

RESPONSE TO GRAND JURY REPORT FORM

Report Title: "Golden Gate Village - The Clock is Ticking"

Report Date: May 17, 2018

Response by: Marin County Board of Supervisors

FINDINGS

- We agree with the finding(s) numbered: **F1-F3, F6, and F8-F11.**
- We disagree wholly or partially with the finding(s) numbered: **F4-F5, F7, and F12-F13.**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Recommendation **R5** has been implemented.
- Recommendations numbered **R2** and **R4** will not be implemented because they are not warranted or reasonable.

Marin County Board of Supervisors

Response to Findings and Recommendations from Grand Jury Report “Golden Gate Village - The Clock is Ticking”

FINDINGS:

- F1. The buildings at GGV have suffered from a severe accumulation of deferred maintenance due to lack of sufficient funding from HUD for decades.**

Response: Agree.

Public housing has not been adequately funded by the federal government for decades. The Marin Housing Authority (MHA) estimates that Golden Gate Villages (GGV) would require \$63 million for a complete rehabilitation. Nationally the figure is an estimated \$26 billion.

- F2. The structures are deteriorating to the point that an increasing number of units will not be habitable.**

Response: Agree.

Facility systems are designed to be naturally replaced over time due to wear and tear. Insufficient and declining maintenance funding from the federal government for systems and structures exacerbates and accelerates the problems.

- F3. A scenario for development (Scenario B) has been created by CVR Associates and approved by the Marin Housing Authority Board of Commissioners.**

Response: Agree.

CVR developed their Scenario B based on information provided in the Community Working Group report, information from GGV residents and the Resident Council, as well as CVR’s own experiences from successful projects nationally.

- F4. The CVR scenario relies upon a RAD conversion, which is a competitive application, for which the likelihood of success is**

unknown and with current planned budget cuts likely to be highly sought after by many public housing agencies.

Response: Partially Disagree.

While the likelihood of success of the RAD program is unknown, the RAD program is being consistently expanded since its inception. Further, HUD encourages public housing authorities to participate in the RAD program and supports public housing authorities with this endeavor. MHA will also explore other HUD redevelopment that support revitalizations.

F5. The CVR Associates scenario has substantial financial uncertainties and identifies at least a \$19M gap even if successful.

Response: Partially Disagree.

While we agree the CVR scenario identifies a funding gap, typically in affordable housing development such financing gaps are addressed by a developer, which has not yet been identified.

F6. GGV is vital to Marin County based upon historical significance and the fact that it is the only family public housing in Marin.

Response: Agree.

F7. Marin has been declared the least racially diverse county in the State.

Response: Partially disagree.

The Race Counts report on Marin County, available online at <http://www.racecounts.org/county/marin/>, is an analysis of disparity - not diversity - which found Marin County the most racially disparate county in the state. The report reviews economic opportunity, crime and justice, healthcare, and housing - comparing access, availability, and quality among these indicators by race. While Marin ranks well in healthcare, crime rates and other indicators, the benefits aren't shared equally by race. We appreciate that Marin City is among the most racially diverse communities in the County and we remain committed to working with MHA to ensure residents are not displaced as we consider options for housing improvements.

F8. GGV is part of Marin City, one of the more racially diverse areas in Marin.

Response: Agree.

F9. Given current housing trends in Marin it is unlikely that residents would be able to relocate in the County if GGV is gone.

Response: Agree.

F10. There is a fear of displacement by the residents of GGV stemming from a mistrust of public programs and a history of failure in other communities for public housing.

Response: Agree.

Trust is being developed through authentic and transparent engagement and outreach and by demonstrating progress and responsiveness to resident needs.

F11. The efforts of SF Hope provide a model for a successful revitalization that Marin can use in its own efforts.

Response: Agree.

Best practices like HOPE SF are being reviewed as prototypes for how to revitalize Golden Gate Village.

F12. The success of SF Hope was based on the establishment of a mayoral office appointee to work in concert with the San Francisco Housing Authority in order to coordinate rehabilitation of these communities.

Response: Partially Disagree.

The success of HOPE SF was made possible with strong leadership, but the establishment of a separate appointee is not necessary to achieve success. In fact, most public housing authorities across the state and the country rehabilitate communities without such an appointment.

F13. The County's leadership has shown a lack of urgency as regards the deteriorating property at GGV.

Response: Disagree.

The County has supported the strategy that MHA has utilized, which reflects best practices and the HOPE SF model - including a community-driven and consensus-building approach that engages and informs residents, preparing them for the revitalization process while deepening trust and empowering residents. This social/community building component runs parallel to, but also importantly precedes, the construction/development process. Over the next six months, MHA intends to seek a partnership with a developer as recommended by the CVR Report so that the revitalization planning can be implemented.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2017-2018 Marin County Civil Grand Jury recommends that:

- R2. Within six months, the Marin County Board of Supervisors should appoint and empower a coordinator independent of the Marin Housing Authority to lead the efforts to improve GGV in conjunction with the Marin Housing Authority and other agencies. These would include the physical construction and social programs at GGV as well as the coordination of public and private resources.**

Response: This recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable.

The success of HOPE SF was made possible with strong leadership. We believe that we have such strong leadership and experience from MHA's Executive Director Lewis Jordan.

- R4. The Marin County Board of Supervisors should proceed immediately to engage an established firm with experience in resolving mistrust issues who can work to create an atmosphere of trust between the residents of GGV and the Marin Housing Authority.**

Response: This recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable.

MHA has and will continue to lead an inclusive planning process that will build trust through engagement and outreach and by demonstrating progress and responsiveness to resident needs. The current strategy of including a community-driven and consensus-building approach will prepare residents for the revitalization process while deepening trust. Such efforts take patience, and success is best demonstrated by delivering results.

Over the next six months, MHA will seek a partnership with a developer as recommended by the CVR Report so that the revitalization planning can be implemented, where we hope the results of current trust-building efforts will begin to be more clearly demonstrated.

- R5. The Marin County Board of Supervisors, in conjunction with the Marin Housing Authority and GGV residents, should develop high priority programs that go beyond the housing needs of the**

community. These include job programs, a strong commitment to youth in the area, and help in establishing local leadership on issues that involve the GGV community.

Response: This recommendation has been implemented.

A key element of best practices like HOPE SF includes service connections to existing and new programs so that the socio-economic factors are addressed, along with the physical revitalization. MHA has a strong Family Self Sufficiency program to support GGV residents with case management services who are working to achieve educational and employment goals. This program can assist residents in creating an escrow account with increased earned income. MHA is part of a collaborative community of providers that help address the needs of its residents. In addition, MHA works closely with the school and County Library to support families and children by developing programs that reward good attendance as well as promote reading. Additionally, in the development of the RFQ a significant emphasis will be given to programs that develop youth and build capacity in the community.