



**DRAFT
SUBSTANTIAL AMENDMENT
TO
SAN FRANCISCO'S
2011-2012 ACTION PLAN

FOR
EMERGENCY SOLUTIONS GRANT (ESG)
FUNDING**

**For Public Review Between
March 22, 2012 and April 20, 2012**

Mayor's Office of Housing
1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
Phone: 415-701-5500
Fax: 415-701-5501
www.sfgov.org/moh

Welcome to San Francisco's DRAFT Substantial Amendment to the 2011-2012 Action Plan.

NOTES FOR PUBLIC REVIEW and COMMENT:

- 1) This draft document is available for public review and comment between March 22, 2012 and April 20, 2012.
- 2) You may review the on-line version or review a hard copy of the draft document at the following locations:
 - Offices of MOH, 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor;
 - Main Branch of the SF Public Library, 100 Larkin Street, 5th Floor, Government Information Center.
- 3) Staff welcomes your comments in writing. They may be directed to: MOH, Action Plan Staff, 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103. Your comments will be directed to the appropriate agency. In your comment, please be specific about your issue and refer to a specific section of the Draft Plan, if appropriate.
- 4) The close of the public comment period is April 20, 2012.
- 5) The public is invited to provide testimony on the Draft Substantial Amendment at a public hearing on Wednesday, March 28, 2012 at 4:00pm. The hearing will take place at 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 2nd Floor Atrium Conference Room.
- 6) Thank you in advance for your participation in this process.
- 7) For more information, please call (415) 701-5500.

I. Background and Purpose

The Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act of 2009 (HEARTH Act), enacted into law on May 20, 2009, revised the Emergency Shelter Grants program and renamed it as the Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG) program. On December 5, 2011, the interim regulation for the Emergency Solutions Grants program was published (Interim Rule), and on January 4, 2012, the revised ESG regulations went into effect.

ESG program regulations were still being revised when Fiscal Year 2011-2012 ESG funds became available. HUD chose to release 2011-2012 ESG funds in a two-stage allocation process. The first allocation was made available immediately, to avoid a lapse in funding for existing ESG activities. In the first round, San Francisco received \$902,146, which was available on July 1, 2011, the beginning of San Francisco's 2011-2012 program year. This first allocation was subject to the Emergency Shelter Grants regulations in effect at that time.

The grant amounts for the second ESG allocation, which reflect a national increase in ESG funding from FY 2010 to FY 2011, were posted on HUD's website at the same time that HUD posted the Interim Rule for the revised ESG program. For the second ESG allocation, San Francisco will receive an additional \$507,457, resulting in a total FY 2011 ESG allocation of \$1,409,603. The funds provided in the second allocation will be subject to all of the requirements under the revised ESG regulations.

To receive the second allocation of funds for the FY 2011 ESG grant, San Francisco is required to submit, and obtain HUD approval of, a substantial amendment to the FY 2011 Action Plan, in accordance with San Francisco's Citizen Participation Plan and 24 CFR Part 91, as amended by the Interim Rule. The substantial amendment must be submitted to HUD no later than May 15, 2012.

II. Summary of Consultation Process

The San Francisco Local Homeless Coordinating Board (Local Board) is the lead entity for the San Francisco Continuum of Care. The Local Board is staffed by the City's Human Services Agency (HSA). HSA staff has informed and updated the Local Board over the past two years about the changes to the ESG program. After the Interim rule for the revised ESG program was published, staff from the Mayor's Office of Housing (MOH), the lead agency for the City's ESG program, has been working closely with HSA staff and the Local Board to plan for the revised ESG program. MOH staff presented its funding priorities to the Local Board's funding subcommittee and then to the full board for comments as part of its allocation process.

MOH staff also met with HSA staff to review their existing performance standards that had been developed for other McKinney-Vento funded programs and HPRP funded programs to serve as a basis for the ESG performance standards. Finally, MOH staff is coordinating training for its ESG recipients on the operations of HMIS with HSA's HMIS coordinator, and will be sharing expenses for HMIS with HSA, based on the numbers of users established through the software agreement created between HSA and the HMIS software developer.

III. Summary of Citizen Participation Process

The Citizen's Committee on Community Development (CCCD) is a nine-member advisory body charged with promoting citizen participation for CDBG and ESG programs. Members are appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors, and represent a broad cross-section of communities served by the two programs. The CCCD holds public hearings, assists with the identification of community needs and the formulation of program priorities, and makes funding recommendations for the CDBG and ESG programs to the Mayor. The CCCD has regular monthly public meetings.

Public Input on Needs

In preparation for the development of the 2010-2014 Consolidated Plan, during the fall of 2009, MOH, along with OEWD and SFRA, convened 10 public hearings in key neighborhoods, including each of the six HUD-approved Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas, to collect detailed public input on specific community needs. In addition, a separate hearing was convened specifically with homeless providers and individuals to receive comments specifically on homeless strategies.

In preparation for the 2012-2013 program year (in which the FY 2011 second ESG allocation will be spent), the CCCD, MOH, OEWD and SFRA conducted two public hearings in October 2011 to solicit feedback and ideas from residents and the community at large concerning the five-year Consolidated Plan. The public meetings were accessible to persons with disabilities and translation services were made available to the public.

Notice of the hearings was published in the San Francisco Examiner, in neighborhood-based newspapers, and on MOH's website. MOH also sent out a mass mailing of the public notice. The mailing list consisted of more than 1,000 non-profit organizations, neighborhood-based groups and public agencies, including the San Francisco Housing Authority. Persons who did not want to speak at a public hearing were encouraged to provide written comments to MOH.

Public Input on the Draft Substantial Amendment to the 2011-2012 Action Plan

The Draft Substantial Amendment to the 2011-2012 Action Plan, which includes the preliminary funding recommendations for the FY 2011 second ESG allocation, is available to the public for review and comment between March 22, 2012 and April 20, 2012. The public has access to review a hard copy of the Draft Substantial Amendment at the Main Branch of the Public Library and at the MOH office. The document is also posted on the MOH website. The CCCD, MOH and OEWD will hold a public hearing on March 28, 2012 to receive comments on the Draft 2012-2013 Action Plan and the Draft Substantial Amendment to the 2011-2012 Action Plan and the preliminary funding recommendations that are included in the two documents. Persons who do not want to speak at the public hearing are encouraged to provide written comments to MOH. A summary of the comments received within the public review period will be included in the Substantial Amendment to the 2011-2012 Action Plan that will be submitted to HUD.

The City published a notice in the San Francisco Chronicle on March 10, March 21 and April 7, 2012 informing the public of the March 28th public hearing and the availability of the draft documents for review and comment. Notices were also published in neighborhood-based newspapers and posted on the websites of MOH and OEWD. In addition, MOH sent out a mass mailing of the public notice. A copy of the public notice can be found in the Appendix of the 2012-2013 Action Plan.

The 2012-2013 budget and the preliminary funding recommendations will be considered in the Budget and Finance Committee of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in late April. The supporting resolutions will be considered by the full Board of Supervisors. These meetings include additional opportunities for public comment.

IV. Match

The ESG program requires a match in an amount that equals the amount of ESG funds provided by HUD. Matching contributions may be obtained from any source, including any federal resource other than the ESG program, as well as state, local and private sources. According to the ESG regulations, the City may comply with this requirement by providing the matching funds itself, or through matching funds provided by any ESG sub-recipient. For program year 2012-2013, a total of \$ 14,324,894 in non-ESG funds will be provided by ESG sub-recipient to support the emergency shelter, rapid re-housing and homeless prevention activities that are supported by ESG funding. The ESG-funded agencies will provide the following matching amounts:

Agency Name	Matching Dollars
AIDS Housing Alliance	\$152,230
Asian Women's Shelter	\$1,008,831
Bar Assoc. of SF Volunteer Legal Services	\$124,083
Central City Hospitality House	\$349,749
Community Awareness & Treatment Services	\$201,319
Compass Family Services	\$875,043
Dolores Street Community Services	\$1,089,314
Episcopal Community Services of SF	\$2,246,549
Eviction Defense Collaborative, Inc.	\$536,282
Eviction Defense Collaborative, Inc.	\$744,289
Gum Moon Residence Hall	\$65,433
Hamilton Family Center, Inc	\$2,146,683
Hamilton Family Center, Inc	\$1,456,943
La Casa de las Madres	\$1,180,910
Larkin Street Youth Services	\$1,588,818
Larkin Street Youth Services	\$320,748
Providence Foundation	\$9,900
Tenderloin Housing Clinic, Inc.	\$380,000
	\$14,324,894

V. Proposed Activities and Overall Budget

A. Proposed Activities

2nd Round 2011-2012 ESG Program

The following is a list of funding recommendations for the Second Round of the 2011-2012 ESG program. The list of recommended projects is organized by five-year goals and objectives that are in the 2010-2014 Consolidated Plan. All of the ESG-recommended projects meet Goal 3: Formerly homeless individuals and families are stable, supported and live in permanent housing. While a recommended project may meet more than one objective, it is only listed under its primary objective.

Goal 3: Formerly homeless individuals and families are stable, supported and live in permanent housing

Objective 1: Decrease the incidence of homelessness by avoiding tenant evictions and foreclosures and increasing housing stability

Agency Name	Project Description	2012-2013 Funding Recommendation
AIDS Housing Alliance	Homeless and eviction prevention services primarily for persons with HIV/AIDS	\$21,366
Bar Assoc. of SF Volunteer Legal Services	Legal representation in eviction cases for indigent clients at immediate risk of becoming homeless	\$18,000
Catholic Charities CYO	Tenant based rental assistance	\$90,000
Compass Family Services	Homeless and eviction prevention services and housing counseling for individuals and families	\$10,000
Eviction Defense Collaborative, Inc.	Counseling and emergency legal assistance for tenants threatened with eviction	\$10,000
Eviction Defense Collaborative, Inc.	Tenant based rental assistance for low-income residents at risk of eviction	\$70,000
Hamilton Family Center, Inc	Tenant based rental assistance and housing counseling for individuals and families	\$28,000
Tenderloin Housing Clinic, Inc.	Legal counseling and representation for tenants threatened with eviction	\$17,500
		\$264,866

Objective 2: Stabilize homeless individuals through outreach, services and residency in emergency and transitional shelters that lead to accessing and maintaining permanent housing

Agency Name	Project Description	2012-2013 Funding Recommendation
Asian Women's Shelter	Intensive case management, counseling, advocacy and emergency shelter services primarily for Asian and Pacific Islander battered women and their	\$20,400

Agency Name	Project Description	2012-2013 Funding Recommendation
	children	
Central City Hospitality House	Shelter beds for homeless men	\$13,000
Community Awareness & Treatment Services	Shelter beds and services for homeless women	\$6,000
Dolores Street Community Services	Shelter beds and case management services primarily for homeless men	\$41,600
Episcopal Community Services of SF	Shelter beds for homeless men and women	\$13,000
Gum Moon Residence Hall	Transitional housing program for Asian immigrant domestic violence women	\$11,000
Hamilton Family Center, Inc	Shelter beds and case management services primarily for families	\$10,000
La Casa de las Madres	Safe bednights, basic needs provision, and support to stabilize housing options, and DIC provides case management, planning, and follow-up services to stabilize lives	\$50,000
Larkin Street Youth Services	Shelter beds and services to homeless youth	\$10,800
Larkin Street Youth Services	Workforce readiness and employment program for transitional aged youth	\$11,600
Providence Foundation	Shelter beds and services for homeless persons	\$9,000
The Mary Elizabeth Inn	Shelter beds for homeless women	\$10,000
YMCA of San Francisco (Bayview)	Day shelter for homeless individuals	\$10,000
		\$216,400

General Administration

Agency Name	Project Description	2012-2013 Funding Recommendation
Mayor's Office of Housing	General ESG administration	\$60,613
Mayor's Office of Housing	HMIS	\$578
		\$61,191

TOTAL 2011-2012 Second Round ESG: \$542,457

B. Discussion of Funding Priorities

MOH proposes to utilize its second allocation of ESG funding to support a mix of rapid re-housing services and subsidies, homelessness prevention services and subsidies, and emergency shelter operations and essential services. In 2012-13, MOH will increase the percentage of funds directed towards rapid re-housing and homeless prevention services from 25% to 47%, decreasing the percentage allocated towards shelter from 70% to 42%, and dedicating .1% to HMIS. This aligns with the stated HUD priority to emphasize rapid re-housing and homeless prevention with the additional second allocation.

MOH's ESG program explicitly supports the objectives in the *Opening Doors* report, most specifically Objective 3, "Provide affordable housing to people experiencing or most at risk of homelessness," and Objective 10, "Transform homeless services to crisis response systems that prevent homelessness and rapidly return people who experience homelessness to stable housing."

Objective 3's strategies include supporting additional rental housing subsidies through federal resources to individuals and families experiencing or most at risk of homeless, so that household pay no more than 30 percent of their income for housing. This strategy is supported by the City's continued funding of rental subsidies and move-in expenses for families and individuals facing eviction and those homeless families and individuals who need rapid re-housing.

Objective 10 states that temporary residential programs such as shelters are an integral part of the crisis response system, and should be effective in helping people experiencing homelessness successfully and quickly achieve the outcome of long-term housing. These programs must be readily accessible to unaccompanied youth and families of all configurations, and address the needs of non—English speaking clients as well as unaccompanied LGBT youth. This objective also includes as a strategy that best practices learned from the Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing Program be utilized when implementing the Emergency solutions Grant.

Obstacles to meeting underserved needs for San Francisco are related to the extent of need in the City and the diversity of the population of the City. Major obstacles are limited funds, language barriers and gaps in institutional structure.

Due to high housing costs, economic conditions, poverty and unemployment, a significantly large number of low-income San Franciscans are not economically self sufficient. The limited resources that are available to support programs and services that help individuals and families to become self sufficient are inadequate. The situation is made worse by reductions in funding at the federal, state and local government levels at the same time as needs are increasing due to the weak economy. To minimize the impact of the City's limited resources, MOH and OEWD have increased our strategic coordination with other City departments in an effort to avoid duplication of services and to maximize the leveraging of federal, state and local dollars.

Another major obstacle is language barriers. San Francisco has historically been a haven for immigrants. Language barriers impact immigrants' abilities to access necessities such as employment, healthcare, and police protection. Many adult immigrants and refugees are not necessarily literate in their own native languages, and struggle to master the complexities of English. In particular, sophisticated transactions such as legal issues or governmental forms may be confusing. Of all San Franciscans over the age of five, 46% speak a language other than English at home, with the largest language groups being Chinese, Spanish, Tagalog and Russian. Fifty percent of the Asian population are of limited English proficiency (LEP), meaning that they speak English less than "very well." Thirty percent of Asian children are identified as LEP. Fourteen percent of San Francisco households are "linguistically isolated" with no one in the household over the age of 14 indicating that they speak English "well" or "very well". Among Asian households, that number increases to 35%. At the individual level, about 25% of all San Franciscans in the 2008 survey indicated that they did not speak English "very well", which is the third highest percentage in the state of California, and the 10th highest percentage of any county in the entire United States.

In response to this particular obstacle, San Francisco uses CDBG resources to provide language-appropriate services to linguistically and culturally isolated individuals and families, including translation services, legal services, vocational ESL instruction, information and referral, and case management. Services are provided through CDBG funding to neighborhood-based multi-service community centers.

The large number of non-profit organizations serving low-income communities in San Francisco is both an asset and a challenge. With a long history of serving the community, the sheer number of non-profits leads to increased competition for limited resources. Conversely, the benefits of a rich variety of social service organizations often translates to more community-based and culturally competent services for low-income residents. Lack of organizational capacity of non-profits is another gap in institutional structure. In response, the City is engaged in an ongoing effort to work with non-profits in organizational and programmatic capacity building to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of service delivery.

It is the City’s policy to coordinate community development and housing activities among its departments. Because this works involves many City departments, coordination and information sharing across the various departments are challenges. City staff meets on a regular and as-needed basis with colleagues from other City departments to overcome gaps in institutional structure.

C. Detailed Budget

FY 2011 Detailed Budget Table					
First Allocation		\$902,146	FY 2011 <u>Emergency Shelter Grants/Emergency Solutions</u> <u>Grants</u> <u>Program Allocations</u>		
Second Allocation		\$507,457			
Grant Amount		\$1,409,603			
Total Administration		\$105,720			
			First Allocation	Second Allocation	Total Fiscal Year 2011
	Eligible Activities	Activity Amount	Reprogrammed Amount	Activity Amount	Activity Amount
Emergency Shelter Grants Program	Homeless Assistance	\$605,600	\$0		\$605,600
	<i>Rehab/Conversion</i>				\$0
	<i>Operations</i>	\$363,200			\$363,200
	<i>Essential Services</i>	\$242,400			\$242,400
	Homelessness Prevention	\$216,439			\$216,439
	Administration	\$45,107			\$45,107
	Emergency Shelter Grants Subtotal	\$867,146	\$0		\$867,146
Emergency Solutions Grants Program	Emergency Shelter**			\$226,400	\$226,400
	<i>Renovation**</i>			\$0	\$0
	<i>Operation**</i>			\$165,800	\$165,800
	<i>Essential Service**</i>			\$60,600	\$60,600
	<i>URA Assistance**</i>			\$0	\$0

Street Outreach - Essential Services**			\$0	\$0
HMIS			\$578	\$578
Rapid Re-housing		\$17,500	\$83,683	\$101,183
<i>Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services</i>		\$8,750	\$38,691	\$47,441
<i>Tenant-Based Rental Assistance</i>		\$8,750	\$44,992	\$53,742
<i>Project-Based Rental Assistance</i>				\$0
Homelessness Prevention		\$17,500	\$136,183	\$153,683
<i>Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services</i>		\$8,750	\$91,191	\$99,941
<i>Tenant-Based Rental Assistance</i>		\$8,750	\$44,992	\$53,742
<i>Project-Based Rental Assistance</i>				\$0
Administration			\$60,613	\$60,613
Emergency Solutions Grants Subtotal		\$35,000	\$507,457	\$542,457
		Total Grant Amount:		\$1,409,603

**Allowable only if the amount obligated for homeless assistance activities using funds from the first allocation is less than the expenditure limit for emergency shelter and street outreach activities (see Section IILB. of this Notice).

VI. Written Standards for Provision of ESG Assistance

A. Standard policies and procedures for evaluating individuals' and families' eligibility for assistance under ESG

Standards are based on eligibility forms that will be completed by for all clients receiving services. A comprehensive intake form based on HMIS requirements will be implemented. In addition, depending on the service needed, a homeless prevention form or a homeless verification form will be completed.

B. Policies and procedures for coordination among emergency shelter providers, essential service providers, homelessness prevention and rapid re-housing assistance providers, other homeless assistance providers, and mainstream service and housing providers

Shelter providers meet bimonthly by program type (single adult and family). There are similar bimonthly meetings for homeless prevention/rental assistance programs, rental subsidy/rapid re-housing programs, and family supportive housing. Project Homeless Connect also brings together providers and City services through its quarterly City-wide convening.

C. Policies and procedures for determining and prioritizing which eligible families and individuals will receive homelessness prevention assistance and which eligible families and individuals will receive rapid re-housing assistance

Eligible clients must be extremely low-income (30% AMI for ESG) and have at least one other risk factor as reference on the Screening tool. Families in shelter and on the centralized intake wait list for shelter are prioritized.

D. Standards for determining the share of rent and utilities costs that each program participant must pay, if any, while receiving homelessness prevention or rapid re-housing assistance

Based on policies developed through the HPRP program and other City-funded homeless prevention and rapid re-housing assistance programs, MOH has established the following standards:

For homeless prevention programs and rapid re-housing assistance programs providing subsidies, participants cannot pay less than 50% of their income toward rent or more than 85% of their income toward rent. When calculating the rent-to-income ratio, MOH will use net income, including food stamps.

The shallow rent subsidy amount will be determined by each household's income to rent ratio. The monthly lease agreement the household has entered into will be calculated against each household's monthly income. The goal will be to use the rental subsidy to bring the household income to rent ratio within a 40% to 50% range. However, the maximum subsidy may put some households within the 50 to 60% range.

E. Standards for determining how long a particular program participant will be provided with rental assistance and whether and how the amount of that assistance will be adjusted over time

Programs will be permitted to decide or propose whether the amount of subsidy will remain the same until the client can successfully transition into permanent housing, or whether it will decrease proportionally as income increases over the length of the subsidy. Subsidies are capped at 18 months.

F. Standards for determining the type, amount, and duration of housing stabilization and/or relocation services to provide a program participant, including the limits, if any, on the homelessness prevention or rapid re-housing assistance that each program participant may receive, such as the maximum amount of assistance, maximum number of months the program participants receives assistance; or the maximum number of times the program participants may receive assistance

MOH staff reviewed the existing standards created for HPRP grants and other existing City grants for homeless prevention and rapid re-housing assistance. Based on that review, MOH is in the process of developing the following guidelines which will be put out for further discussion and public input:

- Participants may receive housing and relocation stabilization services for up to 18 months.
- Only short and medium term subsidies and back rent payments count toward the 18 month time limit for rental assistance – security/utility deposits, utility payments, and moving costs do not count.
- Rapid re-housing assistance and homeless prevention subsidies are capped at \$800 per month.
- With the exception of \$800 per month maximum allowed for short and medium term subsidy payments, there is no limit on the dollar amount of financial assistance a participant can seek from a program, as long as the maximum total of 18 months of rental assistance allowable is not exceeded.
- Funds may be used for up to 18 months of utility payments, including up to 6 months of utility payments in arrears, for each program participant.
- Homeless prevention/rental assistance grants are \$1500 maximum.
- Clients can be assisted by programs twice in 5 years. This requirement will be put into place starting with services received on or after July 1, 2012.

VII. Process for Making Sub-awards

In San Francisco, MOH is the lead agency responsible for allocating four federal funding sources, Community Development Block Grant, Emergency Solutions Grant, HOME Investment Partnership and Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS funds for community development and housing activities. The process is outlined below:

- In partnership with the Citizen's Committee on Community Development (CCCD), MOH and the Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) conduct multiple public hearings to solicit citizen input on community needs for allocating funds from four federal sources, including ESG;
- MOH and OEWD issue Requests for Proposals and hold technical assistance workshops to provide information on the application and the review process;
- MOH and OEWD staff review applications and make funding recommendations to the CCCD;
- CCCD makes funding recommendations to the Mayor;
- In partnership with the CCCD, MOH and OEWD conduct a public hearing to solicit input on the preliminary recommendations;
- Funding recommendations go through the San Francisco Board of Supervisors review process;
- The Board of Supervisors and the Mayor approve the funding recommendations; and
- MOH submits annual Action Plan application for HUD consideration.

VIII. Homeless Participation Requirement

MOH staff currently coordinates with HSA staff and the Local Board to ensure that the perspective of homeless and formerly homeless individuals and families are integrated into the goals and objectives of the Consolidated Plan. MOH will be developing a more comprehensive plan to incorporate input from these individuals and families during the 2012-13 program year.

IX. Performance Standards

ESG activities have historically been evaluated by reviewing the progress towards monthly workplan activity goals through MOH's real-time online reporting system, as well as through annual program monitoring visits and review of progress towards performance indicators contained within the Consolidated Plan. In the 2012-13 program year, all ESG grantees will be required to conform their reporting to HMIS requirements. MOH will be working with HSA and the Local Board to review its performance standards and make any refinements necessary to maximize the ability to effectively achieve the expected community outcomes.

X. Written standards required for recipients who are eligible and decide to use part of the second allocation of FY 2011 funds for emergency shelter and street outreach activities

A. If funding essential services related to street outreach with second allocation: standards for targeting and providing these services

Street outreach is currently not being funded with ESG funds.

B. If funding any emergency shelter activities with second allocation: policies and procedures for admission, diversion, referral and discharge by emergency shelters assisted under ESG, including standards regarding length of stay, if any, and safeguards to meet the safety and shelter needs of special populations and persons with the highest barriers to housing

Families:

- Families seeking shelter must go through Compass Connecting Point, the centralized intake agency. They will meet with a counselor for an assessment and be placed on the wait list for an opening in one of three HSA-funded 3-6 month full service shelters. Placements occur as rooms become available.
- Basic eligibility: A family is eligible for the shelter waiting list if the client is (1) an adult (2) with custody of a minor child and/or is currently pregnant, and (3) is currently homeless.
- A family can be placed on the priority list for shelter placement if any one member of the family has a documented medical or mental health condition that will be exacerbated by staying in an emergency shelter.

Single Adults:

Set-aside beds are available for CAAP clients (because of the Care Not Cash legislation), veterans (referred by Swords to Plowshares), and clients referred by the SF Homeless Outreach Team. Any set-aside beds that are unoccupied at 4:30pm become open to the general population.

For single adults seeking shelter, reservations for the same day are obtained in person at CHANGES (the city's adult emergency shelter reservation system) reservation stations as sleeping units (beds, mats or cots) are available.

The CHANGES reservation stations do not determine or change the length of reservation possible but will offer what is available at the time of the request.

- One- to three-day reservations are made when the sleeping unit is available for that period but has either an on-going reservation or a designated use that makes it unavailable for a longer reservation. These reservations cannot be extended at the shelter.
- 90-day reservations are made whenever a sleeping unit is available for at least that period of time.

C. If funding essential services related to emergency shelter with second allocation: policies and procedures for assessing, prioritizing, and reassessing individuals' and families' needs for essential services related to emergency shelter.

All 3-6 month family shelters have case managers to assess need for services, and participation in case management is mandatory. Single adult shelters use a roving case management team model in which clients with substance abuse and/or mental health conditions are prioritized for services. This program is called SF START and is under a DPH contract.