



California Department of  
Housing and Community Development

# No Place Like Home Program

Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2019-20







## Contents

- 01** HCD Mission, Vision, and Core Values
- 02** Introducing No Place Like Home
- 04** Background & Purpose
- 06** Alternative Process County Allocation
- 10** Competitive Allocation
- 16** Noncompetitive Allocation
- 19** Housing Production Outcomes
- 20** Tenant Outcomes
- 23** Future Program Modifications
- 24** Appendix 1 - Balance of State Counties
- 27** Appendix 2 - Alternative Process Counties
- 28** Appendix 3 - NPLH Remaining County Noncompetitive Allocation Balances
- 32** Appendix 4 - NPLH Summary





Cathedral Palms in Riverside County | Photo courtesy of Riverside University Health System

# HCD Mission, Vision, and Core Values

## Mission

Promote safe, affordable homes and vibrant, inclusive, sustainable communities for all Californians.

## Vision

Every California resident can live, work, and play in healthy communities of opportunity.

## Core Values

**INNOVATION:** Empowered to apply creative solutions

**PROFESSIONALISM:** Demonstrate a willing attitude, open-mindedness, competence, and respect at all levels

**ACCOUNTABILITY:** Responsible, thoughtful ownership and acknowledgement of actions and performance

**MISSION-DRIVEN:** Determined and focused on achieving HCD's purpose

**INTEGRITY:** Direct, honest, transparent, and ethical in every action

**DIVERSITY:** Support, strengthen, and foster diversity and inclusive teams, programs, and partnerships

# Introducing No Place Like Home

The No Place Like Home (NPLH) program serves California's most-vulnerable homeless population — people with severe mental illness who are experiencing homelessness or who are exiting institutions (such as correctional facilities) and have a history of experiencing homelessness.

This report is the first of required annual reports submitted to the California Health Facilities Financing Authority. The report reflects the accomplishments of the NPLH program through the 2019-20 fiscal year. The report includes the following to the extent that this data is currently available:

1. Processes established for distributing funds.
2. Distribution of funds among counties.

3. Information on supportive housing developments funded through the program, including:
  - Location of projects
  - Number of units assisted
  - Occupancy restrictions
  - Number of individuals and households served
  - Related income levels
  - Homeless, veteran, and mental health status
4. Recommendations for future modifications to improve program efficiency or to further the goals of the program

*Please note that detailed data on tenant outcomes is not yet available since all NPLH-funded projects to date are in the financing or construction phases and are not yet ready for occupancy.*





## Background & Purpose

In 2016, California enacted Assembly Bills 1618 (Chapter 43, Statutes 2016) and 1628 (Chapter 322, Statutes 2016) that created the No Place Like Home (NPLH) program. The program was created to increase the supply of permanent supportive housing and build upon existing programs to combat homelessness among Californians in need of mental health services. These statutes authorized the California Health Facilities Financing Authority to issue up to \$2 billion in revenue bonds to provide funding, administered by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), for the development of permanent supportive housing for individuals living with a serious mental illness who are in need of mental health

services and are experiencing homelessness, chronic homelessness, or who are at-risk of chronic homelessness as these terms are defined under the NPLH program guidelines. In November 2018, California voters also approved Proposition 2, which authorized the existing NPLH program and bond sale to construct permanent supportive housing for the target population and to capitalize operating reserves with annual debt service payments limited to \$140 million per year.

Eligible program activities include development costs associated with the design, acquisition, new construction, rehabilitation, or preservation of multifamily rental housing units provided as permanent supportive housing for the program's target population. In addition, funds may be used for capitalized operating reserves to address building operating revenue shortfalls attributable to the housing being rented to extremely

low-income households funded through the NPLH program.

Since March of 2019, the program has awarded more than \$1.1 billion of the up to \$2 billion currently authorized under program statute. Projects that have received awards are expected to create 4,489 units of housing.

This number will increase over time as more awards are made.

NPLH funds for development costs are provided as deferred payment residual receipts loans with a minimum loan term and project affordability period of 55 years. Recent changes to the program enacted by Senate Bill 1030 (Chapter 165, Statutes 2020), change the nature of the capitalized operating subsidy reserves (COSR) awards to grants instead of loans. Under the NPLH program guidelines, these reserves are sized to remain available for use by individual projects for a minimum of 20 years.

Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) Sections 5849.8 and 5849.9 provide the authority for three allocations under the program:

### Alternative Process Counties

Funds allocated directly to counties with at least five percent of the state's homeless population AND that demonstrate capacity to administer program funds. Includes a share of noncompetitive allocation funds.

### Competitive Allocation

Funds distributed through a competitive process for non-Alternative Process Counties announced through an annual Notice of Funding Availability.

### Noncompetitive Allocation

Awarded over-the-counter to projects proportionate to the number of homeless persons within each county, with a minimum of \$500,000 available in each county. Can be combined with competitive allocation funds.

Check out HCD's website for more information on the NPLH program guidelines: <https://www.hcd.ca.gov/grants-funding/active-funding/nplh.shtml#guidelines>



425 Auzerais Apartments in Santa Clara County | Photo courtesy of Santa Clara County of Supportive Housing

# Alternative Process County Allocation

**A**lternative Process Counties (APCs) are counties with five percent or more of the state’s homeless population that demonstrate the capacity to directly administer loan funds for permanent supportive housing serving the NPLH target population. Formula allocations to the APCs come from both the noncompetitive allocation and the competitive allocation. Amounts to the APCs from the competitive allocation are calculated prior to determining how much is available in the competition for funds among the remainder of the counties.

## Eligibility Requirements and Designation

The NPLH statute, Welfare and Institutions Code 5849.8 (b), requires HCD to consider the following when qualifying eligible counties to participate as APCs:

- Demonstrated ability to finance permanent supportive housing with local and federal funds, and monitor requirements for the life of the loan
- Past history of delivering supportive services to the NPLH target population in housing
- Past history of committing project-based vouchers to supportive housing
- Ability to prioritize the most vulnerable within the target population through a coordinated entry system (CES)

In addition, the statute directs HCD to address any program parameters for the Alternative County process in the NPLH program guidelines, including but not limited to, the following:

- The county’s NPLH project selection process
- Eligible use of funds
- Loan terms, rent, and occupancy restrictions
- Provision of supportive services
- Reporting and monitoring requirements

In October 2018, HCD designated four counties as APCs in accordance with the mentioned requirements and as further detailed in Article III of the NPLH program guidelines.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.hcd.ca.gov/grants-funding/active-funding/nplh.shtml#guidelines>

Together, these counties comprise 55 percent of the State’s homeless population based on the most recent Point-in-Time (PIT) count data published by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for both sheltered and unsheltered homeless persons in 2019.

**Table 1: 2019 Point-In-Time Count Data**

COUNTY	2019 PIT COUNT	% OF STATEWIDE TOTAL
Los Angeles	58,190	38.46%
San Diego	8,102	5.36%
San Francisco	8,035	5.31%
Santa Clara	9,706	6.42%
Total	84,033	55.55%



## Funds Distribution

As of June 30, 2020, over \$757 million has been awarded to APCs. Amounts awarded are based on formulas for determining amounts available for noncompetitive allocation and competitive allocation funds found in Section 102 of the NPLH program guidelines.<sup>2</sup>

The allocations and awards in Table 2 reflect an advance of Round 3 funds to each of the APCs to enable more projects to be funded based on current demand in their existing affordable housing development pipelines. Consequently, awards to APCs for fiscal year 2020-21 will be reduced by the amounts advanced.

Each APC selects projects to receive these funds, underwrites each NPLH loan, and acts in the capacity of lender and long-term monitor of these projects over the 55-year minimum required loan term/period of affordability. In turn, HCD provides technical assistance and monitors the ongoing implementation of each APC program in accordance with the

Table 2: APC Funds Awarded as of June 30, 2020

ALTERNATIVE PROCESS COUNTY	NONCOMPETITIVE ALLOCATION	ROUND 1: COMPETITIVE ALLOCATION AWARDS	ROUND 2: COMPETITIVE ALLOCATION AWARDS	TOTAL
Los Angeles	\$75,259,413	\$155,230,056	\$310,460,112	\$540,949,581
San Diego	\$12,713,886	\$28,069,001	\$40,000,000	\$80,782,887
San Francisco	\$9,519,091	\$18,250,554	\$36,501,108	\$64,270,753
Santa Clara	\$10,262,970	\$20,478,901	\$40,957,802	\$71,699,673
Total	\$107,755,360	\$222,028,512	\$427,919,022	\$757,702,894

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.hcd.ca.gov/grants-funding/active-funding/nplh.shtml#guidelines>

approved program design. The NPLH program (WIC 5849.8 (b)) requires funds awarded by HCD to APCs that are not committed to supportive housing developments within two years following the award of these funds be returned to the department for reallocation under the competitive program.

## Commitments and Disbursements

Once HCD awards funds to an APC, the APC can begin drawing down NPLH funds to award to a project. HCD will disburse up to four draws per year to the APC if the department has received all of the following:

1. An award letter or other evidence of commitment of NPLH funds by the APC to the specific project(s) for which funds are being requested.

2. A cash flow analysis which indicates how much the APC is projected to need for awarded projects for the specific time period for which funds are being requested.
3. A certification that the APC awarded the funds to the specific project(s) in accordance with the project selection process approved by HCD.

If the project awarded is not utilizing NPLH funding for predevelopment or construction period activities, but instead used to pay off the construction loan, then those funds will not be disbursed until construction is complete and the NPLH units are occupied, (the start of the permanent financing period).

Table 3: Alternative Process County NPLH Fund Disbursements As of August 30, 2020

APC	AWARDED	DISBURSED	% DISBURSED
Los Angeles	\$540,949,581	\$146,003,000	27%
San Diego	\$80,782,887	\$34,381,199	43%
San Francisco	\$64,270,753	\$27,769,645	43%
Santa Clara	\$71,699,673	\$4,400,000	6%

## Competitive Allocation

The competitive allocation offers up to \$1.8 billion (less the amounts for HCD administration, default reserve, and bond issuance costs), to counties qualifying as alternative process counties (APCs), and other counties, referred to as the Balance of State (BOS) counties. Funds provided to the BOS counties are provided through a competitive process administered by HCD.

### Allocation Methodology

BOS counties are grouped together based on county population size to compete for available funds, so counties of similar size compete against each other for available funds:

- Large counties (population greater than 750,000)
- Medium counties (population between 200,000 to 750,000)
- Small counties (population less than 200,000)
- Proportionate share of extremely low-income renter households that are paying more than 50 percent of their income for rent using HUD’s Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy dataset<sup>3</sup>. This factor is weighted at 30 percent.

Funds available to each population group and to the APCs are based on a formula, which accounts for the following:

- Proportionate share of homeless people among the counties within each group based on the most recent PIT count of both sheltered and unsheltered homeless individuals as published by HUD, and as compared to the state’s total homeless population. This factor is weighted at 70 percent; and

Notwithstanding this calculation, the small county allocation cannot have available to it less than eight percent of the total funds made available in any given funding round. HCD can also shift unrequested funds from one allocation to another to fund other projects that score high enough to be funded and are financially feasible. Amounts reallocated from an undersubscribed county population group will be made available to that same county population group in the following round so that the county population group is “made whole”.

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.huduser.gov/portal/datasets/cp.html>

## Competitive Notice of Funding Availability Status

Program statute requires that HCD offer at least four rounds of competitive allocation funds, with each round of awards no more than 12 months apart. As of December 30, 2020, three rounds of competitive allocation funds have been offered through the Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA), making over \$540 million available to the BOS counties.



Table 4: NOFA Amounts - Balance of State Counties

ROUNDS	LARGE COUNTIES	MEDIUM COUNTIES	SMALL COUNTIES	TOTAL
Round 1	\$93,525,977	\$52,445,511	\$32,000,000	\$177,971,488
Round 2	\$90,871,339	\$52,445,511	\$34,654,638	\$177,971,488
Round 3	\$106,876,025	\$43,962,132	\$36,595,102	\$187,433,259
Total	\$291,273,341	\$148,853,154	\$103,249,740	\$543,376,235



## Application Evaluation Criteria

In addition to the project threshold and financial feasibility requirements for non-competitive allocation funds, competitive allocation projects funded must also score high enough to be funded among other projects within its county population pool. Additional detail on these scoring criteria can be found in Section 205 of the NPLH program guidelines.<sup>4</sup>

Table 5: Application Evaluation Criteria

RATING CATEGORY	MAXIMUM POINTS	SUMMARY
Percentage of Total Project Units Restricted to the Target Population	65	Percentage of total project units restricted as NPLH units, and use of coordinated entry system (CES), to refer NPLH-eligible households to available units and/or use of an alternate similar system to refer persons at-risk of chronic homelessness to NPLH units
Leverage of Development Funding	20	Ratio of the NPLH loan to other sources of committed development funding attributable to the NPLH units. Noncompetitive allocation funds may count as leveraged funds
Leverage of Rental or Operating Subsidies	35	Percentage of NPLH units that have committed non-HCD project-based or sponsor-based operating subsidies with terms substantially similar to that of other project-based rental or operating assistance
Readiness to Proceed	50	Percentage of total construction and permanent financing committed, completion of all necessary environmental clearances, land use approvals
Extent of On-Site and Off-Site Supportive Services	20	Points for case management provided on-site at the project, use of evidence-based practices to assist NPLH tenants to retain their housing, offering more services than required, and implementing resident involvement strategies
Past History of Evidence Based Practices	10	Points for prior experience of the lead service provider in implementing evidence-based practices recognized to lead to a reduction in homelessness, or other related use of evidenced-based practices to serve special needs populations

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.hcd.ca.gov/grants-funding/active-funding/nplh.shtml#guidelines>



**Table 6: Funds Distribution - Balance of State Counties Round 1**

ALLOCATION	APPLICATIONS RECEIVED	AMOUNTS REQUESTED	AMOUNTS AWARDED	PROJECTS FUNDED
Large County	30	\$126,228,871	\$96,180,615	23
Medium County	8	\$43,778,577	\$38,750,556	7
Small County	7	\$23,889,262	\$24,355,799	6
Total	45	\$193,896,710	\$159,286,970	36

**Table 7: Funds Distribution - Balance of State Counties Round 2**

ALLOCATION	APPLICATIONS RECEIVED	AMOUNTS REQUESTED	AMOUNTS AWARDED	PROJECTS FUNDED
Large County	37	\$278,839,549	\$90,871,339	9
Medium County	14	\$68,736,599	\$57,040,613	12
Small County	9	\$30,041,759	\$30,059,536	9
Total	60	\$377,617,907	\$177,971,488	30

The data in Tables 6 and 7 illustrate the increasing demand for NPLH funds between Round 1 and Round 2 among all county population groups. While the medium and small county groups were slightly undersubscribed in Round 1, demand within each of these applicant pools has increased.

The large county allocation continues to be oversubscribed (requests for funding exceeded funding available), with demand more than doubling between Round 1 and Round 2, and the number of funded projects decreasing by 14 from the previous funding round due to the increased size of some large county awards in Round 2.

However, the amount of funds available to the large county applicant pool will increase in Round 3 due to an increase in the overall

proportionate share of the state's homeless population among these counties.

Additional information on NPLH funded projects can be found in Appendices 1 and 2.





## Non-competitive Allocation

The noncompetitive allocation offers \$190 million in one-time funds to counties on an over-the-counter basis. Each county is eligible to receive a minimum of \$500,000 and additional funds proportionate to the number of unsheltered and sheltered homeless individuals within the county based on the most recent homeless Point-in-Time (PIT) count as published by HUD as of the issuance of the HCD's noncompetitive allocation NOFA.

### Allocation Methodology

Counties access these funds by submitting eligible project applications, alone or in partnership with a developer. Projects seeking only non-competitive allocation funds from the program are evaluated by HCD or the APC to ensure that they meet applicable underwriting standards and will be financially feasible for the minimum 55-year affordability period for projects of five or more units. In addition to financial feasibility requirements, applicants must satisfy other project threshold eligibility requirements including, but not limited to, the following:

- Eligible uses of funds
- Minimum development team experience
- Legal site control over the land and any remaining structures
- Supportive services and project amenities appropriate for the NPLH target population
- NPLH units integrated with other units within the building(s)
- Property Management Plan meets state Housing First requirements
- Adequate budget for environmental remediation or other necessary costs<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Additional HCD project threshold criteria not listed above are discussed in the NPLH program guidelines (section 202).

### Noncompetitive Notice of Funding Availability

HCD issued the noncompetitive allocation NOFA in August of 2018. As of October 2020, HCD and the APCs together have received \$141,429,745 in noncompetitive allocation applications and have made awards to individual projects in 26 counties. Alpine county declined to use their noncompetitive allocation due to the low number of people experiencing homelessness in the county and the lack of available land for development.

In 2018 and 2019, HCD offered counties the option of using their noncompetitive

allocation funds for shared housing activities, such as single-family, duplex, tri-plex and four-plex rental housing where households have their own bedrooms, but share bathrooms, kitchens, and other living spaces. Under this option, given the small size of these properties, counties could be approved by HCD to be the lender for these funds with counties performing application selection, underwriting, loan servicing, and long-term monitoring functions under a method of distribution meeting NPLH requirements. No county chose the shared housing option, and the opportunity for counties to be designated by HCD to administer their noncompetitive allocation funds for shared housing activities has expired.

To date, most projects funded by HCD have used noncompetitive allocation funds in combination with larger awards offered through the competitive allocation. Approximately \$48 million in noncompetitive allocation funds remain. HCD anticipates awarding the remainder of these funds over the next 12 to 24 months. Appendix 3 provides more information on individual county noncompetitive allocations and remaining balances. Any uncommitted noncompetitive allocation funds remaining prior to making awards under the Round 4 competitive allocation will revert to the competitive allocation for awards under that NOFA. The Round 4 NOFA is anticipated to be the final NOFA under the current bond authority.



Hollister Lofts in Santa Barbara County | Photo courtesy of Santa Barbara County Department of Behavioral Wellness

# Housing Production Outcomes

HCD makes annual awards to the APCs who, in turn, select projects for funding. APCs must commit their funds to projects within 24 months of the department’s award to the APC. HCD also makes annual awards directly to projects in the BOS counties.

HCD estimates that the projects awarded to date, as well as other planned awards made by the APCs under their Round 1 and Round 2 contracts with the department, will result in 4,489 NPLH-assisted units. The commitment of NPLH funds to a project also makes it possible to leverage other needed financing for an affordable housing development. Together, NPLH and other financing sources are estimated to create approximately 11,347 homes of affordable housing through these Round 1 and Round 2 funded projects.

Table 8: NPLH Estimated Unit Totals from Round 1 and Round 2 Alternative Process Counties

ALLOCATION	ANTICIPATED NPLH UNITS
Los Angeles	2,171
San Diego	275
San Francisco	251
Santa Clara	341
APC Subtotal	3,038

NPLH Units - Balance of State Counties

ALLOCATION	ANTICIPATED NPLH UNITS
Large Counties	775
Medium Counties	454
Small Counties	222
Balance of State Subtotal*	1,451
Projected NPLH total as of June 30, 2020	4,489

\* Unit numbers by county can be found in Appendices 1 and 2.



## Tenant Outcomes

Since all NPLH projects funded to date have not yet completed construction or rehabilitation, HCD has no tenant outcome data to report at this time. Once projects have been completed, counties are required to report annually on outcome measures for the NPLH-assisted units specified in Section 214 of the NPLH program guidelines. This information will be compiled as part of future annual reports and also made available on the HCD website.

These outcome measures include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Project location, services, and amenities
- Number of individuals and households served, and their veteran status and qualification upon move in as homeless, chronically homeless, or at-risk of chronic homelessness
- The number of tenants who continue to have a serious mental disorder or the number who are seriously emotionally disturbed children or adolescents, as defined under WIC Section 5600.3
- Head of household gender, race, ethnicity, age
- Current income levels, and changes in income levels during the reporting period due to changes in public assistance, employment, or other cash or non-cash income
- Whether new tenants were living on the streets or in shelters prior to move in
- Whether tenants who moved out during the reporting period left for other permanent affordable housing, were institutionalized, or returned to homelessness
- Number of tenants who died during the reporting period
- If available, counties may also provide aggregated data on:
  1. Emergency room visits for NPLH tenants before and after move in
  2. Average number of hospital and psychiatric facility admissions and in-patient days before and after move in, and
  3. Number of arrests and returns to jail or prison before and after move in



## Future Program Modifications

HCD annually evaluates the need for changes to the NPLH program guidelines to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the program. In 2019, the department released a program guideline amendment package focused primarily on changes to the application evaluation process from lessons learned during Round 1. These amendments both clarify program requirements and provide greater flexibility where needed. Changes were also made to conform NPLH practices to that of other HCD programs to ensure consistent administration on such issues as per-unit subsidy limit formulas, use of multiple HCD funding sources within the same project, and fast-tracked land use approvals.

NPLH program guideline amendments for Round 3, adopted in October 2020, were much narrower in scope but sought to provide greater flexibility with program deadlines, standardize the per-unit subsidy limits for capitalized operating subsidy reserves (COSRs), clarify critical program requirements, and implement recent changes to Senate Bill 1030 (Chapter 165, Statutes 2020).

As projects complete construction, are occupied, and long-term monitoring begins, HCD, in consultation with program stakeholders, will continue to evaluate what is working well and where improvements are needed in order to better assist the NPLH target population in accessing and retaining safe homes, and to help projects remain in good physical and financial condition over the long-term.





# Appendix 1

## State Bond Funds – Proposition 2 No Place Like Home – Balance of State Counties

PROGRAM AND COUNTY	# OF AWARDS	AWARD AMOUNTS	HCD ASSISTED OR REGULATED UNITS	NEW HOUSING UNITS	REHAB HOUSING UNITS	OTHER ACTIVITIES	TYPE OF ACTIVITY	OTHER FUNDS LEVERAGED
Alameda	12	\$91,625,690	252	777	24		New construction, acquisition and rehabilitation	\$562,666,926
Berkeley, City of	2	\$12,173,015	28	140			New construction	\$111,639,785
Butte	1	\$3,433,105	15	100			New construction	\$44,968,295
Contra Costa	2	\$9,610,003	23	92			New construction	\$60,067,642
El Dorado	1	\$3,395,283	10	65			New construction	\$21,514,521
Fresno	5	\$26,850,023	101	184	28		New construction, acquisition and rehabilitation	\$83,918,126
Humboldt	2	\$8,516,735	33	81			New construction	\$22,335,163
Kern	3	\$6,258,268	44	102			New construction	\$16,914,916
Madera	1	\$4,925,436	16	52			New construction	\$21,492,070

(Appendix 1 continued)

PROGRAM AND COUNTY	# OF AWARDS	AWARD AMOUNTS	HCD ASSISTED OR REGULATED UNITS	NEW HOUSING UNITS	REHAB HOUSING UNITS	OTHER ACTIVITIES	TYPE OF ACTIVITY	OTHER FUNDS LEVERAGED
Marin	1	\$4,455,120	15	32			New construction	\$7,409,277
Mariposa	2	\$4,074,509	17	48			New construction	\$16,012,424
Mendocino	1	\$5,469,618	19	40			New construction	\$10,545,607
Monterey	3	\$12,636,367	37	201			New construction	\$94,631,594
Napa	1	\$7,921,804	32		66		Acquisition and rehabilitation	\$22,378,466
Nevada	2	\$3,013,212	18	41	6		New Construction and rehabilitation	\$10,448,639
Orange	3	\$11,798,050	35	153			New construction	\$64,870,552
Placer	1	\$2,751,317	20	79			New construction	\$28,535,793
Riverside	4	\$23,659,297	162	195	224		New construction, acquisition and rehabilitation	\$98,187,799
Sacramento	3	\$27,265,091	137	174	134		New construction, acquisition and rehabilitation	\$108,707,803
San Bernardino	1	\$2,591,000	12	112			New construction	\$41,324,962

(Appendix 1 continued)

PROGRAM AND COUNTY	# OF AWARDS	AWARD AMOUNTS	HCD ASSISTED OR REGULATED UNITS	NEW HOUSING UNITS	REHAB HOUSING UNITS	OTHER ACTIVITIES	TYPE OF ACTIVITY	OTHER FUNDS LEVERAGED
San Luis Obispo	1	\$10,435,350	24	50			New construction	\$11,866,892
San Mateo	1	\$1,740,281	9		57		Acquisition and rehabilitation	\$43,327,749
Santa Barbara	2	\$6,322,998	29	46			New construction	\$18,764,824
Santa Cruz	1	\$2,243,926	10	57			New construction	\$39,687,789
Shasta	1	\$3,424,433	15	49			New construction	\$15,334,545
Solano	2	\$10,793,514	57	147			New construction	\$71,365,419
Sonoma	3	\$22,098,095	69	135			New construction	\$70,353,125
Stanislaus	2	\$9,380,382	66	34	107		New construction, acquisition and rehabilitation	\$10,637,503
Tehama	1	\$4,658,655	15	32			New construction	\$7,864,083
Tulare	2	\$11,672,556	42	144			New construction	\$46,074,309
Yolo	2	\$12,365,747	70	146			New construction	\$32,935,552
Yuba	1	\$3,373,963	19	41			New construction	\$11,652,592
<b>Program Total:</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>\$370,932,843</b>	<b>1,451</b>	<b>3,549</b>	<b>646</b>	<b>0</b>		<b>\$1,828,434,742</b>

## Appendix 2

### State Bond Funds – Proposition 2 No Place Like Home – Alternative Process Counties

PROGRAM AND COUNTY	# OF AWARDS	AWARD AMOUNTS	HCD ASSISTED OR REGULATED UNITS	NEW HOUSING UNITS	REHAB HOUSING UNITS	OTHER ACTIVITIES	TYPE OF ACTIVITY	OTHER FUNDS LEVERAGED
Los Angeles	2	\$540,949,581	2,171	4,670			Local program, program administration	\$1,598,324,685
San Diego	2	\$80,782,887	275	876			Local program, program administration	\$312,900,789
San Francisco	2	\$64,270,753	251	711			Local program	\$435,474,807
Santa Clara	2	\$71,699,673	341	895			Local program	\$359,023,532
<b>Program Total:</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>\$757,702,894</b>	<b>3,038</b>	<b>7,152</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>		<b>\$2,705,723,813</b>



## Appendix 3

### NPLH Remaining County Noncompetitive Allocation Balances as of October 2020

COUNTY NAME	ALLOCATION AMOUNT	NONCOMPETITIVE AWARDED	NONCOMPETITIVE FUNDS REMAINING TO AWARD
Alameda	\$6,464,468	\$6,464,468	\$0
Alpine	\$500,000	\$0	\$0
Amador	\$500,000	\$0	\$500,000
Berkeley	\$1,350,299	\$1,350,299	\$0
Butte	\$1,659,786	\$1,659,786	\$0
Calaveras	\$500,000	\$0	\$500,000
Colusa	\$500,000	\$0	\$500,000
Contra Costa	\$2,231,574	\$0	\$2,231,574
Del Norte	\$500,000	\$0	\$500,000
El Dorado	\$836,801	\$836,801	\$0
Fresno	\$2,183,000	\$0	\$2,183,000
Glenn	\$500,000	\$0	\$500,000
Humboldt	\$1,054,690	\$1,054,690	\$0

(Appendix 3 continued)

COUNTY NAME	ALLOCATION AMOUNT	NONCOMPETITIVE AWARDED	NONCOMPETITIVE FUNDS REMAINING TO AWARD
Imperial	\$1,602,885	\$0	\$1,602,885
Inyo	\$500,000	\$0	\$500,000
Kern	\$1,125,469	\$750,000	\$375,469
Kings	\$500,000	\$0	\$500,000
Lake	\$557,845	\$0	\$557,845
Lassen	\$500,000	\$0	\$500,000
Los Angeles	\$75,259,413	\$75,259,413	\$0
Madera	\$617,522	\$400,000	\$217,522
Marin	\$1,551,535	\$1,551,535	\$0
Mariposa	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$0
Mendocino	\$1,719,462	\$0	\$1,719,462
Merced	\$631,401	\$0	\$631,401
Modoc	\$500,000	\$0	\$500,000
Mono	\$500,000	\$0	\$500,000
Monterey	\$3,938,610	\$3,938,610	\$0
Napa	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$0
Nevada	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$0

(Appendix 3 continued)

COUNTY NAME	ALLOCATION AMOUNT	NONCOMPETITIVE AWARDED	NONCOMPETITIVE FUNDS REMAINING TO AWARD
Orange	\$6,651,830	\$0	\$6,651,830
Placer	\$921,458	\$902,280	\$19,178
Plumas	\$500,000	\$0	\$500,000
Riverside	\$3,340,454	\$0	\$3,340,454
Sacramento	\$5,087,737	\$2,800,000	\$2,287,737
San Benito	\$732,713	\$0	\$732,713
San Bernardino	\$2,591,023	\$2,591,000	\$23
San Diego	\$12,713,886	\$12,713,886	\$0
San Francisco	\$9,519,091	\$9,519,091	\$0
San Joaquin	\$2,141,364	\$0	\$2,141,364
San Luis Obispo	\$1,562,638	\$0	\$1,562,638
San Mateo	\$1,740,281	\$1,740,281	\$0
Santa Barbara	\$2,582,696	\$1,500,000	\$1,082,696
Santa Clara	\$10,262,970	\$10,262,970	\$0
Santa Cruz	\$3,122,563	\$0	\$3,122,563
Shasta	\$889,538	\$889,538	\$0

(Appendix 3 continued)

COUNTY NAME	ALLOCATION AMOUNT	NONCOMPETITIVE AWARDED	NONCOMPETITIVE FUNDS REMAINING TO AWARD
Sierra	\$500,000	\$0	\$500,000
Siskiyou	\$500,000	\$0	\$500,000
Solano	\$1,711,136	\$1,711,136	\$0
Sonoma	\$3,935,834	\$0	\$3,935,834
Stanislaus	\$2,306,517	\$0	\$2,306,517
Sutter	\$500,000	\$0	\$500,000
Tehama	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$0
Tri-City (Claremont, La Verne, Pomona)	\$1,140,736	\$0	\$1,140,736
Trinity	\$500,000	\$0	\$500,000
Tulare	\$925,621	\$925,621	\$0
Tuolumne	\$500,000	\$0	\$500,000
Ventura	\$1,600,109	\$0	\$1,600,109
Yolo	\$638,340	\$608,340	\$30,000
Yuba	\$596,705	\$0	\$596,705
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$190,000,000</b>	<b>\$141,429,745</b>	<b>\$48,070,255</b>

## Appendix 4

### NPLH Summary – Noncompetitive Allocation through June 30, 2020

NPLH COUNTIES	TOTAL AVAILABLE	COMMITTED <sup>1</sup>	AVAILABLE	CAPITAL COSTS AWARDED <sup>2</sup>	LOCAL ADMINISTRATION AWARDED	CAPITALIZED OPERATING RESERVES AWARDED <sup>3</sup>	NPLH ASSISTED UNITS <sup>4</sup>
<b>Alternative Process Counties<sup>5</sup></b>							
Los Angeles	\$75,259,413	\$75,259,413	\$0	\$67,733,472	\$7,525,941		308
San Diego	\$12,713,886	\$12,713,886	\$0	\$6,992,638		\$5,721,248	24
San Francisco	\$9,519,091	\$9,519,091	\$0	\$9,519,091			44
Santa Clara	\$10,262,970	\$10,262,970	\$0	\$10,262,970			55
<b>Alternative Process County Subtotal</b>	<b>\$107,755,360</b>	<b>\$107,755,360</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$94,508,171</b>	<b>\$7,525,941</b>	<b>\$5,721,248</b>	<b>431</b>
<b>Other Counties</b>							
Large County Allocation	\$35,157,309	\$14,345,749	\$20,811,560	\$14,345,749			21
Medium County Allocation	\$26,628,871	\$12,797,308	\$13,831,563	\$12,797,308			39
Small County Allocation	\$20,458,460	\$6,531,328	\$13,927,132	\$6,531,328			
<b>Balance of State County Subtotal</b>	<b>\$82,244,640</b>	<b>\$33,674,385</b>	<b>\$48,570,255</b>	<b>\$33,674,385</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Noncompetitive Allocation Total</b>	<b>\$190,000,000</b>	<b>\$141,429,745</b>	<b>\$48,570,255</b>	<b>\$128,182,556</b>	<b>\$7,525,941</b>	<b>\$5,721,248</b>	<b>491</b>

### NPLH Summary – Competitive Allocation<sup>6</sup> through June 30, 2020

NPLH COUNTIES	TOTAL AVAILABLE	COMMITTED <sup>1</sup>	AVAILABLE	CAPITAL COSTS AWARDED <sup>2</sup>	LOCAL ADMINISTRATION AWARDED	CAPITALIZED OPERATING RESERVES AWARDED <sup>3</sup>	NPLH ASSISTED UNITS <sup>4</sup>
<b>Alternative Process Counties<sup>5</sup></b>							
Los Angeles		\$465,690,168		\$419,121,151	\$46,569,017		1,863
San Diego		\$68,069,001		\$54,189,008	\$6,806,900	\$7,073,093	251
San Francisco		\$54,751,662		\$54,751,662			207
Santa Clara		\$61,436,703		\$57,340,923	\$4,095,780		286
<b>Alternative Process County Subtotal</b>	<b>\$924,293,099</b>	<b>\$649,947,534</b>	<b>\$274,345,565</b>	<b>\$585,402,744</b>	<b>\$57,471,697</b>	<b>\$7,073,093</b>	<b>2,607</b>
<b>Other Counties</b>							
Large County Allocation		\$187,051,954		\$138,410,659		\$48,641,295	754
Medium County Allocation		\$95,791,169		\$71,794,767		\$23,996,402	415
Small County Allocation		\$54,415,335		\$35,590,532		\$18,824,803	222
<b>Balance of State County Subtotal</b>	<b>\$738,443,901</b>	<b>\$337,258,458</b>	<b>\$401,185,443</b>	<b>\$245,795,958</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$91,462,500</b>	<b>1,391</b>
<b>Competitive Allocation Total</b>	<b>\$1,662,737,000</b>	<b>\$987,205,992</b>	<b>\$675,531,008</b>	<b>\$831,198,702</b>	<b>\$57,471,697</b>	<b>\$98,535,593</b>	<b>3,998</b>
<b>Total NPLH Program</b>	<b>\$1,852,737,000</b>	<b>\$1,128,635,737</b>	<b>\$724,101,263</b>	<b>\$959,381,258</b>	<b>\$64,997,638</b>	<b>\$104,256,841</b>	<b>4,489</b>



<b>BOND AUTHORIZATION:</b>	\$2,000,000,000
<b>HCD ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS (5%):</b>	\$100,000,000
<b>RESERVES TO PREVENT DEFAULTS:</b>	\$9,000,000
<b>CAPITALIZED INTEREST PROJECTION:</b>	\$16,799,000
<b>BOND COSTS:</b>	\$15,464,000
<b>OTHER STATEWIDE COSTS:</b>	\$6,000,000
<b>NPLH PROJECT COSTS:</b>	\$1,852,737,000

#### Footnotes

- 1 Funding has been awarded but may not have been disbursed.
- 2 Capital costs are all project development costs, not including any Capitalized Operating Subsidy Reserve and Local Administration costs.
- 3 Capitalized Operating Subsidy Reserves are reserves established to address project operating deficits attributable to NPLH assisted units.
- 4 Most projects using Noncompetitive funds from the Large, Medium, and Small County Allocations also used Competitive Allocation funds; therefore, the NPLH Unit count for their Noncompetitive Allocation funds is an unduplicated number. Where no unit number is shown, these units are reflected in the Competitive Allocation unit count.
- 5 Alternative Process Counties have five percent or more of the statewide homeless population that have been designated to administer their own allocation of NPLH funds.
- 6 Total amounts available to each of the Alternative Process Counties and the Large Medium and Small allocations from the Competitive Allocation are determined by formula in individual Notices of Funding Availability (NOFAs). Since not all NOFAs have been released, the individual allocation amounts available and remaining are not yet known.



Caritas Village in Sonoma County | Photo courtesy of Burbank Housing



## No Place Like Home Program

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

[WWW.HCD.CA.GOV](http://WWW.HCD.CA.GOV)

FOLLOW US ON SOCIAL MEDIA:



Front and back cover images of Saint Teresa of Calcutta Villa in San Diego County  
Photo courtesy of San Diego Housing Commission