

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.

Overall the Alameda County HOME Consortium did not make much progress in carrying out its Strategic Plan and Action Plan goals due to COVID-19 shelter-in place restrictions. The Alameda County HOME Consortium has an initiative to dedicate HOME funds to projects that are ready to go and have all other financing in place. This has worked to free up funds from jurisdictions that received an annual allocation but did not have a viable project each year. One HOME project completed construction this year: the City of Alameda completed construction of Rosefield Village (3 HOME units); Matsya Village is a CHDO project that is pre-development; the City of Hayward's Mission Paradise is in the pre-development phase on a 75-unit project, construction is expected to start in Fall 2022. Urban County CDBG funds were used on a qualified Community-Based Development Organization for the pre-development work on an affordable rental housing development with 71 units in Castro Valley.

The HOME program did not complete any homeowner rehabilitations due to COVID-19 restrictions. The Alameda County Urban County CDBG Rehabilitation was significantly impacted by the COVID-19 shelter-in place restrictions. Only 51 MHR were completed. Urban County CARES Act funds launched a Mortgage Assistance program for low-income homeowners behind on their mortgage payments due to COVID restrictions. Neighborhood facilities improvements funded with regular FY21 CDBG included the completion of a new childcare center in Ashland, completion of a sewer replacement project for a transitional housing facility for homeless families, completion of an expansion of Dig Deep Farms facility in the Unincorporated County. The farm provides employment opportunities and fresh produce to low-income residents. Axis Community Health started construction of a new clinic facility to serve low-income Dublin residents.

In the chart below, 5-Year Strategic Plan accomplishments are reflected. Please note that almost all programs suspended operations in March 2020 due to COVID-19 Shelter In-Place restrictions, which continued until May 2021. The chart reflects both regular CDBG and CDBG CARES Act funded projects.

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 |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|---|---------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| Community Development | Non-Housing Community Development | CDBG: \$ | Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit | Persons Assisted | 2000 | 7678 | 383.90% | 2000 | 7436 | 371.80% |
| Community Development | Non-Housing Community Development | CDBG: \$ | Homeless Person Overnight Shelter | Persons Assisted | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | |
| Community Development | Non-Housing Community Development | CDBG: \$ | Overnight/Emergency Shelter/Transitional Housing Beds added | Beds | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | |
| Economic Development | Non-Housing Community Development | CDBG: \$ | Facade treatment/business building rehabilitation | Business | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Economic Development | Non-Housing Community Development | CDBG: \$ | Jobs created/retained | Jobs | 150 | 10 | 6.67% | 8 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Economic Development | Non-Housing Community Development | CDBG: \$ | Businesses assisted | Businesses Assisted | 25 | 43 | 172.00% | 20 | 23 | 115.00% |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|--|------------------------|-----|-----|--------|-----|-----|--------|
| Homeless | Homeless | CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$ | Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing | Households Assisted | 350 | 0 | 0.00% | | | |
| Homeless | Homeless | CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$ | Homelessness Prevention | Persons Assisted | 250 | 17 | 6.80% | 183 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Housing | Affordable Housing | CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ | Rental units constructed | Household Housing Unit | 250 | 9 | 3.60% | 14 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Housing | Affordable Housing | CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ | Rental units rehabilitated | Household Housing Unit | 100 | 0 | 0.00% | | | |
| Housing | Affordable Housing | CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ | Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated | Household Housing Unit | 250 | 57 | 22.80% | 105 | 53 | 50.48% |
| Housing | Affordable Housing | CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ | Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing | Households Assisted | 0 | 23 | | 0 | 23 | |
| Housing Discrimination | Affordable Housing | CDBG: \$ | Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit | Persons Assisted | 0 | 612 | | 0 | 612 | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|--|------------------------|------|-------|---------|-----|------|---------|
| Housing Discrimination | Affordable Housing | CDBG: \$ | Public service activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit | Households Assisted | 3750 | 654 | 17.44% | 750 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Housing Discrimination | Affordable Housing | CDBG: \$ | Homeless Person Overnight Shelter | Persons Assisted | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | |
| Public Services | Non-Housing Community Development | CDBG: \$ | Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit | Persons Assisted | 5000 | 32529 | 650.58% | 778 | 4503 | 578.79% |
| Public Services | Non-Housing Community Development | CDBG: \$ | Homeless Person Overnight Shelter | Persons Assisted | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | |
| Public Services | Non-Housing Community Development | CDBG: \$ | Overnight/Emergency Shelter/Transitional Housing Beds added | Beds | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | |
| Rental Assistance | Affordable Housing | CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ | Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing | Households Assisted | 750 | 132 | 17.60% | 85 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Supportive Housing | Non-Homeless Special Needs | CDBG: \$8276 / HOME: \$ | Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit | Persons Assisted | 0 | 0 | | 20 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Supportive Housing | Non-Homeless Special Needs | CDBG: \$8276 / HOME: \$ | Rental units constructed | Household Housing Unit | 50 | 9 | 18.00% | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|--|---------------------|---|---|--|----|---|-------|
| Supportive Housing | Non-Homeless Special Needs | CDBG: \$8276 / HOME: \$ | Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing | Households Assisted | 0 | 0 | | 50 | 0 | 0.00% |
|--------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|--|---------------------|---|---|--|----|---|-------|

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

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

Overall the Alameda County HOME Consortium did not make much progress in carrying out its Strategic Plan and Action Plan goals due to COVID-19 shelter-in place restrictions. The Alameda County HOME Consortium has an initiative to dedicate HOME funds to projects that are ready to go and have all other financing in place. This has worked to free up funds from jurisdictions that received an annual allocation but did not have a viable project each year. One HOME project completed construction this year: the City of Alameda completed construction of Rosefield Village (3 HOME units); Matsya Village is a CHDO project that is pre-development; the City of Hayward’s Mission Paradise is in the pre-development phase on a 75-unit project, construction is expected to start in Fall 2022. Urban County CDBG funds were used on a qualified Community-Based Development Organization for the pre-development work on an affordable rental housing development with 71 units in Castro Valley.

The HOME program did not complete any homeowner rehabilitations due to COVID-19 restrictions. The Alameda County Urban County CDBG Rehabilitation was significantly impacted by the COVID-19 shelter-in place restrictions. Only 51 MHR were completed. Urban County CARES Act funds launched a Mortgage Assistance program for low-income homeowners behind on their mortgage payments due to COVID restrictions. Neighborhood facilities improvements funded with regular FY21 CDBG included the completion of a new childcare center in Ashland, completion of a sewer replacement project for a transitional housing facility for homeless families, completion of an expansion of Dig Deep Farms facility in the Unincorporated County. The farm provides employment opportunities and fresh produce to low-income residents. Axis Community Health started construction of a new clinic facility to serve low-income Dublin residents.

In the chart below, 5-Year Strategic Plan accomplishments are reflected. Please note that almost all programs suspended operations in March 2020 due to COVID-19 Shelter In-Place restrictions, which continued until May 2021. The chart reflects both regular CDBG and CDBG CARES Act funded projects.

CR-10 - Racial and Ethnic composition of families assisted

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

91.520(a)

| | CDBG | HOME | ESG |
|---|--------------|-------------|------------|
| White | 2,876 | 53 | 27 |
| Black or African American | 2,516 | 112 | 43 |
| Asian | 1,581 | 11 | 11 |
| American Indian or American Native | 651 | 12 | 31 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 82 | 7 | 20 |
| Total | 7,706 | 195 | 132 |
| Hispanic | 1,182 | 41 | 53 |
| Not Hispanic | 6,524 | 154 | 69 |

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

Narrative

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 | 2,546,303 | 3,482,642 |
| HOME | public - federal | 3,288,039 | 371,387 |
| ESG | public - federal | 185,092 | 5,896 |

Table 3 - Resources Made Available

Narrative

Identify the geographic distribution and location of investments

| Target Area | Planned Percentage of Allocation | Actual Percentage of Allocation | Narrative Description |
|--|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Ashland, Unincorporated Alameda County | 8 | 13 | |
| Consortium-wide | 52 | 3 | |
| County-wide | 1 | 0 | |
| EDEN PROJECT AREA, CHERRYLAND SUB-AREA | 6 | 13 | |
| Urban County-wide | 33 | 71 | |

Table 4 – Identify the geographic distribution and location of investments

Narrative

For CARES Act funds (CDBG and ESG) the Allocation Breakdown is as follows:

Cherryland 3% and Urban County-wide 97%.

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.

HOME match waived for this program year.

The Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) program provides funding to engage and support individuals and families experiencing homelessness. Within Alameda County, there are three federal Housing and Urban Development (HUD) grantees for the ESG program: the City of Oakland, the City of Berkeley, and the Community Development Agency's (CDA) Housing and Community Development Department (HCD) for the Urban County (consisting of the five smallest cities and the unincorporated county). The California Department of Housing and Community Development (State HCD) provides ESG program funding, which County HCD administers for non-entitlement jurisdictions (remainder of the County). ESG funds may be used for payment of maintenance and operating costs of emergency shelters for people experiencing homelessness; provision of essential services to shelter residents; rapid rehousing and homelessness prevention; rental assistance, housing relocation and stabilization services; street outreach essential services; Homeless Management Information System; and program administration.

On March 27, 2020 the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Stimulus (CARES) Act was signed into law and allocated roughly \$2 trillion in federal relief for the COVID-19 Public Health Crisis, including \$339.8 billion to be directed towards state and local governments intended to "prevent, prepare for, and respond to Coronavirus." The CARES Act includes increased funding and allocations within the ESG program (referenced as ESG-CV funds). All three of the entitlement jurisdictions within Alameda County received additional funds from the CAREs Act, as did State HCD. ESG-CV funds directly from HUD, City of Oakland, City of Berkeley as well as from California State HCD have been used to support a cross jurisdictional, system-wide effort to mitigate COVID-19 impacts through the provision rental assistance, emergency shelter, and Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) support activities. Alameda County initiated a coordinated countywide response working with all jurisdictions in the county to prioritize those unhoused individuals as most at risk for COVID into Project Roomkey non-congregate shelters and to prioritize their exits to permanent supportive housing.

Additionally, federal ESG annual funds were leveraged with matching funds obtained by our service provider to support rapid re-housing and emergency shelter services. The sources of these service provider matching funds include City of Hayward CDBG, California Child & Adult Food Program (CAFCP), Alameda County Social Services Agency as well as funding from private foundations and community support donations.

| Fiscal Year Summary – HOME Match | |
|--|------------|
| 1. Excess match from prior Federal fiscal year | 82,045,210 |
| 2. Match contributed during current Federal fiscal year | 0 |
| 3. Total match available for current Federal fiscal year (Line 1 plus Line 2) | 82,045,210 |
| 4. Match liability for current Federal fiscal year | 0 |
| 5. Excess match carried over to next Federal fiscal year (Line 3 minus Line 4) | 82,045,210 |

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 |
| | | | | | | | | |

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 \$ |
| 344,098 | 347,902 | 391,247 | 275,854 | 300,753 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sub-Contracts | | | | | | |
| Number | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dollar Amount | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | Women Business Enterprises | Male | | | |
| Contracts | | | | | | |
| Dollar Amount | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Number | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Sub-Contracts | | | | | | |
| Number | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Dollar Amount | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |

Table 8 - Minority Business and Women Business Enterprises

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

Table 9 – Minority Owners of Rental Property

| Relocation and Real Property Acquisition – Indicate the number of persons displaced, the cost of relocation payments, the number of parcels acquired, and the cost of acquisition | | | | | | |
|--|-------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|----------|--------------------|
| Parcels Acquired | | 0 | | 0 | | |
| Businesses Displaced | | 0 | | 0 | | |
| Nonprofit Organizations Displaced | | 0 | | 0 | | |
| Households Temporarily Relocated, not Displaced | | 0 | | 0 | | |
| Households Displaced | Total | Minority Property Enterprises | | | | White Non-Hispanic |
| | | Alaskan Native or American Indian | Asian or Pacific Islander | Black Non-Hispanic | Hispanic | |
| Number | 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 | 183 | 143 |
| Number of Non-Homeless households to be provided affordable housing units | 204 | 98 |
| Number of Special-Needs households to be provided affordable housing units | 70 | 0 |
| Total | 457 | 241 |

Table 11 – Number of Households

| | One-Year Goal | Actual |
|--|---------------|------------|
| Number of households supported through Rental Assistance | 265 | 22 |
| Number of households supported through The Production of New Units | 14 | 0 |
| Number of households supported through Rehab of Existing Units | 168 | 88 |
| Number of households supported through Acquisition of Existing Units | 10 | 0 |
| Total | 457 | 110 |

Table 12 – Number of Households Supported

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

COVID-19 shelter-In Place significantly affect the construction schedule of several affordable housing development projects causing a delay in completing construction. Most of the funding went into providing rental assistance through TBRA program or direct payments to landlords for low-income renters who had not been able to pay their rent due to being laid off. Many of the projects that were delayed in FY21 are now receiving additional financial assistance through state and federal funding. The biggest delay at the moment is hiring qualified housing development staff to assist in loan closing and

contract development. Progress on goals has been pushed back by two years for most projects. One project – Alameda’s Rosefield Village was completed.

Discuss how these outcomes will impact future annual action plans.

The number one priority of the HOME Consortium is to Increase the availability of affordable rental housing for extremely low income (30% Area Median Income (AMI), very low income (50% AMI) and low income (80% AMI) households. There has been increased activity on affordable rental housing construction projects towards the end of FY20 with restrictions being lifted. The A-1 Bond funds for Alameda County has and will result in more affordable housing units being produced in the next few years. More homeless housing is in the pipeline with State Homekey funds which in the HOME Consortium are being supplemented with HOME ARPA funds.

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 | 22 | 12 |
| Low-income | 20 | 10 |
| Moderate-income | 11 | 0 |
| Total | 53 | 22 |

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

Hayward City Council adopted the Let's House Hayward! Strategic Plan early in FY2021 to make homelessness rare and brief in Hayward. The City continued operating its Hayward Navigation Center (HNC) and opened a non-congregate Navigation Center Annex in response to COVID-19. Once enrolled in the HNC or Annex, clients have access to services to link them to permanent housing and prevent future homelessness.

Building Futures provided case management services to 18 persons in the City of Alameda.

The City of Livermore works closely with the neighboring jurisdictions in the Tri-Valley Region to assess partnering opportunities. The City has adopted the Home Together Plan, which is a community-wide plan for Alameda County to dramatically reduce homelessness by 2026 and reverse racial disparities in homelessness through centering equity.

The Livermore City Council formed a Subcommittee on Homelessness. Subcommittee activities included a series of community meetings with presentations from experts and service providers to expand the community dialogue around homelessness issues and to discuss potential program strengths, challenges, and resources.

Livermore also continued to provide programs to help unhoused neighbors. The programs include a regional crisis intervention service program and other Livermore only programs such as shower and laundry services, trash service, and bio-hazard clean-up services. The City also funded multiple providers, including Abode Services, Bay Area Community Health, CityServe, and Open Heart Kitchen, to provide a number of homeless outreach services such as meal provision, mobile health, and housing navigation.

The Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) program provides funding to engage and support individuals and families experiencing homelessness. Alameda County initiated a coordinated, countywide COVID-19 emergency response in 2020, working with all jurisdictions in the county, to prioritize those unhoused individuals as most at risk for COVID-19 into Project Roomkey hotel sites (temporary, non-congregate shelter) and to prioritize their exits to permanent supportive housing. Emergency Solutions Grant CARES Act (ESG-CV) funds were used to support temporary emergency shelter sites. ESG-CV funds also provided rapid-rehousing rental assistance to individuals who are currently residing in Project Roomkey sites within Operation Comfort and Operation Safer Ground as they transition to permanent housing. This rapid re-housing effort is part of a countywide, emergency response for COVID-19, and

collaborative jurisdictional efforts.

The 2022 PIT Count recorded 489 unsheltered people and 0 sheltered people in Union City. This is a 361% increase compared to 2019. These individuals are served by a number of mobile health services.

Addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

Year-round emergency shelter capacity within the HOME Consortium during FY22 consisted of 364 for families with minor children and 396 beds for single adults for a total of 760 emergency shelter beds.

The overall transitional housing capacity in the HOME Consortium jurisdictions is 234 beds with 86 beds for families with minor children and 148 beds for single adults. Of the 148 beds for adults, 71 of those are grant per diem beds restricted to Veterans.

During the rainy season, warming station shelters operated in Alameda (6 beds), Fremont (27 beds), Hayward (18 Beds), Livermore (6 beds) and San Leandro (35 beds).

The majority of the Continuum of Care's homeless population continues to be unsheltered (73% as of the February 22, 2022 Point-In-Time Count).

The City of Alameda participated in Everyone Counts, 2021 the point-in-time (PIT) count. The PIT count revealed that the number of homeless individuals in the City had increased from 231 in 2019 to 264, with 180 of these individuals living unsheltered. The City provides services and facilitates affordable housing preservation and development.

The City of Alameda expanded its emergency shelter services in FY21 by expanding existing programs and securing funding for new projects. Using CARES Act funding, the City funded the Safe Parking program and Day Center programming. The City expanded the program operating hours to include weekends and holiday hours. In addition, the Day Center offered overnight shelter. Participants of the Day Center and Safe Parking as well as unhoused individuals throughout the city benefit from Housing Navigation services offered through Building Futures onsite at the Day Center.

The City of Alameda supported Winter Warming services by providing medically vulnerable individuals with hotel stays and case management during the cold weather season. The City funded a group warming shelter during the cold weather season that was open two days a week and on days with inclement weather.

In FY21, the City of Alameda secured a grant from the State of California and a match of HOME-ARPA funds from Alameda County HCD to construct a new, 47-unit supportive homeless housing project (Dignity Village) that will temporarily house approximately 60 people. Five of these units will be set-aside for transitional age youth who are homeless or at-risk of homelessness. Youth who are transitioning out of the foster care system and are beginning to live independently will qualify for these

units.

The City of Alameda also began work to convert three vacant homes owned by the City into Emergency Housing for homeless individuals and families.

The City of Livermore continues to use local funds to support Sojourner House, the only homeless shelter in the Tri-Valley that accepts families and single men with children. Sojourner House has 16 beds.

Livermore also allocated In-Lieu funds to Tri-Valley Haven for domestic violence housing services.

Livermore contributed general funds to help support a Winter Shelter Relief Program which provided emergency motel shelter for medically vulnerable people experiencing homelessness.

The City of Union City allocates \$80,000 in General Fund dollars to cover the costs of the CAREEvan program for people living in their vehicles. On average, 35-40 households use the program on a given night. The City also allocated \$120,473 in CARES Act funding to the program.

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 Continuum is working with publicly funded institutions of care to ensure that persons are not discharged into homelessness. The Realignment Housing Program has housing specialists work with persons in the County jail on their housing needs prior to their release date and is funded by Alameda County Probation Department to rapidly rehouse those who are or could become homeless. It also participated in the Youth Transitions Planning partnership funded by Health and Human services (HHS) to ensure that no transitional age youth aging out of foster care exits to homelessness. The partnership works to coordinate the foster care and McKinney funded housing resources to ensure youth do not fall out of housing. In addition, Alameda County received a Youth Homeless Demonstration Program grant to begin in the next fiscal year.

The City of Alameda maintained moratoria on evictions and rent increases through FY 2021. Residents continued to benefit from the Alameda County Housing & Community Development launched the Alameda County Housing Secure Emergency Rental Assistance Program (AC ERAP), which helps prevent displacement of tenants who were past due on their rent.

The City of Livermore provides HOME and CDBG funding to nonprofit agencies implementing Tenant-Based Rental Assistance (TBRA) programs that provide case management and mental health services to

homeless adults, families, and domestic violence survivors at risk of homelessness for up to 24 months. HOME funds pay for rental assistance and CDBG funds are used for case management services and project delivery costs.

Livermore uses local funds to provide housing counseling and crisis stabilization services that provide low-income individuals and families with critical resources and case management to help avoid losing their housing.

Livermore continues to expand Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) through affordable housing development projects in Livermore. In addition to creating new housing units for persons experiencing homelessness, the Vineyard Housing and Services project will expand an existing food and homeless services site to provide critical infrastructure for addressing the City's strategic plan goals. It will also operate a Winter emergency shelter after construction is completed in 2023.

Alameda County is a “housing first” Continuum of Care and is working with several publicly funded institutions of care to ensure that persons are not discharged into homelessness. All funded programs prioritize finding clients permanent housing as quickly as possible without any clinical pre-conditions. The Realignment Housing Program has housing specialists work with persons in the County jail on their housing needs prior to their release date and is funded by Alameda County Probation Department to rapidly rehouse those who are or could become homeless. It also participated actively in the Youth Transitions Planning partnership funded to ensure that no transitional age youth aging out of foster care exits to homelessness.

The Alameda County HOME Consortium has expanded resources for families experiencing homelessness. While families make up a smaller share of the Point-In-Time Count, they made up 22% of homeless people served by the housing crisis response system over the course of the year. This difference indicates that family stays in homelessness may be shorter than for unaccompanied adults and that our system resources are better matched to the needs of families.

The City of Union City used General Fund and CDBG funding to support public service nonprofits that provide services to help low-income individuals and families avoid homelessness.

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

We are building a Housing Crisis Response System in Alameda County that prevents homelessness whenever possible, provides dignified homeless safety net services, and maintains people in permanent homes with ongoing subsidies and services. Coordinated Entry is the front door and central organizing

feature of the Housing Crisis Response System. The purpose of Coordinated Entry is to quickly assess the needs of people in crisis, connect them to available support, and track the outcomes and performance of the system. Coordinated Entry provides a standard and transparent way for the Housing Crisis Response System to effectively identify people in Alameda County who are experiencing a housing crisis and assess their needs, then prioritize and match them to the most supportive services and housing programs for which they are eligible. To do this, Alameda County Office of Homeless Care and Coordination (OHCC) manages a Countywide By-Name-List, which is maintained in HMIS and governed by all applicable privacy and security policies.

In FY 2021, the City of Alameda offered several programs to support those experiencing homelessness as well as prevent individuals and families from becoming homeless. Eden Information and Referral connects callers through its 2-1-1 service and also manages the Alameda Homeless Hotline (Hotline). The Hotline was launched to provide a central phone number where persons experiencing homelessness, merchants, and residents can call to get connected to services, obtain information, and report non-emergency situations with the homeless. An outreach team makes contact with individuals who are unsheltered and homeless to provide access to resources and support with linking with the housing navigation services at the Day Center, and becoming document ready for housing opportunities. Building Futures' staff also provide emergency help with situations that arise, such as vehicle repair or hotel stays for the medically vulnerable. Participants of Safe Parking and the Day Center have access to case management that includes support with transitioning to permanent housing. Building Futures offers once a week housing navigation office hours onsite. There is also support with obtaining the documentation needed to move in to any housing opportunities identified.

The City of Livermore continues to support a variety of homeless programs and initiatives. The City Council has made Homelessness and Affordable Housing a Council priority, and adopted the Home Together 2026 Implementation Plan to dramatically reduce homelessness, centering racial equity, in Alameda County

In addition, Livermore continues to leverage funding for Crisis Intervention Services, Tenant-Based Rental Assistance, the Street Medicine program, and funding for the Tri-Valley Haven shelters.

Livermore secured a Family Homelessness Challenge Grant from the State of California that will allow the Livermore Housing Authority (LHA) to set aside vacant units at their properties for unhoused families and to provide patient, linguistically accessible, and trauma-informed supportive services to help program participants permanently escape homelessness. The City and LHA are working closely with staff from the Livermore Valley Unified School District and homeless services providers to ensure the program meets the needs of unhoused families in Livermore and limits returns to homelessness.

The City of Union City received funds from the County to pay for a part time housing navigator from Abode Services to help clients in the CAREEvan program. Union City also received a \$200,000 grant from the State Homeless Emergency Aid Program to further support CAREEvan and provide additional services like a mobile hygiene service.

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

Actions taken to address the needs of public housing

The Alameda County HOME Consortium has three Public Housing Agencies, the Housing Authority of the County of Alameda, the City of Alameda Housing Authority and the City of Livermore Housing Authority. Actions taken by the City of Alameda Housing Authority and the City of Livermore Housing Authority are being reported in their respective jurisdictional CAPERS.

The Housing Authority of the County of Alameda (HACA) has no public housing, having converted its 230 former public housing units to project-based vouchers under either the Section 18 program or the RAD Program.

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

Not applicable - HACA has no more public housing.

Actions taken to provide assistance to troubled PHAs

Not applicable - HACA is not a troubled PHA.

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

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

Current Market - There are a number of barriers to providing affordable housing in the Urban County, based on both real estate market and non-market related factors. Rents have rapidly risen over the past five years, due to a lack of affordable alternatives. The construction of affordable rental projects has not met the demand as COVID-19 has slowed the rate of construction considerably. Housing purchase prices are increasing in the Bay Area. The high cost and limited availability of land in many parts of the Urban County contribute to high development costs, which make affordable housing project financial feasibility more difficult to attain. Construction costs remain high. Affordable housing developments generally require multiple funding sources from public and private sources. The availability of public financing sources has become increasingly competitive over the past few years and has been severely restricted at the State and Federal levels, which also serves as a barrier to the development of affordable housing.

Land Use Controls and Building Requirements - Urban County jurisdictions have implemented various land use policies to assist in lowering development costs for affordable housing and continue to work through the local County and city lobbyists each year to support legislation that will assist in increasing the opportunities for affordable housing. All jurisdictions are in the process of completing an update to the Housing Element sections of their General Plans, and as a result some have modified their housing policies.

In Alameda County there is additional development pressure on the limited vacant or underutilized parcels within the urban limit-lines in the County. This has added to the increasing prices for these parcels, further increasing the development costs. The increased competition for sites also makes it more difficult for nonprofit developers to obtain sites, regardless of price.

Public Policy - Neighborhood opposition is often raised under issues such as environmental issues and, parking and school impacts. The Urban County and Alameda County support efforts to educate the community on the value and benefits of affordable housing. One such effort is East Bay Housing Week undertaken by East Bay Housing Organizations (EBHO), a membership organization representing more than 100 developers, architects, tenants, and others involved with affordable housing. This week is designed to educate the public of the facts of affordable housing, increase the number of supporters, and eliminate or minimize community opposition before it starts.

Non-Governmental Constraints - Price of Land - Land costs are rising in the Urban County as the amount of vacant, developable land decreases and due to a very competitive market. This is particularly true for the Urban County cities of Albany, Dublin, Emeryville, Piedmont, and Newark.

Cost of Construction - Construction costs have remained high in the past year. These costs are high throughout Alameda County including within the Urban County.

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

Alameda County HCD and the Urban County member cities continue to be involved in efforts to assist homeless and special need populations through the provision of additional services and housing. Outside of administering funds that provide supportive housing, staff members are involved in a number of local and national policy forums to ensure that current and potential future funding for these populations remains in place. We continue to seek funds that will add to the County's supply of homeless services and supportive housing opportunities and the jurisdictions continue to work with homeless and special need providers to find resources and meet needs. HCD was a recipient of ESC-CV funds which assisted in putting homeless individuals into motel rooms to assist with COVID-19 quarantining or protection from infection. ESG-CV funding also supported rapid re-housing rental assistance to those individuals who are currently residing in Project Roomkey sites within Operation Comfort and Operation Safer Ground, and identified through Coordinated Entry, as they transition to permanent housing. In addition, activities supported by ESG-CV requires significant reporting to the U.S. Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requiring additional staff support for HMIS. Funds from this grant augment this additional HMIS work.

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

The Alameda County Healthy Homes Department of the Alameda County Community Development Agency plays a primary role in addressing the prevention and treatment of lead poisoning county-wide. Its lead hazard reduction program is focused within the County Services Area (CSA), the special district which funds lead poisoning prevention efforts in the cities of Alameda, Berkeley, Emeryville, and Oakland. The City of Emeryville is the only Urban County City within the CSA at this time.

The City of Emeryville receives more than \$20,000 in services annually as a participant in the County Service Area. This is equivalent to the total amount of special service fees paid by Emeryville property owners of pre-1978 residential housing units. Services include homeowner presentations, trainings, unsafe lead work practice responses, technical assistance and advisements, as well as case management of lead poisoned children.

During fiscal year **2020/2021**, The Healthy Homes Department provided the following services in the City of Emeryville:

- Four technical assistance consultations and advisement on lead and healthy housing.
- One unit property completed under the Lead Hazard Control Program.
- Mailings and literature racks promoting lead poisoning prevention and other Department services were sent to families, City of Emeryville Clerk's Office and City of Emeryville Adult Services Agency.

- Information line, E-subscribe, social media outreach including Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, YouTube page; radio outreach to Univision, Pandora, Bonneville FM Radio Stations: 99.7 KMVQ, 96.5 KOIT, 98.5 KUFX, 102.9 KBLX, 196.5 KOIT for a myriad of education services.
- Univision TV Public Service Announcement.
- Print media and web postings on news media outlets such as The Post, Berkeleyside and Oaklandside.
- The Healthy Homes Department also conducts lead safety and healthy homes trainings, lead risk assessments, healthy homes assessments, inspections and hazard reduction. The Department's Lead Hazard Repair Program corrected lead-based paint hazards at one Emeryville property during the period using lead-certified professionals. All identified lead hazards were addressed and housing units completed under this program receive clearance evaluations to ensure that dust lead levels meet HUD clearance standards.

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

COVID-19 has continued to increase the number of people in poverty dramatically due to job loss with shelter in-place requirements. Crisis poverty is a recurring condition in Alameda County, including people who are at-risk of homelessness, or who are currently homeless in Alameda County. Families in poverty have difficulty in securing housing in the absence of income supports and housing assistance. They also have other social service needs such as affordable childcare, employment training, life skills and management counseling, and adequate transportation.

The Section 8 Programs administered by the Housing Authority of Alameda County (HACA), City of Alameda and City of Livermore Housing Authorities provide subsidies to enable lower income households to obtain affordable housing in the private market. The Family Self Sufficiency program operated by the housing authorities aims to keep families from falling into poverty and to reduce the number of families in poverty.

Affordable housing programs such as the HOME Investment Partnership Program and Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) administered by Alameda County HCD provide funds for housing that will be affordable and allow lower income households to use a higher percentage of their income on other necessities besides rent.

Special needs housing programs such as Continuum of Care grants, HOPWA, and ESG, are coordinated with social service agencies and provide affordable supportive housing for individuals who are living in poverty. Services include self-sufficiency supports such as job training and placement and budget and life skills management.

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

The strength of the housing and community development delivery systems is coordination of efforts between jurisdictions and groups that oversee these efforts on an inter-jurisdictional basis. Alameda

County HCD is the lead agency in implementing the Urban County's housing and community development initiatives and coordinates actively with Urban County jurisdictions and organizations. The Alameda County Urban County Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meets bi-monthly to coordinate the delivery of housing and other services to lower income residents in the Urban County jurisdictions and to discuss programmatic and policy matters relating to the federal housing and community development funding sources used in these jurisdictions. The TAC is comprised of staff from the individual jurisdictions in the Urban County.

The Housing and Community Development Citizens Advisory Committee (HCDAC) meets bi-monthly to discuss programmatic and policy matters relating to the federal housing and community development funding sources used in the Urban County, and also provides citizen input on housing and community development policy and implementation within the Urban County. The Urban County also has a representative attend the HOME Consortium meeting and report back on pertinent issues.

HCD, as lead agency of the Urban County and HOME Consortium, participates in several initiatives that gain their strength through public/private coordination. The County's Shelter Plus Care Program and Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) Program are coordinated through participation of housing and services providers and agencies.

Most of the affordable housing development implemented through HCD is carried out through coordination with nonprofit housing developers, including Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDOs), in addition to private for-profit developers, service providers, and lenders; this coordination is a central element of HCD's role in the Urban County.

EveryOne Home is Alameda County's road map for ending homelessness. EveryOne Home focuses on the large, overlapping populations of people in different systems of care (homeless services and housing, AIDS services and housing, mental health services and housing) who frequently are on the streets or cycle in and out of housing. EveryOne Home is designed to end homelessness and keep extremely low income people with HIV/AIDS and/or chronic mental health problems housed. In FY20 EveryOne Home and its partners undertook numerous initiatives to implement the plan to assist homelessness in Alameda County.

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

A primary strength of the housing and community development delivery systems is the coordination of efforts between the jurisdictions and the groups that oversee these efforts on an inter-jurisdictional basis. An additional strength is the level of coordination between service providers, particularly those addressing housing needs of the homeless, special needs populations, and housing providers. Non-housing community development programs within the Urban County are involved in coordination between the Urban County jurisdictions and the agencies or organizations involved in the particular community development area.

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

Fair housing choice is protected under state and federal law. All government actions and policies are formulated and implemented so that fair housing law is upheld. Impediments to fair housing choice are defined as any actions, omissions, or decisions taken because of race, color, sex, disability, familial status or national origin that restrict housing choices or the availability of housing choice; or any actions, omissions or decisions that have this effect. This definition applies to both the private and public sector. The HOME Consortium Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing (AI) includes jurisdictional demographic information for each local jurisdiction in the Consortium, an evaluation of the jurisdictions' fair housing status, a description of public and private impediments to fair housing choice, an assessment of current public and private fair housing programs, and conclusions and recommendations. The Analysis is compiled with input and contributions from each local jurisdiction in the Consortium, public housing authorities, fair housing organizations, and HUD's Pacific/Hawaii Region Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity (FHEO) Division. The Analysis of Impediments is produced at the Consortium level because constraints to fair housing choice occur both at the local and regional level, by both private and public sector policies and actions. In addition, the opportunities for eliminating impediments to fair housing choice are found at the local and regional level. Regular updates on fair housing issues and programs are presented at the meetings of the HOME Consortium Technical Advisory Committee, the Urban County Technical Advisory Committee, and the Housing and Community Development Advisory Committee. The HOME Consortium's Regional Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (AI) with specific actions for FY21 can be found in the attachments.

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

HCD monitors subrecipient jurisdictions in the HOME Consortium for compliance with HOME regulations and in the Urban County for compliance with CDBG regulations. This year no jurisdictional monitoring took place due to COVID-19 Shelter In-Place restrictions.

HCD's Asset Management Consultant was able to conduct Desk monitorings. The complete list of monitorings is located in the Appendix. The first step involves a desk review of the property's annual occupancy, compliance, and financial reports, financial audit and supporting property management documents. The second step is a one-hour conference call with the Property Manager and/or Property Supervisor to review the property's practices in regard to annual inspections, maintenance, annual re-certifications, and other relevant topics. The third step is a review of a sample of HCD-restricted unit files at the project. Due to COVID concerns, the location is set up to allow for physical distancing between the consultant and property staff.

After the review is finished, the consultant writes the Monitoring Report with County staff. Project staff submit responses to the report for review by the consultant and County staff. A close out letter is sent to the project, after all responses are approved by County staff.

Housing that is constructed or rehabilitated with HOME funds must meet all applicable local codes, rehabilitation standards, ordinances, and zoning ordinances at the time of project completion. The HOME Consortium utilizes local Building Inspectors for on-site inspection to determine whether the property and HOME units are properly constructed at project completion. These projects are then re-inspected after one year to see if the property continues to meet local building habitability standards. For each inspection visit, the jurisdiction must determine how many HOME-assisted units must be inspected in the project (on-site items to be inspected include: site, building exterior, building systems, and common areas). No HOME unit inspections were conducted this year due to COVID Shelter-In-Place restrictions.

The City of Hayward completed monitorings at 8 projects and the City of Alameda completed monitorings of 5 projects.

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.

Each year the Alameda County Housing and Community Development Advisory Committee (HCDAC) convenes a public hearing concerning the CAPER. Public Notices are placed on each jurisdiction's website.

The Public Hearing was held at the HCDAC meeting on September 13, 2022. The meeting was held via Zoom. The hearing is listed and noticed as a hearing in the agenda. HCD staff present the staff report regarding the CAPER. Committee members ask questions of staff; the public is then asked to make comments. Any comments are recorded in the meeting minutes and are also listed below. See attachment for Official Notice.

There was a 15-day public review period, for the draft version of the Alameda County HOME Consortium CAPER during September 6 – 20, 2022. The public hearing was held on September 13, 2022 at 6:00 p.m. via Zoom. This is in accordance with the citizen participation requirements for the Consolidated Planning process set forth in each Consortium jurisdiction's *Citizen Participation Plan*. Additionally, several Consortium jurisdictions hold additional city-specific public hearings during the 15-day public review period. Those comments would be included in their respective CAPER.

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.

The Urban County made progress towards the priorities and objectives set forth in its FY21 Action Plan and additional CARES Act funds. The Urban County was an entitlement recipient of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds during FY21 and received an allocation of HOME funds as a member of the Alameda County HOME Consortium. With these and other funding sources, the Urban County delayed committing HOME funds to affordable housing projects which served or will serve low, very low and extremely low-income households, formerly homeless households, and special needs populations until FY22. The RFP was released in August 2022. FY21 funds have been committed to community development activities throughout the Urban County, which have served lower income households and forwarded the objectives of the FY21 Action Plan. CDBG funds have been successfully utilized to benefit lower income households.

The Urban County met the CDBG timeliness goal this 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 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.

HCD monitors its projects based on HOME requirements. Annually, HCD collects an annual housing development compliance report from all projects, which includes submission of financial reports, tenant lists, information on leasing for the year, and information on any changes to their established fair marketing plan and annual audits. HCD also established a three-year site visit and inspection plan after the HOME Rule change. HCD online database tracks and records monitorings, inspections and compliance for management and reporting. See attached list for HOME projects that were monitored during FY21.

Fair Housing: To ensure that all of HCD's development partners are complying with fair housing laws, HCD takes the following steps: 1) As part of the RFP process, applicants must turn in a draft fair housing and marketing plan for HCD staff review prior to awarding the funds. 2) Prior to lease up, HCD staff require the submission of a final and completed plan. 3) Annually, HCD requires the submission of an annual compliance report from each housing development project that includes information on all vacancies for the year, and all marketing and leasing activities that have taken place.

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

Affirmative marketing actions have been effective in the HOME-funded projects completed since the inception of the Alameda County HOME Consortium in 1992. Each jurisdiction ensures that owners, potential tenants and the public are informed regarding the procedures and requirements for rental and homebuyer projects (with five or more HOME units). Methods include utilizing the Equal Housing Opportunity logo or slogan when using the media, community contacts and in displaying fair housing posters. Procedures have been developed to be used by owners to inform and solicit applications from people in the housing market who are not likely to apply for the housing without special outreach. Examples included utilizing ads in foreign language newspapers, and outreach to housing authorities and local community groups in target neighborhoods.

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

The HOME Consortium received \$173,630.46 for CDBG and \$347,902.08 for HOME in program income. There were 8 TBRA projects and 1 CHDO housing development project in which program income funds were used.

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)

The HOME projects committed to during the period of this report include: four tenant-based rental assistance programs for low income people.

CR-58 – Section 3

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

| Total Labor Hours | CDBG | HOME | ESG | HOPWA | HTF |
|---------------------------------------|------|------|-----|-------|-----|
| Total Number of Activities | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Labor Hours | 0 | | | | |
| Total Section 3 Worker Hours | 0 | | | | |
| Total Targeted Section 3 Worker Hours | 0 | | | | |

Table 14 – Total Labor Hours

| Qualitative Efforts - Number of Activities by Program | CDBG | HOME | ESG | HOPWA | HTF |
|---|------|------|-----|-------|-----|
| Outreach efforts to generate job applicants who are Public Housing Targeted Workers | | | | | |
| Outreach efforts to generate job applicants who are Other Funding Targeted Workers. | | | | | |
| Direct, on-the job training (including apprenticeships). | | | | | |
| Indirect training such as arranging for, contracting for, or paying tuition for, off-site training. | | | | | |
| Technical assistance to help Section 3 workers compete for jobs (e.g., resume assistance, coaching). | | | | | |
| Outreach efforts to identify and secure bids from Section 3 business concerns. | | | | | |
| Technical assistance to help Section 3 business concerns understand and bid on contracts. | | | | | |
| Division of contracts into smaller jobs to facilitate participation by Section 3 business concerns. | | | | | |
| Provided or connected residents with assistance in seeking employment including: drafting resumes, preparing for interviews, finding job opportunities, connecting residents to job placement services. | | | | | |
| Held one or more job fairs. | | | | | |
| Provided or connected residents with supportive services that can provide direct services or referrals. | | | | | |
| Provided or connected residents with supportive services that provide one or more of the following: work readiness health screenings, interview clothing, uniforms, test fees, transportation. | | | | | |
| Assisted residents with finding child care. | | | | | |
| Assisted residents to apply for, or attend community college or a four year educational institution. | | | | | |
| Assisted residents to apply for, or attend vocational/technical training. | | | | | |
| Assisted residents to obtain financial literacy training and/or coaching. | | | | | |
| Bonding assistance, guaranties, or other efforts to support viable bids from Section 3 business concerns. | | | | | |
| Provided or connected residents with training on computer use or online technologies. | | | | | |
| Promoting the use of a business registry designed to create opportunities for disadvantaged and small businesses. | | | | | |
| Outreach, engagement, or referrals with the state one-stop system, as designed in Section 121(e)(2) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act. | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Other. | | | | | |
|--------|--|--|--|--|--|

Table 15 – Qualitative Efforts - Number of Activities by Program

Narrative

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 | ALAMEDA COUNTY |
| Organizational DUNS Number | 021116418 |
| UEI | |
| EIN/TIN Number | 946000501 |
| Identify the Field Office | SAN FRANCISCO |
| Identify CoC(s) in which the recipient or subrecipient(s) will provide ESG assistance | Oakland/Alameda County CoC |

ESG Contact Name

| | |
|--------------------|--------------|
| Prefix | Ms |
| First Name | Michelle |
| Middle Name | |
| Last Name | Starratt |
| Suffix | |
| Title | HCD Director |

ESG Contact Address

| | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Street Address 1 | 224 W Winton Ave Ste 108 |
| Street Address 2 | Room 108 |
| City | Hayward |
| State | CA |
| ZIP Code | 94544- |
| Phone Number | 5106705939 |
| Extension | |
| Fax Number | |
| Email Address | michelle.starratt@acgov.org |

ESG Secondary Contact

| | |
|----------------------|---------------------------|
| Prefix | Mr |
| First Name | Riley |
| Last Name | Wilkerson |
| Suffix | |
| Title | HCD Manager |
| Phone Number | 5106709797 |
| Extension | |
| Email Address | riley.wilkerson@acgov.org |

2. Reporting Period—All Recipients Complete

| | |
|--------------------------------|------------|
| Program Year Start Date | 07/01/2021 |
| Program Year End Date | 06/30/2022 |

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

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: ALAMEDA COUNTY
City: Oakland
State: CA
Zip Code: 94612, 4222
DUNS Number: 021116418
UEI:
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Unit of Government
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 1148455.4

CR-65 - Persons Assisted

4. Persons Served

4a. Complete for Homelessness Prevention Activities

| Number of Persons in Households | Total |
|---------------------------------|-----------|
| Adults | 17 |
| Children | 0 |
| Don't Know/Refused/Other | 0 |
| Missing Information | 0 |
| Total | 17 |

Table 16 – Household Information for Homeless Prevention Activities

4b. Complete for Rapid Re-Housing Activities

| Number of Persons in Households | Total |
|---------------------------------|----------|
| Adults | 9 |
| Children | 0 |
| Don't Know/Refused/Other | 0 |
| Missing Information | 0 |
| Total | 9 |

Table 17 – Household Information for Rapid Re-Housing Activities

4c. Complete for Shelter

| Number of Persons in Households | Total |
|---------------------------------|-----------|
| Adults | 12 |
| Children | 0 |
| Don't Know/Refused/Other | 0 |
| Missing Information | 0 |
| Total | 12 |

Table 18 – Shelter Information

4d. Street Outreach

| Number of Persons in Households | Total |
|---------------------------------|----------|
| Adults | 0 |
| Children | 0 |
| Don't Know/Refused/Other | 0 |
| Missing Information | 0 |
| Total | 0 |

Table 19 – Household Information for Street Outreach

4e. Totals for all Persons Served with ESG

| Number of Persons in Households | Total |
|---------------------------------|-----------|
| Adults | 38 |
| Children | 0 |
| Don't Know/Refused/Other | 0 |
| Missing Information | 0 |
| Total | 38 |

Table 20 – Household Information for Persons Served with ESG

5. Gender—Complete for All Activities

| | Total |
|--------------------------|-----------|
| Male | 0 |
| Female | 0 |
| Transgender | 0 |
| Don't Know/Refused/Other | 0 |
| Missing Information | 38 |
| Total | 38 |

Table 21 – Gender Information

6. Age—Complete for All Activities

| | Total |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| Under 18 | 38 |
| 18-24 | 0 |
| 25 and over | 0 |
| Don't Know/Refused/Other | 0 |
| Missing Information | 0 |
| Total | 38 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Victims of Domestic Violence | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Elderly | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| HIV/AIDS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Chronically Homeless | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Persons with Disabilities: | | | | |
| Severely Mentally Ill | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Chronic Substance Abuse | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Disability | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total (Unduplicated if possible) | 12 | 2 | 3 | 8 |

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 | 5,840 |
| Total Number of bed-nights provided | 5,840 |
| Capacity Utilization | 100.00% |

Table 24 – Shelter Capacity

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

Tri-Valley Haven operated a homeless shelter as well as family support services, food pantry, domestic violence shelter in addition to other comprehensive safety-net services in the Livermore, Dublin, and Pleasanton area. Tri Valley Haven’s executed contract included the provision of emergency shelter activities, rapid rehousing, and homeless prevention for homeless individuals and people at imminent risk of homelessness. The shelter at Sojourner House is a 16-bed facility and is the only shelter in the Tri-Valley Area that accepts two-parent families, single fathers with children, and families with teenage boys. Case management was provided at the shelter, including a shelter addiction specialist funded by this contract. Rapid rehousing funding and a Housing Specialist were also included in the contract to assist families to obtain housing through first/last month’s rent, moving expenses, and rental assistance. The provision of homelessness prevention activities included rental assistance and utility payments for families or individuals who were considered at risk of losing their housing and becoming homeless. The Tri Valley Haven contract covered the period of July 1, 2020 to August 31, 2021. The completed goals for FY 2021-2022 included:

- Provision of emergency shelter activities to a minimum total of 17 individuals.
- To provide rapid re-housing services to a minimum total of 9 Urban County individuals.
- To provide homelessness prevention services to a minimum total of 12 Urban County individuals.

CR-75 – Expenditures

11. Expenditures

11a. ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention

| | Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year | | |
|---|---|----------|----------|
| | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal Homelessness Prevention | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 25 – ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention

11b. ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing

| | Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year | | |
|---|---|----------|----------|
| | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal Rapid Re-Housing | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 26 – ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing

11c. ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

| | Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year | | |
|--------------------|---|------|------|
| | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
| Essential Services | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Operations | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Renovation | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | | | |
|-----------------|----------|----------|----------|
| Major Rehab | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Conversion | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 27 – ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

11d. Other Grant Expenditures

| | Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year | | |
|-----------------|---|------|------|
| | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
| Street Outreach | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| HMIS | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Administration | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 28 - Other Grant Expenditures

11e. Total ESG Grant Funds

| Total ESG Funds Expended | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|
| | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 29 - Total ESG Funds Expended

11f. Match Source

| | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|-------------------------|------|------|------|
| Other Non-ESG HUD Funds | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Federal Funds | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| State Government | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Local Government | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Private Funds | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | | | |
|---------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Fees | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Program Income | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Match Amount | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 30 - Other Funds Expended on Eligible ESG Activities

11g. Total

| Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 31 - Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities