

HOPE SF

Executive Summary: Baseline Evaluation Report

HOPE SF is an ambitious cross-sector effort to transform several San Francisco public housing projects into environmentally and economically sustainable mixed-income communities. HOPE SF is led by the San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and the Housing Authority¹ in partnership with Enterprise Community Partners and The San Francisco Foundation (TSFF).

This is a brief Executive Summary of a much larger comprehensive, integrated report on baseline conditions at four HOPE SF sites: Hunters View, Alice Griffith, Potrero Terrace and Annex, and Sunnydale. The full report provides a summary of the current physical and human realities that these public housing residents experience on a day-to-day basis, covering the time period from July 2010 to June 2011. This baseline assessment is part of a larger five-year evaluation conducted by LFA Group: *Learning for Action* to systematically track, analyze, and report on a set of indicators organized around HOPE SF's goals. The full baseline report, including an additional set of recommendations beyond those included in this Executive Summary, can be downloaded at: bit.ly/BaselineReport.

Methods Overview

LFA Group relied on the following data sources for the baseline evaluation:

- **Hunters View Household Survey:** 102 of 128 households (80%) completed the Household Survey.²
- **Key Informant Interviews:** LFA Group conducted interviews with individuals in leadership positions within the initiative to gather their perspectives and insights into the progress of the initiative.
- **Administrative Datasets:** Through an agreement with the City of San Francisco, LFA Group gained access to de-identified data on public housing residents from the following city agencies: First 5 San Francisco; San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD); Department of Children, Youth, and their Families (DCYF); Human Services Agency (HSA); Mayor's Office of Housing (MOH); Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD); San Francisco Housing Authority (SFHA); and San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (SFRA). LFA Group also drew on the Healthy Development Measurement Tool (HDMT) and the Tracking-at-a-Glance (TAAG) Service Connection database.
- **Document Review:** LFA Group relied on a number of documents to understand the details of the initiative and to capitalize on existing knowledge.

The HOPE SF Theory of Change

The HOPE SF Theory of Change, which articulates the initiative's strategy and intended outcomes, is included on the following page. The remainder of the Executive Summary is organized around the Theory of Change – specifically the "Impacts" column and the "Strategies" column.

¹ At the founding of HOPE SF, a third leader was the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (SFRA). Due to the California budget crisis and a resulting policy introduced by Governor Brown, the SFRA was dissolved on February 1, 2012.

² The evaluation team also completed a survey at Alice Griffith in May 2012. Results from that survey will be made available in the summer of 2012.

HOPE SF Theory of Change

HOPE SF ADDRESSES SERIOUS PROBLEMS...

- **Environmental:** HOPE SF properties are dilapidated with leaking plumbing, boarded-up windows, vermin, mold, and non-functioning appliances, and are in neighborhoods with poor infrastructure.
- **Social:** HOPE SF communities are pockets of concentrated poverty, unemployment, social isolation and violence.
- **Health:** The stresses of poverty, isolation, crime and lack of economic opportunity mean poor health outcomes for residents.
- **Education:** Youth face barriers to educational achievement that challenge them to be prepared for college and careers.

... THROUGH A UNIQUE APPROACH WITH IMPLICATIONS FOR ANTI-POVERTY EFFORTS NATIONWIDE

- Previous efforts to keep original residents have fallen short; the HOPE SF approach will create communities where residents will be able to stay and will want to stay. This approach includes:
 - On-site relocation and incentives to get on lease
 - Investment in community building and service connection on site and linking residents with the surrounding community
 - Partnerships with SFUSD and other agencies to improve schools in the community
- Extensive and intensive public-private partnerships to develop mixed-income communities
- Cross-site evaluation, launched at the start with data-sharing agreements in place across city departments with implications for demonstrating effectiveness of physical and social interventions on improved resident outcomes

IF

AND

THEN

These HYPOTHESES are true:

- This long-term, **two-generation strategy** of supporting adults through workforce development and service connection, while simultaneously improving learning, health, and self-efficacy among children, will help lift current families out of poverty and create the conditions for the next generation to **escape the cycle of poverty** and achieve their greatest potential.
- Neighborhoods with **enhanced safety, high quality infrastructure, and nearby amenities** reduce isolation, support economic self-sufficiency, and promote health.
- Revitalization, community building and service connection will create a community where people of higher income levels will want to live. Creating **mixed-income communities** will improve opportunities and outcomes for public housing residents.

We undertake these STRATEGIES:

Replace obsolete public housing within mixed-income developments

- Create new affordable housing, leveraging public and private local and national resources.
- Incorporate green and healthy site designs and units.

Improve social and economic outcomes for existing public housing residents

- Implement a Service Connection model to link residents with needed services.
- Create economic opportunities through workforce development efforts and the redevelopment process.
- Promote community building efforts within public housing sites.
- Provide resident training and capacity building to promote and sustain leadership and engagement.

Create thriving, appealing neighborhoods desirable to people of all income levels by introducing new amenities and enhancing existing community assets

- Integrate neighborhood improvement into the revitalization strategy.
- Build a strong sense of community within sites and between sites and surrounding neighborhoods.
- Promote mixed-income communities, which will in turn support revitalization in neighborhoods.

Change systems to promote and sustain desired outcomes for residents, developments, and neighborhoods

- Leverage the increased coordination among city partners to increase safety; increased safety will facilitate additional positive outcomes for health, educational attainment, and employment.
- Bring together DPH efforts with those of community providers to increase access to healthcare and prevention services, and to promote healthy living conditions that decrease rates of chronic disease.
- Partner with SFUSD to implement the community school model in local schools and improve school quality
- Enhance the workforce system to create more effective on-ramps to employment that offers a living wage and opportunities for advancement.

We can have these IMPACTS:

The supply of high-quality affordable housing is increased.

Residents are stably housed, healthy, and economically self-sufficient.

Communities are economically and environmentally sustainable.

Children are free from abuse and neglect.

Mixed-income communities thrive at redevelopment sites.

HOPE SF serves as a new national model for public housing revitalization.

Supply of High-Quality Affordable Housing

Over time, HOPE SF will replace the current dilapidated public housing at the sites listed in Exhibit 1 with new public housing units, as well as high-quality mixed-income housing. (This evaluation covers the first four sites listed. Construction is not scheduled to begin at the other sites until after the 2017 end date of this evaluation.) HOPE SF will add a total of 4,256 new units. The first units will open in December of 2012 at Hunters View.

Exhibit 1. Current Phases of and Projected Activity at HOPE SF Sites

Name	Neighborhood	Current Phase	Replacement Public Housing	Total Housing Proposed	Net New Housing
Active Currently					
Hunters View	Bayview Hunters Point	Construction	267	740	473
Alice Griffith	Bayview Hunters Point	Pre-development	256	1210	954
Potrero Annex and Terrace	Potrero Hill	Planning/Entitlement	606	1604	998
Sunnydale	Visitacion Valley	Planning/Entitlement	785	1700	915
Westside Courts	Western Addition	Feasibility	136	205	69
Longer Term					
Hunters Point	Bayview Hunters Point	No developer yet	133	274	141
Westbrook/ Hunters Point East	Bayview Hunters Point	No developer yet	306	1012	706
Total			2,489	6,745	4,256

Data Source: Health Task Force Recommendations to the Campaign for HOPE SF Steering Committee, December 2011.

A key principle of HOPE SF is to engage residents in the redevelopment process. However, less than half of Hunters View residents (44%) agree that they “have a say in plans for how the new housing development will look, and about half (51%) are “satisfied with what is planned for the future housing development.”

Recommendation

- HOPE SF can explore ways to improve the decision-making process so residents feel that their recommendations are being considered, and that there is follow-through on promises made.

Question for Reflection

- What can HOPE SF do to better educate residents about their housing rights and responsibilities so that they are not afraid of, or discouraged from participating in the redevelopment process?

Housing, Health, Safety, Education, and Economic Self-Sufficiency

Housing

According to the Hunters View Household Survey, turnover is quite low: 64% of residents have lived in public housing more than 15 years, and 56% have lived at the Hunters View development more than 15 years. Although the on-lease population is quite stable, a large population of individuals is most likely living off-lease at each site – or at least using HOPE SF addresses to receive benefits. In a study conducted at the San Francisco Human Services Agency, a staff analyst estimated the size of the off-lease population at Sunnydale. This study concluded that in addition to the 1725 on-lease residents, there are 593 individuals who are not on lease but receive benefits at a Sunnydale address. HOPE SF and the SFHA are working to move off-lease individuals who reside at each site on to a lease.

Current housing conditions for HOPE SF residents are extremely poor. Residences have mold, water leaks, and peeling paint – and most are not handicap-accessible. The surrounding areas often have broken concrete, a lack of sufficient lighting, and poor sewer systems that back up frequently.

Health

HOPE SF residents are exposed to unhealthy living conditions by living in substandard, run-down housing, and in socially isolated and unsafe neighborhoods. The table below summarizes key indicators of health for HOPE SF residents.

Exhibit 2. Health Indicators

Key Indicators	Hunters View	Alice Griffith	Potrero	Sunnydale	San Francisco
1) Percent of Residents with Health Coverage (18-64)	83%	90%	N/A	N/A	89%
2) Percent of Residents with Health Coverage (65+)	100%	100%	N/A	N/A	99%
3) Percent of Residents with Asthma	26%	21%	N/A	N/A	13%
4) Percent of Residents with Diabetes	29%	16%	N/A	N/A	6%
5) Percent of Residents High Blood Pressure	50%	34%	N/A	N/A	23%

Data Sources: Hunters View and Alice Griffith data are from the Tracking-at-a-Glance database. Medical conditions are self-reported by residents. The San Francisco data are from the 2009 California Health Interview Survey, <http://www.askchis.com/main/DQ3/geographic.asp>.

Recommendations

- Invest in violence prevention, stress management, and other strategies that prioritize the residents' physical safety.
- Continue to empower residents to lead and participate in health and wellness activities.
- Support and expand existing health and wellness programming at each site, with a focus on enhancing residents' ability to take part in self-care activities.
- Identify and recognize exceptional individuals and programs that promote health and wellness to inform best practices.

Safety

One of HOPE SF's eight guiding principles is to build a strong sense of community at each of the four redevelopment sites, and a key component of any healthy community is public safety. Repeated exposure to violence can lead to negative health outcomes such as post-traumatic stress disorder, depressive and anxiety disorders, substance abuse/dependence, and risky sexual behavior (including assault). Safety affects not only health outcomes, but also employment outcomes and other engagement opportunities for individuals and communities. HOPE SF recognizes that improving safety conditions is fundamental to success in all arenas.

[I hope the revitalization] stops all the killings, and drug activities. [I want to] be able to see my children have children.

I hope this stops all the killing. I've lost so many people due to guns.

Hunters View Residents

Exhibit 3. Safety Indicators

Key Indicators	Hunters View	Alice Griffith	Potrero	Sunnydale	San Francisco
1) Percent of Residents who Feel Very Safe Alone in the Parking Lots, Front Yards, Street, and Sidewalk Right Outside their Home at Night*	20%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2) Percent of Residents Reporting Shootings and Violence are a Big Problem in their Neighborhood*	68%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
3) Rate of Physical Assaults (per 1,000 people, 2005-2007)	70	107	71	47	44
4) Rate of Homicides (per 1,000 people, 2005-2007)	3.0	2.0	0.6	0.6	.3
5) Rate of Property Crimes (per 1,000 people, 2005-2007)	186	289	305	100	177

*For Alice Griffith, information is available from a household survey implemented in April through May 2012 and the results will be addressed in next year's evaluation report. For Potrero and Sunnydale, resident household survey data are not available.

Data Sources: Household Survey and the Healthy Development Measurement Tool.

Recommendations

- Develop a coordinated safety strategy.
- Prioritize funding and initiatives focused on safety.
- Capitalize on existing meeting opportunities with residents to discuss and address safety issues.

Questions for Reflection

- Are there additional stakeholders whose work focuses on safety to bring to existing collaborative structures?
- At some sites, safety interventions are successful; at others they are less so. Can natural comparisons among sites be used to understand the factors promoting success?

Education & Youth Development

HOPE SF has adopted a two-generation strategy to break the cycle of poverty: an approach emphasizing connection to services for adults and connection to education and youth development programs for children. Poverty is tightly linked to low levels of educational attainment. Nationally, among adults aged 25 and over, a third of those who had no college experience have annual

incomes below the poverty level.³ Adults with no college experience also make up almost two-thirds of adults who live in poverty.⁴ Education provides long-term financial returns, even when that education is at the preschool level; for at-risk children, quality early education is associated with an increase in adults' earnings and employee benefits.⁵

Exhibit 4. Education & Youth Development Indicators

Key Indicators	Hunters View	Alice Griffith	Potrero	Sunnydale
1) Proportion of Four-Year Olds Enrolled in Preschool For All	25%	48%	47%	45%
2) Average Number of Days Students Attend Out-of-School-Time Programming During the School Year (School Year has 176 days)	69	102	108	108
3) Proportion of Students Who Participate in Summer Programming	32%	23%	22%	27%
4) Number of Children and Youth (Age 0-24) Attending Youth Development Programs	36%	33%	29%	31%
5) Proportion of Middle-School Students Who are Truant or Chronically Truant	53%	40%	48%	34%

Data Source: San Francisco Unified School District and the Department of Children, Youth, and Their Families.

In San Francisco as a whole, 25% of students (at all grade levels combined) are truant or chronically truant.⁶

Recommendations

- Reduce duplication between SFUSD and DCYF OST services to serve more HOPE SF children.
- Verify attendance rates for youth programming.
- Leverage the success of school-based programming.
- Continue to provide opportunities for youth leadership.
- Leverage existing data systems, such as TAAG, to better track the engagement of youth in on-site and off-site youth programming.

Questions for Reflection

- How can Hunters View students in particular be better supported (given their very high truancy rate for middle school students, and their lower rates of participation in Preschool-for-All and out-of-school time programming)?
- How can HOPE SF help to address truancy and disconnection from school for all youth?
- Why are there low enrollment rates in Preschool For All?

³ "Two Generations, One Future; Moving Parents and Children beyond Poverty Together," Ascend at the Aspen Institute (February 2012).

⁴ Zakia Redd et al., "Two Generations in Poverty: Status and Trends among Parents and Children in the United States, 2000-2010," Child Trends (2011).

⁵ "Two Generations, One Future; Moving Parents and Children beyond Poverty Together."

⁶ California Department of Education, Special Education Division, Special Education Data, 2010-2011, <http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/SpecEd/> (July 31, 2012).

Child Welfare

In instances in which an allegation of child abuse or neglect is substantiated, a child welfare case is opened for the child. The table below summarizes rates of substantiated abuse for each of the four housing sites, as well as that of San Francisco as a whole.

Exhibit 5. Active Child Welfare Cases

	Hunters View	Alice Griffith	Potrero	Sunnydale	San Francisco
Percent of Children with an Active Child Welfare Case	10%	12%	9%	8%	<1%

Data Source: "Serving Public Housing Residents in San Francisco: Recommendations to Support HOPE SF and Beyond," prepared for Human Services Agency and Mayor's Office of Housing, City and County of San Francisco.

LFA Group collected child welfare statistics from a report prepared by an analyst at the Human Services Agency. It is unclear if these data will be available for the evaluation in the future.

Recommendation

- Formalize a process for including child welfare indicators as part of the HOPE SF evaluation.

Economic Self-Sufficiency

At its heart, HOPE SF is an anti-poverty initiative. As families increase earned income and build assets, they decrease dependence on public benefits and begin to move out of poverty.

Exhibit 6. Economic Self-Sufficiency and Employment Indicators

Key Indicators	Hunters View	Alice Griffith	Potrero	Sunnydale
1) Average Annual Household Income	\$12,750	\$16,432	\$14,028	\$13,487
2) Percent of Families Living under the Federal Poverty Level (Adjusted for Family Size)	67%	67%	64%	70%
3) Percent of Non-Disabled Adults Employed (Ages 25-64)	28%	30%	43%	35%
4) Percent of Residents who Have a Post-Secondary Degree, or Credential with Workforce Value*	11%	14%	14%	17%
5) Adults (Ages 25-64) who Participate in Job Readiness, Training, or Placement Services (as a Percent of Unemployed, non-Disabled Adults)	1%	2%	1%	2%
6) Average Annual Earnings for those Employed (Ages 25-64)	\$19,029	\$21,660	\$17,074	\$17,764
7) Of Households with the Head of Household under 65 and <u>not</u> on SSI, the Percentage with Employment Income	34%	30%	46%	39%
8) Percent of Families with Heads of Household under 65, that Receive at Least one Benefit Type	81%	82%	75%	76%

Data Sources: San Francisco Housing Authority, Office of Economic and Workforce Development, and Human Services Agency.

Weak labor force attachment and low earnings are two of the most visible indicators of disadvantage for HOPE SF residents. The following key findings stand out:

1. A large majority of families is living below the poverty level;
2. Employment rates for individuals are extremely low, and there is a correspondingly low rate of educational attainment;
3. Despite low employment rates, there are few adults participating in workforce programming;
4. Annual earnings for those employed are low;
5. Low proportions of households receive income from employment; and
6. Between 75% and 82% of households receive at least one benefit type, even when the head of household is under the age of 65.

Recommendations

- Segment the population of households, acknowledging that different sets of goals are appropriate for each segment (for some families, income from employment is a feasible option; for others, economic well-being should be maximized through appropriate connection with benefits and other support measures).
- For those who are not on a near-term path to stable employment, strategies should focus on supporting good health. Capitalize on health strategies to help remove employment barriers.
- HOPE SF should integrate into its partnership organizations that offer Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) services.
- Convene an advisory group that focuses specifically on workforce.
- Make more extensive workforce development tracking data a focus of TAAG investment.
- Introduce substantial new investments into the system that incentivize public agencies and community-based organizations to target their resources to HOPE SF residents.
- Support service connectors to generate awareness of opportunities in the workforce system.
- Pursue a range of strategies that focus on building the human capital of HOPE SF residents.
- Invest in connecting HOPE SF residents to transitional jobs that incorporate barrier removal and other supports.
- Support the further development of OEWD's sectoral strategy, while ensuring that this strategy benefits HOPE SF residents in particular.
- Improve working residents' access to the EITC to increase their effective wage.

Reflections on Core HOPE SF Human Capital Strategies: Service Connection and Community Building

Service Connection

Despite the need for and availability of services, many HOPE SF residents remain disconnected from the support and resources that they could benefit from. The City and County of San Francisco Service Connection Plan⁷ articulates a model for connecting HOPE SF residents to needed services during the first two phases of physical redevelopment.⁸ This model leverages the broad and rich

⁷ HOPE SF City and County of San Francisco Service Connection Plan (January 30, 2009).

⁸ Service connection will progress alongside physical redevelopment of each site and is expected to look different in different phases of the initiative. The three phases of development are: 1-lead-up to physical relocation and demolition; 2-during demolition and construction; and 3-

network of services already available to San Francisco residents and provides additional supports to help residents access existing resources during the redevelopment process. The model links residents to specialized services in the surrounding community, and to service needs that can be met on site, such as child care and after-school programming.

During the 2010-2011 fiscal year there was a great deal of turnover among Service Connection staff, and this turnover tended to slow down progress in trust-building. Service connection work in public housing is inherently challenging: service connectors need their own supports to avoid burnout and reduce turnover. Staff working on site face isolation, stress, resident skepticism, and lack of safety. Safety issues in particular create serious barriers. Unsafe conditions hinder the ability of service connectors to engage fully in their work, and to build trust with residents. Lack of safety is also a barrier for residents to fully engage with services: if they do not feel safe leaving the housing site, they will be unlikely to work with off-site providers.

Exhibit 7. Service Connection Indicators

Key Indicators	Hunters View	Alice Griffith	Potrero	Sunnydale
1) Percent of Residents Completing a Needs Assessment	46%	23%	N/A	N/A
2) Percent of All Residents 18+ who Receive Min. One Referral	30%	N/A	N/A	N/A
3) Percent of Residents Receiving Two or More Referrals	27%	N/A	N/A	N/A

Data Source: Tracking-at-a-Glance database.

Recommendations

- Convene HOPE SF stakeholders to address issues of safety. Safety rises to the top as a concern for service connectors and residents alike.
- Develop a comprehensive user manual for conducting needs assessments and entering data into the Tracking-At-A-Glance data system.

Questions for Reflection

- What additional supports can be provided to on-site staff to maximize retention of service connection team members and consistency for residents?
- Can the existing provider directory be updated with new resources and providers, and catalogued with specific information about the services that have been most popular and effective for residents at each site?

Community Building

At each HOPE SF site, developers hire community builders who engage the residents in planning for community revitalization. Community builders focus on developing a sense of community among the residents by engaging them on issues of shared interest and importance (e.g., public safety and neighborhood schools). These activities are designed to forge relationships and to strengthen social

reoccupancy and beyond. Development teams and consultants are responsible for drafting site-specific resident services plans that build upon the City plan but focus on the second and third phases of physical redevelopment.

networks, and are often blended with activities that are oriented toward providing services to the community (e.g. financial literacy workshops).

Exhibit 8. Community Building Indicators

Key Indicators	Hunters View	Alice Griffith	Potrero	Sunnydale
1) Percent of Residents who Believe People in their Community have Influence Over What the Neighborhood is Like*	48%	N/A	N/A	N/A
2) Percent of Residents Who Report That When There are Problems in the Neighborhood, the People who Live There Can Get Them Solved*	29%	N/A	N/A	N/A
3) Percent of Residents who Report Trust in their Neighbors*	15%	N/A	N/A	N/A
4) Percent of Residents who Trust that San Francisco Officials have their Community's Best Interests at Heart*	37%	N/A	N/A	N/A

*For Alice Griffith, information is available from a household survey implemented in April through May 2012 and the results will be addressed in next year's evaluation report. For Potrero and Sunnydale, resident household survey data are not available.

The four sites are at different phases with respect to community building. The Hunters View and Alice Griffith sites have progressed to the service connection stage of the revitalization process, but service connectors also continue to build on and engage the residents in regular community building activities that were established through the community building phase. At Potrero, a community builder has been working intensively with the residents since 2008. At Sunnydale, the developer decided in the second half of 2011 to bring on service connectors, but to have them do community building work as well.⁹

Recommendations

- Develop venues for staff to share lessons learned across sites.
- Continue to employ previously-identified successful strategies to increase resident engagement.
- Re-launch the HOPE SF Leadership Academy as soon as possible.

Questions for Reflection

- Does mobilizing residents at all stages of programming impact engagement?
- Can HOPE SF prioritize funding for community building initiatives that are multi-pronged (addressing issues in multiple arenas, for example safety, health, and youth development)?
- How can HOPE SF continue to engage in ongoing communication with residents?
- How can transportation issues for Leadership Academy attendees be resolved?

⁹ Mercy Housing developed a partnership with Bayview YMCA to support community building and service connection efforts at Sunnydale. This was a strategic decision to establish a community-based organization that could serve the community in the long-term and over the course of the redevelopment phases.