

Recommended HOPE Position

In order to maximize opportunities to support the strategic direction and advance the goals and recommendations articulated in the HOPE Plan, the sub-committee tasked by the IAC at its July 9, 2008 meeting (Judith Christensen, Barbara Pierce, Sandy Council, Deborah Torres, Duane Bay and Debbie Greiff) recommends that the HOPE IAC adopt the following position relative to SB 2 and the related housing element revisions underway throughout the 21 jurisdictions in the county:

- Every jurisdiction submit and get certified an updated housing element that complies with SB 2 in both the letter and spirit of the law through the creation and timely implementation of housing element programs and policies that:
 - Reflect the results of the local housing need analyses;
 - Identify available resources, including land and financing (and where appropriate, potential master leasing sites as recommended as a housing creation strategy in HOPE), in particular for supportive and other housing affordable to extremely low income households; and,
 - Mitigate identified governmental and nongovernmental constraints.
- Every jurisdiction adopt a common methodology for identifying and analyzing the housing and service needs of homeless persons and families as well as assessing the unmet need for emergency shelter, based on the methodological foundation provided in the HOPE Plan and refined/adapted according to best practices to meet the specific requirements of SB 2.
- Every jurisdiction adopt, as a common element within their plans for reducing constraints to developing transitional and supportive housing, a program that ensures zoning treats transitional and supportive housing as a residential use, subject only to those restrictions on residential uses contained in the same type of structure.
- Every jurisdiction adopt, as a common element within their plans for reducing constraints to developing transitional and supportive housing, specific policies that encourage and provide financial and other incentives (e.g., increased per unit/project funding, density bonuses, decrease in parking requirements, etc.) for including supportive housing, and other housing affordable to extremely low income households, in all new affordable housing projects.
- All jurisdictions support the development of a county-wide data system/capacity able to generate accurate information needed to advance the policy goals of HOPE and SB 2, i.e., unduplicated housing and service needs of homeless people, the capacity to meet them, and the success in ending/preventing homelessness. Local jurisdictions should encourage local community-based providers with whom they partner to address the needs of homeless people to participate in emerging HOPE data efforts.
- Every jurisdiction that has not adopted the HOPE Plan, as a specific action of their Housing Element program, hold a study session on and consider endorsing the HOPE Plan.
- In accordance with the HOPE Plan's strategic recommendations, HOPE-affiliated entities (i.e., County departments, cities and other community groups/organizations which have adopted the Plan) be discouraged from providing support for the creation of new emergency shelters (unless jurisdictions choose not to comply with SB 2 which requires them to affirmatively develop and implement a plan to reduce constraints on the development of transitional and supportive housing.)

Appendix A: Development/Property Management Consultants

Organization	City, St	Developments
Chicago Dwellings Association	Chicago, IL	
National Housing Conference	Washington, DC	
david baker + partners	San Francisco, CA	Curran House, Folsom Dore, Delmas Park
San Diego Housing Federation	San Diego, CA	
Community HousingWorks	San Diego, CA	Multiple
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corp	San Francisco, CA	Tenderloin
A. F. Evans Development Company	San Francisco, CA	Tenderloin (Turk)
Chinese Community Housing Corporation	San Francisco, CA	Tenderloin (Turk)
Mercy Charities Housing Development Corporation	San Francisco, CA	Tenderloin (111 Jones)
Catholic Charities of the Archdioceses of San Francisco	San Francisco, CA	Tenderloin (111 Jones)
McCormack Baron Salazar	St. Louis, MO	Ninth Square Redev.
The Related Companies, L.P.	St. Louis, MO	Ninth Square Redev.
Seattle Housing Resource Group	Seattle, WA	Cascade Courts
Change All Souls Housing Corp	Washington, DC	Columbia Heights
St. Vincent de Paul Village	San Diego, CA	Villa Harvey Mandel, Village Place, Joan Kroc Center

Appendix B: Affordable Housing Comparables

Characteristics of Best Practice High-Density Affordable Housing Models	Curran House	201 Turk Street	111 Jones Street	Bryson Apartments	Oak Terrace	Columbia Heights Vill	Genesis Apartments	Father Joe's Villages (16th & Market)
Meets User Needs								
More bedrooms	•	•				•	•	•
Large kitchens	•	•	•			•		•
Extra storage space	•		•				•	•
Laundry room on each floor with camera monitor								
Sufficiently large community room to accommodate group activities and entertainment/games for youth	•	•	•		•	•	•	•
Outdoor space with basketball hoops			•					•
Library space								•
Barbecue equipment in open area								•
Understands and Responds to its Context								
Central entry way	•	•	•	•	•	•		•
Sufficient sunlight for outdoor play areas	•	•	•		•	•	•	•
Minimal unpatrolled, hidden areas where youth can congregate without supervision	•	•			•	•	•	•
Outdoor and common space should not be accessible by the general public	•	•	•	•	•		•	•
Common space should have controlled access, probably at the same place as the building entry	•	•	•		•		•	•
Visual access to community space allows for tenants to self-monitor	•		•		•			•
Enhances its Neighborhood								
Attractive design	•	•	•		•	•	•	•
Fits in with neighborhood character in height, scale and form	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Adequate green space and landscaping	•	•	•		some	•	•	•
Is Built to Last								
Affective Maintenance of play and common area equipment		•	•		•	•	•	•
Affordable yet quality materials	•		•		•	•	•	•
Avoids long hallways	•			•	•			
Energy and environmental efficiency through upgraded windows, insulation and equipment	•		•		•	•	•	•
Neighborhood Context and Demographics								
Mixed use and diverse income levels within the building		•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Located in mixed income neighborhoods			•	•	•	•	•	•
Nearby open park space, grassy area for physical activity			•	•		•		•
Easy access to public transit	•	•	•		•	•	•	•
Located near employment centers	•	•			•	•	•	•
Nearby grocery store, pharmacy, health care, schools and library	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•