



Executive Summary

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

1. Introduction

The Consolidated Plan establishes local priorities consistent with national objectives and priorities established by HUD (US Department of Housing and Urban Development) to utilize funds allocated by the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), the HOME Investment Partnership Program, and the Emergency Solution Grant (ESG). Over the five-year period covered by the Consolidated Plan over \$20 million is expected to be available through these programs, including allocations and program income.

2. Summary of the objectives and outcomes identified in the Plan

As determined in the assessment of needs and market analysis included in this plan, three broad needs were identified. The first was the need for affordable housing choice, including safe housing in good condition for all residents. In response to that need a goal was set to increase and preserve affordable housing choice which will be accomplished through projects such as home repair, down payment assistance, supporting development of new housing, rental housing rehabilitation and providing permanent supportive housing.

The second priority need established is to reduce homelessness and increase stability for all residents, including support for self-sufficiency. In response to this need a corresponding goal was set to reduce homelessness and increase stability. Projects meeting this goal include interventions across a broad spectrum, such as supportive and emergency services, transitional housing and shelters, homeless interventions and prevention, and activities to increase self-sufficiency (e.g., job training, employment readiness, and education).

The third priority need established in the planning process is the need for community and economic development and the corresponding goal is to improve infrastructure, facilities and economic opportunities. Projects to meet this goal will include extensive work with infrastructure, which is seen in both Tacoma and Lakewood as essential in encouraging stability in neighborhoods, increasing access to persons with disabilities, and attracting and retaining businesses. Projects will also support micro-enterprises and business development. Projects will also support public facilities, parks, and transportation improvements.

3. Evaluation of past performance

The City of Tacoma and the City of Lakewood have made significant progress over the years in meeting needs. The organizational structure, coordination between departments within the cities, and coordination with agencies, Pierce County and the region have allowed streamlined performance and delivery in spite of dwindling resources. As with this Consortium Consolidated Plan, goals were set targeting the need for housing, building a suitable living environment through services and infrastructure, and fostering a system and improvements to spur economic development.

Tacoma and Lakewood are key partners in regional planning efforts, including the Tacoma/Lakewood/Pierce County Continuum of Care and the Tacoma Pierce County Affordable Housing Consortium as well as broader regional organizations such as the Puget Sound Regional Council. Creation and support of the Tacoma Community Redevelopment Authority has benefitted both Cities and greatly expanded the availability and condition of affordable housing. Integration of Human Services strategic planning in both

cities contributes to efficient allocation of funds (CDBG, general fund, and other sources) to meet needs. The Housing Authorities are key partners and providers and both Tacoma and Lakewood. These and other partnerships, built over the years, are the basis for past successful performance and a promising path forward. While a strong system is in place, decreased funding and public support is a challenge felt by the Consortium and by cooperating agencies.

4. Summary of citizen participation process and consultation process

The consultation process for this Consolidated Plan was extensive, giving citizens many opportunities to contribute. Meetings were held in neighborhoods in Tacoma and Lakewood. In addition to the neighborhood meetings, community meetings were held that specifically encouraged input from seniors, persons with disabilities, African Americans, Asian/Pacific Islanders and Hispanics. Many of those who attended were lower-income and were receiving assistance. Their input was valuable in outlining needs. Public hearings on needs and on the draft Consolidated Plan, Strategic Plan and Annual Action Plans for both Tacoma and Lakewood were held in each city. There was extensive outreach to stakeholders and organizations. Strategic plans and needs assessments completed by partners in Pierce County enriched needs outlined in this Consortium Consolidated Plan. The Lakewood Community Services Advisory Board, the Tacoma Community Redevelopment Authority Board provided review and oversight during the process, in addition to extensive coordination within departments in each of the jurisdictions.

5. Summary of public comments

Comments were supportive of continued funding on behalf of affordable housing, shelter and other homeless interventions, public services, and economic development. Those providing input at the public hearing on needs in Tacoma included the Tacoma-Pierce County Habitat for Humanity, Metropolitan Development Council, Associated Ministries, Shiloh Baptist Church, Rescue Mission, Rebuilding Tacoma Together, the William Factory and Spaceworks. In Lakewood, those offering testimony at the public hearing on needs included the Pierce County Housing Authority, YMCA Child Care, and Tacoma-Pierce County Habitat for Humanity, each of whom encouraging continued support. Comments on needs were incorporated in sections in the Consolidated Plan and many of the organizations were included among those interviewed individually as well.

Comments at public hearings in Tacoma on the draft Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan included a representative from the William Factory about the importance of continued funding for the business incubator, the benefits to Tacoma and disadvantaged populations in the City. A citizen expressed concern that no street outreach or homelessness prevention programs were being funded with ESG dollars, even though they were eligible activities. He commented about the importance of street outreach to homeless veterans, including African American female veterans. Some are served by smaller organizations that have not been competitive in the annual allocation process. The City will refer this

concern to the Continuum of Care and ESG Review Panel for consideration in future funding cycles. One comment was received at the public hearing in Lakewood on the draft Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan about the importance of jobs. This topic was addressed as a concern throughout the Consolidated Plan.

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

All comments were considered and/or incorporated in the Consolidated Plan.

7. Summary

The Process

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

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

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

Agency Role	Name	Department/Agency
CDBG Administrator		City of Tacoma
HOME Administrator		City of Tacoma
ESG Administrator		City of Tacoma

Table 1 – Responsible Agencies

Narrative

Consolidated Plan Public Contact Information

Carey Jenkins, CED Housing Division Manager. cjenkins@cityoftacoma.org 253.591.5238

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

1. Introduction

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

Representatives from the City of Tacoma and the City of Lakewood participate in regional planning efforts concerning all aspect of needs and opportunities covered by this Consolidated Plan, including economic development, transportation, public services, special needs, homelessness, and housing. Needs far exceed resources and the Cities, Pierce County, Puget Sound Regional Council have worked together to make decisions and set long-term priorities. Coordination within the Cities also consisted of input and review from the Lakewood CDBG Citizens Advisory Board and the Tacoma Community Redevelop Authority (TCRA). Coordination with the Tacoma Housing Authority, the Pierce County Housing Authority, service-providing agencies, and other stakeholders are described below. Their comments and input are reflected in discussions throughout this Consolidated Plan.

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

The Cities of Tacoma and Lakewood are actively engaged members of the Tacoma/Lakewood/Pierce County Continuum of Care. The three jurisdictions are the three most involved governmental entities in the Continuum, cooperatively working on programs to meet needs for housing and services. Both Tacoma and Lakewood support the Continuum's priorities focusing on the needs of the most vulnerable populations including chronically homeless persons, unaccompanied youth, families with children, and veterans, among others. The Continuum's recently established Centralized Intake System (AP4H) is supported by both Tacoma and Lakewood and is designed to provide assessment and rapid placement in appropriate housing, reducing vulnerability and increasing stability. The Cities were integral partners in developing the 2012 Tacoma Tacoma/Lakewood/Pierce County Plan to End Homelessness.

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

The Cities of Tacoma and Lakewood work closely with the Collaborative Applicant of the Continuum of Care (Pierce County) planning for allocation and use of Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) funds. ESG policies and procedures were created and are updated periodically in cooperation with Pierce County and Tacoma to ensure that ESG subrecipients are operating programs consistently across eligible

activities. Performance is reviewed by both entities. The Collaborative Applicant is also the HMIS lead and works closely with City of Tacoma to maximize use of HMIS resources and to draw data for reports on project performance and program outcomes.

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

Table 2 – Agencies, groups, organizations who participated

1	Agency/Group/Organization	Metropolitan Development Council
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services - Housing Services-homeless Services-Employment Service-Fair Housing Services - Victims Regional organization Planning organization
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview
2	Agency/Group/Organization	Asia Pacific Cultural Center
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Regional organization Civic Leaders
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Lead-based Paint Strategy Non-Homeless Special Needs Economic Development
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview
3	Agency/Group/Organization	Associated Ministerial Alliance
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Civic Leaders
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Non-Homeless Special Needs Anti-poverty Strategy

	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview with ministers
4	Agency/Group/Organization	Associated Ministries
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services - Housing Services-Persons with Disabilities Services-Victims of Domestic Violence Services-homeless Services-Education Services-Employment Service-Fair Housing Services - Victims Regional organization Planning organization
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview
5	Agency/Group/Organization	Clover Park School District
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services-Education
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview
6	Agency/Group/Organization	CRYSTAL JUDSON FAMILY JUSTICE CENTER
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services-Victims of Domestic Violence

	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Non-Homeless Special Needs
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview
7	Agency/Group/Organization	Emergency Food Network
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services-Children Services-Elderly Persons Services-Persons with Disabilities Services-Persons with HIV/AIDS
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Homeless Needs - Families with children Non-Homeless Special Needs
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview
8	Agency/Group/Organization	Franklin Pierce School District
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services-Children Services-Education
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview
9	Agency/Group/Organization	Greater Lakes Mental Health
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services - Housing Services-Persons with Disabilities Services-homeless Services-Health Health Agency
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Public Housing Needs Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs Market Analysis

	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview
10	Agency/Group/Organization	Joint Base Lewis McChord
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Other government - Federal
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Needs - Veterans Non-Homeless Special Needs Economic Development Market Analysis
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview
11	Agency/Group/Organization	Korean Women's Association
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services - Housing Services-Children Services-Elderly Persons Services-Victims of Domestic Violence Regional organization
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Non-Homeless Special Needs Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview
12	Agency/Group/Organization	City of Lakewood
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Other government - Local Planning organization

	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Lead-based Paint Strategy Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Economic Development Market Analysis Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Interviews with City Manager, Council Members, Code Enforcement, Community Development, Planning, Community Safety & Resource Team, Planning, Police
13	Agency/Group/Organization	LASA
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services - Housing Services-Victims of Domestic Violence Services-homeless Services-Education Service-Fair Housing Services - Victims Regional organization
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Public Housing Needs Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview

14	Agency/Group/Organization	Pierce County Community Connections
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services - Housing Services-Elderly Persons Services-Persons with Disabilities Services-Persons with HIV/AIDS Services-Victims of Domestic Violence Services-homeless Health Agency Other government - County Planning organization
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Public Housing Needs Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview
15	Agency/Group/Organization	Pierce County Housing Authority
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing PHA Services - Housing Planning organization
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Public Housing Needs Homeless Needs - Families with children Non-Homeless Special Needs Market Analysis
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview

16	Agency/Group/Organization	South Sound Outreach Services
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services-Elderly Persons Services-Persons with Disabilities Services-Persons with HIV/AIDS Services-homeless
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview
17	Agency/Group/Organization	St. Leo's Food Bank
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services-Children Services-Elderly Persons Services-Persons with Disabilities Services-Persons with HIV/AIDS Services-Victims of Domestic Violence Services-homeless
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview
18	Agency/Group/Organization	TACID
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services-Persons with Disabilities Services-Education Services-Employment Service-Fair Housing Regional organization Planning organization

	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Non-Homeless Special Needs
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview
19	Agency/Group/Organization	City of Tacoma
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Other government - Local Planning organization
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Lead-based Paint Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs Economic Development Market Analysis Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interviews with City Manager, Council Members, Planning, Community & Economic Development, Code Enforcement, Police, Fire Department, COT-NCSICS, Neighborhood & Community Services
20	Agency/Group/Organization	Tacoma Community House
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services - Housing Services-Education Services-Employment Services - Victims
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Non-Homeless Special Needs
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview; needs of immigrants and refugees

21	Agency/Group/Organization	TACOMA HOUSING AUTHORITY
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing PHA Services - Housing Services-Employment Service-Fair Housing
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Public Housing Needs Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Families with children Non-Homeless Special Needs Economic Development Market Analysis Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview
22	Agency/Group/Organization	Tacoma Pierce County Affordable Housing Consortium
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Regional organization Planning organization
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Public Housing Needs Non-Homeless Special Needs Economic Development Market Analysis Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview
23	Agency/Group/Organization	Tacoma Pierce County Habitat for Humanity
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Non-Homeless Special Needs Market Analysis

	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview
24	Agency/Group/Organization	Tacoma School District
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services-Children Services-Education
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview
25	Agency/Group/Organization	United Way of Pierce County1501 pACIFIC aVENUE
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Regional organization Planning organization
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Non-Homeless Special Needs Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview
26	Agency/Group/Organization	Washington State Department of Veterans Affairs
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services - Housing Services-Education Services-Employment Other government - State
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Needs - Veterans Non-Homeless Special Needs
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview

27	Agency/Group/Organization	West Pierce Fire and Rescue
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Other government - County
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Non-Homeless Special Needs
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Meeting with first responders
28	Agency/Group/Organization	YWCA of Pierce County
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services - Housing Services-Children Services-Victims of Domestic Violence Services-Health Services - Victims
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homeless Needs - Families with children Non-Homeless Special Needs
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview

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

No agencies were intentionally excluded from consultation. Every effort was made to ensure advance publication of meetings and opportunities to contribute.

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

Name of Plan	Lead Organization	How do the goals of your Strategic Plan overlap with the goals of each plan?
Continuum of Care	Pierce County Community Connections	

Table 3 – Other local / regional / federal planning efforts

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

The City of Tacoma and the City of Lakewood work closely with the Tacoma Housing Authority and the Pierce County Housing Authority. The Cities participate in the Tacoma/Lakewood/Pierce County Continuum of Care and are active in the Tacoma Pierce County Affordable Housing Consortium, the Economic Development Board for Tacoma-Pierce County, the Pierce County Human Services Coalition and other public entities and associations that set priorities for use of resources in the region, set goals, and measure progress in meeting those goals.

Narrative

A number of plans and reports were consulted in preparation of this Consolidated Plan, reflecting policies, needs or significant research. Those include:

- City of Lakewood, *Comprehensive Plan*. (Revised 2014)
- City of Lakewood, Council Goals & Priorities. (Adopted July 2014)
- City of Lakewood, *Economic Vitality Strategy*. (2014)
- City of Lakewood, *Human Services Needs Analysis Report*. (2014)
- City of Lakewood, *Lakewood Legacy Plan: A Parks and Recreation Master Plan*. (2014)
- City of Tacoma Affordable Housing Policy Advisory Group, *Policy Recommendations to the Council*. (2010).
- City of Tacoma Comprehensive Plan. (Amended 2014)
- City of Tacoma Neighborhood & Community Services Department, Human Services Division, *2015-2019 City of Tacoma Human Services Strategic Plan*. (2014)
- City of Tacoma, Economic Development: 2013-2014 Strategic Framework & Action Plan.
- City of Tacoma, Finance Department, Office of Management and Budget, *2013-2018 Draft Capital Facilities Program*. (2012)
- Economic Development Board for Tacoma-Pierce County, *2011-2015 Future Focus Work Program*.
- Focus Strategies. *Assessment of Pierce County Centralized Intake*, prepared for Pierce County Community Connections. (2014)
- Marc Bolan Consulting, *City of Tacoma Domestic Violence Needs and Gaps Assessment*, prepared for the City of Tacoma Human Rights and Human Services Department. (2011)
- Pierce County Community Connections Aging and Disability Resources, *2014-2015 Draft Area Plan Update*. (2014)
- Pierce County Community Connections, *Pierce County HIV/AIDS Housing Plan*. (2013)
- Pierce County Planning and Land Services, *Buildable Lands Report*. (2014)
- Puget Sound Regional Council. *Regional Economic Strategy for the Central Puget Sound Region*. (2012)

- Puget Sound Regional Council. *Vision 2040: The Growth Management, Environmental, Economic and Transportation Strategy for the Central Puget Sound Region*. (adopted 2008)
- State of Washington Department of Commerce, *Homelessness in Washington State: Annual Report on the Homeless Grant Programs*. (2014)
- State of Washington Department of Commerce, *Housing Needs Assessment*. (2015)
- Tacoma Housing Authority, *Moving to Work Annual Plan*. (2014)
- Tacoma/Lakewood/Pierce County Continuum of Care, *Plan to End Homelessness*. (2012)
- Tacoma/Pierce County Affordable Housing Consortium, *Affordable Housing Guidebook, 2015 Edition*.
- Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department, *2014 Pierce County Community Health Improvement Plan*. (2014)
- Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department, Office of Assessment, Planning, and Improvement, *A Community Mental Health and Chemical Dependency Assessment, City of Tacoma*. (2012)
- Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department. *2014 Pierce County Community Health Improvement Plan*. (2014)
- United Way of Pierce County, *A Community Conversation*. (2014)
- Washington State Department of Health, *HIV Surveillance Semiannual Report*, 1st Edition 2014.
- Workforce Central, *Pierce County Local Integrated Workforce Plan: 2013-2017*

PR-15 Citizen Participation - 91.401, 91.105, 91.200(c)

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

Citizen participation was encouraged in several ways, including meetings with neighborhood organizations in both Tacoma and Lakewood, community meetings in Tacoma that specifically encouraged input from seniors, persons with disabilities, African Americans, Asian/Pacific Islanders and Hispanics. Neighborhood and community meetings include:

- Beacon Activity Center
- Bethlehem Baptist Church
- Indochinese Cultural & Service Center
- Central Lakes (Lake City) Neighborhood (Lakewood)
- Northeast Lakewood Neighborhood
- Pacific Neighborhood (Lakewood)
- South Lakes (Tillicum/Woodbrook) Neighborhood (Lakewood)
- Portland Avenue Community Center
- Tacoma Central Neighborhood Forum
- Tacoma Eastside (ENACT) Neighborhood
- Tacoma South End Neighborhood
- Tacoma West End Neighborhood

Public hearings on needs were held in both Cities and all were advertised in the *News Tribune*:

- Public hearing on needs in Tacoma was held on November 24, 2014
- Public hearing on needs in Lakewood was held on October 2, 2014
- Public hearing on the Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan in Tacoma was held on April 15, 2015.

- Public hearing on the Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan in Lakewood was held on April 20, 2015.

Drafts of the Tacoma-Lakewood Consortium Consolidated Plan, the Tacoma Annual Action Plan 2015, and the Lakewood Annual Action Plan 2015 were made available on websites of the individual cities and the Tacoma Public Library, City of Tacoma Community and Economic Development Department, the City of Tacoma Customer Support Center, the Lakewood Library, Tillicum Library, and at the City of Lakewood Community Development Department.

Citizen Participation Outreach

Sort Order	Mode of Outreach	Target of Outreach	Summary of response/attendance	Summary of comments received	Summary of comments not accepted and reasons	URL (if applicable)
1	Public Hearing	Non-targeted/broad community	Public hearing on needs Tacoma		All comments were accepted and considered in the assessment needs and market analysis	
2	Public Hearing	Non-targeted/broad community	Public hearing on needs in Tacoma		All comments were accepted and considered in the assessment of needs and market analysis	

Sort Order	Mode of Outreach	Target of Outreach	Summary of response/attendance	Summary of comments received	Summary of comments not accepted and reasons	URL (If applicable)
3	Public Hearing	Non-targeted/broad community	Public hearing on draft plans in Tacoma		All comments were considered and/or already reflected in the plans	
4	Public Hearing	Non-targeted/broad community	Public hearing on draft plans in Lakewood		All comments were already reflected in the plan	

Table 4 – Citizen Participation Outreach

Needs Assessment

NA-05 Overview

Needs Assessment Overview

NA-10 Housing Needs Assessment - 24 CFR 91.405, 24 CFR 91.205 (a,b,c)

Summary of Housing Needs

Demographics	Base Year: 2000	Most Recent Year: 2011	% Change
Population	251,767	258,137	3%
Households	100,029	103,834	4%
Median Income	\$0.00	\$0.00	

Table 5 - Housing Needs Assessment Demographics

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

Number of Households Table

	0-30% HAMFI	>30-50% HAMFI	>50-80% HAMFI	>80-100% HAMFI	>100% HAMFI
Total Households *	14,770	12,665	18,130	11,565	46,705
Small Family Households *	4,925	4,240	6,625	4,380	23,440
Large Family Households *	855	870	1,690	645	2,870
Household contains at least one person 62-74 years of age	2,110	2,055	2,470	1,590	7,745
Household contains at least one person age 75 or older	1,745	2,035	2,535	1,285	3,300
Households with one or more children 6 years old or younger *	3,175	2,500	3,540	1,560	4,735
* the highest income category for these family types is >80% HAMFI					

Table 6 - Total Households Table

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

Housing Needs Summary Tables

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

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS										
Substandard Housing - Lacking complete plumbing or kitchen facilities	385	375	160	135	1,055	10	25	30	35	100
Severely Overcrowded - With >1.51 people per room (and complete kitchen and plumbing)	170	320	250	50	790	10	40	35	25	110
Overcrowded - With 1.01-1.5 people per room (and none of the above problems)	280	325	325	100	1,030	10	75	285	85	455
Housing cost burden greater than 50% of income (and none of the above problems)	7,640	3,085	955	50	11,730	1,815	1,940	2,155	835	6,745
Housing cost burden greater than 30% of income (and none of the above problems)	1,075	3,670	4,515	1,040	10,300	295	735	1,900	1,865	4,795

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
Zero/negative Income (and none of the above problems)	1,035	0	0	0	1,035	405	0	0	0	405

Table 7 – Housing Problems Table

Data 2007-2011 CHAS

Source:

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

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS										
Having 1 or more of four housing problems	8,470	4,110	1,685	335	14,600	1,850	2,080	2,500	980	7,410
Having none of four housing problems	2,430	4,680	9,065	5,685	21,860	580	1,795	4,880	4,560	11,815
Household has negative income, but none of the other housing problems	1,035	0	0	0	1,035	405	0	0	0	405

Table 8 – Housing Problems 2

Data 2007-2011 CHAS

Source:

3. Cost Burden > 30%

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS								
Small Related	3,585	2,760	2,245	8,590	584	800	1,805	3,189
Large Related	645	415	460	1,520	145	380	669	1,194
Elderly	1,545	1,520	825	3,890	1,080	1,015	1,020	3,115

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total
Other	3,700	2,810	2,160	8,670	324	595	790	1,709
Total need by income	9,475	7,505	5,690	22,670	2,133	2,790	4,284	9,207

Table 9 – Cost Burden > 30%

Data 2007-2011 CHAS
Source:

4. Cost Burden > 50%

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS								
Small Related	3,180	1,090	380	4,650	565	675	880	2,120
Large Related	520	150	0	670	115	285	285	685
Elderly	1,195	600	270	2,065	880	560	585	2,025
Other	3,335	1,435	380	5,150	260	500	450	1,210
Total need by income	8,230	3,275	1,030	12,535	1,820	2,020	2,200	6,040

Table 10 – Cost Burden > 50%

Data 2007-2011 CHAS
Source:

5. Crowding (More than one person per room)

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS										
Single family households	335	485	505	130	1,455	0	35	295	100	430
Multiple, unrelated family households	85	75	45	20	225	10	80	25	15	130
Other, non-family households	60	85	25	0	170	10	0	0	0	10
Total need by income	480	645	575	150	1,850	20	115	320	115	570

Table 11 – Crowding Information - 1/2

Data 2007-2011 CHAS
Source:

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

Table 12 – Crowding Information – 2/2

Data Source
Comments:

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

There are fewer family households and more nonfamily (relative to total households) in both Tacoma and Lakewood compared to all of Pierce County and Washington. Almost one-third of households in both Tacoma and Lakewood are people living alone, and 10% of all households in both cities are single persons aged 65 and older.

The average household size is decreasing and the number of single person households is increasing – 32% of the households in Tacoma and Lakewood consisted of single persons (2009-2013 ACS). This will likely increase because of a number of factors – young people starting out on their own, an increasing share of seniors looking for a change in living, and people opting to live independently for other reasons. Not all will be able to achieve this on their own. Economic needs are not the only concern that must be considered going forward, needs also extend to accessibility. Safe housing for seniors on their own and persons with disabilities includes sufficient units on a single level, with safe transportation, near amenities and services.

A growing elderly population requires planning for housing, transportation and services. Older residents are more likely to be isolated or homebound and in need of additional support to live safely in their homes whether in homes they own or rent. Planning for the needs of an aging population is consistent with planning benefitting the whole community – diverse housing types and locations, transportation alternatives, and ready availability of goods and services. A 2006 national study framed the question about preparedness for aging and their caregivers as “whether cities and counties can ensure their communities are ‘livable; for all ages – not only good places to grow up, but good places to grow old.”

Certainly low household income in relation to housing costs will be a primary contributor to this inability. The Washington 2015 *Housing Needs Assessment* used CHAS data to determine that 61% of single person households are cost-burdened (paying more than 30% of income for housing). The median

income for single person households was \$26,048 in Lakewood (2009-2013 ACS) and \$31,985 in Tacoma. Housing would be affordable at \$651 a month in Lakewood and \$780 in Tacoma, both below median rents for the individual cities. These are the median incomes for all ages. The median income for youngest householders and oldest householders is low compared to older working householders.

The Pierce County Continuum of Care in 2014 (based on HMIS data) estimated that at least 2,817 single persons become homeless in Pierce County each year. The actual number is undoubtedly higher. There were 801 homeless individuals counted in the Point-in-Time count in January 2014 – 33% of these individuals were unsheltered.

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

There is no sure way to estimate the true extent of the population in need. National ACS data show that 40% of Lakewood and 43% of Tacoma residents 65 and older have one or more disabilities. There is unmet need for supportive housing for persons with disabilities, including individuals who are homeless. There is an additional need to bolster the in-home care support for persons with disabilities as there is a need to expand housing options. The City of Tacoma and the City of Lakewood support homeownership for persons with developmental disabilities, as well as providing support for services.

Notably the most frequent qualifying disability (federally for SSI) among working age persons (18 to 64) is mental illness. Domestic violence is not always (even usually) reported to authorities. When reported, there is need for long-term support needed to transition safely out of violence. There are not enough supports currently in place. In 2014 the Crystal Judson Family Justice Center in Tacoma served 82 Lakewood residents and 933 Tacoma residents who were victims of domestic violence. Combined that accounted for just 45% of the clients served in that year. The most victims were young adults (66% were age 25 to 44) and 15% were even younger (between 15 and 24). Domestic violence is a significant contributor to family disruption and homelessness, particularly for those without resources to escape violence on their own. Safe housing for people with disabilities and victims of domestic violence means affordable, secure housing for some and services for most.

What are the most common housing problems?

CHAS (Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy) data are special census tabulations provided to HUD. The CHAS tables cross-tabulate household income, household type, race and ethnicity of the head of household, housing costs and limited data on housing condition (lack of complete plumbing and kitchen facilities and overcrowding). According to these estimates, there were 45,565 households in Tacoma and Lakewood with incomes at or below 80% of HUD-adjusted Area Median Income (AMI).

CHAS tables rely largely on data obtained by the American Community Survey. Housing problems include lack of complete plumbing or kitchen facilities, overcrowding (1.01 to 1.5 persons per room), and cost burden (paying more than 30% of income for housing including utilities). Severe housing problems include lack of complete plumbing or kitchen facilities, severe overcrowding (1.51 or more persons per room) and severe cost burden (housing costs in excess of 50% of income).

Lower income households are more likely to be renters than own the unit in which they live. There are slightly more owners than renters in Tacoma and Lakewood (52% of all households were owners and 48% renters). However, only 37% of owner households compared to 74% of renter households had incomes below 100% of AMI. At the lowest income levels (from 0% to 30% of AMI) the majority of both renter and owner households had one or more severe housing problems – 71% of renters and 65% of owners had severe housing problems. By far the greatest need or condition was cost in relation to income – households were paying 50% or more of household income for housing and utilities.

The majority of both renter and owner households with incomes between 30% and 50% of AMI had housing problems as well, although fewer severe problems – 47% of renters and 54% of owners with incomes between 30% and 50% of AMI had severe housing problems. Again, by far the most prevalent contributing factor was cost in relation to income. While cost was the most prevalent problem, 1,055 renters and 100 owner households were estimated to be living without complete plumbing or kitchen facilities. Overcrowding was also an issue – 790 renters and 110 owners were estimated to be living in severely overcrowded conditions (more than 1.51 persons per room); and, 1,030 renters and 455 owners were estimated to be living in crowded conditions (1.01 to 1.50 persons per room).

Looking across all income categories and all types of problems (up to 100% of AMI), 39% of all renter households and 38% of all owner households had one or more severe housing problems; 27% of renters and 24% of owners had a problem that was not severe. While these percentages are similar, the number of lower income renter households with problems (mostly because of cost) was far greater – 24,905 renters and 12,205 owners with incomes below 100% of AMI had one or more housing problems.

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

It is difficult to draw conclusions from CHAS data regarding needs by household type. The 2015 State of Washington Housing Needs Assessment expresses concerns about several populations. By age and composition, elderly households are and will be looking for different types of housing to meet changing

needs – possibly smaller rental units. This demand may compete with other renters. Younger householders are also likely to be challenged, particularly by cost. The Needs Assessment (page 42) points out that in Washington close to 60% of younger householders (under 24) were burdened by high costs of housing. The report further points out that single-person households (including the elderly) are most cost-burdened – 61% are – compared to other sizes of households. Finally, people with disabilities have as a rule far less to spend on housing and, therefore, are most likely to have housing problems.

Some levels of income are important to keep in mind when considering housing and services for low-income persons and families.

- Individuals eligible for SSI (2014) would receive up to \$721 per month. Eligible couples could receive up to \$1,062 per month.
- Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) benefits have fallen in recent years. In Washington TANF benefit levels for a single-parent family of three was \$478 in July 2014 (unchanged since 2010), which was a 42% reduction since 1996 (in inflation adjusted dollars).
- Washington minimum wage was \$9.47 an hour as of January 2015, up from \$9.32 in 2014.

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

There are no reliable data at the community level to make a valid estimate of the number of households at risk of homelessness. Persons with extreme cost burdens and, in general, populations with very low incomes (30% or less of AMI) are among the most vulnerable to homelessness. While CHAS data can be a beginning point for estimates in terms of numbers of very low income households, a combination of factors contribute to risk, such as domestic violence, illness, addiction, high health and housing costs, and unemployment. The current Centralized Intake system, in place since 2011, will be improved as part of the larger effort to coordinate the path out of homelessness in Pierce County (described earlier). The streamlined application in combination with improvements to the data system will provide better estimates of the number and characteristics of those at risk and outcomes of interventions.

The number of children living with a single parent (without a spouse present) is not insignificant. The 2009-2013 American Community Survey estimated that in Tacoma 37% of children in households with their parents were living with a single parent, the majority of these with a single female parent (no spouse present). In Lakewood this was somewhat higher – 42% of children living with parents were in

households with a single parent, again mostly female parents. There were also children living with custodial grandparents, some single, not included in the estimates.

In Lakewood, 20% of the population lived in poverty as did 18% of the population in Tacoma. A greater share of children under the age of 18 lived in poverty than was true of the general population – 31% in Lakewood and 26% in Tacoma. Female householders (with no husband present) with children were often living in poverty (41% in Lakewood and 42% in Tacoma were) and those with very young children more so (63% in Lakewood and 55% in Tacoma were living in poverty).

United Way of Pierce County conducted a number of “community conversations” in the summer of 2014. Overall results showed that people felt that poverty was the number one barrier for families. This same priority was expressed by respondents living in the Clover Park School District and in the Tacoma School District (conversations focused on East Side and Hilltop). Residents in the Franklin Pierce School District also identified poverty and unemployment as huge barriers, with lack of transportation as the single most important barrier.

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

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

The Centralized Intake (CI) system in Pierce County will be utilizing a revised assessment during the next few months to better capture the conditions bringing people into homelessness, or putting them at risk of homelessness. This will also improve the ability to target interventions to stabilize the household or prevent the household from entering the homeless system in the first place. Cost of housing, utilities and transportation, coupled with low incomes and poverty put people at risk. Loss of a job or a medical expense or condition can be the determining factor in loss of housing. Unstable housing conditions also include doubling up in overcrowded conditions. Stakeholders interviewed for this Consolidated Plan reported that households are renting rooms in houses, resulting in overcrowded conditions and the risk of code violations and eviction, which has the potential for cycling in and out of homelessness. Temporary shelters can be insecure because, while programs provide for short-term assistance, the stay duration is not long enough to result in stable housing. Examples include persons coming from prison through a short-term transition program who are not able to find employment and victims of domestic violence who may need a long period to gain skills for independence.

Discussion

NA-15 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Problems - 91.405, 91.205

(b)(2)

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

Introduction

0%-30% of Area Median Income

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	11,700	1,630	1,445
White	6,070	1,080	815
Black / African American	2,270	210	360
Asian	905	205	105
American Indian, Alaska Native	165	20	0
Pacific Islander	95	10	0
Hispanic	1,270	45	155

Table 13 - Disproportionally Greater Need 0 - 30% AMI

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

*The four housing problems are:

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

30%-50% of Area Median Income

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	10,590	2,075	0
White	6,640	1,435	0
Black / African American	1,470	240	0
Asian	690	220	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	70	45	0
Pacific Islander	105	0	0
Hispanic	1,125	115	0

Table 14 - Disproportionally Greater Need 30 - 50% AMI

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

*The four housing problems are:

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

50%-80% of Area Median Income

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	10,605	7,525	0
White	6,660	5,005	0
Black / African American	1,285	860	0
Asian	730	620	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	105	175	0
Pacific Islander	125	40	0
Hispanic	1,440	610	0

Table 15 - Disproportionally Greater Need 50 - 80% AMI

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

*The four housing problems are:

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

80%-100% of Area Median Income

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	4,220	7,340	0
White	2,880	5,020	0
Black / African American	515	800	0
Asian	255	340	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	0	234	0
Pacific Islander	10	110	0
Hispanic	355	560	0

Table 16 - Disproportionally Greater Need 80 - 100% AMI

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

*The four housing problems are:

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

Discussion

NA-20 Disproportionately Greater Need: Severe Housing Problems - 91.405, 91.205 (b)(2)

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

Introduction

0%-30% of Area Median Income

Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	10,320	3,010	1,445
White	5,400	1,750	815
Black / African American	2,055	425	360
Asian	710	400	105
American Indian, Alaska Native	150	35	0
Pacific Islander	65	40	0
Hispanic	1,160	155	155

Table 17 – Severe Housing Problems 0 - 30% AMI

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

*The four severe housing problems are:

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

30%-50% of Area Median Income

Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	6,190	6,475	0
White	3,770	4,305	0
Black / African American	920	790	0
Asian	255	655	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	45	70	0
Pacific Islander	70	35	0
Hispanic	765	470	0

Table 18 – Severe Housing Problems 30 - 50% AMI

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

*The four severe housing problems are:

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

50%-80% of Area Median Income

Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	4,190	13,940	0
White	2,575	9,085	0
Black / African American	545	1,600	0
Asian	325	1,025	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	40	230	0
Pacific Islander	90	75	0
Hispanic	525	1,525	0

Table 19 – Severe Housing Problems 50 - 80% AMI

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

*The four severe housing problems are:

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

80%-100% of Area Median Income

Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	1,315	10,250	0
White	870	7,035	0
Black / African American	195	1,125	0
Asian	105	495	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	0	234	0
Pacific Islander	10	110	0
Hispanic	90	825	0

Table 20 – Severe Housing Problems 80 - 100% AMI

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

*The four severe housing problems are:

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

Discussion

NA-25 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens - 91.405, 91.205 (b)(2)

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

Introduction

Housing Cost Burden

Housing Cost Burden	<=30%	30-50%	>50%	No / negative income (not computed)
Jurisdiction as a whole	19,845	16,355	19,485	1,455
White	42,750	15,315	12,045	815
Black / African American	5,230	2,480	3,565	360
Asian	3,800	1,630	1,320	105
American Indian, Alaska Native	900	215	220	0
Pacific Islander	620	170	130	0
Hispanic	3,795	2,195	1,865	155

Table 21 – Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens AMI

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

Discussion

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

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

Disproportionately greater need is defined as a difference greater than ten percentage points for any racial or ethnic group than the jurisdiction as a whole. It should be noted though that margins of error associated with the estimates (based on American Community Survey sampling) are too large to rely on for small populations and should be viewed with caution. All the individual CHAS tables were analyzed for disparities excluding numbers that were unreasonably small. That analysis found a disproportionately greater need for Hispanic householders with incomes between 30% and 50% of AMI (91% had one or more housing problems compared to 77% of households in the jurisdiction as a whole in that income range).

CHAS Table 21 (Housing Cost Burdens) summarizes cost burden by race and ethnicity of the householder for all households in the Tacoma-Lakewood region, not just those with incomes below 100% of AMI. For the jurisdiction as a whole, 42% of households experienced cost burdens at 30% or more of household income. Racial or ethnic minority-headed households were not disproportionately cost-burdened compared to the jurisdiction as a whole at the 30% and greater level. However, there was a disproportionate share of Black/African American-headed households experiencing a severe cost burden (paying 50% or more of income for housing) compared to the jurisdiction as a whole – 32% of Black/African American-headed households compared to 19% of households for the jurisdiction as a whole were paying 50% or more of income for housing (severe cost burden). There was the same disproportionality for Pacific Islander-headed households (32% were paying 50% or more of income for housing compared to 19% for the jurisdiction as a whole).

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

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

Both Tacoma and Lakewood are diverse cities, substantially more so than Pierce County and Washington. The largest racial minority (single race) in the 2010 census was Black or African American in both cities (12% in Lakewood and 11% in Tacoma), followed by Asian (9% in Lakewood and 8% in Tacoma). In terms of ethnicity, 15% of the population in Lakewood identified themselves as Hispanic as did 11% in Tacoma.

A multinational population is an asset in any community, as is a richly diverse population. However, the inability to communicate in English can isolate individuals and families from their neighbors and from the larger community. Whether new to the area or longer-term residents, people with limited English language skills may face barriers in accessing services and understanding important life transactions. Stakeholders contributing to this Consolidated Plan reported that inability to speak English, combined with cultural differences, is a barrier to getting housing and services, in part due to the absence of translation services. While ESL courses are available in Tacoma and Lakewood, more are needed.

Recent immigrants, especially those who are coming from countries as refugees, face additional challenges including post-traumatic stress as a result of war or other events in their native country. They must cope with learning English, adapt to a new lifestyle, find employment, develop job skills, introduce children to a new education system, and adjust to other challenges of acclimation. Finding employment and gainful careers is a priority which means starting a new career for many whose degrees and education are not transferrable. Lack of credit, employment and rental history in the United States is a barrier to finding housing, in particular.

Defining “minority” as Hispanic and/or race other than white alone, 46% of the population in Lakewood and 40% of the population in Tacoma in 2010 was minority. Areas of disproportionate concentration are those in which there is a greater than 10% difference than the jurisdiction as a whole. While the Consolidated Plan for Lakewood and Tacoma was prepared as a regional plan, populations in the cities differ; therefore, disproportionate concentrations of minority populations were computed separately.

Block groups in Lakewood in which 57% or more of the population was minority were considered to have disproportionate concentrations. That was the case in ten block groups. Most block groups with disproportionate concentrations of minority populations in Lakewood were found along the Pacific Highway. This included most of the Pacific Neighborhood, a portion of the Lakeview Neighborhood between Lakeview Avenue and Bridgeport Way SW, and sections of the Northeast Lakewood Neighborhood. In relation to the total population of Lakewood, 21% live in block groups that have a disproportionate share of minority population.

Block groups in Tacoma in which 51% or more of the population was minority in 2010 were considered to have disproportionate concentrations. That was the case in 43 block groups. These areas were primarily located just north of I-5 between Sprague and Yakima to 6th and south of I-5 in several areas including areas east of Pacific Avenue, scattered block groups north of 96th and west of Yakima, and

along South Tacoma Way. In relation to the total population of Tacoma, 26% live in block groups that have a disproportionate share of minority population.

NA-35 Public Housing - 91.405, 91.205 (b)

Introduction

The City of Tacoma and the City of Lakewood support housing development to benefit all residents at all income levels. The challenge of meeting diverse needs is considerable given that both cities are essentially built out. While the greatest challenge is in maintaining housing affordability and providing new units for households most in need, subsidized and non-subsidized, with and without support services, this is not the only challenge. Raising the quality of neighborhoods and providing opportunities for residents including education, employment and access to basic services and amenities is also a priority, especially in lower-income areas.

The Tacoma/Pierce County Affordable Housing Consortium, founded in 2001, brings multiple partners to the table, including the Cities of Tacoma and Lakewood, the Puyallup Tribe of Indians, the Tacoma Housing Authority, Pierce County Housing Authority, developers, realtors, and providers to work on opportunities to increase housing choice. Many choices exist, but not enough. Pierce County Community Connections completed an inventory of assisted housing in the Pierce County in 2014. Results of that detailed analysis indicate that there are 6,963 units of subsidized or assisted housing units in Tacoma and 916 in Lakewood. The total assisted units for all of Pierce County is 12,837 units. These were developed by multiple parties and coalitions. In addition to these are tenant-based vouchers managed by the Tacoma Housing Authority and Pierce County Authority. Regardless of the extensive number of units, there is need for more in order to provide stability to households.

Totals in Use

	Program Type								
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers			Special Purpose Voucher		
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
# of units vouchers in use	0	93	1,025	5,513	685	4,631	133	38	1

Table 22 - Public Housing by Program Type

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

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Characteristics of Residents

	Program Type							
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers			Special Purpose Voucher	
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program
# Homeless at admission	0	3	2	21	0	21	0	0
# of Elderly Program Participants (>62)	0	14	270	1,023	141	866	13	1
# of Disabled Families	0	45	361	1,950	92	1,786	54	4
# of Families requesting accessibility features	0	93	1,025	5,513	685	4,631	133	38
# of HIV/AIDS program participants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
# of DV victims	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 23 – Characteristics of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Race of Residents

Race	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Program Type					
				Vouchers			Special Purpose Voucher		
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
White	0	61	450	3,156	371	2,676	65	25	1
Black/African American	0	24	287	1,839	210	1,551	64	9	0
Asian	0	4	245	313	52	258	1	0	0
American Indian/Alaska Native	0	3	18	115	29	83	1	2	0
Pacific Islander	0	1	22	90	23	63	2	2	0
Other	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Table 24 – Race of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Ethnicity of Residents

Ethnicity	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Program Type					
				Vouchers			Special Purpose Voucher		
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
Hispanic	0	11	67	340	60	273	4	2	0
Not Hispanic	0	82	958	5,173	625	4,358	129	36	1

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

Table 25 – Ethnicity of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

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

What are the number and type of families on the waiting lists for public housing and section 8 tenant-based rental assistance? Based on the information above, and any other information available to the jurisdiction, what are the most immediate needs of residents of public housing and Housing Choice voucher holders?

The wait list for Tacoma Housing Authority public housing stood at 6,460 as of this writing and remained open. There are several hundred on wait lists for openings in other housing programs. The Pierce County Housing Authority had 93 on the wait list, but the wait list was last open in 2012. People typically wait for several years (as many as five years) on the wait lists. There are many barriers to being housed, in addition to lack of units. Persons who are most difficult to house are persons with disabilities, especially those with untreated mental health problems and other needs for supportive housing. People may be ineligible for a number of reasons including past felony convictions, use of illegal drugs, poor rental history, pattern of eviction, or property damage.

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

Populations identified as hardest to serve based on wait lists and applicants for various housing programs offered by or in which the housing authorities participate are the same as those in the general population. Housing authorities are involved across types of assisted housing from public housing and vouchers to housing homeless persons and those at risk of being homeless. The pressing needs mentioned include persons with disabilities (prominently with mental health problems), elderly and frail elderly (particularly those with dementia or complicating disabilities), veterans (even with VASH vouchers), and homeless families needing long term case management to achieve stability. Add to the list single parent households with children, homeless youth, people being discharged from institutions, persons who are homeless, and immigrants and refugees (who may not have documentation, in addition to barriers caused by language and cultural differences). Complicating the picture further is the lack of living wage jobs. Many do not earn enough to move into housing even if able to come up with move in costs. Even low skilled and poorly paid positions are out of reach of some people who have been unemployed for a long time and/or lack basic employable skills.

Discussion

NA-40 Homeless Needs Assessment - 91.405, 91.205 (c)

Introduction:

National studies estimate that four to five times more people will be homeless during the year than are homeless on a given night, indicating the depth of the problem and the difficult task ahead for groups wishing to end homelessness as we know it. The causes of homelessness are myriad, but can be boiled down to two big picture causes: poverty and lack of affordable housing (as noted in the *Tacoma/Lakewood/Pierce County Continuum of Care Plan to End Homelessness 2012*). Clear contributors are untreated chronic health problems, mental illness, substance abuse, domestic violence, loss of employment, and prohibitive medical bills, to name some of the factors.

The Tacoma/Lakewood/Pierce County Continuum of Care Point-in-Time (PIT) count taken in January 2014 found 1,464 people who were homeless in Pierce County. The 2014 PIT count, while conducted to some extent throughout Pierce County, focused largely on Tacoma because of the number of shelters and transitional housing found in Tacoma and feeding programs which are open to unsheltered persons. In spite of improved efforts to accurately count the number of homeless persons on any one night, the fact is that a substantial number go uncounted. They are uncounted because of difficulty organizing volunteers to comb every corner of the County, because of inclement weather, and because people who are homeless (some living in cars) may not wish to be found.

Homeless Needs Assessment

Population	Estimate the # of persons experiencing homelessness on a given night		Estimate the # experiencing homelessness each year	Estimate the # becoming homeless each year	Estimate the # exiting homelessness each year	Estimate the # of days persons experience homelessness
	Sheltered	Unsheltered				
Persons in Households with Adult(s) and Child(ren)	610	16	1,496	1,496	414	214

Population	Estimate the # of persons experiencing homelessness on a given night		Estimate the # experiencing homelessness each year	Estimate the # becoming homeless each year	Estimate the # exiting homelessness each year	Estimate the # of days persons experience homelessness
	Sheltered	Unsheltered				
Persons in Households with Only Children	27	10	58	58	1	278
Persons in Households with Only Adults	534	267	2,817	2,817	49	85
Chronically Homeless Individuals	90	123	627	627	10	85
Chronically Homeless Families	5	6	24	24	3	214
Veterans	129	33	398	398	38	214
Unaccompanied Child	27	10	58	58	1	278
Persons with HIV	0	0	12	12	0	0

Table 26 - Homeless Needs Assessment

Data Source Comments: Tacoma/Lakewood/Pierce County Continuum of Care Point-in-Time Count 2014; HMIS; Annual Homeless Assessment Report.

Indicate if the homeless population is: Has No Rural Homeless

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

The Tacoma/Lakewood/Pierce County Continuum of Care reported that at least 4,371 persons experience homelessness each year, which is the number of individuals that contacted the Centralized Intake (CI) system in Pierce County (Access Point 4 Housing – AP4H). This certainly undercounts the number and also excludes those housed through systems outside AP4H (such as Housing First, some permanent supportive housing for persons with mental health problems, housing for victims of domestic violence, walk-in shelters, and some veterans’ housing programs). This is also based on completed assessments. Associated Ministries estimates that half of initial calls complete assessments.

Certainly the largest volume of calls was from single adults, followed by families with children. Successfully placing qualified applicants in permanent housing is challenged by lack of resources. For example, 1,496 persons in families contacted the Centralized Intake system and were assessed for housing and just 414 found permanent housing (supportive or otherwise) after a wait of seven months (214 days average). Barriers include lack of housing resources to meet those assessed, unmet needs for supportive services, client circumstances or histories and requirements of housing providers. Screened and approved applicants with past evictions and criminal offenses are difficult to serve as are individuals with major health problems or disabilities.

While the current HMIS reporting provides data as a start there are significant gaps. Improvements in the data system and Centralized Intake process (including the application) in the future, paired with the homeless provider system improvements, will lead to more accurate reporting and a more effective solution to homelessness in Pierce County. Focus Strategies completed an *Assessment of Pierce County Centralized Intake* for Pierce County Community Connections in November 2014. This is a first step in refining the system to end homelessness.

While there are homeless persons camping or staying in areas outside of the urbanized area, rural homelessness is not applicable to the Cities of Lakewood and Tacoma. Rural homelessness outside of the two cities is considered to be limited in number and largely with similar needs and characteristics to those found in the urban area. Providers in Lakewood and Tacoma serve homeless persons living on the streets and those who have been living or camping in surrounding incorporated areas. During winter months, it is somewhat easier to provide outreach to unsheltered people at feeding programs, libraries, or other public places where people spend time in heated spaces. In warmer months, street outreach and referral are more difficult and less effective.

Nature and Extent of Homelessness: (Optional)

Race:	Sheltered:	Unsheltered (optional)
White	561	209
Black or African American	281	48
Asian	24	1
American Indian or Alaska Native	22	11
Pacific Islander	67	2
Ethnicity:	Sheltered:	Unsheltered (optional)
Hispanic	170	18
Not Hispanic	1,001	275

Data Source:

Tacoma/Lakewood/Pierce County Continuum of Care Point-in-Time Count 2014

Comments:

Note: There were 216 sheltered individuals of more than one race and 22 unsheltered in addition to those shown in the table.

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

In the 2014 PIT, families with children represented 43% of those counted, mostly sheltered. Many more contacted the Centralized Intake (CI) system, in fact over twice as many were on record as having been assessed. There are additional families housed through systems working with victims of domestic violence and veteran family stabilization (Supportive Services for Veteran Families). Among families that are difficult to house are extended families who may not fit the qualifications of providers, families with older youth (sometimes meaning a child age 18 or older must leave unless in school), and parenting youth who are too young to qualify for DSHS assistance. The circumstances can be more or less complicated, but the need is clear, just on the basis of income alone. The 2015 State of Washington Housing Needs Assessment expresses concern for many households. In Pierce County, for every 100 households with income below 30% of Area Median Income, there are only ten units available – a gap of 90 units and that gap is not expected to diminish over the next five years. In Tacoma, specifically, that gap is marginally smaller – 88 units and expected to increase to 89 units in the next five years.

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

Of the 1,464 persons identified in the 2014 PIT, 53% were identified as white, which is somewhat lower than found in the 2010 census for Tacoma (65% white) and Lakewood (59% white). Black or African Americans represented a disproportionate share of homeless persons (22%) in the PIT, compared to the share in the general population in Lakewood (12%) and Tacoma (11%) as identified in the 2010 census. No other disparities were noted comparing the PIT with the 2010 census.

Describe the Nature and Extent of Unsheltered and Sheltered Homelessness.

Nearly all (80%) of those counted on the single night were housed temporarily in shelters or transitional housing, but 20% (293 individuals) were unsheltered. Among the 1,464 people counted in 2014, 38% (626 people) were in households with children. Most of those family households were sheltered (97% were). There were 37 unaccompanied children or youth counted, 73% sheltered. Over half (55%) of those counted in January 2014 were adults alone or in households without children; just two-thirds of these adults were temporarily sheltered. The Point-in-Time count makes every effort to include a survey of those identified. Among the 1,464 people counted in 2014 who responded to the survey, 213 were determined to be chronically homeless – the majority (58%) unsheltered. There were 162 veterans identified, of whom 20% were unsheltered. Untreated serious mental illness is a significant contributor to homelessness. There were 197 persons identified with serious mental illness in the January 2014 PIT count – 52 were unsheltered. There were 177 victims of domestic violence – 10 of whom were unsheltered. There were 90 individuals with substance use disorders – 45 were unsheltered.

Discussion:

NA-45 Non-Homeless Special Needs Assessment - 91.405, 91.205 (b,d)

Introduction

Some populations are especially vulnerable and will likely have temporary or long-term requirements for additional support. Those populations are introduced in following sections: persons who are elderly and frail; persons with mental, physical or developmental disabilities; veterans, particularly homeless veterans; victims of domestic violence; homeless youth; persons with HIV/AIDS. While the topics are introduced somewhat independently, the special needs often overlap.

The Washington State Department of Social and Health Services published a report summarizing findings of a survey of potential clients and their families and service professionals that addressed the needs of older adults and people with disabilities. The results painted a not surprising picture of people wanting to live as part of communities and families, with access to in-home supports and accommodations to enable them to live safely. There was concern about running out of money, of being isolated, and being a burden on care-givers and families. Access to community services, including recreation, was emphasized by both potential clients/family caregivers and providers.

The City of Tacoma began collecting a 0.1% Mental Health and Chemical Dependency sales tax in April 2012. The City's behavioral health systems was the focus of research as a first step in setting goals for services and identified particularly vulnerable populations (homeless persons, some active duty personnel and veterans, youth, and African Americans). Further there was lack of awareness of services available and some service fragmentation. Criminal justice involvement was pronounced in Pierce County, as is true nationally, pointing to the need for intervention in advance of involvement in criminal justice systems which are not equipped for treatment and which can stigmatize individuals, creating long term barriers.

These needs were repeated by stakeholders contributing to this Consolidated Plan. In meetings with first responders, including police, emergency responders, fire, and code enforcement in Tacoma and Lakewood, unmet needs of persons with mental health problems were a priority. There is increased ability to evaluate mental problems for people on the street because of initiatives such as the mental health PATH teams working with homeless individuals and increased embedding mental health professionals with first responders. Departments themselves are increasing their capacity to respond, such as Tacoma FD Cares (Fire Department) in Tacoma.

The City of Tacoma has prioritized mental health and chemical dependency funding in four areas:

- Community-based care to increase access for persons who are uninsured or underinsured
- Jail and hospital diversion to increase interventions and housing
- Programs targeted to youth
- Reduction in chronic homelessness

Describe the characteristics of special needs populations in your community:

Elderly: As the “baby boomers” (those born between 1946 and 1964) age, the proportion of elderly and then frail elderly will increase. At the same time that care needs of an aging population increase, the share of working age individuals will decline relative to the population dependent upon them. Isolation is often undetected. Many seniors live alone – 10% of all households in Lakewood and Tacoma were single individuals 65 and older (2010 census) and most of those were women (73% in Lakewood and 71% in Tacoma). Access to amenities and services is especially difficult for seniors who should not or cannot drive. Seniors are more likely to have a disability, most frequently an ambulatory difficulty. Adequate transportation is a problem. Getting around in areas without sidewalks and curb cuts and getting into buildings without ADA improvements are significant barriers.

Mental/Physical/Developmental Disabilities: The 2009-2013 ACS estimated that 12% of Tacoma’s and 16% of Lakewood’s population between the ages of 18 and 64 had a disability, as did 5% of those under the age of 18. A recent analysis of 2012 single-year ACS data for Washington State showed that statewide the employment rate of working-age people with disabilities was 37%, compared with 77% for persons without disabilities. About 18% were receiving SSI and 26% were living in poverty (compared with 11% of working-age adults without a disability).

The Washington Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) funded mental health services for 6,071 lower-income qualifying clients in Tacoma and 2,462 in Lakewood (2012-2013). It is difficult to measure the incidence of serious mental illness (SMI). A 2003 study by DSHS estimated that there were 36,255 persons with SMI in the Pierce County RSN (Regional Service Network). Included in the total estimate were 944 persons who were homeless and 13,340 children with serious emotional disorders (SED).

Drug/Alcohol Dependency: DSHS served 2,742 lower-income clients with alcohol and substance abuse-related services in Tacoma and 580 in Lakewood between July 2012 and June 2013. Substance abuse disorders may accompany mental illness and are often co-occurring disorders. Both mental illness and substance abuse disorders are factors in homelessness in Pierce County. The 2014 Point-in-Time count identified 90 individuals with substance disorders, half of them unsheltered. Shelter requirements may make it more difficult to house persons with substance abuse disorders who are using at the time of screening.

Domestic Violence: Data on the actual occurrence of domestic violence are remarkably limited. Certainly violence in the home and in relationships cuts across societal measures – income, occupation, race, and ethnicity. Statistics are limited to some extent by the sources of data. The National Network to End Domestic Violence reports on those seeking help from agencies. This is a snapshot of the more vulnerable – those who experience barriers in escaping violence such as lack of income, lack of personal esteem, immigrant status, absence of family or peer support. In *2013 Domestic Violence Counts* that the Network reported that 2,082 victims were served in Washington State in a single day. The Crystal Judson Center provided services to 2,255 unique clients in 2014 and answered another 3,800 calls to the hotline. YWCA Pierce County turned away 237 calls per month in 2014, although many were duplicated calls. The Point-in-Time count of homelessness in 2014 in Pierce County found 177 victims, all sheltered.

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

The elderly are vulnerable on many fronts. Many have reduced income with retirement – surviving spouses even more so. ACS estimates (2009-2013) that 10% of seniors (65 and over) in Tacoma and Lakewood were living below poverty. The official poverty threshold, however, does not adequately estimate economic insecurity. The Washington Elder Economic Security Initiative calculated a standard for economic security based on an assessment of housing, food, health care, transportation and essential personal and household items. In Pierce County, the 2013 average Social Security income was below the standard for single persons or an elderly couple renting a one-bedroom apartment.

The Pierce County Community Connections Aging and Disability Resources (ADR) identified several issue areas as priorities including support for family and kinship caregivers. The Plan notes that there is an increasing reliance on kinship care made more important by diminishing state resources. The Aging and Disability Resource Center in Pierce County is a central point of access to services and information. In light of needs current and projected, the quality of home care is critical. Among other focus areas included in the Plan is transportation for persons with special needs who are reliant on public transportation, volunteers and nonprofit services that do not adequately meet the needs.

The Washington Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) served 1,645 clients with developmental disabilities in Tacoma and 533 in Lakewood July 2012 and June 2013. While needs of persons with intellectual or developmental disabilities (I/DD) depend on the nature and extent of the disability, needs tend to be ongoing, met largely within the family (87% were living with parents or relatives) and usually with inadequate additional public support. Family caregivers need support as well, including respite. That many caregivers are aging raises new concerns for the future. All of the challenges faced by other populations with special needs are more challenging, but not unsurmountable, for people with intellectual or developmental disabilities.

However, to get there, steps must be taken to overcome underemployment (70% persons with I/DD unemployed and/or working for insufficient compensation), lack of income (SSI alone is meager as is the \$2,000 ceiling on savings), poor accessibility (to transportation, services, medical and dental care), and lack of appropriate affordable housing (a primary need for most). TACID (Tacoma Area Coalition of Individuals with Disabilities) has a strong focus on developing peer supports. The agency reports significant challenges in transportation, finding suitable and affordable housing, and employment with sufficient accommodations.

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

According to Washington State HIV Surveillance Semiannual Report (1st Edition 2014), there were 291 new cases of HIV diagnosed in Pierce County between 2009 and 2013, for a total cumulative diagnosis from 1982 of 1,825 cases. As of the end of December 2013, 607 persons in Pierce County were known to be living with HIV (not AIDS) and 686 persons living with AIDS.

The *Pierce County HIV/AIDS Housing Plan (2013)* will serve as an addendum to the Tacoma/Lakewood/

Pierce County Continuum of Care Plan to End Homelessness and will guide priorities and strategies. The plan estimates that annually about 400 people living with HIV/AIDS may be at risk of homelessness and that there is a need for 75 to 100 additional units of housing. Safe and supportive housing is one of the key preventive strategies. In addition to the need for housing, there is a need for integrated, in-home, co-occurring disorder treatment to address mental health and substance use disorders that complicate stability. There is also a need for targeted outreach to populations with the highest incidence of new HIV/AIDS cases to reduce incidence and to prevent late-stage diagnoses.

Discussion:

Veterans: Nationally, data show that the majority of homeless veterans are male (92% are) and disproportionately African American or Hispanic (40% are). An estimated 12% of persons who are homeless in the United States are veterans. The majority suffer from mental illness and/or alcohol or substance abuse. They have served in war, mostly since Vietnam and in more recent Middle East war zones. Veterans who have experienced combat may suffer from PTSD and/or have suffered from brain injuries or trauma. These injuries leave them vulnerable to family disruption. Lack of education or training outside of the military adds to the stress of transferring military skills to civilian life.

In 2013 over 58,000 veterans were found homeless across the nation. In the 2014 Pierce County Point-in-Time count, 162 homeless persons counted were veterans. It is assumed that many more were homeless than counted as many seek to avoid contact with authorities. It is estimated that at least 398 veterans were homeless during the year, just based on HMIS data. In addition to those actually homeless, another estimated 1.4 million veterans are considered to be at risk of homelessness due to poverty and lack of support networks. Housing and services are major needs, particularly affordable housing, medical care, and mental health care. As reported in the *Community Mental Health and Chemical Dependency Assessment*, a Department of Defense Task Force estimated that as many as 38% of soldiers report psychological symptoms and that more than 13% of the Army meets the criteria for PTSD.

Homeless and vulnerable youth: The number of identified homeless students increased 47% in Washington from 20,780 in the 2008-2009 school year to 30,609 in the 2012-2013 school year. While some of this is undoubtedly due to better identification of students, there is likely a real increase in homelessness. The definition for homelessness under McKinney-Vento includes students and families who are temporarily living in doubled-up situations (couch surfing), which differs from the HUD definition of homelessness. The majority of students identified as homeless fall into that category (69% in Washington in 2012-2013 did).

In the Tacoma School District (with an enrollment of 29,035 students in the 2012-2013 school year (October 2012 count), 1,489 students were identified as homeless that year – roughly 5% of all students. The number of identified homeless students increased 23% by the next school year (2013-2014) to 1,832 students – 6% of enrolled students. In Lakewood, the Clover Park School District reported 266 homeless students in the 2012-2013 school year (about 2% of enrollment). In Tacoma, the Franklin Pierce School District reported 123 homeless students (also about 2% of enrollment). To the extent students and families are perilously housed in doubled up situations, they are at risk of being without shelter and homeless. As with identification of homeless persons in general, counting people who do not wish to be

counted is a challenge. This may be particularly the case with unaccompanied youth. They may be identified if in school, but many are not.

McKinney-Vento Liaisons report that barriers are lack of affordable housing, loss of employment, lack of emergency help with rent or unexpected expenses. Unaccompanied youth are very difficult because options are very limited, especially for those 15 to 18. If youth are doubled up, they are housed and not a priority. Housing for Success is an option for unaccompanied youth, but there are not enough homes to meet the need.

NA-50 Non-Housing Community Development Needs - 91.415, 91.215 (f)

Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Facilities:

The City of Tacoma has made concerted efforts over the years to improve community facilities and infrastructure in the downtown area and in neighborhoods. Those efforts will continue. Identification of policies and projects appropriate to planning for public facilities are driven by the City's Comprehensive Plan and by the Capital Facilities Program. Projects identified in the recent 6-year Plan are include more than \$2.6 billion in total financing needs, highlighted by the following:

- Parks, recreation, and cultural facility needs, include major expenditures for renovation of the Tacoma Dome and City park improvements (\$83 million)
- Municipal facilities and services, with major needs for fire training facilities and for community and senior centers, as well as libraries (\$174 million)
- Utilities and services, with major expenditures for Tacoma Power, water distribution and water quality improvements, and wastewater management (\$1.7 million)
- Community development, including downtown and Foss Waterway (\$22 million).

The City of Lakewood's Comprehensive Plan sets the overall vision for public facilities and improvements in the City. This vision and plan is supported by implementation plans. Projects for improved and new parks and recreation are set out in the *Lakewood Legacy Plan*. This plan identifies projects totaling \$2.5 million over the next six years (2015-2020) including improvements in trails, expansion of Springbrook Park, Harry Todd Playground Replacement and a Village Green at Town Center. Capital Improvements Projects identified by Public Works include extensive road construction and improvements; citywide safety improvements to signalize intersections; extensive improvements to construct sidewalks, curbs, gutters and provide street lighting; and, additional provision of sewer services and connections.

At the neighborhood level in both Tacoma and Lakewood, there is an ongoing need for improvements to parks and recreational facilities, community facility renovations and access to improved transportation options and support. Facilities serving people who are homeless persons and persons with special needs have been identified as needs. The City of Tacoma is working with Pierce County to construct a youth drop-in center which will fill part of the gap in shelter and services to vulnerable youth. There is a need, as well, for center or strategy for serving younger youth who are at risk.

Historic preservation remains an important strategy in Tacoma, in particular. A number of buildings have been added to the Tacoma Register of Historic Place, which now includes over 160 properties, sites, and

places. The City has established a loan program to encourage preservation; some of these projects have, in the past, preserved affordable housing as well as renewing commercial and other opportunities.

How were these needs determined?

Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Improvements:

Regional policies included in *Vision 2040* (Puget Sound Regional Council) recognize that planning to accommodate growth requires there is a balance in housing, jobs, infrastructure, transportation and services. Support for multimodal transportation and infrastructure are key. Both Tacoma and Lakewood have substantial needs for projects improving infrastructure. Having the proper infrastructure in place is necessary for strong and accessible neighborhoods; to attract new housing development and renovate the old; and, to encourage economic development and business investment, which will create badly-needed employment.

The Pierce County Health Improvement Plan, calls for a number of improvements to build health communities. These include having safe places to exercise; and, bringing safe water and sewer services to residents in lower income neighborhoods (among other recommendations). The United Way recent public outreach to determine needs in the community (*A Community Conversation*) identified lack of sufficient transportation and the ability to access resources as a primary barrier.

Tacoma's *Capital Facilities Programs* (2013-2018) identifies the following public improvement and infrastructure needs in several areas:

- Community development projects, which include 30 Local Improvement Districts (LIDs) in neighborhoods or business districts (\$177 million)
- Transportation Improvements, including street and sidewalk improvements, bridge construction, and bike lanes (\$522 million)

In Lakewood, the City Council recently prioritized projects to provide infrastructure and improvements in support of neighborhoods and business to improve living conditions and stimulate economic development. The City of Lakewood 6-Year Capital Improvement Plan for Parks (*Lakewood Legacy Plan*) was mentioned above and included \$2.5 million in projects including trail improvements. The *Six-Year*

Comprehensive Transportation Program (2015-2020) contains projects totaling \$120 million over the next five years. Included are roads and sidewalks connecting neighborhoods and linking to amenities and services, many of which are poorly or not at all connected.

At the neighborhood level in both Tacoma and Lakewood improvements to streets, sidewalks, bike paths, signalization, and ADA accessibility were among needs identified. Community workshops in Tacoma (Vision 2025) identified the need for transportation alternatives and better connections. In meetings held with neighborhoods in both Tacoma and Lakewood in preparation for this Consolidated Plan, lack of infrastructure was a consistent theme – road improvements, ADA improvements, sidewalks, street lights, curb cuts and better transportation connections.

In Tacoma, annual allocations of CDBG funds are made available for neighborhood-serving community development projects based on Council-approved priorities. Typically these projects will match City and other resources going into the same project. Examples of such projects include public improvements in support of community-defined affordable housing or public facility developments, ADA improvements to remove architectural barriers, and other neighborhood-initiated projects in compliance with the applicable code of federal regulations (CFR).

How were these needs determined?

Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Services:

Needs for public services are described in several sections in the Consolidated Plan, including sections discussing populations with special needs and homelessness. In addition to this planning process, the needs for public services are outlined in current human services plans for Tacoma and Lakewood, both of which have been recently updated to reflect current priorities. The City of Tacoma 2015-2019 *Human Services Strategic Plan* identifies four strategic priorities:

- Prepare children and youth for success – which includes increasing parenting skills, removing academic barriers, and focusing on the most vulnerable to remove barriers; and, preventing gangs and gang involvement
- Increase employability, self-determination, and empowerment for adults – which includes workforce development; and, self-determination and empowerment
- Meet basic needs of Tacoma residents – housing stabilization; food security; and, safety

- Enhance mental health/substance use disorder services – which include diversion from jail and hospitals; reducing chronic homelessness; community-based care; and a focus on youth.

A strong part of the plan is the analysis of access to opportunities, which is defined in terms of conditions in place that contribute to success. However, it is more than situational in that barriers outside of the boundaries of neighborhoods contribute to challenges in being successful. Those barriers include lack of affordable housing, lack of affordable childcare (and care offered during-off hours and for infants), and lack of transportation. Language and cultural barriers are also significant and serve to isolate households and impede successful utilization of community resources. Tacoma’s Equity and Empowerment Initiative looks to break down structural barriers. Among other goals, this means involving all people in decisions, identifying where resources and where they are not, and looking for ways to remove barriers and open doors to giving all residents a path to strive.

The City of Lakewood *Human Services Needs Analysis Report* likewise set funding priorities over the next few years. Needs of the most vulnerable populations were identified:

- Low-income families in persistent poverty
- School-age youth, particularly those with adverse childhood experiences
- Elderly and persons with disabilities
- People without (or with limited) resources with health problems, including mental health and chemical dependency
- People with limited English and cultural barriers that limit access to resources

In light of those priority needs and populations, the City of Lakewood set several strategy focus areas:

- Housing
- Stabilization services
- Emotional support
- Access to health and human services

The Cities of Lakewood and Tacoma participate in the Pierce County Human Services Coalition and the Tacoma/Lakewood/Pierce County Continuum of Care among other coalitions that consider needs for public services and make recommendations based on knowledge of the existing systems and gaps in light of continuously reduced federal and state funding. General Funds from both Tacoma and

Lakewood support public services. The 0.1% tax in Tacoma (2012) will provide additional funding for mental health and substance abuse interventions/prevention and will help meet resource gaps. However, funding is not sufficient. Tacoma and Lakewood determinations of needs for public services and funding priorities are highly coordinated and prevention-focused.

How were these needs determined?

Housing Market Analysis

MA-05 Overview

Housing Market Analysis Overview:

Both Tacoma and Lakewood encourage development. Tacoma wants to focus growth for the downtown area and along transportation corridors. Lakewood is working with developers and builders to take advantage of land in Lakewood to provide infill throughout the City as well as developing in new areas where zoning allows. Toward this end, the City has identified unused or underutilized land in all neighborhoods. Not only does this provide needed housing but it is consistent with the policy of raising housing quality. There are several areas in Lakewood with rundown properties and with vacant or abandoned units. Where they exist, these conditions make the neighborhood unsafe and depress property values. Encouraging new development, including higher end development, can revitalize neighborhoods and contribute to the tax base and the overall economy as well as increasing opportunities.

Development is more than applications for building permits, to be sure. Consistent with the Washington State Growth Management Act policies, there must be a balance of residential concentrations and employment opportunities. The Pierce County Building Lands Report indicates that the City of Tacoma is on target for projections on both residential and employment growth, but Lakewood lags in employment. The balance between jobs and housing and all that entails is an important consideration for both Cities as they strive to attract business and industry by providing infrastructure, develop the skills of the workforce, and bring residential densities close to opportunities.

MA-10 Housing Market Analysis: Number of Housing Units - 91.410, 91.210(a)&(b)(2)

Introduction

Most residential development in Tacoma, like that in Pierce County and the State of Washington, consists of single family detached houses and most of that in low-density areas of single family and small multifamily housing. Higher density developments are scattered to some extent throughout Tacoma, but tend to be found near downtown, in the Eastside, and along the main transportation corridors. While Tacoma was the 3rd most populated city in Washington (after Seattle and Spokane) in 2014, Tacoma ranked 15th in population density (persons per square mile). Seattle was most populated and was the densest – at 7,645 persons per square mile almost twice the density of Tacoma (4,037 persons per square mile).

A smaller share (46%) of housing in Lakewood was single family detached units. Small multifamily units (from two to 19 units) accounted for about 33% of housing as of the 2009-2013 ACS. In terms of land use in Lakewood, areas of highest population density are located along I-5 and in north Lakewood in areas containing multifamily housing. Least populated areas are residential areas around the lakes in central Lakewood, which also correspond to the more affluent neighborhoods. Lakewood is the 18th most populated city in Washington (2014 OFM estimates) and is ranked 18th in terms of density (2,918 persons per square mile).

According to American Community Survey estimates (2009-2013), about 6% of housing in Lakewood was mobile homes. Mobile homes can be an affordable housing option for low income households; however, older poorly maintained units remain a problem. The deteriorating condition of mobile homes in Lakewood is a concern. Several of the parks are in areas zoned commercial, such as those along Pacific Highway Southwest. As property values increase, there will be corresponding pressure to consolidate properties and redevelop. The antiquated condition of many mobile homes will prevent relocation.

All residential properties by number of units

Property Type	Number	%
1-unit detached structure	66,275	59%
1-unit, attached structure	3,483	3%
2-4 units	11,506	10%
5-19 units	16,541	15%
20 or more units	13,187	12%
Mobile Home, boat, RV, van, etc	1,661	1%
Total	112,653	100%

Table 27 – Residential Properties by Unit Number

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Unit Size by Tenure

	Owners		Renters	
	Number	%	Number	%
No bedroom	117	0%	3,317	7%
1 bedroom	1,137	2%	14,802	29%
2 bedrooms	10,400	19%	20,322	40%
3 or more bedrooms	41,850	78%	11,889	24%
Total	53,504	99%	50,330	100%

Table 28 – Unit Size by Tenure

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

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

Housing assistance programs target the most vulnerable. As charted in the *State of Washington Housing Needs Assessment* developed by Mullin & Lonergan Associates for the Affordable Housing Advisory Committee, targets for subsidized units vary with programs. Federal, state and local funds subsidize households with earnings below 60% of AMI, and generally specifically target the lowest income (at or below 30% of AMI). The Tacoma Housing Authority has the largest number of public housing units (809 units in non-scattered site community projects) and has a current target of providing 75% of those units to very low-income households (those with incomes at or below 50% of AMI when they enter the program).

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

The Housing Needs Assessment discusses units across the State of Washington that might be lost due to expiring contracts, drawing on data from the National Housing Trust summary of HUD project-based subsidy contract monthly reports. Up to three-quarters have contracts up for renewal. However, local housing programs have been successful in preserving three out of four units with expiring contracts. The Tacoma Housing Authority anticipates converting 34 units of scattered site public housing to homeownership. No other loss of units was reported.

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

Housing costs are out of reach for many households in Pierce County (and Tacoma and Lakewood). For example, a household with a single wage earner at \$15 an hour would not be able to afford a unit priced at \$820 (the median rent in Lakewood) – housing would be affordable to that individual at \$780.

Without (and even with) a subsidy, many households with lowest incomes must compete for housing in their price range, settle for units in poor condition, live in overcrowded circumstances, or live in areas with less access to opportunities (employment, education and amenities). Stakeholders interviewed for this Consolidated Plan reported that people are living precariously for lack of affordable housing – in garages and crowded in single rooms. Persons with special needs, disabilities, mental health problems, substance abuse issues, those released from institutions, seniors wanting to downsize or move to more accommodating housing, young people starting out are examples of many in Tacoma and Lakewood who may not find suitable housing within their means.

Describe the need for specific types of housing:

Discussion

MA-15 Housing Market Analysis: Cost of Housing - 91.410, 91.210(a)

Introduction

Cost of Housing

	Base Year: 2000	Most Recent Year: 2011	% Change
Median Home Value	0	0	0%
Median Contract Rent	0	0	0%

Table 29 – Cost of Housing

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

Rent Paid	Number	%
Less than \$500	8,406	16.7%
\$500-999	31,480	62.5%
\$1,000-1,499	8,225	16.3%
\$1,500-1,999	1,575	3.1%
\$2,000 or more	644	1.3%
Total	50,330	100.0%

Table 30 - Rent Paid

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Housing Affordability

% Units affordable to Households earning	Renter	Owner
30% HAMFI	2,855	No Data
50% HAMFI	9,710	1,055
80% HAMFI	29,120	5,139
100% HAMFI	No Data	11,009
Total	41,685	17,203

Table 31 – Housing Affordability

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

Monthly Rent

Monthly Rent (\$)	Efficiency (no bedroom)	1 Bedroom	2 Bedroom	3 Bedroom	4 Bedroom
Fair Market Rent	608	740	964	1,421	1,707
High HOME Rent	638	767	999	1,178	1,295

Monthly Rent (\$)	Efficiency (no bedroom)	1 Bedroom	2 Bedroom	3 Bedroom	4 Bedroom
Low HOME Rent	627	672	807	932	1,040

Table 32 – Monthly Rent

Data Source: HUD FMR and HOME Rents

Is there sufficient housing for households at all income levels?

The 2015 *State of Washington Housing Needs Assessment* points to rising costs of housing in Washington between 2000 and 2012 (in constant dollars). The median gross rent between 2000 and 2012 rose from \$663 to \$951. The increase, if due to inflation alone, would have resulted in a median gross rent of \$884 in 2012. Rent increases were highest in the Puget Sound region. Not only have rents increased overall, the percent of units in lower ranges have dropped in proportion to higher costing units. For example, in 2000 about 15% of units had a gross rent of \$1,000 or more and by 2012 45% of units had a gross rent of \$1,000 or more.

Similarly the median owner-estimated values of owner-occupied units in Washington rose from \$168,300 in 2000 to \$272,900 which was an inflation adjusted increase of about 22%. While housing prices are increasing, renter income is decreasing. Comparing 2000 and 2012 median income for renter households found about a 2% decline after adjusting for inflation. Median household income for owner households increased slightly (by about 1% during that same period after adjusting for inflation).

The gap in affordability is particularly severe among lowest income households. The gap is determined by comparing levels of household income with available housing affordable at that income range, which includes vacant units and housing actually occupied by households with incomes in the matching range. Housing is not allocated by need, unless housing is held specifically for qualifying households (both in terms of ability to pay and household composition), such as most subsidized housing. Instead, many lower cost units (owned or rented) are occupied by households with higher incomes, better credit, and fewer needs. Many of the lowest income households have barriers that limit choices, such as poor credit histories and criminal histories.

In Pierce County for every 100 households with incomes at or below 30% of median family income, there were only ten units available, leaving a gap of 90 units per 100 households (2012 data). For every 100 households with incomes at or below 50% of median family income, just 29 units were available, leaving a gap of 71 units per 100 households. The estimates in Tacoma are not much different. For every 100 households with incomes at or below 30% of median family income, there were only 12 units

available, leaving a gap of 88 units per 100 households. For every 100 households with incomes at or below 50% of median family income, 32 units were available, leaving a gap of 68 units.

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

Housing costs in both Tacoma and Lakewood are lower on average (Table 29) than in Pierce County and Washington. Still, housing costs are rising – both rental and purchase. According to results of surveys conducted by the Washington Center for Real Estate Research (University of Washington), the average rent in the spring of 2014 in Pierce County was \$887 with a vacancy of 4.04%. The survey includes units in larger complexes only (five or more units) and varies with landlord response rates. The general trend in the last five years is that of steadily increasing rents and declining vacancies (among the apartments surveyed).

The Washington Center for Real Estate Research also looks at trends in purchase prices and affordability of housing on the market. Data provided in the WCRER publication *Washington State's Housing Market 2nd Quarter 2014* showed a 5% higher median resale housing price in Pierce County from the median price a year earlier. The affordability of housing for homebuyers was reflected in the Housing Affordability Index of 165.7 for Pierce County (2014 2nd quarter) which measures the degree to which a household with median income could buy a median-priced home. This means that a household with median income had 65.7% more income than the minimum required to buy a median-priced home. (As a comparison, the all-buyer index (HAI) in Washington for the same period was 144.2.)

A second index applies to first-time buyers and assumes a lower-priced unit (85% of median), lower income (70% of median), lower down payment, and possible assistance with the downpayment or other favorable terms. The first-time HAI in Pierce County in the second quarter of 2014 was 86.9, meaning housing (at 85% of median) was not affordable to first-time buyers (earning 70% of median). First-time buyers in Pierce County had just 86.9% of assets and capacity to buy a home. The first-time buyer index (HAI) in Washington State was 81.0. Housing is becoming less affordable. The 2015 State of Washington Housing Needs Assessment concludes that housing costs (in inflation adjusted dollars) are increasing while median renter incomes have decreased in Washington (again in inflation adjusted dollars).

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

The 2014 HUD Fair Market Rents (FMRs) had been adjusted downward by approximately 5% from 2013 FMRs, in spite of rising costs. However, the 2015 FMRs, were pegged almost 5% higher than the 2014 rents (2015 HUD HOME Program rents are expected to be published for effect in July 2015).

Discussion

MA-20 Housing Market Analysis: Condition of Housing - 91.410, 91.210(a)

Introduction

Housing in Tacoma is older than in Lakewood – more than one-third (36%) of units were built before 1950 and 27% of units were built before 1940. This is consistent with Tacoma’s being a long-established urban and economic center. Lakewood, on the other hand, was more a residential development, especially between 1950 and 1979, during which time 57% of units were built.

The age of housing is not necessarily an indication of housing condition. If well-maintained, older houses and neighborhoods can be both safe and highly valued. Often centrally located, these neighborhoods are frequently the target for redevelopment and improvement as people buy and restore homes. On the other hand, older properties and neighborhoods that are not maintained, while sometimes offering more affordable housing, can pose health and safety issues for residents. Preservation of existing housing stock, where possible, is one of the best strategies for retaining affordable housing.

Describe the jurisdiction's definition for "substandard condition" and "substandard condition but suitable for rehabilitation":

For purposes of this Consolidated Plan, units are in standard condition if they meet HUD Uniform Physical Condition Standards (UPCS) and/or current applicable codes. Units substandard but suitable for rehabilitation are those that may not meet one or more of UPC Standards but can be reasonably repaired to extend the life of the building, contribute to the safety of the occupant, and improve conditions or livability of the structure. Substandard and not suitable for rehabilitation are units that are in poor condition and not structurally and/or financially feasible to rehabilitate.

Condition of Units

Condition of Units	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Number	%	Number	%
With one selected Condition	18,657	35%	24,136	48%
With two selected Conditions	529	1%	1,700	3%
With three selected Conditions	39	0%	206	0%
With four selected Conditions	0	0%	0	0%
No selected Conditions	34,279	64%	24,288	48%
Total	53,504	100%	50,330	99%

Table 33 - Condition of Units

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Year Unit Built

Year Unit Built	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Number	%	Number	%
2000 or later	3,339	6%	4,937	10%
1980-1999	10,120	19%	12,059	24%
1950-1979	21,499	40%	22,295	44%
Before 1950	18,546	35%	11,039	22%
Total	53,504	100%	50,330	100%

Table 34 – Year Unit Built

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

Risk of Lead-Based Paint Hazard

Risk of Lead-Based Paint Hazard	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Number	%	Number	%
Total Number of Units Built Before 1980	40,045	75%	33,334	66%
Housing Units build before 1980 with children present	2,505	5%	3,585	7%

Table 35 – Risk of Lead-Based Paint

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

Vacant Units

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

Table 36 - Vacant Units

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

Describe the need for owner and rental rehabilitation based on the condition of the jurisdiction's housing.

Both Tacoma and Lakewood have areas in which housing needs repair or improvements and both cities provide or support programs contributing to housing rehabilitation and energy efficiency. Tacoma and Lakewood have active code enforcement divisions to promote health, safety and appearance of existing buildings. In both Tacoma and Lakewood code enforcement staff works with neighborhoods as part of a team of responders to help establish neighborhood priorities and identify concerns about blight, dilapidated conditions, and public safety and code violations. Where single family structures (as well as multifamily structures) are not suitable for rehabilitation and are a blighting influence on neighborhoods, they might be appropriate for demolition on a spot blight basis.

Many of Lakewood's mobile homes are in very poor condition and beyond hope of rehabilitation. There are also areas in which rental units are poorly maintained, some of the properties belonging to absentee landlords with little incentive to maintain the units. McChord Gate, in particular, is an example of an area in poor condition. An added problem in Lakewood is the accumulation of trash and garbage, including abandoned furniture and larger items. While disposing of trash and garbage is mandatory, residents cannot always afford (or choose not to pay for) dump fees or the expense of having trash hauled. High rental turnover leads to the ongoing and expensive problem of cleaning up junk.

Vacant and abandoned buildings are a source of serious problems, again in both cities. In Tacoma there are properties that banks have not foreclosed on and that are not maintained. Code enforcement is hard pressed to respond to calls (as many as 7,000 calls a year) and lacks authority to readily enter the property. They may be vacant, vandalized, occupied by squatters, or the site of illegal activities. Even boarded up and secure, they are unsightly and contribute to neighborhood blight.

The City of Tacoma instituted a provisional rental property license in 2012 as an initial step in maintaining the quality of rental housing and the City of Lakewood is taking this under consideration. While in the early stages in Tacoma, the program has proven effective in other jurisdictions and worked to benefit the landlord, the tenants and the city. The City of Lakewood has focused efforts on revitalizing neighborhoods to coordinate infrastructure, housing, and facilities to realize a positive and stabilizing result. Tillicum is an example of such coordinated efforts on the part of the City and partners, such as Tacoma Pierce County Habitat for Humanity.

Estimate the number of housing units within the jurisdiction that are occupied by low or moderate income families that contain lead-based paint hazards. 91.205(e), 91.405

The Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992 seeks to identify and mitigate sources of lead in the home. A high level of lead in the blood is particularly toxic to children age six and younger. Childhood lead poisoning is the number one environmental health hazard facing American children. Lead can damage the central nervous system, cause mental retardation, convulsions and sometimes death. Even low levels of lead can result in lowered intelligence, reading and learning disabilities, decreased attention span, hyperactivity and aggressive behavior.

Use of lead in paint was banned in 1978, but used prior to that time with increased frequency in earlier decades. According to American Community Survey estimates (2009-2013), 66% of housing in Lakewood

and 71% of housing in Tacoma was built before 1980. Children who live in homes with lead-based paint can become exposed by inadvertently ingesting or inhaling lead contained in household dust. This is particularly a problem when houses are remodeled using practices such as scraping or sanding old paint. Lead-based paint is not the only culprit. Lead has also been identified in many other sources, including some vinyl blinds, pottery, lead in water pipes, lead in dust brought into the home from work sites, certain hobbies (like lead solder in stained glass work), and some herbal remedies.

The table showing risk of lead-based paint hazards combines CHAS (Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy) estimates of households with young children (to age six) and 2007-2011 ACS estimates of occupied units built before 1980 by tenure. Based on these estimates, 11% of households renting units built before 1980 and 6% of owner-occupant households living in units built before 1980 have children age six or younger living in the household. Conservatively, all older housing with young children should be a concern in terms of lead exposure. No attempt was made here to further refine these estimates, which are of all households with young children regardless of household income.

Not all of these children are at risk, however. Risk increases with age of the unit (actual presence of lead) and unit deterioration (poor substrate condition), moisture intrusion and deteriorated painted surfaces. Whether rented or owned, the cost of maintenance often contributes to deteriorating conditions and risk of lead exposure. Unfortunately, testing for elevated blood-lead levels in children is inadequate. There has been an increase in testing in Washington after a lead in toys scare in 2008 caused parents to test their children, but testing is not routine. Washington Department of Health records blood-lead testing results. Note that testing results are reported by location of testing facility and not the address of the child. Between 2008 and 2012, 6,957 children to age six were tested in Tacoma and Lakewood (most of the 7,701 tested in Pierce County. Of those tested, 142 in Tacoma and Lakewood (150 in the County) were found with elevated blood levels, which was defined as 5mcg/dL or higher. (The definition of elevated was 10mcg/dL before 2012, but the current definition – now termed “level of reference” – applied to data included here.)

Discussion

MA-25 Public And Assisted Housing - 91.410, 91.210(b)

Introduction

Totals Number of Units

	Program Type								
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers					
				Total	Project -based	Tenant -based	Special Purpose Voucher		
							Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
# of units vouchers available	0	91	1,045	6,494	773	5,721	1,017	0	4
# of accessible units									

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

Table 37 – Total Number of Units by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Describe the supply of public housing developments:

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

The Tacoma Housing Authority has 843 units of public housing in 19 locations, with another 34 scattered site units. Of these, 353 are reserved for seniors and persons with disabilities; all others are family housing. The Pierce County Housing Authority has 127 scattered site public housing units (all family units). Public housing units (other than scattered site) held by the Tacoma Housing Authority are slated for conversion to RAD (Rental Assistance Demonstration) in 2016 which moves them to a Section 8 platform. While there will be no loss in the number of units, the change gives housing authorities more freedom to leverage public and private debt and equity. New financing through tax credits will make funds available for ongoing maintenance, rehabilitation and operations.

Maintaining scattered inventory is costly. The Tacoma Housing Authority will convert 34 scattered public housing units to homeownership, through HUD Section 32 program. Pierce County Housing Authority would like to transition scattered site public housing units to project-based vouchers in the future.

In addition to public housing, both housing authorities have vouchers which make up the largest part of subsidized housing available through the housing authorities. The Tacoma Housing Authority manages 3,796 tenant based vouchers and the Pierce County Housing Authority manages 2,500 tenant-based vouchers, in addition to 601 project-based vouchers for the combined agencies.

Public Housing Condition

Public Housing Development	Average Inspection Score
Hillside I	0
Hillside II	0
Hillside Terrace	0
Salishan One	0
Salishan Two	0
Salishan Three	0
Salishan Four	0
Salishan Five	0
Salishan Six	0
K Street	0
G Street	0
E. B. White	0
Fawcett	0
Wright	0
6th Avenue	0
Bergerson Terrace	0
Dixon Village	0
Bay Terrace	0
THA scattered site	0
PCA scattered site	0

Table 38 - Public Housing Condition

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

All public housing units in Tacoma and Lakewood are in good condition. Tacoma Housing Authority is redeveloping Bay Terrace Phase II to create a mix of units with project-based vouchers and market rate units. Phase I of this redevelopment was completed in 2014. The Pierce County Housing Authority is replacing siding, decks and windows at Lakewood Village.

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

The Pierce County Housing Authority, having only scattered site public housing, has no tenant association. However, the PCHA offers the Ready-to-Rent program to increase tenancy skills and offers Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) services to tenants in public housing and those in Section 8 units. In

addition, PCHA partners with Sound Families, Greater Lakes Mental Health, Good Samaritan Mental Health Services and the Housing First program to reach and provide services to homeless families.

The Tacoma Housing Authority also has a FSS program which is offered to both public housing residents and those in Section 8 programs. The THA is a Moving to Work housing authority. As such, there is a strong emphasis on economic self-sufficiency. A number of innovative approaches are in place to help tenants succeed and, for those able, to move beyond needing housing assistance. Among the strategies is increasing access to support services, incentives to reward earnings and a program (Education Project) to improve education outcomes for youth. The McCarver Elementary School Initiative is a targeted intervention focusing on families who were homeless or at-risk, matching housing subsidy, parent-training and empowerment, supportive services, and improved academic standards at the school to benefit both the school and families and contribute to neighborhood stability.

Discussion:

MA-30 Homeless Facilities and Services - 91.410, 91.210(c)

Introduction

Resources to reduce and prevent homelessness are severely taxed. The Tacoma/Lakewood/Pierce County Continuum of Care, in the 2012 *Plan to End Homelessness* recognizes that challenge and works to coordinate the efforts and intent of multiple funders and providers, which includes aligning funding and priorities. The Plan notes an unfortunate starting point in eliminating homelessness:

The current array of homeless housing and services was not consciously designed. Rather, it is the result of years of inflexible fund sources layered or cobbled together as a reaction to trends in homelessness and homeless program policy and funding. The end result is that we have become very good at managing homelessness rather than moving toward ending it.

According to the 2014 Housing Inventory Count (HIC) Report, there were 1,878 beds in facilities targeted to homeless individuals. This included 513 year-round beds in emergency shelters, 145 seasonal beds, 566 beds in transitional housing settings and 654 beds in permanent supportive housing facilities.

The HIC identified 65 beds available to older youth, but not children under age 18. A new youth drop-in shelter (ages 13 to 24), along with an overnight emergency shelter for youth 18 to 24, is planned with initial funding from Tacoma and Pierce County. The facility will open early in 2016. A second phase will provide emergency shelter for youth under age 18. Permanent supportive housing includes eight units for persons with HIV/AIDS and 46 units for persons with mental health issues. A recent increase in the number of beds designated for chronically homeless persons brings the current total to 491 permanent supportive housing beds. Overall resources designated for veterans include 280 permanent supportive housing beds.

While there are no new units under development at this writing, the Continuum of Care has allocated funding to convert seven scattered site units in Lakewood (Living Access Support Alliance) from transitional to rapid re-housing (expected August 2015) and four units in Tacoma (Manresa) from transitional to permanent supportive housing.

There is not enough permanent supportive housing and additional development is challenged, making it hard to serve clients with special needs. State and local funding for supportive services is generally an annual allocation. Obtaining capital funds for affordable housing requires a long term commitment (40 to 50 years, according to stakeholders interviewed for this Consolidated Plan). Without a long term commitment for supportive services it is difficult to develop additional supportive housing. In addition, current sources of funding are being challenged and may not be available in the future. The Housing Trust Fund has declined and there is increased competition for the funding including the possibility of targeting more for homeownership. Document recording fees in Washington were earmarked for supportive services but there is a possibility that may change.

One potential source to meet the need for additional permanent supportive housing resources is through conversion of transitional units to permanent supportive housing. A 2013 study to identify current transitional housing units appropriate for conversion found 22 transitional housing units suitable for conversion to permanent supportive housing and 244 units suitable for rapid rehousing/permanent supportive housing.

Facilities Targeted to Homeless Persons

	Emergency Shelter Beds		Transitional Housing Beds	Permanent Supportive Housing Beds	
	Year Round Beds (Current & New)	Voucher / Seasonal / Overflow Beds	Current & New	Current & New	Under Development
Households with Adult(s) and Child(ren)	235	0	454	72	0
Households with Only Adults	278	145	112	582	0

	Emergency Shelter Beds		Transitional Housing Beds	Permanent Supportive Housing Beds	
	Year Round Beds (Current & New)	Voucher / Seasonal / Overflow Beds	Current & New	Current & New	Under Development
Chronically Homeless Households	0	0	0	419	0
Veterans	0	0	0	280	0
Unaccompanied Youth	0	0	0	0	0

Table 39 - Facilities Targeted to Homeless Persons

Data Source Comments: Pierce County Community Connections February 2015; HUD's 2014 Continuum of Care Homeless Assistance Programs Housing Inventory Count Report

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

All major federal mainstream services are available to homeless program clients within the Tacoma/Lakewood/Pierce County Continuum of Care. These programs include mainstream resources such as TANF, WIC, Food Stamps, Medicare, Medicaid, Veterans healthcare, SSI, and SSDI. Many agency case managers and counselors make a focused effort to assist clients to access the programs for which they qualify. Agency staff periodically attend training to receive updating on the specific program requirements and how best to assist clients to access the services.

These mainstream services, which provide financial supports, health maintenance, employment programs and assistance with housing and food expenses, are critical tools complementing the services provided to homeless persons in the community. Of note are the veterans' assistance service programs and vouchers which have been greatly expanded in recent years in an effort to end veteran's homelessness. Several Continuum of Care members assist clients to access programs as they work with Community Services Offices of the Washington State Department of Health and Human Services, the Pierce County Health Department, the local Veterans Administration, and the Social Security Office. Case managers from homeless housing providers and service agencies closely coordinate with these local offices to assure appropriate services are made available to their clients and are actually accessed. Many assist clients to apply for program benefits. Homeless providers meet periodically to plan for improved coordination of mainstream resources.

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

The Continuum of Care has established a central point of access, called Access Point 4 Housing (AP4H), operated by the Associated Ministries, to help not only persons who are homeless but also people in crisis. Their goal is to find stabilizing services and housing by first assessing needs and then helping them obtain appropriate homelessness prevention services, rent and utility assistance, strength-based assessment, case management and referral to shelter or other housing best suited to the individual needs of the client.

This diversion intervention shows promise in preventing families and individuals from entering homelessness. Clients participate in a short interview to explore the nature of problems they are facing; and a coordinated flexible response is developed to prevent them from becoming homeless or to find stabilizing services and/or housing for those who are homeless. It is expected that as many as 20% of people calling in to the Centralized Intake system will have problems that can be resolved, diverting

them from homelessness. Examples of solutions are short-term assistance with housing costs, dispute resolution, or transportation costs. It is hoped that using the “lightest touch” will ultimately increase to success and diversion for 50% of callers – half of callers avoiding the homeless system.

The primary source for information on available nonmainstream services (for both homeless and non-homeless persons) in Tacoma and Lakewood is the *Member Resource Directory* of the Tacoma-Pierce County Coalition to End Homelessness. An array of specialized services are available, including crisis centers and helplines operated by five key organizations, food and clothing programs, employment services, elderly/seniors/disabled programs, mental health counseling and treatment, medical and dental health services, educational programs, legal assistance, substance abuse treatment and counseling, and financial services. In addition, many of these programs and others provide services targeted directly at meeting the needs of specific populations, such as youth, veterans, as well as programs for survivors of domestic violence, families, and specialized services for men and for women.

MA-35 Special Needs Facilities and Services - 91.410, 91.210(d)

Introduction

The aging population will need additional supportive services in the years ahead which are mirrored in other populations with special needs including persons with mental illness, substance abuse problems, HIV/AIDS, and those with developmental or physical disabilities. For all, the overriding understanding is that self-sufficiency and independence are primary goals, while being connected to the community and family. Supportive services and case management are necessary during crisis intervention and stabilization and, for some, on an ongoing basis. For victims of domestic violence and persons with disabilities, the needs go beyond crisis and short-term intervention. A flexible system of support is required to assist the individual or family to achieve self-sufficiency.

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

The cost for in-home care, should that be required, dramatically increases the amount of income a senior, or person with disabilities, needs to be secure (Elder Economic Security Index) – more than doubling the cost if 16 hours of care was added (more than triple the cost for 36 hours of care). Fixed income, such as Social Security, sees modest annual increases; actual increases in cost of living are far from modest.

Providing appropriate and timely assessment, treatment and support services is a challenge made more difficult by lack of adequate funding. In a 2015 study by Mental Health America, Washington State was rated among the highest in prevalence of mental illness and the lowest access to care (these are related measures). Washington achieved an overall ranking of 48 (out of 51). Contributors to the development of this Consolidated Plan consistently mentioned the need for crisis intervention, housing, and supportive services for persons with mental illness. Mental illness is a primary factor in homelessness, including homeless veterans. The Pierce County Health Department identified mental health as the number one priority. Among goals is increasing use of best practices for all ages, starting with youth, increasing behavioral health support particularly for those who are underserved, and increasing collaboration among partners.

According to data compiled by the Washington State Coalition Against Domestic Violence, having limited options for economic stability can keep victims in relationships with violent abusers. Lack of affordable housing is key among the barriers to escaping abuse. Washington State tracks domestic violence-related

deaths. In the 10-year period between 2004 and 2013, there were 87 such homicides in Pierce County and 26 abuser suicides.

The *City of Tacoma Domestic Violence Needs and Gaps Assessment* reported that domestic violence-related offenses for Pierce County and Tacoma were among the highest in Washington (over a 5-year period). Result from a survey of providers showed that 22% of clients were undocumented and that a large number (estimate of 32%) had limited English. Most, but not all, were female (about 87% were). There were a disproportionate share of minority persons, according survey results – 61% were persons of color including African American and Hispanic.

Gaps in services interfere with victims making successful safe transitions from violence. That successful transition is met with multiple barriers – lack of affordable housing, lack of legal representation (including with family law), finding suitable employment, and recovering from abuse. While victims of domestic violence are protected from discrimination, the presence of protective orders alone can persuade landlords against renting. Many victims have mental health and/or substance abuse problems, lack basic training for jobs, cannot find childcare, and cannot afford transportation. Some victims who are immigrants are further victimized because documentation is tied to the abuser. LGBT victims are better served, but not perfectly. The system is designed for the mainstream population and transgender clients may have problems.

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

There were 6,731 people living in group quarter in Tacoma and 1,488 in Lakewood in 2010. Correctional institutions and nursing homes accounted for the largest part of those in institutionalized settings. College dormitories were a major contributor to noninstitutionalized setting. Other noninstitutionalized settings include emergency and transition shelters, group homes, residential treatment centers, religious group quarters and workers group quarters. The sizable military population at Joint Base Lewis-McChord (JBLM) is reflected in the populations shown in Pierce County.

Discharge planning is an important consideration in Lakewood, Tacoma and Pierce County both for provision of services and ensuring people are not released into homelessness. Western State Hospital in Lakewood is a regional facility serving 19 counties in Washington and provides both outpatient and residential care for individuals with mental illness. Some individuals released after treatment stay in the area. People also transition from JBLM into the region. Transition assistance is provided by JBLM, but some veterans are vulnerable and receive assistance in the community to adjust.

The Lakewood/Tacoma/Pierce County Continuum of Care members continue to work to prevent the discharge of persons from institutions into homelessness. The goal is to provide or broker tailored services and treatment in housing and prevention programs. The Continuum's Discharge Planning subcommittee has worked on developing plans and actions for improving the system of discharging from institutions to prevent individuals from becoming homeless. The City of Tacoma will continue to utilize funds generated by the mental health/chemical dependency sales tax to facilitate system-wide improvements to the delivery of mental health and chemical dependency services.

The State Department of Corrections will continue to have a place at the table to assist in the Continuum of Care's planning process. The Department will principally work with the Incarcerated Veterans Program, Pioneer Human Services, shelters and the Metropolitan Development Council to prevent discharges into homelessness. Several agencies will work with health and mental health care facilities to find housing for persons being discharged following their health care. Key players working toward the goal of successful transitions of mental health discharges to the community will be the PATH teams, Positive Interactions, Western State Hospital, Franciscan Health Care, Multicare/Good Samaritan Greater Lakes Mental Health Care, the Rescue Mission, Comprehensive Life Resources and Catholic Community Services. Multidisciplinary teams will begin the planning for children aging out of foster care six months prior to the "aging out" date and will use housing and transitional housing resources primarily available through the Pierce County Alliance and the Housing for Success partnership.

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

Multiple plans, in addition to this Consolidated Plan (including the Tacoma/Lakewood/Pierce County Continuum of Care *Plan to End Homelessness*, City of Tacoma *Human Services Strategic Plan*, the City of Lakewood *Human Services Needs Analysis Report*, and the City of Tacoma *Community Mental Health and Chemical Dependency Assessment*) set strategies to be employed in increasing supportive housing and services for persons with special needs. The Consolidated Plan sets a goal of reducing homelessness and increasing stability, which includes housing and supportive services for persons with special needs who may be vulnerable to homelessness.

In addition to continued funding for affordable housing, the Cities provide funding for the Affordable Housing Fund, part of which is used to leverage funding to provide housing for persons with special needs. Funding from Tacoma Community Redevelopment Authority is funding Mercy Housing

Northwest's development of the New Tacoma II Senior Apartments in the Hilltop Neighborhood in Tacoma which will provide 40 units of housing for low-income seniors with eight units reserved for formerly homeless seniors. City of Lakewood support for the new LASA Prairie Oaks Client Service Center will provide services and housing for vulnerable populations, including persons with special needs. In addition, the Tacoma/Lakewood/Pierce County Continuum of Care is committed to utilize rapid rehousing resources to prevent homelessness among vulnerable populations, many of whom have special needs.

General Funds in Lakewood and Tacoma provide major support for persons with special needs. Projects funded in 2014 (and examples of those going forward) included funding for agencies working with persons with HIV/AIDS, victims of domestic violence, persons with developmental and other disabilities, vulnerable youth, parenting teens, and elderly/frail elderly. Notable in Tacoma is the 0.1% tax with funds set aside for mental health and substance abuse intervention/prevention. CDBG funds used for public services include housing and support for victims of domestic violence, persons with substance abuse problems, workforce training and skills development to enhance self-sufficiency.

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

MA-40 Barriers to Affordable Housing - 91.410, 91.210(e)

Describe any negative effects of public policies on affordable housing and residential investment

The Growth Management Act in Washington requires making affordable housing available to all residents. Regional policies included in Vision 2040 call for provision and preservation of a range of housing options, including both rental and purchase; a particular focus on lower-income households and households with special needs; and, equitable and rational distribution of housing throughout the community. Policies recognize that there is jobs-housing balance so workers have opportunities to live in proximity to work. Planning around regional growth centers promotes increased density and coordinated support for multimodal transportation, infrastructure and services.

Lack of affordable housing is a pressing problem in Tacoma and Lakewood. The barriers to providing new affordable housing and retaining existing units in Lakewood and Tacoma, as in other substantially developed cities, are the results of a combination of factors: low household income relative to rising housing costs (particularly for homeownership); housing demand fluctuating with the economy in the Puget Sound region including changes in troop levels at nearby JBLM; lack of sufficient stable, living wage jobs in Tacoma and Lakewood; lack of vacant land with infrastructure in place for development; high cost of labor and materials; and, lack of economic incentives for private market investment in redevelopment or new development.

Market perception also prevents development in some neighborhoods because potential investors and even residents perceive a neighborhood as dangerous due to crime, poor investment for short-term profit, and/or continued deterioration. Both Tacoma and Lakewood have focused on crime-free neighborhoods, code enforcement and removal of blight in troubled neighborhoods. Both Cities are committed to investing in infrastructure and public facilities to invigorate neighborhoods and create incentives for housing and other development.

City of Tacoma Affordable Housing Policy Advisory Group (AHPAG) made a number of policy recommendations to the Tacoma City Council in 2010 to increase affordable housing. The AHPAG continues to work with the City, through the Tacoma Planning Commission to integrate policies and create incentives for increased affordable housing development. In addition to making policy and zoning changes, the AHPAG recognizes the importance of increasing the demand side of the equation – working to raise education/job skills, economic development/job creation, and improved transportation.

Tacoma and Lakewood are members of the Tacoma/Pierce County Affordable Housing Consortium which brings together nonprofit and for-profit developers to identify and support strategies to increase and preserve affordable housing. The Tacoma Community Redevelopment Authority (supported by both Cities) has loaned over \$35 million and leveraged \$350 million since 1998 to create and preserve affordable housing.

Tacoma and Lakewood are committed to creating vibrant and healthy neighborhoods with housing choices for all residents. Both Cities have recently updated the Housing Element of their respective Comprehensive Plans (2014 for both) and integrated policies for developing affordable housing. In addition to policies and strategies to increase affordable housing and maintaining/improving neighborhood quality, the Cities are providing for increased density along transportation corridors, urban centers, and mixed-use centers.

MA-45 Non-Housing Community Development Assets - 91.410, 91.210(f)

Introduction

With the arrival of American settlers in the late 1840s, Tacoma arose as an industrial and transportation hub, first with the deep water port, then enhanced by rail and highways. In addition to the local economic base and that in Pierce County, both Tacoma and Lakewood benefitted from the larger Puget Sound economic system. An important early and continuing contributor to development in the region is Joint Base Lewis-McChord (renamed in 2010) forming the southern boundary of Lakewood.

While Tacoma (incorporated 1884) developed as a major urban city, supporting trade and industry, Lakewood was primarily residential. Fairly recently incorporated (1996), Lakewood grew around numerous lakes which have historically been a draw for recreation as well as residential development for military personnel and retirees and people commuting to jobs elsewhere in Puget Sound.

Puget Sound is a regional economy. People make choices about where to live and work based on several factors including jobs, the cost of housing, and the reasonableness of commuting. The average worker in Washington commutes about a half hour between home and work. That is not remarkably different for workers in Lakewood and Tacoma. More people both live and work in Tacoma than is true of Washington. Nearly half (47%) of Tacoma residents who work both live and work in Tacoma. Fewer (27%) of Lakewood residents both live and work in Lakewood. This is not surprising given Lakewood's history as more a residential community.

The cost of commuting to and from work has received increased attention in relation to housing cost. Money saved in housing is offset by the cost of commuting. One study (Lipman, Barbara. *A Heavy Load: The Combined Housing and Transportation Burdens of Working Families*. 2006) determined that when housing and commute costs are combined, the combination of the two is considerably greater than 30% of income for working families. The study drew information from 28 metropolitan areas across the country. A typical household budget (for the combined 28 metropolitan areas sampled for the study) included 27% for housing and 20% for transportation – 47% combined. However, working families

with incomes between \$20,000 and \$50,000 spent 58% of their earnings for the combination of transportation and housing, split about evenly between housing (28%) and transportation (30%).

Economic Development Market Analysis

Business Activity

Business by Sector	Number of Workers	Number of Jobs	Share of Workers %	Share of Jobs %	Jobs less workers %
Agriculture, Mining, Oil & Gas Extraction	432	3	1	0	-1
Arts, Entertainment, Accommodations	7,737	7,934	13	10	-3
Construction	3,290	2,458	5	3	-2
Education and Health Care Services	13,576	26,574	22	35	13
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	3,672	5,290	6	7	1
Information	1,379	1,114	2	1	-1
Manufacturing	6,021	6,487	10	9	-1
Other Services	5,287	5,918	9	8	-1
Professional, Scientific, Management Services	4,277	3,684	7	5	-2
Public Administration	0	0	0	0	0
Retail Trade	8,734	11,007	14	14	0
Transportation and Warehousing	3,444	1,728	6	2	-4
Wholesale Trade	3,998	3,839	6	5	-1
Total	61,847	76,036	--	--	--

Table 40 - Business Activity

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

Labor Force

Total Population in the Civilian Labor Force	101,575
Civilian Employed Population 16 years and over	90,659
Unemployment Rate	10.75
Unemployment Rate for Ages 16-24	33.52
Unemployment Rate for Ages 25-65	6.30

Table 41 - Labor Force

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Occupations by Sector	Number of People
Management, business and financial	19,068
Farming, fisheries and forestry occupations	4,180
Service	11,587
Sales and office	22,539
Construction, extraction, maintenance and repair	8,165
Production, transportation and material moving	5,794

Table 42 – Occupations by Sector

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Travel Time

Travel Time	Number	Percentage
< 30 Minutes	57,199	66%
30-59 Minutes	22,626	26%
60 or More Minutes	7,336	8%
Total	87,161	100%

Table 43 - Travel Time

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Education:

Educational Attainment by Employment Status (Population 16 and Older)

Educational Attainment	In Labor Force		Not in Labor Force
	Civilian Employed	Unemployed	
Less than high school graduate	5,892	780	5,538
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	19,474	2,197	7,875
Some college or Associate's degree	27,553	2,882	8,508
Bachelor's degree or higher	22,062	968	3,488

Table 44 - Educational Attainment by Employment Status

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Educational Attainment by Age

	Age				
	18–24 yrs	25–34 yrs	35–44 yrs	45–65 yrs	65+ yrs
Less than 9th grade	410	951	865	2,072	2,242
9th to 12th grade, no diploma	4,343	2,844	2,406	3,072	1,953
High school graduate, GED, or alternative	6,947	8,267	7,106	14,362	7,515
Some college, no degree	8,280	8,132	6,735	13,244	4,959
Associate's degree	1,483	3,249	2,894	5,288	933
Bachelor's degree	1,465	4,909	4,525	7,903	2,787
Graduate or professional degree	26	2,114	2,497	4,963	2,130

Table 45 - Educational Attainment by Age

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Educational Attainment – Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months

Educational Attainment	Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months
Less than high school graduate	20,224
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	30,901
Some college or Associate's degree	34,560
Bachelor's degree	47,903
Graduate or professional degree	64,790

Table 46 – Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

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

Over the past two decades, the economic base in Pierce County has shifted along with that in the Puget Sound region. Manufacturing jobs, once the mainstay of good paying positions, have declined and are in line to be replaced with a stronger service and retail economy. Both Tacoma and Lakewood are looking for opportunities to expand economic opportunities. Industries employing the most civilians include education, services, and health care, followed by retail trade.

Joint Base Lewis-McChord is the single largest employer in Pierce County. Many of the jobs on base, however, are occupied by military dependents and not held by persons without a military attachment. There is concern about reduction in troops, but if that should occur, it is not expected to affect local employment. Education, government and health care are clearly major employers in the County. State Farm Insurance Company relocated to Tacoma taking the building vacated by Russell Investments.

Manufacturing, including Boeing in Frederickson in Pierce County, continues to be an important manufacturing sector. The Port of Tacoma is in the process of aligning with the Port of Seattle (Seaport Alliance) which makes the aligned ports a major contender for shipping on the west coast. However, with super tankers and the opening of the enlarged canal in Panama, shipping is entering a new age which may impact the industry in Tacoma and on the west coast of the United States.

Describe the workforce and infrastructure needs of the business community:

The City of Tacoma plan for economic development outlines strategies within several areas that are to be prioritized over the next few years (2013-2014 Strategic Framework and Action Plan). Included among those is a focus on the Central Business District, the Dome, and Brewery District for continued revitalization and infrastructure improvements that can catalyze additional development and opportunities. The City also intends to focus its revitalization efforts on neighborhood centers such as the Lincoln Business District and South Tacoma with targeted resources to upgrade public improvements and beautify these neighborhoods. The City will aim to reuse city-owned and privately-owned properties for this purpose, where appropriate. Small business development has long been a focus of Tacoma's economic development strategies and remains so going forward, including support for entrepreneurship, incubators, and small business technical support. In addition, the City will partner with educational institutions, particularly University of Washington Tacoma, Bates Technical College, University of Puget Sound, Pacific Lutheran University, and Tacoma Community College to provide education and training particularly around new economic opportunities and to meet skilled labor requirements of existing and future businesses. The City will seek to expand the Innovation Partnership Zone (IPZ) in Tacoma (designated by the Department of Commerce).

Neighborhood revitalization is integral to economic development in Tacoma. This includes developing more walkable neighborhoods and vibrant neighborhood centers to attract and retain businesses and encourage infill. Reuse of vacant or underutilized buildings, encouraging infill, removing blighted structures, and removing architectural barriers are all steps to creating that vibrancy.

Central to Lakewood’s vision of economic development is transformation from its start as a bedroom community to a city that is diversified, full-service, and self-contained (Comprehensive Plan, Economic Development). The Comprehensive Plan calls for expansion of infrastructure including improving housing and redeveloping underutilized commercial and industrial properties. Essential infrastructure to encourage economic development has included basic and expensive elements – extending sewers and building roads into areas not previously served. Once completed and in place, opportunities for industry and employment are possible. Development is not starting from scratch – over \$20 million has been invested in Tillicum and Woodbrook and major corridor improvements have been made, including completion of the Sounder Station.

In addition to encouraging development and completed utilization of industrial parks, economic development will take advantage of retail, education and health care systems. The Lakewood Mall was transformed into Towne Center, giving the City a central focus. Pierce College and Clover Park Technical College have added health sciences and technical buildings, in line with Saint Clare/Franciscan Health, Multicare and other health facilities in Lakewood. Essential to economic development are continued removal or redevelopment of blighted or underutilized properties. Revitalization and redevelopment in the near future will focus on the Central Business District, the South Tacoma Way and Pacific Highway Corridors; Springbrook; Tillicum/Woodbrook; Lakeview (Lakewood Station District); and, Lake City.

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

The economy has changed, dramatically compared to several decades ago. Recovering from the recent Great Recession, Tacoma and Lakewood are looking for avenues to economic stability and growth. In that process the Cities are not alone. The Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) in *Vision 2040* acknowledges the transition from a past base of resource extraction and manufacturing to a future base of a globally-focused economy relying on a skilled workforce to both develop and sustain future enterprises. Goals for the economy include a specific focus on people – family wage jobs, high quality education, equity, diversity and targeted growth. Of note as well in this vision is the connection of housing and jobs.

Like the Puget Sound Regional Council, Lakewood and Tacoma are also establishing visions for economic vitality and those visions are not just jobs or just housing, but about what makes a community work. In workshops held as part of Tacoma *Vision 2025* process, the vision for successful economic and employment development was described by participants as linked to multimodal transportation, schools, housing, services, education, and vital neighborhoods.

While recovery from the Great Recession is not as dramatic as in Seattle, Tacoma and Pierce County are recovering, according to an analysis in the *Seattle Times*, with aerospace strong in Frederickson (Boeing and Toray Composites), new investment in downtown Tacoma (expansion of the Tacoma Art Museum and a new YMCA, movie theaters and restaurants on Pacific Avenues, and new housing on the waterfront), growth in cyber security firms and business partnerships with University of Washington Tacoma IT department are pointing to business development and new jobs. So too is the Seaport Alliance, which is a collaborative approach to strengthen the Ports of Seattle and Tacoma. At the same time, there is uncertainty about reductions at JBLM.

In the 2011-2015 work program (*Future Focus: Jobs and Wealth*), the Economic Development Board for Tacoma-Pierce County outlines strategies to retain and expand business opportunities. These strategies focus on existing and emerging clusters (clean technology; logistics and international trade; aerospace and advanced manufacturing; health care; information technology; and defense contractors) and on promoting regional headquarters in finance, insurance, real estate, and information technology.

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

The 2009-2013 American Community Survey estimated that 12% of residents in both Tacoma and Lakewood lacked a high school diploma or equivalency, which was higher than in Washington and in Pierce County. At the other end of the spectrum, about 21% of Lakewood's and 25% of Tacoma's population 25 and older had a bachelor's degree or higher – somewhat lower than Washington.

Education matters in terms of earnings. Median earnings for residents 25 and older without a high school degree (or equivalency) totaled \$18,305 in Lakewood and \$21,122 in Tacoma and increased with each level of educational attainment. Median earnings rose for both male and females, but the median was higher at each level of education for males than females. At the national level data show not only increased earnings with education, but decreased unemployment.

Median earnings for males working full-time, year-around was about 23% higher than that for female workers working full-time, year-around in Lakewood and 20% higher in Tacoma. This may be the result of occupations selected by or available to women based on training or preference. Median income from earnings for all workers in Lakewood was \$27,588 and in Tacoma \$31,377 – well below the median for

full-time workers. This suggests that a substantial share of workers were employed part-time or for part of the year.

Historically, manufacturing was an important segment of the economy in Puget Sound, as well as other sectors that utilized employees with low entry-level skills and training. As the number of jobs in manufacturing continue to decline and employment in other sectors increases, there will be a demand for workers who have degrees (even advanced degrees) in technical fields (science and math) and for workers with post-high school vocational training. There is a challenge in Puget Sound of finding an appropriately trained work force to fill current and future jobs, to attract new business development, and to replace aging workers nearing retirement.

The PSRC report notes several challenges to meeting needs:

- Lack of sufficient higher education capacity
- Mismatch between higher education capacity and employer needs
- Rising cost of education limits enrollment and saddles students with debts
- Low high school graduation rates (below national average)
- Unmet need for training beyond high school; need to increase degrees and certificates awarded
- Retirees with a replacement workforce both smaller and without appropriate training

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

Innovation Partnership Zones (IPZ), designated by the Department of Commerce, link universities, private sector partners and the workforce to support innovation and stimulate economic opportunities. As noted in the CEDS, there are seven Innovation Partnership Zones in the central Puget Sound region including the Urban Clean Water Technology Innovation Partnership Zone in Tacoma which was founded in partnership with the City of Tacoma, the University of Washington Tacoma, and the Puget Sound Partnership. The Center for Urban Waters at the University of Washington Tacoma provides scientific expertise as well as training for students. Other partnerships between Tacoma and Lakewood and educational facilities located nearby or in the individual cities were discussed under economic development strategies above and not repeated here.

Workforce Central in Pierce County, in the *Pierce County Local Integrated Workforce Plan*, outlines the vision of the Pierce County Workforce Development Council to meet the labor needs of industry clusters

(healthcare, aerospace manufacturing, trade/transportation, information technology, national security, construction, building products manufacturing, and food manufacturing). The plan also inventories Pierce County's Workforce development system which, in brief, is a partnership between agencies (including Tacoma Housing Authority, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, Metropolitan Development Council, Vadis, Tacoma Goodwill Industries, educational facilities and others) to provide support for training initiatives and multiple information sharing events (such as career days).

Those workforce training initiatives include:

- RallyPoint/6: Training and reintegration of veterans (along with support for families)
- Employment & Housing Navigator: Education, training and employment for persons who are homeless along with support services and case management
- Heroes at Home 2 Program: Training, tuition, and job placement for military spouses
- Pierce County Youth Consortium (PCYC): Collaboration of youth-serving agencies to improve coordination and provide services to youth
- Resources for Education and Career Help (REACH): Services for disenfranchised youth
- Youth Building Tacoma: Services for youth and paid internships
- Manufacturing Academy: Training and apprenticeship in manufacturing trade

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

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

The Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) adopted in 2012 the two-volume *Regional Economic Strategy for the Central Puget Sound Region (STRATEGY and ECONOMY)* which is the CEDS for the four-county region (Snohomish, King, Pierce and Kitsap counties). The plan acknowledges the challenge of developing and maintaining a robust regional economy in light of changing employment sectors and the significant global competition.

Goals outlined in the long-range strategy hinge on five foundations:

1. Education and workforce development: family wage jobs and a trained workforce
2. Business climate: regional climate supporting investment and job creation
3. Entrepreneurship and innovation: harnessing and encouraging the assets in the region
4. Infrastructure: transportation, information, technology, and location (housing and resources)

5. Quality of life: supporting residents and drawing investment

Discussion

MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion

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

Households with problems, by far the most frequent of which is high cost in relation to household income, are located throughout the Cities rather than in one area. The likelihood of housing problems, though, is higher in lower income block groups discussed below.

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

Defining "minority" as Hispanic and/or race other than white alone, 46% of the population in Lakewood and 40% of the population in Tacoma in 2010 was minority. Areas of disproportionate concentration are those in which there is a greater than 10% difference than the jurisdiction as a whole. While the Consolidated Plan for Lakewood and Tacoma was prepared as a regional plan, populations in the cities differ; therefore, disproportionate concentrations of minority populations were computed separately. (See Appendix D for listing of block groups with disproportionate minority concentrations.)

Block groups in Lakewood in which 57% or more of the population was minority were considered to have disproportionate concentrations. That was the case in ten block groups. Most block groups with disproportionate concentrations of minority populations in Lakewood were found along the Pacific Highway. This included most of the Pacific Neighborhood, a portion of the Lakeview Neighborhood between Lakeview Avenue and Bridgeport Way SW, and sections of the Northeast Lakewood Neighborhood. In relation to the total population of Lakewood, 21% live in block groups that have a disproportionate share of minority population.

Block groups in Tacoma in which 51% or more of the population was minority in 2010 were considered to have disproportionate concentrations. That was the case in 43 block groups. These areas were primarily located just north of I-5 between Sprague and Yakima to 6th and south of I-5 in several areas including areas east of Pacific Avenue, scattered block groups north of 96th and west of Yakima, and along South Tacoma Way. In relation to the total population of Tacoma, 26% live in block groups that have a disproportionate share of minority population.

Low-moderate income block groups are those in which 51% or more of the population lives in households with incomes below 80% of Area Median Income (AMI). The latest HUD tabulations (2014

using 2006-2010 ACS data) showed 27 qualifying block groups in Lakewood and 73 qualifying block groups in Tacoma. In Lakewood the qualifying areas are found primarily in Tillicum/Woodbrook, and north and south along I-5 in East Lakewood. In Tacoma, the qualifying block groups are located throughout the City, but areas with the highest percent low-mod population are in south Tacoma (south of I-5 and east of Portland Avenue) and in the downtown area.

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

Are there any community assets in these areas/neighborhoods?

Are there other strategic opportunities in any of these areas?

Strategic Plan

SP-05 Overview

Strategic Plan Overview

This strategic plan sets priority needs and goals for the City of Tacoma and the City of Lakewood over the next five years. Priorities were established after review of information and data, broad discussions in the community, consideration of strategic plans of partner agencies and providers in the region, and City planning documents. While Tacoma and Lakewood have been a HOME Consortium and prepared parallel strategic plans in the past, this is the first Consolidated Plan and Five-Year Consortium Strategic Plan with shared elements. Each City will continue to prepare Annual Action Plans unique to their jurisdiction. Tacoma, through the Tacoma Community Redevelopment Authority, will administer HOME Consortium funds.

Three priority needs were established, each a high priority:

- Need for affordable housing choice
- Need for basic services and for homeless prevention and intervention
- Need for community and economic development

Three goals were established to meet the needs:

- Increase and preserve affordable housing choice
- Reduce homelessness and increase stability
- Improve infrastructure, facilities and economic development

The Tacoma City Council sets funding priorities every two years for use of entitlement funds that guide applications; Lakewood City Council sets these goals annually. General priorities require consistency with the Consolidated Plan and funds are used to leverage funds from other sources when possible. Priorities further reflect Council direction regarding eligible activities in four broad areas: housing, community development, economic development, and public services. The order of these priorities is determined based on broader opportunities and needs within each jurisdiction. Public services in both Cities are also supported with General Fund dollars and allocations are coordinated under strategic plans for human services in both jurisdictions.

SP-10 Geographic Priorities - 91.415, 91.215(a)(1)

Geographic Area

Table 47 - Geographic Priority Areas

General Allocation Priorities

Describe the basis for allocating investments geographically within the state

There are currently no designated or HUD-approved geographic target areas in either Tacoma or Lakewood. The Cities will continue to focus improvements on areas that qualify because of concentrations of lower-income households. At the same time, both Tacoma and Lakewood recognize that advantages are gained in focusing development in areas, matching funding sources and concentrating efforts to make a noticeable and sustainable difference in an area for the benefit of the neighborhood and the larger jurisdiction. CDBG funds will be matched with funds from other sources to accomplish this goal. The City of Tacoma has partnered with the Tacoma Housing Authority, nonprofit housing and service providers, and other stakeholders to make dramatic improvements in the Central, Eastside, South Tacoma and South End neighborhoods. The Central Business District has benefited and remains a priority. In Lakewood, redevelopment in Tillicum has significantly improved opportunities for lower income households. Over the years improvements included installation of main sewer system, improvements to roads, sidewalks, parks, and the Tillicum Community Center have facilitated delivery of services in this isolated and impoverished neighborhood. In partnership with Tacoma Pierce County Habitat for Humanity, safe housing for purchase has replaced blighted and vacant buildings and introduced a new level of stability.

SP-25 Priority Needs - 91.415, 91.215(a)(2)

Priority Needs

Table 48 – Priority Needs Summary

1	Priority Need Name	Affordable Housing Choice
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Low Moderate Large Families Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse veterans Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Victims of Domestic Violence
	Geographic Areas Affected	
	Associated Goals	Increase and preserve affordable housing choice

	Description	Housing condition and housing affordability are pressing issues in Tacoma and Lakewood. Developers struggle to provide sufficient affordable housing in light of high costs of land and materials, limited availability of land in built-out cities, the cost of providing infrastructure when land is found. Demand for affordable housing options is increasing especially with an aging population and others in need of accessible, lower-cost housing with access to service and amenities. Lower income households are already burdened and vulnerable to homelessness. Among renter households, 39% of those with incomes less than 100% of AMI (14,600 households) are paying more than 50% of household income for rent, or have other severe housing problems; 71% of renter households with incomes at or below 30% of AMI have severe housing problems. Among owner households (with incomes below 100% of AMI), 38% (7,410 households) had severe housing problems and 65% of owners with incomes at or below 30% of AMI had severe housing problems.
	Basis for Relative Priority	The need for affordable housing was consistently identified as a high priority by stakeholders interviewed and reports/plans reviewed for this Consolidated Plan. Lack of affordable housing is a barrier to stability for lower income households including working householders; for persons with special needs (victims of domestic violence, vulnerable veterans, persons with mental health or substance abuse problems); for people looking for safe and appropriate options in housing (aging seniors, young householders starting out). The need for a range of housing, including housing for middle income householders is a priority in redeveloping neighborhoods to create stability, attract businesses, and improve access to opportunities throughout the Cities.
2	Priority Need Name	Basic services & homeless prevention/intervention
	Priority Level	High

<p>Population</p>	<p>Extremely Low Low Large Families Families with Children Elderly Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families Victims of Domestic Violence</p>
<p>Geographic Areas Affected</p>	
<p>Associated Goals</p>	<p>Reduce homelessness and increase stability</p>
<p>Description</p>	<p>There were 1,464 homeless persons counted in the 2014 Point-in-Time count in Pierce County; very conservatively 4,400 persons are homeless (as counted by the HMIS system). People wait for months for housing to escape homelessness and sometimes years to get into publicly subsidized housing. People with special needs (victims of domestic violence, persons with mental health/substance abuse problems, youth, veterans vulnerable to homelessness, frail elderly, persons with HIV/AIDS) need supportive services to attain stability and sometimes permanently to maintain stability and avoid homelessness. Providers struggle to meet needs with declining resources. Focus on sustaining services is not the only priority. Lifting people out of poverty, increasing earning capacity, providing training/job skills/life skills is included in activities to address this need.</p>

	Basis for Relative Priority	Poverty was the most important barrier voiced by respondents to the United Way “listening sessions” held in setting priorities for funding. In Lakewood 20% of the population lives in poverty, as does 18% in Tacoma. Among youth under 18, 31% in Lakewood and 26% in Tacoma lived in poverty; among seniors, 10% in both Cities lived in poverty; and, among female householders with children under the age of 5, 55% in Tacoma and 63% in Lakewood lived in poverty. Lifting people out of poverty (and homelessness) and into stable housing, sometimes with long-term support services is a priority identified in plans and by stakeholders.
3	Priority Need Name	Community and economic development
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Low Moderate Middle Large Families Families with Children Elderly Non-housing Community Development
	Geographic Areas Affected	
	Associated Goals	Infrastructure, facilities & economic opportunity
	Description	Infrastructure (failing or lacking altogether) are priorities and are basic components in creating safe and vibrant neighborhoods and attracting businesses and jobs. Economic development and the need for jobs, especially those with living wages. As of 2013, 8.1% of civilian labor force in the Tacoma Metropolitan District was unemployed – 30,000 jobless (conservatively) and 60,000 counting those who quit looking or were underemployed. Tacoma and Lakewood are part of a regional, multi-county economy and are looking to build on strengths, putting housing and employment together (consistent with Puget Sound Regional Council Vision 2040 on the economy). These means building the infrastructure and labor force, along with job development. There is a need to provide multiple transportation options, trails and bike paths, increased density around business centers and transportation corridors, and increase accessibility for persons with disabilities throughout the Cities.

<p>Basis for Relative Priority</p>	<p>The need for community and economic development is a high priority. Capital Improvements Plans in both Cities outline extensive needs; the difficulty is prioritization of projects given limited resources and insufficient tax revenue to provide the needed infrastructure. The Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) contains five foundations including building family wage jobs; support for investment and job creation; encouraging innovation and entrepreneurship; building infrastructure; and, support quality of life.</p>
-------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Narrative (Optional)

SP-30 Influence of Market Conditions - 91.415, 91.215(b)

Influence of Market Conditions

Affordable Housing Type	Market Characteristics that will influence the use of funds available for housing type
Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA)	Not applicable (no tenant-based rental assistance)
TBRA for Non-Homeless Special Needs	Not applicable (no tenant-based rental assistance)
New Unit Production	
Rehabilitation	
Acquisition, including preservation	

Table 49 – Influence of Market Conditions

SP-35 Anticipated Resources - 91.420(b), 91.215(a)(4), 91.220(c)(1,2)

Introduction

Funds in the first year of the plan are FY 2015 allocations. The amounts assumed to be available in the remaining four years of the plan are based on a combination of strategies. The City of Tacoma used multiples of total annual funds, assuming stable annual allocations and equal program income.

Anticipated Resources

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
CDBG	public - federal	Acquisition Admin and Planning Economic Development Housing Public Improvements Public Services	2,234,649	180,000	862,095	3,276,744	13,106,976	
HOME	public - federal	Acquisition Homebuyer assistance Homeowner rehab Multifamily rental new construction Multifamily rental rehab New construction for ownership TBRA	943,877	30,000	0	973,877	3,895,508	

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
ESG	public - federal	Conversion and rehab for transitional housing Financial Assistance Overnight shelter Rapid re-housing (rental assistance) Rental Assistance Services Transitional housing	199,158	0	20,544	219,702	878,808	

Table 50 - Anticipated Resources

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

The City of Tacoma matches CDBG and HOME funds with grants, local funds, nonprofit organizations, Low-Income Housing Tax Credits, corporate grants, and donations (among other sources) to increase the benefit and success of projects using federal CDBG, HOME, and ESG dollars. In fiscal year 2013, CDBG funds in the amount of about \$1.8 million and HOME funds (Consortium) of about \$1.2 million leveraged over \$37.5 million. The Affordable Housing Fund, under the oversight of the Tacoma Community Redevelopment Authority, increases the ability of partners to provide affordable housing by providing a stable source of funding to leverage additional resources. Tacoma has committed federal CDBG and HOME funds to affordable projects early. Up-front local government support has been critical in anchoring projects and obtaining additional funding. Without that early commitment, competition would take funding elsewhere.

In Lakewood, as in Tacoma, CDBG expenditures leverage funding from multiple sources on nearly all projects, with the exception of homeowner rehabilitation/repair program (Major Home Repair and HOME Housing Rehabilitation). In fiscal year 2013, for example, CDBG funds in the amount of approximately \$400,000 leveraged non-CDBG funds nearly seven times that amount. A loan pool was established with a Section 108 loan for the purpose of economic development and job creation. Revolving loan funds from program income support housing development, infrastructure, economic development and public facilities. A joint-venture between the City of Lakewood, the Tacoma Housing Authority and LASA (Living Access Support Alliance) will provide housing and services for homeless individuals and families. A successful partnership between the City of Lakewood and Tacoma-Pierce County Habitat for Humanity will continue to provide new affordable housing opportunities in the Tillicum neighborhood.

HOME match requirements for the Consortium are met through multiple sources, including sources such as private grants and donations, Attorney General Funds, and the State Housing Trust Fund. In Tacoma, ESG match requirements are met through various sources, depending on the project. Sources in 2014-2015 included the Washington State, Pierce County, foundations and corporate grants, private donations and City of Tacoma General Fund dollars.

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

Use of publicly-owned land or property is not anticipated in projects currently planned or underway although if those opportunities arise, such land and property will be included.

Discussion

SP-40 Institutional Delivery Structure - 91.415, 91.215(k)

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

Responsible Entity	Responsible Entity Type	Role	Geographic Area Served
City of Tacoma	Government	Economic Development Homelessness Non-homeless special needs Ownership Planning Rental neighborhood improvements public facilities public services	Jurisdiction
Tacoma Community Redevelopment Authority	Redevelopment authority	Ownership Planning Rental	Jurisdiction

Table 51 - Institutional Delivery Structure

Assess of Strengths and Gaps in the Institutional Delivery System

In the City of Tacoma, projects funded with CDBG funds are administered by the Community and Economic Development Department with oversight by the Tacoma Community Redevelopment Authority and the Human Services Commission, both appointed by the Tacoma City Council. Tacoma and Lakewood receive HOME (Home Investment Partnership) funds jointly as a Consortium. The Tacoma Community Redevelopment Authority administers housing programs using both CDBG and HOME funds, with support from City staff. In Lakewood, projects funded with CDBG funds are administered by the Community Development Department, with public oversight by the Council-appointed CDBG Citizen's Advisory Board (CAB). The Homeownership Center of Tacoma is the Community Housing Development Organization (CHDO) in Tacoma and is successful in increasing housing in the region.

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

Homelessness Prevention Services	Available in the Community	Targeted to Homeless	Targeted to People with HIV
Homelessness Prevention Services			
Counseling/Advocacy	X	X	X
Legal Assistance	X	X	X

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

Table 52 - Homeless Prevention Services Summary

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

There is an array of agencies providing services in Pierce County covering virtually all areas of need, including most areas of need for persons who are homeless or at risk of homelessness. Detailed information on service availability is regularly updated (Tacoma-Pierce County Coalition to end Homelessness, Member Resource Directory). The United Way 2-1-1 Call Center provides referrals for all callers and the Centralized Intake System through Access Point 4 Housing (AP4H) connects persons who are homeless with appropriate services and housing to the extent it is available.

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

There is considerable coordination between agencies. The Centralized Intake System has made a difference in avoiding duplication and increasing the ability to access the right form of help for those who are homeless. The strength in the array of community partners who made services available and

work with one another to identify gaps. The Human Services Collaboration in Pierce County draws agencies and funders together to align applications, identify needs and gaps, and take steps possible to strengthen the system.

Overwhelmingly the gaps can be attributed to lack of resources to meet the needs. Services are available, but there is not enough. Services and housing resources are inadequate to meet the need across the board. Not only is there a lack of emergency services, there is a lack of services and systems to bridge the period between crisis and stability. It is not for want of willing agencies. The *Human Services Needs Analysis Report* (2014) prepared by the City of Lakewood, the City of Tacoma *Human Services Strategic Plan* (2015-2019), and 2012 Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department *Community Mental Health and Chemical Dependency Assessment* are among key reports identifying gaps in services and strategies to meet the needs. Outreach for this Consolidated Plan reiterated the gaps. The types of needs are discussed in earlier sections. It should be noted that it is not just of the lack of services in sufficient quantity or duration, needs are made more difficult to overcome by lack of transportation (the right bus routes at the right time and in the right frequency), unaffordable child care (also at the right times, for example, to meet work schedules), poverty/lack of living wage jobs, lack of affordable housing, and isolation because of language or cultural differences that are not addressed in the current delivery system.

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

Lakewood and Tacoma continue to participate in the Human Services Collaboration in Pierce County, the Lakewood/Tacoma/Pierce County Continuum of Care, and other collaborations to identify strategies to strengthen the service delivery system. Both are on the subcommittees for SHB2163 and SHB2060 that establish policies and funding priorities for use of document recording fees set by that legislation. Human services are funded in both jurisdictions with general funds, guided by strategic plans. Importantly, the Tacoma City Council approved a sales tax increase (0.1%) for use in addressing needs of persons with mental health and chemical dependency issues. Decisions on use of funds and priorities are coordinated across departments in both Cities and across agencies in Pierce County. The Pierce County Human Services Collaboration brings needs, gaps and opportunities to the front of the discussion as does the Lakewood/Tacoma/Pierce County Continuum of Care.

SP-45 Goals - 91.415, 91.215(a)(4)

Goals Summary Information

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
1	Increase and preserve affordable housing choice	2015	2019	Affordable Housing Public Housing Homeless		Affordable Housing Choice		Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 20 Households Assisted Rental units rehabilitated: 48 Household Housing Unit Homeowner Housing Added: 443 Household Housing Unit Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated: 1159 Household Housing Unit Direct Financial Assistance to Homebuyers: 139 Households Assisted

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
2	Reduce homelessness and increase stability	2015	2019	Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs		Basic services & homeless prevention/intervention		Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 3475 Persons Assisted Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing: 1100 Households Assisted Homeless Person Overnight Shelter: 29700 Persons Assisted
3	Infrastructure, facilities & economic opportunity	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development		Community and economic development		Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 12000 Persons Assisted Jobs created/retained: 116 Jobs

Table 53 – Goals Summary

Goal Descriptions

1	Goal Name	Increase and preserve affordable housing choice
	Goal Description	Projects contributing to increasing affordable housing choice include home repairs and weatherization to preserve the condition of owner-occupied units; down payment assistance for new homeowners; developing new rental housing opportunities; rehabilitation of rental housing; supporting development of new subsidized housing; and, increasing permanent supportive housing.
2	Goal Name	Reduce homelessness and increase stability
	Goal Description	Projects contributing to reducing homelessness and increasing stability of Tacoma and Lakewood residents include providing supportive services to meet basic needs; providing supportive services to move toward self-sufficiency; projects that provide job training and education; emergency services, including support for shelters and transitional housing; and supporting services for people with special needs.
3	Goal Name	Infrastructure, facilities & economic opportunity
	Goal Description	Projects that support improving infrastructure, facilities and economic opportunities include maintain and improving community facilities; maintaining and improving infrastructure (such as streets, sidewalks, ADA improvements); improvements to facades and other projects to attract and support businesses; support for micro-enterprises and small business development; historic preservation; and removal of slums and blight.

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

SP-50 Public Housing Accessibility and Involvement - 91.415, 91.215(c)

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

Not applicable (no required 504 Voluntary Agreement in effect)

Activities to Increase Resident Involvements

The Pierce County Housing Authority and the Tacoma Housing Authority have Family Self Sufficiency (FSS) programs that provide case management and assistance to households to increase earning capacity, build skills, and acquire capital to become homeowners. The Cities of Tacoma and Lakewood support homeownership counseling and fund partners to increase homeownership, including the Tacoma Housing Authority. Significantly, both Tacoma and Lakewood have provided assistance to extend homeownership to persons with developmental disabilities, working through the Pierce County Coalition for Developmental Disabilities. In addition, both Cities fund home-ownership counseling as a prerequisite to homeownership under the down payment assistance programs and other ownership programs. Information about down payment assistance programs in Lakewood and Tacoma (now through the Washington State Department of Commerce) is made available to the housing authorities.

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

No

Plan to remove the 'troubled' designation

SP-55 Strategic Plan Barriers to Affordable Housing - 91.415, 91.215(h)

Barriers to Affordable Housing

The Growth Management Act in Washington requires making affordable housing available to all residents. Regional policies included in Vision 2040 call for provision and preservation of a range of housing options, including both rental and purchase; a particular focus on lower-income households and households with special needs; and, equitable and rational distribution of housing throughout the community. Policies recognize that there is jobs-housing balance so workers have opportunities to live in proximity to work. Planning around regional growth centers promotes increased density and coordinated support for multimodal transportation, infrastructure and services.

Â

Lack of affordable housing is a pressing problem in Tacoma and Lakewood. The barriers to providing new affordable housing and retaining existing units in Lakewood and Tacoma, as in other substantially developed cities, are the results of a combination of factors:Â low household income relative to rising housing costs (particularly for homeownership); housing demand fluctuating with the economy in the Puget Sound region including changes in troop levels at nearby JBLM; lack of sufficient stable, living wage jobs in Tacoma and Lakewood; lack of vacant land with infrastructure in place for development; high cost of labor and materials; and, lack of economic incentives for private market investment in redevelopment or new development.

Â

Market perception also prevents development in some neighborhoods because potential investors and even residents perceive a neighborhood as dangerous due to crime, poor investment for short-term profit, and/or continued deterioration. Both Tacoma and Lakewood have focused on crime-free neighborhoods, code enforcement and removal of blight in troubled neighborhoods. Both Cities are committed to investing in infrastructure and public facilities to invigorate neighborhoods and create incentives for housing and other development.

Â

City of Tacoma Affordable Housing Policy Advisory Group (AHPAG) made a number of policy recommendations to the Tacoma City Council in 2010 to increase affordable housing. The AHPAG continues to work with the City, through the Tacoma Planning Commission to integrate policies and create incentives for increased affordable housing development. In addition to making policy and zoning changes, the AHPAG recognizes the importance of increasing the demand side of the equation â€” working to raise education/job skills, economic development/job creation, and improved transportation.

Tacoma and Lakewood are members of the Tacoma/Pierce County Affordable Housing Consortium which brings together nonprofit and for-profit developers to identify and support strategies to increase

and preserve affordable housing. The Tacoma Community Redevelopment Authority (supported by both Cities) has loaned over \$35 million and leveraged \$350 million since 1998 to create and preserve affordable housing.

Â

Tacoma and Lakewood are committed to creating vibrant and healthy neighborhoods with housing choices for all residents. Both Cities have recently updated the Housing Element of their respective Comprehensive Plans (2014 for both) and integrated policies for developing affordable housing. In addition to policies and strategies to increase affordable housing and maintaining/improving neighborhood quality, the Cities are providing for increased density along transportation corridors, urban centers, and mixed-use centers.

Strategy to Remove or Ameliorate the Barriers to Affordable Housing

The Tacoma and Lakewood will continue to review policies in their Comprehensive Plans to encourage affordable housing, including such strategies as infill housing and accessory dwellings. They will likewise encourage higher densities, particularly in mixed-use and urban centers. In public “visioning meetings” held to check in with and pass on information to attendees, higher densities were seen as positive (consistent with neighborhood character and design). Increasingly mixed-use centers are seen as offering more amenities, transportation options, choices in housing and other opportunities enriching the neighborhoods and the city.

The Cities will continue to provide support for nonprofit agencies through funding and collaboration to increase the opportunity for affordable housing development and will continue to support downpayment assistance as a strategy to increase homeownership, coupled with homebuyer education in readiness for ownership.

Tacoma and Lakewood will continue to focus on revitalizing neighborhoods through code enforcement, crime-free housing, infrastructure provision and addressing blighting conditions to raise neighborhood stability and quality and promote new investment. This is an opportunity for partnerships with nonprofit agencies (such as Habitat for Humanity) and non-profit development. At the same time, both cities recognize the need to work toward relieving concentrations of poverty and low-access to opportunities by encouraging projects that revitalize and improve the quality of neighborhoods along with projects and policies that increase the capacity of residents.

SP-60 Homelessness Strategy - 91.415, 91.215(d)

Describe how the jurisdiction's strategic plan goals contribute to:

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

A primary goal of the 2012 Tacoma/Lakewood/Pierce Continuum of Care Plan to End Homelessness is to provide a system of centralized entry, intake and referral. The newly-developed Centralized Intake System, Access Point 4 Housing (AP4H), implements that goal. It is designed to prevent homelessness and provide access to stabilizing housing and services depending upon the needs of the individual or family. Associated Ministries of Tacoma is the agency designated to administer the single point of entry AP4H system for all persons who are literally homeless or those who are at imminent risk of becoming homeless (will be homeless in 72 hours absent an intervention). The system provides for intake, screening for eligibility, assessment of needs, diversion services and rapid placement in appropriate housing resources. Persons in need are matched to the prevention program or the rehousing program that most closely meets their individual needs.

In the coming months, Tacoma and Lakewood representatives will participate in the Continuum's consideration of the results of a January 2015 report assessing the initial stages of operation of AP4H. The report recommended improving data collection and analysis, establishing prioritizing criteria for placing homeless subpopulations, reducing barriers to accessing homeless housing resources, further integrating the system into HMIS, and ongoing planning to maximize the impact and capacity of the system. The Continuum will be considering actions to implement findings as appropriate.

People can still access walk-up same day shelters without first going through the Centralized Intake System, but it is hoped that an assessment can be made and those individuals linked to services and housing. In addition, PATH (Projects for Assistance in Transition from Homelessness) and Positive Interaction teams reach out to homeless persons, particularly those with a wide range of disabilities, including mental illness, and try to connect them with emergency mental health beds and treatment. Mapping, provided by Optum, has been helpful in identifying locations for outreach. In addition, Tacoma supports additional efforts to assess youth and find them suitable services. A new youth drop-in shelter (ages 13 to 24), along with an overnight emergency shelter for youth 18 to 24, is planned with initial funding from Tacoma and Pierce County. The facility will open early in 2016. A second phase will provide emergency shelter for youth under age 18. The Living Access Support Alliance (LASA) received \$3 million from the Washington Housing Trust Fund that enabled LASA to partner with the Tacoma Housing Authority to build a new facility at Prairie Oaks that will provide 15 units of permanent supportive housing for homeless families, along with a new office and client services center.

Addressing the emergency and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

The Cities of Tacoma and Lakewood fully support, and are partners in implementing, the Continuum's Plan to End Homelessness. The 2012 Plan calls for significant changes over the coming years to retool homeless housing resources available within the County. In addition to expanding rapid rehousing, the plan calls for converting some of the time-limiting homeless housing stock into permanent housing with supports tailored to unique needs. Where appropriate, transitional housing will be converted to permanent supportive housing and/or rapid rehousing resources and financial resources will be increasingly dedicated for that purpose. Key to this strategy will be the continued provision of strengths-based services, decreasing barriers to housing, and tailoring services to the specific needs of individuals and families. At the same time, the City and County are committed to ensuring there is adequate emergency shelter for unsheltered individuals and families. This involves maintaining the current inventory of emergency shelter beds while encouraging practices that move residents out of shelter more quickly and into permanent housing.

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

The Continuum and its partners are working to improve the capacity of homeless providers to assist families and individuals toward successful transitions to permanent housing. A primary effort is working with homeless housing providers to reduce barriers to housing (such as unnecessary criteria for program entrance) so that rapid placement into stable housing can be achieved. In addition, the Continuum has been working toward increasing education and information exchange among homeless provider staff on national best practices for facilitating access to affordable housing and enhancing stabilization to prevent returns to homelessness.

Plans include continuing support and assessment of the AP4H intake system and expansion of outreach efforts to shorten the length of time persons are homeless as well as development of additional youth outreach services and shelter capacity. Other efforts include continued utilization of ESG and other local government resources to provide rapid rehousing services for persons coming into the system and use of revenues from the 0.1 percent local sales tax provision in Tacoma to provide funds for improvements to services to persons with chemical dependency and those with mental illness, including persons who are chronically homeless.

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

The overall strategy of the Lakewood/Tacoma/Pierce County Continuum of Care related to planning to prevent the discharge of persons from institutions into homelessness is to provide or broker tailored services and treatment in housing and prevention programs. The Continuum's Discharge Planning subcommittee has worked on developing plans and actions for improving the system of discharging from institutions to prevent individuals from becoming homeless. The City of Tacoma will continue to utilize funds generated by the mental health/chemical dependency sales tax to facilitate system-wide improvements to the delivery of mental health and chemical dependency services.

The State Department of Corrections will continue to have a place at the table to assist in the Continuum of Care's planning process. The Department will principally work with the Incarcerated Veterans Program, Pioneer Human Services, shelters and the Metropolitan Development Council to prevent discharges into homelessness. Several agencies will work with health and mental health care facilities to find housing for persons being discharged following their health care. Key players working toward the goal of successful transitions of mental health discharges to the community will be the PATH teams, Positive Interactions, Western State Hospital, Franciscan Health Care, Multicare/Good Samaritan Greater Lakes Mental Health Care, the Rescue Mission, Comprehensive Life Resources and Catholic Community Services. Multidisciplinary teams will begin the planning for children aging out of foster care six months prior to the "aging out" date and will use housing and transitional housing resources primarily available through the Pierce County Alliance and the Housing for Success partnership.

SP-65 Lead-based Paint Hazards - 91.415, 91.215(i)

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

Consistent with Title X of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992, the Cities of Tacoma and Lakewood provide information on lead-safe practices to owners of all properties receiving up to \$5,000 of federally-funded assistance. If work on painted surfaces is involved in properties constructed prior to 1978, the presence of lead is assumed and safe work practices are followed. In addition to the above, homes with repairs in excess of \$5,000 in federally-funded rehabilitation assistance are assessed for risk (completed by a certified LBP firm) or are presumed to have lead. If surfaces to be disturbed are determined to contain lead, interim controls are exercised, occupants notified, and clearance test performed by an EPA certified firm. Properties constructed prior to 1978 and acquired with federal funds are inspected for hazards and acquired rental properties are inspected periodically.

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

Much of the housing stock in Tacoma, in particular, and Lakewood was constructed prior to 1978. While not exclusively the case, older units with irregular maintenance may pose a risk to residents. Housing repair projects favor lower-income households by virtue of their eligibility, and at-risk housing units by virtue of their affordability (condition and age). The Cities provide information on lead-safe practices to households involved in the repair programs and have brochures in the City offices for the general public on the dangers of lead and the importance of safe practices.

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

Lead-safe practices are required in all rehabilitation programs where housing was constructed prior to 1978, as described above.

SP-70 Anti-Poverty Strategy - 91.415, 91.215(j)

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

The Cities will continue to support programs and projects that assist low-income persons, including projects that offer solutions to help them out of poverty. All three of the goals in this Strategic Plan have the capacity to reduce the number of households living in poverty. Further, CDBG, HOME and ESG funds leverage additional monies to address the same issues. Projects are also the result of long collaborations between agencies and partners, including Pierce County, the Tacoma Housing Authority and the Pierce County Housing Authority. Funding from other sources – local, state, federal, foundations, private donors – are coordinated for the best benefit given continually declining resources.

The goal of increasing and preserving affordable housing choice includes projects that will provide new housing to lower income households, some with ongoing subsidy and support. Decreasing the cost of housing is one significant way of increasing household income, leaving more for households to allocate to helping themselves (training, transportation, childcare). Down payment assistance programs, along with housing counseling, will allow households to build equity and achieve stability in neighborhoods. Housing repair programs allow persons to live in safer housing and improve the neighborhood. Funds used to acquire blighted properties and replace with safe units for ownership create avenues out of poverty for low-income buyers and increase the value of neighboring properties.

The goal of reducing homelessness and increasing stability of residents likewise offers a path out of poverty and homelessness. Household-focused and individual-focused case management, coupled with rapid rehousing can eliminate periods of debilitating homelessness and rebuild attachment to the community, productive employment and education, all of which are challenged during periods of homelessness. Support for job training, literacy, and early interventions for youth provide incentives and skills for employment.

The goal of improving infrastructure, facilities and economic opportunities also has the capacity to help households and neighborhoods out of poverty. Investing in infrastructure and improvements to revitalize neighborhoods raises the quality of the neighborhood, makes it more attractive for new residents and more attractive to other investment and businesses providing jobs. Projects to improve business areas and to make façade improvements also increase the potential for investment. Projects also fund small business development directly, some through revolving loan funds, all of which result in jobs for lower income persons, some of whom enter the programs from poverty. Major barriers to achieving reductions in the number of households in poverty are limited resources (including funding) and broad changes in local economies beyond control of the Cities.

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

The Cities of Tacoma and Lakewood work closely with the Tacoma Housing Authority (Moving to Work) and the Pierce County Housing Authority and support Family Self-Sufficiency programs. Both Tacoma and Lakewood are represented on the Tacoma/Pierce County Affordable Housing Consortium to work on issues of affordable housing. Both are party to implementing many of the policies recommended by the Affordable Housing Advisory Group created at the request of the City of Tacoma. Policies about affordable housing concern both disposable income and housing cost. Looking even more broadly, Tacoma and Lakewood participate in a multicounty planning system (Puget Sound Regional Council) that is looking at regional growth and economic development, as well as equal access to opportunities.

SP-80 Monitoring - 91.230

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

Desk monitoring will consist of close examination of periodic reports submitted by subrecipients or property owners for compliance with program regulations and subrecipient agreements as well as compliance with requirements to report on progress and outcome measures specific to each award. As a condition of loan approval, the Tacoma Community Redevelopment Authority (TCRA) may have imposed additional requirements in the form of targeted set-asides (e.g., homeless units). Document review will occur at least annually and more frequently if determined necessary. Wherever possible, problems are corrected through discussions or negotiation with the subrecipient. As individual situations dictate, additional desk monitoring, onsite monitoring, and/or technical assistance is provided.

Timing and frequency of onsite monitoring depends on the complexity of the activity and the degree to which an activity or subrecipient is at risk of noncompliance with program requirements. More frequent visits may occur depending on identification of potential problems or risks. The purpose of monitoring, which can include reviewing records, property inspections, or other activities appropriate to the project, is to identify any potential areas of noncompliance and assist the subrecipient in making the necessary changes to allow for successful implementation and completion of the activity.

The Tacoma Community Redevelopment Authority (TCRA) will contract with an independent third party inspection company to conduct onsite inspections of its rental housing portfolio. The purpose of the inspections is to insure that rental housing meets or exceeds the Uniform Physical Condition Standards (UPCS). Inspections of each property will take place at least every three years.

Expected Resources

AP-15 Expected Resources - 91.420(b), 91.220(c)(1,2)

Introduction

Funds in the first year of the plan are FY 2015 allocations. The amounts assumed to be available in the remaining four years of the plan are based on a combination of strategies. The City of Tacoma used multiples of total annual funds, assuming stable annual allocations and equal program income.

Anticipated Resources

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
CDBG	public - federal	Acquisition Admin and Planning Economic Development Housing Public Improvements Public Services	2,234,649	180,000	862,095	3,276,744	13,106,976	

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
HOME	public - federal	Acquisition Homebuyer assistance Homeowner rehab Multifamily rental new construction Multifamily rental rehab New construction for ownership TBRA	943,877	30,000	0	973,877	3,895,508	
ESG	public - federal	Conversion and rehab for transitional housing Financial Assistance Overnight shelter Rapid re-housing (rental assistance) Rental Assistance Services Transitional housing	199,158	0	20,544	219,702	878,808	

Table 54 - Expected Resources – Priority Table

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

The City of Tacoma matches CDBG and HOME funds with grants, local funds, nonprofit organizations, Low-Income Housing Tax Credits, corporate grants, and donations (among other sources) to increase the benefit and success of projects using federal CDBG, HOME, and ESG

dollars. In fiscal year 2013, CDBG funds in the amount of about \$1.8 million and HOME funds (Consortium) of about \$1.2 million leveraged over \$37.5 million. The Affordable Housing Fund, under the oversight of the Tacoma Community Redevelopment Authority, increases the ability of partners to provide affordable housing by providing a stable source of funding to leverage additional resources. Tacoma has committed federal CDBG and HOME funds to affordable projects early. Up-front local government support has been critical in anchoring projects and obtaining additional funding. Without that early commitment, competition would take funding elsewhere.

In Lakewood, as in Tacoma, CDBG expenditures leverage funding from multiple sources on nearly all projects, with the exception of homeowner rehabilitation/repair program (Major Home Repair and HOME Housing Rehabilitation). In fiscal year 2013, for example, CDBG funds in the amount of approximately \$400,000 leveraged non-CDBG funds nearly seven times that amount. A loan pool was established with a Section 108 loan for the purpose of economic development and job creation. Revolving loan funds from program income support housing development, infrastructure, economic development and public facilities. A joint-venture between the City of Lakewood, the Tacoma Housing Authority and LASA (Living Access Support Alliance) will provide housing and services for homeless individuals and families. A successful partnership between the City of Lakewood and Tacoma-Pierce County Habitat for Humanity will continue to provide new affordable housing opportunities in the Tillicum neighborhood.

HOME match requirements for the Consortium are met through multiple sources, including sources such as private grants and donations, Attorney General Funds, and the State Housing Trust Fund. In Tacoma, ESG match requirements are met through various sources, depending on the project. Sources in 2014-2015 included the Washington State, Pierce County, foundations and corporate grants, private donations and City of Tacoma General Fund dollars.

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

Use of publicly-owned land or property is not anticipated in projects currently planned or underway although if those opportunities arise, such land and property will be included.

Discussion

Annual Goals and Objectives

AP-20 Annual Goals and Objectives - 91.420, 91.220(c)(3)&(e)

Goals Summary Information

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
1	Increase and preserve affordable housing choice	2015	2019	Affordable Housing Public Housing Homeless		Affordable Housing Choice		Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 4 Households Assisted Rental units rehabilitated: 5 Household Housing Unit Homeowner Housing Added: 88 Household Housing Unit Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated: 290 Household Housing Unit Direct Financial Assistance to Homebuyers: 27 Households Assisted

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
2	Reduce homelessness and increase stability	2015	2019	Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs		Basic services & homeless prevention/intervention		Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 695 Persons Assisted Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing: 220 Households Assisted Homeless Person Overnight Shelter: 5940 Persons Assisted
3	Infrastructure, facilities & economic opportunity	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development		Community and economic development		Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 3000 Persons Assisted Jobs created/retained: 29 Jobs

Table 55 – Goals Summary

Goal Descriptions

1	Goal Name	Increase and preserve affordable housing choice
	Goal Description	
2	Goal Name	Reduce homelessness and increase stability
	Goal Description	
3	Goal Name	Infrastructure, facilities & economic opportunity
	Goal Description	

AP-35 Projects - 91.420, 91.220(d)

Introduction

Over the course of six funding cycles, the City of Tacoma has continually experienced a trend of decreased funding across the CDBG, HOME and ESG programs. The overall decrease in funds during this period is approximately thirty-three percent.

Of the anticipated amount of funds to be received, twenty percent is proposed for administrative purposes correlating with the management of the City's CDBG program. Fifteen percent is proposed for human services related public services. In accordance with the Consolidated Plan, fifty percent is proposed for housing assistance projects. Staff proposes setting aside one hundred thousand dollars for neighborhood projects and public improvements, such as ADA enhancements and curb cuts. Staff proposes the remaining balance of funds be allocated to economic development projects. These allocations are consistent with the City Council's two-year funding priorities that were approved in December 2013.

#	Project Name
1	Associated Ministries - Paint Tacoma / Pierce Beautiful
2	MDC Weatherization Program
3	RTSS Rebuilding Day 2017 and Year-Round Program
4	RTSS Minor Home Repair Program
5	TCRA Housing Rehabilitation Staff
6	William Factory Small Business Incubator - Tacoma Entrepreneurial Assistance Program (TEAP)
7	WMF Small Business Incubator Microenterprise Assistance
8	CED/CC Spaceworks Tacoma Program
9	City of Tacoma CEDD, ADA Ramp Public Improvements
10	City of Tacoma CED and NCS Workforce Development
11	Economic Development Fund
12	CCS Homeless Adult Services: Supportive Services
13	YWCA Pierce County Legal Services Program
14	Exodus Housing - Domestic Violence (Rapid RE-Housing Program)
15	South Sound Outreach Services Financial Empowerment
16	Phoebe Family Reunification and Resiliency
17	Salvation Army - Jarvie Family Emergency Housing Center
18	Tacoma Housing Authority - Moving to Work
19	The Rescue Mission Family Shelter
20	VADIS Flash
21	YWCA Domestic Violence Shelter
22	Community Development Housing Organization (CHDO Set-ASide)
23	City of Tacoma CDBG Administration
24	City of Tacoma HOME Administration

#	Project Name
25	City of Lakewood HOME Administration
26	City of Tacoma HOME Down Payment Assistance
27	City of Tacoma HOME Affordable Housing Fund
28	City of Lakewood HOME Affordable Housing Fund
29	City of Lakewood HOME Housing Rehabilitation Program
30	City of Lakewood HOME Down Payment Assistance
31	TCRA Affordable Housing Fund
32	ESG15 Tacoma (2015)

Table 56 – Project Information

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

The allocation of federal resources to address community needs is prioritized, in part, by bi-annual funding priorities approved prior to the start of the application process by the Tacoma City Council.

Very few projects or programs approved for funding are geographic-based and most of the funding is used to support low income persons directly and/or the provision of affordable housing. A small amount of CDBG funds (\$100,000) has been set-aside to establish a CDBG Public Facilities Fund to support community development activities that facilitate neighborhood improvements such as street-related improvements (e.g. Local Improvement Districts) to include the installation of curb cuts in lower to moderate income areas.

All programs and projects must be consistent with Community Development Block Grant (CDBG); and HOME Investment Partnership Program (HOME) and any other funding source regulations and requirements as applicable. CDBG projects must meet one of three major criteria: (1) benefitting lower-income persons, (2) removing blight, or (3) meeting an urgent need. HOME projects must provide housing or assist in housing for low-income persons.

The Funding Priorities are organized into six categories: (1) General; (2) Set-asides; (3) Housing; (4) Community Development; (5) Economic Development; and (6) Human Services.

Housing Priorities (CDBG and HOME) – Homeownership programs that benefit low-income owners with repairs and rehabilitation, programs that assist first- time homebuyers to purchase a home, maintaining and expanding affordable rental housing for families and elderly, providing supportive housing for homeless and/or special needs individuals and families that may include emergency and transitional shelters, and special needs housing with support services.

Community Development Priorities (CDBG only) – Activities that support neighborhood improvements for lower income residents whose income does not exceed 80% of the area median income (AMI), as defined by HUD. Such activities may include; (a) payment of LID assessments for lower income homeowners; (b) street-related improvements such as installing curb cuts in low to moderate

income neighborhoods; (c) eligible neighborhood innovative grant projects; and (d) public facilities.

Economic Development Priorities (CDBG only) – Help increase jobs and business opportunities such as: (a) creation or retention of jobs for lower income persons; (b) business services that support lower income neighborhood and/or lower income groups; and (c) financial and technical assistance for disadvantaged persons who own or plan to start a business; (d) revitalization of blighted or lower income business districts through historic preservation, conservation actions and neighborhood economic development.

Human Services Priorities (CDBG) - Must be able to show significant impact of their services on lower income populations through acceptable Outcome Based Evaluation (OBE) systems. Programs must participate in efforts toward improving the systems serving persons who are experiencing homelessness or who are at risk of homelessness. CDBG funds will only be used for programs which target lower income Tacoma residents, provide stabilization services, and address housing stabilization services, economic stabilization services, and youth emergency stabilization services.

AP-38 Project Summary
Project Summary Information

1	Project Name	Associated Ministries - Paint Tacoma / Pierce Beautiful
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Increase and preserve affordable housing choice
	Needs Addressed	Affordable Housing Choice
	Funding	:
	Description	The program paints the homes of individuals who earn 80% or less of Area Median Income (AMI), own and reside in the home and whose home does not need major repairs prior to painting or pose a danger to volunteer painters. The majority of homeowners earn 50% or less of AMI. The value of the service is an estimated \$2,200 per home. Program serves of all Tacoma and Pierce County with a majority of work within City boundaries. Volunteer paint crews perform the painting. Supplies and paint are obtained at discounted prices using non CDBG funds. Will paint 27 homes. The program is managed by Associated Ministries located at 903 S 13th Street, Tacoma, WA 98405.
	Target Date	6/30/2016
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	The funds are estimated to help 33 very low income seniors, persons with a disability or lower income families who cannot maintain their homes.
	Location Description	Citywide
	Planned Activities	Homeowner rehab. Funds will support administration of the Paint Tacoma-Pierce Beautiful program including the organization of volunteer labor for painting and minor repairs to income qualified homeowners unable to repair their own homes.
2	Project Name	MDC Weatherization Program
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Increase and preserve affordable housing choice
	Needs Addressed	Affordable Housing Choice
	Funding	:

	Description	The program provides weatherization services to homeowners who earn 50% or less of Area Median Income (AMI). The program's scope of services will be expanded slightly to include some minor home repairs give that MDC will not offer its Emergency Minor Home Repair or Home Repair programs in the 2016- 2017 program-year. Will weatherize 50 homes.
	Target Date	6/30/2016
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	Funds will used to provide assistance to 50 low-income seniors and disabled persons.
	Location Description	Citywide
	Planned Activities	Homeowner rehab. Funds will be used to conduct minor home repairs and weatherization for income qualified persons unable to afford the repairs themselves.
3	Project Name	RTSS Rebuilding Day 2017 and Year-Round Program
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Increase and preserve affordable housing choice
	Needs Addressed	Affordable Housing Choice
	Funding	:
	Description	Program provides health and safety related home repairs and rehabilitation for low income disabled, families with children and elderly households earning 50% or less of Area Median Income. Repairs include installation of grab bars, installation of wheelchair ramps, floor repairs, roof repairs, electrical, plumbing, etc. Rebuilding Day occurs the third Saturday of April annually. Skilled and unskilled volunteers participate. Year-round services are provided by licensed contractors who are volunteers and who provide the services as their time allows. Will serve 34 homeowners.
	Target Date	6/30/2015
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	The funds will be used to assist 25 low-income seniors, disables persons and low-income families.
	Location Description	Citywide

	Planned Activities	Homeowner rehab. Funds will be used to conduct health and safety related repairs or modifications to homes owned and occupied by low-income seniors, disables persons and low-income families unable to afford to make them corrections.
4	Project Name	RTSS Minor Home Repair Program
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Increase and preserve affordable housing choice
	Needs Addressed	Affordable Housing Choice
	Funding	:
	Description	Program provides health and safety related home repairs and rehabilitaion such as patching roof leaks, gutter repairs, plumbing and electrical fixes, fence repairs etc. Majority of the repairs will be completed by a Construction Manager hired specifically for this program. An administrator will be hired to conduct record keeping and another AmeriCorps member will be sought to help coordinate services. The program's services will be similar to what is already offered through its Year-Round and Rebuilding Day program with the exception that an in-house Construction Manager will perform most of the work. RTSS anticipates it will be able to service more homeowners in potentially a quicker timeframe (between 3-6 months is the current average) through the abilities of the Construction Manager. Will provide services to 120 homeowners.
	Target Date	6/30/2016
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	Homeowner rehab. Funds will provide 160 low income persons with the ability to conduct one-time repair services to their home.
	Location Description	Citywide
	Planned Activities	Funds will provide grants of up to \$5,000 to income qualified homeowners to conduct repairs to their homes.
5	Project Name	TCRA Housing Rehabilitation Staff
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Increase and preserve affordable housing choice Infrastructure, facilities & economic opportunity

	Needs Addressed	Affordable Housing Choice Community and economic development
	Funding	:
	Description	Funding for City staff costs to process loans and provide related rehabilitation oversight for the Single Family Homeowner Occupied Rehabilitation Loan Program, the multifamily NOFA Program, the affordable housing and economic development contracts, and public improvements project(s). These programs are managed by the staff of the Tacoma Community and Economic Development (CED) Department located at 747 Market Street, Tacoma, WA 98402.
	Target Date	6/30/2016
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	N/A
	Location Description	N/A
	Planned Activities	Funding for City staff costs to process loans and provide related rehabilitation oversight for the Single Family Homeowner Occupied Rehabilitation Loan Program, the multifamily NOFA Program, the affordable housing and economic development contracts, and public improvements project(s).
6	Project Name	William Factory Small Business Incubator - Tacoma Entrepreneurial Assistance Program (TEAP)
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Infrastructure, facilities & economic opportunity
	Needs Addressed	Community and economic development
	Funding	:
	Description	Funding will provide small business counseling, services and training aimed at creating/growing employment. Targeted groups: women, minorities, veterans and low-income individuals.
	Target Date	6/30/2016

	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	Funds will be used to create jobs for 8 persons included in targeted groups: women, minorities, veterans and low-income individuals.
	Location Description	Citywide
	Planned Activities	Job creation
7	Project Name	WMF Small Business Incubator Microenterprise Assistance
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Infrastructure, facilities & economic opportunity
	Needs Addressed	Community and economic development
	Funding	:
	Description	Provide tenant space for up to 40 microenterprise business owners with technical assistance primarily in the fields of construction and information technology. Based on past performance the program's tenant businesses will create approximately 8 full-time equivalent jobs.
	Target Date	6/30/2016
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	
	Location Description	Citywide
	Planned Activities	Job creation/retention
8	Project Name	CED/CC Spaceworks Tacoma Program
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Infrastructure, facilities & economic opportunity
	Needs Addressed	Community and economic development
	Funding	:

	Description	Program is a decentralized incubator. It operates two creative entrepreneurial cohorts per year. Entrepreneurs are provided technical assistance through a series of business assistance courses. Spaceworks then microenterprise start-ups in securing operating space in commercial buildings that are privately owned and are vacant or underutilized. The microenterprises benefit from a discounted rate for 6 months. At the end of 6 months the entrepreneur has an opportunity to sign a long-term lease with the property owner. The program is in its 6th year and approximately 75% of participants have signed long-term leases after their 6 month introductory period. the program received a grant from Chase Bank in 2015. They will use this, in part, to create a Tier 2, for which they have hired additional staff to provide ongoing support to program alumni. The program is actively working with property owners in the Lincoln District Revitalization Area to place program participants in Lincoln District store fronts.
	Target Date	6/30/2015
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	8 low income individuals.
	Location Description	Citywide
	Planned Activities	Jobs created/retained
9	Project Name	City of Tacoma CEDD, ADA Ramp Public Improvements
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Infrastructure, facilities & economic opportunity
	Needs Addressed	Community and economic development
	Funding	:
	Description	Funds will be used to assist in identified public improvement project(s) targeting either the Lincoln or South Tacoma areas. Likely projects will include curb and gutter build-out or ADA improvements linked to high priority housing or Economic Development programs.
	Target Date	6/30/2016

	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	3,000 duplicated persons
	Location Description	Citywide
	Planned Activities	Public Facilities/Improvements
10	Project Name	City of Tacoma CED and NCS Workforce Development
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Increase and preserve affordable housing choice
	Needs Addressed	Affordable Housing Choice
	Funding	:
	Description	Funds will be used for workforce development activities in demand occupations specifically in construction and advanced manufacturing. The workforce development programming provides outreach and assessment, job-readiness, supportive services, pre-apprenticeship training, and job placement/retention services to adults (18-years and older) at State certified pre-apprenticeship programs such as the Manufacturing Academy and the TOOL Center, a pre-apprenticeship program that offers a pathway to living wage employment.
	Target Date	6/30/2016
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	The first year of the project will include pre-development and development work. It is not anticipated that a leasing up of the units will occur and beneficiaries accounted for until the next funding year.
	Location Description	1216-1218 Martin Luther King Jr Way. Hilltop District
	Planned Activities	Rehabilitation
11	Project Name	Economic Development Fund
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Infrastructure, facilities & economic opportunity
	Needs Addressed	Community and economic development
	Funding	:

	Description	Tacoma Community Redevelopment Authority (TCRA) to directly acquire property for redevelopment through its existing newly created Economic Development Fund (EDF). Through the Annual Action Plan process, the City Council will allocate CDBG and other funds to support the recommended EDF operated by the TCRA.
	Target Date	6/30/2016
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	5 jobs
	Location Description	Citywide
	Planned Activities	Development
12	Project Name	CCS Homeless Adult Services: Supportive Services
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Reduce homelessness and increase stability
	Needs Addressed	Basic services & homeless prevention/intervention
	Funding	:
	Description	Provides overnight emergency shelter and tailored services to homeless adult individuals, with the goal of moving them towards more stable housing.
	Target Date	6/30/2016
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	750 single adults experiencing homelessness
	Location Description	Citywide
	Planned Activities	Emergency Shelter
13	Project Name	YWCA Pierce County Legal Services Program
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Reduce homelessness and increase stability
	Needs Addressed	Basic services & homeless prevention/intervention
	Funding	:

	Description	Provides free legal assistance to survivors of domestic violence.
	Target Date	6/30/2016
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	830 families experiencing homelessness
	Location Description	Citywide
	Planned Activities	Emergency shelter
14	Project Name	Exodus Housing - Domestic Violence (Rapid RE-Housing Program)
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Reduce homelessness and increase stability
	Needs Addressed	Basic services & homeless prevention/intervention
	Funding	:
	Description	Housing and supportive services for victims of domestic violence and their families.
	Target Date	6/30/2016
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	75 victims of domestic violence and their families.
	Location Description	Citywide
	Planned Activities	Temporary housing and supportive services
15	Project Name	South Sound Outreach Services Financial Empowerment
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Reduce homelessness and increase stability
	Needs Addressed	Basic services & homeless prevention/intervention
	Funding	:
	Description	Program is designed to improve financial outcomes for clients and customers through credit-building loans, micro loans, financial capabilities classes, and one-on-one coaching.
	Target Date	6/30/2016

	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	350 low income and formerly homeless families.
	Location Description	Citywide
	Planned Activities	Supportive services
16	Project Name	Phoebe Family Reunification and Resiliency
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Reduce homelessness and increase stability
	Needs Addressed	Basic services & homeless prevention/intervention
	Funding	:
	Description	Provides transitional housing, services, and support to women with children under 7 impacted by chemical dependency, homelessness, and domestic violence.
	Target Date	6/30/2016
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	70 chemically dependent women with children
	Location Description	Citywide
	Planned Activities	Temporary housing and supportive housing
17	Project Name	Salvation Army - Jarvie Family Emergency Housing Center
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Reduce homelessness and increase stability
	Needs Addressed	Basic services & homeless prevention/intervention
	Funding	:
	Description	The program provides emergency housing and supportive services for families and single women experiencing homelessness.
	Target Date	6/30/2016

	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	250 families and single women experiencing homelessness
	Location Description	Citywide
	Planned Activities	Temporary housing and supportive services
18	Project Name	Tacoma Housing Authority - Moving to Work
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Reduce homelessness and increase stability
	Needs Addressed	Basic services & homeless prevention/intervention
	Funding	:
	Description	Provides case management, financial literacy training, employment preparation, post-employment support, and educational services to help low-income residents of public housing obtain employment and wage progression.
	Target Date	6/30/2016
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	225 residents of public and subsidized housing
	Location Description	Citywide
	Planned Activities	Employment/education services
19	Project Name	The Rescue Mission Family Shelter
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Reduce homelessness and increase stability
	Needs Addressed	Basic services & homeless prevention/intervention
	Funding	:
	Description	Provides for the basic needs of single women and families experiencing homelessness, while linking them with services and supports to obtain permanent housing and self-sufficiency.
	Target Date	6/30/2016

	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	860 men experiencing homelessness
	Location Description	Citywide
	Planned Activities	Emergency shelter
20	Project Name	VADIS Flash
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Reduce homelessness and increase stability
	Needs Addressed	Basic services & homeless prevention/intervention
	Funding	:
	Description	Provides the employment services and life skills training components in the Housing 4 Success partnership, focusing on eliminating barriers to employment and schooling, reducing homelessness and returns to homelessness for youth and young adults.
	Target Date	6/30/2016
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	50 youth exiting homelessness
	Location Description	Citywide
	Planned Activities	Employment/education services
21	Project Name	YWCA Domestic Violence Shelter
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Reduce homelessness and increase stability
	Needs Addressed	Basic services & homeless prevention/intervention
	Funding	:
	Description	Provides confidential and secure emergency shelter for survivors of intimate partner violence and their children, and also connects survivors to resources for safe permanent housing.
	Target Date	6/30/2016

	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	280 survivors of intimate partner abuse
	Location Description	Citywide
	Planned Activities	Emergency shelter
22	Project Name	Community Development Housing Organization (CHDO Set-ASide)
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Increase and preserve affordable housing choice
	Needs Addressed	Affordable Housing Choice
	Funding	:
	Description	A percentage of the annual HOME funding will be set-aside for the operational support of local Community Development Housing Organizations (CHDOs) to facilitate the development of affordable housing opportunities. The funds will be managed by TCRA with staff support from the Tacoma Community and Economic Development (CED) Department located at 747 Market Street, Tacoma 98402.
	Target Date	6/30/2016
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	2 low income homeowners and/or homebuyers
	Location Description	Citywide
	Planned Activities	Housing rehabilitation and development
23	Project Name	City of Tacoma CDBG Administration
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Increase and preserve affordable housing choice Reduce homelessness and increase stability Infrastructure, facilities & economic opportunity
	Needs Addressed	Affordable Housing Choice Basic services & homeless prevention/intervention Community and economic development
	Funding	:

	Description	Provide funding to be used to support program management, coordination, monitoring and evaluation of the City of Tacoma's CDBG program. The project is managed by staff from the Tacoma Community and Economic Development (CED) Department located at 747 Market Street, Tacoma WA 98402.
	Target Date	6/30/2016
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	N/A
	Location Description	N/A
	Planned Activities	N/A
24	Project Name	City of Tacoma HOME Administration
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Increase and preserve affordable housing choice
	Needs Addressed	Affordable Housing Choice
	Funding	:
	Description	Provide funding to be used to support program management, coordination, monitoring and evaluation of the City of Tacoma's HOME program. The project is managed by staff from the Tacoma Community and Economic Development (CED) Department located at 747 Market Street, Tacoma WA 98402.
	Target Date	6/30/2016
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	N/A
	Location Description	N/A
	Planned Activities	N/A
25	Project Name	City of Lakewood HOME Administration
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Increase and preserve affordable housing choice
	Needs Addressed	Affordable Housing Choice

	Funding	:
	Description	Provide funding to be used to support program management, coordination, monitoring and evaluation of the City of Lakewood's HOME program. The project is managed by staff from the Tacoma Community and Economic Development (CED) Department on behalf of the City of Lakewood located at 747 Market Street, Tacoma WA 98402.
	Target Date	6/30/2016
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	N/A
	Location Description	N/A
	Planned Activities	N/A
26	Project Name	City of Tacoma HOME Down Payment Assistance
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Increase and preserve affordable housing choice
	Needs Addressed	Affordable Housing Choice
	Funding	:
	Description	Program provides down payment assistance to eligible low income homebuyers. The estimated amount includes a carryover amount \$150,000 in previous years funds and does not include FY2016-17 new grant monies.
	Target Date	6/30/2016
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	25 eligible low income homebuyers
	Location Description	Citywide
	Planned Activities	Down payment assistance and related costs, including housing counseling services.
27	Project Name	City of Tacoma HOME Affordable Housing Fund
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Increase and preserve affordable housing choice

	Needs Addressed	Affordable Housing Choice
	Funding	:
	Description	Funding supports the acquisition, construction and/or rehabilitation of affordable housing for low income rentals and/or to facilitate new homeownership opportunities.
	Target Date	6/30/2016
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	85 low income household housing units
	Location Description	Citywide
	Planned Activities	Housing rehabilitation and development
28	Project Name	City of Lakewood HOME Affordable Housing Fund
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Increase and preserve affordable housing choice
	Needs Addressed	Affordable Housing Choice
	Funding	:
	Description	Provides funding for a permanent affordable housing fund to support the acquisition, construction and/or rehabilitation of affordable housing for low income rentals and/or to facilitate new homeownership opportunities.
	Target Date	6/30/2016
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	1 low income homeowner
	Location Description	Citywide
Planned Activities	Housing rehabilitation/development	
29	Project Name	City of Lakewood HOME Housing Rehabilitation Program
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Increase and preserve affordable housing choice
	Needs Addressed	Affordable Housing Choice

	Funding	:
	Description	Loan program to assist eligible low income homeowners with housing rehabilitation.
	Target Date	6/30/2016
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	2 low income homeowners
	Location Description	Citywide
	Planned Activities	Homeowner rehab
30	Project Name	City of Lakewood HOME Down Payment Assistance
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Increase and preserve affordable housing choice
	Needs Addressed	Affordable Housing Choice
	Funding	:
	Description	Program provides down payment assistance to eligible low income homebuyers.
	Target Date	6/30/2016
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	2 low income homebuyers
	Location Description	Citywide
	Planned Activities	Homeownership
31	Project Name	TCRA Affordable Housing Fund
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Increase and preserve affordable housing choice
	Needs Addressed	Affordable Housing Choice
	Funding	:

	Description	Funds will support the repair, rehabilitation or purchase of affordable housing for the benefit of low-income residents. The funds may also be used to facilitate the development of new housing projects that provide permanent rental and homeownership opportunities for low income residents including emergency and/or special needs housing for the homeless and people with a mental disabilities. CDBG funding includes \$839,375* in program income. The funds will be managed by TCRA with staff support from the Tacoma Community and Economic Development (CED) Department located at 747 Market Street, Tacoma, WA 98402.
	Target Date	6/30/2016
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	29 low income households
	Location Description	Citywide
	Planned Activities	Housing rehabilitation and development
32	Project Name	ESG15 Tacoma (2015)
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Reduce homelessness and increase stability
	Needs Addressed	Basic services & homeless prevention/intervention
	Funding	:
	Description	Rapid rehousing households will be provided with housing search, placement, and other assistance, including case management services, and short or medium term rental assistance under a graduated rental subsidy to ensure housing stability prior to exit. Persons served through emergency shelter facilities will receive a safe shelter, children's services, life skills training, navigation services, domestic violence safety planning and advocacy, 24-hour crisis line for domestic violence victims, and homeless teen services that include meals, needs assessment and planning, connection to resources, and other essential services. Of the \$219,702.95 available in ESG funding, to include \$199,158 in new grant funds and \$20,544.95 in reprogrammed funds, \$85,359 is allocated to rapid re-housing, \$114,428.15 for Emergency Shelter, 14,937 for ESG Administration and \$4,978.8 for HMIS . HMIS activities include data entry, data quality, and reporting.
	Target Date	

	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	3,115 individuals and families experiencing homelessness, survivors of intimate partner abuse
	Location Description	Citywide
	Planned Activities	Emergency shelter, housing stabilization services, administration, HIMIS Operations

AP-50 Geographic Distribution - 91.420, 91.220(f)

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

In targeting CDBG and HOME funds, the City has typically looked to block groups with at least 51% low and moderate income populations as many of Tacoma’s minority and ethnic populations continue to be concentrated in these areas. Many of these block groups tend to have a higher concentration of renter-occupied housing units that suffer from a general state of slums and blight, large concentrations of aged housing stock suffering from a lack of routine maintenance, and infrastructure improvements that are either inadequate or are outdated in accordance with current development requirements.

Tacoma recognizes the advantages gained in focusing development in areas, matching funding sources and concentrating efforts to make a noticeable and sustainable difference in an area for the benefit of the neighborhood and the larger jurisdiction. CDBG funds will be matched with funds from other sources to accomplish this goal. The City has partnered with the Tacoma Housing Authority, nonprofit housing and service providers, and other stakeholders to make dramatic improvements in the Central, Eastside, South Tacoma and South End neighborhoods. The Central Business District has benefited and remains a priority.

New efforts at urban renewal are also being prioritized in Tacoma’s various neighborhood serving business districts. For example, the Lincoln Business District will benefit from more the \$4 million in City funds to be used for public improvements and streetscape beautification. At the same time, it is anticipated that TCRA funds will be made available for business development loans, other streetscape improvements and community development projects as they arise. Within the residential neighborhoods immediately surrounding the Lincoln Business District, a marketing campaign will be initiated to highlight the City’s down payment assistance and home owner occupied rehabilitation programs. Other areas such as the McKinley Business District are also benefitting from an initial feasibility study that will determine the possibility of adaptively reusing a former police substation by turning it into artist lofts.

Geographic Distribution

Target Area	Percentage of Funds

Table 57 - Geographic Distribution

Rationale for the priorities for allocating investments geographically

Discussion

Affordable Housing

AP-55 Affordable Housing - 91.420, 91.220(g)

Introduction

In 2010 the Tacoma-Pierce County Affordable Housing Consortium (AHC) established an Affordable Housing Policy Advisory Group to create new affordable housing policy for the city of Tacoma. Over the six months, the group reviewed prior efforts to address affordable housing policy researching existing demographic data and policy documents. Their primary goal was to produce a report which could be used to help build a consensus to further advocate for affordable housing in the community.

On December 3, 2010, their final report was presented to the City which was discussed over the ensuing four months. On May 17, 2011, the Tacoma City Council passed Resolution 38264 adopting recommended Affordable Housing Policy Principles. As stated in the resolution, the housing principles can be summarized as follows:

1. The City's welfare requires an adequate supply of well-built and well-managed affordable housing serving the full range of incomes appearing among its residents. An adequate supply of this housing is vital to important civic needs and values;
2. Affordable housing development by nonprofit developers, public and private, in the City, region, and nation have been among the most attractively designed, most environmentally innovative and best managed in the market place;
3. Nonprofit development of affordable housing will never likely be adequate to meet the City's needs. The City needs a companion strategy to enlist the engine of private market rate developments to include a measure of affordable units. These strategies also provide the added benefit of economic and demographic integration;
4. Affordable housing development has spurred the revitalization of neighborhoods, encouraging both public and private investment, helping the City attain its desired density, and furthering neighborhood

economic development;

5. Affordable housing is an asset to be encouraged and not a detriment to be tolerated and controlled;

6. The City should provide the development of affordable housing in every neighborhood;

7. In seeking the appropriate balance, the City should not have to compromise important neighborhood design standards in order to promote affordable housing. Instead, proper design should allow affordable housing to show the way for all development serving all incomes toward a greener, more sustainable urban future that accommodates the appropriate density that the City's planning documents anticipate to be necessary for the City's projected population allocations; and

8. In a complex community like Tacoma, interests and policies often clash. Good governance is the effort to balance them appropriately. In doing so, the City should give a very high priority to the promotion of affordable housing development.

One Year Goals for the Number of Households to be Supported	
Homeless	6,085
Non-Homeless	695
Special-Needs	355
Total	7,135

Table 58 - One Year Goals for Affordable Housing by Support Requirement

One Year Goals for the Number of Households Supported Through	
Rental Assistance	0
The Production of New Units	86
Rehab of Existing Units	238
Acquisition of Existing Units	25
Total	349

Table 59 - One Year Goals for Affordable Housing by Support Type
Discussion

AP-60 Public Housing - 91.420, 91.220(h)

Introduction

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

The Tacoma Housing Authority (THA) continues to excel at partnership with their housing residents to not only improve the self-sufficiency of the residents, but also to include them in resident councils in the design and operations of their complexes. THA's HOPE VI project, Salishan, was completed in 2011 and continues to set a standard of resident involvement that is repeated throughout other projects. During the previous funding year, THA completed its final stage redevelopment for Bayside Terrace Phase 1. The redevelopment included the demolition of 104 public housing units located on two sites and the construction of 70 new units along with a community center on one block for Phase One. THA anticipates beginning construction on Phase II in the fall of 2015. This final phase will provide an additional 80 units of housing. Hilltop Lofts is another THA project which is located along the City's Martin Luther King, Jr. corridor. It will consist of up to 74 units of new affordable housing that will augment several adaptive reuse projects occurring in close proximity. Together these projects will serve as a catalyst to transform the Hilltop neighborhood of the City.

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

The City continues to promote homeownership opportunities for all through the down payment assistance program. The City acknowledges one of the primary obstacles to homeownership for low and moderate income households remains the inability to sufficiently save for a down payment. Through the down payment assistance program, the City is able to provide low income households with the funds necessary to acquire a home. Loans are provided as a second mortgage with affordable monthly payments limited to 35 percent of household income (combined 1st and 2nd mortgage payment). As part of the program, homeownership counseling is provided to ensure the new homebuyers are successful both in their ability to continue to afford and maintain their new home.

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

Discussion

AP-65 Homeless and Other Special Needs Activities - 91.420, 91.220(i)

Introduction

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

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

Studies of homelessness have shown that there are as many causes for homelessness as there are homeless persons and efforts to address the problem are often as complex as the reasons causing homelessness. There are no reliable data at the local or community level to make a valid estimate of the numbers of families at risk of homelessness. Causes range from extreme cost burdens, to domestic violence, illness, addiction, unemployment, and physical/mental health issues. Recent homeless counts have found as many as 1,464 persons homeless in Pierce County (CoC Point-in-Time count taken in January 2014). While this number represents a significant population of persons in need, it is suspected this number is actually low. The CoC actually estimates at least 4,371 persons experience homelessness each year, which is the number of individuals that contacted the Centralized Intake system in Pierce County in 2014.

The City of Tacoma uses the county-wide centralized intake system, Access Point 4 Housing, to provide housing assistance to homeless persons within the City. Households experiencing homelessness get screened for eligibility and assessed to determine the best housing program match. Since Access Point 4 Housing opened its doors in January 2011, local jurisdictions and service providers have worked to get the word out in the community about using it as the point of entry to services, and to publicize the phone number for households to call. The City of Tacoma opened a new Customer Support Center in 2013, as well as implemented a 3-1-1 hotline for citizens to call with questions about City resources. Information about Access Point 4 Housing is given out to individuals experiencing homelessness who call in for help.

Efforts in Tacoma to respond to homelessness are coordinated through the Pierce County Continuum of Care (CoC), a group of homeless providers, developers, and governmental agencies with a goal of ending homelessness in the county. Tacoma, as a member of the CoC participates in monthly meetings to discuss issues related to the long range plan of ending homelessness. Additionally, Tacoma serves on the CoC funding committee with members from Lakewood, Pierce County, and nonprofit organizations allocating funding to homeless housing and services providers.

Addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

The City of Tacoma uses both local and federal funds to support emergency shelters and transitional housing for individuals and families. With the national shift in emphasis from transitional housing to

rapid re-housing, most of the transitional housing providers are making changes to the way they operate their programs. The City is supportive of Pierce County's plan to evaluate the current continuum of services and develop a strategy to convert some transitional housing units to rapid re-housing or permanent supportive housing. At the same time, the City and County are committed to ensuring there is adequate emergency shelter for unsheltered individuals and families. This not only involves maintaining the current inventory of shelter beds, but also encouraging practices which move residents out of the shelter more quickly and into permanent housing so that beds are freed up for others in need.

The City's primary goal for 2015-16 is to decrease the length of stay in emergency shelters and transitional housing for homeless families. Action steps include:

Participate in Pierce County's efforts to develop a system-wide plan for conversion of transitional housing to rapid re-housing and/or permanent supportive housing.

Participate in the rapid re-housing collaborative group associated with Pierce County's Continuum of Care to ensure alignment in standards of service delivery and coordination of referrals between the shelters, rapid re-housing providers, and Access Point 4 Housing in order to maximize the number of households moved from emergency shelter into permanent housing.

Continue systems innovation work with Pierce County, which is focused on implementing strengths-based services, decreasing barriers to housing, and tailoring services to the specific and individualized needs of clients/families.

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

Tacoma fully supports the Continuum's Plan to End Homelessness. The 2012 Plan calls for significant changes over the coming years to retool homeless housing resources available within the County. The plan calls for converting some of the time-limiting homeless housing stock into permanent housing with supports tailored to unique needs. Where appropriate, transitional housing will be converted to permanent supportive housing and/or rapid rehousing resources and financial resources will be increasingly dedicated for that purpose. In addition to expanding rapid rehousing, the Continuum and its partners are working to improve the capacity of homeless providers to assist families and individuals successfully make the transition to permanent housing. A primary effort is working with homeless housing providers to reduce barriers to housing so that rapid placement into stable housing can be achieved.

In December 2014, Nativity House opened 50 units of permanent affordable housing. This project which

is sponsored by Catholic Community Services sits alongside their overnight shelter and service center that was developed as a comprehensive homeless services facility. Separately, Metropolitan Development Council (MDC) redeveloped Randall Townsend Apartments which will add an additional 35 units of housing to previously homeless adults. In early 2015, Mercy Housing, Northwest broke ground on its New Tacoma Phase II project that will provide 40 additional units of senior housing next door to the existing 74 units that was previously developed.

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

The overall strategy of the Continuum of Care related to planning to prevent the discharge of persons from institutions into homelessness is to provide or broker tailored services and treatment in housing and prevention programs. The Continuum's Discharge Planning subcommittee has worked on developing plans and actions for improving the system of discharging from institutions to prevent individuals from becoming homeless. Agencies will work with health and mental health care facilities to find housing for persons being discharged following their health care. Key players working toward the goal of successful transitions of mental health discharges to the community will be the PATH teams, Positive Interactions, Western State Hospital, Franciscan Health Care, Multicare/Good Samaritan Greater Lakes Mental Health Care, the Rescue Mission, Comprehensive Life Resources and Catholic Community Services. In an effort to ease the transition from incarceration, the Washington State Department of Corrections will coordinate with the Incarcerated Veterans Program, Pioneer Human Services, shelters and the Metropolitan Development Council to prevent discharges into homelessness. Additionally, multidisciplinary teams will begin the planning for children aging out of foster care six months prior to the "aging out" date and will use housing and transitional housing resources primarily available through the Pierce County Alliance and the Housing for Success partnership.

As part of a comprehensive effort to eliminate homelessness, the Continuum has worked diligently to increase education and information exchange among homeless providers and governmental entities on national best practices in order to facilitate access to affordable housing and enhance stabilization to prevent returns to homelessness.

Discussion

AP-75 Barriers to affordable housing - 91.420, 91.220(j)

Introduction

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

infrastructure and public facilities to invigorate neighborhoods and create incentives for housing and other development.

The City of Tacoma Affordable Housing Policy Advisory Group (AHPAG) made a number of policy recommendations to the Tacoma City Council in 2010 to increase affordable housing. The AHPAG continues to work with the City, through the Tacoma Planning Commission to integrate policies and create incentives for increased affordable housing development. In addition to making policy and zoning changes, the AHPAG recognizes the importance of increasing the demand side of the equation – working to raise education/job skills, economic development/job creation, and improved transportation.

Tacoma is a member of the Tacoma/Pierce County Affordable Housing Consortium which brings together nonprofit and for-profit developers to identify and support strategies to increase and preserve affordable housing. The Tacoma Community Redevelopment Authority (supported by both Cities) has loaned over \$35 million and leveraged \$350 million since 1998 to create and preserve affordable housing.

Discussion

AP-85 Other Actions - 91.420, 91.220(k)

Introduction

Actions planned to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs

The City will continue to support fair housing education and other activities that support fair housing for all. Potential activities include workshops focused on education and the equal application of landlord/tenant and fair housing laws and relocation assistance for individuals at risk of homelessness through no fault of their own due to discriminatory housing practices, or as a result of building and code enforcement closures, fires, or redevelopment activities.

The City will continue to maintain funds to provide relocation assistance and rent subsidies to lower-income tenants being displaced by code enforcement. The program will be administered by the City's Neighborhood and Community Services Department and will be funded through the general fund.

Actions planned to foster and maintain affordable housing

Tacoma is committed to creating vibrant and healthy neighborhoods with housing choices for all residents and has recently updated the Housing Element of their respective Comprehensive Plan (2014) and integrated policies for developing affordable housing. In addition to policies and strategies to increase affordable housing and maintaining/improving neighborhood quality, the City is providing for increased density along transportation corridors, urban centers, and mixed-use centers.

Tacoma will continue to review policies in their Comprehensive Plan to encourage affordable housing, including such strategies as infill housing and accessory dwellings. They will likewise encourage higher densities, particularly in mixed-use and urban centers. In public "visioning meetings" held to check in with and pass on information to attendees, higher densities were seen as positive (consistent with neighborhood character and design). Increasingly mixed-use centers are seen as offering more amenities, transportation options, choices in housing and other opportunities enriching the neighborhoods and the city.

Tacoma will continue to provide support for nonprofit agencies through funding and collaboration to increase the opportunity for affordable housing development and will continue to support

downpayment assistance as a strategy to increase homeownership, coupled with homebuyer education in readiness for ownership.

Tacoma will continue to focus on revitalizing neighborhoods through code enforcement, crime-free housing, infrastructure provision and addressing blighting conditions to raise neighborhood stability and quality and promote new investment. This is an opportunity for partnerships with nonprofit agencies and non-profit development. At the same time, Tacoma recognizes the need to work toward relieving concentrations of poverty and low-access to opportunities by encouraging projects that revitalize and improve the quality of neighborhoods along with projects and policies that increase the capacity of residents.

Actions planned to reduce lead-based paint hazards

Consistent with Title X of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992, the City of Tacoma provides information on lead-safe practices to owners of all properties receiving up to \$5,000 of federally-funded assistance. If work on painted surfaces is involved in properties constructed prior to 1978, the presence of lead is assumed and safe work practices are followed. In addition to the above, homes with repairs in excess of \$5,000 in federally-funded rehabilitation assistance are assessed for risk (completed by a certified LBP firm) or are presumed to have lead. If surfaces to be disturbed are determined to contain lead, interim controls are exercised, occupants notified, and clearance test performed by an EPA certified firm. Properties constructed prior to 1978 and acquired with federal funds are inspected for hazards and acquired rental properties are inspected periodically.

Much of the housing stock in Tacoma was constructed prior to 1978. While not exclusively the case, older units with irregular maintenance may pose a risk to residents. Housing repair projects favor lower-income households by virtue of their eligibility, and at-risk housing units by virtue of their affordability (condition and age). The City and its representatives provide information on lead-safe practices to households involved in the repair programs and have brochures in the City offices for the general public on the dangers of lead and the importance of safe practices.

Lead-safe practices are required in all rehabilitation programs where housing was constructed prior to 1978, as described above.

Actions planned to reduce the number of poverty-level families

Tacoma will continue to support programs and projects that assist low-income persons, including projects that offer solutions to help them out of poverty. All three of the goals in this Strategic Plan have the capacity to reduce the number of households living in poverty. Further, CDBG, HOME and ESG funds leverage additional monies to address the same issues. Projects are also the result of long collaborations between agencies and partners, including Pierce County, the Tacoma Housing Authority and the Pierce

County Housing Authority. Funding from other sources – local, state, federal, foundations, private donors – are coordinated for the best benefit given continually declining resources.

The goal of increasing and preserving affordable housing choice includes projects that will provide new housing to lower income households, some with ongoing subsidy and support. Decreasing the cost of housing is one significant way of increasing household income, leaving more for households to allocate to helping themselves (training, transportation, childcare). Down payment assistance programs, along with housing counseling, will allow households to build equity and achieve stability in neighborhoods. Housing repair programs allow persons to live in safer housing and improve the neighborhood. Funds used to acquire blighted properties and replace with safe units for ownership create avenues out of poverty for low-income buyers and increase the value of neighboring properties.

The goal of reducing homelessness and increasing stability of residents likewise offers a path out of poverty and homelessness. Household-focused and individual-focused case management, coupled with rapid rehousing can eliminate periods of debilitating homelessness and rebuild attachment to the community, productive employment and education, all of which are challenged during periods of homelessness. Support for job training, literacy, and early interventions for youth provide incentives and skills for employment.

The goal of improving infrastructure, facilities and economic opportunities also has the capacity to help households and neighborhoods out of poverty. Investing in infrastructure and improvements to revitalize neighborhoods raises the quality of the neighborhood, makes it more attractive for new residents and more attractive to other investment and businesses providing jobs. Projects to improve business areas and to make façade improvements also increase the potential for investment. Projects also fund small business development directly, some through revolving loan funds, all of which result in jobs for lower income persons, some of whom enter the programs from poverty. Major barriers to achieving reductions in the number of households in poverty are limited resources (including funding) and broad changes in local economies beyond control of the City.

Actions planned to develop institutional structure

The overall strategy of the Lakewood/Tacoma/Pierce County Continuum of Care related to planning to prevent the discharge of persons from institutions into homelessness is to provide or broker tailored services and treatment in housing and prevention programs. The Continuum's Discharge Planning subcommittee has worked on developing plans and actions for improving the system of discharging from institutions to prevent individuals from becoming homeless. The City of Tacoma will continue to utilize funds generated by the mental health/chemical dependency sales tax to facilitate system-wide improvements to the delivery of mental health and chemical dependency services.

The State Department of Corrections will continue to have a place at the table to assist in the Continuum of Care's planning process. The Department will principally work with the Incarcerated Veterans Program, Pioneer Human Services, shelters and the Metropolitan Development Council to prevent discharges into homelessness. Several agencies will work with health and mental health care facilities to find housing for persons being discharged following their health care. Key players working toward the goal of successful transitions of mental health discharges to the community will be the PATH teams, Positive Interactions, Western State Hospital, Franciscan Health Care, Multicare/Good Samaritan Greater Lakes Mental Health Care, the Rescue Mission, Comprehensive Life Resources and Catholic Community Services. Multidisciplinary teams will begin the planning for children aging out of foster care six months prior to the "aging out" date and will use housing and transitional housing resources primarily available through the Pierce County Alliance and the Housing for Success partnership.

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

The City is the convener of monthly human services Collaboration meetings. Collaboration partners include for profit and nonprofit providers of housing, services, homeless programs, domestic violence and family services, youth programs, food banks, and healthcare services.

Pierce County homeless providers, developers and governmental agencies have joined to develop a comprehensive plan for a coordinated care system for the homeless with the goal of ending homelessness in the county. In 1996, the Tacoma/Pierce County Coalition for the Homeless created the Pierce County Continuum of Care (CoC) to serve as the planning body of this Coalition. Tacoma is a member of the CoC and participates in the monthly meeting to discuss issues related to the activities of the long-range plan of reducing homelessness.

Tacoma, Lakewood and Pierce County adopted a Ten-Year Plan to End Chronic Homelessness in 2004, and are represented on the Tacoma/Pierce County Coalition for the Homeless to collaborate in reducing chronic homelessness. The plan describes a need for therapeutic treatment and case management services for the mentally ill and substance abusing populations, linking housing with services, creating low cost permanent supportive housing and creating systems changes through education and advocacy.

The City continues to maintain collaborative relationships with many nonprofit agencies, local housing authorities, mental and social service agencies, and local and State governmental agencies to provide access to health care and other programs and services, provide a continuum of affordable housing, support education and training opportunities to aid in obtaining livable-wage jobs, and promote services that encourage self-sufficiency as a lasting solution to breaking the cycle of poverty.

Discussion

Program Specific Requirements

AP-90 Program Specific Requirements - 91.420, 91.220(I)(1,2,4)

Introduction

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

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

1. The total amount of program income that will have been received before the start of the next program year and that has not yet been reprogrammed	180,000
2. The amount of proceeds from section 108 loan guarantees that will be used during the year to address the priority needs and specific objectives identified in the grantee's strategic plan.	0
3. The amount of surplus funds from urban renewal settlements	0
4. The amount of any grant funds returned to the line of credit for which the planned use has not been included in a prior statement or plan	0
5. The amount of income from float-funded activities	0
Total Program Income:	180,000

Other CDBG Requirements

1. The amount of urgent need activities	0
2. The estimated percentage of CDBG funds that will be used for activities that benefit persons of low and moderate income. Overall Benefit - A consecutive period of one, two or three years may be used to determine that a minimum overall benefit of 70% of CDBG funds is used to benefit persons of low and moderate income. Specify the years covered that include this Annual Action Plan.	100.00%

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

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

The City of Tacoma uses only specified forms of assistance (i.e. 24CFR 92.205b) such as equity investments, interest-bearing loans, deferred payment loans, and grants.

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

The Tacoma Consortium utilizes Recapture for its homebuyer programs. Recapture includes any HOME investment, including interest, if any, that reduced the initial purchase price from the fair market value to an affordable price ("Direct Subsidy"), but excludes the amount between the initial cost of producing the unit and the fair market value of the property. Recaptured HOME funds are due upon sale, transfer, or if the HOME-assisted property is no longer the primary residence of the homebuyer. The Consortium allows for each Subrecipient to determine the method of recapture on a program by program basis, provided it meets one of the two methods outlined below:

A. Recapture the Entire Amount. The Consortium will recapture the entire outstanding balance of principal and interest, including any late fees, of its total HOME Investment. The amount recaptured will not exceed the total net proceeds available.

B. Reduction during Affordability Period. The Consortium may reduce the HOME investment amount to be recaptured on a prorata basis for the time the homeowner has owned and occupied the housing measured against the required affordability period. The Consortium requires a 30-year affordability period when forgiving debt to homebuyers. The HOME investment is decreased in equal amounts over a 25-year amortization schedule beginning in year 6.

The Consortium's Subrecipient and Development partners utilize the following recapture methods:

Tacoma Community Redevelopment Authority (Directly administered programs) - Recapture Entire Amount; City of Lakewood (for Directly administered programs) - Recapture Entire Amount; Washington State Housing Finance Commission (Subrecipient) - Recapture Entire Amount; Homeownership Center of Tacoma (CHDO / Development) - Recapture Entire Amount ; T/PC Habitat for Humanity (Development) - Reduction during Affordability Period

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

Each homebuyer is underwritten to ensure that they meet not only income-eligibility requirements, but that the burden of overall mortgage proposed is affordability to that household. Since 2002, the Consortium has had a policy for front and back-end ratios, examining the overall housing debt and the debt of each family, the appropriateness of the assistance, and financial resources to sustain homeownership. Each HOME assisted property will require a promissory note, deed of trust restrictions, and a written HOME agreement during the federal period of affordability with specific terms and conditions established by each Consortium member.

To ensure affordability, the Consortium adheres to affordability requirements as set forth in 24 CFR 92.254(a)(4): When the total HOME investment is less than \$15,000, a federal affordability period of not less than 5- years will be required. When the total HOME investment is \$15,000 to \$40,000, a federal affordability period of not less than 10-years will be required; for investments of over \$40,000, the required federal affordability period will be a minimum of 15-years. This federal affordability period is not contingent on loan terms or an amortization period. When the Consortium forgives homebuyer investment, an affordability period of 30-years shall be required.

Funds that are recaptured from the sale of property by the homebuyer, or if the property is no longer used as their primary residence during the federal affordability period, will be returned to the City of Tacoma, as lead agency of the Consortium. The federal affordability restrictions may terminate upon foreclosure, transfer in lieu of foreclosure, or assignment of an FHA-insured mortgage to HUD.

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

The City does not allow for refinancing to homeowners or for multi-family properties.

Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG)
Reference 91.220(l)(4)

1. Include written standards for providing ESG assistance (may include as attachment)

Please see attachment in AD 25 section under Unique Appendices.

2. If the Continuum of Care has established centralized or coordinated assessment system that meets HUD requirements, describe that centralized or coordinated assessment system.

Pierce County's centralized intake and assessment system (operated through Access Point 4 Housing) has been online since January 31, 2011. In Pierce County, there is one number to call to access information and services for households experiencing homelessness. Access Point 4 Housing staff conducts initial eligibility screenings to determine whether or not callers qualify for housing resources. Within 5 business days of the screening, eligible clients receive intake assessments to determine which housing provider to refer them to. For clients who do not qualify for ESG, staff provides referrals to other community resources.

Providers participate in centralized intake as follows: Time-limited housing programs that do not admit clients the same day must list all openings in the Daily Vacancy & Tracking Form, and can only take clients that have been assessed by Access Point 4 Housing. Clients in a time-limited housing program that have been assessed by Access Point 4 Housing can go directly to a rapid re-housing, transitional or permanent supportive housing program in the community without going back to Access Point for Housing.

Some housing providers voluntarily list openings in the Daily Vacancy & Tracking Form and may take clients from Access Point 4 Housing, but are not required to do so. These include shelter programs that admit clients the same day; permanent supportive housing programs and time-limited housing programs that serve a specialized population and/or house only clients they currently serve through other programs in their agency; and domestic violence programs.

3. Identify the process for making sub-awards and describe how the ESG allocation available to private nonprofit organizations (including community and faith-based organizations).

In keeping with the City's Citizen Participation Plan, Tacoma utilizes a competitive process to make sub-awards. Applications for ESG funding are accepted every two years. Awards are made for one year, with the second year of funding contingent upon program performance and availability of funding. The most recent application process occurred in February of 2014.

The regular review body for human service applications is the City Council-appointed Human Services Commission. However, in order to comply with the ESG requirement to consult with the

local Continuum of Care, the City established a special ESG review panel in 2012, comprised of several Continuum of Care members as well as members of the Human Services Commission. This 5-member review panel was convened in February of 2014 to review applications and make funding recommendations, and was re-convened in 2015 to review performance of the programs that received funding in 2014-15. City contracting staff provided performance information to the panel in the areas of billing/reporting, outputs, contract monitoring, Outcome Based Evaluation (OBE) and Budget/Spendedown. Seven of the eight programs met expectations and were recommended for a second year of funding. KWA's We Are Family Home program did not meet expectations and therefore was not recommended for a second year of funding. Award amounts to the remaining programs were adjusted to account for this decision, as well as to ensure that the increase in the total ESG allocation and the re-programmed funds from prior periods was accounted for.

In accordance with the City's Citizen Participation Plan and process for making funding decisions, recommendations were presented to Council and published for public comment. A public hearing was held on April 14, 2015. City Council approved the recommendations on May 5, 2015. Following the acceptance and approval of the substantial amendment by HUD, funds will be committed to programs through the City's contracting process.

4. If the jurisdiction is unable to meet the homeless participation requirement in 24 CFR 576.405(a), the jurisdiction must specify its plan for reaching out to and consulting with homeless or formerly homeless individuals in considering policies and funding decisions regarding facilities and services funded under ESG.

The City of Tacoma's policy making entity is the City Council. Since none of the City Council members is either currently or formerly homeless, the City met the homeless participation requirement by including a formerly homeless individual on the review panel that made funding recommendations during the sub-award process. This individual is also a member of the Pierce County Continuum of Care.

5. Describe performance standards for evaluating ESG.

The City of Tacoma recognizes that performance standards will evolve over the next few years as the ESG Interim Rule is implemented and as sub-recipients improve their program outcomes through the evaluation of HMIS data and integration of ESG services into the Continuum of Care. In the interim, ESG activities will be measured through two measurement systems: the following objectives adopted from the Continuum of Care performance outcomes:

The City of Tacoma will evaluate ESG activities through the following two measurement systems:

Outcome Based Evaluation (OBE): All human service organizations funded through the City are required to participate in OBE. Each program is required to select an outcome (from a mandated outcome list) that is aligned with the program's core services. For example, a program providing rapid re-housing services might select, "Attained permanent housing." The program would track

how many of their clients achieved this outcome and report on it to the City in an annual report. Outcome performance is considered in all funding application processes as part of the overall score.

HMIS: The City will continue to consult with the CoC regarding performance measures of the HEARTH ACT and how best to utilize HMIS. This will include identifying performance objectives and targets. The following will be tracked through HMIS:

- Length of time persons are homeless
- Exits to permanent housing
- Income

Performance standards for ESG will include the following:

- Shortening the time people spend homeless (Target: Rapid re-housing clients will find permanent housing within 30 days of the start of services)
- Increasing the percentage of persons who exit to permanent housing or remain in permanent housing at the end of the program year (Target: 85% for rapid re-housing clients)
- Increasing the percentage of persons over 18 who increased their total income at program exit or at the end of the program year (Target: 20% for all ESG clients)

Discussion

Appendix - Alternate/Local Data Sources

Executive Summary

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

1. Introduction

The Consolidated Plan establishes local priorities consistent with national objectives and priorities established by HUD (US Department of Housing and Urban Development) to utilize funds allocated by the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), the HOME Investment Partnership Program, and the Emergency Solution Grant (ESG). Over the five-year period covered by the Consolidated Plan over \$20 million is expected to be available through these programs, including allocations and program income.

2. Summary of the objectives and outcomes identified in the Plan

As determined in the assessment of needs and market analysis included in this plan, three broad needs were identified. The first was the need for affordable housing choice, including safe housing in good condition for all residents. In response to that need a goal was set to increase and preserve affordable housing choice which will be accomplished through projects such as home repair, down payment assistance, supporting development of new housing, rental housing rehabilitation and providing permanent supportive housing.

The second priority need established is to reduce homelessness and increase stability for all residents, including support for self-sufficiency. In response to this need a corresponding goal was set to reduce homelessness and increase stability. Projects meeting this goal include interventions across a broad spectrum, such as supportive and emergency services, transitional housing and shelters, homeless interventions and prevention, and activities to increase self-sufficiency (e.g., job training, employment readiness, and education).

The third priority need established in the planning process is the need for community and economic development and the corresponding goal is to improve infrastructure, facilities and economic opportunities. Projects to meet this goal will include extensive work with infrastructure, which is seen in

both Tacoma and Lakewood as essential in encouraging stability in neighborhoods, increasing access to persons with disabilities, and attracting and retaining businesses. Projects will also support micro-enterprises and business development. Projects will also support public facilities, parks, and transportation improvements.

3. Evaluation of past performance

The City of Tacoma and the City of Lakewood have made significant progress over the years in meeting needs. The organizational structure, coordination between departments within the cities, and coordination with agencies, Pierce County and the region have allowed streamlined performance and delivery in spite of dwindling resources. As with this Consortium Consolidated Plan, goals were set targeting the need for housing, building a suitable living environment through services and infrastructure, and fostering a system and improvements to spur economic development.

Tacoma and Lakewood are key partners in regional planning efforts, including the Tacoma/Lakewood/Pierce County Continuum of Care and the Tacoma Pierce County Affordable Housing Consortium as well as broader regional organizations such as the Puget Sound Regional Council. Creation and support of the Tacoma Community Redevelopment Authority has benefitted both Cities and greatly expanded the availability and condition of affordable housing. Integration of Human Services strategic planning in both cities contributes to efficient allocation of funds (CDBG, general fund, and other sources) to meet needs. The Housing Authorities are key partners and providers and both Tacoma and Lakewood. These and other partnerships, built over the years, are the basis for past successful performance and a promising path forward. While a strong system is in place, decreased funding and public support is a challenge felt by the Consortium and by cooperating agencies.

4. Summary of citizen participation process and consultation process

The consultation process for this Consolidated Plan was extensive, giving citizens many opportunities to contribute. Meetings were held in neighborhoods in Tacoma and Lakewood. In addition to the neighborhood meetings, community meetings were held that specifically encouraged input from seniors, persons with disabilities, African Americans, Asian/Pacific Islanders and Hispanics. Many of those who attended were lower-income and were receiving assistance. Their input was valuable in outlining needs. Public hearings on needs and on the draft Consolidated Plan, Strategic Plan and Annual Action Plans for both Tacoma and Lakewood were held in each city. There was extensive outreach to stakeholders and organizations. Strategic plans and needs assessments completed by partners in Pierce County enriched needs outlined in this Consortium Consolidated Plan. The Lakewood Community Services Advisory Board, the Tacoma Community Redevelopment Authority Board provided review and oversight during the process, in addition to extensive coordination within departments in each of the jurisdictions.

5. Summary of public comments

Comments were supportive of continued funding on behalf of affordable housing, shelter and other homeless interventions, public services, and economic development. Those providing input at the public hearing on needs in Tacoma included the Tacoma-Pierce County Habitat for Humanity, Metropolitan Development Council, Associated Ministries, Shiloh Baptist Church, Rescue Mission, Rebuilding Tacoma Together, the William Factory and Spaceworks. In Lakewood, those offering testimony at the public hearing on needs included the Pierce County Housing Authority, YMCA Child Care, and Tacoma-Pierce County Habitat for Humanity, each of whom encouraging continued support. Comments on needs were incorporated in sections in the Consolidated Plan and many of the organizations were included among those interviewed individually as well.

Comments at public hearings in Tacoma on the draft Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan included a representative from the William Factory about the importance of continued funding for the business incubator, the benefits to Tacoma and disadvantaged populations in the City. A citizen expressed concern that no street outreach or homelessness prevention programs were being funded with ESG dollars, even though they were eligible activities. He commented about the importance of street outreach to homeless veterans, including African American female veterans. Some are served by smaller organizations that have not been competitive in the annual allocation process. The City will refer this concern to the Continuum of Care and ESG Review Panel for consideration in future funding cycles. One comment was received at the public hearing in Lakewood on the draft Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan about the importance of jobs. This topic was addressed as a concern throughout the Consolidated Plan.

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

All comments were considered and/or incorporated in the Consolidated Plan.

7. Summary

The Process

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

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

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

Agency Role	Name	Department/Agency
CDBG Administrator	LAKEWOOD	Community Development Department

Table 60– Responsible Agencies

Narrative

Consolidated Plan Public Contact Information

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

1. Introduction

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

Representatives from the City of Tacoma and the City of Lakewood participate in regional planning efforts concerning all aspect of needs and opportunities covered by this Consolidated Plan, including economic development, transportation, public services, special needs, homelessness, and housing. Needs far exceed resources and the Cities, Pierce County, Puget Sound Regional Council have worked together to make decisions and set long-term priorities. Coordination within the Cities also consisted of input and review from the Lakewood CDBG Citizens Advisory Board and the Tacoma Community Redevelop Authority (TCRA). Coordination with the Tacoma Housing Authority, the Pierce County Housing Authority, service-providing agencies, and other stakeholders are described below. Their comments and input are reflected in discussions throughout this Consolidated Plan.

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

The Cities of Tacoma and Lakewood are actively engaged members of the Tacoma/Lakewood/Pierce County Continuum of Care. The three jurisdictions are the three most involved governmental entities in the Continuum, cooperatively working on programs to meet needs for housing and services. Both Tacoma and Lakewood support the Continuum's priorities focusing on the needs of the most vulnerable populations including chronically homeless persons, unaccompanied youth, families with children, and veterans, among others. The Continuum's recently established Centralized Intake System (AP4H) is supported by both Tacoma and Lakewood and is designed to provide assessment and rapid placement in appropriate housing, reducing vulnerability and increasing stability. The Cities were integral partners in developing the 2012 Tacoma Tacoma/Lakewood/Pierce County Plan to End Homelessness.

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

The Cities of Tacoma and Lakewood work closely with the Collaborative Applicant of the Continuum of Care (Pierce County) planning for allocation and use of Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) funds. ESG policies and procedures were created and are updated periodically in cooperation with Pierce County and Tacoma to ensure that ESG subrecipients are operating programs consistently across eligible

activities. Performance is reviewed by both entities. The Collaborative Applicant is also the HMIS lead and works closely with City of Tacoma to maximize use of HMIS resources and to draw data for reports on project performance and program outcomes.

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

Table 61– Agencies, groups, organizations who participated

1	Agency/Group/Organization	Metropolitan Development Council
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services - Housing Services-homeless Services-Employment Service-Fair Housing Services - Victims Regional organization Planning organization
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview
2	Agency/Group/Organization	Asia Pacific Cultural Center
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Regional organization Civic Leaders
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Non-Homeless Special Needs Economic Development Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview
3	Agency/Group/Organization	Associated Ministerial Alliance
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Civic Leaders
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Non-Homeless Special Needs Anti-poverty Strategy

	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Meeting with ministers
4	Agency/Group/Organization	ASSOCIATED MINISTRIES OF TACOMA-PIERCE COUNTY
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services - Housing Services-Persons with Disabilities Services-Persons with HIV/AIDS Services-Victims of Domestic Violence Services-homeless Services-Education Services-Employment Service-Fair Housing Services - Victims Regional organization Planning organization
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview
5	Agency/Group/Organization	Clover Park School District
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services-Children Services-Education
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview

6	Agency/Group/Organization	CRYSTAL JUDSON FAMILY JUSTICE CENTER
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services-Victims of Domestic Violence
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Non-Homeless Special Needs
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview
7	Agency/Group/Organization	Emergency Food Network
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services-Children Services-Elderly Persons Services-Persons with Disabilities Services-Persons with HIV/AIDS
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Homeless Needs - Families with children Non-Homeless Special Needs
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview
8	Agency/Group/Organization	Franklin Pierce School District
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services-Children Services-Education
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview
9	Agency/Group/Organization	Greater Lakes Mental Health
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services - Housing Services-Persons with Disabilities Services-homeless Services-Health Health Agency

	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Public Housing Needs Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs Market Analysis
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview
10	Agency/Group/Organization	Joint Base Lewis McChord
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Other government - Federal
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Needs - Veterans Non-Homeless Special Needs Economic Development Market Analysis
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview
11	Agency/Group/Organization	Korean Women's Association
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services - Housing Services-Children Services-Elderly Persons Services-Victims of Domestic Violence Regional organization
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Non-Homeless Special Needs Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview
12	Agency/Group/Organization	City of Lakewood
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Other government - Local Planning organization

	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Lead-based Paint Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs Economic Development Market Analysis Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Interviews with City Manager, Council Members, Code Enforcement, Community Development, Planning, Community Safety & Resource Team, Planning, Police
13	Agency/Group/Organization	LASA
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services - Housing Services-Victims of Domestic Violence Services-homeless Services-Education Service-Fair Housing Services - Victims Regional organization
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Public Housing Needs Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview

14	Agency/Group/Organization	Pierce County Community Connections
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services - Housing Services-Elderly Persons Services-Persons with Disabilities Services-Persons with HIV/AIDS Services-Victims of Domestic Violence Services-homeless Health Agency Other government - County Planning organization
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Public Housing Needs Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interviews
15	Agency/Group/Organization	Pierce County Housing Authority
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing PHA Services - Housing Planning organization
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Public Housing Needs Homeless Needs - Families with children Non-Homeless Special Needs Market Analysis
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview

16	Agency/Group/Organization	South Sound Outreach Services
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services-Elderly Persons Services-Persons with Disabilities Services-Persons with HIV/AIDS Services-Victims of Domestic Violence Services-homeless
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview
17	Agency/Group/Organization	St. Leo's Food Bank
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services-Children Services-Elderly Persons Services-Persons with Disabilities Services-Persons with HIV/AIDS Services-Victims of Domestic Violence Services-homeless
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview

18	Agency/Group/Organization	TACID
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services-Persons with Disabilities Services-Education Services-Employment Service-Fair Housing Regional organization Planning organization
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Non-Homeless Special Needs
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview
19	Agency/Group/Organization	City of Tacoma
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Other government - Local Planning organization
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Lead-based Paint Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs Economic Development Market Analysis Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interviews with City Manager, Council Members, Planning, Community & Economic Development, Code Enforcement, Police, Fire Department, COT-NCSICS, Neighborhood & Community Services
20	Agency/Group/Organization	Tacoma Community House
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services - Housing Services-Education Services-Employment Services - Victims
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Non-Homeless Special Needs

	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview; needs of immigrants and refugees
21	Agency/Group/Organization	TACOMA HOUSING AUTHORITY
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing PHA Services - Housing Services-Employment Service-Fair Housing
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Public Housing Needs Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Families with children Non-Homeless Special Needs Economic Development Market Analysis Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview
22	Agency/Group/Organization	Tacoma Pierce County Affordable Housing Consortium
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Regional organization Planning organization
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Public Housing Needs Non-Homeless Special Needs Economic Development Market Analysis Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview
23	Agency/Group/Organization	Tacoma Pierce County Habitat for Humanity
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing

	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Non-Homeless Special Needs Market Analysis
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview
24	Agency/Group/Organization	Tacoma School District
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services - Housing Services-Education
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview
25	Agency/Group/Organization	United Way of Pierce County 1501 pACIFIC aVENUE
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Regional organization Planning organization
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Non-Homeless Special Needs Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview
26	Agency/Group/Organization	Washington State Department of Veterans Affairs
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services - Housing Services-Education Services-Employment Other government - State
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homelessness Needs - Veterans Non-Homeless Special Needs

	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview
27	Agency/Group/Organization	West Pierce Fire and Rescue
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Other government - County
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Non-Homeless Special Needs
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Meeting with first responders
28	Agency/Group/Organization	YWCA of Pierce County
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services - Housing Services-Children Services-Victims of Domestic Violence Services-Health Services - Victims
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Homeless Needs - Families with children Non-Homeless Special Needs
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Individual interview

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

No agencies were intentionally excluded from consultation. Every effort was made to ensure advance publication of meetings and opportunities to contribute.

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

Name of Plan	Lead Organization	How do the goals of your Strategic Plan overlap with the goals of each plan?
Continuum of Care	Pierce County Community Connections	

Table 62– Other local / regional / federal planning efforts

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

The City of Tacoma and the City of Lakewood work closely with the Tacoma Housing Authority and the Pierce County Housing Authority. The Cities participate in the Tacoma/Lakewood/Pierce County Continuum of Care and are active in the Tacoma Pierce County Affordable Housing Consortium, the Economic Development Board for Tacoma-Pierce County, the Pierce County Human Services Coalition and other public entities and associations that set priorities for use of resources in the region, set goals, and measure progress in meeting those goals.

Narrative

A number of plans and reports were consulted in preparation of this Consolidated Plan, reflecting policies, needs or significant research. Those include:

- City of Lakewood, *Comprehensive Plan*. (Revised 2014)

- City of Lakewood, Council Goals & Priorities. (Adopted July 2014)

- City of Lakewood, *Economic Vitality Strategy*. (2014)

- City of Lakewood, *Human Services Needs Analysis Report*. (2014)

- City of Lakewood, *Lakewood Legacy Plan: A Parks and Recreation Master Plan*. (2014)

- City of Tacoma Affordable Housing Policy Advisory Group, *Policy Recommendations to the Council*. (2010).

- City of Tacoma Comprehensive Plan. (Amended 2014)

- City of Tacoma Neighborhood & Community Services Department, Human Services Division, *2015-2019 City of Tacoma Human Services Strategic Plan*. (2014)

- City of Tacoma, Economic Development: 2013-2014 Strategic Framework & Action Plan.

- City of Tacoma, Finance Department, Office of Management and Budget, *2013-2018 Draft Capital Facilities Program*. (2012)

- Economic Development Board for Tacoma-Pierce County, *2011-2015 Future Focus Work Program*.

- Focus Strategies. *Assessment of Pierce County Centralized Intake*, prepared for Pierce County Community Connections. (2014)

- Marc Bolan Consulting, *City of Tacoma Domestic Violence Needs and Gaps Assessment*, prepared for the City of Tacoma Human Rights and Human Services Department. (2011)

- Pierce County Community Connections Aging and Disability Resources, *2014-2015 Draft Area Plan Update*. (2014)

- Pierce County Community Connections, *Pierce County HIV/AIDS Housing Plan*. (2013)

- Pierce County Planning and Land Services, *Buildable Lands Report*. (2014)

- Puget Sound Regional Council. *Regional Economic Strategy for the Central Puget Sound Region*. (2012)

- Puget Sound Regional Council. *Vision 2040: The Growth Management, Environmental, Economic and Transportation Strategy for the Central Puget Sound Region*. (adopted 2008)

- State of Washington Department of Commerce, *Homelessness in Washington State: Annual Report on the Homeless Grant Programs*. (2014)

- State of Washington Department of Commerce, *Housing Needs Assessment*. (2015)

- Tacoma Housing Authority, *Moving to Work Annual Plan*. (2014)

- Tacoma/Lakewood/Pierce County Continuum of Care, *Plan to End Homelessness*. (2012)

- Tacoma/Pierce County Affordable Housing Consortium, *Affordable Housing Guidebook, 2015 Edition*.

- Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department, *2014 Pierce County Community Health Improvement Plan*. (2014)

- Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department, Office of Assessment, Planning, and Improvement, *A Community Mental Health and Chemical Dependency Assessment, City of Tacoma*. (2012)

- Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department. *2014 Pierce County Community Health Improvement Plan*. (2014)

- United Way of Pierce County, *A Community Conversation*. (2014)

- Washington State Department of Health, *HIV Surveillance Semiannual Report*, 1st Edition 2014.

- Workforce Central, *Pierce County Local Integrated Workforce Plan: 2013-2017*

PR-15 Citizen Participation - 91.401, 91.105, 91.200(c)

1. Summary of citizen participation process/Efforts made to broaden citizen participation

Summarize citizen participation process and how it impacted goal-setting

Citizen participation was encouraged in several ways, including meetings with neighborhood organizations in both Tacoma and Lakewood, community meetings in Tacoma that specifically encouraged input from seniors, persons with disabilities, African Americans, Asian/Pacific Islanders and Hispanics. Neighborhood and community meetings include:

- Beacon Activity Center
- Bethlehem Baptist Church
- Indochinese Cultural & Service Center
- Central Lakes (Lake City) Neighborhood (Lakewood)
- Northeast Lakewood Neighborhood
- Pacific Neighborhood (Lakewood)
- South Lakes (Tillicum/Woodbrook) Neighborhood (Lakewood)
- Portland Avenue Community Center
- Tacoma Central Neighborhood Forum
- Tacoma Eastside (ENACT) Neighborhood
- Tacoma South End Neighborhood
- Tacoma West End Neighborhood

Public hearings on needs were held in both Cities and all were advertised in the *News Tribune*:

- Public hearing on needs in Tacoma was held on November 24, 2014
- Public hearing on needs in Lakewood was held on October 2, 2014
- Public hearing on the Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan in Tacoma was held on April 15, 2015.

- Public hearing on the Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan in Lakewood was held on April 20, 2015.

Drafts of the Tacoma-Lakewood Consortium Consolidated Plan, the Tacoma Annual Action Plan 2015, and the Lakewood Annual Action Plan 2015 were made available on websites of the individual cities and the Tacoma Public Library, City of Tacoma Community and Economic Development Department, the City of Tacoma Customer Support Center, the Lakewood Library, Tillicum Library, and at the City of Lakewood Community Development Department.

Citizen Participation Outreach

Sort Order	Mode of Outreach	Target of Outreach	Summary of response/attendance	Summary of comments received	Summary of comments not accepted and reasons	URL (If applicable)
1	Public Hearing	Non-targeted/broad community	Public hearing on needs in Tacoma		All comments were accepted and considered in the assessment of needs and market analysis	
2	Public Hearing	Non-targeted/broad community	Public hearing on needs in Lakewood		All comments were accepted and considered in the assessment of needs and market analysis	

Sort Order	Mode of Outreach	Target of Outreach	Summary of response/attendance	Summary of comments received	Summary of comments not accepted and reasons	URL (If applicable)
3	Public Hearing	Non-targeted/broad community	Public hearing on draft plan in Tacoma		All comments were considered and/or already reflected in the plans	
4	Public Hearing	Non-targeted/broad community	Public hearing on draft plan in Lakewood		All comments were already reflected in the plan	

Table 63– Citizen Participation Outreach

Needs Assessment

NA-05 Overview

Needs Assessment Overview

NA-50 Non-Housing Community Development Needs - 91.415, 91.215 (f)

Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Facilities:

The City of Tacoma has made concerted efforts over the years to improve community facilities and infrastructure in the downtown area and in neighborhoods. Those efforts will continue. Identification of policies and projects appropriate to planning for public facilities are driven by the City's Comprehensive Plan and by the Capital Facilities Program. Projects identified in the recent 6-year Plan are include more than \$2.6 billion in total financing needs, highlighted by the following:

- Parks, recreation, and cultural facility needs, include major expenditures for renovation of the Tacoma Dome and City park improvements (\$83 million)
- Municipal facilities and services, with major needs for fire training facilities and for community and senior centers, as well as libraries (\$174 million)
- Utilities and services, with major expenditures for Tacoma Power, water distribution and water quality improvements, and wastewater management (\$1.7 million)
- Community development, including downtown and Foss Waterway (\$22 million).

The City of Lakewood's Comprehensive Plan sets the overall vision for public facilities and improvements in the City. This vision and plan is supported by implementation plans. Projects for improved and new parks and recreation are set out in the *Lakewood Legacy Plan*. This plan identifies projects totaling \$2.5 million over the next six years (2015-2020) including improvements in trails, expansion of Springbrook Park, Harry Todd Playground Replacement and a Village Green at Town Center. Capital Improvements Projects identified by Public Works include extensive road construction and improvements; citywide safety improvements to signalize intersections; extensive improvements to construct sidewalks, curbs, gutters and provide street lighting; and, additional provision of sewer services and connections.

At the neighborhood level in both Tacoma and Lakewood, there is an ongoing need for improvements to parks and recreational facilities, community facility renovations and access to improved transportation options and support. Facilities serving people who are homeless persons and persons with special needs have been identified as needs. The City of Tacoma is working with Pierce County to construct a youth drop-in center which will fill part of the gap in shelter and services to vulnerable youth. There is a need, as well, for center or strategy for serving younger youth who are at risk.

Historic preservation remains an important strategy in Tacoma, in particular. A number of buildings have been added to the Tacoma Register of Historic Place, which now includes over 160 properties, sites, and

places. The City has established a loan program to encourage preservation; some of these projects have, in the past, preserved affordable housing as well as renewing commercial and other opportunities.

How were these needs determined?

Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Improvements:

Regional policies included in *Vision 2040* (Puget Sound Regional Council) recognize that planning to accommodate growth requires there is a balance in housing, jobs, infrastructure, transportation and services. Support for multimodal transportation and infrastructure are key. Both Tacoma and Lakewood have substantial needs for projects improving infrastructure. Having the proper infrastructure in place is necessary for strong and accessible neighborhoods; to attract new housing development and renovate the old; and, to encourage economic development and business investment, which will create badly-needed employment.

The Pierce County Health Improvement Plan, calls for a number of improvements to build health communities. These include having safe places to exercise; and, bringing safe water and sewer services to residents in lower income neighborhoods (among other recommendations). The United Way recent public outreach to determine needs in the community (*A Community Conversation*) identified lack of sufficient transportation and the ability to access resources as a primary barrier.

Tacoma's *Capital Facilities Programs* (2013-2018) identifies the following public improvement and infrastructure needs in several areas:

- Community development projects, which include 30 Local Improvement Districts (LIDs) in neighborhoods or business districts (\$177 million)
- Transportation Improvements, including street and sidewalk improvements, bridge construction, and bike lanes (\$522 million)

In Lakewood, the City Council recently prioritized projects to provide infrastructure and improvements in support of neighborhoods and business to improve living conditions and stimulate economic development. The City of Lakewood 6-Year Capital Improvement Plan for Parks (*Lakewood Legacy Plan*) was mentioned above and included \$2.5 million in projects including trail improvements. The *Six-Year*

Comprehensive Transportation Program (2015-2020) contains projects totaling \$120 million over the next five years. Included are roads and sidewalks connecting neighborhoods and linking to amenities and services, many of which are poorly or not at all connected.

At the neighborhood level in both Tacoma and Lakewood improvements to streets, sidewalks, bike paths, signalization, and ADA accessibility were among needs identified. Community workshops in Tacoma (Vision 2025) identified the need for transportation alternatives and better connections. In meetings held with neighborhoods in both Tacoma and Lakewood in preparation for this Consolidated Plan, lack of infrastructure was a consistent theme – road improvements, ADA improvements, sidewalks, street lights, curb cuts and better transportation connections.

In Tacoma, annual allocations of CDBG funds are made available for neighborhood-serving community development projects based on Council-approved priorities. Typically these projects will match City and other resources going into the same project. Examples of such projects include public improvements in support of community-defined affordable housing or public facility developments, ADA improvements to remove architectural barriers, and other neighborhood-initiated projects in compliance with the applicable code of federal regulations (CFR).

How were these needs determined?

Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Services:

Needs for public services are described in several sections in the Consolidated Plan, including sections discussing populations with special needs and homelessness. In addition to this planning process, the needs for public services are outlined in current human services plans for Tacoma and Lakewood, both of which have been recently updated to reflect current priorities. The City of Tacoma 2015-2019 *Human Services Strategic Plan* identifies four strategic priorities:

- Prepare children and youth for success – which includes increasing parenting skills, removing academic barriers, and focusing on the most vulnerable to remove barriers; and, preventing gangs and gang involvement
- Increase employability, self-determination, and empowerment for adults – which includes workforce development; and, self-determination and empowerment
- Meet basic needs of Tacoma residents – housing stabilization; food security; and, safety

- Enhance mental health/substance use disorder services – which include diversion from jail and hospitals; reducing chronic homelessness; community-based care; and a focus on youth.

A strong part of the plan is the analysis of access to opportunities, which is defined in terms of conditions in place that contribute to success. However, it is more than situational in that barriers outside of the boundaries of neighborhoods contribute to challenges in being successful. Those barriers include lack of affordable housing, lack of affordable childcare (and care offered during-off hours and for infants), and lack of transportation. Language and cultural barriers are also significant and serve to isolate households and impede successful utilization of community resources. Tacoma’s Equity and Empowerment Initiative looks to break down structural barriers. Among other goals, this means involving all people in decisions, identifying where resources and where they are not, and looking for ways to remove barriers and open doors to giving all residents a path to strive.

The City of Lakewood *Human Services Needs Analysis Report* likewise set funding priorities over the next few years. Needs of the most vulnerable populations were identified:

- Low-income families in persistent poverty
- School-age youth, particularly those with adverse childhood experiences
- Elderly and persons with disabilities
- People without (or with limited) resources with health problems, including mental health and chemical dependency
- People with limited English and cultural barriers that limit access to resources

In light of those priority needs and populations, the City of Lakewood set several strategy focus areas:

- Housing
- Stabilization services
- Emotional support
- Access to health and human services

The Cities of Lakewood and Tacoma participate in the Pierce County Human Services Coalition and the Tacoma/Lakewood/Pierce County Continuum of Care among other coalitions that consider needs for public services and make recommendations based on knowledge of the existing systems and gaps in light of continuously reduced federal and state funding. General Funds from both Tacoma and

Lakewood support public services. The 0.1% tax in Tacoma (2012) will provide additional funding for mental health and substance abuse interventions/prevention and will help meet resource gaps. However, funding is not sufficient. Tacoma and Lakewood determinations of needs for public services and funding priorities are highly coordinated and prevention-focused.

How were these needs determined?

Based on the needs analysis above, describe the State's needs in Colonias

Housing Market Analysis

MA-05 Overview

Housing Market Analysis Overview:

Both Tacoma and Lakewood encourage development. Tacoma wants to focus growth for the downtown area and along transportation corridors. Lakewood is working with developers and builders to take advantage of land in Lakewood to provide infill throughout the City as well as developing in new areas where zoning allows. Toward this end, the City has identified unused or underutilized land in all neighborhoods. Not only does this provide needed housing but it is consistent with the policy of raising housing quality. There are several areas in Lakewood with rundown properties and with vacant or abandoned units. Where they exist, these conditions make the neighborhood unsafe and depress property values. Encouraging new development, including higher end development, can revitalize neighborhoods and contribute to the tax base and the overall economy as well as increasing opportunities.

Development is more than applications for building permits, to be sure. Consistent with the Washington State Growth Management Act policies, there must be a balance of residential concentrations and employment opportunities. The Pierce County Building Lands Report indicates that the City of Tacoma is on target for projections on both residential and employment growth, but Lakewood lags in employment. The balance between jobs and housing and all that entails is an important consideration for both Cities as they strive to attract business and industry by providing infrastructure, develop the skills of the workforce, and bring residential densities close to opportunities.

MA-45 Non-Housing Community Development Assets - 91.410, 91.210(f)

Introduction

With the arrival of American settlers in the late 1840s, Tacoma arose as an industrial and transportation hub, first with the deep water port, then enhanced by rail and highways. In addition to the local economic base and that in Pierce County, both Tacoma and Lakewood benefitted from the larger Puget Sound economic system. An important early and continuing contributor to development in the region is Joint Base Lewis-McChord (renamed in 2010) forming the southern boundary of Lakewood.

While Tacoma (incorporated 1884) developed as a major urban city, supporting trade and industry, Lakewood was primarily residential. Fairly recently incorporated (1996), Lakewood grew around numerous lakes which have historically been a draw for recreation as well as residential development for military personnel and retirees and people commuting to jobs elsewhere in Puget Sound.

Puget Sound is a regional economy. People make choices about where to live and work based on several factors including jobs, the cost of housing, and the reasonableness of commuting. The average worker in Washington commutes about a half hour between home and work. That is not remarkably different for workers in Lakewood and Tacoma. More people both live and work in Tacoma than is true of Washington. Nearly half (47%) of Tacoma residents who work both live and work in Tacoma. Fewer (27%) of Lakewood residents both live and work in Lakewood. This is not surprising given Lakewood's history as more a residential community.

The cost of commuting to and from work has received increased attention in relation to housing cost. Money saved in housing is offset by the cost of commuting. One study (Lipman, Barbara. *A Heavy Load: The Combined Housing and Transportation Burdens of Working Families*. 2006) determined that when housing and commute costs are combined, the combination of the two is considerably greater than 30% of income for working families. The study drew information from 28 metropolitan areas across the country. A typical household budget (for the combined 28 metropolitan areas sampled for the study) included 27% for housing and 20% for transportation – 47% combined. However, working families

with incomes between \$20,000 and \$50,000 spent 58% of their earnings for the combination of transportation and housing, split about evenly between housing (28%) and transportation (30%).

Economic Development Market Analysis

Business Activity

Business by Sector	Number of Workers	Number of Jobs	Share of Workers %	Share of Jobs %	Jobs less workers %
Agriculture, Mining, Oil & Gas Extraction	57	12	0	0	0
Arts, Entertainment, Accommodations	1,788	2,961	14	18	4
Construction	596	953	5	6	1
Education and Health Care Services	2,833	3,637	22	22	0
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	790	1,152	6	7	1
Information	276	131	2	1	-1
Manufacturing	1,028	776	8	5	-3
Other Services	1,279	1,375	10	8	-2
Professional, Scientific, Management Services	858	1,026	7	6	-1
Public Administration	0	0	0	0	0
Retail Trade	1,878	3,212	15	19	4
Transportation and Warehousing	602	736	5	4	-1
Wholesale Trade	730	866	6	5	-1
Total	12,715	16,837	--	--	--

Table 64 - Business Activity

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

Labor Force

Total Population in the Civilian Labor Force	26,013
----------------------------------------------	--------

Civilian Employed Population 16 years and over	22,604
Unemployment Rate	13.10
Unemployment Rate for Ages 16-24	50.20
Unemployment Rate for Ages 25-65	6.10

Table 65 - Labor Force

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Occupations by Sector	Number of People
Management, business and financial	3,885
Farming, fisheries and forestry occupations	954
Service	2,678
Sales and office	5,944
Construction, extraction, maintenance and repair	2,596
Production, transportation and material moving	1,859

Table 66 – Occupations by Sector

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Travel Time

Travel Time	Number	Percentage
< 30 Minutes	16,038	67%
30-59 Minutes	5,800	24%
60 or More Minutes	2,002	8%
Total	23,840	100%

Table 67 - Travel Time

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Education:

Educational Attainment by Employment Status (Population 16 and Older)

Educational Attainment	In Labor Force		Not in Labor Force
	Civilian Employed	Unemployed	
Less than high school graduate	1,927	307	1,580
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	5,054	706	2,841
Some college or Associate's degree	7,164	663	3,312
Bachelor's degree or higher	4,391	216	1,199

Table 68 - Educational Attainment by Employment Status

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Educational Attainment by Age

	Age				
	18-24 yrs	25-34 yrs	35-44 yrs	45-65 yrs	65+ yrs
Less than 9th grade	264	404	198	500	465
9th to 12th grade, no diploma	1,290	1,006	560	1,162	779
High school graduate, GED, or alternative	2,323	2,812	2,265	3,799	2,129
Some college, no degree	2,501	2,384	2,277	4,128	1,773
Associate's degree	358	717	826	1,748	392
Bachelor's degree	221	1,089	712	2,479	1,182
Graduate or professional degree	0	418	165	1,376	877

Table 69 - Educational Attainment by Age

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Educational Attainment – Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months

Educational Attainment	Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months
Less than high school graduate	17,312

Educational Attainment	Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	27,166
Some college or Associate's degree	37,590
Bachelor's degree	45,350
Graduate or professional degree	62,035

Table 70 – Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months

Data Source: 2007-2011 ACS

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

Over the past two decades, the economic base in Pierce County has shifted along with that in the Puget Sound region. Manufacturing jobs, once the mainstay of good paying positions, have declined and are in line to be replaced with a stronger service and retail economy. Both Tacoma and Lakewood are looking for opportunities to expand economic opportunities. Industries employing the most civilians include education, services, and health care, followed by retail trade.

Joint Base Lewis-McChord is the single largest employer in Pierce County. Many of the jobs on base, however, are occupied by military dependents and not held by persons without a military attachment. There is concern about reduction in troops, but if that should occur, it is not expected to affect local employment. Education, government and health care are clearly major employers in the County. State Farm Insurance Company relocated to Tacoma taking the building vacated by Russell Investments.

Manufacturing, including Boeing in Frederickson in Pierce County, continues to be an important manufacturing sector. The Port of Tacoma is in the process of aligning with the Port of Seattle (Seaport Alliance) which makes the aligned ports a major contender for shipping on the west coast. However, with super tankers and the opening of the enlarged canal in Panama, shipping is entering a new age which may impact the industry in Tacoma and on the west coast of the United States.

Describe the workforce and infrastructure needs of the business community:

The City of Tacoma plan for economic development outlines strategies within several areas that are to be prioritized over the next few years (2013-2014 Strategic Framework and Action Plan). Included among those is a focus on the Central Business District, the Dome, and Brewery District for continued revitalization and infrastructure improvements that can catalyze additional development and opportunities. The City also intends to focus its revitalization efforts on neighborhood centers such as the Lincoln Business District and South Tacoma with targeted resources to upgrade public improvements and beautify these neighborhoods. The City will aim to reuse city-owned and privately-owned properties for this purpose, where appropriate. Small business development has long been a focus of Tacoma’s economic development strategies and remains so going forward, including support for entrepreneurship, incubators, and small business technical support. In addition, the City will partner with educational institutions, particularly University of Washington Tacoma, Bates Technical College, University of Puget Sound, Pacific Lutheran University, and Tacoma Community College to provide education and training particularly around new economic opportunities and to meet skilled labor requirements of existing and future businesses. The City will seek to expand the Innovation Partnership Zone (IPZ) in Tacoma (designated by the Department of Commerce).

Neighborhood revitalization is integral to economic development in Tacoma. This includes developing more walkable neighborhoods and vibrant neighborhood centers to attract and retain businesses and encourage infill. Reuse of vacant or underutilized buildings, encouraging infill, removing blighted structures, and removing architectural barriers are all steps to creating that vibrancy.

Central to Lakewood’s vision of economic development is transformation from its start as a bedroom community to a city that is diversified, full-service, and self-contained (Comprehensive Plan, Economic Development). The Comprehensive Plan calls for expansion of infrastructure including improving housing and redeveloping underutilized commercial and industrial properties. Essential infrastructure to encourage economic development has included basic and expensive elements – extending sewers and building roads into areas not previously served. Once completed and in place, opportunities for industry and employment are possible. Development is not starting from scratch – over \$20 million has been invested in Tillicum and Woodbrook and major corridor improvements have been made, including completion of the Sounder Station.

In addition to encouraging development and completed utilization of industrial parks, economic development will take advantage of retail, education and health care systems. The Lakewood Mall was transformed into Towne Center, giving the City a central focus. Pierce College and Clover Park Technical College have added health sciences and technical buildings, in line with Saint Clare/Franciscan Health, Multicare and other health facilities in Lakewood. Essential to economic development are continued removal or redevelopment of blighted or underutilized properties. Revitalization and redevelopment in the near future will focus on the Central Business District, the South Tacoma Way and Pacific Highway Corridors; Springbrook; Tillicum/Woodbrook; Lakeview (Lakewood Station District); and, Lake City.

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

The economy has changed, dramatically compared to several decades ago. Recovering from the recent Great Recession, Tacoma and Lakewood are looking for avenues to economic stability and growth. In that process the Cities are not alone. The Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) in *Vision 2040* acknowledges the transition from a past base of resource extraction and manufacturing to a future base of a globally-focused economy relying on a skilled workforce to both develop and sustain future enterprises. Goals for the economy include a specific focus on people – family wage jobs, high quality education, equity, diversity and targeted growth. Of note as well in this vision is the connection of housing and jobs.

Like the Puget Sound Regional Council, Lakewood and Tacoma are also establishing visions for economic vitality and those visions are not just jobs or just housing, but about what makes a community work. In workshops held as part of Tacoma *Vision 2025* process, the vision for successful economic and employment development was described by participants as linked to multimodal transportation, schools, housing, services, education, and vital neighborhoods.

While recovery from the Great Recession is not as dramatic as in Seattle, Tacoma and Pierce County are recovering, according to an analysis in the *Seattle Times*, with aerospace strong in Frederickson (Boeing and Toray Composites), new investment in downtown Tacoma (expansion of the Tacoma Art Museum and a new YMCA, movie theaters and restaurants on Pacific Avenues, and new housing on the waterfront), growth in

cyber security firms and business partnerships with University of Washington Tacoma IT department are pointing to business development and new jobs. So too is the Seaport Alliance, which is a collaborative approach to strengthen the Ports of Seattle and Tacoma. At the same time, there is uncertainty about reductions at JBLM.

In the 2011-2015 work program (*Future Focus: Jobs and Wealth*), the Economic Development Board for Tacoma-Pierce County outlines strategies to retain and expand business opportunities. These strategies focus on existing and emerging clusters (clean technology; logistics and international trade; aerospace and advanced manufacturing; health care; information technology; and defense contractors) and on promoting regional headquarters in finance, insurance, real estate, and information technology.

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

The 2009-2013 American Community Survey estimated that 12% of residents in both Tacoma and Lakewood lacked a high school diploma or equivalency, which was higher than in Washington and in Pierce County. At the other end of the spectrum, about 21% of Lakewood's and 25% of Tacoma's population 25 and older had a bachelor's degree or higher – somewhat lower than Washington.

Education matters in terms of earnings. Median earnings for residents 25 and older without a high school degree (or equivalency) totaled \$18,305 in Lakewood and \$21,122 in Tacoma and increased with each level of educational attainment. Median earnings rose for both male and females, but the median was higher at each level of education for males than females. At the national level data show not only increased earnings with education, but decreased unemployment.

Median earnings for males working full-time, year-around was about 23% higher than that for female workers working full-time, year-around in Lakewood and 20% higher in Tacoma. This may be the result of occupations selected by or available to women based on training or preference. Median income from earnings for all workers in Lakewood was \$27,588 and in Tacoma \$31,377 – well below the median for full-time workers. This suggests that a substantial share of workers were employed part-time or for part of the year.

Historically, manufacturing was an important segment of the economy in Puget Sound, as well as other sectors that utilized employees with low entry-level skills and training. As the number of jobs in manufacturing continue to decline and employment in other sectors increases, there will be a demand for workers who have degrees (even advanced degrees) in technical fields (science and math) and for workers with post-high school vocational training. There is a challenge in Puget Sound of finding an appropriately trained work force to fill current and future jobs, to attract new business development, and to replace aging workers nearing retirement.

The PSRC report notes several challenges to meeting needs:

- Lack of sufficient higher education capacity
- Mismatch between higher education capacity and employer needs
- Rising cost of education limits enrollment and saddles students with debts
- Low high school graduation rates (below national average)
- Unmet need for training beyond high school; need to increase degrees and certificates awarded

Retirees with a replacement workforce both smaller and without appropriate training

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

Innovation Partnership Zones (IPZ), designated by the Department of Commerce, link universities, private sector partners and the workforce to support innovation and stimulate economic opportunities. As noted in the CEDS, there are seven Innovation Partnership Zones in the central Puget Sound region including the Urban Clean Water Technology Innovation Partnership Zone in Tacoma which was founded in partnership with the City of Tacoma, the University of Washington Tacoma, and the Puget Sound Partnership. The Center for Urban Waters at the University of Washington Tacoma provides scientific expertise as well as training for students. Other partnerships between Tacoma and Lakewood and educational facilities located nearby or in the individual cities were discussed under economic development strategies above and not repeated here.

Workforce Central in Pierce County, in the *Pierce County Local Integrated Workforce Plan*, outlines the vision of the Pierce County Workforce Development Council to meet the labor needs of industry clusters (healthcare, aerospace manufacturing, trade/transportation, information technology, national security, construction, building products manufacturing, and food manufacturing). The plan also inventories Pierce County's Workforce development system which, in brief, is a partnership between agencies (including Tacoma Housing Authority, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, Metropolitan Development Council, Vadis, Tacoma Goodwill Industries, educational facilities and others) to provide support for training initiatives and multiple information sharing events (such as career days).

Those workforce training initiatives include:

- RallyPoint/6: Training and reintegration of veterans (along with support for families)
- Employment & Housing Navigator: Education, training and employment for persons who are homeless along with support services and case management
- Heroes at Home 2 Program: Training, tuition, and job placement for military spouses
- Pierce County Youth Consortium (PCYC): Collaboration of youth-serving agencies to improve coordination and provide services to youth
- Resources for Education and Career Help (REACH): Services for disenfranchised youth
- Youth Building Tacoma: Services for youth and paid internships
- Manufacturing Academy: Training and apprenticeship in manufacturing trade

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

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

The Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) adopted in 2012 the two-volume *Regional Economic Strategy for the Central Puget Sound Region (STRATEGY and ECONOMY)* which is the CEDS for the four-county region (Snohomish, King, Pierce and Kitsap counties). The plan acknowledges

the challenge of developing and maintaining a robust regional economy in light of changing employment sectors and the significant global competition.

Goals outlined in the long-range strategy hinge on five foundations:

6. Education and workforce development: family wage jobs and a trained workforce
7. Business climate: regional climate supporting investment and job creation
8. Entrepreneurship and innovation: harnessing and encouraging the assets in the region
9. Infrastructure: transportation, information, technology, and location (housing and resources)
10. Quality of life: supporting residents and drawing investment

Discussion

MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion

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

Households with problems, by far the most frequent of which is high cost in relation to household income, are located throughout the Cities rather than in one area. The likelihood of housing problems, though, is higher in lower income block groups discussed below.

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

Defining "minority" as Hispanic and/or race other than white alone, 46% of the population in Lakewood and 40% of the population in Tacoma in 2010 was minority. Areas of disproportionate concentration are those in which there is a greater than 10% difference than the jurisdiction as a whole. While the Consolidated Plan for Lakewood and Tacoma was prepared as a regional plan, populations in the cities differ; therefore, disproportionate concentrations of minority populations were computed separately. (See Appendix D for listing of block groups with disproportionate minority concentrations.)

Block groups in Lakewood in which 57% or more of the population was minority were considered to have disproportionate concentrations. That was the case in ten block groups. Most block groups with disproportionate concentrations of minority populations in Lakewood were found along the Pacific Highway. This included most of the Pacific Neighborhood, a portion of the Lakeview Neighborhood between Lakeview Avenue and Bridgeport Way SW, and sections of the Northeast Lakewood Neighborhood. In relation to the total population of Lakewood, 21% live in block groups that have a disproportionate share of minority population.

Block groups in Tacoma in which 51% or more of the population was minority in 2010 were considered to have disproportionate concentrations. That was the case in 43 block groups. These areas were primarily located just north of I-5 between Sprague and Yakima to 6th and south of I-5 in several areas including areas east of Pacific Avenue, scattered block groups north of 96th and west of Yakima, and along South Tacoma Way. In relation to the total population of Tacoma, 26% live in block groups that have a disproportionate share of minority population.

Low-moderate income block groups are those in which 51% or more of the population lives in households with incomes below 80% of Area Median Income (AMI). The latest HUD tabulations (2014

using 2006-2010 ACS data) showed 27 qualifying block groups in Lakewood and 73 qualifying block groups in Tacoma. In Lakewood the qualifying areas are found primarily in Tillicum/Woodbrook, and north and south along I-5 in East Lakewood. In Tacoma, the qualifying block groups are located throughout the City, but areas with the highest percent low-mod population are in south Tacoma (south of I-5 and east of Portland Avenue) and in the downtown area.

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

Are there any community assets in these areas/neighborhoods?

Are there other strategic opportunities in any of these areas?

Strategic Plan

SP-05 Overview

Strategic Plan Overview

This strategic plan sets priority needs and goals for the City of Tacoma and the City of Lakewood over the next five years. Priorities were established after review of information and data, broad discussions in the community, consideration of strategic plans of partner agencies and providers in the region, and City planning documents. While Tacoma and Lakewood have been a HOME Consortium and prepared parallel strategic plans in the past, this is the first Consolidated Plan and Five-Year Consortium Strategic Plan with shared elements. Each City will continue to prepare Annual Action Plans unique to their jurisdiction. Tacoma, through the Tacoma Community Redevelopment Authority, will administer HOME Consortium funds.

Three priority needs were established, each a high priority:

- Need for affordable housing choice
- Need for basic services and for homeless prevention and intervention
- Need for community and economic development

Three goals were established to meet the needs:

- Increase and preserve affordable housing choice
- Reduce homelessness and increase stability
- Improve infrastructure, facilities and economic development

The Tacoma City Council sets funding priorities every two years for use of entitlement funds that guide applications; Lakewood City Council sets these goals annually. General priorities require consistency with the Consolidated Plan and funds are used to leverage funds from other sources when possible. Priorities further reflect Council direction regarding eligible activities in four broad areas: housing, community development, economic development, and public services. The order of these priorities is determined based on broader opportunities and needs within each jurisdiction. Public services in both Cities are also supported with General Fund dollars and allocations are coordinated under strategic plans for human services in both jurisdictions.

SP-10 Geographic Priorities - 91.415, 91.215(a)(1)

Geographic Area

Table 71 - Geographic Priority Areas

General Allocation Priorities

Describe the basis for allocating investments geographically within the state

There are currently no designated or HUD-approved geographic target areas in either Tacoma or Lakewood. The Cities will continue to focus improvements on areas that qualify because of concentrations of lower-income households. At the same time, both Tacoma and Lakewood recognize that advantages are gained in focusing development in areas, matching funding sources and concentrating efforts to make a noticeable and sustainable difference in an area for the benefit of the neighborhood and the larger jurisdiction. CDBG funds will be matched with funds from other sources to accomplish this goal. The City of Tacoma has partnered with the Tacoma Housing Authority, nonprofit housing and service providers, and other stakeholders to make dramatic improvements in the Central, Eastside, South Tacoma and South End neighborhoods. The Central Business District has benefited and remains a priority. In Lakewood, redevelopment in Tillicum has significantly improved opportunities for lower income households. Over the years improvements included installation of main sewer system, improvements to roads, sidewalks, parks, and the Tillicum Community Center have facilitated delivery of services in this isolated and impoverished neighborhood. In partnership with Tacoma Pierce County Habitat for Humanity, safe housing for purchase has replaced blighted and vacant buildings and introduced a new level of stability.

SP-25 Priority Needs - 91.415, 91.215(a)(2)

Priority Needs

Table 72 – Priority Needs Summary

1	Priority Need Name	Affordable housing choice
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Low Moderate Large Families Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse veterans Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Victims of Domestic Violence
	Geographic Areas Affected	
	Associated Goals	Increase and preserve affordable housing choices

	Description	Housing condition and housing affordability are pressing issues in Tacoma and Lakewood. Developers struggle to provide sufficient affordable housing in light of high costs of land and materials, limited availability of land in built-out cities, the cost of providing infrastructure when land is found. Demand for affordable housing options is increasing especially with an aging population and others in need of accessible, lower-cost housing with access to service and amenities. Lower income households are already burdened and vulnerable to homelessness. Among renter households, 39% of those with incomes less than 100% of AMI (14,600 households) are paying more than 50% of household income for rent, or have other severe housing problems; 71% of renter households with incomes at or below 30% of AMI have severe housing problems. Among owner households (with incomes below 100% of AMI), 38% (7,410 households) had severe housing problems and 65% of owners with incomes at or below 30% of AMI had severe housing problems.
	Basis for Relative Priority	The need for affordable housing was consistently identified as a high priority by stakeholders interviewed and reports/plans reviewed for this Consolidated Plan. Lack of affordable housing is a barrier to stability for lower income households including working householders; for persons with special needs (victims of domestic violence, vulnerable veterans, persons with mental health or substance abuse problems); for people looking for safe and appropriate options in housing (aging seniors, young householders starting out). The need for a range of housing, including housing for middle income householders is a priority in redeveloping neighborhoods to create stability, attract businesses, and improve access to opportunities throughout the Cities.
2	Priority Need Name	Basic services & homeless prevention/intervention
	Priority Level	High

Population	Extremely Low Low Large Families Families with Children Elderly Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families Victims of Domestic Violence
Geographic Areas Affected	
Associated Goals	Reduce homelessness and increase stability
Description	There were 1,464 homeless persons counted in the 2014 Point-in-Time count in Pierce County; very conservatively 4,400 persons are homeless (as counted by the HMIS system). People wait for months for housing to escape homelessness and sometimes years to get into publicly subsidized housing. People with special needs (victims of domestic violence, persons with mental health/substance abuse problems, youth, veterans vulnerable to homelessness, frail elderly, persons with HIV/AIDS) need supportive services to attain stability and sometimes permanently to maintain stability and avoid homelessness. Providers struggle to meet needs with declining resources. Focus on sustaining services is not the only priority. Lifting people out of poverty, increasing earning capacity, providing training/job skills/life skills is included in activities to address this need.

	Basis for Relative Priority	Poverty was the most important barrier voiced by respondents to the United Way “listening sessions” held in setting priorities for funding. In Lakewood 20% of the population lives in poverty, as does 18% in Tacoma. Among youth under 18, 31% in Lakewood and 26% in Tacoma lived in poverty; among seniors, 10% in both Cities lived in poverty; and, among female householders with children under the age of 5, 55% in Tacoma and 63% in Lakewood lived in poverty. Lifting people out of poverty (and homelessness) and into stable housing, sometimes with long-term support services is a priority identified in plans and by stakeholders.
3	Priority Need Name	Community and Economic Development
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Low Moderate Middle Large Families Families with Children Elderly Non-housing Community Development
	Geographic Areas Affected	
	Associated Goals	Infrastructure, facilities & economic opportunity
	Description	Infrastructure (failing or lacking altogether) are priorities and are basic components in creating safe and vibrant neighborhoods and attracting businesses and jobs. Economic development and the need for jobs, especially those with living wages. As of 2013, 8.1% of civilian labor force in the Tacoma Metropolitan District was unemployed – 30,000 jobless (conservatively) and 60,000 counting those who quit looking or were underemployed. Tacoma and Lakewood are part of a regional, multi-county economy and are looking to build on strengths, putting housing and employment together (consistent with Puget Sound Regional Council Vision 2040 on the economy). These means building the infrastructure and labor force, along with job development. There is a need to provide multiple transportation options, trails and bike paths, increased density around business centers and transportation corridors, and increase accessibility for persons with disabilities throughout the Cities.

<p>Basis for Relative Priority</p>	<p>The need for community and economic development is a high priority. Capital Improvements Plans in both Cities outline extensive needs; the difficulty is prioritization of projects given limited resources and insufficient tax revenue to provide the needed infrastructure. The Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) contains five foundations including building family wage jobs; support for investment and job creation; encouraging innovation and entrepreneurship; building infrastructure; and, support quality of life.</p>
-------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Narrative (Optional)

SP-35 Anticipated Resources - 91.420(b), 91.215(a)(4), 91.220(c)(1,2)

Introduction

Funds in the first year of the plan are FY 2015 allocations. The amounts assumed to be available in the remaining four years of the plan are based on a combination of strategies. The City of Lakewood used a more conservative approach and used a percentage of allocations and program income.

Anticipated Resources

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
CDBG	public - federal	Acquisition Admin and Planning Economic Development Housing Public Improvements Public Services	467,748	53,000	0	520,748	2,068,678	

Table 73 - Anticipated Resources

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

The City of Tacoma matches CDBG and HOME funds with grants, local funds, nonprofit organizations, Low-Income Housing Tax Credits, corporate grants, and donations (among other sources) to increase the benefit and success of projects using federal CDBG, HOME, and ESG dollars. In fiscal year 2013, CDBG funds in the amount of about \$1.8 million and HOME funds (Consortium) of about \$1.2 million leveraged over

\$37.5 million. The Affordable Housing Fund, under the oversight of the Tacoma Community Redevelopment Authority, increases the ability of partners to provide affordable housing by providing a stable source of funding to leverage additional resources. Tacoma has committed federal CDBG and HOME funds to affordable projects early. Up-front local government support has been critical in anchoring projects and obtaining additional funding. Without that early commitment, competition would take funding elsewhere.

In Lakewood, as in Tacoma, CDBG expenditures leverage funding from multiple sources on nearly all projects, with the exception of homeowner rehabilitation/repair program (Major Home Repair and HOME Housing Rehabilitation). In fiscal year 2013, for example, CDBG funds in the amount of approximately \$400,000 leveraged non-CDBG funds nearly seven times that amount. A loan pool was established with a Section 108 loan for the purpose of economic development and job creation. Revolving loan funds from program income support housing development, infrastructure, economic development and public facilities. A joint-venture between the City of Lakewood, the Tacoma Housing Authority and LASA (Living Access Support Alliance) will provide housing and services for homeless individuals and families. A successful partnership between the City of Lakewood and Tacoma-Pierce County Habitat for Humanity will continue to provide new affordable housing opportunities in the Tillicum neighborhood.

HOME match requirements for the Consortium are met through multiple sources, including sources such as private grants and donations, Attorney General Funds, and the State Housing Trust Fund. In Tacoma, ESG match requirements are met through various sources, depending on the project. Sources in 2014-2015 included the Washington State, Pierce County, foundations and corporate grants, private donations and City of Tacoma General Fund dollars.

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

Use of publicly-owned land or property is not anticipated in projects currently planned or underway although if those opportunities arise, such land and property will be included.

Discussion

SP-40 Institutional Delivery Structure - 91.415, 91.215(k)

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

Responsible Entity	Responsible Entity Type	Role	Geographic Area Served
City of Lakewood	Government	Economic Development Homelessness Non-homeless special needs Ownership Planning neighborhood improvements public facilities public services	Jurisdiction

Table 74 - Institutional Delivery Structure

Assess of Strengths and Gaps in the Institutional Delivery System

In the City of Tacoma, projects funded with CDBG funds are administered by the Community and Economic Development Department with oversight by the Tacoma Community Redevelopment Authority and the Human Services Commission, both appointed by the Tacoma City Council. Tacoma and Lakewood receive HOME (Home Investment Partnership) funds jointly as a Consortium. The Tacoma Community Redevelopment Authority administers housing programs using both CDBG and HOME funds, with support from City staff. In Lakewood, projects funded with CDBG funds are administered by the Community Development Department, with public oversight by the Council-appointed CDBG Citizen's Advisory Board (CAB). The Homeownership Center of Tacoma is the Community Housing Development Organization (CHDO) in Tacoma and is successful in increasing housing in the region.

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

Homelessness Prevention Services	Available in the Community	Targeted to Homeless	Targeted to People with HIV
Homelessness Prevention Services			
Counseling/Advocacy	X	X	X
Legal Assistance	X	X	X
Mortgage Assistance	X		
Rental Assistance	X	X	X
Utilities Assistance	X	X	X

Street Outreach Services			
Law Enforcement	X	X	
Mobile Clinics	X	X	
Other Street Outreach Services	X	X	X
Supportive Services			
Alcohol & Drug Abuse	X	X	X
Child Care	X	X	
Education	X	X	
Employment and Employment Training	X	X	
Healthcare	X		X
HIV/AIDS	X	X	X
Life Skills	X	X	X
Mental Health Counseling	X	X	X
Transportation	X	X	X
Other			

Table 75 - Homeless Prevention Services Summary

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

There is an array of agencies providing services in Pierce County covering virtually all areas of need, including most areas of need for persons who are homeless or at risk of homelessness. Detailed information on service availability is regularly updated (Tacoma-Pierce County Coalition to end Homelessness, Member Resource Directory). The United Way 2-1-1 Call Center provides referrals for all callers and the Centralized Intake System through Access Point 4 Housing (AP4H) connects persons who are homeless with appropriate services and housing to the extent it is available.

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

There is considerable coordination between agencies. The Centralized Intake System has made a difference in avoiding duplication and increasing the ability to access the right form of help for those who are homeless. The strength in the array of community partners who made services available and work with one another to identify gaps. The Human Services Collaboration in Pierce County draws agencies and funders together to align applications, identify needs and gaps, and take steps possible to strengthen the system.

Overwhelmingly the gaps can be attributed to lack of resources to meet the needs. Services are available, but there is not enough. Services and housing resources are inadequate to meet the need across the board. Not only is there a lack of emergency services, there is a lack of services and systems to bridge the period between crisis and stability. It is not for want of willing agencies. The *Human Services Needs Analysis Report (2014)* prepared by the City of Lakewood, the City of Tacoma *Human Services Strategic Plan (2015-2019)*, and 2012 Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department *Community Mental Health and Chemical Dependency Assessment* are among key reports identifying gaps in services and strategies to meet the needs. Outreach for this Consolidated Plan reiterated the gaps. The types of needs are discussed in earlier sections. It should be noted that it is not just of the lack of services in sufficient quantity or duration, needs are made more difficult to overcome by lack of transportation (the right bus routes at the right time and in the right frequency), unaffordable child care (also at the right times, for example, to meet work schedules), poverty/lack of living wage jobs, lack of affordable housing, and isolation because of language or cultural differences that are not addressed in the current delivery system.

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

Lakewood and Tacoma continue to participate in the Human Services Collaboration in Pierce County, the Lakewood/Tacoma/Pierce County Continuum of Care, and other collaborations to identify strategies to strengthen the service delivery system. Both are on the subcommittees for SHB2163 and SHB2060 that establish policies and funding priorities for use of document recording fees set by that legislation. Human services are funded in both jurisdictions with general funds, guided by strategic plans. Importantly, the Tacoma City Council approved a sales tax increase (0.1%) for use in addressing needs of persons with mental health and chemical dependency issues. Decisions on use of funds and priorities are coordinated across departments in both Cities and across agencies in Pierce County. The Pierce County Human Services Collaboration brings needs, gaps and opportunities to the front of the discussion as does the Lakewood/Tacoma/Pierce County Continuum of Care.

SP-45 Goals - 91.415, 91.215(a)(4)

Goals Summary Information

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
1	Increase and preserve affordable housing choices	2015	2019	Affordable Housing Public Housing Homeless		Affordable housing choice		Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated: 26 Household Housing Unit Direct Financial Assistance to Homebuyers: 5 Households Assisted
2	Reduce homelessness and increase stability	2015	2019	Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs		Basic services & homeless prevention/intervention		
3	Infrastructure, facilities & economic opportunity	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development		Community and Economic Development		Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 32415 Persons Assisted Jobs created/retained: 2 Jobs Buildings Demolished: 16 Buildings

Table 76 – Goals Summary

Goal Descriptions

1	Goal Name	Increase and preserve affordable housing choices
	Goal Description	Projects contributing to increasing affordable housing choice include home repairs and weatherization to preserve the condition of owner-occupied units; down payment assistance for new homeowners; developing new rental housing opportunities; rehabilitation of rental housing; supporting development of new subsidized housing; and, increasing permanent supportive housing.
2	Goal Name	Reduce homelessness and increase stability
	Goal Description	Projects contributing to reducing homelessness and increasing stability of Tacoma and Lakewood residents include providing supportive services to meet basic needs; providing supportive services to move toward self-sufficiency; projects that provide job training and education; emergency services, including support for shelters and transitional housing; and supporting services for people with special needs.
3	Goal Name	Infrastructure, facilities & economic opportunity
	Goal Description	Projects that support improving infrastructure, facilities and economic opportunities include maintain and improving community facilities; maintaining and improving infrastructure (such as streets, sidewalks, ADA improvements); improvements to facades and other projects to attract and support businesses; support for micro-enterprises and small business development; historic preservation; and removal of slums and blight.

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

SP-65 Lead-based Paint Hazards - 91.415, 91.215(i)

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

Consistent with Title X of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992, the Cities of Tacoma and Lakewood provide information on lead-safe practices to owners of all properties receiving up to \$5,000 of federally-funded assistance. If work on painted surfaces is involved in properties constructed prior to 1978, the presence of lead is assumed and safe work practices are followed. In addition to the above, homes with repairs in excess of \$5,000 in federally-funded rehabilitation assistance are assessed for risk (completed by a certified LBP firm) or are presumed to have lead. If surfaces to be disturbed are determined to contain lead, interim controls are exercised, occupants notified, and clearance test performed by an EPA certified firm. Properties constructed prior to 1978 and acquired with federal funds are inspected for hazards and acquired rental properties are inspected periodically.

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

Lead-safe practices are required in all rehabilitation programs where housing was constructed prior to 1978, as described above.

SP-70 Anti-Poverty Strategy - 91.415, 91.215(j)

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

The Cities will continue to support programs and projects that assist low-income persons, including projects that offer solutions to help them out of poverty. All three of the goals in this Strategic Plan have the capacity to reduce the number of households living in poverty. Further, CDBG, HOME and ESG funds leverage additional monies to address the same issues. Projects are also the result of long collaborations between agencies and partners, including Pierce County, the Tacoma Housing Authority and the Pierce County Housing Authority. Funding from other sources – local, state, federal, foundations, private donors – are coordinated for the best benefit given continually declining resources.

The goal of increasing and preserving affordable housing choice includes projects that will provide new housing to lower income households, some with ongoing subsidy and support. Decreasing the cost of housing is one significant way of increasing household income, leaving more for households to allocate to helping themselves (training, transportation, childcare). Down payment assistance programs, along with housing counseling, will allow households to build equity and achieve stability in neighborhoods. Housing repair programs allow persons to live in safer housing and improve the neighborhood. Funds used to acquire blighted properties and replace with safe units for ownership create avenues out of poverty for low-income buyers and increase the value of neighboring properties.

The goal of reducing homelessness and increasing stability of residents likewise offers a path out of poverty and homelessness. Household-focused and individual-focused case management, coupled with rapid rehousing can eliminate periods of debilitating homelessness and rebuild attachment to the community, productive employment and education, all of which are challenged during periods of homelessness. Support for job training, literacy, and early interventions for youth provide incentives and skills for employment.

The goal of improving infrastructure, facilities and economic opportunities also has the capacity to help households and neighborhoods out of poverty. Investing in infrastructure and improvements to revitalize neighborhoods raises the quality of the neighborhood, makes it more attractive for new residents and more attractive to other investment and businesses providing jobs. Projects to improve business areas and to make façade improvements also increase the potential for investment. Projects also fund small business development directly, some through revolving loan funds, all of which result in jobs for lower income persons, some of whom enter the programs from poverty. Major barriers to achieving reductions in the number of households in poverty are limited resources (including funding) and broad changes in local economies beyond control of the Cities.

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

The Cities of Tacoma and Lakewood work closely with the Tacoma Housing Authority (Moving to Work) and the Pierce County Housing Authority and support Family Self-Sufficiency programs. Both Tacoma and Lakewood are represented on the Tacoma/Pierce County Affordable Housing Consortium to work on issues of affordable housing. Both are party to implementing many of the policies recommended by the Affordable Housing Advisory Group created at the request of the City of Tacoma. Policies about affordable housing concern both disposable income and housing cost. Looking even more broadly, Tacoma and Lakewood participate in a multicounty planning system (Puget Sound Regional Council) that is looking at regional growth and economic development, as well as equal access to opportunities.

SP-80 Monitoring - 91.230

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

Desk monitoring will consist of close examination of periodic reports submitted by subrecipients or property owners for compliance with program regulations and subrecipient agreements as well as compliance with requirements to report on progress and outcome measures specific to each award. As a condition of loan approval, the Tacoma Community Redevelopment Authority (TCRA) may have imposed additional requirements in the form of targeted set-asides (e.g., homeless units). Document review will occur at least annually and more frequently if determined necessary. Wherever possible, problems are corrected through discussions or negotiation with the subrecipient. As individual situations dictate, additional desk monitoring, onsite monitoring, and/or technical assistance is provided.

Timing and frequency of onsite monitoring depends on the complexity of the activity and the degree to which an activity or subrecipient is at risk of noncompliance with program requirements. More frequent visits may occur depending on identification of potential problems or risks. The purpose of monitoring, which can include reviewing records, property inspections, or other activities appropriate to the project, is to identify any potential areas of noncompliance and assist the subrecipient in making the necessary changes to allow for successful implementation and completion of the activity.

The Tacoma Community Redevelopment Authority (TCRA) will contract with an independent third party inspection company to conduct onsite inspections of its rental housing portfolio. The purpose of the inspections is to insure that rental housing meets or exceeds the Uniform Physical Condition Standards (UPCS). Inspections of each property will take place at least every three years.

Expected Resources

AP-15 Expected Resources - 91.420(b), 91.220(c)(1,2)

Introduction

Funds in the first year of the plan are FY 2015 allocations. The amounts assumed to be available in the remaining four years of the plan are based on a combination of strategies. The City of Lakewood used a more conservative approach and used a percentage of allocations and program income.

Anticipated Resources

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
CDBG	public - federal	Acquisition Admin and Planning Economic Development Housing Public Improvements Public Services	467,748	53,000	0	520,748	2,068,678	

Table 77 - Expected Resources – Priority Table

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

The City of Tacoma matches CDBG and HOME funds with grants, local funds, nonprofit organizations, Low-Income Housing Tax Credits, corporate grants, and donations (among other sources) to increase the benefit and success of projects using federal CDBG, HOME, and ESG dollars. In fiscal year 2013, CDBG funds in the amount of about \$1.8 million and HOME funds (Consortium) of about \$1.2 million leveraged over \$37.5 million. The Affordable Housing Fund, under the oversight of the Tacoma Community Redevelopment Authority, increases the ability of partners to provide affordable housing by providing a stable source of funding to leverage additional resources. Tacoma has committed federal CDBG and HOME funds to affordable projects early. Up-front local government support has been critical in anchoring projects and obtaining additional funding. Without that early commitment, competition would take funding elsewhere.

In Lakewood, as in Tacoma, CDBG expenditures leverage funding from multiple sources on nearly all projects, with the exception of homeowner rehabilitation/repair program (Major Home Repair and HOME Housing Rehabilitation). In fiscal year 2013, for example, CDBG funds in the amount of approximately \$400,000 leveraged non-CDBG funds nearly seven times that amount. A loan pool was established with a Section 108 loan for the purpose of economic development and job creation. Revolving loan funds from program income support housing development, infrastructure, economic development and public facilities. A joint-venture between the City of Lakewood, the Tacoma Housing Authority and LASA (Living Access Support Alliance) will provide housing and services for homeless individuals and families. A successful partnership between the City of Lakewood and Tacoma-Pierce County Habitat for Humanity will continue to provide new affordable housing opportunities in the Tillicum neighborhood.

HOME match requirements for the Consortium are met through multiple sources, including sources such as private grants and donations, Attorney General Funds, and the State Housing Trust Fund. In Tacoma, ESG match requirements are met through various sources, depending on the project. Sources in 2014-2015 included the Washington State, Pierce County, foundations and corporate grants, private donations and City of Tacoma General Fund dollars.

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

Use of publicly-owned land or property is not anticipated in projects currently planned or underway although if those opportunities arise, such land and property will be included.

Discussion

Annual Goals and Objectives

AP-20 Annual Goals and Objectives - 91.420, 91.220(c)(3)&(e)

Goals Summary Information

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
1	Increase and preserve affordable housing choices	2015	2019	Affordable Housing Public Housing Homeless		Affordable housing choice		Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated: 5 Household Housing Unit Direct Financial Assistance to Homebuyers: 1 Households Assisted
2	Reduce homelessness and increase stability	2015	2019	Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs		Basic services & homeless prevention/intervention		
3	Infrastructure, facilities & economic opportunity	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development		Community and Economic Development		Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 12753 Persons Assisted Jobs created/retained: 1 Jobs Buildings Demolished: 3 Buildings

Table 78 – Goals Summary

Goal Descriptions

1	Goal Name	Increase and preserve affordable housing choices
	Goal Description	
2	Goal Name	Reduce homelessness and increase stability
	Goal Description	
3	Goal Name	Infrastructure, facilities & economic opportunity
	Goal Description	

AP-35 Projects - 91.420, 91.220(d)

Introduction

The 2015 Annual Action Plan provides general project descriptions and funding details in support of the goals and priorities as identified in the Consolidated Plan. Funding is to be focused primarily on infrastructure improvements in support of economic development opportunities throughout Lakewood. Homelessness and public services needs are to be targeted with General Fund allocations in FY 2015.

#	Project Name
1	108th Street Roadway Improvements
2	Major Home Repair
3	Administration
4	Down Payment Assistance
5	Economic Development Business Loan Program
6	CDBG administration of HOME Housing Services

Table 79 – Project Information

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

Through a planning and citizen participation process, FY 2015 policies and priorities were developed for addressing community and economic development, removal of blight, revitalizing underserved neighborhoods, eliminating threats to public health and safety, and conserving/expanding stocks of affordable housing. Included in this process was a review of alternative funding sources, including City General Funds, State and other local funding sources available to meet an array of needs. As a result of this process, the Lakewood City Council adopted the following policies and priorities on the use of FY 2015 CDBG and HOME funds in order of priority:

11. Physical Infrastructure Improvements
12. Public Service
13. Housing
14. Economic Development

AP-38 Project Summary

Project Summary Information

1	Project Name	108th Street Roadway Improvements
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Infrastructure, facilities & economic opportunity
	Needs Addressed	Community and Economic Development
	Funding	:
	Description	Project will provide accessibility improvements, including sidewalk, signalization, ramps, and roadway improvements necessary to meet current ADA requirements along 108th St SW.
	Target Date	6/30/2016
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	The infrastructure improvements will provide an area benefit to a total of 12,753 Lakewood citizens, of which 7,185 are low and moderate income individuals.
	Location Description	
	Planned Activities	
2	Project Name	Major Home Repair
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Increase and preserve affordable housing choices
	Needs Addressed	Affordable housing choice
	Funding	:

	Description	Provides major home repair/sewer connection loans which may include connection of side-sewers to sewer main, decommissioning of septic systems, roofing, architectural barrier removal, plumbing, electrical, weatherization, major systems replacement/upgrade, general rehabilitation, etc, for low-income homeowners.
	Target Date	6/30/2016
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	Project will provide housing repair assistance loans to 3 low and moderate income households.
	Location Description	
	Planned Activities	
3	Project Name	Administration
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	
	Needs Addressed	
	Funding	:
	Description	Administration cost to support overall program management, coordination, monitoring and evaluation, as managed by the Community Development Department.
	Target Date	6/30/2016
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	
	Location Description	
	Planned Activities	
4	Project Name	Down Payment Assistance

	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Increase and preserve affordable housing choices
	Needs Addressed	Affordable housing choice
	Funding	:
	Description	Provides down payment assistance, including housing counseling services, to low income homebuyers for the purpose of providing affordable homeownership opportunities.
	Target Date	
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	Project will provide direct financial assistance to one low income household.
	Location Description	
	Planned Activities	
5	Project Name	Economic Development Business Loan Program
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Infrastructure, facilities & economic opportunity
	Needs Addressed	Community and Economic Development
	Funding	:
	Description	Provides for a low-interest business loan fund for the purpose of creating and expanding economic opportunities for low income individuals or to create and/or retaining low-income jobs. Funding will assist microenterprises with development of existing businesses throughout the year.
	Target Date	
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	Project will create or retain one job for a low and moderate income person through direct financial assistance to business(es).

	Location Description	
	Planned Activities	
6	Project Name	CDBG administration of HOME Housing Services
	Target Area	
	Goals Supported	Increase and preserve affordable housing choices
	Needs Addressed	Affordable housing choice
	Funding	:
	Description	Program administration and housing services in support of HOME Program.
	Target Date	6/30/2015
	Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities	Program will assist two low and moderate income households with housing repair assistance.
	Location Description	
	Planned Activities	

AP-50 Geographic Distribution - 91.420, 91.220(f)

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

In targeting CDBG and HOME funds, the City has typically looked to block groups with at least 51% low and moderate income populations as many of Lakewood's minority and ethnic populations continue to be concentrated in these areas. Many of these block groups tend to have a higher concentration of renter-occupied housing units that suffer from a general state of slums and blight, large concentrations of aged housing stock suffering from a lack of routine maintenance, and infrastructure improvements that are either inadequate or are outdated in accordance with current development requirements.

In FY 2015, Lakewood is looking to make crucial infrastructure investments to those low income block groups where the infrastructure is either lacking or inadequate to ensure public safety and accessibility. By funding accessibility improvements, including sidewalk, signalization, ramps, and roadway improvements necessary to meet current ADA requirements along 108th St. SW, the City is targeting the predominantly low income Census Tracts 71805, 71807, and 71901. Additionally, the City plans to continue its targeting of the low income Census Tract 72000 with its Major Home Repair/Sewer Loan Program which assists low and moderate income homeowners with connection fees and construction costs associated with connecting to recently constructed sewers in these neighborhoods. For all other funding, the City has not identified specific targeted areas; programs are open to eligible low and moderate income individuals citywide.

Geographic Distribution

Target Area	Percentage of Funds

Table 80 - Geographic Distribution

Rationale for the priorities for allocating investments geographically

Discussion

AP-85 Other Actions - 91.420, 91.220(k)

Introduction

Actions planned to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs

The City will continue to support fair housing education and other activities that support fair housing for all. Potential activities include workshops focused on education and the equal application of landlord/tenant and fair housing laws and relocation assistance for individuals at risk of homelessness through no fault of their own due to discriminatory housing practices, or as a result of building and code enforcement closures, fires, or redevelopment activities. Funding for Lakewood's relocation assistance program is provided through a grant from the Nisqually Indian Tribe Grant program.

In FY 2015, the City will offer an emergency housing repair program for households that do not qualify for the City's CDBG and HOME-funded programs. The program will utilize grant funds provided by the Nisqually Indian Tribe to make emergency repairs to low income, owner-occupied households who otherwise lack the means to make the necessary repairs.

Actions planned to foster and maintain affordable housing

Lakewood recognizes the importance affordable housing and homeownership play in building vibrant communities. The City encourages the redevelopment of blighted and abandoned properties through collaboration with Tacoma-Pierce County Habitat for Humanity, developing new single-family affordable housing units in the Tillicum neighborhood and throughout Lakewood. Acquisition of existing single-family housing stock is supported through the down payment assistance programs (CDBG and HOME). Multifamily housing is supported and encouraged with Lakewood's Affordable Housing Fund (HOME) as well as through zoning density bonuses offered to developers of affordable housing. Finally, the Major Home Repair (CDBG) and Housing Rehabilitation (HOME) programs offer homeowners an opportunity to maintain existing housing affordability by remedying deferred maintenance and code related deficiencies.

The City has a long-standing partnership with the Pierce County Housing Authority in developing and maintaining affordable housing opportunities for Lakewood residents. Activities have included the replacement of stairs, landings, doors and windows, roof repair and replacement, electrical upgrades, weatherization activities, and the installation of sewer upgrades/connections. Recent partnerships have been extended to the Tacoma Housing Authority to construct Prairie Oaks, a 15-unit permanent affordable housing complex for low income families. The City also maintains connections with many

nonprofit housing organizations such as: Network Tacoma, LASA, Metropolitan Development Council, Catholic Community Services, The Rescue Mission, Pierce County Coalition for Developmental Disabilities, YMCA and YWCA, Rebuilding Together South Sound, Greater Lakes, and Associated Ministries. It is through these partnerships the City is able to leverage its resources and develop projects on a much larger scale than would be possible on our own.

Actions planned to reduce lead-based paint hazards

In accordance with the Washington State Renovation, Repair and Painting Program and 24 CFR Part 35, subparts A, B, J, K, and R, the City of Lakewood requires that all projects/homes receiving CDBG or HOME funds that were built prior to 1978, with construction costs over \$5,000, be inspected and analyzed for the presence of lead-based paint or are to be presumed to contain lead. All lead hazards be identified through this process are required to be brought into compliance with Title X of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 as part of the project's scope of work. CDBG and HOME funds may be provided for testing, risk assessment, and clearances for eligible activities.

With approximately 65% of Lakewood's 26,627 housing units being built prior to 1978, there exists the potential for 17,307 housing units to contain lead-based paint hazards of some kind. To inform the community of the hazards of lead-based paint the City offers copies of the EPA's "Protect Your Family from Lead in Your Home" and HUD's "Renovate Right" pamphlets at City Hall and provides copies of these pamphlets to all housing repair program applicants. As part of the City's single and multifamily housing programs, XRF paint inspections and Risk Assessments are conducted, lead-safe work is conducted by Washington State certified RRP renovation contractors, abatement work is conducted by certified abatement contractors, and Clearance testing of all disturbed surfaces is performed by certified Risk Assessors.

In FY 2015, the City expects to conduct lead paint inspections on all properties funded with the down payment assistance program and risk assessments on up to five homes served by housing repair programs. When completed, all homes will be free of lead-based paint hazards.

Actions planned to reduce the number of poverty-level families

Actions to reduce the number of poverty-level families include the funding of vital services and programs focused on outcome driven, client centered services that lead to housing stability and economic opportunity. Funding through the 1% human services allocation is targeted to programs that provide low income households with housing stability, basic needs (health, food, clothing, etc.), services directed towards self-sufficiency (domestic violence, child care, job training, etc.). For 2015, the City anticipates funding of these programs to reach approximately \$320,000.

Additional actions include the implementation of a recent needs analysis conducted to review and analyze gaps in services and opportunities both in Lakewood and the county. By ensuring programs funded serve the needs of Lakewood citizens, and those needs could not be met through other programs or funding sources, the City is ensuring a best-practices approach to critical services funding.

Actions planned to develop institutional structure

In an effort to better coordinate and improve the implementation of the Consolidated Plan and human services program, the city recently combined the Community Development Block Grant Citizens Advisory Board and the Human Services Funding Advisory Board into one advisory body, the Community Services Advisory Board (CSAB). The newly formed CSAB functions in a review and advisory capacity to City administration and City Council regarding program priorities and funding recommendations for both human services and CDBG/HOME programs.

Board responsibilities include facilitating the cooperation and coordination of human services and Consolidated Plan activities, holding public hearings to receive input on community development and human service's needs, developing policy guidance and program evaluation criteria, and making funding recommendations. On the human services side, the Board is responsible for reviewing needs assessments and gap analyses in order to develop a strategic action plan. Additionally, the Board provides guidance and recommendations in preparing the City's CDBG and HOME funding policies and priorities, Consolidated Plan, Annual Action Plan, and Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation Report. As part of the Section 108 process, the Board serves as a review panel for potential loan applicants.

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

The City is the convener of monthly human services Collaboration meetings. Collaboration partners include for profit and nonprofit providers of housing, services, homeless programs, dv and family services, youth programs, food banks, and healthcare services.

Pierce County homeless providers, developers and governmental agencies have joined to develop a comprehensive plan for a coordinated care system for the homeless with the goal of ending homelessness in the county. In 1996, the Tacoma/Pierce County Coalition for the Homeless created the Pierce County Continuum of Care (CoC) to serve as the planning body of this Coalition. Lakewood is a member of the CoC and participates in the monthly meeting to discuss issues related to the activities of

the long-range plan of reducing homelessness.

Lakewood, Tacoma and Pierce County adopted a Ten-Year Plan to End Chronic Homelessness in 2004, and are represented on the Tacoma/Pierce County Coalition for the Homeless to collaborate in reducing chronic homelessness. The plan describes a need for therapeutic treatment and case management services for the mentally ill and substance abusing populations, linking housing with services, creating low cost permanent supportive housing and creating systems changes through education and advocacy.

The City continues to maintain collaborative relationships with many nonprofit agencies, local housing authorities, mental and social service agencies, and local and State governmental agencies to provide access to health care and other programs and services, provide a continuum of affordable housing, support education and training opportunities to aid in obtaining livable-wage jobs, and promote services that encourage self-sufficiency as a lasting solution to breaking the cycle of poverty.

Discussion

Program Specific Requirements

AP-90 Program Specific Requirements - 91.420, 91.220(I)(1,2,4)

Introduction

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

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

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

Other CDBG Requirements

1. The amount of urgent need activities	0
2. The estimated percentage of CDBG funds that will be used for activities that benefit persons of low and moderate income. Overall Benefit - A consecutive period of one, two or three years may be used to determine that a minimum overall benefit of 70% of CDBG funds is used to benefit persons of low and moderate income. Specify the years covered that include this Annual Action Plan.	100.00%

Discussion

Appendix - Alternate/Local Data Sources