

CR-05 - Goals and Outcomes

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

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

The following accomplishments, for both the 2019 program year and the 2018-2022 strategic plan to date include goals related to the Assessment of Fair Housing and outcomes are represented in Attachment #1 to this CAPER; this is why you will see a large number of zeroes in the below tables.

In the second year of the City of Seattle's five-year consolidated plan, we assess that our progress in meeting our Consolidated Plan objectives are on track and that our funds are being used for the correct purposes. This assessment is made within the context of the City's overall budget and other resources available to assist low- and moderate-income persons, such as the Families and Education Levy and the Housing Levy, the Seattle Housing Levy and general fund investments that leverage CDBG/HOME/HOPWA/ESG activities.

Highlights in program year 2019 include

- providing overnight shelter to over 3,000 single adults;
- assisting over 500 small businesses, mostly owned by and serving marginalized populations, through emergency working capital grants and technical assistance;
- rehabilitating the homes of over 450 people with low- and moderate incomes who are also elderly and/or living with a disability;
- upgrading parks accessed by over 40,000 Seattle residents;
- providing work and employment training to 130 individuals.

NOTE: For all Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH) goals, see attached 2017-2019 AFH Work Plan Accomplishments for detailed description of activities and accomplishments. The AFH overall goals listed in Table One are comprised of multiple project activities detailed in the attachment. If one of six projects is accomplished in a particular program year, that is manually tracked as a percentage of the overall goal, **but there is no accomplishment data for the individual activities tracked in IDIS** to auto-populate Table One. Goals listed that are labeled "AFH/CPD" indicate activities that are **partially** funded with federal grant funds but also involve other fund sources. The IDIS CAPER data listed in these goals reflects **only the portion** of CDBG/HOME/HOPWA or ESG funded activities each year for the five years of our 2018-2022 Consolidated Plan. This may

result in incomplete goal percentages for AFH/CPD related goals. Because this is the first time AFH goals are integrated into the CAPER template, resulting in a new compilation of IDIS accomplishment data, comparison to prior years' CAPER reports will be complex. Future HUD instructions and changes to IDIS report templates may help streamline this reporting.

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

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

Goal	Category	Source / Amount	Indicator	Unit of Measure	Expected – Strategic Plan	Actual – Strategic Plan	Percent Complete	Expected – Program Year	Actual – Program Year	Percent Complete
AFH: Access to high opportunity areas	Non-Housing Community Development		Other	Other	0	0				
AFH: Access to housing in high opportunity areas	Affordable Housing Public Housing Non-Housing Community Development		Other	Other	0	0				
AFH: Address access to proficient schools	Non-Housing Community Development		Other	Other	0	0				

AFH: All communities are environmentally sound	Non-Housing Community Development		Other	Other	0	0		0	0	
AFH: Combat institutional racism and barriers	Affordable Housing Non-Housing Community Development		Other	Other	0	0		0	0	
AFH: Create supp hsg, reduce barriers for homeless	Affordable Housing Public Housing Homeless		Other	Other	0	0		0	0	
AFH: Dedicated resources for affordable housing	Affordable Housing		Other	Other	0	0				
AFH: Engage communities in civic participation	Outreach		Other	Other	0	0		0	0	
AFH: Equitable input to environ. justice issues	Non-Housing Community Development		Other	Other	0	0				
AFH: Equitable outreach efforts to support HALA	Affordable Housing Non-Housing Community Development		Other	Other	0	0				

AFH: Housing for persons with different abilities	Non-Homeless Special Needs		Other	Other	0	0				
AFH: Partnerships to imp public health outcomes	Public Housing Non-Housing Community Development		Other	Other	0	0				
AFH: Promote equitable growth in new development	Affordable Housing Public Housing Non-Housing Community Development		Other	Other	0	0		0	0	
AFH: Provide more housing choices for families	Affordable Housing Public Housing		Other	Other	0	0		0	0	
AFH: Pursue best practices to end biases	Non-Housing Community Development		Other	Other	0	0		0	0	

AFH: Services to those with different abilities	Affordable Housing Public Housing Non-Homeless Special Needs		Other	Other	0	0		0	0	
AFH: Stay accountable to Comprehensive GM Plan	Affordable Housing Non-Housing Community Development		Other	Other	0	0		0	0	
AFH:Equitable access and amenities throughout city	Non-Housing Community Development		Other	Other	0	0		0	0	
AFH:Fair housing education to all involved parties	Public Housing Non-Housing Community Development		Other	Other	0	0				
AFH:Increase housing options for homeless families	Homeless		Other	Other	0	0		0	0	
AFH:Strong community despite displacement pressure	Non-Housing Community Development		Other	Other	0	0		0	0	

AFH/CPD: Equitable investment across communities	Public Housing Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	500	0	0.00%	0	0	
AFH/CPD: Equitable investment across communities	Public Housing Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Other	Other	0	0				
AFH/CPD: Increase access to government facilities	Non-Housing Community Development		Other	Other	0	0		0	0	
AFH/CPD: Initiatives support marginalized groups	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	0	0		150	130	86.67%
AFH/CPD: Initiatives support marginalized groups	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	750	263	35.07%	0	0	
AFH/CPD: Initiatives support marginalized groups	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Other	Other	0	0				

AFH/CPD: Preserve and increase affordable housing	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$	Rental units constructed	Household Housing Unit	110	0	0.00%	22	11	50.00%
AFH/CPD: Preserve and increase affordable housing	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$	Rental units rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	130	42	32.31%			
AFH/CPD: Preserve and increase affordable housing	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$	Other	Other	0	0				
AFH/CPD: Promote financial security for LMI HHS	Affordable Housing Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	800	649	81.13%	400	254	63.50%
AFH/CPD: Promote financial security for LMI HHS	Affordable Housing Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Other	Other	0	0		0	0	
AFH/CPD: Provide housing/services to seniors	Affordable Housing Public Housing	CDBG: \$	Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	2500	424	16.96%	500	424	84.80%
AFH/CPD: Provide housing/services to seniors	Affordable Housing Public Housing	CDBG: \$	Other	Other	0	0				

AFH/CPD:Resources for at-risk renters/owners	Affordable Housing Non-Homeless Special Needs	CDBG: \$	Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	100	0	0.00%	30	29	96.67%
AFH/CPD:Resources for at-risk renters/owners	Affordable Housing Non-Homeless Special Needs	CDBG: \$	Other	Other	0	0				
CPD: Access to Nature and Physical Activities	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	175000	98035	56.02%	35000	46985	134.24%
CPD: Affordable Commercial Opportunities	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Businesses assisted	Businesses Assisted	100	0	0.00%			

CPD: Increase Disaster Readiness	Affordable Housing Public Housing Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs Non-Housing Community Development		Other	Other	0	0		0	0	
CPD: Increase homeless services	Homeless	CDBG: \$ / HOPWA: \$ / ESG: \$	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	36000	5232	14.53%	0	0	
CPD: Increase homeless services	Homeless	CDBG: \$ / HOPWA: \$ / ESG: \$	Homeless Person Overnight Shelter	Persons Assisted	19000	5979	31.47%	500	3840	768.00%
CPD: Increase homeless services	Homeless	CDBG: \$ / HOPWA: \$ / ESG: \$	Overnight/Emergency Shelter/Transitional Housing Beds added	Beds	0	0		0	0	

CPD: Increase homeless services	Homeless	CDBG: \$ / HOPWA: \$ / ESG: \$	HIV/AIDS Housing Operations	Household Housing Unit	2500	0	0.00%			
CPD: Increase Small Business Assistance	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Facade treatment/business building rehabilitation	Business	0	0		0	0	
CPD: Increase Small Business Assistance	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Businesses assisted	Businesses Assisted	2000	305	15.25%	120	466	388.33%

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

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

CR-10 - Racial and Ethnic composition of families assisted

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

91.520(a)

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

Narrative

Note that the Race/Ethnicity categories used for this table do not match the racial categories used in IDIS for individual project tracking, especially the category for the multi-racial persons. This data may not be a perfect match between the two sources.

CR-15 - Resources and Investments 91.520(a)

Identify the resources made available

Source of Funds	Source	Resources Made Available	Amount Expended During Program Year
CDBG	public - federal	13,718,307	8,824,470
HOME	public - federal	4,043,164	612,647
HOPWA	public - federal	2,712,362	2,067,021
ESG	public - federal	805,090	740,219
Other	public - local	0	0

Table 3 - Resources Made Available

Narrative

The Resources Made Available address the City's annual Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnership (HOME), Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) and Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) allocations received by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. The Amount Expended During the Program Year address the funds from the 2019 allocation and funds from previous allocation years that were expended by the City during this Program Year.

Identify the geographic distribution and location of investments

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

Table 4 – Identify the geographic distribution and location of investments

Narrative

At present, the City is not implementing any official HUD designated geographic based priority areas such as NRSAs or Empowerment Zone or Brownfields. Allocations and program activities are funded City-wide in accordance with eligibility and program priorities set through partner department policies.

Leveraging

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

Fiscal Year Summary – HOME Match	
1. Excess match from prior Federal fiscal year	14,632,386
2. Match contributed during current Federal fiscal year	614,124
3. Total match available for current Federal fiscal year (Line 1 plus Line 2)	15,246,510
4. Match liability for current Federal fiscal year	29,786
5. Excess match carried over to next Federal fiscal year (Line 3 minus Line 4)	15,216,724

Table 5 – Fiscal Year Summary - HOME Match Report

Match Contribution for the Federal Fiscal Year								
Project No. or Other ID	Date of Contribution	Cash (non-Federal sources)	Foregone Taxes, Fees, Charges	Appraised Land/Real Property	Required Infrastructure	Site Preparation, Construction Materials, Donated labor	Bond Financing	Total Match
Lake City Family Housing	0	0	346,864	0	0	0	0	346,864
Operations and Maintenance	0	267,260	0	0	0	0	0	267,260

Table 6 – Match Contribution for the Federal Fiscal Year

HOME MBE/WBE report

Program Income – Enter the program amounts for the reporting period				
Balance on hand at beginning of reporting period	Amount received during reporting period	Total amount expended during reporting period	Amount expended for TBRA	Balance on hand at end of reporting period
\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
3,063,235	1,117,408	0	0	4,180,643

Table 7 – Program Income

Minority Business Enterprises and Women Business Enterprises – Indicate the number and dollar value of contracts for HOME projects completed during the reporting period						
	Total	Minority Business Enterprises				White Non-Hispanic
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	
Contracts						
Dollar Amount	15,865,347	0	0	0	0	15,865,347
Number	2	0	0	0	0	2
Sub-Contracts						
Number	13	1	1	1	6	4
Dollar Amount	3,528,022	4,250	1,091,153	813,004	1,341,937	277,678
	Total	Women Business Enterprises	Male			
Contracts						
Dollar Amount	15,865,347	0	15,865,347			
Number	2	0	2			
Sub-Contracts						
Number	13	4	9			
Dollar Amount	3,528,022	277,678	3,250,344			

Table 8 - Minority Business and Women Business Enterprises

Minority Owners of Rental Property – Indicate the number of HOME assisted rental property owners and the total amount of HOME funds in these rental properties assisted						
	Total	Minority Property Owners				White Non-Hispanic
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	
Number	1	0	0	0	0	1
Dollar Amount	3,222,611	0	0	0	0	3,222,611

Table 9 – Minority Owners of Rental Property

Relocation and Real Property Acquisition – Indicate the number of persons displaced, the cost of relocation payments, the number of parcels acquired, and the cost of acquisition

Parcels Acquired		0	0			
Businesses Displaced		0	0			
Nonprofit Organizations Displaced		0	0			
Households Temporarily Relocated, not Displaced		0	0			
Households Displaced	Total	Minority Property Enterprises				White Non-Hispanic
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	
Number	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cost	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 10 – Relocation and Real Property Acquisition

CR-20 - Affordable Housing 91.520(b)

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

	One-Year Goal	Actual
Number of Homeless households to be provided affordable housing units	120	28
Number of Non-Homeless households to be provided affordable housing units	608	585
Number of Special-Needs households to be provided affordable housing units	109	0
Total	837	613

Table 11 – Number of Households

	One-Year Goal	Actual
Number of households supported through Rental Assistance	209	132
Number of households supported through The Production of New Units	22	28
Number of households supported through Rehab of Existing Units	606	453
Number of households supported through Acquisition of Existing Units	0	0
Total	837	613

Table 12 – Number of Households Supported

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

Discuss how these outcomes will impact future annual action plans.

Include the number of extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income persons

served by each activity where information on income by family size is required to determine the eligibility of the activity.

Number of Households Served	CDBG Actual	HOME Actual
Extremely Low-income	214	6
Low-income	156	22
Moderate-income	54	0
Total	424	28

Table 13 – Number of Households Served

Narrative Information

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

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

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

In 2019 the City of Seattle, in partnership with King County, the Seattle-King County CoC and other partners committed to consolidating its homeless investments into a single entity, charged with "creating a homelessness response system that centers customer voice to eliminate inequities and end homelessness for all. In 2019 work also began, lead by the Corporation for Supportive Housing on developing an Regional Action Plan that will be a reflection of what the community articulates through engagement and data. More information can be found here: <https://regionalhomelessnessystem.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/introduction-to-the-regional-action-plan-06-2019.pdf>

The City of Seattle also contracts with several service providers to conduct street outreach to persons living unsheltered. The City also operates a Navigation Team of social workers, outreach staff and police officers who target individuals living in unsafe encampment conditions and provide direct referral into some of the City's shelters. Coordinated Entry for All (CEA) has been operational in Seattle and King County for several years. CEA trained assessors conduct VI-SPDAT assessments with families, young adults and single adults at Regional Access Points (RAPs), shelters, day centers, and other designated sites. Outreach providers working with unsheltered persons also conduct VI-SPDATs. Once assessment results are entered into CEA the households are placed on the community queue for housing. In 2018 CEA convened multiple community stakeholders and conducted research to assess the effectiveness of current CEA practice. As a result of this analysis, our CoC has increased diversion resources and standards, and anticipates shifting to a Dynamic Prioritization coordinated entry model in 2019.

Addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

In 2016, the City of Seattle assessed the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of people experiencing homelessness. This survey of over 1,000 people resulted in a comprehensive realignment of the City's investments in a 2017 RFP to re-award all City homelessness funds, including those represented in this plan. That RFP was due to be re-issued in 2020 but has been put on hold as responsibility for assessing, planning and funding emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of people experiencing homelessness moves to the new regional entity, which will center the voices of those experiencing homelessness.

Helping low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless, especially extremely low-income individuals and families and those who are: likely to become homeless after being discharged from publicly funded institutions and systems of care (such as health care facilities, mental health facilities, foster care and other youth facilities, and corrections

programs and institutions); and, receiving assistance from public or private agencies that address housing, health, social services, employment, education, or youth needs

The Human Services Department has worked closely with institutions and systems of care to reduce the rate of persons being exited from those programs into homelessness. Our partners working at the County jail work closely with housing providers to ensure that people completing their sentence are exiting to housing whenever possible. The State of Washington has increased support for youth aging out of the foster care system to reduce exits to homelessness. Additionally, the CEA system is funded to provide diversion and prevention assistance to households seeking assistance to retain or maintain housing before entering homelessness.

Additionally, the Office of Economic Development, uses over \$2.6 million in General Funds to support nonprofit service provider programs which train low-income, low-skill individuals, both youth and adults, to join the workforce and thus avoid homelessness. In addition to these training and worker readiness programs, OED staff work with local high demand industry leaders facing worker shortages and with the Community College District to develop worker training certifications aligned with their workforce needs.

To further develop our workforce and local businesses, OED staff work with a wide range of small business owners directly and indirectly through contract partners. Within our contracts we include a condition which requires our contract partners to engage and serve with at least 20 percent WMBEs (women/minority-owned business enterprises). OED staff encourage WMBE vendors to register and self-identify on the City's Online Business Directory through face to face business contacts, community events, community forums, and chamber events. OED also maintains a relationship with a translation phone bank that has allowed OED staff to work with a more diverse public by being accessible via over-the-phone translation of over 200 languages.

The Office of Housing manages the voter approved Seattle Housing Levy that provides affordable housing for Seattle's low-income residents. In August of 2016, the seven-year housing levy was renewed by Seattle voters which doubled the total effort to provide funds for affordable housing. It is expected to generate \$290 million over the next seven years. The levy's goals are to produce and preserve 2,150 apartments affordable for at least 50 years, reinvest in 350 affordable apartments, provide rent assistance and other supports for 4,500 families to prevent homelessness, assist 280 low-income homeowners, and provide loans for acquisition and rental rehabilitation of existing affordable apartments.

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

All Home, the CoC lead for Seattle and King County, has been measuring system performance for the last several years. The most current performance data can be seen on the website at:

<http://allhomekc.org/quarterly-data/> In partnership with other funders, the City of Seattle is working to increase our system performance in terms of increasing exit rates to permanent housing, decreasing the length of time households spend homeless, and more. A major challenge to this work is the housing affordability crisis engulfing the United States, and felt acutely in Seattle. The newly formed Regional Entity responsible for helping people experiencing homelessness will be charged with assessing and addressing their housing needs.

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

Actions taken to address the needs of public housing

Seattle Housing Authority (SHA) continues to advance its affordable housing goals, which are guided by a strategic plan for 2016-2020:

Create more affordable housing: Leverage resources to increase rental assistance and housing units for more people in need of affordable housing. Advance affordable housing policy: Champion public policies that increase the viability, availability, and accessibility of affordable housing for people with low incomes. Diversify housing choice: Expand available housing choices, demonstrate alternative housing models, and preserve and increase access to neighborhoods throughout Seattle that would otherwise be out of reach for people with low incomes. Preserve and promote high quality housing: Provide safe, accessible, sustainable, and attractive living environments that contribute to Seattle neighborhoods through preservation and redevelopment of SHA's housing stock. Connect people to opportunity: Invest in communities through partnerships so that neighborhoods where participants live support access to opportunities such as good jobs, parks, transit, arts, high-performing schools, and healthy living. Strengthen community and service: Facilitate supportive relationships and respectful interactions among participants, staff, partner organizations, and neighbors so that people feel valued, proud, and connected to the community they live in. Enhance senior and disabled living: Connect senior and disabled participants to the services they need and facilitate access to other housing choices along a continuum of care as appropriate. Economically empower people: Assist participants in benefiting from education and employment to increase their economic security, skills, income, assets, and financial well-being. Support youth achievement: Promote access to high-quality learning opportunities for young children, youth, and young adults that increase educational performance, college and career readiness, and encourage lifelong well-being.

In 2018 SHA employed strategies to address the needs of public housing residents, including job placement and referral services, case management through SHA staff and contracts with agencies such as City of Seattle Aging and Disability Services, individualized planning and assessment to provide connections to training and education, and leadership development through SHA's Community Builders. SHA connected households with educational resources, including tutoring and recruitment for College Bound enrollment.

SHA's JobLink completed its first full year in 2018. JobLink connects residents to employment, education and resources through one-on-one support. The program is open to SHA residents age 18 and older, and helps residents build job preparation and interview skills, teaches financial planning and literacy skills, supports a resident to start a small business, connects residents with resources in the community such as childcare and transportation support, and helps residents sign up for college or vocational training or apply for jobs and explore buying a home.

In 2018 SHA completed repair and rehabilitation work at several properties to extend their useful life.

Building upgrades included roofs, exteriors, and elevator work at multiple properties, including Jefferson Terrace and several Seattle Senior Housing Program (SSHP) buildings. The agency completed security upgrades for several SSHP buildings, as well as work on UFAS units at Jefferson Terrace and Tri-Court. Interior upgrades were completed in numerous scattered site locations as well as Gideon Matthews, Columbia Place, and Jefferson Terrace. SHA also installed mini-split HVAC units in the community rooms of most SSHP buildings, as feasible.

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

In 2018 SHA's Community Builders supported residents interested in becoming involved in management, working with residents to form and sustain elected resident councils and issue-specific work groups to collaborate with management on issues of common interest. In addition, SHA organized and supported representatives from public housing communities to serve on the Joint Policy Advisory Committee and Seattle Senior Housing Program Advisory Council, with which SHA regularly consults on major policy issues. Residents were also involved in planning for the use of HUD's Resident Participation Funds.

Seattle Housing Authority also continued the Aging in Place Volunteer Initiative to bring activities and educational opportunities to senior communities and to recruit resident volunteers to lead these endeavors. The purpose of the initiative is to keep residents active and engaged and to help them to live independently longer.

SHA also supported JobLink participants interested in becoming homeowners. JobLink participants interested in pursuing homeownership receive coaching services related to saving for a down payment as well as building and repairing credit. Coaches also make connections to relevant community resources, including Habitat for Humanity and HomeSight.

Actions taken to provide assistance to troubled PHAs

Not applicable.

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

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

SEE ATTACHED 2019 AFH ACCOMPLISHMENTS attachments. In 2019, the City continued implementation of the Housing Affordability and Livability Agenda (HALA)—an advisory committee report with 65 recommendations to increase the affordability and availability of housing in Seattle. A key focus of the City’s effort was passage of Mandatory Housing Affordability (MHA) - land use policies that will make affordable housing requirements mandatory for nearly all multifamily residential and commercial development in Seattle. MHA requires new development to include affordable homes or contribute to a City fund for affordable housing. In order to put MHA in effect in an area, using a State-approved approach, the City must make zoning changes that add development capacity and expand housing choices. By adding development capacity MHA will also increase the supply of market rate housing in high-opportunity areas of the City, in order to help address the housing shortage.

From 2015 to 2017, City Council adopted legislation establishing MHA requirements and rezones in the University District, Downtown, South Lake Union, Chinatown-International District, and along 23rd Ave in the Central Area, and Uptown. In November 2017, the City released a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) that analyzed putting MHA into effect throughout the city. The FEIS included a preferred alternative for implementing MHA in multifamily and commercial zones, urban villages, and urban village expansions studied during the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan process. Key features of the preferred alternative include implementing MHA broadly to help meet the City's goal for affordable housing production, locating more housing in areas with high access to opportunity and low risk of displacement, and expanding urban villages to an approximate 10-minute walk from frequent transit. After a lengthy SEPA appeal that concluded in November 2018, the City Council continued reviewing the proposed MHA legislation and conducted further public engagement in early 2019. On February 25, 2019, the Council’s MHA committee voted on several amendments approved the legislation (as amended), sending the bill towards a final full Council vote on March 18, 2019. New zoning designations (including expansion of land available for multifamily housing development) and corresponding affordable housing requirements would take effect 30 days following passage of the legislation. Other actions were taken to implement HALA recommendations. The City took steps to prioritize surplus City-owned property for affordable housing development and coordinated with regional transit agencies on developing affordable housing at locations with access to transit. The City Council passed reforms to the design review process in 2017 to reduce costs added to new housing and increase effectiveness of community engagement. Legislation was transmitted to City Council to reform parking regulations to reduce additional costs added to new housing due to parking regulations. For further detail and to view all 65 recommendations covering a broad set of topics related to affordable housing, see website at <http://www.seattle.gov/hala>.

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

See CR - 20, 25, and 30 earlier in this report.

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

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 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.

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

Besides on-going programs which help stabilize and create mobility for qualifying households such as child-care subsidies, youth training programs, and homelessness job retraining programs like Seattle Conservation Corp; the City took major steps in 2017 to help households rise above the poverty level. The Rental Registration and Inspection Ordinance focuses on rental housing units' compliance with safety and basic maintenance requirements. The program educates property owners, managers, and renters about their rights and responsibilities, and through a comprehensive inspection process, helps make sure that rental properties meet City housing code. Inspectors use the RRIO Checklist, a set of plain-language requirements developed in consultation with rental property owners, renters, and other community members.

Seattle's history of legislation in support of stable and sustainable incomes in the community includes the passage of Seattle Paid Sick and Safe Time Ordinance in 2012 and implementing the Minimum Wage Ordinance which took effect on April 1, 2015. The Secure Scheduling requirements for hourly workers in large food and retail businesses to require predictable work schedules passed in 2017. Paid Parental Leave for City employees, many of whom would otherwise qualify as working poor. The intent of C.B. 118356 is to provide critical bonding time for employees of the City to have with their children. This legislation also serves to address gender pay equity initiatives within the City by prioritizing paid parental leave for both women and men, which shifts the perception that women should be the main child-care provider both in the home and at work.

Via the Office of Economic Development, the City's General Funds support over \$2.6 million in contracts with nonprofit service providers for programs targeted to low-income, low-skill youth and adults to gain the training they need to join the workforce. OED staff also work with local industries facing worker

shortages and with the Community College District to develop worker training certifications aligned with their workforce needs. OED contracts with small business owners include a condition which requires our contract partners to engage and serve with at least 20 percent WMBEs (women/minority-owned business enterprises) to ensure investment in businesses owned by more vulnerable populations. OED's Language Line account makes OED staff and services more accessible by providing over-the-phone translation services available in over 200 languages.

The Utility Discount Program (UDP) offers eligible LI customers a 60% discount on their Seattle City Light bill and a 50% discount on their Seattle Public Utilities bills. Vehicle License Fee Rebate. In 2014, voters in the City of Seattle approved a car tab increase to pay for improved transit service. Car tabs, also known as Vehicle License Fees, increased to \$80 per vehicle on June 1, 2015. However, via the \$20 Car Tab Rebate program, income qualified vehicle owners with a car registered in Seattle are eligible to receive a \$20 rebate check.

The City's Equitable Development Implementation (EDI) fund fosters community leadership and supports organizations to promote equitable access to housing, jobs, education, parks, cultural expression, healthy food and other community needs and amenities. Through 2019, 25 projects have been awarded funding totalling approximately \$23m.

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

The Federal Grants Management Unit, responsible for development of the CAPER, Consolidated Plan, and Annual Action Plan reports, is housed in the Human Services Department of the City of Seattle. While ESG, HOPWA, and public services CDBG funds are retained within the Human Services Department, other CDBG funds are allocated to the Office of Housing, Office of Economic Development, Parks Department, and Office of Immigrant and Refugee Affairs. Extensive technical assistance work, especially on an activity by activity basis, is done across department lines by CDBG Administration staff to ensure program and reporting compliance. In 2019, a long-term process was launched to improve the institutional strength of the Federal Grants Unit to ensure proactive and high-quality program administration.

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

City of Seattle and SHA continue to engage extensively with both private market housing developers and landlords to increase the availability of affordable housing in Seattle, as well as partnering with health, education, and homeless social service systems and nonprofit partners to improve supports for SHA participants. The Yesler Terrace Redevelopment project began in 2006 and continues through 2018. The critical upgrade and infrastructure, business, mixed use and housing improvements going into this project will ultimately benefit many of the 1,200 current residents. It will include 1,800 affordable homes for low and moderate-income residents, 65,000 square feet for neighborhood services, and multiple parks and space for community gardening. Support youth and educational achievement with

multiple contracts and lease space for service providers that provide services such as tutoring. SHA and Seattle Public Schools continue to partner to boost academic outcomes for the 5,000+ students living in SHA-subsidized housing, beginning with raising attendance. This partnership is sustaining successful efforts and implementing innovative approaches that improve attendance through three key levers: family engagement, community supports, and systems level changes. Work with Seattle's Aging and Disability Services to provide support to older residents, extending their ability to remain in their units. Committed project-based vouchers to the King County Combined Funders allocation and the Home from School initiative, which provided affordable housing to homeless families with children at Bailey Gatzert Elementary. School in the Yesler neighborhood. This pilot program, developed in partnership with the school system and the City, benefits both families and the school as a whole in decreasing interruptions to students' education. Continued engagement in regional and agency-level work around the intersection of health and housing. SHA developed strategies to leverage its role as a housing organization to improve the health and stability of its participants. SHA partnered with KCHA, City of Seattle, King County, HealthierHere, Public Health, CSH, and many direct service providers.

Continued Robert Wood Johnson Foundation-funding research projects in partnership with Public Health Seattle-King County focused on accessing and interpreting Medicaid claims of SHA participants to better understand health needs and discrepancies between SHA populations and the Medicaid population as a whole; and a second project to evaluate the health impacts of the Yesler Terrace community redevelopment strategies on residents' health and well-being. A third data-driven project funded in part by Robert Wood Johnson Foundation has focused on matching Managed Care Organization-level data to our residential information to allow for a deeper understanding of health care use and needs. In partnership with the City of Seattle's Aging and Disability Services, SHA helped to design an easier way for staff and residents across our housing systems to be referred to service providers for health and stability related needs. A new referral and response system were beta-tested in 2018 and will continue to be tested, refined, and launched in 2019.

Data mapping with the City of Seattle helped allow outreach to 2700 potential recipients of Medicaid Transformation Waiver (1115) Funded MAC/TSOA; over 100 individuals who may qualify for the intensive Foundational Community Supports program have also been identified through shared data and partnership activities. SHA continued to fund \$1.2 million in direct health-related programming through contracted services with providers such as Aging and Disability Services, Full Life Care, NeighborCare Health, and Neighborhood House to enhance care coordination as well as nursing, crisis intervention, and social wellbeing programming.

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

The Seattle Office for Civil Rights (OCR) conducts education and outreach through free quarterly fair housing workshops for housing providers and community in partnership with Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (DCI) to make information on housing laws easier to access for the public.

These sessions are held in downtown Seattle and other locations around the City to meet people where they are at. OCR and DCI piloted sessions for community members to raise awareness of tenant rights and has continued housing provider education which maintains existing relationships. The partnership with DCI has led to reaching owners who own less than 2.5 units and have less access to technical assistance than larger providers that are connected to landlord organizations.

In 2019, OCR conducted fair housing campaigns which included social media, radio spots, and print materials. The campaigns focused on fair housing and Fair Chance Housing legislation. In addition to campaigns, OCR held trainings and tabled at community events to reach community members and housing providers. OCR investigates complaints of discrimination in housing but does not rely solely on individuals to come forward. OCR carries out strategic enforcement via OCR housing testing based on protected classes.

CR-40 - Monitoring 91.220 and 91.230

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

Monitoring starts with accurate and adequate documentation of service levels, participant characteristics, specific actions taken to assist participants, service outcomes, project accomplishments, contractor progress payments, and expenditure records. All subrecipient agencies are required to develop and maintain this documentation under the terms of their respective funding agreements. City departments implementing CDBG-funded programs utilize the following documents and means to ensure compliance with documentation requirements:

- Status Reports that are submitted with each invoice
- Narrative Reports
- Mid-Year Progress and Year End Reports
- On-Site Monitoring/Assessment of each agency, depending on nature of activity, some are completed on an ongoing basis, on an annual basis and/or on a 2 to 3-year cycle. On-site monitoring involves verification of reports that have been submitted, a review of organizational fiscal practices, and compliance with contract terms, which routinely include non-discrimination and affirmative marketing clauses.
- On-going monitoring of agency throughout the year associated with the submittal of detailed invoice documentation
- Depending on the program, compliance/eligibility is accomplished through the loan qualification process, including on-site physical inspections and tenant file reviews, in-progress inspections as needed and final inspections are completed before issuing final payment to a contractor
- Whenever an urgent issue is identified, a site visit is scheduled by the Project Manager/Specialist and a singular review is done addressing a specific compliance issue or a more in-depth agency review is done on a case-by-case basis, as needed
- Labor Standards monitoring is conducted when necessary on qualifying projects. Our Labor Standards monitor conducts preconstruction meetings, on-site interviews with workers, and reviews weekly certified payrolls. Enforcement of Davis-Bacon wages and related requirements are enforced by the withholding of retainage from contractors.

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

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

The City of Seattle always strives to allow the public to participate in the planning processes as fully as possible. With the on-set of the COVID-19 pandemic, workloads have increased. The 2019 CAPER was made available for public comment on 6/30/2020 for the duration of the year and in support of the development of the 2021 Annual Action Plan. Any and all comments will be incorporated into the 2021 Annual Action Plan.

CR-45 - CDBG 91.520(c)

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

No changes in the jurisdiction's program objectives were made during this program year.

Does this Jurisdiction have any open Brownfields Economic Development Initiative (BEDI) grants?

No

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

CR-50 - HOME 91.520(d)

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

Please list those projects that should have been inspected on-site this program year based upon the schedule in §92.504(d). Indicate which of these were inspected and a summary of issues that were detected during the inspection. For those that were not inspected, please indicate the reason and how you will remedy the situation.

Please see attachment with full table of rental housing program activities

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

Seattle's Office of Housing includes a nondiscrimination and affirmative marketing clause in the HOME Agreements executed with Borrowers. This clause states: "Borrower shall comply with all federal and state laws and regulations prohibiting discrimination in housing, including without limitation the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988 and the regulations thereunder, as the same may be amended from time to time. Borrower shall comply with the requirements of Seattle Municipal Code Chapter 14.08 and with the following affirmative marketing requirements for advertisement and rental of Units in the Property:

- (1) Borrower shall include a description of affirmative marketing efforts in its Management Plan.
- (2) Borrower shall maintain records documenting affirmative marketing efforts and shall report annually to City on such efforts and their results.
- (3) Notices or signs advertising the availability of vacant Units shall include the Equal Housing Opportunity logo.
- (4) Borrower shall take actions to provide information and otherwise attract eligible persons from all racial, ethnic and gender groups in the housing market area of the Property. Such actions shall include special outreach to inform and solicit applications from persons who are otherwise unlikely to apply for housing in the Property, according to procedures promulgated by the City from time to time pursuant to 24 CFR Section 92.351."

Our annual project monitoring evaluates performance in this area in accordance with the HOME Agreement, as well as the Seattle Housing Levy Administrative and Financial Plan Housing Funding Policies. The A&F Plan policy for affirmative marketing compliance and performance evaluation assesses the following: "The housing is affirmatively marketed, including advertisements in OH-identified listing sites that reach the general population and underserved groups; the population is diverse; and the

borrower can demonstrate nondiscriminatory treatment for all applicants and occupants, consistent with federal, state, and local fair housing laws and regulations." To demonstrate compliance, borrowers are required to submit marketing materials or a statement explaining the project's approach to affirmative marketing, as well as documentation of any fair housing complaints and dispositions (if any) to the Seattle Office of Housing each year.

The Race/Ethnicity composition of households served in our multifamily rental housing program is assessed on an annual basis. We are pleased to see that minority groups and communities of color served by the program generally reflect demographics of Low-Income renters of the city or exceed them. Results consistently demonstrate that households served in the rental housing program is comparable to, or exceed, the Race/Ethnicity of Seattle's Low-Income renter population, based on CHAS American Community Survey 5-year average data. Black/African American households comprise 12% of Seattle's Low-Income renter households but represent 29% of households served in the OH rental housing program. Non-white, non-Hispanic households make up 60% of Seattle's total Low-Income renter households but make up only 43% of households served.

The Seattle Office of Housing continues to engage external stakeholders around our Affirmative Marketing Policy, to ascertain ways it can be strengthened.

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

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

Through Seattle's housing initiatives, over the course of 38 years, the City has established a solid foundation of housing resources used by thousands of households. With each year's newly funded units, the Office of Housing's portfolio grows, meaning even more housing in Seattle remains affordable to low- and modest-income families and individuals. Our office's Asset Management specialists work with housing providers to keep these buildings financially viable and in good condition from year to year. In 2019, we continued implementing housing programs funded by our local Housing Levy, passed again by Seattle voters by over a 70% margin in August 2016. This is the sixth ballot measure since 1981 that Seattle voters have approved for low-income housing. The Seattle Housing Levy provides \$290 million for affordable housing for seven years (2017-2023). Our portfolio dates back over three decades, with some of the older properties needing recapitalization. Part of our accountability to voters and to supporters of the Housing Levy is that our affordable housing portfolio be maintained in good condition and continue to serve its intended population. 2019 saw the completion of 6 affordable housing rental projects, adding 785 income and rent-restricted units to the portfolio. In total, the Office of Housing's rental housing portfolio in operations as of 12/31/18 was 13,213 units (12,868 income and rent

restricted units).

The Asset Management unit within the Office of Housing had another busy year with physical inspections of 83 properties and the review of annual reports of 300 projects. This nuts and bolts review process is labor intensive for the staff of the Asset Management unit, but it is vital that the Office of Housing keep a watchful eye on the portfolio to ensure that we continue our financial fiduciary responsibility to the tax payers of the City of Seattle.

CR-55 - HOPWA 91.520(e)

Identify the number of individuals assisted and the types of assistance provided

Table for report on the one-year goals for the number of households provided housing through the use of HOPWA activities for: short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance payments to prevent homelessness of the individual or family; tenant-based rental assistance; and units provided in housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds.

Number of Households Served Through:	One-year Goal	Actual
Short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance to prevent homelessness of the individual or family	95	95
Tenant-based rental assistance	142	132
Units provided in permanent housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	103	103
Units provided in transitional short-term housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	0	0

Table 14 – HOPWA Number of Households Served

Narrative

See separate HOPWA CAPER attached to this report.

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

ESG Supplement to the CAPER in *e-snaps*

For Paperwork Reduction Act

1. Recipient Information—All Recipients Complete

Basic Grant Information

Recipient Name	SEATTLE
Organizational DUNS Number	612695425
EIN/TIN Number	916001275
Identify the Field Office	SEATTLE
Identify CoC(s) in which the recipient or subrecipient(s) will provide ESG assistance	Seattle/King County CoC

CAPER

35

ESG Contact Name

Prefix	Mr
First Name	Dan
Middle Name	0
Last Name	Burton
Suffix	0
Title	Federal Grants Manager

ESG Contact Address

Street Address 1	P. O. Box 34215
Street Address 2	0
City	Seattle
State	WA
ZIP Code	98124-4215
Phone Number	2062565415
Extension	0
Fax Number	0
Email Address	dan.burton@seattle.gov

ESG Secondary Contact

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

2. Reporting Period—All Recipients Complete

Program Year Start Date	01/01/2019
Program Year End Date	12/31/2019

3a. Subrecipient Form – Complete one form for each subrecipient

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: YWCA OF SEATTLE, KING AND SNOHOMISH COUNTY

City: Seattle

State: WA

Zip Code: 98101, 3001

DUNS Number: 071846208

Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 737465

CR-65 - Persons Assisted

4. Persons Served

4a. Complete for Homelessness Prevention Activities

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

Table 16 – Household Information for Homeless Prevention Activities

4b. Complete for Rapid Re-Housing Activities

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

Table 17 – Household Information for Rapid Re-Housing Activities

4c. Complete for Shelter

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

Table 18 – Shelter Information

4d. Street Outreach

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

Table 19 – Household Information for Street Outreach

4e. Totals for all Persons Served with ESG

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

Table 20 – Household Information for Persons Served with ESG

5. Gender—Complete for All Activities

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

Table 21 – Gender Information

6. Age—Complete for All Activities

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

Table 22 – Age Information

7. Special Populations Served—Complete for All Activities

Number of Persons in Households

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

Table 23 – Special Population Served

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

10. Shelter Utilization

Number of New Units - Rehabbed	0
Number of New Units - Conversion	0
Total Number of bed-nights available	40,150
Total Number of bed-nights provided	32,809
Capacity Utilization	81.72%

Table 24 – Shelter Capacity

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

The CoC performance standard for utilization of emergency shelter is a minimum utilization rate of 85% for single adults/families and 90% for youth/young adults, and a target utilization rate of 95% for all populations. ESG funded two overnight shelters, operating 110 beds. Utilization during 2019 was 82%, and increase of 5% from 2018. Lower than desired occupancy can be attributed to one of the two programs provides emergency shelter to families in individual units and when each family leaves there can be delays while the unit is turned over.

CR-75 – Expenditures

11. Expenditures

11a. ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2017	2018	2019
Expenditures for Rental Assistance	0	0	0
Expenditures for Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services - Financial Assistance	0	0	0
Expenditures for Housing Relocation & Stabilization Services - Services	0	0	0
Expenditures for Homeless Prevention under Emergency Shelter Grants Program	323,556	0	0
Subtotal Homelessness Prevention	323,556	0	0

Table 25 – ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention

11b. ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2017	2018	2019
Expenditures for Rental Assistance	0	0	0
Expenditures for Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services - Financial Assistance	0	0	0
Expenditures for Housing Relocation & Stabilization Services - Services	0	0	0
Expenditures for Homeless Assistance under Emergency Shelter Grants Program	0	177,022	234,837
Subtotal Rapid Re-Housing	0	177,022	234,837

Table 26 – ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing

11c. ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2017	2018	2019
Essential Services	0	0	0
Operations	424,667	438,998	502,628
Renovation	0	0	0

Major Rehab	0	0	0
Conversion	0	0	0
Subtotal	424,667	438,998	502,628

Table 27 – ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

11d. Other Grant Expenditures

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2017	2018	2019
Street Outreach	0	0	0
HMIS	0	0	0
Administration	20,648	14,528	1,976

Table 28 - Other Grant Expenditures

11e. Total ESG Grant Funds

Total ESG Funds Expended	2017	2018	2019
	768,871	630,548	739,441

Table 29 - Total ESG Funds Expended

11f. Match Source

	2017	2018	2019
Other Non-ESG HUD Funds	0	0	0
Other Federal Funds	0	0	0
State Government	0	0	0
Local Government	777,890	630,548	739,441
Private Funds	0	0	0

Other	0	0	0
Fees	0	0	0
Program Income	0	0	0
Total Match Amount	777,890	630,548	739,441

Table 30 - Other Funds Expended on Eligible ESG Activities

11g. Total

Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities	2017	2018	2019
	1,546,761	1,261,096	1,478,882

Table 31 - Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities