

April 27, 2020

MEMORANDUM

To: Select Budget Committee
From: Traci Ratzliff, Yolanda Ho, Amy Gore, Analysts, and Aly Pennucci, Supervising Analyst
Subject: Response to Questions on Payroll Expense Tax Package - Spending Plan

On Wednesday, April 22, 2020 the Select Budget Committee (“Select Committee”) began discussions on the proposed Payroll Expense Tax package – Spending Plan and Appropriation bill ([Council Bill 119774](#)). This memo provides additional information for the Select Committee in response to that discussion and questions raised in the days immediately following. The questions and requests for information are arranged by the following categories:

- A. General inquiries related to the entire spending plan proposal or to both social housing and Green New Deal (GND) investments (pg. 1)**
 - B. Cash Assistance (pg.3)**
 - C. Social Housing Investments (pg. 6)**
- A. General inquiries related to the entire spending plan proposal or to both social housing and GND investments**
1. Please provide a table that includes expenditures by year (including proposed spending in 2020).
 2. How many jobs can we estimate could be supported by the proposed social housing and GND investments?

Appendix 1 (pg. 9) to this memo includes a table with the proposed expenditures by year.

Information available to estimate the number of jobs that could be supported by the proposed investments varies. In some cases, the data available includes information only about direct jobs supported while others combine direct and indirect jobs, and still others include direct, indirect, and induced job estimates.¹ The information described below is taken from a number of sources that employ different methodologies to estimate jobs supported by investments in a particular industry; therefore it should be understood as one approach to roughly estimate jobs that could be supported, but the actual number of jobs created or supported by the proposed investments may be higher or lower than what is described. Further, the estimates do not account for jobs that are lost because of changes in

¹ Direct jobs are jobs supported directly by the new investment (e.g. workers on a construction site); indirect jobs are jobs supported as a result of the new investment (e.g. a paint supply store that supplies the construction project); induced jobs are supported as a result of the spending on goods and services resulting from the people directly and indirectly employed through the new investment (e.g. buying groceries or paying rent).

an industry (e.g. one job in the fossil fuel economy is “redirected” to a job in the green economy”) or other reductions in jobs due to market conditions (e.g. construction jobs for market rate development may decline in a recession, but the same type of job could be supported during the recession through government investments in affordable housing development).

- Table 1 summarizes the estimated number of jobs that could be supported or created from the proposed social housing investments. This includes direct and indirect jobs supported by the construction of new housing units and direct jobs that support the operation and provision of on-site services at newly constructed permanent supportive housing (PSH) units.
- Table 2 summarizes the estimated number of jobs that could be supported or created from the GND investments. The rule of thumb method described includes the estimated direct, indirect, and induced jobs supported by the investment. The City’s job tool estimates direct construction-related jobs only.
- Table 3 includes a summary of the direct, indirect, and induced jobs supported by the investments in new construction housing units and the GND investments using the rule of thumb method.

New Construction Housing Unit Development Job Estimate

According to the April 2015 National Association of Home Builders (NAHB) [report](#), construction of a 100-unit multifamily building supports 90 jobs (this includes direct construction jobs and indirect jobs in the wholesale and retail trades, and in business and professional services). The same study indicates that a 100-unit multifamily building supports 71 jobs by the induced spending in the local economy.

The spending plan estimates that about 3,500 units of affordable housing will be funded in the first five years of the tax and an additional 3,100 units by year 10 for a total of 6,600 new housing units. Based on this information, we estimate the funding will support 3,150 direct and indirect jobs by the end of five years and 5,940 direct and indirect jobs by the end of 10 years.

New Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) Project Job Estimate

Each new PSH project will require staff to support the operations and provision of on-site services for each building. On average, City-funded PSH buildings require 20 full-time employees to operate and provide services at such buildings. Some buildings may have more or less staffing depending on the operating model.

The average City-funded PSH building includes 100 units. The spending plan estimates that 1,400 units of PSH will be funded in the first five years of the tax and an additional 1,300 units by year 10 for a total of 2,700 PSH units. Based on this information, we estimate that

the investments made in the first five years will fund the development of 14 new PSH buildings requiring 280 direct jobs to support these projects after construction is completed and by year 10 an additional 13 PSH buildings will be funded, requiring an additional 260 direct jobs to support these projects for a total of 540 jobs needed to staff the new PSH units funded in the first 10 years. It should be noted that completion and opening of these projects will happen over the course of the five to 10+ years, as they are being financed and constructed.

Table 1: Summary of Job Estimates from proposed social housing investments

	5-Year Unit Estimate	5-Year Job Estimate	10-Year Unit Estimate	10-Year Job Estimate
New Construction – direct and indirect jobs	3,500	3,150	6,600	5,940
New Construction – induced jobs	3,500	2,485	6,600	4,686
PSH Projects – direct jobs	1,400	280	2,700	540

GND Related Investment Job Estimate

There is no common methodology for projecting job creation or support as a result of energy efficiency (EE) investments, though there are a couple of resources and tools that we can draw upon to develop estimates:

- A rule of thumb is that for every \$1 million in EE investments, 17 jobs are supported. Grist has a good overview of the background and principles in this estimate: <https://grist.org/green-jobs/2011-11-18-how-does-energy-efficiency-create-jobs/>.
- The City also has a jobs tool, developed by Inclusive Economics as part of the Bloomberg American Climate Cities Challenge. Note that the tool does not account for job losses, or any other jobs created or supported in the supply chain (e.g. manufacturers or distributor jobs for HVAC). This tool is simply projecting the local contractor job impact; thus, the estimates are substantially lower.

Table 2 presents an estimate of jobs calculated by both methods using the GND investment amounts proposed. For ease of analysis, GND investments were assumed to be entirely dedicated to converting homes from fossil fuel-based heat sources (i.e., heating oil or natural gas) to electric heat pumps in the jobs tool.

Table 2: Summary of Job Estimates from proposed GND investments

Method	5-Year Job Estimate	10-Year Job Estimate
Rule of thumb	11,010	22,860
Jobs tool	2,500	4,370

Table 3: Summary of Job Estimates from proposed New Construction Housing Investments and GND investments

Jobs Supported by Category (direct, indirect, and induced jobs) *	Years 1-5	Years 1-10
Housing: New Construction (per 100 units)	5,640	10,630
GND: Home Heat Conversion (per \$1M invested)	11,010	22,860

*All numbers rounded to the nearest 10

B. Cash Assistance

1. Please provide a table comparing the eligibility program for the programs that could be used to distribute the first \$100 million of emergency cash assistance.

As proposed, 50 percent of the funds (\$100 million) for the emergency cash assistance would be distributed to low-income households enrolled in existing City assistance programs, or State assistance programs administered by the City, such as Fresh Bucks, the Child Care Assistance Program, and the Early Childhood Education and Assistance Program. Please see Appendix 2 (pg. 10) to this memo for a table that provides a comparison of the income thresholds for certain City administered programs.

2. What is the City’s role, if any, in administering the State’s Early Childhood Education and Assistance Program (ECEAP)? Does the City have access to the enrollment data for ECEAP families, including names, addresses, and income information that could be used to distribute cash assistance?

The Department of Education and Early Learning (DEEL) is an ECEAP contractor; the City administers ECEAP funds by subcontracting with community-based organizations (CBOs). The City receives state grants funds for this program; the City does not supplement those funds with City dollars.

DEEL is the contractor to the State and then subcontracts with providers to provide ECEAP services. DEEL’s staff provides contract monitoring, technical assistance and program quality assurance activities but enrollment is handled entirely by the subcontracted CBOs. The City has contact information for ECEAP families served through the City’s contract. However, the City ran into issues with the emergency grocery voucher program because ECEAP eligibility is not tied to residency exclusively. If you live or work in Seattle, you’re eligible for DEEL’s ECEAP program. This caused confusion with the grocery voucher program because they did not enroll any family that participates in ECEAP through the City’s contract if they had an address outside of the City (e.g. families that enrolled through the City because the work in the City but did not reside in the City; in some cases, if they have moved into the City since enrolling they may have been missed). The grocery vouchers also

were not sent to any family enrolled in Seattle Preschool Program or Pathway who moved out of the City.

3. Are there other models that could inform the proposed plan to distribute cash assistance (e.g. the model the City of Austin, TX is using to distribute funding)?

As described in question one, to distribute the emergency cash assistance as quickly as possible, the proposal in CB 119774 builds on the [Emergency Grocery Voucher Program](#) by distributing 50 percent of the funds (\$100 million) to low-income households enrolled in existing City assistance programs, or State assistance programs administered by the City, such as Fresh Bucks, the Child Care Assistance Program, and the ECEAP. The remaining \$100 million would be distributed to those impacted by the COVID-19 crisis but not enrolled in an existing City assistance programs, or State assistance programs administered by the City.

Appendix 3 (pg. 12) provides a comparison of the process used to distribute specific types of assistance for the following programs:

- *Seattle's Emergency Grocery Voucher Program:* Launched in March 2020, the [grocery voucher program](#) distributed \$5 million in grocery vouchers to 6,250 households impacted by the COVID-19 crisis. The program is continuing to raise money to distribute additional vouchers.
- *United Way-King County Rental Assistance:* In April 2020, with a \$1 million contribution from the City and \$4 million from other public and private contributions, the United Way expanded their [HomeBase](#) program to provide one month of rental assistance to households with incomes below 50% of Area Median Income and who have been economically impacted by COVID-19 and are behind in rent. United Way estimates that approximately 2000 families will be assisted with the initial \$5 million investment. The program is actively fund raising to provide additional assistance; the Council will consider legislation that could provide additional resources for this program; the Mayor has proposed allocating an additional \$1.5 million in Community Development Block Grant funding received as part of the CARES Act Funding.
- *Austin, TX COVID-19 Emergency Relief:* In April 2020, the Austin City Council established Austin's [Relief in a State of Emergency \(RISE\)](#) program following adoption of [Ordinance No. 20200409-087](#), which appropriates \$15 million for COVID-19 emergency relief, and [Resolution #20200409-81](#), which directs the distribution of the emergency relief funds.

The main difference between the programs described and the proposal in CB 119774 is that these programs rely 100 percent on partnerships with nonprofit organizations while the proposal in CB 119774 would have the City distributing at least half of the funds directly. However, CB 119774 does not foreclose on the possibility of working with nonprofit CBOs to distribute at least half of the emergency cash assistance. Further, Councilmember Sawant has asked Central Staff to prepare an amendment for the Select

Committee’s consideration at a later date that would state explicitly that at least half of the funding could be distributed through partnerships with CBOs.

4. Please provide options to ensure that people will not be asked to disclose immigration status in order to receive cash assistance.

The proposed legislation specifies that the distribution of the second round of cash assistance “prioritize those who experience structural or institutional barriers to accessing support from the government (e.g., language barriers, fear of deportation, experiencing homelessness, lack of a permanent address, experiencing domestic violence, seniors), and those who require assistance immediately (i.e., people who are recently unemployed or had their work hours severely reduced).”

According to [Seattle Municipal Code \(SMC\) 4.18.015](#), “...unless otherwise required by law or by court order, no Seattle City officer or employee shall inquire into the immigration status of any person, or engage in activities designed to ascertain the immigration status of any person.” Since being established in 2002, this policy has been reaffirmed by the Mayor and Council, most recently in adoption of [Resolution 31890](#) in 2019.

To meet the objective of the proposed legislation and to comply with the SMC:

- Qualifying for assistance should not require any questions about immigration status, nor should it require proof of citizenship or other documentation related to immigration status. This is consistent with the current provision of services in the City of Seattle.
- The program should use trusted intermediaries that work with immigrant and refugee communities and are capable of culturally competent service delivery, including with individuals regardless of their immigration status. This is consistent with the approach taken for the grocery voucher program and rent assistance program.

5. In CB 119774, Sections 2.B.1.a and 2.B.1.b describe two different groups of households – one already enrolled in City administered programs, and the other whose finances have been negatively impacted by COVID. Given what we know about the economic impact of COVID, and the response to other direct assistance programs such as Small Business Stabilization Fund and rental assistance, it’s reasonable to think that many more than 100,000 households may fall into the second “bucket” alone. Given that, can you speak to the decisions to include both groups, versus just households negatively impacted by COVID?

The two stage distribution included in the proposal was intended to both get funds out quickly (to existing program clients) as well as to give the Exec time to develop a more robust and equitable way of identifying those negatively impacted by COVID but who are not enrolled in assistance programs.

6. Can you speak to the decision to provide flat payments, instead of scaling the payments to the size of the household or even to the degree of the need? For instance, households that are enrolled in the Utility Discount Program and Fresh Bucks must qualify based on gross income, with the threshold set by household size. It's reasonable to think that a \$500 payment would go a lot farther in a household of 1 than in a household of 5 people.

A flat payment allows funds to be distributed quicker with less need for applicants to supply information and for that information to be verified. A variable approach to cash assistance is possible, but will require more time to develop the program and distribute funds.

7. Is there a possibility that the direct payments may make some households ineligible for other services or programs they currently depend upon? For instance, when eligibility is determined by income?

Possibly. Central Staff will follow-up with more information when available.

C. Social Housing Investments

1. Provide data showing households who are rent burdened to help understand where there is the greatest need.

Rent burden is typically defined as spending more than 30 percent of household income on rent. US Department of Housing and Urban Development uses two categories to describe households who are rent burdened: (a) rent burdened households (those paying 30 percent to 50 percent of their income for rent) and (b) severely rent burdened households (those paying more than 50 percent of their income for rent). The data summarized in Table 4 shows that:

- Of households with incomes ≤ 80 percent area median income AMI, 34 percent (29,300 households) are rent burdened and about 36 percent (30,900 households) are severely rent burdened.
- Of households with incomes > 80 percent AMI, nine percent (7,200 households) are rent burdened; less than one percent (640 households) are severely rent burdened.

Table 4: Renter Households Rent Burdened by Income Level

Household Income Level (% AMI)	Not Rent Burdened	Rent Burdened >30% to 50%	Severely Rent Burdened > 50%	Total	% Rent Burdened > 30% to 50%	% Severely Rent Burdened > 50%
$\leq 30\%$ AMI	10,105	6,685	23,570	40,360	16.6%	58.4%
$> 30\%$ to 50% AMI	4,490	12,720	6,200	23,410	54.3%	26.5%
$> 50\%$ to 80% AMI	11,460	9,895	1,145	22,500	44.0%	5.1%
$> 80\%$ to 100% AMI	12,255	4,540	340	17,135	26.5%	2.0%
$> 100\%$ AMI	57,420	2,700	200	60,320	4.5%	0.3%
Total	95,725	36,540	31,455	163,720	22.3%	19.2%

Source: 2012-2016 American Community Survey CHAS Data

2. How many permanent support housing (PSH) units are needed in Seattle?

The 2019 Point-in-time count found approximately 8,000 people experiencing homelessness in the City (not in any sort of permanent housing, such as PSH). Of those, it is estimated that more than 1,500 experience chronic homelessness. If one assumes PSH is the best intervention for these individuals, then an additional 1,500 PSH beds are needed to house the number of people currently experiencing chronic homelessness. There are currently 2,967 permanent supportive housing units supported by the City of Seattle.

3. Please provide a more detailed breakdown of the housing estimates.²

Table 5: Estimate of Affordable Housing Units

	Estimated # of Units Funded: Years 1-5*	Estimated # of Units Funded: Years 1-10*
Permanent Supportive Housing and housing serving tenants with incomes <30% AMI	1,400	2,700
Housing serving tenants with incomes between 30% to 80% AMI	1,600	3,100
Housing serving tenants with incomes >80% AMI	400	800
Acquisition of existing buildings (to be converted to income- and rent-restricted units serving households with incomes from 0-100% AMI)	2,100	4,000
Total	5,600	10,600

**All numbers rounded to the nearest 100*

4. Beginning in 2023, members of the proposed Social Housing Board would be elected by the people if a Charter Amendment is made to allow for that election. Are there other examples of oversight boards that are an elected body in the City?

The Charter, as far back as 1890, states the Library Board is appointed by the Mayor and Council, according to City Archivist.

² Please see the assumptions that informed these estimates described on page 4 of the [Central Staff memo](#) presented at the 04/22/2020 Select Committee Meeting

5. Section 2C in CB 119774 ties allowable rent increase limits in newly constructed social housing to the annual percent increase in the housing component of the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for residences in Seattle. Seattle has experienced nation-leading increases in rent, so this wouldn't seem to slow down rent increases much. If this metric were applied to recent years, for instance, we could have seen rent increases of 6.4 percent in 2017, 5.9 percent in 2018, and then 4.1 percent in 2019. What alternate measures were considered, and why was this chosen?

This is a policy choice and could be tied to a different CPI or the maximum annual increase could establish a maximum increase or both (e.g. it could be limited to CPI up to x percent but never more than x percent). Based on the Housing component of the CPI for the last three years, here is what would have been permitted in terms of annual increases in rent: 2017 6.4 percent; 2018 5.9 percent and 2019 4.1 percent.

CPI-Housing, being a subset of the aggregate index CPI-ALL ITEMS, meets the same criteria for reliability, third-party objectivity, consistently updated schedule, and local market focus as CPI-ALL ITEMS does. CPI-Shelter, however, is better than CPI-ALL ITEMS at tracking changes in average multifamily residential rents.

6. The Social Housing Board is described as having responsibility for oversight of housing programs created by this legislation and making recommendations to the City Council and Executive. Does the Social Housing Board have decision-making authority? How would this new board interact with the Council's committee with oversight of housing, which is tasked with policy direction, oversight and recommendations on Housing policies and programs, including the Office of Housing, investing and promoting the development and preservation of affordable housing for workers, families and retirees?

The Social Housing Board would provide guidance but would not have decision making-authority. Ultimately the authority to spend money generated through this tax would reside with the Council and would be determined annually when the City considers the annual budget.

How this board would interact with the Council, with the Office of Housing, and other boards may be address in the implementation plan but generally speaking is expected to interact in a manner similar to other boards that advise the City on policy and budget priorities.

Appendices:

1. Proposed Expenditures by Years
2. Eligibility Criteria for Existing City Run or Administered Programs
3. Assistance Programs Comparison

cc: Kirstan Arestad, Executive Director

Appendix 1: Proposed Expenditures by Year

Program/Activity	Program Description	2020 Spending	2021 Spending	2022 Spending	2023 Spending	2024 Spending	2025 Spending	Total
Emergency Cash Assistance								
Cash Assistance to Low Income Households Impacted by COVID-19	Provide cash assistance to Seattle households (HH) during the COVID-19 Crisis. These funds could serve up to 100,000 Seattle households with monthly payments of five hundred dollars for four months.	\$200 million	-	-	-	-	-	\$200 million For 100,000 HH
Interfund loan repayment	Pay back the interfund loan (including interest) used in 2020 to provide the \$200 million in emergency cash assistance.	-	\$5 million ¹	-	-	-	-	Up to \$5 million for the interest payment on
Affordable Housing Inventory & Services								
Rental Housing Production to Assist Households from Zero to 100% of AMI	Capital construction or acquisition of units in affordable housing projects, including mixed income, permanently serving households with incomes from 0% of Area Median Income (AMI) to 100% of AMI.	-	\$414 million	\$362 million	\$362 million	\$361 million	\$361 million	\$1.8 billion 5-Year Goal: 5,600 units
Operating and Services Support for PSH	Operating and services support for PSH serving the most vulnerable homeless with incomes at 0-30% of AMI.	-	-	\$9 million	\$17 million	\$25 million	\$33 million	\$84 million Supporting 1,400 PSH units
Affordable Housing Inventory and Services Subtotal		-	\$414 million	\$371 million	\$378 million	\$386 million	\$394 million	\$1.9 billion
<i>% of revenue (after start-up and ongoing administrative costs)</i>		-	55%	75%	75%	75%	75%	
Green New Deal Implementation								
Green New Deal Implementation	Fund the following strategies to help implement Seattle's Green New Deal as articulated in Resolution 31895: investments to convert residential housing units from natural gas and heating oil to electric heat; solar installations; weatherization of existing residences; and investing in job training programs to equip workers with the necessary skills to thrive in the green economy and ensure a just transition for workers whose jobs currently depend on the fossil fuel industry.	-	\$138 million	\$124 million	\$126 million	\$129 million	\$131 million	\$648 million
% of total revenue		-	18%	25%	25%	25%	25%	23%
Start-up & Ongoing Costs								
Start-up costs and ongoing administration		-	\$29 million	\$15 million	\$16 million	\$16 million	\$16 million	\$92 million
% of total revenue		-	5%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%
TOTAL ANNUAL SPENDING:		\$200 million	\$586 million	\$510 million	\$520 million	\$531 million	\$541 million	\$2.9 billion

¹ The spending plan assumes that in 2020, the City will use an interfund loan to direct \$200 million dollars to be distributed as cash assistance directly to low-income households in the City of Seattle in response to the impacts of the COVID-19 emergency. In 2021, the payroll tax revenue generated in 2020 but collected in 2021 will be used first to pay back that interfund loan, including interest.

Appendix 2: Eligibility Criteria for Existing City Run or Administered Programs

Household/ Family Size	Early Childhood Education and Assistance Program <i>110% Federal Poverty Level</i>	Child Care Assistance Program <i>200 - 350% Federal Poverty Level</i>	Utility Discount Program <i>70% State Median Income</i>	Seattle Preschool Program <i>350% Federal Poverty Level</i>	Fresh Bucks <i>80% Area Median Income (HUD)</i>
1	\$14,036	\$25,520 – \$44,660	\$35,592	\$44,660	\$61,800
2	\$18,964	\$34,480 – \$60,340	\$46,548	\$60,340	\$70,600
3	\$23,892	\$43,440 – \$76,020	\$57,492	\$76,020	\$79,450
4	\$28,820	\$52,400 – \$91,700	\$68,448	\$91,700	\$88,250
5	\$33,748	\$61,360 – \$107,380	\$79,404	\$107,380	\$95,350
6	\$38,676	\$70,320 – \$123,060	\$90,348	\$123,060	\$102,400
7	\$43,604	\$79,280 – \$138,740	\$92,400	\$138,740	\$109,450
8	\$48,532	\$88,240 – \$154,420	\$94,464	\$154,420	\$116,500
9	\$53,460	\$97,200 – \$170,100	\$95,516	\$170,100	\$123,550
10	\$58,388	\$106,160 – \$185,780	\$98,568	\$185,780	\$130,650

Appendix 3: Assistance Programs Comparison

	Austin RISE	United Way-King County Rental Assistance ²	Seattle’s Emergency Grocery Voucher Program
Total Funding	\$15 million	\$5 million	\$5 million
Assistance Provided	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve food access; • Assist with rental or mortgage payments; • Assist with necessary bills (e.g. utility bills); • Assist with medical expenses; • Assist with the purchase of diapers, baby formula and other child-care expenses; • Assist survivors of domestic violence; • Provide case management; or • Provide other direct relief services provided by CBO to assist individuals and families in meeting basic needs, including essential hygiene, and alleviating hardships. • Provide direct cash assistance 	One month’s rent payment – maximum amount based on unit size.	\$800 in vouchers to purchase food, cleaning supplies, and other household goods at any Safeway store in Washington state. The benefit is provided in two batches of \$400/month.
Priority Populations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meet broad eligibility standards for Austin Public Health grant programs, such as a family income at or below 200% of federal poverty income guidelines; • Have experienced a significant hardship or loss of household income related to the COVID-19 pandemic; • Are ineligible for other forms of significant governmental relief (such as the CARES Act) or are receiving such relief in a limited or delayed manner that does not meet their needs; and • People who have tested positive for COVID-19 or have a high probability of infection based on contact tracing, while maintaining appropriate confidentiality. 	Any low-income household economically impacted by COVID-19 and behind on rent.	For this first round of vouchers, the priority was to identify those who may be most in need who could also be enrolled quickly. The City prioritized families enrolled in existing programs with closest ties to communities of color, and those programs developed with extensive race and social justice analysis.
Eligibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Live in Austin • Eligibility for, or enrollment in, other means-tested benefits programs, such as SNAP or Medicaid, may be considered as a substitute for income or demonstration of need, but this standard may not be required for eligibility. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Live in King County • Are behind in rent • Are economically impacted by COVID-19 • Income is at or below 50% of AMI (see the UWKC program webpage for details on the income thresholds) 	<p>Are enrolled in the following programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Child Care Assistance Program (CCAP) • Early Childhood Education and Assistance Program (ECEAP), all enrolled families that are below 350% of FPL • Seattle Preschool Program and Pathway to Seattle Preschool Program – all enrolled families that are below 350% of FPL • Seattle Parks and Recreation’s list of families/households who are currently receiving City Scholarships for School-Age Care (SAC) • Fresh Bucks
Application Process	Individuals work with community organizations to access assistance.	On-line application available for completion; 2-1-1 could be contacted for assistance in completing application; or community-based organizations could be contacted for assistance completing application	<p>For the first distribution Families enrolled in the programs described previously automatically received a voucher.</p> <p>For the second round of distribution, CBOs would request and receive vouchers to serve up to 100-200 families.</p>
Distribution Method	Austin Public Health has initially partnered with four organizations (Catholic Charities, Asian Family Support Services, El Buen Samaritano, and Austin Area Urban League), and developed an application process for other organizations to apply for funds.	Urban League, Solid Ground, and Wellspring selected to implement the program. These organizations review completed applications and make payments directly to landlords once they approve applications. Each agency is given administration funding to cover costs of implementing program and can draw down funds for rent payments from a centralized pool of funds held by United Way.	The City mailed vouchers for families enrolled in the programs described previously. 2,000 additional vouchers will be distributed to displaced workers via CBOs. The following CBOs will be distributing these vouchers: Asian Counseling and Referral Services, API Chaya, Casa Latina, Entre Hermanos, Fair Work Center, Ingersoll Gender Center, Lake City Collective, Providence Regina House, Refugee Women’s Alliance, United Indians of All Tribes, Villa Comunitaria, and West African Community Council.

² Additional fund raising ongoing; the [CB 119785](#) would provide an additional \$1.5 million for this program.