

Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report for the year 2006

A summary and evaluation of how the King County Consortium used its federal Housing and Community Development funds in 2006 to help carry out the goals and objectives identified in its Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan for 2005-2009.

March 30, 2007

Submitted to:

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Community Planning and Development
909 First Avenue, Suite 200
Seattle, Washington 98104

Submitted by:

King County Housing and Community Development Program
Community Services Division, Department of Community and Human Services
Exchange Building, 821 Second Avenue, Suite 500
Seattle, Washington 98104

The King County Consortium 2006

The King County Consortium is an interjurisdictional partnership of King County and the cities and towns of Algona, Auburn, Beaux Arts, Bellevue, Black Diamond, Bothell, Burien, Carnation, Clyde Hill, Covington, Des Moines, Duvall, Enumclaw, Federal Way, Issaquah, Hunts Point, Kenmore, Kent, Kirkland, Lake Forest Park, Maple Valley, Mercer Island, Newcastle, North Bend, Pacific, Redmond, Renton, Sammamish, SeaTac, Shoreline, Skykomish, Snoqualmie, Tukwila, Woodinville, and Yarrow Point.

Ron Sims, King County Executive

Joint Recommendations Committee 2006 (governance body of the Consortium)

The Honorable Ava Frisinger, Mayor, City of Issaquah, Chair
The Honorable Howard Botts, Mayor, City of Black Diamond
Councilmember Jeanne Burbidge, City of Federal Way
Councilmember Terry Anderson, City of SeaTac
Councilmember Rich Gustafson, City of Shoreline
Michael Davolio, Director of Planning, Building and Community, City of Auburn
David Baker, Deputy Mayor, City of Kenmore
Dan Stroh, Planning Director, City of Bellevue, Alternate
Katherin Johnson, Human Services Manager, City of Kent
Terry Higashiyama, Community Services Administrator, City of Renton, Alternate
Adrienne Quinn, Director of Housing, City of Seattle
Maura Brueger, Senior Advisor for Federal Relations, King County
Jackie MacLean, Director, King County Department of Community and Human Services
Stephanie Warden, Director, King County Department of Development and Environmental Services, Co-chair

King County Department of Community and Human Services

Jackie MacLean, Director, Department of Community and Human Services
Linda Peterson, Division Director, Community Services Division
Cheryl Markham, Acting Program Manager, Housing and Community Development Program

Project Staff: Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report

Carole Antoncich, Homeless Housing Coordinator
Eileen Bleeker, Housing Finance Program Planner
Cheryl Markham, Affordable Housing Planning and Development Coordinator
Florence Nabagenyi, Fiscal Coordinator
Kathy Tremper, Community Development Coordinator

Contact Person Regarding Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report:

If you have questions or concerns about this report, please contact:

Kathy Tremper, Community Development Coordinator
King County Housing and Community Development Program
821 Second Avenue, Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98104-1958

Telephone: 206-205-6431

Fax: (206) 296-0229

TTY Relay: 711

Email: kathy.tremper@metrokc.gov

**This report is available in alternative formats
upon request.**

Contents

| | | |
|------|---|-----------|
| I. | Introduction | 2 |
| II. | Executive Summary | 3 |
| III. | Program Accomplishments | 6 |
| | A. Goal One: Ensure, Decent Affordable Housing | 6 |
| | <u>Affordable Housing Objective 1</u> - Preserve and expand supply of affordable rental housing available to low- and moderate-income households, including households with special needs. | |
| | <u>Affordable Housing Objective 2</u> - Preserve the housing of low- to moderate-income home owners, and provide programs for low- and moderate-income households that are prepared to become first-time home owners. | |
| | <u>Affordable Housing Objective 3</u> - King County will plan for and support fair housing strategies and initiatives designed to affirmatively further fair housing and increase access to housing, and to housing programs and services for low- to moderate-income households. | |
| | B. Goal Two: Ending Homelessness | 18 |
| | <u>Homeless Objective 1</u> - Support programs that prevent homelessness. | |
| | <u>Homeless Objective 2</u> - Support a range of permanent affordable housing options for homeless households. | |
| | <u>Homeless Objective 3</u> - Provide programs and services to address the temporary housing needs and other needs of households when homelessness occurs. | |
| | <u>Homeless Objective 4</u> - King County will approach homelessness planning and coordination as a regional issue, and work with the Committee to End Homelessness, cities, housing funders, community agencies and homeless people to achieve such coordinated efforts. | |
| | C. Goal Three: Establish and Maintain a Suitable Living Environment and Expand Economic Opportunities | 23 |
| | <u>Community/Economic Development Objective 1</u> - Improve the ability of health and human service agencies to serve our low- to moderate-income residents effectively and efficiently. | |
| | <u>Community/Economic Development Objective 2</u> - Improve the living environment in low- and moderate-income neighborhoods/communities in accordance with jurisdictions' adopted Comprehensive Plans and the Countywide Planning Policies. | |
| | <u>Community/Economic Development Objective 3</u> - Expand economic opportunities for low- to moderate-income persons. | |
| IV. | Public Housing and Resident Initiatives | 29 |
| V. | Resources Made Available | 33 |
| | A. Formula Grant Programs - Table 1 | 33 |
| | B. Other Public and Private Resources for Housing Activities - Table 2 | 34 |
| | C. Community/Economic Development Resources for Non-Housing Activities - Table 3 ... | 38 |
| VI. | Evaluation of Actions, Program Changes, and Certifications of Consistency with the Consolidated Plan | 40 |
| | A. Evaluation of Housing Programs | 40 |
| | 1. Homeless Housing Program | |
| | 2. Housing Repair Program | |
| | 3. Housing Finance Program | |
| | 4. Relocation | |
| | 5. Affordable Housing Planning and Development Section | |
| | B. Evaluation of Relocation Activities | 43 |
| | C. Evaluation of Community Development | 43 |
| | 1. Timeliness | |
| | 2. Consortium Re-structured | |

| | | |
|--------------|--|-----------|
| 3. | Environmental Review | |
| D. | Evaluation of Economic Development Program | 43 |
| 1. | Float Loan | |
| 2. | Section 108 Loan | |
| E. | Monitoring | 43 |
| 1. | Community Development Monitoring Update | |
| 2. | Homeless Housing Monitoring Update | |
| F. | Modifications to the Action Plan | 46 |
| G. | Certifications of Consistency with the Consolidated Plan | 46 |
| H. | Other Measures of Progress | 46 |
| I. | Summary of Citizen Comments Received | 46 |
| 1. | Community Development Planning | |
| 2. | Homeless Continuum of Care Planning | |
| 3. | Web Site Availability | |
| J. | Public Input on Annual Performance Report | 47 |
| | | |
| VII. | Attachments | 48 |
| | Attachment A: Financial Summary Report | 48 |
| | Attachment B: HOME Report | 51 |
| | Attachment C: Tables (4-17) | 57 |
| | Table 4: Households Assisted by Type | |
| | Table 5: Households Assisted with Housing by Income Level | |
| | Table 6: Goals for Average Number of Renter Households to be Served Annually | |
| | Table 7: Homeless Households and Individuals Served in Shelters & Transitional Housing | |
| | Table 8: Production Summary: 2006 Allocations by King County Consortium | |
| | Table 9: Housing Allocations by Objectives | |
| | Table 10: Number of Persons Served in Public Services | |
| | Table 11: Number of Active Public Improvements Projects | |
| | Table 12: Number of Active Community Facility Projects | |
| | Table 13: Number of Businesses & Persons Assisted in Economic Development Activities | |
| | Table 14: Projects/Units Rehabilitated with CDBG Funds Completed | |
| | Table 15: Employment Support Services Delivered by CDBG 2006 | |
| | Table 16: Non-Housing Community Development Allocations by Objectives | |
| | Table 17: Households and Individuals Served by Race/Ethnic Group in King County | |
| VIII. | Attachment D: Project Activity Performance Report | 68 |

I. Introduction

Purpose of the Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER)

The King County Consortium is pleased to present the *Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER)* for the program year 2006. Each year, King County reports to the general public and to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) about how it used federal funds available for housing and community development in the past year. This CAPER details what funds were made available in 2006, and how they were used to help carry out the priority needs and strategies identified in the King County Consortium's *Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan for 2005-2009 (Consolidated Plan)*.

To learn more about the housing and community development needs in King County outside Seattle, and the priorities for investment of federal funds in 2006, please refer to the Consortium's Consolidated Plan. The Consolidated Plan is a unified approach to planning for and addressing the housing and community development needs of low-income people in King County outside Seattle. Required by HUD, the plan consolidates planning for three federal programs under which King County receives annual grants based on a formula: Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnership (HOME), and Emergency Shelter Grant Program (ESG). The Consolidated Plan also provides guidance regarding the use of federal McKinney funds for homelessness.¹ Together, the formula grant programs plus program income funds provide over \$15.8 million annually for affordable housing development, community facilities, infrastructure improvements, and human services, especially homeless assistance.

Geographic Area Covered by the CAPER

King County prepares the Consolidated Plan and the CAPER on behalf of the King County Consortium, a special partnership between King County and most of the suburban cities and towns. Two configurations of the Consortium are recognized: for sharing CDBG funds, the CDBG Consortium comprises 34 cities and towns, plus the unincorporated areas of the County. It excludes Seattle, Bellevue, Kent and Auburn, which receive CDBG directly from the federal government, and the cities of Medina, Milton and New Castle. For sharing HOME and ESG funds, the Consortium is the same as the CDBG Consortium except that it includes the cities of Bellevue, Kent and Auburn.

Program-Specific Information Available Upon Request

The CAPER is designed to provide a meaningful overview of the King County Consortium's progress in addressing affordable housing needs, in ending homelessness, and in improving the living environment and expanding the economic opportunities for low-income residents. Detailed information about specific projects supported with federal funds is located in Attachment D.

¹ McKinney homeless assistance funds are not provided to the Consortium as a formula grant, but rather based on national competition, so the funds are not under the direct control of the Consortium. However, the Consortium has the ability to strongly influence the federal funding decisions via its guidance in the Consolidated Plan and its role in coordinating the local applications for the annual national competition.

II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

King County's community stakeholders helped establish goals and objectives for the use of its Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME and other federal "formula" funds. King County receives about \$12 million of these formula funds from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development each year, which is supplemented by program income, chiefly from loan repayments. The county administers on behalf of the county and participating cities and towns (the Consortium).

The goals and objectives that our stakeholders helped establish are described in the King County Consortium's Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan for 2005–2009. There are specific objectives, strategies and annual performance targets for each of three major goals. Consistent with the intent of the federal funds, the three major goals are:

Goal One: Ensure Decent, Affordable Housing

Goal Two: End Homelessness

Goal Three: Establish and Maintain a Suitable Living Environment and Expand Economic Opportunities

This is a summary of King County's performance in meeting its housing and community development goals, strategies and objectives during the year 2006.

Goal One: Provide decent affordable housing to King County's communities.

In 2006, the King County Consortium provided funding for housing strategies for very low-, low- and moderate-income households (households at or below 30%, 50% and 80% of the area median income). Strategies include: expanding and preserving the supply of rental and owner housing affordable to these income levels, preserving the housing of home owners at these income levels, providing first-time homebuyer opportunities for households at these income levels and affirmatively furthering fair housing.

430 units of new affordable rental housing were funded; 218 of those units are targeted to persons with special needs, including the elderly and persons with disabilities; **296** of those units were designated for households with very low-incomes at or below 30% of area median income.

80 units of existing affordable rental housing were rehabilitated with installation of a fire sprinkler system.

10 renters with disabilities were assisted with accessibility modifications and life safety equipment for their existing rental housing.

33 units of new ownership housing were funded; 4 of the units are for households at or below 65% of area median income and 29 of the units are for households at or below 80% of area median income.

406 homes owned by very low- to moderate-income households were repaired or improved, improving the health and safety of the housing stock in King County.

In addition, County staff worked with the **private for-profit market on covenant agreements** in master planned developments that will lead to the production of **102 units** of rental housing affordable to households with incomes under 80% of the area median income, **33 units** affordable to households with income between 80% and 120%

of area median income, and **3 units** affordable to households from 100% to 120% of area median income in Redmond.

Goal Two: End Homelessness in King County.

In 2006 the King County Consortium continued to work with the regional Committee to End Homelessness to align and coordinate our program with the goals and objectives of the Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness in King County. Strategies include homeless prevention, temporary housing and services and permanent supportive housing; strategies will increasingly move towards more non time-limited supportive housing in order to substantially reduce homelessness, particularly chronic homelessness.

272 households received homelessness prevention services through the King County Housing Stability Program to stabilize them in their permanent housing; 94% of the households that received these services were still housed 6 months later.

An additional **168 households** received eviction prevention services through other funded projects.

487 permanent supportive housing units were provided for homeless households with a history of mental illness, substance abuse and/or AIDS.

139,137 bednights of emergency shelter were provided to homeless households who were safe and sheltered from the elements.

174,015 units of nights of transitional housing were provided to increase the housing stability of homeless households.

Goal Three: Provide a suitable living environment and economic opportunities for very-low to moderate-income persons and communities.

In 2006, the King County Consortium provided funding for human service, community facility, and public improvement strategies to benefit very low- to moderate-income households and communities; as well as economic development strategies to increase the viability of existing commercial or industrial areas in very low- to moderate-income communities and to increase employment opportunities for very low- to moderate-income persons.

10 community facility projects were completed, and an additional 8 funded projects were underway to be completed in 2007 or beyond; projects involve acquisition, construction, expansion, repair and improvement of community facilities that provide vital human services.

59,510 persons received essential human services including senior services, child care services, emergency food, clothing and financial assistance, health care, youth services and domestic violence victim services. An **additional 469 persons received employment support services** to enable them to get or keep a job.

6 public improvement projects were completed and an additional 10 funded projects were underway to be completed in 2007 or beyond; projects involve park improvements, street and sidewalk improvements, water and septic system improvements, and assistance with assessments for very low- to moderate-income households.

3 small and/or disadvantaged businesses received financial assistance with façade improvements.

18 small and/or disadvantaged businesses received technical assistance to improve their viability.

469 low- to moderate-income persons were served with employment services through two community based development organizations.

III. Program Accomplishments

A. Goal One: Ensure Decent, Affordable Housing

There are three objectives under the goal of ensuring decent, affordable housing. They relate to 1) rental housing, 2) home ownership, and 3) fair housing choice.

Goal One Long-term Outcome: There will be an adequate supply of affordable housing in the Consortium for low- and moderate-income households, so that fewer households are paying more than they can afford.

Goal One Indicator: The 2010 Census will show that, as compared to the 2000 Census, the percentage of households at or below 50 percent of Area Median Income (AMI) who are severely cost-burdened will have been reduced.

Affordable Housing Objective 1

Preserve and expand the supply of affordable rental housing available to low- and moderate-income households, including households with special needs.

Strategy 1A:

Make capital funds available for the new construction of good quality, permanent affordable rental housing for low- and moderate-income households; for the acquisition of existing rental housing and the rehabilitation of that housing into good quality, permanent affordable rental housing for low- and moderate-income households; and for the acquisition of land on which to build affordable and/or mixed-income rental housing; and for the long term preservation of existing affordable rental housing units.

Short-term Outputs and Outcomes for Affordable Housing Objective

1) AH 1A. Short-term Annual Outputs

Average number of rental units to be funded for new construction, acquisition and rehabilitation, and preservation of affordable housing annually:

Projected Output: Three hundred units of rental housing; at least 50 of the 300 units of rental housing shall be targeted to persons/households with special needs. (Special needs include the elderly, frail elderly, homeless households and persons with disabilities.)

Actual Output: Through the annual process of competitively awarding funds from a variety of federal, state, and local sources, the county's housing finance program has facilitated the creation and preservation of 430 new units of permanent housing, of which 218 (46 percent) were designated for persons or households with special needs. Of the total, 296 units (63 percent) were designated for persons or households with incomes at or below 30 percent of AMI.

The following projects were funded to increase the supply of affordable rental housing by creating four hundred thirty units:

- Community Homes – Community Homes’ Houses five & six – Acquisition and rehabilitation of two homes to provide ten beds of permanent housing for homeless individuals with developmental disabilities.
- Mental Health Housing Foundation – Tall Firs Cottages – Construction of 7 single family homes to provide 25 beds of permanent rental housing for individuals with mental illness.
- Foundation for the Challenged – FFC Community Housing II – Acquisition and rehabilitation of 4 homes to provide 12 beds for individuals with developmental disabilities.
- Hopelink – Duvall Family Housing - Construction of eight units of housing for families that are homeless or transitioning from homelessness.
- Downtown Action to Save Housing – Fifth & Williams Apartments – Acquisition and construction of 91 units of affordable rental housing for families in Renton. Six of the units will serve as “transition in place” for victims of domestic violence.
- St. Andrew’s Housing Group – Mine Hill Apartments – Acquisition and rehabilitation of 28 units of very low-income housing in Issaquah.
- Downtown Emergency Services Center – Tenth Avenue Supportive Housing – Acquisition and rehabilitation of 75 studios to provide homeless individuals, including those disabled by mental illness and/or substance abuse.
- Plymouth Housing Group – Third & Blanchard Building – Construction of 92 studios to provide permanent housing for homeless seniors.
- Archdiocesan Housing Authority – Holden Street Family Housing – Construction of 26 apartments to offer “transition in place” housing for formerly homeless families. Two units will be set aside for disabled households.
- Urban League – Colman School - Acquisition and rehabilitation of Colman School to provide 36 units of housing for individuals and small families. Ten units will be reserved for individuals or families who are either homeless or at risk of homelessness.
- Jubilee Women’s Center – Jubilee House – Rehabilitation of existing housing to create 27 beds for homeless women whose incomes fall below 30 percent of the area median income. The majority of women served suffer mental illness or some type of physical disability. Others have been victims of domestic violence.

Six units of housing for extremely low-income individuals with developmental disabilities were funded with King County Developmental Disabilities Division (KCDDD) Housing Innovations for Persons with Developmental Disabilities funds through the City of Seattle Low-Income Housing Program. The units are in non-profit multi-family affordable housing projects in Seattle. Four of these units will be for persons with dual diagnoses of mental illness and developmental disability who are chronically homeless.

Projected Output: Five Hundred new renter households will be served annually by rental units completed during the year

Actual Output: In 2006, six housing projects were completed, occupied, and filed their first annual report. These projects were funded with federal and local funds. The projects totaled 163 units of affordable rental housing. In 2006, they served 383 renter households, most with incomes at or below 30 percent of AMI². See Table 6.

These activities are a few of those accomplished that address the following Objective in the Community Planning and Development (CPD) Outcome Performance Measurement System

² This output did not meet the projected output because King County is changing the way we measure this output from the past, accordingly, we will be amending our Consolidated Plan for this output.

- Objective: Decent Housing
- Outcome: Affordability

Strategy 1B:

Make capital funds available to rehabilitate existing rental units for low- and moderate-income households. This strategy is different from acquisition and rehabilitation in Strategy A. This strategy addresses rehabilitation needs of existing affordable non-profit housing, or existing for-profit housing where the owner is willing to restrict the affordability of the rents for a specified period of time. It includes making modifications to the rental unit(s) of low- to moderate-income residents with a disability in order that the units will be accessible.

1) AH 1B. Short-term Annual Output

Projected Output: Five to one hundred units will receive funding for rehabilitation and/or modification annually.

Actual Output: Five units of existing affordable rental housing received funding for rehabilitation. Ten units were modified through the Home Access Modification (HAM) program.

- Life Enrichment Options – Sammamish House – Rehabilitation of an existing house serving five adults with developmentally disabilities.

2) AH 1B. Short-term Outcome

Projected Outcome: The tenant(s) have an improved quality of life due to the improvements /rehabilitation and/or modification(s).

Actual Outcome: HAM financed accessibility modifications to ten rental units housing persons with special needs. HAM also provides some life safety equipment for hearing impaired individuals (ex. smoke/fire detectors for hearing impaired). Surveys completed by five of the ten households that received financial assistance to repair their homes through September 30, 2006 indicate:

- Provides support I need to continue living independently – 80 percent;
- Solves a health or safety hazard – 40 percent;
- Improves my quality of life – 40 percent

These activities are a few of those accomplished that address the following Objective in the Community Planning and Development (CPD) Outcome Performance Measurement System

- Objective: Decent Housing
- Outcomes: Affordability/Accessibility
(Designation depends on goal of particular project).

Strategy 1C:

King County staff will work in partnership and/or coordination with consortium cities staff and community stakeholder organizations on the following and other housing-related activities. These activities do not have annual output or outcome goals and will be reported on, as progress occurs, in narrative fashion:

Projected Performance: The consortium will support the creation of affordable rental housing in the private market through zoning and incentive programs in all consortium jurisdictions, such as impact fee waivers, density bonuses, inclusionary zoning and allocation of surplus county or city property for affordable housing; county staff will provide technical assistance, as needed, to help consortium cities meet countywide planning policy goals for affordable housing.

Actual Performance:

1) Affordable rental units that will be created by for-profit developers: Completed covenants for Trilogy Parcels V-8, V-9, V-10 & V-11, securing the affordability of 102 units for households earning 80 percent of AMI or less, 33 units for households earning 80-100 percent of AMI and 3 units for households earning 100-120 percent of Percent. These units may be developed as rental units, ownership units or a combination of both types of tenure.

2) Assisted with the disposition of surplus property and Transit Oriented Development (TOD) projects at the North Stadium Parking Lot which will create at least 100 affordable rental housing units.

3) Assisted with efforts to revise the portion of the King County Code prioritizing the sale of surplus property for affordable housing development.

Projected Performance: King County will provide housing development technical assistance to non-profit organizations, with priority for assistance given to organizations that are relatively new to housing development or organizations that wish to expand their services into King County outside the City of Seattle and will serve the highest priority populations.

Actual Performance: Community Homes, a small nonprofit that operates adult family homes for persons with developmental disabilities was assisted with applications to secure funding for the development of homes number 5 and 6, and with the pieces of work necessary to acquire and rehabilitate the homes for their intended use. Assistance was also provided to help the organization move forward on their strategic plan with a new executive director on board, and to transition to a new development consultant for 2007.

Friends of Youth and Hopelink, two nonprofit organizations based in east King County, continued to receive technical assistance with the next steps in developing a community service center and housing for homeless families. Staff coordinated the development plan for the project and helped the two organizations transition to a new development consultant for 2007.

St. Thomas Housing Group, a newly formed non-profit organization, was assisted with technical assistance to submit applications for funding to develop a group home for men transitioning from shelters on the eastside.

Projected Performance: King County will provide a credit enhancement program that promotes the development of housing for low- to moderate-income households, and explore other innovative methods of assisting with the financing of affordable housing.

Actual Performance: King County worked extensively with the King County Housing Authority in early 2006 to finish negotiations on a credit enhancement commitment for \$35 million. King County guarantees bonds used to finance affordable rental units (non public housing units) at KCHA's Greenbridge HOPE VI redevelopment. Negotiations were concluded in 2006 with King County credit enhancing up to \$35 million in construction and permanent financing for the project. Credit enhancement will save the project an anticipated \$2.7 million.

KCHA requested an additional \$15 million in credit enhancement for construction financing on the Greenbridge HOPE VI redevelopment late in 2006. Negotiations are continuing and will be concluded in early 2007 for this additional credit enhancement commitment.

Projected Performance: King County will collaborate with the King County Housing Authority to support the planning process and development of the Greenbridge Hope VI mixed-income housing and community development project at the Park Lake Homes site in White Center. This work may be done in conjunction with a neighborhood revitalization strategy to be developed with the White Center community (see Goal #3, Objective #4).

Actual Performance: King County went under contract with the King County Housing Authority for \$2.0 million in HOME funding to assist in the construction of 39 HOME-regulated units of housing for low income households at their Greenbridge HOPE VI redevelopment. Funds were used in the construction of the Seola Crossing phase of KCHA's HOPE VI redevelopment and should be fully occupied in early 2007.

King County staff continued to be actively involved in the King County Housing Authority's Greenbridge Community Task Force in 2006.

Projected Performance: King County will support legislation and other initiatives designed to increase funding and other support for affordable housing; and will coordinate with statewide and community-based housing agencies to provide housing education for the public and policy makers in order to build support to increase the housing funding base and to enhance acceptance of affordable housing.

Actual Performance: HFP helped to successfully secure \$120 million for the State Housing Trust Fund. Of this amount, an estimated \$48 million will be invested in projects within King County.

Projected Performance: King County will work with local housing authorities to provide mutual support and coordination on affordable housing planning issues; on applications for various programs, such as rental assistance and vouchers targeted to persons with disabilities; on planning issues such as the allocation of project-based vouchers that complement the consortium's priorities; on efforts to educate and inform landlords about the benefits of participating in the Section 8 program; and on the development of other programs that may benefit our region.

Actual Performance: King County staff worked with the King County Housing Authority (KCHA), other local housing authorities and other local funders to mutually plan for adequate housing for the neediest members of the community, and to coordinate housing authority vouchers with capital and services funding in order to completely fund high priority housing projects. King County staff also worked with KCHA to improve performance of the Housing Access and Services Program for persons with disabilities.

Projected Performance: King County will continue to work with housing funders, mainstream service systems (such as the developmental disabilities system, the drug/alcohol system, and the mental health system), and housing referral, information and advocacy organizations to plan for community-based housing options for persons with special needs; to develop supportive housing plans and partnerships for populations that need enhanced housing support in order to be successful in permanent housing; to advocate for funding for the operations and maintenance of housing for very low-income households and households with special needs, and for the services needed for supportive housing.

Actual Performance: King County staff worked with Region 4 of the Washington State Division of Developmental Disabilities (DDD) and the King County Developmental Disabilities Division (KCDDD) in order to have coordination between our housing program and DD mainstream system services. This work of planners in the HCD program has resulted in a tenant referral agreement and housing oversight relationships, which ensure that the highest-priority needs are being met in a way that is consistent with the responsibilities of the public funders. King County Housing Finance Program funding decisions for DD housing projects are predicated on explicit

endorsement from State DDD for the project concept and are conditioned with the requirement that a commitment to the agreements referred to above is accepted by all parties.

King County housing staff also coordinate with the Mental Health Chemical Abuse and Dependency Services Division (MHCADS) when considering applications for projects which will serve MHCADS clients with a high level of need for support.

Projected Performance: King County HCD will partner with the KCDDD to provide housing program(s) that expand community-based housing options for persons with developmental disabilities and will explore similar opportunities with systems that serve other special needs populations.

Actual Performance:

- Two units of housing for extremely low-income individuals with developmental disabilities were funded with KCDDD Housing Innovations for Persons with Developmental Disabilities (HIPDD) funds through the City of Seattle Low-Income Housing Program. The units are in a nonprofit multi-family affordable housing project in Seattle.
- King County and KCDDD worked on the following housing programs in 2006 to expand community-based housing options for persons with developmental disabilities.
 - King County HCD and KCDDD coordinated an emergency housing assistance program to provide homelessness prevention assistance to adults and families on the Washington State DDD caseload who are in jeopardy of losing their housing. In 2006, this program served 56 adults and families with an average award of \$664 per grantee.
 - King County HCD and KCDDD extended its pilot program that assists young adults with supports and housing vouchers so that they can live independently in the community. The program contracts with WISE for planning and support services, with ongoing independent living support provided by work study students. This pilot program served five individuals in 2006.
 - King County HCD and KCDDD identified strategies to improve access to accessible housing units for persons with disabilities who are seeking housing in the private market in King County.
 - King County HCD and KCDDD collaborated to provide housing information and referral to clients on the DDD caseload, including referral to affordable housing and information on ways to create affordable housing for family members with developmental disabilities.

Projected Performance: King County will coordinate, to the extent feasible, with housing funders, and housing information and advocacy organizations to streamline funding applications, contracting and monitoring processes.

Actual Performance: King County Housing Finance Program participates quarterly with local and state public funders on issues regarding annual compliance monitoring and physical property inspections. This collaboration has resulted in a combined annual report form and more efficient use of staff time involved in the inspection of jointly funded projects. The HFP will begin in 2006 to work with the King County Housing Authority to determine what efficiency gains may be realized by comparing inspection requirements for jointly funded/subsidized projects.

Projected Performance: King County will continue to support affordable housing projects that:

- Are environmentally sound (“green” housing); and

- Are sustainable; and
- Are projected to save on long-term costs for the owner and the residents; and
- Are designed to accommodate all persons, regardless of their level of mobility; and
- Allow residents to age in their home.
- This program will support but may go beyond LEED environmental standards, as well as “universal design”³ standards for affordable housing project applicants that volunteer to participate. The consortium will coordinate efforts to implement this program such that participating projects do not encounter barriers from local codes that may conflict with the adopted standards, or delays in contracting.

Actual Performance: In 2006, the county required applicants for housing funds to use life-cycle cost analysis for selected components of planned housing projects in order to justify assumptions and specifications incorporated into project design. This requirement will be extended in 2007 funding rounds and the county will offer both training and technical information to prospective applicants as needed to support their efforts to design and build more sustainable housing projects.

In 2006, King County gained expertise in the application of Universal Design (UD) in affordable housing by requiring particular UD features in housing funded with one of our local funding sources, the Housing Innovations for Persons with Developmental Disabilities (HIPDD) fund. When projects receive HIPDD funding, developers are given a checklist of recommended universal design features and work with King County staff to finalize which of these features will be included in their project. This pilot UD program is providing King County with information about the appropriate UD elements to include in a UD incentive program for all affordable housing funded by King County.

Projected Performance: King County may work with housing and community stakeholders to find and implement ways to reduce the move-in cost burden barrier to securing permanent housing for low- to moderate-income households, such as a security deposit bond program.

Actual Performance: Actual Performance: In 2006, King County staff worked with a subcommittee of the Committee to End Homelessness to propose a model program that will reduce barriers to entering rental housing for low-income homeless households, including the use of enhanced security deposits and other risk mitigation tools that will provide protections for participating landlords.

Projected Performance: King County may encourage and support housing developers in applying for HUD Section 202 and 811 programs to provide housing for seniors and persons with disabilities.

Actual Performance: No performance to report this year.

Projected Performance: King County may explore land banking for the construction of affordable rental housing, especially in areas targeted for future transit and/or slated for higher density development.

Actual Performance: No performance to report this year.

³ For more information about Universal Design see Affordable Housing Objective #3, Strategy 3.B.

Affordable Housing Objective 2

Preserve the housing of low- to moderate-income home owners, and provide programs for low- and moderate-income households that are prepared to become first-time home owners.

Strategy 2A:

Make capital funds available to repair and/or improve, including accessibility improvements, the existing stock of homes owned by low- to moderate-income households (includes individual condominiums, town homes, and mobile/manufactured homes). Programs funded under this strategy include, but are not limited to, major home repair, emergency home repair, and mobile home repair.

Short-term Outputs and Outcomes for Affordable Housing Objective

1) AH 2A. Short-term Annual Output

Projected Output: Three hundred homes improved/repared annually.

Projected Output: Three hundred low- to moderate-income home owners have their existing home repaired and/or improved.

Actual Output: A total of 406 homes were repaired. Of those, 158 homes were repaired through King County's Housing Repair Program and 248 homes received minor home repairs in Renton, SeaTac, Tukwila and Shoreline including: electrical, plumbing, carpentry and disability access improvements. These programs enabled homeowners to maintain their health and safety and assisted them in preserving their homes.

2) AH 2A. Short-term Outcome

Projected Outcome: Three hundred low- to moderate-income home owners per year have an improved quality of life, with little or no cost. Through improvements to their housing, some home owners will be able to continue to live independently in their home.

Actual Outcome:

Surveys were completed by 52 housing repair clients through September 30, 2006, and they responded as follows:

- Keeps my home in good shape – 78 percent;
- Solves a health or safety hazard – 61 percent;
- Improves my quality of life – 67 percent; and
- Greatly improves my feeling of safety – 52 percent

These activities are a few of those accomplished that address the following Objective in the Community Planning and Development (CPD) Outcome Performance Measurement System

- Objective: Decent Housing
- Outcomes: Affordability/Accessibility

Strategy 2B:

Make funds available for first-time home buyer opportunities, including education, housing counseling and down payment assistance for low- to moderate-income households who are prepared to purchase their first home; especially households who are under-served in the ownership housing market, including households with special needs.

Short-term Outputs and Outcomes for Affordable Housing Objective

1) AH 2B. Short-term Annual Output

Projected Output: Homebuyer services and assistance provided to 10-35 households per year.

Actual Output:

1) Ownership Units: HFP awarded \$950,000 of 2006 HOME funds to the Low Income Housing Institute (LIHI) to create 33 units of ownership housing, 4 units for individuals and families with incomes at or below 65 percent of AMI and the rest with incomes at or below 80 percent of AMI. The HOME investment will facilitate the creation of a land trust which will own the land under the housing in perpetuity, making the housing affordable to low income home buyers for the long term.

2) Homebuyer Assistance:

- King County has partnered with the Washington State Housing Finance Commission (the Finance Commission) and A Regional Coalition for Housing (ARCH) to provide downpayment assistance to first-time homebuyers in East King County using \$300,000 in 2003 and 2004 ADDI funds. The contract was finalized in September of 2006 and one loan had closed by year end 2006.
- The increasing cost of homes in South King County has hindered the purchase of homes to low income first-time homebuyers under the First Homes Program, administered by HomeSight.

1) AH 2B. Outcomes

Projected Outcome: Success as a homeowner and satisfaction with homeownership over time.

Projected Outcome: The homeowner has built some equity in their home, and in some cases has increased their equity because the home has increased in value over time.

Actual Outcome: Will be measured in year five.

These activities are a few of those accomplished that address the following Objective in the Community Planning and Development (CPD) Outcome Performance Measurement System

- Objective: Decent Housing
- Outcomes: Affordability

Strategy 2C:

King County staff will work in partnership and/or coordination with consortium city staff and community stakeholder organizations on the following activities. These activities do not have annual output or outcome goals, and will be reported on as progress occurs, in narrative fashion.

Projected Performance: King County will support the creation of a range affordable home ownership opportunities through zoning and incentive programs in all consortium jurisdictions, such as impact fee waivers, density bonuses, inclusionary zoning and the allocation of surplus county or city property; county staff will provide technical assistance, as needed, to help consortium cities meet Countywide Planning Policy (CPP) goals for affordable housing.

Actual Performance:

- 1) Affordable ownership units that will be created by for-profit developers:
 - a) Completed covenant for Trilogy Division 10, securing twelve units of housing for sale to households at 110-120 percent AMI.
 - b) Completed covenants for Trilogy Parcels V-8, V-9, V-10 & V-11, securing affordability of 102 units for households earning 80 percent of AMI or less, 33 units for households earning 80-100 percent of AMI and 3 units for households earning 100-120 percent of median income. These units may be developed as rental units, ownership units or a combination of both types of tenure.
 - c) Completed two density bonus agreements securing affordability of two ownership units for households earning 80 percent of median income.
- 2) Assisted with the disposition of surplus property and TOD projects at the Brooks Village, North Stadium Parking Lot and 140th Street sites which have the potential to create at least 70 affordable ownership housing units.
- 3) Assisted with efforts to revise the portion of the King County Code prioritizing the sale of surplus property for affordable housing development.

Projected Performance: King County will support the Seattle-King County Coalition for Responsible Lending (SKCCRL) in combating the devastating effects of predatory lending in the King County region and in working with other organizations to coordinate efforts, such as the King County Individual Development Account (IDA) collaborative. King County will work with the SKCCRL to provide funds for predatory lending counseling and/or gap financing for eligible clients seeking a “rescue” loan who have been a victim of predatory lending and are at risk of losing their home.

Actual Performance: King County staff continued to have a leadership role with the SKCCRL, including: 1) completing a senior outreach program which distributed approximately 700 brochures to seniors throughout King County 2) working with coalition members to create a rescue loan program for the King County region.

Projected Performance: King County will support the acquisition and preservation of mobile home parks, when feasible, to protect low- and moderate-income mobile home owners who might otherwise be displaced due to redevelopment. King County will explore a comprehensive strategy to further extend the long-term affordability of mobile home parks that currently have an agreement with the County, including strategies to have parks owned by park residents.

Actual Performance: No performance to report at this time.

Projected Performance: King County will work with special needs populations and stakeholders to develop homeownership opportunities for special needs households for whom home ownership is appropriate.

Actual Performance: King County HCD and KCDDD funded a homeownership program for persons with disabilities in King County. King County is now working with the KCHA to

determine the feasibility of allowing existing Section 8 voucher holders to use their vouchers towards their monthly first mortgage payment through the homeownership program.

Projected Performance: King County will support the work of the KCHA to ensure that there are affordable ownership opportunities for low- and moderate-income households, especially Park Lake Homes tenants who are prepared for home ownership, in the Greenbridge HOPE VI project in White Center.

Actual Performance: King County continues to participate on the King County Housing Authority Greenbridge Community Task Force and works with the Greenbridge staff to ensure that there are first-time home ownership opportunities for low- to moderate-income households, including Park Lake Homes tenants who are prepared to be home owners.

Projected Performance: King County will work with housing authorities and community agencies to provide targeted outreach to federally subsidized tenants and other low- to moderate-income tenants who are prepared to work towards the goal of achieving home ownership.

Actual Performance: Under King County's Home Choice Plus – ARCH program (the County's program with the Finance Commission and ARCH to provide downpayment assistance to first-time homebuyers in East King County) ARCH has conducted outreach to identify potential first-time homebuyers among:

- residents of public housing through King County Housing Authority's Family Self Sufficiency Program;
- persons working with IDAs which are coordinated by Hopelink, the YWCA and Urban League;
- residents of manufactured housing in mobile home parks; and
- new immigrants to King County served by the International District Housing Alliance.

Projected Performance: King County may work with community stakeholders to plan for and support programs that reduce the cost of homeownership for low- to moderate-income households, such as land trusts, limited-equity co-ops, and sweat equity programs.

Actual Performance: King County has awarded HOME funds to the Low Income Housing Institute to create a community land trust and develop 33 units of ownership housing for first-time homebuyers.

Projected Performance: King County may advocate for a waiver or regulatory change to enable the consortium to assist low- to moderate-income condo owners with the payment of common area repair assessments that exceed regular homeowner dues and are unaffordable to the low- to moderate-income condo owner.

Actual Performance: No performance to report at this time.

Projected Performance: King County may explore land banking for the acquisition of land on which to construct affordable ownership housing, especially land that is in an area targeted for future transit and/or slated for higher density development.

These activities are a few of those accomplished that address the following Objective in the Community Planning and Development (CPD) Outcome Performance Measurement System

- Objective: Decent Housing

- Outcomes: Availability/Affordability/Accessibility
(Designation depends on goal of particular project).

Actual Performance: No performance to report this year.

Projected Performance: King County may work with local housing authorities, other funders and financial institutions to explore the development of Section 8 homeownership program(s) in our region. A Section 8 homeownership program would work with households that are prepared to become homeowners to use a Section 8 voucher to help subsidize the purchase of a home rather than ongoing rent.

Actual Performance: King County began discussions with housing authority staff this year, however, this use of vouchers may not be a priority at this time due to the regional focus on ending homelessness.

Affordable Housing Objective 3

King County will plan for and support fair housing strategies and initiatives designed to affirmatively further fair housing and increase access to housing, and to housing programs and services for low- to moderate-income households. King County staff may work with Consortium city staff and community stakeholder agencies on these fair housing strategies. These strategies do not have annual output or outcome goals, and will be reported on, as progress occurs, in narrative fashion.

Strategy 3A:

Projected Performance: The King County Consortium will develop a new Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (AI) in 2006, as well as a new Fair Housing Action Plan. The consortium's current Fair Housing Action Plan activities have been updated annually as we have learned about new fair housing issues from community agencies and fair housing enforcement agencies, but we are in need of a new comprehensive analysis and plan to guide our activities.

Actual Performance: King County completed its Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice and adopted a

Strategy 3B:

Projected Performance: King County and the consortium will continue to carry out initiatives and activities that further fair housing in the region.

- Fair housing education and outreach;;
- Fair housing forums, conferences and meetings;
- Fair housing enforcement;
- Fair housing technical assistance.

Actual Performance:

- Education and outreach activities:

- King County HCD staff partnered with City of Seattle OH staff to sponsor a special training covering fair housing in the development and operation of homeless housing;
- King County staff partnered with the KCOOCR to provide a fair housing training focussing on reasonable accomodations for landlords participating in the United Way's Ready to Rent program;
- KCOOCR, in partnership with other regional fair housing agencies, developed a disability access resources guide for rental owners and managers;
- KCOOCR, in partnership with other regional fair housing agencies, conducted bi-monthly fair housing workshops and seminars and published a quarterly newsletter;
- KCOOCR distributed fair housing posters to landlords;
- KCOOCR, in partnership with other regional fair housing agencies, placed all of the fair housing partners materials into CD format;
- KCOOCR expanded its extensive web site, including the addition of fair housing information on its Kids web site;
- Forums, Conferences and Meetings:
 - KCOOCR worked in partnership with a coalition of civil rights agencies to sponsor the 20th Annual Tacoma Fair Housing Conference, providing many of the workshops at the conference.
 - KCOOCR provided fair housing information at a booth at 5 housing related events.
 - KCOOCR attends regular meetings of fair housing enforcement agencies and fair housing partners in Western WA and WA State.
- The King County Office of Civil Rights (KCOOCR) continued to provide fair housing enforcement services in unincorporated King County and to coordinate with the Washington State Human Rights Commission for enforcement in the rest of King County outside Seattle: Enforcement data for 2006 in unincorporated King County:
 - 6 cases were filed and 9 cases were resolved, including cases filed in prior years.
- HCD staff provided fair housing technical assistance to the King County Developmental Disabilities Division regarding reasonable accommodation issues for their clients, and assisted members of the public with fair housing referrals and information.

These activities are a few of those accomplished that address the following Objective in the Community Planning and Development (CPD) Outcome Performance Measurement System

- Objective: Decent Housing
- Outcomes: Affordability /Accessibility

B. Goal Two: Ending Homelessness

King County and the consortium will develop a long-term outcome(s) for our goal to end homeless in coordination with the outcomes that are being developed through our region-wide Continuum of Care planning body, the Committee to End Homelessness. Long-term outcomes will relate to the reduction of homelessness, and particularly the reduction of chronic homelessness in King County.

Homeless Objective 1

Support programs that prevent homelessness.

Strategy 1A:

Continue to allocate funds for the Consortium-wide Housing Stability Program, a program that provides grants, loans and counseling to households facing an eviction or foreclosure, or to households trying to secure the funds to move in to permanent rental housing. The Consortium will explore an amendment to the Consortium's Interlocal Cooperation Agreement in order to expand this program in 2006 and beyond.

Short-term Outputs and Outcomes for Homeless Objective #1

1) H 1A. Short-term Annual Output

Projected Output: Two hundred households are served annually, with a proportionate increase in number of households to be served in 2006 and beyond (if funding is expanded).

Actual Output: A total of 272 households were served through the King County Consortium's Housing Stability Program, which is administered by the Fremont Public Association.

2) H 1A. Short-term Outcome

Projected Outcome: At least 75 percent of the households served remain stable in permanent housing.

Actual Outcome: Households are interviewed six months after they receive assistance to determine if they have remained stable and to see if they need referrals or other information. During 2006, 254 households were reached and interviewed, and 239 of those households remained permanently housed after 6 months for a 94 percent success rate.

Strategy 1B:

Strategies B and C do not have annual output or outcome goals, and will be reported on, as progress occurs, in narrative fashion.

Projected Performance: Support other initiatives and programs designed to prevent homelessness:

Two eviction prevention projects were funded under the Emergency Shelter Grant Program in 2006. Catholic Community Service's Legal Action Center provided eviction prevention services to 148 households. A total of 85, or 57 percent of the households receiving these services had a positive outcome, which allowed the client to maintain their current living situation or obtain other housing and avoid eviction proceedings. Vashon Youth and Family Services served 20 households with eviction prevention services through rent and/or utility assistance. All of these households (100 percent) were able to remain in their housing

With current expense (CX) funds, King County currently funds two additional programs designed to prevent homelessness: The Tenants' Union provides information and referral, counseling and workshops for tenants, and Solid Ground's Housing Counseling Program provides telephone counseling to address specific issues of tenant and homeowner rights and responsibilities, in-depth housing counseling to resolve housing crises, and education to increase financial literacy and solvency.

A portion of new State (2163) funds targeted to homelessness were allocated to homelessness prevention programs.

The King County Veterans and Human Services Levy will provide significant new resources to Housing Stability.

These activities are a few of those accomplished that address the following Objective in the Community Planning and Development (CPD) Outcome Performance Measurement System

- Objective: Decent Housing
- Outcomes: Affordability

Strategy 1C:

Projected Performance: Ensure that Consortium homelessness prevention initiatives and programs are consistent with the Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness to be adopted by the Committee to End Homelessness in 2004.

Actual Performance: The Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness in King County has a strong emphasis on prevention. Specific prevention strategies for the various population groups of homeless people are being developed. King County staff are actively participating in this process, both helping to shape prevention strategies and ensuring that the programs we fund are consistent with the strategies.

Homeless Objective 2

Support a range of permanent affordable housing options for homeless households.

Strategy 2A:

Fund permanent supportive housing through the Shelter Plus Care Program.

1) H 2A. Short-term Annual Output

Projected Output: There were 464 units of permanent supportive housing funded

Actual Output: Shelter Plus Care funded 487 units of permanent supportive housing in 2006.

2) H 2A. Short-term Outcome

Projected Outcome: A majority of the households served remain housed and increase their housing stability.

Actual Outcome: Over the time covered by the report Shelter Plus Care (SPC) provided housing to 818 participants in 487 units. 747 remained permanently housed six months after entering the Shelter Plus Care program. This is 98 percent of the 758 participants that entered Shelter Plus Care at least six months ago. An additional 60 participants have not been in the Shelter Plus Care Program for six months yet.

Strategy 2B:

Strategies B and C do not have annual output or outcome goals, and will be reported on, as progress occurs, in narrative fashion.

Projected Performance: Coordinate with public housing funders, community-based organizations, housing organizations and other stakeholders to plan for a range of permanent housing units that serve very low-income households at 30% of AMI and below, and that are targeted to serve homeless households, including bunkhouses, SRO's and unit that allow households to "transition in place". Some of our Housing projects will address this as well in Goal 1 Objective 1 Strategy A.

Actual Performance: A group of public homeless housing funders, with leadership from King County, meets regularly for planning and coordination purposes. In 2006 for the first time in King County, Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for homeless housing, was released jointly by King County, City of Seattle, Public Housing Authorities, Sound Families and United Way.

Strategy 2C:

Projected Performance: Ensure that all initiatives and programs related to permanent supportive housing for the formerly homeless, and other forms of permanent housing targeted to homeless households are consistent with the Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness in King County.

Actual Performance: All permanent housing targeted to homeless households is consistent with the Ten Year Plan. The Committee to End Homelessness in King County (CEHKC) staff is sited within the King County Department of Community and Human Services, and coordinates closely with King County staff.

Provide programs and services to address the temporary housing needs and other needs of households when homelessness occurs.

Strategy 3A:

Allocate funds for emergency shelter and transitional housing programs for operations and maintenance, supportive services and rental assistance.

1) H 3A. Short-term Annual Output

Projected Output: 86,000 bednights of emergency shelter provided

Projected Output: 140,000 unit nights of transitional housing

Actual Outputs: 139,137 bednights of emergency shelter were provided by programs funded with federal, state and local funds. This total includes emergency winter shelters, open only October through March.

174,015 unit nights of transitional housing were provided by programs funded with federal, state and local funds.

2) H 3A. Short-term Outcomes

Projected Outcome: Homeless persons/households are safe and sheltered from the elements for the night.

Actual Outcome: Individuals and households receiving bednights of emergency shelter were safe and sheltered from the elements for the night.

Projected Outcome: For shelters that house persons longer than 30 days and all transitional housing projects: Increase the housing stability of homeless households by helping them to

move along the housing continuum into more stable housing. We use three indicators to measure our progress on this projected outcome.

Indicator One: the number and percentage of individuals and/or households who move from emergency shelter to transitional or permanent housing.

Actual Outcome for Indicator One: A total of 389 households exited emergency shelter, with 281 moving to either transitional or permanent housing, for a success rate of 72 percent using this indicator.

Indicator Two: the number and percentage of individuals and/or households who move from transitional housing to permanent housing or who successfully “transition in place”.

Actual Outcome for Indicator Two: A total of 942 households exited from transitional housing, and of these, 665 moved to permanent housing. This represents a 71 percent success rate using this indicator.

These activities are a few of those accomplished that address the following Objective in the Community Planning and Development (CPD) Outcome Performance Measurement System

- Objective: Suitable Living
- Outcomes: Affordability /Accessibility for the purpose of creating suitable living environments

Strategy 3B:

Projected Performance: Ensure that all initiatives and programs related to the provision of emergency shelter and transitional housing are consistent with the Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness in King County.

Actual Performance: In 2006, representatives from King County and other Consortium jurisdictions participated on the CEHKC’s task Emergency Shelter Task Force, whose charge was to develop guidance for the gradual shift from temporary to permanent housing.

Homeless Objective 4

King County will approach homelessness planning and coordination as a regional issue, and work with the Committee to End Homelessness, cities, housing funders, community agencies and homeless people to achieve such coordinated efforts. These strategies do not have annual output or outcome goals, and will be reported on as progress occurs, in narrative fashion.

Strategy 4A:

Projected Performance: Ensure that all homeless projects and initiatives supported with local, state and federal funds are consistent with the vision, principles and recommendations of the Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness in King County.

Actual Performance: There have been conscious, consistent efforts to ensure that to the extent possible, all homeless projects and initiatives are consistent with the Ten Year Plan. There is representation from throughout the consortium on the various committees of the CEHKC, from the governing board to task forces and work groups, as well as frequent communication and consultation between CEHKC staff, King County, and members of the consortium.

Strategy 4B:

Projected Performance: Continue to provide leadership and participation in the countywide McKinney Continuum of Care annual competitive funding round, or its successor.

Actual Performance: A county staff person continues to lead the McKinney planning process in coordination with staff from the City of Seattle.

Strategy 4C:

Projected Performance: The Consortium will participate in efforts to improve the efficiency and accountability of the regional homeless service system, particularly through the Homeless Management Information System Safe Harbors.

Actual Performance: The Consortium uses CDBG funds and three McKinney grants to help support to the Safe Harbors Homeless Management Information System. A portion of Veterans and Human Services levy funds and State 2163 funds will also be used to fund Safe Harbors.

Strategy 4D:

Projected Performance: The Consortium will work with other systems providing support services for persons at risk of homelessness (for example, the Mental Health system) to ensure state or federal legislative support for coordination of housing and support services.

Actual Performance: Through the Committee to End Homelessness, strategies are being developed to address this issue.

C. Goal Three: Establish and Maintain a Suitable Living Environment and Expand Economic Opportunities

The three objectives relate to (1) improving the ability of human services agencies to serve our residents, (2) improving living conditions in low- and moderate-income neighborhoods and communities, and (3) expanding economic opportunities for low- and moderate-income persons.

Community/Economic Development Objective 1

Improve the ability of health and human service agencies to serve our low- to moderate-income residents effectively and efficiently.

Strategy 1A:

Make CDBG capital funds available to improve the capacity of health and human service agencies to provide priority human services to our low- to moderate-income residents effectively and efficiently. The Consortium will explore methods of more efficiently coordinating the allocation of funds for regional and/or sub-regional community facility projects.

1) CD/ED 1A. Short-term Annual Output

Projected Output: Three community facility projects completed

Actual Performance: In 2006, 10 community facility projects were completed (See Table 12). Three projects were substantially complete last year but were held open pending final labor documentation being submitted and reviewed. These are now considered complete. There are six facility projects that have been completed but are being held open until documentation is collected to support that a national objective has been met. Beneficiary data will be collected on

these projects during program year 2007 to substantiate that they meet the national objective and they will be closed in the 2007 CAPER. A total of \$1,479,160 was expended in 2006 on community facility projects.

\$77,400 was allocated to one community facility project for design, engineering, and project management (Lutheran Community Services). The facility will be used for the delivery of social services to low and moderate income clients. Construction of the project is nearly complete.

Another project (acquisition) was funded several years ago, Friends of Youth, Duvall Community Services Facility Acquisition. All funds were expended for the acquisition of the site. The agency had been unable to build the community facility due to a moratorium imposed by the City. The moratorium has been lifted and the project is moving forward. The project will remain open until completion of the facility and the delivery of services that will meet the national objective.

Details relating to these project activities can be found in the Public Facilities section of the Project Activity Performance Report in Attachment D.

These activities address the following Objective in the Community Planning and Development (CPD) Outcome Performance Measurement System:

- Objective: Suitable Living
- Outcomes: Accessibility for the purpose of creating suitable living environments

2) CD/ED 1A. Short-term Annual Outcome

Projected Outcome:

Human service facility providers will be able to:

- increase the amount or type of services they provide, or
- increase the number of people they serve, or
- increase the quality and/or accessibility (of the building as well as the geographic location) of service provision.

Actual Outcome:

Providers have given the following accomplishment reports:

The completion of the Maple Valley Food Bank facility expansion has enabled the agency to provide a safe and warm environment to provide emergency items to its clients. Due to the increased size of the warehouse they are able to sort and distributed a greater volume of food.

The Northshore Senior Center Skybridge Construction was completed and is providing access to seniors for services at a center located across the street from the senior center. CDBG funds were used to build a pedestrian sky bridge linking the Northshore Senior Center with the new Northshore Health and Wellness Center across the street, for the benefit of low and moderate-income elders and severely disabled adults.

Through the use of CDBG funding, the Federal Way Senior Center now has accessible doors for its seniors. The seniors are able to gain access to the facility with much more ease and without the required aide of another person.

These activities are a few of those accomplished that address the following Objective in the Community Planning and Development (CPD) Outcome Performance Measurement System:

- Objective: Suitable Living
- Outcomes: Accessibility for the purpose of creating suitable living environments

Strategy 1B:

The Consortium will allocate funds for priority human services as identified in the needs analysis portion of the plan and as identified by Consortium jurisdictions. The Consortium will evaluate the Housing Stability Program and homelessness services for increase, in relation to other human services, for the 2006 funding cycle (See also Goal II, End Homelessness, Objective #1).

1) CD/ED 1B. Short-term Annual Output

Projected Output: 50,000 unduplicated persons served.

Actual Output:

The consortium served a total of 59,510 persons (See Table 10) throughout the year with the following types of activities:

- distribution of food products to food banks located within the Consortium;
- provision of emergency food, shelter, clothing, transportation and utility assistance;
- provision of child care scholarships for low- and moderate income families;
- provision of employment training and counseling;
- provision of health and dental care to low- and moderate-income persons;
- provision of services to victims of domestic violence and their children;
- provision of operational support to senior centers;
- provision of transportation services to seniors; and
- provision of multi-service activities to youth, seniors and families.

In 2006, \$1,072,817 was allocated to human service activities and an additional \$627,537 for assisting 469 persons with employment support services. Employment support services were provided through two Community Based Development Organizations (CBDO), Hopelink and Multi-Service Center (See Table 15).

These activities address the following Objective in the Community Planning and Development (CPD) Outcome Performance Measurement System:

Objective: Suitable Living

Outcomes: Affordability /Accessibility for the purpose of creating suitable living environments

2) CD/ED 1B. Short-term Annual Outcome

Outcomes and outcome indicators for the various service areas will be consistent with the King County Regional Outcomes Alignment Planning Process.

Actual Outcome: No performance to report this year.

These activities address the following Objective in the Community Planning and Development (CPD) Outcome Performance Measurement System

- Objective: Suitable Living
- Outcomes: Accessibility for the purpose of creating suitable living environments

Community/Economic Development Objective 2

Improve the living environment in low- and moderate-income neighborhoods/communities in accordance with jurisdictions' adopted Comprehensive Plans and the Countywide Planning Policies.

Strategy 2A:

Make CDBG capital funds available to for high priority public infrastructure improvements and/or park facility needs, including accessibility improvements, in a range of low- to moderate-income areas of the Consortium.

1) CD/ED 2A. Short-term Annual Output

Projected Output: Three public infrastructure/park facilities projects were completed.

Actual Output: Six public infrastructure projects were completed and closed (See Table 11) – activities include park improvements in the City of Federal Way and Des Moines, curb ramp improvements in City of Shoreline; construction of sidewalks along Morgan Street in Black Diamond and water main replacement in the City of Duvall along NE Stewart Street.

The Community Septic System in Skykomish (name changed to Skykomish Wastewater Facilities Environmental Design) and a sanitary sewer collection system in the City of Carnation are still underway.

Ten other public improvement projects are in various stages of completion. Accomplishments for these activities will be reported in the 2007 CAPER.

In 2006, \$1,514,366 of block grant funds were identified for the following public infrastructure projects: a park in Burien, Black Diamond and SeaTac, a sport court in the City of Algona; a sidewalk improvement project in Shoreline, and a replacement of a water main in the City of Duvall.

GREENBRIDGE SECTION 108 LOAN: The King County Housing Authority completed demolition required for road construction, design, right of way acquisition, construction, and construction management of public roadway improvements and associated costs for sidewalks, street lighting, and traffic signals during 2006; funds were also used for demolition required for park construction, planning, construction, and construction management of parks located in Greenbridge; and for the design and engineering, necessary demolition, construction, and construction management of Storm Water Drainage facilities for the Project.

These activities address the following Objective in the Community Planning and Development (CPD) Outcome Performance Measurement System:

- Suitable Living Environment
- Affordability for purpose of creating suitable living environments

Strategy 2B:

Revitalize deteriorated areas with high rates of poverty in the Consortium. In particular, King County will work with the White Center community to develop a Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy (“NRS”) for this area, which has the highest poverty rate in the County. The Consortium will explore whether there are other high poverty areas that may benefit from an NRS.

Outputs and Outcomes will be determined independently for each NRS developed. Outcomes may include increases in property values, safer streets, less crime, etc.

Actual Output: No performance to report.

Actual Outcome: No performance to report.

Strategy 2C:

Assist small and/or economically disadvantaged businesses that are located in predominately low- to moderate-income communities, or that are combating blight, to rehabilitate and/or improve their commercial property. These projects may or may not be connected with a NRS.

1) CD/ED 2C. Short-term Annual Output

Projected Output: Four commercial property improvements annually.

Actual Output: Three loans were issued to private for-profit businesses for façade improvements in White Center.

2) CD/ED 2C. Short-term Annual Outcome

Projected Outcome: The surrounding low- to moderate-income neighborhood is improved by having better commercial services and shopping opportunities available to it, or by having blight removed.

Actual Outcome: Will be reported in the 2009 CAPER.

These activities are a few of those accomplished that address the following Objective in the Community Planning and Development (CPD) Outcome Performance Measurement System

- Objective: Economic Opportunity
- Outcomes: Sustainability

Community/Economic Development Objective 3

Expand economic opportunities for low- to moderate-income persons.

This objective will be carried out pursuant to the following principles:

- The strategies of this objective will be carried out in a manner that is consistent with the economic development vision contained in the updated Countywide Planning Policies.

- Assistance to for-profit businesses will be provided in a manner that maximizes public benefits, minimizes public costs, minimizes direct financial assistance to the business and provides fair opportunities for all eligible businesses to participate.

Strategy 3A:

Assist businesses that provide services to predominantly low to moderate-income communities to create or retain jobs for low- and moderate-income persons by providing 1) technical assistance, and/or 2) CDBG loans and loan guarantees.

1) CD/ED 3A. Short-term Annual Output

Projected Output: Twenty businesses assisted annually, at least 15 of which are small and/or economically disadvantaged.

Actual Output: The Economic Development Program provided technical assistance to 18 small business owners/entrepreneurs in the White Center business district. Three businesses were assisted (See Table 13).

2) CD/ED 3B. Long-term Outcome

Projected Outcome: Employment opportunities for low- to moderate-income persons are retained and/or increased.

Actual Outcome: No jobs to report.

These activities are a few of those accomplished that address the following Objective in the Community Planning and Development (CPD) Outcome Performance Measurement System

- Objective: Economic Opportunity
- Outcomes: Sustainability

Strategy 3B:

Assist low to moderate-income persons with employment support services that increase economic opportunities. Such services concerned with employment include, but are not limited to peer support programs, job counseling, and childcare and transportation assistance. Outcomes and outcome indicators will be consistent with the King County Regional Outcomes Alignment Planning Process.

Projected Output: Three hundred or more low-to moderate income persons are assisted with employment related services

Projected Outcome: Employment support services have resulted in low-to moderate income persons obtain living wage jobs.

Actual Performance: A total of 469 people were served with employment support services provided by Hopelink and the Multi-Service Center, which are community based development organizations (See Table 15).

These activities are a few of those accomplished that address the following Objective in the Community Planning and Development (CPD) Outcome Performance Measurement System

- Objective: Economic Opportunity
- Outcomes: Sustainability

IV. Public Housing and Resident Initiatives

King County Housing Authority

The King County Consortium and the King County Housing Authority (KCHA) continue to strengthen their partnership as they work together in addressing the County's housing needs. Building on its past performance as one of the strongest Housing Authorities in the nation, KCHA's Public Housing Program and the Housing Authority's Section 8 Housing Program continue to perform at the highest level while KCHA's bond and tax credit properties continue to expand in number in order to meet the housing needs of King County's working families. Because of KCHA's longstanding high performance, the Authority was selected by HUD to become a Moving to Work Housing Authority in 2003. This distinction, given to less than the top 1 percent of the Housing Authorities nationwide, allows for flexibility in the development of local program policies that will better meet Housing Authority and community needs. The King County Housing Authority is an independent municipal corporation established under Washington state law. The Housing Authority continues to play a vital role in assisting local government in rising to the challenge of developing housing and settlement patterns that are sustainable over the long term while protecting the environment and quality of life in this region. In addition to providing decent affordable housing to the County's elderly, disabled and poorest households, KCHA continues to both shape and assist private market efforts to expand the stock of affordable "workforce" housing.

Overview

Since its establishment in 1939, the King County Housing Authority has played a key role in providing affordable housing options for the residents of King County. Through partnerships with local communities and nonprofit organizations, KCHA delivers affordable housing and related supportive services such as education, economic development, and social services to more than 38,000 residents who earn less than the County median income. Of the public housing and Section 8 voucher holder residents, 2,719 are elderly and 4,972 are disabled. We provide safe and affordable housing to families with a total population of over 12,921 children. The King County Housing Authority's approach in serving families is to put independence and self-sufficiency as a cornerstone of program delivery.

KCHA owns or controls approximately 8,000 units of housing (3,168 of which are public housing or subsidized units). Additionally, the Section 8 voucher program continues to grow, reaching a record high of nearly 8,500 units in 2006 despite recent funding cutbacks. In addition, KCHA controls over 4,700 tax credit and/or tax-exempt bond-funded affordable workforce housing units. KCHA also owns three manufactured housing "homeownership" communities (324 units) and provides more than 2,000 subsidies to support emergency, transitional, and permanent housing for homeless families and people with special needs. KCHA delivers home repair and weatherization services to private low-income homeowners, mobile home owners, and landlords who rent to income eligible tenants living in King County. The Authority also provides tax-exempt financing to other affordable housing developers.

As an added support to KCHA residents, the Housing Authority works with a network of community partners that provide comprehensive social and supportive services such as healthcare, transportation, child care, youth development and employment and job training.

Public Housing

KCHA owns and directly manages 2,756 units of public housing. The year 2006 saw the continuation of the Authority's upgrade program with the completion of more than \$5.3 million in capital improvements to rehabilitate or modernize its public housing buildings. The work included fire and life safety improvements, interior renovations, energy efficiency measures, exterior building work, including painting and installation of entry doors, and roofing replacements.

In terms of public safety within our public housing communities, KCHA continues to place great emphasis on partnerships with law enforcement agencies. KCHA funds are used to augment community-policing activities within several of its largest family developments in Kent, White Center, Bellevue, Auburn and North King County.

In 2005, the Authority transitioned from the Agency Plan requirements to the development of an annual plan and report in support of Moving to Work. In these endeavors, the Housing Authority continues to work with its public housing and Section 8 residents who assist in the review of draft plans and provide comments on proposed policies and procedures.

In 2001 the Housing Authority successfully applied for a HOPE VI redevelopment grant from HUD for Park Lake site I. The HOPE VI grant provides \$35 million in federal funds and will generate an additional \$175 million in matching funds for a long-term redevelopment of Park Lake and the surrounding White Center community. During 2006, the Housing Authority continued the extensive effort required of this complex project which will provide new public housing market rate rental housing and affordable home ownership opportunities as well as new and expanded community facilities. Construction of the first phase of new housing began in late 2005; the first 82 units of housing ready were occupied in August 2006. A new community school was constructed as part of this community and it opened for the school year in September 2005.

Section 8

The year 2005 saw continued growth for the Housing Authority's Section 8 program. The Housing Authority successfully applied for and received both regular Section 8 vouchers and vouchers to serve special needs populations. The Section 8 housing population neared 8,500 households at year-end (2006).

During 2006, KCHA and other regional Housing Authorities worked with the Gates Sound Families Initiative to help create additional transitional housing for families with children. In addition, the Authority continues to work with other community groups to develop housing and wrap-around services for special needs populations, using project based Section 8 vouchers to support the provision of housing while private, non-profit agencies provide appropriate support services.

Resident Services

The Resident Services department of KCHA is comprised of 22 staff members. Nine individuals make up the Support Service Coordination Program. This team provides direct support to residents living in 23 buildings dedicated to housing senior and disabled populations. Five staff

members are assigned to the HOPE VI Family Service program. This team works with families displaced by the HOPE VI redevelopment project by providing relocation assistance, housing stability assistance, support with housing and non-housing emergency issues, self-sufficiency and long-term goal development, and community building. Additional staff within the Resident Services department coordinate a wide variety of contracts and partnerships with public and community-based agencies to ensure that support services are provided to residents within all of KCHA's affordable housing programs. These services include job skills development and job placement services, English as a second language and citizenship classes, GED, childcare, Head Start, youth recreation and education support programs, crime prevention and intervention, and health promotion and nutrition programming. The department also coordinates a 504 Reasonable Accommodation program, which coordinates responses to resident and application requests for reasonable accommodation in public housing and for Section 8 participants and applicants.

The challenge KCHA faced in 2006 and beyond is the continuing reduction in social services program support at the federal level. This erosion of federal support affects all of KCHA's population – children, youth, adults, and seniors. Due to federal funding cuts, KCHA's ability to provide onsite community police stations, after school and evening youth activity programs and other activities aimed at the reduction of crime in our public housing communities is becoming more and more limited. In order to preserve a level of service to our residents, KCHA worked with our partner agencies to come up with program funding. In 2006, KCHA budgeted over half a million dollars of its reserves to continue funding the most vital programs.

KCHA continues to set aside space at our buildings and developments for the operation of resident support services. In 2006, KCHA opened the Springwood Youth Center. The new Youth Center, a \$3.4 million, two-story, 10,800 square-foot facility, features a gym, computer lab, classrooms for homework assistance and arts and crafts, a recreation room and a commercial kitchen. The capital campaign initiative that built the building represents a partnership between KCHA and three nonprofit agencies. Funding includes federal, state, county, local foundations, and business support. One of KCHA's community partners will manage and operate the programs available at the Youth Center.

Housing Preservation

KCHA continued its program of acquiring properties for the purpose of preserving and developing affordable housing opportunities in areas that suffer from a lack of affordable housing, especially east and north King County. We also use this program to acquire and redevelop distressed properties to improve the housing stock for lower income households and to help improve neighborhood conditions.

Special Needs Housing

Since 1998, KCHA has been highly successful in expanding its inventory of Section 8 assistance dedicated to "special needs" housing. Working in close partnership with King County Housing Department of Community and Human Services and this region's behavioral health care and support service systems serving persons with disabilities, KCHA continues to run the Housing Access and Services Program which provides persons with disabilities expedited access to tenant-based Section 8 assistance including extended case management. KCHA also continues to provide project-based assistance to housing programs whose goal is to offer supportive housing to persons with disabilities.

Housing Repair and Weatherization Program

KCHA's Home Repair and Weatherization Department works closely with King County's Housing Repair Program and with King County's suburban cities to provide energy conservation and housing rehabilitation services to low-income households. In 2006, KCHA invested more than \$3.6 million to preserve affordable housing in King County through its weatherization and low-income home repair program. In addition, KCHA is continuing to work with King County, the City of Seattle, the Annie E. Casey Foundation and utility companies to provide housing rehabilitation services and weatherization to low-income households in the White Center area, the area of King County with the greatest concentration of poverty.

V. Resources Made Available

The King County Consortium administered over \$15.8 million in federal housing and community development funds in 2006, making them available to the community through competitive processes. In 2006, these funds benefited 174,298 persons and 1,956 households through housing development activities, housing repair programs, public services, facilities, public improvements, and economic development.

From January through December 2006, the King County Consortium utilized a combination of federal and non-federal funds to further the goals and objectives in the Consolidated Plan. A total of **\$15,851,722** was made available through federal Housing and Urban Development formula grants or entitlements. The total amount of resources used in the consortium for housing activities is shown in Table 2, and the total amount of resources for non-housing activities is shown in Table 3.

C. Formula Grant Programs

The table below shows resources made available and expended for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnership (HOME), and Emergency Shelter Grant Program (ESG). Funds expended do not equal funds made available because some projects are "in the pipeline" and will not be completed for another year.

Table 1: HUD Formula Grant Programs: Funds Available and Expended, 2006

| Grant Program | | Funds Made Available During 2006 | \$ Expended in 2006 (includes expenditures for 2006 projects as well as previous years) |
|----------------------|---------------------------|---|--|
| CDBG | Entitlement | \$6,209,982 | \$4,989,876 |
| | Program Income Recaptured | \$4,607,005 | \$3,245,628 |
| | subtotal | \$275,859 | |
| | | \$11,092,846 | \$8,235,504 |
| HOME | Entitlement | \$4,160,001 | \$5,021,599 |
| | Program Income | \$308,331 | \$308,331 |
| | subtotal | \$4,468,332 | \$5,329,930 |
| ADDI | Entitlement | \$96,781 | \$120,000 |
| ESG | Entitlement | \$193,763 | \$227,844 |
| TOTAL | | \$15,851,722 | \$13,913,278 |

*Program income that was collected in 2006 and allocated to eligible activities in 2006.

D. Other Public and Private Resources for Housing Activities

In the areas of both housing and community development, the federal funds available from HOME, CDBG, and ESG were complemented by and helped leverage a broad range of other public and private resources.

Housing Assistance

We identified over \$160,253,998 in total funds made available in the King County Consortium in 2006 for housing-related activities, not including most private sector contributions. More than half of this is federal dollars going into the support of public housing and Section 8 rental assistance offered through the King County Housing Authority and the Renton Housing Authority. Of the remainder, \$5,591,641 was federal formula grant funding through HOME, CDBG, and ESG.

Most of the rest was state and local dollars. Activities included new construction, acquisition and rehabilitation, home repair, capacity building, pre-development costs, rental assistance, support for housing operations, homelessness prevention, emergency shelters, transitional housing and other homeless programs.

Table 2: Resources Identified For Affordable Housing, 2006

Table 2: Other Public and Private Resources for Housing Activities

| <i>Source</i> | <i>Amount</i> | <i>Projects Supported (There may be duplication since most projects have multiple fund sources.)</i> |
|--|---------------|--|
| <i>Local Government Resources</i> | | |
| King County Housing Opportunity Fund (HOF) (general funds for housing development) | \$3,128,744 | Allocated funds to four projects in the Consortium |

| Source | Amount | Projects Supported (There may be duplication since most projects have multiple fund sources.) |
|--|---------------|---|
| King County Current Expense (general funds) | \$781,929 | Supported emergency housing services, transitional housing operations, homeless shelters and related services, shelter and transitional housing for victims of domestic violence, housing counseling and community voice mail |
| East King County suburban cities who are members of ARCH (general funds and other non-federal funds) | \$569,592 | 280 Clark, Adult Family Homes 5 and 6, and HouseKey + ARCH |
| Regional Affordable Housing Program Funds (RAHP) – revenue generated by SHB 2060 document recording fee for allocation by King County HCD according to an Interlocal Agreement (capital) | \$5,444,375 | Allocated funds to six projects in the Consortium |
| Regional Affordable Housing Program Funds (RAHP) – (operating) | \$633,615 | Supported 24 transitional housing and emergency shelter programs throughout King County , including the City of Seattle |
| subtotal | \$10,558,255 | |

State Resources

| Source | Amount | Projects Supported (There may be duplication since most projects have multiple fund sources.) |
|---|---------------|--|
| Washington State – Housing Assistance Program/Trust Fund | \$8,235,500 | Allocations made for six projects in the Consortium |
| Washington State Transitional Housing, Operating & Rental Assistance Program | \$1,034,208 | Operating support for transitional housing and rental assistance programs serving homeless families with children (7/1/05-6/30/06) |
| Washington State Funds for homelessness programs in King County, including Emergency Shelter Assistance Program and Emergency Housing Assistance Program / Families with Children Funds | \$1,144,471 | Supports approximately 60 programs throughout Seattle and King County |
| subtotal | \$10,414,179 | |
| Federal Resources | | |
| Washington State Housing Finance Commission: Low Income Housing Tax Credits \$3,453,911; Tax Exempt Bonds \$0 | \$3,453,911 | Allocations made for four projects in the Consortium |
| HUD Supportive Housing Programs | \$554,606 | Supports four transitional housing programs for veterans, victims of DV and families with children |

Table 3: Community/Economic Development Resources for Completed Public (Human) Services, Community Facilities and Public Infrastructure and Parks, 2006

Table 3: Community/Economic Development Resources for Completed Public (Human) Services, Community Facilities and Public Infrastructure and Parks, 2006

| Source | Resource Amount |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Public (Human) Services | |
| King County Consortium CDBG | \$391,277 |
| Other Federal | \$8,052,643 |
| State/Local | \$26,052,371 |
| Private | \$16,296,884 |
| Other | \$8,737,453 |
| Total | \$59,530,628 |
| Public Improvements and Parks | |
| King County Consortium CDBG | \$791,283 |
| Other Federal | \$- |
| State/Local | \$624,842 |
| Private | \$4,300 |
| Other | \$- |
| Total | \$1,420,425 |
| Community Facilities | |
| King County Consortium CDBG | \$2,109,178 |
| Other Federal | \$35,630 |
| State/Local | \$2,125,318 |
| Private | \$6,020,778 |
| Other | \$678,082 |
| Total | \$10,968,986 |

VI. Evaluation of Actions, Program Changes, and Certifications of Consistency with the Consolidated Plan

The King County Consortium made significant progress in carrying out the activities described in the 2006 Action Plan. The King County Consortium's activities in 2006 addressed the priority needs outlined in the 2005-2009 Consolidated Plan. We have been highly successful at utilizing our federal funds, along with state and local funds that we administer, to serve the neediest residents of the Consortium. In addition, we coordinated with other available federal, state, and local resources (as shown in the tables above), allowing for a high degree of leverage for CDBG, HOME, and ESG funds.

A. Evaluation of Housing Programs

1. Homeless Housing Program

The homeless programs met all the goals of the housing objectives for homeless households and those at risk of homelessness. The applicable HUD performance measures were achieved. Our Housing Stability Program met the HUD objective of Decent Housing and the outcome of Affordability by serving 272 households with grants, loans and counseling to avoid eviction or foreclosure. Of those contacted after six months, 94 percent were still stable in housing. Our shelter and transitional housing programs met the Suitable Living objective and Availability/Accessibility outcome by providing 139,137 bednights of emergency shelter and 174,015 unit nights of transitional housing with a 71 percent success rate of moving to more stable housing.

In a broader sense, we have made significant progress toward our goal of ending homelessness. We are coordinating with other community partners and aligning our work with the strategies of the Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness in King County. There continues to be many barriers to achieving this goal, including the lack of resources and the severe shortage of housing affordable to the poorest segment of our residents, especially homeless individuals and families.

2. Housing Repair Program

The housing repair program met all the goals for the Consortium's housing objective to preserve the supply of affordable housing for low- to moderate-income households and to provide programs for owners and renters with special needs. This program experiences a continuous flow of applications for assistance.

The funding level for the housing repair program was substantially less than the previous year. This is reflected in the volume of approved and completed projects reported.

3. Housing Finance Program

King County's Housing Finance Program met its goals for the outcome statement, "Affordability for the purpose of providing decent housing", through the creation and/or preservation of housing units for low-to-moderate-income households, including households with special needs and homeless households. The need to capitalize both operating and replacement reserves in the absence of adequate rental subsidies continues to act as a constraint on the ability of the program to meet the regional need for affordable rental housing for households with incomes at or below 30 percent of AMI. HUD goals for providing decent, affordable housing were met or exceeded in 2006.

The finance program continues to encourage the growth of low-income housing developers active in King County outside the City of Seattle, particularly developers skilled in housing for special needs populations. Staff will be working with the Seattle-King County Housing Development Consortium towards this capacity-building goal. There will be two HFP funding rounds in the spring and fall of 2007. HFP was satisfied with the results of the pre-application process in 2006 and will repeat this process in 2007. Program staff consider that this creates the best chance to ensure high-quality project applications that are consistent with County housing priorities and with the limitations of available funding sources.

In the interest of continuing to improve HFP performance with regard to timely expenditure of federal funds, HFP will continue to work on coordinating funding efforts with other public funders, and finding eligible ways to replace non-federal funds with federal funds in projects that are ready to spend. Recent efforts along these lines have generated a broad consensus among public funders we must find a way to enable applicants to submit simultaneous applications to all or most of the fund sources needed for a project. We anticipate significant progress in this regard during 2007.

In light of the County's commitment to ending homelessness within a decade, HFP will establish priorities for its 2007 funding round that increase the incentives for developers to create permanent housing for populations who are either homeless or at risk of homelessness, and who may require an array of supportive services to maintain stable housing situations.

HFP continues to work toward affordable home-ownership but ADDI constraints on down payment assistance limit the effectiveness of this tool. In the Puget Sound housing market, with median home prices over \$300,000 in most areas – and over \$400,000 in some – a much greater capital write-down or significantly larger down payment assistance is needed to bring ownership within reach of households with incomes at or below 80 percent of AMI. HFP has funded a forward-looking local agency with the goal of develop a locally appropriate land trust model for home ownership projects, as the best way to create long-term affordability in ownership housing.

4. Affordable Housing Planning and Development Evaluation Section:

The AHPD section met the following HUD performance measures: affordability and accessibility for the purpose of decent housing. Staff worked on planning initiatives and programs to address the range of housing affordability levels needed by residents of King County, and to address housing access barriers, particularly for residents who may be the subject of discrimination.

- **Federal Housing Planning.** This year King County did a new Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice and found that there are a number of barriers to housing access, particularly to some of the classes of persons protected by fair housing law. These issues may play a significant role in the disproportionately high percentage of persons of color who are homeless. King County is very concerned about this issue and will be looking at some innovative ways to implement its fair housing action plan in the coming years to try to see some results by way of reducing the disproportional percentage of persons of color in the homeless population.
- **Regional Measures of Affordable Housing and Homeless Housing Progress:** King County and its regional partners are working to measure progress in meeting the overall need for affordable housing and for permanent supportive housing that will help homeless households be successful. It is a challenge to determine the best method for measuring progress, but the work continues to evolve.
- King County staff worked with private developers on required agreements in master planned developments that will produce units of decent affordable housing.

B. Evaluation of Relocation Activities

Projects assisted with CDBG funding that involved relocation activities for 2006 are as follows:

- Garden Park II Apartments (Project C04141) – Multi-Service Center (MSC) was awarded an additional \$170,741 in CDBG from the city of Federal Way for a total of \$309,451 in CDBG funding for the acquisition and rehabilitation of an 86 unit apartment complex. MSC has received all the needed funding to proceed with the acquisition and rehab of the project. General Information Notices were issued to tenants. Permanent displacement of one tenant took place in June 2006. Additional information can be found in the HOME section under relocation.
- White Center Food Bank (Project C04051): King County Housing Authority (KCHA) received a CDBG float loan for their HOPE VI project which included funding to assist the local food bank with relocating to a new site. The food bank moved in to its new permanent location in 2006. KCHA completed the final relocation packet in 2006. They paid for all temporary relocation expenses and reestablishment expenses totaling over \$200,000.
- Summerwood Apartments (Project C04163): Downtown Action to Save Housing received \$78,826 in 2004 CDBG funds. This project involved the acquisition and rehab of an apartment complex in Redmond to create 111 units of affordable rental housing. Initial certification of income started in 2006 and permanent displacement of five households occurred in July, August and September 2006 with a total relocation cost of \$5,830.

C. Evaluation of Community Development Program

HCD, in collaboration with the larger suburban cities in the Consortium, as well as the City of Seattle, City of Bellevue, and City of Auburn, participated in two regional pre-application workshops: one at the Carco Theater in Renton in March 2006, and one at the Kirkland City Hall in April 2006. The workshops were designed for nonprofit agencies interested in applying for CDBG funds for capital projects. Detailed information about CDBG Program requirements was provided.

Information about the workshop was included in a flyer that HCD e-mailed and mailed to nonprofit agencies, local governments, Unincorporated Area Councils and the Snoqualmie Tribe to notify them of the upcoming availability of CDBG funds for community facility and public improvement projects, as well as web site feature under 'What's New' section.

The 2005 Human Service awards were extended one year through 2006 to allow for transition from the former 15 city pass-through system to the existing sub-regional framework. The county contracted directly with the non-profit and municipal agencies who implemented the human service activities. A request for proposal was conducted in Spring 2006 for new human service project activities that will commence in 2007.

1. Timeliness

In August 2006, the draw down ratio for the King County Consortium (per the HUD IDIS report) was 1.04; at the end of December the ratio was .79.

2. Environmental Review

HCD Staff continues to attend training on the Environmental Regulations offered by the local HUD Field Office. The HCD Environmental Procedure Manual was updated to incorporate new regulations. HCD Staff also provided technical assistance to participating cities Application Workshops in the spring and did preliminary assessments during the initial stages of the allocation process.

D. Evaluation of Economic Development Program

Economic Development (ED) staff submitted to HUD a Section 108 loan in the amount of \$6.775 million. ED staff also provided technical assistance to 18 small and/or disadvantaged businesses located in the White Center business district and continued to market the CDIL loan program to qualified private for profit enterprises and public agencies. The 40 year historic low interest rates provided the biggest barrier to lending out CDBG funds. However as rates continue to rise, during 2006 the Section 108 and CDIL loans will become more attractive to potential borrowers. In addition a concentrated effort to provide small business loans for façade improvement in the White Center business district should increase the funding opportunities for this loan program.

1. Float Loan

Greenbridge Float Loan (Project C04050) – In 2005 \$1.75 million was loaned to the King County Housing Authority (KCHA) to assist with infrastructure costs in the redevelopment of the Park Lake Homes community (now called Greenbridge) in the White Center area of unincorporated King County. The loan is for a maximum 30 months at zero interest. King County agreed to forgive KCHA's loan and repay the CDBG fund on behalf of the KCHA through a transfer of general local government funds (a combination of King County Current Expense funds, Road funds, Real Estate Excise Tax funds, and Surface Water Management funds) once KCHA fulfilled the terms of the loan. \$710,000 was repaid on February 3, 2006. The remaining balance of the loan, \$1,040,000 is anticipated to be fully repaid in April 2007.

Mine Hill/280 Clark Apartments (Project C05052) – an Amendment to the 2005 Action Plan reflected a new Float loan activity for King County CDBG Consortium in the amount of \$5,810,598. The funds were used to acquire two existing apartment complexes for St. Andrews Housing Group. The loan is secured with a letter of credit from Key Bank. The term of the loan is a maximum of 30 months from closing. An interest rate of 1.9% per annum is being charged from October 15, 2005 to maturity on April 15, 2008. The loan fee is one percent. This will produce an estimated interest income of \$250,000 at the maximum. Two principal and interest repayments totaling \$2,732,647 have been made in 2006. The remaining balance of \$3,077,951 is anticipated to be repaid in 2007. Interest income will be less than the maximum.

2. Section 108 Loan

King County was successful in obtaining the Section 108 Loan for \$8 million for the King County Housing Authority. The housing authority is making great progress with the federal HOPE VI grant funds for infrastructure improvements associated with the redevelopment of Park Lake Homes (now called Greenbridge) in White Center. The infrastructure improvements for this predominantly low- and moderate-income community include new streets and sidewalks, drainage and utilities, pedestrian paths and greenways. The loan repayments would be made by King County over a period of 10 to 20 years, using a variety of fund sources: Roads funds, Surface Water Management funds, Real Estate Excise Tax funds, Current Expense and CDBG funds.

E. Monitoring

HCD Staff identified specific areas of compliance to review and monitoring was conducted for projects under contract included but were not limited to:

- Documenting King County's compliance with requirement for conducting subrecipient monitoring (set for in CDBG Program Regulations);
- Assuring that subrecipient program administration and funded projects are completed in compliance with established regulations and that project activities continue to serve the target population identified in the initial application;
- Ascertaining that CDBG Subrecipients are complying with applicable federal regulations, OMB Circulars and King County ordinances (regulatory requirements) relating to financial management systems, procurement and contracting , property management and disposition, labor standards, record keeping and reporting requirements.

1. Community Development Program – Monitoring Update

Monitoring: HCD Staff identified specific areas of compliance to review and monitoring was conducted for projects under contract included but were not limited to:

- Documenting King County's compliance with requirement for conducting subrecipient monitoring (set for in CDBG Program Regulations).
- Assure that subrecipient program administration and funded projects are completed in compliance with established regulations and that project activities continue to serve the target population identified in the initial application. The following cities were monitored: Federal Way, Renton and Shoreline.
- ascertained that CDBG Subrecipients are complying with applicable federal regulations, OMB Circulars and King County ordinances (regulatory requirements) relating to financial management systems, procurement and contracting , property management and disposition, labor standards, record keeping and reporting requirements;

2006 Accomplishments: Audit

Washington State Auditors Office Report on Financial Statements and Federal Single Audit

- Three Audit reports were submitted and reviewed by Community Development Staff for the cities of Redmond, Federal Way and Renton.
- ascertained that CDBG subrecipients are meeting performance requirements specified in the subrecipient agreement and target populations are being served;

2006 Accomplishments: Desktop Monitoring

- Each quarter project and program accomplishments are submitted at the time of reimbursement request. These reports are reviewed to determine whether they are meeting the performance requirements specified in the subrecipient agreement and target populations served.
- Technical assistance is provided in a timely fashion to ensure regulatory compliance is understood.

2006 Accomplishments: Workshops

CD Staff conducted and/or participated in four Technical Assistance Application Workshops prior to Request For Proposals being advertised. Project Managers and the CD Coordinator throughout the course of the year conducted several one on one consultations.

2006 HUD Monitoring

In September 2006, the Washington State HUD Field Office performed an on-site monitoring and reviewed the following areas of the CDBG program: economic development activities, eligibility, national objective, and financial management. In the HOME program HUD Staff reviewed the homebuyers program, eligibility, income determination, and program income and management oversight. It also completed a limited Civil Rights review under the Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity Act for CDBG and HOME.

An exit conference with HUD was held in October, 2006 and letter was received January 23, 2007. The monitoring letter identified three findings and three concerns regarding the CDBG Program.

- Findings 1 and 2 concerned economic development record keeping requirements and listing activities in HUD's Integrated Disbursement and Information System (IDIS).
- Finding 3 indicated that King County classified project management cost as direct activity delivery costs rather than program administration.
- Concern 1 indicated that King county miscalculated the end date of the KCHA Float Loan
- Concern 2 concerned economic development activities listed in IDIS.
- Concern 3 indicated the County did not meet record keeping requirements for individuals participating in employment support services delivered by Community Based Development Organizations.

The County responded to HUD's letter on March 9, 2007. The County agreed to address Findings 1 and 2 and Concern 2 regarding economic development and made adjustments to IDIS and reclassified some costs to project delivery costs for the loan to Saint Andrews Housing Group. The County contends with respect to Finding 3, project management costs are direct activity delivery costs rather than program administration costs. Regarding Concern 1 the county agreed to repay the KCHA float loan by July 14, 2007.

The County disagrees with HUD regarding Concern 3 and described how employment support activities implemented by CBDOs meet all regulatory requirements.

The County will continue to work with HUD to resolve these findings and concerns.

2. Homeless Housing Program – Monitoring Update

- CDBG Funds – King County monitored the Housing Stability Project in 2006.
- ESG Funds – HUD conducted an audit of the YWCA and Eastside Interfaith Social Concerns Council in 2006.
- Supportive Housing Program Funds – HUD conducted an audit of Eastside Domestic Violence Program in 2006.

- Local and State Funds – The County conducted monitoring visits of The Church Council of Greater Seattle, Homelessness Project; Fremont Public Association, Solid Ground Program and Broadview Transitional and Shelter; Exodus Housing; Eastside Domestic Violence Program; El Centro de la Raza; Multi-Service Center – Rental Assistance Program; Valley Cities Counseling and Referral; Catholic Community Services Rental Assistance Program; Hopelink, Dixie Price and Hopelink Place.

For the HOME program monitoring, see Attachment B: HOME Report.

F. Modifications to the Action Plan

Modifications to 2006 Action Plan included a few minor changes concerning specific projects, as appropriate. The Plan also was modified to reflect funding decreases to project activities due to a lesser entitlement amount received than anticipated. Amendments to the 2006 Action Plan and to prior year Action Plans are available upon request.

G. Certifications of Consistency with the Consolidated Plan

HCD staff review projects located in the King County Consortium for consistency with the Consolidated Plan and for consistency with the Consortium's relocation policies, if applicable. King County staff review project applications to local funding entities, WA State funding entities, and federal funding entities: Sound Families, the Washington State Housing Finance Commission Tax Credit and Bond Programs, the Washington State Housing Trust Fund, HUD, the McKinney Continuum of Care Application, HOPWA, and Federal Home Loan Bank. HCD staff provided all project applicants whose projects were consistent with the 2005-2009 Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan the required certification of consistency.

H. Other Measures of Progress

Because so many factors influence our region's well-being— such as the economy, population growth, income levels, the impacts of welfare reform, and many others— King County also has a "Benchmarks Program" in place to help track the overall state of the County. Through the Benchmarks Program, King County has set long-term goals that are consistent with federal housing and community development goals, including specific goals relating to the provision of affordable housing. The benchmarks measure how well King County is doing as a people, place, and economy, and are used to monitor our progress over time. For more information on the King County Benchmarks Program, please contact Rose Curran, Benchmark Program Manager at (206) 205-0715, or write to her at the King County Budget Department, 516 3rd Avenue, Room #420, Seattle, WA 98104.

I. Summary of Citizen Comments Received

Throughout the program year, many opportunities were provided for citizens to comment on the Consolidated Plan, its strategies, and the use of federal funds. Naturally, most comments occur in the context of community meetings held when we are establishing or refining policies or priorities that will drive the use of Consortium funds. In 2006 input was gathered through the following:

- **Community Development Planning.** The county and Consortium Cities held two joint application workshops in March and April to provide technical assistance to interested applicants. Additional technical assistance was offered by county staff during the allocation process. A Public Forum was held September 9th and applicants invited to

present their proposals to the Sub-Region Advisory Group members. This allowed for direct communication between the applicants and the Sub-Region Advisory Group members concerning details of each project proposed. The Sub-region Advisory Group then met as one body to consider regional project activities. The members then met as sub-regions to review and finalize recommendations they made within their respective areas to finalize recommendations to the Joint Recommendations Committee (JRC). Applicants were provided a summary of the Sub-Region Advisory Group recommendations in advance of the JRC funding meeting. The JRC considered recommendations and adopted them for the program year.

- **Homeless Continuum of Care Planning.** Several public meetings were held in connection with developing the 2006 McKinney Continuum of Care application for Seattle-King County, and a community-based Steering Committee guided the process.
- **Web Site Availability.** King County Housing and Community Development (HCD) offers web site access to its federal HUD grant plans and performance reporting documents at www.metrokc.gov/dchs/csd/housing. Public comments are received and responded to as well as incorporated into the Citizen participation portion of a report. Comments for the CAPER report are directed to: Kathy Tremper at Kathy.tremper@metrokc.gov. All comments receive a response from a member of HCD Staff.

J. Public Input on Annual Performance Report

Public comment was invited in the preparation and review of this *2006 Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation Report* and the Consortium sponsored a public meeting held March 15, 2007, to gather public comments on the CAPER. No comments were received.

Attachment A: Financial Summary Information for CDBG

Attachment to HUD Form 4949.3 of 2006 CAPER

ATTACHMENT A: Financial Summary Report for CDBG

| | |
|---|-------------|
| A. Program Income Received | |
| Revolving Small Business Loans Interest | \$86,881 |
| Float Loan Principal | \$3,442,647 |
| Float Loan Interest | \$14,772 |
| Housing Repair Loans | \$1,047,934 |
| Other Repayments | \$5,000 |
| TOTAL PROGRAM INCOME | \$4,597,234 |
| | |
| B. Other Receivables | |
| Two Float Loans Outstanding | \$3,854,700 |
| Four Revolving Loans Outstanding | \$120,283 |
| TOTAL OTHER RECEIVABLES | \$3,974,983 |
| | |
| | |

Financial Summary

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Community Planning and Development

Grantee Performance Report Community Development Block Grant Program

OMB Approval No. 2506-0077 (Exp. 3/31/94)

Public Reporting Burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 12 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Reports Management Officer, Office of Information Policies and Systems, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C. 20410-3600 and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (2506-0077), Washington, D.C. 20503. Do not send this completed form to either of these addresses.

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| 1. Name of Grantee King County, WA | | 2. Grant Number B-06-UC-53-0001 | | 3. Reporting Period From 1/1/2006 To 12/31/06 | |
| Part I: Summary of CDBG Resources | | | | | |
| 1. Unexpended CDBG funds at end of previous reporting period (Balance from prior program years) | | | | \$ 9,985,494 | |
| 2. Entitlement Grant from form HUD-7082 | | | | \$ 6,209,982 | |
| 3. Surplus Urban Renewal Funds | | | | \$ | |
| 4. Section 108 Guaranteed Loan Funds (Principal Amount) | | | | \$ | |
| 5. Program Income received by: | | | | | |
| | | Grantee (Column A) | | Subrecipient (Column B) | |
| a. Revolving Funds | | \$ 86,881 | | \$ | |
| b. Other (Identify below. If more space is needed use an attachment.) | | | | | |
| Principal | | \$ 4,520,124 | | \$ | |
| Interest | | \$ 0 | | \$ | |
| c. Total Program Income (Sum of columns a and b) | | | | \$ 4,607,005 | |
| 6. Prior Period Adjustments (if column is a negative amount, enclose in brackets) | | | | \$ | |
| 7. Total CDBG Funds available for use during this reporting period (sum of lines 1 through 6) | | | | \$ 20,802,481 | |
| Part II: Summary of CDBG Expenditures | | | | | |
| 8. Total expenditures reported on Activity Summary, forms HUD-4949.2 & 4949.2A | | | | \$ 8,355,523 | |
| 9. Total expended for Planning & Administration, form HUD-4949.2 | | \$ 1,241,735 | | | |
| 10. Amount subject to Low/Mod Benefit Calculation (line 8 minus line 9) | | \$ 7,113,788 | | | |
| 11. CDBG funds used for Section 108 principal & interest payments | | | | \$ | |
| 12. Total expenditures (line 8 plus line 11) | | | | \$ 8,355,523 | |
| 13. Unexpended balance (line 7 minus line 12) | | | | \$ 12,446,958 | |
| Part III: Low/Mod Benefit This Reporting Period | | | | | |
| 14. Total Low/Mod credit for multi-unit housing expenditures from form HUD-4949.2A | | | | \$ 125,000 | |
| 15. Total from all other activities qualifying as low/mod expenditures from forms HUD-4949.2 and 4949.2A | | | | \$ 6,988,788 | |
| 16. Total (line 14 plus line 15) | | | | \$ 7,113,788 | |
| 17. Percent benefit to low/mod persons (line 16 divided by line 10 this reporting period) | | | | 100 % | |

This form may be reproduced on local office copiers.

Previous edits are obsolete.

Retain this record for 3 years.

page (1) of (2)

form HUD 4949.3 (06/24/93)

ref Handbook 6510.2

| Part IV: Low/Mod Benefit for Multi-Year Certifications (Complete only if certification period includes prior years) | | | |
|--|----------|----------|---------------|
| Program years (PY) covered in certification | PY _____ | PY _____ | PY _____ |
| 18. Cumulative net expenditures subject to program benefit calculation | | | \$ _____ |
| 19. Cumulative expenditures benefiting low/mod persons | | | \$ _____ |
| 20. Percent benefit to low/mod persons (line 19 divided by line 18) | | | _____ |
| Part V: For Public Service (PS) Activities Only: Public Service Cap Calculation | | | |
| 21. Total PS expenditures from column h, form HUD-4949.2A | | | \$ 1,070,497 |
| 22. Total PS unliquidated obligations from column r, form HUD-4949.2A | | | \$ 2,320 |
| 23. Sum of line 21 and line 22 | | | \$ 1,072,817 |
| 24. Total PS unliquidated obligations reported at the end of the previous reporting period | | | \$ 1,261 |
| 25. Net obligations for public services (line 23 minus line 24) | | | \$ 1,071,556 |
| 26. Amount of Program Income received in the preceding program year | | | \$ 1,233,288 |
| 27. Entitlement Grant Amount (from line 2) | | | \$ 6,209,982 |
| 28. Sum of lines 26 and 27 | | | \$ 7,443,270 |
| 29. Percent funds obligated for Public Services Activities (line 25 divided by line 28) | | | 14.40 |
| Part VI: Planning and Program Administration Cap Calculation | | | |
| 30. Total Planning & Administration expenditures | | | \$ 1,241,735 |
| 31. Total Planning & Administration unliquidated obligations | | | \$ 0 |
| 32. Sum of lines 30 and 31 | | | \$ 1,241,735 |
| 33. Total Planning & Administration unliquidated obligation reported at end of previous reporting period | | | \$ 0 |
| 34. Net obligations for Planning & Administration (line 32 minus line 33) | | | \$ 1,241,735 |
| 35. Amount subject to Planning & Administration cap (grant amount from line 2 plus line 5c) | | | \$ 10,816,987 |
| 36. Percent funds obligated for Planning & Administration Activities | | | 11.48 |

NOTE:

This form may be reproduced on local office copiers.
 Previous edits are obsolete.
 Retain this record for 3 years.

page (2) of (2)

form HUD 4949.3 (06/24/93)
 ref Handbook 6510.2

Attachment B

King County HOME Consortium

Summary of Activities

A. Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan (H&CD Plan):

Overall

During 2006, the King County HOME Consortium used HOME resources including a 2006 entitlement grant of \$4,160,001 an American Dream Downpayment Initiative (ADDI) grant of \$96,781, program income of \$342,590 and prior year unallocated ADDI funds.

Housing Development

\$3,671,591 was allocated by the Housing Finance Program to new housing development projects consistent with Affordable Housing Objective 1, Strategy A of the H & CD Plan to *make capital funds available for the construction, acquisition or rehabilitation of good quality, new permanent affordable rental housing for low- and moderate income households*. If all of the HOME-assisted projects are completed successfully, 212 affordable housing units will be produced.

Two of the four rental housing projects awarded 2006 funds (including an amendment to a previously-funded project) involve acquisition and rehabilitation of existing housing units making them decent, safe and permanently affordable to extremely low and low-income families. St. Andrew's Housing Group's Mine Hill Apartments project creates 28 affordable rental family housing units for households whose incomes range from 30% to 60% of the area median income. All of the units will be HOME-assisted. The County's investment will leverage approximately \$5.7 million in other funds.

The second rehabilitation project is a 2006 amendment to the MultiService Center's (MSC) 85 unit Garden Park II project (now called Villa Capri). The rehabilitation project will address community safety issues in the city of Federal Way by providing nonprofit ownership and oversight to a deteriorating apartment complex. This project will create 43 units at 30% of median income, 35 units at 50% of median income and 7 units at 60% of median income. Of the total 85 units, 78 will be HOME-assisted. As a Community Housing Development Organization, MSC will add more units of family housing to its growing portfolio.

Two additional HOME-funded projects involve new construction and the creation of 100 units of permanent affordable rental housing. One project will create 8 units of rental housing for homeless families in the East King County town of Duvall. This project involves collaboration between Hopelink who will own and operate the housing units atop a community facility to be developed by Friends of Youth. Hopelink is also a Community Housing Development Organization and has been working with Friends of Youth to accumulate the financing needed to complete this ambitious project. The housing will serve homeless families, six of the units will house families in transition and two units will provide permanent housing.

The second new construction project by Downtown Action to Create Housing will produce 91 units of permanent affordable rental housing for low-income individuals and families as part of the Fifth and Williams project in the city of Renton. Sixty-nine units will serve households with incomes up to 50% of the area median and twenty-two units will serve households up to 60% of the area median income. Six of the units will provide transitional housing for victims of domestic violence. Total development costs are currently projected to be \$18.4 million.

Rental Rehabilitation Program

During 2006, the requirements of the Rental Rehabilitation Program using HOME funds were re-visited. **\$45,000** in prior year HOME funds have been earmarked for the program which also meet the H&CD Plan Affordable Housing Objective 1, Strategy B *to make capital funds available to rehabilitate existing rental units for low- and moderate-income households.*

The Rental Rehabilitation Program is designed to help preserve the existing stock of affordable rental housing and keep it in safe, decent, sanitary condition. Non-profit and for-profit organizations are eligible to apply for these funds. In 2006, The Rental Rehabilitation Program did not make any loans using HOME funds because it was difficult for non-profit and for-profit agencies to meet the HOME requirements. However, the Program did make a \$53,000 loan using local funds to rehabilitate a group home owned by a non-profit agency to house five individuals with developmental disabilities.

The Rental Rehabilitation Program is working with the Asset Manger to identify non-profit housing projects with an existing County investment that are in need of rehabilitation and market the Rental Rehabilitation Program to those agencies.

HOME funds have also been used consistent with H&CD Affordable Housing Objective #2, Strategy A to make capital funds available to repair and/or improve the existing stock of homes owned by low- to moderate-income households.

Homeowner Rehabilitation Program

Three hundred thousand dollars (**\$300,000**) of the 2006 available HOME funds was used for single-family housing rehabilitation. The rehabilitation of owner-occupied homes is part of a continuing effort to preserve the existing affordable housing stock and keep people in their homes. During the year 2006, the housing repair program completed 10 owner-occupied single-family residences, expending \$155,610 which includes projects initiated in previous years but completed in 2006. Also another \$41,510 is committed to 2 applicants where construction is underway but not completed as of 12/31/06. Other activities included marketing the programs, servicing the existing loan portfolio, and regional participation in housing rehabilitation issues.

Homeownership Programs

HOME funds are being used consistent with H&CD Affordable Housing Objective #2, Strategy B to make funds available for first-time homebuyer opportunities including education, housing counseling and down payment assistance for low- to moderate-income households. Both generic HOME funds as well as ADDI funds have been awarded to first-time homebuyer projects.

The Washington State Housing Finance Commission in partnership with A Regional Coalition for Housing (ARCH) has received an additional **\$300,000** in ADDI funds for down payment assistance loans under the first recapitalization of the House Key Plus – ARCH Program. ADDI funds are combined with Finance Commission and local funds from East King County cities for a second mortgage of up to \$30,000 per borrower. This program, as of December 2006, has closed 21 purchases by first-time homebuyers. The program continues to be marketed to residents in public housing and in mobile home parks by ARCH.

Planning and Administration

\$450,259 or 10% of the HOME and program Income funds available in 2006 were used to cover HOME program administration. Annual reports were collected and reviewed for 46 HOME-assisted projects, covering approximately 1,173 HOME-assisted units. These projects cover transitional and permanent rental housing serving low and very-low income families and individuals. (See also Section G. Monitoring & Inspections of HOME projects)

Overall, HOME funds continue to be targeted primarily to rental projects toward very low-income families and individuals whose incomes fall below 50% of area median income. Priority for housing development funds in 2006 was to create permanent rental housing serving low (50% of AMI) and extremely low (30% of AMI) income households. In parts of King County where market rates are equivalent to rents affordable at 50% of AMI such as South King County, HOME funds help create affordable units serving households well below this level.

B. Private Sector Participation:

Total requests for housing development funds continue to exceed the amount of funds available. As a result, King County's HOME programs rely on the participation of the private sector to leverage resources to successfully implement housing projects. This includes private lenders, tax credit or tax-exempt bond investors, and sometimes loans from foundations. The need to assemble a wide variety of public and private funds often results in lengthy development timelines even though our nonprofit housing organizations are well prepared to meet the complex and diverse requirements of each funding source.

The nonprofit housing development projects also leverage other public sector funds, primarily State Housing Trust Funds and Consortium city CDBG or local funds. In addition, our nonprofit sponsors partner with private development consultants, construction contractors and realtors to develop HOME-funded projects while King County's Housing Finance Program staff enlists the assistance of private sector experts in real estate and finance to help review housing project development proposals. These private sector experts serve as members of an external advisory committee. King County's Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds compliment the HOME Program by funding rental housing for persons with special needs as well as homeowner rehabilitation and first-time homebuyer activities, serving households up to 80% of median income.

With the receipt of ADDI funds, King County has partnered with the Washington State Housing Finance Commission (WSHFC) Homeownership Program. WSHFC works directly with mortgage lenders to offer affordable first mortgages which will be combined with ADDI-funded second mortgages for eligible first-time homebuyers.

The County's homeowner rehabilitation program also leverages private sector financing. Within the homeowner housing repair program, property owners may be offered a matching loan. The applicant pays half the cost of rehabilitation using a private loan and the other half is borrowed from King County as a zero-interest deferred payment loan. The maximum loan from the County is \$20,000. Also the new relationship with the King County Housing Authority allows many projects to leverage various weatherization funds and consolidate the construction management efforts.

HOME Program Match

HOME development funds are targeted to affordable permanent rental housing or the promotion of homeownership opportunities for households below 80% of median income. Local county Housing Opportunity funds and the Regional Affordable Housing Program funds often serve as match for HOME projects and are targeted to families or individuals at the lowest income level and those with special housing needs when awarded to the same projects.

C. Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDOs)

King County continues its efforts to support organizations that meet the CHDO criteria under HOME. These efforts include outreach and contacts with organizations like Common Ground that provide technical assistance to organizations interested in becoming CHDOs. King County staff informs nonprofit organizations about the advantages provided under the HOME program for CHDOs and outlines the criteria that must be met in order for an organization to receive the CHDO designation. The Consortium's HOME policies allow CHDOs to apply for and receive operating support funds to build the capacity of these agencies. The agency must demonstrate how an additional award would increase its ability to produce, own and manage affordable housing. Two CHDO projects received 2006 HOME funds: MSC received additional funds to develop the Villa Capri apartment rehabilitation project and Hopelink received HOME funds to develop new rental housing units in Duvall.

King County continues to focus its efforts on strengthening the capacity of existing CHDOs instead of trying to develop new CHDOs, under the Consortium's policy to provide operating support. Currently, the County Consortium has eight organizations designated as CHDOs.

D. Affirmative Marketing:

King County has policies and procedures for affirmative marketing of vacant units in projects of five or more units, per 24 CFR 92.351.

King County informs the general public with a description of affirmative marketing requirements when advertising its program in legal notices and advertisements in general media throughout the County. The requirements are also set out in press releases given to general media and community newspapers throughout the County.

Owners desiring to participate in the HOME program are informed of affirmative marketing requirements in the first interview. Potential tenants are informed of the requirements when given "Notice of Right to Continue in Occupancy."

In addition, the Equal Housing Opportunity logo in all material distributed about the program.

Owners are required to display the Equal Housing Opportunity logo during rehab work, list vacancies with the King County Housing Authority, advertise vacancies through community and minority newspapers, and/or list vacancies with minority community outreach programs and housing counseling agencies.

Recordkeeping required of owners includes keeping rejected applications of potential tenants, copies of advertising of vacant units, and copies of letters listing vacant units with minority outreach groups. Sufficient records must be kept to comply with 24 CFR 508.

E. Minority Outreach:

King County has a minority outreach effort for the HOME program aimed at bringing minority- and women-owned businesses (M/WB) into participating as contractors or suppliers for renovation and construction projects. The County encourages the following practices to promote open competitive opportunities for small businesses including M/WBEs:

1. Scheduling a pre-bid or pre-solicitation conference to provide project information and to inform M/WBEs and other firms of contracting and subcontracting opportunities.
2. Placing all qualified small businesses attempting to do business in the County, including M/WBEs, on solicitation lists, and providing written notice of subcontracting opportunities

to M/WBEs and all other small businesses capable of performing the work, including without limitation all businesses on any list provided by the County, in sufficient time to allow such businesses to respond to the written solicitations.

3. Breaking down total requirements into smaller tasks or quantities, where economically feasible, in order to permit maximum participation by small businesses including M/WBEs.
4. Establishing delivery schedules, where the requirements of this contract permit that encourages participation by small businesses, including M/WBEs.
5. Providing small businesses including M/WBEs that express interest with adequate and timely information about plans, specifications, and requirements of the contract.
6. Utilizing the services of available community organizations, contractor groups, local assistance offices, the County, and other organizations that provide assistance in the recruitment and placement of small businesses including M/WBEs.

F. Tenant Assistance/Relocation:

1. King County prioritizes projects that don't cause the displacement of existing tenants. All recipients are made aware of the impact (both financial and staffing) that federally-required relocation procedures and payments may have. King County will only consider funding HOME projects with potential relocation if the project meets a critical housing need that outweighs the negative impact of residential and business displacement.
2. The King County Relocation Specialist monitors each HOME-assisted project to insure the timely issuance of required notices and project compliance. Multi-Service Center (MSC) was awarded \$858,890 of 2004 HOME funds and received a conditional commitment of an additional \$650,000 of 2006 HOME funds for the acquisition and rehabilitation of an 85-unit apartment complex called Garden Park II Apartments in the City of Federal Way. MSC received all the needed funding to proceed with acquisition and rehab of this project. General Information Notices were issued to tenants in 2003. Due to natural attrition and the condition of the project, one original tenant was permanently displaced in June 2006 with a total relocation cost of \$5,830.
3. The steps taken by the developer's relocation agent to coordinate the provision of housing assistance and the delivery of special services to those occupants displaced include:
 - a. Identifying any special needs during the interview process.
 - b. Keeping the occupant informed of project progress.
 - c. Identifying comparable housing.
 - d. Taking the displaced person to inspect the comparable housing.
 - e. Completing claim forms.
 - f. Coordinating the move.
 - g. Assisting the occupants in any way possible.

Tenants, who are not displaced, are kept informed of project progress. Tenants are assisted if temporary relocation is needed and rents are monitored upon completion for compliance with the Uniform Relocation Act.

G. Monitoring & Inspections of HOME projects

A joint inspection tool, based on the HUD Real Estate Assessment Center (REAC) Physical Assessment Sub-system was developed by the public funders and visits to properties are currently coordinated between funders to minimize the burden of “multiple visits” to the same property over the course of a year. Schedules between public funders are coordinated for jointly funded projects.

On-site inspections for King County HOME funded projects were performed for 111 HOME-assisted units during 2006. Fifty units had no documented deficiencies and 61 units had a wide range of documented deficiencies per the Uniform Physical Conditions Standards used. Insufficient clearance of baseboard heaters, and inoperable or missing GFCI outlets continue to be the most common health and safety deficiency. One post abatement inspection was required.

King County and other participating public funders continue to use a combined annual report form. Owners of publicly-funded affordable housing are required to submit this report. In addition to demographic and compliance information on tenant occupants of the housing, the report also collects critical year-end operating and reserve information to help property owners and funders identify potential issues in advance of problems. The data allows staff to provide technical assistance to property owners in a timely manner.

During 2006 King County continued to participate with the State and other public funders to develop a web-based Combined Funders Annual Report. This would eliminate a lot of redundancy in reporting by the contractors and the burdensome editing process of the current Excel workbooks when the annual reports are filed. Although King County is one of the few funders to accept electronic filing of the reports, extensive editing is still required before summaries of the data can be generated for performance reporting.

Attachment C: Tables 4 - 17

Households Assisted with Housing

In 2006, at least 5,000 low- and moderate-income households in the King County Consortium were assisted with affordable housing. As shown in Tables 4 and 5, they included families and individuals who are homeowners, renters, homeless people, and people with special needs. Most had incomes below 30 percent of the median. Types of assistance provided include subsidized permanent and transitional housing units, emergency shelter, home repair (both renter and owner occupied), and preservation of mobile home parks.

Table 4: Households Assisted by Type, 2006

| Type of Household Assisted | Number | Percent |
|------------------------------|--------|---------|
| Family Households | 2882 | 53.9% |
| Single Individual Households | 2466 | 46.1% |
| Total Households Assisted | 5348 | 100.0% |

Table 5: Households Assisted With Housing by Income Level, 2006 (HOME, CDBG, and ESG only)

| Income Level % of median income | Homeowners | Renters | Homeless | Total | Percent |
|---------------------------------|------------|-------------|------------|-------------|---------------|
| 0% to 30% of median | 291 | 2239 | 761 | 3291 | 63.8% |
| 31% to 50% | 229 | 993 | 53 | 1275 | 24.7% |
| 51% to 80% | 145 | 338 | 5 | 488 | 9.5% |
| 81% + | 31 | 50 | 1 | 82 | 1.6% |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 23 | 23 | 0.4% |
| TOTAL | 696 | 3620 | 843 | 5159 | 100.0% |

Note: "Home owner" category is primarily households served through home repair programs, preservation of mobile home park projects and opportunities for first time home buyers; "Homeless" includes persons served in shelters and transitional housing as well as those making the transition to permanent housing. An additional 2,823 Households were served by units produced with King County local funding. This includes 2,582 renters, and 240 owner households consisting of individual families.

Table 6: Goals for the average number of renter households to be served annually in completed housing units, by household type and income:

| Type of Household | At or Below 30% of Area Median Income (AMI) | 31% to 50% of AMIs | 51% to 60% of AMI | 61% to 80% of AMI |
|---|--|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Small Related Households (2-4 persons) | 30 High Need | 7 High Need | 0 Medium Need | 0 Low Need |
| Large Related Households (5+ persons) | 6 High Need | 1 High Need | 0 Medium Need | 0 Low Need |
| Elderly Households | 0 High Need | 0 High Need | 0 Medium Need | 0 Low Need |
| Households with Special Needs | 329 High Need | 3 High Need | 0 Medium Need | 0 Low Need |
| All Other Households | 5 High Need | 2 High Need | 0 Medium Need | 0 Low Need |
| Total Renter Households Served | 370 | 13 | 0 | 0 |
| Annual Goal = 500 | | | | |

Table 7: Homeless Households and Individuals Served in Shelters and Transitional Housing, 2006 (ESG and CDBG funds only)

| | <i>Households Served</i> | <i>Individuals Served</i> | <i>Individuals Turned Away</i> |
|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Emergency Shelter | 938 | 2,000 | 26,993 |
| Transitional Housing | | 27 | |
| Total | 938 | 2,027 | 26,993 |

Source: Client profile reports submitted by shelter programs, calendar year 2006. Includes only those programs receiving CDBG and/or ESG funds. Counts may include duplication.

Table 8: Production Summary: 2006 Allocations By King County Consortium ⁴

| <i>Housing type</i> | <i>Units</i> | <i>% of total</i> |
|--|--------------|-------------------|
| Permanent housing | 418 | 89% |
| Transitional housing | 12 | 3% |
| Homeownership | 38 | 8% |
| Total | 468 | 100% |
| <i>Type of household to be served</i> | <i>Units</i> | <i>% of total</i> |
| Family units | 204 | 44% |
| Individual units | 46 | 10% |
| Special needs units | 218 | 46% |
| Total | 468 | 100% |
| <i>Income level</i> | <i>Units</i> | <i>% of total</i> |
| Affordable to 0-30% of median income: | 296 | 63% |
| Affordable to 31-50% of median income: | 101 | 22% |
| Affordable to 51-80% of median income: | 71 | 15% |
| Total Units | 468 | 100% |

⁴ Includes HOME, CDBG County and Small Cities housing set-aside, the King County Housing Opportunity Fund and Pass-through Cities CDBG allocations.

Table 9: Housing Allocations by Objectives, 2006

| Objectives (not in priority order) | 2006 Housing-Related Project Allocations from HOME, CDBG |
|---|--|
| #1 - Preserve and expand the supply of affordable rental housing available to low- and moderate-income households, including households with special needs | \$6,006,146 |
| #2 - Preserve the housing of low- to moderate-income homeowners, and provide programs for low- and moderate-income households that are prepared to become first-time homeowners | \$6,339,832 |
| #3 - King County will plan for and support fair housing strategies and initiatives designed to affirmatively further fair housing and increase access to housing, and to housing programs and services for low- to moderate-income households. King County staff may work with Consortium city staff and community stakeholder agencies on these fair housing strategies. These strategies do not have annual output or outcome goals, and will be reported on as progress occurs in narrative fashion. | \$1,574,194 |
| Total | \$13,920,172 |

Public Services**Table 10: Number of Persons Served in Public Services, 2006***

| Public Services | No. of Persons Served |
|---|-----------------------|
| Table 10: Number of Persons Served in Public Services, 2006 | |
| Priority Need Category | |
| Basic Needs-emergency food and financial assistance | 49,823 |
| Senior Services | 5,811 |
| Health Care Services | 2,674 |
| Youth Services | 987 |
| Employment Training/Self Sufficiency (not CBDO) | 93 |
| Child Care Services | 83 |
| Domestic Violence Victim Services | 39 |
| Total: | 59,510 |

Note: Does not include emergency shelter, transitional housing, homelessness prevention or other housing services; Also does not include employment support services provided by Community Based Development Organizations

Public Improvements

Table 11: Number of Active Public Improvements Projects, 2006

| Priority Need Category | Actual No. of Projects Assisted | Actual No. of Projects Completed |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Water/Sewer Improvements | 4 | 1 |
| Street Improvements | 3 | 1 |
| Sidewalk Improvements | 3 | 2 |
| Parks/Recreational Facilities | 6 | 2 |
| Total: | 16 | 6 |

Community Facilities

Table 12: Number of Active Community Facility (including acquisition, rehabilitation and new construction) Projects, 2006

Table 12: Number of Active Community Facility Projects, 2006

| Priority Need Category | No. of Projects Assisted | No. of Projects Completed |
|---|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Senior Centers | 3 | 2 |
| Youth Centers | 2 | 2 |
| Neighborhood Facilities (food banks, counseling, social services) | 9 | 4 |
| Health Facilities | 3 | 1 |
| Facilities for Abused/Neglected Children | 1 | 1 |
| TOTAL: | 18 | 10 |

Economic Development

Table 13: Number of Businesses and Persons Assisted in Economic Development Activities, 2006

| Priority Need Category | No. of Businesses Assisted | No. of Persons Assisted | No. of Jobs Created/Retained | Percent of Jobs Assisted |
|------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| For-Profit Businesses | 3 | | | |
| Total: | 3 | | | |

Table 14: Projects/Units Rehabilitated with CDBG Funds Completed in 2006

| Year Funded | Project | Units Completed | CDBG Funds | Other Funds |
|----------------|---|-----------------|-------------|-------------|
| multiple years | King County Housing Repair Program | 71 | \$803,946 | \$301,906 |
| 2006 | Minor Home Repair Programs (Renton, Tukwila, SeaTac, Shoreline) | 248 | \$253,184 | \$16,096 |
| | Subtotal Housing Repair Programs | 319 | \$1,057,130 | \$318,002 |
| 2005 | Federal Way - King County Housing Authority Southridge C05028 | 80 | \$125,000 | \$2,743,782 |
| | Subtotal Housing Rehabilitation | 399 | \$1,182,130 | \$3,061,784 |
| | Community Facilities | | | |
| 2004 | Federal Way Boys & Girls Club Youth Development Center C04128 | 1 | \$340,517 | \$3,580,737 |
| 2004 | Black Diamond Community Center Facility Rehab C04748 | 1 | \$5,395 | \$187,000 |
| 2005 | Family Resource Center Roof Replacement C05031 | 1 | \$8,824 | \$- |

Table 15. Employment Support Services Delivered by Community Based Development Organizations 2006

| Project | No. of Unduplicated Persons Served | Employment Plans Developed | Child Care Support for Working Parents | Job Support/Case Management Sessions | Job Placement/Improvement |
|--|------------------------------------|----------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Hopelink Employment & Child Care Program C06231 | 138 | | 45 | 480 | |
| Hopelink Rural Connections C06233 | 54 | 50 | | | |
| Subtotal Hopelink: | 192 | 50 | 45 | 480 | |
| Multi-Service Center Employment Services C06235 | 135 | 132 | | | 52 |
| Federal Way MSC Employee Development Services C06578 | 99 | 90 | | | 39 |
| Renton MSC Employee Development Services C06140 | 43 | 43 | 11 | | 27 |
| Subtotal Multi-Service Center: | 277 | 265 | 11 | | 118 |
| TOTAL | 469 | 315 | 56 | 480 | 118 |

Table 16: Non-Housing Community Development Allocations by Objectives, 2006

| Objectives (not in priority order) | CDBG Allocations |
|--|--------------------|
| #1 - Improve the ability of health and human service agencies to serve our low- to moderate-income residents effectively and efficiently | \$635,400 |
| #2 Improve the living environment in low- and moderate-income neighborhoods/communities in accordance with jurisdictions' adopted Comprehensive Plans and Countywide Planning Policies | \$1,011,710 |
| #3 - Expand economic opportunities for low- to moderate-income persons | \$753,838 |
| TOTAL | \$2,400,948 |

Table 17:

Table 17: King County Consortium, Beneficiaries by Racial/ Ethnic Categories, 2006

| CDBG Beneficiaries by Racial/Ethnic Categories | | Persons | | Households | |
|---|-------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-------------|
| Includes both housing and non-housing activities | | | | | |
| Race/Ethnic Group | Total Persons | # Hispanic | Total Households | # Hispanic | |
| White | 112,777 | 17,739 | 1,664 | 55 | |
| Black/African American | 19,060 | 180 | 138 | 1 | |
| Asian | 6,029 | 3 | 108 | 1 | |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native | 3,925 | 208 | 27 | 4 | |
| Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific islander | 2,609 | 6 | 8 | 1 | |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native & White | 271 | 9 | 15 | 4 | |
| Asian & White | 658 | 0 | 6 | 0 | |
| Black/African American & White | 699 | 6 | 6 | 1 | |
| Am. Indian/Alaskan Native & Black/African American | 49 | 3 | 0 | 0 | |
| Other Multi-Racial | 26,910 | 11,849 | 63 | 8 | |
| | Total: | 172,987 | 30,003 | 2,035 | 75 |
| | Percent Hispanic | | 17.3% | | 3.7% |

HOME & ADDI Unit Completions by Racial/Ethnic Categories

Includes rental units, first-time homebuyers and homeowners

| Race/Ethnic Group | Households | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| | Total Households | # Hispanic |
| White | 41 | 2 |
| Black/African American | 5 | 0 |
| Asian | 3 | 0 |

| | | |
|--|----|------|
| American Indian/Alaskan Native | 3 | 2 |
| Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific islander | 0 | 0 |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native & White | 0 | 0 |
| Asian & White | 0 | 0 |
| Black/African American & White | 0 | 0 |
| Am. Indian/Alaskan Native & Black/African American | 0 | 0 |
| Other Multi-Racial | 0 | 0 |
| Total: | 52 | 4 |
| Percent Hispanic | | 7.7% |

ESG Beneficiaries by Racial/Ethnic Categories

| Race/Ethnic Group | Persons | |
|--|---------------|------------|
| | Total Persons | # Hispanic |
| White | 1,042 | 97 |
| Black/African American | 628 | 0 |
| Asian | 44 | 1 |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native | 91 | 1 |
| Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific islander | 28 | 0 |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native & White | 22 | 2 |
| Asian & White | 2 | 0 |
| Black/African American & White | 58 | 1 |
| Am. Indian/Alaskan Native & Black/African American | 2 | 0 |
| Other Multi-Racial | 283 | 89 |
| Total: | 2,200 | 191 |
| Percent Hispanic | | 8.7% |

TOTAL CDBG, HOME/ADDI and ESG

| Race/Ethnic Group | Total Persons | | Total Households | |
|--|---------------|------------|------------------|------------|
| | Total Persons | # Hispanic | Total Households | # Hispanic |
| White | 113,819 | 17,836 | 1,705 | 57 |
| Black/African American | 19,688 | 180 | 143 | 1 |
| Asian | 6,073 | 4 | 111 | 1 |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native | 4,016 | 209 | 30 | 6 |
| Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific islander | 2,637 | 6 | 8 | 1 |

| | | | | |
|--|---------|--------|-------|------|
| American Indian/Alaskan Native & White | 293 | 11 | 15 | 4 |
| Asian & White | 660 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Black/African American & White | 757 | 7 | 6 | 1 |
| Am. Indian/Alaskan Native & Black/African American | 51 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Multi-Racial | 27,193 | 11,938 | 63 | 8 |
| Total: | 175,187 | 30,194 | 2,087 | 79 |
| Percent Hispanic | | 17.2% | | 3.8% |

*Race/Ethnic data collected through federal programs is not directly comparable to census data. These groups can only be compared with the census data "Two or More Races" category and "Some Other Race" category.

*For capital development projects, the ethnicity is reported for head of household and not individuals in the household. Therefore, numbers counted in households not persons.

Attachment D: Project Activity Performance Report