

San Gabriel Valley  
Regional Homeless Services Strategy  
Final Report

presented to:

San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments

March 31, 2009

Study Team:  
Corporation for Supportive Housing  
Shelter Partnership, Inc.  
Urban Initiatives  
McDermott Consulting

## Table of Contents

<b>BACKGROUND</b> .....	1
<b>SUMMARY OF FINDINGS</b> .....	1
<b>Phase I: Population Identification and Needs Assessment</b> .....	2
The Homeless Population in the San Gabriel Valley	
The Gaps: Addressing Unmet Needs to Reduce Homelessness in the San Gabriel Valley	
<b>Phase II: Consensus-Building Process to Develop an Implementation Plan to Address Unmet Needs</b> .....	5
Key Issues Identified	
Summary of Priorities by Sub-Regional Cluster Group	
First Priority: Permanent Supportive Housing	
Second Priority: Short-Term Housing (Emergency Shelter & Transitional Housing)	
Third Priority: Access Center	
Summary of Five-Year Housing and Service Targets by Cluster Group	
<b>IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....	14
<b>Strategic Objective I: Develop Leadership, Political Will, and Community Support</b> ....	14
Recommendation 1: Create a Valley-wide Membership Based Organization for the Primary Purpose of Education, Advocacy, and Coordination	
Recommendation 2: Meet and Confer with Municipal Leaders, Community Groups, Business Leaders, Faith-based and Community Service Providers within the San Gabriel Valley	
<b>Strategic Objective II: Build Provider Capacity &amp; Expand the Service Delivery System</b> .....	16
Recommendation 1: Engage Community and Faith-based Service Providers in Planning, Training and Overall Capacity Building	
Recommendation 2: Create More Housing Opportunities for Homeless Persons in the San Gabriel Valley	
Recommendation 3: Create an Access Center in Cluster Five	
Recommendation 4: Develop Valley-wide Referral and Information Sharing System	
<b>Strategic Objective III: Leverage and Maximize Utilization of Available Financial Resources</b> .....	18
Recommendation 1: Form a San Gabriel Valley Supportive Housing Pipeline Review Committee	
Recommendation 2: Commit Local Investments from Municipalities Across Multiple Jurisdictions within the San Gabriel Valley to Stimulate Housing Production	
Recommendation 3: Utilize New Funding Opportunities to Expand Short-term Housing and Rapid Re-housing Programs	
<b>CONCLUSION</b> .....	22
<b>EXHIBITS</b>	
Exhibit One: Strategy Recommendations Short-term Implementation Steps and Timeline	
Exhibit Two: San Gabriel Valley Supportive Housing Production Financial Model	

## **BACKGROUND**

In April 2006, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors approved a Homeless Prevention Initiative through which the County seeks to effectively address homelessness issues through a focus on housing assistance, supportive social services, and improved service-delivery coordination to achieve housing stability and self-sufficiency. In response to concerns raised regarding local participation in the implementation of the Initiative in the region, the Board of Supervisors decided to utilize a community-based, “bottom-up” approach to address this issue. Subsequently, the Board of Supervisors approached the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG) to undertake a preliminary needs assessment and develop a plan to coordinate homeless service delivery in the San Gabriel Valley.

In December 2007, the SGVCOG Governing Board identified the homeless study as an objective for their 2007-08 strategic plan. After a public procurement process, SGVCOG awarded the project contract to Corporation for Supportive Housing (CSH).

The study was divided into two phases:

- I. Population identification and needs assessment; and**
- II. Consensus-building process focused on development of an implementation plan to meet unmet needs.**

## **SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

Critical to the effort was the principle that the development of a consensus driven implementation plan would only be successful if founded on a needs assessment that accurately portrayed local knowledge of the San Gabriel Valley homeless population and the existing service system in the region.

Additionally, the strategy development process identified the following principles that set a framework for understanding the priorities and recommendations set forth in this report.

1. The strategy was created for community planning purposes and is intended for that use only.
2. The goals, recommendations and strategies set forth in this plan are designed for the San Gabriel Valley as a region.
3. Implementation of this strategy will be led by Valley-wide council made-up of community and faith-based organizations and local government representatives which will centrally organize and coordinate the homeless service-delivery system.

## PHASE I: POPULATION IDENTIFICATION AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The Phase I Report provided an assessment of the existing level and scope of services and programs for homeless persons in the region, the existing homeless population in the region, an identification of the unmet needs, and a recommended framework for addressing those needs. In order to produce an accurate and comprehensive assessment, the team developed an inclusive approach, working aggressively to identify as many sources of relevant information and to receive input from as many stakeholders as possible. These sources included a survey of homeless service providers, program site visits, client data review, survey of city managers, city staff interviews, and phone interviews with faith-based organizations.

### The Homeless Population in the San Gabriel Valley

- **Local perceptions of the number of homeless persons in the San Gabriel Valley may be less than what was estimated in the 2007 homeless counts.** The 2007 homeless count estimated 10,911 homeless persons in the San Gabriel Valley at a given point in time. In order to establish an estimate based on local experience and perceptions, the team analyzed data from various sources which resulted in the estimated number of 5,043 homeless persons on any given night in the San Gabriel Valley. The lower estimate established a minimum baseline of need about which local stakeholders can agree and begin planning to reduce homelessness across the San Gabriel Valley. For purposes of this study effort and the planning recommendations herein, we use a mid-point between these two estimates of 7,977 homeless persons.
- **Regardless of which estimate is employed, current homeless services and housing opportunities throughout the San Gabriel Valley are not adequate to meet the need and available resources are not equally utilized across the region.**
- **Overall, the human face of homelessness in the San Gabriel Valley is not markedly different from that of other regions.** Based on statistics gathered from service providers in the valley, of the homeless adults, approximately 61% are men and 39% are women. Families with children constitute 36% of the population. More than one-third of the adults report suffering from physical and/or mental disabilities. Nearly 8% of the homeless adults are veterans. One-third of single adults are “chronically homeless,” meaning that they are disabled and have been homeless for more than one year or have experienced repeated stays in the streets, emergency shelters, or other temporary settings four or more times in the past three years.
- **When analyzed on a sub-regional level, the characteristics of the homeless population within various areas of the San Gabriel Valley do vary greatly.** In order to accurately assess homeless population estimates, characteristics, services, and unmet needs, the study divided the San Gabriel Valley into six

preliminary study areas or “cluster groups”. Analysis of homeless population characteristics at this level found that clusters of cities differ in their sub-population profile. Having a better understanding of the location of homeless individuals as well as variations among sub-populations will enhance efforts to develop a strategy that reflects the differences in needs and realities of the various communities in the valley. The number of study areas was subsequently reduced after further input from jurisdictional representatives.

## **The Gaps: Addressing Unmet Needs to Reduce Homelessness in the San Gabriel Valley**

- **There is no centralized access point for coordination of information and resource sharing.** This deficiency frustrates and hampers nonprofit and faith-based organizations’ ability to work effectively with local governments and the county. It could be addressed with technological solutions and will also necessitate interagency coordination specifically for the purpose of improving service delivery and streamlining client referrals. Such coordination would also support public-private efforts to coordinate and leverage existing resources and facilitate sharing of best practices amongst providers.
- **There is a critical shortage of short term housing.** The Valley lacks an adequate number of emergency shelter and transitional housing programs that enable temporarily homeless individuals and families to quickly stabilize their lives and escape long-term homelessness. The majority of service providers as well as many city officials throughout the San Gabriel Valley emphasized the lack of short-term housing options in the current system as a major barrier to providing services in the region.
- **There is a critical shortage of permanent supportive housing.** Approximately one-third of the homeless population suffers from mental and physical disabilities who need longer term support to stabilize their lives and end their homelessness. National data shows that this subset of the homeless population takes up about half of the short term housing resources meant to address temporary homelessness. Consistent with this data, in the San Gabriel Valley, 30% of adult clients in short term housing programs reported their previous residence to be another short term housing program. It has been shown that permanent supportive housing will successfully end homelessness for this sub-set of the population. Direct placement into permanent supportive housing can prevent inappropriate use of temporary housing programs and free up available short-term beds for those who are able to quickly stabilize their lives and exit homelessness with only short-term supports.
- **There is a need for increased specialized/mental health services.** Agencies that provide mental health services, outpatient and residential substance abuse treatment, medical detoxification, and HIV/AIDS services can be critical in assisting the homeless to achieve stability and independence. Within the entire

San Gabriel Valley, we could only locate ten agencies that offer mental health services to the homeless. In addition, though many of the service providers identified will work with people who are homeless, this population is not their main client base.

The Phase I Report was presented to the Governing Board of the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments on November 20, 2008.

## **PHASE II: CONSENSUS-BUILDING PROCESS TO DEVELOP AN IMPLEMENTATION PLAN TO ADDRESS UNMET NEEDS**

The main focus of Phase II in the development of a Regional Homeless Services Strategy for the San Gabriel Valley was to work directly with municipalities, nonprofit and faith-based service providers, and other local leadership in the San Gabriel Valley to:

- Examine system gaps identified in Phase I in the context of existing financial and political opportunities and constraints;
- Determine housing and service delivery models consistent with community context and preference;
- Determine priorities and goals in each of the sub-regional areas;
- Identify Federal, State, and local resources available for financing the implementation of these locally determined goals; and
- Determine the best structure for organizing and coordinating the San Gabriel Valley service-delivery system for moving forward.

A series of community meetings were conducted throughout the San Gabriel Valley which brought together a wide array of stakeholder groups, including elected city officials, city and county staff, and community and faith-based service providers. Through a participatory consensus building process, participants explored and prioritized community specific strategies to address gaps in the service delivery system, including the setting of sub-regional priorities, program and housing production targets, and identification of available resources. In addition, participants identified opportunities and challenges for developing a regional homeless services strategy and the organizational structure for implementing the strategy. A total of 124 individuals representing twenty-nine cities, three supervisorial districts, and twenty-two community or faith-based organizations attended the Phase II meetings.

### **Key Issues Identified**

Discussions from the set of cluster level meetings identified the following key issues that participants overwhelmingly agreed should be addressed in the Regional Homeless Services Strategy.

- **Implementation of homeless service and housing strategies should be led by community and faith-based organizations in active partnership with local government.** The development of the San Gabriel Valley Regional Homeless Services Strategy is based on the premise that private and community based organizations would operate the expanded services and housing programs in the Valley. Stakeholders involved in this planning process recognized the importance of public-private partnerships and the role that non-profit and for-profit organizations play in spearheading new housing development

and service delivery programs. Cities also recognize that they must play an active role in supporting these efforts.

- **Implementation strategies for strengthening and expanding the San Gabriel Valley homeless services delivery system should be based on the Continuum of Care (CoC) model developed by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).** The Continuum of Care model is designed to address homelessness through a coordinated community-based process of identifying needs and building a system to address those needs. The fundamental components of a comprehensive CoC system include: street outreach, intake and assessment; emergency shelter; transitional housing; and permanent affordable and supportive housing.
- **Clusters differ in their cities' familiarity with working together on this issue thereby creating different starting points for intervention strategies.** Cities demonstrated varying levels of experience in working with other jurisdictions and service providers in the organization and delivery of homeless services. Many cities were familiar with the current service delivery coordinating networks and supported increased collaboration, while others had no prior experience working with cities or agencies outside of their jurisdiction. With this in mind, cities' "readiness to proceed" in participating in a service-delivery network varies in different sub-regions of the San Gabriel Valley. There was widespread agreement that SB 2 requirements will require cities to move away from the status quo and the strategy development efforts should make a stronger linkage to helping cities fulfill this mandate.
- **More education of elected officials, city staff, and community members is required to achieve consensus on homeless program development.** Numerous city representatives expressed that in order to proceed with specific, quantifiable commitments to expanding services and housing opportunities, their city council should go through a more extensive educational process. This includes educational outreach as well as further exposure to the various intervention methods and tools and resources available to local jurisdictions. Clusters discussed various methods for engaging in outreach including site tours of model housing and programs and presentations at city council meetings.
- **A structure for organizing and coordinating the San Gabriel Valley service delivery system is required.** Throughout the Phase II process, there was consensus that in order for the ultimate strategy to be successful, an overarching structure would need to exist to facilitate the development and implementation of those strategies designed to enhance the service-delivery system. Additionally, there was agreement that the structure should be led by community and faith-based organizations in partnership with local governments. During the Phase II meetings, participants discussed relative advantages and disadvantages of various organizational structures, including four sub-regions, a bifurcation of the Valley into East and West networks, or a single valley-wide system. By the end

of the process, there was agreement that the creation of a single valley-wide system was most desirable and would be the most effective structure for coordinating, implementing, and strengthening the homeless service-delivery system in the San Gabriel Valley. The creation of a Valley-wide Coordinating Council and its guiding principles is discussed in further detail under the Implementation Strategy and Recommendations section of this report.

**Summary of Priorities by Sub-Regional Cluster Group**

At the valley-wide “kick-off” meeting, participants decided to re-define the sub-region clusters that were to be used for subsequent planning and strategy development sessions. The consensus was that there should be four sub-regional cluster groups. Following is a jurisdictional listing and geographic configuration of the four San Gabriel Valley sub-regional “cluster groups”.

<b>Cluster 1</b>	<b>Cluster 2</b>	<b>Cluster 3</b>	<b>Cluster 4</b>	<b>Cluster 5</b>
Altadena	Alhambra	<i>Collapsed</i>	Avocado Heights	Claremont
Arcadia	El Monte		Baldwin Park	Diamond Bar
Azusa	Montebello		Bassett	Glendora
Bradbury	Monterey Park		Charter Oak	La Verne
Duarte	North El Monte		Citrus	Pomona
East Pasadena	Rosemead		City of Industry	San Dimas
Irwindale	San Gabriel		Covina	
La Canada-Flintridge	South El Monte		Hacienda Heights	
Mayflower Village	South San Gabriel		La Puente	
Monrovia	Temple City		Rowland Heights	
Pasadena			So. San Jose Hills	
San Marino			Valinda	
Sierra Madre			Vincent	
South Pasadena			Walnut	
			West Covina	
			West Puente Valley	

**Table 1  
Clusters for Phase II Homeless Services Strategy Development**



**Figure 1**  
**Map of Clusters for Phase II Homeless Services Strategy Development**

A key component of the Phase II meetings was to establish local priorities in addressing gaps in the current system. Beginning with the presentation of program models, best practices, and available resources, participants discussed the costs and priorities of various interventions within each of the cluster groups. Through continued discussion at each of the stakeholder meetings, participants further developed local priorities for addressing gaps in the homeless service delivery system in their respective regions.

Table 2 depicts the housing and service priorities established by the participants within each sub-region.

Priority	Cluster One	Cluster Two	Cluster Four	Cluster Five
#1	Permanent Supportive Housing	Permanent Supportive Housing	Permanent Supportive Housing	Permanent Supportive Housing
#2	Transitional Housing	Access Center	Transitional Housing	Access Center
#3	Emergency Shelter	Emergency Shelter & Transitional Housing (tie)	Access Center	Transitional Housing

**Table 2**  
**Homeless Housing and Service Priorities by Cluster Group**

### **First Priority: Permanent Supportive Housing**

Permanent supportive housing is a combination of deeply affordable housing with on-site supportive services designed to end homelessness for people who have multiple barriers to housing stability, including people who have been homeless for the longest periods of time and are struggling with chronic health and mental health conditions. Often categorized as chronically homeless, these individuals have long histories of homelessness as well as multiple barriers to employment and housing stability, which might include mental illness, chemical dependency, and other disabling or chronic health conditions. In addition to chronically homeless individuals, some homeless families with long histories of homelessness and multiple barriers to housing stability, such as mental illness, substance abuse, and other disabling conditions as well as some transition age youth (18 – 24 years of age) with multiple needs can also benefit from supportive housing.

Supportive housing can be created through a variety of housing models to blend into the existing fabric of the community. Models include apartments, townhouses and single family homes that exclusively house formerly homeless persons, apartment buildings or townhouses that mix special-needs housing with general affordable housing, and rent-subsidized apartments leased in the private market

The San Gabriel Valley has an estimated 5,076 homeless individuals, of which approximately one-third, or 1,662, can be categorized as chronically homeless. In addition, there are approximately 967 homeless families and 387 transition aged youth in the Valley. Currently, there are only 232 units of permanent supportive housing throughout the San Gabriel Valley.

Quite notably, each of the four cluster groups established permanent supportive housing as their number one priority for addressing gaps in the homeless service delivery system and the most appropriate means for reducing the number of homeless persons in the San Gabriel Valley. However, each cluster group expressed interest in pursuing different approaches to creating supportive housing within their communities based on their knowledge of the existing housing stock and neighborhood character, neighborhood economic conditions, and other community-specific opportunities such as foreclosure and vacancy rates and affordable housing activity.

- Cluster Group 1 stakeholder meeting discussions focused on creating (1) mixed-population affordable housing developments with set-asides of supportive housing units for formerly homeless tenants, specific interest in transit-oriented development projects; and (2) scattered-site units in the private rental market leased with Shelter Plus Care or Section 8 vouchers.
- Cluster Group 2 stakeholder meeting discussions did not involve development of any kind, but focused exclusively on the model of scattered-site units leased in the private market.
- Cluster Group 4 stakeholders expressed equal interest in both (1) scattered-site leasing options and (2) supportive housing unit set-asides in affordable housing developments (“mixed population housing developments”). There was also

particular interest in utilizing Neighborhood Stabilization Program funding to redevelop foreclosed properties in order to create new permanent supportive housing opportunities.

- Cluster Group 5 stakeholder meetings explored all three models. The initial discussion centered on scattered site leased units and small developments designed exclusively for homeless people with disabilities. As the process progressed, representatives of three municipalities identified local affordable housing development activity and expressed interest in setting aside supportive housing units within projects in their development pipelines.

### **Second Priority: Short –Term Housing (Emergency Shelter and Transitional Housing)**

Emergency shelter and transitional housing both fall within the category of short-term housing, which provides a temporary residence for homeless clients. In general, emergency shelter allows clients to stay from one night up to six months while transitional housing allows clients to remain for a longer period of time, often up to two years. By and large, emergency shelter provides basic on-site services such as case management, meals and clothing. While the quality of services may vary, traditionally, transitional housing offers a more structured program with a higher level of on-site services including mental health counseling, substance abuse counseling and legal assistance, all of which are designed to help clients exit homelessness.

Ideally, short-term housing offers an entry point into the Continuum of Care (CoC), which aims to facilitate the movement of clients through a progression of programs, with the ultimate goal of securing more stable and permanent housing. At the same time, short-term housing programs should provide access to services that will help clients not only obtain but also retain permanent housing. Unfortunately, the demand for short-term housing in the San Gabriel Valley far outstrips the supply. In addition, many of the programs have barriers to entry. For example, of the short-term housing programs, 75% require sobriety, preventing a significant portion of people who are homeless from accessing the housing. Those that cannot overcome these barriers should be directed toward lower demand permanent supportive housing where they can receive access to the supportive services they need to stabilize their lives.

**Short-term Housing for Single Individuals:** The San Gabriel Valley has an estimated 5,076 homeless individuals and a total of 257 short-term beds for individuals. Of these short-term beds, 149 were in transitional housing and 108 were in emergency shelters. Thus, while the overall ratio of short-term (emergency shelter and transitional housing) beds to homeless individuals was 1:20, the ratio of transitional beds to homeless individuals was 1:34 and the ratio of emergency shelter beds to homeless individuals was 1:47. It should be noted that the ratios differ greatly by sub-region. This is indicated by the fact that the majority of short-term beds are located in clusters one and five (primarily in the cities of Pasadena and Pomona, respectively) while conversely there are very few short-term beds for individuals in clusters two and four.

**Short-term Housing for Families:** The San Gabriel Valley has an estimated 2,901 homeless persons in families and a total of 343 short-term beds for families. Of these short-term beds, 165 are in transitional housing and 178 are in emergency shelters. Thus, while the ratio of short-term (emergency shelter and transitional housing) beds to persons in families was 1:9, the ratio of transitional housing beds to homeless persons in families was 1:18 and the ratio of emergency shelter beds to homeless persons in families was 1:16. As with individuals, it should be noted that the ratios differ greatly by sub-region, with the majority of short-term beds for families being located in clusters one and five and a limited number located in clusters two and four.

Cluster groups one and four placed transitional housing as their second priority, and clusters two and five placed it as their third priority (in cluster two it tied with emergency shelter). Cluster one placed emergency shelter as their third priority.

### **Third Priority: Access Centers**

Access centers, also known as multi-service centers, represent another entry point for homeless individuals and families into the continuum of care. While these programs vary in their operations, they are generally designed to function as a “one stop shop” for homeless clients to access basic services and referrals to off-site services. Some access centers are able to offer a more comprehensive set of services by co-locating a number of service providers in one facility. Co-locating provides a more efficient and effective way for clients to receive services aimed at ending their homelessness.

Cluster two has an existing access center located in the City of El Monte. In 2007-08, this access center served 299 unduplicated clients. Cluster four has two existing access centers, one located in the City of West Covina and one in Hacienda Heights. In 2007-08, the access center in West Covina reported serving 470 unduplicated clients. In 2007-08, the access center in Hacienda Heights served approximately 867 unduplicated clients. Currently, no access center exists in cluster five.

Cluster groups two and five both placed access centers as their second priority and cluster group four placed it as their third priority.

### **Summary of Five-Year Housing and Service Targets by Cluster Group**

Using the priorities established by the stakeholders in each cluster, 5-year housing and service targets for each of the sub-regions were developed. The targets are cluster-wide and presume that the total number will be achieved cumulatively through the creation of multiple small and medium sized housing and program facilities located throughout each of the sub-regions. In addition, the targets rely upon the majority of housing targets to be achieved through the use of rental-subsidy vouchers in scattered-site units leased in the private market. Following are examples of two programs that illustrate the recommended program scale.

### **McGill House**

*City of Covina and Citrus Valley Health Foundation*

This single-family home provides transitional housing and supportive services to two homeless families at a time. It has a seven-bed capacity and provides medical, health, and psychological counseling as well as employment and housing support. This program provides a good example of a public-private partnership in which local, County, and Federal funding were leveraged to increase local capacity.



### **Elm Avenue Apartments**

*City of Long Beach and  
Mental Health America of Los Angeles*



These apartments provide seventeen units of permanent rental housing for low income adults, nine of whom are disabled with histories of mental illness and chronic homelessness. It is an example of mixed tenancy affordable housing, and permanent supportive housing.

The study team determined that a resource-based analysis in the development of short term and permanent supportive housing production goals would provide a more practical set of goals that are achievable and realistic. Instead of developing permanent supportive housing production goals based on the number of homeless people in need, a financial model was developed based on the amount of resources available to produce such housing. The permanent supportive housing production targets were therefore established based upon analysis of available Federal, State, and County resources over a five year period as well as the local match needed to leverage these resources. The targeted number was then divided equally amongst the four sub-regions based upon the fact that there is a roughly equal number of estimated homeless in each of the four sub-regions. The short-term housing targets were established based upon the estimated number of homeless persons and the existing short-term beds in each sub-region.

Below are the five-year housing and services implementation targets for each of the cluster groups.

<b>Priority</b>	<b>Cluster One</b>	<b>Cluster Two</b>	<b>Cluster Four</b>	<b>Cluster Five</b>
<b>#1</b>	Permanent Supportive Housing: <b>47 developed units of PSH (in small PSH projects and affordable housing set-asides)</b> <b>100 scattered-site rent-subsidized units leased in the private market</b>	Permanent Supportive Housing: <b>47 developed units of PSH (in small PSH projects and affordable housing set-asides)</b> <b>100 scattered-site rent-subsidized units leased in the private market</b>	Permanent Supportive Housing: <b>47 developed units of PSH (in small PSH projects and affordable housing set-asides)</b> <b>100 scattered-site rent-subsidized units leased in the private market</b>	Permanent Supportive Housing: <b>47 developed units of PSH (in small PSH projects and affordable housing set-asides)</b> <b>100 scattered-site rent-subsidized units leased in the private market</b>
<b>#2</b>	Transitional Housing: <b>40-60 TH beds for singles</b> <b>Scattered-site, master-leased short-term housing for 125 Families</b>	Access Center: <b>One Access Center</b>	Transitional Housing: <b>60-90 TH beds for singles</b> <b>Scattered-site, master-leased short-term housing for 125 Families</b>	Access Center: <b>One Access Center</b>
<b>#3</b>	Emergency Shelter: <b>60-90 ES beds for singles</b>	Emergency Shelter: <b>60-90 ES beds for singles</b> Transitional Housing: <b>40-60 TH beds for singles</b> <b>Scattered-site, master-leased short-term housing for 125 Families</b>	Access Center: <b>One Access Center</b>	Transitional Housing: <b>100-150 TH beds for singles</b> <b>Scattered-site, master-leased short-term housing for 125 Families</b>

**Table 3  
Five-Year Targets Associated with each Cluster Group Priorities**

## **IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

In the implementation of the San Gabriel Valley Regional Homeless Services Strategy the following three strategic components quickly emerged as essential to any effective integrated plan for reducing homelessness in the San Gabriel Valley. These interrelated components represent the three primary areas of focus for the implementation strategy.

### **I. Will**

Develop leadership, political will, and community support;

### **II. Capacity**

Build provider capacity and expand the service delivery system; and

### **III. Resources**

Leverage and maximize utilization of available financial resources.

Following are specific recommendations under each of the three strategic objectives that were identified through the community planning process to reduce homelessness in the San Gabriel Valley. Exhibit One of the report identifies short-term implementation steps and timelines that correspond to each of the recommendations.

### **STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE I: DEVELOP LEADERSHIP, POLITICAL WILL, AND COMMUNITY SUPPORT**

#### **Recommendation 1: Create a Valley-wide membership based organization for the primary purpose of education, advocacy, and coordination.**

The current homeless service delivery system in the San Gabriel Valley includes an array of services, shelter and housing programs operating throughout the region. While recognizing the interagency coordination that presently occurs through the San Gabriel Valley Consortium on Homelessness, the Pasadena Housing and Homeless Network, the Pomona Continuum of Care Coalition, and the City of El Monte Veterans and Homeless Affairs Commission, the Valley lacks an overarching structure to coordinate and further develop the homeless delivery system Valley-wide.

Through the homeless services strategy development process, consensus was achieved that the creation of a single valley-wide system was the most effective structure for coordinating, implementing, and strengthening the homeless service-delivery system in the San Gabriel Valley. The intent of creating a Valley-wide Coordinating Council would not be to replace or duplicate the current coalitions and networks, but to enhance their work. In addition, it would serve as a means to build partnerships between service providers and San Gabriel Valley cities to collectively work on implementing the Regional Homeless Service Strategy.

In order for a successful organization to emerge, the creation of the agency should include the following guiding principles.

### **Valley-Wide Coordinating Council Guiding Principles:**

- The Council will be the primary entity in the San Gabriel Valley to coordinate with the County of Los Angeles, the Los Angeles Homeless Service Authority, and others in planning the implementation of the Regional Homeless Services Strategy;
- The organization should drive implementation of sub-regional goals;
- The Governing Board of the agency shall be representative of the array of non-profit and faith-based service providers, the ethnic make-up of the communities represented, as well as geographically balanced;
- Membership should be inclusive and should include:
  - ✓ representatives from the community and faith-based organizations operating throughout the Valley
  - ✓ staff or elected representatives from each of the thirty-one Valley cities
  - ✓ staff from the three County Board offices representing the Valley
  - ✓ all other homeless coalitions and networks operating in the Valley
  - ✓ the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority
  - ✓ County of Los Angeles Community Development Commission
  - ✓ County departments
  - ✓ non-profit and for-profit housing developers, and
  - ✓ the business community;
- The coordinating network should engage established structures in the eastern and western portions of the San Gabriel Valley and enhance existing structures;
- This agency will not assume the County's social services responsibilities, but rather facilitate the appropriate implementation of those strategies;
- Cities should not be asked to take on more than their fair share and municipal resources will be primarily directed to homeless programs and projects;
- The organization should have full-time staff; and
- It should act as a central depository for data on homelessness, information on programs, expertise and best practices, and service coordination and funding opportunities.

To maintain the forward momentum from this study effort, it is recommended that the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments develop an Ad Hoc Homeless Services Committee to facilitate the creation of the Valley-wide Coordinating Council. The basic responsibilities of the Committee would be to:

- Establish the Coordinating Council's composition and adherence to guiding principles; and
- Assist the Coordinating Council to identify and secure staffing resources.

### **Recommendation 2: Meet and confer with municipal leaders, community groups, business leaders, faith-based and community service providers within the San Gabriel Valley.**

Throughout the process there was consensus that additional education and information sharing was required, especially for elected officials, but also for all segments of the community, in order for the implementation of the strategy to be successful. The Valley-

wide organization should be responsible for coordinating the advocacy efforts. These efforts should include:

- Site visits to supportive housing and other homeless program projects that serve to demonstrate best practices in successfully reducing the number of homeless people;
- Exchanges with other municipalities who have successfully created intergovernmental collaboration efforts in planning for and financing the creation of permanent supportive housing in their jurisdictions; and
- Presentations to City Councils, community organization, faith-based organizations and business leaders on issues of homelessness, successful intervention models for reducing the number of homeless persons, and effective ways in which they can be involved in contributing to solutions in their communities.

## **STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE II: BUILD PROVIDER CAPACITY AND EXPAND THE SERVICE DELIVERY SYSTEM**

### **Recommendation 1: Engage community and faith-based service providers in planning, training and overall capacity building.**

In order to expand the service delivery system and secure and leverage the resources discussed in detail within the Resources section below, a great deal of organizational and technical capacity must be developed among the San Gabriel Valley's network of housing and service providers. Partnerships must be formed between housing developers and homeless service specialists. Local housing agencies must engage in dialogue and receive technical assistance toward achieving housing production targets and service expansion goals. In addition, service providers that have not traditionally provided services within housing must seek assistance to learn ways in which their services can be linked to persons in housing. Shelter Partnership, Inc. and the Corporation for Supportive Housing can provide assistance in these areas:

- A. Facilitating partnerships between service providers and housing developers; and
- B. Training to service providers in providing permanent housing placement and housing retention services.

In addition, the Corporation for Supportive Housing can provide assistance in the following areas as well:

- A. Hosting peer to peer exchange among government staff and elected officials, including coordinating site visits and facilitating dialog to share best practices;
- B. Hosting peer to peer exchange among housing and service providers, including coordinating site visits and facilitating dialog to share best practices;
- C. Opening New Doors Supportive Housing Institute, a comprehensive series of workshops in which housing developers and service providers develop supportive housing concepts into fundable projects;
- D. Organizational capacity building grants to service providers and non-profit housing developers seeking to create permanent supportive housing; and

- E. Project Initiation Loans, zero percent interest forgivable loans to explore feasibility of potential supportive housing development sites.

Service providers must seek technical assistance and guidance to enact program standards that reflect best practices and establish standardized outcome goals by service delivery component for all programs. Shelter Partnership, Inc. and the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) can provide assistance in these areas.

**Recommendation 2: Create more housing opportunities for homeless persons in the San Gabriel Valley.**

Participants throughout the process were unanimous in their assessment that the most pressing need in the San Gabriel Valley was for housing – both short-term beds in emergency shelters and transitional housing programs as well as permanent housing. Service providers reported that due to the lack of housing resources for homeless individuals and families they were often unable to refer people to appropriate housing. In addition, the majority of homeless persons currently being served in their short-term housing programs did not have a permanent housing placement option. The following recommendations would increase the availability of housing options and dramatically reduce the number of homeless persons in the San Gabriel Valley.

**Recommendation 2.1: Create 588 units of permanent supportive housing over the next five-years.**

Based upon a conservative analysis of available resources to the region, it was determined that a production goal of 188 units of permanent supportive housing can feasibly be achieved over the next five years within the San Gabriel Valley. The majority of projects would be comprised of smaller (four to twenty unit) dedicated homeless projects as well as set-aside units for homeless persons in mixed population affordable housing developments. However, in order to maximize available resources, specifically through the Low Income Housing Tax Credit program, at least one larger, forty-unit development should be created in the region within the next few years.

In addition, we recommend that 400 units of permanent supportive housing should be created utilizing rent-subsidized scattered site units leased in the private market by formerly homeless tenants. The combined goal of 588 units over the next five years would more than double the number of available supportive housing units in the Valley. Of the total units created, it is recommended that 488 are targeted towards chronically homeless individuals and 100 are targeted toward homeless families with multiple barriers to housing stability.

**Recommendation 2.2: Create 150 emergency shelter beds and 300 transitional housing beds for homeless single individuals over the next five years.**

Based on the estimated need for short-term housing and the capacity that could be developed, the San Gabriel Valley should target a regional goal of 300 transitional housing beds and 150 emergency shelter beds over the next five years. The number of beds per sub-region differs, and takes into account the estimated number

of homeless individuals and the number of existing beds within that cluster group. Owing to the limited experience that some cities in the Valley have with siting homeless facilities and the uneven capacity of the region's service providers, it is recommended that small and moderate-sized facilities are utilized, which would also be more consistent with the scale of communities in the Valley.

**Recommendation 2.3: Create scattered-site housing programs to serve 100 families annually.**

Based on available rental assistance and vouchers, a goal of placing 100 families annually in scattered-site housing throughout the San Gabriel Valley is recommended. Over the next five years, this would assist 500 families to stabilize their housing situation and exit homelessness.

For homeless families, it is recommended that a scattered-site model of housing be utilized, which would place families in master-leased apartments throughout the Valley. Rather than building a transitional housing facility, a scattered-site model is preferable as it allows for rapid re-housing since a site does not have to be acquired. Master-leased apartments would be used until Section 8 rental vouchers or other forms of rental assistance were secured for each client family.

**Recommendation 3: Create an access center in cluster five.**

There is currently an access center located in each of the four sub-regions except for cluster five. In order to create a more comprehensive continuum of care in this sub-region it is recommended that an access center is created in cluster five. Stakeholders in the area proposed an innovative design for a rotating site access center. Instead of providing services at a fixed site, service providers, County, and local staff would collectively rotate amongst participating jurisdictions thereby providing services to a larger geographic area. This multi-jurisdictional design would also allow for cost sharing amongst the participating cities, thus maximizing the use of resources.

**Recommendation 4: Develop valley-wide referral and information sharing system.**

Currently there is no information and referral system specifically for programs operating in the San Gabriel Valley. Repeatedly throughout the planning process, community and faith-based service providers, city staff, as well as others interested in providing services cited the lack of information sharing as one of the major deficiencies of the current system. Developing such a system would allow for better coordination of services, a reduction of duplication of efforts, and greater access to the system of care.

**STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE III: LEVERAGE AND MAXIMIZE UTILIZATION OF AVAILABLE FINANCIAL RESOURCES**

**Recommendation 1: Form a San Gabriel Valley supportive housing pipeline review committee.**

Supportive housing requires three types of funding which are typically administered by separate silos of government: capital investments and subsidies (to build the housing),

operating subsidies (to keep the rents deeply affordable to formerly homeless people who have little income), and funding for services (to help formerly homeless tenants stabilize their lives and maintain their housing, even in times of crisis).

Presently in the San Gabriel Valley (and elsewhere in the county), supportive housing providers bear the burden of assembling these three types of funding by cobbling together a multitude of funding sources. Consequently, unit production has been modest and few organizations in the San Gabriel Valley have emerged that are willing to take on this task. However, when housing developers and service providers know that such funding mechanisms will be regularly available, there is greater incentive to take on the risks of acquiring property for development and housing and serving a very vulnerable population. By assuming the responsibility of aligning and coordinating their own funding programs, government can facilitate more development and attract more providers to the field of supportive housing.

In order to better coordinate resources, a Valley-wide supportive housing pipeline committee should be formed to review projects in development and align local and county funding commitments. The San Gabriel Valley committee should coordinate their efforts with Los Angeles County's Special Needs Housing Alliance Project Review Committee.

**Recommendation 2: Commit local investments from municipalities across multiple jurisdictions within the San Gabriel Valley to stimulate housing production.**

In order to produce more housing options in the San Gabriel Valley, local resources will be required in order to leverage and maximize Federal, State, and County funds. While some jurisdictions are currently contributing local dollars to homeless programs in the Valley, many jurisdictions have not been able to take full advantage of available Federal, State and County funding opportunities due to limited staffing capacity, limited resources, or lack of knowledge regarding opportunities for supportive housing and services currently available at the county, state, and federal levels. Municipalities with modest housing budgets should negotiate multi-jurisdictional agreements with neighboring cities to pool their resources.

As part of the consensus building process, the Corporation for Supportive Housing produced a financial model for the San Gabriel Valley which calculated the amount of Federal, State, and County funds available for supportive housing production in the region. The model, provided as Exhibit Two of the report, illustrates how the San Gabriel Valley can stimulate the creation of 588 new units of permanent supportive housing throughout the Valley over the next five years. As outlined previously, the total includes 188 units created through new development and 400 units created through the use of rental subsidies in scattered site units leased in the private market.

By making financial commitments to supportive housing projects from across multiple jurisdictions and aligning County resources with those local commitments, municipalities

within the San Gabriel Valley can maximize the impact of their investments and increase the level of development in the region.

**Recommendation 2.1: Leverage capital investments.**

Using the financial model, it was calculated that a combined local investment from San Gabriel Valley cities of approximately \$37.3 million could leverage over \$36.7 million in capital investments from Federal, State, and County sources in order to develop 188 new units of permanent supportive housing. The model is based on the assumption that local investments will be required in order to leverage and maximize Federal, State, and County subsidies.

The five-year financial model assumes that most housing developed in the region will be small to medium sized projects. We assume only one larger size 40-unit development will leverage 9% low income housing tax credits. Conservatively, no 4% credits were included due to the current status of the bond market

Local commitment assumes use of Low-Moderate Income Housing Set Aside Tax Increment Financing and Home Investment Partnerships Program (HOME) funds. The model assumes local investment of less than 9% of Low-Moderate Income Housing Set Aside revenue projected over the five year period from twenty-six cities in the region. The model also assumes use of less than one-third of annual HOME allocations from eight jurisdictions over the five year period. The model does not assume use of Community Development Block Grant funds allocated to ten jurisdictions in the region. As the bond market improves, 4% Low Income Housing Tax Credits may again provide an alternate source of financing for small-scale housing development thereby reducing the amount of local investment necessary to achieve the housing production goals.

Additional leveraged sources include Federal Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP), State Multifamily Housing Program (MHP Supportive Housing), State Mental Health Service Act (MHSA) Housing program funds, and Los Angeles County City of Industry Special Needs Housing program funds.

**Recommendation 2.2: Leverage operating subsidies.**

Our financial modeling projects that local investments will leverage additional operating subsidies as well. This includes capitalized operating subsidies for 83 of the 188 units available through the MHSA Housing program, rental subsidy vouchers through the Shelter Plus Care program (accessible through LAHSA) for 67 of the 188 units, and 38 project-based Section 8 certificates through the Housing Authority of the County of Los Angeles. The project-based Section 8 certificates may be available for the first time as part of the NOFA released annually by the County of Los Angeles Special Needs Housing Program. Additional Section 8 certificates will be required from local Housing Authorities, including the County of Los Angeles, Baldwin Park, Pasadena and Pomona, in order to create the 400 scattered site units leased in the private market. Along with the ability to project-base certificates for supportive housing projects, Housing Authorities can create Section 8 certificate set-

aside programs that prioritize the housing of persons who are homeless. Housing Authorities interested in creating such a program can allocate underutilized vouchers and vouchers made available through turn over.

**Recommendation 2.3: Leverage funding for services in permanent supportive housing.**

In order to bring 600 units of permanent supportive housing on line in the San Gabriel Valley over the next 5 years, roughly \$976,000 of new funding for services must be secured each year. San Gabriel Valley government and stakeholders should work with the County of Los Angeles to identify and secure this funding in order to meet these permanent supportive housing production goals.

**Recommendation 2.4: Negotiate supportive housing unit set-asides with affordable housing developers.**

Affordable housing developers can fill gaps in development budgets by tapping supportive housing capital subsidy programs available through the State such as MHP-Supportive Housing (administered by the Housing and Community Development department) and the Mental Health Service Act Housing program (administered by CalHFA). This requires setting aside a portion of the units in a development as supportive housing for formerly homeless tenants and forging partnerships with service providers who can deliver on-site services in those buildings to ensure tenant stability. The Corporation for Supportive Housing can provide direct technical assistance to cities and housing developers to assist them in financing mixed population developments. In addition, eligible cities can soon receive technical assistance from the Los Angeles County Community Development Commission in developing affordable and supportive housing in order to better access City of Industry housing funds.

**Recommendation 3: Utilize new funding opportunities to expand short-term housing and rapid re-housing programs.**

Even as there are constraints on the economy, new opportunities are emerging that will bring additional resources to expand services and housing production in the San Gabriel Valley.

These opportunities include the release of Homeless Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing Program (HPRP) funds as well as additional Neighborhood Stabilization Program funds as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (the federal stimulus package signed by President Obama on February 17). In addition, an increased number of rental vouchers have recently been made available to targeted groups, including Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) vouchers for veterans and Family Unification Program vouchers for families, potentially increasing the number available in the region. These voucher programs can provide long-term rental subsidies to lease housing in the private market.

These opportunities should be pursued to leverage available Los Angeles County Homeless Prevention Initiative funds to create additional short-term housing and rapid re-housing programs in the San Gabriel Valley.

## **CONCLUSION**

The success of the San Gabriel Valley Homeless Services Strategy hinges on three core components: Capacity, Resources and Will. These strategic components were identified through a locally driven consensus process conducted over the past eight months. Findings, issues, recommendations and targets articulated in this Regional Homeless Services Strategy were also derived through this process of participatory planning and education. This effort, led by the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments, should serve as a model for other regions seeking to develop community-based solutions to homelessness.

The implementation of each of the interrelated strategic components of this Regional Homeless Services Strategy should take place concurrently. Financial resources and capacity-building opportunities identified in this document are time-limited and should be taken advantage of now, while they are available and while the momentum and awareness is heightened.

During the process of conducting this study, the following public and private partners expressed commitments to providing financial and technical support to the San Gabriel Valley in implementation of this Regional Homeless Services Strategy: United Way of Greater Los Angeles, Corporation for Supportive Housing, Shelter Partnership, Inc., San Gabriel Valley Consortium on Homelessness, Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority, the County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors, County of Los Angeles Chief Executive Office, and the Los Angeles County Community Development Commission. Civic leaders and stakeholders of the San Gabriel Valley should avail themselves of these offers of support and partnership in order to successfully strengthen the homeless delivery system and end homelessness among residents of the San Gabriel Valley.

Strategy Recommendations Short-term Implementation Steps and Timeline

<b>Strategic Objective I Develop Leadership, Political Will, and Community Support.</b>		
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Action Steps</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>
<b>1.</b> Create a Valley-wide membership based organization for the primary purpose of education, advocacy, and coordination.	➤ SGVCOG Governing Board approves creation of SGVCOG Ad Hoc Homeless Services Committee.	4/16/09
	➤ Ad Hoc Homeless Services Committee creates position description for staff person.	6/15/09
	➤ Full-time staff person hired.	9/1/09
	➤ Ad Hoc Committee and staff identify and enlist Coordinating Council’s members.	11/1/09
	➤ SGV Coordinating Council established.	12/1/09
<b>2.</b> Meet and confer with municipal leaders, community groups, business leaders, faith-based and community service providers within the San Gabriel Valley.	➤ As part of Coordinating Council membership identification effort, staff person meets with existing homeless coalitions, consortiums, networks, SGVCOG Housing Committee, Planning Directors TAC and SGV City Managers Association.	Fall 2009
	➤ Coordinating Council gives a presentation on reducing homelessness to a SGV City Council, community/civic group, faith-based group on a monthly basis.	2010

<b>Strategic Objective II Build Provider Capacity and Expand the Service Delivery System.</b>		
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Action Steps</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>
<b>1.</b> Engage community and faith-based service providers in planning, training and overall capacity building.	➤ SGV Homeless Network, Coalitions, and Consortium facilitate service provider organizational capacity building “workshops” on a quarterly basis from available community.	On-going
<b>2.</b> Create more housing opportunities for homeless persons in the San Gabriel Valley.		
<b>2.1</b> Create 588 units of permanent supportive housing over the next five-years.	➤ Ad Hoc Homeless Services Committee will work with the Board of Supervisors office to prioritize Homeless Prevention Initiative funds made available for the SGV region and assist in coordinating the release of Request(s) for Proposals.	11/1/09
<b>2.2</b> Create 150 emergency shelter beds and 300 transitional housing beds for homeless single individuals over the next five years.	➤ Ad Hoc Homeless Services Committee will work with the Board of Supervisors office to prioritize Homeless Prevention Initiative funds made available for the SGV region and assist in coordinating the release of Request(s) for Proposals.	11/1/09
<b>2.3</b> Create scattered-site housing programs to serve 100 families annually.	➤ Ad Hoc Homeless Services Committee will work with the Board of Supervisors office to prioritize Homeless Prevention Initiative funds made available for the SGV region and assist in coordinating the release of Request(s) for Proposals.	11/1/09

<b>Strategic Objective II (continued)</b>		
<b>Build Provider Capacity and Expand the Service Delivery System.</b>		
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Action Steps</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>
<b>3.</b> Create an access center in cluster five.	➤ Ad Hoc Homeless Services Committee will work with the Board of Supervisors office to prioritize Homeless Prevention Initiative funds made available for the SGV region and assist in coordinating the release of Request(s) for Proposals.	11/1/09
<b>4.</b> Develop valley-wide referral and information sharing system.	➤ Coordinating Council staff person will work with the San Gabriel Valley Consortium to assist in the development of a valley-wide referral and information sharing system.	11/1/09

<b>Strategic Objective III Leverage and Maximize Utilization of Available Financial Resources.</b>		
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Action Steps</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>
1. Form a San Gabriel Valley supportive housing pipeline review committee.	➤ Ad Hoc Homeless Services Committee will work with SGVCOG Housing Committee and the Coordinating Council to form a SGV supportive housing development pipeline review committee.	11/01/09
2. Commit local investments from municipalities across multiple jurisdictions within the San Gabriel Valley to stimulate housing production.		
2.1 Leverage capital investments.	➤ Cities will begin to explore potential supportive housing projects in their jurisdictions and take advantage of available technical assistance.	2009
2.2 Leverage operating subsidies.	➤ Cities will begin to explore potential supportive housing projects in their jurisdictions and take advantage of available technical assistance.	2009
2.3 Leverage funding for services in permanent supportive housing.	➤ Cities will begin to explore potential supportive housing projects in their jurisdictions and take advantage of available technical assistance.	2009
2.4 Negotiate supportive housing unit set-asides with affordable housing developers.	➤ Cities should take advantage of Community Development Commission Technical Assistance program and set-aside supportive housing units in newly developed affordable housing projects.	2009

<b>Strategic Objective III (continued)</b>		
<b>Leverage and Maximize Utilization of Available Financial Resources.</b>		
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Action Steps</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>
3. Utilize new funding opportunities to expand short-term housing and rapid re-housing programs.	➤ All cities that received a Homeless Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing Program allocation shall take advantage of available technical assistance to design and implement a program in their jurisdiction.	5/1/09



San Gabriel Valley - Supportive Housing Production Program  
Program Summary and Timeline

Table 1: Production Program Summary

TOTAL NUMBER OF UNITS:	188	TIME FRAME IN YEARS:	5
------------------------	-----	----------------------	---

Table 2: Overview of Unit Production Plans (Occupancy By Year)

	Unit Production by Year						
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Total Units							
Total Supportive Housing Units	0	0	32	65	30	31	30

Table 3: Financing Commitments Required for the Production of the Units (By Year)

	Unit Production by Year <sup>2</sup>					Total	
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014		2015
Total Costs	\$12,000,000	\$25,106,250	\$11,935,125	\$12,293,179	\$12,661,974	\$0	\$73,996,528
Capital Financing Commitments	\$3,654,405	\$7,886,948	\$3,867,638	\$4,246,344	\$4,366,201	\$0	\$24,021,537
Operating Financing Commitments <sup>1</sup>	\$0	\$806,400	\$1,638,000	\$756,000	\$781,200	\$756,000	\$4,737,600
Services Financing New Commitments	\$15,654,405	\$33,799,598	\$17,440,763	\$17,295,523	\$17,809,375	\$756,000	\$102,755,665
<b>TOTAL FINANCING COMMITMENTS</b>							

<sup>1</sup> Total cost associated with planned unit production, based on a ten-year subsidy commitment at projected Fair Market Rent.

<sup>2</sup> Expenditures typically occur one budget year after a funding commitment is secured, as reflected in Table 4.

<sup>3</sup> Services costs are based on the following assumptions: Case management and administrative costs only;

10% of units for Families at \$12,000/Yr/Unit; 10% of units for Youth at \$8,000/Yr/Unit; and 80% of units for Chronically Homeless at \$8,000/Yr/Unit.

Table 4: Financing Expenditures Required for the Production of the Units (By Year)

	Unit Production by Year					Total	
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014		2015
Total Costs	\$0	\$12,000,000	\$25,106,250	\$11,935,125	\$12,293,179	\$12,661,974	\$73,996,528
Capital Financing Expenditures	\$0	\$0	\$365,441	\$1,154,135	\$1,540,899	\$1,965,534	\$5,026,009
Operating Financing Expenditures	\$0	\$0	\$268,800	\$814,800	\$1,066,800	\$1,327,200	\$3,477,600
Services Financing Expenditures	\$0	\$12,000,000	\$25,740,491	\$13,904,060	\$14,900,878	\$15,954,708	\$82,500,137
<b>TOTAL FINANCING EXPENDITURES</b>							



# San Gabriel Valley - Supportive Housing Production Program By Year Capital Allocations and Unit Potential

**Table 1: Capital Allocations By Year**

Source	Total Allocation	Financing Commitments by Year				
		2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
9% Low Income Housing Tax Credits <sup>1</sup>	\$6,952,500	\$0	\$6,952,500	\$0	\$0	\$0
State MHP (Supportive Housing) <sup>2</sup>	\$4,560,000	\$1,520,000	\$3,040,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
State MHSA Housing Program (CalHFA) <sup>3</sup>	\$15,200,350	\$3,144,900	\$2,620,750	\$3,144,900	\$3,144,900	\$3,144,900
LA County City of Industry <sup>4</sup>	\$8,100,000	\$1,600,000	\$2,000,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000
HOME <sup>5</sup>	\$8,826,195	\$1,765,239	\$1,765,239	\$1,765,239	\$1,765,239	\$1,765,239
Neighborhood Stabilization Program <sup>6</sup>	\$1,920,000	\$1,920,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Local Gap <sup>7</sup>	\$28,437,483	\$2,049,861	\$8,727,761	\$5,524,986	\$5,883,040	\$6,251,835
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$73,996,528</b>	<b>\$12,000,000</b>	<b>\$25,106,250</b>	<b>\$11,935,125</b>	<b>\$12,293,179</b>	<b>\$12,661,974</b>

**Table 2: Unit Production Potential**

Average Unit Cost	\$375,000	\$386,250	\$397,838	\$409,773	\$422,066
Total Units	32	65	30	31	30

<sup>1</sup> Assumes a 33% share of County tax credit allocation plus 33% of the Small Development tax credit set aside and 33% of the Special Needs tax credit set aside.

<sup>2</sup> Assumes that County of LA uses 35% of LA County's share (28%) of available funding.

<sup>3</sup> Based on allocations taken from Legislative Analyst's Report on MHSA; assumes 40% of the projected 35% of LA County funds assumed to be available for non-City of LA projects.

<sup>4</sup> Assumes 25% of special needs projected allocation.

<sup>5</sup> Assumes 33% of HOME projected allocations from 8 cities in the SGV (minus 15% for administration).

<sup>6</sup> Assumes utilization of additional Neighborhood Stabilization Program funds.

<sup>7</sup> May be filled with use of Housing Set-Aside (low-moderate income) Tax Increment Financing funds available to 26 cities in the SGV or other local sources.

**Table 3: Unit Production Type (by year)**

Project Type	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Small 100% PSH Projects	128	25	20	31	30
Medium-sized Tax Credit Projects	40	40	0	0	0
Affordable Housing PSH units Set-aside	20	10	10	0	0
Leased Scattered-Site	400	80	80	80	80
<b>Total Units</b>	<b>588</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>110</b>



## San Gabriel Valley - Supportive Housing Production Program By Year Operating Allocations and Unit Potential

Source	Total Allocation	Voucher or Voucher Equivalents				
		2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Tenant Based Vouchers	400	80	80	80	80	80
Project-Based Section 8	38	9	8	9	4	8
Shelter Plus Care	67	6	40	5	10	6
MHSA Housing Program <sup>1</sup>	83	17	17	16	17	16
MHSA FSPs	TBD					
Tenant Rent	TBD					
<b>Totals</b>	<b>588</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>110</b>

<sup>1</sup> Based on 40% of the projected 35% of LA County's share of funds (from Legislative Analyst's MHSA Report extrapolated over 5 years) and CalHFA 20-Yr capitalized reserve modeling.



**San Gabriel Valley - Supportive Housing Production Program  
Targeted Tenancy and Production Strategies**

**Table 1: Targeted Tenancy by Production Strategy and Unit Size**

Building Type	Number of Projects	100% PSH Projects (New / Rehab)		Affordable Housing (Set-Aside)		Leased		Total PSH Units
		1 BR	2 BR	1 BR	2 BR	1 BR	2 BR	
<b>SINGLES</b>								
20 Unit Building	1	20	0	0	0	0	0	20
16 Unit Building	1	16	0	0	0	0	0	16
10 Unit Building	2	20	0	0	0	0	0	20
6 Unit Building	4	24	0	0	0	0	0	24
4 Unit Building	12	48	0	0	0	0	0	48
Scattered-Site Private Market	n/a	0	0	0	0	360	0	360
<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>128</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>360</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>488</b>
<b>FAMILIES</b>								
40 Unit Building (50% PSH)	2	0	0	0	40	0	0	40
10 Unit Building (50% PSH)	4	0	0	0	20	0	0	20
Scattered-Site Private Market	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	40	40
<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>TOTAL PSH Units</b>		<b>128</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>360</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>588</b>