



City of Los Angeles, California, Five-Year Consolidated Plan (Program Years 2008-2013)

This document includes narrative responses to specific questions that grantees of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnership (HOME), American Dream Downpayment Initiative (ADDI), Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) and Emergency Shelter Grants (ESG) programs must respond to assure compliance with HUD Consolidated Planning Regulations.

Executive Summary

The Executive Summary of the Consolidated Plan ("Plan") is intended to provide HUD, non-profit and for-profit housing, community and economic development providers, and City residents and businesses with a comprehensive overview of the City's housing and community development needs, demographics, priorities and strategies, and how the activities will address identified needs and objectives over the next five years. As a result of HUD's 2006 directives, all Consolidated Plan-funded programs and projects must meet both a HUD-defined objective and outcome, with a corresponding performance indicator to measure results.

Background

The Plan is the result of the 1992 amendment to the National Affordable Housing Act (NAHA) of 1990. This legislation required that a single Consolidated Plan be submitted to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for funding of all HUD formula grant programs. These four programs are: Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), Home Investment Partnerships (HOME), Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) Grant, and Emergency Shelter Grant (ESGP). In 2004, the American Dream Downpayment Initiative (ADDI) was passed by Congress and signed by the President as the fifth formula HUD Entitlement grant.

With the receipt of Census 2010 data not anticipated until late 2013, the City of Los Angeles is submitting a full five-year document for the period 2008-2013 using not only Census 2000 and periodic updates, but also HUD State of the Cities Demographic System (SOCDS) data, 2002 HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data, American Housing Survey and American Community Survey (2005) data from the U.S. Census, California Department of Finance data, and other sources of current demographics. City low- and moderate-income census tract and block group data, used to qualify CDBG-funded projects under the Area Benefit National Objective, was updated in 2007 and will be used where appropriate.

Purpose

The Consolidated Plan's purposes are threefold: *it is intended to provide the groundwork for a comprehensive, integrated approach to planning and implementing the City's housing, community development, and economic development needs and priorities in the form of a Strategic Plan.* It replaced the CHAS, or Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, and four separate grant applications. The Consolidated Planning process has allowed the city to effectively coordinate its HUD-funded housing and community development programs and meet its Strategic Plan goals.

The City also identifies other federal, state, county and private sources of funding in the Consolidated Plan as tools to leverage, or extend the impact, of Consolidated Plan funding. For example, the Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) program, originating with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and coordinated by the state of California through the City's Community Action Agency (CAA), funds in part a significant number of Public Service activities, thereby leveraging the impact of CDBG and ESG funding received by the City, particularly for those with extremely low (0-30% of the Los Angeles County Median Income) and very low (31 to 50%) incomes.

The City also leverages Workforce Investment Act funds for employment training and job readiness programs in tandem with CDBG. The New Markets Tax Credit program, administered by the U.S. Treasury provided \$75 million in investment credits for Los Angeles developers in 2007, leveraging CDBG funds allocated for economic development in low-income, distressed areas of the City; and HUD Section 108 loan guarantee funds further the City's economic development strategy by allowing the City additional financial resources to fund catalytic, strategic and cost effective economic development programs.

Because funds are limited and unmet housing needs are great, as HUD CHAS (Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy) data demonstrates, the City leverages Consolidated Plan investments in affordable rental housing development and first time homebuyer assistance with other resources available for this purpose. LAHD has successfully applied for over \$48 million of competitive grants in the past eight years from both HUD and the State of California.

Local resources for affordable rental housing development include City General Funds, redevelopment tax increment, Section 8 project-based vouchers and Los Angeles Department of Water and Power resources for energy-efficient, sustainable building expenses. In addition, tax-exempt mortgage revenue bond finance, federal and state low-income housing tax credits, conventional bank loans, HUD Supportive Housing, 202 and 811 programs, Federal Home Loan Bank Affordable Housing Program (AHP), and State housing programs funded by voter-approved propositions. On average, Consolidated Plan and local City resources for the Affordable Housing Trust Fund are leveraged with four times as much from other sources.

All Consolidated Plan-funded homebuyer assistance programs are the result of public-private partnerships; approved lenders from local financial institutions offer the 'first mortgage' to be combined with LAHD's 'second mortgage'. LAHD frequently applies to the State of California and HUD for competitive grants and tax-exempt finance to supplement the Consolidated Plan resources, and also partners with others to ensure the maximum benefits possible for Los Angeles homebuyers.

The Consolidated Plan also serves as the application for the five federal Entitlement programs received by the City annually. HUD requires that the City submit the Plan prior to allocation of federal grant funds to the City. The Plan also allows the City to apply for other grants when the federal government makes them available to local jurisdictions. Both CDD and LAHD prepare Certifications of Consistency with the Consolidated Plan to assure that both City and external agencies applying for other HUD programs (such as those announced in the annual Notice of Funding Availability, or SuperNOFA) are

proposing activities consistent with the needs, goals and priorities identified in the City's Plan.

The Plan incorporates five major sections: the *Housing and Homeless Needs Assessment*, *Housing Market Analysis*, *Non-Housing Community Development*, *Five Year Strategy*, and the *First Year Action Plan for the period 2008-2009*.

Submitted concurrently with the Consolidated Plan is the First-Year Action Plan ("Plan") for Program Year 2008-2009. The Plan identifies the sources and uses for the City's allocation of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), Home Investment Partnerships (HOME), American Dream Downpayment Initiative (ADDI), Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA), and Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG) funds, identifies specific outcomes and objectives for use of these funds, and defines performance indicators to measure program and project progress and accomplishments. The First Year Action Plan includes the planned distribution of funds; sources of non-Consolidated Plan funding to accomplish leveraging resources, primarily CDBG funding; and of primary importance, provides key information on the programs and projects to be utilized to meet the Five-Year Plan Strategy.

Consolidated Plan Grant Descriptions

- **Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)**

Consolidated Plan funds are allocated to the City by HUD to meet the housing and community development goals, objectives and strategies set forth in the Consolidated Plan and must primarily benefit low- and moderate-income persons. CDBG is the most flexible of the four Consolidated Plan grants, and may be used for a variety of purposes, including affordable housing development and rehabilitation, renovation or construction of neighborhood facilities, economic development, provision of funding to Community-Based Development Organizations (CBDOs) for activities related to employment or economic revitalization; public services, public infrastructure improvements, parks, modification of structures for ADA (Americans With Disabilities Act) compliance, establishment of youth and family community centers, crime prevention and awareness programs, programs and facilities for the homeless and those persons with special needs, such as seniors and the disabled; and acquisition of land and improvements for a specific project. All CDBG-funded projects must meet one of three HUD-defined National Objectives.

Primary Objectives for the CDBG program, as defined by HUD, include:

- Affordable housing for low-income, at-risk homeless, and homeless persons; increased availability of permanent housing; and mortgage financing at reasonable rates;
- A suitable living environment through improvement of safety of our neighborhoods, and increased access to quality facilities and public services; and
- Expansion of economic opportunities through job creation, credit for development activities accessible to low-income residents, and technical assistance to businesses.

- **Home Investment Partnerships Program (HOME) and American Dream Downpayment Initiative (ADDI)**

The HOME Program helps to address the shortage of affordable rental housing and homeownership opportunities in the City by providing funding to support an array of housing-related activities. A new initiative utilizing HOME funds is the Permanent Supportive Housing Program (PSHP), to enable formerly homeless individuals and families to stabilize and rebuild their lives.

The American Dream Down Payment Initiative (ADDI) funds are used by the City to supplement its Purchase Assistance (PA) and Purchase Assistance with Rehabilitation (PAR) soft second mortgages, enabling more homebuyers to afford the expensive market of Los Angeles. Eligibility for the ADDI Program is the same as eligibility for the current HOME-funded Purchase Assistance program, serving first time homebuyers earning below 80% of area median income.

- **Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG)**

ESG funds are used for a wide range of homeless programs. While flexible in terms of serving all homeless subpopulations and preventing persons from becoming homeless, ESG program legislation and implementing regulations limit the types of activities and amounts of funds that can be spent. The five major categories of ESG-eligible activities are: rehabilitation, essential services, operational costs, homeless prevention activities, and administrative costs.

LAHD functions as the grantee for the ESG Program funds, which are passed through via contracts to the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA), a joint powers authority created in 1993 between the City and County of Los Angeles. LAHSA administers ESG funds received by the City and the County for programs operated by homeless services providers. LAHSA provides oversight, management, monitoring and coordination for ESG program activities. In addition, LAHSA evaluates program effectiveness, conducts strategic planning activities, and ensures geographic coverage of homeless services throughout the City.

- **Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS (HOPWA)**

HOPWA funds are used to provide a variety of housing and supportive services for persons living with HIV/AIDS and their families. The City of Los Angeles, through the Housing Department, is the local coordinating entity for HOPWA funding for the entire Los Angeles-Long Beach Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA). Neither the County of Los Angeles nor any other city in the County receives a separate allocation of HOPWA funding. Los Angeles County, City of Los Angeles and other local jurisdictions work together with the Los Angeles Countywide HOPWA Advisory Committee (LACHAC) to implement the program.

Differences between the Previous and New Consolidated Plans

There have been significant improvements undertaken by the City in citizen participation and accountability for the Consolidated Plan grants since the 2003-2008 cycle. For example, there is now:

- **Expanded public participation and citizen input** – The Neighborhood Council structure brought about by electoral approval of 2000 City Charter amendments and election of new Council Members has brought greater participation and fresh insight into meeting the City’s challenges in housing and community development.
- **Greater responsiveness to citizen comments and views** - The 2008-2013 Consolidated Plan will continue to reflect a commitment to public participation through expanded consultation with other organizations, citizen groups, City Commissions and local leadership. Several City commissions were consulted to obtain their expert input on priorities for Plan funding priorities in the fall and winter of 2007.
- **Expanded publication by use of Internet Sites/Websites** – CDD is now publishing the notices for Citizen’s Unit for Participation (CUP) meetings, community meetings and formal public hearings on the Consolidated Plan, Action Plan, the CAPER report, and other HUD-related documents on both its Web Site and the City’s Early Notification System (ENS). CDD is, at this writing, finalizing its master mailing list in anticipation of creating a City List Serve to provide residents, businesses, related City agencies and the nonprofit community with information and developments pertaining to the Consolidated Planning process year round, including information on the annual application cycle.
- **A continuing commitment by the City to develop sound and workable approaches to overcome restraints in budgeting CDBG funds for Public Service activities.** Approximately 34% of the CDBG grant is budgeted for public service activities, including activities that have an economic revitalization or employment training component and that qualify under the CDBG Community-Based Development Organization (CBDO) requirements. Due to the inability of many City organizations to meet CBDO requirements, applications for CDBG funding will not be accepted for any new or additional funding under this category. A major obstacle to meeting underserved needs is the 15% cap, or limitation on allocating CDBG funds for public services; this will be discussed later in this report.
- **A greater emphasis on physical development (infrastructure and community facilities) and economic development projects,** given the limitation on use of CDBG for public service and CBDO activities, the need for capital improvements in a City with an aging infrastructure, expansion needs of service agencies, and the challenge of creating new industries and jobs with a living wage. Projects of these types will nevertheless need to meet strict eligibility and readiness criteria, including unimpeded site control, project financing commitments all in place, absence of legal and financial impediments, and having a realistic project timeline, among other factors.

- **A revised process for certification and re-certification of Community-Based Development Organizations (CBDOs)** in carrying out public service project activities with a job training and/or economic revitalization component. HUD has reviewed and approved changes to CDD's certification process and criteria for designating CBDO activities using CDBG funds, which have been incorporated in CDD's review procedures.
- **Oversight and successful meeting of timeliness and reprogramming of CDBG funds from slow-moving projects** - The City has improved its capability to track and monitor the usage of federal funds, and track the progress of individual projects. Projects are now identified as slow moving or ready to fund, and in 2007, the City is moving toward adoption of revised expenditure guidelines for the timely use of CDBG funds.

This has increased the level of accountability on the part of City departments for effective use of Consolidated Plan resources. Eight major reprogramming actions have been undertaken since 2000, ensuring effective and efficient use of Consolidated Plan funds. Monitoring the City's disbursement ratio is and will remain a top priority for City management.

All five of the City's Consolidated Plan grants have defined time frames for the timely expenditure of funds. For example, HOME and ADDI funds must be committed to and encumbered for specific activities within two years and expended before five years elapse. Congress, through HUD has established a high priority for timely use of CDBG funds; non-compliance with HUD timeliness standards can result in reduction to the City's Line of Credit.

Over the last four years, the undisbursed balance of CDBG funds has increased; in 2007, the ratio exceeded 1.60 program years. However, by the end of 2007, the City had reached the CDBG-required expenditure rate through reprogramming of funds. Over the next five years, the City will continue an aggressive approach to ensure that CDBG funds are spent expeditiously through regular review of undisbursed project balances.

- **Reinforced accountability and responsibilities of implementing departments** – CDD has significantly refined and expanded the use of the Proposed Eligibility Plan (PEP) as an all-purpose document to assure that projects undergo thorough review of HUD eligibility, environmental, and labor standards requirements and a determination of readiness prior to the release of CDBG funds. PEPs are also used for Substantial Amendments, or changes to approved Consolidated Plan project activities. The PEP is proving to be a useful tool for remote monitoring of projects and to assist in program evaluation. The PEP is now being integrated with the City's Contract Tracking System to assure that CDBG-funded contracts are not approved until a PEP has been submitted by City lead departments and approved by CDD.
- **Greater use of CDD staff for departmental and subrecipient training and capacity building** - CDD divisions and other City departments will continue to provide annual in-depth training to City and agency staff in preparation of the Plan and the CAPER. Training has over the last two years been expanded to include grant recordkeeping and HUD requirements for sub-recipient

management, as well as in preparation of the PEP. As part of the annual Consolidated Plan application cycle, CDD staff provides training to applicants on use of the CPAS (Consolidated Plan Application System), an on-line system that permits preparation and submission of funding requests.

- **A commitment to diversification of funding** - To assure continuation of key City services, City departments and community-based organizations will be strongly encouraged to explore ways to build their organizational capacity, and learn how to identify and utilize existing and alternative sources of funding in new and better ways. The Mayor approved reorganization of the CDD to include a Resource Development Unit (RDU) in 2006 which is actively identifying and applying for additional federal and state grants to leverage Consolidated Plan funding. CDD has also established a Capacity Building program for training of agencies in resource development and grants management.
- **Re-evaluation of the City's Gang Prevention and Intervention programs and the Human Services Delivery System.** The City Controller in 2007 issued an audit of two of the City's critical public service systems, with specific recommendations to make the programs more effective. The overarching objective, however, was to determine the best service model given the use of CDBG to finance projects, and the fiscal and regulatory constraints the City must adhere to. Over the next five years, the City will be assessing and restructuring the LA Bridges program, funded in large part by CDBG funds; and the Neighborhood Action Program/Family Development Network structure of the Human Services Delivery System, funded through the CDBG and CSBG grants. The City's overall gang prevention and intervention efforts will be re-evaluated by the new Ad Hoc Committee on Gangs.

Consolidated Plan Priorities and Strategies

The Mayor, in his October 1, 2007 Consolidated Plan memorandum, identified three core priorities for the targeting and expenditure of Action Plan resources; each is described below. Because of the vast extent of need in Los Angeles, all priorities are considered of equal rank:

- **Priority One: Youth Development and Education** – over one-third of the population of the City of Los Angeles is under the age of 18, one of the largest percentages of young people in a major American city. The future health and vitality of Los Angeles is directly tied to the education and development of our youth. Priority will be given to those programs that foster opportunities for increased youth development, create the conditions to raise student achievement, or promote safe and violence-free informal learning environments to protect and enrich our children's lives. Please see discussion of the One Out of Five Report in the anti-poverty section of this document.
- **Priority Two: Job Creation and Securing Our Economic Future** – new opportunities for economic success and stability for families throughout the City must be generated and sustained. Priority will be given to those programs that attract new companies to Los Angeles, assist local and emerging businesses grow, or retain and create well-paying jobs.

- **Priority Three: Affordable and Workforce Housing** – with the continuing increase in housing costs, housing that is affordable and safe must be created and maintained. Priority will be given to those programs that assist Los Angeles’s workforce in finding affordable rental and homeownership opportunities that promote the development of housing near areas of job creation, and that maintain the City’s current affordable housing units.

While the City will continue to refine its priorities and strategies to reflect changing community development needs over the next five years, the commitment remains first and foremost to direct Plan resources to persons of low- and moderate-income.

HUD-Mandated Outcome Performance Measurement System

In 2006, HUD implemented a Performance Measurement System for grantees nationwide. Performance measurement is now a requirement for virtually all federal programs, and performance in the form of defined and measurable objectives and outcomes is now front and center a key consideration in program funding decisions; grantees (and HUD) must demonstrate program results to decision makers and the public. This requirement stems from the recommendations arising from the Government Accountability Performance Review (PART) and OMB’s PART (Program Assessment Review Team) findings which identified significant shortcomings in grantees’ ability to demonstrate the results of federally-assisted programs.

Performance measurement enables HUD and the City to capture program accomplishments, enhance program capacity and results, and build public confidence and support in programs. HUD will use the data provided by the City to summarize “program outcomes” nationally, combine the City’s data with other data to track national trends, prepare national reports on program performance and use data to respond to Congressional and other inquiries about Consolidated Plan programs. The City is now mandated to classify Consolidated Plan-funded activities using HUD’s framework and report outcome data to HUD through the Department’s Integrated Disbursement and Information System (IDIS) annually.

As a result, all activities proposed for funding through the City’s Annual Action Plan, with the exception of administration and planning activities, must meet one of three Objectives: 1) Creating Suitable Living Environments; 2) Providing Decent Affordable Housing; and 3) Creating Economic Opportunities, all of which parallel HUD’s original Primary Objective for the CDBG program. *All activities must also meet one of three Outcomes: 1) Availability/Accessibility; 2) Affordability; and 3) Sustainability.* Each activity must be described in terms of an *Outcome Statement*, composed of both the defined Objective and Outcome. In addition, indicators must be connected to the Outcome Statement.

The City will provide all needed Performance Data in its Annual Action Plans over the next five years, and report in its annual CAPER (Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Reports) and Grantee Performance Report (GPR). A summary of the City’s outcomes, objectives, performance indicators and quantifiable goals for each funded Consolidated Plan activity for the First Year (PY 2008-2009) Action Plan is found in the section “Activities to be Undertaken” of this document, as is the Priority Needs Assessment.

Many housing-related programs can be assigned more than one objective and outcome, since they serve multiple purposes, based on the definitions provided by HUD. Therefore, as HUD has recommended, LAHD has chosen the objectives and outcomes that most closely match the *intent* of each program. The objective of *Providing Decent Housing* applies to nearly all housing programs operated by the City. *Improving Affordability* is the designated outcome of the rental housing production, homebuyer assistance and HOPWA Rental Assistance programs; however, the performance indicator for each program varies. For rental housing development the indicator is the number of new rental housing units provided financing commitments in a Program Year; for homebuyer and HOPWA Rental Assistance the indicator is the number of households assisted, since new housing units are not created by those programs.

LAHD's rehabilitation program outcomes are *Improving Availability or Accessibility*, with the performance indicators of number of units rehabilitated or units assisted, depending on the amount of work performed. For example, since the Handyworker and Home Secure programs provide important, but minimal assistance, which cannot be categorized as true rehabilitation, the 'units assisted' indicator is used.

The programs administered by LAHSA to assist homeless persons and prevent homelessness serve the objective of *Creating a Suitable Living Environment* and the expected outcome is *Improving Availability or Accessibility*. The performance indicator is the number of persons assisted.

General Questions

- 1. Describe the geographic areas of the jurisdiction (including areas of low-income families and/or racial/minority concentration) in which assistance will be directed.***

Los Angeles is a geographically large, racially and ethnically diverse and complex metropolitan area of over 457 square miles, extending from the Los Angeles Harbor to the West San Fernando Valley (a distance of 44 miles); the community of Venice on the Pacific Ocean and east to unincorporated Los Angeles County and the San Gabriel Valley cities. Over 88 other cities and unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County are found adjacent to, or within the City.

The City has 36 established Community Plan Areas (CPA) throughout the City, which will be used as the primary geographic tool of analysis throughout the Consolidated Plan and First Year Action Plan.

Of 2,182,114 U.S.-born City residents, 1,485,576 were born in California, 663,746 were born in a different state of the United States, and 61,792 were born in a United States territory according to the 2000 Census.

Of the 1,512,720 foreign-born, 100,252 were born in Europe, 376,767 were born in Asia, 64,730 were born in Africa, 94,104 were born in the Caribbean or Oceania. 996,996 were born in Latin America, and 13,859 were born in Canada. Of the foreign-born, 569,771 entered between 1990 to March 2000. 509,841 are naturalized citizens and 1,002,879 are not citizens.

By the next national census in 2010, Los Angeles is expected to have a Latino majority for the first time since 1850. The Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) is the number one point of entry for immigrants in the country. The Latino, Asian American, and Caribbean populations are growing particularly quickly — the Asian-American population is the largest of any U.S. city. Los Angeles hosts large populations of Cambodians, Iranians, Armenians, Belizeans, Bulgarians, Ethiopians, Filipinos, Guatemalans, Hungarians, Koreans, Israelis, Mexicans, Salvadorans, Thais, and Pacific Islanders such as Samoans.

Historical populations		
Census	Pop.	%±
1850	1,610	—
1860	4,385	172.4%
1870	5,728	30.6%
1880	11,183	95.2%
1890	50,395	350.6%
1900	102,479	103.4%
1910	319,198	211.5%
1920	576,673	80.7%
1930	1,238,048	114.7%
1940	1,504,277	21.5%
1950	1,970,358	31.0%
1960	2,479,015	25.8%
1970	2,816,061	13.6%
1980	2,966,850	5.4%
1990	3,485,398	17.5%
2000	3,694,820	6.0%
Est. 2006	3,849,378	4.2%

Los Angeles is also home to the largest population of Japanese Americans living in the United States, and has one of the largest Native American populations in the country. The metropolitan area also is home to the second largest concentration of people of Jewish descent (estimated at 621,000) in the Americas, after New York City. Los Angeles also has the second largest Nicaraguan community in the United States after Miami. It also hosts a sizable South Asian community.

Los Angeles is home to people from more than 140 countries speaking 224 different languages. Ethnic enclaves, including Chinatown, Historic Filipino Town, Koreatown, Little Armenia, Little Ethiopia, Little Persia, Little India, Little Tokyo, and Thai Town provide examples of the polyglot character of Los Angeles.

Mentioned earlier, the U.S. Census of 2000 revealed significant racial demographic shifts in the City. Latinos, the largest single ethnic group, comprised 46.5% of the City's population of any race, and live throughout the City. Whites made up 46.9%; African-Americans comprise 11.2% of the City's population and Asians 10%, while Native Americans make up less than 1% (0.8%).

There has been a significant degree of out-migration from the City by Non-Hispanic-Whites, and a substantial influx of Latinos, Asians and Pacific Islanders into Los Angeles over the last ten years, while the number of African-Americans has decreased significantly. According to the 2000 Census, Latinos of Mexican heritage formed the largest ethnic group in Los Angeles, numbering 1,091,686 or 29.5% of the total Latino population. African-Americans, at 415,195 were, according to the 2000 Census, the

second largest minority in Los Angeles. The number of African-Americans declined from 488,000 in the 1990 Census, or a decrease of 15%, a substantial shift.

Ethnic and racial distributions within the City's 36 Community Plan Areas (CPAs) were examined to determine the degree to which members of the City's racial and ethnic groups are concentrated in geographical areas. The narrative and tables that follow show the population of CPAs where the concentration of each ethnic group is at least 10% higher than the Citywide average for that group.

African-Americans

The City's African-American population is concentrated in only four CPAs: Southeast, West Adams, South Central City, and Central City. In fact, 72% of the City's entire African- American population lives in these four areas, within and south of the City's central core. African-Americans comprised about 11% of the City's population in 2000.

Table 1 - African-American Population Higher than 20% of Citywide Average	
Community Plan Area	% African-American (2000/1990 Census)
West Adams	52% (62%)
South Los Angeles	38% (48%)
Southeast	25% (40%)
Central City	23% (21%)

Both the number and proportion of the City's African-American population has declined dramatically over the last decade. In 1980, the City had 504,674 African-American residents constituting 17% of the City's population. By 1990, the number had decreased to 454,289, or approximately 13% of the population.

The 2000 Census revealed that the number of African-Americans had declined to 415,195, or about 11% of the City's population. The population of African-Americans dropped below 20% in Central City North in the 2000 Census (23% v. 18%), which was formerly included as an area of concentration. Several reasons have been suggested for this phenomenon, one of the most common being that African-Americans have found more affordable housing and employment opportunities outside of the City.

Latinos

The composition of California's Latino population differs from that of the rest of the United States, weighted more heavily by people of Mexican and Central American origin, and with larger numbers of immigrants. The Latino population is substantially younger than the non-Latino population, with over a third of Latinos under the age of 18, and less than 1 in 25 over the age of 65. The households of Latinos are larger than those of non-Latinos, due both to larger families and inclusion of other relatives in the household, and the inability of many Latinos to find or afford large family housing.

According to the 2000 Census, the City's Latino population, 46.5% of all residents, was larger than any other group. Fifty percent of all Latinos live in nine community planning areas. Many areas that were once considered African-American communities now have substantial Latino populations. For example, 58.6% of the population of Southeast Los Angeles and 44.7% of the population of South Central Los Angeles is Latino, whereas the 1990 Census revealed the reverse. The Valley reflects an important aspect to population growth in Southern California, namely the dramatic change in ethnic composition, particularly Latinos in the period between the two decennial censuses. The

2000 Census revealed that Hispanics accounted for 36.5% of the Valley's total population (1990 Latino census results here).

Table 2 - Latino Population Higher than 10% of Citywide Average	
Community Plan Area	% Latino
Boyle Heights	94%
Westlake	79%
Arleta-Pacoima	75%
Northeast	64%
Wilmington	62%
Southeast	59%
Sun Valley	55%
Sylmar	52%
Silverlake	51%

Native Americans

Los Angeles has by far the largest urban Native American community in the nation, represented by over 200 different tribes and Alaskan native groups. However, the 2000 Census counted only 29,412 persons, or 0.79% of the City's population as Native American. If Native Americans of Central and South American origin were included, the total would be about 43% higher, based on proportions reported in the 1990 Census.

Asians, Native Hawaiians, and Other Pacific Islanders

Between 1990 and 2000, the City's Asian, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islanders' population increased from 7% to 10% of the City's population. Five Community Planning Areas have concentrations of Asians that exceed 150% of their representation Citywide. A total of 40.3% of the City's Asian population is found in these areas.

The largest groups among those of Asian heritage, according to the 2000 Census, are Filipino (101,062), Korean (91,595), Chinese (63,075), and Japanese (36,992). Both the Chinese and Japanese Asian subgroups registered declines since the 1990 Census.

The Central City North area is the site of Chinatown. The residential population of this community planning area is now very small, as only 2% of all Asians in the City live in this area.

The census tract within which Chinatown is located is 72% Chinese - the greatest concentration of Chinese in any census tract in Southern California. By contrast, the Wilshire area, which is the site of Koreatown, represents 18% of the City's Asian population. Thai populations are heavily represented in the East Hollywood area.

The second largest ethnic group in the San Fernando Valley is Asian/Pacific Islanders with a 12.3 percent share of the total, according to the 2000 Census.

Table 3 - Asian/Pacific Islander Population Higher than 10% of Citywide Average	
Community Plan Area	% Asian/Pacific Islander
Central City North	33%
Silverlake	27%
Wilshire	21%

Table 3 - Asian/Pacific Islander Population Higher than 10% of Citywide Average

Harbor Gateway	19%
Northeast	16%

Whites

The number and proportion of Whites in the City has declined over the past two decades, but is still the second largest group in the City according to the 2000 Census. There are 10 Community Planning Areas in which Whites make up 60% or more of the population. However, this proportion of Whites within the City is projected to decline even further, which will be demonstrated by the 2010 Census.

Forty-five (45%) of the City's White population live in 10 CPAs, according to the 2000 Census:

Table 4 White Population Higher than 10% of Citywide Average

Community Plan Area	% Whites
Brentwood	89%
Bel Air	88%
Sherman Oaks	87%
Encino/Tarzana	86%
Westwood	76%
Westchester	72%
Chatsworth	72%
Canoga Park	71%
Sunland/Tujunga	70%
Northridge	69%

Poverty

It's critical that the City examine not only the concentrations of poverty within the City, but also examine those variables that bear a close relationship statistically. This will be treated in greater detail in this section. The 2000 Census revealed that over 22% of the City's population met Federal guidelines for poverty. American Community Survey data released in 2006 revealed only a slight decline in the City's poverty rate, to about 20%.

Poverty rates - and the populations affected by poverty - vary significantly among the 36 Community Planning Areas within the City. The chart below provides information on those CPAs in which there is a poverty rate of 20% or greater as of the 2000 Census:

Table 5 Poverty Rates in City Community Plan Areas

Community	Total Population for Whom Poverty Status is Determined	Percent	Percent of Age Group Most Affected
Chinatown	5,185	61.19%	12-17, 78.45%
Watts	16,123	47.66%	Under 5, 60.92%
Pico-Union	19,672	44.24%	Under 5, 58.28%
Central City	9,447	41.00%	12-17, 47.60%
Southeast Los Angeles	40,174	38.82%	Under 5, 48.61%
Central City East	2,675	36.04%	6-11, 51.79%
Koreatown	13,561	35.89%	Under 5, 47.55%
South Los Angeles	133,680	35.75%	Under 5, 47.04%
Westlake	30,501	35.30%	6-11, 51.39%

Lincoln Heights	11,400	34.09%	6-11, 47.15%
Crenshaw	29,494	32.54%	Under 5, 46.67%
Boyle Heights	28,140	32.49%	Under 5, 42.87%
Wilmington	14,062	27.05%	6-11, 39.83%
Hollywood	43,477	26.21%	6-11, 41.34%
Silver Lake	10,166	23.18%	12-17, 36.95%
Westwood	8,399	22.95%	18-64, 28.40%
Elysian Park	2,885	22.33%	12-17, 45.81%
Harbor City	6,335	21.93%	6-11, 30.44%
West Adams	4,481	21.71%	Under 5, 31.86%
El Sereno	9,716	21.55%	12-17, 31.38%
North Hollywood	32,289	21.31%	12-17, 30.27%
Arleta-Pacoima	18,950	20.21%	Under 5, 26.94%

What is striking from this data is the disproportionate share of poverty borne by children and youth. Nine CPAs were found to have a percentage of age group most affected by poverty as those five and under, and five CPAs in the age group 6-11.

Poverty rates also vary by location and by race. For example, Table 6 presents poverty data for the five most populated cities in Southern California (Source: Census 2000 SF3)

	Anaheim	Long Beach	Los Angeles	San Diego	Santa Ana
White, not Latino	6.6	9.7	10.1	8.0	8.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	9.4	27.2	17.0	13.2	12.6
Two or More Races	15.7	25.3	24.5	17.8	18.0
Native American	17.1	27.8	27.0	19.2	25.6
Black	14.4	30.1	28.0	20.5	16.9
Latino	21.3	30.7	29.6	26.1	22.6
Other	22.2	32.5	31.0	29.1	23.0

In four of five of the largest Southern California cities, the highest rate of poverty is identified in the “other” category, which the U.S. Census defines as individuals who identified with a group not listed on the census survey.

To better understand the nature and extent of need and the causes of poverty in Los Angeles, in 2005 the Community Development Department, in conjunction with the Department of City Planning, undertook the E-Scan project (Environmental Scan) which examined the characteristics that most demonstrated need within the 36 City-designated Community Plan Areas and how prevalent these factors were throughout the City. A number of factors were analyzed, and CPAs were ranked according to 2000 Census data pertaining to the specific aspect of need. Among the factors examined included:

- Percent of persons without a high school diploma or GED, age 25 or older
- Percent youth in poverty
- Single parent families
- Percent of overcrowding of housing units
- Linguistically isolated persons age 5 or older

- Housing Density and Overcrowding

The analysis revealed several significant associations between CPAs and the variables studied:

- The Boyle Heights CPA of East Los Angeles had the highest percent of persons over 25 without a high school diploma or GED (69%);
- The Southeast Los Angeles CPA had the highest percent of youth in poverty (19.5%) compared to a City Wide average of 8.1%;
- The Southeast Los Angeles CPA also had the largest number of single parent families as a percent of total families (34.4%), compared to a City Wide average of 20.8%;
- The Westlake CPA experienced the highest percentage of severe housing overcrowding, or housing units with 1.51% or more persons per habitable room (49%) v. a City Wide average of 21.5%;
- Westlake also ranked first in population density (33,708 per square mile v. a City Wide average of 7,607) and in the number of total housing units that are renter occupied (95% v. a City Wide average of 61.4%);
- The Central City CPA was ranked an extreme first in net acreage dwelling unit density (219) versus a City Wide average of 10;
- The North and East Central CPAs ranked first in the number of linguistically isolated persons age 5 or older (54.9%) v. a City Wide average of 18.2%

The number of persons per household in the San Fernando Valley ranges from 1.93 in Studio City to 4.54 in Pacoima. In general, the northeast Valley tends to have larger households, while the southwest Valley is in the lower range.

What can be concluded is that effective use of Consolidated Plan funds for non-housing purposes should take into consideration the extreme extent of need in several City communities within Los Angeles: Southeast, Boyle Heights, Westlake, the Central, North, and East Central City areas. Given that 21% of all City households are severely overcrowded, housing affordability is a problem that must be addressed throughout the City.

Analysis of Poverty Variables

In October of 2007, CDD staff coordinated with the Demographic Research Unit staff of the Department of City Planning to further interpret the results of the E-Scan study by using statistical tools to measure the correlation strength among the poverty variables studied.

This data is submitted as the City's foundation for the services justification for the non-housing community development section of the Plan.

The initial determinants used were: **percent renters, population density, and housing per net land area**. The net area calculation takes out non-residential land uses, large open spaces, and streets.

Table 7 provides data on the factors studied. The **data in bold** describes the extreme case for each variable.

TABLE 7 CPA	2000 Pop. (Adj. for Undercount)	1990 Pop.	Pop. Growth, 1990- 2000	Population, Percent Change	Overall Poverty Rate	Percent Youth in Poverty	Persons Per Family	No HS Diploma or Equivalent Age 25 or Older - Count	% of Total Families - Single Parent Female Headed	Single Parent w/ Children Under 18 as % of Total Families	% Unemp	Percent Households Receiving Public Assist.	Percent Overcrowding 1.51 persons per habitable room	Population Density - Persons per square mile	Percent Housing Units Renter Occupied	Net Residential Acreage	Net Acreage Dwelling Unit Density - Units per Square Mile	Linguistically Isolated Persons (Age 5 or Older) %	Total Population Under 21 Years of Age
Arleta-Pacoima	98,072	89,252	8,820	9%	20%	8%	4.68	32,175	26%	21%	10%	9%	41%	8,237	38%	0.35	8	21%	39,388
Bel Air	20,254	19,537	717	4%	5%	3%	2.82	678	11%	6%	4%	1%	1%	1,314	12%	0.58	2	2%	4,136
Boyle Heights	86,735	89,584	-2,849	-3%	33%	26%	4.36	31,816	27%	26%	13%	15%	40%	12,997	75%	0.26	21	37%	33,955
Brentwood	55,215	54,532	683	1%	5%	2%	2.81	1,319	13%	7%	4%	1%	2%	1,451	36%	0.26	4	2%	10,927
Canoga Park	166,259	149,697	16,562	10%	11%	13%	3.27	20,166	18%	14%	6%	3%	19%	5,885	40%	0.53	6	10%	46,479
Central City	25,208	20,966	4,242	17%	44%	11%	2.96	8,121	27%	14%	30%	16%	13%	8,339	93%	0.03	219	31%	3,740
Chatsworth	84,734	79,825	4,909	6%	8%	9%	3.23	8,455	19%	13%	5%	3%	14%	3,298	0%	0.37	5	8%	23,614
Encino-Tarzana	70,227	66,969	3,258	5%	10%	2%	2.92	5,359	18%	10%	5%	2%	8%	3,423	39%	0.50	5	9%	15,429
Granada Hills	57,255	53,609	3,646	6%	8%	2%	3.31	5,270	17%	12%	5%	2%	9%	3,169	28%	0.34	5	7%	16,168
Harbor Gateway	39,976	36,010	3,966	10%	21%	22%	3.83	8,948	26%	23%	10%	9%	32%	7,982	59%	0.31	12	21%	14,667
Hollywood	210,824	213,905	-3,081	-1%	23%	7%	3.19	39,887	25%	18%	10%	6%	22%	8,369	80%	0.42	15	22%	45,792
Mission Hills	134,960	109,592	25,368	19%	22%	24%	3.98	32,732	22%	21%	9%	7%	40%	11,547	52%	0.51	10	26%	50,888
N. and E. Central	24,071	22,479	1,592	7%	32%	20%	3.55	9,016	24%	16%	11%	13%		9,367	90%	0.06	49	55%	4,631
North Hollywood	135,882	122,376	13,506	10%	21%	8%	3.47	28,146	25%	21%	9%	6%	22%	12,776	71%	0.50	15	18%	40,555
Northeast L.A.	241,403	237,269	4,134	2%	21%	22%	3.85	63,857	26%	22%	9%	9%	29%	9,971	56%	0.47	10	22%	82,945
Northridge	62,680	58,705	3,975	6%	14%	15%	3.24	6,600	19%	13%	11%	3%	16%	6,191	43%	0.58	6	10%	18,014
Palms	110,044	103,508	6,536	6%	16%	14%	3.06	13,623	24%	15%	6%	3%	12%	12,207	70%	0.47	18	12%	24,280
Port of L.A.	1,949	1,859	90	5%	23%	4%	3.14	517	27%	36%	9%	3%		298	59%	0.00	54	6%	258
Reseda	98,965	89,930	9,035	9%	14%	17%	3.53	18,191	21%	30%	8%	4%	22%	8,195	45%	0.50	9	15%	30,250
San Pedro	76,028	74,220	1,808	2%	17%	21%	3.22	11,976	30%	39%	7%	6%	14%	6,668	57%	0.28	15	10%	22,777
Sherman Oaks	72,988	69,560	3,428	5%	7%	4%	2.68	3,169	22%	29%	7%	1%	20%	5,372	56%	0.60	8	4%	11,522
Silverlake	76,988	81,088	-4,100	-5%	23%	21%	3.61	18,895	26%	36%	10%	8%	28%	10,611	68%	0.42	15	21%	21,593
South L.A.	260,095	257,559	2,536	1%	34%	27%	3.92	71,455	39%	34%	15%	14%	29%	16,883	67%	0.52	16	19%	101,699
Southeast L.A.	254,976	239,980	14,996	6%	41%	32%	4.56	81,355	34%	34%	16%	20%	41%	16,216	68%	0.41	16	26%	114,450
Sun Valley	86,391	76,900	9,491	11%	19%	21%	4.12	23,264	19%	18%	11%	7%	39%	4,300	42%	0.28	6	21%	31,152
Sunland-Tujunga	58,228	54,480	3,748	6%	12%	12%	3.41	8,668	19%	16%	7%	5%	15%	2,655	36%	0.35	4	8%	17,606

TABLE 7 CPA	2000 Pop. (Adj. for Undercount)	1990 Pop.	Pop. Growth, 1990- 2000	Population, Percent Change	Overall Poverty Rate	Percent Youth in Poverty	Persons Per Family	No HS Diploma or Equivalent Age 25 or Older - Count	% of Total Families - Single Parent Female Headed	Single Parent w/ Children Under 18 as % of Total Families	% Unemp	Percent Households Receiving Public Assist.	Percent Overcrowding 1.51 persons per habitable room	Population Density - Persons per square mile	Percent Housing Units Renter Occupied	Net Residential Acreage	Net Acreage Dwelling Unit Density - Units per Square Mile	Linguistically Isolated Persons (Age 5 or Older) %	Total Population Under 21 Years of Age
Sylmar	69,624	59,643	9,981	14%	13%	16%	4.08	16,005	19%	18%	8%	4%	27%	5,423	29%	0.40	6	14%	26,242
Van Nuys	158,692	136,267	22,425	14%	21%	8%	3.45	33,042	25%	21%	8%	6%	28%	12,313	68%	0.51	14	20%	49,482
Venice	37,758	40,040	-2,282	-6%	12%	7%	2.87	3,906	28%	16%	7%	3%	7%	11,753	69%	0.45	22	5%	5,984
West Adams	172,913	169,395	3,518	2%	26%	24%	3.47	35,912	43%	33%	12%	11%	19%	12,705	64%	0.51	15	12%	58,403
West Los Angeles	71,944	67,832	4,112	6%	12%	7%	2.83	5,296	18%	10%	5%	2%	7%	10,192	62%	0.47	17	9%	12,572
Westchester	51,255	48,003	3,252	6%	9%	8%	2.89	2,732	25%	15%	7%	2%	6%	3,723	49%	0.26	10	3%	12,553
Westlake	106,710	107,062	-352	0%	40%	28%	3.73	37,700	30%	28%	12%	12%	49%	33,708	95%	0.33	53	50%	37,252
Westwood	48,201	41,841	6,360	13%	32%	6%	2.62	1,371	16%	6%	9%	1%	8%	12,943	64%	0.41	20	7%	13,295
Wilmington	75,215	70,204	5,011	7%	24%	24%	3.96	20,447	25%	4%	10%	9%	39%	6,595	59%	0.21	15	23%	29,204
Wilshire	292,101	271,721	20,380	7%	25%	8%	3.32	60,120	26%	20%	9%	6%	29%	20,904	83%	0.53	25	30%	77,309

The September 2007 Brookings Institution study New Housing, Income Inequality, and Distressed Metropolitan Areas found that the Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana Metropolitan Area had the largest increase in family income inequality in the period 1970-2000. The ratio of income inequality in 1970 was 2.83 and in 2000 had grown to 4.44, or a change in the ratio of 1.44. Income inequality is measured by the ratio of income of a typical high-income family (80th percentile of family income) to that of a typical low-income family (20th percentile of family income). Income inequality within a metropolitan area is an important indicator of how poverty changes the residential location decision of rich and poor families in ways that cause neighborhoods to become more segregated by income.

2. Describe the basis for allocating investments geographically within the jurisdiction (or within the EMSA for HOPWA) (91.215(a) (1)) and the basis for assigning the priority (including the relative priority, where required) given to each category of priority needs (91.215(a) (2)). Where appropriate, the jurisdiction should estimate the percentage of funds the jurisdiction plans to dedicate to target areas.

The City has not formally identified target areas for allocation of Plan funds, nor has a system yet been adopted by the City for allocation of funding geographically within the City based upon priority needs. There has been some discussion of establishment of Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas (NRSAs), which may result in their establishment within the timeframe of the ensuing Plan. With the recommendation of the City Controller in its recent audit of the Family Development Network (FDN) system, the Human Services and Family Development Division (HSFD) of CDD is now planning to conduct a City Wide public services needs assessment in connection with restructuring of CDD's Human Services Delivery System. This may result in recommendations for developing a methodology for formally targeting Plan resources.

The June 2007, release of the Community Poverty Strategy (covered in detail in the **Anti-Poverty Strategy** section of this document) should prove to be a useful starting point for identifying needs and assisting in re-evaluation of the City's anti-poverty strategies.

Several City departments and CDD divisions do, however, already have a mandate to target needs geographically and by the extent of poverty (such as the CSBG grant), or by virtue of a federal or state-designated zone, such as the City's Renewal Community (RC) or the state of California Enterprise Zone geographic designations. The City's major public service programs, including the Human Services Delivery System, are by their nature City Wide, but are located in areas characterized by high rates of poverty and other indicators of distress.

As a further example, the Economic Development Division (EDD) of CDD serves the entire City; however, its products and service delivery are focused in low- and moderate-income areas. Typically, service delivery sites, such as the Los Angeles Business Assistance Program (LABAP), are located in areas where poverty rates are at least 20% or higher. EDD's economic development products, such as Empowerment Zone (EZ) bonds, are made available in designated business incentive zones. The basis for allocating CDBG funds is driven by areas with a higher concentration of poverty. The goal is to stimulate local economies that are depressed and to bring essential goods and services that are not available to economically depressed communities because of long-term disinvestment in those areas.

City of Los Angeles, California

CSBG funds are allocated by CDD to City CIPAs (Community Improvement Planning Areas) on the basis of its poverty rate; and are targeted to extremely low-income persons, or those with 30% or less of the Los Angeles County Median Family Income. CSBG funds are blended with CDBG funds for the Human Services Delivery System program, and the distribution of these funds influences the selection of contractors for the HSDS Request for Proposals (RFP).

2. Housing Assistance – Geographic Allocations for CDBG, HOME, ADDI and ESG

In principle, all of LAHD's housing programs operate citywide, assisting lower income households throughout the City of Los Angeles. In practice, because of the high land and home prices in Los Angeles, much of the funds for both rental housing construction and homebuyer assistance are spent in neighborhoods with lower land costs. In the 1990s, target areas were used for some programs, but were discontinued for a variety of reasons.

As mentioned above, 21% of all City households are severely overcrowded. Overpayment for housing by low-income residents is not limited to certain neighborhoods. Particularly with homebuyer assistance efforts, experience has shown that market opportunities can arise throughout the City. For example, enterprising low-and-moderate income first-time homebuyers may find 'fixer-uppers', homes in probate, or other bargains in a variety of neighborhoods. Given the current market situation, foreclosure opportunities are likely as well and LAHD needs to be able to assist the buyers wherever the opportunities arise.

Similarly with LAHD's Housing Rehabilitation Programs, many low-income long-term homeowners and small rental property owners have 'aged in place' and live throughout the City. In order to continue living independently, they are in need of the favorable loan terms that LAHD can provide as well as the protection such loans give against predatory lenders who look for low-income, high-equity owners.

For project activities funded through the CDBG National Objective of Low and Moderate Income Housing, assistance is provided to households, and is not tied to area income. CDBG funds qualified under this National Objective may be spent in any census tract within the City, but only for households that are low- and moderate-income.

Because the City of Los Angeles has many residents with a variety of serious unmet housing needs, as CHAS data demonstrates, we choose to fund several different types of programs to address those needs. The City has to balance a desire to serve as many households as possible with the fact that deep subsidies are required for affordable rental housing development and homebuyer assistance. It is a high priority for the City to help low income elderly homeowners to continue living independently in their homes, as well as to enable young families to achieve the American dream of homeownership. The annual budget allocations represent that balance.

Allocation of Investment – Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA)

LAHD is also responsible for the administration of the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) program. In contrast to the use of other Consolidated Plan resources, which are limited to the City of Los Angeles, HOPWA funds serve all of Los Angeles County, otherwise known as the Los Angeles-Long Beach EMSA (Eligible Metropolitan Statistical Area). Therefore, the HOPWA program funds are not limited to specific geographic areas.

There are three general priorities for the use of HOPWA funds:

- Rental Assistance: Shallow Subsidies and Long Term Rental Assistance.
- Development of housing for persons living with HIV/AIDS (PLWH/A), including emergency shelter, transitional housing, and permanent housing.
- Supportive Services such as housing placement assistance, case management, substance abuse services, and mental health services.

Priority was given to these programs based on the results of surveys in 1999 and 2002, and recommendations of the 2003 Strategic Plan for Providing HIV/AIDS Housing With Supportive Services in Los Angeles County, developed by Shelter Partnership for LAHD and LACHAC.

These represent the greatest needs of PLWH/A respondents in Los Angeles County.

Spotlight on Demographics, Indicators of Need and Priorities, San Fernando Valley

This section on determining priorities and geographical distribution of need cannot be complete without an analysis of demographic characteristics of the San Fernando Valley, the fastest growing area of the city of Los Angeles, with a population of approximately 1.4 million. In 2005, the U.S. Census Bureau conducted the American Community Survey for the newly created San Fernando Valley Sub-County Census District (CCD). The information that follows is provided courtesy of the California State University 2006/2007 San Fernando Valley Economic Report.

One of the barriers to Consolidated Plan funding for San Fernando Valley projects has been the relatively few low-income and poverty census tracts, compared to areas with a far greater number; however, this situation is changing. Communities such as Van Nuys, Panorama City, and Pacoima have large numbers of working poor families among their populations. The need is now demonstrable and justified statistically for expansion of Consolidated Plan resources.

The largest part of the Valley, both in area and population, belongs to the city of Los Angeles. Forty-seven percent of the land and 37 percent of the population of the city of Los Angeles are in the San Fernando Valley. The Los Angeles portion of the Valley is nearly 20 miles across at its widest point and 14 miles north to south, and dominates the six-city Valley, accounting for 80 percent of its population and 77 percent of its land area. Fourteen of the City's CPAs are located in the San Fernando Valley.

The population of the San Fernando Valley grew at 7.4 percent from the Census 2000 date of April 1, 2000 to January 1, 2006, which was slightly slower than the City of Los Angeles (7.6 percent) and the County (7.6 percent) according to population estimates from the California Department of Finance released in May 2006. The population density of the Valley averages 6,303 people per square mile, which is much lower than the rest of the City of Los Angeles with 8,440 people per square mile.

3. Identify Obstacles to Meeting Underserved Needs.

The 2003-2008 Consolidated Plan identified several obstacles to meeting underserved needs in the City; progress has been made in several areas but much work remains to be done. Those obstacles that continue to pose a major challenge to effective Consolidated Planning include:

- **The demand for public services remains sustained and outstrips the City's ability to provide them**

The primary obstacle to meeting underserved needs in the City is sustained high demand for public services, which the City is increasingly unable to fully meet because of continuing national decreases in CDBG and other federal assistance programs, and the limitations of a 15% cap on use of CDBG for public services. Currently, 34% of the CDBG grant received by Los Angeles is budgeted for public service and CBDO activities.

As part of the 33rd Year (PY 2007-2008) Action Plan budget last year, funding was set aside to engage the services of a qualified, independent firm to create a blueprint for the City in identifying the need for and method of delivery of comprehensive anti-gang and social service programs in an effective manner. Existence of a City Wide Needs Assessment and periodic program evaluations would have provided early warning of the past effectiveness (or ineffectiveness) of these activities and others. CDD plans to continue effort to integrate all City social services systems to create a holistic services model. The Mayor and City Administrative Officer (CAO) plan over the next year to begin a dialogue with County of Los Angeles officials about opportunities to partner and collaborate in addressing social service needs for which the County is accountable; yet, or several years, these services have been allocated funding in the City's Consolidated Plan.

- **Constraints on economic development by the need for small business training and the effect of existing land uses**

One of the major obstacles to serving the needs of inner city communities is the difficulty fledgling micro-enterprises and existing small businesses have in finding time to receive the technical assistance and training that would help their business grow. Another barrier is the lack of available industrial land in the City that is appealing to investors.

- **City, State and Federal review and approval process and regulatory requirements**

The City is a complex governmental entity, requiring many levels of reviews for varying purposes. The City by ordinance has adopted a number of contract overlays such as the Living Wage and Equal Benefits Ordinances, whose various mandates and requirements must be met prior to contracting of federal funds. Other federal and state regulatory requirements, including the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) also slow the process of translating Consolidated Plan and other federal and state funding into viable City programs.

- **The potential effect of future restructuring of existing public service programs on existing delivery systems**

The organizational structure and delivery systems of the Human Services Delivery System (both the Neighborhood Action Program and Family Development Network components) and the City's Gang Prevention programs will be re-examined and possibly modified over the next several years of the Consolidated Plan. This will undoubtedly result in a re-evaluation of the effectiveness of these programs, and retargeting of CDBG funds to a

City of Los Angeles, California

differing or expanded clientele. Re-structuring may result in contracting delays or service disruptions. As a result of re-evaluation of the programs, services may be so modified to shift emphases away from previous clienteles.

Managing the Process (91.200 (b))

1. *Identify the lead agency or entity for overseeing the development of the plan and the major public and private agencies responsible for administering programs covered by the consolidated plan.*

The Mayor's Office is the lead department for Consolidated Plan policy direction and funding priorities, review and approval of Consolidated Plan funding application cycles and calendars, review of funding recommendations received from the Community Development and Housing Departments, and in provision of Consolidated Plan funding recommendations to the Los Angeles City Council. The Community Development Department (CDD), LAHD, City Legislative Analyst (CLA) and the City Administrative Officer (CAO) assist the Mayor and Council in program and project review.

The CDD and the LAHD are responsible for preparation of the Consolidated Plan and annual Action Plans, and for coordinating the update of all of the information contained therein of a demographic or programmatic nature. CDD also conducts a review of initial funding applications for eligibility and adherence to HUD National Objectives, which are then submitted to the Mayor for further review and funding recommendations. The City Council approves the Consolidated Plan and annual Action Plans with the Mayor's concurrence and with input from the City's Housing, Community and Economic Development Committee (HCED) and the CAO. CDD received 225 applications for Consolidated Plan funding for Program Year 2008-2009.

The HCED and City Council schedule one or more public hearings on the Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plans. After Council approval and Mayoral concurrence, the Plan is submitted to HUD for review and approval. HUD has 45 days to review, modify, or reject the Consolidated Plan or it is deemed approved. The City's program year extends from April 1 to March 31. Funds, however, are not available until the City has fulfilled all HUD requirements for the Consolidated Plan; resolved any outstanding audit or monitoring findings; completion of the Congressional review process; and execution of grant agreements for all four of the Consolidated Plan programs, evidenced by both the City and HUD approval.

In addition, all approved projects and programs are subject to both the NEPA (Part 58 of the Code of Federal Regulations) and CEQA environmental review process prior to HUD release of funds. For example, no CDBG funds may be drawn down for a project activity until an environmental review is conducted by CDD or LAHD environmental staff, and a request for release of funds (RROF) is provided to HUD for review; nor may costs already incurred by the City or its subrecipients be reimbursed until HUD provides a notice of release of funds.

CDD is responsible for responding to HUD and public inquiries regarding the Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plans in fulfilling its citizen participation responsibilities. CDD and LAHD's respective financial management divisions, working in cooperation with the Mayor's Office and other City departments and agencies, play an active role in identifying the financial status of slow-moving projects; assure that funds are drawn down from the

City of Los Angeles, California

City's HUD Line of Credit in a timely manner; assure prompt payment to City departments, related City agencies and other entities from grant funds; and, in conjunction with the CAO, CLA and other City departments and related City agencies, identify projects ready to fund so that grant resources are used more efficiently and in conformance with HUD's requirements for timely use of Plan funds.

2. Identify the significant aspects of the process by which the plan was developed, and the agencies, groups, organizations, and others who participated in the process.

Development of the Five-Year Consolidated Plan is a highly participatory and inclusive process in Los Angeles. Over fifteen City departments and related City agencies, including the City's Community Redevelopment Agency and Housing Authority, contributed to the Five-Year Non-Housing Community Development strategy; and CDD, in conjunction with LAHD, formally consulted with two City Commissions, the Council on Aging and the Commission on Children, Youth and their Families to obtain their viewpoint on priorities for Consolidated Plan funding. CDD and LAHD consulted with service providers, existing non-profit social service and housing agencies, California state government, federal agencies, local commissions and City committees, and businesses in preparation of the Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan.

Twelve community meetings were held throughout the City during the fall of 2007 and January 2008 to obtain citizen comments on Consolidated Plan priorities. This will be covered in greater detail in the section on Citizen Participation. The Consolidated Plan funding application process, which takes place in the fall, is an open process to all applicants; CPAS, or the Consolidated Plan Application System, permits applicants to complete and submit an on-line application for funding to CDD, which greatly enhances time frames to permit staff review of applications for eligibility and readiness; and in the case of CDBG, meeting of a National Objective. Five training sessions, each averaging over 30 participants, were held in October 2007 to train applicants in the CPAS system. CDD staff then reviews all applications for CDBG eligibility, meeting of a National Objective and readiness of the project based upon objective criteria.

The LAHD provides support to two City Commissions concerned with housing issues: the Rent Adjustment Commission and the Affordable Housing Commission. Each Commission meets twice monthly, with agenda items on various housing issues as well as time for general comments by the public on related matters. These provide an ongoing forum for participation by City residents about important housing-related issues. The Consolidated Plan/Annual Action Plans are presented to the Affordable Housing Commission for their review and comments, and public comments are sought as well.

The Affordable Housing Commission (AHC) provides policy guidance regarding HOME, CDBG and ADDI funding priorities and allocations to housing activities. In order to provide input for the development of the five year Consolidated Plan, the Affordable Housing Commission (AHC) held a public discussion on the subject at one of its regularly scheduled meetings in September 2007. The minutes are included in this document.

The Los Angeles Countywide HOPWA Advisory Committee (LACHAC) provides policy guidance regarding the HOPWA funds received by the City from HUD. LACHAC held a public discussion on the subject at its regularly scheduled meeting in September 2007. The minutes are included in this document.

3. Describe the jurisdiction's consultations with housing, social service agencies, and other entities, including those focusing on services to children, elderly persons, persons with disabilities, persons with HIV/AIDS and their families, and homeless persons.

CDD, in conjunction with LAHD, formally consulted with three City commissions, including the Council on Aging, Commission on Children, Youth and their Families, and the Los Angeles Countywide HOPWA Advisory Committee to obtain their views on Consolidated Plan funding priorities and Plan content.

In order to provide input for the development of the five-year Consolidated Plan, the Los Angeles Countywide HOPWA Advisory Committee (LACHAC) and the Affordable Housing Commission (AHC) held public discussions on the subject at their regularly scheduled meetings in September 2007. Brief summaries of those meetings are given in the Citizen Participation section of this document, and the meeting minutes are included as well.

Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles (HACLA) – Coordination of Public Housing Policy and Practices with Homeless Programs

The Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles (HACLA) is the largest manager of affordable public housing in Southern California and coordinates with LAHD and other agencies on a wide variety of housing-related issues and supportive services. For example, HACLA administers three key programs to address the needs of the homeless for permanent, supportive, affordable housing. HACLA coordinates with the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) and homeless contractors such as Skid Row Housing Trust in applying for annual Super NOFA funding for the Shelter + Care and the Section 8 Single Room Occupancy (SRO) Moderate Rehabilitation programs.

These HUD-funded programs address the permanent housing needs of the homeless, and demonstrate the ability of two major City agencies to integrate institutional resources and services in achieving two goals: helping the homeless to self-sufficiency and promoting affordable and decent housing.

Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) Consultation

The Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) is an independent unit of local government (a Joint Powers Authority) created by the City and County of Los Angeles. LAHSA was created to provide leadership, advocacy, planning, and management of program funding within the Los Angeles Continuum of Care. LAHSA is governed by a ten-member Board of Commissioners, five of whom are appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by City Council, and one by each of the five County Supervisors.

LAHSA's mission is to support, create and sustain solutions to homelessness in Los Angeles County. LAHSA has grown into a model structure for planning and coordinating publicly funded homeless programs throughout the region. As a lead entity administering homeless funds for the City of Los Angeles, LAHSA is responsible for the planning process for the Continuum of Care.

The LAHSA Commission sets funding priorities and policy for homeless programs administered by LAHSA. Several Commission members as well as Executive and senior staff from LAHSA have participated in a wide range of planning activities with other City departments as well as social service agencies to plan for homeless programs. These

City of Los Angeles, California

departments include the Los Angeles Housing Department, the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles, the Community Redevelopment Agency of Los Angeles and the City Planning Department. Consultations were also conducted with social service agencies that provide emergency, transitional and permanent housing to homeless persons as well as providers of supportive services such as job training and mental health services. All these activities will inform the Commission in its discussion of funding priorities for using ESG and CDBG funds under the Consolidated Plan.

Citizen Participation (91.200(b)) - Summarize the City's Citizen Participation Process

With submission of the first Five-Year Consolidated Plan in 1996 (and amended with the 2004-2005 30th Year Action Plan), the City adopted and submitted to HUD a Citizen Participation Plan ("CPP") that outlines the way that the City will maximize citizen involvement in the preparation and decision-making required by the Consolidation Planning process, and assure that persons and businesses affected by Consolidated Plan programs resulting in displacement or relocation are provided assistance.

CDD, in conjunction with its advisory body, the Citizens Unit for Participation (CUP), amended the Plan in 2004 to clarify issues that had arisen since the time of adoption of the original plan. This document has several purposes: to set forth a strategy to encourage citizens to participate in the development of the Consolidated Plan, any substantial amendments to the consolidated plan, provides procedures for possible conflict of interest considerations and disclosure requirements, and the City's Relocation and Anti-Displacement policy, as required by Consolidated Plan regulations.

The City's Citizen Participation Plan requires that:

- Information on the amount of HUD and other federal, state, county and local assistance, including all grant funds and anticipated program income, is provided to the public.
- Information is provided on the range of activities that will be undertaken, including the estimated amount that will benefit low- and moderate-income persons.
- The City will minimize displacement of persons and will assist any persons displaced.
- The City specifies the types and levels of assistance to be made available to persons displaced, even if the city expects that no displacement will occur.
- There is a statement of when and how this information will be made available; and that
- The City will provide for processing and public notification of Substantial Amendments, or changes to approved Annual Action Plan projects. Substantial amendments are triggered by several events, including addition of new projects, deletion of existing approved projects, a change in beneficiaries, a change in the methodology used by the City in distribution of Consolidated Plan funds, and other situations.

Availability of the CPP to the Public

City of Los Angeles, California

The Citizen Participation Plan (CPP) requires adequate advance notice to citizens of each formal hearing on the Consolidated Plan, with sufficient information published in a public notice about the subject of the hearing to permit comment. The City provides for a 30-day public comment period prior to City Council adoption of the Plan and Annual Action Plans. The City fulfills this provision of the CPP annually, not only through publication of a printed notice, but through a variety of media. The public notice meeting schedule is also advertised on the CDD Web Site and the City Web Site, as well as the City Wide ENS (Early Notification System). The public can also obtain information on community meetings and formal public hearings by the Housing Community and Economic Development (HCED) Committee of the City Council, and the City Council itself from the '311' City Wide telephone information system.

The City has refined and updated its Consolidated Plan E-mail data base to accommodate over 3,000 residents, agencies and businesses; information on the Consolidated Plan community meetings, funding opportunities and formal public hearings are provided regularly through this system.

Because of the sheer geographic size and diversity of the City and the extent of need, CDD arranges and holds six community meetings throughout the City during preparation of the draft Plan, and six prior to formal hearing on the Plan and adoption by the City Council. Although not required in the CPP, extensive community meetings permit the City to meet its consultation responsibilities more fully than minimum requirements, and enhance the usefulness of the Consolidated Plan.

Participants' viewpoints are solicited at community meetings on a variety of topics including: potential gaps in City service; the need for targeting of services; best practices in Consolidated Plan preparation; identification of joint planning issues, and sharing of methods to increase citizen participation. Their responses are included in summary form on the following pages and in the 2008-2009 Action Plan Appendix.

As mentioned previously, in preparation for the 2008-2013 Consolidated Plan and First Year Action Plan, the City lead departments (the Community Development and Housing Departments) also consulted with several nonprofit health, social service and assisted housing agencies, City commissions, and providers of services for those with special needs (including the physically and developmentally disabled, persons with HIV/AIDS, seniors and homeless groups) in preparation of the 2008-2013 Plan. All meetings are advertised and open to the public.

On January 23, 2008, the City's Housing, Community and Economic Development Committee heard public testimony on the draft Five-Year Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan.

The Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plans are provided free of charge electronically and in hard copy to the public. Copies of both the 2008-2013 Five-Year Consolidated Plan and 2008-2009 Action Plan are also available for public inspection at the six regional public libraries within the Los Angeles Public Library system.

All of these actions taken together fulfill the CPP goal of expanding public participation in the Consolidated Plan process.

2. Summary of Discussions

Affordable Housing Commission

At the Affordable Housing Commission, the testimony by the public was concerned with a number of issues, including the subprime foreclosure problems facing City residents, and the need for more affordable homeownership opportunities for low and moderate income buyers. A suggestion was made that federal Department of Homeland Security grant funds should be available to enable first responders, such as firefighters and paramedics, to live within the City, so that they are closer when disaster hits.

Los Angeles Countywide HOPWA Advisory Committee

At the Los Angeles Countywide HOPWA Advisory Committee (LACHAC) meeting on Wednesday September 17, 2007 the HOPWA Senior Project Coordinator initiated the discussion. One speaker suggested a new category of HOPWA-funded supportive service, which would educate HOPWA contract agency staff and clients about the dangers of tuberculosis (TB) and hepatitis to persons with HIV. In addition, there are other communicable diseases such as drug-resistant Staphylococcus infections (MRSA), bed bugs, lice and scabies that are prevalent in homeless facilities that serve HOPWA-eligible clients, who are particularly vulnerable. The clients and agencies needs to be educated on these matters. The community would benefit from this type of program. It was announced at the LACHAC meeting, that other comments and written testimony would be accepted up to two weeks after the meeting.

LAHSA COMMISSION

The LAHSA Commission maintains an email list of over one thousand subscribers. Comments at the meetings are considered by the LAHSA Commission before it votes to approve or change the Consolidated Plan application. This year, general community meetings to discuss the homeless situation in Los Angeles and special workgroups to discuss specific subpopulations were convened to inform the 2007 Greater Los Angeles Homeless Count. Comments from the following groups were incorporated into the implementation of the Homeless Count.

- Law Enforcement (local police departments, County Sheriff Department, and California Highway Patrol);
- Outreach Service Providers;
- City and County staff from offices of elected officials;
- Homeless/Formerly Homeless People (including homeless and runaway youth); and
- Park Rangers.

The results of the Homeless Count will inform future planning processes and funding priorities in the City of Los Angeles. Additionally, they will support the City's efforts to craft and implement plans to end homelessness by providing follow-up data to the baseline numbers from 2005 regarding the distribution of homelessness throughout the City. The findings of the 2007 Homeless Count reaffirm findings from the 2005 Greater Los Angeles

City of Los Angeles, California

Homeless Count, such as the poor health conditions of this population, including a high incidence of mental and physical disability. Above all, the information from the 2007 Homeless Count will help policymakers and providers alike, sharpen their focus on meeting the needs of homeless people, and bring to the forefront the urgent need to end homelessness for all populations.

Public Comments and Consultations

2. Provide a summary of citizen comments or views on the plan.

The following summarizes the results of the community meetings (needs assessments) held in September 2007 and January 2008, to obtain public input on the 2008-2013 Consolidated Plan and first year Annual Action Plan (PY 2008-2009).

South Los Angeles Service Area Community Meeting

Tuesday, September 4, 2007, 6:00 PM

Ascot Public Library

120 W. Florence Avenue

Los Angeles, CA 90003

Staff Attending:

Kim Olson and César Avalos – CDD

EJ Martinez - LAHD

Peter Lassen and Alma Woods – CUP members

Attendees: 9

Written Comments:

- Please publish RFPs for mini grants for small organizations and new start-ups. It is difficult for new NPs to get started and also provide administrative training for them.
- Please fund the following: beautification of buildings, community programs for children, youth and their families, community businesses, homeless population/rehabilitation, and senior housing.
- Our young people face many problems than ever before. We need more programs to help get these young people on the right path. They are our future, and if we don't do something regarding the violence we will have a lost generation of kids.

Oral Comments/Questions:

- Agencies like WLCAC should not be funded; they don't do anything for the community.
- What basketball court? Even if they (WLCAC) had one, nobody would go use it.
- All those properties are owned by WLCAC; that's the reason no businesses are opened; all they what is to gain for themselves.

Written Community Needs:

- Housing for elderly and disabled
- Housing for foster youth emancipated (18-21 yrs old)
- Jobs for youth—training programs
- Housing for domestic violence
- Public services
- Economic development
- Neighborhood/public improvements
- Public facilities
- After school programs
- Drug rehabilitation for youths and family
- Skate board arenas for young kids in different areas of the City
- Temporary homeless shelters offering job training

West LA Neighborhood Service Area

Tuesday, September 11, 2007, 6:00 PM
Oakwood Recreation Center
767 California Ave
Venice, CA 90291

Staff Attending: Michele Rose and Gabriela Zarate – CDD
Sally Richman – LAHD
Mindy Meyer – CUP member

Attendees: 6

Written Comments:

- Priority for funds should be given to uninsured adults.
- Priority for funds should be given to homeless people.
- Priority for funds should be given to specialty care access.
- Priority for funds should be given to mental health services integrated into primary medical care.
- Recent government cuts in health care will decrease access to care for uninsured patients through community clinics. Although there are many public health insurance programs available for enrolling children, adults have fewer options.

Oral Comments/Questions:

- The Vera Davis Center in Venice needs more money for services such as after-school programs for children and for homeless people. The building is very old and is falling apart. More staff is needed to provide better service.
- The City should have an Emergency Preparedness Day in Venice. Emergency response training is only available through the Fire Department, and their waiting list is very long.
- Something should be done about RV parking in Venice. There are a lot of people living in their RV's or in their cars. Residents are complaining because RV's take a lot of space and don't leave any parking for residents in the community. The City should come up with "designated" parking for RV's and people sleeping in their cars.
- After school programs are poorly advertised and are not being used enough. The people in the community don't know about this center (Oakwood Recreation Center). Also, there are some personnel issues, not everybody is getting along

City of Los Angeles, California

and that is one of the main reasons people in the community don't send their kids to the centers.

- Housing and Acquisition: There is no City program willing to commit to permanent rehabilitation programs.
- Public Services Cap- LA's BEST after school programs serves kids who are "highly" qualified and leave the other "ok" kids out. There needs to be a program who serves all kids equally and don't leave any kids left out.
- There is a high necessity for Gang Intervention. A lot of the kids don't have any resources; therefore, they go into gangs.
- Venice is a part of the City of Los Angeles that needs continuous support. It is not an all wealthy area as it appears. The median income for a high percentage of the people in the community is \$35K. There is a tendency to forget that this city needs help.

Harbor Neighborhood Service Area

Wednesday, September 5, 2007, 6:00 PM

Wilmington Public Library

1300 N. Avalon

Wilmington, CA 90744

Staff Attending: Bob Hanks, Kim Olson and Gabriela Zarate – CDD
Peter Lassen and Alma Woods – CUP members

Attendees: 3

Written Comments:

- Priority for funds should be given to affordable housing and transitional housing programs for domestic violence victims and their children.
- Priority for funds should be given to childcare development centers.
- Priority for funds should be given to outreach counseling centers for domestic violence victims.
- Funding for domestic violence shelters and programs are being cut every year from all sources (City, State, Federal) and the shelters cannot remain viable or offer a continuum of care with the funding cuts and escalating costs.

Oral Comments/Questions:

- Do Work Source Centers have any partnerships with unions?
- Based on current rent levels, one participant did not agree with \$11.80/hr as being enough to afford basic necessities.
- Has the City considered combining the CDBG community meetings with the CAB and/or CIPA meetings to garner more participation?
- Will CDD be offering more capacity building seminars in the upcoming year?
- Monies for rehabilitation and support programs for adults and juveniles just released from prison should be available.
- There appears to be a problem in the Harbor area regarding affordable housing and information of what is available and how to procure the affordable housing advertised. An agency tried to contact several of the housing projects and was unable to get a response from the contractors or owners.

Central Neighborhood Service Area

Thursday, September 6, 2007, 6:00 PM

Echo Park Library

1410 West Temple Street

Los Angeles, CA 90026

Staff Attending: Michele Rose, César Avalos and Gloria Leonardo – CDD
Sally Richman – LAHD
Peter Lassen – CUP Member

Attendees: 9

Written Comments:

- Recreational facilities, additional LAPD officers, job training and health services are greatly needed.
- Bilingual and bicultural community services such as advocacy, case management, after school programs, affordable housing, adequate street lighting, and small business are also a great need in this community.

Oral Comments/Questions:

- The McArthur/Westlake Area is in need of various improvements such as infrastructure, trees, and additional restrooms in the park. How will the residents apply for these funds to address these needs? – The Mayor's letter for the 33rd program year indicated that stand alones will no longer be funded. Therefore, citizens should write to their Councilpersons to inform them of the community's needs and they are the ones that could apply for these funds.
- What is the city doing to address affordable housing? - The annual plan provides funds for various housing activities such as direct homeownership, rehabilitation, urgent repair, code enforcement, and the Handyworker program.
- There was a discussion on new apartment complexes being built in the city as well as the expensive lofts in the downtown area. Affordable housing is necessary in this area. Concerns about mortgage troubles and foreclosures were also expressed.

Valley Neighborhood Service Area

Thursday, September 6, 2007, 6:00 PM

Van Nuys Public Library

6250 Sylmar Ave

Van Nuys, CA 91401

Staff Attending: Bob Hanks and Kim Olson – CDD
Becky Bendickson, William Huber and Virginia Huber –
CUP members

Attendees: 6

City of Los Angeles, California

Written Comments:

- Priority for funds should be given to homeless services.

Oral Comments/Questions:

- What does an agency serving the homeless have to do to be considered for CDBG funds?
- When does the City anticipate RFPs opening up to agencies?
- Do you have specific maps available online that shows low/mod census tracts/areas in the City?
- To what degree do the Mayor and Council office staffs interact with the Consolidated/Action Plan process?
- Does the City foresee any cutbacks in the four grants in the upcoming year?
- Is funding available for public safety programs such as street lighting?
- Can homeless people fill out the comment sheets?

Central Los Angeles Service Area
Monday, January 14, 2008, 6:00 p.m.
Edendale Public Library
2011 W. Sunset Blvd
Los Angeles, CA 90026

Staff Attending: César Avalos, Mark Hoffman and Gabriela Zarate– CDD
Peter Lassen – CUP member

Attendees: 14

Written Comments:

- Sober Living Homes for low- and no-income tenants are needed.
- Mental health homes for low- and no-income tenants are needed.
- Permanent supportive housing for low- and no-income tenants is needed.
- Skid Row needs housing options for very low-income individuals.

Oral Comments/Questions:

- Why is LA's Best funded with federal funds? Why is it funded if it is not meeting its requirements?
- Tree Initiative was a canopy initiative. Trees are being planted in poor areas.
- Given the existence of Prop K money, why did Belmont get funded?
- Why is PACE still being funded?
- Are the new programs for hiring youth coming from the Mayor or the Youth and Family Centers?
- Why are we using federal money for the Census?
- Why is Fair Housing funding being cut? As is, we need more money to help the people in the community.

Speaker's Observations:

The majority of attendees represented local organizations. Most attendees may have had prior experience with CDBG because the meeting flowed smoothly with little need for

City of Los Angeles, California

clarification on the issues discussed. The introduction period allowed everyone present to provide a snapshot of the services provided to the community. This created an opportunity for networking, which was one of the most positive results of the meeting.

More work is needed to draw local citizens into the community meetings. The few residents in attendance, who were not representing organizations or agencies, questioned many of the items recommended for funding.

City of Los Angeles, California

Harbor Neighborhood Service Area

Monday, January 14, 2008, 5:30 p.m.

Wilmington Public Library

1300 N. Avalon

Wilmington, CA 90744

Staff Attending: Bob Hanks, Kim Olson– CDD
Alma Woods – CUP member

Attendees: 13

Written Comments:

- Who is developing housing for the City?
- Quality of life should be improved by addressing issues such as air pollution, noise pollution, graffiti abatement, vandalism, and dumping of large items.
- This community should have more comprehensive gang prevention services available to youth and families.
- Develop more recreational space for all citizens.
- Locally funded agencies should be required to attend the meetings as a form of accountability to the community.

Oral Comments/Questions:

- Five people found out about the community meetings through agency e-mails or communications.
- South LA commercially zoned property is being rezoned to residential to the detriment of economic development in the area.
- Job training targeting youth does not make sense, when the adult or primary provider of a household is out of work or desires skills needed to compete for living wage jobs.
- Current youth programs (after school, enrichment, mentoring, etc) do not provide enough exposure to cultural experiences outside their community.
- Why are senior housing, care, and services not part of the Mayor's priorities?
- Several community members vocalized their appreciation to the Wilmington Adult Day Care program. The program provides services that are greatly needed.
- There are a lot of agencies that are under funded or under staffed. These factors make it difficult for representatives to attend and participate in the community meetings.

City of Los Angeles, California

Valley Neighborhood Service Area

Monday, January 14, 2008, 6:00 PM
Community Court Volunteer Center
8134 Van Nuys Blvd.
Panorama City, CA 91402

Staff Attending: Laura Ito and Sergio Samayoa, – CDD
Candido Marez, Becky Bendikson, William Huber,
and Virginia Huber – CUP members

Attendees: 20

Written Comments:

- Public Services in the local neighborhoods are needed.
- Gang Prevention programs are needed.
- Parenting Programs are needed.
- Tutoring programs should be made available.

Oral Comments/Questions:

- What happened to the proposal to shift the CDBG program Year forward by three months (e.g. July 1, 2008 – June 30 2009)?
- I am surprised that the Feds cut funding by 3%. I thought funds were set to increase.
- Community Based Organizations (e.g. Community Court) were told “stand alone” projects would not be funded, but it looks like some of them got funding. Why?
- (To the attendees) Some years ago, the handy worker program was about to be eliminated, but many seniors complained and the program was reinstated. Your input is very important.
- Last year, a lot of money was taken from Valley projects and sent to Downtown projects through “reprogramming.” I hope it does not happen this year.
- Most Valley CUP representatives are from Council Districts 3 and 12. It would be nice if more CUP members could be recruited/appointed to represent other parts of the Valley and to assist in identifying general needs or specific projects.
- We are interested in learning what the clients of local Community Based Organizations need. Comments can be sent to CDD at any time.
- Contact list should be distributed to all attendees.

Note Taker Observations:

In general, the meeting had a positive tone that was likely prompted by a notable increase in community participation. A significant amount of time was set aside to allow local agencies to describe the services they offer. The agencies participating in the meeting were diverse in many ways. Some agencies provided services to youth, while others primarily served the elderly. There was at least one developer of affordable housing in attendance, along with a representative for an organization on a mission to plant more trees in the City. Not all agencies in attendance were funded

City of Los Angeles, California

with CDBG. One agency was funded with no government assistance. A strong theme repeated during the meeting was the importance of networking among community organizations. It was agreed that emails on the sign-in sheet would be distributed to all attendees.

City of Los Angeles, California

South Los Angeles Service Area

Tuesday, January 15, 2008, 5:30 PM

Ascot Public Library

120 W. Florence Ave

Los Angeles, CA 90003

Staff Attending:

Kim Olson and Sergio Samayoa – CDD
Alma Woods – CUP member

Attendees: 22

Written Comments:

- Although CD 9 has a high need for services in both public safety and neighborhood activities, it is receiving only a small pot of funds...Why?
- The low-income communities are in need of a cleaner environment.
- Single-parent families need employment.
- The schools are in need of educational materials and supplies.
- The system is less than equitable. Capital projects under the Con Plan were required to be “ready” for completion in one year. The Vision project in CD 8 is recommended in the 33rd year and the 34th year. It is not near completion.
- Community Health Councils (CHC) submitted a letter evaluating the nutritional resource environment in South LA and compared it to West LA. The agency concluded that South LA has significantly fewer grocery stores than the Westside and these stores often fail to carry healthy food items such as low fat milk, whole grain breads, cereals, and fresh produce. The letter notes that since CHC concluded its study, four full-service grocery stores have left South LA.
- CHC respectfully requests that priority is given to projects that focus on improving the local food environment, and that new non-profit entities be seriously considered and granted funding.
- Many of the large chain grocery stores have left the area (CD 10) or are too far for residents to access. CHC has worked in South Los Angeles to improve ways that residents can have access to healthy foods. CHC is requesting funds to encourage revitalization and economic development along Washington Blvd.
- I am an owner of a small grocery store located on Washington Blvd. I have the opportunity to renovate my store with the assistance of a local non-profit organization—CHC. Please consider focusing CDBG funds for economic revitalization of local food stores and that CHC is funded.
- \$900 rent for a single unit is ridiculous; affordable housing is needed.
- Fair Housing is needed.
- Repair of streets and sidewalks is needed.
- More police patrols are needed in this neighborhood.

Oral Comments/Questions:

- I am ecstatic that there are so many people here today!

City of Los Angeles, California

- We need more jobs in the area, so residents do not have to travel so far to work.
- Commercially zoned areas are being converted to housing zones, which translates to fewer jobs in the immediate community.
- Jobs are needed for adult heads of households.
- Musical classes like guitar should not be discontinued.
- There are good projects being funded with CDBG, but there's not enough funding in the budget for youth recreational activities. We need to look at priorities with long-term benefits. Older youth should have access to literacy programs.
- Capital projects should be ready to go, but some were not ready last year and are not ready this year, but still get funded.
- Newton Division (LAPD) has highest crime rate in the City and should get priority.
- It seems as though there is more emphasis on the produce district in CD 9 than residential areas.
- It is important to make your views known to City Council. Write letters to them.

Written Community Needs:

- Part-time and/or seasonal employment for youth.
- Counseling services for families.
- Neighborhood and street clean-ups.
- Recreational activities for youth.
- Cultural activities for youth.
- Academic support services for teens between the ages of 13 and 17.

City of Los Angeles, California

West Los Angeles Service Area

Wednesday, January 16, 2008, 6:00 PM
Vera Davis McClendon Youth and Family Center
600 California Avenue
Venice, CA 90291

Staff Attending:

Michele Rose and Bob Hanks – CDD
Sally Richman - LAHD
Mindy Meyer – CUP member

Attendees: 46

Written Comments:

- Open funding opportunities to new non-profit agencies providing services to homeless and other human services. Make it easier to get operating funds for new non-profits (Open City RFPs to new organizations).
- Make low-interest loans available to new non-profits providing housing and developing new affordable housing.
- Low interest loans for disabled individuals are needed.
- *Necesitamos viviendas economicas y necesitamos Apollo para que no existan los vendedores de drogas.* (We need affordable housing and help in eliminating illegal drug sellers).
- Remedial education/after school programs needed.
- Vocational training for at-risk youth 16-21 needed.
- Recidivism reduction through quality alternative innovative projects that enable communication between at-risk youth City Wide.
- Grass roots organizations in Venice have been delivering services to the community for free for years. It's time for the City to support us financially.
- Funding for facility aid and buildings for programs.
- The homeless problem in public spaces needs to be addressed; homeless people need a place to park their trailers and cars; shelters (transitional and permanent housing) for the homeless.
- Fund youth development for successful organizations without a cap on years funded.
- Companion Youth Learning Program (after-school mentoring and tutoring for ages 15-18) and a cultural events summer program needed.
- Prison ministry – after care, job training, education, family reunification services needed.
- Food bank program needed.
- Low funding results in unequal distribution among organizations within the community of Oakwood.
- Old organizations are not being audited to show actual work; assure CDBG funds are accounted for.
- Section 8 needs to be retained or otherwise Section 8 people will be homeless. *No es correcto que estemos perdiendo nuestras viviendas.* (It's not right that we are losing our homes). *Holiday [sic] Venice esta perdiendo la Sección 8 por que los contratos ya no seran renovados en Septiembre 30, 2008.* (Holyday Venice is losing its Section 8 because the contracts are not being renewed in September 30, 2008). If we lose the Section 8

Breezes del Mar units in Venice, over 200 more people will be displaced and many will once again become homeless; no one will help house the current homeless.

- Need more affordable housing built; preserve existing affordable housing (Holiday/Venice and Breezes del Mar). *Viviendas economicas para la ciudad de Venice.* (Affordable housing for Venice). Save the affordable housing that exists in our area—P.O.W.E.R., 310-392-9700.
- Senior nutrition lunches at senior centers need to be improved, and more programs for seniors and low cost legal services for seniors are needed.
- Create Section 8 family-based affordable housing.
- Improve Culver-Slauson park facilities.
- Bring more funding to “invisible” low-income communities: Oakwood, Holiday/Venice, Mar Vista Gardens.
- Neighborhood improvement - Increased economic development in the form of retail food establishments needed. Increased number of quality sit-down restaurants needed. Greater physical activity sites and green space needed; establishment of more public parks. Improved aesthetics (graffiti removal, walkability, greenery, improved signage; building, planning facades). *Problemas con drogas y pandillas.* (There are problems with drugs and gangs). Job training and placement. Funds for rehabilitation and handicap adaptations are needed.
- Since 1992, South Los Angeles has been one of the few areas to recede and show no signs of economic development or improvement. Funds should be allocated to improve basic necessities such as retail food establishments and physical activity sites that will spur development and increase jobs.
- Graffiti removal and graffiti prevention programs.
- Concern for the safety for library patrons and use of library building by the homeless.
- Establishment of Heritage Museum in Venice for Venice history.
- Need to be concerned about the future of our children so that they do not become a burden to society when they become adults.
- Increase Pacific Graffiti Solutions funding - the Venice community has a very big graffiti problem. Pacific Graffiti Solutions has been very responsive to the request of the community.
- Child and youth development—create more education for children in Venice. Fund more after-school programs. *Programas para los jovenes entre 12 – 17.* (Youth programs for ages 12 – 17).
- I feel Venice and West LA have been passed over when it comes to the seriousness and desperate need for funding.
- Fair housing- Housing discrimination does exist and because of the major cuts in that specific line item, many citizens would be affected by it.
- Need more funds to be generated in areas of financial needs, especially coming from government grants.
- Mental assistance.

Oral Comments/Questions:

- Ivette Neal of Pacific Graffiti Solutions stated that graffiti is rampant in Venice – she has only four employees, but needs ten. Her service area extends from Mulholland Boulevard to the north, to Imperial Highway to the south, Culver City to the west, and downtown Los Angeles to the east.
- Dennis Hathaway of the Venice Neighborhood Council (N.C.) stated that the Council is trying to provide housing and other services for the homeless living in their cars. There were several representatives from this N.C. present at the meeting.
- Eleven attendees, from the Holiday/Venice Tenant Action Committee, and POWER-LA addressed concern about the project-based Section 8 contracts for the Holiday/Venice multi-family housing developments, because the owner has sent notices about his intention to not renew the contracts. There are 200 units in 14 buildings and residents are facing possible loss of their homes after expiration of the contracts in October 2008, and residents are very anxious about this situation.
- Four current tenants of the Holiday Venice development also provided testimony on this issue. Sally Richman spoke to this issue and explained that there are alternative approaches to this problem, and that the properties have been at risk in earlier years. She said that she would contact her LAHD colleagues who are involved in this issue, to work with the residents and the City Council office. The Vice President of the Holiday Venice tenants association recalled that 10 years ago, U.S. Senator Dianne Feinstein intervened to help the residents retain their Section 8 rental assistance.
- Resident (unknown name) provided testimony on graffiti, explained that graffiti is symptomatic of youth problems; when it is called ‘blight’ it leads to other problems. She expressed concern that the term ‘blight’ is used as an excuse for eminent domain, resulting in gentrification and displacement of poor people.
- Michele clarified the term “blight”. Ivette Neal and a local resident discussed the issue of graffiti as art or as blight, agreeing on the need to involve youth in productive art and community activities. The Community Center at which this meeting was held has several such programs on site, and they receive no city funding.
- Resident asked about the \$5 million home ownership line item – what was it for? Pointed out that with the housing bubble, housing counselors are advising against buying at the top of the market. He also pointed out that the funds should be spent instead for more affordable rental housing. S. Richman from LAHD explained that fair housing and LAHD’s administration budget are proposed for reduction and that it is difficult to balance all the competing demands for the funds, since there is so much housing need in the City.
- Resident Edward Williams, who also works at the Westside Center for Independent Living, asked about the proposed \$200,000 cut in Fair Housing, discussed the need for more aggressive fair housing discrimination actions and expansion of fair housing programs by the City. He said there is a great need for affordable housing for persons with disabilities and that all new housing should be built using universal design principles.

City of Los Angeles, California

- One resident commented on the Mayor's priority for youth development; felt that federal funds need to be focused on after school programs at Los Angeles city recreational facilities. Also addressed need for renovation and repairs at the Culver-Slauson city park.
- One commenter discussed need for additional sources of recreational facility funding and how to secure other funding.

Note Taker Observations:

Discussion ensued (led by M. Rose) regarding the need to determine program performance and outcomes, make federally funded programs more accountable and responsive to the City and communities.

Discussion of Census 2010 by Ms. Rose and Ms. Meyer, emphasizing the importance of an accurate count to assure that the City receive its full share of federal funding. Mayor's budget provides recommended CDBG funding for 2010 Census planning and outreach/education.

Representatives from the 1736 Family Crisis Center stated that their organization was willing to take kids from Venice for shelter services.

Mindy Meyer discussed formation of the Affordable Housing Task Force asked for volunteer participants, discussed the Family Development Networks; stated that Jewish Vocational Services may be eligible for CBDO status (Community Based Development Organization).

City of Los Angeles, California

Wednesday, January 16, 2008

El Sereno Library
5226 Huntington Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90032

Staff Attending: Sergio Samayoa and César Avalos – CDD
Raul Estrada – CUP member

Community Attendance: 29

Written Comments:

Each comment sheet asked to identify the community needs for the use of Community Development Block Grant funds. Below is a list of comments submitted during the meeting.

- Economic development.
- Neighborhood/Public improvements.
- Affordable housing.
- Public services.
- Arts/Music facility.
- Multimedia learning facility.
- Resource and outreach center.
- Affordable, full-time childcare.
- Mental health services.
- Affordable medical insurance.
- Million tree program.
- Hazard Park (wet Lands Restoration).
- Community gardens.
- More open space (parks).
- Ascote hill restoration into park.

Oral Comments/Questions:

- Has anybody looked into immigration and tenant discrimination?
- Collaboration between Neighborhood Councils and Community-based organizations (CBOs) is crucial to identifying community needs.
- Community members do not know how to access resources that are available. It is our (CBOs) responsibility to inform the residents of the services we provide.
- Rosehills Review walks the streets, talks to residents, and identifies problems such as broken street light or pothole, and notifies the City Council office and City department to fix the problem.
- Homelessness is a big problem in El Sereno, as it is in the entire City.
- Council Office representative took comment sheets (English and Spanish) to have local residents provide comments during the 30-day period.
- This community needs more music-oriented programs. There is a great need and lack of such programs.
- CDBG funding seems difficult to access. The City should help CBOs access resources.
- The City of Los Angeles has a program for Capacity Building.

City of Los Angeles, California

- Affordable housing is needed in this community.

Note Taker Observations:

The increase of attendees created a well-rounded representation of the East Side communities. It included local residents, businesses, non-profit organizations, local press, and government officials. The meeting seemed positive and interactive. The audience and presenter engaged in dialogue and exchanged information. A Spanish-language translator facilitated communication for one resident.

The presenter allowed every person to make an introduction to the group. Local organizations discussed their services, and provided local residents with additional information. The final 30 minutes of the meeting were set aside to allow for networking. Participants continued their conversations in the parking lot—well after the library was closed.

- 1. Provide a summary of efforts made to broaden public participation in the development of the consolidated plan, including outreach to minorities and non-English speaking persons, as well as persons with disabilities.***

Please see the City's Summary of the Citizen Participation process above. In addition, translators are provided at all community meetings on the Consolidated Plan, and sites for these meetings are verified as meeting ADA standards for accessibility. Flyers advertising community meetings are printed in both English and Spanish, as are all public notices pertaining to the Consolidated Plan, Annual Action Plan, and the CAPER.

- 2. Provide a written explanation of comments not accepted and the reasons why these comments were not accepted.***

The City accepted all comments from the public as a result of its twelve community meetings and the City HCED and City Council public hearings on the Consolidated Plan.

Institutional Structure (91.215 (i))

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

The City is governed by a fifteen-member City Council; each council district represents approximately 235,000 residents. An elected mayor is the chief executive officer of the city, and the official responsible for determining the funding priorities for the four Consolidated Plan grants. The City Council, with the concurrence of the Mayor, approves submission of the Consolidated Plan and annual Action Plans to HUD. In addition, two standing committees of the City Council, the Economic Development and Employment Committee and the Housing and Community Development Committee review and hold hearings on these documents.

While the Los Angeles Community Development Department and the Los Angeles Housing Department have the major responsibility for Consolidated Plan budgeting, project formulation and program implementation, other city departments play an important role as well. For example, the Aging Department administers the Aging Services Delivery System, funded through CDBG and the Older Americans Act.

CDD and LAHD, under the direction of the Mayor's Office, coordinate production of the Consolidated Plan, Annual Action Plan, and the CAPER (Annual Performance Report) and provide technical assistance to implementing departments in writing the Plan narrative and in provision of data supporting the demographic requirements of the document.

The structure of the CDBG program is decentralized. While CDD does administer several program activities through its contract agencies, including several economic development programs, many project activities are administered by sponsoring City departments and City-related agencies such as HACLA and CRA. Guidelines for expenditure of CDBG funds are provided to departmental applicants simultaneously with notification of grant funding, and periodically CDD provides departments with training in HUD grant regulations, grant recordkeeping, and in preparation of the Consolidated Plan and CAPER.

Housing and Homeless Programs

LAHD administers the Consolidated Plan grant funds utilized for housing purposes, including HOME, HOPWA, ADDI, ESG and CDBG funds allocated for LAHD programs. Funds are distributed through a variety of methods, depending on the program. The Affordable Housing Trust Fund issues competitive Notices of Funding Availability (NOFAs) for housing developers to apply for subsidies, which are timed and structured to coincide with federal and state application procedures and deadlines. LAHD's rehabilitation loan programs and homeownership assistance programs operate on a 'first-come, first-served' basis.

Several other programs, such as Handyworker and Home Secure, which offer simple rehabilitation services to eligible elderly or disabled low income households, are implemented by contract agencies chosen by LAHD via competitive RFP processes. HOPWA funds are also allocated to programs implemented by competitively selected contract agencies, as are the CDBG and ESG funds utilized by LAHSA for homeless services and shelters.

Coordination - HOPWA and HIV/AIDS Programs

With oversight by LAHD, the Los Angeles Countywide HOPWA Advisory Committee (LACHAC) weighs in on all HOPWA programs countywide. This 18-member committee was created to provide a broad base of expertise to the HOPWA planning process. The committee is comprised of representatives from the Los Angeles County Commission on HIV Health Services, which locally administers federal Ryan White CARE Act monies; representatives of the Homeless Services community; representatives with non-profit housing development expertise; and public officials of the County of Los Angeles, the City of Los Angeles, including the City of Los Angeles AIDS Coordinator, and the cities of Long Beach, Pasadena, and West Hollywood. Membership also includes individuals who themselves are HIV positive and several representatives from AIDS service organizations. LAHD's HOPWA unit coordinates all HOPWA programs conducted countywide and within the city, linking nonprofit service and housing providers to PLWH/A (Persons living with HIV/AIDS) and their families.

Coordination with various local governments within the Los Angeles-Long Beach region occurs through participation as members of the HOPWA planning process and monthly LACHAC meetings and subcommittee meetings. All HOPWA meetings are public, and all materials provided to committee members are available to the public.

Housing Authority Programs

The Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles (HACLA) manages over 60 Public Housing locations (large developments, scattered and senior sites) with more than 7,400 housing units. HACLA also oversees the management of smaller Section 8 New Construction and other affordable and market rate properties for families or elderly residents. This brings the total number of units provided by HACLA to low-income families and individuals throughout Los Angeles to 9,080, ranging from San Pedro to the San Fernando Valley and from Mar Vista to the Eastside of Los Angeles. The Section 8 program, funded by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), provides rental housing assistance to extremely low and very low-income families, senior citizens, and disabled or handicapped persons. Its objective is to provide affordable, decent and safe housing for eligible families, while increasing a family's residential mobility and choice. HACLA, a state-chartered public housing agency since 1938, now administers the second largest Section 8 Program in the country.

The Housing Authority has two different types of rental subsidies—tenant-based and project-based programs. Both programs have similar income-based admission requirements set by HUD. Households with a tenant-based subsidy have a voucher that allows them to move from one place to another. Those in the project-based programs live in a building in which the units are subsidized. If a tenant moves from the building, they lose their rental subsidy. Generally, those in the project-based programs and some tenant-based programs for special populations are referred by various agencies and building owners to the Housing Authority, which confirms they meet all the Section 8 eligibility requirements. Households on the Housing Voucher tenant-based program come from the Housing Authority's waiting list of applicants. As of September 2007, HACLA has funding for 51,660 units assisting about 100,000 total family members.

Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority

The Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) is an independent unit of local government (a Joint Powers Authority) created by the City and County of Los Angeles. LAHSA was created to provide leadership, advocacy, planning, and management of program funding within the Los Angeles Continuum of Care. LAHSA is governed by a ten-member Board of Commissioners, five of whom are appointed by the Mayor of Los Angeles and confirmed by the City Council, and one by each of the five County Supervisors.

LAHSA plays a key role in coordinating homeless programs with the City and County. Coordination between the City and County of Los Angeles is critical because each controls crucial financial and program resources. LAHSA also integrates its planning efforts in eight Service Planning Areas with nonprofit service providers, community residents, the business community, schools, law enforcement, and other local governments, such as the 85 cities (excluding Glendale, Long Beach and Pasadena) within the County. Funds for homeless programs from the Consolidated Plan will be used to support various components of the Continuum of Care (CoC) operated by nonprofit housing and service providers.

Several City departments and entities such as the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles participate in carrying out the strategies to end homelessness. However, as the lead entity of the CoC, LAHSA will maintain a pivotal role in the implementation of these

City of Los Angeles, California

strategies.

WORKSOURCE CENTERS

2007 saw a significant development that has strengthened the institutional and program links between CDD's WorkSource program and the Los Angeles Community College District, that will result in significant benefits for the unemployed and the working poor. Los Angeles City College (LACC) and the Hollywood WorkSource Center have teamed up to put job and educational resources at one location at Los Angeles City College, which will constitute a strong partnership that aligns education and training with job opportunities. It also allows job training professionals to reach a larger population of young adults in an area that is typically underserved, and it will serve employers seeking a job-ready workforce.

There are 18 WorkSource Centers throughout Los Angeles, which are "one-stop" destinations that offer jobseekers access to computers, information on job openings, recruitment events, training and other services. Businesses and employers use the centers to find qualified employees and fill vacant positions.

The Community Development Department and the Workforce Investment Board (WIB) oversee the WorkSource Centers, which deliver top quality employment services. At LACC, specialized training programs will be available to put job seekers in line for work in some of the fastest growing industries in the region. This will include the new Workforce Readiness Academy portfolio of non-credit classes accessible to students and non-students alike.

This WorkSource Center will offer direct access to training programs in the City's growing industries, such as logistics, healthcare, construction, and hospitality,

As mentioned previously, while the lead departments in the Consolidated Plan process are the Mayor's Office, Community Development Department and the Housing Department, there are nevertheless a significant number of city agencies and departments that oversee a wide variety of grants and programs that provide services to low- and moderate-income city residents, and play an important role in implementing Consolidated Plan project activities:

CITY OF LOS ANGELES DECISION-MAKING BODIES

- Office of the Mayor
- City Council and Council Committees (Housing, Community and Economic Development primary for the Consolidated Plan)
- City Planning Commission
- Community Planning Area Commissions
- Community Redevelopment Agency Board of Commissioners
- Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles Board of Commissioners
- Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority Commission
- Workforce Investment Board

CITY OF LOS ANGELES AGENCIES

- Aging Department
- Building and Safety Department
- City Legislative Analyst (CLA)
- City Administrative Office (CAO)
- Commission On the Status of Women

City of Los Angeles, California

- Commission on Children, Youth and their Families
- Community Development Department (CDD)
- Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA)
- Cultural Affairs Department
- Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles (HACLA)
- Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) (Joint powers agency with County of Los Angeles)
- Los Angeles Housing Department (LAHD)
- Los Angeles Public Library
- Planning Department
- Board of Public Works, including Bureau of Street Services, Engineering, and Lighting
- Recreation and Parks

CITIZENS BOARDS

- Affordable Housing Commission
- Rent Adjustment Commission
- Enterprise Zone/Empowerment Community Advisory Councils
- Los Angeles Countywide HOPWA Advisory Committee (LACHAC)
- The Citizens' Unit for Participation (CUP)
- Community Action Board (CAB)
- Workforce Investment Board (WIB)

CALIFORNIA STATE AGENCIES/DEPARTMENTS

- Aging
- California Coastal Commission
- Coastal Conservancy
- Commerce-Office of Business and Industrial Development
- Corporations
- Department of Community Services and Development
- Emergency Services
- Employment Development Department (EDD)
- Energy Commission
- Secretary of State
- Fair Employment and Housing
- Department of Finance
- California Housing Finance Agency (CHFA)
- Housing and Community Development (HCD)
- Insurance
- Parks and Recreation-Office of Historic Preservation
- Real Estate
- Savings and Loans
- State Banking Department
- California State University and Colleges
- Veterans Affairs

REGIONAL AND COUNTY AGENCIES

- County of Los Angeles
- Los Angeles County Community Development Commission
- Southern California Association of Governments
- Department of Public Social Services
- Department of Children and Family Services

City of Los Angeles, California

- Area Agency on Aging
- Department of Health Services
- California Office of Traffic Safety
- Department of Probation
- Regional Centers (Rehabilitation/Disabled)

FEDERAL AGENCIES

- Federal Home Loan Bank Board (FHLBB)
- Federal Housing Administration (FHA)
- Small Business Administration (SBA)
- Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)
- Veterans Administration (VA)
- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)
- Economic Development Administration (EDA)
- Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS)
- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
- Department of Labor
- Community Development Financial Institutions Fund (CDFIF)

Major participants in the Consolidated Plan process locally include:

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT (CDD)

With a staff of over 300 individuals, CDD administers and distributes federal grants in excess of \$150 million annually to over 200 agencies throughout the city. Each year, these programs provide social services to over 80,000 poor and disadvantaged City residents; job training and placement to 9,000 individuals; summer employment to over 10,000 youth; and a wide range of business and financial services to promote employment and business opportunities in distressed communities.

There are three operating departments that manage the various grants, and are responsible for bringing vital services to the City's low- and moderate-income residents. They include:

• ***HUMAN SERVICES AND FAMILY DEVELOPMENT DIVISION (HSFD)***

The Human Services and Family Development Division administers service contracts for programs as diverse as child safety, gang intervention, literacy and citizenship training, child care, substance abuse treatment, counseling, case management, youth development programs, health related services, child and adult day care, information and referral services, legal aid, emergency food and shelter programs. Recently, City and County staff began discussions on how the City and County can increase linkages between the County's Department of Public Social Services (DPSS) programs such as food stamps and welfare and the City's Family Development Network (FDN) and the Youth and Family Centers (YFCs). Initial ideas include training FDN staff on how to pre-screen clients for referral to DPSS agencies.

• ***NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT DIVISION (NDD)***

The Neighborhood Development Program assists non-profit agencies to acquire, design, renovate and construct neighborhood facilities which house programs such as childcare, transitional shelters, libraries, health clinics, youth activity centers, and senior citizen facilities.

• ***WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT DIVISION (WDD)***

One of the critical goals for the Five-Year Consolidated Plan is to align the goals and activities of the WDD with those of the Economic Development Division (EDD) and the Human Services

Delivery System managed by CDD, HSFD.

The WDD system includes:

- The WorkSource program, which provides placement and training in a variety of occupations, is available at no cost for adults who need help in entering or re-entering the workforce. The WorkSource Center Network is composed of 25 facilities located throughout the city that provide training and placement services. Special services are also available for older workers, dislocated workers, and workers with disabilities.
- The Customized Employment Service, a partnership between industry, government, and education that uses governmental resources to help employers in recruiting, training, and hiring qualified employees. Private Sector Initiative staff work closely with employers to design a Customized Training program that best suits business growth and expansion needs. Staff services include help with planning, oversight, evaluation, training and follow-up.
- The Youth Opportunities program is a full service center for youth education and job training in South Los Angeles.
- Community Service Centers (now ETCs) are funded through the CDBG program and administered by the Housing Authority. These projects, located at ten conventional public housing sites, offer education, computer training, counseling and referrals, and other supportive services.

• **WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARD**

The mission of the City's Workforce Investment Board (WIB) is to develop, in concert with the Mayor and City Council, policy and strategy to ensure that business has access to a trained workforce and workers have access to quality jobs. All of the WIB's services operate on the premise that upward mobility for workers impacts and elevates the prosperity of cities, counties, states, and the country.

The Los Angeles WIB promotes economic well-being locally by:

- Improving employment opportunities for workers by enriching their knowledge base, growing their skill set, and identifying job openings;
- Providing tax incentives, benefits and other support services to businesses; and
- Guiding the city's workforce policy priorities and investments.

The WIB oversees the expenditure of over \$50 million in public funds annually. Individual board members are selected from the leadership ranks of the education, economic development, and organized labor fields as well as other key players in the Los Angeles economy. WIB members are appointed by the Mayor; the majority of sitting board members represent the private sector.

Workforce Investment Board programs are available to workers and businesses through "WorkSource Centers" throughout the Los Angeles Area. Most services are available at no charge.

The WIB's goals include:

- **Improve the core levels of education achievement for both adults and youth**
The Los Angeles Workforce Investment Board initiates programs designed to provide educational facilities and mentoring to both in-school and out-of-school youth. Adult literacy programs are also promoted.
- **Connect workers and businesses to information on jobs and services**
The WIB accomplishes this goal through eighteen WorkSource Centers which provide services to individuals and businesses. WorkSource Centers are based in easily accessible locations throughout Los Angeles. WIB oversees the operations and curriculum of all these centers as well as four facilities dedicated strictly to needs of youths, ages 14 - 21-years old.
- **Increase the percentage of workers earning quality wages**
WIB delivers customized training to upgrade worker skills and qualify them for positions in growing California industries.

WIB particularly targets the following sectors which are showing growth in these areas:

- Transportation / Goods Movement / Logistics
- Construction / "Green" Construction
- Industrial / Manufacturing / "Green" Technology
- Healthcare and Life Sciences
- Early Childcare and Education Worker Training
- Private Security Officers Training
- Hospitality/Tourism Worker Training
- Public Sector and Utilities
- Promote social equity

WIB strives to ensure that Los Angeles workers earn wages which provide for self-sufficiency and that residents facing particularly onerous barriers to employment have access to WIB's programs, and the opportunities derived from them.

- **ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIVISION OF CDD**

The EDD is responsible for oversight of the economic development products and services available from the City. EDD manages the Industrial Development Authority, the Los Angeles Business Assistance Program (LABAP), the State and Federal Business Incentive Zones, the various CDBG-funded loan programs and a recently awarded New Market Tax Credit (NMTC) allocation to the Los Angeles Economic Development Fund.

EDD's Economic Development Strategy (EDS) was developed under the oversight of an advisory board composed of leaders in economic development, the Mayor's Office Economic Development and the Community Redevelopment Agency. The EDS's goal is to provide guidance in setting priorities for economic development projects that will help address the City's need for well paying jobs and strong and vibrant local economies.

The various EDD economic development products and services are carried out through a variety of outlets. The LABAP services are delivered through the use of non-profit organizations that are selected through a competitive process. Major economic development projects are managed in-house through the EDD Lending Unit, which works closely with the

Community Redevelopment Agency to conduct feasibility studies and determine the best mix of financial resources and the appropriate partners for implementation. And last but not least, the EDD Business Development Unit markets and manages the business incentive zones.

The EDD also oversees three State Enterprise Zones as well as a Federal Empowerment Zone and Renewal Community designations. Within these areas, businesses can take advantage of State and/or Federal tax credits and deductions not available to businesses elsewhere. The goal of the incentives is to stimulate business attraction, growth, and increased employment opportunities within economically challenged areas of the City.

Enterprise Zones assist businesses located in the zones to lower their operating costs by providing them with tax credits and deductions. The state offers incentives such as: hiring credits, sales & use tax credits, expense and interest deductions. The City offers local incentives such as, DWP rate discount, site fee waivers, sewer facility hookup payment plans, and reduced parking rates.

The Los Angeles Enterprise Zone was conditionally designated by the State on October 15, 2006. When the designation becomes permanent, it will be valid for 15 years. In addition, the Eastside State Enterprise Zone designation is valid through January 10, 2008, and the Harbor Zone through March 3, 2009.

A fuller discussion of the City's economic development programs may be found in the section Non-Housing Community Development.

- ***ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DIVISION (ASD) OF CDD***

ASD develops the Consolidated Plan, annual Action Plans, the CAPER (Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report), administers the Community Development Block Grant, manages the Citizen Participation process; conducts environmental reviews, and prepares the annual departmental budget. ASD works closely with the Mayor's Office, the CAO, and the CLA in providing Consolidated Plan-funded program and project data, analysis of undisbursed project balances, and project demographic data.

ASD is also responsible for a wide range of supportive services, including: processing of accounts payable, procurement and vendor management, determines eligibility and readiness for projects proposed for CDBG funding; trains departmental and external City staffs in HUD and OMB federal grant management and record keeping requirements; trains City and departmental staff as well as agency applicants in the CPAS (Consolidated Plan Application System) on-line system; assures HUD grant program compliance through review of completed PEP forms and conduct of field reviews; coordinates closely with the Financial Management Division of CDD in determining unspent balances of CDBG funds, this to assure compliance with City and HUD timeliness standards for disbursement of funds; compiles and maintains a library of City demographic and U.S. Census information, and provides miscellaneous support services for other divisions.

In 2006, the General Manager re-organized the ASD to integrate the CDD Contracts Unit in its structure. This unit reviews all contracts for City and federal requirements; assures clear and accurate scope of services; assures that all City-required overlays are included (such as the Living Wage Ordinance); and manages the CDD Contract Tracking System, among many other responsibilities.

- ***FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT DIVISION (FMD) OF CDD***

FMD fulfills several critical grant financial management functions; FMD staff prepare financial reports, conduct on-site fiscal reviews for programs and agencies that receive grant funds,

process cash requests from contracted agencies and vendors, receive and account for program income and loan receivables, prepare cash disbursement and revenue reports for the various federal and state grant programs under its purview; and provide technical assistance in administering federal assistance funds.

LOS ANGELES HOUSING DEPARTMENT (LAHD)

The Los Angeles Housing Department (LAHD) was created by ordinance in 1990 to address the City's housing crisis. The LAHD is the principal housing agency of the City of Los Angeles, and is charged with the development of citywide housing policy and supporting safe and livable neighborhoods through the promotion, development and preservation of decent and affordable housing.

LAHD is the administering agency for four of the five Consolidated Plan grants. In the current year it is responsible for allocating over \$78 million for new affordable rental housing construction, first time homebuyer assistance, a variety of rehabilitation programs, supportive services and housing assistance for persons living with HIV/AIDS and homeless residents, and other housing programs. Each year, LAHD staff routinely inspects over 190,000 rental units for compliance with health and safety codes to ensure decent living conditions, in addition to nearly 10,000 complaint inspections. Annually, over 200,000 inquiries from the public about Rent Stabilization and Code Enforcement are received and nearly 10,000 investigations are undertaken as well.

The LAHD is organized into three bureaus to achieve its mission: Regulatory Compliance & Code, Housing Development, and Administration:

- ***HOUSING DEVELOPMENT BUREAU***

The **Housing Development Bureau** consists of the Major Projects Division and the Home Ownership & Preservation Division. Core functions are:

- to produce and preserve affordable rental housing with financing via the Affordable Housing Trust Fund (AHTF) and the Permanent Supportive Housing Program (PSHP);
- to provide purchase assistance to low and moderate income first-time homebuyers;
- to preserve affordable housing by rehabilitating single-family and small rental properties through comprehensive housing rehabilitation programs; and
- to reduce lead-based paint hazards in the City through education and remediation.

- ***REGULATORY COMPLIANCE & CODE BUREAU***

The **Regulatory Compliance & Code Bureau** is made up of the Code Enforcement Division, the Rent Stabilization Division and the Compliance Division. Core functions are:

- to ensure habitability and housing code compliance for all multifamily housing, including residential hotels, in the City through the Systematic Code Enforcement Program;
- to ensure tenant and landlord rights and responsibilities under the Rent Stabilization Ordinance are both protected and achieved with public information and complaint investigations;
- to ensure due process rights for property owners and tenants subject to enforcement actions; and
- to bill property owners for all applicable fees under applicable ordinances resulting in revenue in excess of \$40 million annually

- **ADMINISTRATION BUREAU**

The **Administration Bureau** is composed of the Accounting Division, the Budget and Management Services Division, Grants Management, and the Systems Division.

The Executive Management Division includes executive staff, Policy & Planning, Public Information and Personnel.

LAHD provides support to two City Commissions concerned with housing issues: the Rent Adjustment Commission and the Affordable Housing Commission. Each Commission meets twice monthly, with agenda items on various housing issues as well as time for general comments by the public on related matters. These provide an ongoing forum for participation by City residents about important housing-related issues. The Consolidated Plan/Annual Action Plans are presented to the Affordable Housing Commission for their review and comments, and public comments are sought as well. The Affordable Housing Commission (AHC) provides policy guidance regarding HOME, CDBG and ADDI funding priorities and allocations to housing activities.

In addition, as part of its role as administering agency for the HOPWA grant, LAHD provides support to the Los Angeles Countywide HOPWA Advisory Committee (LACHAC). LACHAC provides policy guidance regarding the HOPWA funds; its membership includes a variety of stakeholders.

LAHD plays an important role in seeking other resources to leverage with Consolidated Plan grants to address housing issues. For example:

- Nearly \$17 million in grants from the State of California Building Equity and Growth in Neighborhoods Program (BEGIN) and the Cal-HOME Program for down payment assistance awarded to LAHD since 2001;
- Hundreds of millions of dollars worth of tax-exempt mortgage revenue bonds (MRBs) and Mortgage Credit Certificates (MCCs) awarded since the late 1980s;
- Lead-based paint hazard control funds from HUD which are available as grants to supplement LAHD's rehabilitation programs;
- Partnership and joint mortgage revenue bond issuance with the California Housing Finance Agency (CalHFA), which also qualifies homebuyers for additional help from the California Homebuyer Assistance Program (CHAP) and the California Homebuyer Downpayment Assistance Program (CHDAP), which provide cash grants of up to 3 percent of the purchase price.

THE HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES (HACLA)

HACLA provides housing assistance to low-income citizens of Los Angeles. The various programs administered by HACLA provide approximately 47,000 rental housing units to low-income families, senior citizens, and disabled persons. Rental housing units are either HACLA-owned or operated buildings, or in private housing made possible through rent subsidy programs.

The two largest programs in HACLA are the *Conventional Housing Program* and the *Section 8 Housing Assistance Payments Program (HAPP)*. The Conventional Housing Program consists of 21 housing developments and small scattered site developments with a total of 8,761 dwelling units, housing more than 31,000 residents. Developments range in size from the 100-unit Rose Hill Courts complex in the Lincoln Heights area of the east side to the

1,066-unit Nickerson Gardens complex in Southeast Los Angeles. The other major program, Section 8 HAPP, provides a rent subsidy in the form of monthly housing assistance payments to private landlords on behalf of eligible families, senior citizens and disabled persons. There are currently 16,486 households on the waiting list for this program.

The Mayor of the City of Los Angeles appoints the members of HACLA's Board of Commissioners; the City Council confirms the appointments. The seven-member board sets HACLA policy, appoints the executive director, and works to ensure that the agency meets its basic goal of providing decent, safe and sanitary housing for low-income families. HACLA also manages and maintains several Community Service Centers (CSC). The salaries of the employees at the centers are funded with Community Development Block Grant funds.

The City of Los Angeles reviews all proposed HACLA development sites through the City Council, the Planning Commission, and the Department of Building and Safety. The Comprehensive Plan of the HACLA is incorporated into the HACLA consolidated budget process. Both the Board of Commissioners and HUD approve the HACLA budget. HACLA receives most of its funding from the federal government through HUD. California State law sets forth the governing conditions for public housing to which HACLA must adhere. HACLA is also bound by the Code of Federal Regulations including HUD regulations and guidelines.

HACLA's mission has evolved over the last several years to encompass a variety of education, training, and service programs designed to encourage economic self-sufficiency and improve the quality of life for public housing residents.

CITY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

City Planning (DCP) is responsible for preparing and maintaining the General Plan, which guides city decision-making concerning land use, service systems, and circulation. A 5-member Planning Commission, appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the City Council, provides policy guidance on planning and zoning matters related to all development actions.

The *General Plan* is composed of seven elements, including long-range plans for housing, land use, air quality, open space, safety, and circulation. The *Housing Element* is a 5-year policy and program document, prepared by the Planning Department and adopted by the City Council, as required by State law (Section 65580). This Element identifies city housing needs and establishes the official goals, policies, and programs to address them. In addition, the Department administers thirty-six community plans that encompass the City.

The General Plan is implemented through zoning ordinances, specific plans, and capital improvements. This promotes an environment that encourages rational growth, economic vitality and a decent living environment for its citizens. Additionally, the Planning Department is responsible for the processing of requests for discretionary entitlements for land use development. These activities encompass preparation and review of environmental impact reports for private sector projects; processing of requests for conditional use permits, variances, zone changes, and subdivisions; and administration of specific plan regulations. Planning receives funds through the CDBG program to provide data mapping and geotechnical services in support of Consolidated Plan funded programs and applications.

The Planning Department is working with the City's major economic development partner, CRA/LA, in identifying areas currently zoned for industrial use that have the greatest potential for quality job creation. Coordination will result in a pool of higher-quality and more cost-effective projects with strong public benefit, and will therefore have substantial CDBG and Section 108 Loan Guarantee funding potential.

COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY (CRA/LA)

The Community Redevelopment Agency of the city of Los Angeles (CRA/LA) was established by resolution of the Los Angeles City Council in 1948 pursuant to Community Redevelopment Law of the State of California (Health and Safety Code). It is a major partner with the Mayor's Office of Economic Development and CDD's Economic Development Division in implementation of economic development project activities, often using CDBG funds and Section 108 Loan Guarantee (HUD) proceeds as a critical catalyst for affordable housing and economic development.

Legally, The CRA is a public agency established to primarily eliminate physical and economic blight, and performs this charge through a variety of activities:

- By attracting private investment into economically depressed communities;
- Eliminating slums, abandoned or unsafe properties and blight throughout Los Angeles;
- Revitalization of older neighborhoods through historic preservation, rehabilitation, and new development;
- Building housing for all income levels;
- Encourage economic development;
- Create and retain employment opportunities;
- Support the best in urban design, architecture and arts, and
- Ensure the broadest possible citizen participation in its activities.

A Board of seven Commissioners appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the City Council, oversees the CRA/LA. A Chief Executive Officer appointed by the Board directs the staff. Under an "Oversight Ordinance," adopted in 1991, every action of the CRA/LA is subject to City Council approval. CRA/LA redevelopment activities are managed through seven regions throughout Los Angeles: East Valley, West Valley, Hollywood & Central, Downtown, Eastside, South Los Angeles, and the Los Angeles Harbor regions.

CRA/LA currently operates in 32 redevelopment project areas and 3 revitalization areas in the seven regions throughout Los Angeles. Redevelopment Project Areas are designated as blighted by the CRA/LA Board, the Mayor and the City Council for which a redevelopment plan has been approved as required by the California Redevelopment Law. The CRA adopts comprehensive plans for redevelopment areas. These plans provide guidelines and strategies for removing physical and economic blight and provide a vision, goals and timetables for generating growth and new opportunities. Redevelopment plans are created with political, business, and community participation. The plans are the roadmap for spurring growth, creating new housing and improving the quality of life and general welfare of the people who live and work in and around redevelopment areas.

A key CRA/LA objective is to create quality, well-paying jobs in City redevelopment areas through economic development projects and through policies that encourage job creation in projects receiving CRA assistance. In 2003, CRA/LA adopted policies requiring the payment of living wages in certain projects receiving a threshold level of financial assistance.

CRA may be thought of as one leg of the table; CDD, the second; the Office of the Mayor, third; and the developer community the fourth. Redevelopment Project Areas are designated by the CRA/LA Board, the Mayor and the City Council for which a redevelopment plan has been approved as required by the California Community Redevelopment Law. The CRA, while governed by state regulations takes its direction from the Mayor and City Council. CRA seeks private investors for projects and works with the Community Development Department

(CDD) to help manage grants as well as helping to execute the Mayor's goals for the City. One cannot work without the other as all "legs" are needed to make sure developments and goals are met in a timely fashion.

All Los Angeles communities have unique needs. Because it is critical that the needs and aspirations of these communities are understood, CRA/LA communicates accurately and in a timely fashion about its plans and programs by expanding its emphasis on community relations and outreach.

The CRA/LA's funding is derived primarily from four sources:

- Property Tax Increment generated from the redevelopment areas, at least 20% of which is set aside for low and moderate income housing.
- Tax Allocation Bond Proceeds, at least 20% of which are typically restricted for housing.
- Grants from a variety of sources, including the City's Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) allocations, federal Economic Development Administration (EDA) programs, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) "Call for Projects," AB 1290 funds, and bond programs such as Propositions A, C, and K for transportation and parks projects.
- Other General Revenues including the proceeds of land sales, developer payments, rental income, loan repayments, and investment income.

The California Community Redevelopment law specifically mandates that redevelopment agencies act to retain and expand the affordable housing stock. The law requires 20% of the revenues accruing to a redevelopment agency be set aside for affordable housing. CRA/LA has increased its contribution to 25% in projects adopted after January 1, 1994. Approximately another 20% of the incremental property tax is returned to other taxing entities, including the County, City, School District, and Community College District.

The CRA/LA redevelopment work program is classified into five major categories by type of activity. Each activity type represents a CRA/LA priority in redevelopment:

- Economic Development – Activities designed to improve the economic environment of a neighborhood through development that facilitates expansion of existing businesses, including retail, commercial, and industrial uses.
- Housing – CRA/LA's housing set-aside funds, provided through tax increment financing are used for rehabilitation, homeownership, and multifamily rental housing in the redevelopment project areas.
- Public Improvements – These are primarily infrastructure-related activities such as street and sidewalk improvements, street lighting, façade improvements, etc. These improvements enhance the aesthetics of a neighborhood, thereby making the neighborhood more competitive for business retention and growth.
- Mixed Use – These are developments that contain a variety of uses, such as housing, retail, and community space on one project site; and
- Community Development – Activities designed to improve the overall livability of a neighborhood through the facilitation of public services such as transit centers, parks, public art, libraries, etc.

Creating quality affordable housing is a major component of CRA/LA's mission. CRA is providing \$10 million toward the \$50 million Permanent Supportive Housing Initiative, funded as well by the Los Angeles Housing Department, the Housing Authority of the City

City of Los Angeles, California

of Los Angeles, and the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. This fund is expected to create 300 units of housing for chronically homeless individuals, homeless families and youths, and others at high risk of homelessness

Redevelopment opportunities are unpredictable. Projects are planned and executed with a multitude of variables outside the control of CRA/LA Staff. They include fluctuations in interest rates and construction costs, changing market opportunities, community acceptance, land use approval, sufficient private financing and the ability of the CRA/LA and other leveraged funds to close the financing “gap” between available funds and actual construction costs.

The agency utilizes CDBG funds primarily for projects with critical financing gaps; as such, it is a vital source of funding for CRA/LA projects. CDBG has been and continues to be used for acquisition, streetscape improvement projects to get rid of blight and unsightly sidewalks, storefronts, and the Brownfields program. CRA/LA resources, including CDBG, Section 108, and other sources of federal funding are being used for a variety of programs in each redevelopment project area. Programs include creation and rehabilitation of housing and commercial developments, construction of façade improvements and streetscapes, reconstruction of deteriorated public facilities, and other activities. All CRA/LA activities must be consistent with the goals and objectives of the redevelopment plan and with each project area’s five-year implementation plan.

CRA/LA and CDD will be working together more closely than ever before over the next several years, because of the increasing need for economic development throughout the City. A number of residential/commercial mixed use developments and transit oriented community development projects will be coming to the forefront.

CRA/LA’s Director of Resource Development works with the Mayor’s office of Housing and Economic Development, and keeps the Mayor’s office aware of projects that are currently in process; and also advises of opportunities for development in the different redevelopment project areas. The CRA/LA’s Resource Development Department submits a list of priority projects for federal earmarks in concert with the Mayor’s proposed activities and priorities.

CHIEF LEGISLATIVE ANALYST (CLA) AND CITY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER (CAO)

Under the direction of the City Council, the Chief Legislative Analyst (CLA) has the responsibility of coordinating all lobbying and official legislative activity, including housing and community development policy, legislation and issues, on behalf of the City.

The CLA assists the City Council, the City’s governing body, in overseeing the operations of the City’s housing agencies and departments and provides legislative advocacy for housing and community development initiatives. This involves conducting research and analysis on housing and community development projects, programs, policies, ordinances, and budgets proposed by City agencies and departments.

The CLA also assists the Council in the initiation and development of new housing policies and programs, and provides city departments with legislative information and advice, including information on developments pertaining to the Consolidated Plan grants.

The City Administrative Officer (CAO) is the chief administrative financial advisor to the Mayor and the Council and reports directly to both. The CAO conducts investigations, carries out research, and makes recommendations on a variety of City management

City of Los Angeles, California

matters. The CAO assists the Mayor and Council in the preparation of the City budget, plans and directs its administration of the budget, and develops work programs and standards. In addition, the City Administrative Officer:

- Conducts periodic management audits of City departments,
- Administers a risk management program,
- Chairs and participates on several coordinating committees, including the CDBG Task Force; and
- Performs other duties as required by the Mayor or the City Council.

The CAO plays a major role in review of both the draft and final Consolidated Plan and annual Action Plans, and prepares a transmittal to the Mayor and City Council outlining the fiscal and programmatic impact on the City of Consolidated Plan-funded programs.

BUILDING AND SAFETY DEPARTMENT

The Building and Safety Department enforces all ordinances and laws relating to the construction, alteration, repair, demolition, removal or relocation of buildings or structures as well as the installation, alteration, repair, use and operation of heating, plumbing, lighting, ventilation, refrigeration, electrical and mechanical appliances and equipment therein.

The Department also:

- Enforces the zoning ordinance of the City;
- Provides a corrective program for the rehabilitation of substandard dwellings, commercial structures, multifamily housing developments, hotels, schools, hospitals and places of public assembly;
- Inspects residential property on request to determine its compliance with City code requirements
- Participates in several interdepartmental programs funded through the CDBG program, PACE (Proactive Code Enforcement) and the FALCON (Focused Attack Linking Community Organizations and Neighborhoods)

The Pro-Active Code Enforcement (PACE) program, funded primarily through CDBG, is designed to actively seek out code violations within a targeted area to gain compliance and help revitalize that community, increase public safety, reduce crime, and enhance the economic growth and stability of the area. PACE strives to accomplish this goal by educating/empowering stakeholders to resolve Los Angeles Municipal Code building and safety violations voluntarily. When surveying neighborhoods, inspectors focus on violations that include graffiti, trash, abandoned autos, illegal signs, hazardous or illegal construction, illegal use, and substandard single family dwellings.

LADBS operates two CDBG-funded PACE programs:

- A Citywide Team in low- to moderate-income areas defined by census tracts throughout the City; and
- A Council District 1 PACE Team in low- to moderate- income areas defined by census tracts within the boundaries of Council District 1.

Typically, the PACE program receives a request from the Office of the Mayor, City Council Office, or Neighborhood Council to survey an area to identify Code violations related to visual blight. PACE conducts community outreach meetings prior to conducting survey

City of Los Angeles, California

inspections to educate residents on the PACE program. Survey inspections are conducted utilizing a team approach between PACE and residents of the survey areas.

City inspectors issue *Orders to Comply* to property owners when voluntary compliance with City building codes cannot be obtained. PACE makes every effort to work with property owners to bring their property into compliance, including educating them on the availability of various City resources and community assistance available to mitigate Code violations. The priority for deployment of resources to gain compliance or mitigate a hazard is based on the severity of the violation(s) and the degree that life safety is threatened. For example, inspecting a vacant building will have a higher priority than overgrown vegetation.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

The Mayor's Office of Housing and Economic Development (MOHED) provides assistance to businesses through programs such as the:

- Los Angeles Business Team (direct business support and liaison)
- Minority Business Opportunity and Sector Teams
- Los Angeles Office of International Trade

CITY COUNCIL OFFICES

Through field and central offices, the 15 Council offices address economic development by identifying district challenges and potential, drawing on resources to publicize beneficial programs, and working with individual businesses to provide access to financial resources, City permit processes and assist with infrastructure issues. Council offices are instrumental in identifying community development needs within the areas of the city represented.

LOS ANGELES HOMELESS SERVICES AUTHORITY (LAHSA)

The Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) is an independent unit of local government (a Joint Powers Authority) created by the City and County of Los Angeles to provide leadership, advocacy, planning, and management of program funding within the Los Angeles Continuum of Care. LAHSA is governed by a ten-member Board of Commissioners, five of whom are appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by City Council, and one by each of the five County Supervisors.

LAHSA plays a key role in coordinating homeless programs between the City and County of Los Angeles, which is critical because each controls crucial financial and program resources. LAHSA also integrates its planning efforts in eight Service Planning Areas with nonprofit service providers, community residents, the business community, schools, law enforcement, and other local governments, such as the 85 cities (excluding Glendale, Long Beach and Pasadena) within the County. Funds for homeless programs from the Consolidated Plan will be used to support various components of the Continuum of Care operated by nonprofit housing and service providers.

Several city departments and entities such as the Housing Authority of City of Los Angeles participate in carrying out the strategies to end homelessness. However, as the lead entity of the CoC, LAHSA will maintain a pivotal role in the implementation of these strategies.

OTHER ORGANIZATIONS - NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS - HOUSING

Los Angeles is fortunate to have many excellent, experienced affordable housing developers, both non-profit and profit-motivated firms, which develop, own and operate

City of Los Angeles, California

affordable housing developments serving a variety of resident needs. Other local organizations provide invaluable support and experience to local affordable housing issues, including the Southern California Association of Non-Profit Housing (SCANPH), tenant and apartment owner groups, and legal services. Truly, LAHD could not accomplish its mission without such dedicated partners.

Programs operated by LAHD promote coordination between housing and social service agencies in a number of areas. Many of the housing developments financed by the Affordable Housing Trust Fund include childcare centers, community rooms and computer learning centers that facilitate after school tutoring programs, and other services provided by local agencies. All proposed affordable housing developments for persons with special needs must formally arrange for resident services with the appropriate local agencies.

In addition, LAHD collaborates with numerous nonprofit agencies that provide homeownership counseling. LAHD also works in partnership with more than a hundred mortgage lenders throughout the city to deliver its first-time homebuyer programs, and contracts with a variety of nonprofit agencies that perform outreach services to inform potential low-income clients about the availability of loan and grant assistance for rehabilitation of their homes or rental properties, and assist clients with preparation of loan and grant applications.

The HOPWA program is implemented by 30 different agencies that offer services and housing assistance to persons living with HIV/AIDS and their families. LAHD's Lead Outreach Grant and Lead-based Paint Hazard Control Grants from HUD have paid for the services of several non-profit community-based organizations to educate residents of the City's highest-risk neighborhoods about lead hazards. And LAHD's lead-safe work practices program was developed together and continues to coordinate with the Healthy Homes Collaborative, which includes more than 40 local public and private organizations focused on children's health issues.

SUPPORTIVE HOUSING PROVIDERS

Supportive Housing, the combination of housing with on-site social services, has been proven to be one of the most effective solutions to homelessness; the evidence shows that most who live in supportive housing are able to maintain permanent housing, reenter the workforce in greater numbers than their counterparts who reside in shelters, and use expensive public systems (i.e. emergency systems of care) far less than when they were homeless.

The value of supportive housing is the stability it provides for those transitioning out of homelessness, which is key to returning them to independent living. In this way, shelter beds are bypassed and the homeless individual or family moves directly to permanent supportive housing.

Through its Permanent Supportive Housing Program (PSHP), Los Angeles is a participant in the nation's leading approach to alleviating homelessness. The PSHP, administered by the LAHD, was created to: 1) increase the City's supply of supportive housing, 2) reduce production time of PSH by integrating funding and service resources, 3) leverage new and underutilized State and County homelessness dollars, and 4) raise the design standards for PSH and contribute to local redevelopment efforts.

The PSHP is a partnership of City agencies: LAHD, HACLA, CRA/LA, and DWP. A memorandum of understanding (MOU) governs the administration of their initial

City of Los Angeles, California

contribution to the Program, as well as future allocations. Additionally, the LAHSA and County agencies will be involved in the provision of services to the housing produced.

Projects funded by the PSHP must: 1) have at least 40 units (or may be smaller if the project serves transition-aged youth); 2) serve chronically homeless adults, homeless adults, homeless transition-aged youth, chronically homeless families, homeless families, low-income single adults or families; 3) be located with the City of Los Angeles; any family units are to be located outside of Skid Row; and 5) the unit mix must: have at least 50% of the units for formerly homeless households, serve the chronically homeless with special needs (35% minimum, 60% maximum) in projects serving single adults, and market 25% of the units to eligible residents who reside in the neighborhood.

CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE

There are six chambers that work closely with the city to provide business opportunities benefiting residents and business owners; Los Angeles, Boyle Heights, Lincoln Heights, Pacoima, and San Pedro.

SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

Eight Small Business Development Centers provide business/technical assistance in the areas of management training, business seminars, business plan development, information on industrial sites, labor supply, permits, taxation, financing resources, assistance to small minority and women owned business. The State of California and the U.S. Small Business Administration fund the Centers.

PRIVATE SECTOR

Residential Lenders

One of the Affordable Housing Trust Fund's most important features is its ability to draw in the investment of other public and private dollars into housing development in Los Angeles. Affordable Housing Trust Fund (AHTF) financed developments typically leverage nearly \$4 from other sources for every \$1 from the Trust Fund. Not only do banks and thrifts provide loans for a small portion of the development cost of new affordable housing, but they also purchase low income housing tax credits and participate in the City's tax-exempt mortgage revenue bond issuances.

In addition, LAHD's homebuyer assistance programs rely on the participation of mortgage lenders committed to serving first time homebuyers. Lenders provide the first mortgage; LAHD funds the downpayment assistance and the second mortgage. To ensure the most favorable terms for homebuyers, many of the lenders offer the tax exempt below-market financing provided by the California Housing Finance Agency (CalHFA).

PUBLIC/PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS

Community Development Financial Institutions Fund

The Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFI) Fund, an agency of the U.S. Treasury, was created to expand the availability of credit, investment capital, and financial services in distressed urban and rural communities. The Fund was authorized by the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994 as a bipartisan initiative. By stimulating the creation and expansion of diverse community development financial institutions (CDFIs) and by providing incentives to traditional banks and thrifts, the Fund's investments work toward building private markets, creating healthy local tax revenues, and empowering residents.

City of Los Angeles, California

The CDFI Fund provides relatively small infusions of capital to institutions that serve distressed communities and low-income individuals. The Fund's activities leverage private-sector investments from banks, foundations, and other funding sources. Since the Fund's creation, it has made more than \$534 million in awards to community development organizations and financial institutions.

CDFI is a community-based lending institution that promotes community development, serves an investment area or targeted population; provides loans or development investments and development services; maintains accountability to residents; and are not an agency of government. There are several organizations within Los Angeles that are certified CDFIs, including:

- Asian Pacific Revolving Loan Fund
- California Capital Alliance
- Century Community Development Inc.
- Community Commerce Bank
- Community Financial Resource Center (CFRC)
- Comidades Federal Credit Union
- Enterprise Community Partners (formerly known as Enterprise Foundation)
- Episcopal Community Federal Credit Union (in application status)
- FAME Assistance Corporation/FAME Renaissance Equity Fund
- Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC)
- Los Angeles LDC
- NHS Neighborhood Lending Services
- Pacific Coast Regional Small Business Development Corporation
- TELACU Community Capital
- Valley Economic Development Center

Los Angeles Industrial Development Authority

Economic Development efforts in Los Angeles have been greatly strengthened and CDBG funds leveraged through the Los Angeles Industrial Development Authority (IDA), an appointed commission that administers the city's Industrial Development Bond (IDB) program. The IDA is administered by the Community Development Department, Economic Development Division.

The IDA was established in 1982 to provide tax-exempt financing in the form of Industrial Development Bonds and Empowerment Zone Bonds (IDB/EZB) for manufacturing and processing activities within the City of Los Angeles. The enables bonds to be issued with a tax-exempt status, but does not pledge City funds to repay the bond issues.

IDA bonds are offered as an incentive to companies involved in manufacturing and processing activities, Empowerment Zone operations and non-profit organizations to relocate to Los Angeles, or remain and expand in the City, thereby creating and retaining jobs, promoting economic revitalization, and providing much needed public and community services.

City of Los Angeles, California

Since its inception, the IDA has directly issued or facilitated over \$2.3 billion in bond issues. The IDA works closely with a team of qualified financial professionals whose goal is to process bonds in a timely, accurate and cost-effective manner.

The IDA also provides bonds for non-profit organizations to assist in the construction of new buildings, museums, hospitals, schools, etc.

Industrial Development Bonds (IDBs) offer both taxable and tax-exempt financing for commercial and industrial development projects at favorable rates usually below conventional financing. IDBs are used for:

- Property acquisition
- Equipment purchases
- Building improvements; and
- Construction

Tax-exempt issues are restricted to manufacturing concerns. Jobs are created at a ratio of 1 job per \$50,000 investment.

Bond issues may range from \$1,000,000 to \$40,000,000, while tax-exempt bond issues are limited to \$10,000,000. Maximum financing participation is 75% of the project cost, or the appraised value of the underlying property. A single bond issue may include both construction and permanent financing. Terms range from 10-20 years, amortized over 25 years. Collateral normally consists of the project real estate.

The IDA also has a loan assistance program, the Subordinate Loans Revolving Special Fund, which may be able to bridge a financing gap. A single bond issue may include both construction and permanent financing. Terms range from 10 to 20 years, amortized over 30 years. Capital interest only periods are permitted. Collateral normally consists of the project's underlying real estate.

Advantages of IDA Issuance

Bonds benefit the borrower, the investors and the communities in which the projects are located. And, due to the tax-exempt status of bonds, investors benefit from the tax-free interest earnings received from the bonds. The interest income may be lower than other investments, but the tax savings may offset the difference.

The renovation of abandoned and deteriorating buildings, as well as the development of underutilized land revitalizes the surrounding community. The growth in business resulting from bond proceeds allow for the creation of jobs that are usually filled by local residents.

Over the past ten years, the "all-in" interest rate has averaged approximately 4.65%. During this same period, the bond interest rate was as low as 2.8% and the commercial interest rate indicators have consistently been higher than the tax-exempt interest rates. Bonds typically reduce financing costs by 20% - 30% annually. In many cases these savings allow companies to purchase their leased facility or acquire a new property, allowing them to expand and increase the capacity of their operations.

COMMUNITY ACTION BOARD (COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY)

The member board consists of representatives of the poverty section, public sector and the private sector. The board provides oversight to all antipoverty programs funded with

City of Los Angeles, California

CDBG (public service funds only) and CSBG. The CAB functions as an advisory group to Mayor and Council.

The CAB provides for broad community input in grant-funded public services programming, and deliberates priorities and plans for human services delivery system programs and related proposals and funding. Its recommendations are submitted to the Mayor and City Council.

Coordination with the CAB is assured by the Workforce Investment Board's membership on the Community Action Board and ongoing efforts to share information and link job training, human services and all self-sufficiency programs in our area.

CITIZEN'S UNIT FOR PARTICIPATION (CUP)

CUP is the City of Los Angeles's Citizens' Unit for Participation in Housing and Community Development. The Board is charged with representing the interests of the people of the City in directing federal housing and community development funds for The US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

One person from each Council District is appointed by his or her local Council Member to make recommendations based on input from the community. Other members represent the Mayor and the Los Angeles Housing Authority.

The CUP Board, in accordance with HUD requirements, actively seeks community input -- citizen participation -- on a regular basis. With a charter to address the current needs of the Los Angeles community, CUP provides critical information to decision-makers. CUP members are vitally involved in their communities and are in active contact with citizens in their own districts. CUP in 2002 directed preparation of a Citizen Needs Survey, the recommendations of which were reviewed by the Mayor and Council, and influenced the priorities and strategies for housing and community development expenditures through the Consolidated Plan. CUP also reviews Substantial Amendments to the adopted Consolidated Plan and annual Action Plans.

BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS (BPW)/TRANSPORTATION (DOT) DEPARTMENT OF WATER AND POWER (DPW)

These City departments improve and maintain infrastructure in areas such as City water, power, sewers, storm drains, streets, lighting, and transportation. In addition, the Department of Water and Power offers incentives for businesses to locate in business incentive zones, and infrastructure financing programs.

OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

- Beyond Shelter and other Continuum of Care (CoC) agencies
- Concerned Citizens of South Los Angeles
- FAME Renaissance (Economic Development Corporation)
- Grant A.M.E. Housing Development Corporation
- League of Women Voters
- Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC)
- Los Angeles Economic Development Corporation (LAEDC)
- Los Angeles Urban League
- United Auto Workers

LISC is a critical resource in the training and certification of Community Development Corporations within Los Angeles.

City of Los Angeles, California

- ***United Latino Fund (ULF)***

The ULF annually awards grants of up to \$5,000 to organizations that further the social, educational, economic and employment training, and cultural needs of Latinos in Los Angeles.

2. Please describe strengths and gaps in the institutional structure

There are over eighty separate governments within Los Angeles County, not including special districts. The institutional structure of Los Angeles City government has been established for many years, but the 2001 charter election shifted the balance of power towards the executive branch, and provided for more representation of residents at the local level through establishment of neighborhood councils.

HUD, as well as residents, has an understandable interest in assuring the implementation of Consolidated Plan programs are not hindered by institutional factors, both external and internal; and the city is required to identify these factors, and provide information on progress in solving them.

In the 2000-2003 Consolidated Plan, the City identified several weaknesses in the institutional structure that constrains successful implementation of the Consolidated Plan. Many of these factors will still be in evidence over the next five years, but with the City's full intent to address them.

Gaps in the institutional structure for the preservation and production of affordable housing result more from funding limitations and the overwhelming need in Los Angeles, than from anything else. The Mayor's Housing Coordinating Team has identified inefficiencies affecting the affordable housing development process and will be proposing a variety of means to address those issues.

External Barriers to Full Institutional Growth

There are many external barriers that affect the full institutional growth of the City of Los Angeles in a number of areas.

- ***Geographic and Demographic Factors***

Several barriers include the sheer size, ethnic and racial diversity and population of the City of Los Angeles, coupled with high rates of immigration and accompanying poverty. The constant influx of immigrants into City service areas makes it difficult to verify client residency and income eligibility. Federal, state and local funds are limited, and must be used in the most effective manner possible.

- ***Overcoming Language Barriers***

It is estimated that over 140 languages and dialects are spoken in the City and nearly 100 in the city's schools. English as a Second Language (ESL) classes are often oversubscribed, and social service providers are overtaxed by translation requirements. Many low-income residents are discouraged from seeking needed services by language barriers.

- ***Gaps in Private Sector Investment***

There are several conditions that limit private sector investment in distressed areas of Los Angeles, affecting the city's ability to successfully leverage Consolidated Plan funds for needed economic development projects. Some of the barriers include the

extent of blight, time, the cost of assembling and clearing sites, obsolete infrastructure, cost of development in relation to risks, and incompatible land uses. Affordable housing subsidies are steep, and public/private housing development deals are often complex and tied to other developer priorities.

The City has recently seen successful development of retail and mixed-use projects. Such projects provide needed jobs and services for Los Angeles residents.

A major threat to the provision of affordable housing is the continuing trend by landlords to “opt out” of the Project-based Section 8 program. The Housing Authority, however, has reported a reduction in Tenant-based Section 8 voucher turnover and the volume of owners discontinuing participation in the tenant based Section 8 program is significantly lower than in the past two years.

▪ **Gaps in Public Sector Participation and Collaboration**

The capacity of agencies, especially smaller grass roots contractors to provide services declines with each reduction in grant funding. Reduced city funding means reduced agency funding, fewer agency activities, and fewer staff. Turnover of staff in local organizations creates the need for continual training to assure that programs are managed properly and comply with federal, state and local regulations. The turnover gap is a major impediment to the stability of local program management.

One solution lies in the city working more closely with the Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC) and local development corporations, such as FAME Renaissance, Valley Economic Development Corporation, and Concerned Citizens of Los Angeles. This will encourage development of even firmer partnerships between such organizations and city departments in shaping programs and implementation strategies.

Educational institutions, such as the schools of public policy at UCLA, USC, the Center for the Study of Los Angeles at Loyola University, the Pat Brown Institute at California State University, Los Angeles, Occidental College, can provide immensely valuable technical assistance and perspectives into development of more effective, targeted community development programs and building linkages among the private and public sectors.

▪ **The Need for Increased Citizen Participation**

There is generally low level of citizen participation and involvement in deciding the allocation of Consolidated Plan grant funds, demonstrated by low attendance at advisory councils, standing committees, neighborhood advisory boards, community meetings, and, generally, at city council and committee meetings. This is indicative that the City must work harder to encourage involve citizens to be involved in the housing and community development process to a far greater extent than is the case now. The new Neighborhood Councils show much promise as a way to encourage citizen involvement in the Consolidated Planning process.

Strengths and Gaps in the Structure of Homeless Activities

The Los Angeles Continuum of Care (LACoC) comprises all of Los Angeles County with the exceptions of the cities of Glendale, Long Beach and Pasadena. It includes 85 incorporated cities, 34 of which are entitlement cities, and is segmented into eight regional "Service Planning Areas" (SPAs) that are used for planning most mainstream social services. Due to size, geography, multitude of political jurisdictions, diverse homeless

City of Los Angeles, California

populations, and complicated overlapping network of agencies and programs, LAHSA faces significant challenges in bringing stakeholders together to create common goals and action steps that will result in ending chronic homelessness.

Strengths

The Los Angeles CoC continues to implement the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). In an innovative approach to solving homelessness, four separate continua of care (Los Angeles, Glendale, Pasadena and Orange County) have joined together, using the same HMIS software system. This regional collaborative approach is vital in combating homelessness since homeless persons intermittently access services in all these areas. The four continua have agreed to share basic client intake information, and are able to follow clients from area to area as they access services. The data sharing enables providers to shorten the time required for intake assessments, which can allow them to serve more clients. It also provides for more continuity in tracking homelessness throughout the Southern California region. Overall, the collaborative approach provides a platform for sharing data, generating regional reports that are critical to understanding trends and crafting solutions to end homelessness on a regional level.

Since the data is collected on a web-based system, the Continuum of Care will have access to real-time data that tracks service usage and outcomes in the homeless service delivery system upon full system implementation. Specifically, the system is designed around an outcomes-based framework, which emphasizes results rather than activities. In so doing, it provides numerous advantages for service providers and funding sources. Some of the benefits include:

- The ability to detect the need for course-correction in *real time* throughout the implementation of the program;
- Immediate feedback on program success to key stakeholders such as funding sources, board members, staff and clients; and
- Early evidence of program effectiveness that can be used to help build a rationale for continued program funding.

With immediate access to data that is uniformly collected, both LAHSA and the service providers will be able to generate reports from the system at any time during the program year. Data collected will be analyzed by LAHSA's contract monitoring staff and used as a basis to relay concerns and recommendations to the agencies. This will enable the agencies to review their programs and determine areas that need to be addressed immediately in order to achieve the outcomes set forth in their contracts.

Through HMIS, LAHSA will be able to collect demographic and outcome data that are critical for planning, designing and funding effective homeless programs. When fully implemented, HMIS will also facilitate the enumeration of homeless persons because it is designed to provide an unduplicated count of homeless persons accessing the service delivery system.

Gaps

Although significant progress has been made in many of the sub-jurisdictions within the Continuum to end homelessness in the Los Angeles Continuum of Care, there are geographic areas within the Continuum where only limited planning has been completed in developing functional or operational plans. The size and diversity of the Continuum has resulted in a strategy of developing regional implementation plans that are tailored to address specific community/regional issues and needs. LAHSA is currently working to

City of Los Angeles, California

document existing plans, and to engage areas still needing plans in 2008. Additionally, LAHSA is actively participating in planning activities with other city departments and jurisdictions in the LA Continuum. One major planning accomplishment includes the Los Angeles City Mayor's Housing Plan which will call for:

- Creating additional permanent supportive housing for the chronically homeless over the next five years;
- Coordinating housing departments to move more families into Section 8 housing in five years;
- Completing a citywide strategy for funding and locating homeless shelters by December 2008; and
- Completing a Skid Row Vision and Action Plan.
- Working to adopt inclusionary zoning for affordable housing projects.

The Non-Profit and For-Profit Community – A Significant Source of Strength

There are also many non-profit and for-profit organizations in Los Angeles that work together collaboratively in the areas of housing, homeless services, community and economic development, and have been successful in development of coherent and effective human services programs throughout the city. Los Angeles in turn has developed strong institutional links with these entities in jointly undertaking vitally needed community development activities.

One of the biggest challenges facing the City is the difficult task of forming and maintaining active collaboratives in furthering community development goals. A majority of federal funding sources now require that such collaboratives be in place, funding and in-kind commitments established, and linkages fully developed as a condition of funding as preconditions for application and award of federal grant funds.

Another challenge in development of a strong institutional structure and avoiding service gaps is the sheer size and extent of need in the City. Consolidated Plan resources are insufficient to fill the gap, and nonprofit organizations cannot either. However, despite these limitations, The City, working with for-profit and non-profit organizations, has enjoyed several notable successes in bridging institutional barriers and intelligently targeting scarce federal funds.

Other examples of the City's collaboratives include:

- The Workforce Development Division of CDD has established close linkages among employment and training programs, through joint participation with the Los Angeles County Department of Public and Social Services (DPSS), the Los Angeles County Office of Education, the Los Angeles Unified School District, and the State of California Employment Development Department. The U.S. Department of Labor, local governments, and both private and nonprofit providers of employment and training programs also play an active role. Active collaboratives, such as UNITE LA, have been in existence for several years.
- The Human Services and Family Development Division of CDD has transitioned from a "single component" service provision to a consortium-based model approach composed of Family Development Networks (FDNs). This structure has resulted in high participation in problem solving and service delivery strategies by the non-profit community, as well as local, state and federal agencies. The FDN is

City of Los Angeles, California

designed to link to the City's Workforce Development Centers by closely coordinating intake, electronic interface, staff training, information and referral, and case management support. The FDN complement the Centers by providing supportive services such as counseling, parenting skills, childcare access, and alternative youth services.

Proposed Eligibility Plan (PEP)

A significant hurdle has been in development of a comprehensive grants management system City Wide that ensures compliance with Consolidated Plan and OMB regulations. The sheer size and complexity of City government and the multitude of specialized regulations for each of the Consolidated Plan programs results in ineffective use of various contract boilerplates to suit specialized grant needs, which made the task of compliance with the most basic requirements of HUD federal assistance programs difficult.

The Proposed Eligibility Plan (PEP) was designed to address these constraints on efficient and effective Consolidated Plan program implementation.

The PEP is an important inducement to strengthening the city's grants management and overall institutional structure, as it strengthens formal agreements between departments in the form of Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) and Memoranda of Agreement (MOA). City departments must prepare a schedule of projected reimbursement through the four Consolidated Plan grants, and identify all sources of leveraging; cross-cutting federal requirements such as the National Environmental Policy Act (Part 58) and the Davis-Bacon Wage Rate regulations are required review elements for the PEP.

Implementing departments must provide a determination of eligibility and National Objective for PEPs submitted for CDBG reimbursement. Often, CDD staff processing PEPs will visit the site of a proposed project to obtain a better sense of eligibility and scope. In many senses, then, the PEP has become a useful remote monitoring tool.

The information derived from implementing departments' response to these PEP requirements directly link to the CAPER, and provide a baseline for verification of information contained therein.

The City has also adopted a procedure to assure prompt and accurate reconciliation of reprogrammed Consolidated Plan funds with City grant accounting records. Each month, CDD Administrative Services receives an Expenditure Report from the CDD Financial Management Division and project and programs are carefully monitored for timeliness of expenditure.

The Computer Systems Division of CDD has successfully created an automated tracking system which provides the status of all PEPs submitted, provides information on completeness or missing information, and for implementing departments that are tardy in submitting PEPs, a reminder is sent to them. The PEPs are also integrated into CDD's Contract Tracking System (CTS) which better allows contracts staff to determine if an approved PEP is on file.

Survey of the Extent of Need in the City of Los Angeles

The City's institutional analysis for the 2008-2013 Consolidated Plan reveals that the City must develop formal, systematic approaches to determine the extent of need throughout the City, with a significant assist from technology. Although the high incidence of poverty is well documented, it is not completely known whether the extent of poverty is being met

City of Los Angeles, California

with Consolidated Plan programs now in place or planned, especially in the absence of a periodic City Wide evaluation of program effectiveness.

Fulfillment of this goal will be a significant impetus in strengthening the institutional structure of the city and related agencies. Further development of the City's ISIS system mentioned earlier, will result in a comprehensive database of need, and will encourage sharing of client and demographic information electronically throughout the City.

This has been a significant investment in information technology that will prove to be a useful tool in ensuring that City residents in need receive appropriate, high quality human services. The City '311' system, for example, is proving to be an extremely important tool for providing information to residents and businesses.

Regional Needs

The need for home-grown, "ground up" regional approaches and strategies to area wide problems of poverty, affordable housing, movement of persons from welfare to work, and other issues that span a geographic area larger than the city. Lack of comprehensive regional planning is a significant institutional barrier affecting the ability to respond to new challenges and needs.

There has been considerable progress on this issue in the last few years, particularly in integration of human services, Welfare-to-Work and Employment and Training programs. The recent integration of the Rapid Response Unit, linking the program framework of CDD's Economic Development Division and the Workforce Development Division is a significant institutional innovation that will permit faster and more comprehensive assistance to persons needing employment assistance.

2. Assess the strengths and gaps in the delivery system.

The City has scores of non-profit agencies serving a multitude of human service needs. The degree of involvement and cooperation among the City and the non-profit community is high. The City's delivery system, while decentralized has the advantage of flexibility in terms of changing priorities. The City also benefits from the presence of the Los Angeles County service delivery system, which strongly augments the efforts of the City through its subrecipients and contractors of federal Consolidated Plan funds. However, none of the delivery systems are adequately funded to meet the demand for services.

A good example of a major strength in the City's system of delivery of services lies in CDD's Economic Development Division approach. EDD has a strong knowledge of what the City's needs are, and where the gaps lie. With the completion of the Economic Development Strategy, EDD has taken a major step towards the implementation of economic development strategies that will address the City's needs and priorities that will eliminate barriers towards wealthier communities, the creation of quality jobs for low and moderate persons, a labor force that is more productive, developing more entrepreneurs and assisting small businesses grow and mature.

The major gap in EDD's delivery system is the ability to reach out to all the businesses in need of public assistance. Performance measures have been developed and implemented to ensure better quality of the services being delivered and to service a greater number of businesses that need technical assistance.

Los Angeles Housing Department

Programs operated by LAHD promote coordination between housing developers – both for and non-profit - and social service agencies in a number of areas. Many of the housing developments financed by the Affordable Housing Trust Fund include childcare centers, community rooms and computer learning centers that facilitate after school tutoring programs, and other services provided by local agencies.

All proposed permanent supportive housing developments and other affordable housing proposed for persons with special needs must show memoranda of understanding (MOU) or similar commitments with local social service agencies. Depending on the population served, case managers and other agency staff may work at the housing development site.

In addition, the Housing Department collaborates with numerous nonprofit agencies that provide homeownership counseling. All prospective homebuyers who work with the Housing Department are required to complete a minimum of 8 hours of homeownership counseling in order to access our purchase assistance program. LAHD also works in partnership with more than a hundred mortgage lenders throughout the city to deliver its first-time homebuyer programs.

The Housing Department also extensively uses the services of a variety of nonprofit agencies that perform outreach services to inform potential low-income clients about the availability of loan and grant assistance for rehabilitation of their homes or rental properties. Currently, eight agencies act as a conduit for rehabilitation loans from the Housing Department: those agencies do initial eligibility screening, perform feasibility analyses, estimated necessary loan amounts, and generate loan documents for Housing Department approval and funding.

The HOPWA program provides funding for a number of agencies that offer services to persons living with HIV/AIDS and their families. LAHD's Lead Outreach Grant from HUD pays for the services of several non-profit community-based organizations to educate residents of the City's highest-risk neighborhoods about lead-based paint hazards. And LAHD's lead-safe work practices program was developed together and coordinates with the Healthy Homes Collaborative, which includes more than 40 local public and private organizations focused on children's health issues.

3. Assess the strengths and gaps in the delivery system for public housing, including a description of the organizational relationship between the jurisdiction and the public housing agency, including the appointing authority for the commissioners or board of housing agency, relationship regarding hiring, contracting and procurement; provision of services funded by the jurisdiction; review by the jurisdiction of proposed capital improvements as well as proposed development, demolition or disposition of public housing developments.

The Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles (HACLA) manages over 60 Public Housing locations (large developments, scattered family and senior housing sites) with more than 7,400 housing units. HACLA also oversees the management of smaller family, senior Section 8 New Construction and other affordable and market rate properties. This brings the total number of units provided to low-income families and individuals throughout Los Angeles to 9,080, ranging from San Pedro to the San Fernando Valley and from Mar Vista to the City's Eastside. The Section 8 program, funded by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), provides rental housing assistance to extremely

City of Los Angeles, California

low and very low-income families, senior citizens, and disabled persons. Its objective is to provide affordable, decent and safe housing for eligible families, while increasing a family's residential mobility and choice. HACLA, a state chartered public housing agency since 1938, now administers the second largest Section 8 program in the country.

The Housing Authority has two different types of rental subsidies—tenant-based and project-based programs. Both programs have similar income-based admission requirements set by HUD. Households with a tenant-based subsidy have a voucher that allows them to move from one place to another. Those in the project-based programs live in a building in which the units are subsidized. If a tenant moves from the building, they lose their rental subsidy. Generally, those in the project-based programs and some tenant-based programs for special populations are referred by various agencies and building owners to the Housing Authority, which confirms they meet all the Section 8 eligibility requirements. Households on the Housing Voucher tenant-based program come from the Housing Authority's waiting list of applicants. As of September 2007, HACLA has funding for 51,660 units assisting about 100,000 total family members.

Over the years, HACLA has offered a variety of specialized Section 8 programs to eligible households. The different programs currently being administered by the Section 8 Division each have different eligibility requirements and each target various segments of low income households such as persons with AIDS and homeless individuals. The Housing Authority works with other government agencies to deliver support services to Section 8 clients.

HACLA's funding is from five main sources: Rent payments by public housing residents, HUD's annual operating subsidy, HUD's annual Capital Fund for the repair of old housing stock, Section 8 administrative fees and other program and capital grants from various sources. HUD funding for HACLA operating expenses is limited and declining. Meanwhile, needs continue to increase. Not only is HACLA required to maintain an aging housing stock mostly over 50 years old, but we must also provide a range of supportive services for residents to help them progress toward economic self-sufficiency, and comply with complex regulatory requirements.

In the recent past, HACLA has been able to creatively patch together funds from various sources, including the Public Housing Drug Elimination Program (PHDEP), public housing operating subsidy, and surplus Section 8 administrative fees, to bridge this gap between needs and resources. HACLA has used these resources to help pay the costs of resident services, but these options are no longer available.

The ending of PHDEP eliminated a key source of funds for resident programs as well as contributed to the closure of our Public Safety department. Recent legislation imposed strict limits on the use of (reduced) Section 8 funds that prohibit us from using these funds to pay for public housing resident services and community initiatives. The new public housing operating subsidy formula could result in a substantial loss of federal support for HACLA. Given these circumstances, it is safe to conclude the funding outlook is not promising.

HACLA answers to three distinct layers of governmental oversight. It receives federal funding from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), which sets the operating rules. California state law sets forth governing conditions for public housing to which HACLA must adhere. And the Mayor of Los Angeles appoints the seven-member Board of Commissioners overseeing the agency, subject to confirmation by the City

City of Los Angeles, California

Council. The Board sets HACLA policy, appoints the Executive Director and works to ensure the agency meets its basic goal of providing decent, safe and sanitary housing for low-income families. In the past several years, HACLA's mission has evolved beyond this to encompass a variety of education, training and service programs designed to encourage resident economic self-sufficiency and improve their quality of life.

The City of Los Angeles reviews all proposed HACLA development sites through the City Council, the City Planning Commission, and the Department of Building and Safety. The Comprehensive Plan of the HACLA is incorporated into the HACLA budget process. Both the Board of Commissioners and HUD must approve the HACLA budget.

Monitoring (91.230)

1. Describe the standards and procedures that the jurisdiction will use to monitor its housing and community development projects and ensure long-term compliance with program requirements and comprehensive planning requirements.

Both CDD and LAHD, as the primary City departments implementing the Consolidated Plan grants, conduct financial and programmatic monitoring annually in addition to the annual OMB A-133 (Single Audit), as well as periodic Controller audits. The monitoring process used by the two departments varies based on the type of program administered; each of the Consolidated Plan grant have a separate and distinct regulations and requirements. However, both systems are designed to incorporate a variety of monitoring techniques and approaches in a coordinated effort to assure that all funded activities receive an appropriate level of review, and that regulations specific to the Entitlement grants received are followed.

The vast majority of the City's Consolidated Plan-funded programs and project activities involve direct services to low- and moderate-income clients. This made it imperative that City departments and related City agencies develop monitoring procedures that will ensure that activities meet HUD regulatory requirements. This is particularly true of the CDBG program. Recipients of CDBG funds must demonstrate that they are continuing to meet both a National Objective and CDBG eligibility requirements. Recipients must also ensure that subrecipients (or subcontractors) are monitored in a consistent and regular manner and that contract goals and terms are adhered to. The following narratives illustrate the approaches used by several City departments in monitoring Consolidated Plan-funded programs and project activities.

The CDD Administrative Services Division (ASD) Grants Unit reviews all applications for CDBG funding for adherence to CDBG regulatory requirements. Staff frequently consults with City departments and agencies on eligibility and national objective issues, and provides technical assistance to City departments and related City agencies and non-profit organizations in assuring that approved project activities continue to meet HUD CDBG statutory and regulatory requirements. Funding and eligibility recommendations are provided by CDD, Grants Section to the Mayor upon review of all proposed projects.

Other Consolidated Plan-funded entities (such as LAHSA) that administer grants provide a similarly strict initial review of applications for funding. A standing committee of the City Council (Housing, Community and Economic Development) also reviews ConPlan funding requests. CDD grants staff also reviews proposed CDBG programs and projects for

City of Los Angeles, California

readiness, to further assure that activities are begun and completed in a timely manner – thereby assuring timely expenditure of CDBG funds.

In addition, the City Controller's Office and the City Administrative Officer (CAO) conduct in-depth audits and performance reviews of federal grant programs. Since the City has two departments responsible for the five grants, each department's approach will be discussed separately.

CDD is responsible for monitoring part of the CDBG grant, and those actions of four key operating divisions - ICD, HSF, NDD, and WDD, which administer third party contracts for CDBG. All four divisions use a Request for Proposal process to identify contractors.

Monitoring of Human Services Programs

The Human Services and Family Development (HSFD) Division of the Community Development Department (CDD) administers several key CDBG-funded programs, including the Human Services Delivery System, the Domestic Violence Shelter Operations program, and the Rita Walters Learning Complex, among others. In most instances, nonprofit contractors operating these programs are selected through a competitive Request for Proposal process to ensure that contractors have the capacity to properly administer federal grant funds and the organizational capacity to deliver effective services.

The CDD Human Services and Family Development (HSFD) Division monitors projects through regular field visits. Each project receives four on-site visits in a twelve-month program year. As part of this regular monitoring process, the City evaluates service providers' compliance with record keeping, financial management, and the reporting requirements of their contracts. Project progress is also evaluated against agency goals. When problems arise, corrective action plans are initiated. Should improvements not materialize, the City exercises its contractual options to safeguard the expenditure of funds. Project activities are also monitored through review and audit of cash requests from funded agencies.

HSFD program analysts are available on an "as-needed" basis to provide technical assistance to contractors regarding issues such as federal grant requirements, City contract requirements and reporting results of program accomplishments. The HSFD continues to move toward performance-based contract monitoring procedures and is working to redesign the compliance review documents used to better track contractor performance in key areas. Over the past two years, the Financial Management Division (FMD) of the CDD implemented a standard risk assessment (rating) tool to document fiscal performance of all Department contractors.

The HSFD Division is now undertaking a review of all monitoring procedures to go beyond compliance monitoring toward a more comprehensive program evaluation. Planned improvements include more site visits (including evening and weekend visits as appropriate) to determine how actively engaged clients are in the program activities; and using elements of Results-Oriented Management and Accountability (ROMA) to measure program effectiveness and assessment of how HSFD staff can provide more effective technical assistance, to ensure that program activities--not paperwork--take precedence at point of service delivery.

Determination of CDBG Eligibility and National Objective Compliance

City of Los Angeles, California

Upon completion of the Consolidated Plan application submission cycle in the late summer or early fall of each year, the Grants Section of the Administrative Services Division of CDD receives and reviews projects through the Consolidated Plan Application System to determine compliance with CDBG eligibility and National Objective requirements, as well as determine if proposed programs and project activities are “ready to go” – that is, that CDBG funds can be expended within one program year. CDD staff provides the first level of review and coordinates closely with City departments, nonprofit organizations, and related City agencies in assuring that CDBG eligibility and national objective requirements are met. A critical level of review at this point is also whether a proposed program or project activity is *expressly ineligible under the CDBG regulations*.

CDD also closely scrutinizes *continued* compliance with the assigned National Objective through PEP review, field and desk monitoring, and periodic analyses of program and project progress and undisbursed Line of Credit balance. CDD also prepares the annual Grantee Performance Report (GPR) which details expenditure and completion status for all years of approved CDBG-funded project activities. HUD uses the GPR extensively to monitor progress.

Slow-moving or completed projects are given particular attention for potential reprogramming of CDBG funds. The City has been successful in maintaining an allowable undisbursed balance in its Line of Credit.

Use of the PEP as a Remote Monitoring Tool

The PEP, explained earlier, has undergone several enhancements this year, and has undergone review by both the City Attorney and the Los Angeles office of HUD to determine if the PEP has the same effect as an MOU in assuring compliance with HUD regulatory requirements for the four grants. Its usefulness as a monitoring and compliance tool to ensure adherence to Consolidated Plan and individual grant regulations is becoming more and more evident, as its use is expanding to Section 108 loan guarantee, and UDAG program income. The PEP is also used for review and disposition of both minor (technical corrections) and substantial amendments (as defined by the HUD Consolidated Plan regulations) to the annual Action Plan approved projects.

Specific CDD divisions have monitoring procedures in place tailored to the types of programs and project activities undertaken, and the documentation and audit requirements imposed by HUD, OMB and other federal, state, and local requirements

For example, the Economic Development Division (EDD) of CDD has policies and procedures that program monitors follow to conduct semi-yearly site visits of the agencies we partner with for the delivery of economic development activities. Our contracts contain specific goals the partner agencies are responsible for achieving during the terms of the agreement. We have also implemented quarterly meetings to review agency performance and their plan of action for the next quarter. EDD also requires verification of income for all participants requesting services and case management to ensure positive progress is being made.

Monitoring of Housing Programs

- **Monitoring Procedures for Affordable Housing Units - LAHD**

Affordable housing developments assisted with Consolidated Plan grant funds are monitored in two phases: during construction and afterwards, when the property is occupied by low income residents. Before any funds can be released, loan agreements and related documents must be signed by the Borrower and approved by the City.

City of Los Angeles, California

Besides repayment terms, the promissory note, and loan agreement, the City contract may include additional terms agreed to by the borrower, including requirements related to habitability standards, owner residency, tenant eligibility, and/or rent affordability guidelines.

Low-income tenancy and affordable rents are effectuated through a covenant, which is signed by the owner, recorded against the property title, so it 'runs with the land'. Covenants have provisions that require annual tenant re-certification and periodic physical inspections when required by the grant. These additional provisions are no less important than the repayment terms, and a material breach thereof may result in acceleration of the loan and/or foreclosure action against the collateral property.

The development cycle begins with the LAHD commitment, and ultimately culminates into a finished housing development. Typically, the development cycle is 30 to 36 months assuming all goes as planned. LAHD utilizes certain milestones as indicators to determine if the project is on track, within the development cycle described above.

Those milestones include, but are not limited to the following:

- Award of leveraged financing sources (tax credit allocation, MHP award or 202/811 HUD Award). As a requirement of the LAHD commitment, each prospective borrower must immediately apply for an award of subsidy from one of the three aforementioned sources and be in receipt of an award not greater than one year after the LAHD commitment is obtained.
- Project Readiness within 90 – 120 days of receipt of leveraged financing source as demonstrated by receipt of a building permit, an executed construction contract, complete set of plans and building specifications.
- Start of Construction as demonstrated by the developer's issuance of a Notice to Proceed.
- Construction Schedule (generally from 12 – 18 months depending upon the extent of construction, size of building and other building criteria.)
- Construction Completion as evidenced by a Notice of Completion, Final Building Sign off by the City's Department of Building and Safety, or a Certificate of Occupancy.
- Marketing and Lease-Up (generally a three- to six-month process)

These milestones are defined in LAHD's loan agreements, and are monitored by both the Finance Officers and Rehabilitation Construction Specialist from application intake, throughout predevelopment and during the course of construction.

The construction phase is monitored by LAHD Construction Specialists. They perform inspections at each milestone of the process; their approval is required before funds can be released. The City's Building and Safety Department also plays a role in this process, as it will not issue building permits unless all code requirements have been met.

After construction, the Occupancy Monitoring section of LAHD takes over the monitoring responsibility as it checks for the required occupancy ratios, and also determines if clients meet income requirements. Compliance monitoring is accomplished through the regular monitoring of a borrower-provided management plan. Owners must provide LAHD with reports on the current tenants and the rent schedule. These are reviewed for compliance by LAHD staff.

City of Los Angeles, California

Housing developments of five or more units receive annual site visits to confirm written reports and to verify the continued maintenance of the building. In addition, LAHD may randomly audit the property owner's financial, tenant and maintenance records to verify compliance with the management plan.

When HUD issues revised income or maximum rent levels, all property owners are notified of the changes by the Occupancy Monitoring section. LAHD maintains a listing of all assisted properties with covenant restrictions.

The LAHD has built numerous key partnerships with City and State agencies that serve the same or provide similar services to the program's target population. Coordination and outreach with these development partners has created efficiencies in the following ways:

- Coordination of Bi-Annual Reporting
- Identification of Key Housing Developments
- Avoid Duplication of Efforts

The following is an abbreviated list of organizations which partner with LAHD:

- Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA)
- Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA)
- Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles (HACLA)
- Community Development Commission for the County of Los Angeles
- Metropolitan Transit Authority (MTA)
- California Debt Limit Allocation Committee (CDLAC)
- California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (CTCAC)
- California Housing Finance Agency (CalHFA)

Occupancy Monitoring

LAHD's Occupancy Monitoring section is responsible for monitoring property owner compliance with regulations, recorded regulatory agreements, and covenants associated with affordable housing. The Section monitors properties funded through LAHD with federal funds, properties funded with LAHD-issued tax-exempt mortgage revenue bonds, and properties developed with land use concessions available under the Planning Department's Affordable Housing Incentives Program or properties subject to Mello Act affordable housing set-asides. Monitoring activities include review of owner compliance with tenant income and rent ceilings as well as ensuring adherence to any underlying federal regulations, such as HUD Housing Quality Standards.

The responsibilities of LAHD's Occupancy Monitoring section have grown over time: the Section now processes approximately 200 new land use covenants per year and is responsible for monitoring some 18,000 units annually. The Department now has a contractor, chosen via a competitive process, to manage a significant portion of the on-going monitoring function.

In-house staff remains responsible for monitoring the Urban Futures contract, for working with the City Attorney's office to generate covenants and regulatory agreements, for calculating and publishing appropriate rent levels, sales prices, and income limits, and for responding to numerous daily inquiries about the regulations and requirements.

Portfolio Management

City of Los Angeles, California

LAHD makes loans to qualified developers and owners of single family and multi-family residential properties to build or rehabilitate housing or to assist households with the purchase of their first home. The Portfolio Management Section is charged with servicing all of LAHD's loans.

Depending upon loan repayment terms and conditions, servicing is required for a period of two to fifty-five years. In addition to collecting loan payments, loan servicing also involves the analysis of the borrowers' requests to: (1) allow new loans to become senior to the City's loans to facilitate refinancing activities (subordination agreements); (2) change repayment terms (amendments); and (3) allow a smaller pay-off to avoid a complete loss by threatened third-party foreclosure (short-pay).

Additional services are provided in cases where the loan is affected by borrower bankruptcy, death (probate cases), or third-party foreclosure. Moreover, Portfolio Management includes loss mitigation activities, which are essential to preserving LAHD's stream of program income. Program Income derived from loan repayments is used to fund additional housing, economic development, social services, public facilities and related administrative costs.

HOME Grant Monitoring

In addition to adhering to CDBG regulations, and administering the HOPWA and ESG programs, LAHD is the administrator of the HOME program. As described above, LAHD follows monitoring standards and procedures to review and fund affordable housing developments to ensure compliance with HUD's program regulations. Here are a few procedures that ensure specific HOME-program requirements:

Monitoring Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDOs)

- CHDOs are evaluated and re-certified by LAHD every year to ensure that organizations continue to meet all of the CHDO requirements.
- The minimum CHDO set-aside of 15% is calculated annually by LAHD, and allocated to CHDO-sponsored housing development projects.
- CHDO oversight by LAHD includes an evaluation of compliance with the HOME maximum purchase price/after-rehab value limits, the FHA 203(b) limits, for owner-occupied and homebuyer properties.

Other HOME Program Monitoring Activities

- LAHD reviews the status of the HOME grant to ensure that the 24-month deadline to commit and 5-year deadline to expend funds are complied with.
- LAHD monitors and reports back on the HOME match requirements to ensure that the 12.5% match requirement is met. An annual report is sent to HUD along with the Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER).
- LAHD also ensures compliance with the minimum HOME subsidy amount of \$1,000 per rental unit as well as the maximum 221(d)(3) per-unit limit subsidy amounts.
- LAHD ensures that HOME-assisted rental units are inspected at the required frequency of inspections, as stated in the HOME regulations, and ensure compliance with Housing Quality Standards.

City of Los Angeles, California

- LAHD also has the responsibility to ensure that homebuyer and rental properties adhere to the applicable period of affordability. During the affordability period, the City will review tenant household incomes and rents for compliance with HOME and other program requirements.

Monitoring Procedures for Third Party Contractors Implementing Housing Programs: Affordable Housing

The process of implementing a housing program with third party contractors begins with a Request for Proposals (RFPs). The RFP specifies program goals, objectives, a schedule, and grant restrictions. The latter includes a description of the eligible client population. One section of the RFP will include the standards for the service or product to be provided.

On a competitive basis, LAHD will select the program design that has the highest potential of meeting the identified need at a reasonable cost. Once a contractor is selected, an agreement is executed. The agreement will include the scope of work, measurable products, and the standards that must be met to receive compensation and the City's remedies when a contractor fails to perform.

All RFPs, Requests for Qualifications (RFQs), and resulting contracts are reviewed and approved by the Mayor and City Council, following analysis by the City Attorney and the City Administrative Officer. All are discussed as agenda items at public meetings, with multiple opportunities for public comment.

LAHD staff is assigned to monitor progress toward goals and compliance of the completed product with the contract standard. Monitoring is accomplished through a combination of reports and invoices from the contractor coupled with on-site reviews by LAHD staff. Several Consolidated Plan programs utilize third party contractors for program implementation, including LAHD's array of rehabilitation loan programs which use both HOME and CDBG funds, the Urgent Repair Program which utilizes CDBG funds, HOPWA which uses both HOPWA and HOME funds, and LAHSA, which uses ESG and CDBG funds.

LAHD serves as the administering agency for the ESG grant. LAHD's oversight monitoring strategy for LAHSA's City-funded homeless programs generally consists of three components: (1) desk-top review, (2) on-site monitoring, and (3) subcontractor monitoring.

As part of its desk review, LAHD staff reviews and analyzes fiscal and program information and reports submitted by LAHSA on an on-going basis. This includes payment invoices for the various city-funded homeless projects which are submitted to LAHD on a monthly basis; client/program performance reports which are submitted quarterly; and program and budget modification requests which are submitted on an as-needed basis for city review and approval. Lastly, staff reviews LAHSA's Single Audit Act report which is prepared by an independent accounting firm and submitted on an annual basis.

Regarding on-site monitoring, LAHD staff conducts an annual, on-site review of LAHSA's administrative, fiscal, and programmatic operations. Additionally, staff attends and actively participates in the monthly meetings of LAHSA's Finance, Contracts and Grants Management subcommittee, the Programs, Planning, and Policy subcommittee, and the LAHSA Commission. Each of these meetings occurs on a different day of the month.

City of Los Angeles, California

Subcontractor monitoring is one of LAHSA's direct responsibilities. However, LAHD incorporates visits to a sampling of LAHSA's city-funded subcontractors into its annual on-site review of LAHSA.

HOPWA Grant Monitoring

LAHD serves as the administering agency for the HOPWA grant. LAHD conducts Remote Monitoring of all HOPWA-funded contracted agencies. Every month, all HOPWA-funded contractors are required to submit monthly client demographic reports along with their invoices for personnel, program, operations and administrative costs. The client demographic reports capture all of the HUD-required information mandated either through the CAPER or the Integrated Disbursement Information System (IDIS) including but not limited to the following; beneficiary information (both clients with HIV/AIDS and other persons in the family unit), gender and age, race/ethnicity, area of the county clients reside, reasons for leaving, mode of transmission, outcomes and narrative.

Another remote monitoring tool used by LAHD is the quarterly assessment. Every three (3) months, a letter is sent to all HOPWA contracted agencies assessing their performance in regards to expenditure rate and client service amounts. Budget amounts and client service goals are stipulated in each individual agency's contract and also in the Consolidated Plan. The minimum threshold for both of the performance measures is ninety (90) percent and is closely monitored at the conclusion of each twelve (12) month program year. Agencies that do not meet the threshold are required to submit a letter of corrective action to LAHD detailing reasons why they could not meet accomplish their goals and actions to be taken to meet the 90% threshold by the end of the program year.

The LAHD has initiated On-Site Monitoring activities at all of the HOPWA project sponsors that includes a comprehensive assessment of client files to ensure all files have an HIV/AIDS diagnosis form and income verification, ensuring at a minimum that all client income is at or below the 80% of the Area Median Income (AMI). Agencies are also monitored to ensure that clients do not have to pay for services (except for rent) and funds are not used for health services.

A project sponsor's Policy and Procedures are also monitored examining such topics as admissions requirements, waiting list procedures, client confidentiality, termination of service, etc. The LAHD contracts with a technical service provider to provide on-site financial monitoring to ensure agencies accounting and invoicing procedures are accurate and in accord with Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-133 and those of the LAHD.

HACLA Program Monitoring

The City entity responsible for monitoring Workforce Investment Act (WIA) funded programs is the Workforce Investment Board (WIB), supported by the Community Development Department (CDD). The WIB maintains various predictors of success and monitors several outcome measures to determine performance, including: customer satisfaction, administrative capability, contribution to annual plan priorities, number of new and carry over customers, placement rates, average hourly wage at placement, retention measurements, credential rate, and leveraged resources.

The CDD monitors HACLA's CDBG contract use of funds and performance. At this time, HACLA is monitored in terms of:

- Residents served per service

City of Los Angeles, California

- Number of households served
- Number of jobs created

HACLA plans its programs in support of WIB and Mayoral priorities, HUD goals, community need, and the City's Annual Action Plan. The U.S. Department of Labor and HUD review annual progress of agencies such as HACLA.

LAHSA Monitoring

A plan for measuring the programmatic performance and financial integrity of contractors is essential for successful contract management. The purpose of monitoring a project is to ensure that the contractor is operating the program in compliance with the rules and regulations of the program. Ongoing monitoring provides an early indication of problems and can help to prevent fraud, waste and mismanagement. Evidence of non-compliance can constitute a violation of the contract which could result in probation, suspension or termination of the contract. LAHSA's monitoring of ESG and CDBG-funded projects consist of both desk and on-site reviews.

Desk Review

The desk review is performed monthly through invoice processing and quarterly through progress reports submitted to LAHSA by the contractor. Contractors are required to report to LAHSA on a monthly basis (for Winter Shelter) and quarterly basis (for other emergency and transitional programs). The report tracks the progress made by the contractor in meeting its goals as specified in its contract.

If any clarification regarding the invoice and/or report is needed, LAHSA staff contact the appropriate agency staff for additional information. In the event that a contractor has not met its contract goals, LAHSA staff must follow through and inquire why the contractor is not achieving its goals. If the contractor does not submit its invoices and/or reports in a timely manner as stated in its contract, LAHSA may put the contractor on probation for a specified period of time.

On-Site Review

The on-site monitoring review requires staff to conduct a visit to the contractor's facility or premises. The purpose of the on-site review is to verify the information reported to LAHSA during the program and determine overall compliance with program regulations and requirements. LAHSA has developed monitoring tools for programmatic and fiscal monitoring which enable staff to perform the monitoring review in a consistent manner.

The programmatic review includes but is not limited to:

- Documentation of homelessness;
- Verification of program outcomes reported to LAHSA;
- Systems in place for data quality assurance; and
- Administrative and management procedures for operating the program.

The financial monitoring review includes but is not limited to:

- Basis of Accounting;
- Financial Reporting and Accounting System;
- Revenue and Cash Receipts;
- Expenditures and Cash Disbursements; and
- Payroll Calculation Schedule, Benefit Calculation Schedule and Non-Personnel Schedule.

The on-site monitoring review is based on the risk level of each contractor. LAHSA performs an annual risk analysis to determine contractor's risk level. The on-site visit entails:

- Issuance of a notification letter to the contractor stating the proposed date of the site visit;
- Provision of documents that need to be completed and returned to LAHSA prior to the site visit;
- An entrance conference conducted on the day of the on-site visit prior to the review of documentation. This conference basically summarizes the scope of the review;
- Documentation of all work papers produced during the on-site visit;
- An exit conference conducted at the end of the on-site visit. The purpose of the exit conference is to present preliminary conclusions resulting from the review and provide the agency with an opportunity to clarify any issues identified or provide additional documentation.

LAHSA staff is required to provide the contractor with a written monitoring report within 25 days of the monitoring visit. The report is typically positive, and recognizes areas where the agency has done a good job or shown significant improvement, as well as pointing out areas where deficiencies exist and corrective action or improvement is required. The monitoring report contains the following:

- A full description and identification of the finding;
- Cites program requirements or applicable regulations that have been violated;
- Specifies corrective actions that must be taken; and
- Includes a deadline for responding to the monitoring report and also for correcting each finding identified in the monitoring report.

Upon receiving the contractor's response, staff evaluates the actions taken. If the actions taken cure or satisfy the finding, staff sends a clearance letter to the contractor. The purpose of the clearance letter is to establish closure of the finding. If the actions taken by the contractor are unsatisfactory, LAHSA informs the contractor in writing and provides additional time for correction of the finding. In the event that the contractor is still unable to comply with the required corrective actions, LAHSA may put the contractor on probation, suspension or terminate its contract with the contractor.

LAHSA meets the planning requirements of the Consolidated Plan through its Continuum of Care as well as Action Plan meetings. As regional plans to end homelessness are implemented, program outcomes are compared to planned outcomes. The results of the evaluation are used to identify successes and challenges articulated in the plans. They are also used to reassess the plans and update them with data-driven strategies.

Monitoring by the Department of Aging

The Department of Aging receives, in addition to CDBG funds, Federal Older Americans Act funds, State Older Californians Act funds, and City General Fund dollars. The Department is accountable to both the Mayor and City Council, and must comply not only with California Department of Aging regulations, state regulations, and federal regulations as a City entity. The Department must also monitor the limited clientele status of its participants in the Aging Services Delivery System to assure compliance with CDBG regulations, as well as the contract goals and standards for administrative and financial management systems jointly established with its agencies.

Through the Management Information System, program activity is measured on a monthly basis, and reported to management. Quarterly, performance measurement reports are prepared and evaluated for each contracted agency in respect to the contracted services.

Project activities are carried out through multiple nonprofit organizations located in the City. Project progress is monitored through routine extensive desk review, which consists of reviewing monthly expenditure and service level reports and quarterly program performance reports. These measurements are in place to ensure that contractors are in compliance with the scope of work and units of service as contracted. On-site field visits are conducted quarterly to ensure quality of service provided and mitigation of problems. When problems occur, corrective action plans are initiated and monitoring staff work with service providers to resolve issues. Monitors also provide technical assistance when the need arises.

The Department of Aging conducts monthly training for both the Activity coordinator and the ADSC directors. It also has established best practices benchmarks.

An Equal Access and Safety Protocol (EASP) program has been developed by the Department which includes a "Standards of Practice" Manuals, program protocol, and protocol tools to assist and facilitate performance by the contracted agencies. Annual training's for program monitoring staff have been instituted to continue development of these tools and ensure regular monitoring.

Monitoring by the Department on Disability, AIDS Coordinator (ACO)

For CDBG-funded programs administered by the ACO, Department on Disability, program effectiveness and efficiency are continuously monitored through periodic reporting, site visits, and staff participation in funded education and awareness events.

Monitoring of Code Enforcement Programs

The Pro-Active Code Enforcement (PACE) program inspection teams of the Department of Building and Safety (DBS) are reviewed and closely monitored at several levels of management to ensure that the program's goals are met.

Similarly, the Nuisance Property Abatement and Demolition program is continually monitored by both the Department's Code Enforcement Bureau and Financial Services Division to ensure funding is accurately and appropriately expended.

Priority Needs Analysis and Strategies (91.215 (a))

1. ***Describe the basis for assigning the priority given to each category of priority needs.***

The City has identified three priorities for the use of Consolidated Plan funds, outlined in the Executive Summary. Because of the high and sustained demand for public services, job development and training, and affordable housing, all three priorities are ranked as high.

2. ***Identify any obstacles to meeting underserved needs.***

Please see the previous sections on gaps in the service delivery system.

Lead-Based Paint (91.215 (g))

1. **Estimate the number of housing units that contain lead-based paint hazards, as defined in section 1004 of the Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992, and are occupied by extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income families.**
2. **Outline actions proposed or being taken to evaluate and reduce lead-based paint hazards and describe how lead based paint hazards will be integrated into housing policies and programs, and how the plan for the reduction of lead-based hazards is related to the extent of lead poisoning and hazards.**

1. Extent of Lead-Based Paint Hazards in the City of Los Angeles

The federal government believes that the principal remaining threat of lead poisoning is in the thousands of tons of lead embedded in the painted walls and backyard soils of the nation’s large stock of pre-1978 buildings. It is in these housing units where lead-based paint is most likely to be found and where deteriorated paint in dust and soil puts young children at risk of lead poisoning.

Analysis of 2000 Census data shows that in Los Angeles there are 1,054,148 housing units built before 1978, when lead in paint for residential use was finally banned by federal law. Of these units, sixty percent are renter-occupied and forty percent owner-occupied. The units that pose the highest risk to occupants are poorly maintained units built before 1960. These pre-1960 units comprise half of the City’s total housing stock, and are 47% renter occupied and 53% owner occupied. Also, Los Angeles has over 116,000 rental units built before 1939, surpassed only by New York and Chicago. This older housing is predominately found in census tracts with low and very low-income families, is likely to be in poor condition, and therefore most likely to contain lead-based paint hazards.

Table 8, Age of Housing Stock by Tenure

Year Built	Number	Owner	Renter	Percentage
Pre-1940	212,967	96,932	116,035	17%
1940-1949	165,455	77,117	88,338	13%
1950-1959	262,257	128,250	134,007	21%
1960-1969	222,135	71,550	150,585	17%
1970-1979	191,335	53,228	138,106	15%
1980 or Newer	221,274	64,902	156,372	17%
Total	1,275,423	491,979	783,443	100%

Source: Census 2000

City of Los Angeles, California

Number of Families <30% of AMI	% of Families at <30	Number of Families <50% of AMI	% of Families at <50%	Number of Families <80% of AMI	% of Families at <80
133,685	17%	245,688	31%	386,559	48%

Source: City of Los Angeles Planning Department

The Housing Authority conducted extensive bulk sampling and XRF Surveys of the lead-based paint hazards in its public housing units in the 1990s. Risk assessments were also conducted of all the conventional public housing developments per HUD Guidelines (Guidelines for the Removal and Control of Lead-Based Paint Hazards in Housing). HACLA identified 8,226 conventional public housing units with various levels of lead-based and or lead containing paint.

Elevated Blood Lead Levels

Lead poisoning in young children causes permanent neurological damage, and becomes a hazard to children and pregnant women when poor maintenance causes it to peel and flake, when leaded dust is generated by the impact or friction between two lead-paint-coated surfaces in windows and doors; and when flakes of lead-based paint accumulate in play areas where there is uncovered earth. Children under age six often ingest lead from leaded dust or soil on their hands. Small children sometimes eat chips of leaded paint. Since lead poisoning is asymptomatic except at very high levels, and cannot be detected unless blood lead tests are performed, it is essential to test for and remediate hazards of lead-based paint before children are poisoned.

From 2004 through July 2007, 1,702 children under age six were identified in the City with blood lead levels of 10 micrograms per deciliter or higher. A blood lead level of 10 micrograms per deciliter of blood or higher is considered elevated. However, research now indicates that brain damage to children probably occurs at very low levels of blood lead, below 10 micrograms per deciliter. Nearly 30% of these children (509) had at least one reading of 20 micrograms per deciliter or higher. (When a child has two consecutive blood lead levels between 15 and 19 micrograms per deciliter, or one test at 20 micrograms per deciliter or above, the child is considered a lead poisoning “case” according to guidelines published by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.)

Table 9, Elevated Blood Levels

Elevated Blood Level (EBL)	2004	2005	2006	January 2007 through July 2007
≥ 10 and ≤19	477	366	218	132
≥ 20	391	48	42	28

* EBL = 10 or more micrograms of lead per deciliter of blood
 Source: Los Angeles County Department of Health Services

2. Both the LAHD and the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles (HACLA) play a major role in evaluation and reduction of lead-based paint hazards. Their programs are described below.

LAHD Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Programs

Since 1999, the Lead-Safe Housing Rule has required testing for lead-based paint and abatement or control of all lead hazards in housing units rehabilitated with federal funds. The housing rehabilitation programs of the Los Angeles Housing Department (LAHD) conduct inspections for lead-based paint in every housing unit that is rehabilitated with federal funds and abate all lead-based paint hazards.

Given inadequate funding for lead hazard control compared to the need, the most efficient protection against lead poisoning is a building code inspection process that addresses lead-based paint hazards, requires mitigation through paint stabilization and lead safe repair work. Since early 2004, LAHD's Systematic Code Enforcement Program (SCEP) has operated an innovative 'lead-safe work practices program' to comply with state law, designed by the local Healthy Homes Collaborative, comprised of 40 community-based and government agencies.

The lead-safe work practices program was awarded "Best Practices" recognition in the U.S. Conference of Mayors' 2004 CUSP Lead-Safe...For Kids' Sake competition and a U.S. EPA Children's Environmental Health Recognition Award in 2006. Central to the program's success have been community-based organizations that conduct outreach in our oldest and poorest neighborhoods. Two HUD Lead Outreach Grants, awarded in 2003 and 2005, plus a Lead-Based Paint Hazard Control Grant awarded in 2005 support the outreach groups. The enforcement of lead-safe work practices requirements is now citywide, and is no longer a pilot limited to certain parts of the City.

LAHD has successfully applied for several HUD grants to mitigate lead-based paint hazards in housing units that meet grant criteria. They include a Lead Hazard Reduction Demonstration Grant, and a Lead-based Paint Hazard Control Grant which also includes outreach. LAHD plans to continue to seek this grant funding to address lead hazards in Los Angeles.

Lead Grant Program funds are used Citywide. To be eligible for funding, properties meet the following requirements:

- Property owners and/or tenants are low-income (80% of area median income);
- The site contains lead-based paint;
- The property being remediated was built prior to 1978, and
- The units are or will be occupied by families with at least one child less than six years of age either residing or frequenting the location.

LAHD targets projects in high-risk lead hazard areas.

High-risk communities contain:

- A concentration of pre-1940 housing;
- Households with young children (less than 6 years old);
- Low-income residents;
- A high percentage of rental units;
- Minority neighborhoods; and
- A significant number of cases reported with elevated blood lead levels;

Lead Hazard Control Program Activities

The Lead Hazard Reduction Grant Program (LHRP) is responsible for inspecting and financing the mitigation of lead hazards in properties receiving assistance from the grant funds, conducts outreach and education, and provides Lead-Related Construction Certification training to employees of the lead remediation contractors used by the program. Additionally, LAHD's Housing Development Division and Home Ownership and Preservation Divisions conduct lead inspections in the properties where rehabilitation activities are conducted.

LHRP staff coordinates its efforts with various health jurisdictions, community-based organizations, public sector partners and other governmental agencies. Staff meets with the Southern California Health and Housing Council (SCHHC) to coordinate childhood lead poisoning prevention efforts. The SCHHC consists of Los Angeles County Department of Health Services representatives, community groups, tenant advocates and others concerned with lead poisoning prevention issues in the greater Los Angeles area. The LHRP arranged for over 100,000 property owners to receive lead-hazard awareness fact sheets sent with mailings by LAHD's Rent Stabilization and Code Enforcement Divisions.

HACLA Lead-Based Paint Hazard Mitigation Activities

As part of its renovation projects, HACLA has conducted encapsulation or paint stabilization as required in particular circumstances. HACLA also has contracted with eight environmental consulting firms to provide lead-based paint identification, testing, hazard identification/screening, risk assessment, hazard control, and remediation design. Consultant suggestions are incorporated into the planning/design for all public housing construction, modernization and rehabilitation projects. Ongoing comprehensive improvements are in process through HACLA's redevelopments and comprehensive modernization efforts.

Between 1990 and 2005, HACLA demolished 2,043 units in five World War II-era Conventional Public Housing Developments: Normont Terrace, Pico Gardens, Aliso Apartments, Aliso Village and Dana Strand Village. With its redevelopment partners, HACLA oversaw the rebuilding of new lead-free units on the first four sites, with new developments: Harbor Village, New Pico Gardens, Las Casitas Rentals and Pueblo Del Sol.

Under HACLA's Comprehensive Modernization plan, units undergo abatement in which either lead-based paint is removed through demolition or stabilized and enclosed as part of comprehensive modernization work. Nearly 920 units are undergoing Comprehensive Modernization:

- Pueblo Del Rio Extension (270 total units; in Phase 6 of 6 in 2007)
- San Fernando Gardens (448 total units; in Phase 7 of 8 in 2007)
- Estrada Courts Extension (200 total units; in Phase 5 of 5 in 2007)

Comprehensive Modernization has been planned for the remaining public housing sites, subject to funding availability. HACLA has improved resident and employee knowledge of lead-based paint hazards through annual awareness training and workshops conducted by State Certified trainers. HACLA has also provided ongoing environmental compliance training to its in-house project managers and construction inspectors along with field superintendents and other construction personnel.