

COUNTY OF MARIN CONSOLIDATED PLAN FOR FISCAL YEARS 2015-2019

DRAFT



INCLUDING PROJECT BUDGETS FOR:

- ◆ **Community Development Block Grant Program**
(Federal Fiscal Year 2015)
(Local Program Year July 1, 2015-June 30, 2016)
- ◆ **HOME Investment Partnerships Program**
(Federal Fiscal Year 2015)
(Local Program Year July 1, 2015-June 30, 2016)

Prepared by the Marin County Community Development Agency,
Federal Grants Division

Approved by the Marin County Board of Supervisors on
May 5, 2015

DRAFT

**PROJECTS FUNDED
AND
DOLLAR AMOUNTS
TO BE
DETERMINED AT THE**

**March 30, 2015
Priority Setting Committee
Hearing
And
May 5, 2015
Marin County Board of
Supervisors
Hearing**

Executive Summary

ES-05 Executive Summary - 24 CFR 91.200(c), 91.220(b)

1. Introduction

In its use of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME) funds, Marin County has four major emphases:

- Expanding the supply of affordable housing (with outcomes to be measured by the number of units produced),
- Accessibility improvements for people with disabilities for public facilities in the City of San Rafael (with outcomes to be measured by the number of public facilities improved),
- Preserving the existing supply of affordable housing (with outcomes to be measured by the number of units rehabilitated), and
- A variety of public services which will assist seniors, persons with disabilities, youth, single-parent families, and the working poor (with outcomes to be measured by the number of persons assisted).

Marin County's priority for the use of HOME funds is the rehabilitation and construction of housing serving a broad spectrum of people.

2. Summary of the objectives and outcomes identified in the Plan Needs Assessment Overview

Housing needs have escalated in Marin over the past decade, and particularly in the last few years. There is a greater need for rental housing since the recession of 2008. Housing prices are also on the rise and an overflow influx of technical workers from the Silicon Valley/San Francisco areas has only increased the housing values. The rental market remains tight with news reports in the Marin Independent Journal showing a 12% overall increase in rental prices during the past 12 months. 2010 census statistics show that there is a 98.7% occupancy rate in home owner housing and a 94.8% occupancy rate in rental units in the unincorporated areas of the County. The average rental cost has risen from \$1,483 in 2004 to \$2,380 in 2014. Those in need of housing include seniors, people with mental and physical disabilities, single parent households, singles with no children, large households, agricultural workers, the homeless and the local workforce, which is increasingly service based.

3. Evaluation of past performance

Marin County is an extremely high-cost housing market, and there continues to be a serious shortage of affordable housing in Marin County for low-income workers, people with disabilities, and seniors. Each year, we make a little bit of progress in building affordable housing, and we plan to continue that progress by continuing to build more affordable rental housing. Because Marin County is an extremely

expensive housing market, with a very high cost of land, and most vacant developable parcels have significant site engineering issues, we expect that the per-unit costs of rental housing development will continue to be very high. There is increasing support for “green” affordable housing development from long-time environmental activists, who recognize the spillover effects of the air pollution caused by long commutes to Marin. We are fortunate to have active non-profit housing development organizations with a strong sense of social conscience and the entrepreneurial skills to be capable of building housing under difficult economic conditions. However, in an area where planning and building permits can take years to be approved, timing requirements for the use of HOME funds have become particularly problematic, which may result in an increase in the proportion of HOME funds used for housing rehabilitation rather than construction.

4. Summary of citizen participation process and consultation process

Two informal workshops and eight local public hearings were held to elicit public response and program ideas in 2013. Public hearings were held on March 24, 2014, September 11, 2014 and March 30, 2015 by the Countywide Priority Setting Committee, the countywide citizen participation body for the CDBG Program and the HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME). In addition an open informational workshop was held on February 27, 2015 participants included members of the public as well as priority setting committee members.

5. Summary of public comments

At the most recent workshop held on February 27, 2015 attendees expressed concerns about the implementation of the plan and current strategies for affordable disabled housing, calling for a study of collective impact and expressing concern over County expenditures for open space instead of affordable housing. Attendees also wanted more information about when they could become involved in the grant award process. Attendees also questioned the wisdom of spending a lot of staff time on the production of the consolidated plan when the level of funding available is so low relative to the impact it could have in a county where the cost of living is so high and the available buildable property is so limited and so expensive.

6. Summary of comments or views not accepted and the reasons for not accepting them

All comments were accepted. However County expenditures for open space and the willingness of voters to approve special taxes for open space are issues beyond the scope of the Consolidated Plan.

7. Summary

Marin County continues to involve the community in the related planning and funding processes for the County. The limited amount of funding available, the extensive restrictions on those funds and the ever changing types and numbers of applicants make it a difficult if not impossible process to meet the needs of the community.

The Process

PR-05 Lead & Responsible Agencies 24 CFR 91.200(b)

1. Describe agency/entity responsible for preparing the Consolidated Plan and those responsible for administration of each grant program and funding source

The following are the agencies/entities responsible for preparing the Consolidated Plan and those responsible for administration of each grant program and funding source.

Agency Role	Name	Department/Agency
Lead Agency	MARIN COUNTY	
CDBG Administrator	MARIN COUNTY	Community Development Agency, Federal Grants
HOME Administrator	MARIN COUNTY	Community Development Agency, Federal Grants
ESG Administrator		

Table 1 – Responsible Agencies

Narrative

Consolidated Plan Public Contact Information

Roy Bateman, Community Development Manager, 415-473-6698

PR-10 Consultation - 91.100, 91.200(b), 91.215(I)

1. Introduction

The Marin County Citizen Participation Plan and Fiscal Year (FY) 2015-19 Consolidated Plan were developed by the Marin County Community Development Agency and are the product of broad-based consultation with adjacent units of government (including the Counties of Contra Costa, San Francisco, Sonoma, and Solano, and the Cities of Petaluma, Richmond, and Vallejo and city and town governments within Marin County); affordable housing advocates; nonprofit housing developers; public and nonprofit social service providers; and staffs of governmental departments throughout Marin County, including but not limited to: various divisions of the Marin County Department of Health and Human Services, and the Marin County Community Development Agency Environmental Health Services Division, in accordance with Section 91.100(a)(1).

In preparing the portion of this plan concerning lead-based paint hazards, Marin County Community Development Agency Federal Grants Division staff consulted with the State of California Department of Health Services regarding potential sources of environmental lead. Staff also interviewed staff of the Marin County Community Development Agency Environmental Health Services Division and the Marin County Department of Health and Human Services in order to learn more about blood lead level testing programs, the number of cases where high blood levels of lead were detected, and the County's procedure for addressing incidents of high blood lead levels in accordance with section 91.100(a)(2).

The draft Marin County Consolidated Plan was offered to the State of California Department of Housing and Community Development, Division of Housing Policy Development, for review and comment in accordance with section 91.100(a)(3) of the Consolidated Plan regulations. No comments were received from the State.

This Consolidated Plan constitutes the Housing Assistance Plan for Marin County.

Provide a concise summary of the jurisdiction's activities to enhance coordination between public and assisted housing providers and private and governmental health, mental health and service agencies (91.215(I)).

A wide range of private non-profit organizations use CDBG, HOME, and other funding sources to provide affordable housing and human services to people in need. Private for-profit firms provide goods and services and perform rehabilitation and construction to implement housing and community development projects. The strength of this system can be credited to the many nonprofit agencies that specialize in each aspect of housing and community development activities, the many volunteers associated with local nonprofit organizations, and the excellent quality staff in the nonprofit sector.

The county has many planning and discussion forums where public and nonprofit agencies have the opportunity to coordinate supportive service programs, including but not limited to: the Marin

Partnership to End Homelessness, the Marin HIV/AIDS Care Council, the Marin Continuum of Housing and Services, the Marin County Alcohol Advisory Board, the Marin County Advisory Board on Drug Programs, the housing planning committee organized by the Marin Community Mental Health Program, and the Marin Council of Agencies. In addition, concerned agencies create ad hoc committees to address coordination issues as they emerge.

The Marin Continuum of Housing and Services has had much success in facilitating collaborative decision making among nonprofit agencies. As a result, there are fewer gaps in the delivery system than existed five years ago. There have been some gaps in interagency coordination on the County level and in coordinating nonprofit and public agencies to generate collaborative funding proposals that could increase the resources available for housing and services for very low income people.

The Marin Housing Authority implements the Rehabilitation Loan Program, which receives substantial Community Development Block Grant funding from the County. The Housing Authority's proposed development sites and Annual Plan are reviewed and approved by the Housing Authority's Board of Commissioners, but, because there is substantial overlap between the Housing Authority's Board of Commissioners and the Marin County Board of Supervisors, decisions are well-coordinated between the two bodies. While HUD's Consolidated Plan regulations require discussion of any proposed demolition or disposition of public housing in this portion of the Consolidated Plan, no plans for such demolition or disposition exist. Marin Housing is researching ways to maintain the aging complexes and continue to provide safe, affordable housing for low-income county residents. The Housing Authority has analyzed the feasibility of resident homeownership in public housing, but has decided not to pursue that option. The County is encouraging nonprofits to better coordinate their services by facilitating collaborative efforts. In February, 1995, the Marin County Board of Supervisors adopted a policy to reduce the number of projects funded by the Community Development Block Grant Program in half, so that funds could more effectively be focused on a more limited number of housing and public service activities. The County has instituted a mid-management training program that helps to improve communications between mid-level staff in different departments. The Housing Authority has assigned a substantial amount of staff time to coordinate collaborative efforts among public and private agencies on housing and human service issues. As a result, the Housing Authority has been at the forefront of efforts to overcome gaps in housing and community development services.

Describe coordination with the Continuum of Care and efforts to address the needs of homeless persons (particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans, and unaccompanied youth) and persons at risk of homelessness

Homelessness prevention is a priority for Marin housing and service providers since it is more cost-effective to prevent homelessness than to provide services to homeless persons. During the 1990s, the county underwent a major planning effort to address the problem of homelessness and the growing number of families at risk of homelessness.

The Marin County Housing Authority created its Supportive Housing Division in 1990 as a response to the increasing numbers of homeless and at-risk households in Marin County. The agency recognized that this population required specialized programs tailored to address their special needs, specifically the needs of seniors, people with disabilities (particularly mental illness and/or substance abuse problems), people living with AIDS, and families with extremely low incomes. The programs that comprise this department are all built upon a philosophy and strategy of homelessness prevention. By providing a variety of services linked to affordable housing, the Housing Authority helps extremely low income and very low income households access and maintain a stable housing situation. The Housing Authority's Supportive Housing Programs accomplish this goal through a combination of information and referral to housing and related resources, assistance with back rent, shallow rent subsidies, Section 8-type rent subsidies, coordination of on-site services, and case management.

The Housing Authority has the following five programs in its Supportive Services Division:

- The Shelter Plus Care (S + C) Program – long-term rental assistance and supportive services for homeless individuals who have a serious mental illness (and who may also have a substance abuse problem and/or HIV/AIDS). Services are provided by Marin Housing case managers and an array of community-based partner agencies.
- The Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS (HOPWA) Long-Term Rental Assistance Program – long-term rental assistance and coordination of services for individuals and families who are living with HIV or AIDS.
- Family-Self Sufficiency (FSS) Program – case management services for families in the Section 8 program and residents of the Marin City public housing complex who are working to achieve educational and employment goals and becoming independent of public assistance.
- Service Coordinators providing on site case management services at the Senior/Disabled sites to assist in maintaining independent living and coordination of mainstream services.
- Phoenix Project providing on site case management services at MHA's 300 unit family public housing complex to assist male youth between 13-24 years of age address education and career goals.

In the HOPWA program, rental assistance is provided to individuals and families where the head of household or another family member is HIV-positive or has AIDS. Due to the loss of income and medical expenses that come with a terminal illness, these clients are at risk of homelessness. HOPWA program participants lease privately-owned apartments and receive a rental subsidy based on their income level and family composition. The Housing Authority has designed this program to be flexible and highly client-friendly, with particular attention given to protecting the confidentiality of the participants.

Describe consultation with the Continuum(s) of Care that serves the jurisdiction's area in determining how to allocate ESG funds, develop performance standards and evaluate outcomes, and develop funding, policies and procedures for the administration of HMIS

Marin County does not receive ESG funds.

2. Describe Agencies, groups, organizations and others who participated in the process and describe the jurisdictions consultations with housing, social service agencies and other entities

Table 2 – Agencies, groups, organizations who participated

1	Agency/Group/Organization	COUNTY OF MARIN
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services - Housing Services-Children Services-Elderly Persons Services-Persons with Disabilities Services-Persons with HIV/AIDS Services-Victims of Domestic Violence Services-homeless Services-Health Services-Employment Services - Victims Health Agency Child Welfare Agency Other government - County
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Lead-based Paint Strategy Public Housing Needs Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs HOPWA Strategy Economic Development Anti-poverty Strategy
How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	staff consultation	

2	Agency/Group/Organization	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE COUNTY OF MARIN
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing PHA Services-Persons with Disabilities Services-Persons with HIV/AIDS Services-Victims of Domestic Violence Planning organization
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Lead-based Paint Strategy Public Housing Needs Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs HOPWA Strategy Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	staff consultation
3	Agency/Group/Organization	CITY OF SAN RAFAEL
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Other government - Local

	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Lead-based Paint Strategy Public Housing Needs Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs HOPWA Strategy Economic Development Market Analysis Anti-poverty Strategy comments on Consolidated Plan
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	email request for comments on the Consolidated Plan
4	Agency/Group/Organization	CITY OF NOVATO
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Other government - Local

	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Lead-based Paint Strategy Public Housing Needs Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs HOPWA Strategy Economic Development Market Analysis Anti-poverty Strategy Comments on Consolidated Plan
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	email request for comments on the Consolidated Plan
5	Agency/Group/Organization	CITY OF RICHMOND
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Other government - Local

	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Lead-based Paint Strategy Public Housing Needs Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs HOPWA Strategy Economic Development Market Analysis Anti-poverty Strategy Comments on Consolidated Plan
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	email requesting comments on Consolidated Plan
6	Agency/Group/Organization	CITY OF VALLEJO
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Other government - Local

	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Lead-based Paint Strategy Public Housing Needs Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs HOPWA Strategy Economic Development Market Analysis Anti-poverty Strategy Comment on Consolidated Plan
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	email requesting comments on Consolidated Plan
7	Agency/Group/Organization	CITY OF PETALUMA
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Other government - Local

	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Lead-based Paint Strategy Public Housing Needs Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs HOPWA Strategy Economic Development Market Analysis Anti-poverty Strategy Comment on Consolidated Plan
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	email requesting comments on Consolidated Plan
8	Agency/Group/Organization	CONTRA COSTA COUNTY
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Other government - County

	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Lead-based Paint Strategy Public Housing Needs Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs HOPWA Strategy Economic Development Market Analysis Anti-poverty Strategy Comment on Consolidated Plan
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	email requesting comments on Consolidated Plan
9	Agency/Group/Organization	SOLANO COUNTY
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Other government - County

	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Lead-based Paint Strategy Public Housing Needs Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs HOPWA Strategy Economic Development Market Analysis Anti-poverty Strategy Comment on Consolidated Plan
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	email requesting comments on Consolidated Plan
10	Agency/Group/Organization	SONOMA COUNTY
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Other government - County

	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Lead-based Paint Strategy Public Housing Needs Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs HOPWA Strategy Economic Development Market Analysis Anti-poverty Strategy Comment on Consolidated Plan
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	email requesting comments on Consolidated Plan
11	Agency/Group/Organization	BUCKLEW PROGRAMS
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services - Housing Services-Persons with Disabilities local organization
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Staff discussion, annual monitoring visits

12	Agency/Group/Organization	COMMUNITY ACTION MARIN
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services-Children Services-Elderly Persons Services-Persons with Disabilities Services-Persons with HIV/AIDS Services-homeless Local organization
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homeless Needs - Families with children Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Staff discussion, annual monitoring
13	Agency/Group/Organization	FAIR HOUSING OF MARIN
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services - Housing Service-Fair Housing
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homeless Needs - Families with children Non-Homeless Special Needs Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Staff discussion, annual monitoring
14	Agency/Group/Organization	MARIN CITY HEALTH AND WELLNESS CENTER
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services-Children Services-Elderly Persons Services-Persons with Disabilities Services-Persons with HIV/AIDS Services-Health Health Agency

	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Non-Homeless Special Needs Economic Development Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Staff discussion
15	Agency/Group/Organization	MARIN CENTER FOR INDEPENDENT LIVING
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services - Housing Services-Persons with Disabilities
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Non-Homeless Special Needs
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Staff discussion, annual monitoring
16	Agency/Group/Organization	NORTHBAY CHILDREN'S CENTER
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services-Children
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Non-Homeless Special Needs
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Staff discussion, annual monitoring
17	Agency/Group/Organization	NOVATO YOUTH CENTER
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services-Children
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Non-Homeless Special Needs
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Staff discussion, annual monitoring
18	Agency/Group/Organization	SENIOR ACCESS
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services-Elderly Persons Services-Persons with Disabilities Services-Health
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Non-Homeless Special Needs

	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Staff discussion, annual monitoring
19	Agency/Group/Organization	ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Regional organization
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Public Housing Needs Economic Development Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Staff discussion, request for comment on the Consolidated plan
20	Agency/Group/Organization	MARIN COUNTY PRIORITY SETTING COMMITTEE
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services - Housing Services-Children Services-Elderly Persons Regional organization Planning organization Business and Civic Leaders
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Two annual meetings and discussion with staff as needed.
21	Agency/Group/Organization	TOWN OF TIBURON
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Other government - Local

	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Lead-based Paint Strategy Public Housing Needs Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs HOPWA Strategy Economic Development Market Analysis Anti-poverty Strategy Comment on Consolidated plan
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	email requesting comment on Consolidated Plan
22	Agency/Group/Organization	TOWN OF CORTE MADERA
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Other government - Local

	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Lead-based Paint Strategy Public Housing Needs Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs HOPWA Strategy Economic Development Market Analysis Anti-poverty Strategy Comments on Consolidated Plan
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	email requesting comments on Consolidated Plan
23	Agency/Group/Organization	TOWN OF ROSS
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Other government - Local

	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Lead-based Paint Strategy Public Housing Needs Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs HOPWA Strategy Economic Development Market Analysis Anti-poverty Strategy Comments on Consolidated Plan
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	email requesting comments on the Consolidated Plan
24	Agency/Group/Organization	TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Other government - Local

	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Lead-based Paint Strategy Public Housing Needs Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs HOPWA Strategy Economic Development Market Analysis Anti-poverty Strategy Comments on Consolidated Plan
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	email requesting comments on Consolidated Plan
25	Agency/Group/Organization	MARIN COUNTY HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services - Housing Services-Children Services-Elderly Persons Services-Persons with Disabilities Services-Persons with HIV/AIDS Services-Victims of Domestic Violence Services-homeless Services-Health Services - Victims Health Agency Child Welfare Agency

	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Lead-based Paint Strategy Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs HOPWA Strategy Anti-poverty Strategy Continuum of Care
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Staff discussion
26	Agency/Group/Organization	MARIN COMMUNITY FOUNDATION
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services - Housing Services-homeless Service-Fair Housing
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Families with children Non-Homeless Special Needs Market Analysis Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	staff discussion
27	Agency/Group/Organization	SANTA CLARA COUNTY
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Other government - County

	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Lead-based Paint Strategy Public Housing Needs Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs HOPWA Strategy Economic Development Market Analysis Anti-poverty Strategy Comments on Consolidated Plan
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	email requesting comments on the Consolidated Plan

Identify any Agency Types not consulted and provide rationale for not consulting

N/A

Other local/regional/state/federal planning efforts considered when preparing the Plan

Name of Plan	Lead Organization	How do the goals of your Strategic Plan overlap with the goals of each plan?
Continuum of Care	Marin County Health and Human Services	Both address housing and service issues in the County
Housing Element	Marin County Community Development Agency	Both address housing issues in the County
General Plan	Marin County Community Development Agency	Both address housing and development issues

Table 3 – Other local / regional / federal planning efforts

Describe cooperation and coordination with other public entities, including the State and any adjacent units of general local government, in the implementation of the Consolidated Plan (91.215(I))

For the purpose of allocating CDBG funds granted directly to Marin County for housing and community development activities, the County is divided into six geographical regions called Planning Areas. Each Planning Area is allotted a portion of the CDBG funding and convenes at least one public hearing before the Local Area Committee consisting of city council appointees from the cities and towns in the Planning Area plus a County Supervisor whose supervisorial district most closely coincides with the Planning Area. Each local area committee may also include a non-elected community member to represent the needs of racial and ethnic minorities and people with disabilities (In the Novato Planning Area, the Novato City Council assumes the role of the Local Area Committee. In the San Rafael Planning Area, the San Rafael City Council assumes the role of the Local Area Committee for only housing and capital project funding.) Each Local Area Committee held at least one public hearing during the development of the Consolidated Plan to obtain citizen comments on funding proposed projects serving low income persons within the Planning Area. Recommendations from each of the Local Area Committees were forwarded to the Countywide Priority Setting Committee.

The Countywide Priority Setting Committee consists of one representative of the Council of each participating city or town, a member of the Marin County Board of Supervisors, and a non-elected community member. The Countywide Priority Setting Committee recommends allocation of HOME funds and the of the balance of CDBG funds not allocated by the Local Area Committees. The Countywide Priority Setting Committee held one public hearing on March 30, 2015 during the development of the Consolidated Plan to obtain citizen comments on housing and community development needs, and to comment on staff recommendations for funding proposed housing projects located throughout the County with both HOME funds and the Countywide Housing component of CDBG funds. The Countywide Priority Setting Committee also reviewed recommendations from the Local Area Committees for use of CDBG funds for housing and non-housing projects. The Countywide Priority Setting Committee's recommendations for the use of CDBG Local Area Funds, CDBG Countywide Housing funds, and HOME funds were forwarded to the Marin County Board of Supervisors. At a hearing on May 5, 2015 the Marin County Board of Supervisors approved the Consolidated Plan, including budgets for the use of CDBG and HOME funds.

Narrative (optional):

The Marin Continuum of Housing and Services, which has met regularly since March 1993, was organized "to develop a strategy to achieve a coordinated, comprehensive system of housing and related services ranging from emergency shelter to permanent housing." Now renamed the Marin Partnership to End Homelessness (the Partnership), it includes representatives of the Housing Authority and nonprofit organizations specializing in health, mental health, housing, and social services. The Marin County HIV/AIDS Care Council includes a representative of the Marin County Community Development Agency(CDA), which previously implemented the HOPWA Program. In implementing the

HOPWA program, the Marin County CDA and Health and Human Services (HHS) coordinate closely with the Marin Housing Authority, the recipient of HUD HOPWA funds directly from the state.

The Partnership is involved in every aspect of homelessness prevention in the County and collaborates with and receives input from a significant countywide network of governments, community-based organizations, private industry, funders, grassroots organizations and individuals. The Partnership continues to work closely with the Marin Community Foundation, especially in the areas of local funding needs and priorities, emergency services, housing development, and long-range planning. For the past six years, collaborative housing and services funding proposals from Marin County agencies have been coordinated through the Partnership.

HHS acts as the Lead Agency for the Partnership. The Partnership's primary decision making body is the Homeless Policy Steering group which is made up of service and housing providers, city officials, faith based groups and county representatives. Each year HHS leads a community process to prepare the Consolidated Continuum of Care application that helps the county obtain approximately \$2.4 million in annual funding for transitional and permanent supported housing projects. Projects are reviewed each year to evaluate performance and ranked for their inclusion in the Continuum of Care application, the amount Marin receives each year helps to maintain units. Any reallocation of funds would mean the elimination of units for one project to create new projects. The County will continue to make housing assistance for extremely low income persons who are homeless or at risk of homelessness a priority over the next five years. If resources are available, the County's CDBG program will continue to participate in supportive programs that prevent homelessness and address the unmet needs of extremely low income families and individuals. Section 8 vouchers and public housing will be provided for those capable of independent living, and housing with supportive services will be provided for those not capable of living independently.

PR-15 Citizen Participation

1. Summary of citizen participation process/Efforts made to broaden citizen participation Summarize citizen participation process and how it impacted goal-setting

On February 24, 2014, March 24, 2014, and September 11, 2014, the CDBG Countywide Priority Setting Committee held public hearings where there was an agenda item for public comment on the Consolidated Plan and housing and non-housing community development needs. The County held two informational evening workshops for potential CDBG applicants on November 4 and November 5, 2014. The County has established six interjurisdictional planning/citizen participation areas for the CDBG program. Between February 25, 2015 and March 18, 2015, there were six local area CDBG hearings, consisting of four hearings held by CDBG local interjurisdictional committees (for the Richardson Bay, Lower Ross Valley, San Rafael, and Upper Ross Valley planning areas), one hearing held by the San Rafael City Council, and one hearing held by the Novato City Council. On February 26, 2015, a notice was published in the Marin Independent Journal announcing that the draft five-year Consolidated Plan would be available for public review on March 25 and comments would be received until May 1, 2015.

On February 27, 2015, the County held an informational session about the Consolidated Plan process for community members. On March 30, 2015, the CDBG Countywide Priority Setting Committee held a hearing on the draft 5-year Consolidated Plan and CDBG and HOME project funding. On May 5, 2015, the Marin County Board of Supervisors held a final hearing on the draft 5-year Consolidated Plan and CDBG and HOME project funding.

This process has allowed those willing to voice their opinions to be heard and for members of the public to better understand the funding process and its limitations.

Citizen Participation Outreach

Sort Order	Mode of Outreach	Target of Outreach	Summary of response/attendance	Summary of comments received	Summary of comments not accepted and reasons	URL (If applicable)
1	Public Hearing	Minorities Residents of Public and Assisted Housing	February 24, 2014 - CDBG Countywide Priority Setting Committee public hearing with an agenda item for public comment on the Consolidated Plan and needs. 5 attendees	No comments	N/A	
2	Public Hearing	Minorities Non-targeted/broad community	March 24,2014 - CDBG Countywide Priority Setting Committee public hearing with an agenda item for public comment on the Consolidated Plan and needs. 9 attendees	No comments	N/A	

Sort Order	Mode of Outreach	Target of Outreach	Summary of response/attendance	Summary of comments received	Summary of comments not accepted and reasons	URL (If applicable)
3	Public Hearing	Minorities Non-targeted/broad community	September 11,2014 - CDBG Countywide Priority Setting Committee public hearing with an agenda item for public comment on the Consolidated Plan and needs. 4 attendees	No comments	N/A	
4	Public Meeting	Minorities Non-targeted/broad community	November 4, 2014 - workshop for potential CDBG applicants. 4 attendees	No comments	N/A	
5	Public Meeting	Minorities Non-targeted/broad community	November 5,2014 - workshop for potential CDBG applicants. 4 attendees.	No comments	N/A	

Sort Order	Mode of Outreach	Target of Outreach	Summary of response/attendance	Summary of comments received	Summary of comments not accepted and reasons	URL (If applicable)
6	Newspaper Ad	Minorities Non-targeted/broad community	February 26, 2015, a notice was published in the Marin Independent Journal announcing that the draft five-year Consolidated Plan would available for public review on March 25 and comments would be received until May 1, 2015.			

Sort Order	Mode of Outreach	Target of Outreach	Summary of response/attendance	Summary of comments received	Summary of comments not accepted and reasons	URL (If applicable)
7	Public Hearing	Minorities Non-targeted/broad community	On February 27, 2015, the County held an informational session about the Consolidated Plan process for community members. 12 attendees.	One commenter expressed concern about the implementation of the AI and strategies for disabled housing. Several comments expressing concern that staff recommendations were automatically approved. Commenters also wanted more information on the public's role in the PSC and a expressed a desire to know more about the process. One commenter said communities should step up and volunteer to become involved. One commenter said the Con-Plan should look at community land trusts to assure long term	N/A	
		Consolidated Plan	MARIN COUNTY			33

Sort Order	Mode of Outreach	Target of Outreach	Summary of response/attendance	Summary of comments received	Summary of comments not accepted and reasons	URL (If applicable)
8	Public Hearing	Minorities Non-targeted/broad community	Feb 25, 2015 - Richardson Bay Planning Area hearing 12 attendees.	Comments made in support of funding for job training, services for youth and people with dementia, houseboat rehabilitation. One commenter suggested funding be limited to projects that will serve minorities and disabled.	No comments rejected.	
9	Public Hearing	Minorities Non-targeted/broad community	March 5, 2015 - Lower Ross Valley Planning Area hearing 3 attendees	Comments made in support of funding for services for people with dementia and brain injury. Commenter suggested funding be limited to projects that will increase equity, and County should supplement CDBG funding.	All comments accepted, but no action taken on suggestion that County supplement CDBG funding.	

Sort Order	Mode of Outreach	Target of Outreach	Summary of response/attendance	Summary of comments received	Summary of comments not accepted and reasons	URL (If applicable)
10	Public Hearing	Minorities Residents of Public and Assisted Housing	March 9, 2015 - San Rafael Planning Area public services hearing 3 attendees	Comments made in support of funding for services for people with dementia and brain injury.	All comments accepted.	
11	Public Hearing	Minorities Non-targeted/broad community	March 11, 2015 - Upper Ross Valley Planning Area hearing 5 attendees	Comments made in support of funding for services for people with dementia and brain injury.	All comments accepted.	
12	Public Hearing	Minorities Non-targeted/broad community	March 16, 2015 - Novato City Council hearing 7 attendees.	Comments made in support of funding for public services, group homes, rehabilitation loans, and homeless shelter.	All comments accepted.	
13	Public Hearing	Minorities Non-targeted/broad community	March 17, 2015 - San Rafael City Council hearing 5 attendees.	Comments made in support of funding for fair housing, rehabilitation loans, and group homes.	All comments accepted.	

Sort Order	Mode of Outreach	Target of Outreach	Summary of response/attendance	Summary of comments received	Summary of comments not accepted and reasons	URL (If applicable)
14	Public Hearing	Minorities Non-targeted/broad community	March 30, 2015, the CDBG Countywide Priority Setting Committee hearing on the draft 5-year Consolidated Plan. attendees		N/A	
15	Public Hearing	Minorities Non-targeted/broad community	May 5, 2015, the Marin County Board of Supervisors held a final hearing on the draft 5-year Consolidated Plan. attendees.		N/A	

Table 4 – Citizen Participation Outreach

Needs Assessment

NA-05 Overview

Needs Assessment Overview

The Consolidated Plan projects housing needs in Marin County for the five year period between Fiscal Years 2015 and 2019. Local housing agencies believe that the 2010 Census figures for extremely low income, very low income, and low income households understate the total housing need over the period covered by this report. The 2010 Census data does not reflect increases in market rents which have occurred since then. Local social service agencies believe that minority households were under-reported in the Census data and these households tend to have larger families and more serious unmet housing needs than the county average. Additional data was gathered by the Marin County Department of Health & Human Services as Lead Agency for the Continuum of care (CoC) through the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS), a collaboration of eight key homeless housing and service providers.

Until 2014 Marin County received funding from the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) Program through the City and County of San Francisco. These funds are now paid directly from the State to the Marin Housing Authority which administers them in the County.

NA-10 Housing Needs Assessment - 24 CFR 91.205 (a,b,c)

Summary of Housing Needs

Housing needs have escalated in Marin over the past decade, and particularly in the last few years. The need for subsidized rental housing has increased since the recession of 2008. Housing prices are also on the rise and an overflow influx of technical workers from the Silicon Valley/San Francisco areas has only increased rents and housing prices. The rental market remains tight with new reports in the Marin Independent Journal showing a 12% overall increase in rental prices during the past 12 months. 2010 census statistics show that there is a 98.7% occupancy rate in homeowner housing and a 94.8% occupancy rate in rental units in the unincorporated areas of the County. The average rent has risen from \$1,483 in 2004 to \$2,380 in 2014. Those in need of housing include seniors, people with mental and physical disabilities, single parent households, singles with no children, large households, agricultural workers, the homeless, and the local workforce, which is increasingly service based.

*Note - AMI is defined as Area Median Income; HAMFI is defined as HUD Area Median Family Income.

Demographics	Base Year: 2000	Most Recent Year: 2011	% Change
Population	247,289	250,666	1%
Households	100,736	102,832	2%
Median Income	\$71,306.00	\$89,605.00	26%

Table 5 - Housing Needs Assessment Demographics

Data Source: 2000 Census (Base Year), 2007-2011 ACS (Most Recent Year)

Number of Households Table

	0-30% HAMFI	>30-50% HAMFI	>50-80% HAMFI	>80-100% HAMFI	>100% HAMFI
Total Households *	13,523	11,689	16,109	9,659	51,849
Small Family Households *	3,733	3,944	4,839	3,943	26,979
Large Family Households *	504	718	857	481	2,350
Household contains at least one person 62-74 years of age	2,767	2,370	3,982	2,043	11,300
Household contains at least one person age 75 or older	2,698	2,453	2,777	1,384	4,023
Households with one or more children 6 years old or younger *	1,821	1,621	1,683	1,336	4,287
* the highest income category for these family types is >80% HAMFI					

Table 6 - Total Households Table

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

Housing Needs Summary Tables

1. Housing Problems (Households with one of the listed needs)

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS										
Substandard Housing - Lacking complete plumbing or kitchen facilities	229	70	80	65	444	125	38	35	10	208
Severely Overcrowded - With >1.51 people per room (and complete kitchen and plumbing)	349	175	285	115	924	70	0	20	15	105
Overcrowded - With 1.01-1.5 people per room (and none of the above problems)	395	419	355	80	1,249	28	85	30	55	198
Housing cost burden greater than 50% of income (and none of the above problems)	5,548	2,570	808	20	8,946	2,910	2,349	2,800	1,354	9,413
Housing cost burden greater than 30% of income (and none of the above problems)	1,034	2,249	3,432	1,095	7,810	503	1,114	1,680	1,652	4,949

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
Zero/negative Income (and none of the above problems)	385	0	0	0	385	579	0	0	0	579

Table 7 – Housing Problems Table

Data 2007-2011 CHAS

Source:

2. Housing Problems 2 (Households with one or more Severe Housing Problems: Lacks kitchen or complete plumbing, severe overcrowding, severe cost burden)

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS										
Having 1 or more of four housing problems	6,544	3,240	1,529	275	11,588	3,135	2,469	2,885	1,439	9,928
Having none of four housing problems	2,000	3,254	5,808	3,515	14,577	908	2,738	5,864	4,433	13,943
Household has negative income, but none of the other housing problems	385	0	0	0	385	579	0	0	0	579

Table 8 – Housing Problems 2

Data 2007-2011 CHAS

Source:

3. Cost Burden > 30%

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS								
Small Related	2,533	2,269	1,293	6,095	762	1,003	1,800	3,565
Large Related	369	340	180	889	93	237	239	569
Elderly	2,166	1,113	1,096	4,375	1,907	1,756	1,770	5,433

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total
Other	2,397	1,618	1,867	5,882	767	564	748	2,079
Total need by income	7,465	5,340	4,436	17,241	3,529	3,560	4,557	11,646

Table 9 – Cost Burden > 30%

Data 2007-2011 CHAS
Source:

4. Cost Burden > 50%

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS								
Small Related	2,230	1,030	164	3,424	723	874	1,195	2,792
Large Related	290	120	0	410	89	162	154	405
Elderly	1,692	755	238	2,685	1,529	931	1,018	3,478
Other	2,097	774	458	3,329	677	394	489	1,560
Total need by income	6,309	2,679	860	9,848	3,018	2,361	2,856	8,235

Table 10 – Cost Burden > 50%

Data 2007-2011 CHAS
Source:

5. Crowding (More than one person per room)

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS										
Single family households	739	539	545	120	1,943	78	85	30	70	263
Multiple, unrelated family households	30	54	65	25	174	20	0	20	0	40
Other, non-family households	15	30	30	50	125	0	0	0	0	0
Total need by income	784	623	640	195	2,242	98	85	50	70	303

Table 11 – Crowding Information – 1/2

Data 2007-2011 CHAS
Source:

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total
Households with Children Present	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 12 – Crowding Information – 2/2

Data Source
Comments:

Describe the number and type of single person households in need of housing assistance.

Approximately 30% of households in the County are occupied by people living alone, significantly higher than the 23% recorded statewide. The need for workforce housing for those at or below the 2014 median single person household income of \$68,100 is acute. It currently takes two incomes at the 80% AMI income level to afford market rate rental housing in the county. Particularly at risk are seniors, those with disabilities and members of the workforce in the very low to low income range.

Estimate the number and type of families in need of housing assistance who are disabled or victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking.

It is estimated that there are approximately 1,098 people living with disabilities in the county; of these 46% live with a parent or guardian, 23% in a community care facility, 25% live independently, 5% at an Intermediate Care facility, 0.4% at a Skilled Nursing facility and 0.6% have other living arrangements. The Marin Center for Independent Living, for example, served 715 people with all types of disabilities (including older adults) in 2014 throughout Marin County; of these, over 60% were facing a lack of affordable accessible housing. Most of their clients live under the poverty level, and their average client earns about \$10,500 annually. Marin County’s Mental Health Services served 3,716 unduplicated clients in fiscal year 2012/2013, of which 2,721 were adults age 18 and older. Community-based housing and shelter was provided for 553 of their adult clients, or 15% of their total caseload. Housing support in the form of emergency housing and rent assistance was provided for another 43 of their clients. Anecdotally, mental health case managers report that the demand far exceeds the limited available supply of housing and services, and cost of housing continues to increase well in excess of the income of public mental health clients. Affordable housing is a major issue for their clients. The Center for Domestic Peace estimates that it helps between 3,700 and 4,500 victims of domestic violence each year. The 2013 Point in Time Count set the number of domestic violence victims at 242 or 26% of the surveyed homeless population.

What are the most common housing problems?

The predominant housing problem in Marin County is one of cost and availability. There is a shortage of affordable rental housing including multi-family, single family, second units, and Single Room Occupancy (SRO) units as well as smaller moderately priced ownership units for singles, seniors and lower income

families. The median single family home price consistently hovers near the \$1 million mark with median townhome or condominium prices reaching \$435,000 in 2013. Basic rentals come with a price tag of more than \$2,000- the average rental cost in 2014 was nearly \$2,400 per month. This leaves the many low income workers priced out of the market, forcing them to double up or commute from lower priced housing markets. In 2010 approximately 56% of renters and 37% of owners in unincorporated Marin were paying more than 30% of their monthly income for housing.

There is great need for full time housing for farm and ranch workers in West Marin. Current zoning limits multi-unit residential development in agricultural zones. Another complicating factor is that much of West Marin ranch land is under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service which governs the Point Reyes National Seashore, whose purpose is to limit human development in the natural environment. In this area the problem is compounded because many of the existing single family dwellings in the Bolinas, Point Reyes Station and Inverness areas are now second homes or vacation rentals. Anecdotal evidence ranks the number of homes used as full time residences between 25%-45% of all existing homes in the Point Reyes Station and Inverness areas.

Are any populations/household types more affected than others by these problems?

Data for Marin residents does not include the large number of workers who commute from surrounding areas because they are unable to find affordable housing in the County according to Marin Economic Commission figures. These workers, who have an average annual salary of \$59,400, are unable to find housing in the County due to a lack of multi-family rentals or SRO units. The population is also aging and while many seniors own their homes often they are *överhousedö* but cannot find affordable smaller or assisted housing alternatives. The 2010 census recorded more than 11,000 or 12% of households countywide were extremely low income. These numbers include a growing number of seniors and those with mental or physical disabilities.

Describe the characteristics and needs of Low-income individuals and families with children (especially extremely low-income) who are currently housed but are at imminent risk of either residing in shelters or becoming unsheltered 91.205(c)/91.305(c)). Also discuss the needs of formerly homeless families and individuals who are receiving rapid re-housing assistance and are nearing the termination of that assistance

There is a need for every type of affordable housing for extremely low income persons and families. This fact has been confirmed by Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) data and the Marin Housing Authority (MHA) waiting list data, and in conversations with numerous non-profit service providers. There are active 5813 applicants on the Housing Choice Voucher/Section 8 waitlist. Marin Housing Authority has housed 112 applicants from the waiting list over the past 24 months and currently there are 335 applicants searching for housing with an issued voucher. Most are struggling to find rental units with rents that fall within the payment standard and landlords willing to accept Section 8 vouchers. The Marin Housing Authority's Housing Choice Voucher/Section 8 waitlist opened in September 2008 and 11,200 applications were received. More than 4000 of the applicants were

removed from the waiting list due to lack of current mailing address and/or non-eligibility. Additionally Marin Housing Authority has 3,544 applicants on the Public Housing waiting list that last opened in early 2013. This need includes rental assistance (to reduce severe cost burden, reduce overcrowding, and enable people to obtain appropriate housing); group homes for people needing supervised living quarters; multifamily housing; accessible housing for people with physical disabilities and environmental sensitivities; emergency shelter for the homeless; emergency housing for battered persons; transitional housing for those at risk of becoming homeless; housing for the independent elderly, the frail elderly; and housing with support services for persons with mental illness, physical illness, or other disabilities. Housing code enforcement, housing counseling, mediation services for tenants and landlords, and fair housing enforcement are also priorities for serving extremely low income persons.

In its waiting list for assisted housing for the extremely low income, MHA applies local preferences by giving priority to those in following situations: Involuntarily Displaced Families;

Victims of Domestic Violence;

Victims of Natural Disasters;

Victims of Eminent Domain;

Participants in a witness protection program;

County residents who live, work (at least 32 hours per week), or have been hired to work within the limits of Marin County;

Veterans or current military personnel and their families;

Families who are homeless or living in substandard conditions;

Family, elderly or disabled households.

If a jurisdiction provides estimates of the at-risk population(s), it should also include a description of the operational definition of the at-risk group and the methodology used to generate the estimates:

Marin County utilizes HUD guidance for counting sheltered and unsheltered populations in developing its Homeless Point In Time count strategy and methodology. Marin conducts a detailed survey of each individual counted. This allows for a much more robust count than a simple enumeration or random interview method utilized by many other communities. The primary methodology for the count is a housing survey. On the day of the count, nearly 700 surveys were administered throughout the County at over 50 locations/programs. The numbers reflected in this report are based on data gathered from

completed surveys, interviews and aggregate information collected from the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS).

Although Whites make up the majority of the overall population in Marin, persons from communities of color are disproportionately represented in the homeless count. In Marin, Whites (non-Hispanic) comprise approximately 72% of the overall general population, with Black/African Americans comprising 3% and Hispanic/Latino 15%, and Asians 6%. Forty-three percent of those experiencing homelessness identified as White, with Hispanic/Latino recorded as 20%, Black/African Americans as 13%, Multi-racial individuals as 4%, Asians as 4%, and American Indians as 1%. (15% percent of respondents did not define their race/ethnicity.) When comparing the homeless count findings to the overall population, Black/ African Americans are disproportionately represented in the count of persons experiencing homelessness (a ratio of 3% of the overall population compared to 13% of the homeless population).

Specify particular housing characteristics that have been linked with instability and an increased risk of homelessness

The Point In Time Report concluded that health issues, aging, domestic violence and low income or sudden loss of income can all play a factor in housing instability in the County. Comparing health issues reported in 2013 to those reported in 2011: 32% of people counted reported alcohol use in 2013 compared to 23% in 2011, while drug use declined from 22% to 7%. Sixteen percent of respondents reported having co-occurring mental health and substance use conditions in the 2013 count compared to 12% in 2011. Seven percent of respondents reported having a chronic health condition in the 2013 count compared to 20% in the 2011 count. Twenty-six percent of all adults counted had experienced domestic violence in 2013 compared to 14% of adults counted in 2011. This dramatic increase is likely due to a change to the survey. On the 2011 Count survey, domestic violence was included as a response under all health issues. The 2013 count survey included a separate question for domestic violence, which may have contributed to the increase in response.

Among homeless families, 56% of adults in households with children reported domestic/partner violence experience. Thirty eight percent of all women counted and 16% of men counted had experienced domestic violence. These rates of domestic violence are higher than the general U.S. population, in which 24% of women and 14% of men have experienced severe physical violence by an intimate partner. Veterans comprised 9% of the adults experiencing homelessness on the day of the count. This figure is similar to the number of veterans counted in 2011, which was 8%.

Discussion

The 2011 Point In Time Report showed the combined total of homeless persons counted as 5,399; this includes sheltered, unsheltered, and precariously housed persons. In 2013, the total count was 5,323, a decrease of 5%.

This one-day figure provides valuable insight into the needs and demographics of the population experiencing homelessness and those at risk. Through the work and commitment of community partners, service providers and advocates, efforts to reduce the number of those experiencing homelessness may have contributed to the progress made. Various initiatives and housing assistance programs continue to demonstrate promising results, most notably among veterans and people experiencing chronic homelessness.

The majorities of people experiencing homelessness are longtime residents of Marin and were living in Marin when they became homeless. Despite declines in the unemployment rate, many individuals and families do not earn sufficient wages to afford market rate housing in Marin and are at considerable risk of homelessness. The lack of affordable housing continues to be the leading stressor pushing families and individuals into homelessness. Many people experiencing homelessness in Marin struggle with multiple health issues and long-term disabling conditions. The impact of this will require more concerted efforts to link persons experiencing homelessness to mainstream programs such as County Medical Services Program and Social Security Insurance. Prevention services can work. Stimulus programs have had an impact on the Count findings. Despite this funding the population at risk continues to grow.

NA-15 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Problems – 91.205 (b)(2)

Assess the need of any racial or ethnic group that has disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.

Introduction

A high percentage of low income residents of all racial groups have "housing problems," defined by HUD for this report as:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities,
2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities,
3. More than one person per room,
4. Household spends >30% of income on housing.

Given the small number of substandard residential units in Marin County, it is unlikely that inadequate housing quality is the cause of many of these "housing problems." More likely, these people experienced financial reverses (divorce, unemployment, steep medical expenses, or retirement) that decreased their available income below the level they need to comfortably afford housing expenses.

0%-30% of Area Median Income

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	11,203	1,354	955
White	7,723	1,103	725
Black / African American	584	115	0
Asian	364	54	180
American Indian, Alaska Native	35	0	4
Pacific Islander	10	0	0
Hispanic	2,303	74	35

Table 13 - Disproportionally Greater Need 0 - 30% AMI

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

*The four housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities,
2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities,
3. More than one person per room,
4. Cost Burden greater than 30%

30%-50% of Area Median Income

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	9,070	2,624	0
White	6,100	1,974	0
Black / African American	210	115	0
Asian	498	104	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	10	0	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Hispanic	2,119	420	0

Table 14 - Disproportionally Greater Need 30 - 50% AMI

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

*The four housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities,
2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities,
3. More than one person per room,
4. Cost Burden greater than 30%

50%-80% of Area Median Income

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	9,549	6,555	0
White	7,314	5,220	0
Black / African American	205	155	0
Asian	340	250	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	30	20	0
Pacific Islander	30	20	0
Hispanic	1,550	814	0

Table 15 - Disproportionally Greater Need 50 - 80% AMI

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

*The four housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities,
2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities,
3. More than one person per room,
4. Cost Burden greater than 30%

80%-100% of Area Median Income

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	4,445	5,188	0
White	3,750	4,229	0
Black / African American	25	145	0
Asian	105	334	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	0	10	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Hispanic	465	333	0

Table 16 - Disproportionally Greater Need 80 - 100% AMI

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

*The four housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities,
2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities,
3. More than one person per room,
4. Cost Burden greater than 30%

Discussion

The above tables show that cost is the primary factor when considering the frequency with which all races and ethnic groups encounter any of the four identified housing problems. The incidence rate of housing problems are highest among those people with the lowest incomes.

NA-20 Disproportionately Greater Need: Severe Housing Problems – 91.205 (b)(2)

Assess the need of any racial or ethnic group that has disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.

Introduction

A high percentage of low income residents of all racial groups have "housing problems," defined by HUD for this report as:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities,
2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities,
3. More than one person per room,
4. Household spends >50% of income on housing.

Given the small number of substandard residential units in Marin County, it is unlikely that inadequate housing quality is the cause of many of these "housing problems." More likely, these people experienced financial reverses (divorce, unemployment, steep medical expenses, or retirement) that decreased their available income below the level they need to comfortably afford housing expenses.

0%-30% of Area Median Income

Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	9,668	2,893	955
White	6,848	1,999	725
Black / African American	334	365	0
Asian	235	189	180
American Indian, Alaska Native	35	0	4
Pacific Islander	10	0	0
Hispanic	2,084	294	35

Table 17 – Severe Housing Problems 0 - 30% AMI

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

*The four severe housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities,
2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities,
3. More than 1.5 persons per room,
4. Cost Burden over 50%

30%-50% of Area Median Income

Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	5,710	5,999	0
White	3,780	4,279	0
Black / African American	150	175	0
Asian	338	264	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	0	10	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Hispanic	1,319	1,220	0

Table 18 – Severe Housing Problems 30 - 50% AMI

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

*The four severe housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4. Cost Burden over 50%

50%-80% of Area Median Income

Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	4,415	11,684	0
White	3,365	9,159	0
Black / African American	80	285	0
Asian	175	420	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	10	40	0
Pacific Islander	0	50	0
Hispanic	744	1,613	0

Table 19 – Severe Housing Problems 50 - 80% AMI

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

*The four severe housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4. Cost Burden over 50%

80%-100% of Area Median Income

Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	1,714	7,943	0
White	1,379	6,624	0
Black / African American	15	155	0
Asian	50	389	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	0	10	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Hispanic	230	558	0

Table 20 – Severe Housing Problems 80 - 100% AMI

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

*The four severe housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities,
2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities,
3. More than 1.5 persons per room,
4. Cost Burden over 50%

Discussion

The above tables show that cost is the primary factor when considering the frequency with which all races and ethnic groups encounter any of the four identified housing problems. The incidence rate of housing problems are highest among those people with the lowest incomes.

NA-25 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens – 91.205 (b)(2)

Assess the need of any racial or ethnic group that has disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.

Introduction:

Residents of Marin who are white typically earn higher wages than persons of African-American, Hispanic, Native American, and Asian heritage. While the median income for Asian families is high (\$70,815 in 1999), anecdotal evidence suggests that the county has a significant population of lower income Southeast Asian families, suggesting that Asians may have a wider income distribution than whites, although both whites and Asians have about the same median income. However, precise data on the number and housing situation of Asian families is not available.

Hispanic families have a disproportionate number of housing problems. Based on anecdotal evidence, it appears that many Latino families are able to afford market rent because they live in overcrowded conditions, sometimes with two or more families sharing an apartment. Undocumented people do not generally have access to public housing or federal rent subsidies.

A significant proportion of the low income Black families in Marin County live in public housing in Marin City. For this reason, the county has fewer lower income Black families with housing problems than Hispanic families, since families in public housing live in standard quality housing and they tend not to be rent burdened or live in overcrowded conditions.

Housing Cost Burden

Housing Cost Burden	<=30%	30-50%	>50%	No / negative income (not computed)
Jurisdiction as a whole	16,941	13,584	19,492	970
White	48,319	18,087	16,907	744
Black / African American	954	540	529	0
Asian	2,586	1,142	873	185
American Indian, Alaska Native	53	34	45	4
Pacific Islander	130	30	10	0
Hispanic	4,162	2,936	3,149	35

Table 21 – Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens AMI

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

Discussion:

While a majority of Marin's housing stock is in ownership housing and the majority of Marin's residents are white, persons of black or Hispanic heritage are disproportionately highly represented in rental

housing. Blacks are also disproportionately highly represented as renters of lower cost units, units which cost less than the median gross rent. Blacks are disproportionately highly represented in the family public housing complex in Marin City. Although residents of the Marin City public housing generally would not be considered to have "housing problems" as defined by the data set provided by HUD, this area has significant neighborhood-related social problems, particularly related to unemployment and education.

NA-30 Disproportionately Greater Need: Discussion – 91.205(b)(2)

Are there any income categories in which a racial or ethnic group has disproportionately greater need than the needs of that income category as a whole?

Hispanic families are more likely than the general population to live in overcrowded conditions. We have been unable to determine how much of the overcrowding results from more than one family sharing an apartment, how much results from large families who are unable to afford a large enough apartment to accommodate all family members without overcrowding, and how much results from many single immigrants sharing one unit. There is some link between rent burden and overcrowding, since Hispanic families, particularly in the Canal area of San Rafael have been doubling-up in apartments in order to save rent.

If they have needs not identified above, what are those needs?

Those families supported by service industry jobs often cannot afford to live in the County at all, with many living in lower-cost areas outside Marin County, resulting in commute times exceeding 30 minutes.

Are any of those racial or ethnic groups located in specific areas or neighborhoods in your community?

The largest concentration of low income Hispanic families is in the Canal area of San Rafael, where the rental units tend to be moderately priced and bus transit is available. The Canal area has a very high degree of overcrowding (defined as over one person per room). According to the 2010 Census, in the Canal area (Census Tract 1122), 11.7% of households were overcrowded, compared to only 1.2% of households in Marin County as a whole.

Marin City has traditionally had a high concentration of African American residents but recent census figures show that currently whites and African American residents each make up approximately 38% of the area's population.

NA-35 Public Housing – 91.205(b)

Introduction

A significant proportion of the low income black families in Marin County live in public housing in Marin City. For this reason, the county has fewer lower income black families with housing problems than Hispanic families, since families in public housing live in standard quality housing and they tend not to be rent burdened or live in overcrowded conditions. Although residents of the Marin City public housing generally would not be considered to have "housing problems" as defined by the data set provided by HUD, this area has significant neighborhood-related social problems, particularly related to unemployment and education.

Totals in Use

	Program Type								
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers			Special Purpose Voucher		
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
# of units vouchers in use	0	0	471	2,106	29	2,034	20	0	0

Table 22 - Public Housing by Program Type

*includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Characteristics of Residents

	Program Type							
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers			Special Purpose Voucher	
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program
Average Annual Income	0	0	13,765	16,094	18,663	15,812	12,123	0
Average length of stay	0	0	9	9	3	9	0	0
Average Household size	0	0	1	1	3	1	1	0
# Homeless at admission	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
# of Elderly Program Participants (>62)	0	0	159	669	2	653	8	0
# of Disabled Families	0	0	138	749	9	724	9	0
# of Families requesting accessibility features	0	0	471	2,106	29	2,034	20	0
# of HIV/AIDS program participants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
# of DV victims	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 23 – Characteristics of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Race of Residents

Race	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Program Type					
				Vouchers			Special Purpose Voucher		
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
White	0	0	207	1,512	22	1,460	15	0	0
Black/African American	0	0	212	373	5	362	5	0	0
Asian	0	0	41	189	2	182	0	0	0
American Indian/Alaska Native	0	0	5	27	0	25	0	0	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	6	5	0	5	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

*includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition

Table 24 – Race of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Ethnicity of Residents

Ethnicity	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Program Type					
				Vouchers			Special Purpose Voucher		
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
Hispanic	0	0	58	266	9	253	1	0	0
Not Hispanic	0	0	413	1,840	20	1,781	19	0	0

***includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition**

Table 25 – Ethnicity of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Section 504 Needs Assessment: Describe the needs of public housing tenants and applicants on the waiting list for accessible units:

The Marin Center for Independent Living (MCIL) estimates that 50,000-55,000 persons in Marin County have disabilities, and this number will increase significantly since seniors are the fastest growing segment of the County's population. Although data is not available on the income of this population, it is estimated that the majority is lower income. Currently, 15% of units at the five elderly/disabled complexes managed by the Marin Housing Authority are handicapped accessible. In addition to the handicapped accessible units, at two of the complexes, Venetia Oaks and Homestead Terrace, the Marin Housing Authority has made additional handicapped improvements to 84 units, by installing grab bars in bathrooms and installing hot water valves that prevent scalding. Lifehouse (formerly MARC), an agency that serves a large number of developmentally disabled clients, estimates that the county has 1,500 residents who are developmentally disabled.

Most immediate needs of residents of Public Housing and Housing Choice voucher holders

The director of Lifehouse sees a need for more Section 8 vouchers for developmentally disabled persons. Many Lifehouse clients are ready to live independently, but there is a lack of affordable low-cost housing in the county for extremely low income and very low income persons with disabilities. This shortage of affordable housing for developmentally disabled persons has become more acute in the past five years, as more developmentally disabled persons have entered into the housing market in search of smaller home settings (two and three bedroom apartments and houses, as opposed to larger group homes). According to the director of Buckelew Programs, the County has a critical shortage of housing that provides an independent living situation with social service support. For extremely low income and very low income people who are mentally ill. The Housing Authority's Shelter Plus Care Program provides a Section 8 rent subsidy in conjunction with intensive supportive services to 100 formerly homeless individuals and families who have a serious mental illness and who may also have a concurrent substance abuse problem and/or AIDS.

How do these needs compare to the housing needs of the population at large

The needs are quite similar. As previously discussed there is a shortage of available housing in Marin County, due to several factors but primarily due to build out of available sites and the high cost of existing housing. In many areas of West Marin the rural nature of the area, lack of public transportation and relative remoteness increase the barriers to accessible housing.

Discussion

There is a growing need to fund projects that serve people with physical and mental disabilities. Senior citizens are the fastest growing segment of the population. It is estimated that the population of senior citizens will double by the year 2020. As the aging senior population becomes frail, the need to modify existing housing for disabled accessibility will increase. Persons with all types of physical disabilities face

a wide array of barriers, including limited accessibility to buildings, rest rooms, recreational facilities, and sidewalks. As local governments continue to implement the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), the demand for funding to comply with the ADA will continue to increase significantly. Marin County has a strong history of funding local government-sponsored accessibility projects for the removal of architectural barriers to people with disabilities.

Advocates for people with disabilities have asked that new or substantially rehabilitated housing exceed the requirements of the ADA and make at least the living room of all housing units wheelchair-accessible, so that people with disabilities can freely visit their friends' homes. This concept of "visitability" should be implemented as long as it does not impose an undue financial burden on the project.

NA-40 Homeless Needs Assessment – 91.205(c)

Introduction:

The annual Point in Time count establishes the needs of the homeless population. The figures below result from the 2014 survey and housing records supplied by county agencies.

Homeless Needs Assessment

Population	Estimate the # of persons experiencing homelessness on a given night		Estimate the # experiencing homelessness each year	Estimate the # becoming homeless each year	Estimate the # exiting homelessness each year	Estimate the # of days persons experience homelessness
	Sheltered	Unsheltered				
Persons in Households with Adult(s) and Child(ren)	31	478	0	0	0	90
Persons in Households with Only Children	0	0	0	0	0	0
Persons in Households with Only Adults	195	216	0	0	0	300
Chronically Homeless Individuals	160	0	0	0	0	300
Chronically Homeless Families	35	0	0	0	0	300
Veterans	0	60	0	0	0	90
Unaccompanied Child	0	1	0	0	0	90
Persons with HIV	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 26 - Homeless Needs Assessment

Alternate Data Source Name:

Marin Point In Time Count 2014

Data Source Comments:

Indicate if the homeless population is: **Partially Rural Homeless**

Rural Homeless Needs Assessment

Population	Estimate the # of persons experiencing homelessness on a given night		Estimate the # experiencing homelessness each year	Estimate the # becoming homeless each year	Estimate the # exiting homelessness each year	Estimate the # of days persons experience homelessness
	Sheltered	Unsheltered				
Persons in Households with Adult(s) and Child(ren)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Persons in Households with Only Children	0	0	0	0	0	0
Persons in Households with Only Adults	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chronically Homeless Individuals	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chronically Homeless Families	0	0	0	0	0	0
Veterans	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unaccompanied Youth	0	0	0	0	0	0
Persons with HIV	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 27 - Homeless Needs Assessment

Alternate Data Source Name:
 Marin Point In Time Count 2014
Data Source Comments:

For persons in rural areas who are homeless or at risk of homelessness, describe the nature and extent of unsheltered and sheltered homelessness with the jurisdiction:

The County does not collect demographic information specific to its rural areas. The remoteness of many areas of West Marin make it difficult to collect this data but the population in this area is distinctly divided between those who came to the area to pursue an "alternative" lifestyle and a higher income element who purchase available homes as "second or vacation" residences. Other than shelter offered by local churches or mobile units that pick up homeless people in inclement weather and take them to the more populated areas of the County for emergency shelter there are no emergency or transitional housing facilities in West Marin.

If data is not available for the categories "number of persons becoming and exiting homelessness each year," and "number of days that persons experience homelessness," describe these categories for each homeless population type (including chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth):

The 2011 Point in Time Count showed that the following figures are representative of the percentage of homeless families and individuals that were unsheltered for the specified timeframes.

1 week or less	2% of Families, 1% Individuals
1-3 months	11% of Families, 13% Individuals
3-12 months	19% of Families, 22% Individuals
1-4 years	9% of Families, 32% Individuals

5-9 years	2% of Families, 11% Individuals
10+ years	0% of Families, 12% Individuals
Unknown	57% of Families, 9% Individuals

Nature and Extent of Homelessness: (Optional)

Race:	Sheltered:	Unsheltered (optional)
White	0	0
Black or African American	0	0
Asian	0	0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0
Pacific Islander	0	0
Ethnicity:	Sheltered:	Unsheltered (optional)
Hispanic	0	0
Not Hispanic	0	0

Alternate Data Source Name:
 Marin Point In Time Count 2013
 Data Source
 Comments:

Estimate the number and type of families in need of housing assistance for families with children and the families of veterans.

During the 2013 Point In Time Count 99 households with children age 18 or under were counted - 297 individuals(118 adults and 179 kids) living in households with children. In 2011, there were 155 households with children counted. Nearly half (48%) of Marin’s families with children experiencing homelessness identified as Latino/Hispanic; 26% identified as White; 11% identified as Black/African American and 11% identified as Asian. Notably, Whites comprised only 8% of homeless families in the 2011 Count. More than half (57%) of Marin’s homeless households with children indicated they had experienced domestic violence. Most families reported the following reasons for homelessness – lack of affordable housing, no income/loss of job, alcohol/drug issues, or end of a relationship. Nearly one-third (32%) of adults in homelessfamily households reported having a health issue or disability within the family. Forty-one percent reported receiving some source of income or assistance. Most of Marin’s families experiencing homelessness reside in shelters or transitional housing programs (77 households).

Describe the Nature and Extent of Homelessness by Racial and Ethnic Group.

Although Whites make up the majority of the overall population in Marin, persons from communities of color are disproportionately represented in the 2013 Point In Time homeless count. In Marin, Whites (non-Hispanic) comprise nearly 73% of the overall general population, while Blacks comprise fewer than 3% and Hispanic/Latino make up 16% and Asians just less than 6%. The majority of those experiencing homelessness identified as White. Despite this, when comparing the Count findings to the overall population, people of color, particularly African Americans, are disproportionately represented in the count of persons experiencing homelessness.

Describe the Nature and Extent of Unsheltered and Sheltered Homelessness.

The 2011 Full Point In Time report showed 56% (543) of homeless adults counted reported having at least one type of disabling condition such as a physical or developmental disability, chronic illness or a substance abuse problem. Of the 303 single individuals in emergency shelter and transitional housing, 78% reported having a disabling condition compared to 54% of unsheltered single individuals. Eleven percent reported suffering from two or more illnesses or conditions (multiple disabilities). Ten percent also identified as having a co-occurring condition—mental health issue along with a substance abuse issue. Health issues are not atypical to the population experiencing homelessness. Homelessness is a traumatic event which can cause both physical and psychological difficulties. The lack of medical insurance and access to housing can exacerbate problems which could much more easily be managed with housing.

Discussion:

The needs of the homeless population and an outline of ways to address them are contained in HOMEFORALL - The Marin County Continuum of Care 10 Year Plan to Prevent & End Homelessness (2013-2023). Development of housing and shelter facilities is very difficult in rural West Marin, because of environmental constraints and the shortage of developable land. The Bolinas Community Land Trust acquired the Bolinas Garage and converted the service bays into small apartments. Ecumenical Association for Housing (EAH) opened 27 rental units (affordable to families below 50% of median income) in a mixed-use development in Point Reyes Station. While these two projects will not directly address the needs of homeless people in West Marin, they have helped meet the need for more affordable housing in the community. Marin County homeless housing and service providers participate in the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). HMIS is a software application designed to record and store client-level information on the characteristics and service needs of homeless persons throughout Marin's Continuum of Care. The data collected follows universal data standards developed by the U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development (HUD). All participating HMIS agencies agree to collect the universal data elements to ensure an unduplicated count of homeless and at-risk persons in the county. The universal data elements include demographics (age, gender, race/ethnicity) as well as veteran status, disability, last place stayed, length of homelessness, housing status, and zip code of last permanent residence. HMIS enables agencies to track outcomes related to their programs, which helps provide insight into the number of persons entering homeless and those who move on to stable housing. Programs funded under the McKinney-Vento Act are also required to participate and provide information in addition to the universal data elements related to client income, benefits, special needs and domestic violence. Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Rehousing Programs funded under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) were also required to participate in HMIS and track financial assistance and housing outcomes for this program. The HMIS program is overseen by a governance group that helps to maintain the quality and integrity of the data in the system. The current system contains over 15,000 records of individuals who have utilized Marin's homeless housing and services over the past three years. The participating agencies include all emergency shelter, transitional housing and permanent supported housing providers and all key homeless service providers

in the County with the exception of domestic violence shelters. The participation of all the key shelter, housing and service providers helps to provide a picture of the needs of those who are homeless and at risk in the County. However, a small portion of the homeless population may not be captured in the data as the data is limited only to those accessing services.

NA-45 Non-Homeless Special Needs Assessment - 91.205 (b,d)

Introduction:

The need for housing for the disabled has skyrocketed. The number of non-senior disabled tenants in Marin's senior public housing projects has continued to increase. Disabled non-seniors now constitute 31% of the tenants in senior public housing. There is a need for permanent housing facilities with services for persons with mental illness after they leave recovery programs.

Marin County needs more housing with services for the dually diagnosed (persons who are mentally ill and suffering from alcohol or other substance abuse) and for the triple-diagnosed population, which has increased because of the increase in the longevity of people living with AIDS. People with triple diagnosis need services similar to those needed for dual diagnosed clients, but need more intensive support.

The Marin County population is also aging and there is an ever increasing need for accessible housing for low income seniors in both rural and urban settings.

Describe the characteristics of special needs populations in your community:

According to the director of Buckelew Programs, the County has a critical shortage of housing that provides an independent living situation with social service support for extremely low income and very low income people who are mentally ill. The Housing Authority's Shelter Plus Care Program provides a Section 8 rent subsidy in conjunction with intensive supportive services to 100 formerly homeless individuals and families who have a serious mental illness and who may also have a concurrent substance abuse problem and/or AIDS.

The HOPWA Program provides a rent subsidy to individuals and families living with HIV or AIDS. The HOPWA Program Coordinator helps link participants to needed social services. In many ways, the housing conditions faced by people living with AIDS in Marin are the same as the housing conditions faced by the general population. The high cost of housing in Marin is a burden for low income people, particularly if they face the loss of employment income and/or high medical expenses. People with AIDS in Marin, particularly those with less severe health problems, express a strong preference to remain in their homes for as long as possible. This subpopulation needs rent subsidies and a range of support services for both medical and family needs.

There is a critical need for assisted living housing for extremely low income seniors in Marin. Assisted living combines housing with the supportive services that are needed to assist seniors and people with disabilities with the activities of daily living. While there has been development of market-rate assisted living housing, there is an unmet need for assisted living units affordable to extremely low income people.

What are the housing and supportive service needs of these populations and how are these needs determined?

Service providers have reported that there is an unmet need for housing and supportive services in every special needs category including the frail elderly, people living with AIDS, those with mental illness, those with physical disabilities and those with developmental disabilities. Support services would need to be offered between three and seven days a week, two to four hours a day per individual.

The needs of those who could benefit from participation in an organized program to achieve economic independence and self-sufficiency are as follows (numbers do not indicate priority ranking):

- 1) Increasing funds available to organizations operating group treatment facilities for developmentally disabled people and clients with persistent mental illness,
- 2) Training and coordinating volunteer attendants to assist persons with physical impairments,
- 3) Rehabilitating existing affordable housing units for handicapped accessibility,
- 4) Establishing residence(s) and housing assistance programs for people living with HIV, developmentally disabled people, disabled parents with children, people with life-threatening illnesses, and persons suffering from AIDS-related dementia,
- 5) Establishing housing operated by and for people with chronic mental illness,
- 6) Establishing housing opportunities that would enable people with disabilities (including the developmentally disabled, physically disabled, and mentally ill) to live with their spouses and children.

Discuss the size and characteristics of the population with HIV/AIDS and their families within the Eligible Metropolitan Statistical Area:

In Marin County, the HIV/AIDS epidemic has reached virtually all racial and ethnic groups. Yet, data shows the largest proportion of AIDS cases is among gay white men. The vast majority of people with HIV/AIDS in Marin County live alone or with another adult. A relatively small number of people with HIV/AIDS live with dependents. However, anecdotal information about the housing needs of families that include an adult living with AIDS suggests that they face more severe housing affordability problems than people living with AIDS who do not have children.

Since the first Marin County AIDS case was reported in 1982, 1,348 people have been diagnosed with HIV or AIDS in Marin County - 568 of whom are still living an average of 17 new cases were diagnosed each year in the years between 2008 and 2013.

Of the people living with AIDS/HIV in Marin, 87% are Male, 12% are female and 1% are transgender; 71% are White, 17% are Hispanic/Latino, 7% are Black/African American, 2% are Asian, 2% are unknown and 1% is Native Hawaiian/Pacific islander; 1% are between the ages of 13-19, 4% are between the ages of 20-29, 10% are between the ages of 30-39, 24% are between the ages of 40-49, 36% are between the ages of 50-59 and 21% are between the ages of 60-69 with 6% over the age of 70.

Discussion:

The elderly, mentally ill, and physically and mentally disabled are all in need of housing and supportive services. The numbers of seniors who are aging in place in their own homes is increasing, establishing a greater need for modifications to aid with accessibility. The number of people who are dually diagnosed also continues to rise.

NA-50 Non-Housing Community Development Needs – 91.215 (f)

Describe the jurisdiction’s need for Public Facilities:

As previously discussed, housing is very expensive in Marin, and most jobs in the County pay less than what is needed to afford housing in Marin County. Extremely low income, very low income, low income, and moderate income persons are likely to experience rent burden. Consequently, all categories of low income people have less money to spend for other basic needs, such as health care, food, and transportation. The ability of lower income families to meet their needs has suffered because of cutbacks in federal, state, and local human service programs. There is a need to fund and, if possible, expand programs which address the unmet human service needs of homeless families and individuals, the mentally ill, alcohol and drug abusers, victims of domestic violence, severely mentally ill persons, frail elderly persons, the developmentally disabled, persons with AIDS and other serious illnesses, and runaway and abandoned youth.

How were these needs determined?

The types of facilities needed to provide social services were determined by data from public and private agencies that operate senior centers, youth centers, neighborhood facilities, child care centers, recreational facilities and playgrounds, and health facilities. Other types of facilities may be needed in the future as new community needs emerge. The amount of land available in Marin County for developing community facilities is severely limited by zoning and geographical restrictions. Much of the land in Marin is zoned for agricultural use and is not densely populated. In the populated areas of the County, there is little land suitable for development and the land that is available is frequently not affordable to non-profit agencies. Because commercial real estate prices have skyrocketed, the cost of acquiring an existing facility is daunting. It is difficult to find facilities that meet the needs of clients and satisfy licensing and local permit requirements.

Describe the jurisdiction’s need for Public Improvements:

There is a moderate need for infrastructure improvements, residential and non-residential historic preservation, economic development, and planning projects. There is a high need for disabled accessibility improvements throughout Marin, particularly in urban areas.

How were these needs determined?

Research and application of data collected by public and private local agencies.

Describe the jurisdiction’s need for Public Services:

The types of public services needed for lower income households include: medical care for the indigent, emergency food and financial assistance, senior services, services for people with disabilities, transportation services, substance abuse treatment, employment training, fair housing counseling,

immigration counseling, legal aid, family development programs, child care, and youth services. Other public services may be needed as emerging needs become apparent.

Generally, the most severe shortages in social services are for people with multiple disabilities (for example, a person with chronic mental illness and a substance abuse problem). The County has a limited number of programs to link people returning to the community from mental and physical health institutions to appropriate supportive housing. The Marin County Community Mental Health Program is a referral source, and local hospitals provide patients with discharge planning services. The effectiveness of this referral service, however, is limited by the shortage of supportive services needed to assist people to live independently.

The cost of providing social services in West Marin is high because the area is sparsely populated. The economy of West Marin is based on low-paying jobs like agriculture, tourism, and local goods and services. Consequently, the unit cost of providing services in West Marin is greater than in the rest of the county. West Marin receives the smallest amount of the CDBG funds since it has the lowest population density. Due to these factors, the need for public services in West Marin is greater than funds available to support services.

How were these needs determined?

Research and application of data collected by public and private local agencies.

Housing Market Analysis

MA-05 Overview

Housing Market Analysis Overview:

Based on 2010 data from the California Department of Finance, the unincorporated area of Marin has 24,615 single-family homes (constituting 83% of the total housing stock), 4,399 multi-family homes (15% of all housing), and 567 mobile homes, for a total of 29,581 homes. Single-family homes are slightly less dominant Countywide, and comprise just over 70% of the County's total housing stock.

The median home sales price across the County increased from \$650,000 to \$882,400 between 2001 and 2013. This 36% jump occurred while median household income increased by only 0.8%, meaning home values increased significantly more than local incomes. In 2000, the market was already tight, with only 11% of homes valued at less than \$300,000. By 2013, the median home value in unincorporated Marin County was \$966,000 for a single-family home. Condominiums and townhomes were more affordable with a median home value of \$485,000. While many areas throughout the State experienced decreasing values in the real estate market over the past decade, home prices in Marin County have remained relatively stable and will likely continue to rise.

MA-10 Number of Housing Units – 91.210(a)&(b)(2)

Introduction

As of 2014, there were approximately 6,657 households benefiting from affordable housing throughout Marin County’s 12 jurisdictions. The income-restricted housing stock includes 6,657 units comprised of;

More than 101 privately managed rental properties totaling 3,057 units;

274 inclusionary rental units;

758 below-market ownership homes;

9 public housing properties;

2 State funded properties comprising 573 units; and

2,121 Section 8 vouchers.

The majority of affordable housing is in the City-Centered Corridor, although there are several deed restricted rental and ownership properties in the villages of West Marin and the Inland Rural Corridor. These developments demonstrate the future potential for affordable housing in a range of communities and geographic locations throughout the diverse environs of unincorporated Marin.*

*2014 Marin County Housing Element (pg IV-3)

All residential properties by number of units

Property Type	Number	%
1-unit detached structure	68,183	61%
1-unit, attached structure	11,029	10%
2-4 units	8,120	7%
5-19 units	12,556	11%
20 or more units	8,943	8%
Mobile Home, boat, RV, van, etc	2,106	2%
Total	110,937	100%

Table 28 – Residential Properties by Unit Number

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Unit Size by Tenure

	Owners		Renters	
	Number	%	Number	%
No bedroom	243	0%	1,870	5%

	Owners		Renters	
	Number	%	Number	%
1 bedroom	2,039	3%	11,708	31%
2 bedrooms	12,403	19%	15,002	39%
3 or more bedrooms	50,101	77%	9,466	25%
Total	64,786	99%	38,046	100%

Table 29 – Unit Size by Tenure

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Describe the number and targeting (income level/type of family served) of units assisted with federal, state, and local programs.

In spring of 2014, Community Development Agency staff surveyed all affordable housing providers throughout the County, which together supply 2,783 units at nonprofit rental properties, 274 inclusionary rental units, 734 Below Market Rate ownership units, 577 units of public housing, and 2,145 Section 8 vouchers. There are more than 6,600 households that benefit from affordable housing in Marin; however, this represents only 18% of the 37,393 low income households in Marin. Approximately 25% of Marin’s existing affordable units are reserved for seniors or persons with disabilities. The majorities of these households receive income from Social Security, are in the very low income category, and rely heavily on affordable housing to enable them to age within their community.

Provide an assessment of units expected to be lost from the affordable housing inventory for any reason, such as expiration of Section 8 contracts.

As of July 2014, there are 4,368 deed restricted affordable housing units in Marin County. Government Code Section 65583 requires each city and county to conduct an analysis and identify programs for preserving assisted housing developments. The analysis is required to identify any low income units that are at risk of losing deed-restricted subsidies in the next 10 years. According to the California Housing Partnership Corporation, there are three developments with an aggregate total of 152 units deemed at risk of conversion in the unincorporated area of Marin County. Additionally, there are 10 developments with an aggregate total of 156 units within the incorporated cities of the County that are identified as at risk of conversion, primarily in Novato and San Rafael.

The Marin Housing Authority manages 326 Below Market Rate (BMR) home ownership units throughout Marin County that are preserved by deed-restriction, of which 90 units are in the unincorporated County. The Marin Housing Authority processes all resales and monitors the affordability range for these BMR units. There are an additional 408 BMR units in the City of Novato that are managed by Hello Housing. From 2008 to July 2014, the total number of BMR units countywide decreased from 758 units to 734 units, primarily due to foreclosures as a result of the recent economic downturn.

Does the availability of housing units meet the needs of the population?

The Marin Housing Authority (MHA) administers the Section 8 voucher program that provides housing opportunities for approximately 2,200 households. MHA also operates nearly 500 units of Public Housing in Marin. The waiting lists for both the Section 8 voucher program and for Public Housing are a widely accepted indicator of need for affordable housing. The Marin Housing Authority opened its Section 8 waiting list for one week in September 2008, for the first time in several years, and received 11,200 applications. As of June 2014, MHA has processed 2,639 of those applications, leaving 8,561 applicants still on the waiting list.

In February 2014, MHA opened the Public Housing waiting list for one week with the following results:

3,189 households submitted applications

1,148 (or 36%) currently live in Marin County (however, data was not collected on whether applicants currently work in Marin County)

66% of the applications were from families, and 34% were from senior or disabled households

38% of the applications were from Caucasian families, 43% from African American families, and 4% from Asian families

MHA operates 200 units of public housing in five separate complexes within Marin for the elderly and disabled as well as 296 units of public housing for families in Marin City. MHA owns and operates four private properties within Marin County, all for low-income families, seniors, and disabled. The Shelter Plus Care Program, also administered by MHA, provides 75 rental subsidies linked with supportive services to individuals and families who are homeless and living with a mental health disability. There are 26 rental subsidies for people with HIV/AIDS living independently in the community who are served through the Housing Opportunities for People With AIDS Program (HOPWA). Additional programs offer services to specific special needs populations housed through Marin Housing Authority. These programs assist tenants in maintaining their housing and target services to frail seniors, families seeking to become self-sufficient, and at-risk populations with mental health or other disabilities.

Describe the need for specific types of housing:

More than 60% of Marin County's households consist of married-couple families with or without children. Approximately 30% of households are people living alone. This percentage was significantly higher than the overall State figure of 23% for single-person households. As households become smaller, the County needs more housing units to serve the same population. There is a shortage of rental housing, including multi-family, single family, second units, and Single Room Occupancy (SRO) units. In addition, opportunities for smaller, more moderately priced home ownership units are needed to serve singles, senior citizens, and lower income families.

Discussion

The housing type best suited to serve the workforce of Marin, those with an income of approximately \$59,300 a year, is often multi-family rental housing and SRO units located close to transportation and services. Examples of this type of housing include the Fireside and San Clemente developments, which provide subsidized rental housing at a range of affordability levels. These housing developments are close to transit and services and help to reduce commute costs to the low-income residents. Mixed-use developments, such as that planned for the Marinwood Village site and the mixed-use units located at the Strawberry shopping center, are other examples of housing types that may address the needs of Marin's workforce.

MA-15 Housing Market Analysis: Cost of Housing - 91.210(a)

Introduction

The Marin County housing market may be described in one word: expensive. The factors which cause high housing prices and rents are 1) a limited supply of vacant land suitable for housing construction (most cities within Marin County are built out), 2) limited new construction due to voter opposition to growth, 3) high demand resulting from job growth in the region, and 4) relatively high incomes of households.

Cost of Housing

	Base Year: 2000	Most Recent Year: 2011	% Change
Median Home Value	493,300	840,900	70%
Median Contract Rent	1,105	1,475	33%

Table 30 – Cost of Housing

Data Source: 2000 Census (Base Year), 2007-2011 ACS (Most Recent Year)

Rent Paid	Number	%
Less than \$500	3,655	9.6%
\$500-999	4,296	11.3%
\$1,000-1,499	12,299	32.3%
\$1,500-1,999	9,857	25.9%
\$2,000 or more	7,939	20.9%
Total	38,046	100.0%

Table 31 - Rent Paid

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Housing Affordability

% Units affordable to Households earning	Renter	Owner
30% HAMFI	2,189	No Data
50% HAMFI	5,701	1,144
80% HAMFI	19,665	2,896
100% HAMFI	No Data	4,416
Total	27,555	8,456

Table 32 – Housing Affordability

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

Monthly Rent

Monthly Rent (\$)	Efficiency (no bedroom)	1 Bedroom	2 Bedroom	3 Bedroom	4 Bedroom
Fair Market Rent	1,093	1,423	1,795	2,438	2,948
High HOME Rent	1,191	1,334	1,602	1,842	2,035
Low HOME Rent	971	1,040	1,252	1,450	1,620

Table 33 – Monthly Rent

Data Source: HUD FMR and HOME Rents

Is there sufficient housing for households at all income levels?

No. According to the Marin County Community Development Agency, only 16% of the total land area in Marin County (including cities) is suitable for development, 11% of the land in the county has been developed, and 5% is available for development. The remaining land is held in agriculture, parkland, publicly and privately owned open space, watershed and tidelands. The local housing market is characterized by high prices for single family homes (including townhouses and condominiums), high rents, low vacancy rates, and a shortage of vacant land suitable for housing development. The mean average cost of a home hovers around \$1 million and the average rent recorded in 2014 was close to \$2,400 per month.

How is affordability of housing likely to change considering changes to home values and/or rents?

Housing costs and rents continue to rise while the lack of available land remains constant. High development costs make affordable housing development impossible without substantial subsidy. Projects tend to be small scale in Marin County, due to the small size of available undeveloped land, local zoning which favors lower density development, and the need to limit the scale of projects due to environmental concerns and community opposition. Small projects are not able to benefit from economies of scale. This results in higher development costs per unit, and it also results in higher ongoing management costs per rental unit. Higher management costs mean that there is less money available for social services for tenants. According to EAH Housing, the cost of building affordable rental housing can range from \$405,000 to \$565,000 per unit. For this reason, housing construction in the private market has focused on expensive single family homes, townhouses, and condominiums.

How do HOME rents / Fair Market Rent compare to Area Median Rent? How might this impact your strategy to produce or preserve affordable housing?

The HOME and Fair Market Rents are generally substantially lower than the median rents in Marin County. Published Fair Market Rent for a two bedroom unit in 2014 was \$1956 (HOME Program Rents 04/2014) while the average rental cost for a 2 bedroom unit is listed as \$4,937 on the Realtor.com website.

Discussion

Marin County housing is in great demand, with high prices and rents as the primary indicators of this demand. A vacancy rate lower than 5% indicates a high demand for housing, and upward pressure on home prices and rents. Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, vacancy rates hovered between 1% and 2%. the current vacancy rate of 2.2% for rental units and 0.7% for owner-occupied units. Other contributors to high demand are a healthy regional economy, more than one worker per household, and the desirability of Marin County as a place to live (it has good public schools, a beautiful landscape, plenty of recreational and cultural opportunities, and close proximity to San Francisco.)

MA-20 Housing Market Analysis: Condition of Housing – 91.210(a)

Introduction

The condition of Marin County's housing stock ranges from good to excellent. With the exception of the lowest income households, owner-occupants tend to take good care of their property, because they wish to preserve the high market value. Rental units tend to be well-maintained also, due to the high rents asked for vacant apartments.

Definitions

By local definition, a substandard housing unit is lacking complete kitchen and/or plumbing facilities. A unit in substandard condition but suitable for rehabilitation is one that can be rehabilitated to comply with local zoning and building standards.

Condition of Units

Condition of Units	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Number	%	Number	%
With one selected Condition	25,367	39%	19,166	50%
With two selected Conditions	416	1%	1,506	4%
With three selected Conditions	28	0%	47	0%
With four selected Conditions	0	0%	38	0%
No selected Conditions	38,975	60%	17,289	45%
Total	64,786	100%	38,046	99%

Table 34 - Condition of Units

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Year Unit Built

Year Unit Built	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Number	%	Number	%
2000 or later	3,391	5%	1,613	4%
1980-1999	11,071	17%	6,414	17%
1950-1979	37,037	57%	23,301	61%
Before 1950	13,287	21%	6,718	18%
Total	64,786	100%	38,046	100%

Table 35 – Year Unit Built

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

Risk of Lead-Based Paint Hazard

Risk of Lead-Based Paint Hazard	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Number	%	Number	%
Total Number of Units Built Before 1980	50,324	78%	30,019	79%
Housing Units build before 1980 with children present	2,037	3%	1,346	4%

Table 36 – Risk of Lead-Based Paint

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS (Total Units) 2007-2011 CHAS (Units with Children present)

Vacant Units

	Suitable for Rehabilitation	Not Suitable for Rehabilitation	Total
Vacant Units	0	0	0
Abandoned Vacant Units	0	0	0
REO Properties	0	0	0
Abandoned REO Properties	0	0	0

Table 37 - Vacant Units

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

Need for Owner and Rental Rehabilitation

See Section NA-10

Estimated Number of Housing Units Occupied by Low or Moderate Income Families with LBP Hazards

It is estimated that 16,526 (plus or minus 10%), or roughly 69%, of the housing units that are occupied by very low or low income households may contain lead-based paint hazards. This estimate is based on the data reported in the comprehensive and Workable Plan for the Abatement of Lead-Based Paint in Privately Owned Structures, HUD; US Census, 1940 thru 1990. Because Marin has a newer housing stock than other parts of the country, national estimates may exaggerate the lead-based paint hazard in Marin.

Discussion

MA-25 Public and Assisted Housing – 91.210(b)

Introduction

Marin County has a total of 496 public housing units, 296 of which are in Marin City and 200 of which are in elderly/disabled complexes. The waiting list for units in Marin City is competitive, although it is the least competitive portion of the Housing Authority's assisted housing program. The Marin City units have some turnover and many applicants say they would rather live in other parts of Marin. Housing Authority staff notes that the need for housing for the mentally ill has skyrocketed in the last decade. Staff estimates that mentally ill people comprise 60% of the waiting list for elderly public housing projects, an increase from past experience.

Totals Number of Units

	Program Type								
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers					
				Total	Project -based	Tenant -based	Special Purpose Voucher		
							Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
# of units vouchers available	0	0	496	2,145	52	2,093	264	0	0
# of accessible units									

*includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition

Table 38 – Total Number of Units by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Describe the supply of public housing developments:

Describe the number and physical condition of public housing units in the jurisdiction, including those that are participating in an approved Public Housing Agency Plan:

The Marin Housing Authority (MHA) has 496 units of Public Housing; 296 in Marin City of family units and 200 units scattered throughout the county for seniors age 62+ and/or people with disabilities. The Public Housing units were all built in the late 1950's and early 1960's, and due to

the lack of adequate HUD funding over the years, the units have significant deferred maintenance. The physical condition of the public housing in units is based on a 2011 Comprehensive Plan for Physical Needs Assessments (PNA), which shows the properties have over \$85,000,000 of capital and preventative maintenance that will be necessary over the next 45 years; this dollar value reflects an inflation factor of 1.025%. MHA will be conducting another physical needs assessment in 2015 that will be used to determine the capital work for public housing units over the next five years. The table below reflects the scores given to Marin's public housing on a scale of 1-40 with 40 being the highest possible score.

Public Housing Condition

Public Housing Development	Average Inspection Score
Casa Nova - 35 Carmel Drive, Novato	35
Golden Hinde - 5 Golden Hinde Blvd., San Rafael	35
Homsestead Terrace - 100 Linden Ln., San Rafael	35
Kruger Pines - 47 North Knoll Rd., Mill Valley	35
Marin City Public Housing - 429 Drake Ave., Marin City	35
Venetia Oaks - 263 North San Pedro Rd., San Rafael	35

Table 39 - Public Housing Condition

Describe the restoration and revitalization needs of public housing units in the jurisdiction:

The Physical Improvement goals outlined below focus on completion of capital improvements in progress, urgently needed work, mandated improvements and possible future/ long term needs, all with energy conservation measures where cost effective: Urgently needed infrastructure improvements to repair and replace waste lines at the Golden Gate Village complex; Modernization of senior and family developments including: exterior lighting, patio and exterior stairway repairs; The Management Improvements (MI) goals include security surveillance cameras improvements, community preservation and revitalization facilitator, public housing authority-wide modernization of internal business management systems, and the continuation of a resident employment/economic self-sufficiency program. Physical and Management Needs Assessment of all six developments. In addition to modernizing existing public housing units, the MHA in collaboration with the community will be exploring the idea of developing revitalization and replacement housing strategies to preserve deteriorated low-income units it manages through revitalization and maintenance of affordable housing units. The MHA plans to embark into a long term revitalization plan at the Golden Gate Village, a 296-unit family development in Marin City. Any and all of these opportunities could bring the modernization and new construction of new affordable rental and first time homeownership opportunities at the site. MHA Board of Commissioners and staff will work closely with residents, community leaders and other stakeholders through the Community Working Group to evaluate and explore various options for improvement, preservation and revitalization of public housing.

Describe the public housing agency's strategy for improving the living environment of low- and moderate-income families residing in public housing:

With a Capital Fund allocation of less than \$800,000, MHA will never be able to fully address the short and long term needs at the family site of Golden Gate Village through this program alone. The extent of the physical problems, the inappropriateness of existing site plans, and obsolescence of building designs at Golden Gate Village would make extensive repairs at these buildings an ineffective long-term strategy. To this end MHA is establishing a Working Group to create a strategic plan for preservation and

revitalization of public housing that is aligned with MHA's Five Year Annual Plan. The strategies proposed by the Working Group will be in alignment with the County of Marin's Consolidated Plan that identifies a serious shortage of affordable housing opportunities and a need to maintain a stock of housing for very low-income households. In addition, MHA has strengthened relationships with the local schools and established an attendance policy for Public Housing families with children. This program provides incentives for families to be sure their children are attending school. MHA has increased its Resident Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency case management services to all Public Housing residents in all six complexes. This program supports families in attaining health, education, income and financial goals. Some families are able to build escrow accounts as their earned income increases through their participation in the program. No smoking policies were added to the lease in Public Housing. Newly formed resident groups have been established in both the family and senior/disabled properties. These resident groups provide input on policies and the annual and 5-Year Agency Plan. MHA has also strengthened its partnerships with local law enforcement in an effort to decrease crime and provide residents with information to help keep their community safer.

Discussion:

MA-30 Homeless Facilities and Services – 91.210(c)

Introduction

Homeless persons and persons at risk of homelessness are referred by social service organizations, religious congregations, law enforcement agencies, and word-of-mouth to the appropriate services. Typically, clients are assessed to determine the severity of their housing, employment, and psychological or substance abuse problems, and to determine what personal resources they have available. Then counselors will recommend the appropriate supportive services. Marin County homeless housing and service providers participate in the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). HMIS is a software application designed to record and store client-level information on the characteristics and service needs of homeless persons throughout Marin’s Continuum of Care. The data collected follows universal data standards developed by the Department of Housing & Urban Development (HUD). All participating HMIS agencies agree to collect the universal data elements to ensure an unduplicated count of homeless and at risk persons in the county. The universal data elements include demographics (age, gender, race/ethnicity) as well as veteran status, disability, last place stayed, length of homelessness, housing status, and zip code of last permanent residence. HMIS enables agencies to track outcomes related to their programs which helps provide insight into the number of persons entering homeless and those who move on to stable housing.

Facilities and Housing Targeted to Homeless Households

	Emergency Shelter Beds		Transitional Housing Beds	Permanent Supportive Housing Beds	
	Year Round Beds (Current & New)	Voucher / Seasonal / Overflow Beds	Current & New	Current & New	Under Development
Households with Adult(s) and Child(ren)	28	3	148	230	0
Households with Only Adults	135	60	56	146	10
Chronically Homeless Households	0	0	0	219	0
Veterans	0	0	16	35	0
Unaccompanied Youth	0	0	0	0	0

Table 40 - Facilities and Housing Targeted to Homeless Households

Alternate Data Source Name:
Marin Point In Time Count 2013

Data Source Comments:

Proj. Type	Organization Name	Project Name	Inventory Type	Bed Type	Target Pop. A	Utilization Rate
SS	Homeward Bound of Marin	Family Center	C	Facility-based beds	HC	100%
SS	Homeward Bound of Marin	101 Street Center	C	Facility-based beds	SVLP	78%
SS	Homeward Bound of Marin	Wash Program	C	Voucher beds	HC	100%
SS	Homeward Bound of Marin	New Sagnaga Center	C	Facility-based beds	SVLP	100%
SS	Homeward Bound of Marin	Transition to Wellness/Medical	C			
SS	Homeward Bound of Marin	Respite	C	Facility-based beds	SVLP	82%
SS	Homeward Bound of Marin	Visage	C	Facility-based beds	SVLP	100%
SS	St. Vincent de Paul Society	Marin Shelters/Visor Shelter Program	C	Other beds	SVLP	88%
PSH	Supportive Programs	AIL (Assisted Independent Living)	C		SVLP	100%
PSH	Supportive Programs	RSS (Residential Support Services)	C		SVLP	100%
PSH	Supportive Programs	Supported Housing (Marin)	C		SVLP	100%
PSH	Supportive Programs	Supported Housing (non-HUD)	C		SVLP	100%
PSH	Center Point Inc.	Hotels	C		SVLP+HC	100%
PSH	SAH Housing	San Clemente (Service Provider, Homeward Bound)	C		HC	100%
PSH	Eden Housing Investments	Francis Archonke Housing (Service Provider, Homeward Bound)	C		SVLP+HC	88%
PSH	Homeward Bound of Marin	4th St.	C		SVLP	100%
PSH	Homeward Bound of Marin	Carmel	C		SVLP	82%
PSH	Homeward Bound of Marin	Palm Court	C		SVLP	88%

Proj. Type	Organization Name	Project Name	Inventory Type	Bed Type	Target Pop. A	Utilization Rate
PSH	Homeward Bound of Marin	Palm Court II	C		SVLP	100%
PSH	Homeward Bound of Marin	Palm Court III	N		SVLP	100%
PSH	Homeward Bound of Marin	Palm Court IV	N		SVLP	100%
PSH	Housing Authority of the County of Marin	Formerly SNA and Ojayay (Section 8 subsidy)	C		SVLP+HC	100%
PSH	Housing Authority of the County of Marin	Shelter Plus Care	C		SVLP+HC	100%
PSH	Housing Authority of the County of Marin	Shelter Plus Care 2	C		SVLP	100%
PSH	Housing Authority of the County of Marin	VASH	C		SVLP+HC	97%
PSH	River Center	Housing First	C		SVLP	88%
PSH	River Center	Housing First	U		SVLP	
PSH	St. Vincent de Paul Society	Apartment	C		SVLP	78%
PSH	County Rapid Rehousing	Rapid Rehousing	C		SVLP+HC	100%
TH	Center for Domestic Peace	Second Step Transitional Housing (Park)	C		HC	84%
TH	Center for Domestic Peace	Short-Term Transitional Housing	C		SV+HC	100%
TH	Center Point Inc.	1049 Street Charlotte House	C		HC	100%
TH	Center Point Inc.	THP Soledad Street	C		SVLP	87%
TH	Center Point Inc.	V/A Services	C		SVLP	0%
TH	Gleed House	1042 7th St.	C		HC	111%
TH	Hamilton Continuum Returns LP	Hamilton Meadows (Rider Center)	C		SVLP	100%

Proj. Type	Organization Name	Project Name	Inventory Type	Bed Type	Target Pop. A	Utilization Rate
TH	Hamilton Continuum Returns LP	Hamilton Meadows, C405(Second Step) (non-HUD funded)	C		HC	84%
TH	Hamilton Continuum Returns LP	Hamilton Meadows, Center Point	C		SVLP	78%
TH	Hamilton Continuum Returns LP	Hamilton Meadows, Homeward Bound/Meadow Park	C		SVLP+HC	104%
TH	Hamilton Continuum Returns LP	Hamilton Meadows(4th St), C405 (Subsid)	C		SVLP+HC	100%
TH	Homeward Bound of Marin	Family Park	C		HC	108%
TH	Homeward Bound of Marin	New Sagnaga Center (as den beds to veterans)	C		SVLP	82%
TH	Homeward Bound of Marin	The Neil Ray	C		SVLP+HC	88%

Homeless Facilities List

Describe mainstream services, such as health, mental health, and employment services to the extent those services are used to complement services targeted to homeless persons

The Marin County Department of Health and Human Services has an extensive directory of agencies serving persons with special needs.

For people with mental illness, Buckelew Programs and Homeward Bound of Marin offer a wide range of supportive housing. Buckelew Houses offers Residential Support Service (RSS) housing in single-family houses, each serving six to fifteen clients. RSS facilities provide mentally ill adults with basic support services for independent living.

There are over 50 group homes in Marin County serving people with developmental disabilities, with an average of 6 clients per house. These group residences provide supportive services under the supervision of the Golden Gate Regional Center and Community Care Licensing. Most of these facilities are in financial distress.

For people who need treatment of substance abuse problems, Marin nonprofit agencies provide beds in a range of types of recovery facilities. Services for this population are described in detail in the "Marin County Directory of Alcohol, Drug, and Related Programs, Services, and Activities," available from Marin Community Resource and the Marin County Office of Alcohol and Drug Programs.

Because of the availability of Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS Program (HOPWA) funds, the housing needs of some people living with HIV/AIDS are met through long-term rent subsidies. The county has a limited number of programs to link people returning to the community from mental and physical health institutions to appropriate supportive housing. The Marin County Community Mental Health Program is a referral resource, and local hospitals provide patients with discharge planning services. The effectiveness of these referral services, however, is limited by the shortage of supportive housing with services in many categories. Generally, the most severe shortages are in supportive housing for people with multiple problems (for example, a person with chronic mental illness and a substance abuse problem) and people who need a high level of services.

List and describe services and facilities that meet the needs of homeless persons, particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth. If the services and facilities are listed on screen SP-40 Institutional Delivery Structure or screen MA-35 Special Needs Facilities and Services, describe how these facilities and services specifically address the needs of these populations.

See List above

MA-35 Special Needs Facilities and Services – 91.210(d)

Introduction

See Section MA-30

Including the elderly, frail elderly, persons with disabilities (mental, physical, developmental), persons with alcohol or other drug addictions, persons with HIV/AIDS and their families, public housing residents and any other categories the jurisdiction may specify, and describe their supportive housing needs

There are very limited housing opportunities in Marin County for the lower income elderly who need supportive services. The problem is particularly severe for frail lower income seniors. Ross Valley Ecumenical Housing Association operates Tam House in San Anselmo, which provides shared housing and meals for 12 ambulatory seniors, and developed another 10 unit residence which it completed in 2007. Nonprofit and public agencies that operate subsidized senior housing attempt to link residents with the supportive services they need as they grow older and become frail. There are approximately 1,600 units in nine non-subsidized retirement residences in Marin, including "life care" and other types of facilities. Board and care homes have approximately 580 beds in 26 homes, but only an estimated 7% are available at the Supplemental Security Income (SSI) rate, which is all that the very low income frail elderly can afford. Further information about senior housing choices is available in "Choices for Living 2009: A Housing Resource Guide for Marin County Older Adults," published by the Marin County Division on Aging and Adult Services. West Marin has only one nonprofit assisted living facility for seniors and lacks other options for seniors, such as residential care facilities for the elderly ("board and care homes"), adult day care, Alzheimer's day care, retirement homes, and other nursing care facilities. Many houses in this area are in remote and inaccessible areas where home care workers are not comfortable visiting. Around the clock supervision and care is expensive and many people do not have an extra bedroom for a live-in worker. The cost of 24-hour care is not affordable for lower income individuals.

Describe programs for ensuring that persons returning from mental and physical health institutions receive appropriate supportive housing

For people with mental illness, Buckelew Programs and Homeward Bound of Marin offer a wide range of supportive housing. Buckelew Houses offers Residential Support Service (RSS) housing in single-family houses, each serving six to fifteen clients. RSS facilities provide mentally ill adults with basic support services for independent living. In 1997, Buckelew and Ecumenical Association for Housing (EAH) completed construction of a 16-unit supported independent living apartment project for chronically mentally ill persons in Novato. In 1999, Buckelew purchased a condominium unit to rent to its clients. In 2000, Buckelew Community Housing Development Organization, Inc., a new nonprofit sponsored by Buckelew Programs, purchased the Mariposa Apartments in San Rafael to rent to its clients. Buckelew

Programs sponsors the Marin Assisted Independent Living (MAIL) Program, which helps mentally ill adults form shared households in private rental units. Homeward Bound of Marin subleases part of the Carmel Hotel for its Voyager/Carmel program, which provides mentally ill adults with 20 single-room occupancy (SRO) rooms, which are used for a mixture of short-term occupancy and long-term supportive housing. This program provided the model that served as the basis of the design of a new program, Palm Court. Homeward Bound, in partnership with Buckelew, operates several scattered-site apartments and services for formerly homeless adults with mental illness.

Specify the activities that the jurisdiction plans to undertake during the next year to address the housing and supportive services needs identified in accordance with 91.215(e) with respect to persons who are not homeless but have other special needs. Link to one-year goals. 91.315(e)

CDBG funds are proposed for rehabilitation of Lifehouse group homes for people with developmental disabilities, and HOME funds have been set aside for rehabilitation of the Del Ganado Apartments for people with developmental disabilities.

For entitlement/consortia grantees: Specify the activities that the jurisdiction plans to undertake during the next year to address the housing and supportive services needs identified in accordance with 91.215(e) with respect to persons who are not homeless but have other special needs. Link to one-year goals. (91.220(2))

NA

MA-40 Barriers to Affordable Housing – 91.210(e)

Negative Effects of Public Policies on Affordable Housing and Residential Investment

The primary cause of the high cost of housing in Marin County is the high level of market demand for housing and a shortage of developable land. It is difficult to obtain sites for market-rate and subsidized housing development. Much of the land in the County is in public ownership or has been zoned for agricultural use, and is not developable. Within Marin's urbanized U.S. Highway 101 corridor, most of the suitably zoned sites have already been developed. Many of the remaining vacant urban sites have environmental constraints, ie: steep hillsides, marshes, or toxic contamination. In some cases, community opposition to subsidized housing, often framed in terms of environmental conservation or preservation of community character, limits buildable density to a lower level than is permitted by zoning. Project delays caused by litigation can ratchet up the price of a project, making it infeasible or requiring an additional infusion of subsidy. In either case, scarce resources are drained by the cost and delay of litigation, or by actions deemed prudent to prevent litigation. The lack of affordable housing makes it difficult for low-income minorities to move out of areas of minority concentration, and therefore has fair housing implications. The Marin County Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (AI) outlines the barriers to the development of affordable housing in detail. The AI and the Implementation Plan for the Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice were approved by the Marin County Board of Supervisors on October 11, 2011 and are incorporated as part of this Consolidated Plan by reference. Many public agencies have implemented land use and zoning policies to encourage the development of subsidized housing. For example, the County and most cities in Marin require developers of market-rate housing projects to set aside a percentage of units for low- and moderate-income households. For projects with 2-10 units, in cases where it is not feasible to provide inclusionary units on-site, the County will collect "in lieu" fees for deposit in the Marin County Housing Trust Fund. The proceeds from which are distributed to affordable housing projects. Most cities in Marin have similar requirements. State law mandates density bonuses of up to 25% for projects with below market rate units. The County and many cities offer pre-application consultation and expedited application review for proponents of subsidized housing. The County and many cities permit second units to be built in many single-family districts, usually with the size of the second units restricted to maintain affordable rents. Most housing development in the County undergoes extensive discretionary review, slowing the process of development. Permit review fees continue to rise in Marin County, adding to the already expensive development process. Because local tax revenues are increasing more slowly than the cost of maintaining local government services, and because the public is unwilling to spend tax funds to subsidize market-rate development, a continued rise in development application review fees is unavoidable. Many local jurisdictions in Marin County waive or reduce development application fees for affordable housing, and most attempt to speed and simplify the processing of applications for subsidized housing, which can result in substantial cost savings. Fee waiver policies of school districts and utility districts vary, and their desire to assist the development of subsidized housing is increasingly at odds with the financial pressure that all local public agencies are experiencing.

MA-45 Non-Housing Community Development Assets – 91.215 (f)

Introduction

Marin County consistently has the lowest unemployment rate in the State. Sixty percent of Marin County residents commute out to work at predominately white-collar jobs - primarily in San Francisco because it offers more job opportunities. Of the people who work in Marin, 60% are commuting in from other counties with lower costs of living. Many of these workers are employed in low paying service jobs. The Marin County population and resident workforce is aging.

Economic Development Market Analysis

Business Activity

Business by Sector	Number of Workers	Number of Jobs	Share of Workers %	Share of Jobs %	Jobs less workers %
Agriculture, Mining, Oil & Gas Extraction	899	507	1	1	0
Arts, Entertainment, Accommodations	11,119	12,351	14	15	1
Construction	3,715	5,296	5	6	1
Education and Health Care Services	14,719	17,342	18	21	3
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	7,502	6,718	9	8	-1
Information	3,479	2,667	4	3	-1
Manufacturing	3,521	2,160	4	3	-1
Other Services	6,019	6,552	8	8	0
Professional, Scientific, Management Services	14,519	12,874	18	16	-2
Public Administration	3	6	0	0	0
Retail Trade	9,686	11,713	12	14	2
Transportation and Warehousing	1,646	907	2	1	-1
Wholesale Trade	3,327	2,824	4	3	-1
Total	80,154	81,917	--	--	--

Table 41 - Business Activity

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS (Workers), 2011 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (Jobs)

Labor Force

Total Population in the Civilian Labor Force	133,240
Civilian Employed Population 16 years and over	124,781
Unemployment Rate	6.35
Unemployment Rate for Ages 16-24	14.64
Unemployment Rate for Ages 25-65	4.56

Table 42 - Labor Force

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Occupations by Sector	Number of People
Management, business and financial	44,571
Farming, fisheries and forestry occupations	3,777
Service	10,568
Sales and office	28,321
Construction, extraction, maintenance and repair	7,890
Production, transportation and material moving	3,252

Table 43 – Occupations by Sector

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Travel Time

Travel Time	Number	Percentage
< 30 Minutes	60,741	56%
30-59 Minutes	36,367	33%
60 or More Minutes	11,975	11%
Total	109,083	100%

Table 44 - Travel Time

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Education:

Educational Attainment by Employment Status (Population 16 and Older)

Educational Attainment	In Labor Force		Not in Labor Force
	Civilian Employed	Unemployed	
Less than high school graduate	7,031	632	4,429
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	10,671	775	5,068
Some college or Associate's degree	25,535	2,227	7,955

Educational Attainment	In Labor Force		Not in Labor Force
	Civilian Employed	Unemployed	
Bachelor's degree or higher	63,229	2,901	12,632

Table 45 - Educational Attainment by Employment Status

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Educational Attainment by Age

	Age				
	18–24 yrs	25–34 yrs	35–44 yrs	45–65 yrs	65+ yrs
Less than 9th grade	753	2,239	1,786	2,351	1,086
9th to 12th grade, no diploma	1,621	2,112	1,631	1,973	1,597
High school graduate, GED, or alternative	3,865	4,362	4,478	7,705	6,917
Some college, no degree	5,991	4,522	5,900	16,145	8,263
Associate's degree	541	1,594	1,759	5,958	2,441
Bachelor's degree	1,795	6,960	13,786	26,371	10,828
Graduate or professional degree	38	2,545	7,995	21,123	9,850

Table 46 - Educational Attainment by Age

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Educational Attainment – Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months

Educational Attainment	Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months
Less than high school graduate	19,401
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	32,224
Some college or Associate's degree	40,997
Bachelor's degree	64,118
Graduate or professional degree	83,237

Table 47 – Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Based on the Business Activity table above, what are the major employment sectors within your jurisdiction?

The major employment sectors in Marin County are divided as follows: management, business and financial 45.3%, farming, fisheries and forestry occupations 3.8%, service 10.8%, sales and office 28.8%, construction, extraction, maintenance and repair 8.0%, production, transportation and material moving 3.3%.

Describe the workforce and infrastructure needs of the business community:

There are a limited number of large employers in the county because of the high cost of commercial and residential real estate. Ninety percent of the private sector businesses in Marin employ less than 20 employees. Marin County's population commutes to and from other areas. Many service workers commute into the county from Sonoma, Contra Costa and Solano counties while the white collar workers who live in Marin commute to areas in the east bay and San Francisco and Santa Clara Counties. This clogs Marin's portion of the 101 Highway – ranked as one of the worst commutes in the Bay Area by the Metropolitan according to the Marin Transportation Commission (MTC). The majority of inbound workers also struggle to find reliable and affordable transportation options to and from work.

Zillow.com records the median home value in Marin County in 2014 as \$900,600. Marin County home values have gone up 5.2% over the past year. This compares to the mean home value in Sonoma County at \$492,500 and Alameda County at \$436,600.

The California Economic Development Department lists the following priority industries as seeing projected growth in Marin, San Francisco and San Mateo Counties:

Professional and Business Services

Healthcare, Social Assistance, and Educational Services

Leisure and Hospitality.

Workforce Investment Boards have identified three priority industries in 2013 that are common across the region: healthcare, professional services, and hospitality/tourism.

Describe any major changes that may have an economic impact, such as planned local or regional public or private sector investments or initiatives that have affected or may affect job and business growth opportunities during the planning period. Describe any needs for workforce development, business support or infrastructure these changes may create.

Major businesses or investors do not look to bring large facilities into Marin. The high cost and low availability of commercial real estate and the lack of affordable properties with appropriate infrastructure are road blocks to large business development here. There is a concerted community effort to bring a supermarket to an existing shopping center in Marin City in an effort to provide a needed community food source and local jobs.

Because of the aging workforce, and the limited opportunities for young adults to live in Marin County as a result of the lack of affordable housing, it is a challenge for private and public employers to find employees. Currently, more than 60% of employees who work in Marin live outside of Marin, and Marin has the lowest unemployment rate in the state. Businesses and local government recognize these obstacles. So there is little incentive to invest, expand or develop large new businesses in the County. As

the labor force commuting from outside of Marin continues to grow, there is more pressure on the transportation infrastructure, resulting in a negative environmental impact.

How do the skills and education of the current workforce correspond to employment opportunities in the jurisdiction?

The Marin County Workforce Investment Board conducted a survey of employers to determine the skills gap for the current workforce.

Need short term, vocational training: 58.10%

Do not have skills that match requirements: 56.50%

Lack basic skills: 43.50%

Need more work experience: 38.70%

Not job ready: 37.10%

Some need long term or technical training: 37.10%

Businesses were also asked what professional skills are needed for their businesses to stay competitive. Common responses were:

Soft skills, communication skills: 61.30%

Understanding the need for professionalism: 40%

On the job training for new employees: 36.30%

Computer training: 38.80%

Vocational ESL: 30%

- The majority of jobs in Marin that are available to local job seekers are entry-level, low-wage, part-time and seasonal employment.
- Over 50% of Marin residents have a 4-year college degree; 60% of whom commute out to work at predominately white-collar jobs (primarily in San Francisco).
- Those with the highest education and earnings potential commute primarily to San Francisco, approximately 28 miles away, leaving the majority of residents who do not have college degrees to find work within Marin.
- A 2011 report published by the Non-Profit Housing Association of Northern California (NPH) reported that on top of the longer commute time, local transportation systems are clogged by

the 60% of the county's workforce that are traveling to work in Marin from less expensive, neighboring areas. The majority of inbound workers also struggle to find reliable and affordable transportation options to and from work.

Describe any current workforce training initiatives, including those supported by Workforce Investment Boards, community colleges and other organizations. Describe how these efforts will support the jurisdiction's Consolidated Plan.

The Marin County Workforce Investment Board (MCWIB) is committed to increasing worker skills, workplace competencies and the development and use of career pathways that connect job seekers to employment. The MCWIB will continue to work on establishing regional linkages to apprenticeship programs. The MCWIB, along with its North Bay Employment Connection (NBEC), has established working relationships with apprenticeship programs, adult schools and the community colleges to better align and leverage resources, improve coordination of training programs and establish cross-referral. The MCWIB locally, and regionally with NBEC, will focus its Workforce Investment Act (WIA) services on priority industry sectors – healthcare, professional and business services, and leisure and hospitality to create career pathways. Staying industry-focused will provide significant benefits to both employers and job seekers. Job seekers will receive industry-focused job search assistance, training, and connection to industry employers. The MCWIB in partnership with home healthcare sector employers and the American Red Cross will design customized training for current certified nursing assistants (CNAs), home health aides (HHAs) and other home care providers including non-certified personal care assistants (PCAs). Health care employers have already identified a number of areas where skill development is needed including: administering bed baths, transporting, mobility assistance, assisting with activities of daily living, body mechanics, dementia, and Alzheimer's care. The target training will be eligible as continuing education credits, since CNAs must recertify every two years. The MCWIB has contracted with the Marin County Office of Education (MCOE) for the last eight years as their primary provider of WIA youth services. MCOE continues to operate one of the few School to Career Partnerships in the state, due in significant part to the hundreds of employer relationships that have been established all over the county. Staff helps youth understand their career pathway options and places them in internships that align with their future career interests. MCOE operates the alternative high schools in the county, providing ready access to young people at risk of not completing high school who may benefit from services. They partner with a variety of community-based organizations to access out-of-school youth as well. Because of this partnership with the K-12 educational system, staff is readily able to assist youth with understanding the importance of completing high school and pursuing postsecondary education or certificates needed for their future career goals. The MCOE is also working to place youth in internships within the priority industries, including healthcare (employers from Kaiser Permanente, Marin Community Clinic, Marin General, Novato Community Hospital, St. Joseph Hospital, Sutter Health Clinics and several private practices) and business services (including employers from

Fireman's Fund and Desta Tea Company). In addition to the WIB, there are several non-profits in Marin who work specifically to address the gap between employment and education and work with low-income, low-skilled individuals to develop employment and soft skills to enable them to compete in the workforce. Those agencies include the Marin City Community Development Corporation and the Canal Alliance.

Does your jurisdiction participate in a Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS)?

No

If so, what economic development initiatives are you undertaking that may be coordinated with the Consolidated Plan? If not, describe other local/regional plans or initiatives that impact economic growth.

There are several transportation initiatives for residents to have access to employment within the County. There are community and private discussions in Marin City to address the vacancies in the local shopping center and the need for the low-income community to have access to a grocery store.

Discussion

The workforce training programs are focused on providing realistic training to youth and adults to allow them to compete in the available job market.

MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion

Are there areas where households with multiple housing problems are concentrated? (include a definition of "concentration")

The county has three "areas of low income concentration," defined as Census tracts where the population is lower income than the rest of the county, with income not exceeding 80% of the area median. Census tracts 1110 (downtown San Rafael), 1122 (Canal area of San Rafael), and 1290 (Marin City) have the highest concentration of low income households and the highest incidence of poverty.

Are there any areas in the jurisdiction where racial or ethnic minorities or low-income families are concentrated? (include a definition of "concentration")

The county has three "areas of low income concentration," defined as Census tracts where the population is lower income than the rest of the county, with income not exceeding 80% of the area median. Census tracts 1110 (downtown San Rafael), 1122 (Canal area of San Rafael), and 1290 (Marin City) have the highest concentration of low income households and the highest incidence of poverty. Two of these areas also have the highest concentration of Black African/American (CT1290) and Hispanic (CT1122) residents.

What are the characteristics of the market in these areas/neighborhoods?

The demographics of Marin City shifted between 1995 and 2000, with the completion of the 255 apartments and 85 townhomes at the Marin City USA redevelopment project and completion of the 30 unit Braun Court affordable homeownership project. Marin City USA contains a mix of market rate and subsidized rental and for-sale units. Of the 255 Marin City USA apartment units, 66 are available to very low income households and 28 to low income families. Of the 85 townhomes, 34 are part of the Below Market Rate program (BMR) and will have resale restrictions for 30 years. Half of the BMR units were sold to low and moderate income Marin City residents, which fulfilled the project's goal of providing homeownership opportunities to Marin City residents. At least three of the new homebuyers were former public housing residents. Twelve homes at Marin City USA have been purchased by moderate income and higher income Marin City residents. The primary goals of the Marin City USA project were to bring greater racial and economic integration to Marin City. Property management staff for the new apartments at Marin City USA estimated in 1999 that 40% of their residents were African-American, 35% were white, 15% were Hispanic, 5% were Asian/Pacific Islander, and 5% were "other" (do not fall in the categories mentioned). Property management staff also noted that a number of the market rate units were occupied by minority individuals and families. More than half of the homebuyers were white, a quarter of them were African-American, 14% were Asian, and the rest were Hispanic and Native American. Marin City has qualified as a low income and minority concentration area according to HUD statistics. Nearly 72% of public housing residents in Marin City were African-American in 2004, and nearly 81% were minorities.

In the Canal area, there are large numbers of multi-family rentals and residents often live in overcrowded conditions. Educational outcomes are alarmingly low, with over half the adults lacking a high school diploma. The typical worker in the Canal neighborhood earns just over \$21,000, about the same as an American worker in the late 1960s.

Are there any community assets in these areas/neighborhoods?

The Marin City Community Services District provides public parks and recreation, street lighting, and refuse collection services to Marin City residents. Further, the District provides public leadership in all matters that affect the community, including economic development, education, health and wellness, public safety, physical infrastructure, transportation, zoning, signage, land use planning, housing, and redevelopment. The Marin City Community Development Corporation (MCCDC) was established in 1979 to improve the economic quality of life for Marin City residents. Toward this end, MCCDC promotes business opportunities, creates income-generating programs, promotes full employment, builds skills and promotes the concept of economic self-sufficiency. The Marin City Health & Wellness Center is a federally funded health center providing primary health, dental and behavioral health care to residents of public housing and those who are homeless in Marin County. The clinic was established in 2006 to provide affordable and accessible health care services in Marin City/Southern Marin delivered in a way that respects the cultural diversity of the community. Since opening its doors in November 2006. The Marin City Health & Wellness Center had an immediate impact on the community by directly targeting the integrated issues of lack of access to care, and health disparities in Marin City. In 2011, Marin City Health and Wellness Center became a Federally Qualified Health Center (FQHC). Canal Alliance was Incorporated in 1982. It is a comprehensive community resource center that helps low-income, Spanish-speaking immigrants through access to health and social services, youth development, economic security, and citizenship. They provide the full spectrum of immigrant integration initiatives under one roof. Canal Alliance services address many barriers to immigrant integration faced by clients. Bilingual, bicultural staff help connect immigrants to appropriate services. Serving the community for 30 years, the agency have earned the trust of immigrants as a cornerstone organization in the Canal neighborhood. The program has been assisted by both the HOME program to assist in the purchase of housing and CDBG funds for a variety of programs including the UP! Program that encourages Hispanic youth to attend college. Performing Stars transforms the lives of low-income, primarily multicultural, children throughout Marin County by using enrichment programs to build pride, character, discipline and self-esteem. Its programs help youth develop good work habits and positive social skills, enhance academic performance and professional readiness, improve critical thinking and communication skills, and gain the confidence they need to overcome the limitations imposed by poverty.

Are there other strategic opportunities in any of these areas?

The Pickleweed Children's Center in San Rafael serves 48 low income children in its pre-Kindergarten program. It receives consistent financial backing from the City of San Rafael in addition to CDBG funds.

The Marin Learning Center serves 48 pre-school children in Marin City. Both programs offer kindergarten readiness, social and emotional development, self regulation, language and character development programs. The Marin Learning Center also offers therapeutic services, partially funded with CDBG funds.

Strategic Plan

SP-05 Overview

Strategic Plan Overview

The county's goal is to meet all the needs evidenced in the county, however, the greatest obstacle is that needs far exceed available funds. If sufficient public resources were available, the county might be able to satisfy all needs within the time period covered by this report. However, given government funding cuts, it is unlikely that sufficient resources will materialize.

It is the County's goal to support projects which serve the neediest of Marin within the constraints of limited funds and limited sites.

The number of households served with affordable housing projects is highly dependent on the amount of funding made available by the federal and state governments, the availability of suitably zoned sites (which, because Marin is almost built out, is highly variable from one year to the next) and the initiative taken by local community-based nonprofits.

Marin County will continue to place the highest priority on projects that meet the housing needs of extremely low income and very low income individuals and families including renters in elderly, small, and large households; homeless persons and those at risk of homelessness; and individuals with special needs. Marin County's strategy for meeting these housing needs is to leverage federal, state and local resources in order to fund acquisition, rehabilitation, new construction, and rental assistance. The County will continue to be committed to facilities with supportive services for persons with special needs.

The next highest priority for allocating housing funds will be given to acquisition, rehabilitation, new construction, and rental assistance for low income individuals and families. This group includes low income renters in elderly, small, and large households, as well as extremely low income, very low income, and low income homeowners, and low income homeless individuals and families, and low income individuals with special needs. Homeownership projects which stabilize areas of low income and/or minority concentration fall into this category. With whatever resources are available, Marin County will continue to leverage federal, state, and local funds, in order to support the acquisition, rehabilitation, and new construction of all types of housing and to offer rental assistance to lower income households.

Applicant's Name Marin County, California
Priority Need Category Community Development
Specific Objective Number H-1 Marin County will use federal funds to address the affordable housing needs of low income persons by funding an average of 3 projects per year, allocating an average of \$800,000 in CDBG and HOME funds annually.
Specific Objective Number C-1 Marin County will use federal funds to acquire and or rehabilitate community facilities serving the needs of low income persons by funding an average of 3 capital improvement projects per year, allocating an average of \$300,000 in CDBG funds annually
Specific Objective Number PS-1 Marin County will use federal funds to address basic human needs of low income persons by funding an average of 15 public service projects per year, allocating an average of \$180,000 in CDBG funds annually.



Marin County Priority Need Categories

SP-10 Geographic Priorities – 91.215 (a)(1)

Geographic Area

Table 48 - Geographic Priority Areas

1	Area Name:	Countywide
	Area Type:	Other
	Other Target Area Description:	Other
	HUD Approval Date:	
	% of Low/ Mod:	
	Revital Type:	
	Other Revital Description:	
	Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.	
	Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.	
	How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?	
	Identify the needs in this target area.	
	What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?	
	Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?	
2	Area Name:	Countywide, emphasis on locations which are likely to result in increased racial & ethnic diversity
	Area Type:	Other
	Other Target Area Description:	Other
	HUD Approval Date:	
	% of Low/ Mod:	
	Revital Type:	
	Other Revital Description:	
	Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.	

	Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.	
	How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?	
	Identify the needs in this target area.	
	What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?	
	Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?	
3	Area Name:	Countywide, with an emphasis on mobilehome parks and liveaboard houseboat communities
	Area Type:	Other
	Other Target Area Description:	Other
	HUD Approval Date:	
	% of Low/ Mod:	
	Revital Type:	
	Other Revital Description:	
	Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.	
	Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.	
	How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?	
	Identify the needs in this target area.	
	What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?	
	Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?	
4	Area Name:	Countywide, with emphasis on high-need neighborhoods
	Area Type:	Other
	Other Target Area Description:	Other
	HUD Approval Date:	

% of Low/ Mod:	
Revital Type:	
Other Revital Description:	
Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.	
Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.	
How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?	
Identify the needs in this target area.	
What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?	
Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?	

General Allocation Priorities

Describe the basis for allocating investments geographically within the jurisdiction (or within the EMSA for HOPWA)

Geographic Area

In order to further the aims of economic, racial and ethnic integration, and in order to take advantage of all available sites for affordable housing development, it is the County's policy to distribute subsidized housing and CDBG-funded activities throughout the county. Some services which are critical to low income and minority populations will be targeted to areas of low income and minority concentration.

CDBG funds are distributed within Marin County in the following manner. Forty percent (40%) of funds are available for housing on a countywide basis. Sixty percent (60%) of the funds are distributed among six planning areas for housing, community facility, and public service activities, using the same demographic formula that HUD uses nationally to allocate CDBG funding.

For any CDBG Planning Area which includes a city with a population of 50,000 or more (according to population estimates issued by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development), the system described above for allocation of CDBG funds in that Planning Area will, at the option of the largest city in the Planning Area, be modified so that the Planning Area's "proportional share" of CDBG Countywide Housing funds will be added to, and become part of, its planning area allocation. "Proportional share" is defined as the same proportion by which Planning Area funds are distributed among the Planning Areas. This policy is already in place in the San Rafael and Novato planning areas.

General Allocation Priorities

In general, Marin County will continue to place the highest priority on meeting the housing needs of extremely low and very low income individuals and families, including renters in elderly, small, and large households; homeless persons and those at-risk of homelessness; and individuals with special needs throughout all areas of the county.

The number of households served with affordable housing projects is highly dependent on the amount of funding made available by the federal and state governments, the availability of suitably zoned sites (which, because Marin is almost built-out, is highly variable from one year to the next), and the initiative taken by local community-based nonprofits.

With whatever resources are available, Marin County will continue to leverage federal, state, and local funds, in order to support the acquisition, rehabilitation, and new construction of all types of housing and to offer rental assistance to lower income households.

SP-25 Priority Needs - 91.215(a)(2)

Priority Needs

Table 49 – Priority Needs Summary

1	Priority Need Name	Extremely low and very low income rental housing
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Low Large Families Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Rural Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families Victims of Domestic Violence Non-housing Community Development
	Geographic Areas Affected	

	Associated Goals	Rental Housing -New Construction Rental Housing - Acquisition Rental Housing - Rehabilitation Special Needs Housing Housing for Formerly Homeless People Fair Housing Services Other Housing Activities
	Description	Providing housing for extremely low income and very low income individuals and families (excluding homeowners and first-time homebuyers).

<p>Basis for Relative Priority</p>	<p>Market conditions cause a shortage of affordable housing in Marin. There is a great need for all types of housing, for all populations, and for extremely low income, very low income, and low income individuals and families. It is clear that projects serving extremely low income and very low income persons including renters in elderly, small, and large households, homeless individuals and families and those at-risk of homelessness, and individuals with special needs should be given the highest priority for funding. Extremely low income and very low income people are most severely burdened by housing costs.</p> <p>Because of the above factors, all categories of extremely low income and very low income renters are most impacted by housing costs and therefore are the highest priority for housing assistance. People in this category are more likely than the general population to be single parent households, homeless or at risk of homelessness, and persons with disabilities. Consequently, they also need a greater share of social services than the rest of the population. Statistics are not available to show whether immigrants and people whose first language is not English are disproportionately represented in this group.</p> <p><u>Activities:</u> Acquisition, rehabilitation, and new construction of rental housing, rental assistance, and provision of facilities with supportive services for persons with disabilities or special needs will be the focus of Marin County's community development efforts for extremely low income and very low income persons in the five year period covered in this report. Marin County plans to undertake these activities for the following reasons:</p> <p>Acquisition of existing housing can add new units to the affordable housing stock or ensure long-term affordability for subsidized units at risk of becoming market rate. Acquisition usually does not require zoning changes or local government approvals and may face less opposition from neighborhood groups than construction projects.</p> <p>Rehabilitation is needed to help maintain the existing housing stock, meet licensing requirements for group homes, and modify units for accessibility to help the elderly and people with disabilities to remain living independently.</p> <p>New construction is needed for all types of rental housing to increase the county's affordable housing stock.</p> <p>Rental assistance is needed for homeless individuals and families and those at risk of homelessness due to rent burden.</p> <p>The County will continue its commitment to funding facilities with supportive services for individuals with disabilities or service needs.</p>
<p>2 Priority Need Name</p>	<p>Low and moderate income rental housing</p>

Priority Level	High
Population	Low Moderate Large Families Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Rural Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families Victims of Domestic Violence Non-housing Community Development
Geographic Areas Affected	
Associated Goals	Rental Housing -New Construction Rental Housing - Acquisition Rental Housing - Rehabilitation Special Needs Housing Housing for Formerly Homeless People Fair Housing Services
Description	Housing for low and moderate income individuals and families.

	<p>Basis for Relative Priority</p>	<p>The analysis for Priority #1 also applies to this priority.</p> <p>Low and moderate income persons carry the second most severe cost burden for housing in relation to their incomes.</p> <p><u>Housing Market</u></p> <p><u>Activities:</u> The County's primary housing activities in the five years covered by this report will be: acquisition, rehabilitation, and new construction of rental housing, rental assistance, and the provision of facilities with supportive services for persons with disabilities.</p> <p>A comparison of the housing needs of low income people to the availability of affordable housing leads to the conclusion that a balanced mixture of acquisition, rehabilitation, new construction, rental assistance, and supportive services for occupants of rental housing should be the primary activities to be pursued during the term of this plan.</p> <p>Rehabilitation is needed to help maintain the existing housing stock, and for accessibility modifications that allow people to remain living independently.</p> <p>New construction is needed to meet the special housing needs of the elderly and people with disabilities, and to expand the stock of housing.</p> <p>Acquisition of existing housing in many cases ensures long-term affordability. Additionally, acquisition of existing units is less expensive than new construction and consequently serves more people, does not require zoning changes or local government approvals, and faces less opposition from neighborhood groups. However, the quality of acquired units is generally lower than the quality of newly constructed units, so future maintenance and rehabilitation costs are likely to be higher for acquired housing. The risk of delays and unanticipated costs resulting from neighborhood opposition is lower for acquisition projects than for new construction. However, acquisition projects have a much higher risk of hidden defects than new construction.</p> <p>Rental assistance is needed for those whose only housing problem is that they are rent burdened.</p>
3	<p>Priority Need Name</p>	Community facilities
	<p>Priority Level</p>	High

	Population	Extremely Low Low Moderate Large Families Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Rural Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families Victims of Domestic Violence Non-housing Community Development
	Geographic Areas Affected	
	Associated Goals	Community Facilities Accessibility Improvements Child Care Centers
	Description	Community facilities for use by extremely low, very low, low and moderate income individuals and families
	Basis for Relative Priority	There is a need for all types of Community facilities throughout the county that serve extremely low, very low, low and moderate income level individuals and families.
4	Priority Need Name	Public Services

	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Low Moderate Large Families Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Rural Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families Victims of Domestic Violence Non-housing Community Development
	Geographic Areas Affected	
	Associated Goals	Public Services
	Description	Public services for extremely low, very low , low and moderate income individuals and families
	Basis for Relative Priority	There is a continuing need for Countywide public services for extremely low, very low , low and moderate income individuals and families.
5	Priority Need Name	Homeownership Housing - Rehabilitation
	Priority Level	High

	Population	Extremely Low Low Moderate Large Families Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families Victims of Domestic Violence Non-housing Community Development
	Geographic Areas Affected	
	Associated Goals	Homeowner Housing- Rehabilitation Accessibility Improvements
	Description	Rehabilitation aid to extremely low, very low, low and moderate income homeowners
	Basis for Relative Priority	The population of Marin county is aging and the number of citizens with one or more disability is increasing. It is important that accessibility improvements and other rehabilitation services are available to allow residents to stay in their homes.
6	Priority Need Name	Homeownership housing
	Priority Level	Low

Population	Low Moderate Middle Large Families Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Rural Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families Victims of Domestic Violence
Geographic Areas Affected	
Associated Goals	Homeowner Housing - New Construction Homeowner Housing- Rehabilitation
Description	Housing assistance for low and moderate income first-time homebuyers

<p>Basis for Relative Priority</p>	<p><u>Basis for Assigning Priority</u></p> <p>According to the 2015 Marin County Housing Element, the downward trend in new housing units being built in Marin County continues. Between 2000-2010 only 5,549 new homes were built, substantially fewer than the 7,942 built in 1990-1999, the 11,228 built between 1980-1989, and a fraction of the over 20,000 units for each decade between 1950 and 1980, according to the Marin County Housing Element, the percentage of people living in owner-occupied units increased by only 2% from 2000 to 2010. Opposition to new development has reduced the potential housing supply through downzoning of vacant land and reductions in allowable development. Job creation and the high quality of life in Marin has increased demand for housing, which keeps housing costs high.</p> <p><u>Distribution:</u> 1) A limited supply of vacant land with appropriate zoning throughout the county is suitable for development (most cities in Marin County are built out), increasing the competition for housing throughout the County, and 2) Smaller units are likely to be rental units, whereas larger units are likely to be owner-occupied.</p> <p><u>Condition:</u> The overall housing stock is generally in good to excellent condition, and the county has few substandard units (lacking complete kitchen and/or plumbing facilities). Accessibility modifications are needed in many situations to allow people to remain living independently.</p> <p><u>Cost:</u> 1) The above mentioned factors all serve to keep housing prices high; 2) Demand continues to be strong, which keeps vacancy rates low and prices high; 3) Incomes of affluent residents increased faster than the inflation rate between 2000 and 2014, which raised prices for single family homes; 4) Rents continue to be high relative to incomes; and 5) The salaries of new jobs created in the county are generally low, requiring many workers either to pay more than 30% of income toward housing in the county or to live in less expensive outlying areas.</p>
-------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Narrative (Optional)

Distribution: 1) A limited supply of vacant land with appropriate zoning throughout the county is suitable for development (most cities in Marin County are built out), increasing the competition for housing throughout the County, and 2) Smaller units are likely to be rental units, whereas larger units are likely to be owner-occupied.

Condition: The overall housing stock is generally in good to excellent condition, and the county has few substandard units (lacking complete kitchen and/or plumbing facilities). Accessibility modifications are needed in many situations to allow people to remain living independently.

Cost: 1) The above mentioned factors all serve to keep housing prices high; 2) Demand continues to be strong, which keeps vacancy rates low and prices high; 3) The salaries of new jobs created in the county are generally low, requiring many workers either to pay more than 30% of income toward housing in the county or to live in less expensive outlying areas.

SP-30 Influence of Market Conditions – 91.215 (b)

Influence of Market Conditions

Affordable Housing Type	Market Characteristics that will influence the use of funds available for housing type
Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA)	Rental assistance is needed for homeless individuals and families and those at risk of homelessness due to rent burden. Rents in Marin County are extremely high and rising steadily. Opposition to new development and lack of available developable land has increased the cost of available housing units, while increased job creation and local quality of life has increased the numbers of those looking for housing.
TBRA for Non-Homeless Special Needs	The County will continue its commitment to funding facilities with supportive services for individuals with special needs. Rents in Marin County are extremely high and rising steadily. Opposition to new development and lack of available developable land has increased the cost of available housing units, while increased job creation and local quality of life has increased the numbers of those looking for housing.
New Unit Production	New construction is needed for all types of rental housing to increase the county's affordable housing stock. Opposition to new development and lack of available developable land has increased the cost of available housing units, while increased job creation and local quality of life has increased the numbers of those looking for housing.
Rehabilitation	Rehabilitation is needed to help maintain the existing housing stock, meet licensing requirements for group homes, and modify units for accessibility to help the elderly and people with disabilities to remain living independently. Opposition to new development and lack of available developable land has increased the cost of available housing units.
Acquisition, including preservation	Acquisition of existing housing can add new units to the affordable housing stock or ensure long-term affordability for subsidized units at risk of becoming market-rate. Acquisition usually does not require zoning changes or local government approvals and may face less opposition from neighborhood groups than construction projects.

Table 50 – Influence of Market Conditions

SP-35 Anticipated Resources - 91.215(a)(4), 91.220(c)(1,2)

Introduction

Anticipated Resources

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
CDBG	public - federal	Acquisition Admin and Planning Economic Development Housing Public Improvements Public Services	1,295,584	350,000	0	1,645,584	6,600,000	Assumes steady CDBG funding
HOME	public - federal	Acquisition Homebuyer assistance Homeowner rehab Multifamily rental new construction Multifamily rental rehab New construction for ownership TBRA	566,224	0	0	566,224	2,264,000	Assumes steady HOME funding

Table 51 - Anticipated Resources

Explain how federal funds will leverage those additional resources (private, state and local funds), including a description of how matching requirements will be satisfied

With whatever resources are available, Marin County will continue to leverage federal, state, and local funds, in order to support the acquisition, rehabilitation, and new construction of all types of housing and to offer rental assistance to lower income households.

If appropriate, describe publically owned land or property located within the jurisdiction that may be used to address the needs identified in the plan

Most of the publicly owned land in Marin County is parkland or designated open space, which typically is in remote areas and does not have sewer or water utilities available. There would be serious public opposition to selling designated open space for affordable housing development.

Discussion

SP-40 Institutional Delivery Structure – 91.215(k)

Explain the institutional structure through which the jurisdiction will carry out its consolidated plan including private industry, non-profit organizations, and public institutions.

Responsible Entity	Responsible Entity Type	Role	Geographic Area Served
CEDARS OF MARIN	Non-profit organizations	Non-homeless special needs	
COMMUNITY ACTION MARIN, MARIN LEARNING CENTER	Non-profit organizations	public services	
County of Marin	Government	Homelessness Non-homeless special needs Planning Public Housing Rental neighborhood improvements public facilities public services	
Fair Housing of Marin	Non-profit organizations	Homelessness Ownership Planning Rental	
HOMEWARD BOUND OF MARIN	Non-profit organizations	Homelessness	
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE COUNTY OF MARIN	PHA	Homelessness Ownership Planning Public Housing Rental	
MARIN BRAIN INJURY NETWORK	Non-profit organizations	Non-homeless special needs public services	
MARIN CENTER FOR INDEPENDENT LIVING	Non-profit organizations	Non-homeless special needs neighborhood improvements public services	

Responsible Entity	Responsible Entity Type	Role	Geographic Area Served
MARIN CITY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	Government	Economic Development Non-homeless special needs Ownership Rental neighborhood improvements public facilities public services	
MARIN CITY COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT	Government	Economic Development Non-homeless special needs Planning neighborhood improvements public facilities public services	
MARIN COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY	Government	Homelessness Non-homeless special needs Ownership Planning Public Housing Rental neighborhood improvements public facilities public services	
Marin Community Foundation	Non-profit organizations	Economic Development Planning neighborhood improvements public facilities public services	

Responsible Entity	Responsible Entity Type	Role	Geographic Area Served
Marin County Health & Human Services	Government	Homelessness Non-homeless special needs public services	
PERFORMING STARS OF MARIN	Non-profit organizations	public services	
WEST MARIN SENIOR SERVICES	Non-profit organizations	Homelessness Non-homeless special needs public services	
WHISTLESTOP/MARIN SENIOR COORDINATING COUNCIL	Non-profit organizations	Non-homeless special needs public services	
WEST MARIN COMMUNITY RESOURCE CENTER	Non-profit organizations	Homelessness Non-homeless special needs public services	
BUCKELEW COMMUNITY HSG DEV. ORGANIZATION, INC.	Non-profit organizations	Homelessness Non-homeless special needs	
Senior Access	Non-profit organizations	Non-homeless special needs	
Family Law Legal Services	Non-profit organizations	Non-homeless special needs public services	
EAH, INC	Non-profit organizations	Rental	
BOLINAS COMMUNITY LAND TRUST, INC.	Non-profit organizations	Homelessness Rental neighborhood improvements public facilities	
GALILEE HARBOR COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION	Non-profit organizations	neighborhood improvements	
GILEAD HOUSE	Community/Faith-based organization	Non-homeless special needs public services	

Responsible Entity	Responsible Entity Type	Role	Geographic Area Served
BRIDGE HOUSING CORPORATION	Non-profit organizations	Rental	
EPISCOPAL SENIOR COMMUNITIES	Community/Faith-based organization	Non-homeless special needs public services	
NORTHBAY CHILDREN'S CENTER	Non-profit organizations	public services	
CANAL ALLIANCE	Non-profit organizations	Homelessness Non-homeless special needs Rental neighborhood improvements public facilities public services	
FAIRFAX-SAN ANSELMO CHILDREN'S CENTER	Non-profit organizations	public services	
QUALITY CARE FOR KIDS	Non-profit organizations	public services	
CITY OF SAN RAFAEL	Government	neighborhood improvements public facilities public services	
SAN GERONIMO VALLEY COMMUNITY CENTER	Non-profit organizations	public facilities public services	
NOVATO YOUTH CENTER	Regional organization	public facilities public services	
CITY OF NOVATO	Government	neighborhood improvements public facilities public services	
LIFEHOUSE, INC.	Non-profit organizations	Non-homeless special needs public services	

Table 52 - Institutional Delivery Structure

Assess of Strengths and Gaps in the Institutional Delivery System

There are fewer gaps in the delivery system than existed five years ago. As financial pressure on public and nonprofit agencies increases, it appears that some nonprofit agencies will be forced to merge, consolidate, or cease to exist. Pressure from funding agencies for quantitative measures of achievement

has encouraged more sophisticated strategic planning and better coordination among agencies. There has been some criticism of the degree of fragmentation of human services. Local government staff working in different departments on similar issues do not always coordinate as well as they might. There have been some gaps in coordinating nonprofit and public agencies to generate collaborative funding proposals that could increase the resources available for housing and services for very low income people.

Availability of services targeted to homeless persons and persons with HIV and mainstream services

Homelessness Prevention Services	Available in the Community	Targeted to Homeless	Targeted to People with HIV
Homelessness Prevention Services			
Counseling/Advocacy	X	X	X
Legal Assistance	X	X	X
Mortgage Assistance	X		X
Rental Assistance	X		X
Utilities Assistance	X	X	X
Street Outreach Services			
Law Enforcement	X	X	
Mobile Clinics			
Other Street Outreach Services	X	X	
Supportive Services			
Alcohol & Drug Abuse	X	X	X
Child Care	X	X	X
Education	X	X	X
Employment and Employment Training	X	X	X
Healthcare	X	X	X
HIV/AIDS	X	X	X
Life Skills	X	X	X
Mental Health Counseling	X	X	X
Transportation	X	X	X
Other			

Table 53 - Homeless Prevention Services Summary

Describe how the service delivery system including, but not limited to, the services listed above meet the needs of homeless persons (particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth)

The county has many planning and discussion forums where public and nonprofit agencies have the opportunity to coordinate supportive service programs, including but not limited to: the Center for

Volunteer and Non-Profit Leadership, the Marin HIV Care Council, the Marin Partnership to End Homelessness, the Marin County Alcohol and Drug Advisory Board, the Marin County Mental Health Board, the housing planning committee organized by the Marin Community Mental Health Program, and the Marin Council of Agencies. In addition, concerned agencies create ad hoc committees to address coordination issues as they emerge.

Describe the strengths and gaps of the service delivery system for special needs population and persons experiencing homelessness, including, but not limited to, the services listed above

The Marin Partnership to End Homelessness has had much success in facilitating collaborative decision making among nonprofit agencies. As a result, there are fewer gaps in the delivery system than existed five years ago. As financial pressure on public and nonprofit agencies increases, it appears that some nonprofit agencies will be forced to merge, consolidate, or cease to exist. Pressure from funding agencies for quantitative measures of achievement has encouraged more sophisticated strategic planning and better coordination among agencies. There has been some criticism of the degree of fragmentation of human services. Local government staff working in different departments on similar issues do not always coordinate as well as they might. There have been some gaps in coordinating nonprofit and public agencies to generate collaborative funding proposals that could increase the resources available for housing and services for very low income people.

Provide a summary of the strategy for overcoming gaps in the institutional structure and service delivery system for carrying out a strategy to address priority needs

The County is encouraging nonprofits to better coordinate their services by facilitating collaborative efforts. The County has instituted a mid-management training program that helps to improve communications between mid-level staff in different departments. The Housing Authority has assigned a substantial amount of staff time to coordinate collaborative efforts among public and private agencies on housing and human service issues. As a result, the Housing Authority has been at the forefront of efforts to overcome gaps in housing and community development services.

The Marin County Department of Health and Human Services has supported community-based public services and has actively participated in restructuring health care services to achieve better cost-effectiveness.

SP-45 Goals Summary – 91.215(a)(4)

Goals Summary Information

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
1	Rental Housing - New Construction	2015	2019	Affordable Housing	Countywide	Extremely low and very low income rental housing Low and moderate income rental housing	CDBG: \$220,500 HOME: \$151,467	Rental units constructed: 40 Household Housing Unit
2	Rental Housing - Acquisition	2015	2019	Affordable Housing		Extremely low and very low income rental housing Low and moderate income rental housing		
3	Rental Housing - Rehabilitation	2015	2019	Affordable Housing	Countywide Countywide, emphasis on locations which are likely to result in increased racial & ethnic diversity	Extremely low and very low income rental housing Low and moderate income rental housing	CDBG: \$37,000 HOME: \$151,000	Rental units rehabilitated: 80 Household Housing Unit
4	Homeowner Housing - New Construction	2015	2019	Affordable Housing	Countywide Countywide, emphasis on locations which are likely to result in increased racial & ethnic diversity	Homeownership housing	CDBG: \$112,500	Homeowner Housing Added: 10 Household Housing Unit Direct Financial Assistance to Homebuyers: 5 Households Assisted

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
5	Homeowner Housing- Rehabilitation	2015	2019	Affordable Housing	Countywide Countywide, with an emphasis on mobilehome parks and liveaboard houseboat communities Countywide, with emphasis on high-need neighborhoods	Homeownership housing Homeownership Housing - Rehabilitation	CDBG: \$1,362,500	Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated: 90 Household Housing Unit
6	Special Needs Housing	2015	2019	Affordable Housing Non-Homeless Special Needs	Countywide	Extremely low and very low income rental housing Low and moderate income rental housing	CDBG: \$56,750 HOME: \$89,000	Other: 5 Other
7	Homeless Shelters	2015	2019	Homeless				

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
8	Housing for Formerly Homeless People	2015	2019	Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs	Countywide Countywide, emphasis on locations which are likely to result in increased racial & ethnic diversity	Extremely low and very low income rental housing Low and moderate income rental housing	CDBG: \$114,250 HOME: \$416,000	Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing: 10 Households Assisted Homeless Person Overnight Shelter: 20 Persons Assisted Overnight/Emergency Shelter/Transitional Housing Beds added: 40 Beds Homelessness Prevention: 20 Persons Assisted Housing for Homeless added: 10 Household Housing Unit
9	Supportive Housing	2015	2019	Affordable Housing Public Housing Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs				

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
10	Transitional Housing	2015	2019	Affordable Housing Public Housing Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs				
11	Fair Housing Services	2015	2019	Affordable Housing Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs		Extremely low and very low income rental housing Low and moderate income rental housing		
12	Rental Assistance	2015	2019	Affordable Housing Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs				
13	Other Housing Activities	2015	2019	Affordable Housing Public Housing Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs	Countywide Countywide, emphasis on locations which are likely to result in increased racial & ethnic diversity	Extremely low and very low income rental housing		Public service activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 20 Households Assisted

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
14	Community Facilities	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development	Countywide Countywide, with an emphasis on mobilehome parks and liveaboard houseboat communities	Community facilities	CDBG: \$210,185	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 20 Households Assisted
15	Accessibility Improvements	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development	Countywide Countywide, with emphasis on high-need neighborhoods	Community facilities Homeownership Housing - Rehabilitation	CDBG: \$1,001,900	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 2000 Persons Assisted
16	Child Care Centers	2015	2019	Non-Homeless Special Needs Non-Housing Community Development	Countywide Countywide, emphasis on locations which are likely to result in increased racial & ethnic diversity Countywide, with emphasis on high-need neighborhoods	Community facilities	CDBG: \$298,000	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 500 Persons Assisted

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
17	Public Services	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development	Countywide Countywide, emphasis on locations which are likely to result in increased racial & ethnic diversity Countywide, with emphasis on high-need neighborhoods	Public Services	CDBG: \$718,985	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 4500 Persons Assisted

Table 54 – Goals Summary

Goal Descriptions

1	Goal Name	Rental Housing -New Construction
	Goal Description	Construction of new rental housing -Countywide.
2	Goal Name	Rental Housing - Acquisition
	Goal Description	Acquisition of rental housing for extremely low, very low, low and moderate income individuals and families
3	Goal Name	Rental Housing - Rehabilitation
	Goal Description	Rental Housing Rehabilitation for extremely low, very low, low and moderate income individuals and families.
4	Goal Name	Homeowner Housing - New Construction
	Goal Description	Homeowner housing for extremely low, very low, low and moderate income individuals and families
5	Goal Name	Homeowner Housing- Rehabilitation
	Goal Description	Homeowner housing rehabilitation for extremely low, very low, low and moderate income individuals and families

6	Goal Name	Special Needs Housing
	Goal Description	Special needs housing for extremely low, very low, low and moderate income individuals and families
7	Goal Name	Homeless Shelters
	Goal Description	Homeless Shelters extremely low, very low, low and moderate income individuals and families
8	Goal Name	Housing for Formerly Homeless People
	Goal Description	Housing for formerly homeless extremely low, very low, low and moderate income individuals and families
9	Goal Name	Supportive Housing
	Goal Description	Supportive Housing for extremely low, very low, low and moderate income individuals and families
10	Goal Name	Transitional Housing
	Goal Description	Transitional housing for extremely low, very low, low and moderate income individuals and families.
11	Goal Name	Fair Housing Services
	Goal Description	Fair Housing Services for extremely low, very low, low and moderate income individuals and families
12	Goal Name	Rental Assistance
	Goal Description	Rental assistance for extremely low, very low, low and moderate income individuals and families
13	Goal Name	Other Housing Activities
	Goal Description	Other housing activities relating to extremely low, very low, low and moderate income individuals and families.
14	Goal Name	Community Facilities
	Goal Description	Community facilities available to extremely low, very low, low and moderate income individuals and families.
15	Goal Name	Accessibility Improvements
	Goal Description	Accessibility improvements for extremely low, very low, low and moderate income individuals and families
16	Goal Name	Child Care Centers
	Goal Description	Child Care Centers for extremely low, very low, low and moderate income individuals and families

17	Goal Name	Public Services
	Goal Description	Public services for extremely low, very low, low and moderate income individuals and families

Estimate the number of extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income families to whom the jurisdiction will provide affordable housing as defined by HOME 91.315(b)(2)

70 Families

SP-50 Public Housing Accessibility and Involvement – 91.215(c)

Need to Increase the Number of Accessible Units (if Required by a Section 504 Voluntary Compliance Agreement)

Marin County does not have a Section 504 Voluntary Compliance Agreement

Activities to Increase Resident Involvements

N/A

Is the public housing agency designated as troubled under 24 CFR part 902?

No

Plan to remove the ‘troubled’ designation

N/A

SP-55 Barriers to affordable housing – 91.215(h)

Barriers to Affordable Housing

The primary cause of the high cost of housing in Marin County is the high level of market demand for housing and a shortage of developable land. It is difficult to obtain sites for market-rate and subsidized housing development. Much of the land in the County is in public ownership or has been zoned for agricultural use, and is not developable. Within Marin's urbanized U.S. Highway 101 corridor, most of the suitably zoned sites have already been developed. Many of the remaining vacant urban sites have environmental constraints, ie: steep hillsides, marshes, or toxic contamination. In some cases, community opposition to subsidized housing, often framed in terms of environmental conservation or preservation of community character, limits buildable density to a lower level than is permitted by zoning. Project delays caused by litigation can ratchet up the price of a project, making it infeasible or requiring an additional infusion of subsidy. In either case, scarce resources are drained by the cost and delay of litigation, or by actions deemed prudent to prevent litigation. The lack of affordable housing makes it difficult for low-income minorities to move out of areas of minority concentration, and therefore has fair housing implications. The Marin County Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (AI) outlines the barriers to the development of affordable housing in detail. The AI and the Implementation Plan for the Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice were approved by the Marin County Board of Supervisors on October 11, 2011 and are incorporated as part of this Consolidated Plan by reference. Many public agencies have implemented land use and zoning policies to encourage the development of subsidized housing. For example, the County and most cities in Marin require developers of market-rate housing projects to set aside a percentage of units for low- and moderate-income households. For projects with 2-10 units, in cases where it is not feasible to provide inclusionary units on-site, the County will collect "in lieu" fees for deposit in the Marin County Housing Trust Fund. The proceeds from which are distributed to affordable housing projects. Most cities in Marin have similar requirements. State law mandates density bonuses of up to 25% for projects with below market rate units. The County and many cities offer pre-application consultation and expedited application review for proponents of subsidized housing. The County and many cities permit second units to be built in many single-family districts, usually with the size of the second units restricted to maintain affordable rents. Most housing development in the County undergoes extensive discretionary review, slowing the process of development. Permit review fees continue to rise in Marin County, adding to the already expensive development process. Because local tax revenues are increasing more slowly than the cost of maintaining local government services, and because the public is unwilling to spend tax funds to subsidize market-rate development, a continued rise in development application review fees is unavoidable. Many local jurisdictions in Marin County waive or reduce development application fees for affordable housing, and most attempt to speed and simplify the processing of applications for subsidized housing, which can result in substantial cost savings. Fee waiver policies of school districts and utility districts vary, and their desire to assist the development of subsidized housing is increasingly at odds with the financial pressure that all local public agencies are experiencing.

Strategy to Remove or Ameliorate the Barriers to Affordable Housing

The Marin Environmental Housing Collaborative began as a discussion group that brought together environmental advocates and affordable housing advocates (including a staff member of the Marin County Community Development Agency in an atmosphere that encouraged trust-building and communication. The Collaborative received financial support from the County of Marin, the Marin Community Foundation, and the San Francisco Foundation. The group is taking an advocacy role to promote the development of environmentally-friendly affordable housing. Many public agencies have implemented land use and zoning policies that encourage the development of subsidized housing. For example, in order to achieve economic, racial, and ethnic integration, Marin County requires developers of market-rate housing projects to set aside a percentage of units for low- and moderate-income households. For projects with less than 10 units, in cases where it is not feasible to provide inclusionary units on-site, the County will collect "in lieu" fees from the developer and deposit these funds in the Marin County Housing Trust Fund. Proceeds from the Housing Trust Fund are distributed to affordable housing projects. Density bonuses of up to 25% are allowed for projects with below market rate units. The County offers pre-application consultation and expedited application review for proponents of subsidized housing. The County permits second units to be built in many single-family districts, with the size of the second units restricted to maintain affordable rents. Many local jurisdictions in Marin County waive or reduce development application fees for affordable housing, and most attempt to speed and simplify the processing of planning applications for subsidized housing, which can result in substantial cost savings. Fee waiver policies of school districts and utility districts vary, but many have been extremely generous with fee waivers and reductions for subsidized housing in a time when all local public agencies are experiencing severe financial pressure. In general, local tax policies facilitate the development and preservation of subsidized housing. Most subsidized housing qualifies for an exemption from local property taxes, and Marin County has been cooperative in processing applications for tax exemptions. While local fees for processing development applications may seem high, they are actually lower than the local government cost. For example, the Marin County Board of Supervisors has directed the CDA to set fees to recover only 75% of the cost of processing applications.

SP-60 Homelessness Strategy – 91.215(d)

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

Marin Housing Authority staff and social service workers in the County try to identify and offer assistance to at-risk groups, including, but not limited to: persons with an excessive rent burden; elderly persons on a fixed income with high medical expenses; women who have recently become single parents; persons with serious medical problems who have recently undergone a crisis and are unable to handle finances; persons who have requested emergency needs assistance more than once in the past year; persons with substance abuse problems or mental illness; troubled young people in conflict with their families; unemployed or potentially unemployed persons; and other special populations as their needs become apparent.

Key service providers in the county include Ritter Center, St. Vincent de Paul Society, and Adopt A Family. Each of these agencies provides outreach and assessment of people in need. Ritter Center provides a drop-in service, mail and voice mail services, showers, food, medical services, and case management to the homeless. St. Vincent de Paul provides hot meals 7 days a week and has a homeless help desk which provides assistance and referral to services. Adopt A Family provides case management and referrals to services, and provides homeless prevention assistance to families in need.

The Marin Housing Authority has two full-time case managers in the Shelter Plus Care program who routinely visit with homeless individuals on the streets and in areas where homeless people gather.

Service providers in Marin utilize a network of limited resources to connect people in need in the county. Homeward Bound operates the only emergency shelters in the county. Additionally, Legal Aid of Marin serves as a resource for people in need of legal advice or support.

Ritter Center and the St. Vincent de Paul Society are often the first point of contact for homeless persons in the county. Case management offered at Ritter Center helps to connect homeless individuals to services.

Homeless persons and persons at risk of homelessness are referred by the Housing Authority, social service organizations, religious congregations, law enforcement agencies, and word-of-mouth to the appropriate services. Typically, clients are assessed by these agencies to determine the severity of their housing, employment, psychological or substance abuse problems, and what personal resources they have available. Then, counselors make recommendations for appropriate supportive services.

Addressing the emergency and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

With whatever resources are available, Marin County will continue to make funding commitments to programs which prevent homelessness and address the unmet needs of homeless families and individuals, the mentally ill, alcohol and drug abusers, victims of domestic violence, runaway and

abandoned youth, those in need of emergency shelter, and those with transitional housing needs. The emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of subpopulations are generally the same as those previously listed for homeless persons, but some subpopulations may also need special supportive services. In general, there is a greater need for permanent affordable housing.

Homeward Bound of Marin operates homeless shelters and transitional housing for recently homeless people.

The Center for Domestic Peace has an emergency shelter and a transitional housing program for battered women and their children.

Marin County needs additional permanent, affordable housing to serve battered women and their children. Each year an average of 80 women exit Center for Domestic Peace emergency shelter, and approximately 10 women per year exit their transitional housing program. Permanent affordable housing is a key necessity for all families exiting shelters and transitional housing. Homeward Bound reports that there is a similar need for affordable permanent housing for formerly homeless families exiting transitional housing.

Helping homeless persons (especially chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth) make the transition to permanent housing and independent living, including shortening the period of time that individuals and families experience homelessness, facilitating access for homeless individuals and families to affordable housing units, and preventing individuals and families who were recently homeless from becoming homeless again.

The County and the Housing Authority collaborate with a number of social service agencies that identify people at risk of homelessness and provide needed intervention through the Marin Partnership to End Homelessness (the Partnership). The Partnership is involved in every aspect of homelessness prevention in the County and collaborates with and receives input from a significant countywide network of governments, community-based organizations, private industry, funders, and individuals.

The Marin County Department of Health & Human Services (HHS) acts as the Lead Agency for the Continuum of Care (CoC). The Continuum's primary decision-making body is the Homeless Policy Steering group which is made up of service and housing providers, city officials, faith-based groups and county representatives. Each year, HHS leads a community process to prepare the Consolidated CoC application which helps the county obtain approximately \$2.4 million for transitional and permanent supported housing projects. Projects are reviewed each year to evaluate performance and ranked for their inclusion in the CoC plan.

The County will continue to make housing assistance for extremely low income persons who are homeless or at risk of homelessness a priority over the next five years. If resources are available, the County's CDBG and HOME programs will continue to participate in supportive programs that prevent homelessness and address the unmet needs of extremely low income families and individuals. Section 8 vouchers and subsidized housing will be provided for those capable of independent living, and housing with supportive services will be provided for those not ready to of living independently.

Help low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless, especially extremely low-income individuals and families who are likely to become homeless after being discharged from a publicly funded institution or system of care, or who are receiving assistance from public and private agencies that address housing, health, social services, employment, education or youth needs

The highest priority is developing permanent affordable housing projects for homeless families and families leaving transitional housing. Local Housing Elements give priority to housing sites and housing development projects for very-low income and low-income individuals and households. Access to transitional housing programs is gained through referrals from emergency shelter facilities, day service centers, and mental health providers. One of the Marin Housing Authority's local preference categories for Section 8 rental assistance is to serve households successfully graduating from those Marin transitional housing programs which have an arrangement with the Housing Authority. As many as 10% of the Housing Authority's new vouchers and certificates each year are set aside for households making a transition to permanent housing. Section 8 vouchers with supportive services and housing with supportive services are important resources for extremely low income and very low income persons with all types of disabilities, including but not limited to: the developmentally disabled, frail elderly, chronically mentally ill, and persons with HIV/AIDS. The Marin Housing Authority works with a number of service providers, many of whom have been working in the community for a substantial period of time and who are well known to their constituents, the community, local government, faith-based organizations, and neighborhood groups. The transitional housing programs run by Ritter Center, Homeward Bound of Marin, Center Point, Marin Partnership to End Homelessness and The center for Domestic Peace provide counseling and the training needed to help clients move from transitional housing to permanent housing. The Marin County CDBG and HOME programs have a long history of funding family development programs for lower income families, in an effort to help lower income families to become self-sufficient. The supportive services of the Shelter Plus Care Program allow clients initially housed in temporary situations to make the transition to permanent housing. Permanent housing for dual diagnosed adults is extremely scarce, and the development of such housing with supportive services will fill a particularly severe and problematic gap in Marin's continuum of care. The Continuum of Care Gaps Analysis reflects the high need for development of affordable permanent housing units, especially for homeless individuals in need of intensive supportive services.

SP-65 Lead based paint Hazards – 91.215(i)

Actions to address LBP hazards and increase access to housing without LBP hazards

In 1994, the Marin County Housing Authority spent a significant portion of its Comprehensive Grant Program funds for lead-based paint testing and abatement in Marin City public housing. All units were tested, traces of lead were found and lead-based paint has been abated.

How are the actions listed above related to the extent of lead poisoning and hazards?

Sponsors of rehabilitation projects test for lead-based paint during the Phase I toxics study. If lead-based paint hazards are found, abatement is performed as part of the project rehabilitation. Owners of apartments leased to Section 8 certificate-holders must also comply with lead-based paint standards.

How are the actions listed above integrated into housing policies and procedures?

Subrecipients of CDBG and HOME Program funds are contractually responsible for the testing and elimination of lead-based paint. The CDBG and HOME Program contracts include the following language:

Any grants or loans made by the Operating Agency for the rehabilitation of residential structures with assistance provided under this Agreement shall be made subject to the provisions for the elimination of lead-based paint hazards under 24 CFR Part 35. Operating Agency will comply with the requirements of 24 CFR 570.608 (for CDBG, or 24 CFR 92.355 for HOME) for notification, inspection, testing, and abatement procedures concerning lead-based paint.

SP-70 Anti-Poverty Strategy – 91.215(j)

Jurisdiction Goals, Programs and Policies for reducing the number of Poverty-Level Families

There are many compounding factors at the root of poverty. A basic structural factor is our national economic policy, which must balance the conflicting goals of maintaining a low unemployment rate and preventing high inflation. Aside from the basic structure of the economy, there are other significant factors that influence whether people are living at the poverty level. A major factor in Marin County is the breakdown of social relationships. There are many single people and couples with children who lack nearby extended family relationships, and have no one to turn to when a financial or personal crisis hits. Teen pregnancy is also another contributing factor to women and children living in poverty. Pregnant teens frequently lack the involvement of the father and the financial and family support that he might provide.

The last major factor affecting the number of people living in poverty is mental health and substance abuse problems, both of which affect the ability of many to secure and retain employment. In 1999, with support from the County, a new substance abuse detoxification facility was opened. The "detox center" is losing its lease and will need to relocate.

Marin County has two programs for directly addressing poverty, a local General Assistance program and the federally funded Calworks Welfare to Work program. General Assistance provides financial assistance to indigent adults who are employable. Calworks provides cash, medical assistance, food stamps, transportation, and employment training. The goal of Marin County is to help all people reach self-sufficiency. While the County plans to continue social services and income support for people in poverty, no major additional anti-poverty programs are planned.

While it is the County's goal to substantially reduce the number of households with incomes below the poverty line, the revenue available to local government from property tax and sales tax revenue is insufficient to achieve this goal. Until the state and Federal governments, which have access to income tax revenue, provide substantially increased funding for anti-poverty efforts, local governments will not be able to have a major impact on this national problem.

How are the Jurisdiction poverty reducing goals, programs, and policies coordinated with this affordable housing plan

Marin County consistently spends a significant portion of its Community Development Block Grant funds for public services, to help poor families who cannot otherwise afford to obtain essential services. The Marin County Community Development Agency, part of the County government, is responsible for administration of the Community Development Block Grant Program and the HOME Investment Partnerships Program. A Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Countywide Priority Setting Committee, consisting of members of city councils, representatives of minorities and people with disabilities, and chaired by a member of the Board of Supervisors, makes recommendations on the use

of these funds. Final decisions about the use of CDBG and HOME funds are made by the Marin County Board of Supervisors.

Beyond HUD-funded activities, many local programs and policies are designed to assist low income people (including people in poverty) to live decently within their limited incomes. The Marin Housing Authority administers public housing and rental assistance programs, including Section 8, HOPWA rental assistance, and the Housing Stability program, which is funded by contributions from local governments. The Housing Authority also administers inclusionary below-market-rate homeownership programs on behalf of most local governments in the county, and operates a CDBG-funded rehabilitation program for single-family homes, including group homes for people with disabilities, mobile homes, second units within existing houses, and liveaboard floating homes. A wide range of private non-profit organizations use CDBG, HOME, HOPWA, and other funding sources to provide affordable housing and human services to people in need. The strength of this system can be credited to the many nonprofit agencies that specialize in each aspect of housing and community development activities, the many volunteers associated with local nonprofit organizations, and the excellent quality staff in the nonprofit sector.

SP-80 Monitoring – 91.230

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

See Attachment 1-B

Expected Resources

AP-15 Expected Resources – 91.220(c)(1,2)

Introduction

Anticipated Resources

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
CDBG	public - federal	Acquisition Admin and Planning Economic Development Housing Public Improvements Public Services	1,295,584	350,000	0	1,645,584	6,600,000	Assumes steady CDBG funding
HOME	public - federal	Acquisition Homebuyer assistance Homeowner rehab Multifamily rental new construction Multifamily rental rehab New construction for ownership TBRA	566,224	0	0	566,224	2,264,000	Assumes steady HOME funding

Table 55 - Expected Resources – Priority Table

Explain how federal funds will leverage those additional resources (private, state and local funds), including a description of how matching requirements will be satisfied

With whatever resources are available, Marin County will continue to leverage federal, state, and local funds, in order to support the acquisition, rehabilitation, and new construction of all types of housing and to offer rental assistance to lower income households.

If appropriate, describe publically owned land or property located within the jurisdiction that may be used to address the needs identified in the plan

Most of the publicly owned land in Marin County is parkland or designated open space, which typically is in remote areas and does not have sewer or water utilities available. There would be serious public opposition to selling designated open space for affordable housing development.

Discussion

Annual Goals and Objectives

AP-20 Annual Goals and Objectives

Goals Summary Information

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
1	Rental Housing - New Construction	2015	2019	Affordable Housing	Countywide Countywide, emphasis on locations which are likely to result in increased racial & ethnic diversity	Extremely low and very low income rental housing Low and moderate income rental housing		
2	Rental Housing - Acquisition	2015	2019	Affordable Housing		Extremely low and very low income rental housing Low and moderate income rental housing		
3	Rental Housing - Rehabilitation	2015	2019	Affordable Housing	Countywide Countywide, with emphasis on high-need neighborhoods	Extremely low and very low income rental housing Low and moderate income rental housing		
4	Homeowner Housing - New Construction	2015	2019	Affordable Housing	Countywide Countywide, with emphasis on high-need neighborhoods	Homeownership housing		

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
5	Homeowner Housing-Rehabilitation	2015	2019	Affordable Housing	Countywide Countywide, with an emphasis on mobilehome parks and liveaboard houseboat communities Countywide, emphasis on locations which are likely to result in increased racial & ethnic diversity Countywide, with emphasis on high-need neighborhoods	Homeownership housing		
6	Special Needs Housing	2015	2019	Affordable Housing Non-Homeless Special Needs	Countywide	Extremely low and very low income rental housing Low and moderate income rental housing		
7	Homeless Shelters	2015	2019	Homeless		Extremely low and very low income rental housing Low and moderate income rental housing Homeownership housing		

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
8	Housing for Formerly Homeless People	2015	2019	Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs	Countywide	Extremely low and very low income rental housing Low and moderate income rental housing Homeownership housing		
9	Supportive Housing	2015	2019	Affordable Housing Public Housing Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs		Extremely low and very low income rental housing Low and moderate income rental housing Public Services		
10	Transitional Housing	2015	2019	Affordable Housing Public Housing Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs		Extremely low and very low income rental housing Low and moderate income rental housing		
11	Fair Housing Services	2015	2019	Affordable Housing Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs		Extremely low and very low income rental housing Low and moderate income rental housing Homeownership housing		

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
12	Rental Assistance	2015	2019	Affordable Housing Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs		Extremely low and very low income rental housing Low and moderate income rental housing		
13	Other Housing Activities	2015	2019	Affordable Housing Public Housing Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs	Countywide	Extremely low and very low income rental housing Low and moderate income rental housing		
14	Community Facilities	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development		Community facilities		
15	Accessibility Improvements	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development	Countywide Countywide, with emphasis on high-need neighborhoods	Homeownership housing Community facilities Public Services		
16	Child Care Centers	2015	2019	Non-Homeless Special Needs Non-Housing Community Development	Countywide Countywide, with emphasis on high-need neighborhoods	Community facilities Public Services		

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
17	Public Services	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development	Countywide Countywide, with an emphasis on mobilehome parks and liveaboard houseboat communities Countywide, emphasis on locations which are likely to result in increased racial & ethnic diversity Countywide, with emphasis on high-need neighborhoods	Public Services		

Table 56 – Goals Summary

Goal Descriptions

1	Goal Name	Rental Housing -New Construction
	Goal Description	
2	Goal Name	Rental Housing - Acquisition
	Goal Description	
3	Goal Name	Rental Housing - Rehabilitation
	Goal Description	
4	Goal Name	Homeowner Housing - New Construction
	Goal Description	

5	Goal Name	Homeowner Housing- Rehabilitation
	Goal Description	
6	Goal Name	Special Needs Housing
	Goal Description	
7	Goal Name	Homeless Shelters
	Goal Description	
8	Goal Name	Housing for Formerly Homeless People
	Goal Description	
9	Goal Name	Supportive Housing
	Goal Description	
10	Goal Name	Transitional Housing
	Goal Description	
11	Goal Name	Fair Housing Services
	Goal Description	
12	Goal Name	Rental Assistance
	Goal Description	
13	Goal Name	Other Housing Activities
	Goal Description	
14	Goal Name	Community Facilities
	Goal Description	
15	Goal Name	Accessibility Improvements
	Goal Description	

16	Goal Name	Child Care Centers
	Goal Description	
17	Goal Name	Public Services
	Goal Description	

Projects

AP-35 Projects – 91.220(d)

Introduction

PROJECTS FUNDING SUBJECT TO PSC DECISION

Projects

#	Project Name
1	2015 Affordable Housing
2	2015 Public Services
3	2015 Capital / Rehabilitate Community Facilities
4	2015 Program Administration

Table 57 – Project Information

Describe the reasons for allocation priorities and any obstacles to addressing underserved needs

When determining allocation priorities, the County considers local goals, project sponsor capacity and readiness to proceed.

AP-38 Project Summary
Project Summary Information

1	Project Name	2015 Affordable Housing
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	
	Needs Addressed	
	Funding	:
	Description	Specific Objective Number H-1: Address affordable housing needs of low income persons by funding an average of 3 projects per year from CDBG and HOME funds.
	Target Date	
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	
	Location Description	
	Planned Activities	
2	Project Name	2015 Public Services
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	
	Needs Addressed	
	Funding	:
	Description	Specific Objective PS-1: To address basic human needs of low income persons by funding public service projects with CDBG funds.
	Target Date	
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	
	Location Description	
	Planned Activities	
3	Project Name	2015 Capital / Rehabilitate Community Facilities
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	
	Needs Addressed	
	Funding	:

	Description	Specific Objective Number C-1: To acquire and/or rehabilitate community facilities serving the needs of low income persons with CDBG funds.
	Target Date	
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	
	Location Description	
	Planned Activities	
4	Project Name	2015 Program Administration
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	
	Needs Addressed	
	Funding	:
	Description	CDBG Program Administration
	Target Date	
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	
	Location Description	
	Planned Activities	

AP-50 Geographic Distribution – 91.220(f)

Description of the geographic areas of the entitlement (including areas of low-income and minority concentration) where assistance will be directed

Marin County doesnot designate geographic areas whre assistance will be directed, although we do focus some public service spending on high-need neighborhoods. The County is divided into six planning areas

1. Novato Planning Area (includes Novato, Ignacio, Bel Marin Keys, and Black Point)
2. San Rafael Planning Area (includes San Rafael, Los Ranchitos, Lucas Valley, Marinwood, and Santa Venetia)
3. Upper Ross Valley (includes Fairfax, Ross, and San Anselmo)
4. Lower Ross Valley (includes Corte Madera, Larkspur, Kentfield, Greenbrae, and San Quentin)
5. Richardson Bay (includes Belvedere, Mill Valley, Sausalito, Tiburon, Marin City, Strawberry, Tam Valley, and Waldo Point)
6. West Marin, encompassing the inland rural and coastal corridors.

Geographic Distribution

Target Area	Percentage of Funds
Countywide	
Countywide, with an emphasis on mobilehome parks and liveaboard houseboat communities	
Countywide, emphasis on locations which are likely to result in increased racial & ethnic diversity	
Countywide, with emphasis on high-need neighborhoods	

Table 58 - Geographic Distribution

Rationale for the priorities for allocating investments geographically

The County includes two cities with populations exceeding 50,000 that have opted to be included in the CDBG Urban County rather than receiving funding directly from HUD as separate entitlement communities. Funds are distributed as described in the "discussion" section below and according to established HUD procedures.

Discussion

After deduction of administrative expenses, forty percent (40%) of the net Community Development Block Grant monies and one hundred percent (100%) of the net HOME Investment Partnerships Program monies allocated annually to the County of Marin as an "urban county" under the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, shall be allocated for housing purposes on a countywide basis. Distribution of such funds will be made by the Board of Supervisors, on recommendation of the Priority Setting Committee. Such distribution will be consistent with HUD guidelines and evaluation criteria developed by participating cities and the county, to ensure consistency and facilitate implementation of countywide housing goals.

The remaining sixty percent (60%) of the net Community Development Block Grant urban county allocation shall be suballocated to the interjurisdictional citizen participation/planning areas according to the general distribution formula established by HUD based on the latest available countywide data on population, the extent of poverty, and the extent of housing overcrowding, with the provision that the extent of poverty be counted twice. However, a different distribution is hereby expressly authorized if and when necessary to comply with Title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended.

Affordable Housing

AP-55 Affordable Housing – 91.220(g)

Introduction

One Year Goals for the Number of Households to be Supported	
Homeless	0
Non-Homeless	0
Special-Needs	0
Total	0

Table 59 - One Year Goals for Affordable Housing by Support Requirement

One Year Goals for the Number of Households Supported Through	
Rental Assistance	0
The Production of New Units	0
Rehab of Existing Units	0
Acquisition of Existing Units	0
Total	0

Table 60 - One Year Goals for Affordable Housing by Support Type
Discussion

AP-60 Public Housing – 91.220(h)

Introduction

The Marin Housing Authority's public housing program continues to operate at appropriation levels that are too low for long-term sustainability of these properties. The Housing Authority continues to seek additional sources of funding and revenue to efficiently manage and maintain safe, decent, and affordable housing. Over the last few years, administrative costs have been significantly reduced and the Housing Authority continues to implement more efficient systems and implement less cumbersome policies and procedures. The Marin Housing Authority currently serves approximately 890 household members within nearly 500 units.

Actions planned during the next year to address the needs to public housing

The Capital Fund Program (CFP) has generally been the only federal funding for public housing agencies to replace obsolete building systems (heating, electrical, plumbing, ventilation, etc.); make major repairs to elevators, roofs, exteriors, bathrooms, and kitchens; abate hazardous materials; add accessibility modifications; make site improvements; and provide energy upgrades, security, resident services, operating subsidy, and management improvements. CFP funding from the federal government has declined dramatically and has not been adequate to cover replacement costs for the aging public housing stock.

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

The Phoenix Project provides prevention and intervention services focused on opening education and employment opportunities to at-risk young men. The project is a partnership between Performing Stars of Marin and the Marin Housing Authority (MHA) in collaboration with the Sheriff's Department, County Probation, the District Attorney's Office, the Conservation Corps North Bay, Marin City Community Development Corporation, Marin AIDS Project, Bay Area Community Resources, the Marin County Office of Education, and others. It is funded by the Marin Community Foundation, Marin County Probation, and the Marin County Board of Supervisors.

The primary goal of the Resident Opportunities and Self-Sufficiency (ROSS) Service Coordinator is to help residents improve their living conditions, enabling them to age-in-place and avoid placement in a full-care facility to the greatest extent possible. Multi-year HUD funding provides service coordination to 200 elderly and disabled residents in the five MHA complexes designated for this population.

The Family Self-Sufficiency Program (FSS) assists 100 families in the Section 8 program and 40 to 50 families in Marin City Public Housing. Most participants are single mothers and are provided case management and referrals toward individually-crafted educational or employment goals. Marin Community Foundation (MCF) provides additional multi-year funding to expand FSS with the Work Incentive Program, which targets public housing families who have multiple barriers and challenges that

require more intensive case management. With funding support from the MCF and special HUD grants, the Marin Housing Authority has maintained the Family Self-Sufficiency Program in both the Section 8 Voucher Program as well as in Marin City family public housing. This program is directed toward improving the economic situation of residents by ultimately increasing the families' earned income.

The Shelter Plus Care Program combines housing subsidy from HUD McKinney Vento Funds with case management services funded by Marin County Mental Health And Substance Use Services (MHSUS). Shelter Plus Care program eligibility includes individuals and families who are literally homeless and have a severe and persistent mental illness. The Shelter Plus Care Program serves 100 households with a housing subsidy and case management services.

The HOPWA Program combines housing subsidy from HUD and case management services from local community-based organizations with which the Housing Authority has entered into a Memorandum of Understanding to provide services. Individuals and families must have an HIV/AIDS diagnosis confirmed by an appropriate third party and meet income eligibility guidelines. HOPWA is expected to serve 26 households in 2015-16.

Section 3 Resident Training allows the Marin Housing Authority to periodically provide short-term training opportunities to public housing residents in maintenance, landscaping, property management, and administrative support work. Residents work in paid training positions under the supervision of community-based training organizations. These projects typically last four to eight weeks and are designed to provide the basic skills which trainees can take to more permanent jobs in the maintenance, construction, landscaping, property management, or office support fields.

If the PHA is designated as troubled, describe the manner in which financial assistance will be provided or other assistance

NA

Discussion

AP-65 Homeless and Other Special Needs Activities – 91.220(i)

Introduction

Section AP 30 shows the proposed CDBG and HOME activities to be undertaken serving the homeless and special needs populations. In the list of proposed CDBG and HOME projects, activities serving homeless and special needs populations are so noted. (Please note that although Homeward Bound plans to market rental units at Oma Village to families who are working their way out of homelessness, because Oma Village is not formally designated as a homeless shelter or as transitional housing, it is not designated as a project serving homeless and special needs populations.)

Describe the jurisdictions one-year goals and actions for reducing and ending homelessness including

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

Outreach to Families:

- Local school district homeless liaisons coordinate outreach to unsheltered homeless families and provide linkages to family housing/service opportunities.
- The local United Way works with an active Continuum of Care member, to enhance the capacity of the 211 phone service to connect with unsheltered homeless people, screen and assess them, and refer them to appropriate family programs.
- Families are connected with legal services (Legal Aid of Marin) to clear legal barriers to housing (such as criminal records).
- Homeless families are identified to receive public assistance (County Health & Human Services programs) and connect them with local housing resources.

Outreach to All Individuals (including single adults):

- All key homeless providers (housing/non-housing providers) participate in the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS), which helps to identify unsheltered persons.
- Dedicated encampment/street outreach (CARE Teams, Marin Interfaith Street Chaplaincy) identify and engage people daily through peer-led efforts. (CARE Teams average four to six contacts per day.)
- Ritter Center provides day services including medical care, showers, phones, mail, and laundry services, engaging with over 50 unsheltered individuals daily.

Marin strategic plans include outreach targeted to homeless subpopulations (severely mentally ill, veterans, unaccompanied youth) and coordinating links to appropriate housing and service supports.

Addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

All the major transitional housing and emergency shelters in Marin participate in HMIS. The Continuum of Care regularly analyzes HMIS data to develop strategies to help improve utilization of transitional housing and shelter by those most in need, to identify services and programs that will help households achieve housing stability and self-sufficiency, and to determine gaps in inventory and capacity.

Helping homeless persons (especially chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth) make the transition to permanent housing and independent living, including shortening the period of time that individuals and families experience homelessness, facilitating access for homeless individuals and families to affordable housing units, and preventing individuals and families who were recently homeless from becoming homeless again

Addressing Family Homelessness:

The Marin Partnership to End Homelessness is working to implement Ten-Year Plan goals to address family homelessness by assessing the effectiveness of existing interventions for at-risk families to prevent homelessness and expanding new prevention methods developed with Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing Program (HPRP) funds. Building on the success of HPRP, the Continuum of Care is focusing on shelter diversion strategies. The Continuum of Care is also working with Marin Interfaith Network, the Marin Organizing Committee, and Adopt-a-Family to develop private funding to stably house families. The Continuum of Care also coordinates with local educational agencies (e.g., the San Rafael School District's Homeless Liaison) to identify homeless families, assess their needs, and deliver targeted services, with a goal of housing families near their schools of origin.

Helping Households to Become Stably Housed:

The Marin Partnership to End Homelessness coordinates stakeholders and identifies opportunities to increase long-term permanent housing stability. Long-term strategies include:

Increasing access to mainstream services to better stabilize clients in the long-term. Services include outreach, SSI advocacy, and on-site benefits enrollment.

- Expanding integrated interagency service teams providing housing-linked wraparound services.
- Integrating mental health and substance abuse programs to form a behavioral health team, which serves as a cross-sector initiative to increase access to integrated services in community clinics.
- Evaluating quarterly Partnership to End Homelessness and agency performance to deliver targeted technical assistance.

Helping low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless, especially extremely low-income individuals and families and those who are: being discharged from publicly funded institutions and systems of care (such as health care facilities, mental health facilities, foster care and other youth facilities, and corrections programs and institutions); or, receiving assistance from public or private agencies that address housing, health, social services, employment, education, or youth needs

Preventing Households from Becoming Homeless:

Marin Partnership to End Homelessness staff assist in the coordination of efforts of several key prevention providers, including Adopt-a-Family, Canal Alliance, Community Action Marin, Legal Aid of Marin, Novato Human Needs Center, Ritter Center, St. Vincent de Paul Society, and the West Marin Resource Center. In 2012, during our Ten-Year Plan update process, the Homeless Policy Steering Committee (HPSC) identified prevention as a key priority. Prevention action steps include enhancing the capacity of the 211 system to assess and link callers to prevention services, using HPRP data to support efforts to increase prevention resources, and expanding outreach to landlords to make them aware of prevention services.

Discussion

AP-75 Barriers to affordable housing – 91.220(j)

Introduction:

The primary cause of the high cost of housing in Marin County is the high level of market demand for housing in Marin and the relative shortage of developable land. Public policies do have some impact on the cost of housing and the incentives to develop, maintain, and improve affordable housing in Marin County, but are greatly overshadowed by the impact of market demand. It is generally difficult to obtain sites for housing development (both market-rate and subsidized) in Marin County. Much of the land in the county is in public ownership or has been zoned for agricultural use, and is not available for development. Within Marin's urbanized U.S. Highway 101 corridor, most of the desirable suitably zoned sites have already been developed. Many of the remaining vacant urban sites have environmental constraints, such as steep hillsides, marshes, and toxic contamination. When environmental constraints that limit growth are reflected in local planning policies, it is the environmental factors that are the constraint. In some cases, however, community opposition to subsidized housing, often framed in terms of environmental conservation or preservation of community character, limits buildable density to a lower level than is permitted by zoning. Project delays caused by litigation can ratchet up the price of a project, making the project infeasible or requiring an additional infusion of subsidy. In either case, scarce resources are drained by the cost and delay of litigation or by actions deemed prudent to prevent litigation.

Actions it planned to remove or ameliorate the negative effects of public policies that serve as barriers to affordable housing such as land use controls, tax policies affecting land, zoning ordinances, building codes, fees and charges, growth limitations, and policies affecting the return on residential investment

Many public agencies have implemented land use and zoning policies to encourage the development of subsidized housing in order to achieve economic, racial, and ethnic integration. The County and most cities in Marin require developers of market-rate housing projects to set aside a percentage of units for low- and moderate-income households. For projects with 2-10 units, in cases where it is not feasible to provide inclusionary units on-site, the County will collect "in lieu" fees from the developer and deposit these funds in the Marin County Housing Trust Fund. Proceeds from the Housing Trust Fund are distributed to affordable housing projects. State law mandates density bonuses of up to 25% for projects with below market rate units. The County and many cities offer pre-application consultation and expedited application review for proponents of subsidized housing. The County and many cities permit second units to be built in many single-family districts, usually with the size of the second units restricted to maintain affordable rents. In general, local tax policies facilitate the development and preservation of subsidized housing. Most subsidized housing qualifies for an exemption from local property taxes, and the County has been cooperative in processing applications for tax exemptions. Proposition 13, a statewide policy, has resulted in property tax rates that vary minimally across municipal boundaries. Because tax rates vary so little among jurisdictions, differences in tax rates have

no effect on housing prices or the availability of affordable homeownership opportunities. Proposition 13 has, however, put communities in fiscal competition for retail development that generates sales tax revenues, and may result in more land being zoned for retail development than is needed, thereby reducing the amount of land zoned for housing. However, much of the land zoned for retail use in Marin is not desirable for housing use, because of traffic, noise, or toxic contamination. Building codes in Marin County are generally the same as in other jurisdictions in the region. Strict enforcement of building codes results in quality construction and lower long-term maintenance and upkeep expenses. Most Marin communities have ordinances restricting conversion of rental units into condominiums. These ordinances may limit the long-term return on investment in rental housing, but they have succeeded in preserving Marin's stock of rental housing. The Cities of Novato and San Rafael have rent control ordinances affecting only mobile home parks. A number of Marin's jurisdictions have inclusionary housing ordinances, including the Town of Corte Madera, the Town of Fairfax, the City of Larkspur, the County of Marin, the City of Mill Valley, the City of Novato, the Town of San Anselmo, the City of San Rafael, and the Town of Tiburon.

Discussion:

Most housing development in the county undergoes extensive discretionary review, slowing the process of development. Permit review fees continue to rise, adding to the already expensive development process. Because local tax revenues are increasing more slowly than the cost of maintaining local government services, and because the public is unwilling to spend tax funds to subsidize market-rate development, a continued rise in development application review fees is unavoidable. Many local jurisdictions waive or reduce development application fees for affordable housing, and most attempt to speed and simplify the processing of applications for subsidized housing, which can result in substantial cost savings. Fee waiver policies of school districts and utility districts vary, and their desire to assist the development of subsidized housing is increasingly at odds with the financial pressure that all local public agencies are experiencing.

Several jurisdictions, including the City of Belvedere, the Town of Corte Madera, the Town of Fairfax, the City of Larkspur, the County of Marin, the City of Mill Valley, the City of Novato, the Town of Ross, the Town of San Anselmo, and the City of San Rafael, have encouraged second unit conversion as a means of providing affordable housing in existing built-out neighborhoods. Most communities limit the size of second units, which has the effect of limiting rents. In the Town of San Anselmo, new second units are subject to rent control. The City of San Rafael has encouraged the development of multi-family housing in its downtown, and has liberalized zoning regulations to allow affordable multi-family housing in most residential districts. Density bonus policies in the city's housing element offer incentives for the provision of affordable housing units. The City of Sausalito and the City of Mill Valley have been supportive of infill projects in their densely built communities.

The City of Novato, through its Reuse Plan for the decommissioned Hamilton Army Air Field, required the development of significant amounts of affordable housing. The Reuse Plan called for 425 units of market-rate housing and 783 units of below-market-rate housing. Meadow Park consists of 708 newly

constructed units. Originally planned to be a rehabilitation project, Meadow Park is a newly constructed development in the areas formerly called Capehart and Hillside. The Meadow Park project consists of 213 units (including 60 units of transitional housing) for households below 50% of median income, 320 units for households between 50% and 80% of median income, and 250 units for households between 80% and 120% of median income. The housing consists of owner-occupied homes, conventional rental housing, and transitional rental housing with social services. In addition, 32 units of transitional housing, known as The Next Key, has been built at Hamilton, adjacent to Homeward Bound's New Beginnings Center to accommodate participants in the New Beginnings Center's Fresh Starts Culinary Training Program and other training programs. The County of Marin, the City of Mill Valley, and the Town of Tiburon have supported affordable housing using funds collected through their in-lieu fee programs. The City of Mill Valley has sought cooperative development opportunities between the City and nonprofit developers, and has completed two such projects for low-income families.

AP-85 Other Actions – 91.220(k)

Introduction:

Actions planned to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs

To address obstacles to meeting underserved needs, the County proposes to fund activities directed at underserved populations, including racial and ethnic minorities, people with disabilities, and very low income people. For example, Community Development Block Grant assistance will be used to support public services for children of low-income minority families (such as youth development programs in Marin City and the Canal area and various child care programs). Conservation and expansion of the supply of subsidized family rental housing will be a major priority for the use of HUD funds.

Actions planned to foster and maintain affordable housing

To foster and maintain affordable housing, the County will use a large portion of its HUD funding for development, preservation, and rehabilitation of subsidized housing.

Actions planned to reduce lead-based paint hazards

To evaluate and reduce lead-based paint hazards, the County will require all recipients of HUD funding to comply with the requirements for lead paint testing and abatement. The Housing Authority will also continue its program of lead paint testing and abatement for public housing.

Actions planned to reduce the number of poverty-level families

To reduce the number of poverty-level families, Marin County will continue its extensive employment training program and encourage nonprofit organizations to better coordinate their services to families in distress.

Actions planned to develop institutional structure

To develop an improved institutional structure and to enhance coordination between public and private housing and social service agencies, the County will encourage more inter-departmental and inter-agency collaboration. Marin County is a participant in the Marin Partnership to End Homelessness, which is bringing together representatives of public agencies and private nonprofits to envision better ways to organize the provision of subsidized housing and supportive services. Marin County coordinates the Continuum of Care process, which is bringing together representatives of public agencies and private nonprofits to envision better ways to organize the provision of housing and supportive services for homeless people.

Actions planned to enhance coordination between public and private housing and social

service agencies

To foster public housing improvements and resident initiatives, the Housing Authority will continue to seek funding for public housing improvements and will provide public housing residents with technical assistance for resident initiatives as funds permit.

Discussion:

Program Specific Requirements

AP-90 Program Specific Requirements – 91.220(I)(1,2,4)

Introduction:

Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG) Reference 24 CFR 91.220(I)(1)

Projects planned with all CDBG funds expected to be available during the year are identified in the Projects Table. The following identifies program income that is available for use that is included in projects to be carried out.

1. The total amount of program income that will have been received before the start of the next program year and that has not yet been reprogrammed	83,000
2. The amount of proceeds from section 108 loan guarantees that will be used during the year to address the priority needs and specific objectives identified in the grantee's strategic plan.	0
3. The amount of surplus funds from urban renewal settlements	0
4. The amount of any grant funds returned to the line of credit for which the planned use has not been included in a prior statement or plan	0
5. The amount of income from float-funded activities	0
Total Program Income:	83,000

Other CDBG Requirements

1. The amount of urgent need activities	0
2. The estimated percentage of CDBG funds that will be used for activities that benefit persons of low and moderate income. Overall Benefit - A consecutive period of one, two or three years may be used to determine that a minimum overall benefit of 70% of CDBG funds is used to benefit persons of low and moderate income. Specify the years covered that include this Annual Action Plan.	0.00%

HOME Investment Partnership Program (HOME) Reference 24 CFR 91.220(I)(2)

1. A description of other forms of investment being used beyond those identified in Section 92.205 is as follows:

NONE

2. A description of the guidelines that will be used for resale or recapture of HOME funds when used for homebuyer activities as required in 92.254, is as follows:

3. A description of the guidelines for resale or recapture that ensures the affordability of units acquired with HOME funds? See 24 CFR 92.254(a)(4) are as follows:

No homebuyer activities are currently planned.

4. Plans for using HOME funds to refinance existing debt secured by multifamily housing that is rehabilitated with HOME funds along with a description of the refinancing guidelines required that will be used under 24 CFR 92.206(b), are as follows:

No refinancing is currently planned.

Discussion:

Appendix - Alternate/Local Data Sources

1	<p>Data Source Name</p> <p>Marin County Housing Element 2014-2023</p>
	<p>List the name of the organization or individual who originated the data set.</p> <p>Marin County Community Development Agency</p>
	<p>Provide a brief summary of the data set.</p> <p>Updated Housing Element of the Marin County General Plan</p>
	<p>What was the purpose for developing this data set?</p> <p>To identify housing and zoning issues and goals; possible sites for affordable housing</p>
	<p>How comprehensive is the coverage of this administrative data? Is data collection concentrated in one geographic area or among a certain population?</p> <p>The coverage is extensive and encompasses the entire county</p>
	<p>What time period (provide the year, and optionally month, or month and day) is covered by this data set?</p> <p>The report contains historical data about the county but addresses the years 2104-2023</p>
	<p>What is the status of the data set (complete, in progress, or planned)?</p> <p>It has been approved by the Marin County Board of Supervisors and has been sent to the state for review and comment.</p>
2	<p>Data Source Name</p> <p>Marin Point In Time Count 2013</p>
	<p>List the name of the organization or individual who originated the data set.</p> <p>Marin County Health and Human Services</p>
	<p>Provide a brief summary of the data set.</p> <p>Point in Time Count</p>
	<p>What was the purpose for developing this data set?</p> <p>HUD requirements and to establish accurate data pertaining to homelessness in the County</p>
	<p>Provide the year (and optionally month, or month and day) for when the data was collected.</p> <p>Jnauary 24, 2013</p>
	<p>Briefly describe the methodology for the data collection.</p> <p>Marin follows approved methodology for counting shelter and unsheltered populations based on guidance developed by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The primary methodology for the count was a brief survey method.</p>

	<p>Describe the total population from which the sample was taken.</p> <p>During the 2013 one-day count, 933 individuals and persons in families were counted as homeless in Marin.</p>
	<p>Describe the demographics of the respondents or characteristics of the unit of measure, and the number of respondents or units surveyed.</p> <p>2013 Point-in-Time Count Results: A total of 933 people were counted as homeless on January 24, 2013. 693 of the total number of people counted met HUD’s definition of homeless, residing on the street, in emergency shelters or transitional housing programs. 174 were “literally homeless” living in places not meant for human habitation such as cars, streets, and encampments. 519 were in either emergency shelter or transitional housing programs. An additional 240 were sheltered in settings not recognized by HUD, such as motels, jail, hospitals and temporary residence with friends or family. 47 persons were counted in the county jail and 3 at Marin General Hospital. 24 persons were living in motels and 30 had lost their housing and were living with friends or family and stated they were homeless when surveyed the day of the count; 117 persons did not specify their location the night before the count. 388 persons were found to be at risk of homelessness and counted as precariously housed.</p>
3	<p>Data Source Name</p> <p>HOMEFORALL</p>
	<p>List the name of the organization or individual who originated the data set.</p> <p>Marin County Continuum of Care</p>
	<p>Provide a brief summary of the data set.</p> <p>It provides data identifying the numbers and types of homeless individuals and families in the County</p>
	<p>What was the purpose for developing this data set?</p> <p>To establish need and create an action plan to address the challenges and possible solutions leading to significant reductions in homelessness in the County</p>
	<p>How comprehensive is the coverage of this administrative data? Is data collection concentrated in one geographic area or among a certain population?</p> <p>The report addresses countywide need.</p>
	<p>What time period (provide the year, and optionally month, or month and day) is covered by this data set?</p> <p>2013 -2023</p>
	<p>What is the status of the data set (complete, in progress, or planned)?</p> <p>Complete</p>
4	<p>Data Source Name</p> <p>Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice</p>

	<p>List the name of the organization or individual who originated the data set.</p> <p>Fair Housing of Marin</p>
	<p>Provide a brief summary of the data set.</p> <p>This Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (AI) broadly identifies the actions, omissions, and conditions in the county that may have the effect of limiting housing choice for people protected under state and federal fair housing laws.</p>
	<p>What was the purpose for developing this data set?</p> <p>The AI not only identifies impediments to fair housing choice, but also makes recommendations to overcome the effects of those impediments.</p>
	<p>How comprehensive is the coverage of this administrative data? Is data collection concentrated in one geographic area or among a certain population?</p> <p>It encompassed the entire county</p>
	<p>What time period (provide the year, and optionally month, or month and day) is covered by this data set?</p> <p>It was finalized on October 11, 2011</p>
	<p>What is the status of the data set (complete, in progress, or planned)?</p> <p>Complete</p>
5	<p>Data Source Name</p> <p>Portrait of Marin</p>
	<p>List the name of the organization or individual who originated the data set.</p> <p>Marin Community Foundation</p>
	<p>Provide a brief summary of the data set.</p> <p>A review of demographics in Marin County</p>
	<p>What was the purpose for developing this data set?</p> <p>To try and create an environment that reduces health risks; investing in preschool, and addressing the lower per-pupil spending in schools whose students have greatest needs; and expanding affordably priced housing to increase options for older adults and working families and to reduce Marin's car congestion and pollution.</p>
	<p>How comprehensive is the coverage of this administrative data? Is data collection concentrated in one geographic area or among a certain population?</p> <p>The coverage is county wide</p>
	<p>What time period (provide the year, and optionally month, or month and day) is covered by this data set?</p> <p>It was issued January 2012.</p>

	<p>What is the status of the data set (complete, in progress, or planned)?</p> <p>Complete</p>
6	<p>Data Source Name</p> <p>Industry & Occupational Employment Projections</p>
	<p>List the name of the organization or individual who originated the data set.</p> <p>NorthBay Employment Connection</p>
	<p>Provide a brief summary of the data set.</p> <p>workforce and employment data for the Northbay area</p>
	<p>What was the purpose for developing this data set?</p> <p>To identify needs and trends of employment in the area</p>
	<p>How comprehensive is the coverage of this administrative data? Is data collection concentrated in one geographic area or among a certain population?</p> <p>It covers the entire bay area</p>
	<p>What time period (provide the year, and optionally month, or month and day) is covered by this data set?</p> <p>It covers the period between 2014-2019</p>
	<p>What is the status of the data set (complete, in progress, or planned)?</p> <p>Complete</p>
7	<p>Data Source Name</p> <p>Marin Point In Time Count 2014</p>
	<p>List the name of the organization or individual who originated the data set.</p> <p>See Data source #2</p>
	<p>Provide a brief summary of the data set.</p>
	<p>What was the purpose for developing this data set?</p>
	<p>Provide the year (and optionally month, or month and day) for when the data was collected.</p> <p>2014</p>
	<p>Briefly describe the methodology for the data collection.</p>
	<p>Describe the total population from which the sample was taken.</p>

	<p>Describe the demographics of the respondents or characteristics of the unit of measure, and the number of respondents or units surveyed.</p>
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

ATTACHMENT 1-A

TABLES CONTAINING PROJECTS NAMES AND FUNDING AMOUNTS

Dollar amounts to be determined at the Priority Setting Committee Hearing on March 30, 2015 and Marin County Board of Supervisors Hearing on May 5, 2015

ATTACHMENT 1-B

91.230 MONITORING STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES

Monitoring Standards

Staff of the Marin County Community Development Agency are responsible for monitoring activities funded by the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program and the HOME Investment Partnerships Program. We have two basic standards for monitoring:

- (1) Did the project meet its stated objectives and the requirements of its grant contract?
- (2) Compared with the outcome of other grant-funded projects, did the project have sufficient impact on high-priority needs of low income people, as identified in our Community Development Objectives, Action Plan, Consolidated Plan, the Housing Element and other portions of the General Plan, the Ten-Year Homeless Plan, and other local plans?

Other questions used to determine whether a project meets the basic standards include:

- Is the project, as carried out, clearly eligible under both the letter and the spirit of the program regulations and the statutes that govern the program?
- Is the information being supplied by the project sponsor correct and complete?
- Did the project provide significant benefit to very low income people, as well as to low income people?
- Did the project contribute to economic, social, racial, and ethnic integration? Did the project sponsor make a good faith effort at affirmative marketing? How effective was the affirmative marketing?
- Did the project sponsor have the capacity to implement the project alone, and if not, did they make appropriate use of consultants and partnerships with other organizations?
- Is the project cost-effective in comparison with other ways to meet the same need?
- Is the activity conducted in a manner that respects the rights of people with disabilities for equal access?
- How responsive is the project sponsor to emerging community needs and the special needs of minorities?
- Has the project sponsor made appropriate outreach to show a commitment to providing culturally sensitive services to all people?

- Has the project sponsor planned the implementation process to consider timing issues and minimize financial risk?
- Has the project sponsor made efforts to utilize volunteers and to raise funds from sources other than HUD grants?

Our main procedure for monitoring is on-site visits, most of which are conducted in the period between December and March in conjunction with our annual budget-setting process. Project monitoring is performed by, or in consultation with, the same staff representative who administers the project contract and approves billings from the project sponsor. This helps integrate our monitoring with our ongoing efforts to provide assistance, advice, and support to the project sponsors.

Our goal is to conduct a monitoring visit of each active project within a two-year cycle. We identify high-risk subrecipients and target them for more frequent on-site programmatic and fiscal monitoring. Our criteria for identifying high-risk projects are:

- 1) Project sponsors receiving their first federal grant allocation.
- 2) New project sponsors which lack experience in program administration.
- 3) Project sponsors which have had substantial staff turnover or have recently hired a new executive director.
- 4) Project sponsors which are chronically slow to submit bills or reports.
- 5) Project sponsors which consistently present bills that have errors.
- 6) Project sponsors who attempt to bill CDBG or HOME for clearly ineligible items or show a lack of awareness of CDBG or HOME regulations which apply to their project(s).
- 7) Project sponsors who have been allocated unusually large CDBG or HOME grants.
- 8) Project sponsors who frequently change the scope of their project(s).
- 9) Project sponsors who have a reputation in the community for having troubled projects.
- 10) Projects where service delivery has been disrupted because of internal organizational changes.
- 11) Projects that must comply with Davis-Bacon wage standards.
- 12) Projects that generate an inordinate number of complaints from the public.

- 13) Projects that are the focus of community controversy related to program effectiveness.
- 14) Projects that are not meeting contract goals; for example, if a project is serving a smaller number of clients than projected.
- 15) Projects or project sponsors which have lost significant funding sources.
- 16) Project sponsors which fail to submit demographic reporting data on a timely basis or who submit data that appears questionable.
- 17) Other factors that suggest special scrutiny would be appropriate.

Federal Grants Division staff, working as a group, perform a qualitative ranking of projects based on the above criteria. Projects which trigger one or more of the above criteria are classified as high-risk projects. These high-risk projects are monitored at least once a year. In cases where staff find serious problems with a project sponsor, the sponsor is generally warned that they may not be funded in subsequent years or may have their funding reprogrammed to another project. In addition, as time permits, staff offers sponsors of high-risk projects additional guidance and technical assistance. This may involve meeting with project sponsor staff or board members and suggesting resources to improve project effectiveness.

Projects not considered high-risk are considered low-risk projects and are monitored at least once every two years, with many projects monitored on an annual basis.

The County of Marin is committed to bringing business opportunities to minority- and women-owned business enterprises. By encouraging recipients of grants and/or loans to make a good faith effort to hire minority and women-owned businesses (MBE/WBE), the County hopes to increase business opportunities for disadvantaged businesses.

HOME Program grant recipients are informed that they must document a good faith effort to hire minority and women-owned businesses for federally-funded projects. Staff counsels each recipient and prospective recipient on the requirements of the program.

Recipients of HOME funds must document having made a good faith effort to hire minority and women-owned businesses. A good faith effort may include, but not be limited to, the following actions: hiring minority and/or women-owned businesses; keeping a record of phone calls to and interviews with specific contractors to discuss services or products; and solicitation of bids with explanation of the reason for rejecting a low bidder.

Nothing in the Minority and Women's Business Outreach Program is intended to prevent any recipient of federal funding from rejecting a contractor whose bid is too high or who does not meet reasonable qualifications.

ATTACHMENT 1-C

REFERENCES

Marin County General Plan

<http://www.marincounty.org/depts/cd/divisions/planning/2007-marin-countywide-plan>

Marin County Housing Element (2105-2013)

<http://www.marincounty.org/depts/cd/divisions/planning/housing/housing-element>

Portrait of Marin

<http://www.measureofamerica.org/marin/>

2013 PIT findings

https://www.marinhhs.org/sites/default/files/files/servicepages/2013_09/2013_point_in_time_count_full_report.pdf

HOMEFORALL

<https://www.marinhhs.org/10-year-plan>

MARIN County AI – 2011

http://www.marincounty.org/~media/files/departments/cd/federal-grants/analysis_of_impediments_to_fair_housing_choice.pdf

Marin Homeless Planning Guide- update 2012

http://www.healthymarín.org/javascript/htmleditor/uploads/Marin_Homelessness_Planning_Guide_2012_4_17_Update.pdf

Industry and Occupational workforce – Northbay Counties

<http://www.napaworkforce.org/Portals/3/Downloads/report/IndustryandOccupationalEmploymentProjections.pdf>

Census Tract information

<https://geomap.ffiec.gov/FFIECGeocMap/GeocodeMap1.aspx>

Census facts

<http://www.census.gov/quickfacts/table/PST045214/06041,00>

ATTACHMENT 1-D

Place holder for public comments received

ENLARGED PRINTOUT FOR PG 89 Housing Inventory List

Proj. Type	Organization Name	Project Name	Inventory Type	Bed Type	Target Pop. A	Utilization Rate
ES	Homeward Bound of Marin	Family Center	C	Facility-based beds	HC	104%
ES	Homeward Bound of Marin	Mill Street Center	C	Facility-based beds	SMF	78%
ES	Homeward Bound of Marin	Motel Program	C	Voucher beds	HC	100%
ES	Homeward Bound of Marin	New Beginnings Center	C	Facility-based beds	SMF	100%
ES	Homeward Bound of Marin	Transition to Wellness/Medical Respite	C	Facility-based beds	SMF	83%
ES	Homeward Bound of Marin	Voyager	C	Facility-based beds	SMF	100%
ES	St. Vincent de Paul Society	Marin Emergency Winter Shelter Program	C	Other beds	SMF	95%
PSH	Bucklew Programs	AIL (Assisted Independent Living)	C		SMF	100%
PSH	Bucklew Programs	RSS (Residential Support Service)	C		SMF	100%
PSH	Bucklew Programs	Supported Housing (Marin)	C		SMF	100%
PSH	Bucklew Programs	Supported Housing (non- HUD-funded)	C		SMF	100%
PSH	Center Point Inc.	Homelink	C		SMF+HC	100%
PSH	EAH Housing	San Clemente (Service Provider: Homeward Bound)	C		HC	100%
PSH	Eden Housing Investments	Fireside Affordable Housing (Service Provider: Homeward Bound)	C		SMF+HC	86%
PSH	Homeward Bound of Marin	4th St.	C		SMF	100%
PSH	Homeward Bound of Marin	Carmel	C		SMF	92%
PSH	Homeward Bound of Marin	Palm Court	C		SMF	95%
PSH	Homeward Bound of Marin	Palm Court II	C		SMF	100%
PSH	Homeward Bound of Marin	Palm Court III	N		SMF	100%
PSH	Homeward Bound of Marin	Palm Court IV	N		SMF	100%
PSH	Housing Authority of the County of Marin	Formerly SHIA and Odyssey (Section 8 subsidy)	C		SMF+HC	100%
PSH	Housing Authority of the County of Marin	Shelter Plus Care	C		SMF+HC	100%
PSH	Housing Authority of the County of Marin	Shelter Plus Care 3	C		SMF	100%
PSH	Housing Authority of the County of Marin	VASH	C		SMF+HC	97%
PSH	Ritter Center	Housing First	C		SMF	88%
PSH	Ritter Center	Housing First	U		SMF	
PSH	St. Vincent de Paul Society	Apartments	C		SMF	78%
RRH	County Rapid Rehousing	Rapid Rehousing	C		SMF+HC	100%
TH	Center for Domestic Peace	Second Step Transitional Housing (Park)	C		HC	84%
TH	Center for Domestic Peace	Short-Term Transitional Housing	C		SMHC	100%
TH	Center Point Inc.	Mary Street/Charlotte House	C		HC	100%
TH	Center Point Inc.	THP Scattered Sites	C		SMF	87%

TH	Center Point Inc.	VA Services	C		SMF	0%
TH	Gilead House	1042 7th St.	C		HC	111%
TH	Hamilton Continuum Partners LP	Hamilton Meadows: (Ritter Center)	C		SMF	100%
TH	Hamilton Continuum Partners LP	Hamilton Meadows: C4DP/Second-Step (non- HUD funded)	C		HC	84%
TH	Hamilton Continuum Partners LP	Hamilton Meadows: Center Point	C		SMF	78%
TH	Hamilton Continuum Partners LP	Hamilton Meadows: Homeward Bound/Meadow Park	C		SMF+HC	104%
TH	Hamilton Continuum Partners LP	Hamilton Meadows:Marin AIDS Project	C		SMF+HC	100%
TH	Homeward Bound of Marin	Family Park	C		HC	108%
TH	Homeward Bound of Marin	New Beginnings Center (per diem beds for veterans)	C		SMF	62%
TH	Homeward Bound of Marin	The Next Key	C		SMF+HC	95%