

Consolidated Plan

2010 Executive Summary



NYCTM PLANNING
DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING CITY OF NEW YORK

Effective as of August 6, 2010

Consolidated Plan

2010

Executive Summary



Michael R. Bloomberg

Mayor, City of New York

Amanda M. Burden FAICP

Director, Department of City Planning

NYCPLANNING
DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING CITY OF NEW YORK

Department of City Planning
22 Reade Street, New York, N.Y. 10007-1216

nyc.gov/planning

DCP # 09-09

2010 CONSOLIDATED PLAN

August 6, 2010

Executive Summary

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	ES-1
Citizen Participation.....	ES-1
Institutional Structure.....	ES-2
Part I: Community Profile.....	ES-3
Population Profile	ES-3
Housing Profile	ES-4
Public Housing Profile.....	ES-6
Supportive Housing Continuum of Care the Homeless and Other Special Needs Populations.....	ES-6
Part II: Five-Year Strategic Plan.....	ES-8
Part III: One-Year Action Plan	ES-9
Summary of Annual Use of Grant Funds	ES-9
Summary of Funding from All Sources.....	ES-11
Summary of Citizens' Comments/Agencies' Responses.....	ES-11
Additional Information	ES-15

Executive Summary

2010 Consolidated Plan

Introduction

The *2010 Consolidated Plan* is the City of New York's annual application to the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for the four Office of Community Planning and Development entitlement programs: Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnership (HOME), Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG), and Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA).

New York City's Consolidated Plan Program Year 2010 begins January 1, 2010 and ends December 31, 2010. According to federal Consolidated Plan regulations, localities are required to submit their Proposed Plan no later than 45 days prior to the start of the Program Year (November 15, 2009).

In addition to its One-Year Action Plan for the 2010 Consolidated Plan Program Year, the Proposed Plan contained New York City's submission to HUD of its Five-Year Strategic Plan for Consolidated Plan Years 2010-2014. Therefore, the approved *2010 Consolidated Plan* consists of four volumes: Volume 1. Community Profile, and Supportive Housing Continuum of Care; Volume 2. Five-Year Strategic Plan: Priorities and Actions; Volume 3. Action Plan: One Year Use of Funds; Volume 4. Other Actions; Summary of Citizens' Comments, and Appendices.

Citizen Participation

In the Consolidated Plan Formulation Process

In accordance with federal regulations 24 CFR 91.105(e)(1), regarding Consolidated Plan citizen participation requirements, the City of New York conducted a public hearing to solicit comments on the formulation of the Proposed 2010 Consolidated Plan on April 14, 2009.

New Yorkers were invited to attend and participate in the formulation and development of the Consolidated Plan in several ways. Over 2,200 notification letters were sent to New York City residents, organizations and public officials inviting participation in the public hearing. In addition, notices of the previously mentioned activity were published in three local newspapers, one English-language, a Spanish-language, and a Chinese-language daily, each with citywide circulation. Furthermore, a notice was placed as a public service message on the New York City-operated local cable television access channel. The respective notices included relevant Plan-related information so that informed comments are facilitated.

The summarized citizens' comments and agencies' responses are provided at the end of this Executive Summary.

Over the past several Consolidated Plan program years, there has been a decrease in participation in New York City's Consolidated Plan Citizen Participation process. The decrease may be attributed to several factors. First, the steady decrease in federal formula entitlement funds appropriated by Congress for municipalities over the past several years has left New York City little or no opportunity to fund new initiatives or activities proposed or advocated by the public. This is due to the fact that the entitlement grant monies received are used to maintain the activities of the City's existing programs at or near their previous levels.

Second, the formula entitlement funds are used in combination with other funding sources, such as City Capital and Tax Levy funds, and are therefore guided by the City's budget formulation process. The City's Charter-mandated budget process provides numerous opportunities for citizens to provide input. The public and

nonprofit organizations use the budget formulation process to advocate for and make recommendations regarding the City's use of HUD entitlement funds as part of a range of potential city, state and federal funding sources to address their needs. The Consolidated Plan is a reflection of the decisions made in that process. The budget formulation schedule is fully described in Volume 4 of the Proposed Consolidated Plan, Part IV.A., Citizen Participation Plan. In addition, the New York City Independent Budget Office (IBO) has a pamphlet: *The Road to Adopting New York City's Budget*, which provides a brief overview of the process and contact information regarding the various local government entities which contribute to or provide input regarding the City's proposed budget. The pamphlet is available on the web at: <http://www.ibo.nyc.ny.us/IBORoadmap.pdf>.

Lastly, as a result of the overall decrease in the amount of federal formula entitlement funds the City has received, the public and nonprofit organizations have used the City's budget formulation process to petition the Council to increase the City's allocation of its own funds to various programs in order to offset the reductions in the amount of federal entitlement monies allocated/budgeted to the respective programs.

In the Public Comment Review Period and Public Hearing

In order to notify the public of the release of the Proposed Consolidated Plan for public review and of the federally-required public hearing on the contents of the document, the City utilized the same notification methods as it did to announce the public hearing for the formulation of the Proposed Plan. In addition, copies of the *Proposed 2010 Consolidated Plan* were mailed to both the Chairperson and District Manager of each of the City's 59 Community Boards.

To provide public access to the document, copies of the *Proposed 2010 Consolidated Plan* could be obtained at the **City Planning Bookstore**, 22 Reade Street, New York, New York 10007, Phone: 212-720-3667, (**Monday 12:00 pm to 4:00 pm, Tuesday through Friday 10:00 am to 1:00 pm**) or any of the New York City Department of City Planning borough offices. (See end of summary for the locations of the Department of City Planning borough offices.)

In addition, copies of the Proposed Consolidated Plan were made available for reference in the City's Municipal Reference & Research Center (the City Hall Library), and the main public library in each of the five boroughs. (The locations of the respective libraries are provided at the end of the Summary).

Furthermore, the Department of City Planning posted the *Proposed 2010 Consolidated Plan* on the Department's website in Adobe Acrobat format for review by the public. The Internet-based version may be accessed at:

<http://www.nyc.gov/planning>

Public comments received from the public comment period, the public hearing and agencies' responses will be incorporated into the version of the Proposed 2010 Consolidated Plan submitted to HUD

Institutional Structure

The New York City Consolidated Plan serves not only as the City's application for federal funds for four HUD Office of Community Planning and Development formula programs (CDBG, HOME, ESG and HOPWA), but also as the HOPWA grant application for three (3) surrounding counties within the New York Eligible Metropolitan Statistical Area (EMSA): Putnam; Rockland; and, Westchester. The County of Westchester

administers the HOPWA funds for the cities of Mount Vernon, New Rochelle, and Yonkers which are incorporated within its boundaries.

The New York City Department of City Planning is the lead agency in the City's Consolidated Plan application process and is responsible for the formulation, preparation and development of each year's proposed Consolidated Plan. City Planning coordinates Plan-related activities between the Consolidated Plan Committee member agencies and the federal government.

The four federal entitlement programs, CDBG, HOME, HOPWA and ESG, are administered by the following City agencies respectively Office of Management and Budget (OMB), the Department of Housing Preservation and Development (HPD), the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene – Bureau of HIV/AIDS Prevention and Control (DOHMH-BHAPC), and the Department of Homeless Services (DHS).

In addition, the New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA), using primarily Public Housing Capital funds, administers public housing new construction, rehabilitation and modernization activities, and home ownership opportunity programs, along with a Section 8 rental certificate and voucher program for its tenant population.

Furthermore, the City of New York's Continuum of Care for the Homeless and Other Special Needs Populations is administered by various City agencies, each according to their respective area of expertise. The supportive housing programs and services are funded primarily with City (capital and/or expense) and/or State funds.

The Department of Homeless Services (DHS) coordinates social and physical services for homeless families and individuals. Programs for runaway and homeless youth and children aging out of foster care are administered by the Department of Youth and Community Development (DYCD) and Administration for Children's Services (ACS), respectively.

The Human Resources Administration (HRA) provides a range of public benefits and social services which assist in homeless prevention and/or diversion. These are often delivered in conjunction with government sponsored housing efforts. Through HRA's HIV/AIDS Administration (HASA), HRA provides emergency and supported housing assistance and services for families, single adults and children with HIV-related illness or AIDS. The City's Department of Health and Mental Hygiene - Division of Mental Hygiene, along with the State's Offices of Mental Health (OMH), Office of Mental Retardation/Developmental Disabilities (OMRDD), and Office of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse Services (OASAS), plans, contracts for, and monitors services for these disability areas and provides planning support to OASAS in the field of substance abuse services. Several other City agencies address the concerns of targeted groups of citizens by providing housing information and supportive housing services assistance, such as the Department of the Aging (DFTA) (the elderly and frail elderly), the Mayor's Office for People with Disabilities (MOPD) (persons with a disability), and the Mayor's Office to Combat Domestic Violence (MOCDV) (victims of domestic violence).

Part I: Community Profile

Population Profile

New York City's total population in 2005-2007 was 8,246,310 (according to the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey (ACS) 3-Year Estimates). The City continued the trend towards diversity first reported in the 1990 Census: no one racial or ethnic group comprised more than half of the total population. Between 2005-2007, the number of whites and Hispanics remained the same at 35 percent (2,901,098) and 27 percent (2,260,141), respectively, of the City's total population. The Asian population now represents approximately 12 percent (945,004), while Black or African-American decreased to approximately 24 percent (1,952,817) of the total.

Compared with most of the country, New York City has a large share of both high-income households and low-income households. Approximately 35 percent of New York households have incomes at or above \$75,000, reflective of the rest of the U.S. (31 percent). However, 15 percent of the City's households have incomes below \$15,000, compared with only 13 percent in the rest of the country. The share of New Yorkers below the poverty line decreased from 21 percent in 1999 to 19 percent in 2005-2007. Between 1999 and 2005-2007, the population under 18 years and adults 18 to 64 experienced a decrease in the number of persons below the poverty line. However, the elderly (65 years and over) population below the poverty line increased by 15 percent from approximately 160,000 to 184,000.

New York City has the largest immigrant population of any city in the United States. According to the 2005-2007 ACS, there were over 3 million foreign-born persons living in New York City, constituting 36.9 percent of the total population. Nearly 1.5 million of the 3 million foreign-born persons living in New York City were naturalized citizens. Almost one-fifth of foreign-born New Yorkers in 2005-2007 were recent arrivals, having come into the country in 2000 or later. The median age for immigrants to New York City arriving after 2000 was 29 years, slightly below the figure of 31 years for the general population reported in the 2005-2007 ACS.

The median household income for foreign-headed households increased to \$44,700 or 28 percent over the 2000 median of \$35,000. However, this median household income was \$7,700 lower than that for native-headed households: \$44,700 compared with \$52,400. In percentage terms, the gap has increased slightly, with the foreign-headed household median about 85 percent of that for native-headed households, as compared to approximately 88 percent in 2000 and 90 percent in 1990.

There were over 3.1 million households in New York City according to the 2008 Housing Vacancy Survey (HVS). Of City households, 67 percent, or 2,082,000 are renters and 1,019,000 or 33 percent, are owners.

Households headed by a white non-Hispanic householder made up 43 percent of all the households in the city. Black (non-Hispanic) households were 22 percent of all households, and Hispanic householders (all races) were 23 percent of all households. Asian households were 10 percent of all households. Household sizes in these three last groups were larger than for whites.

Renter households in the City in 2008 were headed by 37% white householders, 29% Hispanic, 24% black and 9% Asian householders. Among all the combinations of HUD's Household Type and race/Hispanic origin, the larger components of renter households are: White "all other" (15.8%), Hispanic "small related" (15.1%), White "small related" (12.3%), and Black "small related" (11.9%).

Owner households in the City are predominantly White (56%), followed by 19% Black, 13% Asian and 12% Hispanic. The larger components of all owner households by HUD's Household Type and race/Hispanic origin are: White "small related" households (24.9%), White "small elderly" (17.7%), White "all other" (10.4%) and Black "small related," 8.9%.

Housing Profile

According to the 2008 HVS, the total number of housing units in New York City was 3,328,000 in 2008, up from 3,261,000 in 2005. The total number of renter-occupied and vacant available for rent units was 2,144,000 in 2008 and the total number of owner-occupied and vacant for sale units was 1,046,000. In 2008, the rental vacancy rate in New York City was just 2.91 percent, as 62,499 vacant units were available for rent out of 2,144,451 occupied and vacant available rental units. This is little change from the 64,737 vacant available rental units in 2005, and indicates the very serious shortage of vacant available for rent housing units in the City.

Rental stock dominates the overall housing stock in the City, which was about two-thirds rental units (64.4 percent of all occupied and vacant housing units in the City), with the remaining one-third being either owner units (31.4 percent) or vacant units not available for sale or rent (4.1 percent) in 2008. Rental units are 67.2 percent of the occupied and vacant available housing stock in the City.

Housing Problem by HUD Income Categories

The following analysis is by HUD-defined income categories: extremely low-, very low-, other low-, and moderate/middle-income New York City households. In this discussion “Any Housing Problem” among renters consists of rent burden (gross rent/income ratio) greater than 30 percent, or physically poor housing condition, or overcrowding (more than one person per room). For owners, “Any Housing Problem” consists of overcrowding and/or physically poor housing conditions. “Physically poor” housing means a housing unit that is either: in a dilapidated building, or lacks a complete kitchen and/or bath for exclusive use, or has four or more maintenance deficiencies, or is in a building with three or more types of building defects. The data presented here is not the full extent of the City’s overall housing needs. However, it constitutes fundamental housing needs data for units that would be eligible for federally-funded housing activities under HUD income eligibility limits.

Extremely Low-Income (0-30% MFI)

According to the 2008 HVS, 76.3 percent of extremely low-income renters experience some housing problem, particularly among large related households, where 92 percent experience some housing problem. Overall, about 10.1 percent of extremely low-income renter households live in crowded conditions (more than 1.0 person per room). Crowding in owner-occupied extremely low-income households is very low. About 10% of all extremely low-income renter households rent units in physically poor condition. The highest incidence of this problem is among large related households, where 15 percent rent physically poor units. Very few extremely low-income owner households live in physically poor housing. 90 percent of extremely low-income renters experience housing cost burden over 30 percent, including 75 percent who suffer from extreme cost burden (over 50 percent of income).

Very Low-Income (31-50% MFI)

Of very low-income renter households, 12.4 percent, or 40,000 households, live in crowded conditions. This problem is most concentrated in large related households, where 64 percent live in crowded units. The rate of crowding in very low-income owner households is very low. Of these very low-income renter households, 9.2 percent, or 30,000 households, live in physically poor conditions. Virtually no owner-occupied households at this income level occupy physically poor housing. Eighty-one percent of very low-income renters in this income range suffer from housing cost burden, with 41 percent suffering from extreme cost burden.

Other Low-Income (51-80% MFI)

Of Other low-income renter households, 12.2 percent live in crowded conditions. The crowding problem is particularly severe among large related households, where 66.6 percent live in crowded units. Nine percent of these low-income renter households at 51 – 80% MFI live in units that are physically poor. The highest incidence occurs among small related households where 10 percent rent physically inadequate units. Fifty-one percent of renters in this low-income income range suffer from housing cost burden, including 10 percent with extreme cost burden.

Moderate/Middle-Income (81-120% MFI)

Among these moderate/middle-income renters, 8 percent of the units were physically poor in some manner. Large related households experienced the highest incidence of the household types, at 13 percent in physically poor housing. The incidence of crowding for renters, 10.5 percent, is similar to that of all renter households (10.1 percent). In this income range, which straddles HUD's median income by household size for the area, 20 percent of renter households had a cost burden.

Public Housing Profile

As of June 30, 2009, the New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA) operated 178,986 units of conventional low-income public housing. 158,847 of these apartments are federally subsidized, while the remainder are State and City subsidized developments. NYCHA operates 10,100 apartments exclusively for seniors in 42 senior-only developments and an additional 14 senior-only buildings located in family developments. As of June 30, 2009, over 93% of NYCHA apartments are over 30 years old.

NYCHA's stock is expected to decrease slightly during the next five years through the sale of 262 FHA repossessed homes and 231 Multifamily Homeownership Opportunity Program (MHOP) apartments.

NYCHA's official public housing resident population was 401,357, as of January 1, 2009. It should be noted that this figure does not include unauthorized persons living doubled up in Public Housing or Section 8 Transition households in the City and State developments.

Supportive Housing Continuum of Care the Homeless and Other Special Needs Populations

This section describes the City's Supportive Housing Continuum of Care for Homeless and Other Special Needs Populations. The Supportive Housing Continuum of Care for the Homeless describes the activities which address the needs of homeless individuals and families, to prevent low-income individuals and families from becoming homeless, to help homeless persons make the transition to permanent housing and permanent living. The Supportive Housing Continuum of Care for Other Special Needs Populations addresses the special needs of nonhomeless persons, such as the Mentally Ill, the Chemically Dependent, and the Mentally and Developmentally Disabled, Persons with HIV/AIDS, Victims of Domestic Violence, the Elderly and Frail Elderly, and Persons with Physical Disabilities.

The City of New York uses its Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG) and Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) formula entitlement funds to provide emergency shelter to homeless families and individuals, and supportive housing for persons living with HIV/AIDS, respectively. It should be noted that both the City and the State of New York provide a significant portion of the monies used to operate the supportive housing programs for the other special needs populations.

Since 2005 the Department of Homeless Services (DHS) has conducted an annual city-wide estimate of the street homeless population, the Homeless Outreach Population Estimate, or HOPE. The January 2009 HOPE estimated there were 2,328 unsheltered individuals within the City of New York.

DHS's homeless Shelter System is divided into two functional components: Division of Family Services and the Division of Adult Services, respectively. The Division of Family Services oversees the emergency family shelter system for families with children or pregnant women in New York City. The Division of Adult Services provides services to single adults and adult families without children who are a legal family through marriage or verifiable co-dependence.

In City Fiscal Year (CFY) 2009, families with children constituted 85% of the total number of families in the DHS shelter system, adult families (without children) constituted 15%. A total of 26,353 families were provided

shelter with 91,255 individuals making up those families. Homeless families (adults with minor children or pregnant women) receive transitional services in transitional family residences that come in a variety of models, most of which offer apartment style units and a wide array of support services. As of August 26, 2009, the Division of Family Services provided temporary shelter in 74 Tier II shelters, 48 hotels, and 10 cluster sites. Of these facilities, 5 are being operated directly by DHS. The average number of families with children in shelter per day in CFY09 was 7,948. The average length of stay for these families was 281 days.

Beginning in 2009, transitional housing operations for adult families (families without minor children) moved to the Division of Adult Services. This division oversees 16 adult family residences. The average number of adult families in shelter per day in CFY09 was 1,276. The average length of stay for these families was 370 days.

The Division of Adult Services oversees the Agency's shelter system of emergency and transitional housing facilities for single adult men and single adult women. As of the end of CFY 2009, there are 50 facilities with 7,490 beds in use. There are 26 facilities for women (2,082 beds) and 32 for men (5,408 beds), eight of which are co-ed facilities (*for homeless adult families without minor children*). Four of these facilities are operated directly by the Department of Homeless Services and the rest are operated by non-profit organizations under contract with DHS. In CFY 2009, an average of 7,212 single adults (5,183 men and 2,029 women) resided in the shelter system each night including DHS Safe Havens and veteran's short-term housing, and a total of 29,124 unique individuals (22,079 men and 7,045 women) were provided temporary housing during the year.

Due to New York State laws on the confidentiality rights of persons who are HIV-positive or have AIDS, there is no count of persons living with AIDS or related diseases who are in the shelter system available. Persons who have identified themselves as such are referred to other supportive housing arrangements for people living with AIDS/HIV.

New York City remains the HIV epicenter of the United States (US). In 2008, New York City comprised 2.8% of the US population, but accounted for 7.7% of new estimated AIDS diagnoses, 9.2% of new HIV diagnoses,¹ 11.4% of AIDS deaths in the nation and 17.6% of people living with HIV/AIDS.² **Error! Bookmark not defined.** More recently, the New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (DOHMH) reported that as of June 30, 2009, there were 107,177 New Yorkers living with HIV/AIDS.³ In the first half of 2009, 1,405 New Yorkers were newly diagnosed with HIV (non-AIDS) and an additional 1,480 were newly diagnosed with AIDS. Within the NYC EMSA, more than 108,000 people were living with diagnosed HIV/AIDS at the end of 2007.⁴

HIV prevalence in NYC is neither evenly distributed throughout the 5 boroughs, nor among sub-populations. Unfortunately the lowest-income communities of NYC also have the highest proportion of minority racial/ethnic groups, and the most concentrated HIV/AIDS prevalence areas. Therefore, it is just as important to account for race/ethnicity as a transmission risk factor in these disproportionately affected areas. Through the first half of 2009, Blacks and Hispanics together represented 77% of all persons living with HIV/AIDS in NYC. Meanwhile,

¹ HIV Epidemiology and Field Services Program. New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene. HIV Epidemiology and Field Services Semiannual Report. October 2009.

² HIV Epidemiology and Field Services Program, New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene. HIV Epidemiology and Field Services Semiannual Report. October 2008.

³ HIV Epidemiology and Field Services Program, New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene. HIV Epidemiology and Field Services Semiannual Report. April 2010.

⁴ Bureau of HIV/AIDS Epidemiology, New York State Department of Health. New York State HIV/AIDS Surveillance Annual Report. May 2009. http://www.health.state.ny.us/diseases/aids/statistics/annual/2007/2007-12_annual_surveillance_report.pdf

the proportion of newly diagnosed AIDS cases in NYC among Whites decreased from 48.8% in 1981 to 15.6% in the first half of 2009. Blacks comprised more than half of persons newly diagnosed with HIV (50.6%) or AIDS (51.2%) in the first half of 2009. Viable prevention, treatment, and care approaches that intervene at multiple levels for these populations should continue to be a priority.

The high prevalence of HIV/AIDS in the NYC EMSA among people who are homeless or unstably housed significantly increases the cost and complexity of NYC's HIV/AIDS care system. Without safe, appropriate shelter, persons with AIDS are unable to adhere to complex antiretroviral drug regimens and also are exposed to conditions that threaten their health and well-being.

Part II: Five-Year Strategic Plan

It is important to note the 2008 HVS data regarding housing conditions (overcrowding, housing quality, and rent burden), the homeless populations, and persons living with HIV/AIDS data that are described in Volume 1., Part I., Community Profile represents the City of New York's actual housing needs in terms of the creation, rehabilitation and retention of affordable housing and supportive housing. While the City has made progress in addressing these needs, the level of housing needs cannot be totally remedied within the next five years without a substantial increase in the level of federal funds appropriated to HUD by Congress.

In addition, the City cannot predict future Congressional appropriations for HUD formula entitlement programs, and as an extension, the level of accomplishment that would be achieved through the expenditure of potential federal monies. Therefore, to obtain its five-year Performance Indicator projections, the City has multiplied by five its proposed annual accomplishment data for the formula entitlement-funded program activities expected to be funded in the 2010 Consolidated Plan program (flat-level funding method).

For the 2010-2014 Consolidated Plan Strategic Plan the City of New York is required to use HUD's Performance Outcome Measurement System. The Performance Outcome Measurement System was developed to enable HUD to collect and aggregate standardized performance data on entitlement-funded activities from all entitlement grantees nationwide for use in reporting to Congress on the effectiveness of its formula entitlement programs.

The outcome performance measurement system includes objectives, outcome measures and performance indicators that describe the intended outputs of the various entitlement-funded activities. There are three (3) objectives: creating Suitable Living Environments; providing Decent Affordable Housing; and, creating Economic Opportunities. When combined with the three (3) performance outcome categories of: Accessibility/Availability; Affordability; and, Sustainability, the following nine (9) performance measurement statements are created:

- Accessibility for the purpose of providing Decent Affordable Housing
- Affordability for the purpose of providing Decent Affordable Housing
- Sustainability for the purpose of providing Decent Affordable Housing
- Accessibility for the purpose of creating Suitable Living Environments
- Affordability for the purpose of creating Suitable Living Environments
- Sustainability for the purpose of creating Suitable Living Environments
- Accessibility for the purpose of creating Economic Opportunities
- Affordability for the purpose of creating Economic Opportunities
- Sustainability for the purpose of creating Economic Opportunities

In addition to determining the performance outcome measurement, the System requires entitlement grantees to collect and enter accomplishment data into the HUD Integrated Disbursement and Information System (IDIS) according to eighteen (18) federally-defined Performance Indicator categories. Performance Indicator categories encompass housing construction and rehabilitation, public services and facilities, business/economic development, and homelessness prevention-related activities.

It is important to note that while the eighteen Performance Indicator Categories are designed to capture a majority of the eligible entitlement-funded activities a grantee may undertake, they do not capture every eligible activity. Therefore, due to the limitations of the Performance Indicators there are entitlement-funded strategic objectives that the City of New York intends to address in the 2010-2014 Consolidated Plan Program Years that will not be captured by the Performance Outcome Measurement System. The City has categories these strategic objectives as *N/I* - No Appropriate Indicator, or *N/A*- Not Applicable.

As a result of the Performance Outcome Measurement System's inability to categorize all eligible entitlement-funded activities, the City will reflect the proposed accomplishments by identifying the specific activity undertaken by the program within the given Consolidated Plan Program Year's One-Year Action Plan.

For Consolidated Plan Program Years 2010-2014, the City of New York has identified:

- Four formula entitlement-funded strategic objectives that aim to increase or improve *Accessibility to Decent Affordable Housing* which will result in: 189,540 persons assisted with new/improved access to services (cumulative); 90 rental or owner-occupied units made accessible to persons with disabilities; 5,605 homeownership units constructed; and 250 first-time homebuyers provided with direct financial assistance.
- Eleven formula entitlement-funded strategic objectives that aim to provide or increase *Decent Affordable Housing* which will result in over approximately: 4,385 rental units rehabilitated to bring them from substandard to standard condition; 1,226,140 households provided with legal assistance to prevent homelessness; 1,500 renter households provided with tenant-based rental assistance; 6,250 homeless persons given overnight shelter; 339 persons living with AIDS provided with tenant-based rental assistance; 44,500 persons living with AIDS provided with supportive services; and 4,150 persons living with AIDS provided with supportive housing.
- Three formula entitlement-funded strategic objectives that aim to *Sustain Decent Housing* which will result in: 106,755 rental units rehabilitated; 6,420 owner-occupied units rehabilitated to be lead-safe compliant; and 37,500 housing units served through an anti-drug effort.
- Seventeen formula entitlement-funded strategic objectives that aim to increase the *Availability/Accessibility to a Suitable Living Environment* which will result in: 1,461,080 persons assisted with new/improved access to services; 2,325 homeless persons given overnight shelter; 50 public facilities rehabilitated; 11,000 persons provided new/improved access to a facility; and 50,562,100 individuals served through recreational programs.
- One formula entitlement-funded strategic objective to increase *Affordability of a Suitable Living Environment* which will result in: 2,855 persons assisted with a new/improved access to services.
- Five formula entitlement-funded strategic objectives that aim to increase or improve the *Sustainability of a Suitable Living Environment* through the: home repairs for 11,000 elderly homeowners; the façade renovation for 60 owner-occupied historic homes; renovation to 15 commercial façades on historic buildings; and, 500 demolitions to remove slum or blighted conditions as part of geographically targeted revitalization effort; 40 cultural organizations assisted through capacity building efforts; and 185,000 persons educated about the Bronx River.
- Three formula entitlement-funded strategic objectives that aim to increase the *Availability/Accessibility to Economic Opportunity* which will result in: 1,257,750 persons assisted with new/improved access to

literacy, educational or vocational services; 17,500 existing businesses assisted; 20,000 new businesses assisted; and 11,500 persons served through Business Basics Training.

- Three formula entitlement-funded strategic objectives for which there is No Appropriate Performance Indicator (N/I); and five strategic objectives for which a Performance Indicator is Not Applicable (N/A).

Part III: One-Year Action Plan (amended)

Summary of Annual Use of Grant Funds

For the 2010 Program Year, the City expects to receive approximately \$435,695,700 from the four HUD formula grant programs; \$248,235,000 for CDBG, \$124,813,610 for HOME, \$54,718,998 for HOPWA, and \$7,928,053 for ESG.

These funds are primarily targeted to address the following eligible activities: housing rehabilitation and community development to maximize the preservation of the City's housing stock; the City's continuum of care for homeless single adults and homeless families; and housing opportunities and housing support services for persons with HIV/AIDS.

Housing and Urban Development entitlement grants provided to the City of New York are expected to achieve the following objectives and outcomes:

Community Development Block Grant

- Four programs expect to receive an accumulative total of \$1,038,000 for the purpose of providing accessibility to decent affordable housing.
- Nine programs expect to receive an accumulative total of \$53,017,000 for the purpose of providing affordability for decent affordable housing.
- Six programs expect to receive an accumulative total of \$43,985,000 for the purpose of providing sustainability of decent affordable housing.
- Twelve programs expect to receive an accumulative total of \$26,156,000 for the purpose of creating/improving accessibility to suitable living environments.
- One program expects to receive a total of \$3,292,000 for the purpose of creating/improving affordability for suitable living environments.
- Six programs expect to receive an accumulative total of \$8,785,000 for the purpose of creating/improving sustainability of suitable living environments.
- Four programs expect to receive an accumulative total of \$6,148,000 for the purpose of creating/improving accessibility to economic opportunity.
- Three programs for which there is no appropriate HUD Performance Indicator and, therefore, no applicable HUD defined outcome/objective statement, expect to receive an accumulative total of \$63,147,000 to undertake CDBG-eligible activities.
- The remainder of CDBG funds, \$42,667,000, will be used for program administration and planning and, therefore, HUD-defined outcome/objective statements are not applicable.

HOME Investment Partnership

- Eight programs expect to receive an accumulative total of \$89,125,348 for the purpose of providing accessibility to decent affordable housing.
- Five programs expect to receive an accumulative total of \$21,851,822 for the purpose of providing affordability of decent affordable housing.
- One program expects to receive approximately \$1,363,110 for the purpose of providing sustainable decent affordable housing.

- The remainder of HOME funds, approximately \$12,473,300, will be used for program administration and planning and, therefore, is not applicable to HUD defined outcome/objective statements.

Emergency Shelter Grant

- Three programs expect to receive an accumulative total of approximately \$7,928,000 for the purpose of creating accessibility to suitable living environments.

Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS

- Three programs expect to receive an accumulative total of approximately \$50,500,300 for the purpose of providing affordability of decent affordable housing.
- The remainder of HOPWA funds, approximately \$1,561,900, will be used for program administration and planning and, therefore, is not applicable to HUD defined outcome/objective statements.

Summary of Funding from All Sources

In total, over **\$2.156 billion** in combined funds is expected to be received in 2010. The four formula grants previously discussed account for approximately **\$435.696 million** of this figure.

Other Federal Funds include New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA) public housing authority funds and HUD Competitive Grant program monies.

Summary Table of Funding Sources

	Amount City Expects to Receive in 2010	Amount City Expects to be Received by Other Entities in 2010
Total Federal		
CDBG	\$ 248,235,000	\$ 0
HOME	\$ 124,813,610	\$ 0
ESG	\$ 7,928,053	\$ 0
HOPWA	\$ 54,718,998	\$ 0
NYCHA Funds	\$ 0	\$ 756,738,365*
HUD Competitive	\$ TBD	\$ TBD
Total State	\$ 14,000,000	\$ 17,700,000
Total City	\$ 832,147,038	\$ 0
Total Private	\$ 0	\$ 100,230,125
Total All Sources	\$ 1,281,842,699	\$ 874,668,490

* Includes \$423,284,300 in Public Housing Capital Funds-American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funds

Summary of Citizens' Comments

Comments from the Public Hearing on the Formulation of the Proposed Consolidated Plan

Three persons provided comments.

One person advocated for the use of HOPWA funding for continued legal services to prevent eviction of persons living with AIDS from their rental units. The speaker indicated the current HOPWA contract with a legal service provider for such services had reached its expiration.

In response, the current funding for HIV/AIDS housing-related legal advocacy supported by the City of New York's Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) program was a one-time appropriation in order

to support the efforts of legal advocacy providers to assist persons with HIV/AIDS and their families who were facing eviction. Although the program has been successful at serving persons with HIV/AIDS and their families, there is currently no additional HOPWA funding available with which to continue these programs. However, a portion of the City's Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing Program (HPRP) grant has been allocated to anti-eviction services. Specifically, funding will support legal assistance and social services to low-income persons living with HIV/AIDS who have difficulty maintaining safe, appropriate permanent housing.

Another speaker, a president of a local development corporation, petitioned on behalf of his organization for an increase in CDBG funding for economic development programs. The speaker indicated an increase in funding would assist the organization in furthering economic development programs focused on retaining and creating jobs within the Jamaica community.

The City of New York notes that the CDBG-funded Avenue NYC Program has received an additional \$500,000 in CD funding only for the City Fiscal Year 2010.

The last speaker advocated funding for programs that provide housing and assistance to women and children in the shelter system, specifically for victims of domestic violence. The speaker was of the opinion this homeless subpopulation is often over-looked and as a result, shelter/housing programs for victims of domestic violence are under-funded.

In response, the City has several programs that help homeless families transition from shelter to permanent housing. These programs are Advantage, NYCHA housing and Section 8. Although these programs are not specific to domestic violence survivors, these programs provide resources to help clients attain permanency and self-sufficiency.

Comments Received During the Public Comment Period on the Proposed Consolidated Plan

One citizen raised questions about the allocation and use of funds under the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) entitlement grant program. According to the submitted comments, the citizen questioned how the City ensured that eligible HOPWA clients were made aware of available assistance under the HOPWA program and how persons can apply for HOPWA assistance. Comments also suggested that the City is not in compliance with Federal HOPWA regulations.

The City of New York responded that funds received by the New York City Eligible Metropolitan Statistical Area (EMSA) under the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) program are administered by the New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene. Within the five boroughs of the City of New York, HOPWA funds are used by the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene and the Human Resources Administration - HIV/AIDS Services Administration to provide a range of housing and housing-related supportive services to persons living with HIV/AIDS.

In order to ensure a seamless application process, the Human Resources Administration (HRA) has centralized the application process for all HIV/AIDS Services Administration (HASA) programs within one application. All HASA clients in need of housing assistance may apply for HASA supportive housing. HOPWA funds used by HRA to fund HASA supportive housing are used in combination with other funding sources, such as City and State tax levy funds. All HOPWA-funded service providers, including HASA supportive housing providers, are listed in the Appendix of the City's Consolidated Plan Annual Performance Report (APR), which is available from the Department of City Planning.

Programs that receive HOPWA funding through the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (DOHMH) are listed in the City's Consolidated Plan as well as the Appendix of the City's Consolidated Plan Annual Performance Report (APR). Clients who are interested in applying for DOHMH HOPWA Programs may do so by applying directly for services at the funded program.

All programs funded with HOPWA formula entitlement grant funds in the New York Eligible Metropolitan Statistical Area (EMSA), including those administered by the DOHMH and HASA, are in compliance with all federal regulations, including requirements for client rent contribution.

One writer, on behalf of a local Community Board submitted the following recommendations: 1) Scattered site housing should be used for housing the homeless instead of decommissioned armories, which should be used as community facilities such as recreational centers; 2) Homeless intake and assessment centers should be situated near psychiatric centers and medical hospitals to facilitate the performance of intake and assessment functions; 3) Data on housing affordability (both rental and homeownership) should be based on area median income data generated at the Community Board level; 4) The City should give priority consideration for affordable housing to returning veterans; 5) The recently submitted contextual rezoning proposal for communities within the Community Board should receive expedited review and implementation in order to permit these communities to maintain their existing character while facilitating residential development in underutilized industrial/commercial buildings; and, 6) The City's Uniform Land Use Review (ULURP) and contract review process should be revised to include Community Board review (and approval) of all projects and/or contracts which provide residential supportive services, and affordable housing (with or without) residential supportive services funded with monies originating from governmental (or quasi-governmental) entities.

The Department of Homeless Services responded to recommendations 1, 2 and 4 by stating scattered site housing for single adults is utilized for permanent housing, as a destination for individuals exiting shelter. The City has the right to shelter and therefore must shelter every individual that presents. Shelters are utilized and developed based on need. When available, the City has worked with the community and elected officials to convert unused armory space for community use.

Intake and assessment centers are staffed with appropriate psychiatric and medical professionals to meet client needs.

The City, in partnership with the local and State VA (Veterans Administration), has a comprehensive program for serving homeless Veterans. Since the program was developed in January 2007, more than 2,300 homeless Veterans have moved to permanent housing. DHS has also partnered with the HUD VASH program to make Section 8 vouchers available to homeless Veterans.

The Department of Housing Preservation and Development responded to recommendations 3 and 4.

The methodology for estimating median income data for the Consolidated Plan is based on areas defined by the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) applied to data generated by the U.S. Census Bureau for the New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey (HVS). The Fiscal Year 2010 median income estimates are defined by HUD for the metropolitan area, which for New York City, is comprised of the following counties: Bronx, Kings, New York, Putnam, Queens and Richmond. The smallest geographical area used by HUD for estimating median incomes and defining income limits for federal housing programs is each county; no geographical areas smaller than a county are used.

For the Consolidated Plan and for programs funded by the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development, median income limits are adjusted based on high area housing costs and number of occupants in

the household. In developing specific housing plans, programs and/or applications for funds for local areas the City considers other data on affordability (i.e. both income and housing costs) from the HVS at the sub-borough area level with regard to specific projects. This is not feasible for the purpose of preparing the Consolidated Plan.

Regarding housing priority consideration for returning veterans, currently New York City's HPD does not have programs that specifically target veterans as a preference category. However, HPD currently administers two federal homeownership programs, Asset Area Control Program and Dollar Homes, both of which have a 33 1/3 preference for post-911 veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan.

The New York City Housing Authority also responded to comment 4 by indicating that in 2008, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) awarded NYCHA an additional 1,015 Section 8 rental vouchers specifically for homeless veterans under the Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) initiative. NYCHA recently received an additional funding allocation for 325 Section 8 vouchers from HUD earmarked for the VASH program. The Authority's total of 1,340 vouchers is roughly 10% of the national funding authorized by Congress for the VASH program.

NYCHA is administering these VASH vouchers in partnership with the federal Veteran's Administration (VA) and the NYC Department of Homeless Services (DHS). Applicants are identified and screened by the VA and DHS prior to referral to NYCHA for eligibility certification and voucher issuance. The VA and DHS then provide housing search assistance to help these voucher holders find appropriate apartments that will pass NYCHA's inspection and comply with the rent limits. The VA and DHS offer ongoing support services to the voucher holders in their transition to permanent residential housing.

Since program activity began in early 2009, a total of 948 Section 8 VASH vouchers have been issued through July 17, 2009. Among the vouchers already issued, 277 are now approved for rental with Section 8 subsidy, while 671 continue searching for apartments at this time. NYCHA is projecting another 550 rental approvals for a total of 827 by the end of 2009.

Regarding the recommendation that housing affordability should be based on Community Board-level income data (3), the Department of City Planning responded that for Consolidated Plan-related purposes eligibility for affordable housing (both rental and homeownership) is generally defined by income thresholds as determined by HUD.

Both HUD's median area income data and housing price data are collected, analyzed and released according to U.S. Census Bureau area (and subarea) definitions. For example, fair market (affordable) housing rents are released for New York City as per the New York, NY HUD Metro Fair Market Rent Area (HMFA) which consists on Bronx, Kings (Brooklyn), New York (Manhattan), Queens, Richmond (Staten Island), Putnam and Rockland counties.

Regarding the contextual rezoning proposal for the area within the Community Board, the community board's proposal is currently under review by the Brooklyn Office of the Department of City Planning.

Lastly, regarding the recommended changes to the City's ULURP and contract procedures, both the ULURP and contract processes are established by the New York City Charter. The City is not proposing at this time any changes to the Charter with respect to these procedures.

Additional Information

Copies of the amended 2010 *Consolidated Plan* are available for reference at the following public libraries:

<i>NYC Municipal Reference & Research Center (The City Hall Library)</i> 31 Chambers Street, Suite 110 New York, NY 10007 (212) 788-8590	<i>Science, Industry and Business Library</i> 188 Madison Avenue at 34 th Street New York, N.Y. 10016 (212) 592-7000
<i>Mid-Manhattan Library</i> 455 Fifth Avenue (at 40 th Street) New York, N.Y. 10016 (212) 340-0863	<i>Bronx Reference Center</i> 2556 Bainbridge Avenue Bronx, N.Y. 10458 (718) 579-4257
<i>(Brooklyn) Central Library</i> Grand Army Plaza Brooklyn, N.Y. 11238 (718) 230-2100	<i>Queens Central Library</i> 89-11 Merrick Boulevard Jamaica, N.Y. 11432 (718) 990-0778/0779/0781
<i>St. George Library Center</i> 5 Central Avenue Staten Island, N.Y. 10301 (718) 442-8560	

Any questions or comments concerning the City's Consolidated Plan may be directed to:

Charles V. Sorrentino
New York City Consolidated Plan Coordinator
Department of City Planning
22 Reade Street, 4N
New York, New York 10007
Phone (212) 720-3337
FAX (212) 720-3495