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Section 1: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 Purpose of a Consolidated Plan

The City of Seattle, along with its regional and community partners, contributes to a diverse and substantial number of programs and services to enhance the quality of life for Seattle’s no- to moderate-income communities and residents. The 2009-2012 Consolidated Plan for Housing and Community Development describes Seattle’s housing and community development needs and outlines strategies to address those needs over the next four years. The Plan provides policy guidance for the implementation of programs and services funded by four grants received by the City from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

When submitted to and approved by HUD, the Consolidated Plan represents an agreement with HUD that guides grant expenditures of approximately $21 million in the four federal grants. The four federal grant programs covered in this 2009-2012 Consolidated Plan are:

- Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)
- HOME Investment Partnership
- Emergency Shelter Grant Program (ESGP)
- Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA)

1.1.2 Policy framework

Seattle has enjoyed a long and successful history with the CDBG, HOPWA, ESG and HOME grant programs.

- HOME funds must be used to create affordable housing for low-income households. Eligible activities include homebuyer assistance; creation or rehabilitation of rental or ownership housing units; and tenant-based rental assistance.

- Emergency Shelter Grant funds support the operations of homeless shelters.

- HOPWA funds support housing and services for persons living with HIV/AIDS and their families.

- CDBG is the most flexible of the programs: a great variety of activities that support low- and moderate-income persons may be funded with CDBG. Because of its flexibility, the City has relied on CDBG in the past to support a wide number of activities.
To the extent allowed, and in consideration of other resources available to the City, the 2009-2012 Consolidated Plan goals and strategies support the following priorities of the Mayor and the City Council:

**Mayoral Priorities**

- **Get Seattle Moving** - We must be able to move goods and people around the region efficiently.
- **Keep Our Neighborhoods Safe** – Give police and fire department personnel the tools to do their difficult jobs, ensure accountability for actions taken, and ensure we are the most prepared city in the United States for natural or man-made catastrophes.
- **Create Jobs and Opportunity For All** - Economic opportunity during these difficult times means creating jobs and an environment that invites new investment in Seattle.
- **Build Strong Families and Healthy Communities** - Every part of this city is unique and vital to our growth and our ability to sustain what we love about living and working here.

**Council Priorities**

- Foster safe, just, and healthy communities for all
- Invest public resources fairly and effectively
- Build a livable city for our future

**1.1.3 Key plans referenced in development of the Consolidated Plan**

The City of Seattle is fortunate to draw on a wealth of internally- and externally-developed plans to guide the creation of strategies and funding priorities to meet community needs. Integration of priorities identified from these community-based plans into this Consolidated Plan offers the advantages of avoiding redundant planning processes, enhancing coordination and leveraging of funds among the multiple federal, state and local resources used by the City and its partners to create the housing and service network, and honoring the staff expertise and stakeholder and consumer feedback embedded in these established plans.

A partial listing of plans referenced by or integrated into the 2009-2012 Consolidated Plan includes:

- Seattle/King County Domestic Violence Regional Council Plan
- Area Plan on Aging, 2008-2011, Seattle/King County
- Seattle/King County Public Health Operational Master Plan
- Office of Housing – Seattle Housing Levy Renewal Technical Advisory Committee
- Human Services Strategic Investment Plan
- City of Seattle Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice
- Toward a Sustainable Seattle: City of Seattle Comprehensive Plan
- Seattle Housing Authority Strategic Plan 2005-2010
- 2008 Moving to New Ways Annual Plan, Seattle Housing Authority
Southeast Seattle Action Agenda
A Roof Over Every Bed: Our Community’s Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness in King County

A complete listing of the plans reviewed as part of community consultation to develop the 2009 Consolidated Plan can be found in Section 6.2 - Consolidated Plan Reference Tools.

1.2 Consolidated Plan goals

HUD has adopted a performance measures matrix to identify and clarify the goals and objectives for the Consolidated Plan funds. Listed below are each of the HUD goals and specific strategies the City of Seattle will use to guide expenditures of Consolidated Plan funds in accord with HUD priorities over the next four years. The strategies will involve the federal funds as well as significant leveraged resources from the City General Fund, state and other local and private foundation sources. For a more information regarding the chosen strategies, see Section 4.1 - Four-Year Strategic Plan Matrix.
### 2009-2012 Seattle Consolidated Plan Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HUD GOAL</th>
<th>City Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Promote suitable living environments</td>
<td>A. Support development of community facilities for non-profit agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Coordinate essential domestic violence services and move toward prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Increase availability of affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Increase use of affordable housing as a catalyst for distressed neighborhood economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Improve infrastructure and community resources in distressed neighborhoods to promote economic development and quality of life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Support Decent Housing</td>
<td>A. Prevent homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Move people rapidly from homelessness into housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Measure and report on Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Assist domestic violence victims to access and/or maintain stable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Provide service-enriched housing for homeless and/or special needs populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F. Develop and maintain Seattle’s supply of affordable rental housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. Increase opportunities for low-income households to purchase and/or maintain their own home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Promote Economic Opportunity</td>
<td>A. Increase economic development opportunities for small and minority owned businesses in distressed neighborhoods (by target area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Support commercial corridor revitalization to provide economic opportunity for entrepreneurs, increase jobs, and improve access to goods and services for all distressed neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3 Overview of City Funding Priorities

- **Seattle makes a major investment of its own funds to create a safety net.** CDBG, HOME, HOPWA and ESG funds play a critical role in the City’s strategies to address the needs of no- to moderate-income people in our community. However, one should view the funds in the context of major investments made by the City to create a “safety net” for those in need. For example, as of 2008, our City contributed nearly $68 million annually to health and human services through its General Fund and the Families and Education Levy.¹

In addition, Seattle voters have approved for 16 consecutive years over $242 million in local Housing Levy funds to provide affordable housing opportunities for low-income Seattle residents. Seattle’s Office of Housing estimates that every $1 in CDBG funds leverages $3.21 in other state and local capital funds invested in affordable rental housing development.

- **Public funds provide gap financing for economic development projects.** Similarly, lending from CDBG Section 108, Float Loan and Equity Fund provides necessary gap financing to stimulate private housing, commercial and mixed-use development. Oftentimes, projects are not feasible without this public sector involvement in certain areas of the City. From 2001 to 2007, the City invested $37,487,134 in projects that resulted in 728 new residential units and 255,803 square feet of commercial space. The City’s investment leveraged over $110,000,000 in private funding in these projects.

- **Federal funds have decreased.** As federal funds decreased over the last eight years, especially in the now-$12 million CDBG program (down from $15 million in 2001), the City has focused its use of the federal grants into fewer priority areas and activities while at the same time honoring the maintenance of projects that represent long-term investments (such as affordable housing development and assistance to homeless people), and leveraging state and local funds in support of critical city and regional initiatives (such as the redevelopment of Southeast Seattle to coordinate with rapid transit infrastructure). The following chart shows the decline in CDBG revenues in recent years.

Ending homelessness and revitalizing Southeast Seattle will be overarching goals for Consolidated Plan funding. In response to this decline in CDBG funding, the City in 2006 decided to focus its CDBG funds on two priority areas. For the 2009 – 2012 Consolidated Plan, the City plans to continue to focus the funds on two main areas: 1) supporting the Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness; and 2) supporting economic development in the Rainier Valley (Southeast Seattle). The City leverages its own General Fund and many other state and local sources to extend the reach of these four federal programs in order to support necessary community and economic development and social service programs that are often integrally tied to the success of the activities supported by the Consolidated Plan’s programs.

For program year 2009, we estimate having $13.5 million available to us in CDBG-related resources. Of that amount, almost 88% or $11.8 million will be allocated to the two priority areas, including preserving and building affordable housing; providing operating costs of services for homeless persons; and fund the Rainier Valley Community Development Fund. The remaining $1.7 million is divided between grant and program administration, policy planning, business assistance and development, and social services facilities development.

Some programs will no longer receive CDBG support due to decreases in funding. In previous years, the City of Seattle relied on CDBG to support a number of programs. Because of decreases in funding, these programs no longer receive CDBG support (although other City funding and resources may have been diverted to meet these needs):

- Child care subsidies
- Case management services for seniors and disabled persons
- Business façade improvement program
- Parks upgrades in low- and moderate-income neighborhoods
- Small neighborhood infrastructure projects
The City anticipates $7.2 million from HOME, HOPWA and ESG. Current revenue estimates related to the remaining three Consolidated Plan funds (direct grant from HUD and program-related income) are as follows:

- HOME: $5.1 million
- HOPWA: $1.6 million
- ESG: $542,360

Because HOME, ESG, and HOPWA programs are much smaller than CDBG programs and are authorized by Congress for more specific purposes, their uses are already focused on specific activities. For more detail on the policies and initiatives informing the priorities for the City’s use of CDBG, ESG, HOME and HOPWA federal funds, see Section 4.1 - Strategic Plan.
In 2008, the City of Seattle’s Consolidated Plan funds were allocated in the following manner using the HUD’s Objective/Outcome matrix. We anticipate 2009 allocations to follow this general pattern. HUD allows local jurisdictions substantial discretion in classifying programs and activities. Overlap between the various outcome categories is apparent. For instance, there is a debatable line between “accessibility” and “affordability”; for many households, the cost of a service or housing unit is the primary factor in its accessibility to that household. The main federally funded activities categorized into each cell of the matrix are identified below:

### Distribution of 2008 CDBG, ESG, HOME, HOPWA funds by Stated Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Suitable Living Environment</td>
<td>$4,049,504 (shelter and services for homeless persons)</td>
<td>$115,348 (transitional housing assistance)</td>
<td>$1,738,472 (CDBG planning &amp; admin &amp; social service facility capital improvements)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Decent Housing</td>
<td>$3,934,268 (rental assistance, homebuyer assistance)</td>
<td>$818,247 (housing planning &amp; admin)</td>
<td>$6,089,049 (increasing or preserving the supply of affordable housing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Economic Opportunity</td>
<td>$4,988,675 (business development funding)</td>
<td>$15,000 (development of affordable loans for business developments)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.4 How have the needs of Seattle’s communities and residents changed since the 2005-2008 Consolidated Plan?

Much of our analysis confirms trends that are already informally discussed by community members. Indeed, our current programming of CDBG, HOME, HOPWA, and ESG funds already responds well to key needs identified by community members. We are fortunate that these federal funds are also leveraged by a considerable investment of local resources, including the existing Seattle Housing Levy, other local voter-approved funding initiatives, private foundations, and the City’s General Fund. Major items of interest in our current needs analysis include the following:

• **Seattle’s strengthening economy over the last five years has led to rising land values and residential and commercial rents.** These increases pose a challenge for many residents and businesses seeking affordable housing or commercial space. Small businesses located in previously underinvested neighborhoods such as the Central Area, the International District, Rainier Valley, and Delridge are particularly affected.

• **Nearly 20% of Seattle renters pay more than half their income for rent.** Due in part to rising rents, approximately 19% of renters in Seattle pay more than half their income for rent (approximately 21,400 households, not including one-person student households). These renters face a severe cost burden and are at risk of losing their housing. Paying more than half their income for rent makes it very difficult for these renters to afford other household expenses—at a time when food, transportation, and many other critical needs are increasing in price.

• **A growing economy with low unemployment drives up wages and costs.** According to a Forbes.com July, 17, 2008 article, “Seattle's 3.7% unemployment rate, well under the national average of 5.5%, would normally be a good thing. Seattle’s prices are up 5.8% from summer 2007, a tie for the highest inflation rate in the country with Dallas, where high energy costs for home cooling and driving are eating up incomes.”

• **Home prices have risen faster than incomes.** Although home prices have begun to decline, the past eight years have seen home price growth that has significantly outpaced wage growth. From 2000 to 2008, the average single family home price increased 77%, from $316,800 to $559,300, and the average condo increased 62%, from $244,050 to $396,150. Meanwhile, the annual salary of the average Seattle worker increased only 31%, from $49,000 to $64,000 in the same period.

• **Light rail construction has disrupted conditions for many businesses in Southeast Seattle.** Link Light Rail construction along Martin Luther King Jr. Way South was substantially completed at the end of 2007 and many of the neighborhood’s businesses

---

are in a fragile and vulnerable state as a result of the length and significance of the construction activities that interrupted their business activities.

- **In some underserved neighborhoods, new development requires public support to be feasible.** In Seattle’s Central Area, Delridge/Southwest Seattle, Chinatown/International District, and Rainier Valley/Southeast Seattle neighborhoods, new mixed-use and commercial economic development projects that fulfill both affordable housing and commercial needs cannot generally be developed feasibly without support from a public financing or assistance program.

- **More than 9,000 people used homeless services during 2007.** The Safe Harbors Homeless Management Information System shows more than 9,000 uniquely identified and unduplicated people received services from participating publicly funded emergency shelters and transitional housing programs in King County during 2007.

- **More than 6,000 county residents are living with HIV/AIDS.** There were 6,320 King County residents living with HIV or AIDS at the beginning of 2008, of whom approximately 80%, or 5,047 live in Seattle.

- **Approximately 17% of people living with HIV/AIDS need housing assistance.** Housing assistance and housing-related services are among the greatest unmet needs identified by persons living with HIV/AIDS, according to data from the 2007 Comprehensive HIV Needs Assessment compiled by Public Health – Seattle & King County. Assessment data estimates that more than 1,036 people living with AIDS need assistance finding housing and/or emergency, short-term or ongoing rental assistance.

- **Despite increases in capacity for emergency shelter and transitional housing programs for domestic violence victims, the turn-away rate for Seattle and King County averages 18 to 1.** In 2007, a total of 981 individuals were served through domestic violence shelter / transitional housing / motel voucher programs in Seattle and King County. Fully 25% of those in the emergency system were young children aged 0-5 years. Another 1,165 adults (who may or may not have entered shelter) received counseling through Domestic Violence Community Advocacy programs throughout King County. Even though emergency shelter and transitional housing capacity has increased for victims of domestic violence in recent years, shelter turn-away rates continue to rise. The duplicated turn-away rate for Seattle and King County averages 18 to 1.

The 2009 – 2012 Consolidated Plan will provide a roadmap to guide the use of the four federal fund sources in efforts to address needs such as these. Programs and activities will be operated or funded by the City of Seattle Human Services Department (HSD), City Office of Housing (OH), and City Office of Economic Development (OED). Since much of our existing programming in recent years has already been shifted to address these trends, the uses of these federal funds will not deviate significantly from the recent updates to the 2005 – 2008 Consolidated Plan. The new Plan, however, will present a more streamlined and integrated view of the needs and Seattle’s responses to those needs.
1.5 Past Performance and Challenges in meeting Consolidated Plan goals

Past Performance

The Code of Federal Regulations (CFR 24 § 91.200 of the HUD regulations) calls for a Consolidated Plan “executive summary that includes the objectives and outcomes identified in the plan as well as an evaluation of past performance.” Report data from City of Seattle sub-recipients offers a profile of successful investment of federal, state and local funds. In program year 2007 (the last complete year for which information is available at the time of publication of this Plan), Consolidated Plan funds:

- Preserved or produced 417 units of affordable rental housing
- Helped 61 families purchase their first homes
- Moved 972 homeless households into transitional or permanent housing
- Averted housing loss (evictions) for 784 households
- Provided $8.8 million in CDBG-secured loans to three community and economic development projects
- Helped develop 21,500 square feet of commercial or community space for businesses and neighborhoods
- Provided $2.5 million in loans to four businesses in the Rainier Valley to promote community revitalization

The plan for 2009 and beyond is to continue these types of successes.

Challenges

CFR 24 § 91.215(a)(3) states that the Strategic Plan will…” identify any obstacles to meeting underserved needs.” For a detailed analysis of the scope and diversity of needs anticipated over the next four years affecting Seattle’s communities and residents, see Section 3 – Needs Assessment.

The City will continue to refine the 2009-2012 Consolidated Plan priorities over the next four years to reflect changes in the demand for housing and services, feedback from consumers and constituents, and the increasingly challenging environment urban American cities face. Challenges include:

- **Changing demographics.** Seattle’s demographics are changing as residents become older and more economically stratified, and as families with younger children tend to move out to the region’s suburbs. At the same time, infrastructure to support residents staying in the city (particularly low-income households with fewer options to relocate) is at capacity in many instances; and may not effectively support the increasing diversity of the population.
While we know that the demographics of the City are changing, quantifying that change has been made difficult by the lack of comparability between the American Communities Survey (ACS) data and the 2000 U. S. Census data. Lack of trend data may hinder the development or reports or studies, thereby hindering the effectiveness of efforts to plan service adjustments and changes.

- **Transportation needs.** Increasing environmental and economic concerns have led residents to demand transit options and regional connections that allow workers reasonably cost-effective means to travel between home and employment sites. Low- and moderate-income workers tend to rely on service sectors jobs (that are often concentrated in the city) while simultaneously needing to live further away from the city center in order to find affordable housing.

- **Housing affordability.** Seattle has limited remaining land development capacity. The resulting pressure on prices leads to increased need for housing affordable to low- and moderate-income households, as well as affordable business development for neighborhood businesses.

- **An increasing refugee and immigrant population.** The City’s increasing refugee and immigrant population creates specific challenges for the development of City services, including social services. The Mayor’s Race and Social Justice Initiative calls for the creation of a community that is enriched by its diverse cultures, with full participation by all its residents. The delivery of social services is particularly culturally sensitive, however, and efforts to involve clients in the design of the City’s service delivery may require changes to established allocation practices and procedures.

- **Underinvestment in some neighborhoods.** Despite rising land values, new development projects in historically underinvested low- and moderate-income neighborhoods are economically challenged by high construction costs and insufficient property values. At the same time, increasing commercial rents pose a challenge to small businesses in these neighborhoods that rely on affordable commercial space for viability.

- **Decreasing government budgets.** Local and state budgets have been affected by the deepening regional economic downturns. As a result, the amount of discretionary funds available for leveraging federal grant sources may be reduced.

- **Decreasing charitable giving in response to the worsening economy.** Non-profit social services agencies, which provide the bulk of the actual delivery of social services and the development of affordable housing, will be challenged during the next several years due to the worsening economic situation. Fewer discretionary dollars may translate into fewer charitable contributions from individuals and corporate sponsors.
1.6 Institutional partnerships

The housing, community development, and human service delivery system in Seattle consists of a number of complementary components. Key public partners that receive Consolidated Plan funds include the City of Seattle’s Human Services Department, Office of Housing, and Office of Economic Development. Other City departments and agencies involved in implementation or policy development include the Office of Policy and Management, Department of Finance, Public Health – Seattle & King County, and the Seattle Housing Authority.

Non-profit agency partners are many and varied. Local non-profits include: Seattle Housing Development Consortium, Seattle Human Services Coalition, Minority Executive Directors’ Coalition, non-profit housing developers, community development corporations, social service provider coalitions, emergency shelter providers, food banks, other human services providers and agencies working with special needs populations, and community development finance institutions. Private foundations, lenders, developers, contractors, and a range of businesses are also integral partners in advancing the City’s goals and strategies. The Committee to End Homelessness, made up of government and local non-profit leaders, as well as consumers, provides vital leadership to the efforts of the Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness. The Rainier Valley Community Development Fund receives a substantial amount of CDBG funds and is the primary driver behind the City’s efforts in the Rainier Valley revitalization.

- **The CDBG Administration Office in the Human Services Department** is the lead office in implementing and administering the CDBG program. The Office provides centralized monitoring, financial management and support to CDBG programs delivered through HSD, Office of Housing, and Office of Economic Development. The CDBG Administration Office assures the eligibility of proposed projects and of compliance with environmental and labor standards regulations, assists in periodic accountability reviews, and provides guidance to City agencies and non-profit organizations in implementing the City’s Consolidated Plan.

- **The Human Services Department (HSD)** provides CDBG, ESG, HOPWA, and local funds to social service providers for a wide range of services to benefit families and individuals with low incomes, children, youth, domestic violence victims, seniors, homeless individuals and families, and persons with disabilities. HSD also operates several programs directly, including a child care subsidy program and a utility assistance program. A pool of CDBG funds is also available for HSD to provide capital loans for agencies developing, expanding, or redeveloping direct service facilities.

- **The Office of Housing (OH)** works with housing developers (primarily non-profit), financial institutions, and other public funders to create affordable housing opportunities. OH manages the preservation and development of multifamily housing, coordinates affordable housing development, and creates homeownership opportunities. OH programs include single-family home repair, weatherization, homebuyer assistance, multifamily preservation and production, and developer incentive programs. OH uses a combination of CDBG, HOME, and local resources such as the local Housing Levy to
fund their efforts. OH is the lead agency in administering and implementing, in coordination with the CDBG Administration Office, the HOME and ADDI funds.

- **The Office of Economic Development (OED)** uses the power of City government, CDBG and other funds to support a healthy, diversified economic base and to bring economic opportunities to all of Seattle’s citizens, especially the most disadvantaged. OED takes these actions in cooperation with private sector firms, community-based organizations, and other public sector institutions whenever possible. A major undertaking with CDBG funds in the past few years has been the support of business interruption mitigation payments and community development projects in the Rainier Valley (along the path of light rail construction through Southeast Seattle). OED is also the City’s lead agency for the development of Section 108 loan funds, with which OED has undertaken several major projects in the past year.

- **The Seattle Housing Authority (SHA)** is a unique housing development and policy-planning partner with the City of Seattle. As the largest public housing provider in the state, SHA has the ability to access special housing support services and continues its commitment to providing and coordinating housing support services for its residents. SHA owns approximately 5,200 units of federally funded public housing, administers more than 8,300 additional units through the federal Housing Choice Voucher Program, administers about 1,100 units of locally funded housing under the Seattle Senior Housing Bond Issue Program, and operates an additional 1,000 low-income rental units financed through tax-exempt bonds and the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit program. SHA is also the local bond issuer for the many non-profit-sponsored-low income housing properties.

**Coordination with other Public Agency Programs**

Seattle’s housing and community development agencies have a number of resources available to them for capital and development funding. The Washington State Housing Finance Commission makes tax-exempt bond funds available for multifamily rehabilitation and first-time homebuyers. The federal Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Program provides assistance to private and non-profit low-income housing developers. The area’s development agencies are very active in the pursuit of New Markets Tax Credits. The sale of tax credits to private investors provides significant cash contributions to projects developed by local non-profit agencies. The City of Seattle coordinates and negotiates with these and other public funders to maximize funding and leverage opportunities on a project-specific basis, and to minimize duplicative use restrictions on properties.

**Role of Community-based Organizations**

Seattle boasts a strong network of community-based non-profit organizations that provide a wide range of high-quality housing and human services for area residents in need. On the housing development side, about 20 non-profit groups and Public Development Authorities (PDAs) have become major developers of subsidized housing in Seattle. They are joined by 12 community-based development organizations (CBDOs). These CBDOs carry out neighborhood stabilization,
economic development, and energy conservation programs. The City has active contracts with nearly 200 human services provider agencies that form the basis of our efforts to support low- and moderate-income persons.

1.7 What is new in the 2009-2012 Plan?

Highlights of the new plan include:

- **A significantly expanded Needs Assessment Section**, including use of 2006 American Community Survey PUMS data to identify characteristics of households with severe housing cost burden and detailed information on new special needs populations including veterans and people with disabilities;

- **A new and more accessible matrix format** (graphic versus narrative) for the Four-Year Strategies Plan (the section that indicates the priorities for programming and services during the life of the plan);

- **Inclusion, for the first time, of information from the Safe Harbors Homeless Management Information System on those who are served by homeless programs.** Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) data collection has been required for HUD-funded homeless programs since 2005. Seattle and King County’s Safe Harbors data collection and reporting leads national standards as evidenced by the showcasing of our 2007 six-month report at the National Alliance to End Homelessness conference in Washington DC in the fall of 2008. Michigan was the only other jurisdiction to produce a comprehensive report using automated HMIS data. Information from Safe Harbor’s first full-year report on the homeless population served by publicly funded emergency shelters and transitional housing programs in Seattle and King County is now included in Section 3 – Needs Assessment.

- **An expanded Lead-Based Paint (LBP) issues analysis** of the housing inventory affected by LBP and the long term effects of LBP exposure on Seattle's kids and families;

- **Expanded use of accessibility tools** such as alternative text only and translated formats (for access by vision impaired and hearing impaired and non-ESL) availability planned for the published Consolidated Plan

- **A new web-based link to cited plans, databases and studies throughout the Plan in one reference tool**, as well as hyperlinks to full studies and documents in the body of the text for ease of research. The 2009 Consolidated Plan will reference more than 50 City and non-City studies, strategic plans, and policy documents (e.g. the Area Agency on Aging 2008-2011 Area Plan, WSDOT transit studies, state economic development forecasts, Washington Women's Funding Alliance study, United Way plans, Seattle and King County public health studies, etc.)
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Section 2: COMMUNITY AND POPULATION PROFILE

2.1 General Demographics

2.1.1 Introduction

The information presented in the Community and Population Profile provides an overview of Seattle residents’ demographic characteristics, including: the estimated number of individuals and households; distribution of residents by age, gender and race/ethnicity; and income and poverty levels in our community.

This section also presents information on home prices, rent levels and overall economic indicators for Seattle to provide a context for the challenges of helping individuals, families and communities survive—and succeed—in Seattle.

Specifically, this section:

- Responds to HUD regulations to describe the grant recipient’s community and the population that is eligible to receive assistance;
- Provides general and population-specific data that is used to guide policy and program development and that may be considered in reconciling competing needs for fund allocation;
- Summarizes emerging trends that specifically affect low- and moderate-income individuals and households; and
- Presents factors which may affect communities’ overall demographic trends and growth, diversity, economic health, or quality of life.

2.1.2 Change in the U.S. Census Method of Collecting Data – Shift from Decennial Census to American Community Survey (ACS)

Since the completion of the last decennial U.S. Census in 2000, the U.S. Census Bureau has changed how it compiles demographic information. It has developed an ongoing statistical summary of a sample group of households—called the American Community Survey (ACS)—which it has released each year since 2005, and which will replace the census long form in 2010. Because of this change, much of the information presented in this document is based on the ACS.
The Census Bureau began full-scale implementation of the American Community Survey (ACS) in 2005. The ACS is sent to about 250,000 addresses each month. Over the course of a year, about one household out of every forty receives the ACS questionnaire. As a comparison, the decennial census long form had been sent to about one in six households once every ten years. Currently, the ACS publishes single-year data for all areas with populations of 65,000 or more. Areas with populations less than 65,000 will require the use of multiyear averages to reach an appropriate sample size for data publication.

In late 2008, the Census Bureau will release three-year estimates for areas with populations greater than 20,000. In 2010, it will release five-year estimates for all areas, including census tracts and block groups. These multiyear estimates will be updated annually, with estimates published for the largest areas in all formats (one-, three- and five-year). It is important to note that sample sizes in the ACS are smaller than they were for the decennial census long form. Given this, annual ACS estimates may have large margins of error, particularly for small population subgroups.

The Census Bureau indicates that it is not always advisable to compare decennial census data directly to ACS data. Differences in methodology between the ACS and the decennial census present a host of challenges to planners who have relied on the decennial census to understand population characteristics and corresponding housing and service needs over time. In addition to the margins of error that result from the ACS’ small sample sizes, there are also certain overall differences between the decennial census and ACS methodology, including differences in residence rules and reference periods for questions.

In general, the Census Bureau encourages users to make comparisons between ACS data and past decennial census data on population, household, and housing characteristics but not on amounts. At the same time, the Census Bureau advises users that comparisons on some specific subjects should only be made with caution, and that direct comparisons on some survey items should not be made. These issues can make it difficult to analyze trends over time, since it is not always possible to compare older decennial census data with new ACS data.

As you read the information that is presented in this Consolidated Plan, please note the citations to ACS data and the notes about when margins of error must be considered. If you would like to learn more about these changes to census data, please visit the ACS home page at http://www.census.gov/acs/www/.
2.1.3 State, Regional and Local Population Growth

Washington State Growth Trends

Washington’s population as a whole is still growing, but at a somewhat slower rate than earlier in the decade. Since 2000, King County has experienced the largest county population increase in the state.

- **Statewide growth rates peaked in 2006.** Washington State’s Office of Financial Management (OFM) estimates the state’s population at 6,587,600 as of April 1, 2008. This represents an increase of 11.8% since 2000, and 1.5% percent since April 2007. Growth for April 2007 through 2008 represents the second year of slowing, though still strong growth for the state, since annual growth rates this decade peaked in 2006.

- **Migration accounts for half the state’s growth.** Migration from outside the state, especially migration associated with people seeking or taking new jobs, is a key part of Washington State’s growth.\(^3\) In general, net migration (meaning migration into the state minus migration out) accounts for more than half of the state’s growth. Year-to-year levels of net migration depend on the relative performance of Washington’s economy versus the economy in nearby states and in the nation as a whole.

- **Net migration has slowed since 2006.** While net migration accounted for more than half of the state’s growth in the year ending April 2008, this was the second annual decline since 2006 in both the absolute level and percentage contribution of net migration to overall growth. ([See chart below/on next page].)

- **The economic downturn may further slow migration.** In releasing the 2008 population estimates, OFM’s chief demographer noted that the national housing market contraction and the slowing of economic growth is likely limiting mobility, as people are finding it more difficult to sell their homes. Thus, while housing and job markets in Washington are among the healthiest in the nation, this state is not experiencing as much net migration as would otherwise be expected.

---

Figure 2-1: Components of Population Growth, Washington State

• Population growth is concentrated in western Washington. The majority of population growth since 2000 has remained concentrated in western Washington counties. Though smaller counties have had larger rates of increase, the biggest numerical gains in population since 2000 have been in the largest counties in the state, with increases of 147,154 in King County, 104,582 in Pierce County, 90,576 in Snohomish County. These Puget Sound region counties were also the counties that added the most population between April 2007 and 2008.
King County and Seattle Growth Trends

Seattle’s population as a whole is still growing, but not as fast as King County overall

Figure 2-3: Population in Seattle and King County, 2000, 2008

- Seattle and King County are the largest in the state. With more than 1.5 million people as of April 2008, King County is the largest county in Washington State, with a population over twice the size of the next largest county. Seattle, with a 2008 population of 592,800, is the largest city in both the county and the state.  

- King County has had the highest absolute growth in the state. Between 2000 and 2008, King County’s population grew by about 147,000 people or 8.5%, while Seattle’s population increased by about 29,500 or about 5.2%. (While the county’s population did not grow as quickly as the state’s overall population during this period, King County continued to register the highest absolute growth among the state’s counties.)

- Seattle and King County have grown each year. Both Seattle and King County saw annual population gains every year since 2000, although population growth slowed temporarily for both the city and county in the aftermath of the national recession in 2001. Annual growth accelerated in 2005 in the county and in 2006 in the city. During the last two years, the rate of population growth in Seattle has trailed that of the county.


---

overall by only about 0.1%. Population growth in Seattle was slightly slower in the year ending April 2008 than in the year ending April 2007, but still remained above 1%.

Seattle Population growth trends

Seattle’s population will keep growing into the future
More than 100,000 new people are expected between 2000 and 2030

Figure 2-4: 2000 to 2030 Population Forecasts for Seattle
By Puget Sound Regional Council

Source: Puget Sound Regional Council, Sub-County (Small Area) Forecasts (Released Oct 26, 2006)
http://psrc.org/data/forecasts/index.htm

- **Seattle is anticipated to experience strong population growth.** The most recent population forecasts produced by the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) were generated in 2006 and are expected to be updated soon. These forecasts projected a 20%, or 100,000 person, increase in Seattle’s population between 2000 and 2030.

- **Household size will decline.** PSRC predicts that household size in Seattle will continue to decline slightly between 2000 and 2030, from about 2.08 people per household to less than 2 people per household.

- **New strategy assumes increase growth in major cities.** The newly-adopted Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) Vision 2040 (http://psrc.org/projects/vision/pubs/vision2040/index.htm) uses county-level population projections from OFM to provide guidance to cities and towns for developing new local growth targets in their comprehensive plans. The plan calls for the region’s five major
cities—Seattle, Tacoma, Everett, Bremerton, and Bellevue—to accommodate 540,000 additional people and 511,000 additional jobs between 2000 and 2040. This represents 32% of the population growth and 42% of the employment growth anticipated in the regional vision. These shares of population and job growth represent increases—especially for population—compared to the previously adopted targets.

• **Seattle anticipates increased population growth.** The city’s current 20-year household growth target, as set forth in the Seattle Comprehensive Plan (http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Seattle_s_Comprehensive_Plan/Overview/), anticipates an additional 47,000 households between 2004 and 2024.

• **King County’s growth target will need to be increased.** In 2007, OFM released new population projections for counties. OFM’s projection for King County is for a substantially greater rate and amount of growth than the OFM forecast from 2002. The 20-year target for countywide household growth that King County adopts in its next major comprehensive plan update will therefore need to reflect a substantially higher rate of growth than its current plan. [http://www.metrokc.gov/ddes/compplan/CPP-current.pdf]

• **Seattle’s growth target will also need to be increased.** Seattle’s target will also likely need to be increased to account for the recent OFM forecasts. The next major updates of the city and county comprehensive plans are due in 2011. See http://www.metrokc.gov/ddes/compplan/CPP-current.pdf

---

5This reflects updates Seattle made in the City’s Comprehensive Plan in 2005 to targets for the 2001-2022 time period.
2.1.4 Seattle Demographics

Age

Seattle’s population is growing older and the aging of the baby boomers will shape the next several decades

Figure 2-5: Seattle Population by Age

The Puget Sound Regional Council provided Seattle with a set of age-cohort projections, which are shown in the chart above. The most prominent age-related trend to occur over the next decades in Seattle, as in the nation as a whole, is the aging of the baby boomers.

- Aging baby boomers will shape Seattle’s population. The 2000 Census estimated that residents between 45 and 59 years old made up about 19% of Seattle’s population. (The 2006 ACS estimate for this age group was higher, at 23%.) As the chart shows, the number of Seattle residents in the 60-to-74 and 75-and older-age groups will grow

---

6 These are rough projections. For each decade projected, PSRC started with the assumption that the population in each age-group in Seattle would grow at the same rate as PSRC projects for the same age-group in King County. Because Seattle’s overall population is expected to grow more slowly than Seattle’s, PSRC then adjusted the resulting age-group projections for Seattle by multiplying each of them by the ratio of the forecast estimate for Seattle to the forecast for King County, which are published as part of PSRC’s set of Small Area Forecasts.
rapidly in the next few decades with the aging of the baby boom cohorts (reflected roughly by the 45-to-59 age group in 2000). The last of the baby boomers are expected to retire between 2020 and 2025, at which point all members of the baby boom generation will be older than 65.

- **Seattle will have more residents 60 and older.** Residents age 60 or older made up 15% of Seattle’s population in the 2000 Census (and about 16% in the 2006 ACS). The projections prepared by the Puget Sound Regional Council estimate that the population of older adults, those 60 and older, will increase to 26% of the population by 2030. These older residents are more likely to need additional support services to stay in their homes and neighborhoods over time.

- **Seattle will have fewer young adults.** Young adults (ages 20-30) make up 20% of Seattle’s population. This number is expected to decline to 18%, but Seattle will continue to be attractive to young adults.
Household Type

Non-family households make up 55.3% of Seattle households. Family households make up 44.7% of Seattle households.

Figure 2-6: Seattle Households by Type

Source: 2006 ACS (Table: Data Profile of Selected Social Characteristics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household by Detailed Type</th>
<th>Percent of All Seattle Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family households (families):</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With own children under 18 years</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married-couple families</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With own children under 18 years</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male householder, no wife present</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With own children under 18 years</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female householder, no husband present</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With own children under 18 years</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfamily households:</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder living alone</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2006 ACS (Table: Data Profile of Selected Social Characteristics)
• **Non-families make up a majority of Seattle households.** The 2006 ACS estimates that 55% of Seattle households are non-family households. Householders living alone make up the large majority of these non-family households, and, at 43% of all Seattle households, are the most common household type in the city.

• **Senior households make up nearly 10% of Seattle households.** Seniors who live alone make up about 20% of the city’s one-person households, or about 9% of all Seattle households overall.

• **Married couples without children at home are the most common family type.** The most common type of family household in Seattle is a married couple *without* children at home: about 20% of all Seattle households, or roughly 33% of family households, are married couples without children at home.\(^7\)

• **Married couples with children make up less than 15% of Seattle households.** Households in which a married couple and one or more children reside comprise just 14% of all Seattle households. Single-parent families make up about 5% of Seattle families. Of these single-parent families, approximately 80% are headed by women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 2-7: Average household size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter households</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: 2006 ACS (Table B25010)*

• **Homeowners have larger household sizes than renters.** Household sizes tend to be larger for owner than for renter households: the average number of people living in a homeowner household is about 2.3, whereas the average number in a renter household is 1.8.

---

\(^7\) The ACS tabulations of these estimates categorize families in terms of whether the householder and their own minor child or children are in household. Households with children in which the householder is not a parent are categorized under “other family.” Other relatives living together, such as two siblings with no children in the household, are also captured under “other family.”
Income

Factors influencing income remain consistent with those in the last decennial census

- **Income patterns vary by race, ethnicity, age, household type, and education level.** The types of income disparities revealed in the ACS estimates are generally consistent with those in the last decennial census.

- **White householders have higher incomes.** White householders who are not Hispanic tend to have higher household incomes than do people of color. In 2006, white householders in Seattle had a median income of $63,370, compared with $48,611 for Asian householders and $26,057 for African American householders.

  Figure 2-8: Median Income of Seattle Households by Race and Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Race of Householder</th>
<th>Median Income</th>
<th>Percent of Total Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>$63,370</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>$26,057</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native</td>
<td>$21,029</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>$48,611</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race</td>
<td>$38,247</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>$43,313</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Ethnicity of Householder</th>
<th>Median Income</th>
<th>Percent of Total Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino origin (of any race)</td>
<td>$40,758</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White alone, not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>$64,051</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N indicates that data for this geographic area cannot be displayed because the number of sample cases is too small.

Source: U.S. Census ACS, 2006 (Table S1903)

- **Middle-aged householders have higher incomes.** Households in which householder is between 25 and 64 years of age have the highest median household incomes: $65,521 for those between 25 and 44 years old and $69,862 for those between 45 and 64 years old, compared with $31,188 for those older than 65.

---

8The median income estimates discussed in this subsection are those published as part of the ACS tabulations, and are not the same as the Seattle Median Income estimates used in the Housing Market chapter. These estimates were derived from ACS microdata to analyze levels of housing cost burden.
Figure 2-9: Median Income of Seattle Households by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Age of Householder</th>
<th>Median Income</th>
<th>Percent of Total Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 to 24 years</td>
<td>$29,161</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 44 years</td>
<td>$65,521</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 64 years</td>
<td>$69,862</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>$31,188</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS, 2006 (Table S1903)

- **Two-parent families have higher incomes.** Married-couple family households generally tend to have higher incomes, in part because they are more likely to have two wage earners. However, single-parent families headed by a woman have much lower median household incomes than other family types.

Figure 2-10: Median Income of Seattle Households by Type of Household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Households</th>
<th>Median Income</th>
<th>Percent of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With own children under 18 years</td>
<td>$84,787</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With no own children under 18 years</td>
<td>$81,658</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married-couple families</td>
<td>$97,738</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female householder, no husband present</td>
<td>$38,725</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male householder, no wife present</td>
<td>$52,224</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Family Households</th>
<th>Median Income</th>
<th>Percent of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female householder</td>
<td>$39,795</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living alone</td>
<td>$33,429</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not living alone</td>
<td>$61,272</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male householder</td>
<td>$46,819</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living alone</td>
<td>$39,868</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not living alone</td>
<td>$76,537</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS, 2006 (Table S1903)
Householders with higher levels of education have higher incomes. The 2006 ACS estimates note that householders with a graduate or professional degree had a median income of $59,804 compared with $18,641 for those who had not graduated from high school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school graduate</td>
<td>$18,641</td>
<td>$22,151</td>
<td>$13,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate (includes equivalency)</td>
<td>$26,123</td>
<td>$31,715</td>
<td>$20,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college or associate's degree</td>
<td>$31,936</td>
<td>$40,217</td>
<td>$26,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>$45,221</td>
<td>$55,446</td>
<td>$36,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>$59,804</td>
<td>$73,991</td>
<td>$49,164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS, 2006 (Table S1501)
Race & Ethnicity

Seattle is a moderately diverse city racially and ethnically. People of color make up 32% of Seattle’s population.

Figure 2-12: Seattle Population by Race

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006 American Community Survey (ACS) estimates.
Notes: ACS estimates carry margins of error. The Census Bureau asks about Hispanic/Latino ethnicity separately from race. People of Hispanic or Latino ethnicity may identify as any race.
In this survey, 5.9% of people identified themselves as of Hispanic/Latino ethnicity.

- **Seattle is a moderately diverse city, racially and ethnically.** About 70% of Seattle’s population is comprised of people who are White, non-Hispanic. However, the city’s diversity is increasing, largely due to the growth in the number of foreign-born residents.

- **Nearly 20% of Seattle residents are foreign born.** In 2000, 95,000 people in Seattle were foreign born. They comprised approximately 17% of the city’s population. The 2006 ACS estimate of foreign born residents is 19%. In response to this trend, Mayor Greg Nickels launched the *Immigrants and Refugees Initiative* in 2007 to increase the transparency of City government and make services more accessible to both immigrant and refugee communities.
Gender

Women are a narrow majority of the total population in Seattle.

Figure 2-13: Age Distribution of the Population by Gender, 2006

- **Women are in the majority in Seattle.** Women are estimated to be a narrow majority (about 50.4%) of the total population.

- **People between 25 and 34 are the largest age group.** For both males and females, the age group with the largest share of total population and the only groups with shares totaling greater than 10% are those who are 25 to 34 years old. In 2006, the share of both these age groups had fallen slightly.\(^9\)

---

\(^9\) To estimate age distributions, data on the shares of population by age and gender (from the U.S. Census 2000 and American Community Survey 2006) were applied to the figures for total population in each year, as estimated by the U.S. Intercensal Estimates.
2.2 Emerging Trends Affecting No- to Moderate-Income Households

2.2.1 Poverty affects significant portions of the population

More than 10% of Seattle residents live in poverty. According to the 2006 ACS, about 12% of individuals in Seattle population are living below poverty level, and another 13% have incomes from between 100% and 200% of the poverty level.

- **A higher proportion of children live in poverty.** The proportion of children affected by poverty is higher than the proportion of the overall population: about 16% of children have incomes below the poverty threshold.

- **Families with children have higher levels of poverty.** About 7% of all families are estimated to have incomes below poverty level. Among families with children the estimated poverty rate was higher: about 11% of families with children have incomes below poverty level.

As previously noted, all ACS estimates carry margins of error. Because these margins of error can be quite high for population subgroups, 2000 Census estimates were used to supplement the ACS findings. In general, the 2000 Census and 2006 ACS estimates show similar patterns of poverty among different groups.

Please note again that due to differences in survey method and questionnaire items, income and poverty rate estimates from the ACS cannot be directly compared with those from the 2000 Census.

**Children and families with children are disproportionately affected by poverty.** The 2000 Census, like the 2006 ACS, shows disproportionately high rates of poverty among children. Families with children are much more likely to live below the poverty level than families overall. This is particularly true for single-parent families headed by a woman. Non-family households, particularly seniors living alone, are also more likely than family households to have incomes below poverty. The 2000 Census estimates also reveal much higher poverty rates for people of color.
Figure 2-14: Individual and Family Poverty Rates Estimates Past 12 Months, 2006 ACS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Household</th>
<th>Percent below poverty level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children under 18 years</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With related children under 18 years</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS, 2006 (Tables S1701 and S1702)

Figure 2-15: 1999 Individual and Family Poverty Rates Estimates, 2000 Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Household</th>
<th>Percent below poverty level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children under 18 years</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With related children under 18 years</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With related children under 5 years</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With householder 65 years and over</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married-couple families</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With related children under 18 years</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With related children under 5 years</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families with female householder, no husband present</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With related children under 18 years</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With related children under 5 years</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfamily householder</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder 65 years and over, living alone</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census ACS, 2006 (Tables, QT-P34, QT-P35, PCT55)
### Figure 2-16: 1999 Individual Poverty Rates Estimates By Race and Ethnicity, 2000 Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Percent below poverty level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, any race</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Alone, not Hispanic</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: U.S. Census ACS, 2006 (Tables, QT-P34, QT-P35, PCT55)*
2.2.2 Disproportionality of race/ethnicity among low-income and homeless people

People of Color Are Over-Represented Among the Homeless. Poverty disproportionately affects communities of color. In Seattle, African Americans make up a little over 8% of the total city population. In King county, African Americans represent 6% of the overall population but in the countywide shelter and transitional housing system (including Seattle) African Americans are the largest ethnic minority making up 36% of homeless individuals and 55% of families\(^\text{10}\).

Those who identified themselves as Latino or Hispanics made up 9% of those receiving shelter/transitional services, more than the roughly 5-6% within the county-wide population.

Native Americans make up less than 1% of the general population in King County, but among the homeless in the Safe Harbors system, they constituted 4.1% of homeless adults. Almost 7% of single homeless women were Native American.

Figure 2-17: Race of Those Served by Safe Harbors, 2007
(n=5,416 for All Individuals, 1,299 for Family Members)

Note that not all clients provided information. Percentages shown in this figure are based only on the 5,416 individuals and 1,299 family members who provided information, rather than on the full analysis dataset. Information on Hispanic/Latino origin is tabulated separately as per the U.S. Census Bureau.

\(^\text{10}\) City of Seattle Human Services Department, King County Department of Community & Human Services and United Way of King County, Homelessness in King County: Safe Harbors, January – December 2007, Summary 2008.
2.2.3 Seattle/King County is aging

This section summarizes the *Seattle/King County Area Agency on Aging 2008-2010 Strategic Plan*. Complete text of the plan is available at [http://www.agingkingcounty.org/docs/AreaPlan2008-2011_Final.pdf](http://www.agingkingcounty.org/docs/AreaPlan2008-2011_Final.pdf)

The 60 and over population is far from homogeneous -- it comprises several generations of people, with subtle-yet-significant differences in outlook, values and aspirations.

Figure 2-18: King County 60+ Population, Number and Percent of Total Population

- **Life expectancy is higher than it was in the past.** Thanks to remarkable advancements in medicine, nutrition, and general living standards, King County residents reaching the age of 60 can now expect to live about 32 years longer than someone born a century ago. This dramatic increase in life expectancy, from 47 years in 1900 to 79 years in 2000, is the main factor contributing to a significant increase in the number of older adults. Another factor is about to play out: the dramatic rise in birth rates after World War II known as the “baby boom.” This “boomer” generation is just beginning to turn 60, and will likely have profound effects on the aging services field.
• **Services for older adults must take increased life expectancy into account.** Programs and policies targeting the 60-and-over population must take into account the needs of at least three cohorts of older adults. While most “young old” (often defined as ages 60-74) adults are often active, healthy, and independent, those in the “older old” (75-84) and “oldest old” groups (85+) and older are more likely to face disabling conditions (Figure 2). This “age diversity” is an important consideration for policymakers.

**Figure 2-19: Rates of Disability in King County by Type and Age**

![Bar chart showing rates of disability by type and age.]

*Source: Seattle/King County Area Agency on Aging 2008-2011 Strategic Plan.*

While the number of 60+ residents has just begun its dramatic increase, the number of 85+ residents has been rising since 1990, and will continue to do so for the remainder of this decade (Figure 3).

• **The number of people older than 85 has risen steadily.** This cohort has the highest rates of disabling medical conditions. Improving services to this population while controlling costs represents one of the biggest challenges – and opportunities – for local service providers, including the Area Agency on Aging.
Figure 2-20: King County 85+ Population, Number and Percent of Total Population

Source: Seattle/King County Area Agency on Aging 2008-2011 Strategic Plan.
The Baby Boomers Arrive

The baby boomers represent the largest cohort to reach retirement age.

Figure 2-21: King County Population by 5-Year Age Cohorts, 2004

- The proportion of those 60 and older will increase through 2025. During the relatively stable decade of 1990-2000, King County’s 60-and-older population increased only modestly in number, and actually decreased as a percentage of the total population. However, by 2005 this percentage had turned positive again, and will see huge increases through at least the year 2025, when the number of those 60 or older is expected to reach 480,000 persons, or almost 23% of the total population.

- The baby boomer generation will change the concept of retirement. The size of the boomer generation has caused concern about spending on social programs, as well as finding the workforce necessary to support them. However, there is cause for optimism as well, as the boomers represent the healthiest and best-educated generation yet to retire. There is reason to believe they will challenge traditional definitions of and assumptions about retirement, in ways that constitute a net gain to the economy and society as a whole.
2.2.4 The proportion of foreign-born residents continues to increase

By 2000, nearly 17% of Seattle’s population is foreign-born, 40% more than a decade earlier.

Figure 2-22: Seattle’s Foreign Born Population by Place of Birth, 2006

- The proportion of foreign-born residents has increased dramatically. As of 2000, nearly 17% of Seattle residents were foreign-born.\textsuperscript{11} This translates into an increase of 95,000 people, a figure that is 40% higher than in 1990. Growth in the foreign-born population was four times higher than the city’s overall population growth during the 1990s. In the 2006 ACS, an estimated 19% of Seattle’s residents surveyed were foreign-born, a figure which likely represents a continued increase in both the number and percentage contribution of foreign-born persons to the fabric of the Seattle community.

- More than half of Seattle’s foreign-born residents were born in Asia. Despite higher rates of growth during the 1990s among people from Africa, the Americas, and Oceania, Asia still remained in 2000 and in 2006, the birthplace of more than half the city’s foreign-born residents. For a detailed analysis of the similarities and differences among

Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in Seattle, see “A Community of Contrasts”\textsuperscript{12} published by the Asian American Legal Center in 2006.

- **Some foreign-born residents will return to their native countries.** Not everyone born in a foreign country and now living in the U.S. is an immigrant. The foreign-born population includes diplomats, foreign students, and temporary workers—many of whom will return to their home country.

- **King County continues to be a significant resettlement area for refugees.** Voluntary resettlement agencies resettled 1,208 refugees in King County in 2007, including 325 from Somalia, 171 from Burma/Myanmar, 195 from the Ukraine, 104 from Russia, 70 from Burundi, 76 from Iran, 27 from Iraq, 15 from Vietnam, 23 from Eritrea, 60 from Ethiopia, 5 from Liberia, 7 from Sudan and 9 from Afghanistan.

- **The state as a whole ranks near the top in the nation as a resettlement location.** Washington ranks sixth in the nation in the number of refugees who have settled here. It also has the third largest population of secondary migrants (refugees who initially resettled in other parts of the country, but migrated to Seattle and other parts of the state).

- **Approximately 80,000 refugees now live in King County.** The Washington State Office of Refugee and Immigrant Assistance estimates that approximately 80,000 refugees currently live in King County. Approximately 42% of the refugees who live in the area are from Southeast Asian countries. However, a growing segment of this population is from East Africa, which now represents about 22% of the refugee population, and includes refugees from Ethiopia, Eritrea, Somalia, Liberia, Burundi and Sudan. Eastern Europeans make up 31% of the refugee population in King County; most live in South and East King County. Less than 10% of the refugee population is from the Middle East.

- **Refugee resettlement slowed following 9/11, but has since increased.** The more stringent screening of foreign arrivals to the U.S. following 9/11 is reflected in the decreased number of refugees admitted for resettlement in recent years. Admission ceilings nationally for new arrivals were radically reduced or were not met after 9/11. In 2001, 70,000 refugees were admitted to the country, but only 27,000 were admitted in 2002. Refugee admissions increased dramatically in 2003 when 20,529 were admitted nationally during the first six months of the year. Of this number, 31.5% were from the former Soviet Union, 31.9% were from Africa, 16.6% from the Near East, 6.9% from Asia and 1.2% from Latin America.

\textsuperscript{12}“A Community of Contrasts: Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in the United States”, Asian Pacific Legal Center of Southern California, pps 54-61, \url{www.advancingequality.org}. 
Those who speak a language other than English at home are less likely to have attended college and more likely to live in poverty. In 2006, among people who spoke only English at home, an estimated 17% had a high school education or less; and 10% were below poverty level. Among those who spoke a language other than English at home, approximately 42% had a high school education or less; and about 19% had incomes below poverty level. Still, it is important to note that almost 40% of persons speaking a language other than English at home have obtained a bachelor’s degree or above.
2.2.5 Employment sector profile

Recent Seattle job growth has been concentrated in services

Figure 2-24: Change in Seattle Covered Employment by Industry, 1995-2006

- The number of service sector jobs has increased, while the number of jobs in the goods sector has decreased. Virtually all service industries have been adding jobs over the last decade. Industries adding the most jobs in Seattle between 1995 and 2006 were professional, scientific and technical services, and health care and social assistance. Employment has fallen in the goods sector. Many goods-related industries have experienced employment declines since 1995, with manufacturing registering the largest drop.
The service industry includes a mix of occupations. Management, professional and related occupations account for over half of service industry jobs. These jobs generally require a high level of education and pay relatively high wages. Service occupations are the second largest group. This category includes food preparation, building and grounds maintenance, personal care, protective service and health care support occupations. Sales and office occupations account for most of the remaining service jobs.
Service industries employ a mix of high and lower wage workers

Figure 2-26: Median Earnings by Occupation, Seattle Residents, 2006

Most future job growth will be in high-wage and low-wage occupations. Technological change and globalization are driving growth at the high end of the occupational structure:

- Technological change increases the demand for workers who can use technology effectively;
- Technological change has eliminated some middle- and low-skill jobs;
- The country’s trade patterns favor high skill jobs; and
- Outsourcing has eliminated some middle-skill jobs.

Jobs that require personal contact will continue to grow. Low skill service jobs will continue to increase in number because many of those jobs require personal contact. They cannot be automated easily or outsourced.
Figure 2-27: U.S. Employment Change Forecast, 2006-16
With 2006 Median Earnings


Figure 2-28: Seattle-King County Top 5 Jobs - Highest numbers of openings
2009-2014
(2006 average wages)

Avg Wage: $18,401  $33,467  $38,752  $49,078  $71,292

13 Note: Transportation category includes such jobs as: air traffic controllers, bus drivers, commercial pilots, industrial truck operators, refuse and recyclable material collectors, taxi drivers, service station attendants, delivery truck drivers, heavy truck drivers, transportation workers, etc.
2.2.6 Multiple factors influence housing demand

Housing demand in the future will be influenced by workers’ preferences. One component of housing demand is the need for housing for a growing Seattle workforce. The nature of this demand will be shaped by the types of jobs that are created and the housing preferences of future workers. Although we cannot know the housing choices of future workers, we do have information about the housing choices of current workers. This information, when combined with employment forecasts, can provide insight into the future housing demand that will result from employment growth in Seattle.

This section presents data on the characteristics of Seattle workers’ households. To reduce complexity, only households with one or two workers were included in the analysis. This exclusion should not skew the analysis unduly, because households that have three workers account for a relatively small share of total households.¹⁴

Where do Seattle Workers Live?

Figure 2-29: Place of Residence for Households with One or Two Seattle Workers, 2000

- Half of Seattle workers live in Seattle; the other half live outside the city. In total, 51% of households with one or two Seattle workers live in Seattle; 49% live elsewhere.

¹⁴ NOTE: Household characteristics data for Seattle workers were taken from the Census Public Use Microdata (PUMS) sample file for Washington State. Census 2000 data were used instead of 2006 ACS data because the Census 2000 data have significantly lower margins of error for the data that identify place of work.
• **Most Seattle workers who live outside the city live elsewhere in King County.** Of those King County households, 51% live in South King County, 34% in East King County and 15% in North King County.

• **A small but significant number of Seattle workers live in Snohomish or Pierce counties.** Snohomish County, which is located to the north of King County, accounts for 10% of non-resident Seattle workers; Pierce County, which is located to the south and is farther from Seattle than Snohomish County, accounts for 5% of non-resident Seattle workers.
Residence Location by Type of Household

Figure 2-30: Place of Residence for Households with One or Two Seattle Workers, by Household Type, 2000

- **A majority of single-worker households live in Seattle.** Over 60% of single-worker households live and work in Seattle.

- **A higher proportion of households with two Seattle workers live in Seattle.** Of households with two Seattle workers, 65% live in Seattle; the remaining 35% live outside the city and both workers commute in.

- **A majority of two-worker households that have both a Seattle worker and a worker who is employed outside of the city live outside Seattle.** For households with two workers, one of whom works in Seattle and one of whom works outside the city, a full 75% live outside the city. Three-quarters of these households choose to live outside of the city. This is an interesting finding, since this is the only group for that the pull exerted by job location is essentially balanced between the city and non-city locations. This may suggest that the attraction of living outside of the city is strong for many households, particularly for those in which at least one person works outside the city. It may also reflect the fact that, although Seattle is the region’s major employment center, it does not contain sufficient housing for all Seattle workers.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Public Use Microdata Sample.
Place of Residence by Occupation

Figure 2-31: Occupation and Place of Residence for Workers in Households With One or Two Seattle Workers, 2000

- **Workers in management, professional and related occupations** are somewhat more likely to live in Seattle than outside of the city. This occupational group is expected to experience strong growth in future years.

- **Service workers** are split evenly between Seattle and other locations. This occupational group is expected to experience relatively strong growth in future years.

- **Workers in the slower growing “blue collar” occupational groups** exhibit a strong preference for living outside of the city. Only 35% of households with workers in the construction, extraction, and maintenance and production, transportation, and material moving occupations live in Seattle. This may be a result of workers’ need to find more affordable housing options than are available in Seattle.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Public Use Microdata Sample.
Place of Residence by Household Income

Figure 2-32: Median Household Income for Households with One or Two Seattle Workers, by Place of Residence, 2000

- **Incomes are higher for households that live outside Seattle.** For all three household types (one Seattle worker, two Seattle workers, and two workers split between Seattle and outside the city), households that live outside Seattle have higher incomes than households that live in Seattle.

- **The income gap between Seattle and non-Seattle residents is smallest for households that have a Seattle worker and a non-Seattle worker.** This finding may indicate that when workers in a household are split between their workplace, the household’s decision about where to live is based more on convenience than on affordability.

*Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Public Use Microdata Sample.*
Housing Tenure by Place of Residence

Figure 2-33: Housing Tenure for Households with One or Two Seattle Workers, by Place of Residence, 2000

- **In 2000, 59% of Seattle worker households owned their homes.** This was higher than the 48% homeownership rate for Seattle workers who lived in Seattle. (Note that between 2000 and 2006, the Seattle homeownership rate for all households (not simply workers) increased to 52%. It is unclear whether economic conditions will result in a decline of the homeownership rate.)

- **Homeownership rates for Seattle workers in 2000 were much higher for non-Seattle residents than for Seattle residents.** Of Seattle workers who lived outside the city in 2000, 71% were homeowners compared to 48% of Seattle workers who lived in the city.

- **The pattern of owner/renter characteristics mirrors the pattern of single family/multifamily characteristics** Residence outside Seattle is associated with high rates of homeownership and single family residence.
Dwelling Unit Type by Place of Residence

Figure 2-34: Dwelling Unit Type for Households with One or Two Seattle Workers, by Location, 2000

- In 2000, 63% of Seattle worker households lived in single family units. The housing stock within Seattle in 2000 was made up of 49% single family units and 51% multifamily units. The relatively high rate of single family residence for Seattle workers is due to the fact that roughly half of all Seattle workers in 2000 lived outside the city where single family homes were more common.

- Single family residence is much more prevalent for Seattle workers that live outside Seattle. Approximately 52% of Seattle workers living in Seattle in 2000 live in single family units; by contrast, 76% of Seattle workers who lived outside the city lived in single family units.

- The pattern of single-family – multi-family characteristics mirrors the pattern of owner-renter characteristics (see previous graph). Residence outside of the city is associated with high rates of both homeownership and single-family residence.

Source: U.S. Census, Public Use Microdata Sample.
Households with School Age Children by Place of Residence

Figure 2-35: Presence of School Age Children for Households With One or Two Seattle Workers, by Location, 2000

- **Most Seattle workers do not have school age children.** Only 26% of Seattle worker households in 2000 included school age children in 2000.

- **Seattle worker households living outside Seattle are much more likely to include children than those who live in Seattle.** Only 17% of Seattle worker households living inside the city had school age children, compared with 36% for Seattle worker households who lived outside the city.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Public Use Microdata Sample.
Household Location by Age of Householder

Figure 2-36: Age of Householder for Households With One or Two Seattle Workers, by Location, 2000

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Public Use Microdata Sample.
Note: Percentages add to 100% for each residence location (Seattle and Elsewhere).

- **Youngest and oldest worker households are more likely to live in Seattle.** Seattle worker households under age 35 and over age 64 are more likely to live in Seattle than to live outside the city.

- **Middle-aged workers are more likely to live outside the city.** Seattle worker households headed by people between 35 and 64 years of age are proportionately more likely to live outside Seattle than to live in the city.
2.2.7 Housing Affordability

Low- and moderate-income people, as well as many workers, cannot afford to live in Seattle.

A number of factors—such as quality of schools and neighborhoods and proximity to jobs and relatives—are important as households make choices about where to live. Housing cost is an equally important consideration. Unfortunately, the cost of housing in Seattle poses a barrier to many households who might want to live here.

Figure 2-37: Percent of Households That Are Severely Cost Burdened (Renters and Owners Combined)

Source: US Census, 2006 ACS, PUMS. Analysis does not include one-person student households. Note: the Census Bureau did not calculate housing cost burden for approximately 5,000 (or 2.1% of) households in Seattle.

- **About 16%** of all Seattle households pay more than half their income for housing. The number of Seattle households paying more than half of their income for housing is estimated from the American Community Survey PUMS analysis to be about 40,000 (not including one-person student households). This is considered by HUD to be a **severe** cost burden.

---

15 Many students receive financial gifts from parents and other sources. Some of this assistance may be unlikely to be counted in Census Bureau questionnaires. The analysis in this chapter excludes one-person student households only in order to reduce artificial upward skewing of cost burden rate estimates. (Students in households of 2+ persons are included because a number of these students may be supporting their own children.)
Severe cost burden is mostly borne by low-income households. The chart above shows the income levels of households (renters and owners combined) who pay more than half their income for housing. The largest share of households with a severe housing cost burden is made up of those with extremely low incomes. Roughly 43% of severely cost burdened households have incomes of 0-30% of Seattle Median Income (SMI). Households with incomes of 0-50% of SMI make up about 66% (or 26,000) of the households with a severe cost burden.
Workers in a number of different occupations cannot afford a one bedroom apartment. Five common Seattle occupations – food server, child care worker, retail salesperson, administrative assistant and paramedic – earn too little to afford the average one bedroom apartment. The average one bedroom apartment in Seattle requires an hourly wage of $19.52. That requires an annual income of $40,600 – over 70% of median income for a 1-person household.\textsuperscript{16}

Single-earner households, including single-parent families, often have difficulty affording a two bedroom/two bath apartment with wages in many common occupations. In addition to the occupations mentioned in the prior example, the average wage paid to high school teachers in the Seattle area is not enough to afford a two bedroom/two bath apartment. The average two bedroom/two bath apartment in Seattle requires an hourly wage of $30.17 in a full-time job, or an annual income of $62,760.

The average rent for a two bedroom/two bath apartment in Seattle is also not affordable for many two-earner households. For example, two-earner households earning average wages in any combination of the first three occupations on the chart on the previous page would not be able to afford such a unit, even with both earners working full time.

\textsuperscript{16} Median income information based on the 2006 American Community Survey PUMS income distribution converted to 2008 dollars.
• **Many workers cannot afford to buy a condominium.** Only one of the common Seattle occupations listed above – a computer software engineer – pays enough, on average, for a single job holder to afford the median-priced Seattle condo ($328,625). Even many two-earner households cannot afford to purchase the median priced condominium, which requires an hourly wage of $39.71. This translates into an annual income of $82,600 – 127% of the HUD-published median income for a 2-person household.  

• **Single family homes and townhomes are even less affordable.** The median-priced home in Seattle ($468,775) requires an hourly wage of $49.70 to be affordable. None of the common occupations listed above can afford to purchase this median-priced home with the average wages that employers in the Seattle area pay persons in these occupations. Some combinations of occupations in a two-earner household can afford a median-priced house or townhome; but others cannot. For example, a registered nurse and a retail sales clerk would earn just enough to afford the median-priced home, but a child care worker and paramedic’s combined income would not be high enough. Ensuring an affordable mortgage payment for such a home would require an annual income of $103,200 – 141% of the HUD-published median income for a 3-person household.

---

17 Affordability analysis assumes 0.876% of assessed value for annual taxes; $45 per month insurance; $300 per month condo fees; 6.24% 30-year fixed rate mortgage; and 35% front end ratio (housing costs as percent of gross income).

18 Assumes 0.876% of assessed value for annual taxes; $65 per month insurance; 6.24% 30 year fixed rate mortgage; and 35% front end ratio (housing costs as percent of gross income).
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3.1 Housing Market Analysis – Impact on No- to Moderate-Income Households

Introduction

*Seattle’s housing market is in flux*

- **Rents have increased recently after several years of flat rents.** Average rents for apartments in Seattle held steady during the early years of the decade, but began to increase during the last two years. Condominium conversions spiked in 2006, constraining the supply of rentals, but have since dropped sharply. Still, rents have continued to increase into the spring of 2008, an average of 10% over spring 2007 rents. Rents are projected to increase by 17% through the end of 2010 (for an average annual rate of 5.9%).

- **More than 21,000 renter households pay more than half their income for rent.** Due in part to rising rents, approximately 18% of all Seattle renter households (excluding one-person student households) now pay more than half their income for rent. These severely cost burdened households, over 60% of whom have very low incomes, could be at risk for housing loss.

- **The homeownership rate in Seattle had been falling in recent decades, but increased significantly between 2000 and 2006.** By 2006, the homeownership rate had risen above 50% (to 52%) for the first time since 1980. However, tightened credit requirements may cause Seattle’s homeownership rate to remain steady or even decline over the next several years.

- **Home prices have begun to decline, but remain higher than many households can afford.** Seattle home and condominium prices rose steadily during the early years of the decade, significantly outpacing growth in wages. The median price of homes in Seattle reached $500,000 in the second quarter of 2007. Median home prices have declined since then, to $468,775 in June 2008.

- **More than 18,000 homeowner households pay more than half their income for housing costs.** Due in part to Seattle’s high home prices, approximately 14% of all Seattle homeowner households now pay more than half their income for housing costs (excluding one-person student households). These severely cost burdened owner households, almost 70% of whom have low or moderate incomes, could be at risk of foreclosure.

- **Seattle added more than 12,000 units between the beginning of 2004 and June of 2008.** During that period, Seattle grew at an average rate of nearly 3,000 units per year. Growth continued at a high rate during the first half of 2008. By June of 2008, there were approximately 296,000 total housing units in the city.
3.1.1 Income of Households

Income Distribution of Seattle Households

*Seattle has many lower income and higher income households*

Figure 3-1: Income Distribution of Seattle Households
Relative to Seattle Median Income (SMI), 2006

Source: U.S. Census American Community Survey, 2006 PUMS. Analysis does not include one-person student households.

- Nearly 70% of Seattle households are either low-income or wealthy; less than one-third are middle-income. As the chart above shows, about 38% of households are low-income (incomes of 80% of median income or less); and 31% are wealthy (incomes that are 151% of median income or more). Only 31% of Seattle households are middle-income, with incomes between 81% and 150% of median income.

- Over half of renters have incomes below 80% of median. Slightly over half (an estimated 55%) of renters have incomes that are 80% of median income or less, compared with about 23% of homeowners and 38% of all households.

- Nearly half of all homeowners are higher income households. Roughly 43% of homeowners have incomes that are 151% of median income or more, compared with about 17% of renters and 31% of all households.

---

19 Median income information is based on the 2006 American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) income data, excluding one-person student households. See Note 2 at the end of the Housing Market chapter for more information about the use of 2006 American Community Survey PUMS estimates.
Income Distribution by Age
Household income varies by age; many seniors are living on low, fixed incomes

Figure 3-2: Household Income by Age of Householder

- **Younger adult heads of household** (ages 25-44) make up over one-third of Seattle’s households, and make up the bulk of households with incomes between $50,000 and $99,999.

- **Baby boomer heads of household** (ages 45-64) make up the largest share of the lowest income (those with incomes of less than $15,000 a year), and the very wealthy (those with incomes over $200,000 a year).

- **Older adult heads of household** (age 65 and over) tend to have incomes that are lower than incomes for other age groups. This is largely related to the fact that many older adults are retired and no longer wage earners, and also to the fact that older households are more likely to contain only one person. The majority of older adult households have incomes of $50,000 or less. Many seniors have assets (such as a home or retirement savings) but little income: in 2006, 12.8% of Seattle residents older than 65 lived in poverty.

---

20 While by no means immune to poverty, senior-headed households who own their home were less likely to be poor than households generally. Senior households who were renters were much more likely to have incomes under the poverty threshold than both senior owners and households generally.
### 3.1.2 General Characteristics of the Housing Market

#### Number of Housing Units

*Seattle added almost 12,000 units from the beginning of 2004 to June 2008*

![Figure 3-3: Number of Housing Units, Seattle](image)

**Source:** Estimates from Seattle Department of Planning & Development, 2008.

- **Rapid pace of growth.** From the beginning of 2004 through June 2008, the number of housing units in Seattle increased by almost 12,000 or about 4%. Annual growth during these years averaged almost 3,000 units per year. Growth was particularly rapid during 2007, when approximately 3,700 housing units were added. A fast pace of growth continued during the first half of 2008, when an additional 1,900 units were permitted, bringing the total number of housing units in Seattle to approximately 296,000. High growth rates are expected to continue during the next two years as units now under construction are completed.

- **Share of regional growth.** As indicated in Seattle’s Comprehensive Plan, the City’s 20-year household growth target for the period 2004 to 2024 is an additional 47,000 households. This represents the share of growth projected for King County that Seattle is planning for under the state Growth Management Act. Given the pace with which housing units have been added during the first four years of this period, the City is on track to meet these targets.

---

21 Notes: Housing unit estimates shown are for the end of each calendar year except for the 2008 estimate, which is current through the end of June. Unit estimates include vacant units as well as occupied units. The category of “Housing Units Added” during each year reflects the number of permits finaled.
Housing Condition

Earthquake safety a key issue for Seattle

• **Approximately 200 residential buildings may need seismic retrofitting.** A recent study commissioned by the City of Seattle’s Department of Planning and Development (DPD) estimates that there are approximately 200 residential un-reinforced masonry buildings (URM’s) in the city. Most of these buildings have not been seismically retrofitted.

• **Regulations may be changed.** Currently, Seattle requires seismic retrofits when a building is undergoing substantial alterations or significantly increasing the number of units in the building. However, given new scientific information about the risk of earthquake in Seattle and information about the number of URM’s, decision makers are determining how to respond. One option may require all URM’s to be seismically reinforced within a certain amount of time.

• **City-subsidized housing units are monitored and upgraded as needed.** The City of Seattle’s Office of Housing has a long-standing practice of upgrading buildings in the existing low-income rental housing inventory. From this inventory, a total of 63 URM buildings containing 4,000 units have been identified. For these buildings, upgrades have included some level of seismic retrofits.

Overcrowding

About 1 in 20 households may live in overcrowded conditions

• **The year 2000 Census estimates that about 5% of all Seattle households were overcrowded.** According to a common measure of overcrowding employed by the Census Bureau, overcrowding occurs when a household must live with more than one person per bedroom. In both the 2000 Census and the 2006 American Community Survey (ACS), the estimated percentage of households living in overcrowded conditions is higher for renter households than for owners. The 2000 Census estimate for the share of renter households in overcrowded conditions is 7%, while in the 2006 ACS it is 3%. For owner households, the 2000 Census estimated that 2% were overcrowded, while the 2006 ACS estimated 1%. For comparison, the national rate of overcrowding is 5.75% of all households.\(^\text{22}\)

\(^{22}\) The 2006 ACS provides a lower, but potentially less accurate overcrowding estimate of 1.6% of Seattle households. Even though the ACS data are more recent, the percentages from the last census may be a better estimate and suggest that the problem of overcrowding may be more significant in our city. ACS estimates have much larger relative margins of error than do estimates from the last decennial census. Additionally, the level of outreach to difficult-to-enumerate households—e.g., linguistically isolated households—has tended to be greater for the decennial census than for the ACS.

\(^{23}\) Source: Simmons, Patrick A., Patterns and Trends in Overcrowded Housing: Early Results from Census 2000, Fannie Mae Foundation Census Note 09, August 2002, p. 16.
3.1.3 Rental Market Characteristics

Rent Levels

*Sharp increases since 2006 after several years of flat rents*

**Figure 3-4: Average Apartment Rents in Seattle**

- **Average rents for apartments in Seattle held steady from 2002 to 2006**, but have begun to increase sharply over the last two years.

- **Studio.** The spring 2008 rent for the average studio was $861, an 11% increase from 2007. A one-earner household would need an hourly wage of $16.56 to afford the average studio rent.\(^{24}\)

- **One Bedroom.** The spring 2008 rent for the average one bedroom apartment was $1,015, a 10% increase from 2007. A one-earner household would need an hourly wage of $19.52.

- **Two Bedroom.** The spring 2008 rent for the average two bedroom/two bath apartment was $1,569, a 10% increase from 2007. For a one-earner household, this unit would require an hourly wage of $30.17. A two-earner household with two full-time jobs averaging $15.08 per hour could also afford the same apartment.

- **Rents are anticipated to continue to rise.** Dupre+Scott Apartment Advisors forecasts that rents will climb 17% from April 2008 to December 2010. That is a 5.9% average annual increase.

\(^{24}\) *Estimates of wages required to afford average rents are based on each earner working 40 hours per week. An affordable rent is considered to be any amount less than or equal to 30% of one month’s earnings.*
• **Rents are higher in newer units.** As the chart above shows, rents for units of all types are significantly higher for newer units (those built since 2005).

  ![Figure 3-5: Average Rents by Age of Building](chart)

  *Source: Estimates from Dupre + Scott Apartment Advisors, Spring 2008.*

• **Apartment availability varies by location.** Downtown and First Hill contain more than a quarter of all rental units (28%). North of 85th and Ballard/Greenlake contain one-third (33%). Fewer than 5% are located in either West Seattle or Beacon Hill/Rainier Valley.

  ![Figure 3-6: Distribution of Seattle Rental Units by Neighborhood, 2008](chart)

  *Source: Estimates from Dupre + Scott Apartment Advisors, Spring 2008.*

• **Rents also vary by location.** The most affordable rents tend to be North of 85th and in Beacon Hill/Rainier Valley. As shown in the map on the next page, market rents average from a low of $702 per month in Rainier Valley to over twice that amount ($1,488 per month) in Downtown. Although apartments in South Seattle tend to be affordable to lower-income families, those neighborhoods do not have as many apartments relative to other, higher density areas in Seattle.
Overall Average Rent Levels by Neighborhood
2006 – 2008

Rents are not adjusted for inflation.

Source: Dupre+Scott Spring 2008
Vacancy Rates
*Increased competition for apartments has driven up rents*

**Figure 3-8: Apartment Vacancy Rates**

- **Vacancy rates were higher earlier this decade.** For most of the early years of the decade, apartment vacancy rates were well above 5%, a key factor in keeping rents stable.

- **Vacancy rates have declined sharply, causing rents to rise.** Since 2005, vacancy rates have declined sharply to an average of under 3% for all units combined. These very low vacancy rates have made it difficult for many to find an affordable apartment. The rental market has tightened in part because home prices and financing have made it difficult for many Seattle residents to purchase a home.

*Source: Dupre + Scott Apartment Advisors, Spring 2008.*
Rental Affordability

Many workers in the area cannot afford Seattle rents

Figure 3-9: Average Wages and Affordability of Average Rents


- **Workers in a number of different occupations cannot afford a one bedroom apartment.** Five common Seattle occupations – food server, child care worker, retail salesperson, administrative assistant and paramedic – earn too little to afford the average one bedroom apartment. The average one bedroom apartment in Seattle requires an hourly wage of $19.52. That requires an annual income of $40,600 – over 70% of median income for a 1-person household.  

- **Single-earner households, including single-parent families, often have difficulty affording a two bedroom/two bath apartment with wages in many common occupations.** In addition to the occupations mentioned in the prior example, the average wage paid to high school teachers in the Seattle area is not enough to afford a two bedroom/two bath apartment. The average two bedroom/two bath apartment in Seattle requires an hourly wage of $30.17 in a full-time job, or an annual income of $62,760.

- **The average rent for a two bedroom/two bath apartment in Seattle is also not affordable for many two-earner households.** For example, two-earner households earning average wages in any combination of the first three occupations on the chart on the previous page would not be

---

25 Median income information based on the 2006 American Community Survey PUMS income distribution converted to 2008 dollars.
able to afford such a unit, even with both earners working full time.

**Rental Affordability for Minimum Wage Workers**
*Those earning minimum wage cannot afford Seattle rents*

- **Rents are too high for minimum wage workers.** Seattle’s average market rents are out of reach for workers with jobs paying Washington State’s 2008 minimum wage of $8.07 per hour. Even studio apartments would require two people working 40 hours a week, 52 weeks a year in order to avoid a housing cost burden. The table below summarizes those findings.

- **High rent levels can lead to poor quality of life.** Because of the disconnect between average rents and what a minimum wage worker earns, many low-income households must spend a large portion of their income on rent. This often means that very little is available for food, transportation, child care, and other expenses, and may leave low-income renters at risk of homelessness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Type</th>
<th>Monthly Rent</th>
<th>Recommended Monthly Wage to Afford Rent (at 30% of Income)</th>
<th>Hours Needed per Week to Afford Monthly Rent at Recommended 30% of Income</th>
<th>Number of Workers Needed at 40 Hours per Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>$861</td>
<td>$2,870</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 BR</td>
<td>$1,015</td>
<td>$3,383</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 BR/1BA</td>
<td>$1,109</td>
<td>$3,697</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 BR/2 BA</td>
<td>$1,569</td>
<td>$5,230</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 BR/2 BA</td>
<td>$1,731</td>
<td>$5,770</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: City of Seattle Office of Housing, 2008.*
Severely Cost Burdened Renter Households
More than 21,000 renter households pay more than half their income for rent

Figure 3-11: Income of Renter Households Paying More than Half of Income for Rent

Source: US Census, 2006 American Community Survey PUMS. Analysis does not include one-person student households. Note that the U.S. Census Bureau does not have cost burden data for approximately 4,800 (or 4.2% of) of renter households. *Income figures are 2006 Seattle Median Income for two-person households, shown in 2008 dollars (see Note 1 at the end of the Housing Market section for more information). The dollar figures are included to show context only.

- **Roughly 18% of Seattle renter households pay more than half their income for rent.** The number of Seattle renter households paying more than half of their income for rent is estimated at 21,400 (not including one-person student households).

- **Severe cost burden is mostly borne by extremely low-income households.** The chart above shows the income levels of those who pay more than half their income for rent, demonstrating that the most severe housing cost burden is shouldered by extremely low-income households. Those with incomes between 0 and 30% of the Seattle median income make up more than 60% of the renter households in Seattle with a severe cost burden.

- **About 9% of Seattle renter households pay more than three-quarters of their income for rent.** The number of Seattle renter households paying more than three-quarters of their income for rent is estimated at roughly 10,600 (not including one-person student households). About eight in ten of these very severely cost burdened renter households have incomes between 0 and 30% of the Seattle median income.
Age of Householders in Severely Cost Burdened Renter Households

*Older renters more likely to face a severe cost burden*

Figure 3-12: Age of Renter Householders Paying More than Half of Income for Rent

![Pie chart showing age distribution of severely cost burdened renters](image)

Source: US Census, 2006 American Community Survey PUMS. Analysis does not include one-person student households.

- **Severely cost burdened renter householders are divided among age groups.** About 16% of the severely cost burdened heads of household in the sample analyzed are 25 years old or younger. Another 27% are between 26 and 40; 35% are between 41 and 62; and 22% are older than 62.

Figure 3-13: Percentage of Renter Householders in Each Age Group Who Pay More than Half Their Income for Rent

![Bar chart showing percentage of renters in each age group](image)

Source: US Census, 2006 American Community Survey PUMS. Analysis does not include one-person student households.

- **Older renters are more likely to face a severe cost burden.** About 18% of the renter households in the American Community Survey sample analyzed face a severe cost burden. However, several age groups in the sample face a higher than average likelihood of severe cost burden. Older renter households face the highest likelihood: 28% of renter householders older than 62 face a severe cost burden. These older renters make up 15% of all renter households, but, as the pie chart at the top of the page shows, they make up 22% of all renters who face a severe cost burden.
Race of Householders in Severely Cost Burdened Renter Households

African American, Native American renters more likely to face a severe cost burden

Figure 3-14: Race of Renter Householders Paying More than Half of Income for Rent

Source: US Census, 2006 American Community Survey PUMS. Analysis does not include one-person student households.

- Because most renters are white, most cost burdened renters are white. In the sample analyzed, 60% of renter householders with a severe cost burden are white. However, this is less than the proportion of white renters overall (70%).

Figure 3-15: Percentage of Renter Households in Each Race Group Who Pay More than Half Their Income for Rent

Source: US Census, 2006 American Community Survey. Analysis does not include one-person student households.

- African American and Native American renters have a higher chance of facing a severe cost burden. As noted previously, the analysis performed suggests that roughly 18% of renter households face a severe cost burden. However, some households are disproportionately more likely to be burdened by unaffordable housing costs: nearly 40% of African American renters and 36% of Native American renters face a severe cost burden. African American renter households make up only 9% of all renter households, but 18% of renters with severe cost burden. However, because there are more white renter households in Seattle overall, a higher absolute number of white households face a severe cost burden.
Type of Severely Cost Burdened Renter Households
Singles, female single-parent families more likely to face a severe cost burden

Figure 3-16: Type of Renter Households Paying More than Half Their Income for Rent

Source: US Census, 2006 American Community Survey PUMS. Analysis does not include one-person student households.

- The largest group of severely cost burdened renters is single-person households. In the data sample analyzed, single-person households make up 54% of all renter households, but make up 63% of renters with a severe cost burden.

Figure 3-17: Percentage of Renter Households of Each Type Who Pay More than Half Their Income for Rent

Source: US Census, 2006 American Community Survey PUMS. Analysis does not include one-person student households.

- Female-headed single-parent families are more likely to face a severe cost burden. On average, a renter household in our sample had an 18% chance of facing a severe cost burden. Among female-headed single-parent families (who make up 8% of all renter households), about a third face a severe cost burden. As noted previously, single-person renters are less likely to face a severe cost burden (22% of single person renters) but because there are more of these households, their absolute numbers are higher.
Size of Severely Cost Burdened Renter Households

Single person households more likely, and two-person households less likely, to face a severe cost burden

Figure 3-18: Size of Renter Households Paying More than Half Their Income for Rent

Source: US Census, 2006 American Community Survey PUMS. Analysis does not include one-person student households.

Figure 3-19: Percentage of Renter Households of Each Size Who Pay More than Half Their Income for Rent

Source: US Census, 2006 American Community Survey. Analysis does not include one-person student households.

- Single-person households in the sample analyzed are more likely to face a severe cost burden. While 18% of renter households overall face a severe cost burden, 22% of single-person households face a severe cost burden; 20% of households with four or more people face a severe cost burden.

- Fewer two-person households face a severe cost burden. A comparatively small share (11%) of the two-person households analyzed face a severe cost burden.
Number of Children in Severely Cost Burdened Renter Households
Singles, large families more likely to face a severe cost burden

Figure 3-20: Number of Children in Severely Cost Burdened Renter Households

Source: US Census, 2006 American Community Survey PUMS. Analysis does not include one-person student households.

- Most severely cost burdened renter households do not have children. Renters without children make up 87% of all renter households, and 86% of severely cost burdened renter households.

Figure 3-21: Percentage of Renter Households Paying More than Half Their Income for Rent by Number of Children

Source: US Census, 2006 American Community Survey PUMS. Analysis does not include one-person student households.

- Households with two or more children are more likely to face a severe cost burden. Overall, 18% of renter households face a severe cost burden. Families in the sample with two or more children are more likely to face a severe cost burden (30% of those with two children, 28% of those with three or more children). However, because there are fewer renter households with children, they make up a lower absolute number of those with severe cost burden.
3.1.4 Homeownership Market Characteristics

Homeownership Rate

Seattle’s homeownership rate is above 50% for the first time since 1980

Figure 3-22: Estimated Percentage of Seattle Households That are Owners

- **Homeownership rates have increased nationally.** Nationally, since 1940, the trend of increasing homeownership rates was interrupted only during the 1980s. Census Bureau estimates indicate that the nation’s homeownership rate increased further between the 2000 Census and the 2006 American Community Survey (from 66.2% to 67.3%, +/- 0.1%).

- **Between 2000 and 2006, Seattle reversed a three-decade-long trend, and joined the national trend of rising homeownership rates.** Seattle’s homeownership rate fell between the 1970 Census and the 2000 Census, but increased between 2000 and 2006. In 2006, the U.S. Census Bureau’s annual American Community Survey estimated that the homeownership rate in Seattle was once again above 50% (to 51.9%, +/-1.4%). This marked the first time since 1980 that more than half of Seattle households were homeowners. Factors behind the increase in Seattle’s homeownership rate since 2000 included several of the same factors that drove increases in homeownership in the nation as a whole, even in the face of increasing home prices: creative financing mechanisms that required lower down payments, adjustable mortgage rates, and the development of smaller, more affordable condominiums and town homes.

- **The trend toward rising homeownership rates is beginning to stall nationally and may also begin to do so locally.** National homeownership rates, as estimated by the Census Bureau’s Housing Vacancy Survey, peaked in the second quarter of 2004 and have fallen five of the last seven quarters. Tightening lending requirements and increasing foreclosures may cause Seattle’s homeownership rate to remain steady or even decline over the next several years.

• **Area foreclosures have increased.** Following national trends, foreclosures in King and Snohomish Counties have begun to increase. According to information collected by RealtyTrac, an Irvine, California, company, 1,030 properties in the two-county area had foreclosure filings in July 2008, up 41% from July 2007 and 13% from June 2008. The Seattle area’s foreclosure rate has been lower than the median for other cities tracked, however.\(^{26}\)

\(^{26}\) Cohen, Aubrey, “Foreclosures up 13% from June, 41% from 2007, realty report shows,” Seattle Post-Intelligencer, August 14, 2008.
Housing Sales Prices
Buying a home, especially a single-family home or townhome, remains out of reach for many households

Figure 3-23: Home Sale Prices and Household Incomes in Seattle

| Source: Sales prices for existing and new construction homes from Northwest Multiple Listing Service; income estimates from Seattle Finance Department. Note: Figures not adjusted for inflation. |

- **Home price increases have outpaced wages.** In 2000, the estimated median household earned $48,981; by 2008, a rough projection is that median income increased 31%, to roughly $64,000 per year. Meanwhile, in 2000, Seattle’s median single family home price, per the Northwest Multiple Listing Service, was $270,575; less than a decade later, the median single family home price had increased 73%, to $468,775.

- **Home prices are beginning to go down.** The cost of the median-priced home in Seattle reached nearly $500,000 in the second quarter of 2007. Median home prices declined 7% between June 2007 and March 2008, to $462,000, but have since increased slightly, to $468,775 in June 2008.

- **Condominium prices continue to increase.** The cost of the median priced condo in Seattle increased from $298,125 in 2006 to $323,100 in 2007 to $328,625 in June 2008.

The map on the next page shows median home and condominium sales prices by neighborhood for January through June 2008.

---

27 Income estimates are rough. These are based on the 2000 Census and 2006 American Community Survey, with rates of change based on per capita income growth estimates and forecasts from the Puget Sound Economic Forecaster, June 2008.
Figure 3-24: Seattle Median Home and Condominium Prices (Existing & New Construction Combined)

Source: NWMLS, January-June 2008
Condominium Conversions
Condominium conversions peaked in 2006 and have dropped sharply since then

Figure 3-25: Seattle Condominium Conversions

Source: Dupre+Scott Apartment Advisors, Condominium Conversion and Reconversion Lists, 9/5/08.

- **Condominium conversions peaked in 2006.** Condominium conversions (the conversion of rental units into ownership units) increased steadily during the early years of the decade, peaking in 2006 with 6,756 conversions. Market analysts note that the increasing number of condominium conversions in Seattle contributed to rising rents during that period.

- **Conversions dropped sharply in 2007 and 2008.** The number of condominium conversions dropped as the housing market slowed. Conversions dropped 35% in 2007 from the previous year’s total, to 4,380 conversions; and in 2008 through the end of August, there have been only 291 condo conversions.

- **Some condominium units are now being reconverted to rental.** As the for-sale housing market has slowed during 2007 and 2008, 436 units that had been converted to condominiums have actually been reconverted to rental units. The reconversions provide further evidence of Seattle’s strong rental market.
Ownership Affordability

Many Seattle workers cannot afford to own a home

Figure 3-26: Average Wages and Affordability

- Many workers cannot afford to buy a condominium. Only one of the common Seattle occupations listed above – a computer software engineer – pay enough, on average, for a single job holder to afford the median-priced Seattle condo ($352,300 as of June 2008). Even many two-earner households cannot afford to purchase the median priced condominium, which requires an hourly wage of $42.16. This translates into an annual income of $87,700 – 135% of the HUD-published median income for a 2-person household.  

- Single-family homes and townhomes are even less affordable. The median-priced home in Seattle ($484,025) requires an hourly wage of $51.18 to be affordable. Workers in any of the common occupations listed above cannot afford to purchase this median-priced home with the average wages that employers in the Seattle area pay persons in these occupations. Some combinations of occupations in a two-earner household can afford a median-priced house or townhome; but others cannot. For example, a registered nurse and a retail sales clerk would earn just enough to afford the median-priced home, but a child care worker and paramedic’s combined income would not be high enough. Ensuring an affordable mortgage payment for such a home would require an annual income of $106,500 – 145% of the HUD-published median income for a 3-person household.

Source: Wage information for Seattle-Bellevue-Everett Metro area from State Employment Security Department, 2008; median home sale prices for January-June 2008 from Northwest Multiple Listing Service; affordability calculations by Seattle Office of Housing

---

28 Affordability analysis assumes 0.876% of assessed value for annual taxes; $45 per month insurance; $300 per month condo fees; 6.24% 30-year fixed rate mortgage; and 35% front end ratio (housing costs as percent of gross income).

29 Assumes 0.876% of assessed value for annual taxes; $65 per month insurance; 6.24% 30 year fixed rate mortgage; and 35% front end ratio (housing costs as percent of gross income).
Severely Cost Burdened Owner Households
More than 18,000 homeowners pay more than half their income for housing costs

Figure 3-27: Income of Owner Households Paying More than Half of Income for Housing

Source: US Census, 2006 American Community Survey PUMS. Totals do not include one-person student households. Note that the U.S. Census Bureau does not have cost burden data for approximately 270 (or 0.2% of) owner households.

*Income figures are 2006 Seattle Median Income for two-person households, shown in 2008 dollars (see Note 1 at the end of the Housing Market section for more information). The dollar figures are included to show context only.

- **American Community Survey PUMS data suggest that about 14% of Seattle homeowners pay more than half their income for housing costs.** Based on this analysis, the number of Seattle homeowner households paying more than half of their income for housing costs is estimated at about 19,000 (not including one-person student households). The estimates regarding cost burden among homeowners includes owner households who currently have a mortgage, as well as those who do not.

- **Severe cost burden is distributed among income groups.** The chart above shows the income levels of homeowner households who pay more than half their income for housing costs: 67% of those households earn 0-80% of the Seattle median income, but another 33% earn more than 80% of median income.

- **Homeowners with a severe cost burden are at greater risk of foreclosure.** Households who must pay more than half their income for housing, particularly those with low incomes, may find it difficult to make payments on their mortgage and therefore may be at risk of foreclosure. As previously discussed, foreclosure rates are currently on the rise in Seattle, as they are in the nation as a whole.
Most severely cost burdened homeowners are older than 40

Figure 3-28: Age of Homeowner Householders
Paying More than Half of Income for Housing

Source: US Census, 2006 American Community Survey PUMS. Analysis does not include one-person student households.

- Most of the homeowners who are severely cost burdened are older than 40, because most homeowners overall are older than 40. In the sample analyzed, three-quarters of severely cost burdened heads of homeowner household are in the 40+ age group. About a quarter (26%) of severely cost burdened homeowner households are headed by someone older than 62, while these households make up only 21% of all homeowner households.

Figure 3-29: Percentage of Homeowner Householders in Each Age Group Who Pay More than Half Their Income for Housing

Source: US Census, 2006 American Community Survey PUMS. Analysis does not include one-person student households.

- Young homeowners are most likely to face a severe cost burden, but their absolute numbers are small. Among homeowners younger than 25 (only 0.3% of the sample analyzed), about one-third face a severe cost burden.
Race of Severely Cost Burdened Homeowner Households

Non-white homeowners more likely to face a severe cost burden

Figure 3-30: Race of Homeowner Householders Paying More than Half of Income for Housing

Source: US Census, 2006 American Community Survey PUMS. Analysis does not include one-person student households.

- Most homeowner householders in Seattle are white, so most owner households with severe cost burden are white. White homeowners make up 73% of all homeowners who face a severe cost burden in the sample analyzed. However, that is less than the proportion of white homeowners overall (81%).

Figure 3-31: Percentage of Homeowner Householders in Each Race Group Who Pay More than Half Their Income for Housing

Source: US Census, 2006 American Community Survey PUMS. Analysis does not include one-person student households.

- Non-white homeowners are more likely to face a severe cost burden. Overall, 14% of homeowner households face a severe cost burden. Non-white homeowners are more likely to face a severe cost burden. However, because a relatively small proportion of the homeowners in Seattle are of a race other than white, the absolute number of cost-burdened non-white homeowners is relatively low.
Type of Severely Cost Burdened Homeowner Households
Single parent and single homeowners most likely to face a severe cost burden

Figure 3-32: Type of Homeowner Households Paying More than Half of Income for Housing

Source: US Census, 2006 American Community Survey PUMS. Analysis does not include one-person student households.

- **Single-person households are most likely to be severely cost burdened.** In the sample analyzed, nearly 50% of homeowner households paying more than half of their income for housing are single-person households (By contrast, single-person households made up only 31% of the owner households in the sample.) Another 30% of severely cost burdened households are married families (with or without children), although married families make up 51% of all owner households. Female-headed single parent households make up 11% of those with severe cost burden.

Figure 3-33: Percentage of Homeowner Households of Each Type Who Pay More than Half Their Income for Housing

Source: US Census, 2006 American Community Survey PUMS. Analysis does not include one-person student households.

- **Single-parent families and single homeowners are most likely to face a severe cost burden.** Overall, 14% of homeowner households face a severe cost burden. Among single-parent families, however, an estimated 23% (female-headed) and 21% (male-headed) face a severe cost burden; 22% of one-person households face a severe cost burden.
Size of Severely Cost Burdened Homeowner Households

*Single homeowners most likely to face a severe cost burden*

**Figure 3-34: Size of Homeowner Households Paying More than Half of Income for Housing**

- **One-person households make up the largest proportion of severely cost burdened owner households.** As noted previously, while less than one-third of all homeowner households in the sample reviewed are single-person households, they make up 49% of those with a severe cost burden. Households with two people make up 37% of all owner households, but only 29% of those with a severe cost burden.

**Figure 3-35: Percentage of Homeowner Households of Each Size Who Pay More than Half Their Income for Housing**

- **Single-person homeowner households are more likely to face a severe cost burden.** Overall, 14% of homeowner households face a severe cost burden. Among single-person owner households, 22% face a severe cost burden, a higher rate than for any other size of owner household.
Children in Severely Cost Burdened Homeowner Households

Singles, large families most likely to face a severe cost burden

**Figure 3-36: Number of Children in Homeowner Households Paying More than Half of Income for Housing**

Source: US Census, 2006 American Community Survey PUMS. Analysis does not include one-person student households.

- The majority of severely cost burdened owner households do not include children, just as the majority of owner households overall do not include children. Owner households without children make up 75% of all homeowner households, and 78% of owners with severe cost burden.

**Figure 3-37: Likelihood of Severe Homeowner Cost Burden by Number of Children**

Source: US Census, 2006 American Community Survey PUMS. Analysis does not include one-person student households.

- Households with three or more children are more likely to face a severe cost burden. Overall, 14% of homeowner households face a severe cost burden. Among homeowner households, approximately 2% have three or more children, but 34% of these larger families face a severe cost burden. Because so few families have this many children in Seattle, however, their absolute numbers are relatively low.
3.1.5 Subsidized Housing: Numbers and Location

Total Subsidized Rental Housing Units
Nearly 16% of rental stock is subsidized

- **Seattle has an estimated 22,000 subsidized rental housing units.** Seattle has a strong network of non-profit housing developers in addition to the Seattle Housing Authority, one of the best public housing authorities in the nation. Together, the federal government, state, county and city governments, and private organizations have funded an estimated 22,000 subsidized rental housing units for low-income families and individuals. These units are located throughout the city, with the highest concentration in downtown.

**Figure 3-38: Affordability of Subsidized Rental Units in Seattle**

Note that median income levels are HUD-designated, and differ from ACS median income for City of Seattle.

- **The majority of subsidized rental units are affordable to those earning less than half the median income.** More than three-quarters of all subsidized housing units in Seattle are affordable to households earning 0-50% of median income: nearly half are affordable to households earning less than 30% of median income.
Figure 3-39: Subsidized Housing in Seattle

Note that tenant-based voucher locations are not shown on this map due to privacy laws.
Source: Seattle Office of Housing, 2008
City of Seattle and Seattle Housing Authority Units

Local voters have supported production of subsidized housing

- **City of Seattle housing production.** The Seattle Office of Housing has used Seattle voter-approved housing levy proceeds, federal funds and other subsidies to secure over 9,600 low-income units in 261 buildings. The following chart breaks the portfolio down by income limits of households served:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Limit</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-30% AMI</td>
<td>4,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-50% AMI</td>
<td>3,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-80% AMI</td>
<td>1,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,655</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Seattle Office of Housing, Spring 2008.*

- **Seattle Housing Authority (SHA) owns or manages 7,800 rental units** and administers over 6,000 Housing Choice Vouchers. Among SHA programs, 81 to 96% of households have incomes below 30% AMI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 8 New Construction</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income Public Housing</td>
<td>5,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle Senior Housing Program</td>
<td>993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOPE VI non-public rental housing</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other affordable housing</td>
<td>1,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHA managed, owned by others</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,811</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Seattle Housing Authority, FY 2007 Moving To Work Annual Report, p. 21.*

SHA classifies the condition of its units as good. SHA is midway through “homeWorks,” an effort to renovate 22 public housing high-rises. This renovation project has been funded from a combination of low-income housing tax credit investment and bonds, and will be repaid using a portion of the public housing capital grant from HUD over the next 20 years. Projects funded through “homeWorks” include exterior repairs, mechanical systems replacement, and common area improvements. Phase I construction was completed during FY 2007, Phase II construction is anticipated to be completed during 2008, and Phase III construction will begin during 2008.\(^{30}\)

---

No units are anticipated to be lost. SHA does not anticipate losing any public housing units from this inventory. The number of public housing units owned by SHA reflects past reductions approved by HUD. SHA anticipates completing 50 units at High Point in early 2009 and will complete 122 scattered site replacements in 2008.

SHA will add 263 accessible units by 2014. As a result of a Voluntary Compliance Agreement signed with HUD in November 2007, SHA will make 263 public housing units fully compliant with the Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards (UFAS) by 2014: 101 units are due in 2008; 41 units in 2009; 13 units in 2010; 32 units in 2011; 42 units in 2012; 20 units in 2013; and 14 units in 2014.

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

Over 6,000 vouchers are being used

• **Over 6,000 tenant- and project-based housing choice vouchers are currently in use in Seattle.** Seattle has a waiting list for Housing Choice Vouchers. Since the demand for housing assistance often exceeds the limited resources available to HUD and the local housing agencies, long waiting periods are common. In fact, a public housing authority may close its waiting list when it has more families on the list than can be aided in the near future. The Section 8 waiting list in Seattle was opened for the first time in three years in May 2006 and then again in May 2008.

• **Housing Choice Voucher holders are chosen via lottery.** Providing additional evidence of Seattle’s affordable housing crisis, this spring 12,400 entered a lottery for 4,000 waiting list positions for Seattle Housing Authority’s Housing Choice Voucher program.

• **Housing Choice Voucher holders have very low incomes.** The average income of tenant based voucher holders is $13,448. Tenants of units funded in part through project-based vouchers have significantly lower incomes, although they increased by more than 6% for the third year in a row to an average of $9,009 in FY 2007.31

• **In many cases, vouchers are “project-based” with existing subsidized housing units to provide additional support to extremely low-income households.** In 2001, SHA adopted a project-basing policy designed to support extremely low-income and homeless households. As part of SHA’s Moving to Work agreement with HUD, SHA may raise the maximum percentage of vouchers that may be project-based. SHA will also continue piloting the “provider-based” program that ties supportive services with housing subsidy. Project-based units are spread throughout the city, not clustered in certain neighborhoods.

• **Unlike project-based vouchers, Housing Choice Vouchers are clustered in low-income neighborhoods.** As the map on the next page shows, the majority of Housing Choice Vouchers are being used in lower income neighborhoods – such as the Rainier Valley – where rents are comparatively low.

---

31 Seattle Housing Authority, FY 2007 Moving to Work Annual Report, p. 11.
Figure 3-42: Tenant-Based Housing Choice Vouchers by Zip Code

Source: Seattle Housing Authority, January 2008 estimate
3.1.6  NOTES to Housing Market Section

Note 1:  
Seattle Median Household Income (SMI)

In the Housing Market chapter of the 2009-2012 Consolidated Plan, housing needs are analyzed for a series of income categories, all expressed as percent of median household income for the City of Seattle, adjusted by household size (SMI). Each sample household’s income was expressed as a percent of the median income estimate for its own household size category. The following table shows Seattle Median Household Income by Household Size (excluding one-person student households to be consistent with the analysis in this section) based on the U.S. Census 2006 American Community Survey (see Note 2 for more details). The 2006 household incomes used in the ACS analysis are shown in 2008 dollars. Showing the figures in 2008 dollars is intended to help the reader better relate to the income estimates.

Seattle Median Household Income (SMI) 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Size</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>120%</th>
<th>150%</th>
<th>200%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$11,683</td>
<td>$19,471</td>
<td>$31,154</td>
<td>$38,943</td>
<td>$46,731</td>
<td>$58,414</td>
<td>$77,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$24,272</td>
<td>$40,453</td>
<td>$64,725</td>
<td>$80,906</td>
<td>$97,087</td>
<td>$121,359</td>
<td>$161,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$26,537</td>
<td>$44,229</td>
<td>$70,766</td>
<td>$88,457</td>
<td>$106,148</td>
<td>$132,686</td>
<td>$176,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$31,307</td>
<td>$52,179</td>
<td>$83,486</td>
<td>$104,358</td>
<td>$125,229</td>
<td>$156,537</td>
<td>$208,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+</td>
<td>$23,754</td>
<td>$39,590</td>
<td>$63,344</td>
<td>$79,180</td>
<td>$95,016</td>
<td>$118,770</td>
<td>$158,360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Affordable Rents
Percent of Seattle Median Income, by Household Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Size</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>120%</th>
<th>150%</th>
<th>200%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$292</td>
<td>$487</td>
<td>$779</td>
<td>$974</td>
<td>$1,168</td>
<td>$1,460</td>
<td>$1,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$607</td>
<td>$1,011</td>
<td>$1,618</td>
<td>$2,023</td>
<td>$2,427</td>
<td>$3,034</td>
<td>$4,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$663</td>
<td>$1,106</td>
<td>$1,769</td>
<td>$2,211</td>
<td>$2,654</td>
<td>$3,317</td>
<td>$4,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$783</td>
<td>$1,304</td>
<td>$2,087</td>
<td>$2,609</td>
<td>$3,131</td>
<td>$3,913</td>
<td>$5,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+</td>
<td>$594</td>
<td>$990</td>
<td>$1,584</td>
<td>$1,979</td>
<td>$2,375</td>
<td>$2,969</td>
<td>$3,959</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Seattle Office of Housing (rents are calculated to equal 30% of household income; note that these rents are not the same as HUD’s annually published income limits, which are available in Appendix A of the 2009-2012 Consolidated Plan).
Note 2:

Use of American Community Survey (ACS) and ACS Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS)

Much of the information on renter and owner households in the Seattle Housing Market analysis is based on estimates from the Census Bureau’s American Community Survey (ACS). ACS estimates are based on a sample (about 1 in 40 households nationwide per year) and are subject to sampling error. Margins of error are shown in the ACS tables the Census Bureau publishes on its “American Factfinder” website: http://factfinder.census.gov.

Estimates of the shares of Seattle households that are severely burdened by housing costs are based on a tailored analysis performed by the City of Seattle’s Office of Housing using 2006 ACS PUMS data. (PUMS is an acronym for “Public Use Microdata Sample.”) The Puget Sound Regional Council assembled and provided the ACS PUMS data to the City. All charts and text referring to “Seattle Median Income” (SMI) are based on the ACS PUMS data. (SMI is the reference point with which cost is compared in this order to estimate the shares of cost burdened renter and owner households in Seattle.) Note 1 provides additional details, including a table showing SMI estimates for specific household sizes.

Margins of error for estimates derived from the ACS PUMS dataset are larger than for the ACS as a whole. This is mostly because the PUMS dataset is pulled from a sample of the ACS sample. The PUMS dataset was used, however, because it enabled an analysis of Seattle households that was more tailored to the specific topics addressed in this section than would have been possible with the regular ACS tabulations published by the Census Bureau. (The ACS PUMS dataset comprises about 40% of the sample in the ACS as a whole, or about 1% of households in the nation.)

All estimates derived from the ACS PUMS must be regarded as rough estimates. Margins of error in the PUMS data are large relative to estimates for small population and household subgroups. In many, but not all cases, the analysis presented aggregated small subgroups to reduce margins of error.

Actual current numbers of cost burdened households are likely higher than the 2006 ACS-based estimates. Estimates in this chapter regarding the number of households in different income ranges and the number of households facing a severe cost burden are directly from the PUMS analysis. However, the 2006 ACS and the PUMS yielded lower household numbers (even after applying weighting to the PUMS) than City estimates. The actual current numbers of severely cost burdened households in Seattle are likely higher than the 40,000 estimated with the 2006 ACS PUMS given this and given the substantial number of housing units added in the city between 2006 and 2008.

---

32 The Census Bureau indicates that ACS estimates are not meant to provide population or household counts, but to provide estimates regarding the characteristics of the population and of households. At the county level, the Census Bureau controls ACS population and housing unit estimates to the Bureau’s intercensal estimates. However, the same is not done at the city level. Based on PSRC estimates, Seattle had about 267,000 households in April of 2006.
Note 3:
Definitions of Selected 2006 American Community Survey Terms

Median Income – The median divides the income distribution into two equal parts: one-half of the cases falling below the median income and one-half above the median. For households and families, the median income is based on the distribution of the total number of households and families including those with no income. The median income for individuals is based on individuals 15 years old and over with income. Median income for households, families, and individuals is computed on the basis of a standard distribution.

- Household – A household includes all the people who occupy a housing unit. (People not living in households are classified as living in group quarters.) A housing unit is a house, an apartment, a mobile home, a group of rooms, or a single room that is occupied (or if vacant, is intended for occupancy) as separate living quarters. Separate living quarters are those in which the occupants live separately from any other people in the building and which have direct access from the outside of the building or through a common hall. The occupants may be a single family, one person living alone, two or more families living together, or any other group of related or unrelated people who share living arrangements.

- Average Household Size – A measure obtained by dividing the number of people in households by the number of households. In cases where people in households are cross-classified by race or Hispanic origin, people in the household are classified by the race or Hispanic origin of the householder rather than the race or Hispanic origin of each individual. Average household size is rounded to the nearest hundredth.

- Gross Rent – The data on gross rent were obtained from answers to Housing Questions 14a-d and 18 in the 2006 American Community Survey. Gross rent is the contract rent plus the estimated average monthly cost of utilities (electricity, gas, and water and sewer) and fuels (oil, coal, kerosene, wood, etc.) if these are paid by the renter (or paid for the renter by someone else). Gross rent is intended to eliminate differentials that result from varying practices with respect to the inclusion of utilities and fuels as part of the rental payment. The estimated costs of water and sewer, and fuels are reported on a 12-month basis but are converted to monthly figures for the tabulations. Renter units occupied without payment of cash rent are shown separately as “No cash rent” in the tabulations.

- Selected Monthly Owner Costs – The data on selected monthly owner costs were obtained from Housing Questions 14 and Questions 20 through 24 in the 2006 American Community Survey. The data were obtained for owner-occupied units. Selected monthly owner costs are the sum of payments for mortgages, deeds of trust, contracts to purchase, or similar debts on the property (including payments for the first mortgage, second mortgages, home equity loans, and other junior mortgages); real estate taxes; fire, hazard, and flood insurance on the property; utilities (electricity, gas, and water and sewer); and fuels (oil, coal, kerosene, wood, etc.). It also includes, where appropriate, the monthly condominium fee for condominiums and mobile home costs (installment loan payments, personal property taxes, site rent, registration fees, and license fees). Selected monthly owner costs were tabulated for all owner-occupied units, and usually are shown separately for units “with a mortgage” and for units “not mortgaged.”

Other Subject Definitions from the U.S. Census American Community Survey for 2006 can be found at: http://www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/2006/usedata/Subject_Definitions.pdf.
3.2  Nature and Extent of Homelessness in Seattle

This section describes the nature and extent of homelessness. It defines homelessness, addresses the scope and characteristics of homeless families and individuals in Seattle/King County, and describes the factors that create and sustain homelessness. This section also includes an inventory of services, emergency shelter and housing, and describes the housing and services needed to prevent and end homelessness in Seattle.

- **Homelessness is among the most visible and dramatic indicators of poverty in our community.** Homelessness is primarily related to the lack of affordable, appropriate, supportive housing options for households with low incomes. But homelessness is not simply an affordable housing issue. It is brought about by a confluence of complex economic, social, and personal factors. Some of the contributing factors to homelessness include declining federal housing subsidies, low incomes, rising cost of housing and living expenses, and limited support systems for people with special needs, including the availability of mental health services.

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

**U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development Definition of Homelessness**

The federal McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act defines a person as homeless when that person lacks a fixed, regular, and adequate night-time residence, and has a primary night-time residence that is

- a supervised publicly or privately operated shelter designed to provide temporary living accommodations,
- an institution that provides a temporary residence for individuals intended to be institutionalized, or
- a public or private place not designed for, or ordinarily used as, a regular sleeping accommodation for human beings.

- **The exact number of people who find themselves homeless and at risk of homelessness is difficult to determine.** However, two primary data sources are used to estimate the number of homeless individuals, young adults and families who are living on the street, in shelters and in transitional housing programs. These are the One Night Count of People Who are Homeless in King County and the Safe Harbors Homeless Management Information System.

- **On one night: The One Night Count.** Each year, the Seattle King County Coalition for the Homeless sponsors a count of those who are unsheltered and in emergency shelters and
transitional housing on a single night. During the January 2008 One Night Count in King County, an estimated 8,439 people were identified as homeless. Nearly one-third of these individuals (31% or 2,631) were living on the streets without any shelter.

The 8,439 people identified as homeless during the One Night Count were surveyed in Seattle and throughout the remainder of the county.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unsheltered</th>
<th>Emergency Shelter</th>
<th>Transitional Housing</th>
<th>Total Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>1,976</td>
<td>2,153</td>
<td>2,188</td>
<td>6,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County (including Seattle)</td>
<td>2,631</td>
<td>2,515</td>
<td>3,293</td>
<td>8,439</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than 6,300 people (or approximately 75% of those who were surveyed during the 2008 One Night Count) were unsheltered or in emergency shelter or transitional housing inside Seattle. This number includes single adults, young adults, families with children, and unaccompanied youth under age 18.

The annual *One Night Count of People Who Are Homeless in King County* provides a point-in-time view of the nature and extent of homelessness in Seattle and King County. The One Night Count consists of two parts: a street count of people without shelter; and a survey of individuals and families living in emergency shelters and transitional housing programs. For the 2008 One Night Count, the survey and street count took place over the night of January 24-25, 2008. Providers at 64 emergency shelters and 124 transitional housing programs participated in completing the 2008 survey.

King County has one of the nation’s longest established counts of people who are homeless. For the past 28 years, the One Night Count has helped to gather important information and provide the basis for advocacy and planning work. While the One Night Count provides a valuable, point in time view of homelessness in King County, it cannot account for all the unsheltered people. Many others in our community are homeless but are not included in this survey.

- **Over the course of one year: Safe Harbors**. King County’s Homeless Management Information System, Safe Harbors, determined there were more than 9,000 uniquely identified and unduplicated people who received services from participating publicly funded emergency shelters and transitional housing programs in King County during 2007. Data from these programs included more than 19,000 service records. More than 90% of the people identified – a total of 8,240 – received services in Safe Harbors programs located within Seattle.
Safe Harbors is King County’s web-based Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). The Safe Harbors HMIS collects information on and the use of services and the characteristics of those who are homeless. Planners, policymakers and service providers are able to use aggregate data from Safe Harbors to quantify the nature and extent of homelessness over time, to identify patterns of service use, and to direct funding and services to those who are most in need.

Safe Harbors is a joint project of the City of Seattle, the King County Department of Community and Human Services, and United Way of King County. The system collects data from a total of 170 programs with (86% of the beds available to people who are homeless in King County, not including domestic violence shelters). In 2008, Safe Harbors released its first annual report, providing a baseline for current and future analysis.

3.2.1 The Number and Characteristics of People Experiencing Homelessness

Our community’s One Night Count and Safe Harbors HMIS provide information about the demographics and characteristics of people who are homeless and receiving services in emergency shelters and transitional housing programs in King County (in which Seattle is the largest city). The points below describe homelessness based on countywide data and note unique characteristics within the Seattle homeless population.

The majority of people in emergency shelters and transitional housing programs are single adults. Between January and December 2007, Safe Harbors reported on an unduplicated and uniquely identified total of 7,036 single individuals and 1,930 members of 665 families (the average family included two children) countywide. Of those people, 96% of single adults and 75% of families received services in shelters or transitional housing programs located in Seattle. Of those who were served countywide, 75% were single adults and just over 25% were part of a family. In Seattle, where there are more shelters and transitional housing programs that serve single adults, 82% of homeless individuals were single adults and 18% were members of families. Overall, men made up 71% and women made up 29% of adults (including both single individuals and adults in families).

It is important to note that this information is drawn from the existing service system and therefore reflects demographic characteristics of those this system is able to serve. The number, type and proportion of people represented are directly related to the number and type of programs available. For example, there are almost no beds available for couples without children and very few beds for unaccompanied minors.
• **Family households are predominantly headed by single women.** Of families surveyed during the One Night Count, 80% of households were headed by single parents, and 95% of these households were headed by single female adults or teen mothers. Of families using programs in the Safe Harbors system, 70% of adults in families served during 2007 were women.

• **There are too many children without homes in our community.** More than 1,100 children received services in Safe Harbors programs in King County during 2007. Of these children, approximately 77% (846 children) were homeless in Seattle. During the 2008 One Night Count, 1,878 children under the age of 18 were surveyed in shelters and transitional housing programs, full 32% of the shelter and transitional housing residents that evening.

The average age of children served by Safe Harbors programs was 8 years old. The majority of children are school-age (66%); a third (34%) are under 5 years old.

![Figure 3-46: Age of Children in Families (n=1,103)](image)

Source: 2007 Safe Harbors

• **About half of those who are homeless are middle aged.** Approximately half of the homeless individuals who reported their age to Safe Harbors were between the ages of 35 and 55. The average age of all single individuals was 43.6 years. Women were slightly younger at 41.1 years. There were 1,268 people (18%) older than 55, and 227 older than 64.

• **Young adults aged 18 to 24 make up nearly 10% of homeless individuals in King County.** During 2007, 558 young adults (aged 18 to 24) were served by Safe Harbors programs. They made up 8.5% of the single individuals who were served. A somewhat higher proportion of these young adults are female (36%) than for all single individuals who were served (32%). Nearly 200 of the young adults served identified family problems (such as a family crisis, domestic violence, or displacement) as a cause of their homelessness.
3.2.2 What do we know about factors that contribute to homelessness?

- **Incomes do not support living and housing costs.** Poverty is linked to homelessness. The lack of a living wage income and adequate income support often means that people must choose between housing, utilities, healthcare, child care, and food. Local and national research shows that at least one-quarter of homeless people are employed, but without sufficient wages to be stable in their housing.

- **Many of those who are homeless have applied for public assistance.** Homeless single adults and families living in shelter and transitional housing programs have no income or very little income. Many receive or have applied for some form of public assistance such as General Assistance-Unemployable (GAU), Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), Supplemental Security Income (SSI), or unemployment compensation.

- **Those who are homeless live below the poverty level.** Of those who reported income to Safe Harbors, the median monthly income is $339 for individuals and $648 for families. This translates into a gross income of $4,068 per year for individuals and $7,776 for families, well below the Federal Poverty Level of $10,400 for an individual and $17,600 for a three-person family. For homeless individuals, 64% of those who provided income information live on less than $500/month and another 29% live on $500-999/month, for an annual income of less than $12,000 a year.

- **Those who are homeless cannot afford housing costs.** Market rate housing far exceeds the means of those living in emergency shelter programs. In order for a household to be able to afford the rent for a one bedroom apartment in Seattle, a household needs an hourly wage of $20.83, more than double the 2008 minimum wage of $8.07 per hour.
• **Those who are homeless rely on a variety of income sources.** Those who provided information to *Safe Harbors* in 2007 listed a wide variety of sources of income that included wages, employment, unemployment insurance, public benefits, disability payments, and pensions.

**Figure 3-48: Sources of Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Single Individuals (n = 1,707)</th>
<th>Number with this source</th>
<th>Family Members (n= 577)</th>
<th>Number with this source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alimony, spousal or child support</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Assistance</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension/retirement (not incl. Veterans’ Administration)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Security Income/ Social Security Disability Insurance</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Assistance for Needy Families</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment insurance</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans’ disability or pension</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other sources</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please note that income categories are not mutually exclusive.*

*Source: 2007 Safe Harbors*

• **People of color are over-represented among the homeless.** Poverty disproportionately affects communities of color. In Seattle, African Americans make up slightly more than 8% of the total city population. In King County, African Americans represent 6% of the overall population. However, in the countywide shelter and transitional housing system (which includes Seattle) African Americans are the largest ethnic minority, making up 36% of homeless individuals and 55% of families.  

Those who identified themselves as Latino or Hispanics made up 9% of those receiving shelter or transitional services, more than the approximately 5-6% within the overall county population.

Native Americans make up less than 1% of the overall population in King County, but among those using Safe Harbors services, they constituted 4.1% of homeless adults. Almost 7% of single homeless women were Native American.

---

Figure 3-49: Race of Those Served by Safe Harbors, 2007
(n=5,416 for All Individuals, 1,299 for Family Members)

Note that not all clients provided information. Percentages shown in this figure are based only on the 5,416 individuals and 1,299 family members who provided information, rather than on the full analysis dataset. Information on Hispanic/Latino origin is tabulated separately as per the U.S. Census Bureau.

- **Many of those who are homeless have special needs.** Many of the people who experience homelessness have special needs. Nearly 40% of adults served by Safe Harbors in 2007 reported that they had special needs such as a physical disability, mental illness, or chemical or alcohol addiction. Chemical dependency and mental illness are the most frequently reported disabling conditions for people who are homeless, affecting nearly half of those in shelters.35

- **Nearly one-quarter of those who are homeless are chronically homeless.** Safe Harbors identified 1,513 single individuals in 2007 as chronically homeless (22% of all individuals served by Safe Harbors). The Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness in King County estimates that 2,500 housing units will be needed for people who meet the U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development’s (HUD) definition of chronically homeless.

- **Those who are chronically homeless have special needs.** Chronically homeless single adults have disabling conditions that are often exacerbated by the trauma of being homeless. They often face multiple barriers to accessing and maintaining housing. Individuals experiencing chronic episodes of homelessness are among the most frequent users of emergency healthcare, shelters and the criminal justice system. These systems are not designed to adequately address the ongoing and persistent barriers that prevent chronically homeless individuals from becoming

35 Analysis by staff from the King County Mental Health, Chemical Abuse and Dependency Services Division (MHCADSD) of the Department of Community and Human Services, as reported in Mental Illness and Drug Dependency Action Plan, October 2007.
stable and improving their health.

- **Veterans are over-represented among homeless individuals.** Of single individuals using Safe Harbors services in King County during 2007, 15% identified themselves as veterans. This is higher than the 10% of veterans found in the overall county population. Homeless veterans are older on average, than other individuals who are homeless: the average age for a homeless veteran is 49.3 years, compared with 43.6 for all single individuals who were served by Safe Harbors. Approximately 32% of the veterans served by Safe Harbors are 55 years and older and are potentially Vietnam era veterans. Younger veterans (under 35 years) make up 8.4% of the homeless veterans and may have served in Iraq and Afghanistan.

- **People who experience homelessness have less education than the general population.** Of those who provided education information to Safe Harbors during 2007, 36 41% of single individuals lack either a high school diploma or GED, compared with 5% of the overall, countywide population. Young adults who are homeless are significantly less educated: a full 50% of young adults who provided information lack a high school diploma or GED.

- **Safe Harbors collected 8,745 exit records during 2007.** Although most of these records did not include destination information, nearly 25% of the records indicated that clients had found subsidized housing, and 20% of the records indicated that clients had found unsubsidized housing.

3.2.3 **Can we predict who might become homeless?**

- **Many types of people are at risk for homelessness.** Individuals and families at risk of losing their housing come from a variety of backgrounds. These households may live in market-rate rental housing, subsidized housing, or may even own their homes. They may live in overcrowded or unsafe conditions, “couch surf,” stay in motels, or find other temporary places to sleep at night.

- **There are no clear predictive indicators of homelessness.** Recent research and evaluation of prevention programs across the United States finds that there are no clear predictive indicators of homelessness. A mix of factors related to poverty and destabilized lives are prevalent among those who become homeless. However, research over the last 20 years has not been able to determine which single factor or mix of factors will cause individuals or families to lose their housing and become homeless. 38

36 Approximately 12% of those served by Safe Harbors volunteered information on their level of education.
37 Note that these are service records, not necessarily individual people.
38 Preventing Homelessness in King County, Washington, Committee to End Homelessness King County, Prevention Task Force, 2008.
• **Low-income, single-parent families are most at risk.** Locally, the most vulnerable households are low-income, single-parent households whose head of household may be employed but not earning enough to meet the family’s needs. In these families, the children may be receiving some services from the school system. Geographic areas with high numbers of households at risk for homelessness include those with high numbers of families living below the poverty level, a high concentration of single-parent families, high numbers of people receiving public assistance, and high numbers of evictions and utility shut-offs.

### 3.2.4 What types of housing and services are needed to end homelessness?

• **Nearly 10,000 new affordable housing units are needed in King County.** The Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness in King County identifies the need for 9,500 permanent, affordable housing units throughout the county, designed with a range of supportive services to help people who are homeless. Increasing the housing options available for homeless individuals, families, young adults and youth will help local emergency systems move vulnerable households into permanent housing with greater opportunity for long-term stability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homeless Subpopulation</th>
<th>Total Units Needed</th>
<th>Intensive</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chronically homeless individuals</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other single adults</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Single Adults</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth/Young Adults</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,625</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,275</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,600</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In addition to on-site services where provided, all formerly homeless individuals and families will be able to access services through related systems as needed to support housing stability and quality of life. In addition, support in securing affordable and appropriate housing will be needed by many households.

The table above represents the Committee to End Homelessness’ estimate of the number of permanent housing units needed in King County for different populations based on required needs.

39 The 9,500 goal includes developing 4,725 new units of housing and securing 4,775 units from existing housing stock that would be affordable for homeless individuals and families.

40 *A Roof Over Every Bed in King County: Our Community’s Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness.*
levels of on-site support services. These housing units would be made affordable through direct rental subsidies, operating subsidies, and/or capital development investments. The service components for housing range from independent units with few or no services to permanent, supportive housing programs with a robust array of services.

- **Local entities have made progress in producing affordable housing.** Local governments and non-profit housing developers have made substantial progress toward meeting the affordable housing production goals of the Ten-Year Plan. Since the Plan was adopted in 2005, a total of 2,860 units have been funded countywide. This total includes 1,449 units that became operational between 2005 and 2007, and an additional 1,411 in the development pipeline that will be opening between 2008 and 2011. Approximately 70% of these units are located within Seattle. Countywide, an additional 6,640 units will be needed by 2015 to meet the goals outlined in the Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness.

  **Figure 3-51: Ten-Year Plan Housing Production Goals and Need**
  **King County, including Seattle**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homeless Subpopulation</th>
<th>Total Units Needed</th>
<th>Units Completed</th>
<th>Units In Pipeline</th>
<th>Remaining Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUD-defined chronic homeless</strong></td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>1,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other single adults</strong></td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>3,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Single Adults</strong></td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>1,147</td>
<td>5,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Families</strong></td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>1,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youth/Young Adults</strong></td>
<td>300</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>1,449</td>
<td>1,411</td>
<td>6,640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **The City’s “Housing First” model provides long-term support.** The City of Seattle supports a housing model that quickly moves individuals and families into permanent housing. Seattle has made investments in “Housing First” models that focus on rapid access to housing that is not time-limited and does not require services as a condition of tenancy. This housing model removes many of the barriers that prevent people from securing stable housing. Crisis intervention, rapid housing placement, follow-up case management, and supportive services are key components of this model. People find housing first; then, flexible, individualized supportive services follow housing placement to prevent the reoccurrence of homelessness.

- **Interim survival mechanisms are needed as housing is developed.** The Ten-Year Plan recognizes that, “people experiencing homelessness are at immediate personal risk and have a basic right to safety, as do all members of our community. Interim survival mechanisms—services focused on keeping people alive—that respect the rights of all community members and neighborhoods are necessary until such time that affordable permanent

---

41 The Seattle Housing Authority has a local preference that prioritizes people who are homeless or extremely low-income for federally funded Project-based and Section 8 or Housing Choice vouchers programs.

housing is available to all.” Our existing system includes emergency and transitional housing programs to address immediate needs and to provide support for homeless individuals and families to move them into affordable, appropriate housing.

**Figure 3-52:**
**Inventory of Emergency Shelter and Transitional Housing Units**
Beds/Units in Seattle Facility-Based Programs, year-round

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Emergency Shelter</th>
<th>Transitional Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Women</td>
<td>310 beds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Men</td>
<td>898 beds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Adults</td>
<td>353 beds</td>
<td>1,056 beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women with Children</td>
<td>173 beds in 60 units</td>
<td>32 beds * in 16 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families with Children</td>
<td>350 beds in 75 units</td>
<td>1,668 beds in 441 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth/Young Adults</td>
<td>33 beds</td>
<td>140 beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,117 beds</strong> in 1,729 units</td>
<td><strong>2,896 beds</strong> in 1,653 units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*transitional housing for young parents

*Source: Inventory of Homeless Units and Beds, Committee to End Homelessness, 2007*

- **Seattle provides 2,117 beds in emergency and enhanced shelter programs.**\(^{43}\) Community-based agencies operate a network of shelter facilities in Seattle that provide a total year-round capacity of approximately 2,117 beds (1,729 units). A total of 69% of these beds are funded through City-administered CDBG, ESG, HOPWA and Seattle General Fund dollars. Additional shelter, with varying capacity, is provided through numerous hotel/motel voucher programs. During the winter months of October through March, shelter capacity is further expanded with an additional 295 beds.

Seattle’s shelter funding supports outcome-based, service-enriched programs called *enhanced shelter*. These facility-based programs provide short-term accommodation where an individualized needs assessment and case plan guide the transition from homelessness to more permanent housing placement and stability. Case management and information and referral services help households access mainstream services, including mental health, primary care, alcohol and drug abuse assistance, education, training and employment.

\(^{43}\) Emergency shelter is defined as temporary shelter from the elements and unsafe streets for families and individuals. Shelter programs in Seattle are either fixed capacity (facility-based) or flexible capacity (hotel/motel vouchers, tent city, etc.). Emergency shelters typically address the basic health, food, clothing, and personal hygiene needs of the households they serve and provide information and referrals about supportive services and housing. Shelters range from mats on the floor in a common space to beds in individuals units.
Seattle provides 2,896 beds in transitional housing programs. There are a total of 2,896 beds (1,653 units) in transitional housing and transition-in-place units in Seattle for homeless individuals, families, youth, and young adults. There are two types of transitional housing models being used in Seattle. In both models, the individual needs of the residents determine the type and intensity of services to promote residential stability, increased skill levels and/or income, and greater independence. The primary funding sources used in the development and operation of both types of transitional housing are Seattle Housing Levy, federal McKinney program funding, Sound Families program, CDBG, HOME, HOPWA, Section 8, City of Seattle General Funds, program income, United Way, and private resources.

1. Traditional facility-based programs that enable homeless people to benefit from a peer group setting, a time-limited length of stay, and/or confidential location; and

2. “Transition-in-place” programs, in which supportive services are tailored to needs over time and there is no time limitation on residency. Ongoing supportive services decrease as residents become stable in their housing.

Outreach and assessment services help those in need find services. Outreach to homeless individuals, families, young adults and youth is designed to help households access services and to support them in finding safe, permanent, affordable housing. Special efforts are designed to assist youth and young adults, veterans, people who are seriously mentally ill, substance abusers, and people living with HIV/AIDS.

Trained staff members work on the streets, in shelters and day centers, healthcare clinics and hospitals, institutions, meal programs, day labor sites, and sobering centers where homeless individuals may be found during the day and at night to help them access services, such as case management, referrals, and counseling. Outreach, engagement and assessment work occurs through street canvassing (youth programs), mobile health vans, special programs in public schools, and through linkages with the public safety and criminal justice systems.

We are building an outreach system in which professionals are skilled and familiar with chronic street populations and knowledgeable about community services; where they help build relationships with homeless people based on trust and hope, sometimes over long periods of time, employing harm-reduction approaches and helping individuals to identify and overcome barriers that prevent them from accessing housing.

Several state and federal sources support this component, coupled with McKinney, HOPWA, City of Seattle General Funds, United Way investments and private resources.

---

44 Transitional housing is temporary housing that is time-limited, generally allowing clients to stay from three months to two years. Tenure is contingent upon participation in services and compliance with program rules and tenancy. The goal of transitional housing is to provide the level of support needed for participants to become ready to move or “graduate” into permanent housing. Intensity and range of services provided varies among programs, appropriate to the needs of the target population served. Services may include case management, information and referral, life skills training, and tenant education.
• **Supportive services help people succeed in permanent housing.** Supportive services are linked to housing to enable homeless individuals and family members to access, retain and thrive in permanent housing. Many people who become homeless face multiple barriers that prevent them from becoming stable in housing. The level and range of supportive services varies for different population groups and for each homeless individual or family member.

Supportive services needs include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary health care</th>
<th>Financial counseling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental health care</td>
<td>Translation services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse services</td>
<td>Veterans’ services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Rental assistance/housing subsidy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job training/placement</td>
<td>Protective payee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public assistance</td>
<td>Food and clothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence services</td>
<td>Legal services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene services</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent living skills</td>
<td>Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case management</td>
<td>Housing search</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care</td>
<td>Housing stabilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS services</td>
<td>Family reconciliation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supportive services are provided on-site or co-located with housing or linked to service sites in the community. These services are delivered by housing agencies, by mainstream service systems (mental health, healthcare, chemical dependency) or arranged under collaborative agreements between the housing provider and a service provider. New initiatives are underway in our community to improve the provision of supportive services. Increased collaboration among partners is enabling a more seamless linkage of homeless people to eligible public benefits.

Community providers rely on government grant programs from local, state, and federal sources, combined with United Way, private donations as well as program income from clients to sustain these services. The City of Seattle allocates CDBG, ESG, HOPWA, HOME, McKinney, and Seattle General Funds to provide supportive service linked to housing access and stability.

• **Homelessness Prevention services help keep people in their homes.** The inventory of prevention and housing stability services available in Seattle include:

- time-limited mortgage and rental assistance, utility assistance, rent and security deposits;
- housing stability case management linking households to community resources, income supports, entitlement programs, and supportive services (mental health, chemical dependency, job training and employment, food stamps, or other income support programs);
- counseling and advocacy on budgeting and debt reduction, credit counseling, landlord/tenant relations, and legal assistance;
- information and referral services, community information hotlines and helplines, and resource manuals that provide connections to community services; and
- in-kind emergency assistance (food, clothing, transportation, medical care).
These services are supported from a variety of federal, state, local government funding programs and private organizations, including: Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA); Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP); Ryan White HIV/AIDS Treatment Modernization Act; Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA); State of Washington Emergency Shelter Assistance Program (ESAP); State Transitional Housing, Operating and Rent Program (THOR); and State Additional Requirements for Emergency Needs (AREN) Programs; Emergency Housing Assistance Program (EHAP); local government allocations; United Way of King County; and support from individuals, faith-based entities, and nonprofit community-based agencies.
3.3 Special Needs and Vulnerable Populations

3.3.1 Persons Living with AIDS

- **There were at least 6,320 King County residents living with HIV or AIDS at the beginning of 2008.** Public Health staff estimate that approximately 80% or 5,047 of those individuals reside in Seattle. The Seattle-King County Public Health HIV/AIDS Program notes that this number represents only the “reported” cases that have been diagnosed within the county and reported to Public Health. An estimated 7,200 to 7,800 people are living with HIV or AIDS in the county, but many of these people may be unaware of their infection (not tested or have not received their HIV-positive test result), may have tested anonymously, or have not been recorded in the HIV surveillance system.

- **In King County, there have been 350-400 new HIV diagnoses each year since 1998.** While the number of new cases has remained level over time, the reported number of residents with HIV/AIDS has been increasing as the number of HIV-related deaths has declined to about 100 persons annually, or less than the number new cases. Ninety percent of all infections are among men who have sex with men, injection drug users, or foreign-born Blacks. Most HIV-infected King County residents are White men who have sex with men, are 30-45 years of age at the time of diagnosis, and reside in Seattle. However, an increasing proportion of cases are among foreign-born Blacks, and residents outside Seattle.

- **HIV/AIDS affects a diverse array of people.** In Seattle-King County, as in the country as a whole, epidemiological data indicate that HIV and AIDS are disproportionately affecting African Americans and foreign-born Black immigrants. Overall, the percent of HIV/AIDS cases among people of color has risen steadily since the early years of the epidemic in King County, from 13% of cases in 1984-86 to 26% in 1993-95 and 35% in 1999-2001. Blacks are 4.5 times more likely to be infected with HIV than whites and are the most disproportionately impacted racial group. About 2% of Black men and 1% of Black women in King County are currently living with HIV/AIDS.

**Housing Needs**

- **Housing stability is a challenge for those with HIV/AIDS.** The 2004 Seattle-King County

---


46 Seattle & King County Public Health HIV/AIDS Program, Strategic and Operational Plan for HIV Prevention in King County, October 2007.
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AIDS Housing Plan notes that many people experience increasingly complex physical, emotional, and behavioral health issues and other challenges that affect their housing stability. When coupled with low incomes and a challenging housing market, as is the case in King County, housing stability becomes elusive. Given average rents in King County, these individuals are often priced out of the rental market. Access to housing is further complicated by factors related to mental illness, substance use, chronic homelessness, histories of incarceration, immigration status, and language and cultural barriers. Housing and service providers are focusing more energy, time, and resources on populations that face multiple challenges in accessing or maintaining housing in addition to a lack of financial resources. Housing alone will not solve the underlying issues for many consumers. However, these underlying issues often cannot be addressed when an individual is not in stable housing.

- **People living with HIV/AIDS represent a range of needs.** Some people enter the AIDS housing system because they have lost income and economic independence due to illness. Others enter the system having had few personal or financial resources to begin with and may not see HIV/AIDS as their most immediate concern. To effectively house these diverse clients, case managers and service providers must have a broad range of skill and knowledge. However, given the decreasing availability of services through related systems, meeting these needs is difficult and at times impossible. Housing people with complex lives presents significant challenges for affordable housing providers that focus on supporting those living with HIV/AIDS. A lack of independent living skills limits the ability of some people to succeed in housing, yet there are few programs that provide independent living skills training. Ongoing case management, services, and social support are necessary components, but are often unavailable. As non-profit housing providers partner with the AIDS service system to house people living with HIV/AIDS who have complex health and life challenges, gaps in these services are increasingly problematic.  

- **Housing is a significant need for those living with HIV/AIDS.** Housing assistance and housing-related services are among the greatest unmet needs identified by persons living with HIV/AIDS, according to data from the 2007 Comprehensive HIV Needs Assessment compiled by Seattle/King County Public Health. Assessment data indicate that over 1,036 people living with HIV/AIDS need assistance finding housing and/or emergency, short-term or on-going rental assistance. This includes more than 900 men and 140 women. These needs include transitional and permanent housing placements, as well help paying rent to maintain current housing. Many individuals and families are forced to make critical choices when their income is not sufficient to meet their basic living needs. It may mean fewer meals, no healthcare, and loss of utilities, overcrowded housing or eviction. For people living with HIV/AIDS who have low incomes, these choices can have a serious effect on their health status.

- **Homelessness puts people at risk of HIV/AIDS.** Based on surveys of HIV infection among

---

49 Seattle-King County HIV/AIDS Housing Plan prepared by AIDS Housing of Washington (currently Building Changes) for the City of Seattle Human Services Department, September 2004.
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homeless persons in King County and studies across the country, homelessness puts men and women at higher risk for HIV infection. Homeless persons reported with HIV/AIDS in King County were more likely to be persons of color and to have been exposed through injection drug use compared to those who were not homeless.\textsuperscript{51}

**Needs Assessment Survey**

The following information is based on the Seattle/King County HIV/AIDS Case Management Survey (October 2007). This is a small sample of needs from 26 survey respondents (case managers) with a total of 1,836 clients in their caseloads. Case managers identified 20% of their clients who were in need of emergency, transitional or permanent supportive and independent housing (360 individuals). Mental illness and/or chemical dependency were barriers to housing for more than half of these individuals (191 clients).

- **Increasing numbers of people living with AIDS who have housing needs also have criminal, credit, and rental histories along with mental health and chemical dependency issues.** Although some housing programs and resources in the AIDS housing continuum are dedicated to serving people with multiple barriers to housing stability, much of the housing was developed for people who could live independently.

- **Mental health services, chemical dependency services, transportation, and money management training were the top services listed as necessary supports for housing stability.** Case managers indicated that supportive housing with staffing 24 hours/7 days per week would help a large number (66% of those in need or 247 clients) succeed in housing.

- **Survey respondents were experiencing complex life challenges that affected housing stability.** One in ten was homeless or at risk of homelessness at the time of the survey, and more than half of all respondents had been homeless in the past. Women and African Americans had the highest rate of previous homelessness. One in three respondents indicated that they had been in jail or prison at some point in their lives.

- **The most frequent reason given by those who had been homeless was lack of income.** Respondents who had been homeless indicated the reasons for their last episode of homelessness. The most frequent response was lack of income, followed by eviction or being asked to move. In addition, 24% indicated moving to a new area without financial or personnel resources, 24% became homeless due to alcohol or drug use, 11% were released from jail or prison, 10% were released from another institution, and 10% became homeless due to domestic violence.

**Housing and Services Continuum**

- **Seattle-King County has a well-developed continuum of HIV/AIDS-dedicated housing and services, but there are still gaps.** The local AIDS continuum of care includes counseling and testing services, medical care (including ambulatory, specialty, in-patient, alternative, and dental care), access to drug therapies, insurance programs, medical case management, housing

\textsuperscript{51} HIV/AIDS Epidemiology Programs Fact Sheet: Homeless Persons, May 2003
assistance, home health care, skilled nursing care, adult day health care, substance use treatment and counseling, mental health therapy and counseling, transportation, medical nutrition therapy, food and meals programs, psychosocial support, outreach, health education/risk reduction, treatment adherence support, and phone referrals and linkages to medical and dental care.

It also includes independent and supported transitional and permanent housing units, medical respite, assisted living and skilled nursing beds. Despite the resources available through the housing and services continuum, however, there are gaps in our housing and services system. HOPWA funds are able to provide more than 300 individuals with direct housing and rental assistance each year, but there is a great demand for services for these limited resources.

• **Seattle and King County staff are currently assessing needs and planning a response.** In response to current needs, the Seattle Human Services Department and the Seattle-King County Public Health HIV/AIDS Program (Ryan White CARE Act Administrator) coordinated a review and planning process to identify current and emergent needs and priorities for the Seattle-King County AIDS Housing Continuum in July 2008. The HIV/AIDS Housing Committee is a joint Ryan White and Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) planning body. The Housing Committee is comprised of representatives from AIDS housing programs, case management providers and representatives from other housing and homelessness agencies both within and external to the HIV/AIDS field. The Committee will continue its work to develop local HIV/AIDS housing policies, conduct assessments of housing-related needs and address the full spectrum of housing issues facing people living with HIV/AIDS in the Seattle/King County.
3.3.2 People with disabilities

Key Federal Policies

- The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requires states to provide community-based treatment for persons with disabilities. The 1999 “Olmstead Decision” provided that Title II of the ADA requires states to place, whenever possible, qualified individuals with mental disabilities in community settings rather than in institutions. Further, states were encouraged to develop “comprehensive, effective working plans” aimed at providing services to individuals with disabilities in the most integrated settings possible. Executive Order 13217 and the New Freedom Initiative, both briefly described below, also promote community-based initiatives for individuals with disabilities.

- The New Freedom Initiative seeks to promote full access to the community for those with disabilities. This initiative is part of the Bush Administration’s efforts to remove the barriers to community living that are present in the lives of persons with disabilities. It proposes six broad objectives:
  1. Increase access to assistive and universally designed technologies;
  2. Expand educational opportunities;
  3. Promote homeownership;
  4. Integrate Americans with disabilities into the workforce;
  5. Expand transportation options; and
  6. Promote full access to community life.

- Executive Order 13217 directs federal agencies to work with states to ensure compliance with the Olmstead Decision and the ADA. The executive order has a wider scope than the Olmstead Decision by targeting all persons with disabilities, rather than only those with mental disabilities. In addition, the Executive Order directed the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Justice, Department of Education, the Department of Labor, and the Social Security Administration to “evaluate the policies, programs, statutes and regulations of their respective agencies to determine whether any should be revised or modified to improve the availability of community-based services for qualified individuals with disabilities.” The collaborative efforts are designed to ensure that HUD and the other designated agencies work together to integrate persons with disabilities into local communities.

- The Executive Order has resulted in a number of community initiatives, including outreach to people with disabilities. In response to Executive Order 13217, the Office of Community Planning and Development (CPD) conducted an evaluation of the CDBG, HOME, and HOPWA programs, which included a review of the relevant policies, statutes, and regulations, to determine how to improve the availability of services for persons with disabilities. It was determined that current CDBG, HOME, and HOPWA statutes and regulations provide jurisdictions with sufficient latitude to implement a wide variety of activities directed toward
improved community facilities and services, housing, neighborhood revitalization, and economic development. However, it was noted that outreach efforts could be expanded to ensure that persons with disabilities are aware of the support that may be available to them through CDBG, HOME, and HOPWA-assisted programs in the jurisdictions in which they reside.

Profile of People with Disabilities in Seattle

- **One in eight Seattle residents over the age of five has a disability.** Disability prevalence is very low among children and rises with age, reaching 40% among people older than 65. However, the majority of Seattle residents with disabilities (58%) are working-age adults from 16 to 64. The major contributing causes of disability in adults are orthopedic problems, particularly back problems, and mental health problems.

- **Working-age Seattle residents with disabilities as a group are more likely to be economically and socially disadvantaged.** Their poverty rates are almost three times those of adults without disabilities, and they tend to have less education, poorer health and lower levels of employment. These factors, combined with need for accommodation and housing discrimination, make them more vulnerable than those without disabilities to the tightness of the current housing market.

- **Nationally, disability among older adults has been declining about 1% per year, but this decline is predicted to reverse by 2020 as today's younger adults age.** Disability among younger adults is increasing for whites and nonwhites, for people inside and outside the labor force, and among all education levels. Two likely causes are the growth in obesity and the increasing number of people with chronic illnesses such as diabetes.

- **In consequence, rates of nursing home institutionalization are predicted to rise within the next decade as younger adults approach old age.** This would reverse several decades of declining institutionalization among the elderly. If these national trends continue to apply to the Seattle population, we can expect more difficulty in helping older adults and those with disabilities to age in place.

City of Seattle approach to the needs of people with disabilities

- **The City of Seattle serves people with disabilities through a variety of programs and services.** Through the CDBG, HOME, ESG and HOPWA grant administration and monitoring process, the City updates anti-discrimination and accessibility legal requirements within its contracts, and offers training and technical assistance to grant recipients to address changes in federal, state and local legislation. City contractors have been responsive, and in some cases ahead of City administration efforts, to ensure that programs and services are accessible and culturally responsive to the diverse clients the funded programs serve.

- **The Seattle Housing Authority (SHA) will build or convert a minimum of 263 public housing units.** During 2008, SHA entered into a Voluntary Compliance Agreement with HUD concerning SHA's obligations under Section 504 and Title II of the ADA. Under this agreement, SHA will build or convert a minimum of 263 public housing units to Uniform Federal
Accessibility Standards (UFAS) Accessible or UFAS Adaptable housing; review administrative offices to ensure that these offices are accessible to persons with disabilities (to UFAS and ADA standards); review its Manual of Operations to ensure the policies and procedures meet ADA standards; and provide training regarding all applicable regulations to agency staff.

Accessibility for community services and resources

- The Mayor’s Office for Senior Citizens is a primary resource for City programs serving seniors and adults with disabilities living in Seattle. It provides an array of services including assistance with utility and other bills, employment resources, computer classes, and arts and social events. Additional information regarding services of people with disabilities is available via the following web sites:
  - Area Agency on Aging
  - Promoting Healthy Aging Initiatives
  - Resources for Seniors
  - Resources for Caregivers

One unique program for adults with disabilities is the FLASH card (Fun Leisure Access Savings and Health) card, which provides discounts on some services and products. Other programs in Seattle for adults with disabilities are most easily accessed through the 211 Community Information Line, by dialing 211 or 1-800-621-4636. The City is proactive in advertising and referral to other local, state and national programs targeted to serve individuals with disabilities. For example, the City’s Teen website (http://www.seattle.gov/teen/health/disabilities.htm) includes information about the Job Accommodation Network (JAN) operated by the U.S. Department of Labor as well as links to the state Division of Vocational Rehabilitation and Washington Relay Communications services.

In addition to education and referral efforts, the City of Seattle Office of Civil Rights (SOCR) is responsible for formal inquiry and response to citizens who feel that the City has not fulfilled federal Americans with Disability Act (ADA) requirements. SOCR also handles discrimination complaints based on all protected classes including those with disabilities.

Finally, the 2009-2012 Consolidated Plan itself will be made available in alternative formats accessible to those with limited vision via the Internet.
3.3.3 Veterans

- **Over 138,000 veterans live in King County.** According to the 2009-2013 Washington State Department of Veterans Affairs (WDVA) Strategic Plan, the 2000 Census counted more than 670,000 veterans living in Washington State. The federal government estimated in 2006 that 138,000 veterans were living in King County, and that number will only increase as troops return from service in Iraq and Afghanistan. The challenges of reintegration (particularly following multiple deployments) cause many to face housing instability or become homeless. Two segments of the veteran population are growing at high rates: veterans over age 85 and veterans returning from the current war.

Veterans over age 85

- **The U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs projects the number of veterans over age 85 in Washington State will grow by 35% between 2005 and 2010.** Several unique characteristics affect service needs for these veterans:
  
  - Increase in number of veterans suffering from dementia;
  - Presence of wartime disabilities, both physical and mental; and
  - Increase in veterans considered medically indigent.

Veterans returning from the current wars

- **Veterans returning from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan also have unique needs and characteristics.** Washington State has experienced one of the largest mobilizations of "citizen soldiers," those individuals serving in our State National Guard or Armed Forces Reserve Units, in history. Some of the challenges returnees face is:
  
  - Combat wounds;
  - Head injuries / Traumatic Brain Injury;
  - Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) symptoms and readjustment challenges;
  - Employment or re-employment;
  - Risk of becoming homeless; or
  - Significant family readjustment issues following active duty.

- **There is increased diversity within this new veteran population.** From 2000 through 2013, the number of women veterans in Washington will increase by over 10,000. Within the same timeframe, the number of minority veterans is also projected to increase by nearly 10,000. This includes Tribal Veterans who are served through a unique network of Tribal Veterans Representatives. As citizen soldiers return from extended overseas deployments, many will need assistance with ongoing medical, mental health or readjustment issues. Some may require assistance with re-employment or education or need emergency help to overcome a financial crisis.

---

53 2009-2013 Strategic Plan, Washington State Department of Veterans Affairs, pps. 9-10.
• **Veterans of the current wars have lower incomes and less education than past veterans.** Organizations that serve veterans in King County report that veterans returning from recent Middle East deployments tend to have lower incomes and less education than veterans who were part of previous deployments.\(^{54}\)

• **Current veterans’ largest unmet need is for mental health care.** A recent analysis of data on the long-term needs and costs of veterans returning from the Iraq and Afghanistan conflicts found the largest unmet need to be mental health care. Unprecedented percentages of returning veterans face behavioral health issues related to stress, trauma, and other experiences and conditions.\(^{55}\) Stress on family relationships is also prevalent among veterans’ households, which may increase the risk of homelessness among both the veterans and their families.

• **Nearly 20% of individuals who are homeless in King County are veterans.** Safe Harbors, the countywide homeless management information system, reports that 19% of individuals served during 2007 by emergency shelters and transitional housing programs identify themselves as veterans, a number that is nearly double the proportion of veterans in the overall county population. They are also older than the general homeless population with an average age of 50 years. More than a third of homeless veterans in King County are over age 55.

---

\(^{54}\) King County Department of Community and Human Services, Veterans and Human Services Levy, Final Procurement Plan
3.3.4 Survivors of Domestic Violence and Assault

Profile of those seeking assistance

- Nearly 1,000 domestic violence victims were served by emergency shelter or transitional housing programs during 2007. Domestic violence is a widespread social and public health problem that affects not only the victims, the perpetrators, and their children, but the entire community. In 2007, through seven contracts with four City-funded Domestic Violence Shelter/Housing Programs, 981 individuals (including 469 adults) were housed in emergency shelters, transitional housing programs, or using hotel/motel vouchers.

- An additional 1,804 domestic violence victims received advocacy and support services. In addition, through 10 contracts with City-funded Domestic Violence Community Advocacy Programs, 1,804 individuals (including 1,165 adults), who may or may not have entered a domestic violence shelter or transitional housing program, received advocacy and support services through a domestic violence community advocacy program.

- Domestic violence victims are typically between the ages of 18 and 59. Data compiled in Toward Safety and Justice: Domestic Violence in Seattle 2006, which was published by the Seattle Human Services Department’s Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Prevention Division, paints a portrait of a domestic violence victim in Seattle using City-funded services. Women are predominately the victims of domestic violence in our community. Domestic violence victims are typically between the ages of 18 and 59, and this wide range of ages means that services for victims must accommodate single women, women with children, and women nearing retirement age.

Figure 3-53: Ages, Total People in DV Shelter, Transitional Housing, Hotel-Motel Voucher, 2007

Source: Toward Safety and Justice: Domestic Violence in Seattle 2006, Seattle Human Services Department, Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Prevention Division
Many victims who seek City help live in poverty. Economically, those victims seeking services at City-funded agencies tend to fall in the very-low- or low-income categories, meaning that many victims and their children live in poverty, which can make leaving an abusive relationship much more challenging if the victim is economically dependent on her batterer.
• When the decision is made to end an abusive relationship, the victim often has nowhere to go. While many victims of domestic violence do attempt to remain in their home, both safety concerns and financial limitations are frequently insurmountable barriers. A 2003 study reported that 38% of victims of domestic violence became homeless after separating from their abuser. An additional 25% indicated that they had to leave their homes during the year after separation for both safety and financial reasons.\(^{56}\)

• City initiatives have focused on preventing homelessness. The 2007-2010 City of Seattle Human Services Department’s Domestic Violence and Homelessness Strategic Plan includes initiatives intended to prevent homelessness so victims may either remain in their home or return to their home after fleeing for safety. A safety assessment is critical since the most dangerous time for a victim of domestic violence is when s/he makes the decision to end the relationship. It is also critical for the victim to have a safe place to go during this potentially dangerous period. There is still a significant lack of housing.

![Figure 3-56: Adults (Total 1,165) Served at DV Community Advocacy Programs (CAP) – by Area of Residence](image)

*Source: 2007 contract reports data from CAP programs including: ADWAS, Chaya, Consejo, New Beginnings, NW Network, ReWA, Salvation Army, and Seattle Counseling Services, Seattle Indian Health Board, and YWCA E. Cherry Branch.*

### Estimating Unmet Need for Housing and Services

• Even though emergency shelter and transitional housing capacity has increased for victims of domestic violence since the previous Consolidated Plan, turn-away rates continue to rise. The turn-away rate for Seattle and King County averages 18 to 1. Programs count each individual request (including the children in a family) when domestic violence is the presenting cause of homelessness. Turn-away rates for all programs are much higher when requests are included from those not experiencing immediate domestic violence. In Seattle, the highest rate among shelter programs is 27 to 1, while the lowest rate is 9 to 1. The individual count is duplicated within programs as well as across programs, since personally identifying information is not collected from callers due to federal and state confidentiality requirement.

There are approximately 70 emergency beds or units in King County for domestic violence victims. Forty-five of the units are in confidential facilities. Two of the shelter facilities have moved from community living group homes to individual apartments. One agency leases apartments scattered throughout a large complex. The other agency purchased and renovated an apartment building. Two culturally-specific service providers created a combined total of six emergency apartment units tailored for the cultural needs of their residents. The City of Seattle has also made hotel/motel voucher funding available for agencies throughout King County to provide emergency rooms to Seattle residents.

There are currently 139 transitional housing units for victims of domestic violence. Fifty-one of the units are operated by culturally-specific domestic violence service providers. Ten of the units are for survivors who are also struggling with chemical dependency. The Seattle transitional programs receive an average of 15 applications for each available unit. Several agencies have also developed permanent supportive housing programs. One agency has 15 units for families and 10 units for singles. An Office of Violence Against Women grant is funding 6 units per year for the next three years for three Seattle agencies.

There continues to be racial disparity in the domestic violence emergency shelter population as in the general homeless shelter population. In 2007, 75% of emergency shelter residents in Seattle-funded domestic violence programs were women and children of color. During the same year, 58% of program participants in Seattle-funded domestic violence community advocacy programs were women of color.

A number of other issues affect victims of domestic violence. In addition to an inadequate supply of safe emergency housing options, there are several other issues that further affect those...
who are homeless due to domestic violence.

- **Mental Health Problems:** Women who have experienced domestic violence also experience high levels of physical and mental health problems. Symptoms of post traumatic stress disorder compound the difficulties that victims of domestic violence may have with accessing and maintaining safe housing.

- **Chemical Dependency:** Many women turn to prescription medication, alcohol, and/or street drugs to self-medicate. Anecdotal information from local shelters estimates that as many as 50% to 80% of any given shelter population is struggling with substance use and relapse issues.

- **Employment:** Victims and survivors usually do seek employment, but are often not able to maintain it because of interference from abusive partners.

- **Criminal Legal and Civil Legal Systems:** Victims and survivors often struggle with criminal cases (either the batterers’ or the victims’), with family law issues, and with immigration issues. Time in court may affect employment. In addition, many victims do not have enough money for attorney fees.

- **Housing Practices and Policies:** Suitability requirements for public housing often prevent a victim or survivor from securing housing due to poor credit history, negative landlord references, or a criminal history record due to the domestic violence.
3.3.5 The Senior Community and Those “Aging in Place”

This section is compiled from information in the Area Agency on Aging (AAA) 2008-2010 Strategic Plan. The AAA Plan, which was co-sponsored by the Seattle Human Services Department’s Aging and Disability Services Division (ADS), describes key community needs and trends, and summarizes its annual budget of $51 million in federal, state, and local resources, listing planned levels of service through King County for the next four years.

While the fund sources administered by the Area Agency on Aging are not solely targeted to those with no-to-moderate income, many of the service priorities affect that segment of the older population.

The AAA’s planning process included key stakeholders and partners in service provision, including recruiting the Seattle Housing Authority to conduct a Senior Housing study as part of its planning efforts (see Section 5.1.1 – Plan for Public Input – Community Consultation).

The Area Plan highlights key trends in the aging and disabled population, including:

- In 2005, almost 15% of the population was over 60. By 2025, 23% will be over 60;
- 81% of baby boomers expect to work beyond retirement;
- More older women will live in poverty than older men;
- Self-care limitations are increasing among 45-64 year-olds; and
- Disability rates are increasing among female, low-income, less-educated older adults.

Profile of Seattle/King County seniors (those 60 and older)\(^57\)

- **Life expectancy has increased dramatically.** Thanks to remarkable advancements in medicine, nutrition, and general living standards, King County residents reaching the age of 60 can now expect to live about 32 years longer than someone born a century ago. This dramatic increase in life expectancy, from 47 years in 1900 to 79 years in 2000, is the main factor contributing to a significant increase in the number of older adults. Another factor is about to play out: the dramatic rise in birth rates after World War II known as the “baby boom.” This “boomer” generation is just beginning to turn 60, and will likely have profound effects on the aging services field.

• **Longer life expectancies mean that older adults have different needs based on their age.** Programs and policies targeting those over 60 must take into account the needs of at least three cohorts of older adults. While most “young old” (often defined as ages 60-74) adults are often active, healthy, and independent, those in the “older old” (75-84) and “oldest old” groups (85+) and older are more likely to face disabling conditions (Figure 2). This “age diversity” is an important consideration for policymakers.

**Figure 3-59: Rates of Disability in King County by Type and Age**

Source: Seattle/King County Area Agency on Aging 2008-2011 Strategic Plan.
While the number of 60+ residents has just begun its dramatic increase, the number of 85+ residents has been climbing since 1990, and will continue to do so for the remainder of this decade. Those over age 85 have the highest rates of disabling medical conditions. Improving services to this population while controlling costs represents one of the biggest challenges – and opportunities – for Area Agencies on Aging.

**Figure 3-60: King County 85+ Population, Number and Percent of Total Pop.**

![Graph showing population of 85+ in King County from 1990 to 2025.](Source: Seattle/King County Area Agency on Aging 2008-2011 Strategic Plan.)

There are disparities in condition between older adults of different races and ethnicities. Increasing diversity has created a vibrant cultural background for elders choosing to spend their later years in King County. However, significant disparities exist among these groups in terms of health, social, and economic status. For instance, while the average King County resident born in
2000 can expect to live more than 80 years, there is wide disparity among racial/ethnic groups. Asians have the highest life expectancy and can expect to live 10 more years than African Americans.

- **Health disparities can be clearly seen in the life expectancies for older adults.** At age 65, average life expectancy for King County residents is 84.5 years, meaning the typical 65-year-old can expect to live almost 20 additional years. Compared with 1995 data, life expectancy at 65 rose for every group except African Americans and Native Americans, who saw decreases of 0.4 and 1.5 years, respectively.

![Figure 3-62: Life Expectancy at Age 65 by Race/Ethnicity, 2004](source: Seattle/King County Area Agency on Aging 2008-2011 Strategic Plan.)

Health disparities across ethnic groups may become even more pronounced as a more diverse cohort of King County residents turns 60. Addressing these inequalities is one of the major challenges facing the aging network.
The Boomers Arrive

- The baby boomers represent the largest cohort yet to reach retirement age. The Area Plan covers an especially important period in which the first big wave of “baby boomers” celebrates their 60th birthdays. Many policymakers are concerned about the fiscal impact of this generation leaving the workforce and drawing on entitlement programs, while others see an opportunity to change the very definition of “retirement.”

Figure 3-63: King County Population by 5-Year Age Cohorts, 2004

- The proportion of those 60 and older will increase through 2025. During the relatively stable decade of 1990-2000, King County’s 60-and-older population increased only modestly in number, and actually decreased as a percentage of the total population. However, by 2005 this percentage had turned positive again, and will see huge increases through at least the year 2025, when the number of those 60 or older is expected to reach 480,000 persons, or almost 23% of the total population.

- The baby boomer generation will change the concept of retirement. The size of the boomer generation has caused concern about spending on social programs, as well as finding the workforce necessary to support them. However, there is cause for optimism as well, as the boomers represent the healthiest and best-educated generation yet to retire. There is reason to believe they will challenge traditional definitions of and assumptions about retirement, in ways that constitute a net gain to the economy and society as a whole.
Poverty Rates Have Increased For Older People

- **The number of older adults living in poverty is increasing.** In 1990, 6.9% of county residents 65 and older were living below poverty; by 2000, this proportion had risen to slightly 7.1%. Census Bureau estimates for 2005 show an increase in this proportion to 8.9%.

- ** Older adults living in poverty can be found throughout the county.** One might expect that elder poverty would be concentrated in a few areas, but pockets can be found throughout the county (based on the 2000 Census, the last year for which census tract data was available). In King County, older African Americans have the highest poverty rates, followed by Asians, and Hispanics/Latinos.

**Figure 3-64: County 65+ Pop. Below Poverty, by Race and Hisp./Latino Ethnicity**

According to the 2000 Census, the poverty rate among the 65+ population was highest in Seattle (9.9%) and lowest on Vashon Island (2.3%).

**Figure 3-65:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subregion</th>
<th>Total 65+</th>
<th>65+ Below Poverty</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Rural</td>
<td>2,565</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Urban</td>
<td>38,952</td>
<td>1,835</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Urban</td>
<td>15,319</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seattle</strong></td>
<td>67,804</td>
<td>6,709</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Rural</td>
<td>4,679</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Urban</td>
<td>51,126</td>
<td>3,132</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vashon</td>
<td>1,327</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>181,772</td>
<td>12,937</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Seattle/King County Area Agency on Aging 2008-2011 Strategic Plan.*
Disabilities Increase, Rates Decline

- **Overall disability rates among the 60 and older population are declining.** This is a very encouraging trend that is occurring among all age cohorts over 60. However, low-income and less educated older adults are not benefiting from this trend.

- **Long-term trends with respect to the needs for disability services are unclear.** It is not clear which trend – rising numbers of older adults or lower rates of disability – will “swamp” the other in terms of the future need for services. It is also not clear how long the trend toward lower disability rates will continue, and there is some indication it may reverse as the boomers retire and rates of obesity increase.

- **There are disparities in disability rates among different racial and ethnic groups.** There is limited information on whether disability decline is benefiting all racial/ethnic groups equally. It is clear, however, that significant disparities remain.

In King County, older African Americans and older persons from two or more races have significantly higher rates of disability than other racial groups.

### County 65+ Pop with Disabilities by Race and Hispanic/Latino Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Total 65+</th>
<th>65+ With Disability</th>
<th>% With Disability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>6,163</td>
<td>3,183</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>15,460</td>
<td>6,195</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>156,196</td>
<td>58,227</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-racial</td>
<td>2,147</td>
<td>1,278</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>181,772</strong></td>
<td><strong>69,647</strong></td>
<td><strong>38.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino*</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>1,011</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* overlaps with other categories
Active seniors and Social Engagement

• The past four years have seen a growing awareness of the importance of remaining active and involved in the community in our later years. From a health perspective, studies have shown that remaining socially active is one of the strongest predictors of continued health and longevity.

From a societal perspective, it is desirable that older adults can remain in their communities and stay or become active in social and civic organizations. Despite stereotypes, few older adults live in nursing facilities, and a majority reports no disability whatsoever. As a growing number of frail elders place increasing burdens on our social support systems, it makes sense to tap into the wisdom and experience of the vast majority of older adults who are not frail and vulnerable.

• A new vision of retirement is gaining strength that recognizes retirement as a time for leisure and reflection, but also a time for active engagement in community life. This can be through paid employment, volunteer commitments, or even. This vision recognizes that most people can expect to live up to 20 years after retirement – almost a quarter of their lives. Most of these years will not be spent in nursing homes (where only about 5% of older adults live) or otherwise incapacitated. In fact 60% of older adults report no disability whatsoever, and rates of disability have been decreasing dramatically for this population. Each generation of retirees has been healthier, wealthier, better educated, and longer-lived than the one that preceded it.

• Technology can play a key role in shaping the coming retirement revolution. Social networking web sites are being developed targeting recent retirees and active older adults. The increasing ability to rapidly share information on elder-friendly volunteer opportunities will contribute to community engagement for older people. More seniors choosing "encore careers” should accelerate this trend, as well as the increasing numbers of technology-savvy seniors approaching retirement age.
3.3.6 Children and Youth

Low-Income Children

This section uses data from Seattle Public Schools and specialized studies offer insight into the population in need.

Seattle Public Schools

- There are 45,276 students enrolled in Seattle Public Schools,\(^{58}\) 39% of whom are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch. Children of color comprise 57.5% of the student population and white students comprise 42.5%. Of these students 36.9% do not live with both parents. Based on the income level of their parents, 39% of students are eligible for free or reduced lunch.

- Nearly one-quarter of students have non-English speaking backgrounds. In June 2007, 10,466 students, or 23.3% of the total Seattle Public School enrollment, had non-English speaking backgrounds. Of these, 5,971, or 13.3% were receiving bilingual services, and 14% were receiving special education services. For the class of 2007, 61.5% of those who entered the class in the last four years graduated on time, while 30.1% dropped out.

Special Needs

- The Women’s Funding Alliance analyzed needs of women and girls in the Puget Sound region. The Women’s Funding Alliance public foundation provides grants throughout the Puget Sound region [generally four counties; Snohomish, King (including Seattle), Pierce and Whatcom counties] focused on improving the health and vitality of communities by investing in opportunities for women and girls. In 2007, the Alliance funded an in-depth study on quality of life for women and girls in the region to help policy makers determine the needs and strengths of this population. A Closer Look provides data and analysis\(^{59}\) that emphasize the following points:

  - Single women with children have the lowest median annual earnings of any family type. Married couples with children in King County earn about 160% more per year than single women with children.

  - Nearly 180,000 women and girls in the four-county region are living in poverty. In Washington, 33% of Hispanic, Black, and American Indian/Alaskan Native girls live in poverty.

\(^{58}\) Data Profile Summary 2007, Seattle Public Schools

• Poverty disproportionately affects single women with children. However, service providers in the four-county region suggested the face of poverty may be changing. More than ever before, they are serving two-parent households that struggle to make ends meet, despite the fact that at least one parent works outside the home.

• Lack of affordable, flexible child care is one of the most significant barriers to women achieving economic security in the four-county region. A Spring 2008 Child Care Resources telephone survey confirmed the severe shortage of infant care and toddler care, with its finding of zero vacancies for infant care and few toddler spaces available at 58 child care centers.

• Lack of early childhood education and caregiver support limit women’s educational opportunities. Lack of quality, affordable, and culturally and linguistically appropriate early care and education programs, as well as support for caregivers—including respite care for those whose children have special health care needs and for those caring for aging parents and older family members—are major barriers to educational attainment for women and girls in the four county region.

• English Language Learners have lower graduation rates. Graduation rates for children with limited English proficiency are 58% compared with 70% for the general student population.

• Infant mortality rates vary by racial and ethnic group. Across the state, the infant mortality rate for American Indian/Alaskan Native and African American mothers is double that of mothers in other racial/ethnic groups.

A Closer Look, offers a wealth of information, including graphics, for those interested in more detail on the topic.

Homeless Young Adults

The needs of homeless young adults (ages 18-25 years old) have been well documented by the recently published A Plan to End Young Adult Homelessness in King County conducted as part of the Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness in King County. The Young Adult Plan emphasizes the importance of addressing the unique needs of homeless youth, before homelessness becomes an embedded lifestyle:

• Abuse and neglect, and the resulting trauma, are common conditions for at-risk young adults. Homeless youth and young adults often report that their family relationships have been strained by emotional abuse, neglect, alcoholism, addictions, or disapproval of their sexuality and/or sexual identity. These experiences have a profound effect on how young adults engage in services: some feel safer sleeping outside rather than putting themselves under an adult’s care. While the engagement process for any young adult takes longer than for most adults (and can be compared to chronically
homeless adults), young adults who have experienced trauma, including those with Posttraumatic Stress Disorder, require different approaches to address these root issues.

- **Among homeless adults who are 25 or older, 35% became homeless for the first time when they were between 12 and 24 years of age.** A study by Martha Burt of The Urban Institute found that the longer the episode of homelessness as a youth or young adult, the higher the risk that he or she will end up as a chronically homeless adult. Many homeless street young adults would meet HUD criteria for chronic homelessness if they were participating in the system.  

- **The need for services for young adult who are homeless is growing.** In 2007, ROOTS (in Seattle’s University District) turned away 1,038 young adults from its shelter (up nearly 400% from 2005). YouthCare (which has multiple Seattle locations) served more than 1,100 young adults (unduplicated) in 2007, and has waiting lists for housing and employment services. Healthcare for the Homeless Network (countywide) served 709 young adults with health care services. There is a great need for housing and services for homeless young adults, and that the need is growing rather than declining. Fortunately, young adults in transitional living placements are beginning to access housing vouchers to gain permanent housing.

- **There are at least 1,113 young adults who are homeless in our county at any given time.** A national study by Martha Burt (*Helping America’s Homeless*) estimated that individuals aged 18 to 24 make up 12% of the adult homeless population. Based on these estimates, and using the 2007 One Night Count of 8,439 homeless in King County, which is widely considered to be a conservative estimate of homeless prevalence, we can estimate that there are at least 1,013 homeless young adults at a given time in our county.

- **It is estimated that 295 young adults can be served on a given night in emergency, transitional, and permanent housing in King County, half in housing that is dedicated with services tailored for young adults.** These programs have demonstrated that they are in great demand, as occupancy rates are increasing, with most programs showing rates of 90% or higher. Emergency shelter use is at an all-time high, with ROOTS shelter and The Landing turning away young adults nearly every night. Between the 2007 and 2008 One Night Counts, there was an increase of 80 young adults living in older adult and family emergency shelters and transitional housing.

### Estimating Housing and Service Needs for Homeless Young Adults

- **At least 718 young adults who are homeless are not housed at any given time.** The following table estimates the number of housing units, beds, and vouchers that homeless young adults are currently accessing, and the number who are homeless and not receiving assistance.
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60 *A Plan to End Young Adult Homelessness in King County*, Committee to End Homelessness, May 2008, pps 2-4.
61 Ibid., p. 3.
### Figure 3-67: Estimating Housing and Service Needs for Homeless Young Adults

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young Adults in Dedicated Housing (capacity at a given time)</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total: Number of Young Adults Receiving Housing Assistance</strong></td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Adults who are Homeless (at a given time in 2008)</td>
<td>1,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total GAP: Number of Homeless Young Adults Not Housed</strong></td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Regional priorities for homeless young adults are:
  - Scattered-site, non-time-limited stable housing for 25 homeless young adults, including developmentally-appropriate, ethnically- and community-based support services; and
  - Interim housing for 30 homeless young adults awaiting entry into transitional or non-time-limited stable housing, including short-term housing assistance and developmentally appropriate, ethnically- and community-based support services.

### Homeless Unaccompanied Youth Under 18

- **Homeless youth under the age of 18 experience homelessness for many of the same reasons as homeless young adults.** These reasons include family conflict, abuse, and being thrown out of their home because of sexual orientation or pregnancy. Furthermore, many youth become homeless when they leave juvenile detention, correctional institutions, or mental health institutions, or run away from foster care. Nationally, Burt has estimated that 7-8% of all youth between the ages of 12 to 17 have spent one or more nights away from home without permission. While 90% of these youth reunite with their parents or live with friends or family members, timely services are critical to keep youth from living on the streets and becoming chronically homeless.

- **Unfortunately services for minors are limited because of their age.** Washington’s Becca Bill requires that shelters report homeless youth to their parents or the police within eight hours, making many homeless youth very wary of shelters. Furthermore, homeless youth and young adults are unlike homeless adults in that they often avoid services because of past negative experiences with adults. Consequently, outreach is essential to engage youth and encourage them to access services so that they can avoid living on the streets.

- **Housing options for minors are limited.** Once homeless youth are identified, options for housing are limited to family reconciliation, foster care, or transitional housing. Furthermore, there are additional state licensing issues for shelters and foster care group homes that serve minors, which makes these placements more staff-intensive and thus more expensive. These placements must impose many rules to meet state requirements,
and these rules may pose more barriers to homeless youth. Housing options for unaccompanied minors must be linked to multiple ethnically and developmentally appropriate services to help them learn to live independently. Most of these youth have not completed high school and have little or no job experience. In addition, 40-50% has drug or alcohol problems and/or mental health problems (Burt).

- **Seattle currently has only one shelter and limited Transitional Living Programs for unaccompanied minors.** Seattle’s priorities for homeless unaccompanied minors have not yet been determined. Providers would like a plan for homeless youth similar to A Plan to End Young Adult Homelessness in King County.
3.3.7 Foreign-born residents (including Refugee and Immigrant communities)

Profile of Refugee and Immigrant Communities

- **Seattle has been an entry portal for refugees and immigrants for almost four decades.** The City has responded to the influx of New Americans by celebrating diverse cultures and languages and by providing services to help them successfully assimilate to U. S. life.

- **Nearly 17% of Seattle’s population is foreign-born.** According to the 2000 Census, a total of 94,952 Seattle residents, nearly 17% of the population was born abroad. This figure is 40% higher than the total a decade earlier and more than four times higher than the city’s overall 9% growth rate during the 1990s.

- **More than half of Seattle’s foreign-born residents were born in Asia.** Despite higher rates of growth during the 1990s among people from Africa (320%), the Americas (74%), and Oceania (63%), Asia still remains the birthplace of more than half the city’s foreign-born. The number of Seattle residents from Asia increased only 34% during the 1990s. For a detailed analysis of the similarities and differences among Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in Seattle see “A Community of Contrasts” published by the Asian American Legal Center in 2006.

- **Over half of Seattle’s foreign-born residents have become naturalized U.S. citizens.** This is the second highest among 23 largest cities in a Brookings Institution study.

- **The state of Washington ranks sixth in the nation in the number of refugees who have settled here.** It also has the third largest population of secondary migrants (refugees who initially resettled in other parts of the country, but migrated to Seattle and other parts of Washington State). Refugee resettlement agencies helped 2,216 refugees resettle in Washington in 2007, bringing the total number of refugees who have settled in the state to approximately 300,000. The newest arrivals continue to be from the former Soviet Union and Africa with smaller groups from many diverse nations.

- **The Washington State Office of Refugee and Immigrant Assistance estimates that approximately 80,000 refugees currently live in King County.** Approximately 42% of the refugees who live in the area are from Southeast Asian countries. However, a growing segment of this population is from East Africa, which represents about 22% of the refugee population. East African refugees come from Ethiopia, Eritrea, Somalia, Liberia, Burundi, and Sudan. Eastern Europeans make up 31 % of the refugee population in King County; however most reside in South and East King County. Less than 10% of
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the refugee population is from the Middle East. Voluntary resettlement agencies resettled 1,208 refugees in King County in 2007 including 325 from Somalia, 171 from Burma/Myanmar, 195 from the Ukraine, 104 from Russia, 70 from Burundi, 76 from Iran, 27 from Iraq, 15 from Vietnam, 23 from Eritrea, 60 from Ethiopia, 5 from Liberia, 7 from Sudan and 9 from Afghanistan.

- **Refugee resettlement slowed following 9/11, but has since increased.** The more stringent screening of foreign arrivals to the U.S. following 9/11 is reflected in the decreased number of refugees admitted for resettlement in recent years. Admission ceilings nationally for new arrivals were radically reduced or were not met after 9/11. In 2001, 70,000 refugees were admitted to the country, but only 27,000 were admitted in 2002. Refugee admissions increased dramatically in 2003 when 20,529 were admitted nationally during the first six months of the year. Of this number, 31.5% were from the former Soviet Union, 31.9% were from Africa, 16.6% from the Near East, 6.9% from Asia and 1.2% from Latin America.

- **Refugees and immigrants face significant barriers to economic and social stability including access to appropriate housing for their families.** Unfortunately, in the current tight labor market, there remain a significant number of refugees and immigrants who need assistance from government programs such as Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and Refugee Cash and Medical Assistance (RCMA) programs.

  New refugee arrivals without families receive medical and cash assistance for eight months; those with families are enrolled in the TANF program. Data for 2006 from the Economic Services Administration, Washington State Department of Social and Health Services, show 1,142 limited-English-speaking households enrolled in TANF in King County and 147 refugees received RCMA.

- **Refugees who have jobs work more hours and make about $1 less an hour than most Americans.** Many refugee workers pay significantly more than 30% of their incomes for housing (the amount HUD designates as “affordable”). Without necessary skills, literacy, or familiarity with the system of housing assistance and supportive services available to needy Americans, many refugees experience prolonged periods of unemployment and struggle with keeping a home for themselves and their families.

**Impact on Homelessness**

- **Refugees and immigrants, who become homeless, often will not use emergency shelters because they lack culturally and linguistically appropriate services.** However, the annual One Night Count conducted in January 2007, found 699 people with limited English proficiency (designated as LEP, or Limited English Proficient) in shelters or transitional housing, 11.7% of the total of 5,964 people who were counted. Of the 699 LEP persons, 66 were single individuals and 633 were members of families with children. The majority of LEP persons who were counted were East Africans, whose number increased from 5% of LEP persons in shelters in 1998 to 12% in 2007.
• Reliable numbers regarding the local homeless refugee population are difficult to obtain because a large segment of this population does not access shelters. Instead they become highly transient moving from one overcrowded home to another. Barriers facing Somali families are compounded by the large size of their families.

• Refugees and immigrants face cultural and linguistic barriers that hinder their access to housing and supportive services. These barriers make it difficult to complete applications for housing. Once they find housing, refugees and immigrants often have difficulty understanding rules and regulations, notices about increases in rent, waiting lists, or loss of housing subsidies. For those who find subsidized housing, notices sent to them when they have an increase in income are also confusing; and when their incomes decrease, they often do not know how to get their rents reduced and face a time lag with higher rents. Because many of these families and individuals have limited English-speaking and literacy skills, they may lose their place on waiting lists when the only mode of communication is by telephone or the Internet.

• Housing for large refugee or immigrant families, along with bilingual and culturally appropriate services, is an emerging need. A limited scope research study conducted by a University of Washington Geography student investigated current housing challenges faced by refugees in Washington communities. Challenges included finding and keeping housing and exploring housing resources that are available. The report noted that housing challenges vary from one refugee community to another, as different communities have different housing preferences and needs.

Impact on access to subsidized private and public housing

• More than 20% of Seattle Housing Authority tenants speak a language other than English at home. Data provided by the Seattle Housing Authority (SHA) on July 12, 2007 notes that 29% or 1,158 households in SHA low-income public housing communities report speaking a language other than English. In HOPE VI communities, which include High Point, New Holly and Rainier Vista, 54% or 579 households speak a language other than English. Among Section 8 certificate holders, 22% or 2,243 households report speaking a language other than English at home. Counting all SHA housing units, 2,243 or 22% of all residents are non English-speakers. It should be noted that only in HOPE VI communities is information about primary language systematically gathered for all households. In other housing programs, language is typically tracked only if the household requests an interpreter. SHA also reports that the average annual income of households who reside in public housing is $17,981, although for households reporting Cambodian as their primary language, the average household income was $14,826.

• Many refugees and immigrants experience fluctuations in income due to the seasonal nature of their work. Such income variability makes it difficult to qualify as renters for private market housing. Some refugee families, such as Somalis, are not
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64 See also Women’s Funding Alliance: A Closer Look, p. 6.
easily accommodated in available private or public subsidized affordable housing units due to the large size of their families. Sometimes these families must split up to find housing, resulting in tensions within the normally strong family support system that is part of their culture.

Response to needs of refugee and immigrant communities

- The City of Seattle offers an example of ways to make services more accessible to persons whose first language is not English. The “Immigrant and Refugee Report and Action Plan of 2007” is a comprehensive initiative to strengthen City services for immigrant and refugee communities. To provide better customer services to non-English-speaking residents, the City has improved communications and outreach strategies for immigrant and refugee communities. Added services include interpretation and translation to help refugees and immigrants access essential services in City government and the community, to inform them about U.S. civil rights laws, and to help them gain access to affordable legal services.

- The City maintains a language web portal which features indexes of translated documents for 26 languages. The City has also taken affirmative steps to help refugees and immigrants learn English and to access educational and training opportunities.

The City’s Community Facilities Loan Program, funded by the Community Development Block Grant Program, provides resources for several community-based agencies that help refugees and immigrants with emergency needs, achieve self sufficiency and adjust to U.S. life.
3.3.8 Impact of Mental illness and Chemical Addiction

Profile of mental illness and people with chemical addiction

- **As many as one-third of adults in Seattle may experience mental illness or substance abuse in the course of a year.** A national survey found that during a 12-month period, 32% of surveyed adults had an episode of a diagnosable mental condition or abused alcohol or drugs. \(^65\) The survey estimated that 19% of the non-institutionalized adult population experiences anxiety disorders in a 12-month period; 10% have mood disorders such as depression; and 10% have impulse control disorders. Substance abuse and mental illness are strongly related; one increases the risk of the other. About 15% of those with diagnosable mental illness have a co-occurring substance abuse disorder. Among those with severe mental illness, the prevalence of substance abuse is estimated to be 20%, compared to about 6% among those without mental illness. Of those with an addictive disorder, 43% have at least one diagnosable mental disorder.

**Mental illness**

- **Approximately 6% of adults suffer from serious mental illness.** For most people, an episode of mental illness is brief and mild. The main burden of mental illness is concentrated in the 5.8% of the adult population with serious mental illness, defined as mental disorders that interfere with some area of social functioning. The prevalence of severe mental illness has not changed significantly over time. Females, younger people, those with less education and lower incomes, and the never- or formerly-married are at higher risk for serious mental illness. Hispanics and non-Hispanic Blacks have no greater risk for psychiatric disorders than do Whites, but tend to have more persistent disorders.

- **The needs of those who are mentally ill vary depending on other factors, such as age or health.** Clinicians have identified five clusters of severely mentally ill individuals: older people in poor health who have psychiatric symptoms; individuals with both psychiatric and substance use disorders; chronically mentally ill persons with disability and long treatment histories; persons who function in the community but who are isolated as a result of anxiety, depression, or trauma-related social fears; and mental health consumers who get support for their mental health problems and function well. \(^66\) This pattern of individuals experiencing severe mental illness suggests that housing needs among these populations will vary greatly.
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Substance Abuse

- A project screening Seattle’s Harborview Medical Center emergency admissions for drug and alcohol use in 2005-6 found that 51% of admitted patients presently abused alcohol and 44% had used illegal drugs in the 12 months before the screening (persons could report more than one type of use). The Washington State Division of Social and Health Services Research and Data Analysis Division uses the estimate that drug and alcohol abuse affect about 8% of non-institutionalized adults in King County in a given year, based on national prevalence data. But local treatment professionals believe this estimate is too low. Other studies use self-reported rates of substance use and abuse as an indicator of alcohol abuse. For instance, the 2008 Communities Count BRFSS survey data tracks self-reported binge drinking (five or more drinks on one occasion for men and four drinks for women), although it may not identify people who are alcohol-dependent. During the 2005-2007 period, the rate of binge drinking among Seattle adults (at 17.5%) was significantly higher than the 14% rate reported in the rest of King County.

- Those who struggle with alcohol or chemical dependency commonly abuse multiple substances. Among Seattle residents admitted to publicly-funded substance abuse treatment in 2007, 40% said alcohol was their primary addiction, 22% listed cocaine, 16% sought treatment for heroin, and 11% named marijuana. Multiple substances are commonly abused. In comparison, national data indicate that about 66% of substance abusers are dependent on alcohol, 19% abuse illicit drugs but not alcohol, and 14% depend on or abuse both alcohol and drugs (SAMHSA).

- The number of drug-related deaths in Seattle and King County have continues to rise. Compared to 1997, the 2006 rate of drug-caused overdose deaths has increased 56% to 14.0 per 100,000. Cocaine is the most common drug in emergency department reports, and cocaine involved deaths are at their highest level in a decade. Deaths and treatment admissions involving prescription-type opiates continue to increase. Heroin-related admissions and deaths dropped slightly in 2006, remaining second only to cocaine among the illegal drugs. Methamphetamine indicators have plateaued at moderate levels in the County, with lower use in Seattle.

Trends

- Adults are living longer with mental disorders and substance abuse disorders, and others will develop these illnesses in later life. Predicting the social effect of this trend is difficult. The number of persons with mental disorders in later life will increase, and as family caregivers age, the need for supportive housing will increase as well. Gerontologists suspect that the abuse of alcohol and other drugs by the present cohort of aging baby boomers as they age will be quite different from the previous generation’s
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67 Research and Data Analysis report on WASBIRT intervention, Harborview Medical Center, May 2007.
substance abuse patterns. Baby boomers have a different attitude toward alcohol and other drugs than their parents, and they are more likely to have experimented with drugs during their lifetimes (CSAT, 1998).

- **Generational differences make it hard to predict the needs of those with mental illness and substance abuse disorders.** Very robust birth cohort differences in use have been observed for cocaine, cannabis, and other extra-medical drug use, but not for alcohol or tobacco. These generational differences make it hard to predict housing needs. Many younger adults who are chemically dependent or mentally ill never become homeless, but people who are poor, addicted and mentally ill are at greatly increased risk.

**Impact on Homelessness**

- **Chemical dependence and mental illness are the most frequently reported disabling conditions for people who are homeless.** The prevalence of mental illness and chemical dependence is estimated to affect almost half of all homeless individuals in shelters. When individuals with mental illness, co-occurring substance abuse disorders and other co-morbid chronic health conditions become homeless, they tend to remain homeless for longer periods of time and incur more service costs than other homeless individuals. Because many of these individuals experience extended or repeated episodes of homelessness, they often move from the streets to shelters, emergency rooms, hospitals or the criminal justice system.

- **The increase in homelessness over the past two decades cannot be solely be explained by addiction rates or by de-institutionalization of the mentally ill.** Many people who are chemically dependent or mentally ill never become homeless, but people who are poor, addicted and mentally ill are at increased risk.

- **Loss of low-income housing since the 1980s has pushed those with addiction and mental illness onto the street.** The loss of Single Room Occupancy (SRO) housing, a source of stability for many poor people suffering from addiction and/or mental illness, has particularly affected homelessness in this group. Housing with services will be needed to keep this population stable and housed.

- **In King County an estimated 18% of those who are homeless suffer from mental illness, and 20% report substance abuse problems.** During the 2008 One Night Count of 5,808 adults and children in emergency shelters and transitional housing programs, 1,072 (18%) reported mental illness and 1,190 (20%) reported alcohol or substance abuse. Of those reporting chemical dependency, 62% were chronic abusers. Nine percent of persons in emergency housing had a dual diagnosis of co-occurring chemical dependency and mental illness. These numbers certainly under-represent the extent of disabling conditions among the homeless.
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70 Analysis by staff from the King County Mental Health, Chemical Abuse and Dependency Services Division (MHCADSD) of the Department of Community and Human Services, as reported in Mental Illness and Drug Dependency Action Plan, October 2007.
• Individuals in King County who are homeless and suffer from mental illness are four times more likely to be jailed and three times more likely to be hospitalized than individuals who are mentally ill but have a home. It costs King County $98 per day per jail bed for an ordinary prisoner, and $300 per day per bed for a mentally ill one. In the King County jail system, 50% of all inmates using Jail Health reported they were homeless.

Seattle’s Downtown Emergency Services Center (DESC) reported in 2007 that among its homeless clients, 21% had been incarcerated, 41% had co-occurring disorders, and 66% reported a history of substance abuse.\(^{71}\)

3.4 Community-based Economic Development Needs

This section of the Consolidated Plan focuses on the City of Seattle’s economic development strategy, in particular how this strategy targets economically needy communities and neighborhoods.

- **Seattle’s economic development strategy is place-based, focused on neighborhoods in need.** The City of Seattle employs a place-based community economic development strategy to increase opportunities for all residents to benefit from Seattle’s economic growth. Publicly funded economic development programs aimed at Seattle’s low- and moderate-income neighborhoods have the ability to spur neighborhood-wide change when sufficient resources are deployed.

- **A place-based revitalization strategy addresses the range of physical, economic, and social conditions to improve the overall quality of life and economic opportunities for neighborhood residents.** Critical to this process is the revitalization of commercial areas, because these areas create jobs for local residents, act as an incubator for small businesses, provide goods and services to the local market (thereby keeping local dollars in the community) and improve the overall image of the neighborhood as an active and vital place. The City’s place-based strategy relies on our community partners and non-profit organizations to contribute to neighborhood revitalization. Ultimately, successful revitalization efforts must leverage public, private, and community resources to achieve their goals.

- **Long-term sustainability is key to City economic development efforts.** Commercial corridor revitalization includes analyzing business districts’ physical, economic and social needs; assessing strengths and challenges; setting forth concrete actions; and measuring outcomes. The goal is to build the necessary foundation and infrastructure so that after the City’s involvement ends the neighborhood will be able to continue to implement and sustain positive changes.

- **Focused revitalization efforts can result in increased impact.** There are a number of common activities employed by redevelopment organizations across the country to create change in neighborhoods. These activities include business support and retention, real estate development, and community organizational development. By concentrating a number of revitalization activities in a focused geographic area, these activities can leverage and reinforce one another to create more significant impact.

3.4.1 Seattle’s Economic Status

This section provides an analysis of the economic needs of Seattle’s distressed neighborhoods, including the challenge local businesses face in finding affordable property. The analysis of changing land prices relied primarily on data from the King County Department of Assessments,
supplemented by information from anecdotal sources including recent media analyses, and the Seattle Office of Economic Development’s insights from working with community-based economic development partners in specific neighborhoods.

- **Since the 2001 recession, Seattle’s overall economy has gradually regained strength and has been generating job and population growth.** In 2001, the Puget Sound economy, including Seattle, was hit with the “triple shocks” of 9/11, the economic recession, and the “dot-com” bust. Since then, the region has been in a slow but steady recovery. By 2007, regional employment was growing at 2.8%, more than twice the national average.

During 2007 and 2008 to date, however, the region began to experience an economic slowdown triggered by the national subprime mortgage crisis. To date, the effects of the national slowdown on the local housing market have been more moderate than in many other cities across the country that had experienced greater levels of speculative development.

The rising costs associated with food and petroleum products have contributed to an increasingly difficult personal economy for many Seattle households. Those with relatively few resources and little or no savings to fall back on have been hardest hit by increasing costs.

- **The initial strengthening economy led to a robust private housing market, which in turn spurred economic revitalization across numerous neighborhoods but has also increased home prices, as discussed in the Housing Market section of this Plan.** Rental and property prices for businesses have also increased, creating new challenges for small businesses in a number of Seattle neighborhoods.

- **Seattle’s Office of Economic Development has implemented a number of strategies to support neighborhood business districts.** The Seattle Office of Economic Development (OED) supports the revitalization of distressed neighborhood business districts while preserving business/commercial affordability and community character in a number of ways. OED a) provides loans for real estate development; b) works with Seattle’s community development corporations (CDCs) that operate in distressed neighborhoods; and c) leads the city’s work with the Rainier Valley Community Development Fund, a non-profit community financing entity that serves Southeast Seattle.

In addition, OED has led development of and manages community development policies that provide the framework for comprehensive, multi-faceted revitalization efforts carried out by many City departments and community partners. For example, the Southeast Seattle Action Agenda created a broad vision for the revitalization of Southeast Seattle that resulted from a City-led, community-driven process in 2005. OED established a Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area (NRSA) in Southeast Seattle based on the Action Agenda to provide a tool for the use of federal Community Development Block
Grant funds. OED is also leading the coordination of city and community efforts to implement economic development initiatives outlined in the Action Agenda.

- **However, local programs may not be enough to meet current challenges.** Numerous public programs and policies have been implemented to respond to recent economic trends. However, public programs and policies may not be adequate to meet the challenges fueled by private market forces that have eroded affordability citywide.

### 3.4.2 Distressed Neighborhood Economic Needs

**Historically underinvested neighborhoods share a number of common indicators.** The table below summarizes key social and economic indicators for several historically underinvested neighborhoods in Seattle. These areas are among the most economically disadvantaged in Seattle. While the city as a whole had 11% of residents in poverty in 2000, all of these neighborhoods had significantly greater shares of residents in poverty, in particular, a total poverty rate of 48% in the Chinatown/International District. These four neighborhoods also had higher percentages of unemployed residents and residents with less formal education.

**Note:** 2000 U.S. census data is the most recent information available collected at the level of census tracts and census block groups which most closely conforms to recognized Seattle neighborhood boundaries. The analysis below relies primarily on 2000 census data for that reason.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% 25 or Older with Bachelor's degree or higher</th>
<th>% Unemployed</th>
<th>% in Poverty</th>
<th>% Foreign-born</th>
<th>% Non-white</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seattle</strong></td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Targeted Neighborhoods**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>% 25 or Older with Bachelor's degree or higher</th>
<th>% Unemployed</th>
<th>% in Poverty</th>
<th>% Foreign-born</th>
<th>% Non-white</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central District</td>
<td>34,053</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delridge</td>
<td>13,775</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International District</td>
<td>3,816</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainier Valley</td>
<td>44,966</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non-targeted Neighborhoods**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>% 25 or Older with Bachelor's degree or higher</th>
<th>% Unemployed</th>
<th>% in Poverty</th>
<th>% Foreign-born</th>
<th>% Non-white</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>461,679</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** U.S. Census 2000.

- **These distressed neighborhoods have experienced varying levels of revitalization since 2000.** Since the 2000 Census, these neighborhoods have seen varying levels of economic and physical revitalization, as the Seattle economy has gained strength and public agencies have invested in physical, economic, and social infrastructure in
distressed areas. Land values in these neighborhoods remain relatively low compared to the rest of Seattle. As a result, new development projects have difficulty attracting sufficient private financing, leaving these neighborhoods without needed investments in retail goods and services.

- **Even in distressed neighborhoods, land values and commercial rents are rising.** Although land values are lower than in other areas of Seattle, values have been rising in distressed neighborhoods, and these neighborhoods have veered close to (or already reached) a “tipping point” toward gentrification and displacement of low-income and minority residents and/or businesses. Today, these vulnerable neighborhoods include the Central District/Capitol Hill, Delridge/Southwest Seattle, Chinatown/International District, and the Rainier Valley/Southeast Seattle.

- **Rising land values have led to rent increases, which have been a challenge for small businesses.** As Seattle’s economy has gained strength over the last five years, rising land values have led to increased property prices and rents that pose a challenge for many businesses, particularly small businesses located in previously underinvested neighborhoods. In many cases, these businesses had been able to survive at least partly due to affordable rents and/or land. Rising land values have created an affordability challenge in these neighborhoods.

- **Overall, all four neighborhoods identified as distressed have witnessed an increase in development activity spurred by the strengthening regional economy.** In the Central District, several mixed-use redevelopments have been proposed or constructed on underutilized parcels, including a new mixed-use redevelopment on the Wonder Bread site at South Jackson Street and 18th Avenue South. The First Hill neighborhood, adjacent to the Central District, has seen a similar trend of mixed-use development, particularly on old auto repair and retail lots, and has experienced a “maxing out” of density on multifamily-zoned parcels. Health institutions in the First Hill neighborhood, including Swedish Hospital, have expanded. In the Delridge neighborhood in Southwest Seattle, property values have increased. The adjacent White Center/Roxbury area has seen renovation of the Westwood Town Center shopping mall, frequent “tear-downs” of residential lots for multifamily/townhome development, and the redevelopment of the Greenbridge public housing community by the King County Housing Authority. In the Chinatown/International District and Little Saigon, new projects since 2004 have included at least two new apartment buildings, an expanded community museum, and numerous small commercial developments. The City is considering zoning changes, including increases in allowed heights that could increase the value of development in some areas of the International District. This has the potential to increase property values, land costs, and business rents.

---

72 King County Assessor 2007 Commercial Area Reports by Sub-Area.
Southeast Seattle’s Rainier Valley has witnessed particularly transformative trends, the result of a confluence of public activities that include the construction of a light rail line with three stations in the Valley; redevelopment of two major public housing communities, Holly Park and Rainier Vista; the continued revitalization of the Columbia City neighborhood; and the Rainier Valley’s status as one of the last in-city locations for new development. As a result, numerous private development projects have been proposed or completed over the last decade. In 2007 alone, for-profit developers proposed over 1,500 condominium and apartment units within a 10-minute walk of the soon-to-be-opened light rail stations. According to a recent article in the Seattle Times, these developments will be the area’s first multifamily housing units built without public subsidies in over 30 years.\footnote{Pryne, Eric. “MLK Makeover.” The Seattle Times, April 20, 2008.}

New development planned or underway is listed below for each of the light rail station areas:

- **Mount Baker Station area:** Mixed-use development over planned Sound Transit bus terminal, old Firestone site to be offered for sale for mixed-use development, University of Washington-owned Grocery Outlet site, affordable housing and retail on old Chubby & Tubby retail site.

- **Columbia City Station area:** Potential mixed-use development at three of the four corners of the intersection of Martin Luther King Jr. Way South and South Alaska Street, potential redevelopment of Zion Preparatory Academy, town homes at 35th Avenue South and South Edmunds Street, mixed-use development at Columbia Plaza site, 400 apartments and retail at 37th Avenue South and South Hudson Street, and condominiums and retail at Rainier Avenue South and 39th Avenue South.

- **Othello Station area:** Sale of two underdeveloped properties at Martin Luther King Jr. Way South and South Myrtle Street, homeless housing and retail at Union Gospel Mission property, potential redevelopment of old Safeway site, 730 apartments and retail north and south of South Othello Street at 42nd Avenue South, affordable housing at South Kenyon Street and 39th Avenue South, and mixed-use development at southwest corner of South Othello Street and Martin Luther King Jr. Way South.

- **New developments lead to concern about displacement.** The development activities in Southeast Seattle have caused significant community concern about displacement of long-time residents and business owners, particularly those who are low-income and people of color.

An important aspect of these communities is the significant proportion of ethnic immigrant-owned businesses that compose the business communities, particularly in the Chinatown/International District and Little Saigon neighborhoods and in Southeast Seattle.
Seattle’s Chinatown/International District and Little Saigon are home to nearly 500 small businesses and over 65 non-profits, the vast majority of which are owned by and/or serve Asian and Pacific Islander community members. Over 30% of business owners who responded to a 2006 survey indicated they are non-English speaking or speak English and an additional language. In the Chinatown/International District overall, 35 of 79 restaurants are Chinese, and in Little Saigon 24 of 35 restaurants are Vietnamese. Most of these businesses pay $1 to $2 per square foot in rent (as of 2007), and have historically relied on the cheaper rents in these locations in order to sustain their businesses.\(^{75}\)

In Southeast Seattle, a more diverse mix of ethnic immigrant businesses, including Asian- and African-owned enterprises, has been a hallmark of the area over many years. These businesses are dispersed along both Rainier Avenue South and Martin Luther King, Jr. Way South, the two primary thoroughfares through the neighborhood. According to the Rainier Valley Community Development Fund, a majority of businesses located along Martin Luther King Jr. Way South are immigrant-owned.

![Figure 3-69: Southeast Seattle Business Ownership](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East African</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Ethnic</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Interim Community Development Association, Community Survey, 2006; City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development, “Little Saigon and Chinatown/International District Economic Impact Study”, 2007*

- **Immigrant businesses strengthen the local economy.** Studies have shown that immigrant businesses make strong contributions to the local economy because they tend to form and operate businesses during both strong and weak economic times, have a higher rate of business formation on average than native-born residents, and often help cities activate underutilized land and recapture tax revenues from suburban shopping districts.\(^{76}\)

\(^{75}\) Interim Community Development Association, Community Survey, 2006; City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development, “Little Saigon and Chinatown/International District Economic Impact Study”, 2007.

• **Immigrant businesses often encounter obstacles.** Yet immigrant businesses also encounter obstacles, some of which are encountered by all small business owners but some of which are specific to immigrant owner status. These include language and cultural barriers that often make it difficult for business owners to be aware of and understand rules and regulations and obtain business financing. In addition, many immigrant businesses operate on razor-thin profit margins and are not connected to local economic development organizations. All of these factors render ethnic-owned businesses in these neighborhoods more vulnerable to changing market conditions such as escalating land values, rents, and development costs.

• **Strengthening immigrant-owned business and ethnic business districts requires a new framework for providing business services to immigrant communities.** The primary strategy to assist immigrant businesses is to build connections between existing business support programs and trusted community organizations to effectively address the needs of ethnic business districts.

### 3.4.3 Property Values, Vacant Land trends in Distressed areas

The following section shows changes in the value of property transactions between 1999-2001 and 2004-2006 for the distressed areas described above, drawing on data from King County Assessor Commercial Area Reports from 2002 and 2007. Several caveats concerning the data should be noted:

- The data for each assessor report is collected over an approximately two-year window prior to the date of the report. The 2002 Commercial Area Reports, thus, include data collected from property transactions between 1999 and 2001; and the 2007 reports include data from 2004 through 2006. As a result, the trend analysis is not a comparison between two exact points in time but between two “windows” that span approximately two years on each end.

- The data from the 2002 report reflects the larger economic recession that took place during that period as a result of both 9/11 and the “dot-com” bust. Values of property transactions reflected in the data are likely to reflect the influence of these larger forces.

- Because the County Assessor bases property valuations on a sampling of property transactions for each report period, some of the data analysis relies on small sample sizes. This was particularly the case with sales prices for vacant land, which tend to have fewer transactions given the urban nature of the neighborhoods in the analysis. The data tables in the Appendix include information about the number of transactions used to calculate average sale prices.

- **Every sub-area experienced sales price appreciation, with the largest increase occurring in the Central District.** There, average sales price increased from $23 to $101 per square foot. White Center increased the least, from $21 to $24. Prices in the

---

77 Ibid, pp. 5, 6, 26.
Chinatown/International District and Little Saigon rose from $69 to $96, while prices in the Rainier Valley increased from $19 to $44.

| Figure 3-71: Vacant Land Sales SP/Land Area by Zoning Category (2006 $) |
|---|---|
| 1999-2001 | 2004-06 |
| **International District & Little Saigon** | **International District & Little Saigon** |
| Chinatown/ID | Chinatown/ID |
| IDM 75-85 | $103 | IDM 75-85 | $100 |
| IDM 100-120 | $103 | IDM 100-120 | $105 |
| IDR 150 | $103 | IDR 150 | $115 |
| Little Saigon | Little Saigon |
| C-zones | $23-$51 | C-zones | $40-$70 |
| NC-1 | $17-$57 | NC-1 | $50-$55 |
| NC-2 | $17-$28 | NC-2 | $55 |
| NC-3 | $23-$74 | NC-3 | $45-$75 |
| **Central District** | **Central District** |
| Central District—central | Central District—central |
| Commercial | $23-$40 | NC-1 | $80-$85 |
| | | NC-2 | $95 |
| | | NC-3 | $100-$105 |
| Central District—southeast | Central District—southeast |
| C-zones | $11-$30 | C-zones | $55-$60 |
| NC-1 | $17-$23 | NC-1 | $45-$55 |
| NC-2 | $11-$34 | NC-2 | $50-$55 |
| NC-3 | $6-$28 | NC-3 | $60 |
| **First Hill** | **First Hill** |
| NC-2 | $57-$68 | NC-2 | $120 |
| NC-3 | $80-$102 | NC-3 | $120-$160 |
| Commercial | $80-$102 |
| **White Center & Roxbury** | **White Center & Roxbury** |
| NC-1 | $14 | North White Center |
| NC-2 | $14-$17 | C-zones | $20-$25 |
| NC-3 | $23 | NC-1 | $15-$25 |
| | | NC-2 | $25 |
| | | NC-3 | $35 |
| **White Center** | **White Center** |
| NC-1 | $18 |
| CB (Community Business) | $4-$30 |
| **Rainier Valley** | **Rainier Valley** |
| Mt. Baker | Mt. Baker |
| C-zones | $11-$34 | C-zones | $35-$50 |
| NC-1 | $34-$103 | NC-1 | $25-$40 |
| NC-3 | $46-$91 | NC-3 | $40-$50 |
| Rainier Valley/Columbia City | Rainier Valley/Columbia City |
| C-zones | $6-$23 | C-zones | $20-$45 |
| NC-1 | $11-$17 | NC-1 | $25-$30 |
Similar to trends for vacant land, every sub-area experienced sales price appreciation for improved land, with the largest increased occurring in the Central District. In the Central District, average sales price more than doubled, from $117 to $267 per square foot. Rainier Valley sales prices rose from $141 to $170 per square foot, while property on First Hill increased from $117 to $209. Improved land in White Center appreciated from $128 to $177 per square foot.

Figure 3-72: Average Sales Price of Improved Land, Seattle (Non-residential)

Source: King County Assessor, Commercial Area Reports, 2002, 2007.
Note: Only transactions of property zoned commercial and neighborhood-commercial were included. All prices are inflation-adjusted and shown in January 2006 dollars.
3.4.4 Socio-Economic Profile: A Detailed Look at Southeast Seattle

This section provides a demographic profile of the Rainier Valley in comparison to Southeast Seattle, the city of Seattle and King County. The demographic information provided in this report is based on the 2000 Census. The data for Southeast Seattle include the 13 census tracts that lie between Interstate 5 and Lake Washington and Interstate 90 and the city limits to the south. The data for the Rainier Valley are based on the census block groups that encompass the Rainier Valley.

Race and Ethnicity

- **The Rainier Valley is a multi-ethnic community.** Of the community’s total population, 82% of the residents are non-white. Asians, the most prevalent ethnicity, comprise 40% of the population; Blacks/ African Americans, the second largest group, comprise 27%; and Native American and Pacific Islanders comprise 1.03 and 1.7% of the population respectively. Among the Black population, a significant number are fairly recent immigrants, largely from Eritrea, Ethiopia, and Somalia in Northeast Africa.

![Figure 3-74: Ethnic Composition of Rainier Valley](image)


- When compared to the racial and ethnic composition of the city overall, the Rainier Valley has significantly higher prevalence of non-whites. While non-whites are in the majority in Rainier Valley, whites make up the majority of Seattle’s population, accounting for 70% of the city’s population. The rates of all non-white groups are lower in Seattle as a whole than in the Rainier Valley, with the proportion of Blacks and Asians significantly lower citywide than in the Rainier Valley. Blacks account for 27% in

---

Rainier Valley versus 8% citywide. Asians account for 40% of the Rainier Valley’s population, but only 13% in Seattle as a whole.

**Figure 3-75: Ethnic Composition of Rainier Valley, Region**

- The Rainier Valley has more than twice the proportion of foreign-born residents as Seattle as a whole. In the Rainier Valley, 40% of residents are foreign-born. This rate is significantly higher than that of Southeast Seattle (35%), Seattle (17%), King County (15%), and the State of Washington (10%).

**Figure 3-76: Percentage of Foreign Born of Rainier Valley, Region**

**Figure 3-77: Languages other than English Spoken at Home, Southeast Seattle**
The high levels of foreign-born individuals are reflected in the variety of languages spoken in Southeast Seattle. In the Rainier Valley, 45% of residents over age 5 speak a language other than English at home. The most common language besides English is Chinese with 7,586 native speakers. Large numbers of Rainier Valley residents also speak Tagalog (5,544), Vietnamese (5,177), and Spanish (4,179) as well. A smaller but significant number of people speak Japanese (1,039), Monkhmer/Cambodian (1,017), Laotian (1,293), and a variety of both African (2,191), and Pacific Island (1,900) dialects.

Incomes

Figure 3-78: 1999 Median Household Income

Source: U.S. Census 2000

79 Census data for the Language spoken at home is not available for the Rainier Valley since language data is not available on the block group level of analysis.
• **Household incomes in the Rainier Valley are considerably lower than for the city as a whole.** The median household income for the Rainier Valley was $38,731. This figure is considerably lower than that of Southeast Seattle ($44,655), Seattle ($45,736), King County ($53,157), and Washington State ($45,776).

**Poverty**

• **More Rainier Valley residents live in poverty.** In the Rainier Valley, 7,214 Rainier Valley residents (18%) lived in poverty in 1999. This figure includes 2,750 children under 17 years of age who represent 41% of all children in the Rainier Valley.

![Figure 3-79: Prevalence of Poverty](image)

**Source:** U.S. Census 2000

• **Rainier Valley’s poverty rate is 55% above the citywide poverty rate.** Rainier Valley’s overall poverty rate is 5% higher than that of the remainder of Southeast Seattle (13%). It is 6% higher than Seattle as a whole (12%). Rainier Valley’s poverty rate is 55% above the citywide poverty rate. Rainier Valley is among the neighborhoods with the highest levels of poverty in Seattle and King County.

---

80 This figure was derived by averaging the 1999 median incomes for the Census block groups that fall within the Rainier Valley.

81 This figure is approximated as the population by age and the poverty data are from two different Census summary files (SF1 and SF3).
Educational Attainment

Rainier Valley residents’ ability to access upward economic mobility and opportunities are limited due to low levels of educational attainment. Of Rainier Valley residents 25 and older, 7,682 (30%) have attained less than a high school education. There are more than 2.5 times more people in the neighborhood with less than a high school diploma (30%) than have Bachelor’s degrees (14%). Southeast Seattle has a similar pattern: residents with less than a high school diploma (25%) outnumber those with Bachelor’s degrees (18%). In Seattle, King County, and Washington State as a whole, on the other hand, the inverse is true: a higher proportion of people have Bachelor’s degrees than less than a high school education. In Seattle, for example, 11% of people have not completed high school; while 30% have Bachelor’s degrees.

Age

The population of the Rainier Valley is younger than for the city as a whole. Children under 18 comprise 16% of Seattle’s population, but 27% of the Rainier Valley population. Because of the neighborhood’s high percentages of children and low incomes and educational attainment, Rainier Valley residents would likely benefit from educational support for at-risk children.

Source: U.S. Census 2000
**Household Composition**

- **Rainier Valley household sizes are larger than for Seattle as a whole.** The average household size in Rainier Valley is 3.01. This figure is higher than that of the remainder of Southeast Seattle (2.86), Seattle (2.08), King County (2.39) and Washington (2.53). Of the 13,187 households in Rainier Valley, 89% of them are family households. The proportion of family households in Rainier Valley is significantly higher than the percentage of family household in Seattle (74%). Of Rainier Valley’s family households, 1,921 (22%) are headed by single parents. This figure is nearly double the rate of single parent families in Seattle (12%).
Housing Tenure

- The Rainier Valley has a higher homeownership rate than Seattle as a whole. The Rainier Valley had 13,187 occupied housing units in 2000. Of these units, 53% were owner-occupied and 47% were renter-occupied. When compared to Southeast Seattle, the Rainier Valley has 9% fewer owner-occupied units. But, when compared to Seattle as a whole, Rainier Valley has 5% more owner-occupied housing units. Both the Rainier Valley (53%) and Southeast Seattle (62%) have higher owner-occupancy rates than Seattle (48%) as a whole. This pattern is reinforced by the relatively large household sizes in the Rainier Valley. Many other Seattle neighborhoods, by contrast, have lower household sizes and high concentrations of multifamily housing and housing designed for singles or couples without children.

![Figure 3-83: Rainier Valley Housing Tenure by Race](source)

- Whites and Asians are the only two Rainier Valley racial groups that have higher percentages of homeowners than renters. In the Rainier Valley, 67% of Whites and 64% of Asians own their homes. Relatively equal numbers of Blacks in Rainier Valley own and rent their homes: 48% own and 52% rent. Greater numbers of American Indians, Pacific Islanders and Hispanics rent rather than own: 70% of American Indians, 56% of Pacific Islanders and 71% of Hispanics living in the Rainier Valley rent their homes.

Housing Cost Burden

- A high proportion of Rainier Valley renter households face a housing cost burden. Within the Rainier Valley, 2,555 Rainier Valley renter households (42% of all renters in the neighborhood) pay over 30% of their gross household income for rent. The percentage of Rainier Valley households paying 30% or more for rent is slightly higher
than households living in the reminder of Southeast Seattle (42%), Seattle (40%), King County (38%), and Washington (39%).

- **Rainier Valley homeowner households spend, on average a quarter of their income on housing costs.** The housing cost burden for homeowner households follows a similar trend: Rainer Valley households spend a median of 24% of their gross income on home ownership costs, 3% more than for Seattle homeowners as a whole.

**Southeast Seattle Action Agenda**

- **Southeast Seattle has shown evidence of revitalization; however, significant portions of the community remain economically distressed.** Significant public and private investment currently underway present opportunities for stimulating further revitalization. These include the construction of LINK light rail, the $50 million Rainier Valley Community Development Fund (RVCDF), and two major public housing redevelopments.

As a result, the City of Seattle, in partnership with community-based organizations in Southeast Seattle, is focusing its resources on implementing the Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy for Southeast Seattle.

The Rainier Valley Community Development Fund (RVCDF) is a $50 million fund established to support community development in the Rainier Valley. The City of Seattle, along with Sound Transit and King County, established the RVCDF to support light rail mitigation and overall community development in Southeast Seattle. The City of Seattle is the most significant source for the RVCDF, committing $42.8 of the $50 million. From its inception in 2002, the RVCDF has focused its work on providing supplemental mitigation assistance to businesses that have been affected by the construction of Seattle’s light rail line. As of the end of 2007, the RVCDF reported that of the 302 businesses that were located along the light rail line, 33 businesses left the Rainier Valley, 35 went out of business, and 4 had “status pending.”

As light rail construction is nearing completion, the RVCDF will be accelerating its Community Development Program to support small business development and physical revitalization. In addition to the RVCDF, two local community-based development organizations, SEED and HomeSight, will target their activities toward strengthening the commercial nodes in Southeast Seattle.
3.5 Community Non-profit Facility Infrastructure Needs

The City of Seattle relies heavily on community-based non-profit social service providers to deliver the services needed by Seattle’s homeless and low- to moderate-income residents and families. Traditionally, Community Facilities CDBG funds have been targeted to support the non-profit and City public service and development goals rather than general neighborhood and street improvements eligible under HUD guidelines. The City chooses to enhance its investment of other local, state and federal funds in public services by offering Community Facilities funding via competitive bids because of the proven link between service quality and the service environment.

- **Facilities improvements can offer several benefits for clients and service providers.**
  Previous research\(^{82}\) conducted by The Bush Foundation in St. Paul, Minnesota identified several benefits for clients and service providers as a result of facilities improvements. For clients benefits included:
  - Better service
  - Addition of new services
  - Additional clients served
  - Improved client attitudes

  Organizational benefits included:
  - Increased effectiveness
  - Greater financial stability
  - Lower building operating costs
  - Improved staff morale
  - Increased funding potential and broader donor base
  - Greater internal cooperation
  - Catalyst for organizational change

  The Bush Foundation study reviewed capital improvement projects at 121 non-profit organizations. The study found that “[n]early all of the human services agencies interviewed and surveyed . . . said their [capital] project strengthened their organization and resulted in better service for clients. Over three-quarters of the agencies said the project had a positive impact on their neighborhood.”\(^{83}\)

- **Social service agencies will review their capital infrastructure needs.** In the current social environment, given advances in technology and their demands on building systems, the interest in sustainable building practices, and a real estate market in flux,


\(^{83}\) Ibid, p. 2.
non-profit social service delivery agencies must review their capital infrastructure and evaluate how they are positioned for the future.

In recognition of the importance of direct service facilities, the City of Seattle has been providing CDBG-funded loans for capital improvements and acquisitions of direct social service delivery space for over 17 years. For the past 12 years, since 1995, over 175 capital project proposals have sought funding from the Community Facilities Loan Program. Requests for financial assistance over that time amounted to over $33 million. Over that same period, resources allocated for the program have been just under $15 million, making for a ratio of $2.28 dollars needed against every $1 available for social service facilities. Not surprisingly, the program has only been able to provide funding to 55% of those 175 requests. With an average request of $190,000, the resources available have allowed to program to provide an average award of $150,000.

The Community Facilities Loan Program provides one of the least expensive sources of financing for non-profit agencies seeking capital improvement financing. The funds are loaned on a forgivable basis, with principal and interest payments deferred or forgiven at the end of a specified “continuing use” period of providing benefits to no- to moderate-income persons and families. Other sources of capital funding include grants from local and national foundations, capital campaign fundraising, loans from local community development banks and commercial banks, and loans from King County and the State of Washington.

Providing support for facilities acquisition, remodeling or development is a specifically eligible activity under 24 CFR 570.201(c) for CDBG funds. Thus the Community Facilities Loan Program can provide CDBG funds in a straight-forward yet flexible way to provide assistance to non-profit social services agencies.

- City staff provide technical assistance to non-profits receiving facilities funding. In addition to providing financial resources, staff supporting this program also provides much-needed technical assistance to agencies with little or no experience in implementing a major capital improvement project. City project managers spend considerable time assisting agencies in the areas of construction financing, real estate ownership and title issues, working with several lenders with an interest in establishing liens on the property, federal procurement and labor standards requirements, and construction contracting. The need for this assistance is not surprising, as the Bush Foundation study notes:

  “Because capital projects are infrequent, staff rarely has the necessary technical knowledge and experience; sometimes they lack enough knowledge to know they need assistance.” 84

In anticipation of the Request for Investments process coming up in the fall of 2008 for facilities loans, program staff has been receiving increasing inquiries from agencies about

84 Building Stronger Organizations, p. 3.
the timing and the amount of funds available. This program continues to be in demand among the service-provider community in Seattle.
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Section 4:  FOUR-YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN

4.1 How were the 2009-2012 City of Seattle Consolidated Plan Strategies and Priorities Developed?

4.1.1 Context for Consolidated Plan Priorities

Strategic plans are developed in the context of relevant local and national leadership initiatives, regional distinctions among existing infrastructure and populations in need, as well as local economic cycles and funding histories. Accordingly, the City’s 2009-2012 Consolidated Plan was developed in the context of four major drivers:

1. Overall program eligibility and goals, as outlined in federal Housing and Urban Development (HUD) regulations.
2. Priorities developed by Seattle’s Mayor and adopted by the City Council.
3. Needs identified through community consultation and planning carried out by those with expertise in programs and services for no- to moderate-income people and special populations. See Section 3 – Needs Assessment.
4. Resources available at the federal, state, and local levels, and their respective use restrictions and guidelines.

In consideration of these drivers, the 2009-2012 Consolidated Plan reflects commitments, begun in 2006, to use Consolidated Plan funds to support the regional Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness and the completion of the adopted Southeast Seattle Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area plan.

Although annual funding allocations over the next four years will be refined to reflect changes in the demand for housing and services, feedback from consumers and constituents, and the increasingly challenging environment urban American cities face, the general direction and emphasis on these two issue areas—ending homelessness and revitalizing Southeast Seattle—will remain. Trends that may alter the annual allocations over the next four years may include:

- **Changing demographics.** Seattle’s demographics are changing as residents become older and more economically stratified, and as families with younger children tend to move out to the region’s suburbs. At the same time, infrastructure to support residents staying in the city (particularly low-income households with fewer options to relocate) is at capacity in many instances; and may not effectively support the increasing diversity of the population.

- **Transportation needs.** Increasing environmental and economic concerns have led residents to demand transit options and regional connections that allow workers
reasonably cost-effective means to travel between home and employment sites. Low- and moderate-income workers tend to rely on service sectors jobs (that are often concentrated in the city) while simultaneously needing to live further away from the city center in order to find affordable housing.

- **Housing affordability.** Seattle has limited remaining land development capacity. The resulting pressure on prices leads to increased need for housing affordable to low- and moderate-income households, as well as affordable business development for neighborhood businesses.

- **Homelessness.** Progress on the development of transitional housing and Housing First options as envisioned by the Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness may affect the implementation of the Consolidated Plan, as will shifts in the population and demographics of those who are homeless in our county.

### 4.1.2 U.S. Dept. of Housing and Urban Development Goals and Federal Program Eligibility

At minimum, HUD requires that the activities funded by the four federal grants governed by this Consolidated Plan benefit persons who are from low- to moderate-income households or who are homeless according to federal definitions. Since the 2009 income definitions are not yet available, the 2008 Income Eligibility Guidelines are presented for illustrative purposes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Size (number of persons)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (30% median)</td>
<td>$17,100</td>
<td>$19,500</td>
<td>$21,950</td>
<td>$24,400</td>
<td>$26,350</td>
<td>$28,300</td>
<td>$30,250</td>
<td>$32,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (50% median)</td>
<td>$28,500</td>
<td>$32,550</td>
<td>$36,650</td>
<td>$40,700</td>
<td>$43,950</td>
<td>$47,200</td>
<td>$50,450</td>
<td>$53,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Income (80% median)</td>
<td>$43,050</td>
<td>$49,200</td>
<td>$55,350</td>
<td>$61,500</td>
<td>$66,400</td>
<td>$71,350</td>
<td>$76,250</td>
<td>$81,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2008 Seattle-Bellevue HMFA median family income = $81,400

In addition, HUD has adopted a performance measures matrix to clarify the goals and objectives for the Consolidated Plan funds. Three broad goal areas have been identified. It is important to note that these HUD goals are not prescriptive. Each individual jurisdiction has the flexibility to focus funds on one, two, or all three of these goal areas as demanded by local circumstances.
The 2009-2012 Consolidated Plan adopts the three HUD goals and addresses Seattle’s needs with the corresponding strategies contained in the Four Year Strategic Matrix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009-2012 Seattle Consolidated Plan Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUD GOAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Support development of community facilities for non-profit agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Coordinate essential domestic violence services and move toward prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Increase availability of affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Increase use of affordable housing as a catalyst for distressed neighborhood economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Improve infrastructure and community resources in distressed neighborhoods to promote economic development and quality of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Promote suitable living environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Prevent homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Move people rapidly from homelessness into housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Measure and report on Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Assist domestic violence victims to access and/or maintain stable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Provide service-enriched housing for homeless and/or special needs populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Develop and maintain Seattle’s supply of affordable rental housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Increase opportunities for low-income households to purchase and/or maintain their own home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Support Decent Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Increase economic development opportunities for small and minority-owned businesses in distressed neighborhoods (by target area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Support commercial corridor revitalization to provide economic opportunity for entrepreneurs, increase jobs, and improve access to goods and services for all distressed neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1.3 Mayor and Council Priorities

The 2009-2012 Consolidated Plan strategies were also developed in the context of Mayor Greg Nickels’ priorities (link http://www.seattle.gov/mayor/PRIORITIES.htm). The mayoral initiatives are:

- **Get Seattle Moving.** Transportation will continue to be a paramount issue for our economy, the environment and the people who live in Seattle. In order for businesses to thrive, generating jobs and tax revenues, we must be able to move goods and people around the region efficiently. Putting a relentless focus on building light rail and replacing the Alaskan Way viaduct (State Route 99) is an essential part of creating a 21st century transportation network.

- **Keep Our Neighborhoods Safe.** Public safety is the paramount duty of the City. Our police and fire personnel are first rate and should be recognized as such. We need to give them the tools, training, and equipment to do these difficult jobs, maintain accountability for actions taken, and ensure we are the most prepared city in the United States for natural or man-made catastrophes.

- **Create Jobs and Opportunity For All.** Economic opportunity during these difficult times means creating jobs and an environment that invites new investment in Seattle.

- **Build Strong Families and Healthy Communities.** Healthy communities are the heart of a great city. Every part of this city is unique and vital to our growth and our ability to sustain what we love about living and working here. Our diverse cultures bring life, vitality and economic growth to Seattle.

In addition, the 2009-2012 Consolidated Plan also takes into consideration the City Council’s 2008 Themes and Priorities (link http://www.seattle.gov/council/issues/2008themes_and_priorities.htm). The Council’s stated priorities are:

**Foster safe, just, and healthy communities for all**

- Protect public safety and challenge gang violence by investing in human services and police resources.
- Increase affordable housing through incentive zoning and innovative financing.
- Take action to improve pedestrian safety.
- Keep neighborhoods in the driver’s seat of neighborhood plan updates.
- Maintain and enhance our built environment to promote sustainable communities and a strong economy.

**Invest public resources fairly and effectively**

- Move forward regional decisions on light rail, the Viaduct, and SR520.
- Make the transportation system work by investing Bridging the Gap dollars in transportation choices.
- Ensure equal access to technology and pioneer new ways to engage the community through technology.
• Take action to maintain a sustainable Seattle City Light, in partnership with employees, customers, and suppliers.
• Find new ways for meaningful public involvement to develop a balanced 2009-2010 budget that meets community needs by spending every dollar wisely.

Build a livable city for our future

• Ensure that Seattle’s parks, Seattle Center and the Pike Place Market continue to meet the diverse needs and interests of the people of Seattle.
• Implement the Zero Waste Strategy.
• Protect the urban forest and plant more trees.

4.1.4 Community Consultation and Needs Assessment as key element of strategy development

The City of Seattle is fortunate to draw on a wealth of internally- and externally-developed plans to guide the creation of strategies and funding priorities to meet community needs. Integrating priorities identified from these community-based plans into this Consolidated Plan’s Needs Assessment (see Section 3) offers the advantages of avoiding redundant planning processes, enhancing coordination and leveraging funds among the multiple federal, state and local resources used by the City and its partners to create the housing and service network, and honoring the staff expertise and stakeholder and consumer feedback embedded in these established plans.

A partial listing of plans referenced by or integrated into the 2009-2012 Consolidated Plan includes:

• Seattle/King County Domestic Violence Regional Council Plan
• Area Plan on Aging, 2008-2011, Seattle/King County
• Seattle/King County Public Health Operational Master Plan
• Office of Housing – Seattle Housing Levy Renewal Technical Advisory Committee
• Human Services Strategic Investment Plan
• City of Seattle Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice
• Toward a Sustainable Seattle: City of Seattle Comprehensive Plan
• Seattle Housing Authority Strategic Plan 2005-2010
• 2008 Moving to New Ways Annual Plan, Seattle Housing Authority
• Southeast Seattle Action Agenda
• A Roof Over Every Bed: Our Community’s Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness in King County

A complete listing of the plans reviewed as part of community consultation to develop the 2009 Consolidated Plan can be found in Section 6.2 - Consolidated Plan Reference Tools.

Finally, once the community consultation process helped build the draft 2009-2012 Consolidated Plan, a separate public comment period occurred after the draft plan was published in mid-August 2008. See the Section 5.1.2 Plan for Public Input – Public comments summary.
4.1.5 Resource Considerations

The Consolidated Plan funds cannot address all of the priorities and community needs that have been articulated. The funds represent only $21 million against a City General Fund budget (in 2008) of $926 million, and an overall (2008) City budget of $3.5 billion. Consolidated Plan funds are used within the guidelines of their governing federal regulations.

- **Community Development Block Grant funds have declined nationally and locally.** The most flexible and largest of the four federal funds, the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), has seen its budget—both federally and locally—decline nearly 18% since 2001. The decreased funding has forced the City, over the past four years, to consider what other resources are available to support CDBG-funded programs. The City of Seattle has committed a number of other resources to sustain the needs identified in this Consolidated Plan. The reality, though, is that resources must be shared with other City priorities (such as those identified above). Thus, while some programs formerly funded with CDBG have been covered by other fund sources, some programs have not.

- **Seattle’s CDBG funds have been focused on ending homelessness and supporting the revitalization of the Rainier Valley (Southeast Seattle).** Since 2006, the City has focused CDBG funds on two priority areas. The 2009 – 2012 Consolidated Plan will continue to support these two priorities: 1) support the Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness; and 2) support economic development in the Rainier Valley (Southeast Seattle). The City leverages its own General Fund and many other state and local sources to extend the reach of these four federal programs in order to support necessary community, economic development, and social service programs that are often integrally tied to the success of the activities supported by the Consolidated Plan’s programs.

- **Some programs are no longer supported by CDBG funds.** The following programs, supported by CDBG in the 2005 Consolidated Plan, no longer receive such support, but may be supported by other funds available to the City:
  - Child care subsidies;
  - Case management services for seniors and disabled persons;
  - Business façade improvement program;
  - Parks upgrades in low- and moderate-income neighborhoods; and
  - Small neighborhood infrastructure projects.
4.2 How will the City invest federal funds over the next four years?

4.2.1 City of Seattle Approach to Housing, Community Development and Response to Homelessness

City departments developed overarching principles and directions for each of the major investment areas. The following outlines those principles in terms of a general approach to strategies that are listed in detail in the Four-Year Matrix below.

For detail on the policies and/or guidelines that govern the implementation of a given housing project, neighborhood revitalization effort, or homelessness response program, please refer to Appendices section 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3.

Seattle’s Housing Development Strategy

Introduction

Families and individuals looking for affordable housing in Seattle are facing an increasingly difficult set of challenges:

- Local wages are not keeping pace with Seattle’s housing prices;
- Rents are increasing;
- More than 21,000 renters pay more than half their income for rent;
- Single family home and condominium prices have stagnated, but remain higher than many households can afford; and
- More than 18,000 homeowner households pay more than half their income for housing costs.

A successful Seattle housing strategy must address the needs of people with extremely and very low incomes and assist with boosting the supply of housing for moderate-wage workers. In addition, the housing strategy must support the Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness. The following section summarizes the three important community planning efforts that guide Seattle’s work on housing issues, Seattle funding expected to be available in 2009 to implement key affordable housing strategies, and City program activities that address various income segments. A matrix outline of housing strategies is then presented.

Community Planning Processes and Documents

Seattle’s work on housing issues is guided by three community planning efforts: Toward a Sustainable Seattle: Seattle Comprehensive Plan, Neighborhood Plans, and the Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness

- **Toward a Sustainable Seattle: Seattle Comprehensive Plan.** Seattle’s Comprehensive Plan was adopted in response to the State of Washington’s Growth Management Act. It
includes goals and policies that address many housing issues. It establishes housing affordability targets for Seattle’s housing stock:

- 20% of additional units in the City should be affordable to households earning at or below 50% of median income; and
- 17% of additional units should be affordable to households earning between 50% and 80% of median income; and
- 27% of expected housing growth should be affordable to households earning between 81% and 120% of median income.

- **Neighborhood Plans.** During the last decade, 38 Neighborhood Plans were prepared and accepted by the City Council. Many of these plans addressed the need for affordable housing, and many communities proposed innovative solutions in their plans. These plans provide guidance for housing strategies in different geographic areas of the city. Efforts to update Neighborhood Plans in key locations, particularly in support of housing goals and objectives in transit-oriented areas, will begin during 2009. These efforts are expected to help guide housing activities in selected areas during between 2009 and 2012.

- **Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness.** The Ten-Year Plan is supported by the City of Seattle, King County, the Church Council of Greater Seattle, the United Way of King County, and others. It has set out the goal of ending homelessness by the year 2015. Its strategies include preventing homelessness, creating more housing, moving people rapidly into housing, building the political will to end homelessness, and measuring the outcomes of local efforts.

**City of Seattle funding anticipated in 2009**

Funding from the sources listed below is anticipated to be available to support affordable housing objectives and strategies in 2009: City of Seattle funding to be available for production and preservation of rental housing, rental project operating and maintenance subsidy, emergency and tenant-based rental assistance, downpayment assistance for first-time buyers, low-income homeowner rehabilitation, and weatherization assistance.

Programs and funding amounts below are based on the following assumptions:

- **Housing Levy:** funding as shown will be available in 2009, the last year of funding under the current 2002 Housing Levy (does not include Levy interest earnings).
- **Federal CDBG and HOME:** resources assumed to continue at approximately 2008 levels in 2009.
- **CDBG and HOME Loan Repayments:** loan repayments that are estimated to come in during 2009 and subsequently be available for new loans.
- **General Fund:** estimated amount available in 2009 for Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness and Housing First project activity.
- **Weatherization:** estimated amount available in 2009 from Federal/State and City Light sources.
Seattle Rental Housing Programs

Rental Programs Production Estimated for 2009
200 rental units funded
500 households provided rent assistance
370 units weatherized

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rental Program</th>
<th>Funding Anticipated in 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Housing Levy Rental (Source: A&amp;F Plan)</td>
<td>$8,015,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Housing Levy O&amp;M (Source: A&amp;F Plan)</td>
<td>$989,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Housing Levy Rent Assistance (Source: A&amp;F Plan)</td>
<td>$406,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Housing Levy NHOP (Source: A and F Plan)</td>
<td>$1,030,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HOME (Source: Consolidated Plan)</td>
<td>$2,760,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CDBG (Source: Consolidated Plan)</td>
<td>$627,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HOME/CDBG Loan Repaym ents (Estimate)</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Downtown Commercial &amp; Residential Bonus/TDR (Estimate)</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Weatherization (Estimate)</td>
<td>$3,154,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• General Fund</td>
<td>$1,833,364</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal Rental Funding $23,318,177

Seattle Homeownership Housing Programs

Homeownership Programs Production Estimated for 2009
40 homebuyers purchase homes
650 homes get needed minor repairs
180 homes weatherized
35 homes rehabilitated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homeownership Program</th>
<th>Funding Anticipated in 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Housing Levy Owner (Source: A &amp; F Plan)</td>
<td>$1,115,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HOME (Source: Consolidated Plan)</td>
<td>$911,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CDBG (Source: Consolidated Plan)</td>
<td>$92,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CDBG Minor Home Repair (Source: Consolidated Plan)</td>
<td>$449,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CDBG Buyer Education &amp; Counseling (Source: Consolidated Plan)</td>
<td>$216,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HOME/CDBG Loan Repaym ents (Estimate)</td>
<td>$1,050,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Weatherization (Estimate)</td>
<td>$1,553,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Downtown Residential Bonus Program (Estimate)</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal Homeownership Funding $4,337,923

Grand Total – All Housing Funds Anticipated in 2009 $27,656,100
Seattle Housing Programs and Income Levels Served

The following table shows programs available to assist households at different income levels. Programs include those that provide funding, as well as incentive programs that offer increased development capacity or residential property tax exemptions in return for providing units at below-market rate rents or home prices.

Non-federal housing programs:

- **Levy Rental Preservation & Production Program.** Funds can be used to pay for acquisition and/or rehabilitation costs associated with preserving vacant or occupied buildings, for new construction projects, and for permanent or “take-out” financing, including refinancing of existing loans. Tenant households must generally have incomes at or below the applicable limit for the unit—30%, 50% or 60% of median income, adjusted for household size. At least 59% of funding must serve households with income at or below 30% of median. In some projects, some or all units may be reserved for homeless persons or households with one or more members who have a disability or special need. Where appropriate, sponsors are expected to contract with service providers or provide appropriate support services.

- **Levy Neighborhood Housing Opportunity Program (NHOP).** NHOP funding is focused primarily within economically distressed communities in the city. Selected projects are expected to contribute to revitalization in those areas. All NHOP funding must be used for units serving households up to 80% of median income, including at least 25% of that amount for units serving households with incomes up to 30% of median income.

- **Levy Operating & Maintenance Program.** This program provides operating support for housing affordable to households with incomes at or below 30% of median income. Funds are used to fill the gap between eligible operating and enhanced property management costs and project income.

- **Levy Homeownership Program.** These funds assist low-income first-time homebuyers to purchase a home in the city. At least 50% of the funds must assist borrowers with incomes at or below 60% of median income. The maximum household income for all borrowers is 80% of median income.

- **Levy Rental Assistance Program.** Rental assistance is a cash subsidy that pays landlords the difference between market rent and what low-income individuals and families can afford. The rental assistance is usually paid to a private landlord through a community-based non-profit organization. The financial assistance is often accompanied by case management or other services to help increase tenants’ stability.

- **Seattle Homes Within Reach (Multifamily Tax Exemption Program).** This program allows developers to receive a property tax exemption on the residential portion of a development for up to 12 years. In exchange, 20% of the rental units must be affordable for moderate-wage workers; for homeownership projects, only the income-eligible homebuyers receive the exemption. The program is now available in 39 target areas (all designated Urban Centers and Villages) in Seattle.
• **Downtown Transferable Development Rights (TDR) Program.** The TDR Program is one way that developers of Downtown office buildings and hotels can achieve additional density. It helps Seattle achieve a more variable scale of buildings in Downtown by allowing density to be moved from one site to another. Owners of certified housing TDR sites can sell excess development rights to commercial developers and use the proceeds for renovation of the housing. Rental units that are preserved must remain affordable for households with incomes up to 50% of median income for 50 years.

• **Downtown Commercial Bonus Program.** The Commercial Bonus Program allows additional density for office and hotel developments on sites zoned DOC-1, DOC-2, DMC 240, and DMC 340 in exchange for affordable housing and child care for lower-wage workers. The housing and/or child care can be built by the commercial developer or a financial contribution of $18.75 per square foot of bonus floor area for housing and $3.25 per square foot of bonus floor area for child care may be made to the City for those purposes.

• **Downtown Residential Bonus Program.** The Downtown Residential Bonus Program allows additional residential gross floor area and height in developments in exchange for affordable housing. The developer can provide affordable housing units in or adjacent to the new residential tower or make a financial contribution (approximately $18.94 per square foot of bonus floor area) to the City to fund new affordable housing in Downtown. Affordable housing units are intended to primarily serve modest-wage service workers in Downtown.
## Housing Programs and Income Levels Served

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rental</th>
<th>Homeownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>120% AMI</strong></td>
<td>• Seattle Homes Within Reach—Multifamily Property Tax Exemption (100%-120% AMI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>100% AMI</strong> ($57,000)</td>
<td>• Downtown Residential Bonus Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **80% AMI** ($43,050) | • Levy Homeownership Program  
| | • Levy Neighborhood Housing Opportunity Program  
| | • HOME/CDBG Rental Preservation & Production  
| | • HomeWise Weatherization  
| | • Downtown Residential & Commercial Bonus Programs  
| | • Seattle Homes Within Reach—Multifamily Property Tax Exemption  
| **50% AMI** ($28,500) | • CDBG Senior Services Minor Home Repair Program  
| | • HomeWise Homeowner Rehabilitation  
| | • HomeWise Weatherization  
| **30% AMI** ($17,100) | • CDBG Senior Services Minor Home Repair Program  
| | • HomeWise Homeowner Rehabilitation  
| | • HomeWise Weatherization  

* Income limits are per HUD for 1-person households in 2008
Seattle’s Community Development Strategy

The Seattle Office of Economic Development (OED) has taken a multi-pronged approach to support community economic development that supports the City’s overarching goals. OED’s approach will: a) target high-priority geographic areas in need of public investments and attention; b) continue to invest in projects that will catalyze economic revitalization; and c) simultaneously invest in projects that preserve affordability and ethnic vitality in neighborhoods.

The City of Seattle works with Community Development Corporations (CDCs) as key partners to implement “place-based” commercial corridor revitalization strategies. CDCs also work within their neighborhoods to create and maintain organizational capacity, recruit volunteers, develop community leadership, and facilitate organizational partnerships. These tasks are critical to the success of neighborhood change. Supporting the organizations that are leading and implementing neighborhood revitalization to ensure their capacity to fund and sustain these activities is an important part of reaching revitalization goals. Among the organizational approaches are: forming new chambers of commerce or merchant associations or strengthening existing ones, or forming new business improvement districts or strengthening existing ones.

Strategies that support these overarching principles are described in the Four-Year Matrix.

Seattle’s Homelessness Response Strategy

The City of Seattle and its partners are committed to ending homelessness. Through its grants and contracts with community-based organizations, the City invests in services to prevent homelessness and to help homeless people access and retain permanent, affordable housing. The City also invests in the development of affordable, permanent housing for homeless and low-income individuals and families.

- **The Ten-Year Plan guides local work to end homelessness.** Our community’s strategies to prevent and end homelessness are guided by the planning work and priorities of the King County Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness, *A Roof Over Every Bed in King County*.85 City investments and service delivery strategies are aligned with regional priorities identified in the Ten-Year Plan. The Committee to End Homelessness in King County identifies needs, prioritizes strategies and coordinates implementation of the plan.

- **A diverse group has come together to end homelessness.** The Committee to End Homelessness brings together homeless and formerly homeless youth, young adults and adults; members of faith communities; representatives from philanthropy, business, local government, and non-profit human service and housing development agencies; advocates; and other stakeholders from across the county, all with a commitment to end homelessness in King County by 2015. The ongoing implementation of the Ten-Year Plan relies on a number of committees and workgroups to carry out short-term projects and develop longer term plans.

---

85 Link to Ten-Year Plan
The vision for a regional response to homelessness began when faith-based community members initiated a series of dialogues on the homelessness crisis. In 2002, the Church Council of Greater Seattle, the City of Seattle, King County, United Way of King County, the Seattle/King County Coalition on Homelessness, and four regional Human Services Alliances created the Committee to End Homelessness.

- **The Ten-Year Plan focuses on ending homelessness through five strategies:**
  1. Prevent people from becoming homeless;
  2. Build or acquire more affordable housing and move people rapidly from homelessness to housing with integrated services;
  3. Increase the efficiency of the existing system that serves homeless people;
  4. Build and sustain the public and political will to end homelessness; and
  5. Measure and report outcomes.

  The plan sets a goal of securing 9,500 new and existing affordable housing units by 2015.

- **A number of solutions to homelessness must be implemented to serve different groups.** The Ten-Year Plan acknowledges that solutions to homelessness differ among each of the subpopulations of families, single adults, youth and young adults, and recommends quantified goals for housing development specific to each group. In addition, the Ten-Year Plan focuses attention on the disproportional representation of people of color among those who are homeless. It notes that services for those who are homeless must be provided in a culturally competent way.

**Strategy 1: Preventing Homelessness**

Prevention strategies designed to avert homelessness among households at risk are one of the key priorities and strategies of the Ten Year Plan.

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

**Discharge Planning and Coordination:**

- **The process of discharging people from institutions, such as hospitals or jails, is a key part of preventing further homelessness.** In addition to the primary prevention efforts described above, the Committee to End Homelessness has made discharge coordination efforts a priority. A number of institutions are working together to coordinate discharge from institutions into interim and permanent housing, rather than to the streets. Coordination with the health care, criminal justice, foster care, and the mental health and chemical dependency systems is an ongoing priority need in prevention of
Strategy 2: Moving People Rapidly Into Housing

- **Ending homelessness requires that people secure housing as quickly as possible.** The network of services designed to move people into affordable, appropriate housing includes outreach and assessment, supportive services, and emergency and transitional housing programs. Affordable, permanent housing models for individuals and families who are homeless or who may be at imminent risk of becoming homeless have also been developed to address a range of needs.

- **Seattle’s Housing First model supports this goal.** The City of Seattle supports the development of housing that quickly moves individuals and families into housing. Seattle has made investments in “Housing First” models that focus on rapid access to housing that is not time-limited and does not require services as a condition of tenancy. These housing models remove many of the barriers that prevent people from securing stable housing. Crisis intervention, rapid housing placement, follow-up case management, and supportive services are key components of putting people into housing first, with flexible, individualized supportive services following housing placement to prevent the reoccurrence of homelessness.

1.1.1 **Strategy 3: Building Political and Public Will to End Homelessness**

- **Ending homelessness requires a commitment from leaders and members of the community.** Educating the community on homelessness and proven strategies to end it is one of the Committee’s principal actions.

- **Local efforts have led to statewide funding for homeless services.** The Committee to End Homelessness, in collaboration with the United Way of King County, the Washington Low-income Housing Alliance, and the Washington Coalition for the Homeless has been successful in increasing state funding to end homelessness. A sustained, multi-year commitment of funding to support capital, rental and operating subsidies and service dollars is necessary to end homelessness. Federal and state legislative advocacy to increase funding is among our key priorities.

Strategy 4: Increasing the Efficiency of the Existing System

- **Resources for homeless services must be used efficiently and effectively.** The City invests more than $40 million annually in preventing and ending homelessness. Ending homelessness requires generating the resources needed for adequate housing and necessary services and then using resources in an efficient, effective and equitable way.

- **The City uses best practices to allocate investments.** The City of Seattle participates with other local funders to coordinate investments through a comprehensive Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA)—a streamlined application and funding process that has been recognized as a best practice by the National Alliance to End Homelessness and the Corporation for Supportive Housing.
Our actions and strategies to increase the efficiency of existing systems focus on the restructuring and coordinating services, streamlining rules and regulations and making the best use of scarce community resources.

- **Coordinated, system-wide tools have been adopted to help providers become more effective.** In addition, our community is exploring ways to create a coordinated entry system linking people in need to the most appropriate services; to establish system-wide case management standards; to employ shallow rental subsidies; and to create a dynamic, supportive system that provides opportunities for “graduation”—increasing self-sufficiency and reducing reliance on deep housing subsidies in order to make resources available to homeless individuals with more intensive needs.

**Strategy 5: Measuring and Reporting Outcomes**

- **Measuring the results of investments and services and providing regular reports on achievements guides planning and policy work to end homelessness.** One of the primary tools for measuring and reporting on success will be Safe Harbors, our community’s Homeless Management Information System (HMIS).
4.2.2 Strategic Plan – Four Year Priorities Matrix

For program year 2009, we estimate having $13.8 million available in CDBG-related resources. Of that amount, almost 88%, or $11.8 million, will be allocated to these two areas, including projects to preserve and build affordable housing, to support providing for the operating costs of services for homeless persons, and to fund the Rainier Valley Community Development Fund. The remaining $2 million will be divided between business assistance and development, grant and program administration, policy planning and social services facilities development.

We expect $542,000 for the Emergency Shelter Grant Program, $1.6 million for HOPWA, and $5.3 million for the HOME Investment Partnership.

The following Four-Year Strategic Plan matrix is organized by the three goals adopted by the City, which reflect HUD’s national objectives for federal funding under CDBG, ESG, HOME and HOPWA grants. It should be noted that the strategies listed reflect activities that will leverage many other City, private foundation, county, state and federal sources in order to support the complex systems of housing, economic development, public services and community infrastructure. (See the Financial Summary and Leveraging sections, 4.3.3).

Activities are listed by goal, department(s) with leadership roles, HUD Performance Measure category codes, identified strategy, and the year in which the initiative or project is anticipated to be completed. Strategies that are expected to generate program contracts each year show an “X” in each of the four years. This matrix, along with the Annual Allocation Plan, will become the baseline for the City of Seattle’s annual Update and Consolidated Annual Plan Performance Report (CAPER) over the life of the 2009-2012 Consolidated Plan.

Strategic Plan Matrix Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HSD</td>
<td>Human Services Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Office of Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHA</td>
<td>Seattle Housing Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OED</td>
<td>Office of Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV</td>
<td>HSD – Domestic Violence &amp; Sexual Assault Prevention division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCR</td>
<td>Seattle Office for Civil Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“X”</td>
<td>denotes anticipated completion date of strategy/activity listed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key to HUD Performance Measures Codes:

HUD’s Performance Measures system requires grantees to capture data in the national database (IDIS) based on categorization by three program objectives and three outcome indicators. Each CDBG, ESG, HOME, or HOPWA-funded activity must choose one performance objective and one performance outcome as defined by HUD (e.g. 1.2 = Suitable Living Environment, Availability / Accessibility). Based on these classifications, HUD requires additional data to be entered into the IDIS database specific to desired results for different types of programs.

These outcome statements will help the grantee to demonstrate the results its program is making at the local level and help HUD to demonstrate how Federal funds are being used to make a difference at the national level.

Source: HUD Training Manual and Guidebook, June 20-21, 2007

List of cited sub-plans (see Section 6.2 – Reference Tools)

Domestic Violence Homeless Strategic Plan
Biennial report on Domestic Violence in Seattle
Domestic Violence - Criminal Justice Strategic Plan
Office of Economic Development: Community Development Corporations Work Programs
Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness (TYP)
Human Services Department: Strategic Investment Plan (SIP)
Office of Economic Development: Southeast Seattle Strategic Map
## 2009 – 2012 City of Seattle Consolidated Plan: Strategic Plan Priorities Matrix

### GOAL 1: PROMOTE SUITABLE LIVING ENVIRONMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORG</th>
<th>HUD PM</th>
<th>Ref to sub-plan</th>
<th>STRATEGY DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HSD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>COMMUNITY FACILITIES FOR NON-PROFIT AGENCIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide funding for zero-interest, forgivable loans to non-profit social services agencies to acquire, improve, or rehabilitate direct service space</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allocate community facilities loans on a competitive basis via a Request for Investments process. Process will commit funds on a biennial basis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide technical assistance to non-profit agencies regarding financing, development and management of capital projects</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>COORDINATION OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DV/Homeless</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Coordinate with other funders to create a resource pool that may temporarily help domestic violence victims safely stay in or return to their homes while income options are explored and secured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DV/Homeless</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Increase the funding for civil legal assistance, legal advocacy and community advocacy, so that victim/survivors, whether they go to shelter or not, have adequate access to safety strategies, resource information, legal options, and advocacy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DV/Homeless</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Develop and improve strategies, both through policy changes and through funding, to ensure the safety of women and children in their home</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2009 – 2012 City of Seattle Consolidated Plan: Strategic Plan Priorities Matrix

### GOAL 1: PROMOTE SUITABLE LIVING ENVIRONMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORG</th>
<th>HUD PM</th>
<th>Ref to sub-plan</th>
<th>STRATEGY DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>DV/Homeless Strategic Plan</td>
<td>4 Develop a recommended model for hotel/motel voucher programs so emergency, safe housing may be provided for domestic violence victims who are fleeing a dangerous home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>DV/Homeless Strategic Plan</td>
<td>5 Develop guidelines for supportive services to survivors of domestic violence who are tenants in permanent, supportive housing operated by mainstream homeless/housing providers</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>DV/Criminal Justice Strategic Plan</td>
<td>6 Determine and strive to implement the best mechanism (one-stop/no-wrong door) for responding to family violence</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. INCREASE AVAILABILITY OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORG</th>
<th>HUD PM</th>
<th>Ref to sub-plan</th>
<th>STRATEGY DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Increase the use of land use incentives that enable voluntary contributions to affordable housing by private and nonprofit developers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Whenever significant zoning changes are adopted, implement zoning incentives so that developers who take advantage of increases to height and density limits would be required to either build affordable units as part of their residential project, or pay into a fund to create housing affordable for working families</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Address all housing development strategies as part of planning effort for 2009 Housing Levy approval campaign</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OH & OED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORG</th>
<th>HUD PM</th>
<th>Ref to sub-plan</th>
<th>STRATEGY DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Increase the overall housing supply in Seattle’s urban centers, including a full range of affordable housing, in particular affordable workforce housing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2009 – 2012 City of Seattle Consolidated Plan: Strategic Plan Priorities Matrix

### GOAL 1: PROMOTE SUITABLE LIVING ENVIRONMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORG</th>
<th>HUD PM Ref to sub-plan</th>
<th>STRATEGY DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>D. INCREASE USE OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING AS CATALYST FOR DISTRESSED NEIGHBORHOOD ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Use affordable housing programs to prevent displacement in revitalizing communities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH &amp; SHA</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Promote development of mixed-use, mixed-income projects designed to advance both housing and community development goals in economically distressed neighborhoods</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OED</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>E. IMPROVE INFRASTRUCTURE AND COMMUNITY RESOURCES IN DISTRESSED NEIGHBORHOODS TO PROMOTE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND QUALITY OF LIFE (by target area)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>OED CDC Work Programs Develop vacant and underutilized parcels toward uses that support the community’s vision for the area</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>OED CDC Work Programs Retain and grow the diversity of small businesses owned by and serving the diverse population of the neighborhood</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>OED CDC Work Programs Attract a wider variety of businesses, jobs, good, services and housing to meet the needs of neighborhood residents</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GOAL 1: PROMOTE SUITABLE LIVING ENVIRONMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORG</th>
<th>HUD PM</th>
<th>Ref to sub-plan</th>
<th>STRATEGY DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Chinatown/International District and Little Saigon</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1.1 OED CDC Work Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Develop a Design/Vision Center in the neighborhood as a focal point for information sharing and collaboration for redevelopment of vacant and dilapidated properties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1.2 OED CDC Work Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Pursue redevelopment projects that will provide additional affordable commercial space and residential/office base</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1.3 OED CDC Work Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 Coordinate input and interests of diverse community stakeholders and organizations for key advocacy and planning efforts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1.1 OED CDC Work Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 Coordinate street and park improvements consistent with community priorities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>OED Central Seattle, Capitol Hill and Delridge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1.2 OED CDC Work Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 Develop mixed-use projects that provide affordable and work force housing and commercial space</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1.3 OED CDC Work Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 Create a viable business node to recruit and retain new businesses</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1.1 OED CDC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 Complete pedestrian, street and façade improvements as prioritized by</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORG</td>
<td>HUD PM</td>
<td>Ref to sub-plan</td>
<td>STRATEGY DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>neighborhood-based non-profit community development organizations consistent with community priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OED CDC Work Programs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Develop a corridor strategic action plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2009 – 2012 City of Seattle Consolidated Plan: Strategic Plan Priorities Matrix

### GOAL 2: SUPPORT DECENT HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORG</th>
<th>HUD PM</th>
<th>Ref to sub-plan</th>
<th>STRATEGY DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DSD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. PREVENT HOMELESSNESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>HSD SIP</td>
<td>1. Provide rent or mortgage assistance, and/or move-in assistance, linked with case management to individuals who are homeless or at-risk of homelessness to support their housing stability</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>HSD SIP</td>
<td>2. Contract with community based organizations to prevent the eviction or displacement of low-income households from their housing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>HSD SIP</td>
<td>3. Assist persons living with HIV/AIDS with low-incomess and who are need of housing and/or housing support to achieve and maintain housing stability</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B. MOVE HOMELESS PEOPLE RAPIDLY INTO HOUSING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>HSD SIP</td>
<td>1. Assist homeless individuals, families and youth with emergency support services including emergency shelter and enhanced shelter, meals, hygiene services, day centers, counseling, and case management to enable individuals to achieve stability, access and maintain housing.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORG</td>
<td>HUD PM</td>
<td>Ref to sub-plan</td>
<td>STRATEGY DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSD</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>HSD SIP 2</td>
<td>Assist homeless individuals, families, youth and young adults with supportive services designed to move them rapidly to permanent housing and to maintain continued stability in housing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSD</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Allocate federal and local funds for homelessness services via biennial competitive Request for Proposals, including enhanced shelter, transitional housing, and other homeless support programs incorporating elements of the Strategic Investment Plan, Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness, best practices, and community input</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSD &amp; OH</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>TYP 4</td>
<td>Promote strategies that place and support chronically homeless individuals and individuals with long histories of homelessness in permanent housing, including “Housing First” models where traditional barriers to tenancy are removed and a range of flexible services are available to support individual needs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>TYP 5</td>
<td>Promote access to housing within the existing housing stock through the Landlord Liaison Project and other programs that work in partnership with landlords, by providing first/last/deposit funds, portable credit report, damage deposit mitigation fund, and short-term rental assistance designed to help individuals and families access housing and maintain stability <em>(see strategy E.6 below)</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSD</td>
<td>C.</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MEASURE &amp; REPORT ON TEN YEAR PLAN TO END HOMELESSNESS OUTCOMES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>TYP 1</td>
<td>Support full implementation and on-going operation of the Safe Harbors homeless management information system (HMIS) to obtain and evaluate data about homeless people to set policy, develop and</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*see strategy E.6 below*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORG</th>
<th>HUD PM</th>
<th>Ref to sub-plan</th>
<th>STRATEGY DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>implement programs and services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>TYP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Measure results of investments and services and provide regular reports on achievements; use data to guide planning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D. ASSIST DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIMS TO ACCESS/MAINTAIN STABLE HOUSING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>DV/Homeless Strategic Plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Educate domestic violence survivors who live in subsidized housing about their rights under federal and state law to remain in their housing unit or be moved to a safer unit</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>DV/Homeless Strategic Plan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Work on development of a coordinated system for resource information and access to interim and permanent housing which is able to appropriately work with DV survivors</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E. PROVIDE SERVICE-ENRICHED HOUSING FOR HOMELESS AND/OR SPECIAL NEEDS POPULATIONS, WITH THE GOAL OF ENDING HOMELESSNESS, NOT JUST MANAGING IT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provide building operating funds for City-funded affordable rental housing for homeless and special needs residents so that units can be well-maintained and financially viable</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provide supportive services in permanent affordable housing projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GOAL 2: SUPPORT DECENT HOUSING

#### STRATEGY DESCRIPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORG</th>
<th>HUD PM</th>
<th>Ref to sub-plan</th>
<th>STRATEGY DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to allow persons who are chronically homeless or formerly chronically homeless to achieve and sustain housing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH &amp; SHA</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Increase the supply of affordable housing linked with supportive services for homeless and special needs residents</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH &amp; SHA</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Assist homeless families, individuals and youth by providing supportive services in transitional housing, enabling residents to move to stable, permanent housing and achieve self-sufficiency</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH &amp; HSD</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Through planning initiatives and evaluation studies, work to improve program delivery and services, as well as increase housing and services funding, for supportive housing.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH, HSD &amp; SHA</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Provide rental assistance to families and individuals to help maintain their housing stability <em>(see B. 7 &amp; B. 8 above)</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHA &amp; HSD</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Foster stability and self-sufficiency among SHA public housing residents and program participants by creating a variety of service-enriched environments and providing a range of supportive services. <em>(SHA, HSD)</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INCREASE AND MAINTAIN THE SUPPLY OF AFFORDABLE RENTAL HOUSING IN SEATTLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Increase supply of rental units affordable to moderate-income worker households through Seattle Homes Within Reach programs <em>(e.g. Multifamily Tax Exemption Program; Commercial and Residential)</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2009 – 2012 City of Seattle Consolidated Plan: Strategic Plan Priorities Matrix

**GOAL 2: SUPPORT DECENT HOUSING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORG</th>
<th>HUD PM</th>
<th>Ref to sub-plan</th>
<th>STRATEGY DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bonus Programs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Identify potential new City resources and lending programs for housing production and preservation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>In cooperation with public, private and nonprofit partners, strive to increase State, federal and private funding for housing and to preserve existing resources</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH &amp; SHA</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Increase the supply of below-market-rental housing (private and public housing units) for families and individuals with low-incomes throughout the city</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rejuvenate and maintain the supply of affordable subsidized rental housing owned or managed by Seattle Housing Authority</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce housing costs for low-income tenants, and operating costs for subsidized housing, by funding weatherization improvements and promoting sustainable building techniques in City-funded and Seattle Housing Authority development projects</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHA</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Public Housing Disabilities accommodation: As a result of a Voluntary Compliance Agreement signed with HUD in November 2007, SHA will make 263 public housing units fully compliant with the Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards (UFAS) by 2014: 101 units are due in 2008; 41 units in 2009; 13 units in 2010; 32 units in 2011; 42 units in 2012; 20 units in 2013; and 14 units in 2014.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GOAL 2: SUPPORT DECENT HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORG</th>
<th>HUD PM</th>
<th>Ref to sub-plan</th>
<th>STRATEGY DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Resident Involvement:</strong> SHA Community Builders will work with interested residents to form and sustain duly-elected resident councils and issue-specific work groups to work with management on issues of common interest. In addition, most communities send representatives to the Joint Policy Advisory Committee, with whom SHA regularly consults on major policy issues. Residents will help plan for the use of HUD's Resident Participation Funds.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>Administer the portfolio of City-funded affordable rental housing so that units are well-maintained and serve intended low-income residents</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>INCREASE OPPORTUNITIES FOR LOW-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS TO PURCHASE AND MAINTAIN THEIR HOMES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Provide down-payment assistance to low-income first-time homebuyers purchasing a home in Seattle</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Provide low-interest loans and grants to low-income homeowners for home repair and weatherization</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Increase supply of condominium units and other homes affordable to first time homebuyers through Seattle Homes Within Reach programs (e.g. Multifamily Tax Exemption Program; Commercial and Residential Bonus Programs)</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2009 – 2012 City of Seattle Consolidated Plan: Strategic Plan Priorities Matrix

#### GOAL 2: SUPPORT DECENT HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORG</th>
<th>HUD PM</th>
<th>Ref to sub-plan</th>
<th>STRATEGY DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Help low-income families in danger of losing their homes through Seattle’s Foreclosure Prevention Program, which combines stabilization loans and pre-foreclosure counseling and repayment plans</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH &amp; SHA</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Promote education and counseling for low-income first-time buyers and homeowners</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH &amp; SHA</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Encourage programs and activities that increase the supply of affordable homeownership units in Seattle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH &amp; SOCR</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Develop initiatives to assist homeowners at risk of losing their home due to predatory lending practices</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GOAL 3: EXPAND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORG</th>
<th>HUD PM</th>
<th>Ref to sub-plan</th>
<th>STRATEGY DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>A.</strong> INCREASE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR SMALL AND MINORITY OWNED BUSINESSES IN DISTRESSED NEIGHBORHOODS (by target area)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Southeast Seattle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>SE Seattle NRSA</td>
<td>1 Improve outreach and technical assistance targeted to small business, in particular those with limited English proficiency, to support business development.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>SE Seattle NRSA</td>
<td>2 Stabilize and grow small businesses impacted by light rail construction to allow them to benefit from increased economic activity resulting from the public and private investment planned for the area.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>SE Seattle NRSA</td>
<td>3 Encourage the development of mixed-use development that provides additional affordable housing and commercial space in the neighborhood’s commercial districts and light rail station areas.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>B.</strong> SUPPORT COMMERCIAL CORRIDOR REVITALIZATION TO PROVIDE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY FOR ENTREPRENEURS, INCREASE JOBS, AND IMPROVE ACCESS TO GOODS AND SERVICES FOR ALL DISTRESSED NEIGHBORHOODS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Strategic Maps, CDC Work Programs</td>
<td>4 Track baseline data and/or coordinate with CDC partners to monitor changing market conditions and other factors that will influence nature and extent of future areas of need, and associated City efforts.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2009 – 2012 City of Seattle Consolidated Plan: Strategic Plan Priorities Matrix
### GOAL 3: EXPAND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORG</th>
<th>HUD PM</th>
<th>Ref to sub-plan</th>
<th>STRATEGY DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Assist the development of catalytic mixed-use projects with Section 108 and Float loan financing, providing opportunities for business growth and new jobs.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 What will the Consolidated Plan Allocations be in 2009?

The Annual Allocation Plan (APP), formerly known as the Table of Proposed Projects, illustrates all the activities the City will fund in a given year with the four fund sources and provides more detail with regard to anticipated sub-recipients, performance measures for each activity, and fund allocations.

The following estimates of available revenues for 2009 are being developed in the summer of 2008. At this time, we anticipate that our 2009 allocations in each of the four programs governed by this Consolidated Plan will remain the same as they were for program year 2008. This includes the estimate for the American Dream Downpayment Initiative portion of the HOME program.

CDBG

The CDBG program is funded primarily via the annual entitlement from HUD. In 2008, that amounted to $12,022,310. We have built the 2009 allocations based on this same entitlement amount, plus the following sources of revenues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Income from:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009 Homewise Program</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Homeownership Program</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 MultiFamily Program</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current and Prior Years’ float loan interest payments</td>
<td>$193,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reprogrammed funds from prior years</td>
<td>$310,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OTHER REVENUES</td>
<td>$1,813,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTIMATED ENTITLEMENT</td>
<td>$12,022,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTIMATED CDBG BUDGET</td>
<td>$13,836,135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HOME/ADDI

In 2008, Seattle received an appropriation of $4,142,653 from HUD for the Home Investment Partnership program. We are planning for the same amount in 2009. In addition, the American Dream Downpayment Initiative is expected to provide another $37,308, as it did in 2008.

Program Income from the HOME Program is expected to remain relatively stable at $1 million.

HOPWA and ESG

In 2008, Seattle’s portion of the HOPWA and ESG programs were $1,663,000 and $542,360 respectively. As of the summer of 2008, we do not anticipate significant changes to these amounts.

All of these estimates are based on Seattle CDBG Administration’s assessment of Congressional action on the 2009 federal budget as of mid-July 2008. These estimates are subject to change as Congress and the President wrap up work on the FY2009 budget. Changes in revenues, and their
effects on program allocations, will be reflected in a substantial amendment to the 2009-2012 Consolidated Plan to be developed in the spring of 2009. Generally, HUD formally informs jurisdictions of their current fiscal year allocations during the spring of any given calendar year.

Allocations to specific activities are found in the 2009 Table of Proposed Projects (TPP), included in the body of this document. The allocation of Consolidated Plan funds is made in accordance with the stated policies and strategies contained in the 2009-2012 Consolidated Plan. Funds are appropriated to the following City departments for the identified purposes:

**Human Services Department (HSD):** Activities are focused on supporting services that assist homeless persons and families out of homelessness and into appropriate housing, supporting non-profit social service organizations with their facility needs, and CDBG Administration.

**Office of Housing (OH):** Funds are used to create affordable housing options for low- and moderate-income Seattle residents.

**Office of Economic Development (OED):** Provides support for the economic development of low-income neighborhoods and businesses with a variety of business development products, and support for the neighborhood revitalization activities of the Southeast Seattle Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area.

### 4.3.1 2009 Allocation Guidelines

**CDBG Allocation Guidelines**

Since 2006, the City’s broad objectives for CDBG funds have been to support the Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness and to support economic revitalization in Southeast Seattle. The funding guidelines remain unchanged for 2009:

- The City will continue to maximize the amount of CDBG funding for public services while mitigating major fluctuations in the public services cap caused by fluctuations in annual program income.

- Public services funds shall focus on activities that support the region’s Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness.

- The City has committed to support neighborhood revitalization in the Rainier Valley (in Southeast Seattle) through the Rainier Valley Community Development Fund. City Ordinance 121763, adopted April 2005, adopted a Substitute Funding Agreement with the Central Puget Sound Regional Transit Authority that laid out a plan for CDBG allocations to this project through 2012. Following a full allocation to the public services cap, CDBG funds will be allocated to support the intent of the Substitute Funding Agreement.
• Remaining CDBG resources shall be used to support affordable housing preservation and
development, community facilities and economic development activities throughout the City,
and CDBG administration activities.

• All programs funded by CDBG, whether they are operated by City departments or by
community-based organizations, will be consistent with the goals of the Consolidated Plan.

• CDBG allocations for programs operated by City departments will be determined through the
City’s budget process.

• The City’s policy is to permit up to 20% of CDBG expenditures for administration and
planning activities, as allowed under CDBG regulations. Also, federal regulations currently
allow cities to set aside up to 10% of the CDBG grant funds as contingency for cost overruns.

• In the event that projected revenues differ from actual revenues, the CDBG Administrator
will work with affected City departments to implement the policies and strategies stated in
this Plan. At the earliest possible opportunity, prior to submittal of the revised Table of
Proposed Projects to the Council, the CDBG Administrator will present recommendations to
the Mayor and City Council on how to meet the actual revenues following the substantial
amendment public process rules. Mayor and Council decisions will then be incorporated into
a revised annual Table of Proposed Projects submitted to HUD.

• In order to meet HUD’s timely expenditure requirements and to ensure funds are expended in
a deliberate and efficient process, the CDBG Administrator shall, no later than April 1 of
each year, review CDBG allocations made to all entities. The CDBG Administrator, in
consultation with the affected City departments as well as the Executive department
overseeing these entities, will evaluate the recapture of CDBG funds under the following
conditions:

1. Unexpended CDBG funds allocated to human services, planning, administration, and
City’s internal staffing and operating costs shall be recaptured at the end of City’s fiscal
year;

2. Unexpended CDBG funds allocated to various technical and project assistance activities
including those supporting the operations of non-profit developers carrying out economic
development and low-income housing development activities, shall be recaptured at the
end of a one-year contractual cycle;

3. Unexpended CDBG funds allocated to physical development activities including
affordable housing, community facilities, and business equity investment shall be
recaptured at the end of three years from the date of award notice or funding reservation
letter from the City, unless these funds are encumbered by authorized and executed
contracts, or unless substantial expenditure and progress on the project are documented,
including substantial completion of design in the case of capital projects;

4. Funds not otherwise covered under #1, 2 and 3 above that are not awarded or encumbered
after three years shall be recaptured at the end of the City’s fiscal year.
• Recaptured funds will be used in accordance with the guidelines contained in this Plan.

Should CDBG revenues exceed the planned amount, the additional resources shall be allocated in accordance with these funding guidelines. The unplanned resources may also be used to:

1. Mitigate the funding reductions applied to various CDBG programs, grant administration, and planning efforts over the past several years in response to diminishing resources;

2. Provide a comparable funding increase to the aforementioned program areas to the extent possible;

3. Increase funding for those physical development programs that leverage non-City revenues or that do not require on-going annual funding. To the extent possible, the City shall avoid development of a CDBG operating expense base that cannot be sustained if the federal government fails to maintain future CDBG funding at the current levels.

Should CDBG revenues come in lower than planned, the City will continue its policy that the priority for managing decreases in CDBG resources will, to the extent possible, be to reduce funding allocations in physical development and/or administrative activities and not in public services, nor as committed in the Substitute Funding Agreement.

• The CDBG funding reductions shall be made in planning, administration, and/or physical development programs, including program delivery costs. One-time-only capital projects are most likely to experience reduced allocations of any CDBG revenue decrease. Funding reductions may be applied across-the-board among physical development programs.

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

ESG Allocation Guidelines

ESG funds have been used in Seattle to improve the quality of emergency shelters; to support shelter initiatives to expand capacity; and to provide "essential services," non-maintenance, or security personnel to access supportive services to stabilize people in the community. A maximum of 5% of the grant is allocated to the Human Services Department (HSD) for administrative costs, while 95% of the total grant provides support for programs providing services to homeless people. The HSD Community Services Division administers the ESG program.

HOME Allocation Guidelines

The HOME program is the largest federal block grant to state and local governments designed exclusively to create affordable housing for low-income households. Federal rules allow participating jurisdictions to choose among a broad range of eligible activities using HOME
funds: provide home purchase or rehabilitation financing assistance to eligible homeowners and new homebuyers; build or rehabilitate housing for rent or ownership; pay for other reasonable and necessary expenses related to the development of affordable housing, including site acquisition or improvement, demolition of dilapidated housing to make way for HOME-assisted development, and payment of relocation expenses; and to provide for tenant-based rental assistance contracts.

As stated above, the City of Seattle is estimating a 2009 HOME allocation of $4,142,653, which is unchanged from the 2008 allocation. This includes $2,610,265 for rental housing preservation and development, $911,567 for homebuyer programs, $205,947 for rent stabilization, and $411,265 for HOME administration. An additional $1 million of HOME program income is projected for 2009. Program income funds are allocated for homebuyer programs and rental housing preservation and development. All low-income housing production, preservation and assistance programs funded by HOME will be consistent with the goals of the Consolidated Plan.

**HOPWA Revenue Estimate and Allocation Guidelines**

HOPWA funds are allocated for the purpose of supporting persons with HIV and AIDS and their family members in individual living situations. Activities include rent subsidies and supporting services.
4.3.2 2009 Annual Allocation Priorities

Just as the **Four-Year Strategic Plan Matrix** above documents the priority strategies the City and its partners will focus on during the next four years; the **2009 Annual Allocation Plan** following indicates the key activities and respective fund allocations from the four federal fund sources that will be implemented beginning in January, 2009.
City of Seattle 2009 Annual Allocation Plan – November 13, 2008

The 2009 Table of Proposed Projects is the proposed one-year spending plan for Consolidated Plan funds for the City’s 2009 fiscal year. These allocations are aligned with the strategies and objectives as described in this 2009 – 2012 Consolidated Plan.

NOTE: The contents of this Table and Plan are not intended to confer any legal rights or entitlements on any persons, groups, or entities, including those named as intended recipients of funds or as program beneficiaries. The terms of this Plan are subject to amendment and to the effect of applicable laws, regulations and ordinances. Statements of numerical goals or outcomes are for the purpose of measuring the success of programs and policies and do not impose a legal obligation on the City to achieve the intended results. Actual funding of particular programs and projects identified in this Table is subject to completion of various further actions, some of which involve discretionary determinations by the City or others. These include HUD approval of this Plan; appropriations by the United States Congress and the City Council; reviews and determinations under environmental and related laws; and results of bidding and contracting processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>HUD Matrix codes</th>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>ESG</th>
<th>HOPWA</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>2009 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Office of Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11: HomeWise and Homebuyer Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111: Rehabilitation Lending and Investment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1110 City of Seattle OH</td>
<td>Housing Technical Assistance - HomeWise and Homebuyer Staffing (CDBG) (Citywide)</td>
<td>14A 202</td>
<td>$361,279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$361,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support staff and related costs of managing homebuyer assistance programs and homeowner rehabilitation projects, managing rehabilitation, energy conservation, paying contract costs for compliance with lead-based paint, complying with Section 106 Historic Preservation regulations, and processing loans</td>
<td>LMH</td>
<td></td>
<td>LocGov Prog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance indicator: 550 housing units weatherized; 35 housing units repaired; homebuyer assistance indicator is shown below under Homebuyer Programs (HOME)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111: Rehabilitation Lending and Investment Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$361,279</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112: Homebuyer Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1120 City of Seattle OH</td>
<td>Homebuyer Programs (CDBG PI and HOME PI) (Citywide)</td>
<td>05R 201(e)</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$1,050,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CDBG and HOME program income will be used for eligible low-income homebuyer activities. Up to 10% of program income may be used for program delivery.</td>
<td>LMH</td>
<td></td>
<td>LocGov Prog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance indicator: Shown below under Homebuyer Programs (HOME)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1120 City of Seattle OH</td>
<td>Homebuyer Programs (CDBG) (Citywide)</td>
<td>05R 201(e)</td>
<td>$92,712</td>
<td></td>
<td>$92,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>HUD Matrix codes</td>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>ESG</td>
<td>HOPWA</td>
<td>HOME</td>
<td>2009 Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG funds will be used for eligible low-income homebuyer activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Performance indicator:</em> Shown below under Homebuyer Programs (HOME)</td>
<td>LocGov Prog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Seattle OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>112: Homebuyer Programs (HOME) (Citywide)</strong></td>
<td>05R 201(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$911,567</td>
<td>$911,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOME homeownership funds will be used for eligible low-income homebuyer activities.</td>
<td>LMH LocGov Prog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Performance indicator:</em> HOME and CDBG funding combine with other OH funding to provide an estimated $2.1 million for homeownership housing assistance and production in 2009 – that funding is expected to help 40 households purchase homes.</td>
<td>Start date: 1/1/2009 – Completion date: 12/31/2009.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>112: Homebuyer Assistance Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$642,712</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,411,567</td>
<td>$2,054,279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Seattle OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>113: Minor Home Repair</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Services of Seattle &amp; King County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>113: Minor Home Repair Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$449,917</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$449,917</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Seattle OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>114: Homebuyer Education and Counseling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>114: Homebuyer Education and Counseling Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$216,989</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$216,989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Seattle OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11: Homeownership and Homebuyer Programs Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$1,670,897</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,411,567</td>
<td>$3,082,464</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

220
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>HUD Matrix codes</th>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>ESG</th>
<th>HOPWA</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>2009 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>12: Multifamily Production and Preservation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121: Multifamily Lending and Investment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121 020 City of Seattle OH</td>
<td>Rental Housing Preservation &amp; Development (HOME PI) (Citywide)</td>
<td>14B 202</td>
<td>LMH</td>
<td>LocGov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide gap financing for acquisition and/or rehabilitation or new construction to provide multifamily rental housing with long-term rent and income restrictions, for low-income households, consistent with HOME Program regulations. Up to 10% of program income may be used for program delivery.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance indicator:</strong> Shown below under Rental Housing Preservation &amp; Development (HOME)</td>
<td>Start date: 1/1/2009 – Completion date: 12/31/2009.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121 030 City of Seattle OH</td>
<td>Rental Housing Preservation &amp; Development (HOME) (Citywide)</td>
<td>14B 202</td>
<td>LMH</td>
<td>LocGov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide gap financing for acquisition and/or rehabilitation or new construction to provide multifamily rental housing with long-term rent and income restrictions, for low-income households, consistent with HOME Program regulations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,610,874</td>
<td>$2,610,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance indicator:</strong> HOME and CDBG funding combine with other OH funding to provide an estimated $13 million for rental housing production and development in 2009—that funding is expected to fund 200 units.</td>
<td>Start date: 1/1/2009 – Completion date: 12/31/2009.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121 040 City of Seattle OH</td>
<td>Rental Housing Preservation &amp; Development (CDBG and HOME Recapture) (Citywide)</td>
<td>14B 202</td>
<td>LMH</td>
<td>LocGov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide gap financing for acquisition and/or rehabilitation or new construction to provide for homeless housing and multifamily rental housing with long-term rent and income restrictions, for low-income and homeless households, consistent with CDBG Program regulations. The HOME funds are from prior years’ under expenditures, not the 2009 entitlement from HUD nor from HOME program income.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$827,205</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance indicator:</strong> Shown above under Rental Housing Preservation &amp; Development (HOME)</td>
<td>Start date: 1/1/2009 – Completion date: 12/31/2009.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121 050 City of Seattle OH</td>
<td>Rental Housing Preservation &amp; Development (CDBG PI) (Citywide)</td>
<td>14B 202</td>
<td></td>
<td>LocGov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide gap financing for acquisition and/or rehabilitation or new construction to provide for homeless housing and multifamily rental housing with long-term rent and income restrictions, for low-income and homeless households, consistent with CDBG Program regulations. The HOME funds are from prior years’ under expenditures, not the 2009 entitlement from HUD nor from HOME program income.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>HUD Matrix codes</td>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>ESG</td>
<td>HOPWA</td>
<td>HOME</td>
<td>2009 Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide gap financing for acquisition and/or rehabilitation or new construction to provide multifamily rental housing with long-term rent and income restrictions, for low-income households, consistent with CDBG Program regulations. Up to 10% of program income may be used for program delivery. <strong>Performance indicator:</strong> Shown above under Rental Housing Preservation &amp; Development (HOME) <strong>Start date:</strong> 1/1/2009 – <strong>Completion date:</strong> 12/31/2009.</td>
<td>LMH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>121: Multifamily Lending and Investment Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,327,205</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,260,874</td>
<td>$4,588,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12: Multifamily Production and Preservation Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,327,205</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,260,874</td>
<td>$4,588,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13: Program Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>133: Program Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133 010 City of Seattle OH <strong>Program Development Staffing (CDBG) (Citywide)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff and related costs of creating new housing strategies to ensure sufficient supply of affordable housing for households at a wide range of income levels, including lower-wage workers and homeless families and individuals; developing strategies for neighborhood revitalization without displacing vulnerable populations; identifying strategies to protect families from predatory lending; administering programs such as Multifamily Tax Exemption and TDR/Bonus; leveraging City housing funds; writing and updating the housing element of the Consolidated Plan; preparing reports required for regulatory compliance; and coordinating outreach to stakeholders on potential policy changes and new housing affordability strategies. <strong>Performance indicator:</strong> NA <strong>Start date:</strong> 1/1/2009 – <strong>Completion date:</strong> 12/31/2009.</td>
<td>20 205 LMC LocGov</td>
<td>$46,774</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$46,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>133: Program Development Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$46,774</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$46,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13: Program Development Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$46,774</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$46,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14: Administration &amp; Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>142: Management Support Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142 010 City of Seattle OH <strong>HOME Administration (HOME) (700 5th Avenue, 57th Floor)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$414,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund City costs of implementing the HOME program.</td>
<td>21A 206 [LMH]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$414,265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Activity

**Performance indicator:** N/A  
**Start date:** 1/1/2009 – **Completion date:** 12/31/2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>HUD Matrix codes</th>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>ESG</th>
<th>HOPWA</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>2009 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>142: Management Support Services Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$414,265</td>
<td>$414,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14: Administration &amp; Management Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$414,265</td>
<td>$414,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: Office of Housing Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,044,876</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,086,706</td>
<td>$8,131,582</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2: Human Services Department

#### 21: Leadership & Management Services

##### 212: Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of Seattle HSD</th>
<th>Human Services Planning (700 Fifth Avenue, #5800: Citywide)</th>
<th>20205 LMC LocGov</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>212  010</td>
<td>Staff will develop and evaluate City human service strategies, goals, policies, and programs for low- and moderate-income households, including those of people who are homeless or who have special needs. Staff will also be responsible for development of the Consolidated Plan and annual updates and other CDBG-related planning tasks.</td>
<td>$56,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Performance indicator:</strong> N/A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Start date:</strong> 1/1/2009 — <strong>Completion date:</strong> 12/31/2009.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### 212: Planning Subtotal

|                   | $56,126 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $56,126 |

##### 215: Grants & Budget Administration [H55]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of Seattle HSD</th>
<th>Block Grant Administration (Office: 700 Fifth Avenue, #5800)</th>
<th>21A 206 LMC LocGov</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>215  010</td>
<td>Provide administration and technical assistance to City departments and community-based organizations so they can implement CDBG and other HUD grant funds and programs in an efficient, accountable, and responsive manner.</td>
<td>$1,100,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Performance indicator:</strong> N/A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Start date:</strong> 1/1/2009 — <strong>Completion date:</strong> 12/31/2009.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### 215: Grants & Budget Administration Subtotal

|                   | $1,100,745 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $1,100,745 |

### 23: Children, Youth, & Family Development

#### 231: Youth Development
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>HUD Matrix codes</th>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>ESG</th>
<th>HOPWA</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>2009 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YMCA Young Adults in Transition</td>
<td>03T 201(e)</td>
<td>$32,053</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$32,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Adults In Transition (YAIT) program houses up to 19 homeless young adults ages 18 to 24 who are willing to work. Residents can stay for a maximum of 24 months. Services include counseling, health and fitness facilities assistance with educational, and employment goals. <strong>Performance Indicator:</strong> 20 unduplicated youth enrolled; 10 of whom secure permanent housing when exiting program. <strong>Start date:</strong> 1/1/2009 — <strong>Completion date:</strong> 12/31/2009.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23: Children, Youth, &amp; Family Dev. Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$32,053</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$32,053</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24: Community Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities RFP (Citywide)</td>
<td>03 201(c)</td>
<td>$214,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$214,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make funding allocations through a competitive Request for Proposals process to various community-based organizations for planning, acquisition, construction, or renovation activities. Provide funding for a number of capital improvement projects proposed by community-based agencies serving low- to moderate-income clients and neighborhoods. Awards will be announced at the conclusion of an RFP process during 2008. <strong>Performance indicator:</strong> 3 facilities projects. <strong>Start date:</strong> 1/1/2009 — <strong>Completion date:</strong> 12/31/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241: Community Facilities Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$214,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$214,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242: Emergency &amp; Transitional Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazarus Day Center Operations (416 2nd Ave, 98104)</td>
<td>03T 201(e)</td>
<td>$75,193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide hygiene and laundry facilities, light snacks or meals, and information to homeless men and women aged 50 and older. <strong>Performance indicator:</strong> 1,600 persons who are homeless. <strong>Start date:</strong> 1/1/2009 — <strong>Completion date:</strong> 12/31/2009.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Reststop Essential Services (1922 9th Ave, 98121)</td>
<td>26 03T 201(e)</td>
<td>$113,032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$113,032</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide toilets, showers, washers, dryers, temporary storage, and waiting areas to homeless adults. Project is also funded with 2005 ESG carry forward of $43,626, for total budget of $108,035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>HUD Matrix codes</td>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>ESG</td>
<td>HOPWA</td>
<td>HOME</td>
<td>2009 Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Booth House (Restricted Address)</td>
<td>2605G 201(e)</td>
<td>$7,758</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242 Salvation Army</td>
<td>LMC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Beginnings Shelter For Battered Women (Restricted address)</td>
<td>05G 201(e)</td>
<td>$8,247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242 New Beginnings</td>
<td>LMC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angeline's Day and Hygiene Center (2024 - 3rd Avenue 98121)</td>
<td>03T 201(e)</td>
<td>$397,993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$397,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242 YWCA of Seattle-King County</td>
<td>LMC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter Grant Program Administration (Office: 618 2nd Avenue)</td>
<td>2621A 206</td>
<td>$26,210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$26,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242 City of Seattle HSD</td>
<td>LocGov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloha Inn (1911 Aurora Avenue N, 98109)</td>
<td>03T 201(e)</td>
<td>$165,181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$165,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242 Archdiocesan Housing Authority</td>
<td>LMC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noel House (2301 Second Avenue, 98121)</td>
<td>03T 201(e)</td>
<td>$433,910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$433,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>HUD Matrix codes</td>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>ESG</td>
<td>HOPWA</td>
<td>HOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Archdiocesan Housing Authority | Emergency shelter and transitional services for homeless women.  
*Performance Indicator:* 58 individuals placed in permanent or LT transitional housing  
*Start date:* 1/1/2009 – *Completion date:* 12/31/2009 | LMC SubPriv      |          |         |         |        |            |
| 242 230   | **St. Martin de Porres** (1561 Alaskan Way S, 98134)                      | 03T 201(e)       | $299,217 |         |         |        | $299,217   |
|           | Emergency shelter and transitional services for homeless individuals  
*Performance indicator:* 37 individuals placed in permanent or LT transitional housing  
*Start date:* 1/1/2009 – *Completion date:* 12/31/2009 | LMC SubPriv      |          |         |         |        |            |
| Archdiocesan Housing Authority | Emergency shelter and transitional services for homeless individuals  
*Performance indicator:* 37 individuals placed in permanent or LT transitional housing  
*Start date:* 1/1/2009 – *Completion date:* 12/31/2009 | LMC SubPriv      |          |         |         |        |            |
| 242 240   | **Main Shelter Program** (517 3rd Ave, 98104)                              | 03T 201(e)       | $641,946 | $355,060 |         |        | $997,006   |
|           | Provide emergency shelter and supportive transitional services for homeless adult persons.  
*Performance indicator:* 70 individuals placed in permanent or LT transitional housing  
*Start date:* 1/1/2009 – *Completion date:* 12/31/2009 | LMC SubPriv      |          |         |         |        |            |
| Archdiocesan Housing Authority | Emergency shelter and transitional services for homeless individuals  
*Performance indicator:* 70 individuals placed in permanent or LT transitional housing  
*Start date:* 1/1/2009 – *Completion date:* 12/31/2009 | LMC SubPriv      |          |         |         |        |            |
| Family Services | **Transitional Assistance**                                               | 03T 201(e)       | $266,498 |         |         |        | $266,498   |
|           | Provide transitional assistance to move people from homelessness into housing.  
*Performance indicator:* 128 households placed into shelter, 64 of those exit to permanent or LT transitional housing  
*Start date:* 1/1/2009 – *Completion date:* 12/31/2009 | LMC SubPriv      |          |         |         |        |            |
| Solid Ground | **Broadview Emergency Shelter and Transitional Housing** (restricted address)  
*Emergency:* $232,115;  
*Performance indicator:* 53 families placed into shelter, 37 of those exit to permanent or LT transitional housing  
*Transitional:* $209,072;  
*Performance indicator:* 31 families placed into LT transitional housing, 21 of those exit to permanent housing  
*Start date:* 1/1/2009 – *Completion date:* 12/31/2009 | LMC SubPriv      |          |         |         |        | $441,187   |
<p>| Solid Ground | <strong>Family Shelter</strong> (Citywide)                                      | 03T 201(e)       | $144,895 |         |         |        | $144,895   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>HUD Matrix codes</th>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>ESG</th>
<th>HOPWA</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>2009 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provide emergency shelter, counseling and extended stay shelter to homeless families, with support services to help transition out of homelessness</strong></td>
<td>LMC</td>
<td>SubPriv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Performance indicator:</em> 59 families placed into enhanced shelter, 36 of those exit to stable housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start date:</strong> 1/1/2009 – <strong>Completion date:</strong> 12/31/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Angeline’s Enhanced Shelter Program</strong> (2024 - 3rd Avenue 98121)</td>
<td>03 T 201(e)</td>
<td>$96,616</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$96,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced shelter and supportive services to help transition individuals out of homelessness</td>
<td>LMC</td>
<td>SubPriv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Performance indicator:</em> 27 individuals placed in permanent or long-term transitional housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start date:</strong> 1/1/2009 – <strong>Completion date:</strong> 12/31/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Downtown Emergency Shelter</strong> (1118 5th Avenue, 98101)</td>
<td>03 T 201(e)</td>
<td>$214,659</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$214,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide emergency shelter and counseling services for homeless women and children in crisis.</td>
<td>LMC</td>
<td>SubPriv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Performance indicator:</em> 18 households and an additional 65 single persons placed in permanent or long-term transitional housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start date:</strong> 1/1/2009 – <strong>Completion date:</strong> 12/31/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seattle Emergency Housing</strong> (2820 E. Cherry, 98122)</td>
<td>03 T 201(e)</td>
<td>$448,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$448,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide emergency shelter for 2- and 1-parent homeless families; also provide supportive services.</td>
<td>LMC</td>
<td>SubPriv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Performance indicator:</em> 100 families placed into enhanced shelter, 80 families exit to permanent or long-term transitional housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start date:</strong> 1/1/2009 – <strong>Completion date:</strong> 12/31/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>242: Emergency &amp; Transitional Services Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,353,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>243: Tenant Stabilization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resident Choices</strong> (citywide)</td>
<td>2803T 201(e)</td>
<td>$297,876</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$297,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eviction Prevention: provide intervention and supportive services to maintain the housing of low income tenants who are at high risk of eviction or other cause of imminent housing loss.</td>
<td>LMC</td>
<td>SubPriv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Performance Indicator:</em> 210 households.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start Date:</strong> 1/1/2009 – <strong>Completion Date:</strong> 12/31/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Stability Program</strong> (citywide)</td>
<td>03 T 201(e)</td>
<td>$121,713</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$121,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Code</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>HUD Matrix codes</td>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>ESG</td>
<td>HOPWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 020          | Housing Group | Eviction Prevention: Agency provides in-house intervention and supportive services to its tenants who are at high risk of eviction.  
Performance Indicator: 140 households.  
Start Date: 1/1/2009 – Completion Date: 12/31/2009 | LMC SubPriv |      |     |       |  |         |
| 243 030      | YWCA         | Project Self-Sufficiency (citywide)  
Housing Stability: provides eviction intervention, supportive services, and placement in Transitional housing units pending permanent housing placement primarily for single women of color with dependents who are homeless or subject to imminent eviction.  
Performance Indicator: 90 households.  
Start Date: 1/1/2009 – Completion Date: 12/31/2009 | 03T 201(e) LMC SubPriv | $110,648 |     |     | $110,648 | |         |
| 243 040      | Compass Center | Housing Stability Program (citywide)  
Eviction Prevention: provide intervention and supportive services to maintain the housing of extremely low income formerly homeless tenants who are subject to eviction action or other cause of imminent housing loss.  
Performance Indicator: 142 individuals.  
Start Date: 1/1/2009 – Completion Date: 12/31/2009 | 03T 201(e) LMC SubPriv | $40,346 |     |     | $40,346 | |         |
| 243 050      | Catholic Community Services | Legal Action Center (citywide)  
Eviction Prevention: provide legal representation and litigation services to low income tenants who are the subjects of wrongful landlord eviction actions.  
Performance Indicator: 135 households.  
Start Date: 1/1/2009 – Completion Date: 12/31/2009 | 03T 201(e) LMC SubPriv | $110,648 |     |     | $110,648 | |         |
| 243 060      | TBD          | HOPWA RFP  
An RFP process will be used to allocate the 2008 HOPWA funds. The RFP will occur in 2008. | 28 03T 201(e) [LMC] LocGov |     |     | $1,663,000 | | $1,663,000 |
| 243 070      | Salvation Army | Rent Stabilization Program (Citywide)  
Provide rental assistance with case management services to low-income households who are transitioning out of homelessness or at-risk of eviction.  
Performance Indicator: 100 households (general).  
Start Date: 1/1/2009 – Completion Date: 12/31/2009. | 03T 201(e) LMC SubPriv | $109,987 |     | $205,947 | | $315,934 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>HUD Matrix codes</th>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>ESG</th>
<th>HOPWA</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>2009 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>243: Tenant Stabilization Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$791,218</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,663,000</td>
<td>$205,947</td>
<td>$2,660,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24: Community Services Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,630,713</td>
<td>$510,307</td>
<td>$1,663,000</td>
<td>$205,947</td>
<td>$7,009,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Human Services Department Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,787,584</td>
<td>$542,360</td>
<td>$1,663,000</td>
<td>$205,947</td>
<td>$8,198,891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4: Office of Economic Development

#### 42: Neighborhood and Community Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>421: Community Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>421 010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421 020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421 050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mitigation available to businesses affected by light rail construction along Martin Luther King, Jr. Way. Real estate development activities will involve both new construction and the rehabilitation of existing building stock for the purpose of stimulating economic activity, increasing the inventory of commercial spaces for Rainier Valley businesses, and promoting affordable housing for Rainier Valley residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421: Community Development Subtotal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422: Community Development Loans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Development Council Float Loan Origination (N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handle marketing and outreach for the CDBG Float Loan and Section 108 Loan programs, and provide technical assistance to prospective borrowers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance indicator: 1 loan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start date: 1/1/2009 – Completion date: 12/31/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422: Community Development Loans Subtotal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42: Neighborhood and Community Development Subtotal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Office of Economic Development Subtotal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUND TOTALS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.3 Leveraging

Based on current funding levels, the 2009–2012 Consolidated Plan anticipates the receipt and use of approximately $72 million of federal funds in the four Consolidated Plan funding programs over the course of the four years. In spite of recent reductions in allocation amounts from the federal government, especially in the flexible CDBG program, the City of Seattle’s intent for these funds remains to help support the achievement of the City’s housing, human services, and community development goals.

- **The City of Seattle contributes $68 million annually to health and human services.** CDBG, HOME, HOPWA and ESG funds play a critical role in the City’s strategies to address the needs of no- to moderate-income people in our community. However, one should view these funds in the context of the major investments made by the City to create a “safety net” for those in need. For example, as of 2008, our City contributed nearly $68 million annually to health and human services through its General Fund and the Families and Education Levy.86

- **Since 1982, Seattle voters have supported over $242 million in voter-approved levies for low-income housing.** In addition, Seattle voters have approved for 16 consecutive years over $242 million in local Housing Levy funds to provide affordable housing opportunities for low-income Seattle residents. Seattle’s Office of Housing estimates that every $1 in CDBG funds leverages $3.21 in other state and local capital funds invested in affordable rental housing development.

- **The City’s investment has leveraged over $110 million for development projects.** Similarly, lending from CDBG Section 108, Float Loan and Equity Fund provides necessary gap financing to stimulate private housing, commercial and mixed-use development. Oftentimes, projects are not feasible in certain areas of Seattle without this public sector involvement. From 2001 to 2007, the City invested $37,487,134 in catalytic projects that resulted in 728 new residential units and 255,803 square feet of commercial space. The City’s investment leveraged over $110,000,000 in private funding in these projects.

Other federal, state, and local resources will be used to help achieve these goals as well. Some of these other sources are utilized directly by the City and others are used by community-based non-profit organizations in conjunction with City CDBG, HOPWA, ESG, or HOME funds. Significant other sources include:

- McKinney Homeless Services program
- State and federal funds for rent certificates and vouchers
- Tax exempt lending and equity programs (e.g. New Markets Tax Credits program)
- State Housing Trust Fund
- State Community Services Facilities Loan Program
- City of Seattle General Fund

• City of Seattle Housing Levy.

The use of private resources such as debt financing, equity, private fundraising, expertise, materials, donations, land and buildings, is an essential element of Seattle’s development of affordable housing and public (community) facilities. Major sources of private investment are:

• United Way (which increasingly supports service costs connected to emergency housing and homeless services)
• Impact Capital (which supports interim financing, predevelopment financing, and tax credit projects)
• Local philanthropic foundations (which make both operating and capital grants for housing development and public service operation)
• Local banks (owner equity, match, labor, and expertise)

Leveraged resources include thousands of hours of citizens' time spent planning and revising policy documents governing Seattle’s activities and assisting in evaluating and improving programs and services implemented to achieve the Consolidated Plan goals.
4.4 Anti-Poverty Strategy

HUD 24 CFR § 91.215(j) requires a “concise summary of the jurisdiction’s goals, programs and policies for reducing the number of poverty-level families and how the jurisdiction’s goals, programs and policies for producing and preserving affordable housing, set forth in the housing component of the Consolidated Plan, will be coordinated with other programs and services for which the jurisdiction is responsible and the extent to which they will reduce (or assist in reducing) the number of poverty-level families, taking into consideration factors over which the jurisdiction has no control.”

As discussed under the Leveraging topic of this section (see section 4.3.3) the City of Seattle and its partners coordinate a diverse range of programs and services funded through multiple sources to help no- and low-income families. As of 2008, our City contributed nearly $68 million annually to health and human services through its General Fund and the Families and Education Levy. Additionally, Seattle voters have approved for 16 consecutive years over $242 million in local Housing Levy funds to provide affordable housing opportunities for low-income Seattle residents.

Over the years of the City’s federal CDBG/ESG/HOME/HOPWA administration, and in concert with multiple City departments’ efforts with their community partners, a network of services has evolved to:

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

The following is not intended as an exhaustive list, but it demonstrates the breadth and diversity of efforts to assist low- and moderate-income people. The information gives the reader a better context of the initiatives, partnerships, programs, and services that surround the Consolidated Plan’s federal funds. While no one program or service can address all needs for those in poverty, the City of Seattle places high value on timely and useful referrals and efforts that concentrate on preventing those at-risk from becoming entrenched in poverty.

---

4.4.1 Assist low-income families and individuals who are struggling to access resources that may help move them to self-sufficiency

- **PeoplePoint: Bridge to Benefits (formerly Help for Working Families)** offers coordinated referral to a range of services which assist low and moderate income people. One call to PeoplePoint may connect eligible callers to energy and utility assistance, child care and preschool options, health insurance programs, food assistance, Seattle Jobs Initiative and the Earned Income Tax Credit campaign operated by United Way of King County. For more information call (206) 684 – 0355 or visit: [http://www.seattle.gov/humanservices/financialassistance/](http://www.seattle.gov/humanservices/financialassistance/).

- **Washington 2-1-1 Information Network (Community Information Line)** offers a statewide coordinated referral service for programs that assist in a very diverse range of issues from tenant eviction issues to community based services. For more information call 2-1-1 or the alternate toll free number 1-877-211-WASH (9274), or visit: [http://www.resourcehouse.com/en/wa/cgi-bin/location.asp](http://www.resourcehouse.com/en/wa/cgi-bin/location.asp).

- **Mayor’s Office for Senior Citizens (MOSC)** offers information, resources and referrals for seniors and adults with disabilities and those who care for them to a wide range of programs sponsored through the City, the State and community partners. The MOSC is administered by the Area Agency on Aging. For more information call 206-684-0500 or visit [http://www.seattle.gov/humanservices/seniorsdisabled/mosc/](http://www.seattle.gov/humanservices/seniorsdisabled/mosc/).

- **City of Seattle Healthy Communities Initiative** adopted by the City in March 2006, establishes a policy that directs the City of Seattle’s investments and efforts in public health services. The resolution articulates the vision, goals, strategies and policy framework that direct our efforts and investments in public health. Specifically, the City’s vision seeks to eliminate health disparities based on race, income, ethnicity, immigrant/refugee status, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, health insurance status, neighborhood, or level of education through an array of strategies. For more information and to view the 2006 list of healthcare investments (totaling $20,394, 859 in City General and Other funds) tied to homeless and other vulnerable pops through the Healthy Communities Initiative, visit: [http://www.seattle.gov/humanservices/foodhealth/publichealth/HCI_CityFundedPrograms.pdf](http://www.seattle.gov/humanservices/foodhealth/publichealth/HCI_CityFundedPrograms.pdf).

- **Homeless Families, Children, and Youth Support Services** coordinated by the City of Seattle Offices of Housing and Human Services, and the Seattle Housing Authority, assist homeless families, children and youth in moving to safe, stable housing by leveraging additional support and referral to subsidized affordable housing. See Section 3.3.6 – Needs Assessment – Children and Youth for detail on the range of programs serving homeless and vulnerable populations in Seattle.

- **Food Programs** help supplement low-income families’ food resources, an increasingly critical need during a time in which food prices have risen 8% from 2007 according to

- **Utility Assistance programs** combine federal and local resources to offer eligible households discounted rates for electric, heat and water, as well as limited assistance paying utility bills. Access to these programs can be made by contacting PeoplePoint or by visiting: [http://www.seattle.gov/humanservices/financialassistance/utility.htm](http://www.seattle.gov/humanservices/financialassistance/utility.htm).

- **Seattle "Family Centers" and teen parent support programs** are operated by different community agencies which form a network of places where families can go to get connected, grow friendships, and build a sense of community. In 2008, City funding for the centers was almost $1.4 million. Family Centers are created around the simple idea that when people need help they should be able to get it from people who respect them and understand their culture. The philosophy of family support in Family Centers is built upon [Family Support Principles](http://www.seattle.gov/humanservices/financialassistance/utility.htm). The primary goal of Family Centers is to promote healthy families and strengthen adults in their roles as parents, nurturers and providers. Family centers increase or improve:

  - Self-determination and resourcefulness
  - Community safety and livability
  - Parent-child relationships
  - Childhood early learning and school success
  - Civic participation


**4.4.2 Prevent poverty through assistance to Seattle’s children and through life-long educational efforts**

- **Families and Education Levy** is a key component of the City’s strategy to support children. Levy programs include:

  - Early learning – $4 million annually
    
    *Includes money for sending 400 4-year-olds to preschool so they’ll enter kindergarten ready to learn*

---

- Student health – $3.3 million annually
  *Keeps kids healthy by supporting school-based health centers and providing school nurses*

- Out-of-school time – $3.1 million annually
  *Offers after-school academic activities for elementary and middle school students to keep them focused on learning and out of trouble*

- Family support and family involvement – $2.6 million annually
  *Provide support services to families experiencing difficulties so they can better meet their kids’ developmental needs*

- High-risk middle- and high-school youth – $1.3 million annually
  *Take a coordinated case management approach for high-risk middle- and high-school youth to reduce delinquency and help them develop positive goals*

The initial levy was passed in 1990 and renewed in 1997 and again in 2004. It provides $68 million in funds for services throughout the city. The most recent levy renewal incorporated a sharper focus on preparing children to be ready for school, improving academic achievement, reducing disproportionate performance by race, ethnicity, and income, and helping students complete school. Emphasis is placed on serving students and schools that have traditionally underperformed. For more information visit: [http://www.seattle.gov/neighborhoods/education/edlevy.htm](http://www.seattle.gov/neighborhoods/education/edlevy.htm)

- **Early Childhood Education and Assistance Program (ECEAP)** provides preschool education that helps children from families whose income is below 110% of the federal poverty line to be prepared for school. Funded through the State of Washington’s Department of Early Learning and the City of Seattle, ECAEAP offers free, high-quality, culturally and linguistically appropriate preschool services for eligible three- and four-year-olds and their families. The primary goal is to help participating children develop the skills they need to be ready for school and acquire a passion for lifelong learning. Families have access to information, resources, and training that support them in moving towards their individual and family goals. For more information visit: [http://www.seattle.gov/humanservices/children_families/school/preschool.htm](http://www.seattle.gov/humanservices/children_families/school/preschool.htm)

- **City Department of Neighborhood’s Office of Education** coordinates with the City Human Services Department - Seattle Youth Employment Project (SYEP) and the Governor’s Office of Education Ombudsman to help get children ready for school, succeed academically and graduate from high school. For more information visit: [http://www.seattle.gov/neighborhoods/education/](http://www.seattle.gov/neighborhoods/education/)

- **Seattle Early Reading First (SERF)** works with early childhood education centers to promote literacy development of preschool children in low-income, high-risk communities. In 2003, Seattle was one of 29 cities nationwide to implement Early Reading First. The federal Department of Education (DOE) grant for 2007 to 2010 is administered by the City’s Human Services Department in cooperation with Seattle Public Schools, the Seattle Public Library, and the University of Washington. The program operates in five child care centers throughout Seattle that serve mostly low-income children. For more information contact the HSD SERF Project Manager, [ann-margaret.webb@seattle.gov](mailto:ann-margaret.webb@seattle.gov).
• **Project SOAR** promotes the development of healthy children through nurturing home environments, early identification and intervention around developmental issues, high quality child care and out-of-school time activities as part of a collaboration with United Way of King County. The City allocated $135,000 in 2007 and 2008 to fund SOAR, a merger of the City’s Project Lift-Off and United Way’s Children’s Initiative, to implement and monitor the SOAR action agendas on Early Childhood & School-Readiness and School-Age Children & Youth.

• **Upward Bound** offers educational enhancement and a college preparatory program for low-income high school youth.

4.4.3 **Alleviate poverty by improving family and individual economic opportunities that lead to sustaining a living wage**

• **Child care Assistance** helps eligible low- and moderate-income working families pay for child care for children aged 1 month to 13 years. Families can choose (based on available capacity) from approximately 145 licensed family child care homes and centers in Seattle, which contract with the City to provide high-quality and affordable child care.

• **Seattle Youth Employment** provides job training, placement and educational enhancement to low-income youth. The program increases the number of youth who receive the support needed to complete high school, stay out of the juvenile justice system, and develop the skills and assets necessary to make a positive transition to adulthood. For more information visit: [http://www.seattle.gov/humanservices/youth/employment.htm](http://www.seattle.gov/humanservices/youth/employment.htm).

• **Annual Youth and Education Job Fair** is the largest youth employment fair in the region. It is sponsored by the Seattle Human Services Department and Seattle Department of Parks & Recreation. In 2008, more than 70 employers and educational institutions hosted information booths covering employment opportunities, postsecondary apprenticeships, trade schools and college options. For more information, visit: [www.seattle.gov/humanservice/youth/](http://www.seattle.gov/humanservice/youth/).

• **Seattle Jobs Initiative** addresses a critical need of Seattle’s low-income individuals by providing job training and support services—including access to housing, child care, transportation and counseling—which together make it possible for people to secure, retain and advance in jobs that pay a living wage. For more information visit: [http://www.seattlejobsinitiative.com/how/index.html](http://www.seattlejobsinitiative.com/how/index.html).

• **The Age 55+ Employment Resource Center** helps hundreds of older workers find jobs to support their basic needs each year, and helps local employers find experienced, dedicated and reliable employees. Services are free to both job seekers and employers. For more information visit: [http://www.seattle.gov/humanservices/seniorsdisabled/mosc/employment.htm](http://www.seattle.gov/humanservices/seniorsdisabled/mosc/employment.htm).
• **Seattle Conservation Corps (SCC)**, established in 1986, is a unique Parks & Recreation program that gives back in two ways: it trains formerly troubled people for viable, living-wage jobs; and it provides trained workers for needed work in Seattle parks and for other agencies and employers on a contract basis. The SCC provides homeless adults with opportunities to learn and work in a structured program that gives them with job skills and helps them carry out projects that benefit our citizens and our environment. SCC is a year-round employment program with an annual budget of about $4 million. Seventy-five percent of program costs are covered by doing work for public sector employers, as well as foundation and private grant fundraising. For more information visit: [http://www.seattle.gov/parks/scc/](http://www.seattle.gov/parks/scc/).

• **Race & Social Justice Initiative**: The City of Seattle is becoming increasingly diverse. A primary challenge of this diversity is the ongoing struggle to create a community in which all people are valued, regardless of their background. Mayor Nickels’ **Race and Social Justice Initiative** seeks to reduce disproportionality in economic opportunity, education, civic engagement, and other areas, and to make City services more relevant to Seattle’s diverse populations.

• **City’s “Unbanked” Initiative** offers help for low-income individuals without access to basic banking services (an ATM card, checking accounts, savings) to build credit and financial assets. Seattle is working with a coalition of municipal governments across the country called Cities for Financial Empowerment (CFE) and the Seattle/King County Asset Building Collaborative to boost economic opportunity for low and moderate-income people. For more information contact: [jerry.degrieck@seattle.gov](mailto:jerry.degrieck@seattle.gov).

• **Office of Economic Development** provides low-interest loans for mid-sized and large mixed-use and commercial projects. For-profit, non-profit, and community developers may be eligible. OED funds projects that achieve significant public benefits including:
  
  • Creation of jobs;
  • Affordable housing that will support neighborhood businesses while helping to preserve a diverse economic base of residents; and
  • Redevelopment of abandoned or underutilized property that will contribute to the revitalization of the City’s business districts.


• **Metro Ticketbook Program** provides subsidized bus tickets for low-income and homeless people who need transportation to services, jobs, and child care. In 2008, the City received $662,500 from King County to distribute to 66 non-profit, community-based organizations selected through a competitive application process. Priority was given to agencies that serve primarily homeless clients. Organizations purchase tickets at 20% of actual cost and then distribute the tickets to clients. For more information, please contact Arlene Oki at 206-684-0106 or [arlene.oki@seattle.gov](mailto:arlene.oki@seattle.gov).
• **Prevailing wage requirements** are monitored by the Department of Executive Administration for all City employees working on its construction projects, as well as for any project receiving federal funding. The CDBG Administration office, housed in the Department of Human Services is charged with oversight federal Davis-Bacon Act and related requirements for all CDBG/ESG/HOME/HOPWA projects. Ensuring that fair wages are provided, in combination with training and apprenticeship programs, are another avenue the City pursues to support low- and moderate-income people other than through direct program costs. For more information visit: http://www.seattle.gov/contract/prevailwage.htm for City construction projects, see http://seattle.gov/housing/development/WageRate.htm for affordable housing projects let through the Office of Housing, or contact Michael.Look@seattle.gov for CDBG projects.

4.4.4 **Coordinate anti-poverty strategy services with affordable housing programs**

Excessive rent burdens and low vacancy rates have gravely affected low-income Seattle households. Housing assistance programs identified in this Consolidated Plan help individuals and families stabilize housing and focus their attention on attaining a better standard of living. The City’s focus will continue to be on multifamily rental units for households with incomes below 30% of median income. Seattle will increase the programs available to assist households to move from subsidized rental units to become homeowners as the next step on the housing continuum.

• **Office of Housing (OH) Notices of Fund Availability (NOFA)** are the primary method of alerting the public and housing developers when funding is available for the acquisition, rehabilitation, or construction of subsidized affordable housing. Periodic bid processes are used to allocate multifamily rental projects, homebuyer assistance, and supported housing targeted to vulnerable and homeless populations. The requirements of successful award of any of these bid processes includes consistency with the policy and priorities laid out in the Consolidated Plan, adherence to all applicable local, state and federal laws, and project feasibility.

In fact, applicants using the City’s online NOFA site are linked directly to the Consolidated Plan from the OH website. Many of the partnerships involved in housing development project link non-profit housing development expertise with social services delivery expertise contributed by experienced community providers.

In addition, the supportive housing for homeless populations NOFA itself is coordinated among six public and private funders (City of Seattle, King County, United Way, Seattle and King County Housing Authorities, and ARCH, A Regional Coalition for Housing) in one application process. For more information on the Housing Levy and Office of Housing NOFA process visit: http://seattle.gov/housing/development/default.htm

• **Weatherization and Minor Home Repair programs** assist low-income homeowners, particularly seniors, with home rehabilitation loans and minor repairs in an effort to keep
them in their homes. For more information on homebuyer assistance and weatherization programs visit: http://seattle.gov/housing/HomeWise/default.htm.

- **Downpayment Assistance and Homebuyer Counseling** both focus on obtaining and keeping low- and moderate-income people in homes. Services are provided primarily through community based partners. For more information visit: http://seattle.gov/housing/buying/programs.htm.

- **Predatory Lending education** is offered in light of the recent crisis in foreclosure and the common complaint of unfair practices experienced by low-income households and particularly people of color. For more information visit: http://www.seattle.gov/housing/predatorylending/default.htm and see Appendix D on Impediments to Affordable Housing.

- **Preservation of existing affordable housing** is critical to addressing affordable housing needs in Seattle. Many of the strategies described in the Housing Market chapter of the Consolidated Plan specifically relate to preservation. Key preservation strategies include programs that provide funding for projects with expiring regulatory agreements and deferred maintenance needs, and active monitoring of the Office of Housing’s portfolio of City-funded affordable housing units to ensure their long-term physical and financial viability. For more information on incentives for preservation of affordable housing visit: http://www.seattle.gov/housing/incentives/default.htm.
Section 5 – PLAN FOR PUBLIC INPUT

5.1 Public Input for development of 2009-2012 Consolidated Plan

5.1.1 Community consultation (see Section 6 – Reference Tools for links to most of the community plans consulted).

Descriptions of the public input efforts conducted by organizations whose published studies and plans are cited in the Consolidated Plan are summarized below. This is not an exhaustive list, since not all plans included such information in their respective publications.

1. AIDS Housing Continuum Planning Meeting

HSD and Public Health – Seattle & King County HIV/AIDS Program staff worked together to coordinate a planning retreat to create a vision for the AIDS Housing continuum in Seattle and King County in the year 2012. Over 15 agencies were represented and spent the day discussing emerging needs and identifying service and housing strategies for homeless and low-income persons living with HIV/AIDS in our community. The priorities that emerged from the session include: reviewing the focus of the housing continuum; creating low-barrier, service-enriched housing units; and enhancing the centralized housing entry system that exists within the AIDS housing system. These priorities will be incorporated into the work of the AIDS Housing Committee over the next year.

2. Seattle Housing Authority Moving to New Ways (MTW) 2008 Annual Plan development.

As part of developing the MTW Plan and annual budget, SHA provides opportunities for public review and comment.

- The primary opportunity is a public hearing. Residents are notified of the hearing through The Voice (a monthly newspaper for SHA residents), a notice on rent statements, posters in SHA buildings, and a letter to about 120 resident leaders.

- The public is informed via SHA's free monthly e-mail newsletter, Building Community, which reaches about 1,300 subscribers, and through posting on www.seattlehousing.org and an ad in the Seattle/King County newspaper of record, the Daily Journal of Commerce.

- SHA held a public hearing on September 17, 2007. About 40 people attended, including residents of SHA housing programs. The draft plan and annual budget were presented and testimony taken, followed by a general question and answer period.

- SHA’s Joint Policy Advisory Committee, which is made up of resident representatives who advise SHA on issues of concern to residents, discussed major
plan activities on September 11 and 13, 2007. In total, about 50 resident leaders attended.

3. **Seattle/King County Area Agency on Aging 2008 strategic plan development:**

The Older American’s Act (OAA) requires the Area Agency on Aging to establish a volunteer Advisory Council to assist in identifying unmet needs, advise on needed services, and advocate for policies and programs that promote quality of life. As required by the OAA, our plan incorporates suggestions from the Advisory Council as well as numerous partners in the community. We engaged community members in several activities to better understand local needs by conducting:

- Five Focus on the Future community forums,
- An on-line survey through *Seniors Digest,*
- Three focus group discussions with older adults and health and social service providers, and
- A review of the Draft Plan by the Advisory Council, Sponsors, and key partners, and
- Three public hearings

4. **Homeless Youth and Young Adult subcommittee of TYP:**

Marci Curtain, HSD liaison to the Ten Year Plan Homeless Youth and Young adult subcommittee submitted the recently published “*A Plan to End Young Adult Homelessness in King County*” in response to a call for comment on the draft Homeless Needs Assessment section in August 2008. Excerpts from that plan are included in the Special Needs and Vulnerable Populations analysis in Section 3 – Needs Assessment of the 2009 Consolidated Plan.

5. **Human Services Department - Homeless coordinating committee**

On August 12, 2008, Andrea Akita announced the availability of the 2009 Consolidated Plan for comment. The group of 15+ internal City and external Ten Year Plan committee liaisons were encouraged to submit comment, especially on the draft Homeless Needs section of the Consolidated Plan.

5.1.2 **Consolidated Plan public comment summary**

During the 2007-2008 period of development for the Consolidated Plan, staff took advantage of multiple formal and informal venues for engaging the general public and consumers in dialogue about the issues they identified as emergent and/or important to consider in evaluating program options and funding decisions. Not all venues were specific to the four federal fund sources, but all are relevant to the needs captured in Section 2 and Section 3 of this Consolidated Plan. Input venues included:
• Specific drafts of sections of the Consolidated Plan vetted through standing cross-
organization work groups for comment (e.g. Human Services Homeless coordinating
committee, Housing Levy work group, CEH- Ten Year Plan Homeless Youth and Young
Adult subcommittee, etc.)

• Staffing of on-going or issue specific community groups and feedback from those
participants

• Advertisement of the opportunity for public comment on the draft Consolidated Plan
through print and online media including:
  ❖ Legal notice through the Daily Journal of Commerce on August 19, 2008
  ❖ August 19, 2008 notice of public comment and explanation of 2009 Consolidated
    Plan development process on HSD’s CDBG administration website posted at
    http://www.seattle.gov/humanservices/community_development/conplan/default.htm
  ❖ August, 2008 listing of link to draft 2009 Consolidated Plan on Office of Housing
    website under “In the News” at http://seattle.gov/housing
  ❖ Article published in the September, 2008 Area Agency on Aging sponsored e-
    newsletter Senior Digest
  ❖ Publication to public and community services stakeholders via the September
    2008 Human Services Department newsletter
  ❖ Public hearings held jointly with City Council review of the draft document on
    three occasions: August 6th, September 3rd and September 17, 2008. Comments
    received summarized below.

1. **Ballard Home for All**

   The voluntary group of neighborhood and homeless service advocates is organized
   around the issue of increasing numbers of individuals and families who are living our of
   parked cars or campers in various locations in Ballard. Human Services Department staff
   are working with this group to educate them about existing options for homeless services
   and learn about community concerns and thoughts regarding car camping for homeless
   people.

• **Refugee and Immigrant symposium:** A limited scope research study conducted by a
  University of Washington Geography student investigated current housing challenges
  faced by refugees in Washington communities. Challenges included finding and keeping
  housing and exploring housing resources that are available. The report noted that housing
  challenges vary from one refugee community to another, as different communities have
  different housing preferences and needs. The methodology used for the study included
  handwritten surveys, translated focus group discussions, and personal interviews with
  refugee housing recipients and providers. Focus group topics included personal housing
  experiences, including frustrations when looking for housing; use of low-cost or free
  services such as shelters; suggestions to improve housing services; and experiences
  refugees encountered working with non-profit service organizations, private landlords
  and the public housing authorities. The author gathered a number of comments and
  concerns during the course of the study.
Concerns from Somali families included:

- Difficulty getting on the waiting list for subsidized housing.
- Difficulty accessing public and private housing.
- Insufficient information about federal protections against discriminatory housing practices (Fair Housing Act).
- Lacking the skills and education for the American job market.
- Lacking long-term rental histories, a requirement of many landlords.
- Difficulties of single-parent households to receive affordable childcare.

Refugees from the former Soviet Union reported similar concerns:

- Language barriers, wait list, and inadequate access to housing information.
- Perceived or actual discrimination from landlords.
- Limited income prevents rental of units large enough to accommodate the number of adults living in one space.
- Desire to live close to family and friends or within certain school districts force living in areas where affordable housing is scarce or non-existent.

Public Housing Authority staff comments:

- Language barriers between housing seekers and housing providers lead to miscommunication and non-compliance with housing regulations.
- Using family members for interpretation can result in incorrect interpretations where the potential housing client receives information that their family member thinks they want to hear, rather than actual housing rules.
- Lack of cultural understanding can lead to Housing Authority staff inadvertently offending potential housing clients, which then makes the client less cooperative with the housing application process and less compliant once housing is secured.
- Some refugee clients don’t follow housing rules because they either don’t understand or are choosing not to follow the rules originally agreed upon.

Rental Assistance/Section 8 Housing Program summary comments:

- Refugees like vouchers because they allow housing support without the negative, stigmatizing public housing associations.
- Vouchers expand housing opportunities and enable openings on waiting lists.
- Agency-based vouchers allow housing decision to be made jointly by case manager and client.
- Limited number of availability of vouchers does not address current housing demand.
- Difficult to help LEP clients get through all the necessary paperwork.
- It is impossible to get all potentially eligible people on the wait list.
- Research findings indicated that the design of a housing orientation information packet could have immediate benefit to nonprofits that lack the time or resources to conduct training sessions or hire a housing coordinator to develop and package this information.
Other comments from refugee and immigrant participants in the study:

• Section 8 certificates issued by the Seattle Housing Authority and the King County Housing Authority create a safety net to prevent homelessness and stabilize the lives of many refugee and immigrant households.
• Refugees noted that though they met all requirements for the Program, they often faced additional scrutiny from housing authority staff.
• Conflicting requirements from the Seattle Housing Authority and the King County Housing Authority make it difficult for refugees and immigrants to access the program.
• Though community nonprofit agencies which serve refugees and immigrants report that many refugees reside in public housing in Seattle, the local Housing Authority currently does not compile data on the number of refugees and immigrants on its waiting list.

The report concluded with recommendations including:

• Create a single, centralized housing information center, staffed full time with staff informed about public and private housing resources, options, basic rental rules, and related information.
• Provide housing information translated into “high demand” languages.
• Create an incentive program to encourage refugees to transition from public housing to the private market.
• Improve training for staff members who assist refugees with housing resources. This training should include information about the Landlord/Tenant Act as well as other housing laws and concerns.

2. Presentation of the DRAFT 2009 Consolidated Plan highlights to the Seattle King County Coalition for the Homeless (SKCCH) on 8/20/08:

General reaction was one of interest in the next four year funding cycle. No comments were received specific to the Goals and data presented. The Seattle/King County Coalition on Homelessness (SKCCH) was formed in 1979 and is one of the oldest homeless coalitions in the country. The Coalition works collaboratively to ensure the safety and survival of people who are homeless and to end the crisis of homelessness in our region. SKCCH's current membership roster includes over 60 agencies serving homeless people County-wide.

Ongoing efforts of the coalition include:
• Organizes and implements advocacy campaigns for increased funding for homelessness and housing programs
• Takes a leadership role in the Committee to End Homelessness in King County
• Shapes public policy related to housing, poverty and homelessness
• Coordinates the Annual One Night Count of homeless individuals on the street and in shelter & transitional programs
• Organizes and implements "Project Cool", a yearly event that collects and distributes back-to-school supplies for homeless children
• Provides an important forum for information sharing in relation to service-provision, current legislative issues, and funding resources
• Allocates government funds through competitive processes

3. **Comments from Advisory council on Aging and Disability Services:**

• A letter calling for all publicly funded housing to be built utilizing Universal Design (UD) elements that assist those with limited mobility and physical handicaps including:
  • Step-free entrances, with smooth flooring transitions between rooms
  • Wide doors at least 36” wide
  • Wheelchair accessible path to all rooms on main floor
  • Lever door handles
  • Adjustable height shower heads
  • Variable height work surfaces in the kitchen and bathroom
  • Light switches placed at entryway to each room
  • Rocker style switches at convenient height (44-48”) for old and younger disabled
  • Electrical wall outlets at least 18” above floor level
  • Grab-bars in bathrooms (shower, bathtub, and toilet areas)
  • At least one main floor toilet wheelchair accessible
  • Non-slip surface on stair treads

While these considerations may add slightly to the cost per unit, they are necessary to allow publicly funded housing to serve Seattle’s large and rapidly growing aged and disabled populations, and to allow aging-in-place.

4. **Comments from Mr. Robert Jackson, given in person to CDBG Administrator on September 12, 2008:**

• Mr. Jackson requested and received both a hard copy and electronic copy of the draft Consolidated Plan to review
• He asked that charts and graphs used in the Needs Assessment section of the draft Plan be available in color for improved readability
• He complained broadly that City documents are hard to find, that neither the Clerk’s Office nor the neighborhood service bureaus know anything about the draft Consolidated Plan and therefore could not provide him with any information. He suggested that there be one reading room in City where all City documents could be made available. He also suggested having CD ROMs of the documents available at all public hearings or meetings about the plan. (Note: the City plans to make both hard copy and CD-ROM copies of the final plan available to the public through a variety of outlets.)
• He would like, clearly described in the first few pages the author and a phone number for the author, and thought a footer identifying the version of the draft plan would be a good idea
• He also indicated it would be a good time to evaluate the Seattle Housing Authority’s “Moving to Work” plan
5. Comments from August 6, 2008  Housing and Economic Development Committee briefing

- Comments specific to the draft 2009 Consolidated Plan were not received
- However, 12 citizens commented on the City’s proposed application for the Fort Lawton Redevelopment plan which focuses on providing opportunities for housing for low-income and formerly homeless individuals. Neighborhood support for the planned redevelopment is generally positive with concerns for the proposed density and mix of housing units as well as protection of green space and trees on the existing land. Traffic concerns regarding the entrance to the new development and its shared boundary with existing streets were also raised. The Office of Housing, as lead for the Fort Lawton proposal, worked closely with CDBG administration to use data from the adopted 2005 Consolidated Plan in the application as well as creating consistency with the proposed 2009 Consolidated Plan.

6. Comments from September 3, 2008  Housing and Economic Development Committee briefing

- Comments specific to the draft 2009 Consolidated Plan were not received
- However, three citizens commented on the City’s proposed application for the Fort Lawton Redevelopment plan. Concerns were raised regarding parts of the application that were still at the “conceptual” phase with a request to access details of planning development as soon as practicable.
- Linda Pilot, a private citizen raised concerns about relocation of subsidized housing residents in Jefferson Terrace due to potential condo conversion. As a disabled person she cannot pay for moving from a public housing unit to a private apartment and asked that the City remain involved to monitor the outcome of potential relocation.

7. Comments from September 17, 2008  Housing and Economic Development Committee briefing

- No comments received at the hearing or via communication with City Council staff.
5.2 Citizen Participation Plan

Introduction

The City of Seattle is required by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to have a detailed Citizen Participation Plan that contains the City's policies and procedures for public involvement in the Consolidated Plan process and the use of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME), Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG), and Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) money.

The community involvement process has three main objectives:

• To determine how well our housing, economic and human development funding is meeting the needs of the community
• To determine what other types of resources and services are needed in the future
• To help develop priorities

The City will provide community members with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the Citizen Participation Plan and on substantial amendments to the Participation Plan. The City will announce the availability of the Citizen Participation Plan in the Daily Journal of Commerce and online at the City’s official website for the Human Services Department. Copies are also available at the CDBG Administration Office and will also be mailed to individuals by request by calling 206-684-0288.

I. CONSOLIDATED PLANS AND ANNUAL UPDATES

Encouraging Public Participation

The Citizen Participation Plan encourages public participation by:

• Facilitating involvement of residents of public and assisted housing and of low- and moderate-income people, especially those living in neighborhoods and areas where CDBG, HOPWA, ESG and HOME grants might be spent.

• Holding public hearings at relevant stages of the funding process. Hearings must give residents a chance to state community needs, review the proposed uses of funds, and comment on the past uses of these funds.

• Taking whatever actions are appropriate to encourage involvement from people of color, people who do not speak English, and people with disabilities.

• Mayor Greg Nickels launched an Immigrant and Refugee initiative as part of Seattle’s commitment to improve access to services for an increasingly multi-cultural and diverse population. The initiative includes a translation and interpretation policy. The policy guides the City’s efforts to provide access to key services and increase the transparency of City forms and publications through languages other than English. Interested residents and community groups may request pertinent sections of CDBG related reports for translation into Spanish, Vietnamese, Cantonese, Mandarin, Somali, Tagalog and Korean. In addition, translations of the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) about the 2009-2012
Consolidated Plan are planned to be available on the CDBG website: http://www.seattle.gov/humanservices/community_development/conplan/default.htm

The Role of Low-Income People

HUD declares that the primary purpose of the programs covered by this Citizen Participation Plan is to improve communities by providing: decent housing, a suitable living environment, and expanded economic opportunities -- all principally for low- and moderate-income people. The amount of federal CDBG, HOME, ESG, and HOPWA money Seattle gets each year is heavily based upon the severity of poverty, substandard housing conditions, and the prevalence of HIV/AIDS. Hence, it is necessary that the Consolidated Planning process genuinely involve low-income residents who experience these conditions. Meaningful participation from low-income people must take place at all stages of the process, including: identifying needs; setting priorities among these needs, deciding how much money should be allocated to each high-priority need, and suggesting the types of programs to meet high-priority needs; overseeing the way in which programs are carried out; and, commenting on program performance.

The Various Stages of the Consolidated Plan Process

The policies and procedures in this Citizen Participation Plan relate to several stages of action mentioned in law or regulation. In general, these stages or events include:

1. Identification of housing and community development needs.
2. Preparation of a draft plan for use of funds for the upcoming year called the Proposed Annual Action Plan or a new Consolidated Plan. The final Annual Action Plan and Consolidated Plan are adopted by the City Council.
3. Development of a Substantial Amendment, if it is necessary to change how the money already budgeted in an Annual Action Plan will be used, or to change the priorities established in the Consolidated Plan. If a Substantial Amendment is needed, it will be proposed, considered, and acted upon.
4. Preparation of an Annual Performance Report after a complete program year. The Annual Performance Report is released for public review and comment and then sent to HUD.

The Program Year

The "program year" chosen by Seattle is January through December.

Community members may comment on the Citizen Participation Plan for a period of fifteen (15) days from the date of the publication of notice announcing its availability by writing to the CDBG Administration Office of the Human Services Department, P.O. Box 34215, Seattle, Washington, 98124-4215, or by e-mail to blockgrants@seattle.gov.

Citizen Comment Overview

- **All comments are welcomed.** The City urges community members to identify needs and share their housing and community development ideas. All comments and suggestions regarding the Citizen Participation Plan, Consolidated Plan, Annual Performance Report, and Section 108 Loan Guarantee Projects are welcome.
• **There is a 30-day comment period for the Consolidated Plan and Substantial Amendments.** Community members may comment on the Consolidated Plan, and, when applicable, on a Substantial Amendment(s) to these documents for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of the publication of notice announcing its availability by writing to the CDBG Administration Office of the Human Services Department, P.O. Box 34215, Seattle, Washington, 98124-4215, or by e-mail to blockgrants@seattle.gov.

• **There is a 15-day comment period for the Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report.** Community members may comment on the Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) for a period of fifteen (15) days from the date of the publication of notice announcing its availability by writing to the CDBG Administration Office of the Human Services Department, P.O. Box 34215, Seattle, Washington, 98124-4215, or by e-mail to blockgrants@seattle.gov.

• **All documents will be made available on the Internet.** The Citizen Participation Plan, Consolidated Plan and Annual Performance Report will be made available online on the City of Seattle Department of Human Services website.

• **Arrangements will be made for those with special needs.** For announced public hearings before the City Council or a committee of the Council, persons with hearing impairments may call the City Council Office at 206-684-8888 or TDD 206 233-0025.

• **Non-English speaking community members and sight-impaired persons** may call the CDBG Administration Office at 206-684-0288 or e-mail to blockgrants@seattle.gov to make arrangements for translated materials and recordings.

**Public Notice**

Public notice shall be provided once certain documents are available, such as the Proposed Annual Update or Consolidated Plan, any proposed and final Substantial Amendment to the Annual Update or Consolidated Plan, and the Annual Performance Report. In addition, public notice shall be provided of all public hearings and all public meetings relating to the use of funds or planning process covered by this Citizen Participation Plan. Public notice shall be provided with enough lead-time for residents to take informed action. The amount of lead-time will depend upon the event.

• **Notice of a Public Hearing will be published 14 days before the event.** Notice of all public hearings will be published in the *Daily Journal of Commerce* and community newspapers fourteen (14) days prior to the date of the hearings.

• **Notices will be published in a variety of sources.** The City shall publish public notices in the *Daily Journal of Commerce* and in community newspapers as necessary and appropriate. To encourage involvement by people of color, people who do not speak English, and people with disabilities, public notice may also be provided through flyers or letters to neighborhood organizations, public housing resident groups, religious organizations, and non-profit agencies providing services to low-income people through mailing lists maintained by the City of Seattle Human Services Department, the Office of Economic Development, and the Office of Housing. The contents will include the date, time, location and purpose of the meeting or hearing, or a summary of the content of the
newly available document. In addition, a public notice will be sent to any person or organization requesting to be on a mailing list. Public notices will also be published online at the official website of the City’s Human Services Department.

- **Members of the public will have access to records and information.** The City will provide the public with reasonable and timely access to the data or content of the Consolidated Plan, as well as the proposed, actual, and past use of funds covered by this Citizen Participation Plan. The City’s public disclosure policies and procedures will be followed.

- **Members of the public will have access to meetings.** The City will provide the public with reasonable and timely access to local meetings relating to the Consolidated Plan process.

- **Standard Documents will be made available to members of the public.** Standard documents include: the proposed and final Annual Update and Consolidated Plan adopted by the City Council; proposed and final Substantial Amendments to either an Annual Update or the Consolidated Plan; Annual Performance Reports; and the Citizen Participation Plan.

In the spirit of encouraging public participation, copies of standard documents will be provided to the public at no cost and within a minimum of five working days of a request. These materials will be available in a form accessible to persons with disabilities, when requested.

**Public Hearings and Meetings**

Public hearings are held in order to obtain the public’s views. Hearings cover community needs, development of proposed activities and proposed uses of funds, and a review of program performance, i.e. to review what was accomplished with the use of funds spent during the past program year. To ensure that City Council members are able to hear the views of potential and actual beneficiaries of the funds, at least one annual public hearing will be sponsored by the City Council.

- **Public hearings will be accessible to members of the public.** Public hearings will be scheduled at times convenient to most people who benefit or who might benefit from the use of funds. Hearings will be held at locations accessible by bus. All public hearings will be held at locations accessible to people with disabilities. Provisions will be made for people with disabilities when requests are made at least five working days prior to a hearing. In addition, translators will be provided for people who do not speak English when requests are made at least five working days prior to a hearing.

- **The public process will involve a number of opportunities to comment.** At least one public hearing will be held each year to obtain the views and opinions about housing and community development needs and the priority of those needs from potential and actual beneficiaries of the funds. In order to encourage public involvement, focus groups and small group meetings may be held prior to the first public hearing to help determine the specific needs and priorities identified by low- and moderate-income people. There will be a considerable effort to engage communities of color and marginalized communities. The meetings, if held, will be completed thirty (30) days before a draft Plan is published.
for comment so that the needs identified can be considered by the City and addressed in the draft Annual Update/Consolidated Plan.

- **Public hearings will be held at least 15 days after the draft Consolidated Plan is made available and members of the public will have at least 30 days to comment.** A public hearing will be conducted by City Council at least fifteen (15) days after the Proposed Annual Update/Consolidated Plan is available to the public. The public shall have a minimum of thirty (30) days from the time of the publication of proposed Annual Updates or Consolidated Plans to comment on the proposed documents before a Final Annual Update/Consolidated Plan is approved by the City Council.

- **All comments will be carefully considered.** In preparing a final Annual Update or Consolidated Plan, careful consideration will be given to all comments and views expressed by the public, whether given as oral testimony at the public hearing or submitted in writing during the review and comment period. The final Annual Update or Consolidated Plan will have a section that presents all comments, plus explanations of the City’s response.

**Technical Assistance**

City staff will work with organizations and individuals representative of low- and moderate-income people who are interested in developing and submitting a proposal to obtain funding for an activity under any of the programs covered by the Consolidated Plan. The level and type of assistance will be determined by the City, but does not include the provision of funds to the group.

**II. CONSOLIDATED ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND EVALUATION REPORT**

- **A performance report is required each year.** Every year, Seattle must send HUD Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) within 90 days after the close of the program year. In general, the CAPER must describe how funds were actually used and the extent to which these funds were used for activities that benefited low- and moderate-income people.

- **The City will conduct a public comment process for the CAPER.** The City will provide public notice that a CAPER report is available so that residents will have an opportunity to review it and comment on it. The following procedures apply specifically for CAPER reports:
  - There will be a fifteen (15)-day comment period once the CAPER is made available to the public prior to submitting the report to HUD;
  - The CAPER will be available online at the City Human Services Department’s website; and
  - Copies will be mailed to individuals by request by calling 206-684-0288 or e-mailing the request to blockgranst@seattle.gov.

- **All comments will be carefully considered.** In preparing the CAPER for submission to HUD, consideration will be given to all comments and views expressed by the public.
The CAPER that is submitted to HUD will have a section that summarizes all citizen comments or views in addition to explanations why any comments were not accepted.

III. SUBSTANTIAL AMENDMENTS

The City of Seattle must specify the criteria it will use for determining what changes in the planned or actual activities of the Consolidated Plan constitute a Substantial Amendment to the Consolidated Plan. The following describes those criteria and the procedures for citizen notification and comment on such proposed Substantial Amendments prior to the implementation of such amendments.

Criteria

Changes in the City of Seattle’s Consolidated Plan that constitute Substantial Amendments include only the following:

- A change in the use of CDBG funds from one eligible activity to another; or

- Any changes in excess of $50,000 in the amount allocated to any project or activity as shown in the Proposed Annual Action Plan (or in any allocation list subsequently adopted by the City Council).

Procedure

- **Each Substantial Amendment requires a public notice period.** Prior to the adoption of any Substantial Amendment to the City’s Consolidated Plan, the City shall publish in the Daily Journal of Commerce, a "Notice of Substantial Amendment to the Consolidated Plan," which will identify the activities involved and the nature of the substantial amendment to be implemented. The notice will advise citizens that they have a period of thirty (30) days to seek additional information or to comment on the change by writing to the address below.

- **Substantial Amendments must be adopted by the City Council after all comments are considered.** Before adopting a proposed Substantial Amendment, the City shall consider the comments received in writing and oral comments at public hearings and make modifications to the proposed substantial amendment where appropriate. All Substantial Amendments shall be implemented only after the City Council has adopted the Substantial Amendment by resolution or ordinance. Amendments to the Consolidated Plan that are not substantial may be submitted for City Council approval at the discretion of the HSD Director. The final adopted Substantial Amendment shall be made available to the public, and a copy of the amendment shall be forwarded to HUD in the form of an amendment to the City’s Consolidated Plan. A summary of the comments or views received, and a summary of any comments or views not accepted and the reasons those comments were not accepted, shall be attached to the Substantial Amendment and submitted to HUD.

IV. CHANGING THE CITIZEN PARTICIPATION PLAN

Substantial Amendments to the Citizen Participation Plan can be made only after the public has been notified of intent to modify it, and only after the public has had a reasonable opportunity to
review and comment on proposed substantial change. Substantial Amendments to the Citizen Participation Plan must be adopted by City Council.

Complaint Procedures

Written complaints from the public about the Consolidated Plan, amendments or the performance report will receive a meaningful, written reply within fifteen (15) working days. The public may write to:

CDBG Administration Office
City of Seattle Human Services Department
P.O. Box 34215
Seattle, Washington 98124-4215

V. SECTION 108 LOAN GUARANTEE PROJECTS

Technical Assistance

- The City will provide technical assistance to proposers. The City will provide technical assistance to groups who are developing proposals that may benefit from and be eligible for Section 108 Loan Guarantee Fund assistance. The City will provide assistance through the Office of Economic Development (OED) or through a contracted assistance provider. Technical assistance will include an initial review of the proposed project and a financial and regulatory feasibility assessment. The level and type of assistance will be determined at the discretion of the OED.

Public Hearings

- Two public hearings will be held for the Section 108 Loan Guarantee program. All Section 108 Loan Guarantee applications must be approved by the City Council. The public hearing for each Section 108 Loan Guarantee Program application will be held in conjunction with a Council committee meeting or briefing regarding a resolution that authorizes the application to be submitted to HUD. Based on input from the public and the Council committee regarding the proposed application, the City will consider comments from the public hearing and modify the application if appropriate.

- Each project will also be reviewed at a public hearing. Each individual project proposed to be assisted with Section 108 Loan Guarantee will be reviewed at a public hearing held in conjunction with the City Council committee that will vote on the ordinance authorizing the contractual agreements to implement the loan proposal (after HUD’s approval of the City’s Section 108 Loan Guarantee application.)

- Accommodations will be made for people with special needs. For Section 108 Loan Guarantee application hearings, the City will provide the appropriate accommodations if the project affects non-English speaking persons. Translators will be provided for people who do not speak English when requests are made at least five working days prior to a hearing. For public hearings specific to an application, the City will work with applicable community-based development organizations to conduct outreach to non-English speaking persons. In addition, community members can call (206) 233-3885 to make
arrangements for translated materials and recordings. The public announcement will also indicate services that are accessible for physically disabled individuals (print and communication access will be provided upon request).

Location of Hearings

- **The Section 108 Loan Guarantee application hearings will be held at the City of Seattle’s Council Chambers.** Every attempt will be made to schedule these hearings during evening hours. The City will provide contact information that includes a phone number, address and an email address for people who wish to provide additional feedback or cannot attend the public hearing.

Notices of Public Hearings

- **Notice will be provided for Section 108 Loan Guarantee application public hearings.** Notices of Section 108 Loan Guarantee application public hearings will be published in the *Daily Journal of Commerce* and any applicable local or ethnic newspapers fifteen (15) days in advance of the hearing. All notices will include the amount of guaranteed loan funds expected to be made available for the coming year (including program income anticipated to be generated by the activities carried out with guaranteed loan funds) and the amounts proposed to be used for activities that benefit low- and moderate-income persons.

  All notices for program application hearings will include:
  - A description of the proposed activity, the amount of the guaranteed loan, and any program income to be generated; and
  - A citation of the National Objective (benefit to low- and moderate-income persons, elimination of slum and blight or urgent need) and the activity eligibility (e.g., area benefit, housing, jobs, limited clientele, etc); and whether the activity will result in displacement. If the project displaces individuals, the public hearing notice will either detail the City’s displacement plans or provide information on how to access the displacement plan.

  - **If substantial changes are to be made to the original 108 Loan application, a public notice of the hearing/application will describe the substantial changes that are being proposed.** A substantial change to the Section 108 Loan Guarantee application is defined as any change to the borrower, loan amount, project activity, project location, fees, term and security.

Availability of Application

- **The proposed application and supporting documents will be made available to the public.** A proposed application and supporting documents will be made available to the public two weeks prior to the public hearing (Council committee meeting) through either a direct request for information from the Office of Economic Development (OED) or through the City of Seattle’s web site, which will be enumerated in the public notice. A copy of the final application, as submitted to HUD, will be available to the public by request at OED.
Grievances and Complaints

- **The City will respond to all written complaints.** The Office of Economic Development will respond to any written citizen grievances or complaints within **fifteen (15)** days of receipt of such notice, where practicable. In all public notices and during the public hearings, the City will make available contact information for citizens who wish to express any grievances or complaints regarding the project.

Public Participation

- **The City encourages citizen participation, particularly by low- and moderate-income persons.** The processes that will be used to encourage and carry out public participation are described under “Encouraging Citizen Participation” as found elsewhere in this Plan. In addition, the City will encourage public participation by using the City’s network of community-based development organizations, which represent many of the geographic areas in which Section 108 projects are located.

VI. RESIDENTIAL ANTI-DISPLACEMENT AND RELOCATION ASSISTANCE

Seattle will minimize displacement of families and individuals from their homes and neighborhoods as a result of projects discussed in the Consolidated Plan and projects that are funded through Section 108 Loan Guarantee assistance.

- **Projects that receive funds from CDBG (Community Development Block Grant), HOME (Home Investments Partnerships Program), UDAG (Urban Development Action Grant) or a Section 108 Loan Guarantee (funds awarded under section 108 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974) or funding from any program income that may accrue from these programs, the City has adopted a Residential Antidisplacement Plan and Relocation Assistance Policy that applies to such projects and that specifies the levels of relocation assistance available. (See Ordinance 119163).**

- **Projects included in the Consolidated Plan that do not receive funds from CDBG, HOME, UDAG or Section 108 Loan Guarantee funds,** the City has other ordinances in place that may apply and that may require relocation assistance for any persons displaced as a result of certain projects. For any projects that involve City-funded acquisition of property that may also include state or federal funds, SMC chapter 20.84, which provides for relocation assistance in certain instances, applies and specifies relocation assistance available.

- **Projects that do not involve state or federal assistance that involve demolition, change of use, substantial rehabilitation, or removal of subsidized housing restrictions that may result in displacement,** SMC chapter 22.210 applies and provides for relocation assistance to low-income renter households. For projects that may involve displacement of renters from residential rental projects converting to condominiums, SMC chapter 22.903 applies and provides for relocation assistance to such persons.
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6.1 Glossary

The terms and acronyms listed in this glossary, when used in the Plan, have the meanings set forth below unless they are used in a section that defines them differently or the context suggests otherwise.

- “ACS” – American Community Survey
- “ADDI” – American Dream Downpayment Initiative
- “affordable housing” – a housing unit for which the occupant is paying no more than 30% of household income for gross housing costs, including utility costs paid by the occupant.
- “affordable workforce housing” – affordable housing for households with incomes between 31 and 80% of median income.
- Aging & Disability Services (ADS) - is sponsored by the City of Seattle, King County, & United Way of King County, which serve as a policy setting board of the agency. ADS is also the assigned Area Agency on Aging for the Seattle-King County region & administers the Mayor's Office for Senior Citizens (MOSC).
- “American Community Survey” – a new tool developed by the U.S. Census Bureau, the ACS is an ongoing statistical summary of a sample group of households, which has been released each year since 2005 and which will replace the census long form in 2010. ACS estimates are based on a sample (about 1 in 40 households nationwide per year) and are subject to sampling error.
- “American Dream Downpayment Initiative” – provides downpayment, closing costs, and rehabilitation assistance to eligible individuals; is administered as part of the federal HOME Program.
- “assisted housing” – owner-occupied or rental housing that is subject to restrictions on rents, rate of return, or sale prices as a result of any of the following: one or more governmental subsidies provided with respect to such housing, including grants, loans, or rent subsidies from public funds; any land use bonus; a transfer of development rights; or use of bonus contributions or mitigation funds administered by the City; or tenant-based subsidies such as Section 8 vouchers.
- “burdened by housing costs” – see Glossary definition of “housing cost burden”
- “CDBG” – Community Development Block Grant
- “chronically homeless” – According to HUD, a person is defined as being “chronically homeless” if he or she has a disabling condition and has been continuously homeless for a year or more or has had at least four episodes of homelessness in the past three years.
- “Community Development Block Grant” – a federal program authorized by the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, which replaced several community development categorical grant programs. CDBG provides eligible metropolitan cities,
urban counties (called "entitlement communities") and states with annual direct grants that they can use to revitalize neighborhoods, expand affordable housing and economic opportunities, and/or improve community facilities and services, principally to benefit households with incomes not exceeding 80% of median income.

- **"Comprehensive Plan"** – Seattle’s Comprehensive Plan, as approved and amended, adopted in accordance with the State of Washington Growth Management Act, RCW Chapter 36.70A.

- **"consistent with the Consolidated Plan"** – A jurisdiction’s certification that an application is consistent with its Consolidated Plan means the jurisdiction’s Plan shows need, the proposed activities are consistent with the jurisdiction’s strategic plan, and the location of the proposed activities is consistent with geographic areas specified in the Plan. The jurisdiction shall provide the reasons for the denial when it fails to provide a certification of consistency.

- **"credit enhancement"** – a variety of provisions that may be used to reduce the credit risk of an obligation (e.g. loan guarantee, where the City is contractually bound to meet the obligations of one party should that party default).

- **"Department of Planning & Development"** – the Seattle Department of Planning and Development, and any successor departments or offices of the City.

- **"DPD"** – Department of Planning and Development

- **"disabled household"** – a household composed of one or more persons at least one of whom is an adult (a person of at least 18 years of age) who has a disability. (See Glossary definition of “person with a disability”.)

- **Domestic Violence & Sexual Assault Prevention (DVSAP)** (formerly the Domestic and Sexual Violence Prevention Office) guides the City's response to domestic violence through: planning, policy and program development, interdepartmental coordination, education and training, consultation and technical assistance, resource development, research, and provision of contracted services.

- **"elderly person"** – see “senior person”

- **"emergency shelter"** – any facility with overnight sleeping accommodations, the primary purpose of which is to provide temporary shelter for the homeless in general or for specific populations of the homeless.

- **“Emergency Shelter Grant”** – a federal grant program designed to help improve the quality of existing emergency shelters for the homeless, to make available additional shelters, to meet the costs of operating shelters, to provide essential social services to homeless individuals, and to help prevent homelessness.

- **“ESG”** – Emergency Shelter Grant

- **“extremely low-income household”** – a household whose income does not exceed 30% of median family income, as determined by HUD, with adjustments for smaller or larger
families, except that HUD may establish income ceilings higher or lower than 30% of the
median for the area on the basis of findings by HUD that such variations are necessary
because of prevailing levels of construction costs or fair market rents, or unusually high
or low family incomes.

- **“Fair Housing Act”** – the federal Fair Housing Act, 42 USC Sec. 3601 et seq., as
  amended, which requires, among other things, that owners of rental housing generally not
discriminate against potential tenants based on race, sex, color, religion, national origin,
disability or familial status.

- **“Family”** – for the purpose of describing relative housing needs among low-income
  households, the term “family” means a group of two or more people who reside together
  and who are related by birth, marriage, or adoption (U.S. Census definition).

- **“Family Self-Sufficiency Program (FSS)”** – a program enacted by Section 554 of the
  National Affordable Housing Act which directs Public Housing Agencies (PHAs) and
  Indian Housing Authorities (IHAs) to use Section 8 assistance under the rental certificate
  and rental voucher programs, together with public and private resources, to provide
  supportive services to enable participating families to achieve economic independence
  and self-sufficiency.

- **“Federal Housing Administration”** – a division of the Department of Housing and
  Urban Development. Its main activity is the insuring of residential mortgage loans made
  by private lenders. FHA also sets standards for underwriting mortgages.

- **“FHA”** – Federal Housing Administration

- **“FHA mortgage limit”** – the one-family mortgage limit for the Seattle-Bellevue-Everett
  Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), as reported annually by HUD.

- **“HIV/AIDS”** – the disease of human immunodeficiency virus/acquired
  immunodeficiency syndrome or any conditions arising from the etiologic agent for
  acquired immunodeficiency syndrome.

- **“HMIS”** – Homeless Management Information System (see also Glossary definition for
  “Safe Harbors”)

- **“HOME”** – HOME Investment Partnership

- **“HOME Investment Partnership”** – a federal grant program designed to help
  jurisdictions expand the supply of decent and affordable rental and ownership housing for
  low- and very low-income households.

- **“Homebuyer Assistance Program”** – a City of Seattle program designed to assist low-
  income households to purchase homes in the City of Seattle.

- **“Homeless”** – a family or individual that
  (1) lacks a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence; or
  (2) has, or had within 30 days before occupancy of subsidized rental housing, a primary
  nighttime residence that is
(a) a supervised, publicly or privately operated shelter designed to provide temporary living accommodations (including welfare hotels and congregate shelters); or
(b) an institution that provides a temporary residence for individuals intended to be institutionalized; or
(c) a public or private place not designed for, or ordinarily used as, a regular sleeping accommodation for human beings; or
(d) transitional housing,

or

(3) is certified by a public or non-profit agency, acceptable to the City, to be in imminent danger of becoming a homeless family or individual under paragraph (1) or (2) above.

- **Homelessness Intervention & Block Grant Administration (HIBGA)** a division of the Seattle Human Services Department that provides resources and services to residents of Seattle to help them find, keep, and maintain shelter and housing, as well as receive adequate nutritional support and stable employment opportunities. In addition, this division funds capital improvements for community facilities.

- **“Homeless Management Information System”** – a database used to collect and analyze information about people who are homeless and to learn more about the emergency services they use. King County’s Homeless Management Information System is called Safe Harbors and is managed by the City of Seattle’s Human Services Department, King County’s Department of Community and Human Services, and United Way of King County. Local jurisdictions must have an HMIS to be competitive for Federal McKinney-Vento funding and for Washington State Department of Community, Trade & Economic Development homeless service funds.

- **“HomeWise”** – a City of Seattle housing program designed for low-income homeowners and renters. HomeWise offers low interest home repair loans, weatherization grants and green grants for installing sustainable products.

- **“HOPE VI”** – a funding program sponsored by the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Seattle Housing Authority has secured over $135 million through this program to redevelop four housing communities in Seattle: High Point, NewHolly, Rainier Vista and Westwood Heights. HOPE VI permits expenditures for the capital costs of demolition, construction, rehabilitation and other physical improvements, development of replacement housing, and community & supportive services.

- **“HOPWA”** – Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (see definition of this federal program below)

- **“household”** – one or more persons occupying a housing unit (U.S. Census definition). Also see Glossary definition of “Family.”

- **“housing cost burden”** – the extent to which gross housing costs, including utility costs, exceed 30% of gross household income, based on data published by the U.S. Census Bureau. A household that pays 31-50% of gross household income for housing costs is considered to face a “housing cost burden.” A household that pays 51-75% of gross household income for housing costs is considered to face a “severe housing cost burden.” A household that pays more than 75% of gross household income for housing costs is considered to face a “very severe housing cost burden.”
• “Housing Investment Area” – a geographic area in which specific housing strategies and resources have been identified to help accomplish revitalization goals. Housing Investment Area boundaries are based on certain criteria, including selected indicators of economic distress. See Appendix G of this Consolidated Plan.

• “Housing Levy” – see Glossary definition of “Levy”

• “Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS” – a federal program that provides housing assistance and supportive services for low-income people with HIV/AIDS and their families. Grants are provided by selection through a national competition of projects proposed by state and local governments and nonprofit organizations.

• “housing problems” – Housing problems include “housing cost burden” (see Glossary definition) and/or “overcrowding” (see Glossary definition) and/or lacking complete kitchen or plumbing facilities.

• “housing unit” – an occupied or vacant house, apartment or single room (SRO housing) that is intended as separate living quarters (U.S. Census definition).

• “HSD” – Human Services Department

• “HSD Director” – the Director of the Seattle Human Services Department, including any director or other head of any department or office that shall succeed to functions of HSD described in the Plan. If more than one such successor department or office, the term HSD Director shall mean the appropriate official according to the allocation of functions between or among such departments.

• “Human Services Department” – the Seattle Human Services Department, and any successor departments or offices of the City.

• “HUD” – United States Department of Housing and Urban Development

• “lead-based paint hazard” – any condition that causes exposure to lead from dust-lead hazards, soil-lead hazards, or lead-based paint that is deteriorated or present in chewable surfaces, friction surfaces, or impact surfaces, and that would result in adverse human health effects.

• “Levy” – the housing programs funded by the levy of additional taxes authorized by the Seattle voters in 2002.

• “low-income household” – a household whose income does not exceed 80% of median family income, as determined by HUD, with adjustments for smaller or larger families, except that HUD may establish income ceilings higher or lower than 80% of the median for the area on the basis of findings by HUD that such variations are necessary because of prevailing levels of construction costs or fair market rents, or unusually high or low family incomes. Note, for CDBG program purposes, HUD defines “low-income household” as a household having an income equal to or less than 50% of median income.
• “Managing for Results” – the City of Seattle budget framework that demonstrates better government and a high return on investment.

• “McKinney” – McKinney Homeless Assistance Program

• “McKinney Homeless Assistance Program” – a federal program administered by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development that consists of several component parts, including supportive housing for persons with disabilities, transitional housing, SRO Moderate Rehabilitation, Supplemental Assistance for Facilities to Assist the Homeless (SAFAH), and special housing services for people with AIDS.

• “median income” – median family income for the Seattle-Bellevue-Everett Division of the Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue Metropolitan Area, as published from time to time by HUD, with adjustments for smaller or larger families or, when the term is used in reference to rents, with adjustments according to average size of household considered to correspond to the size of the housing unit. See detailed notes on median income use in the Housing Market Analysis section of the Needs Assessment chapter and Appendices.

• “MFI” – median family income; see “median income”

• “MI” – median income

• “moderate-income household” – a household whose income is between 81 and 95% of median income, as determined by HUD, with adjustments for smaller or larger families. Note, for CDBG program purposes, HUD defines “moderate-income household” as a household whose income does not exceed the Section 8 low-income limit, established by HUD.

• “Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area (NRSA)” – a comprehensive approach to address economic development needs in particular neighborhoods. These strategies tie five-year outcome based (quantifiable) benchmarks to CDBG funding decisions and offer public agencies and Community Based Development Organizations (CDBO) enhanced flexibility in undertaking activities with CDBG funds in these neighborhoods.

• “new construction” – the construction of housing on a vacant site or a site previously used for non-housing purposes, or the addition of housing units to a property, but not including the rehabilitation or replacement of housing units, whether vacant or occupied, without a material increase in the floor area used for housing on the site.

• “NHOP” – Levy Neighborhood Housing Opportunity Program

• “NOFA” – Notice of Funding Availability

• “non-homeless persons with special needs” – includes frail elderly persons, persons living with HIV/AIDS, disabled persons.

• “OED” – Office of Economic Development

• “Office of Housing” http://www.seattle.gov/housing/ – the Seattle Office of Housing, and any successor departments or offices of the City.

• “OH” – Office of Housing

• “overcrowding” – for purposes of describing relative housing needs, occupancy of a housing unit containing more than one person per room, as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau, for which data are made available by the Census Bureau.

• “owner” – a household that owns the housing unit it occupies. (U.S. Census definition)

• “person with a disability” – federal regulatory definition includes: a person who is determined to
  (1) Have a physical, mental or emotional impairment that:
      (i) is expected to be of long-continued and indefinite duration;
      (ii) substantially impedes his or her ability to live independently; and
      (iii) is of such a nature that the ability could be improved by more suitable housing conditions; or
  (2) Have a developmental disability, as defined in section 102(7) of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act (42 U.S.C. 6001-6007); or
  (3) Be the surviving member or members of any family that had been living in an assisted unit with the deceased member of the family who had a disability at the time of his or her death.

• “project-based rental assistance or subsidies” – rental assistance or subsidies provided for a project, not for a specific tenant. Tenants benefiting from project-based rental assistance give up the right to that assistance upon moving from the project.

• “Public Use Microdata Sample” – A subset of the ACS data for the Seattle area that was compiled by the Puget Sound Regional Council. PUMS data are used in this Plan to provide detailed information about housing market issues. The ACS PUMS dataset comprises about 40% of the sample in the ACS as a whole, or about 1% of households in the nation.

• “PUMS” – Public Use Microdata Sample

• “rental assistance” – rental assistance payments provided as either project-based rental assistance or tenant-based rental assistance.

• “renter” – a household that rents the housing unit it occupies, including both units rented for cash and units occupied without cash payment of rent. (U.S. Census definition)

• “Safe Harbors” – the Seattle/King County Homeless Management Information System. Safe Harbors is used to collect information about people who use homeless services.
• “Seattle median income” – median income estimates specific to Seattle households that have been calculated using estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau’s 2006 American Community Survey (ACS). Use of the Seattle median income in some sections of this Consolidated Plan enables findings on income to be expressed consistent with other observations regarding household characteristics that are based on ACS estimates for Seattle.

• “senior household” – a one or two person household in which the head of the household or spouse is at least 62 years of age.

• “senior person” – an individual who is at least 62 years of age.

• “service needs” – the particular services identified for vulnerable populations, which typically may include transportation, personal care, housekeeping, counseling, meals, case management, personal emergency response, and other services to prevent loss of housing, premature institutionalization and assist individuals to continue living independently.

• “severe housing cost burden” – the extent to which gross housing costs, including utility costs, exceed 50% of gross household income, based on data published by the U.S. Census Bureau.

• “SHA” – Seattle Housing Authority

• “sheltered” – families and persons whose primary nighttime residence is a supervised publicly or privately operated shelter, including emergency shelters, domestic violence shelters, residential shelters for runaway and homeless youth, and any hotel/motel/apartment voucher arrangement paid because the person is homeless. This term does not include persons living doubled up or in overcrowded or substandard conventional housing.

• “single room occupancy” – an SRO is a residential building that provides small private rooms, each of which is intended for occupancy by one individual. SRO buildings often contain kitchen and bathroom facilities that are shared by multiple residents.

• “SIP” – Strategic Investment Plan

• “small household” – a household comprised of one or two persons.

• “Sound Families Initiative” – a program to develop new transitional housing and to expand support services for homeless families, or families in danger of becoming homeless in King, Pierce and Snohomish counties.

• “SMI” – Seattle median income

• “Southeast Seattle Action Agenda” – a broad vision for the revitalization of Southeast Seattle that resulted from a City-led, community-driven process in 2005. The City’s Office of Economic Development established a Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area (NRSA) in Southeast Seattle based on the Action Agenda to provide a tool for the use of federal Community Development Block Grant funds.
• “SRO” – single room occupancy

• “Strategic Investment Plan (SIP)” – a Seattle Human Services Department plan that provides high-level policy direction and recommendations for the City’s investments in the people of Seattle. The plan sets human services investment priorities, guides budgeting decisions, and identifies the most effective strategies.

• “subsidized rental housing” – assisted housing (see Glossary definition) that receives or has received project-based governmental assistance for capital costs and is rented to, or held for rent exclusively to, low-income households as determined at the time of the household’s initial occupancy (or the time of provision of the assistance, if later). Subsidized rental housing does not include owner-occupied units, nor does it include units occupied by Section 8 voucher holders in otherwise unregulated housing.

• “Substantial Amendment” – major changes in an approved housing strategy or allocation plan.

• “supportive housing” – housing, including housing units or group quarters, that includes supportive services.

• “supportive service need in FSS Plan” – the plan that Public Housing Authorities (PHAs) administering a Family Self-Sufficiency program are required to develop to identify the services they will provide to participating families and the source of funding for those services. The supportive services may include child care; transportation; remedial education; education for completion of secondary or postsecondary schooling; job training, preparation and counseling; substance abuse treatment and counseling; training in homemaking and parenting skills; money management, and household management; counseling in home ownership; job development and placement; follow-up assistance after job placement; and other appropriate services.

• “supportive services” – services provided to residents for the purpose of facilitating their independence. Some examples are case management, medical or psychological counseling and supervision, childcare, transportation, and job training.

• “TANF” – Temporary Assistance to Needy Families

• “TDR” – transferable development rights

• “Temporary Assistance to Needy Families” – a federal program created through the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, which replaced the old welfare system. TANF is designed to focus on work and responsibility.

• “tenant-based rental assistance or subsidy” – a form of rental assistance or subsidy provided for the tenant, not for the project such as Section 8 vouchers or certificates.

• “Tenant Relocation Assistance Ordinance” – a Seattle ordinance that provides benefits for residential tenants who will be displaced by housing demolition, substantial rehabilitation, change of use or removal of use restrictions on assisted housing. Benefits include payment of relocation assistance to low-income tenants and advance notice of planned development.
• “transitional housing” – a type of supportive housing that is designed to provide housing and appropriate supportive services to homeless persons to foster independence and the transition into permanent housing.

• “TRAO” – Tenant Relocation Assistance Ordinance

• “very low-income household” – a household whose income does not exceed 50% of median family income, as determined by HUD, with adjustments for smaller or larger families, except that HUD may establish income ceilings higher or lower than 50% of the median for the area on the basis of findings by HUD that such variations are necessary because of prevailing levels of construction costs or fair market rents, or unusually high or low family incomes.

• Youth Development & Achievement (YDA) (formerly the Family and Youth Services Division, FYS) builds on the strengths of young people while providing support services to homeless youth and youth needing job skills training and education.
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WA State Department of Veterans Affairs (WDVA) 2009-2013 Strategic Plan


Toward Safety and Justice: Domestic Violence in Seattle 2006
Contact: Seattle Human Services Department, Linda Olsen, (206) 286-1036, Linda.Olsen@seattle.gov
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Data Profile Summary 2007
Contact: Seattle Public Schools, District Headquarters
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Contact: Marci Curtin, (206) 684-0550, Marci.Curtin@seattle.gov
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Contact: Seattle Human Services Department, Arlene Oki, (206) 684-0106, Arlene.Oki@seattle.gov


NCS-R - National Comorbidity Survey Replication
Contact: National Institute of Mental Health


Identifying meaningful subgroups of adults with severe mental illness
Contact: Seattle Human Services Department, Susan Kinne, (206) 615-1751, Susan.Kinne@seattle.gov
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2008 Communities Count Survey
Contact: Seattle Human Services Department, Susan Kinne, (206) 615-1751, Susan.Kinne@seattle.gov


Report to Congress on the Prevention and Treatment of Co-occurring Substance Abuse Disorders and Mental Disorders
Contact: US Department of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration


Drug Abuse Trends in Seattle and King County
Contact: Seattle Human Services Department, Susan Kinne, (206) 615-1751, Susan.Kinne@seattle.gov


Drug Abuse Trends in Seattle and King County. Bi-annual Report by the Community Epidemiology Work Group of PHSKC and the University of Washington
Contact: Seattle Human Services Department, Susan Kinne, (206) 615-1751, Susan.Kinne@seattle.gov


Housing First, July 2007
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Commercial Area Reports, 2002, 2007 (price of vacant land data)
Section 4: Strategic Plan


   *2008 Update to the Strategic Investment Plan*
   Contact: City of Seattle, Human Services Department


   *2007-2010 Domestic Violence and Homelessness Strategic Plan, City of Seattle*
   Contact: Human Services Department Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Prevention Division


   *Toward Safety and Justice: Domestic Violence in Seattle - 2006*
   Contact: Human Services Department - Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Prevention Division


   *2005-2009 Strategic Plan on Seattle’s Criminal Justice Response to Domestic Violence*
   Contact: Regional Domestic Violence Prevention Council


   *2004-2009 Office of Economic Development Strategic Action Plan*
   Contact: Office of Economic Development, Nancy Yamamoto, (206) 684-8189, Nancy.Yamamoto@seattle.gov


   *Southeast Seattle Action Agenda*
   Contact: Office of Economic Development, Nancy Yamamoto, (206) 684-8189, Nancy.Yamamoto@seattle.gov

*A Roof Over Every Bed: Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness in King County*


*City of Seattle Housing Levy Impact – 2007 Report of Accomplishments*
Contact: Rick Hooper, Seattle Office of Housing
(206) 684-0338, or rick.hooper@seattle.gov


*Seattle Homes Within Reach Program Report – June 2007*

10. Source: [http://www.seattle.gov/housing/pubs/SeattleHousingInventory.pdf](http://www.seattle.gov/housing/pubs/SeattleHousingInventory.pdf)

*Seattle Housing Inventory – March 2007*
Contact: Rick Hooper, Seattle Office of Housing
(206) 684-0338, or rick.hooper@seattle.gov


*2007 Announcement of Foreclosure Prevention Program*
6.3 Contact Us

Questions and comments on the 2009-2012 Consolidated Plan or any of the reports issued by the Homeless Intervention and Block Grant Administration Division may be handled by phone, mail or e-mail.

The Consolidated Plan and CDBG related reports can be found online at:
http://www.seattle.gov/humanservices/community_development/conplan/default.htm

Call or email at:
Michael Look, CDBG Administrator, HIBGA
(206) 615-1717
Michael.Look@seattle.gov

Debra Rhinehart, Senior Planner, HIBGA
(206) 684-0574
Debra.Rhinehart@seattle.gov

Contact the main office of the Human Services Department at 206-386-1001

For those with hearing impairments; call 206-684-0702 (TDD)

Mailing Address:

Seattle Human Services Department
Homelessness Intervention & Block Grant Administration
700 5th Ave Suite 5800
PO Box 34215
Seattle WA 98124-4215

City of Seattle Mayor Greg Nickels has launched an Immigrant and Refugee initiative as part of Seattle’s commitment to improve access to services for an increasingly multi-cultural and diverse population. The initiative includes a translation and interpretation policy. The policy guides the City’s efforts to provide access to key services and increase the transparency of City forms and publications through languages other than English. Interested residents and community groups may request pertinent sections of the 2009-2012 Consolidated Plan for translation into Spanish, Vietnamese, Cantonese, Mandarin, Somali, Tagalog and Korean. In addition, translations of the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) about the Consolidated Plan are planned for the CDBG website listed above.

Non-English speaking community members and sight-impaired persons can contact the CDBG Administration Office at 206-684-0288 or e-mail to blockgrants@seattle.gov to make arrangements for translated materials, text only versions of documents, or recordings.
6.4 Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) about development of the 2009-2012 Consolidated Plan

What does the Consolidated Plan do?

The Consolidated Plan represents an agreement between the City of Seattle and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) that guides grant expenditures of approximately **$21 million** in four federal grants. The four federal grant programs covered in this 2009-2012 Consolidated Plan are:

- Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)
- HOME Investment Partnership
- Emergency Shelter Grant Program (ESGP)
- Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA)

What do those four federal grants do for Seattle communities?

During 2007, Consolidated Plan funds:

- Preserved or produced 417 units of affordable rental housing
- Helped 61 families purchase their first homes
- Moved 972 homeless households into transitional or permanent housing
- Averted housing loss (evictions) for 784 households
- Provided $8.8 million in CDBG-secured loans to three community and economic development projects
- Helped develop 21,500 square feet of commercial or community space for businesses and neighborhoods
- Provided $2.5 million in loans to four businesses in the Rainier Valley to promote community revitalization

What does the data say about the needs of Seattle’s communities and residents?

Much of our analysis confirms trends that are already informally discussed by community members:

- Seattle’s strengthening economy over the last five years has led to rising land values and residential and commercial rents. These increases pose a challenge for many residents seeking affordable housing and affordable commercial space for businesses, particularly small businesses located in previously under-invested neighborhoods such as the Central Area, the International District, Rainier Valley, and Delridge.

- Due in part to rising rents, approximately 19% of renters in Seattle now pay more than half their income for rent (approximately 21,400 households - not including one-person student households). These renters are severely burdened by this cost and at risk of
losing their housing. Paying such high rents makes it very difficult for these renters to afford other household expenses---at a time when food, transportation, and many other critical needs are increasing in price.

- According to a Forbes.com July, 17, 2008 article, “Seattle's 3.7% unemployment rate, well under the national average of 5.5%, would normally be a good thing. But a growing economy with low unemployment drives up wages and costs. The Emerald City’s consumer prices are up 5.8% from this time last year, which ties for the highest inflation rate in the country with Dallas, where high energy costs for home cooling and driving are eating up incomes.”

- In the past eight years, Seattle home prices have risen dramatically but wages have seen significantly less growth. From 2000 to 2008, the average single-family home price increased 77%, from $316,800 to $559,300. From 2000 the 2008, the average condo increased 62%, from $244,050 to $396,150. Meanwhile, the annual salary of the average Seattle worker increased only 31%, from $49,000 to $64,000 in the same period.

- Link Light Rail construction along Martin Luther King Jr. Way South was substantially completed at the end of 2007 and many of the neighborhood’s businesses are in a fragile and vulnerable state as a result of the length and depth of the construction impacts that interrupted their business activities.

- In Seattle’s Central Area, Delridge/Southwest Seattle, Chinatown/International District, and Rainier Valley/Southeast Seattle neighborhoods, new mixed-use and commercial economic development projects that meet both affordable housing and commercial needs cannot generally be developed feasibly without support from a public financing or assistance program.

- The Safe Harbors Homeless Management Information System shows more than 9,000 uniquely identified and unduplicated people received services from participating publicly funded emergency shelters and transitional housing programs in King County in 2007.

- There were 6,320 King County residents living with HIV or AIDS at the beginning of 2008, of whom approximately 80%, or 5,047 live in Seattle.

- Housing assistance and housing-related services are among the greatest unmet need identified by persons living with HIV/AIDS, according to data from the 2007 Comprehensive HIV Needs Assessment compiled by Seattle/King County Public Health. Assessment data estimates that more than 1,036 people living with AIDS need assistance finding housing and/or emergency, short-term or ongoing rental assistance.

- In 2007, a total of 981 individuals were served through domestic violence shelter/transitional housing/motel voucher programs in Seattle and King County. Fully 25% of those in the emergency system were young children aged 0-5 years. Another 1,165 adults (who may or may not have entered shelter) received counseling through Domestic Violence Community Advocacy programs throughout King County. Even though emergency shelter and transitional housing capacity has increased for victims of domestic violence in recent years, shelter turn-away rates continue to rise. The duplicated turn-away rate for Seattle and King County averages 18 to 1.
How will the City spend the $21 million over the next four years?

The 2009-2012 Consolidated Plan reflects ongoing commitments, begun in 2006, to support the regional Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness and the completion of the adopted Southeast Seattle Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area plan. The Consolidated Plan identifies the current use of federal CDBG, ESG, HOME and HOPWA primarily in the following areas:

- Public services targeted to homeless families and individuals guided by the Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness ($7 million)
- Building, acquiring and/or rehabilitating low-income housing through private nonprofit and public housing developers ($7.9 million)
- Encouraging economic development through neighborhood revitalization investments and small business loans, including the Rainier Valley NRSA ($5 million)
- Facility improvement loans to community nonprofits whose work benefits low- and moderate-income Seattle households ($400,000)

How did the City come up with the strategies in the Plan?

The City of Seattle is fortunate to draw on a wealth of internally and externally developed plans to guide the creation of strategies and funding priorities to meet community needs. Integration of priorities identified from these community-based plans into this Consolidated Plan offers the advantages of avoiding redundant planning processes, enhancing coordination and leveraging of funds among the multiple federal, state and local resources used by the City and its partners to create the housing and service network, and honoring the staff expertise and stakeholder and consumer feedback embedded in these established plans.

A partial listing of plans referenced by or integrated into the 2009-2012 Consolidated Plan includes:

- Seattle/King County Domestic Violence Regional Council Plan
- Seattle/King County Area Agency on Aging 2008-2011 Strategic Plan
- State Department of Veterans’ Affairs 2009 Strategic Plan
- Seattle/King County Public Health Plan
- Office of Economic Development - Southeast Seattle Action Agenda
- Office of Housing – 2009 Levy Needs Assessment
- Human Services Department - 2009 Updated Strategic Investment Plan
- City of Seattle Analysis of Impediments to Affordable Housing
- City of Seattle Growth Management Plan & Annual Amendments
- A Roof Over Every Bed: Our Community’s Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness in King County
- Seattle Housing Authority – Annual Plan
- Women’s Funding Alliance – Four County strategies for Women and Children
- United Way – Addressing Chronic Homelessness
- Committee to End Homelessness (CEH) - Report on Homeless Youth and Young Adults
How could the Consolidated Plan affect my interests?

The 2009-2012 Consolidated Plan talks about the needs of homeless, very low-income households and up to moderate-income households. The Housing Market section lays out what we know about the cost burden on renters and homeowners in Seattle and what we think may happen over the next four years that will affect availability of affordable housing in the region. Public housing issues are also included in the proposed strategies.

The Four-Year Strategies Matrix provides an overall picture of the types of programs and who may benefit from the City's allocation of federal, state and local funds. The federal funds allocated through these programs are combined with over $68 million annually to health and human services through its General Fund and the Families and Education Levy.

Additionally, Seattle voters have approved for 16 consecutive years over $242 million in local Housing Levy funds to provide affordable housing opportunities for low-income Seattle residents. Similarly, lending from CDBG Section 108, Float Loan and Equity Fund provides necessary gap financing to stimulate private housing, commercial and mixed-use development. Oftentimes, projects are infeasible without this public sector involvement. From 2001 to 2007, the City invested $37,487,134 in economic development projects that resulted in 728 new residential units and 255,803 square feet of commercial space. In all, the actions taken through the Consolidated Plan can have wide-ranging impacts on Seattle residents and communities.
Section 7 – APPENDICES

City departments develop overarching principles and directions for each of the three major investment areas. See Section 4.2.1 – City of Seattle Approach to Housing, Community Development and Response to Homelessness (in the Section 4 - Strategic Plan) for those principles in terms of a general approach to strategies that are listed in detail in the Four-Year Matrix.

In addition to the City’s general approaches to the strategies, City departments provide policies and/or guidelines that govern the implementation of a given housing project, neighborhood revitalization effort, or homelessness response program. The following Appendices assist non-profit developers, program administrators and the public to understand the rules applied to different types of projects funded through the four federal grants (CDBG, HOME, HOPWA and ESG).

7.1 Housing related implementation policies

7.1.1 2008 HUD Income Eligibility Guidelines
7.1.2 Use of HOME funds, including ADDI
7.1.3 Housing Policies (including)
   Rental Preservation & Production Program Policies
   Homeownership Program Policies
   General Policies for Capital Funding
   HomeWise Program Policies
   Rental Assistance Policies
7.1.4 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing in Seattle, Washington:
   Summary
7.1.5 Lead Based Paint Hazard and Response
7.1.6 Public Housing Annual Plan

7.2 Economic development NRSA implementation policies

7.2.1 SE Seattle NRSA Update

7.3 Human Services implementation policies

7.3.1 HOPWA Funding and Program Eligibility Criteria
7.3.2 Social Services Neighborhood Notification Guidelines
7.3.3 Seattle/King County Discharge Planning and Coordination Policy
7.4 HUD Required Certifications

7.4.1 CDBG Sub-recipient Contract Monitoring Plan
7.4.2 Grantee Certifications
7.1 Housing related implementation policies

7.1.1 Appendix A - 2008 HUD Income Eligibility Guidelines

U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development (HUD)
2008 Income Limits

References in the Housing Market chapter and other parts of the Consolidated Plan to “AMI” (area median income) indicate an income standard different from the Seattle median income (Housing Market section, Note 1). The median family income for the Seattle area is published annually by the U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development (HUD). In order to determine income limits for subsidized housing, the Office of Housing adjusts the median family income according to household size, based on a method used by HUD. The income limits are used for administration of the majority of Seattle’s subsidized housing programs. The following table shows the 2008 income limits for the Seattle-Bellevue HUD Metro Fair Market Rent Area (HMFA), which includes both King and Snohomish counties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Size</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>65%</th>
<th>80%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Person</td>
<td>$17,100</td>
<td>$22,800</td>
<td>$28,500</td>
<td>$34,200</td>
<td>$37,050</td>
<td>$43,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Persons</td>
<td>$19,500</td>
<td>$26,040</td>
<td>$32,550</td>
<td>$39,060</td>
<td>$42,315</td>
<td>$49,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Persons</td>
<td>$21,950</td>
<td>$29,320</td>
<td>$36,650</td>
<td>$43,980</td>
<td>$47,645</td>
<td>$55,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Persons</td>
<td>$24,400</td>
<td>$32,560</td>
<td>$40,700</td>
<td>$48,840</td>
<td>$52,910</td>
<td>$61,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Persons</td>
<td>$26,350</td>
<td>$35,160</td>
<td>$43,950</td>
<td>$52,740</td>
<td>$57,135</td>
<td>$66,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Persons</td>
<td>$28,300</td>
<td>$37,760</td>
<td>$47,200</td>
<td>$56,640</td>
<td>$61,360</td>
<td>$71,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Persons</td>
<td>$30,250</td>
<td>$40,360</td>
<td>$50,450</td>
<td>$60,540</td>
<td>$65,585</td>
<td>$76,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Persons</td>
<td>$32,200</td>
<td>$42,960</td>
<td>$53,700</td>
<td>$64,440</td>
<td>$69,810</td>
<td>$81,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 2009 HOME funding allocation to the City of Seattle is estimated to be $4,142,653. The following table summarizes planned use of estimated HOME allocation funds for 2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Population Served</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>User of Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RENTAL PROGRAMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental production &amp;</td>
<td>Low-income families and individuals</td>
<td>$2,610,874</td>
<td>Affordable housing developers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental assistance</td>
<td>Low-income families and individuals</td>
<td>$205,947</td>
<td>Non-profit service providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,816,821</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOMEOWNERSHIP PROGRAMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homebuyer assistance</td>
<td>Low-income homebuyers</td>
<td>$911,567</td>
<td>Nonprofit agencies, private and for-profit developers and mortgage lenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeownership Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$911,567</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td></td>
<td>$414,265</td>
<td>City of Seattle (HUD allows 10% of non-ADDI funds to be used for admin.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,142,653</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please refer to the *Homebuyer Assistance Program Policies* section of Appendix H of this Consolidated Plan for information on planned use of HOME homebuyer assistance funds and guidelines related to recapture/repayment, refinancing, targeted outreach, and education and counseling.
7.1.3 Appendix C – Housing Policies

The policies outlined in this Appendix C to the 2009-2012 Consolidated Plan pertain to all capital funds administered by the Seattle Office of Housing (OH) unless otherwise noted. Policies for rental assistance funds administered by OH and the Seattle Human Services Department (HSD) are also included. Please refer to the currently applicable 2002 Housing Levy Administrative & Financial Plan for additional policies governing the use of Levy funds.

Rental Preservation & Production Program Policies

Rental Housing Priorities
The rental housing priorities described below indicate the types of rental housing the City is most interested in funding, but are not listed in priority order. Proposed projects not meeting one or more these priorities may still be considered for City funding.

PRIORITY: HOUSING FOR FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN

*Particular interest:*

- The area of greatest need based on 2000 Census special tabulation data provided by HUD is housing for extremely low-income families (0-30% of median income (MI));
- Supportive transitional and permanent housing for families who are homeless.

*Needs rationale:*

- Over 5,000 extremely low-income families in Seattle have housing problems as defined by HUD, meaning they pay more than they can afford for rent and utilities (i.e., > 30% of their income), live in overcrowded conditions, or lack complete kitchen and plumbing facilities. Almost 60% of extremely low-income families pay more than one-half of their household income for rent and utilities.
- The Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness in King County establishes a goal of 9,500 units of housing with services for homeless people, including 1,900 housing units specifically for homeless families.

PRIORITY: HOUSING FOR SMALL HOUSEHOLDS

*Particular interest:*

- The area of greatest need among Seattle’s small households is for housing for extremely low-income (0-30% of MI) single individuals;
- Permanent supportive housing projects serving people who are chronically homeless and/or disabled.

*Needs rationale:*

- In Seattle, over 10,000 extremely low-income singles (under the age of 62) and another 2,500 extremely low-income seniors who live alone or with others pay more than one-half of their income for rent and utilities.
• The Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness in King County identifies a countywide goal of 2,500 units of housing with supportive services for chronically homeless.
• Ninety-eight percent of persons who are homeless or who live in transitional housing report either having no source of income or having extremely low incomes through social security, unemployment insurance, or State general assistance.
• Based on the local One Night Count, more than half of homeless persons suffer from one or more disabilities, such as mental illness, chemical or alcohol dependency, and/or chronic and acute medical conditions.
• National studies have documented the success of supportive housing models on multiple levels:
  ✓ utilization of health services (decreases in emergency room visits, hospitalization, and emergency detoxification, and increases in preventive health care services);
  ✓ employment status (increase in earned income and employment rates when employment services are provided in supportive housing, and decrease in dependence on entitlements);
  ✓ treatment of mental illness (decreased symptoms of schizophrenia and depression); and
  ✓ ending substance abuse (much higher success rates for people living in supportive housing).

PRIORITY: PRESERVATION OF SUBSIDIZED RENTAL HOUSING

Particular interest:
• Projects that preserve affordable units which are at risk due to expiring project-based Section 8 subsidy.
• Preservation of tax credit projects with expiring affordability restrictions, if rents are currently below-market and buildings serve a significant number of very low-income (0-50% of MI) households.
• Preservation of currently affordable units that require recapitalization to extend the useful life of the property and remain affordable to lower-income people.

Needs rationale:
• Seattle has over 3,300 units of project-based Section 8 subsidies. These units are at risk of being lost from the affordable housing stock if owners elect to opt out of the program or if the federal government does not provide renewal funds.
• In addition, a list provided by the Washington State Housing Finance Commission in January 2004 showed 19 other low-income housing tax credit buildings (1,023 units) in Seattle with affordability restrictions that will be expiring by 2006. Some of this affordable housing stock may be at risk of converting to market-rate.
• OH estimates that, although the City-funded affordable rental housing portfolio is virtually all in good condition now, approximately 25% is undercapitalized in terms of meeting long-term replacement and repair needs, so recapitalizing and extending the affordability terms is part of a long-term sustainability goal.

PRIORITY: HOUSING THAT HELPS ADDRESS SPECIFIED COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES

Particular interest:
• Affordable workforce housing (generally housing affordable to households with incomes 31-80% of MI) that furthers revitalization or other community development goals in
Housing Investment Areas. Strategies and priorities for Housing Investment Areas are identified in the Levy Administrative & Financial Plan, Consolidated Plan, and neighborhood plans.

- New construction of affordable housing in urban centers, especially those lagging in meeting their residential growth targets as identified in the Comprehensive Plan or those where affordable housing is needed to help mitigate displacement of low-income people due to gentrification.
- Transit-oriented development projects that are generally located within ½ mile of a light rail station or major transit center.

Needs rationale:

- Mixed-use and multifamily development projects are needed in certain Seattle neighborhoods, particularly ones where the private market is not developing due to economic distress or other factors. Such projects fulfill both housing and commercial needs, and higher-density populations and pedestrian- or transit-friendly orientation meet goals of smart growth, the Growth Management Act, and neighborhood plans.
- The market in some Seattle neighborhoods is not mature enough to support desired mixed-use and residential development without public subsidies. Non-profit developers often are relied on to lead community development and revitalization in distressed areas.
- Housing is integrally connected to targeted community development strategies, as well as to wealth creation efforts for economically disadvantaged families and individuals. Affordable housing not only benefits residents, but also contributes to security and stability of neighborhoods. As neighborhoods revitalize, continued provision of affordable housing helps enable existing residents to continue to live there.
- Locating affordable housing near employment centers and public transit reduces household transportation costs and increases transportation choices.
- The reuse of former military facilities such as Sand Point and For Lawton require affordable housing to help achieve balanced, healthy communities.

Affordability Policies

The policies described in this section apply to capital funds awarded by OH for production or rehabilitation to provide or preserve affordable rental housing, including HOME and CDBG funds, except that these policies do not apply to Housing Levy funds, Sound Families funds, programs where the City leverages other funds through credit enhancement strategies, other City fund sources for which specific affordability guidelines are adopted by City legislation, mitigation funds that are used to provide affordable rental housing in accordance with the findings of a nexus study, or funds used for bridge loans (but amounts repaid on bridge loans and bridge loans converted to long-term financing are subject to these policies unless the fund source for the bridge loan was otherwise exempt). Affordability policies for Levy Rental Preservation & Production Program funds are provided in the currently applicable 2002 Levy Administrative & Financial Plan.

The following rental affordability policies apply to permanent capital funding appropriated for use in a biennial budget cycle (e.g. 2005-2006):

- At least 50% of rental program funds shall be used for units with affordable rents for extremely low-income households;
• Remaining rental program funds shall be used for units with affordable rents for very low-income households, except:
  ✓ Funds may be used to produce or preserve units with affordable rents for low-income households, that are not affordable to very low-income households, in the Central Area, Rainier Valley/Beacon Hill, Delridge/Westwood, South Park, Pioneer Square, and International District Housing Investment Areas as described in Appendix G of this Consolidated Plan;
  ✓ Funds may be used to produce or preserve units with affordable rents for low-income households, that are not affordable to very low-income households, within half a mile of a light rail station or major transit center located outside of Downtown;

• Tenant households with income above the applicable eligibility levels are called “over-income households.” Funds may be used to acquire or rehabilitate an existing, occupied project and subsidize some units affordable to low-income households, but occupied by over-income households with incomes up to 80% of median income. Such funds will be considered to have been used for housing affordable to extremely low-income households or very low-income households, respectively, to the extent the units are required to be occupied solely by and affordable to, such households within 2 years of the date of the loan agreement. In such case, the initial regulatory term will be established for a 52-year period. By the end of the initial 2-year period after the date of the loan agreement, over-income households need to be relocated or the Borrower will be in default and required to return a prorata portion of the OH funding.

Rent Standards and Eligible Households
Except as provided in the Affordability Policies above, program funds are to be used only for units that are occupied or will be initially occupied by eligible households at affordable rents for the respective income categories.

For the purposes of the Consolidated Plan, “affordable rent” for low-income households means annual rent not exceeding 30% of 80% of median income; affordable rent for very low-income households means an annual rent not exceeding 30% of 50% of median income; and affordable rent for extremely low-income households means an annual rent not exceeding 30% of 30% of median income. For the purposes of determining whether a unit bears affordable rent, the term “rent” includes the rent paid by the tenant plus an allowance for utilities paid by the tenant.

City funding is not available for units that are occupied at the time of funding by over-income tenants, as defined under Affordability Policies above, with household income greater than 80% of median income. The City may require as a funding condition that units occupied by such households, although not City-funded, become rent-regulated under a City regulatory agreement when occupancy changes.

Development Project Siting Policy
Unless the Director waives the siting policy as stated below, OH will not fund, or certify as consistent with this Consolidated Plan, a project if the proposed number of subsidized rental housing units for extremely low-income households would exceed the capacity for additional subsidized rental housing units for extremely low-income households in the Census block group where the proposed project is located.
Capacity for additional subsidized rental housing units for extremely low-income households is defined as:

- The total number of housing units in the Census block group according to the latest information as updated annually by the Department of Planning and Development (DPD), multiplied by 20%;
- Less the number of existing subsidized rental housing units for extremely low-income households in the Census block group according to the latest report available from OH (OH’s inventory of subsidized rental housing in Seattle includes projects with capital subsidies from public agencies; i.e. City-funded projects as well as non-City funded projects as reported periodically by county, state and federal agencies).

The siting policy does not apply to projects located within Downtown because of its special nature as a high priority area for affordable housing investment. A map of Downtown is included in Appendix G of this Consolidated Plan.

The OH Director may grant a waiver of the siting policy if one or more of the following criteria are met:

- The proposed project is a neighborhood-supported project.
  To be considered a neighborhood-supported project, OH will need to determine that the proposed project is supported by a reasonable number of immediate neighbors and/or affected neighborhood organizations. Such determination will be based on review of results of the community notification process as described in the Neighborhood Notification and Community Relations Guidelines section (see below) including notification of immediate neighbors, consultation with established community groups, public meetings, and/or other means of community notification as OH deems appropriate. In accordance with national, state and local fair housing laws, OH disregards, in evaluating neighborhood support for the project, any opposition that appears to be based on characteristics of future residents of a project if discrimination based on such characteristics is prohibited.
- Additional market-rate housing development is planned in the Census block group, and OH determines that the proposed project would not result in more than 20% of total housing units in the block group being subsidized rental housing for extremely low-income households, based on an adjusted estimate of total housing units that includes units for which building permits have been issued (based on the Department of Planning & Development’s latest annual report of building permit data) or other such documentation as deemed appropriate by OH.
- OH determines that natural or manmade barriers (e.g. a bluff, waterway, or freeway) physically separate the proposed project from existing concentrations of subsidized rental housing for extremely low-income households.

**Affirmative Marketing**

Borrowers are required to affirmatively market vacant units. Borrowers must use marketing methods designed to reach persons from all segments of the community, including minorities, persons of color and persons with disabilities. In addition, owners are strongly encouraged to inform providers of emergency shelters and transitional housing
about their projects and to promote access to households ready to move into permanent housing. Owners will be required to maintain records of their affirmative marketing efforts and to report annually to OH on those efforts. Borrowers of funding for transitional housing will be required to develop processes to assure that homeless individuals or families coming out of emergency shelters have equal access to transitional housing projects.
Homeownership Program Policies

The policies that follow apply to HOME funds awarded by OH for homeownership purposes, including American Dream Downpayment Initiative (ADDI). The policies do not apply to CDBG, Housing Levy funds or other non-federal funds except where otherwise specifically noted. Policies for use of Levy homeownership funds are provided in the currently applicable 2002 Levy Administrative & Financial Plan.

Eligible Use of Funds

- HOME funds, including ADDI funds, may be used for (1) downpayment and closing cost assistance and/or interest rate write down for eligible buyers; and (2) site acquisition and/or development costs for a home or homes to be sold to eligible buyers.

- OH may provide up to $1,000 of HOME funds to non-profit homeownership organizations at the time of loan closing to help pay for counseling services provided by such organizations in connection with each home to be sold to an eligible buyer household. However, the $1,000 for counseling services must be authorized in the contracts between organizations awarded homeownership funding and OH, and may not be included as part of homebuyer assistance loans to homebuyers.

- The value of the home must not exceed 95% of the median purchase price in Seattle, as published by HUD, or as determined locally through market analysis in accordance with HUD HOME Program requirements.

- Eligible buyer households must purchase a home in Seattle and use it as their principal residence. Purchases of investment properties are not allowed under this program. All types of for-sale units are eligible, including single-family residences, condominium units, limited equity cooperatives, co-housing, land trusts, and homes on leased land. Homes with an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) are eligible, provided that the buyer will be an owner-occupant of the home and ADU tenants and rents meet household income limits and affordability requirements, per HOME regulations. A lease-to-own contract or long-term lease may be considered a purchase.

Homebuyer Eligibility

- Buyers benefited by the program must be low-income, first-time homebuyers. First-time homebuyer is defined as any individual and his or her spouse who have not owned a home during the 3-year period prior to the individual’s purchase of the home. The term first-time homebuyer also includes an individual who is a displaced homemaker or single parent, as defined in 24 CFR Part 92 HOME Investment Partnership Program, Section 92.2 Definitions, as follows:

  Displaced homemaker means an individual who:
  (1) Is an adult;
  (2) Has not worked full-time full-year in the labor force for a number of years but has, during such years, worked primarily without remuneration to care for the home and family; and
  (3) Is unemployed or underemployed and is experiencing difficulty in obtaining or upgrading employment.

  Single parent means an individual who:
(1) Is unmarried or legally separated from a spouse; and
(2) Has one or more minor children of whom the individual has custody or joint custody, or is pregnant.

OH may narrow the definition of “first-time homebuyers” in order to ensure equitable treatment between married and non-married persons, subject to federal requirements in the case of loans using ADDI funds. OH also may, for the same purpose, expand the “single parent” eligibility category with respect to loans not using ADDI funds.

For purposes of ADDI funds, an individual shall not be excluded from consideration as a first-time homebuyer on the basis that the individual owns or owned, as a principal residence during the three-year period, a dwelling unit whose structure is not permanently affixed to a permanent foundation in accordance with local or other applicable regulations or is not in compliance with State, local, or model building codes, or other applicable codes, and cannot be brought into compliance with the codes for less than the cost of constructing a permanent structure.

- Eligible buyer households must successfully complete a pre-purchase homebuyer education program approved by OH.
- Borrowers must be able to financially qualify for a first mortgage approved by OH.

In programs administered directly by the City, qualifying income will be defined using the IRS definition of adjusted gross income for reporting on IRS Form 1040, subject to any adjustments or exclusions required by federal law or regulations. House Key Plus Seattle, a program administered for the City by the Washington State Housing Finance Commission, will use the Section 8 Program definition for gross annual income.

**Funding Guidelines**

HOME funds for homebuyer assistance loans to eligible buyer households are subject to the following conditions:

- Loans will be limited to the amount needed for each buyer household, providing gap financing to enable low-income households unable to qualify for sufficient private financing to purchase a home.

- In order that single-source downpayment assistance may be provided for the convenience of borrowers, in lieu of loans from Levy or other City funds and non-City sources to the same borrower, OH may allow a higher amount of City-funded homebuyer assistance, not to exceed $70,000, for a borrower that receives assistance made as part of a project or lending program for which a developer or nonprofit lending agency has obtained commitments of non-City homebuyer subsidy funds, but only if all of the following conditions are satisfied:
  
  (1) Non-City subsidy funds provided to such project or program must be used for deferred downpayment assistance loans or other assistance that increases the ability of low-income households to purchase a home.
  
  (2) The average amount of City-administered homebuyer assistance for all eligible households benefited by the program, including buyers who do not receive any City-administered funds, may not exceed $45,000.

- Loans will generally be 30-year deferred loans. Loans may include provisions for payment of a share of appreciation. Any share of appreciation payable may be reduced and/or eliminated over time. Loan repayment terms shall specify the interest rate, which
generally shall not exceed 3% simple interest; loan term; period of payment deferral; and any contingent interest or share of appreciation.

- Loans using the recapture option will be structured with repayment obligations, using a promissory note and deed of trust approved by OH.
- Borrowers must provide a minimum of $2,500 or 1% of the purchase price, whichever is greater, of their own funds toward the home purchase as a condition to any homebuyer assistance loan. Homebuyers may receive gifts of funds towards their portion of the downpayment; however, gifts must not exceed 25% of the borrower's total downpayment requirement.
- The terms of each homebuyer assistance loan, except loans involving land trust projects, shall provide that the entire principal balance is due upon sale or refinancing of the home, at the lender’s option, to the extent permitted by applicable law. However, OH may permit assumption of the loan by another eligible borrower in lieu of repayment.
- Eligible buyers or developers may receive homebuyer assistance up to a maximum of $45,000 per assisted household, including both Levy funds and other City-administered funds, unless the maximum is increased in accordance with provisions below. The $45,000 cap includes any fees paid to non-profit homeownership organizations for counseling services. Homebuyer assistance loans include loans to homebuyers and loans to developers or prior owners assumed by, or otherwise passed through to, homebuyers. Homebuyer assistance loans may be used for downpayments, closing costs, and/or first mortgage loan interest rate write down, as approved by OH.
- City-funded assistance for any home improvements, if committed or provided in connection with a home purchase, is considered to be assistance for the purchase and, together with the homebuyer assistance, cannot exceed the applicable funding limit except in the following cases: (1) assistance provided to a nonprofit developer for home purchase or land purchase and/or improvement costs associated with an OH-approved land trust project, and (2) assistance to an eligible buyer purchasing a home located within a Housing Investment Area, for which the combined homebuyer assistance and home improvement assistance may total up to $65,000, provided that the homebuyer assistance does not exceed $45,000.
- Borrowers may use any first mortgage product approved by OH, including FHA and Fannie Mae products, and portfolio loans. FHA 203(k) purchase-rehabilitation loans are also eligible, provided the rehabilitation amount exceeds $5,000.

**Recapture and Resale Guidelines**

- In conformity with HUD rules, OH will impose either resale or recapture requirements, at its option, when HOME funds, including ADDI, are used. The recapture or resale options may be managed by the City, a sub-recipient, or other contracting party at OH’s option. The recapture or resale options cannot be used together in the same loan, except that OH may recapture funds loaned to a land trust in case of a transfer of a home contrary to resale restrictions.
- For HOME funds that are allocated for eligible development costs and programs operated by nonprofit housing agencies, the resale option may be used. In such cases, the agreement with the developer or nonprofit housing agency will provide for long-term affordability of the housing. Requirements include:
✓ The initial sale and any resale of subsidized units during the applicable affordability period must be made to low-income households.

✓ The resale price during the applicable affordability period is limited to maintain an affordable purchase price for subsequent low-income homebuyers. The resale formula must also provide for a fair return to the seller. The resale price and return formula must be approved in advance by OH.

✓ New purchaser income and resale price are restricted during the affordability period via a recorded deed restriction or land covenant, or there is a purchase option or right of first refusal in favor of the City or a City-approved entity at a restricted price, or both methods are used.

• For HOME funds allocated to lending programs, the recapture option may be used. The City or a City-approved entity will have the right to require full repayment of the HOME subsidy, including ADDI funds, when resale occurs, regardless of the applicable affordability period, to the full extent permitted by law.

Subordination Policy
Many program borrowers refinance their homes or borrow against the value of their homes, and request that their homebuyer assistance loan’s lien position be subordinated to another loan. In some cases agreeing to these subordination requests could greatly increase the risk that taxpayer funds may not be paid back. The current policy of OH is that subordination requests will be evaluated by the Homeownership Program Manager and will be considered only when all of the following conditions are met:

• The total proposed loan to value ratio does not exceed 90% of the appraised or assessed value, whichever is less. The new loan does not have a balloon payment before the homebuyer assistance loan maturity date and is not an interest only loan.

• The homeowner needs to refinance only the existing first mortgage indebtedness against the property to take advantage of better rates, terms, and payments, and is not incurring additional indebtedness against the property, except for one or more of the following:
  ✓ Refinancing fees;
  ✓ Payments needed in order to save the house from a foreclosure;
  ✓ Costs of an urgent health and safety repair;
  ✓ Medical, funeral, or other emergency expenses of the homeowner or immediate family that is determined to be allowable by the Homeownership Program Manager.

Targeted Outreach
OH has worked with the Seattle Housing Authority (SHA), local lenders, and the Washington State Housing Finance Commission (WSHFC) to make City downpayment assistance funds available for residents and tenants of public housing and manufactured housing. SHA, through its Family Self-Sufficiency and Section 8 Homeownership programs, is marketing to residents and tenants of public housing and identifying eligible families for homeownership programs. The City will work with the WSHFC and participating lenders to identify tenants of manufactured housing in the City and mail program brochures to them. The City has made Levy, ADDI, and other HOME funds available for downpayment assistance. WSHFC is making below-market
interest rate first mortgages available to eligible borrowers. Private mortgage lenders are originating and closing the mortgage loans.

**Homebuyer Education and Counseling**

All homebuyers using City downpayment assistance funds are required to attend homebuyer education. A portion of available federal funds are awarded by OH for delivery of homebuyer education and counseling programs. In addition, the Seattle Housing Authority (SHA) has up to $15,000 through its DPA Program available for eligible Public Housing and HCV residents who are interested in purchasing a home. SHA staff screen and determine the suitability of residents and tenants of public housing for participation in homebuyer programs.

SHA and King County Housing Authority (KCHA) received ROSS Homeownership Counseling funding in a joint application in FY 2002. In order to administer and distribute the down payment assistance, SHA developed partnerships with several local, culturally-specific non-profit housing counseling agencies such as the Urban League, El Centro de la Raza and the International District Housing Alliance. The role of these counseling agencies is to screen residents for eligibility and provide ethnically-diverse homebuyer outreach, referral, education and counseling. They also recruit for and provide homebuyer education workshops, work with residents on credit issues, pre-qualify and connect them with lending programs and assist with housing search and other supportive services.

When residents have been determined eligible by one of the housing counseling agencies for SHA's Down Payment Assistance Program, SHA staff review the application to ensure that residents meet the guidelines and are protected from predatory lending practices. If approved, up to $15,000 is provided to residents during closing.
General Policies for Capital Funding

The following policies apply to OH-funded affordable rental and homeownership housing capital projects.

Bridge Loan Policy

OH bridge loans are intended to provide short-term funding to permit low-income housing development activities to proceed in advance of the availability of permanent project funding. Bridge loans for affordable housing may be made utilizing any OH-administered fund sources determined to be appropriate by the OH Director. Additional policies for use of Levy bridge loan funds are provided in the currently applicable 2002 Housing Levy Administrative & Financial Plan.

Bridge loans may be made only when, in the judgment of the OH Director, the borrower provides reasonable assurance that the funds will be used for eligible purposes and that permanent funding will be available from other sources on acceptable terms to ensure repayment of the funds before the loan maturity date. The maximum term for bridge loans shall be two (2) years, unless subject to additional bridge loan pilot program conditions and guidelines pursuant to the currently applicable 2002 Levy Administrative & Financial Plan. OH shall require payment of a reasonable rate of interest on bridge loans, which shall be no less than 3% simple interest. In addition, a loan fee may be charged for providing bridge loans.

A bridge loan may be made as a component of a larger loan that includes long-term financing. OH may allow all or a portion of a bridge loan to be converted to a permanent loan subject to maximum subsidy limits for funds administered or allocated by OH and other City agencies that may be combined to provide permanent gap financing for the housing portion of a project, pursuant to the currently applicable 2002 Levy Administrative & Financial Plan. Applications for bridge loans may be made outside of OH’s Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) process.
Neighborhood Notification and Community Relations Guidelines Policy

Prior to application for OH funding (permanent or bridge) for production or preservation of affordable rental housing or development of housing for low-income homebuyers, applicants are required to prepare and begin implementing a community relations plan, including neighborhood notification activities.

A successful notification effort leads to open, ongoing communication between developers and neighbors. This requires cooperation by developers, the City, and neighborhood residents. A positive, open relationship between housing developers and neighbors can prevent misunderstandings, facilitate prompt resolution of any inadvertent misunderstandings, and provide a fair, thoughtful, dependable means of ironing out differences. While not meant to be a definitive process for each proposal and neighborhood, the steps outlined below provide a comprehensive notification process.

It is the policy of the City of Seattle that OH funding of affordable housing not be refused solely on the basis of concerns expressed by neighbors; the City supports and is committed to promoting diversity in Seattle neighborhoods. Consistent with State and Federal law, a housing project should not be excluded from a neighborhood solely based on any of the following characteristics of the persons who will live there: age, ancestry, color, creed, disability, gender identity, marital status, national origin, parental status, political ideology, race, religion, gender, sexual orientation, possession or use of a Section 8 certificate, or use of a guide or service animal by a person with a disability.

The City supports affordable housing projects that will preserve and enhance the strengths of Seattle’s neighborhoods. Housing developers and neighbors should keep OH informed of any issues or concerns throughout the community notification process and operation of the project.

Guidelines for affordable housing developers:

This policy section is intended to provide guidance to developers, acknowledging that neighborhood notification efforts and appropriate community relations plans may vary.

1. Prior to releasing purchase and sale agreement contingencies the developer shall:
   - Consult with OH. OH will help identify developers of other affordable housing in the neighborhood(s) being considered and suggest neighborhood organizations to contact.
   - Contact other affordable housing owners to learn about a neighborhood’s historical and current housing- and development-related concerns.

2. Prior to submitting an application for City Consolidated Plan consistency certification the developer shall:
   - Notify neighbors within at least 500 feet of the site using a written notice, letter or flyer. Consider including basic information about the developer agency, proposed project, estimated schedule, contact person, and neighborhood organizations that have also been notified about the project in the written communication.
   - Contact neighborhood organizations, including the neighborhood community council and the local district council, with updated information about the project, including final site selection, schedule, and proposal for ongoing communication with the neighborhood. The ongoing communication plan may include presentation(s) at regularly scheduled neighborhood organization meeting(s), invitation to a meeting hosted by the housing
developer, formation of an advisory committee, and/or regular project updates in neighborhood organization publications or posted at local libraries, community centers, etc. Information the housing developer should consider sharing at meetings includes the following:

- Experience as a housing developer and manager; provide names and addresses of other affordable housing projects;
- Description of targeted population of the housing, to the extent that it does not compromise the safety, confidentiality or well-being of the residents; information about property management and support services, if applicable;
- Mechanisms for communication between the housing developer and neighbors, including 24-hour contact person and number if possible;
- Estimated schedule for construction and completion; and
- Opportunities for neighbors to provide input on the project (i.e. names of interested neighborhood organizations and how to contact them; community advisory committee; etc.).

3. Maintain communication with immediate neighbors and the neighborhood and community organizations throughout the project’s design and construction phase.

4. Once the housing is operational the developer shall:
   - Invite neighborhood and community organizations and neighbors to project open houses.
   - Establish ongoing communication with neighborhood organizations and neighboring residents and businesses. Promptly address emerging issues and share successes.
   - Keep the City apprised of any issues.

**Guidelines for Neighbors:**

1. Encourage housing developers and residents to be active members of your community. Invite them to neighborhood meetings and events. Build foundation for long-lasting, positive relationship.
2. Communicate concerns about design, operation and management of a project. Work collaboratively with housing developers and/or residents to identify ways to address those concerns.
3. Neighbors may want to consider negotiating a community relations plan with the housing developer if it turns out that clarity of understanding is difficult to reach verbally.
4. Make sure housing developer and/or residents know what is working well.

**Relocation, Displacement, and Real Property Acquisition**

Development of affordable rental and homeownership housing should be designed to minimize displacement of households. Any temporary relocation or permanent displacement of households must comply with all applicable provisions of (a) Seattle Municipal Code 20.84–Relocation Assistance; (b) the City’s Just Cause Eviction Ordinance; and (c) for projects using federal funds, the federal Uniform Relocation Act (URA) and any other relocation regulations and handbooks applicable to the particular funding program.

These policies, laws and regulations contain, among other requirements, different timelines under which households must be given various notices and provided financial assistance under certain circumstances. Consultation with OH staff prior to submission of applications for funding is required for any applicant whose project will involve any temporary or permanent relocation activities.
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Fair Contracting Practices, WMBE Utilization

Sponsors must comply with the City’s Fair Contracting Practices Ordinance. Sponsors and their general contractors shall be encouraged to take actions, consistent with that ordinance, which would increase opportunities for women and minority business enterprises (WMBEs). A combined WMBE aspirational goal of 14% of the total construction and other contracted services contracts shall apply for all affordable rental housing capital projects funded by OH. OH shall encourage additional efforts to increase WMBE participation including mentoring programs and participation in apprenticeship and other training opportunities.
HomeWise Program Policies

OH’s HomeWise Program provides for low-interest home rehabilitation loans and weatherization services primarily for the purpose of improving the health, safety, and energy efficiency of housing for low-income households.

Income limits for rehabilitation loans vary by fund source, but in no case exceed 80% of MI. The maximum individual rehab loan is $45,000, with a waiver by the OH Director allowing up to $10,000 additional (for an overall total of $55,000) due to demonstrated health and safety needs. Interest rates generally are set at 3% simple interest. The loans may generally be amortized or deferred. HomeWise forgivable grants are available, up to $10,000, for lead-based paint abatement if required in a rehabilitation project. Grant terms require full repayment if the home is sold within 5 years and provide for forgiveness after 5 years.

The program generally gives priority to loans for improving health and safety, and for curing code violations. For a time period through December 31, 2009, the program will also give priority for repairs that address exterior dilapidation or conditions that would contribute to neighborhood revitalization in the Rainier Valley/Beacon Hill Housing Investment Area in Southeast Seattle.

Weatherization services are provided for energy efficiency and health and safety improvements in owner- and renter-occupied single-family homes and eligible multifamily rental properties. The income limits for such services vary by fund source.
Rental Assistance Policies

The policies that follow apply to federal funds awarded by OH for rental assistance purposes. The policies do not apply to Housing Levy funds and other non-federal funds. Policies for use of Levy Rental Assistance funds are provided in the currently applicable 2002 Levy Administrative & Financial Plan.

Rental assistance is a cash subsidy that enables low-income individuals and families to pay rent. The rental assistance is usually paid to a private landlord through a community-based, non-profit organization. Rental assistance is often supported with case management or other supportive services to help the tenant remain stable.

The high cost of housing in Seattle poses a significant challenge for many people. The three primary factors that demonstrate the need for tenant-based rental assistance funds are:

- The number of individuals who are homeless;
- The extent to which gross housing costs exceed 30% of gross household income (referred to as “cost burden”); and
- The number of households on the Seattle Housing Authority’s waiting list for subsidized housing.

OH funds support two rental assistance programs: the Rental Stabilization Program and the Emergency Rental Assistance Program. Policies for use of Levy rental assistance funds, which fund the Emergency Rental Assistance Program and fund one aspect of the Rental Stabilization Program, are provided in the currently applicable 2002 Levy Administrative & Financial Plan.

The Rental Stabilization Program provides 6 to 18 month rent subsidies to very low-income households transitioning out of homelessness as well as those in danger of eviction. Levy funds pay for case management services to help tenants remain stable in their housing and to address the many special needs of those who have been or are at risk of becoming homeless. Federal HOME funds are leveraged to pay for tenant rent assistance. Administration of this program is contracted out to a community-based non-profit organization through a competitive process managed by the City’s Human Services Department. The Rental Stabilization Program serves between 75 and 100 households a year.

HOME rental assistance funds must be used for rent payments and/or security deposits. Only low-income and very low-income households are eligible for rental assistance. The Rental Stabilization Program is administered in accordance with additional requirements as outlined in 24 CFR Part 92 HOME Investment Partnership Program, Section 92.209 Tenant-based Rental Assistance.

Per Section 92.209, families are selected in accordance with the following written tenant selection policies and criteria: At least 50% of the families assisted must qualify, or would qualify in the near future without tenant-based rental assistance, for one of three Federal preferences. These are families that (1) occupy substandard housing (including families that are homeless or living in a shelter for homeless families); (2) are paying more than 50% of their annual income for rent; or (3) families that are involuntarily displaced. The remaining households selected to receive HOME funds are ones currently living in permanent housing but at risk of becoming homeless.
Per Section 92.209, the amount of the monthly assistance that a participating jurisdiction may pay to, or on behalf of, a family may not exceed the difference between a rent standard and 30% of the family's monthly adjusted income. The City uses the Seattle Housing Authority’s published Voucher Payment Standard as the rent payment standard for units. The tenant shall pay any amount in excess of the Voucher Payment Standard. The minimum tenant contribution toward rent is $50 per month.

The City certifies that rental-based assistance is an essential element of Seattle’s Consolidated Plan given the priority to secure affordable rental housing to very low-income households most in need.
Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing in Seattle, Washington: Summary

A strong commitment to affirmatively further fair housing is one of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's guiding principles. It is also a requirement for agencies participating in HUD's many housing and community development programs. The Fair Housing Act specifies that the HUD Secretary administer programs and activities relating to housing and urban development in a manner that affirmatively furthers the policies outlined in various fair housing laws and presidential executive orders.

HUD-funded jurisdictions are required to periodically do an analysis of impediments (AI). This is a review of impediments or barriers that affect people’s rights of fair housing choice. It covers public and private policies, practices, and procedures affecting housing choice. Impediments to fair housing choice are defined as any actions, omissions, or decisions that restrict, or have the effect of restricting, the availability of housing choices, based on race, color, religion, sex, disability, familial status, or national origin. The AI serves as the basis for fair housing planning, provides essential information to policy makers, administrative staff, housing providers, lenders, and fair housing advocates, and assists in building public support for fair housing efforts.

Conducting an analysis of impediments is a required component of certification and involves the following:

- An extensive review of a State or Entitlement jurisdiction's laws, regulations, and administrative policies, procedures, and practices;
- An assessment of how those laws affect the location, availability, and accessibility of housing;
- An evaluation of conditions, both public and private, affecting fair housing choice for all protected classes; and
- An assessment of the availability of affordable, accessible housing in a range of unit sizes.

Seattle’s previous AI was conducted in 2004. The 2009-2012 Consolidated Plan includes a newly updated AI, which the City of Seattle contracted with Trang D. Consulting to prepare. The 2008 report includes the following: review of fair housing law; analysis of background data; identification of impediments; overview of existing programs and activities that further fair housing; and an action plan.
The following from the 2008 AI is the summary of impediments and recommended actions to address those.

a. **Summary of Impediments**

**Impediment #1: An inadequate supply of affordable housing in Seattle exacerbates fair housing challenges by impeding housing choice.**

In recent years, strong job and population growth have led to a robust private housing market that have fueled increasing migration of low-income and minority residents toward areas outside of the city as rents and home prices have escalated. Wages for a number of the most prevalent jobs are inadequate to afford even studio apartment rents and a disproportionate share of low-income households continues to be cost-burdened for housing, particularly renters. Despite numerous public programs and policies to preserve and expand affordable housing, the force of the private market continues to drive a decline in housing affordability. In turn, this has begun to translate into reduced housing choice for protected classes, who are disproportionately low-income and racial minorities, as discussed in previous sections of this analysis.

**Impediment #2: In addition to lack of affordable housing, protected classes also continue to experience direct housing discrimination, especially racial and ethnic minorities, refugees and immigrants, families, female headed households with no husband present, and the disabled.** These take several forms including the following:

- Continued incidents of housing discrimination, particularly based on race, disability and family status in areas of North and Central Seattle.
- Lack of knowledge/information about fair housing and the complaint process lead to underreporting of fair housing violations, especially in limited English communities.
- Racial minorities continue to experience differential rates of loan denials.
- Subtle forms of preferential housing advertising exist in some local media sources.
- The current subprime mortgage crisis brings potentially significant impacts on protected classes including: greater vulnerability to foreclosures due to racial minorities being a disproportionate share of subprime loan borrowers, increased difficulty of obtaining home loans, a tighter and less affordable rental housing market, and potential decline in home values and spillover effects in low-income areas.

b. **Recommended Actions to Address Impediments**

The following actions are recommended in response to the impediments described above.

1. **CONTINUED SUPPORT OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT** (Lead agency: OH)

   a. Continue to develop new resources to address affordable housing issues (e.g. Renew City housing levy in Fall 2009).
   b. Continue enforcing relevant City requirements (e.g. siting of extremely low-income rental housing) tied to housing funding.
   c. Explore and implement ways to more effectively utilize existing resources to expand housing choice.
   d. Expand incentive programs that encourage and enable more private developers to create affordable housing.
e. Improve coordination between SOCR and OH in support of housing affordability as a critical element of fair housing.

2. INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATIONRESOURCE ALLOCATION (Lead agency: OH, SOCR)

a. Take advantage of existing opportunities for intergovernmental coordination on affordable housing (e.g. Puget Sound Regional Council and King County).

b. Request HUD funding for key initiatives including fair lending outreach program (action 3b), continued enforcement of fair housing laws (action 4a), increased testing and auditing (action 4c).

3. EDUCATION AND OUTREACH (Lead agency: SOCR)

a. Partner with tenants advocacy groups and community organizations to provide fair housing training to renters. Request HUD funding to provide staff and material resources.

b. Develop a Fair Lending program for renters and prospective homebuyers to provide training in recognizing discriminatory lending practices. Ensure the program is language- and culturally-appropriate for limited English underserved populations.

c. Work with advertising departments of publishers of local housing information to eliminate explicit and implicit forms of preferential advertising.

d. Explore feasibility of establishing a fair housing hotline to encourage education and follow-up on filing of complaints.

e. Continue to reach out to apartment owners and the real estate industry, particularly in North and Central Seattle sub-areas, to encourage education about fair housing.

f. In reasonable cause cases, develop a settlement requirement requiring respondent to provide and assume cost of SOCR-led Fair Housing trainings for tenants. Trainings should be open to the public and advertised in locales commonly-frequented by neighborhood residents such as grocery stores, laundromats, child care centers, grocery stores, etc.

4. CONTINUED ENFORCEMENT OF FAIR HOUSING LAWS (Lead agency: SOCR)

a. Provide continued funding support for investigation of housing discrimination.

b. Continue to coordinate with fair housing enforcement and advocacy agencies (U.S. HUD Regional Office, Fair Housing Center of Washington).

c. Periodically conduct fair housing testing of the rental housing market, especially in Central and North Seattle and for race, family status and disability classes. Ensure HUD support for increased testing and auditing.

5. MONITORINGTRACKING (Lead agencies: OH, SOCR)

a. Explore creating a streamlined database to provide ongoing tracking of demographics of OH-funded and SHA populations.

b. Track number of incoming calls to SOCR and subsequent referrals and discrimination charges emerging from incoming calls.
c. Improve database and coordination with other affordable housing funders in order to better track basic characteristics of subsidized rental housing in Seattle (e.g. location; affordability and size of units).

The full *Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing in Seattle, Washington* can be accessed at [www.seattle.gov/housing](http://www.seattle.gov/housing).
Lead-based paint is the most common source of childhood lead poisoning in the United States. Lead exposure in the home can produce health effects ranging from anemia and behavior problems to irreversible brain damage or death, and younger children are particularly vulnerable. Washington is one of only 4 states that do not require or recommend any minimal level of blood lead level testing for children. Less than one percent of children under the age of six are tested for lead each year, and this group is not representative of all children in the population. Low levels of testing make it hard to evaluate lead paint hazards, and give the impression that elevated blood lead is not a problem here. In four projects, local and state agencies are working to address the lack of data, direct attention to lead-related risks and coordinate agency efforts to reduce them.

CTED study of lead hazards in housing and childhood lead exposure

In 2005, the Washington State Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development (CTED) studied the State’s housing stock to identify areas of potentially high risk for child lead exposure. The study created a statistical model using data on age of housing stock, resident income, soil lead levels and lead poisoning cases from the Washington State Department of Health’s Childhood Lead Poisoning Surveillance program. Age of housing is an important predictor of lead risk because lead paint, the major source of children’s lead exposure, was not banned for residential use until 1978. The study was limited by the shortage of blood lead data from a representative sample of children, as only 4 percent of Washington children have ever received a blood lead test.

The model calculated that 8% of Washington children ages birth to six lived in tracts with the highest risk of elevated blood lead levels, and 20% lived in the next highest risk category. A number of Seattle neighborhoods received the highest risk rating: Georgetown, portions of West Seattle, the Central District, Madrona, First Hill, Capitol Hill, Queen Anne, the University District, Wallingford, Green Lake, and Ballard.

The high risk rating reflects the age of these neighborhoods’ housing stock, much of which was built before 1950. Suburban Seattle had lower risk ratings due to higher proportions of newer homes.89

The CTED study’s findings support those of a 1990 HUD study on lead paint exposure in major cities, which showed how Seattle differs from east coast cities in which most lead paint exposure studies have been conducted. In Seattle, low income is not a consistent predictor of risk for lead paint exposure. Seattle neighborhoods with older housing stock and higher lead paint risk have high property values and higher median income.

Elevated Blood Lead Trends and Incidence Study in Seattle and King County

To address low levels of screening, the Elevated Blood Lead Trends and Incidence Study in Seattle and King County was conducted from October 2005 to March 2008 with funding from the Environmental Protection Agency and the Local Hazardous Waste Management Program in King County. Three audiences were targeted to increase screening in high-risk communities: physicians, licensed childcare providers, and the public. Lead-based paint in housing contaminated imported candies and cross-contamination from occupational exposures were the three most common sources of lead poisoning identified.

The project found that 3.5% of screened King County children under six years had elevated blood lead levels ($\geq 6 \mu g/dL$). Public and private health care providers expressed two concerns about expanded screening: financial (many children are without insurance coverage and Medicaid reimbursement is insufficient to cover test costs), and a belief that lead poisoning is not an issue in King County. Current toxicity screening is primarily motivated by parental request, not clinical judgment. The number of children screened in 2007 was twice that of 2006, probably reflecting both study efforts and a heavily-publicized recall of lead-containing toys in the winter of 2007. (Thomsen, Nicole. Elevated Blood Lead Trends and Incidence Study in King County. Seattle, WA: Local Hazardous Waste Management Program in King County, 2008.)

Washington State Lead Chemical Action Plan

The Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) creates Chemical Action Plans to determine the dangers of a substance, where it is found in the environment and ways to reduce or prevent its harm. A plan for lead was generated because it is widespread, harmful, has known mitigation strategies and because, compared to other states, Washington has a relatively large number of young children with risk factors for lead poisoning and a very low test rate.

The 2008 lead chemical action plan (CAP) was developed by Ecology, the Washington State Department of Health, seven other state agencies, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and an advisory committee of 17 representatives of business, health, environmental and local government organizations. The CAP process requires the Department of Ecology to identify policy options to manage, reduce and phase out use of the metal of concern. To reduce exposure to existing lead, the CAP proposes the following policy options:

- **Education:** encouraging parents to do voluntary home assessments, and developing Ecology guidelines on how to assess lead hazards in homes, reduce exposures, and find appropriate professional help if needed.

- **Prevention strategies** to reduce exposure: Mandatory assessment and disclosure of lead-based paint, soil lead levels, and lead in tap water in all housing at the time of property transfer or new rental tenancy would improve present weak federal and state notification requirements. Mandatory or voluntary targeted remediation would require abatement or remediation of lead in paint, soil and plumbing in houses, schools, and childcares.

- **Enforcement and standards:** delegate responsibility for enforcement of EPA renovation rules on lead to CTED, which already administers the EPA rule on training and certifying lead workers and has a lead-based paint reduction program in place. Review Model Toxics Control Act cleanup levels in light of recent scientific evidence that blood lead levels below the current CDC cutoff of 10 $\mu g/dL$ can harm young children.

The CAP also seeks to find and help children with elevate blood lead levels so that all children in Washington have blood lead levels less than 2 $\mu g/dL$. Increased screening for elevated child
blood lead levels can establish a reliable baseline population measure to identify high risk populations, and assess intervention and prevention programs. The CAP proposes:

- **Some combination** of universal or targeted mandatory or voluntary screening

- **A change in the definition of elevated blood lead level** (BLL) from 10 µg/dL to 2 µg/dl. Current CDC guidelines do not reflect recent studies showing that adverse health effects occur in children with blood lead levels less than 10 µg/dL. There is no known safe level of blood lead, but 2 µg/dL is the median BLL. Case management guidelines for children with elevated BLL should be evaluated to reflect the new standard.

- **Mandatory remediation and abatement** after a confirmed case of a child with an elevated BLL in rental and other homes. DOH and CTED should develop rules for local health departments to assess and remediate lead hazards in housing whenever an elevated BLL is found.

**EPA Lead-based Paint Renovation, Repair and Painting Program (2008)**

This is a federal program governing contractors, property managers and anyone who is paid to renovate houses, apartments and child-occupied facilities built before 1978. For any renovation that will disturb more than 2 ft² of painted surface, new rules establish requirements for notifying occupants about the work, dust sampling on site, and training and certifying those who do the sampling and the lead paint remediation.

**HUD Lead-Based Paint Regulations (24 CFR 91, as amended)**

These are federal requirements that a consolidated plan prepared by local governments must estimate the number of housing units within the jurisdiction containing lead-based paint hazards, outline actions proposed or being taken to evaluate and reduce lead-based paint hazards, and demonstrate compliance with lead-based paint procedures listed within 24 CFR 35, subparts A, B, J, K, and R. When preparing the portion of the consolidated plan concerning lead-based paint hazards, the local government shall consult with state or local health and child welfare agencies and examine existing data related to lead-based paint hazards. See 24 CFR 91.100(a)(3); 24 CFR 91.205(e); 24 CFR 91.215(i); 24 CFR 91.220(k); 24 CFR 91.225(b)(7).

**City of Seattle Lead-Based Paint Activities**

*The City of Seattle Office of Housing requires that borrowers comply with all applicable requirements of federal, state, and local laws and regulations with regard to lead-based paint, including without limitation 24 CFR Part 35 and Section 570.608, and, if HOME funds are involved in a project, 24 CFR 92.355 and 982.401(j). Borrowers are responsible for all testing and abatement activities and all required disclosures, and shall abate any defective lead-based paint surfaces in connection with any rehabilitation of existing improvements in compliance with*
all applicable laws, regulations, HUD guidelines, and prudent practices. The City of Seattle Office of Economic Development requires that all loan recipients at all times comply with all environmental statutes and regulations. In compliance with Federal, State and Local laws and regulation the Seattle Housing Authority performs comprehensive testing for the presence of lead based paint (LBP) in all pre-1978 built properties, where children less than six years old are residing. SHA has initiated the necessary activities and procedures to maintain compliance related to the monitoring and management of lead-based paint. The intent of this policy is to reduce risks to residents living in SHA housing units that contain lead-based paint.\(^{91}\)

The Seattle Housing Authority publishes both a Five Year Strategic Plan and an Annual Moving to New Ways Report. Full text versions can be found by visiting http://www.seattlehousing.org/aboutsha/misc/plans.htm.

Highlights of the 2008 Moving To New Ways (MTW) include:

In 2008, SHA's MTW priorities will include:

- In 2008 SHA may raise the maximum percentage of Housing Choice Vouchers that may be project-based. SHA will also continue piloting the “provider-based” program that ties supportive services with housing subsidy, especially for the homeless.

- SHA may enable project-based Housing Choice Vouchers and low-income public housing to operate seamlessly in communities that operate both programs.

Meeting Seattle’s public housing needs

SHA will continue several community revitalization activities throughout Seattle and explore new opportunities in 2008. These activities include:

- **High Point and Rainier Vista**: New low-income and workforce housing completed in High Point Phase II. Continued infrastructure work and beginning of construction of new rental housing in Phase II of Rainier Vista. Start of construction for the High Point Neighborhood Center and completion of the new Rainier Vista Boys and Girls Club. Homes for sale built by private builders in High Point and Rainier Vista.

- **homeWorks**: Continue the project, a five-year capital program involving bond- and tax credit-financing to renovate 22 public housing high-rises, including comprehensive rehabilitation of building systems and common areas.

- **Yesler Terrace**: Begin to develop a formal plan for the future of Yesler Terrace using the guiding principles established in 2007.

- **Scattered sites**: Sell the remaining 40–45 units in the scattered sites portfolio reconfiguration started in 2004, replacing them with others that are more efficient to manage and maintain.

- **Holly Court**: Identify replacement housing options for Holly Court, and begin planning for the redevelopment of this poorly-designed and -constructed community and adjacent SHA-owned property.

- **Lake City Village**: Beginning in 2007 and continuing in 2008, SHA will market a portion of the Lake City Village site to private townhome builders, evaluate options for the balance of the site, and apply for a HOPE VI grant.
• **Villa Park and Yesler Terrace neighborhoods:** Plan for and possibly implement redevelopment of recent acquisitions: the Douglas Apartments and adjacent property, and several properties owned by SHA in the Yesler Terrace area.

**Meeting the needs of residents and applicants**

SHA will **improve access to its affordable housing programs** through a variety of strategies in 2008 including:

- Implement strategies developed in FY 2007 to improve access to housing information for residents and applicants with limited English proficiency.
- Reopen the Housing Choice Voucher wait list and increase utilization.
- Explore and possibly implement new local preferences for victims of domestic violence, families leaving transitional housing programs such as Sound Families, and households that previously transitioned off housing subsidies owing to earned income.

SHA’s successful **community services programs** will continue in 2008, including:

- Continue the successful mental health crisis intervention and case management program in the public housing high-rises that was expanded during FY 2005.
- Assist at least 160 SHA residents and Housing Choice Voucher participants in developing skills and finding jobs through the Job Connection program.
- In collaboration with several partner agencies, pilot the Seattle Asset Building Initiative to help residents move toward economic security.

**Organizational improvements**

Improvements planned for FY 2008 include:

- Work with HUD to extend SHA’s MTW participation.
- Develop a local system for measuring resident satisfaction.
- Increase SHA’s ability to function in the face of a crisis or natural disaster.

For more information about SHA's Moving To New Ways annual plan or the MTW program, contact Andria Lazaga, Asset Management Coordinator, at alazaga@seattlehousing.org or (206) 615-3546.
7.2 Economic development implementation policies
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1. INTRODUCTION

Regulations published by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development in January 1995 authorize Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) recipients to develop comprehensive approaches to promote economic development within residential neighborhoods that are home to high concentrations of low- and moderate income persons. Known as Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy (NRS) areas, these designations allow neighborhoods more flexibility with the use of federal HUD funds.

This document proposes the continuation of a NRS for Southeast Seattle, that covers the time period from 2005 through 2012. This NRS was previously approved with the 2005 – 2008 Consolidated Plan and it is now necessary to update and resubmit the plan to HUD for re-approval for the period of 2009 – 2012. In addition, the City will annually review progress and adjust the plan as part of the City’s annual Update to the Consolidated Plan, as necessary.

The NRS plan describes how the City of Seattle will use its CDBG resources in conjunction with other major local investments in Southeast Seattle to spur redevelopment of Southeast Seattle and maximize benefit to low- and moderate income persons. The other complementary initiatives covered in this NRS plan include the construction of a light rail system serving the community, redevelopment of Seattle’s two largest public housing projects, and implementation of a Transit-Oriented Community Development Fund for Southeast Seattle.

The strategies and actions proposed in this NRS Plan are grouped in to three priority areas, based on extensive planning and consultation with community representatives from Southeast Seattle. These three high-priority areas are:

- Business Development and Job Creation
- Housing and Commercial Development
- Parks and Public Infrastructure

Within each priority area, the NRS plan identifies specific strategies and results, and assigns responsibility for the execution of the strategies to wide variety of public and non-profit agencies. Specific results are provided for an intermediate target date of 2008, and a final target date of 2012. All results are being revisited in 2008 to monitor progress-to-date and to determine whether adjustments are appropriate. If necessary, OED will update the relevant sections in 2009. In addition, the City and its non-profit partners will assess progress annually in a report to HUD.

History/background of NRSA

The purpose of the Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy (NRS) program is to assist in the revitalization of economically distressed areas. The Southeast Seattle NRS was developed in response to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development’s (HUD) authorization of the Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy (NRS) program. Each NRS area conducts a community-based process to develop a Strategy and actions designed to bolster economic revitalization. This Strategy serves as a planning tool and policy framework for spending federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) dollars in the implementation of community goals. Once HUD approves the Strategy, the City of Seattle receives enhanced flexibility in using CDBG funds in the NRS area. The City’s Office of Economic Development (OED) is the lead agency for managing the NRS program in Seattle.
The selection of neighborhoods for which Neighborhood Revitalization Strategies are developed has been determined by a combination of factors. To ensure that the program serves communities with a high concentration of economic distress, neighborhoods are assessed for eligibility based upon HUD criteria and on the community’s organizational capacity to carry out the Strategy. The designation is valid for five years, when the NRS must be evaluated and if appropriate, updated, and re-approved by the City Council and HUD. In the first cycle of NRSs (1999 to 2004), HUD approved NRS areas for five Seattle neighborhoods, one of which was Southeast Seattle.

Southeast Seattle has shown evidence of revitalization; however, significant portions of Southeast Seattle remain economically distressed and have significant needs for additional economic development. At the same time, significant public and private investments are underway that present opportunities for catalyzing further revitalization. These include the construction of LINK light rail, the $50 million Rainier Valley Community Development Fund, two major public housing redevelopments, and the City of Seattle’s Southeast Seattle Action Agenda released in March 2005.

As a result, the City of Seattle, with the concurrence of community-based development organizations (CBDOs) in Southeast Seattle, is proposing to focus its resources and renew the NRS for Southeast Seattle. This will enable the City to leverage public and private investments from numerous sources targeted to Southeast Seattle and help transform a historically low-income underserved community.

This document is the 2009 – 2012, third round, updated Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy for Southeast Seattle. The NRS contains the key revitalization goals and a comprehensive set of strategies and actions that the City is proposing to achieve those goals. The actions and associated targets are described for 2008 and 2012 to provide a longer-term framework for achieving revitalization. Within this broad spectrum is a sub-set of strategies for the use of HUD CDBG funds in Southeast Seattle, the vast majority of which will be appropriated for the activities of the Rainier Valley Community Development Fund (RVCDF).

Contents of this Document

Section 3 describes the community outreach that resulted in the Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy for Southeast Seattle. Section 4, Community Context, lays out the proposed boundaries for the Southeast Seattle NRSA. Section 5, Assessment, describes the current economic conditions in Southeast Seattle, and challenges and opportunities for revitalization. Section 6 details the community vision and priorities for Southeast Seattle in three topical areas: Business Development and Job Creation, Housing and Commercial Development, and Parks and Public Infrastructure. Section 7 springboards from the key strategies to specific actions which City agencies and community-based organizations (CBDOs) will undertake to implement the strategies. Each action is paired with performance-based results so residents, implementers and funders may track progress. Section 8 describes the proposed method that the City of Seattle and the community will use to monitor and evaluate progress toward revitalization in Southeast Seattle.
2. COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

The Southeast Seattle NRS is built on extensive community consultation and numerous past and recent planning initiatives. Several venues served as opportunities for involvement, including recent neighborhood planning efforts in Southeast Seattle, as well as direct outreach conducted specifically for the development of this NRS.

Planning initiatives

Southeast Seattle Action Agenda. In the autumn of 2004, this community-led, City-staffed planning process was initiated to develop goals and strategies for Southeast Seattle in five topical areas: Business and Job Creation, Physical Development, Education and Workforce Development, Public Safety/Image, and Arts, Culture and Public Space. A broad cross-section of community leaders that represented residents, businesses, social services, educational institutions, and non-profits, was involved in this effort. Sub-committees were organized for each of the five topic areas and over the initial five-month planning effort, approximately 13 subgroup and 3 full group meetings, involving approximately 50 people, were held. Over the course of the two-month community outreach process, over 600 community residents/members were involved and over eleven neighborhood meetings were conducted. The resulting product, the Southeast Seattle Action Agenda, is a living document that continues to be used as the basis for the City’s work in Southeast Seattle. The Action Agenda is being monitored, refined and updated by a team representing several City departments and community organizations.

Recommendations from this planning process and the ongoing updates are reflected in this NRS.

Rainier Valley Community Development Fund (RVCDF). The Rainier Valley Community Development Fund is a $50 million fund established to support community development in the Rainier Valley, which comprises the primary geographic area of the Southeast Seattle NRS. The City of Seattle, along with Sound Transit and King County, established this Fund to support light rail mitigation and overall community development in Southeast Seattle. The City of Seattle is the most significant source for this Fund, committing $42.8 of the $50 million. In addition to the funding appropriations, the City has also committed to supporting the creation and development of a community-based development organization, the Rainier Valley Community Development Fund (RVCDF), to oversee and administer the use of monies from the Fund for the revitalization of Southeast Seattle.

Since its inception in 2002, the RVCDF has focused its work on providing supplemental mitigation assistance to businesses being impacted by construction of Seattle’s light rail line. As supplemental mitigation activities ramp down in 2008 with the completion of light rail construction, RVCDF is accelerating the Fund’s Community Development Program. The Community Development Program will be capitalized primarily by federal CDBG monies appropriated by the City of Seattle.

The RVCDF’s work has been organized as the result of significant community engagement since its inception. A community-based Founding Board was created to build the organizational structure and legal foundations for the RVCDF. A community-identified Board, that meets the CBDO requirements, currently leads the organization. In 2005, the RVCDF facilitated an extensive community process to shape its Community Development Program. To develop the Community Development Program, a stakeholder Steering Committee coordinated community surveys, Technical Advisory Committees, targeted community outreach, and targeted interviews. The creation of the Community Development Program alone has involved several hundred
community members in over a hundred meetings. The results of those efforts have directly influenced the NRS strategies in this document.

**Housing Investment Areas.** In 2003, the Seattle City Council asked the Office of Housing to reexamine the City’s Special Objectives Area (SOA) guidelines, which had been adopted over twenty years ago to prevent over-concentration of subsidized housing in economically distressed areas. The process involved analyzing data to identify changes and trends in historically distressed areas and presenting the information to residents and community groups as part of in-depth discussions. These discussions would help the community to identify strategies to achieve housing and community development goals for their neighborhoods. One of the results of the process was designation of eight Housing Investment Areas (HIAs) throughout Seattle, one of which includes a large part of the Rainier Valley. HIA strategies are broader than those for the former SOAs in that they seek to achieve community development and revitalization objectives unique to each area. One of the key HIA strategies is targeting of funds for two Housing Levy programs (the Neighborhood Housing Opportunity Program and the Homebuyer Assistance Program) primarily in those areas.

**Other Community Planning Efforts.** Several important planning processes have been conducted in Southeast Seattle in the past fifteen years, including the creation of neighborhood plans (1996 to 1999), light rail station area plans (1998 to 2001), and the Southeast Action Plan (1990 to 1991).

**Key Community Organizations**

The Rainier Valley Community Development Fund (RVCDF) is the primary community organization that will utilize CDBG funds to implement the strategies and actions described in this NRS. The RVCDF was established in 2002 as a community-based response to the construction of light rail transit in Southeast Seattle. Since then, RVCDF has worked to support community development in the areas of small business development and physical revitalization.

In addition to the RVCDF, SouthEast Effective Development (SEED) and HomeSight are also key community-based development organizations, specializing in catalytic real estate development and home-ownership respectively. SEED and HomeSight were involved in developing the 1999 NRSA for Southeast Seattle, and have been involved in all the planning efforts described above. This has provided a strong link and assurance that the strategies in the 2005 NRS are consistent with and supportive of other community plans and initiatives.

The community organizations were consulted individually early in the process of developing the NRSA, to help identify and/or validate revitalization priorities, actions and benchmarks. They also reviewed drafts of the NRS and helped shape it leading up to the final NRS. Their work continues to be focused on achieving the goals and strategies within the NRS and they are involved in ongoing conversations with the City about changing conditions in SE Seattle and strategies to address them.
3. COMMUNITY CONTEXT

NRSA Boundaries
The NRSA boundaries for 2009 – 2012 remain the same as the 2005 – 2008 NRSA.

North: S Atlantic Street
South: City of Seattle city limits
West: South on S Sturgis Ave, east on S Holgate S, south on 20th Ave S, east on S Hill St, south on 25th Ave S, east on S Walker St, south on 22nd 22nd Ave S, east on S College St, south on 23rd Ave S, east on S Spokane St, south on 24th Ave S, west on Cheasty Blvd S, south on Beacon St S, east on S Columbia Way, east on S Americus St, south on 26th Ave S, east on S Angelines St, south on S Crest Place St, west on S Ferninand St, south on 26th Ave S, east on S Orcas St, south on 32nd Ave S, west on S Raymond St, south on 30 Ave S, west on S Graham St, south on 29th Ave S, west on S Morgan St, south on S Beacon St, east on Myrtle St, south on 35th Ave S, west on Webster St, South on S Beacon St, South on 36th Ave S, west on Barton St, south on I-5 until Seattle city limits
East: South on 30 Ave S, west on S Massachusets St, north on 29th Ave S, east pm S Massachusetts Ave, south on Brandon Place S, west on S Massachusetts St, south on 28th St S, east on S Holgate Rd, south on 28th Ave S, east on S Bayview St, south onto 30th Ave S, south on Westmore Ave S, east on Walden St, south on Gale Place, east on Hind S Hind St, north on 36th Ave S, south on York Rd S, south onto 37th Ave S, east on Dakota St S, south on 38th Ave S, east on S Alaska St, south on 42nd Ave S, east on S Dawson St, south on 46th Ave S, east on S Bennet St, south on 48th Ave S, west on Juneau St S, south on 47th Ave S, east on S Morgan St, south on 51st Ave S, east on S Orchard St, south on Seward Park Ave, south on 56th Ave S, west on S Roxbury St, south on 51st Ave S until Seattle city limits.

The revitalization area includes all or part of the following Census Tracts and Block Groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Block Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9400</td>
<td>2,3,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9500</td>
<td>5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10000</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10100</td>
<td>3,4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10200</td>
<td>3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10300</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10400</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11000</td>
<td>1,2,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11101</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11102</td>
<td>3,4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11700</td>
<td>1,2,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11800</td>
<td>3,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How area meets demographic criteria
The revitalization strategies contained in this document apply to the designated area depicted in the map below and meet the following criteria:

- The area is comprised of census tracts and block groups where, when taken as an aggregate, more than 54.7% of households are low or moderate-income. The threshold of 54.7% is the “upper quartile percentage” or top 25% of low or moderate-income block groups in Seattle. This is the basic qualifying criteria in order for a neighborhood to qualify as a NRSA. Within the boundaries of the Southeast NRSA, 61.5% of residents are low or moderate income.

- The Southeast NRSA is primarily residential.

- All block groups within the designated NRSA are contiguous.

**Geographic Focus**

The revitalization area described above is also roughly contiguous with the designated Investment Area for the Rainier Valley Community Development Fund. One key difference is that the western boundary of the NRS area includes parts of Beacon Hill that contain significant low and moderate income Census tracts. The RVCDF Investment Area does not include Beacon Hill because the original mandate of the Community Development Fund is to target the Rainier Valley floor, which is the area in which the light rail surface alignment will be located.

The community has identified several existing and emerging business districts within the NRS area that are priorities for investment. These business areas include: North Rainier/McClellan, Columbia City/Edmunds, Martin Luther King Jr. Way at Graham/Orcas, Martin Luther King Jr. Way at Othello, and Rainier Beach/Henderson. These areas are consistent with targeted areas as described in the *Southeast Action Agenda* and the Rainier Valley Community Development Fund’s *Operating Plan* for community development.
History and Geography

Southeast Seattle was first settled in the last part of the 19th century. The area's exceptional timber stands led to construction of timber mills, farming, and residential development. Columbia City, in the heart of the valley, was incorporated as a city in 1892 and later annexed into the City of Seattle. In 1978, the Columbia City Landmark District was established by the City of Seattle, and in 1980 the district was listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

The area has historically been a largely minority, under-invested and low-income area. The Seattle Housing Authority has two major public housing complexes in Southeast Seattle: Rainier Vista and Holly Park. In the last five years, both complexes have undergone major renovation into mixed-use, mixed-income communities integrated with surrounding neighborhoods.

In the 1970's and early 1980's Southeast Seattle and the Rainier Valley suffered the loss of major retail and commercial businesses, including basic retail such as grocery stores. The area's economy slowed and increases in the numbers of residents living in poverty further eroded the commercial base.

The population of the NRS area, while primarily Southeast Asian and African-American, includes all of Seattle's ethnic groups. Recognized as the area of the city with the greatest cultural diversity, Southeast Seattle currently attracts more recent immigrants than any other part of the city. Since the 1980s, many Southeast Asian businesses in particular have opened establishments along Martin Luther King Jr. Way, one of two main corridors that form the backbone of Southeast Seattle. More recently, refugees from East African countries have also settled in the area, further adding to the diverse mix of groups in the community.
4. EXISTING CONDITIONS

Socioeconomic Conditions and Characteristics

• Southeast Seattle has historically been a low-income, underinvested community. The population of nearly 45,000 includes 61.5% low and moderate-income households, compared with 43.9% for the citywide. 17.0% of households live in poverty, compared with 11.8% citywide.  

• The unemployment rate in Southeast Seattle is 8.3%, while for all of Seattle it was 5.1% in 1999. In terms of academic achievement, 15.5% of Southeast students passed the Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL) compared with 34.4% citywide.  

• Southeast Seattle is also very racially diverse compared with the rest of Seattle. Foreign born residents comprise 36.2% of Southeast Seattle compared with 16.9 across the city. Nonwhite households comprise 80.1% of the total population, compared with 29.9% for the city as a whole.  

• Historically, Southeast Seattle has experienced significant underinvestment in business and real estate development. Often, development projects are not built because the market is not mature enough; development costs exceed project value and render projects financially infeasible. Additional public assistance is needed to boost the financial feasibility of development projects, especially those that would spur further revitalization.  

• There is also a gap in local services that forces many residents to go outside the community to meet their shopping needs. A survey conducted by the Rainier Valley Community Development Fund in Southeast Seattle reported that more than 60% of respondents expressed a need for more local businesses. Availability of more varied services would reduce retail leakage into neighboring areas.  

• Recent years have seen greater public and private investment: the construction of light rail as major public transportation infrastructure; refugee and immigrant businesses; gradual strengthening of business districts such as Columbia City, North Rainier, Rainier Beach; and public housing redevelopments at Rainier Vista and NewHolly.  

• These recent public and private investments are helping spur additional revitalization in Southeast Seattle, particularly in Columbia City; however, existing conditions still indicate a need for further revitalization. At the same time, the Southeast community has established its goal that revitalization take place in a manner that is beneficial to, rather than exclusive or displacing of, existing residents and businesses.

---
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Barriers to Revitalization

A number of challenges exist in achieving the community revitalization vision for Southeast Seattle:

Lack of capital to support business development. Small businesses are an integral part of the Rainier Valley economy. They provide for the needs of neighborhoods, and they provide jobs and income for residents. Many new businesses benefit from the Valley’s role as an incubator for new economic entities. Yet many do not have access to credit through traditional sources, and subsequently face difficulty finding the capital to expand their businesses or sustain them through difficult business cycles. Businesses that withstood three years of intensive light rail construction are in a fragile state and face a difficult challenge to recuperate from these impacts.

Under-invested and under-utilized real estate/properties. Despite pockets of recent real estate activity, much of which is either the result of public investment or strong grassroots efforts, new investment is still slow in coming to Southeast Seattle. There is some speculation happening near light rail station areas; however, it remains unproven if developers can earn the rents needed to make projects feasible without public investment. As a result, the community still has many under-utilized and poorly maintained properties.

Retail leakage. Local businesses capture only a portion of local spending. A significant level of residential spending on goods and services is met outside of Southeast Seattle. Business development has not reached its potential capacity.
5. REVITALIZATION GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Community Vision

As described in section 3, a community-led, City-staffed planning initiative called the Southeast Seattle Action Agenda took place in the fall of 2004. This process affirmed many of the community revitalization goals that emerged from previous processes, and further refined strategies and actions for the dynamic conditions of Southeast Seattle today. Out of the Southeast Seattle Action Agenda process, the community developed the following vision:

Southeast Seattle is a vibrant community where: racial, cultural and economic diversity is embraced and preserved; immigrants are welcomed; all residents have access to economic and educational opportunities, housing, and cultural and recreational amenities; and the economic benefits generated by public and private investments are shared with current residents, businesses and community institutions.

The Southeast NRS adopts this vision and a set of strategies intended to foster equitable development in Southeast Seattle by which existing residents and local entrepreneurs as well as future residents and business owners realize the benefits of revitalization, increased prosperity, property values and community well-being. In carrying out the strategies, CBDOs and city agencies will take actions to not displace residents and businesses that desire to remain in the NRSA, including but not limited to offering financial resources to existing businesses and providing increased affordable rental and ownership housing options to residents.

Revitalization Priorities

The community consultation efforts described previously have also articulated the community’s needs and development goals. The Southeast Action Agenda along with numerous previous planning initiatives have identified key areas for community revitalization. The NRS focuses on three high-priority areas:

- Business Development and Job Creation
- Housing and Commercial Development
- Parks and Public Infrastructure

**Business Development and Job Creation.** The community has identified as a priority the need to support business development in Southeast Seattle. This support will largely be in the form of providing additional investment through loans and grants to businesses, as well as technical assistance. Much of this work will be facilitated by the Rainier Valley Community Development Fund through the resources of its Community Development loan fund, which is being capitalized primarily with CDBG dollars. The City will also support this goal through other commitments such as assisting with marketing efforts and piloting a wireless internet access area. The objectives of this goal are to:

1. Encourage local ownership of properties and businesses.
2. Provide opportunities for local businesses to benefit from the increased economic activity that will result from the substantial public and private investment planned for the area.

3. Diversify and increase the availability of retail goods, services and jobs within the Rainier Valley.

4. Preserve the multi-ethnic mix of local entrepreneurs.

5. Promote local residential spending that reinvests in the community while strengthening the area’s role as a shopping destination.

6. Increase employment opportunities through the strengthening of Rainier Valley businesses.

**Housing and Commercial Development.** The community has also identified as a priority the need to encourage continued investment in housing and commercial development in Southeast Seattle. As with business development, much of this support will be in the form of providing loans and grants as incentives to property owners and developers, facilitated by the Rainier Valley Community Development Fund through the resources of its Community Development loan fund, which is being capitalized primarily with CDBG dollars. The City will also support this priority area through investment in housing and mixed-use catalyst developments. The objectives of this goal are to:

7. Promote opportunities for housing, commercial, mixed-use and transit-oriented developments that benefits the people who live and work in the Rainier Valley.

8. Preserve the unique characteristics of existing neighborhoods and their racial, cultural and economic diversity.

9. Improve Rainier Valley’s physical environment by enhancing the commercial and multi-family residential building stock.

10. Augment the supply of affordable housing to limit the potential for displacement caused by rising living costs associated with increased public and private investment.

**Parks and Public Infrastructure.** The City will support physical revitalization through other commitments to invest in new open space, build an effective multimodal transportation system, and support expansion of community and cultural facilities.

11. Improve the quality of the built environment in the Rainier Valley by supporting improvements in open space, transportation and infrastructure.

12. Increase cultural and recreational opportunities and programs that reflect the Rainier Valley’s diverse population into all community development strategies.
6. STRATEGIES, ACTIONS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

This section includes current and future strategies to support revitalization in Southeast Seattle. The strategies provide the shape and direction for neighborhood revitalization and are the link between broad goals and objectives and specific implementation actions. The strategies are borne primarily from elements of the Southeast Seattle Action Agenda.

In this section, each strategy is grouped by goal, related to objectives and followed by action steps which are being or will be undertaken by CBDOs and/or City agencies. Performance results are also included for each action. Results are provided for an intermediate target date of 2008, and a final target date of 2012. All results are being revisited in 2008 to monitor progress-to-date and to determine whether adjustments are appropriate. Note that projected results are cumulative; 2012 figures include 2008 projections. In addition, the NRS will comply with annual reporting requirements to HUD. Where the City has already begun to complete an action or made a definitive commitment to complete an action, this is also indicated. The status of each activity and goal has been updated as of December 31, 2007 and reported to HUD in the 2007 CAPER.

The strategies and actions are grouped by the three priority areas; within each, specific strategies fall into one of two categories: 1) Those that describe how HUD Block Grant Funds will be used to support the Community Development Program of the Rainier Valley Community Development Fund and 2) Other public investments that will support revitalization in Southeast Seattle.

A. BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT AND JOB CREATION

**Strategy 1:** Increase awareness and usage of available business technical assistance and financing, with a particular emphasis on serving the multi-ethnic communities of the Rainier Valley in a culturally appropriate and effective manner. *Strategy 1 achieves objectives #1, 2, 4 and 6.*

**Action 1a:** Identify and fund new approaches to improve access to technical and financial services for limited English speaking business owners.

**City Commitment:** OED will emphasize the improvement of services to refugee and immigrant owned businesses in its program that funds technical assistance for low- to moderate-income business owners.

**Result by 2008:** 25 microenterprises in the Rainier Valley will receive technical assistance with emphasis on immigrant and refugee owned businesses.

**Action 1b:** The RVCDF will continue to leverage its unique expertise in establishing relationships with small businesses, especially ethnic businesses, to provide culturally-competent technical assistance.

**Result by 2008:** RVCDF will provide technical assistance to at least 200 small businesses, with a primary focus on those impacted by light rail construction.

**Result by 2012:** RVCDF will provide technical assistance to a total of 280 small businesses with a shifting focus on serving businesses throughout the Rainier Valley through the RVCDF’s long term community development initiatives.
**Action 1c:** Improve environmental practices of small business owners.

**City Commitment:** The City Office of Sustainability will work with the utilities to increase technical and financial assistance to business owners and operators with limited English, for energy and water efficiency, recycling and waste prevention, hazardous materials reductions and storm water pollution prevention. Outreach in 2005 will focus on restaurants and bakeries in Southeast Seattle.

**Result by 2008:** The City will approach at least 60 small business owners and operators with limited English in effort to improve access to City services to improve energy and water efficiency, recycling and waste prevention, hazardous materials reductions and storm water pollution prevention by mid-2006. The City will have evaluated the success of the program and determine how best to continue to serve this group of businesses.

**Strategy 2:** Support businesses along Martin Luther King Jr. Way S to mitigate the disruptions caused by light rail construction and benefit from the increased economic activity resulting from the substantial public and private investment planned for the area.

**Action 1:** RVCDF will design and administer a program that provides payments to businesses for actual losses and relocation costs incurred due to light rail construction that supplements payments made by Sound Transit.

**Result by 2008:** RVCDF will reach out to all 300 businesses impacted by light rail construction and provide $15 million of financial assistance to 200.

**Result by 2012:** At least 150 of the 300 impacted businesses along the light rail alignment will continue to be operating in the Rainier Valley.

**Strategy 3:** Provide financial assistance to small businesses that currently do not have access to and/or are not reached by existing community lenders, with an emphasis on supporting the retention and growth of locally-owned businesses in the Rainier Valley. **Strategy 4 achieves objectives #1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6.**

**Action 3:** RVCDF will conduct outreach to businesses throughout its service territory to offer access to its products and services to support business development in Southeast Seattle.

**Result by 2008:** RVCDF will complete: (a) outreach to at least 21 businesses; (b) at least 7 Business Incentive Loans resulting in at least 25 new jobs in the Rainier Valley; and (c) at least 10 Business Interest Subsidy Grants, in partnership with another community lender, by the year 2008 resulting in 10 new jobs in the Rainier Valley.

**Result by 2012:** RVCDF will complete: (a) outreach to at least 90 businesses; (b) a total of at least 30 Business Incentives Loans resulting in at least 125 new jobs in the Rainier Valley; and (c) at least 30 Business Interest Subsidy Grants, in partnership with another
Strategy 4: Develop wireless and high speed internet access in the Rainier Valley to spur business growth and development. Strategy 5 achieves objectives #2, 3, and 6.

Result by 2008: Wireless network is installed in the Columbia City business node along Rainier Avenue: (S. Alaska to S. Dawson) and is available through 2008.
Result by 2012: Network functions through 2010, and by 2012 decision is made whether or not to continue and/or expand network into other neighborhoods.

Strategy 5: Initiate and execute a concerted marketing and public outreach effort highlighting the opportunities and successes in the Rainier Valley. Strategy 6 achieves objectives #2, 3, 4, and 5.

Action 5: The Rainier Valley Chamber of Commerce will coordinate the development of a marketing strategy. Participants will include representatives of neighborhood business district organizations, key business leaders, Sound Transit, Seattle Housing Authority, and the City of Seattle. OED will provide $20,000 to pay for the development of the strategy leading and the Chamber will coordinate the fundraising to pay for the implementation of the campaign.

City Commitment: City has provided $20,000 for a marketing campaign to promote the Rainier Valley and its businesses.
Result by 2008: Rainier Valley Chamber of Commerce has developed marketing plan and is coordinating its implementation among participants.
Result by 2012: Marketing plan is completed.

Strategy 6: Support creation of new jobs for local residents by supporting pre-apprenticeship training and job placement for employment opportunities emerging from light rail construction. Strategy 7 achieves objectives #2 and 3.

Action 6: The City of Seattle will provide CDBG funds to the Rainier Valley Community Development Fund to implement a four-year pre-apprenticeship program.
City Commitment: City of Seattle is dedicating $2 million over four years to support this program.
Result by 2008: 160 local residents provided with pre-apprenticeship training and 220 job placements completed.

B. HOUSING AND COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Strategy 1: Encourage development in neighborhood business districts and light rail station areas in Southeast Seattle through incentives, such as increased height/density and reduced parking, provision of public amenities and other planning tools. Strategy 1 achieves objectives #7 and 8.
Action 1a: Evaluate market conditions, zoning and other land use regulations at light rail stations. (OED, OPM, DPD, OH)
Result by 2008: By 2006, complete a feasibility analysis of potential development incentives at key sites, including incentives to encourage affordable housing and public amenities.

Action 1b: Revise land use codes in neighborhood business districts (DPD).
Result by 2008: By 2005, land use revisions made that simplify regulatory requirements, permit residential-only buildings outside designated pedestrian areas, allow more flexibility for parking and open space, and make other changes to promote revitalization.

Action 1d: Support the completion of Seattle Housing Authority’s NewHolly project, particularly the redevelopment of the mixed commercial-residential area adjacent to the Othello station area, into a pedestrian-friendly and transit-oriented community. (OPM, OED, OH)
Result by 2008: Planning and any regulatory changes needed to complete the Othello station area at NewHolly are completed.

Action 1e: Support the completion of SEED’s Rainier Court mixed-use project by assisting with site assembly and project financing. (OED, OH)
Result by 2008: Site assembly for all phases of the Rainier Court development is completed.

Strategy 2: Support development and preservation of homeownership opportunities, including ownership options for low-income and first-time homebuyers, through land use approaches and financial assistance. Strategy 2 achieves objectives #7, 8, 9 and 10.

Action 2a: Encourage the development of town homes and condominiums in and near neighborhood business areas to promote market rate and affordable homeownership options close to retail services and transit. (OH, OED, DPD and RVCDF)

Action 2b: Support the development of attached and detached for-sale housing at NewHolly and Rainier Vista, including affordable homes constructed by private builders and Habitat for Humanity. (SHA and OH)

Results by 2008 for Actions 2a and 2b: 406 homeownership units developed or under development due to City, SHA or nonprofit activities
Results by 2012 for Actions 2a and 2b: 458 homeownership units developed or under development due to City, SHA or nonprofit activities

Action 2c: Propose legislation allowing cottage housing developments in Southeast Seattle. (DPD)
Result by 2008: By 2006, legislation will have been introduced to Council.
**Action 2d:** Propose code amendments to allow detached accessory dwelling units in single-family zones in Southeast Seattle, providing opportunities for rental income for homeowners and for housing that accommodates extended families. (DPD)

**Results by 2008:** By 2005, legislation will have been introduced to Council.

**Action 2e:** Work with housing developers, lenders and housing counseling organizations in Southeast Seattle to market the availability of City-funded down payment assistance for low-income, first-time homebuyers purchasing new and existing homes. (OH)

**Action 2f:** Through a new partnership with Fannie Mae and local lenders, provide housing rehabilitation loans in conjunction with down payment assistance loans to help first-time homebuyers to purchase lower cost homes in revitalizing neighborhoods. The program will also provide refinance of first mortgages in conjunction with rehab loans. (OH)

**Action 2g:** Provide housing repair loans and weatherization grants for low-income homeowners whose homes are in need of health and safety repairs. (OH)

**Results by 2008 for Actions 2e, 2f & 2g:**
- 35 first-time homebuyers receive City purchase assistance
- 45 low-income homeowners receive home repair loans
- 480 low-income residents receive weatherization grants

**Results by 2012 for Actions 2e, 2f & 2g:**
- 55 first-time homebuyers receive City purchase assistance
- 90 low-income homeowners receive home repair loans
- 960 low-income residents receive weatherization grants

**Action 2h:** Working with community partners, prevent displacement of low-income homeowners by educating about the dangers of predatory lending, which is often targeted at minority homeowners and lower-income and minority neighborhoods. (OH)

**Results by 2008:** Information about predatory practices, in a variety of languages, is provided to residents attending homebuyer education classes and requesting information about low-cost home repair programs.

**Strategy 3:** Support rental housing development and preservation for a range of household sizes and a mix of incomes, including opportunities for low-income households and larger families, through land use approaches and financial assistance. **Strategy 3 achieves objectives #7 and 10.**

**Action 3a:** Continue to support rental housing development and preservation through City and nonprofit lending programs, with an emphasis on developments located within the neighborhood business areas designated as urban villages. (OH and RVCDF)

**Action 3b:** Support the development of market rate and affordable rental housing at NewHolly and Rainier Vista. (SHA and OH)
**Action 3c:** Encourage development of rental housing in mixed-use buildings that contain commercial space and/or community facilities, as a catalyst for neighborhood revitalization, using the Seattle Housing Levy’s Neighborhood Housing Opportunity Program and other fund sources. (OH and CDF)

**Result by 2008 for Actions 3a, 3b and 3c:**
825 rental housing units constructed or preserved using public funds and/or incentive programs; 742 of these will have long-term affordability for households below 60% of median income.

**Result by 2012 for Actions 3a, 3b and 3c:**
1,340 rental housing units constructed or preserved using public funds and/or incentive programs; 890 of these will have long-term affordability for households below 60% of median income.

**Strategy 4:** Support the development and improvement of commercial properties, providing opportunities for business growth and new jobs. *Strategy 4 achieves objectives #5, 8, 9 and 11.*

**Action 4a:** Identify and fund at least one small to medium scale development project that allows local businesses to become owners of their place of business.

**Result by 2008:** RVCDF will provide financing to HomeSight as the developer of at least one or more commercial properties that will result in at least 5 local businesses becoming owners of their place of business. RVCDF will coordinate or partner with other CBDOs as appropriate.

**Result by 2012:** Development project (s) completed.

**Action 4b:** Provide loans for development of commercial properties (OED and RVCDF)
*See Business Development and Job Creation, Strategies 2, 4 and 5.*

**Action 4c:** By 2005, submit an application for federal New Market Tax Credits with a substantial amount targeted to development projects in the Rainier Valley. (OED)

**Results by 2008 for Actions 4a, 4b and 4c:** The creation of 85 new jobs.

**Result by 2012 for Actions 4a, 4b and 4c:** The creation of 265 new jobs

**Strategy 5:** Continue to build community capacity to carry out community services and revitalization efforts by supporting key community-based partners, especially CBDOs. *Strategy 5 supports all the objectives.*

**Action 5a:** Provide CDBG funds to the RVCDF for revitalization activities as described in the RVCDF Operating Plan and Operating Plan Amendment, including site assembly loans and real estate financing loans for residential and commercial developments. (OED)

**Result by 2008:** City will fund the program delivery cost of the RVCDF per RVCDF Operating Plan Amendment.

**Result by 2012:** City will fund the program delivery cost of the RVCDF per RVCDF Operating Plan Amendment.
Action 5b: Assist social service agencies to improve, enhance, or increase social services capacity by providing affordable or forgivable loans to improve their facilities. Provide architectural and construction management assistance to ensure the development and completion of sound and efficient capital projects. (HSD)

Result by 2012: Completion of 3 social service community facilities

Action 5c: Continue to support CBDOs and other local non-profit organizations in their efforts to revitalize Southeast Seattle. (OED)

Result by 2008: CBDOs business plans are aligned with the NRS and other community plans and initiatives that support community development in the Rainier Valley. CBDOs have a culturally sensitive systematic community outreach approach to solicit input and educate the community about its goals, mission, initiatives, services and products.

Result by 2012: CBDOs business plans are aligned with the NRS and other community plans and initiatives that support community development in the Rainier Valley. CBDOs have a culturally sensitive systematic community outreach approach to solicit input and educate the community about its goals, mission, initiatives, services and products.

C. PARKS AND PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE

Strategy 1: Address the conflicting demands on Rainier Avenue as a major arterial and neighborhood business district “Main Street.” Strategy 1 achieves objectives #8 and 11.

Action 1a: Identify and address pedestrian safety issues through the installation of sidewalks, crosswalks and other traffic safety measures. (SDOT)

Result by 2008: Complete 44.4 lane miles of paving on arterial streets.
--Complete 56.5 of paving on non-arterial streets.
--Complete 17 sidewalk or curb enhancement projects.
--Complete 13 or more neighborhood traffic calming projects such as traffic circles or speed humps.

Result by 2012: 5 miles of new concrete roadway and sidewalks, new street lights (with substantially higher light level than existing), a new state-of-the-art signal system, including CCTV, emergency vehicle signal preemption, and 10 new signalized pedestrian crossings (from 21 today, to 31 when it's finished), and nearly 1,000 new street trees. Sidewalks, lighting, and landscaping are being improved for 1 mile along South Edmunds (to Columbia City) and for 1.5 miles along South Henderson (to Rainier Beach) to improve pedestrian connections to Light Rail stations.

Action 1b: Identify transportation needs and develop comprehensive transportation improvement financing and programming for Southeast Seattle. (SDOT)

Result by 2008: Completion of multimodal transportation plan which will serve as a blueprint for transportation improvements in Southeast Seattle for next twenty years. Implementation of improvements according to investment strategy.

Result by 2012: Implementation of improvements according to investment strategy.

Strategy 2: Increase the amount of community facilities and public open space in Southeast Seattle. Strategy 2 achieves objective #12.
Action 2: Improve existing community, park and open space facilities in Southeast Seattle. (Parks)

Result by 2008: City will commit 1) over $4 million to make improvements to two community centers in Southeast Seattle by 2006; 2) over $14 million to make improvements to enhance twelve public parks or open spaces in the Rainier Valley, including Columbia Park, John C. Little Park, Martin Luther King Jr. Way Memorial Park, Hillman City P-Patch, Jefferson Park, Lake Washington Boulevard, the Amy Yee Tennis Center, Brighton Playfield and the Mapes Creek Walkway; 3) additional funding to acquire property in the Kubota Garden Natural Area and the East Duwamish Greenbelt.

Result by 2012: Additional improvements will occur through the Department's Capital Improvement Program and through grant funded projects.

Strategy 3: Provide and/or assist in the development of open space that provide recreational opportunities. Strategy 3 achieves objectives #11 and #12.

Action 3: Provide additional “off-road” recreational opportunities to walk or bike between Beacon Hill and the southern boundary of Rainier Valley. (Parks, SDOT)

Result by 2008: City has initiated construction of the initial 3.6 mile segment of the Chief Sealth Trail in Southeast Seattle.

Result by 2012: Completion of the next 1.5 mile segment of Chief Sealth Trail in Southeast Seattle.


Action 4a: City will continue to provide staff resources to coordinate with Sound Transit during light rail construction. This includes construction liaison support, and strategic planning services

Result by 2008: 5 miles of Light rail construction in Southeast Seattle will be completed and in testing mode.

Result by 2012: 5 miles of Light rail in Southeast Seattle completed and operational, with 9,600 boardings at the 4 Rainier Valley stations per day.

Action 4b: City of Seattle is relocating and upgrading major utilities (water, sewer, drainage, electricity) along Martin Luther King Jr. Way South as part of its contribution to light rail construction

Result by 2008: Work complete. All new sewer (trunk and service lines), water, and drainage for the entire length of the corridor, including new service connections to more 300 properties. Water work includes over 13,000 feet of new water pipe. All new overhead electrical and telecommunication utilities south of Henderson Street (about 1 mile), and overhead utilities relocated to new underground utilities north of Henderson (about 4 miles), including new service connections to more than 300 properties.

Result by 2012: All work complete.
7. **HUD REGULATORY FRAMEWORK/IMPLEMENTATION APPROACH**

In Southeast Seattle, the Rainier Valley Community Development Fund (RVCDF) will be one of the key community-based organizations with primary responsibility for implementing the strategies and actions described in this NRS. The RVCDF was incorporated in 2002 as 501(c)(3) non-profit organization to correct the causes of “community deterioration through forms of debt or equity to distressed small businesses and to nonprofit institutions and other organizations working directly with those otherwise disadvantaged by such problems.” In this capacity, the RVCDF is leading the implementation of the $50 million Transit-Oriented Community Development Fund for Southeast Seattle (the Fund). The City, King County and Sound Transit agreed to create this Fund in 1999 to help mitigate impacts of light rail construction and to support revitalization in Southeast Seattle.

An Operating Plan adopted by the City of Seattle and Sound Transit in 2002 describes the initial purposes of the Fund to assist businesses impacted by light rail construction. This work is referred to as supplemental mitigation account activities and has been administered by the RVCDF since its inception. However, the long-term vision for the Fund is to use a large portion of it to contribute to the long-term revitalization of the Rainier Valley. Over the last two years, the Rainier Valley community, led by the Board of the RVCDF, has worked with City, County and Sound Transit staff to develop a Community Development Program as an amendment to the original Operating Plan. This amendment will define and govern the activities, products, and approaches to program delivery and accountability for the Fund.

The Rainier Valley Community has established goals for the Community Development Program that will be incorporated into the amendment to the Operating Plan. They are as follows:

- Support projects that benefit low- and moderate-income residents, businesses, and institutions in the Rainier Valley.
- Use community development funds as a catalyst for fostering commercial and residential development in the Rainier Valley.
- Improve Rainier Valley’s physical environment by enhancing the commercial and multi-family residential building stock.
- Encourage local ownership of properties and businesses.
- Increase employment opportunities through the strengthening of Rainier Valley businesses.
- Augment the supply of affordable housing to limit the potential for displacement caused by rising living costs associated with increased public and private investment.

In addition to accomplishing these goals, the community has established a complementary goal of using a portion of the Fund to support the establishment of a community development financial institution that can invest in the Rainier Valley for many years to come. As such, the RVCDF will administer and implement the Community Development Program of the Fund and originate loans as a Community Based Development Organization (CBDO), as defined by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), using federal Community Development Block Grant funds provided by the City of Seattle. The revenues from the original loans using CDBG would be held permanently in Trust for the benefit of the Rainier Valley Community and...
administered by the RVCDF in its capacity as Trustee. The amendment to the Operating Plan will establish the parameters of the Trust relationship and a subsequent Trust Agreement will determine the specific responsibilities of the RVCDF.

The Community Development Program will be capitalized by public funds to be appropriated by the City of Seattle between 2005 and 2012 to pay for activities defined in the Operating Plan Amendment. Of the total $50 million mandated for use in Southeast Seattle, up to $21.5 million may be spent on supplemental mitigation activities, and $2 million is earmarked for a four-year pre-apprenticeship job training program, per the original 2002 Operating Plan. The remainder will be available for the Community Development Program as defined in the Operating Plan Amendment. Any residual funds not used for supplemental mitigation activities, any funds repaid from supplemental mitigation advances (unless recommitted for supplemental mitigation) and any interest earned on community development loan payments will be dedicated to eligible activities defined in the Operating Plan Amendment.

The Community Development Program will focus on needs identified through several community-based planning efforts, including the Southeast Action Agenda developed in the autumn of 2004. These efforts have consistently identified two critical community priorities: 1) supporting business growth and development, and 2) promoting physical improvements in the Rainier Valley. The Community Development Program is a direct and strategic response to these objectives.

The Community Development Program will consist of two lines of business: Business Development and Real Estate Development. For the initial use of funds for community development purposes, 25% of funds governed by the Operating Plan Amendment will be targeted to Business Development and 75% will be targeted to Real Estate Development. Business Development encourages small business formation, strengthens existing businesses in the Rainier Valley, and promotes job creation. Business loan and grant products include a Business Interest Subsidy Grant and a Business Incentive Loan.

Real Estate Development encourages new catalyst development and physical improvements in the Rainier Valley. This includes a range of physical revitalization activities involving both new construction and rehabilitation of existing building stock, for the purpose of stimulating economic activity, increasing the inventory of commercial spaces for Rainier Valley businesses, and promoting affordable housing for Rainier Valley residents. Real estate loan and grant products include a Site Assembly Loan for Non-profits, a Site Assembly Loan for For-profits, a Site Assembly Interest Subsidy Loan, and a Real Estate Financing Loan.

As the implementing organization of the Community Development Program, the RVCDF will maximize benefit to the community in the most cost-effective manner, strategically using its strengths and expertise, while leveraging the strengths and expertise of other community partners when appropriate. As such, the RVCDF will directly provide some products, while others will be offered in conjunction with established partner organizations.

In order to achieve the community’s revitalization goals, the City of Seattle is proposing to use a portion of the CDBG funds dedicated to the Fund as identified below:
1. **Business Interest Subsidy Grant**: The Business Interest Subsidy Grant will address an existing gap in business lending by enhancing the access of Rainier Valley businesses to loan products currently offered by community-based lending organizations. This product targets borrowers who are less experienced, have poorer credit, and/or inadequate personal assets that could be used as “collateral.” The purpose of this grant is to provide an opportunity for those businesses to improve their operations. The grants can be used for working capital or for machinery and equipment.

RVCDF will market the product to eligible businesses and will partner with an existing organization that currently provides a business loan product. The partner organization will originate the loan using its own monies, and the RVCDF will provide a commitment to pay half of the borrower’s annual interest costs on the loan. The effect of the grant would be to lower the interest cost to the borrowing business and provide additional lending capacity in the Rainier Valley. Each individual transaction will be approved by the RVCDF Board and subject to a final CDBG eligibility determination by the City of Seattle.

The City of Seattle is proposing that HUD release the entire interest subsidy grant upon a determination of eligibility rather than release small monthly grants over a ten year period. This will simplify administration of the Fund and substantially reduce the workload for RVCDF and City staff. Any interest earned off the interest subsidy grant will be tracked by RVCDF but will not be treated as program income, pursuant to CFR 24 §570.500(c). RVCDF is a CBDO and is not designated as a subrecipient.

2. **Site Assembly Interest Subsidy Loans**: This product will help address the impediment of high carrying costs for land using currently available loan products. The product supports site acquisition and land assembly for CDBG eligible projects undertaken by non-profit developers. The Fund will help these developers by assuming some of the cost of assembling land in the Rainier Valley for CDBG eligible projects. RVCDF will partner with an organization that already funds site acquisition for non-profit developers. The partner organization will provide a loan for site acquisition for a CDBG eligible project, and the Fund will provide an interest-free loan for up to 50% of the interest costs of the primary loan.

The City of Seattle interprets 24 Code of Federal Regulations Part 570.203 to allow the use of interest supplements to support a CDBG eligible economic development undertaken by a private non-profit corporation, as proposed under this product of the Fund. HUD confirmation of that interpretation is hereby requested as part of their review of this Southeast Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy.
8. EVALUATION AND MONITORING

The revitalization strategies and actions described above are aimed at making Southeast neighborhoods more livable and economically vibrant for new and existing residents alike. Such outcomes are in concert with Seattle’s Comprehensive Plan goals and are the intended result of the Southeast Seattle NRS.

How will we know that revitalization is happening? At what point will barriers limiting private market investment be overcome? And how can a balance be achieved between upgrading residents’ incomes, local housing values and business investment while still retaining economic and ethnic diversity? While these are difficult questions, we believe a rigorous solution lies in a two-pronged approach to monitoring and evaluating NRSA activities and results.

First, this document includes Output measures for each activity and identifies the public or non-profit agency responsible for the result. These measures, as described in Section 7, are 4-year targets toward which progress will be assessed annually. Second, the City of Seattle will use indicators to assess the overall Outcome of revitalization as defined by a more livable and economically vibrant Southeast Seattle. The indicators below are directly related to the socioeconomic conditions described in Section 5. They have been selected because they are available on a regular basis over time, are relatively cost-efficient to obtain, and can act as a proxy to answer the broader question of “How do we know if Southeast Seattle is revitalizing?”

Revitalization outcomes will be reported in 2008 and 2012. The 2012 evaluation will include a community profile showing demographic and market changes in the SE NRSA, based on the results of the 2010 Census. The Census is the best source of information to allow a detailed look at changes in household incomes, race and ethnicity, homeownership rates, and other community characteristics within the NRSA boundaries. This information will help the City and the community assess whether, and to what extent, the revitalization has occurred at the expense of the racial and economic makeup of the Rainier Valley. It is the intent of this strategy to achieve economic revitalization with minimum impact on the racial, ethnic and economic diversity that distinguishes the Rainier Valley.

In addition, the City will evaluate outcomes of the SE NRSA as achieved through calendar year 2008 and 2012 based on the indicators provided below:

**HOUSING INDICATORS**

**Existing Condition:** Historically, Southeast Seattle has been underinvested in real estate development. Public support is needed to increase the economic feasibility of new workforce housing, which would boost revitalization. Providing housing units that are affordable to lower-income families is another important NRSA goal.

**Indicators of Revitalization:**

- Progress toward the Comprehensive Plan 2024 residential growth targets for the four Rainier Valley urban villages, which call for 2,890 net new households.

---
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• In accordance with the Comprehensive Plan, at least 20% of new housing units would be affordable to households earning up to 50% of median income and at least 17% of new housing units would be affordable to households earning 51-80% of median income.  
• Maintain or increase the supply of rental housing affordable to households with incomes up to 60% of median income, which is currently about 3,750 units.

EMPLOYMENT/BUSINESS INDICATORS

Existing Condition: Gaps in local services force many residents to go outside the community to meet their shopping needs. A more diverse range of available services would increase spending in Southeast Seattle and support business growth. An increase in jobs within the NRSA would be another sign of economic revitalization.

Indicators of Revitalization:
• An increase in the number of City business licenses in Southeast using the 2004 figures as a baseline.
• An increase in the number of loans to small business owners in the Rainier Valley originated by the Rainier Valley Community Development Fund, Community Capital Development and Cascadia Revolving Loan Fund using the 2004 totals as a baseline.
• Progress toward the Comprehensive Plan 2024 employment growth target for the North Rainier Hub Urban Village, which calls for 750 net new jobs.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

Existing Condition: Recent years have seen greater investment in Southeast Seattle, particularly due to light rail construction and major redevelopment at Rainier Vista and NewHolly by Seattle Housing Authority.

Indicator of Revitalization: Private-market residential and commercial development underway in the McClellan and Othello LINK light rail station areas.

100 Establish number of housing units affordable to low-income households through OH MFDB data by block group and Dupre+Scott survey.
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7.3 Human Services implementation policies

7.3.1 Appendix H: HOPWA Funding and Program Eligibility Criteria

The City of Seattle is the grantee for HUD HOPWA funds for King and Snohomish counties. The current annual HUD HOPWA allocation to King/Snohomish counties is approximately $1.6 million. HOPWA funds are used to support people disabled by HIV/AIDS in housing and provides short-term rental subsidies in project based and tenant based subsidy programs.

Over 300 people will receive rental subsidies through HOPWA funding provided by HUD (project based and tenant based subsidies and operating costs). The importance of these funds in helping to stabilize the lives of persons living with AIDS is reflected in our local program’s client outcomes. The National HOPWA goal for housing stability is 80% of HOPWA clients will maintain housing stability, avoid homelessness and access care. In Seattle, King and Snohomish counties, HOPWA outcomes exceed HUD goals with over 90% of clients remaining stable in housing.

Policies and guidelines for HOPWA-funded services are developed by the City of Seattle’s Human Services Department (HSD), HUD’s local HOPWA grantee for King and Snohomish County. HSD follows federal statute and HUD’s regulatory framework and considers recommendations of the community-based AIDS services organizations, health professionals, and interested members of the public that comprise the AIDS Housing Committee (AHC). The AHC acts as the Human Services Department’s (HSD) advisory council regarding formation and implementation of policies related to providing housing services and related assistance to low-income persons and households living with AIDS.

Consistent with HUD regulatory guidelines and past local practice as accepted by HUD, HSD establishes the following eligibility guidelines for HOPWA-funded services:

- Medical diagnosis provided by a physician of HIV-positive status, regardless of the presence or absence of concurrent symptoms; or HIV/AIDS, or AIDS, or disabled by AIDS; and

- Household income not to exceed 50% of HUD Area Median Income.

These guidelines shall remain effective from January 1, 2008 through December 31, 2012, unless modified in this period by the City and such modification is specifically approved by HUD.

Funding Process and Allocation Plan for HOPWA: As the regional administrator for HOPWA funding in King and Snohomish Counties, the Seattle Human Services Department implements its HOPWA investments in programs and projects through open and competitive Request for Investment (RFI)/Request for Proposals (RFP) processes. Information about funding
opportunities are announced and information is available and accessible by community agencies. Eligible applicants are encouraged to attend a proposers’ conference to receive information about local funding priorities, proposal requirements, applicant eligibility, and the funding process. Interested agencies may respond by submitting a proposal requesting an investment by the City of Seattle for a specific project, program, or service. Proposals are evaluated and programs are selected for funding based on criteria outlined in the RFI/RFP.

The Allocation Plan for 2009 includes HOPWA funds for projects. An RFP is planned in 2009 for 2010 funding, based on current planning work of the AIDS Housing Committee to identify projected needs for housing and services over the next three to five years.
7.3.2 Appendix I: Social Services Neighborhood Notification Guidelines (as adopted through approval of the 2008 Update to the 2005-2008 Consolidated Plan)

Prior to application to the Human Services Department (HSD) for City funding or if there is no application, then before any City Council action to appropriate funds, for development of a new, or material expansion of an existing, social service facility, applicants should prepare and begin implementing neighborhood notification activities, including but not limited to, those outlined below. These guidelines shall also apply to social service agencies seeking any City commitment to acquire any interest in any social service facility being developed or expanded.

Social service facilities include any facility for which Community Development Block Grant ("CDBG") may be allocated for capital purposes as a "public facility" activity, whether or not CDBG funds are used. These include, but are not limited to: emergency shelters, housing assistance services, hygiene facilities, food banks, child care facilities, adult day care facilities, employment referral or training facilities, drug/alcohol treatment facilities, and facilities providing counseling and case management services.

Neighborhood notification efforts are intended to facilitate open, ongoing communication between a social service agency and neighbors. This requires cooperation by the social service agency, the City, and neighborhood residents. A positive, open relationship between the social service agency and neighbors can prevent misunderstandings, facilitate prompt resolution of any inadvertent misunderstandings, and provide a fair, thoughtful, dependable means of ironing out differences.

It is the policy of the City of Seattle that City funding of social services facilities not be refused on the basis of neighbors’ opposition. The City supports the location of appropriate services throughout Seattle. A social service facility should not be excluded from a neighborhood based on any of the following characteristics of the persons who will be served by such facility: age, ancestry, color, creed, disability, gender identity, marital status, national origin, parental status, political ideology, race, religion, gender, sexual orientation, or use of a guide or service animal by a person with a disability. Nor should any obligation or requirement be imposed that would discriminate on the basis of any of the foregoing.

The City supports social service facilities that will preserve and enhance the strengths of Seattle’s neighborhoods. These guidelines are intended to promote the general welfare by providing guidance that will assist in fostering relationships between the sponsors and clients of City-funded social service projects and the communities in which they are located. The guidelines are intended to benefit the public generally and are not intended to benefit any particular class of persons or to confer any substantive or procedural rights or remedies on any persons or entities.

Nothing in these guidelines shall be construed as a limit or restriction on the jurisdiction or authority of the Mayor, Director of Human Services, or their designees. Any reference to these guidelines or their incorporation in any ordinance, resolution, NOFA, RFP or other document shall not create any such limit or restriction, nor confer any rights, unless expressly so stated.
This policy section is intended to provide guidance to social service agencies, acknowledging that neighborhood notification activities and efforts may vary.

Neighborhood Notification Activities:

Generally, the goal of neighborhood notification activities and efforts should be to promote a positive relationship between the neighborhood and the social service agency. Neighborhood notification activities should begin when a site has been selected and should include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Prior to submitting an application for City funding; or if there is no application, then before any City Council action to appropriate funds, consult with the HSD. HSD will help identify social service providers in the neighborhood(s) being considered and suggest neighborhood organizations to contact.

2. Prior to submitting an application or if there is no application, then before any City Council action to appropriate funds, contact other social service agencies to learn about a neighborhood’s historical and current concerns regarding provision of social services in the neighborhood.

3. Make reasonable efforts to notify neighbors within at least 500 feet of the site prior to submitting an application or if there is no application, then before any City Council action to appropriate funds, if the site is owned by the agency, or after securing site control if property is not owned by agency, using a written notice, letter, poster at the site of the proposed facility and/or flyer. Consider including basic information about the social service agency, proposed project, estimated schedule, contact person, and neighborhood organizations that have also been notified about the project in the written communication.

4. Prior to submitting an application or if there is no application, then before any City Council action to appropriate funds, and after any award of funds or commitment, contact neighborhood organizations, including the neighborhood community council and the local district council, with information about the social service facility, including a schedule for development or expansion of a social service facility and intentions for ongoing communication with the neighborhood. Ongoing communications may include presentation(s) at regularly scheduled neighborhood organization meeting(s), invitation to a meeting hosted by the social service agency, formation of an advisory committee, and/or regular project updates in neighborhood organization publications or posted at local libraries, community centers, etc. Information the social service agency should consider sharing includes the following:

   • Experience as a social service provider, including names and addresses of other social service facilities operated in the City unless such facilities require confidentiality for the safety of the clients served;
• Description of the services to be provided to the clients served at the social service facility, to the extent that it does not compromise the safety, confidentiality or well-being of the client;
• Information about property management and support services, if applicable;
• Mechanisms for communication between the social service provider and neighbors
• Estimated schedule for development or expansion of facility, if applicable; and
• Opportunities for neighbors to provide input on the facility (e.g. names of interested neighborhood organizations and how to contact them; community advisory committee).

Information provided to the community at all phases (including predevelopment, construction, and operation) of the project should be in languages appropriate for the residents of that community.

Typical activities for fostering positive community relations once the social service facility has been funded by the City, is in development or is operational, would include:

1. Maintain communication with immediate neighbors and the neighborhood and community organizations throughout the project’s design and construction phase.

2. Invite neighborhood and community organizations and neighbors to project open houses.

3. Establish ongoing communication with neighborhood organizations and neighboring residents and businesses. Promptly address emerging issues and share successes. Provide 24-hour contact person and number if possible to community members.

4. Keep the City appraised of any issues.

These guidelines do not apply to medical or dental facilities or to facilities that, by their nature, require confidentiality of location to protect the safety or personal privacy of clients, such as domestic violence shelters.

**Recommendations for Neighborhood Involvement:**

1. Encourage social service agencies to be active members of your community. Invite them to neighborhood meetings and events. Build foundation for long-lasting, positive relationship.

2. Communicate concerns about design, operation and/or management of a social service facility. Work collaboratively with the social service agency to identify ways to address those concerns. Community Relations Plans can be used as a tool for formalizing agreements between a neighborhood and social service agency on how to address identified concerns.

3. Make sure the social service agency is informed about what is working.
Foster Care:

It is the Washington State Division of Children and Family Services' (DCFS) policy to develop independent living plans with each youth no later than age 16 to ensure a smooth transition from foster care, and it is required that all youth have a transition plan by age 17 1/2. This protocol is agreed to and has been implemented in our Continuum of Care.

"Collaborative Transition Team" meetings take place between DCFS, the King County Mental Health Chemical Addiction and Dependency Services Division (MHCADSD), Developmental Disabilities, health care programs and community-based organizations that provide housing and supportive services to meet the specialized needs of these youth. The YMCA is the contracted agency in King County for both independent and transitional living skills, and works with young people from age 15 to 21 as appropriate. They work with youth to develop plans for when they "age out" of foster care, and housing is a primary focus of these efforts, along with education and employment. Those youth who refuse these services develop plans with their DFCS social workers. A variety of housing options are considered, with options in a given case depending on the individual's income, maturity and skill level. The program makes use of the Education Training Voucher Program and Chafee funds, as well as other non-McKinney-funded programs in the community to assist young people to successfully transition and exit foster care with housing in place.

The "Foster Care to Twenty-One" program allows youth to apply to continue in foster care to age 21 if they are attending college or an accredited vocational program. The program provides these additional years of housing to allow for skill building so that the young person will be able to live successfully on their own. Last year's pilot had 50 slots statewide, and the program will expand to 150 slots in 2008.

To prevent youth aging out of foster care from becoming homeless, housing resources are now in place through the $1 million statewide annual allocation under the Independent Youth Housing Program that provides housing stipends and case management services for young adults ages 18 - 23 who are exiting the state dependency system. Additionally, $1.1 million statewide is annually provided to young people who exit the foster care system at age 18, providing health care coverage including mental health and prescription coverage through age 21.

The Committee to End Homelessness Discharge Planning Task Force is working to strengthen partnerships and to expand protocols and programs to ensure that young people aren’t discharged from the foster care system into homelessness.

Health Care:
The Medical Respite Program is an agreed-to protocol and formal partnership between Harborview, our county's public/trauma hospital, Health Care for the Homeless, and two local shelters. The program provides short-term recuperative care for persons meeting HUD's definition of homeless who have an acute medical diagnosis, who need to be discharged from the hospital, and would otherwise be on the streets. Staff provides case management designed to link clients with housing, on-going primary medical care, substance abuse and mental health treatment, and other needed services. To ensure housing, the Respite program continues to design and implement new housing placement resources for people, including: 2 set-aside units of transitional housing per month with the Compass Center; 20 permanent supportive housing set-asides at a Plymouth on Stewart, and a dedicated post-Respite case manager (funded with county funds) & housing assistance (Program Based Section 8) for an additional 20 households. None of these dedicated housing resources are McKinney-Vento funded.

In addition, the King County Mental Health Chemical Addiction and Dependency Services Division (MHCADSD) is implementing new programs in 2007 for clients discharged from institutions or at risk of institutionalization by connecting them to housing and services. Two new Programs of Assertive Community Treatment (PACT) Teams will connect 180 adults, discharged from psychiatric hospitals or high utilizers of hospitals, to housing and intensive services. The programs have case management and non-McKinney funded rental subsidies in place for all individuals being discharged from institutions. The above protocols are understood and agreed to by the CoC and the publicly funded institutions in our geographic area.

In 2007 work is being done to further expand our Health Care discharge protocols. On June 21, 2007, the Health Care for the Homeless Network is co-convening an exploratory meeting with select hospitals (University of Washington, Harborview Medical Center, Swedish, Virginia Mason, Auburn, and others) and long-term care facilities to discuss strategies for improving discharge placements of homeless people, and how to fill gaps that are not fully addressed by the existing protocols and programs. The goal is to more clearly identify the scope of the problem and subsequently develop additional protocols and responses. Finally, a possible new tax-resource (county-wide) is being considered for re-entry including discharge from hospitals for those with medical and behavioral health issues. Housing needs are a key component of this re-entry discussion.

The Committee to End Homelessness Discharge Planning Task Force is working to strengthen partnerships and to expand protocols and programs to ensure that people aren’t discharged from the health care system into homelessness.

**Mental Health:**

There are policies in place to prevent most persons exiting from mental health institutions from being discharged into homelessness by providing housing resources and supports to them at exit. The King County Mental Health, Chemical Abuse and Dependency Services Division (MHCADSD) and Western State Hospital (WSH) have an MOU that establishes protocols for discharge planning for mentally ill persons who are transitioning to a community-based setting, and WSH has a protocol ensuring that all clients who are discharged have a housing placement.
These protocols are understood and have been agreed to by the Continuum of Care and the publicly funded institutions and systems of care in our geographic area. Locally MHCADSD and its partner agencies work together to ensure that, to the maximum extent possible, individuals are not discharged to homelessness, including to HUD McKinney-Vento funded homeless programs. The County has more than 480 beds in its residential program, and the mental health providers own or operate more than 1,600 units of housing (all non-McKinney funded).

MHCADSD has four liaisons at WSH. The liaisons' primary responsibility is discharge planning for King County clients. At time of admission to WSH each client is given an assessment by a Liaison within 30 days of admission. Discharge planning starts at that point. The discharge planning ramps up about two and a half months prior to discharge. It is a collaborative team process which includes the MHCADSD Liaison and WSH staff (ward staff, psychiatrist, and social worker).

At the local level MHCADSD has one Liaison to work with all people not already engaged in treatment who are being discharged from local psychiatric hospitals. When a client is ready for discharge and does not have an obvious plan in place or is not connected to one of MHCADSD providers, the client is referred to the hospital liaison who is charged with developing a plan and connecting him or her to an appropriate provider and housing resources.

In addition, through a formal arrangement between a local shelter and the Crisis Triage unit at Harborview, our public hospital and regional trauma center, there are non-McKinney funded Crisis Respite beds available for homeless and mentally ill adults. A multi-disciplinary team provides ongoing assessment, crisis stabilization engagement and short-term case management services. The staff works with these individuals to secure more stable housing and support services.

In addition, MHCADSD is implementing new programs in 2007 for clients discharged from institutions or at risk of institutionalization by connecting them to housing and services. Two new Programs of Assertive Community Treatment (PACT) Teams will connect 180 adults, discharged from psychiatric hospitals or high utilizers of hospitals, to housing and intensive services. The programs have non-McKinney funded rental subsidies available for all individuals served by the PACT Teams who are being discharged from institutions.
Corrections:

Our local criminal justice (CJ) system has developed a number of formal protocols and procedures to ensure that persons leaving CJ facilities do not just exit to the streets. These protocols and procedures are understood and agreed to by the CoC and publicly funded systems of care in our geographic area, and none of the housing benefits described below is HUD McKinney-Vento funded.

Through the CJ Initiative (CJI) there are three discharge planners in the King County jail (Seattle and Kent Divisions), and one at Community Corrections (a day reporting center) who target those with mental illness and/or chemical dependency. Housing is directly linked to persons leaving the CJ system in several ways:

1. For those with co-occurring mental health and chemical dependency disorders who are otherwise eligible, discharge planners link them to co-occurring disorders (COD) treatment in the community; for those who are homeless this program includes a housing component (up to twelve consecutive months).
2. Homeless and substance abusing individuals, who opt into drug or mental health courts, are provided treatment and six month's of rental assistance.
3. Jail Health Services (JHS) also has 3 case managers who carry out transition planning (including housing placement) for targeted populations (i.e., HIV/AIDS inmate-patients; opioid-dependent inmates; inmates with serious, chronic illnesses; and other inmates housed in the Jail's Infirmary). Some designated housing units are available for HIV/AIDS inmate-patients.
4. Through an MOA with the Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS), CJI includes three DSHS financial services specialists and a DSHS social worker to assist persons in applying for entitlements and publicly-funded benefits, including food stamps, publicly funded chemical dependency treatment (ADATSA), and Medicaid. There is an ADATSA case monitor who does assessments in the King County Jail and links persons to chemical dependency treatment upon release from custody.
5. JHS and/or the Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention have formal partnerships/referral agreements with more than 30 organizations providing a variety of services, including housing support.

The Seattle Municipal Court Justice Center outstation also includes a fulltime DSHS staff with the primary responsibility of coordinating mainstream support with other local housing and supports. With regards to the State Department of Corrections, the county has two formal programs for mentally ill offenders being released from State prison: the Dangerous Mentally Ill Offender Program, and the Mentally Ill Offender Community Transition Program. These include housing placement and treatment.

To enhance the above implemented protocols, a number of programs designed to ensure that offenders are not being discharged to homelessness are being initiated. In 2007, MHCADSD is implementing new programs for clients discharged from institutions or at risk of institutionalization that will connect them to housing and services. A Forensic Assertive Community Treatment (FACT) Team will connect 50 adults discharged from jails or high utilizers of jails to housing and intensive services. The program has non-McKinney funded permanent housing rental subsidies in place for all individuals served by the FACT Team who are being discharged from institutions. The City of Seattle Community Court Day Reporting

102 Please note that “corrections” category refers to local jails and state or federal prisons.
Center is implementing a program designed to provide permanent housing for 45 homeless individuals using City General Funds.

The 2007 Washington State budget added funds through the Mental Health Division for Mental Health Offender Reentry Services. These funds will provide services to an additional 25 offenders leaving the state prison system each year and explicitly includes funds for housing assistance. In 2007 state legislation specific to offenders who are leaving confinement (ESSB 6157) also passed. Among other things it mandates "a pilot program in a minimum of two counties to provide grants to eligible organizations to provide housing assistance to offenders reentering the community who are in need of housing." The pilot is to offer transitional supportive housing and provide housing assistance for a period of up to twelve months. It also allows an offender to obtain the release of funds from his or her personal inmate savings account prior to discharge for the purpose of securing appropriate housing.

The Committee to End Homelessness Discharge Planning Task Force is working to strengthen partnerships and to expand protocols to ensure that people aren’t discharged from the CJ system into homelessness.
7.4 HUD Required Certifications

7.4.1 Appendix K - CDBG Sub-recipient Contract Monitoring Plan

Federal regulations at 24 CFR 91.230 require that all Consolidated Plans review a jurisdiction’s plans to monitor and evaluate programs supported by the four federal fund sources. The City of Seattle Human Services Department is responsible for the overall administration of the Consolidated Plan and the monitoring and evaluation of CDBG program activities as well as the HOPWA and ESG programs. Office of Housing manages the HOME program. The organizational structure developed to implement the Consolidated Plan has two layers of accountability. The first layer encompasses the operating departments that implement programs with city staff. The second layer encompasses programs implemented by sub-recipients and other entities.

Organizational Framework

The housing and community development and human service delivery system in Seattle is composed of a number of complementary components. Key public partners include the City of Seattle’s Human Services Department, Office of Housing, Office for Economic Development, Department of Finance, the Seattle-King County Department of Public Health, and the Seattle Housing Authority. Nonprofit agencies are many and varied: Seattle Housing Development Consortium, Seattle Human Services Coalition, Seattle Minority Executive Director’s Coalition, other nonprofit housing developers, community development corporations, provider coalitions, human services and emergency shelter providers, and agencies working with special needs populations.

1. Within the Human Services Department, the CDBG Administration Office provides centralized monitoring and support to CDBG programs delivered through City offices and agencies. Each year HSD executes Memoranda of Agreement (MOA) with the city departments that administer CDBG funded programs. These agreements identify the responsibilities of the departments and CDBG Administration regarding the implementation, monitoring, and reporting of CDBG activities.
Regulatory Framework

The CDBG regulations (24CFR 570.501 (b)) state that:

“[the grantee] is responsible for ensuring that CDBG funds are used in accordance with all program requirements. The use of …sub-recipients…does not relieve the recipient of this responsibility. The recipient is also responsible for determining the adequacy of performance under sub-recipient agreements…and for taking appropriate action when performance problems arise…”

Monitoring Objectives

The City of Seattle has three objectives in its monitoring and evaluation program:

- Ensure that federally-funded activities comply with federal regulations governing administrative, financial, and programmatic operations;

- Monitor each funded activity to gauge whether or not performance objectives can be met within budget and on schedule; and,

- Ensure that city departments operate their programs in accordance with established program policies.

Tiered Monitoring and Evaluation Program

CDBG implementation occurs in two tiers. The first tier includes the three operating departments. These three departments implement certain activities with city staff. The second tier includes those activities carried out by sub-recipients, borrowers, and community-based development organizations, among others.

The Human Services Department - CDBG Administration Office provides oversight and technical assistance to city staff and participates as needed in agency and program assessments and monitoring visits. Memoranda of Agreement with the each of the operating departments specify that they will:

1. Assure compliance with federal regulations, policies, guidelines, and requirements with respect to the acceptance and use of CDBG funds as specified by HUD;
2. Prior to incurring costs, ensure that each project has had an environmental review and, where appropriate with respect to construction projects, that safeguards and contractual obligations are in place to ensure that Davis Bacon and Related Acts wage and work condition requirements are met;
3. Prepare a program plan or contract and budget for each funded activity and submit the plan or contract to HSD so eligibility can be determined;
4. Provide annual data to ensure that the appropriate national objective is or has been met; and,
5. Meet financial requirements by ensuring all costs are documented and supported.
**Tier I**

Tier I tasks are directed to ensure that the operating departments are meeting their obligations under the Memoranda of Agreement with respect to programs implemented directly by city staff. To do so, the CDBG Administration staff will perform three tasks:

1. Monitor activities implemented by City staff. Some examples are: Multi-Family Housing Fund, Community Facilities RFP, Community Economic Development Program.
2. Work with each operating department to help establish and/or evaluate the system of monitoring and assessment of sub-recipients and other entities including on-site assessment and desk monitoring procedures.
3. Provide up-front technical assistance on eligible activities and other regulatory matters.

**Tier II**

Tier II tasks are directed to sub-recipients and other entities. These tasks are mainly implemented by departmental staff, as opposed to CDBG Administration staff. However, as part of the annual memoranda of agreement between CDBG Administration and the operating departments, annual monitoring plans are submitted by the operating departments to CDBG Administration for review. Oversight activities by departments include:

1. Develop a risk analysis and criteria used to determine what agencies and projects are selected for on-site monitoring or a full assessment.
2. Review and maintenance of project files to ensure that there are: appropriate documentation of project oversight through monthly desk monitoring, documentation of on-going contact (telephone or on site) between the project specialist and the implementing agency identifying problems and solutions.
3. Review annual monitoring results and three-year in depth formal assessment performed by program staff.

Each year the CDBG Administration staff, with the assistance of program staff from all operating departments, prepares the *Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report*. During this time, we determine to what extent objectives and performance targets have been met.

The evaluation is made easier by an outcome-based approach. Using this methodology requires that programs have key results and outcomes that can be tracked and evaluated. Each annual CAPER is reviewed by the City Council and made available to the public for comment prior to its submittal to HUD.
7.4.2 Appendix L – HUD Required Grantee Certifications

Required certifications are on file at the Seattle Human Services Department, CDBG Administration Unit.