Barriers to Affordable Housing

In addition to the overview of barriers to affordable housing noted in MA-40 the City notes two on-going issues:

1. **1. An inadequate supply of affordable housing in Seattle exacerbates fair housing challenges by impeding housing choice.** Seattle's robust private housing market continues to fuel migration of low-income and minority residents toward areas outside of the city as rents and home prices escalate. Wages for a number of the most prevalent jobs are inadequate to afford even studio apartment rents and a disproportionate share of low-income households continue to be cost-burdened for housing, particularly renters. Despite numerous public programs and policies to preserve and expand affordable housing, the force of the private market continues to drive a decline in housing affordability. In turn, this translates into reduced housing choice for protected classes, who are disproportionately low-income and racial minorities.
2. **2. Protected classes continue to experience direct housing discrimination, especially racial and ethnic minorities, refugees and immigrants, families, female headed households with no husband present, and the disabled. These take several forms including the following:**
 - Continued incidents of housing discrimination, particularly based on race, disability and family status in areas of North and Central Seattle.
 - Lack of knowledge/information about fair housing and the complaint process lead to underreporting of fair housing violations, especially in limited English communities.
 - Racial minorities experience differential rates of loan denials.
 - Subtle forms of preferential housing advertising exist in some local media sources

Potential subprime mortgage impacts on protected classes including: greater vulnerability to foreclosures due to racial minorities being a disproportionate share of subprime loan borrowers, increased difficulty of obtaining home loans, a tighter and less affordable rental housing market, and potential decline in home values and spillover effects in low-income areas.

The City of Seattle is currently implementing a broad set of actions to address barriers to fair housing. These include (1) continued support for affordable housing development; (2) intergovernmental coordination on regional goals for affordable housing and funding to achieve those goals; (3) education of and outreach to real estate industry sectors plus renters and homebuyers/owners; and (4) continued enforcement of fair housing enforcement laws.

With the July 19, 2013 release of HUD's Proposed Rule on Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing, the City will be concentrating on preparing for the new planning and assessment process. We are working with a coalition of commissioners from other high cost cities across the nation (San Francisco, Los Angeles, Chicago, Boston, and New York City) and had our first opportunity via conference call to both hear more about the Rule and ask questions of HUD staff and Deputy Secretary Maurice Jones on July 30th. Seattle and the other 5 high-cost cities will be preparing a joint letter with our comments and suggestions for

HUD within the 60 comment period. City of Seattle staff have already had discussions with King County staff about collaborating on a regional Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH). Multiple city departments are coordinating to submit comment on the proposed rule including Housing, Human Services, Seattle HA, Planning & Development and others.

SP-60 Homelessness Strategy – 91.215(d)

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

Addressing the emergency and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

Homelessness Intervention Services in Seattle include a network of shelter and transitional housing programs for individual adults, families, and youth/young adults.

- Shelter, Transitional and Interim Housing programs includes: *Overnight shelter and overnight shelter with enhanced services; Shelter with 24-hour accommodation & service, including shelter for families with children, and shelter for youth under 18 years old; Transitional housing for individuals; families with children; and Transitional Living Programs (TLP) for homeless youth and young adults; and Confidential shelter and transitional housing for victims of domestic violence.*

A network of facilities in Seattle provide a total year-round capacity of approximately 2,223 emergency shelter beds. Additional shelter, with varying capacity, is provided through emergency voucher programs targeted to assist families with children access individual, temporary shelter units in hotel/motels. During the winter months (October through March), the capacity of the shelter system expands, adding more than 412 beds; additional capacity can be added when there are severe weather conditions. The inventory also includes 2,131 year-round, transitional housing beds for families and individuals. Maintenance of shelter capacity, subject to the overall homeless strategy policy, is a critical step toward providing services to the nearly 2,000 "unsheltered" persons identified in the January 2013 PIT count.

Seattle shelter program capacity and services are described in the Seattle Investments in Shelter Programs report and the Committee to End Homelessness' Single Adult Shelter Task Force Report: Role of Shelter in Ending Homelessness. The Human Services Department's strategic Investment Plan for preventing and ending homelessness, Communities Supporting Safe & Stable Housing, identifies how investments in homelessness intervention programs, such as shelter and transitional housing, are balanced with investments to provide homelessness prevention and housing stabilization program services. The Investment Plan can be found here:
www.seattle.gov/humanservices/documents/hsd_csssh_investment_plan_final_062712.pdf.

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 City of Seattle has contributed to the production of 3,312 affordable housing units through construction, preservation, and leasing of housing units dedicated to homeless individuals and families since the community's Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness was introduced in 2005. More than half (57%) of these units have been created for chronically homeless individuals. These units are part of a larger portfolio of Seattle housing investments that have produced more than 10,000 affordable housing units since 1981.

Seattle has adopted a "Housing First" approach for addressing the needs of chronically homeless individuals. Seattle is also increasing its focus on rental assistance program models and leveraging local resources to expand rapid rehousing models for families experiencing homelessness.

Projects awarded funding under this NOFA will be required to participate in system coordination efforts for appropriate units of housing, and must show commitment to participate in the Client Care Coordination (CCC) system, a coordinated referral system which provides access to appropriate housing units specifically for homeless individuals who have histories of high utilizers of hospitals, jails, shelters and other mainstream systems, as well as other chronically homeless and vulnerable street homeless persons with intensive service needs.

Housing Placement, Stabilization & Support Services: financial assistance, services designed to move a homeless household quickly into permanent, "non time-limited" housing. Housing focused services: Case management, housing advocacy, search and placement services for short-term or ongoing support to households to stabilize, move into housing.

Supportive services are provided on-site or co-located with housing or linked to service sites in the community. These services are delivered by housing agencies, by mainstream service or arranged under collaborative agreements between the housing provider and a service provider.

- Mainstream services and resources to increase safety, stability and self-sufficiency, such as healthcare; substance abuse detox and recovery treatment; mental health assessment and treatment; employment training, placement, and retention; housing placement; child care and after-school programs (for programs serving families); legal assistance; removing barriers associated with past felony/criminal conviction; credit counseling; life skills training.
- Case management to connect with mainstream services, community resources (e.g. churches, philanthropic groups, neighborhood groups) and to provide after-placement services for households entering housing. Services focus on preventing future recurrence of homelessness.
- Financial empowerment: Information, education, planning, counseling and coaching to increase financial stability. These services may include assistance with opening a bank account, preparing a budget, taking a class in money management, developing a plan to save money, receiving one-on-one assistance from a debt/credit specialist, applying for public benefits.

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

Prevention strategies designed to avert homelessness among households at risk are one of the key priorities and strategies of ending homelessness. Prevention assistance helps people who are at imminent risk of becoming homeless remain in their housing or secure alternative, appropriate, safe housing that prevents them from entering the shelter system. Program assistance must be well targeted to those most likely to become homeless without these interventions.

Effective homelessness prevention strategies emphasize *primary prevention* focused on emergency assistance and interventions designed to directly prevent individuals, families, and youth from becoming homeless. CEH identified a number of components that must be present for an effective prevention system, including: identification and outreach; information and referral; emergency financial assistance; tenant education, mediation and legal assistance; case management; financial stability services; and long-term self sufficiency.

The discharge planning process for people leaving institutions, such as hospitals or jails, is important in preventing homelessness. In addition to the primary prevention efforts described above, the Continuum of Care has protocols and procedures in place with criminal justice, health care, mental health, and foster care systems to ensure that persons are not routinely discharged to the street/homelessness. These protocols and procedures are outlined each year in Seattle/King County's annual application for HUD Continuum of Care/Supportive Housing funding. Discharge coordination policies from the Seattle/King County CoC application are attached in MA-45, for reference.

SP-65 Lead based paint Hazards – 91.215(i)

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

The City recognizes the need to decrease the level of lead-based paint hazards in residential units improved with City or federal funds. Contractors/workers doing repair or weatherization through one of OH's programs are required to utilize lead-safe work practices. Contractors who perform work for the home repair program are required to complete lead-safe training. The City's six primary contractors for weatherization work have pollution occurrence insurance and each contractor's field employees must possess lead-safe renovator certification. OH's property rehabilitation specialists, who specify and subsequently inspect all weatherization work, are all certified in lead-safe work practices. OH owns an X-ray fluorescence spectrum analyzer in order to accurately determine the presence of lead-based paint in buildings receiving OH HomeWise Program (weatherization) services. This equipment allows the identification of lead-based paint whenever it is present in a home. All OH HomeWise Program clients are provided information regarding lead poisoning prevention.

How are the actions listed above related to the extent of lead poisoning and hazards?

Both weatherization and home repair tend to provide services to older homes where chances that lead paint could be present are high. The above actions are intended to ensure that we adequately address any hazards associated with lead paint in those homes.

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

The weatherization program is governed by the Washington State Department of Commerce, which sets all rules regarding lead paint. These rules can be found the in the 2012 Weatherization Program Manual issued by the WA State Department of Commerce. Home Repair policies regarding lead paint are in the process of being formalized into written policies and procedures.

SP-70 Anti-Poverty Strategy – 91.215(j)

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

The City of Seattle and its partners coordinate a diverse range of programs and services funded through multiple sources to help no- and low-income families. HSD's Anti-Poverty strategy focuses on:

1. **1. Assist families and individuals to access resources that may help move them to self-sufficiency;**
2. **2. Prevent poverty, through assistance to Seattle's children and through life-long education efforts; and**
3. **3. Alleviate poverty by improving family and individual economic opportunities that lead to sustaining a living wage.**

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

Seattle is fortunate to have a community that has been more than generous over the last 20 years by passing levies and initiatives that support the broader housing, human service, and economic self-sufficiency needs of those who have lower incomes or face other barriers to rising out of poverty.

Recently passed initiatives and programs implemented include: **(see attached text below for description of Seattle's Financial Capacity and Asset Building initiatives)**

- **2011 Families and Education Levy** - \$231,560,000 over seven years
Goal: To prepare all children to graduate from school college / career ready
- **2009 Housing Levy**-- \$145 Million Housing Levy – 7 Years
Goals: Produce or preserve 1,850 affordable homes, Assist 3,420 households
- **2013 Career Bridge**—as part of the 2013 Seattle Jobs Plan the *Career Bridge* program to help up to 200 more low-income adults who have additional barriers, including Immigrant and Refugees with limited-English and low levels of education, gain access to the *Pathways to Careers* initiative and obtain the skills they need to get better jobs. \$800,000 in CDBG funds are budgeted for this program expansion.
- **2013 Seattle King County Public Health initiative** to enroll as many residents as possible, with special outreach to vulnerable and underserved populations is poised to make one of the greatest impacts on decreasing individuals' and families' risk of instability due to medical crisis and lack of access to healthcare. HSD and city staff from many departments will be coordinating with Public Health to increase the effectiveness of outreach and actual enrollments for low-income and homeless people.

Financial Empowerment and Asset Building

Financial Empowerment and Asset Building—A key anti-poverty strategy across City programs has been to increase capacity, training, and implement programs which focus on helping households obtain and sustain financial assets. The City founded and has co-led the **Seattle King County Asset Building Collaborative (SKCABC)**, a coalition of more than 60 organizations working to advance financial empowerment strategies in Seattle and throughout the county. The **Bank on Seattle-King County Initiative** provides access to free and low cost checking and savings accounts and free financial education.

SKCABC action teams work on implementation of a variety of financial empowerment strategies including foreclosure prevention and free tax preparation. More than 25 non-profit providers of financial education, counseling, and coaching comprise the **Financial Education Partners Network (FEPN)**.

Living Cities Grant: In 2012, the City received a grant from Living Cities to integrate financial empowerment into City-funded homelessness prevention (HP) services and programs serving homeless families. HSD has worked in partnership with the Mayor’s Office, SKCABC, and the seven agencies providing homelessness prevention and homeless family services. The Living Cities grant supported training opportunities, on-going technical assistance, and the development of a financial empowerment assessment and set up of financial empowerment data elements in Safe Harbors.

Financial Empowerment Centers: The City of Seattle is positioned to receive a three year grant from the Paul G. Allen Family Foundation to develop one Financial Empowerment Center (FEC) with six satellite sites strategically located around the City and co-located with other programs and services. Five full time financial counselors will provide free, intensive financial counseling services to individuals and families in our communities.

SP-80 Monitoring – 91.230

Describe the standards and procedures that the jurisdiction 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

Each department implementing a Consolidate Plan-funded activity is responsible for monitoring the activity for compliance with City and fund-required program standards. For CDBG projects, the CDBG Administration Unit within the Human Services Department will also monitor activities in cooperation with the implementing department. CDBG Administration has also implemented more stringent IDIS reporting practices to ensure that progress on these project are regularly reviewed for timeliness and outcome delivery standards.

All projects to be funded with CDBG are reviewed for eligibility, environmental compliance, and labor standards compliance by CDBG Administration prior to IDIS set-up and funding.

HOPWA and ESG procedures: for these two fund sources, monitoring of activities will follow the monitoring and invoicing requirements as developed by the Human Services Department. Procedures include monthly desk monitoring of performance reports and review of invoices, periodic on-site monitoring for program quality and data verification, review (as applicable) of federal A-133 audit requirements, and a review of financial audits / reports.

For HOME-funded projects, the Office of Housing (OH) implements project monitoring procedures under the Rental Housing Program. OH asset management staff review detailed annual reports submitted by project owners through the combined funders Web-based Annual Reporting System (WBARS). OH also coordinates its monitoring, site visits and inspections with other funders to help reduce administration time and disturbance to residents. OH evaluates compliance and performance in several areas, including occupancy restrictions and affordable rents, unit turnover and vacancy, affirmative marketing and nondiscrimination, physical condition of the building, capital needs planning, funding of replacement and operating reserves, neighbor relations, and fiscal management. OH writes annual performance letters summarizing OH's evaluation in the above areas, and outlining any issues that require action by the owner.

Expected Resources

AP-15 Expected Resources – 91.220(c)(1,2)

Introduction

A conservative approach is taken in estimating revenues for the next program year. Factors included in estimating or projecting future revenues include the President's proposed 2014 budget and the actual 2013 award.

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	8,804,139	840,000	0	9,644,139	27,000,000	Revenue based on assumptions and available public information regarding the President's proposed 2014 budget in the Spring of 2013; for remainder of ConPlan, assume \$9m per year for the next 3 years

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	2,502,176	1,000,000	0	3,502,176	7,500,000	Revenue estimate based 2013 actual award.
HOPWA	public - federal	Permanent housing in facilities Permanent housing placement Short term or transitional housing facilities STRMU Supportive services TBRA	1,706,482	0	0	1,706,482	5,100,000	Revenue estimate based on 2013 actual award.

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	676,093	0	0	676,093	2,028,000	Revenue estimate based 2013 actual award.

Table 57 - 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

The City of Seattle relies on Consolidated Plan funds to provide a foundation for our community and economic development activities. However, they are by no means the only investments the City or the community at large make in programs and services to support low- and moderate-income populations. We anticipate that the pattern of leveraging reported in the 2012 CAPER will continue into the 2014-2018 Consolidated Plan: \$2.52 for every City dollar investment in affordable rental housing preservation and development \$3.53 for every \$1 of HOME funds invested in home-ownership assistance A nearly 1:1 match was achieved in the leveraging of HOPWA dollars to other dollars from the community from a variety of sources.

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 City currently has several buildings which it leases to non-profit entities under "mutually offsetting benefits" arrangements whereby the non-profits provide services to the public in return for its occupancy of the buildings. Most of these are for senior or community center operations.

Discussion

These revenue estimates were developed in the summer of 2013, based on documents outlining the President's proposed 2014 budget for the US Department of Housing and Urban Development and the actual 2013 awards. Program income figures are based on actual experiences and projections for 2013.

Annual Goals and Objectives

AP-20 Annual Goals and Objectives

Goals Summary Information

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
1	Homelessness Prev., Intervention & Hous Stability	2013	2018	Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs		Mitigation of homelessness and related issues		
2	Increase Access to Affordable Housing	2013	2018	Affordable Housing Public Housing				Rental units constructed: 45 Household Housing Unit Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated: 650 Household Housing Unit Direct Financial Assistance to Homebuyers: 11 Households Assisted
3	Economic and Neighborhood Development	2013	2018	Non-Housing Community Development				

Table 58 – Goals Summary

Goal Descriptions

1	Goal Name	Homelessness Prev., Intervention & Hous Stability
	Goal Description	
2	Goal Name	Increase Access to Affordable Housing
	Goal Description	
3	Goal Name	Economic and Neighborhood Development
	Goal Description	

Projects

AP-35 Projects – 91.220(d)

Introduction

This annual action plan provides descriptions of how funds will be used to support the goals and priorities identified in previous sections of this Consolidated Plan. Projects and activities are carefully chosen, many through a competitive process, to ensure the maximum effectiveness in the use of these funds.

Projects

#	Project Name
1	CDBG Administration
2	Human Services Planning
3	Minor Home Repair Program
5	Emergency Solutions Grant Activities
6	DESC Connections
7	AHA Noel House
8	CCS St. Martin de Porres
9	DESC Main Shelter
10	YWCA Seattle Emergency Housing
11	Home Repair Staffing
12	Home Repair Program
13	Homebuyer Program
14	Homebuyer Education and Counseling
15	Multi-Family Housing staffing
16	Rental Housing Preservation and Development
17	Housing Programs Development Staffing
18	HOME Administration
19	Neighborhood Business District Projects
20	Neighborhood Business District Planning
21	Microenterprise Business Technical Assistance
23	Seattle Conservation Corps
24	Parks ADA Upgrades
25	HOPWA RFI
26	Microenterprise Business Lending
27	Neighborhood Business District Staffing
28	Encampment Shelter acquisition

#	Project Name
29	Contingency
30	LIHI Urban Rest Stop
31	Rainier Beach School-based Health Clinic

Table 59 – Project Information

Describe the reasons for allocation priorities and any obstacles to addressing underserved needs

These allocations are proposed based on needs analysis, the availability of other funds targeted to various needs, the purpose of the Consolidated Plan funds, and the availability of City General Funds to meet a wide variety of needs.

Should CDBG revenues exceed the planned amount, the additional resources shall be allocated in accordance with these funding guidelines.

- Mitigate the funding reductions applied to various CDBG programs, grant administration, and planning efforts over the past several years in response to diminishing resources;
- Maximize use of funds for public services to the extent prudent to address gaps in funding for services for homeless persons (such as emergency shelter and day / hygiene services) and other low- and moderate-income households;
- Increase funding for those physical development activities (housing, community facilities, parks, economic development) that do not require on-going annual funding. To the extent possible, the City shall avoid development of a CDBG operating expense base that cannot be sustained if the federal government fails to maintain future CDBG funding at the current levels.

Should CDBG revenues come in lower than planned, the City will continue its policy that the priority for managing decreases in CDBG resources will, to the extent possible, be to reduce funding allocations in physical development and/or administrative activities and not in public services.

- The CDBG funding reductions shall be made in planning, administration, and/or physical

development programs, including program delivery costs. One-time-only capital projects are most likely to experience reduced allocations of any CDBG revenue decrease. Funding reductions may be applied across-the-board among physical development programs. Reductions in administration and planning will be done to the extent that they will not substantially impair the City's ability to manage the Consolidated Plan funds in an accountable manner.

- Comply with expenditure cap limitations on public services and planning and administration.

- The City will explore any other possible areas of savings or reductions that have a minimal impact on sustaining current levels of program operations and services. The CDBG Administrator shall work with affected City programs in identifying and capturing prior year CDBG under-expenditures.

If increases are not substantial or significant enough to enhance or fund an activity, funds may be placed in contingency for programming later in the year or in the next program year.

AP-38 Project Summary

Project Summary Information

1	Project Name	CDBG Administration
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Homelessness Prev., Intervention & Hous Stability Increase Access to Affordable Housing Economic and Neighborhood Development
	Needs Addressed	Mitigation of homelessness and related issues Affordable Housing Preservation and Development Neighborhood Community and Economic Development
	Funding	CDBG: \$920,543
	Description	Fund necessary staff to administer, manage and monitor the implementation of the Consolidated Plan funds and their associated federal regulations.
	Target Date	
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	
	Location Description	
	Planned Activities	Administration, management, and monitoring responsibilities include activity eligibility determination, fund management, labor standards enforcement, and environmental review. Policy leadership and backoffice infrastructure is also included in this activity.
2	Project Name	Human Services Planning
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Homelessness Prev., Intervention & Hous Stability Increase Access to Affordable Housing
	Needs Addressed	Mitigation of homelessness and related issues
	Funding	CDBG: \$130,531

	Description	Support necessary staff to evaluate and provide policy support to investments in homeless and related services.
	Target Date	
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	
	Location Description	
	Planned Activities	Evaluate and develop program recommendations for homeless and related services investments. Develop request for investments processes. Develop Consolidated Plan analyses of homeless, affordable housing, and community development needs.
3	Project Name	Minor Home Repair Program
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Homelessness Prev., Intervention & Hous Stability Increase Access to Affordable Housing
	Needs Addressed	Affordable Housing Preservation and Development
	Funding	CDBG: \$449,917
	Description	Support a subrecipient to provide health- and safety-related minor home repairs for CDBG-eligible low- and moderate-income homeowners.
	Target Date	
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	
	Location Description	
	Planned Activities	Review and assess requested repairs from eligible homeowners. Implement qualifying minor repairs.
4	Project Name	Emergency Solutions Grant Activities
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Homelessness Prev., Intervention & Hous Stability
	Needs Addressed	Mitigation of homelessness and related issues

	Funding	ESG: \$780,457
	Description	Provide funding to support operation of shelter for youth and adults, and homelessness prevention.
	Target Date	
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	
	Location Description	
	Planned Activities	Emergency overnight shelter and supportive services for homeless and unaccompanied youth.
5	Project Name	DESC Connections
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Homelessness Prev., Intervention & Hous Stability
	Needs Addressed	Mitigation of homelessness and related issues
	Funding	CDBG: \$800,763
	Description	Support day center and social services referrals for homeless persons.
	Target Date	12/31/2014
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	
	Location Description	
	Planned Activities	Provision of day center for homeless persons without a place to rest during the day; provision of social services referrals.
6	Project Name	AHA Noel House
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Homelessness Prev., Intervention & Hous Stability
	Needs Addressed	Mitigation of homelessness and related issues
	Funding	CDBG: \$466,786
	Description	Provide emergency shelter for homeless individuals
	Target Date	

	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	
	Location Description	
	Planned Activities	Provision of emergency shelter beds for homeless individuals, plus related services to transition clients into transitional or permanent housing.
7	Project Name	CCS St. Martin de Porres
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Homelessness Prev., Intervention & Hous Stability
	Needs Addressed	Mitigation of homelessness and related issues
	Funding	CDBG: \$478,730
	Description	Support the provision of emergency shelter for homeless individuals
	Target Date	
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	
	Location Description	
	Planned Activities	Emergency shelter and related services for homeless persons.
8	Project Name	DESC Main Shelter
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Homelessness Prev., Intervention & Hous Stability
	Needs Addressed	Mitigation of homelessness and related issues
	Funding	CDBG: \$1,173,052
	Description	Support the costs of an emergency homeless shelter
	Target Date	
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	
Location Description		

	Planned Activities	Emergency shelter beds for homeless persons
9	Project Name	YWCA Seattle Emergency Housing
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Homelessness Prev., Intervention & Hous Stability
	Needs Addressed	Mitigation of homelessness and related issues
	Funding	CDBG: \$465,653
	Description	Support provision of emergency shelter for homeless individuals
	Target Date	
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	
	Location Description	
	Planned Activities	Emergency shelter beds for homeless individuals
10	Project Name	Home Repair Staffing
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Increase Access to Affordable Housing
	Needs Addressed	Affordable Housing Preservation and Development
	Funding	CDBG: \$260,202
	Description	Support staff costs for program delivery of home repair program
	Target Date	
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	
	Location Description	
	Planned Activities	Staff support for home repair program, including client intake assistance and marketing.
11	Project Name	Home Repair Program
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Increase Access to Affordable Housing
	Needs Addressed	Affordable Housing Preservation and Development

	Funding	CDBG: \$230,000
	Description	Support cost of home repair program
	Target Date	
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	
	Location Description	
	Planned Activities	Provide home repair services to qualifying low- and moderate-income homeowners. Repairs will be necessary to maintain occupant health and safety and maintain good supply of housing for CDBG-eligible populations.
12	Project Name	Homebuyer Program
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Increase Access to Affordable Housing
	Needs Addressed	Affordable Housing Preservation and Development
	Funding	CDBG: \$40,000 HOME: \$990,015
	Description	Support costs of providing downpayment assistance to qualifying first time homebuyers
	Target Date	
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	
	Location Description	
	Planned Activities	Downpayment assistance and related costs
13	Project Name	Homebuyer Education and Counseling
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Increase Access to Affordable Housing
	Needs Addressed	Affordable Housing Preservation and Development
	Funding	CDBG: \$216,989

	Description	Support subrecipient cost of providing education for first-time low- and moderate-income homebuyers
	Target Date	
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	
	Location Description	
	Planned Activities	Provision of homebuyer counseling and education services
14	Project Name	Multi-Family Housing staffing
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Increase Access to Affordable Housing
	Needs Addressed	Affordable Housing Preservation and Development
	Funding	CDBG: \$79,939
	Description	Support staff costs supporting multi-family housing rehab and development program
	Target Date	
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	
	Location Description	
	Planned Activities	Staffing costs including contract development and monitoring
15	Project Name	Rental Housing Preservation and Development
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Increase Access to Affordable Housing
	Needs Addressed	Affordable Housing Preservation and Development
	Funding	CDBG: \$811,494 HOME: \$2,426,698
	Description	Capital financing for development and preservation of affordable rental housing.
	Target Date	

	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	
	Location Description	
	Planned Activities	Capital financing related to preservation, development, or acquisition of affordable rental housing.
16	Project Name	Housing Programs Development Staffing
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Increase Access to Affordable Housing
	Needs Addressed	Affordable Housing Preservation and Development
	Funding	CDBG: \$101,139
	Description	Support staff costs for planning and development of affordable housing strategies
	Target Date	
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	
	Location Description	
	Planned Activities	Development of plans and strategies, evaluation, and development of ConPlan
17	Project Name	HOME Administration
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Increase Access to Affordable Housing
	Needs Addressed	Affordable Housing Preservation and Development
	Funding	HOME: \$250,218
	Description	Support costs of staff involved in the administration of the HOME grant.
	Target Date	
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	
	Location Description	
Planned Activities	Grant administration including program evaluation and reporting, and contracting.	

18	Project Name	Neighborhood Business District Projects
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Economic and Neighborhood Development
	Needs Addressed	Neighborhood Community and Economic Development
	Funding	CDBG: \$874,675
	Description	Physical improvements to selected neighborhood business districts
	Target Date	
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	
	Location Description	
	Planned Activities	Implementation of physical improvements (sidewalk improvements, street lighting improvements, etc) in low- and moderate-income neighborhood business districts
19	Project Name	Neighborhood Business District Planning
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Economic and Neighborhood Development
	Needs Addressed	Neighborhood Community and Economic Development
	Funding	CDBG: \$20,000
	Description	Support neighborhood business organizations in the development of neighborhood improvements and business support
	Target Date	12/31/2014
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	
	Location Description	
	Planned Activities	Financial assistance to neighborhood business and economic development organizations
20	Project Name	Microenterprise Business Technical Assistance
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Economic and Neighborhood Development

	Needs Addressed	Neighborhood Community and Economic Development
	Funding	CDBG: \$167,000
	Description	Support subrecipient to deliver technical assistance and business advice to microenterprises or those thinking about starting microenterprises
	Target Date	
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	
	Location Description	
	Planned Activities	Technical assistance and business advice to current and potential microenterprise entrepreneurs
21	Project Name	Seattle Conservation Corps
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	
	Needs Addressed	
	Funding	CDBG: \$808,000
	Description	Provide for improvements in neighborhood parks that serve low- and moderate-income neighborhoods.
	Target Date	
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	
	Location Description	
	Planned Activities	Installation of park improvements including safety fencing, paths, and improved landscaping.
22	Project Name	Parks ADA Upgrades
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Economic and Neighborhood Development
	Needs Addressed	Neighborhood Community and Economic Development
	Funding	CDBG: \$400,000
	Description	Support costs of implementing accessibility upgrades to parks

	Target Date	
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	
	Location Description	
	Planned Activities	Improve accessibility of Seattle's parks for persons with mobility limitations.
23	Project Name	HOPWA RFI
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Increase Access to Affordable Housing
	Needs Addressed	Affordable Housing Preservation and Development
	Funding	HOPWA: \$1,779,541
	Description	Use of HOPWA funds will be determined by a competitive process in the fall of 2014. Successful projects will directly benefit HOPWA-eligible residents.
	Target Date	
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	
	Location Description	
	Planned Activities	Activities most likely will include supporting services and rent assistance.
24	Project Name	Microenterprise Business Lending
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Economic and Neighborhood Development
	Needs Addressed	Neighborhood Community and Economic Development
	Funding	CDBG: \$375,000
	Description	Loans to qualifying microenterprises
	Target Date	
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	

	Location Description	
	Planned Activities	Provision of business loans to qualifying microenterprises
25	Project Name	Neighborhood Business District Staffing
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Economic and Neighborhood Development
	Needs Addressed	Neighborhood Community and Economic Development
	Funding	CDBG: \$92,000
	Description	Staffing to implement and monitor all of the neighborhood business district activities and contracts.
	Target Date	12/31/2014
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	
	Location Description	
	Planned Activities	Administration, monitoring, reporting, and management of neighborhood business district contracts and activities.
26	Project Name	Encampment Shelter acquisition
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Homelessness Prev., Intervention & Hous Stability
	Needs Addressed	Mitigation of homelessness and related issues
	Funding	CDBG: \$400,000
	Description	Acquire access on property suitable to house a homeless shelter and day center for homeless persons.
	Target Date	8/1/2014
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	275 homeless persons are to be provided shelter.
	Location Description	901 Rainier Avenue South, Seattle, Washington
	Planned Activities	Acquisition of easement to provide for long-term commitment for shelter and day center facility
27	Project Name	Contingency

	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Homelessness Prev., Intervention & Hous Stability Economic and Neighborhood Development
	Needs Addressed	Mitigation of homelessness and related issues Neighborhood Community and Economic Development
	Funding	CDBG: \$281,918
	Description	Keep funds in reserve to address potential opportunities for emergent community or social services facilities needs or planning needs. Funds may also be used to address urgent / unanticipated public services needs, to the maximum extent allowable.
	Target Date	
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	
	Location Description	
	Planned Activities	
28	Project Name	LIHI Urban Rest Stop
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Homelessness Prev., Intervention & Hous Stability
	Needs Addressed	Mitigation of homelessness and related issues
	Funding	CDBG: \$74,367
	Description	Provide laundry, shower, and hygiene facilities for homeless persons.
	Target Date	12/31/2014
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	
	Location Description	
	Planned Activities	Provision of hygiene and laundry facilities for homeless persons.
29	Project Name	Rainier Beach School-based Health Clinic
	Target Area	

Goals Supported	Economic and Neighborhood Development
Needs Addressed	Neighborhood Community and Economic Development
Funding	CDBG: \$63,000
Description	Remodel school-based health clinic to create more efficient and effective space for delivery of services.
Target Date	
Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	In the most recent school year, over 2,000 mental health and medical visits were recorded at this location.
Location Description	8815 Seward Park Avenue South, Seattle, 98118
Planned Activities	

AP-50 Geographic Distribution – 91.220(f)

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

The City encourages production and preservation of affordable housing throughout the city to maximize choice for low-income residents of Seattle. OH will encourage project locations that afford low-income residents the greatest access to opportunities such as jobs, quality education, parks and open space, and services. OH will encourage housing projects that support focused community development investments that improve the quality of life in low-income communities, and projects in locations where revitalization trends are leading to the displacement of low-income residents. OH will develop criteria to evaluate project locations, which will be published in Notice of Fund Availability (NOFA) documents. Access to transit will be a priority, as transportation costs are second only to housing costs for a majority of low-income households and many low-income households do not own a car. The location criteria will be tailored according to the population intended to reside in the housing, for example, schools would not be a consideration for senior housing.

Geographic Distribution

Target Area	Percentage of Funds

Table 60 - Geographic Distribution

Rationale for the priorities for allocating investments geographically

Discussion

Affordable Housing

AP-55 Affordable Housing – 91.220(g)

Introduction

The goal numbers presented here reflect activities to be funded with federal funds through the City's Office of Housing. (The rental assistance goal excludes certain homelessness prevention activities funded by the Human Services Department.)

One Year Goals for the Number of Households to be Supported	
Homeless	20
Non-Homeless	22
Special-Needs	7
Total	49

Table 61 - One Year Goals for Affordable Housing by Support Requirement

One Year Goals for the Number of Households Supported Through	
Rental Assistance	0
The Production of New Units	40
Rehab of Existing Units	650
Acquisition of Existing Units	9
Total	699

Table 62 - One Year Goals for Affordable Housing by Support Type

Discussion

It is anticipated that the Senior Services Minor Home Repair program contract administration will be moved to the Human Service Department from the Office of Housing if the budget proposal is approved by the Mayor and Council during the 2014 City budget process. Service levels and number of units is not expected to change significantly, remaining in the range of 700 repairs done to 650 housing units in 2014.

AP-60 Public Housing – 91.220(h)

Introduction

SHA uses a variety of strategies to address the financial and community needs of its residents, including job placement and referral services, case management, savings incentive programs, and support for leadership development through SHA's Community Builders.

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

SHA plans to maintain its efforts to connect residents with case management and services through both SHA staff and contracts with agencies such as ADS. SHA provides support for education, including tutoring and recruitment for College Bound enrollment, as well as job placements and referrals. SHA would like to expand services available to public housing residents, but at this time it is not clear that funding will be available to support expanded services.

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

SHA's Community Builders support residents in becoming involved in management, working with interested residents to form and sustain duly-elected resident councils and issue-specific work groups to work with management on issues of common interest. In addition, most communities send representatives to the Joint Policy Advisory Committee (JPAC), with whom SHA regularly consults on major policy issues. Residents are involved in planning for the use of HUD's Resident Participation Funds.

SHA supports participants who wish to become homeowners through both the FSS program and the new Savings Match Program, which will match the savings that participants have accumulated when they are ready to move out of subsidized housing and into homeownership or private market rentals. SHA is also exploring programs that might enable SHA housing participants to become homeowners in the agency's Scattered Sites portfolio.

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

Not applicable.

Discussion

SHA provides a number of services and programs that are intended to address the needs of its residents, including programs that support education, employment, leadership development, and homeownership.

AP-65 Homeless and Other Special Needs Activities – 91.220(i)

Introduction

Seattle is responding to the needs of persons experiencing homelessness through a coordinated Continuum of Care. The City invests in services to prevent homelessness and to help homeless people access and retain permanent, affordable housing with direct grants through contracts with community-based organizations. The City also invests in the development of affordable, permanent housing for homeless and low-income individuals and families.

The one-year Action Plan goals and action steps implement priorities through planning, program development, investment, and contract monitoring of projects in three strategic investment areas:

- Homelessness Prevention – Providing assistance to prevent people from becoming homeless and needing to enter the shelter;
- Homeless Intervention Services – Connecting people who are homeless with resources to increase safety and access to housing;
- Housing Placement, Stabilization, and Support – Moving people rapidly into housing and providing support when needed to remain in housing.

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 one-year goals and actions for outreach and assessment include:

1. Planning and program development, in conjunction with the Committee to End Homelessness and Seattle/King County Continuum of Care, to implement coordinated entry, coordinated engagement and assessment systems for homeless youth/young adults and for homeless individual adults/households without children. A Coordinated Engagement system for youth/young adults will be developed and implemented in 2013-2014. A system for individuals/households without children will be designed in 2014.
2. Monitoring of City of Seattle funded projects with the King County Family Homelessness Initiative and the continued implementation of the coordinated entry and assessment system for households with children, Family Housing Connection. All projects funded by the City of Seattle that are serving homeless families are required to participate in the Family Housing Connection system, with the exception of confidential shelters for victims of domestic violence. Assessment for DV confidential shelters is managed through a separate coordinated system called Day One.

Investing, contracting and monitoring of funding for outreach services and day centers, drop-in centers,

hygiene service centers and shelter programs. These programs are responsible for reaching out to homeless persons and assessing individual needs for intervention services, referrals to shelter and access to housing. Projects funded by Consolidated Plan funding resources are listed in AP-38, Project Summary. City of Seattle also provides local general fund resources to other projects and programs (listed and updated on the city of Seattle HSD Webpage).

Addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

The one-year goals for addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons include:

1. Investing, contracting and monitoring of funding for emergency shelter and transitional housing programs. These programs assist individual single adults, families, and youth/young adults and special needs populations, including persons with HIV/AIDS. Projects funded by Consolidated Plan funding resources are listed in AP-38, Project Summary. City of Seattle also provides local general fund resources to other projects and programs (listed and updated on the city of Seattle HSD Webpage).
2. Planning , program development and system coordination in conjunction with the Committee to End Homelessness/Continuum of Care on implementation of initiatives that are specifically targeted to assist homeless families with children, homeless youth/young adults, chronically homeless individuals (Client Care Coordination/Campaign to End Chronic Homelessness), and HIV/AIDS (HIV/AIDS Housing Committee and Ryan White Planning and Implementation groups).

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 one-year goals for addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons include:

1. Investing, contracting and monitoring of funding in housing placement, stabilization & support services. This includes financial assistance, services designed to move a homeless household quickly into permanent, “non time-limited” housing; and housing focused services such as case management, housing advocacy, search and placement services for short-term or ongoing support to households to stabilize, move into housing. Programs are designed to rapidly rehouse and stabilize homeless individuals, families, and youth/young adults and special needs populations, including persons with HIV/AIDS, in housing with the most appropriate level and duration of service intervention(s). Projects funded by Consolidated Plan funding resources are

listed in AP-38, Project Summary. City of Seattle also provides local general fund resources to other projects and programs (listed and updated on the city of Seattle HSD Webpage).

2. Planning , program development and system coordination in conjunction with the Committee to End Homelessness/Continuum of Care to implement initiatives aimed at reducing homelessness among families with children, youth/young adults, chronically homeless individuals, and persons living with HIV/AIDS (HIV/AIDS Housing Committee and Ryan White Planning and Implementation groups).
3. Implementation of Committee to End Homelessness Shelter Task Force recommendations, including assessment of housing needs and housing placement for shelter residents with long-term stays.

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

1. Investing, contracting and monitoring of funding in Homelessness Prevention programs that provide financial assistance and housing focused services, such as case management, housing advocacy, search and placement services for short-term or ongoing support to households to stabilize, move into housing. Prevention programs assist individuals, families, youth/young adults and special needs populations, including persons with HIV/AIDS, who are at greatest risk of becoming homeless. Projects funded by Consolidated Plan funding resources are listed in AP-38, Project Summary. City of Seattle also provides local Housing Levy funding with federal funding, such as ESG to support these prevention programs (listed and updated on the city of Seattle HSD Webpage).
2. Planning, program development and system coordination in conjunction with the Committee to End Homelessness/Continuum of Care on implementation of initiatives that prevent homeless families with children, homeless youth/young adults, chronically homeless individuals, and households at-risk of homelessness.

Coordinating homelessness prevention and discharge planning programs and protocols. Discharge planning/protocols in place for health care, mental health institutions, corrections, and foster care systems are included in Section MA-35, Special Needs Facilities and Services.

Discussion

Funding to agencies described in the action plan is provided in the form of a contract between the recipient agency and the Seattle Human Services Department (HSD). The contract contains terms and conditions of funding, reporting and invoicing requirements, performance expectations and service delivery levels, record keeping responsibilities, and consent to on-site monitoring as requested by the

City.

HSD makes funding awards through procurement processes called Requests for Investments (RFIs). An RFI is an open and competitive funding allocation process in which HSD will set the desired outcomes and agencies respond by submitting a proposal requesting an investment to achieve these outcomes by providing specific program or project services. The specific requirements for requests for funding will be detailed in procurement materials. Funding opportunities and materials are posted on the HSD Funding Opportunities web page.

Requests for Investments indicate the amount and type of funding anticipated for specific investment areas, investment outcomes, priorities for investments and program models, eligible activities and performance requirements for contracts awarded through the RFI.

All agencies submitting proposals for investment through the competitive RFI demonstrate their ability to deliver established outcomes for clients by providing specific services. Applications in each process are reviewed for ability to deliver services that meet investment outcomes and goals. Applicants are also asked to demonstrate how they will incorporate specific standards and principles, such as cultural and linguistic relevance, in their program model.

AP-70 HOPWA Goals - 91.220 (I)(3)

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	30
Tenant-based rental assistance	36
Units provided in permanent housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	75
Units provided in transitional short-term housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	15
Total	156

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

Introduction:

All of City of Seattle's housing programs seek to increase affordable housing opportunities for low-income households. This is done in part by providing gap financing to create affordable rental housing, providing downpayment assistance, and decreasing energy costs for low-income households through weatherization and energy conservation improvements.

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

In addition, the City's public policies are generally favorable to affordable housing development, maintenance and improvement. City zoning provides capacity to add a range of housing types in amounts exceeding planning goals. Seattle has implemented the vast majority of the actions identified on HUD's latest Initiative on Removal of Regulatory Barriers questionnaire. One of those actions is Seattle's Comprehensive Plan, which includes a detailed Housing Element. The plan estimates current and anticipated housing needs for the next 20 years, taking into account anticipated growth in the Puget Sound region. The plan addresses needs of both existing and future residents of all incomes. A number of affordable housing strategies are incorporated into Seattle's Land Use Code. An example is the transferable development rights and bonus programs, which have been available to developers in downtown Seattle high rise zones since the mid-1980s. Starting in 2006, Seattle City Council has adopted legislation introducing affordable housing incentives for residential developers in several Seattle neighborhoods: South Lake Union, Downtown, South Downtown, Dravus, Roosevelt, First Hill highrise zones, and multifamily midrise zones in urban centers and urban villages throughout the city. Seattle recognizes that lower parking requirements are one of many components of achieving neighborhoods that are green, livable, and affordable. Housing in downtown and Seattle's five other urban centers have no parking requirement. In addition, new affordable housing and senior housing in other Seattle neighborhoods have lower minimum parking requirements than other types of development. Several years ago the State of Washington adopted legislation authorizing jurisdictions to grant 12-year property tax exemptions as an incentive for multifamily housing development in urban centers. Seattle's current Multifamily Tax Exemption Program requires that twenty percent of the units in each development be affordable to families and individuals with incomes at or below 65, 75, or 85 percent of area median, depending on unit size, as a condition of the tax exemption on the residential improvements.

Discussion:

The City is a prime sponsor of the Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness in King County, which documents the commitment to ending homelessness in King County by 2014 and outlines strategies that support that goal. The Ten-Year Plan considers a variety of strategies targeted to access and retention of housing

for homeless individuals and families. This includes increasing the use of existing private and nonprofit units as well as new construction for permanent supportive housing. OH also dedicates specific local Housing Levy and state funds to leverage additional units of permanent housing for homeless and disabled persons. The Ten-Year Plan emphasizes preventing discharge into homelessness as people move from hospitalization or incarceration.

AP-85 Other Actions – 91.220(k)

Introduction:

Actions planned to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs

Actions planned to foster and maintain affordable housing

Actions planned to reduce lead-based paint hazards

Actions planned to reduce the number of poverty-level families

Actions planned to develop institutional structure

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

Discussion:

Program Specific Requirements

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

Introduction:

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

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

1. The total amount of program income that will have been received before the start of the next program year and that has not yet been reprogrammed	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
2. The estimated percentage of CDBG funds that will be used for activities that benefit persons of low and moderate income. Overall Benefit - A consecutive period of one, two or three years may be used to determine that a minimum overall benefit of 70% of CDBG funds is used to benefit persons of low and moderate income. Specify the years covered that include this Annual Action Plan.	0.00%

HOME Investment Partnership Program (HOME) Reference 24 CFR 91.220(I)(2)

1. A description of other forms of investment being used beyond those identified in Section 92.205 is as follows:

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:

Recapture provisions will apply to loans to home buyers, made by the City or by a subrecipient or other intermediary.

Recapture provision will be enforced by a written HOME Agreement signed by the homebuyer and the City and/or intermediary as well as a recorded Deed of Trust that is the security instrument for the subordinate loan promissory note.

The recapture model that applies is "Recapture entire amount," as further explained below. In case of any bona fide sale, including any foreclosure sale, the City will not recapture more than the Net Proceeds. "Net Proceeds" are defined as the sales price minus superior loan repayment (other than HOME funds) and any closing costs.

The amount to be recaptured includes outstanding principal, plus interest at 3% simple interest, plus shared appreciation computed as determined below. The principal amount subject to recapture is only the direct subsidy benefitting the homebuyer, which is the loan of HOME funds to the homebuyer. Shared appreciation is defined as the amount equal to the applicable Shared Appreciation Percentage, as defined below, multiplied by the Shared Appreciation Net Proceeds, defined generally as the Gross Sales Price of a bona fide sale (otherwise, market value) minus the sum of (a) the original purchase price paid by the homebuyer, plus (b) Eligible Improvement Costs, plus (c) Eligible Sales Costs. The Shared Appreciation Percentage is calculated by dividing the loan amount to the homebuyer by the purchase price paid by the homebuyer.

Resale Requirements

Resale requirements will apply to affordable homeownership opportunities provided using the community land trust model. In that model, The City of Seattle provides funding to a nonprofit community land trust to make available for sale a completed home together with a 99-year leasehold estate on the land, at an affordable price. Resale provisions will be enforced by a recorded covenant signed by the land owner, the homebuyer, and the City, and also through a 99-year ground lease between the land owner and the homebuyer. Under both the covenant and the ground lease, for a period exceeding the minimum HOME affordability period, the home may be sold only to a buyer whose family qualifies as a low-income family, which family will occupy the home as its principal residence. The land owner, through the ground lease, shall have an option to purchase in order to ensure that the home is sold to an eligible buyer at an affordable price.

The Resale Requirement will limit the sale price based on the following formula: Purchase Price x 1.5% compounded annually from time of purchase, plus credit for approved capital improvements.

The Resale Formula includes a credit for capital improvements approved by the land owner, the value of which is determined by a licensed appraiser. The resale price as determined by the Resale

Formula is affordable to low-income buyers with incomes from 50% up to 80% of Area Median Income. Through signing the ground lease, the homebuyer agrees that the Resale Formula generates a fair return.

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:

The description of the guidelines for homebuyer activities (question #2 in this section) apply here as well. Please refer to the response to that question.

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:

**Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG)
Reference 91.220(l)(4)**

1. Include written standards for providing ESG assistance (may include as attachment)

See Appendix in AD-25 for ESG written standards attachment.

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 Seattle/King County Continuum of Care (CoC) does not have a system-wide centralized or coordinated assessment system in place for all population groups.

However, the CoC has recently created a coordinated assessment system for homeless families, Family Housing Connection. The CoC is using the family coordinated entry system as a model to expand coordinated assessment of youth/young adults, and single adults.

The coordinated entry and assessment system for families with children began operations in April 2012. Family Housing Connection partners with more than 80 shelter and housing programs in Seattle and King County, including emergency shelter (excluding Domestic Violence shelters), Rental Assistance Rapid Rehousing Programs, Transitional Housing, Service Enriched Housing, and Supportive Permanent Housing Programs. The system uses the Community Information Line as a central referral and scheduling point. The new system is streamlining access to services for families experiencing homelessness and is collecting data through to provide unduplicated data on the number of homeless families and their housing needs.

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).

The Seattle Human Services Department makes funding awards through procurement processes called Requests for Investments (RFIs). An RFI is an open and competitive funding allocation process in which HSD will set the desired outcomes and agencies respond by submitting a proposal requesting an investment to achieve these outcomes by providing specific program or project services.

The specific requirements for requests for funding will be detailed in procurement materials. Funding opportunities and materials are posted on the HSD Web page: <http://www.seattle.gov/humanservices/funding/>.

Requests for Investments indicate the amount and type of funding anticipated for specific investment areas, investment outcomes, priorities for investments and program models, eligible activities and performance requirements for contracts awarded through the RFI.

All agencies submitting proposals for investment through the competitive RFI will demonstrate their ability to deliver established outcomes for clients by providing specific services. Applications in each process will be reviewed for ability to deliver services that meet investment outcomes and goals. Applicants will also be asked to demonstrate how they will incorporate specific standards and principles, such as cultural and linguistic relevance, in their program model.

Funding will be provided in the form of a contract between the recipient agency and the Seattle Human Services Department. The contract contains terms and conditions of funding, reporting and invoicing requirements, performance expectations and service delivery levels, record keeping responsibilities, and consent to on-site monitoring as requested by the City.

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.

The Seattle / King County Continuum of Care (CoC) includes King County plus the cities of Seattle, Auburn, Bellevue, Federal Way, Kent, Renton, and Shoreline. The lead agency for the CoC is the Committee to End Homelessness, a broad coalition of government, faith communities, non-profits, the business community and homeless and formerly homeless people working together to implement the Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness in King County. ESG funding decisions are coordinated with the CEH, as lead CoC agency, and its Funders Group.

In addition, the City of Seattle completed the Communities Supporting Safe & Stable Housing Investment Plan in 2012, to guide funding policies and allocation of the City's homeless services funding within the Ten-Year Plan. The City's community engagement included outreach and consultation with homeless and formerly homeless individuals who participated in surveys, focus

groups, and on the community Advisory Committee created to oversee the plan.

5. Describe performance standards for evaluating ESG.

Discussion: