

Keeping San Franciscans Housed and Housing San Franciscans: A Funding Proposal

Presented by the
Homeless Emergency Service Providers Association, San Francisco
April 2014

Executive Summary

In the past year, skyrocketing rents and an epidemic of evictions have deepened San Francisco's housing crisis, leaving many low-income San Franciscans literally out in the cold. The Homeless Emergency Service Providers Association (HESPA) recognizes that this situation, while disastrous from a humanitarian point of view, can be mitigated with wise policy decisions and prioritization by our civic leaders. In this spirit, **we propose an infusion of \$13,875,990 from the city budget into our housing and homeless support systems.** This funding will accomplish the following:

- **Halt all preventable evictions** from housing by providing 2,700 at-risk households with the legal resources they need to remain in their homes.
- **Fund 400 household subsidies to families and single adults, including the elderly and disabled,** to move out of homelessness or stay in permanent rent controlled housing.
- **Fund operating subsidies in 114 turnover non-profit housing units** that would otherwise not be affordable to the most vulnerable San Franciscans.
- **Rehabilitate 173 vacant public housing units,** and by opening the waitlist, allow homeless households to occupy those units.
- Move towards bringing the Compass Connecting Point **family shelter waitlist down to zero.**

Context and Summary of Request

In 2012, HESPA developed proposals to ensure safe and dignified emergency services, as well as replace former federal Homeless Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing grants. The resulting funds, allocated by the Mayor and Board of Supervisors—\$3,000,000 for FY2012/13 and an additional \$2,950,000 for FY2013/14—have been indispensable as we strive to alleviate the housing crisis faced by low-income San Franciscans. **Thousands of households have either exited homelessness or maintained their housing thanks to this funding,** and emergency services were deeply enriched to provide increased safety and dignity.

However, the system continues to experience significant need as the housing crisis in San Francisco deepens, and San Franciscans face unprecedented levels of displacement and homelessness. **New initiatives and expanded programs are needed in order to keep pace with the scope of the crisis.** Our proposal for 2014, if funded, will provide the tools to **halt all preventable displacements** of low-income San Franciscans from rent-controlled housing, and to relieve the burden on our city's shelters by providing housing subsidies to some of our most vulnerable citizens. In addition, this funding will create additional jobs, many of which should create jobs for poor and homeless people.

The following proposal outlines HESPA's annualized request for a total of **\$13,875,990 for rapid re-housing subsidies and eviction-prevention services for FY2014/15 (all funding should be baselined)**. Our request consists of four parts, each of which will be described in turn:

1. Continuation of Add-Back Funding for Eviction Prevention (\$950,000)
2. Expansion of Housing Subsidies (\$6,190,367)
3. New initiatives to increase the number of units of public/non-profit owned permanently affordable housing for homeless households (\$3,051,200)
4. New Homelessness- and Eviction-Prevention Services (\$3,684,424)

The proposal is the result of a careful, data-driven process to analyze our current housing and homeless systems, identify service gaps, and tap into the experience and creativity of our providers to determine the most cost-effective solutions. Please see **Attachment 1 for a detailed budget for our proposal.**

Part 1: Continuation of Add-Back Funding for Eviction Prevention

Last year, Mayor Lee funded \$1,000,000 to continue the previous year's successful homeless prevention and rapid re-housing efforts, and the Board of Supervisors added \$950,000 to that pool. This fiscal year, 2013/14, this funding will end homelessness and stave off displacement for 922 households. In order to continue that success, this proposal calls for the continued funding of \$950,000, which covers eviction prevention services and some rent subsidies. **These funds need to go into the baseline and become a permanent part of the resources available to the eviction defense community.**

As a result of this funding, six non-profit agencies have contracted with the Human Services Agency to provide homelessness prevention and rapid re-housing services through nine programs, offering eviction prevention grants, loans and legal assistance, move-in assistance, and shallow rent subsidies for 3 – 24 months to families and individuals in San Francisco. In 2012/13, the initial investment of \$1,000,000 staved off displacement or created exits out of homelessness for 1,300 households. In addition to allowing programs to continue rental assistance to families and single adults

Gina's Story

When Gina Robinson filed requests for her supportive housing provider to accommodate her severely disabled husband, she never anticipated those requests would be met with the landlord's refusal to cooperate. When she fell behind in rent because of medical expenses and the landlord's recertification errors, she never imagined the setback would be met with an eviction lawsuit and result in homelessness.

During the time leading up to the lawsuit, Ms. Robinson tirelessly advocated for her family to transfer into a more accommodating unit for her veteran husband's disabilities. This move would eventually allow him to be more self-sufficient. Though the landlord begrudgingly granted her request, due to accounting errors in recertification—in combination with medical and moving costs—the Robinson family temporarily fell behind in rent, providing a "perfect" opportunity for the landlord to evict them based on non-payment of rent.

It was at this point that Ms. Robinson sought the help of the Eviction Defense Collaborative to respond to the lawsuit and was referred to the RADCo rental assistance program in the same office. The Rental Assistance Coordinator carefully itemized the amount of rent demanded in the lawsuit, and it became clear that there were discrepancies in what the landlord claimed they owed. Eventually, this forced accountability led the landlords to fumble in defense of their numbers and refuse continued cooperation.

traditionally served, this allocation allowed for the expansion of services to populations who had limited or no access to rental assistance previously, including homeless persons living with HIV/AIDS and low-income tenants with long-term rent-controlled housing who would have become homeless if not for the assistance.

Some of the innovative services that the supplemental funding has supported in FY 2013-14 include:

- The new trial project, which has helped 90 households maintain housing during the trial stage of an eviction proceeding in the past nine months alone. More than half of these households would not have stayed in housing without assistance, and better settlement agreements were reached for those who moved out.
- Emergency financial assistance, move-in assistance, short-term rental subsidies, and a new emergency hotel voucher program for LGBT San Franciscans and youth and adults living with HIV/AIDS.

During the past year, programs providing one-time rental assistance have experienced a dramatic increase in demand for eviction prevention assistance. In 2013, one program received more than 1,900 applications for assistance, though the program had capacity to help only 511 households.

Putting this funding into the budget baseline will support the continuation of these vital services to keep San Franciscans from becoming homeless and assist them with exiting homelessness. It will allow us to think long-term and to refine our programs for even greater efficacy. It will provide a stable foundation, helping us to build on our success with programs that have a broader scope and greater impact.

Part 2: Expansion of Rapid Re-housing Subsidies

The largest contributing factor to homelessness is the inability to afford stable housing. Nowhere is this factor more acute than in San Francisco, the most expensive rental housing market in the nation. **City-funded subsidy programs have proven effective; however, changes and more funding are needed** to allow the programs to bridge the increasing gap between income and rent.

Gina's Story Cont'd

Though the Robinsons qualified for multiple family funds, and the landlords knew that the financial assistance would be provided if they supplied the requested documentation, they took a hard stance against this family. As her husband prepared for brain surgery, Ms. Robinson spent the day in court negotiating for her family to keep their home. On the afternoon of their court-mandated settlement conference, the landlords' attorney refused to settle for anything other than a move-out deal. This was outrageous because they had all of the funds lined up to pay the back rent (supposedly the entire basis for their case).

Because of the strong relationship between EDC's legal and rental assistance programs, staff were able to show that the notice upon which Ms. Robinson's case was based demanded an incorrect amount of rent and was therefore defective. When the EDC attorney made the landlords aware that they would have a losing case in trial, the landlords were forced to step back from their original position and negotiate an agreement for the Robinson family to stay.

Though Ms. Robinson is an excellent, articulate advocate for herself and her family, this case clearly illustrates how difficult it is to defend oneself within the legal system. EDC's ability to provide affordable legal representation is an invaluable service in the system that boasts but fails to promote true justice. Skilled legal representation throughout the process, in combination with the ability to provide rental assistance, ultimately allowed the Robinson family to remain in their home.

Molly's story

A 27-year-old single mother of two young boys, Molly was determined to break the cycle of extreme poverty she grew up enduring with her crack-affected mother. Motivated to achieve her dream of becoming a teacher and provide a stable home for her children, she made a regular 2-hour commute to pursue her college education while sleeping on friends' floors, couches, or, when things were really bad, at her abusive ex-boyfriend's house.

A victim of domestic violence, Molly and her older son were homeless for over a year as she struggled to stick to her full-time college schedule. In her darkest hour, when she thought she had no hope left, she came to CCCYO in 2009. She became a client of CCCYO's SF HOME program and found an apartment through the rental subsidy program. The intensive case management service and support helped her create a plan to improve her situation and gave her a second chance to create a safe and loving home for her son. Once the stress of paying rent was off her shoulders, she was able to fully focus on her education, as well as give her son the attention he needed.

An engaged and committed mom now of two, Molly has shown how determination and perseverance can lead to self-sufficiency. She is an example of how these essential rental assistance funds can truly help transform the lives of struggling families. Without this assistance, Molly would still be homeless or in an unsafe and violent situation with her children. These funds allowed Molly to reach her true potential, and she is now a full-time teaching assistant at a charter school in Oakland while pursuing additional certifications to continue her teaching career.

Changes Needed to Current Program

San Francisco's local shallow subsidy programs, created in 2007 in response to advocacy by homeless families, have housed over 300 homeless families in private housing. In order to qualify for the subsidy, families must demonstrate a plan to increase their income so that they can cover the full rent themselves before the subsidy expires. The maximum subsidy is \$800 per month (considered "shallow" since the subsidy covers a relatively small portion of the rent), and families can retain the subsidy for up to five years.

In the last year, San Francisco's skyrocketing housing costs have deeply impacted these programs, which are struggling in several ways:

- The programs have had to increase the average monthly subsidy amount, thus reducing the number of households they can serve.
- The rapid increase in rents has made it nearly impossible to house families inside San Francisco with a small subsidy. Homeless families are increasingly forced to leave San Francisco for less expensive neighboring cities in order to use the subsidies, separating these families from their support systems and communities, forcing children to leave their schools and creating hardship through longer commutes and decreased economic opportunities. In the eight months of this fiscal year, only three families have been successfully housed inside San Francisco with the shallow subsidy, compared to FY 2012/13, when 25 families were housed in San Francisco market rate housing.
- Many families are simply unable to find a landlord who will accept the maximum monthly

subsidy in an increasingly competitive housing market. In one program, there were 150 applications for the subsidy; 74 families were approved for 50 subsidy slots, but only 30 of the families were able to find housing.

- The decision to narrow the target population of the programs has created additional barriers. Last year, the Human Services Agency restricted program eligibility from 50% of Area Median Income (AMI) to 35% of AMI, and has not allowed the subsidy to be used in shared housing. As a result of these combined factors, there are currently 57 subsidies sitting un-utilized today.

We believe that making the following changes to the current program are essential to ensure program success:

- Lift the subsidy limit from \$800 to \$1,000 (\$1,500 in special cases).
- Allow subsidies to be used in shared housing. The current program only allows it to be used with a primary leaseholder. Flexibility would allow for more creative housing solutions.
- Target families who are currently housed, but who are at risk of homelessness due to a short-term drop in household income. This change has the additional benefit of preserving affordable housing in the city by keeping families in their rent-controlled units.
- Allow subsidies to be used to “ladder” up out of supportive housing. Families who have progressed past the need for on-site case management could graduate to housing in the private market. This would free units in supportive housing for homeless households in need of more intensive support services.
- Increase upper income limits. Currently, households of four earning more than \$38,745 do not qualify for the subsidy. If the subsidy could be used for families up to 50% AMI, this would allow more flexibility for those families who are homeless, or who are at risk of losing rent-controlled apartments and being displaced (see **Attachment 2**).
- Pilot a subsidy programs to serve 50 single adults, with an emphasis on keeping at-risk individuals in housing. This pilot will mitigate the fact that the supportive housing pipeline is drying up in coming years, resulting in fewer opportunities for homeless single adults to exit homelessness.

Rapid Re-Housing Results

In a controlled research study by Cloudburst Consulting looking at all families that entered Philadelphia shelters from 10/09 – 5/12 (using Propensity Score Match), outcomes for a group of 1,169 households who were provided with rapid re-housing (RRH) subsidies were compared with 1,286 similar households who did not receive rapid RRH. The findings include:

1) The odds of returning to homelessness were 42% higher for households that did NOT receive RRH

2) 13.6% of the RRH households returned to homelessness whereas 39.4% of those who did not receive RRH returned to homelessness.

Rate of return to homelessness when households with children were provided with RRH and services has been on average 4-13% nationwide (NAEH study of seven communities & Cloudburst data from Utah, NJ, Connecticut and Washington DC).

Funding of \$3,370,476 would allow us to make these changes to expand the population that we are serving, providing housing to 200 additional households. In the process, we would also reduce the size of the Compass Connecting Point family shelter waitlist toward our goal of zero.

Creation of a New Subsidy

The economic changes the United States and San Francisco are facing today are unprecedented,

and income inequality is larger in the United States than it has ever been. According to San Francisco's chief economist, San Francisco has more economic inequality than the State of California, and California has more inequality than any other state in the union. This translates in San Francisco to extreme disparities between rents and income. **Rents are rising rapidly for everyone, but incomes for the bottom 50% of San Franciscans are stagnant.** For many low-income San Franciscans who do not have access to subsidized housing or who have lost their rent-controlled housing, this has become an impossible situation.

One Agency's Success

Hamilton Family Center (HFC) has seen an average rate of 88% (22 out of 25 families) housing retention 12 months after successful completion of its shallow subsidy program (7/1/12 – 9/30/13).

HFC's average total cost of rapid rehousing is approximately \$17,000/family (average subsidy of \$536/month and average length is 588 days + move-in assistance and case management); the annual cost per family is approximately \$11,500.

This translates to a daily cost of \$31.50 compared to \$126/day to house a family at HFC's shelter.

On the supply side, the limited creation of affordable and below-market-rate housing units in San Francisco over the last few years has greatly restricted the available inventory for potential placement for low-income residents. The vast majority of housing developments have opted to pay the "in-lieu-of" fee rather than to create units that are desperately needed in our dramatically changing housing landscape. This means that more families and individuals must seek housing in the private market. Tenant-based subsidy programs are crucial in order to level the playing field.

The current subsidy programs have been effective for a sliver of the population – those who require only temporary help until they can cover market rent on their own after a period of time. However, there are many others who will not be able to increase their income in a relatively short period of time in order to afford housing. For example, a typical service worker, earning \$12 per hour, will earn a little over \$2,000 per

month before taxes, not enough to cover the rent on the lowest 20% of the rental market in San Francisco. **Creation of a new pilot subsidy program recognizes this need and fills a gaping hole in our system.**

The proposed program would serve both homeless households and households at risk of homelessness, and both families and the elderly/disabled. The subsidy would be deep enough to enable households to rent in the bottom 20% of the rental market while contributing 30% of their income toward the rent. Similarly, it would be a need-based subsidy, allowing households to use it as long as necessary. The program would serve people who cannot demonstrate an ability to substantially increase their income, while keeping low-income people of color in San Francisco close to their communities. It would also have the flexibility to be used in either master lease buildings or in scattered sites.

We envision this program serving the most vulnerable citizens with the highest barriers to stability. One example population is the aging disabled: the LGBT Aging Policy Task Force and the federally mandated Ryan White CARE Council have both identified an emerging crisis need for rental subsidies to keep disabled seniors in their homes when their employer-sponsored long-term disability policies expire as they reach retirement age. 18.9% of aging people with HIV will

lose access to their long-term disability programs when they achieve retirement age and are no longer considered disabled. **1,700 older adults with disabling HIV/AIDS are in need of rental assistance to remain in their housing.** In addition, according to the Human Services Agency Planning Division, 4,600 LGBT seniors need access to permanent rental assistance to remain in their homes. This program would serve those most at risk, keeping them in housing and preventing homelessness. Another focus would be immigrants who benefit from San Francisco’s Sanctuary City ordinance and who are unable to move out of San Francisco due to safety concerns and threats of deportation.

The families and individuals that will be served by this program are the most likely to become chronically homeless without intervention. **The program will allow us to house these San Franciscans for about \$15,000 per household, while saving several times that amount on emergency services** that would have been spent to keep these families in shelters or on our streets. The time is right for this new subsidy program that makes both humanitarian and fiscal sense.

The following table outlines our proposed enhancements to rapid re-housing subsidies:

Pop Served	Expansion of Current Subsidy Program			New Subsidy Program			Total Cost
	Description	# of House-holds Served	Cost	Description	# of House-holds Served	Cost	
Families	Expand current “shallow” subsidy program as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use as “ladder” for people leaving supportive housing • serve up to 50% AMI • increase maximum subsidy to \$1,000 (\$1,500 in special cases) • Include shared housing • increase targeting of housed families at risk of homelessness 	150	\$2,671,763	New “deep” subsidy that serves both those at risk of homelessness and homeless people. Rent limits would set at bottom 20% of average rental market in SF. Subsidy would be need-based as opposed to time-limited.	50	\$805,754	\$3,477,517
Single Adults	Expand current “shallow” subsidy program to cover single adults as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use as “ladder” for people leaving supportive housing • time-limited up to five years • serve homeless and formerly homeless singles • Include shared housing 	50	\$698,713				\$698,713
Elderly/ Disabled				New “deep” subsidy that serves both those at risk of homelessness and homeless people. Rent limits would set at bottom 20% of average rental market in SF. Subsidy would be need-based as opposed to time-limited.	150	\$2,014,138	\$2,014,138
Total:		200	\$3,370,476		200	\$2,819,892	\$6,190,367

Part 3: Protect and Expand Public/Non-profit Owned Housing Options

This budget proposal attempts to both prevent homelessness by halting displacement at the front end, and maximize exits out of homelessness at the back end. Given the limited housing options in the private market, we looked to public housing and non-profit owned housing to increase the options to swiftly move people out of homelessness. The advantage of these forms of housing is twofold: it is less expensive to house homeless households in public and non-profit owned housing than in private market rate housing, and these housing options do not require an arduous search to locate a unit.

Our proposal would fund two separate initiatives to achieve these goals for nearly 300 additional households:

Initiative	# of households	Cost
Local Operation Subsidy Program (LOSP)	114	\$1,159,438
Repair Vacant SFHA public housing units	173	\$1,891,762
Total:	271	\$3,051,200

Local Operating Subsidy Program (LOSP)

Low-Income Operating Subsidies (LOSPs) have been used in non-profit housing for a number of years to allow extremely low-income people to move into buildings with affordable rents. They are typically attached to newly constructed units.

The most vulnerable San Franciscans are becoming displaced and homeless at alarming rates:

- San Francisco’s family shelter wait list is at its highest.
- More families are doubled up and living in residential hotels, (*SRO Families United, 2013*).
- SFUSD is reporting rapid growth of school-aged children registered as homeless (*SFUSD, 2012*).
- More elderly and disabled people are losing their homes (*San Francisco Tenants Union, 2/2014*).
- The housing pipeline from the Mayor’s Office of Housing is drying up, as funds move over to maintain public housing.
- Non-profits have lost Multifamily Housing Program (MHP) tax credits.
- Rents are skyrocketing and the need is greater than ever.

Last year, the Coalition on Homelessness put forth a proposal to fund an additional 100 LOSP subsidies in buildings that would open up in the second year of the budget process. In the end, 43 units were funded. There were barriers to using these subsidies, including loans that non-profits had previously negotiated. This year, the Coalition on Homelessness has been meeting with non-profit housing developers, convened by Council of Community Housing Organizations, to

develop a proposal that would enable extremely low-income and homeless San Franciscans to have access to permanent affordable housing.

Our solution is to create a new way of using the LOSP program: **upon vacancy, units in existing affordable housing developments would be designated as LOSP units**, and would receive the difference between what the resident could afford and the unit rent as LOSP funding from the City. Homeless families and individuals would have preference for these units. In addition, LOSP subsidies could be used in those units where households are at risk of displacement due to unaffordable rents.

The following chart reflects the number of units identified by non-profit housing providers (based on estimated turnover) where LOSP subsidies could be inserted.

Housing Provider	# of Units
Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center	35
Mercy Housing	25
Chinatown CDC	15
TNDC	16
Mission Housing	23
Total	114

Fill Vacant Public Housing Units

For months, and in some cases years, 173 public housing units have been sitting, boarded up (see **Attachment 3**). The total cost of rehabilitating these units is \$1,891,762, according to SFHA estimates. The Coalition on Homelessness Housing Justice Workgroup has been engaged in a campaign to fill these vacancies with people who need the housing the most—those with no decent place to call home.

The Coalition has joined with HESPA to urge SFHA to open up their waitlist, which was recently purged of households no longer interested and therefore much shorter than in the past. The waitlist for public housing has been closed since 2010, virtually barring access to young families and those who have been recently disabled. Moreover, the Section 8 waitlist was last open for only one month in 2001. Last year, we successfully changed the preference list for public housing to ensure homeless people were able to rise to the top of the waitlist.

It is a critical use of San Francisco’s General Fund dollars to open these units. Rehabilitating one unit in need of very minor repair would be equivalent to an annual cost of one housing subsidy; whereas the subsidy would need to be funded every year, the rehabilitation costs are one-time. The federal government has been reducing operating costs to the SFHA over the past decade, and they no longer have the funds to keep up with rapid unit turnover (*SFHA, 2014*). Even if the SFHA has plans to fully renovate the buildings where these units are located, this process would take years, and funding sources have not yet been identified. Meanwhile, those experiencing homelessness are left with too few options. Rehabilitating these units will give the city significant “bang for their buck,” as funding would swiftly and economically open these units and transform many lives.

Part 4: New Homelessness- and Eviction-Prevention Services

San Francisco's ongoing eviction epidemic is well documented, and its contribution to the city's homelessness crisis is significant: according to the 2013 San Francisco Homeless Count Survey, 35% of respondents report having been evicted from their housing immediately prior to becoming homeless. Existing legal and financial services for the prevention of evictions have been invaluable lifelines for many San Franciscans; however, these households represent only a fraction of the thousands who are forced out of their rental units each year. **Creative and well-funded solutions are needed to ensure that all of those in need have a fair shot at staying in their homes.**

Our plan is to put a stop to all preventable evictions among the most vulnerable San Franciscans at risk of homelessness. The following chart illustrates the scope of services we propose:

Program	Description	# of Additional Households Served	Cost
Back Rent for Formerly Homeless Families	Ensure formerly homeless families stay in their homes when faced with a temporary one-time shortage of rental funds.	60	\$211,131
Full-Scope Eviction Defense	Guarantee a "right to counsel" for income-eligible tenants, providing full legal representation in court and improving the chances that they can remain in their homes.	2,700	\$2,001,863
Tenant Outreach and Education	Offer a counseling program to proactively address eviction defense, engaging with vulnerable households early in the eviction process and helping them to understand their rights as tenants.	22,000	\$1,268,456
Mediation and Engagement in Supportive Housing Program (MESH)	Pilot program to revamp the way the eviction process is handled by supportive housing providers.	400	\$202,975
Total		25,160	\$3,684,424

Back Rent for Formerly Homeless Families

Back rent has been a critical intervention for households that need one-time assistance to maintain their housing. This assistance prevents them from experiencing the trauma of homelessness, saves the city expensive shelter stays, and ensures stability for the entire family. HESPA has identified 60 families who would benefit from this assistance who would not be served by current funding. The expectation is that these families would return to homelessness without assistance, as they have no access to accumulated wealth and have previously experienced homelessness.

Full-Scope Eviction Defense

The Ellis Act, a state law intended to allow landlords to take units off the rental market, has been increasingly used as a loophole by investors attempting to profit from San Francisco's hot housing market at the expense of tenants. More often, merely the threat of eviction, by means of a letter from a landlord's attorney or harassment from the landlord, is enough to intimidate tenants out of their homes. Legislation is being discussed at the city and state levels to slow the tide of Ellis Act evictions, but **legislative remedies will fall short unless tenants have access to legal services to ensure that their rights under the law are not violated.**

When a tenant is evicted from a rent-controlled unit, that unit becomes a market-rate unit, if it is returned to the rental market at all. These evictions therefore produce a "double whammy:" the tenant is displaced and their former unit is lost forever from the city's affordable housing portfolio. Immediate action is needed to halt the eviction epidemic and stave off further disaster to San Francisco's low-income communities.

We believe that all tenants should have a right to legal representation in court. However, due to funding constraints, our legal service providers only have the resources to provide full-scope eviction defense to a fraction of the most vulnerable households. Other tenants get limited-scope assistance, but without the credible threat of a jury trial, they are often forced into settlement agreements that either require them to move out, or include strict stipulations that put them one late rent payment away from eviction. We need a "surge" in the number of eviction-defense attorneys to level the playing field, to make eviction-happy landlords think twice about litigating for profit, and to keep thousands of San Franciscans in their homes. We believe that such a strategy requires the following:

- 14 eviction (unlawful detainer) defense attorneys who would provide full representation through trial. This would ensure every income-eligible tenant sued for eviction (about 500 additional annually) will be represented in a full-scope capacity, for their entire case.
- Six attorneys to provide eviction defense in no-fault, extra-legal, and other non-unlawful detainer displacements. Adding these positions to the current system would provide 1200 additional households with access to an attorney when facing displacement in forums outside the formal eviction lawsuit. Working closely with the established counseling agencies, these attorneys would take referrals from community groups in ask-out, harass-out, buy-out, and other illegal and quasi-legal forms of eviction.

We are especially confident in the efficacy of this strategy, thanks to this year's pilot program that has already represented 40 households through the trial stage, allowing them to remain in their homes. **It is time to enact a full "right to counsel" for all low-income tenants, fulfilling the promise made by the city.**

Tenant Outreach and Education

As noted above, the majority of evictions never reach the unlawful detainer stage. Cases are far more common where tenants leave their units due to landlords' scare tactics, or accept buy-outs that barely begin to compensate them for the difference in rent that they will have to pay elsewhere. Therefore, in order to complement the proposed enhanced legal services noted above, it is vital that we have an **outreach and education component to engage with tenants in**

underserved communities early in the process, before they have been harassed into moving out of their units because they do not understand their rights as tenants. There is also **great need for increased organization and collaboration between eviction defense providers** in order to leverage to the maximum all city investments in anti-displacement work.

Our outreach plan would require the following components:

- 9 housing counselors will conduct ‘Know Your Rights’ trainings to 1,400 low-income tenants, focusing on issues that lead to constructive evictions and other forces of displacement, such as harassment and habitability issues, as well as eviction prevention resources. These counselors will also conduct one-on-one tenant counseling at their agencies, helping to relieve the current backlog of clients and waiting times for appointments.
- 15 housing outreach workers (8 FTE), will have face-to-face contact with approximately 10,000 residents and distribute literature to more than 35,000 homes in low-income neighborhoods of San Francisco, through door-to-door outreach. Outreach workers will distribute know-your-rights educational materials, interview residents to see if they have tenant-landlord issues, and refer residents to appropriate services.
- 2 staff from a lead agency will serve as outreach coordinators to organize a comprehensive and non-duplicative outreach plan for all participating outreach workers and organizations, as well as coordinating workshop scheduling and materials development.

Mediation and Engagement in Supportive Housing Program (MESH)

Evictions from supportive housing, long controversial, have come under new scrutiny as San Francisco analyzes its policies around homelessness. As Bevan Dufty, Director of HOPE, noted in February’s Budget and Finance Committee hearing on San Francisco’s 10-Year Plan to Abolish Chronic Homelessness, “We’re paying for the supportive housing, we are paying for the attorney that is evicting somebody, we are paying for the attorney that is fighting the eviction, and ultimately we are paying for the services that an individual is going to need that winds up on the street.” **A smarter approach to eviction cases in supportive housing is clearly needed.**

As seen in the table below, a significant number of Eviction Defense Collaborative clients came from City-funded housing.

Eviction Defense Collaborative Households Assisted with Eviction

	Public	City funded	All others	Total
2009	54	307	1,237	1,598
2010	110	391	1,193	1,694
2011	465	408	1,396	2,269
2012	285	372	1,403	2,060
2013	128	389	1,396	1,913

Our answer to Mr. Dufty's call for common sense is a proposal to launch a two-year pilot program for Mediation and Engagement in Supportive Housing (MESH), with the overall goal of reducing the number of evictions from supportive housing. We would leverage existing relationships with low-income housing providers to establish new norms for eviction procedures, such as early and sustained engagement with problematic tenants, as well as mandatory mediation before involving the courts. Once we have proven the new model successful, we plan to roll it out to all publicly funded housing (including public housing, non-profit-run housing, and master-leased buildings).

We envision using volunteer mediators and tenant advocates, leveraging the city's funding for the greatest possible impact. The required resources would include a full-time volunteer coordinator and a program director, in addition to operating costs. Over two years, we project a cost of approximately \$200,000, which would be more than offset by the savings in costs to the city associated with legal representation and tenant turnover.

Call to Action

San Francisco's ongoing housing crisis, as Alan Berube of the Brookings Institution observed, has put its very identity as a city at risk. Can a city consider itself progressive if it does not make room for the poorest of its citizens? Low-income San Franciscans should not have to face the dilemma of either leaving the city or living on its streets. It is within our power to change this reality, and we need to act swiftly. Please support our proposal to keep San Franciscans housed and to house San Franciscans.

Attachment 1: Budget Estimate

HESPA Funding Proposal FY 14-15: Budget Estimate

	Continue 2013-2014 add backs for eviction prevention	Expand rapid re-housing program for 150 families	Expand rapid re-housing program for 50 single adults	New rental subsidy program for 50 families	New rental subsidy Program for 150 elderly or disabled adults	Expand LOSP program in 114 existing affordable housing units	Repair 173 vacant SFHA units	Expand back rent program for 60 families at-risk of eviction	Full scope eviction prevention for 2,700 households	Tenant outreach and education for 22,000 households	Pre-eviction mediation in City funded housing for 400 households	TOTAL
Personnel												
Program Directors	\$0	\$97,500	\$32,500	\$32,500	\$97,500	\$7,410	\$0	\$3,900	\$0	\$0	\$60,000	\$331,310
Case Managers	\$0	\$300,000	\$100,000	\$66,667	\$200,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$666,667
Eviction Defense Attorneys	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,297,500	\$0	\$0	\$1,297,500
Tenant Counselor/Outreach Workers	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$38,000	\$0	\$40,000	\$0	\$818,850	\$45,000	\$941,850
Total Personnel	\$0	\$397,500	\$132,500	\$99,167	\$297,500	\$45,410	\$0	\$43,900	\$1,297,500	\$818,850	\$105,000	\$3,237,327
Payroll Taxes and Benefits (30%)	\$0	\$119,250	\$39,750	\$29,750	\$89,250	\$13,623	\$0	\$13,170	\$389,250	\$245,655	\$31,500	\$971,198
Total Personnel and Benefits	\$0	\$516,750	\$172,250	\$128,917	\$386,750	\$59,033	\$0	\$57,070	\$1,686,750	\$1,064,505	\$136,500	\$4,208,525
Client Financial Assistance												
Client Support/Housing Barriers	\$0	\$75,000	\$12,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$87,500
Furniture Grants	\$0	\$150,000	\$25,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$175,000
Move-in Assistance Grants	\$0	\$240,000	\$60,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$300,000
Subsidies	\$0	\$1,440,000	\$360,000	\$600,000	\$1,440,000	\$1,026,000	\$0	\$111,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,977,000
Total Client Financial Assistance*	\$0	\$1,905,000	\$457,500	\$600,000	\$1,440,000	\$1,026,000	\$0	\$111,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,539,500
Operating Expenses												
Program Costs*	\$950,000	\$150,000	\$37,500	\$50,000	\$112,500	\$57,000	\$0	\$30,000	\$54,000	\$38,500	\$40,000	\$1,519,500
Construction Costs	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,891,762	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,891,762
Total Operating Expenses	\$950,000	\$150,000	\$37,500	\$50,000	\$112,500	\$57,000	\$1,891,762	\$30,000	\$54,000	\$38,500	\$40,000	\$3,411,262
Indirect Costs at 15%	\$0	\$100,013	\$31,463	\$26,838	\$74,888	\$17,405	\$0	\$13,061	\$261,113	\$165,451	\$26,475	\$716,704
Total Expenses	\$950,000	\$2,671,763	\$698,713	\$805,754	\$2,014,138	\$1,159,438	\$1,891,762	\$211,131	\$2,001,863	\$1,268,456	\$202,975	\$13,875,990
Cost/household:		\$17,812	\$13,974	\$16,115	\$13,428	\$10,171	\$10,935.04	\$3,519	\$741	\$58	\$507	

Add Back	\$950,000
Subsidies	\$6,190,367
Existing Housing	\$3,051,200
Prevention	\$3,684,424
Total	\$13,875,990

Notes
1. Subsidy line-item is based on an average, not maximum
2. Rapid re-housing budget based on 12 mo. of an avg. 18 mo. program
3. New subsidy and LOSP programs are considered long-term subsidies

Attachment 2: Sample Budget for Subsidy

AMI 2014	One person	Two persons	Three persons	Four persons	Five persons	Six persons	Seven persons	Eight persons
35%	27,125	31,010	34,895	38,745	41,860	44,975	48,055	51,170
50%	38,750	44,300	49,850	55,350	59,800	64,250	68,650	73,100

- For a household of four at 35% of AMI, the Income Cap is \$38,745.
- For a household of four at 50% AMI, the Income Cap is \$55,350.
- The annual difference between 50% and 35% for a household of four is \$16,605.

Attachment 3: List of SFHA units and costs

Vacant Units as of 2/18/14

#	AMP	Development	Unit Status	Unit #	Address	Bdrm	Move-out Date	Ready & Available	Estimated Cost to Make Ready
1	966	ALEMANY	VACANT	110516	516 ALEMANY	2	1/15/14		\$14,761
2	966	ALEMANY	VACANT	110530	530 ALEMANY	2	1/4/13		\$14,761
3	966	ALEMANY	VACANT	110554	554 ALEMANY	2	1/28/14		\$14,761
4	966	ALEMANY	VACANT	110845	845 ELLSWORTH	1	1/2/14		\$14,761
5	966	ALEMANY	VACANT	110867	867 ELLSWORTH	2	3/18/13		\$14,761
6	966	ALEMANY	VACANT	110909	909 ELLSWORTH	2	11/25/13		\$14,761
7	966	ALEMANY	VACANT	110910	910 ELLSWORTH	2	9/18/13		\$14,761
8	966	ALEMANY	VACANT	110948	948 ELLSWORTH	2	9/6/13		\$14,761
9	967	POTRERO TERRACE	VACANT	020008	1269 WISCONSIN	2	10/28/13		\$14,761
10	967	POTRERO TERRACE	VACANT	020015	1806 25TH ST	2	9/12/13		\$14,761
11	967	POTRERO TERRACE	VACANT	020022	1820 26th STREET	1	9/12/13		\$14,761
12	967	POTRERO TERRACE	VACANT	020028	1722 26 ST	1	9/3/13		\$14,761
13	967	POTRERO TERRACE	VACANT	020037	1740 26th STREET	2	5/16/13		\$14,761
14	967	POTRERO TERRACE	VACANT	020047	1148 CONNECTICUT	2	11/1/13		\$14,761
15	967	POTRERO TERRACE	VACANT	020067	1817 25TH ST	2	11/23/13		\$14,761
16	967	POTRERO TERRACE	VACANT	020079	1845 25TH ST	3	8/9/13		\$14,761
17	967	POTRERO TERRACE	VACANT	020092	1915 25TH ST	2	11/22/13		\$14,761
18	967	POTRERO TERRACE	VACANT	020094	1866 25TH ST	1	12/13/13		\$14,761
19	967	POTRERO TERRACE	VACANT	020107	1864 25TH ST	2	6/7/13		\$14,761
20	967	POTRERO TERRACE	VACANT	020137	1054 CONNECTICUT	2	11/15/13		\$14,761
21	967	POTRERO TERRACE	VACANT	020176	962 CONNECTICUT	2	10/23/13		\$14,761
22	967	POTRERO TERRACE	VACANT	020180	970 CONNECTICUT	2	1/31/14		\$14,761
23	967	POTRERO TERRACE	VACANT	020186	920 CONNECTICUT	2	1/30/14		\$14,761
24	967	POTRERO TERRACE	VACANT	020206	912 CONNECTICUT	2	7/22/13		\$14,761
25	967	POTRERO TERRACE	VACANT	020220	1025 WISCONSIN	2	8/8/13		\$14,761
26	967	POTRERO TERRACE	VACANT	020245	949 CONNECTICUT	2	5/23/13		\$14,761
27	967	POTRERO TERRACE	VACANT	020269	1003 CONNECTICUT	2	7/19/13		\$14,761
28	967	POTRERO TERRACE	VACANT	020300	1073 CONNECTICUT	2	11/7/13		\$14,761
29	967	POTRERO TERRACE	VACANT	020315	1620 25TH ST	2	4/9/13		\$14,761
30	967	POTRERO TERRACE	VACANT	020344	156 DAKOTA	2	8/21/13		\$14,761
31	967	POTRERO TERRACE	VACANT	020354	106 DAKOTA	2	6/14/13		\$14,761
32	967	POTRERO TERRACE	VACANT	020380	88 DAKOTA	2	11/14/13		\$14,761
33	967	POTRERO TERRACE	VACANT	020384	36 DAKOTA	2	12/9/13		\$14,761
34	967	POTRERO TERRACE	VACANT	020394	8 DAKOTA	2	8/6/13		\$14,761
35	967	POTRERO TERRACE	VACANT	020402	1 DAKOTA	2	9/17/13		\$14,761
36	967	POTRERO TERRACE	VACANT	020407	11 DAKOTA	2	12/3/13		\$14,761
37	967	POTRERO TERRACE	VACANT	020416	33 DAKOTA	2	7/15/13		\$14,761
38	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30004	1956 Sunnydale Ave	2	9/30/13		\$14,761
39	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30012	1930 Sunnydale Ave	2	10/7/13		\$14,761
40	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30020	1906 Sunnydale Ave	2	2/13/14		\$14,761
41	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30033	1880 Sunnydale Ave	2	8/2/13		\$14,761
42	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30040	1894 Sunnydale Ave	2	1/3/14		\$14,761
43	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30043	1852 Sunnydale Ave	3	9/4/13		\$14,761
44	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30063	1844 Sunnydale Ave	2	8/7/13		\$14,761
45	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30090	1750 Sunnydale Ave	2	12/9/13		\$14,761
46	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30165	1501 Sunnydale Ave	2	9/27/13		\$14,761
47	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30178	1529 Sunnydale Ave	2	9/26/13		\$14,761
48	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30218	1627 Sunnydale Ave	2	8/13/13		\$14,761
49	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30219	1629 Sunnydale Ave	3	11/4/13		\$14,761
50	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30288	1907 Sunnydale Ave	2	11/21/13		\$14,761
51	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30346	23 Santes St	2	12/4/13		\$14,761
52	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30407	6 Santes St	2	9/11/13		\$14,761
53	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30418	30 Brookdale Ave	2	7/25/13		\$14,761
54	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30443	102 Brookdale Ave	1	1/29/14		\$14,761
55	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30456	132 Brookdale Ave	1	11/15/13		\$14,761
56	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30485	157 Brookdale Ave	1	11/30/13		\$14,761
57	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30507	115 Brookdale Ave	2	11/19/13		\$14,761
58	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30524	49 Brookdale Ave	2	8/7/13		\$14,761
59	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30545	43 Brookdale Ave	3	9/26/12		\$14,761
60	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30579	40 Blythdale Ave	1	11/6/13		\$14,761
61	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30588	58 Blythdale Ave	2	8/30/13		\$14,761
62	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30620	140 Blythdale Ave	2	11/18/13		\$14,761
63	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30626	152 Blythdale Ave	3	10/16/13		\$14,761
64	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30629	162 Blythdale Ave	3	7/22/13		\$14,761
65	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30638	204 Blythdale Ave	3	10/10/13		\$14,761
66	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30649	230 Blythdale Ave	3	10/5/13		\$14,761
67	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30650	232 Blythdale Ave	2	12/4/13		\$14,761
68	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30667	268 Blythdale Ave	2	1/24/14		\$14,761
69	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30689	205 Blythdale Ave	2	10/30/13		\$14,761
70	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30705	151 Blythdale Ave	2	9/6/13		\$14,761
71	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30711	158 Blythdale Ave	3	4/24/13		\$14,761
72	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30741	73 Blythdale Ave	2	11/21/13		\$14,761

Homeless Emergency Services Program Association (HESPA) Budget Proposal 2014

Vacant Units as of 2/18/14

#	AMP	Development	Unit Status	Unit #	Address	Bdrm	Move-out Date	Ready & Available	Estimated Cost to Make Ready
73	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30743	77 Blythdale Ave	3	8/7/13		\$14,761
74	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30744	79 Blythdale Ave	2	11/21/13		\$14,761
75	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30760	23 Blythdale Ave	2	11/13/13		\$14,761
76	968	Sunnydale	Vacancy Master	30762	27 Blythdale Ave	2	11/22/13		\$14,761
77	969	WESTSIDE COURTS	VACANT	060181	2567 SUTTER #101	3	9/2/13		\$14,761
78	969	WESTSIDE COURTS	VACANT	060129	2553 SUTTER #129	1	1/31/14		\$14,761
79	969	WESTSIDE COURTS	VACANT	060211	2593 SUTTER #211	1	7/23/13		\$14,761
80	969	WESTSIDE COURTS	VACANT	060220	2492 POST #220	1	7/3/13		\$14,761
81	969	WESTSIDE COURTS	VACANT	060236	1565 BRODERICK #236	2	10/9/13		\$14,761
82	970	Westbrook Apts	Vacancy Master	70001	847 Innes Ave	4	12/24/12		\$14,761
83	970	Westbrook Apts	Vacancy Master	70019	6 Northridge Rd.	3	6/5/13		\$14,761
84	970	Westbrook Apts	Vacancy Master	70042	41 Northridge Rd.	3	8/28/12		\$14,761
85	970	Westbrook Apts	Vacancy Master	70044	32 Northridge Rd.	2	9/6/12		\$14,761
86	970	Westbrook Apts	Vacancy Master	70062	76 Northridge Rd.	3	8/1/13		\$14,761
87	970	Westbrook Apts	Vacancy Master	70213	168 Kiska Rd	3	7/16/13		\$14,761
88	971	POTTERO ANNEX	VACANT	000169	91 WATCHMAN WAY	3	9/1/13		\$14,761
90	972	Ping Yuen	Vacancy Master	100412	711 Pacific Ave. Apt.412	2	9/18/13		\$12,000
91	972	Ping Yuen	Vacancy Master	100417	711 Pacific Ave. Apt.417	2	9/17/13		\$12,000
92	972	Ping Yuen	Vacancy Master	100430	795 Pacific Ave. Apt.430	2	12/2/13		\$12,000
93	972	Ping Yuen	Vacancy Master	100621	795 Pacific Ave. Apt.621	3	1/24/14		\$12,000
95	972	Ping Yuen	Vacancy Master	100636	795 Pacific Ave. Apt.636	2	2/6/14		\$12,000
97	972	217 Bay	Vacancy Master	240305	227 Bay St. Apt. 305	0	1/21/14		\$8,000
98	973	Hunters Point A West	Vacancy Master	120092	750 Kirkwood #F	2	8/20/13		\$14,761
99	973	Hunters Point A West	Vacancy Master	120109	780 Kirkwood #I	2	11/7/13		\$14,761
101	973	Hunters Point A West	Vacancy Master	120214	1093 Daidale Ave	3	2/11/14		\$14,761
102	973	Hunters Point A West	Vacancy Master	120278	1060 Palos Ave	2	8/13/13		\$14,761
103	973	Hunters Point A West	Vacancy Master	120310	1150 Palos Ave #H	3	1/17/14		\$14,761
104	973	Hunters Point A West	Vacancy Master	120312	1150 Palos Ave #J	2	12/24/13		\$14,761
106	975	Alice Griffith	Vacancy Master	120264	8 NICHOLS WAY	2	11/29/12		\$14,761
107	975	Alice Griffith	Vacancy Master	160097	2400 Griffith St	4	12/4/13		\$14,761
109	975	Alice Griffith	Vacancy Master	160098	2400 Griffith St	3	2/6/14		\$14,761
109	975	Alice Griffith	Vacancy Master	160103	2474 Griffith St	2	4/24/13		\$14,761
140	975	Alice Griffith	Vacancy Master	160126	2538 Griffith St	2	6/1/13		\$14,761
141	975	Alice Griffith	Vacancy Master	160158	182 Cameron Way	4	8/23/13		\$14,761
142	975	Alice Griffith	Vacancy Master	160160	186 Cameron Way	4	2/6/13		\$14,761
143	975	Alice Griffith	Vacancy Master	160163	119 Cameron Way	2	2/6/13		\$14,761
144	975	Alice Griffith	Vacancy Master	160165	116 Cameron Way	2	2/6/13		\$14,761
145	975	Alice Griffith	Vacancy Master	160176	162 Cameron Way	1	11/6/12		\$14,761
146	975	Alice Griffith	Vacancy Master	160184	21 Cameron Way	2	7/23/13		\$14,761
147	975	Alice Griffith	Vacancy Master	160206	61 Cameron Way	2	10/18/13		\$14,761
148	975	Alice Griffith	Vacancy Master	160236	23 Nichols Way	3	12/2/13		\$14,761
149	975	Alice Griffith	Vacancy Master	160245	49 Nichols Way	2	3/20/13		\$14,761
150	975	Alice Griffith	Vacancy Master	160266	85 Nichols Way	4	11/28/13		\$14,761
151	975	Alice Griffith	Vacancy Master	160090	65 Nichols Way	4	8/13/13		\$14,761
152	975	Alice Griffith	Vacancy Master	160198	1025 Fitzgerald Ave	4	7/1/13		\$14,761
153	975	Alice Griffith	Vacancy Master	160304	1051 Fitzgerald Ave	2	8/13/13		\$14,761
154	975	Alice Griffith	Vacancy Master	160312	1094 Fitzgerald Ave	1	12/4/12		\$14,761
155	975	Alice Griffith	Vacancy Master	160332	11 Double Rock St	2	5/1/13		\$14,761
156	975	Alice Griffith	Vacancy Master	160349	104 Double Rock St	2	11/20/13		\$14,761
157	975	Alice Griffith	Vacancy Master	160352	110 Double Rock St	2	10/29/13		\$14,761
158	975	Alice Griffith	Vacancy Master	160353	432 Double Rock St	2	9/16/12		\$14,761
129	976	Ping Yuen North	Vacancy Master	180974	854 Pacific Ave. Apt.L	0	10/31/12		\$8,000
130	976	Ping Yuen North	Vacancy Master	180978	854 Pacific Ave. Apt.G	0	11/22/13		\$8,000
131	976	990 Pacific	Vacancy Master	230319	990 Pacific Ave. Apt. 319	0	4/29/13		\$8,000
132	976	990 Pacific	Vacancy Master	230407	990 Pacific Ave. Apt. 407	0	11/30/13		\$8,000
133	976	990 Pacific	Vacancy Master	230605	990 Pacific Ave. Apt. 605	0	12/31/13		\$8,000
134	977	1760 Bush	Vacancy Master	330294	1760 Bush St. Apt. 204	0	2/5/14		\$8,000
135	977	1760 Bush	Vacancy Master	330308	1760 Bush St. Apt. 308	0	1/31/14		\$8,000
136	977	1760 Bush	Vacancy Master	330312	1760 Bush St. Apt. 312	0	2/14/14		\$8,000
137	977	1760 Bush	Vacancy Master	330515	1760 Bush St. Apt. 515	0	2/14/14		\$8,000
137	977	1760 Bush	Vacancy Master	330603	1760 Bush St. Apt. 603	0	10/1/13		\$8,000
138	977	1760 Bush	Vacancy Master	340307	1880 Pine St. Apt. 307	0	12/31/13		\$8,000
140	977	1880 Pine	Vacancy Master	341108	1880 Pine St. Apt. 1108	1	12/31/13		\$8,000
141	977	1880 Pine	Vacancy Master	170303	1251 TURK ST #303	1	2/3/14		\$8,000
143	978	ROSA PARKS	VACANT	170714	1251 TURK ST #714	2	10/17/13		\$8,000
145	979	Woodside Gardens	Vacancy Master	220214	255 Woodside Avenue Apt. 214	0	2/9/13		\$8,000
146	979	Woodside Gardens	Vacancy Master	220505	255 Woodside Avenue Apt. 505	0	1/21/14		\$8,000
147	979	Woodside Gardens	Vacancy Master	220704	255 Woodside Avenue Apt. 704	0	1/21/14		\$8,000
149	980	MISSION DOLORES/NOE	VACANT	210709	1855 15th St #709	0	7/8/13		\$8,000
151	980	MISSION DOLORES/NOE	VACANT	210904	1855 15TH ST #904	0	7/18/13		\$8,000
152	980	MISSION DOLORES/NOE	VACANT	211007	1855 15th St #1007	0	1/16/14		\$8,000
153	983	546/350 JAMES	VACANT	220204	350 CLING #1F	1	7/31/13		\$8,000

Homeless Emergency Services Program Association (HESPA) Budget Proposal 2014

Vacant Units as of 2/18/14

#	AMP	Development	Unit Status	Unit #	Address	Room	Move-out Date	Ready & Available	Estimated Cost to Make Ready
154	981	666/350 ELLIS	VACANT	250601	350 ELLIS #6A	1	10/14/13		\$8,000
155	981	666/350 ELLIS	VACANT	250603	350 ELLIS #8C	0	8/7/13		\$8,000
156	981	666/350 ELLIS	VACANT	250805	350 ELLIS #8E	0	9/25/13		\$8,000
157	981	666/350 ELLIS	VACANT	251008	350 ELLIS #10H	0	8/31/12		\$8,000
158	981	666/350 ELLIS	VACANT	251105	350 ELLIS #11E	0	7/1/13		\$8,000
159	981	666/350 ELLIS	VACANT	320505	666 ELLIS # 505	0	1/2/14		\$8,000
160	981	666/350 ELLIS	VACANT	320604	666 ELLIS #604	0	8/31/13		\$8,000
161	982	3850 18th ST	VACANT	270209	3850 18TH ST #209	0	12/9/13		\$8,000
162	982	3850 18th ST	VACANT	270211	255 DORLAND #211	0	1/2/14		\$8,000
165	983	Clementina Towers	Vacancy Master	310211	330 Clementina St. Apt. 211	0	6/30/13		\$8,000
166	983	Clementina Towers	Vacancy Master	310218	320 Clementina St. Apt. 218	0	10/31/13		\$8,000
167	983	Clementina Towers	Vacancy Master	310318	320 Clementina St. Apt. 318	0	1/31/14		\$8,000
168	983	Clementina Towers	Vacancy Master	310620	320 Clementina St. Apt. 620	0	2/7/14		\$8,000
169	983	Clementina Towers	Vacancy Master	310906	320 Clementina St. Apt. 906	0	10/30/13		\$8,000
170	984	JK Tower	Vacancy Master	200207	2451 Sacramento Apt. 207	0	9/23/13		\$8,000
171	984	JK Tower	Vacancy Master	200809	2451 Sacramento Apt. 809	0	12/2/13		\$8,000
172	984	JK Tower	Vacancy Master	200905	2451 Sacramento Apt. 905	0	12/2/13		\$8,000
174	985	NOR/RAND/GT HWY/MCAL	VACANT	430303	1750 MCALLISTER #303	0	2/4/13		\$8,000
175	985	NOR/RAND/GT HWY/MCAL	VACANT	430409	1750 MCALLISTER #409	0	7/22/13		\$8,000
176	986	ARGUELLO/SANCHEZ/31ST	VACANT	280409	462 DUBOCE #409	0	6/14/13		\$8,000
179	986	ARGUELLO/SANCHEZ/31ST	VACANT	400202	25 SANCHEZ #202	0	7/1/13		\$8,000
180	986	ARGUELLO/SANCHEZ/31ST	VACANT	400216	25 SANCHEZ #216	0	5/3/13		\$8,000
181	986	ARGUELLO/SANCHEZ/31ST	VACANT	400406	25 SANCHEZ #406	0	12/13/13		\$8,000
182	986	ARGUELLO/SANCHEZ/31ST	VACANT	410507	345 ARGUELLO #507	0	3/1/13		\$8,000
183	986	ARGUELLO/SANCHEZ/31ST	VACANT	420205	491 31st #205	0	9/4/13		\$8,000
184	986	ARGUELLO/SANCHEZ/31ST	VACANT	420305	491 31st #305	0	8/1/13		\$8,000
185	986	ARGUELLO/SANCHEZ/31ST	VACANT	420307	491 31st #307	0	9/26/13		\$8,000
186	986	ARGUELLO/SANCHEZ/31ST	VACANT	420504	491 31st #504	0	8/1/13		\$8,000
193	988	ROBERT PITTS	VACANT	510100	1100 Scott #100	3	11/21/13		\$14,761
194	988	ROBERT PITTS	VACANT	510454	1831 eddy #454	2	2/10/14		\$14,761
195	988	ROBERT PITTS	VACANT	510464	1817 Eddy #464	2	1/8/14		\$14,761