



**U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development**

Los Angeles Field Office - Region IX  
300 N. Los Angeles St., Suite 4054  
Los Angeles, CA 90012  
www.hud.gov

NOV 20 2017

Mr. Gary Halbert, City Manager  
City of Chula Vista  
276 Fourth Avenue  
Chula Vista, CA 91910

Dear Mr. Halbert:

Subject: Community Planning and Development (CPD) Entitlement Programs  
2015 & 2016 Program Year Review

Our Office has completed its review of the City of Chula Vista's Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) for the periods covering July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016, and July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017. This letter highlights significant achievements made by the City of Chula Vista utilizing HUD Consolidated Plan program funds, more specifically, funds from the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program, the HOME Investment Partnerships Act (HOME) Program and the Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Program.

The city received \$1,769,214 in CDBG funds, \$571,833 in HOME funds, and \$153,270 in ESG funds during the 2015 Program Year. The city received \$1,920,628 in CDBG funds, \$645,586 in HOME funds, and \$159,265 in ESG funds during the 2016 Program Year. As detailed in the attached tables, the city's performance has been rated as **Satisfactory** for both years and we want to commend the city for its many accomplishments, including the recent completion of the Duetta Apartments. This project not only increases the city's affordable rental housing stock, but advances the Department's mission of creating safe, decent, and affordable housing.

The city has addressed strategic program goals and objectives which give context and meaning to annual and cumulative accomplishments. All major program requirements are in compliance with HUD regulations. There were no outstanding issues raised during the 2015 and 2016 reviews.

We have also enclosed the latest SNAPSHOT of HOME Program Performance. As of September 30, 2017. The SNAPSHOT identifies the city as a HOME program high performer since there are no red flags.

Finally, the CAPER review is an evaluation of information submitted by a given community in highly abbreviated form, without supporting documentation. The Department's annual CAPER review makes no representation that activities, programs, and IDIS data included in the CAPER meet all regulatory and statutory parameters. Our review is primarily a commentary upon how much progress the grantee has made towards

the goals and objectives stated in its strategic plan, with additional comments made on potential improvements as applicable.

In accordance with the Consolidated Plan regulations described at 24 CFR §91.525, if the city has comments regarding this enclosed report please submit them to this office within 30 days of receipt of this letter. This office may revise the report after considering the city's response. If we do not receive comments within the 30-day time period, this letter and attached report will be considered final and can be made available to the public. The Department's annual CAPER review makes no representation that activities, programs, and IDIS data included in the CAPER meet regulatory and statutory parameters. Compliance with program statutes and regulations will be determined through monitoring or technical assistance visits. Please also consider making our review public and give a copy to your independent public accountant and/or external audit team as required by 2 CFR §200.508.

Should you have any questions, please contact Ester F. Dela, Community Planning and Development Representative, at 213-534-2545.

Sincerely,



William G. Vasquez, Director  
Office of Community Planning  
and Development

Enclosure

c: Angelica Davis and Jose Dorado, Sr. Management Analysts, Development Services  
Department - Housing Division



**Program Year Review Summary Table  
Program Year 2016; Year Two of Five Years (2015-2019)**

**City of Chula Vista**

**Overall Goal: Decent Housing**

Goal Outcome Indicator	5 Year Goal / Unit of Measure	5 Year Cumulative Accomplishments	5 Year Goal Assessment	PY2016 Annual Goal	PY2016 Annual Accomplishments	PY2016 Annual Goal Assessment
Direct Financial Assistance to Homebuyers	20 Households Assisted	1	5%	0*	0	0%
Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated	50 Household Housing Units	4	8%	0*	2	200%
Rental Units Constructed	230 Household Housing Units	15	6.52%	3	0	0%
Rental Units Rehabilitated	2 Household Housing Units	1	50%	0*	0	0%
Goal met, exceeded, or on target; grantee is a good performer in the program area						
Goal not met; extenuating circumstances satisfactorily explained; grantee performance is satisfactory						
Strategic goals and objective not provided and/or not met; data and/or performance in the program area needs to improve						
<i>*The city did not list an annual or 5-year goal for this goal outcome indicator, therefore goal assessments may appear greater than actual accomplishments.</i>						

**Additional HUD Comments regarding the City's Performance towards Decent Housing Goals**

The city has shown some progress in meeting its 5-year goals in this program area. HUD recognizes that the city recently completed the Duetta Apartments, which increases the city's affordable rental housing stock. Based on the anticipated date of completion in IDIS, the accomplishments for this project will be counted in Program Year 2017. In the coming years the city should strive to make progress in meeting its other 5-years goals in the areas of and direct financial assistance to homebuyers, homeowner housing rehabilitated, and rental units rehabilitated. If the city was not able to meet its Annual Action Plan or Consolidated Plan goals in any category, it should provide a narrative describing any extenuating circumstances in its CAPER narrative.

**Overall Goal: Suitable Living Environment**

Goal Outcome Indicator	5 Year Goal / Unit of Measure	5 Year Cumulative Accomplishments	5 Year Goal Assessment	PY2016 Annual Goal	PY2016 Annual Accomplishments	PY2016 Annual Goal Assessment
Homeless Person Overnight Shelter	0 Persons Assisted*	66	6,600%	0*	0	0%
Overnight/Emergency Shelter/Transitional Housing Beds Added	0 Persons Assisted*	0	0	120	28	23.33%
Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	30,000 Persons Assisted	14,540	48.47%	7,390	14,540	196.75%
Public Service Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	8,500 Persons Assisted	10,303	121.21%	2,225	4,622	207.73%
Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing	0 Households Assisted*	0	0	30	40	133.33%
Goal met, exceeded, or on target; grantee is a good performer in the program area						
Goal not met; extenuating circumstances satisfactorily explained; grantee performance is satisfactory						
Strategic goals and objective not provided and/or not met; data and/or performance in the program area needs to improve						
<i>*The city did not list an annual or 5-year goal for this goal outcome indicator, therefore goal assessments may appear greater than actual accomplishments.</i>						

**Additional HUD Comments regarding the City's Performance towards Suitable Living Environment Goals**

The city has made excellent progress in meeting (and in some cases exceeding) its 5-year goals in this program area. Although the city has not yet achieved its 5-year goals in the areas of homeless person overnight shelter, in the coming years the city should strive to make progress in and address these areas. If the city was not able to meet its Action Plan or Consolidated Plan goals in any category, it must provide a narrative describing any extenuating circumstances in its CAPER narrative.



**Overall Goal: Economic Opportunities**

Goal Outcome Indicator	5 Year Goal / Unit of Measure	5 Year Cumulative Accomplishments	5 Year Goal Assessment	PY2016 Annual Goal	PY2016 Annual Accomplishments	PY2016 Annual Goal Assessment
N/A						
Goal met, exceeded, or on target; grantee is a good performer in the program area						Good
Goal not met; extenuating circumstances satisfactorily explained; grantee performance is satisfactory						Satisfactory
Strategic goals and objective not provided and/or not met; data and/or performance in the program area needs to improve						Needs Improvement

**Additional HUD Comments regarding the City's Performance towards Economic Opportunity Goals**

The city did not list economic opportunities as an overall goal in its 5-year plan.

**Grant Amounts for FY 2016**

<b>CDBG</b>	\$1,920,628
<b>Current Year Program Income (CYPI)</b>	\$108,543.17
<b>Prior Year Program Income (PYPI)</b>	\$90,916.19
<b>HOME</b>	\$645,586
<b>ESG</b>	\$159,265
<b>HOPWA</b>	N/A

**Program Requirements - Maximum and Minimum Program Thresholds**

	<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>Actual / Allowable Percentage</b>
<b>CDBG</b>		
Planning & Administration	\$383,501.11	18.90% (20 percent maximum of CDBG Total + CYPI)
Public Services	\$242,956.58	12.08% (15 percent maximum of CDBG Total + PYPI)
Primary Objective (overall benefit)	\$817,795.7	100% (70 percent minimum of CDBG Total/year)
Timeliness	1.04	1.5 by May 2, 2017 [(Amount in line-of-credit + Program income) ÷ Latest grant allocation]
<b>ESG</b>		
Street Outreach		40.04% (60 percent maximum of Street Outreach and Emergency Shelter activities)
Emergency Shelter	\$63,777	
Administration (ESG only)	\$11,943.88	7.5% (7.5 percent maximum of ESG Total)
As applicable, activity caps and all program thresholds are in compliance with program rules.		
The original CAPER submission contained calculations in error in one or more of the above areas. The Agency has submitted additional information documenting compliance in all areas.		
The following activity caps and or program thresholds are not in compliance with program rules. The grantee must take the steps outlined below to correct the deficiency.		
The Grantee's current balance of funds is over the recommended program year standard for this point in the program year. We would encourage the Agency to take all relevant action to be in compliance with the 1.5 program year standard when the regulatory test is taken 60 days before the close of the program year on May 1, 2017. Failure to meet the standard will result in administrative sanctions which are the first step towards monetary penalties. The rate of expenditure on eligible activities must increase if the grantee wishes to avoid administrative sanctions.		
The grantee was previously identified as an untimely grantee and is currently under an expenditure plan. Expenditure rates continue to be low and we continue to be concerned that the grantee is at risk of losing CDBG funds in excess of the 1.5 program year standard.		
		<b>X</b>



**Program Requirements - Narratives, Forms, or Reports**

	Yes	No
Evidence of compliance with MBE/WBE requirements	Yes	
Documentation of match (HOME only)	Yes	
Affirmative Marketing Plan (HOME only)	Yes	
Information regarding on-site inspections (HOME only)	Yes	

**Commitment, CHDO Reservation, & Disbursement Timeframes in the HOME Program:**

Data run on 10/31/2017 indicates that the appropriate annual HOME allocation has met/did not meet the following:

	Yes	No
Commitment [last 24 months from calendar date of review]	N/A	
2012 Disbursement [last 5 years from calendar date of review]	Yes	
2014 CHDO Commitment [last 24 months from calendar date of review]	Yes	
2012 CHDO Disbursement timeframe [last 5 years from calendar date of review]	N/A	

**Comments for any column marked “No”:**

N/A

**Expenditure Timeframe in the ESG Program:**

N/A

**Comments for any column marked “No”:**

N/A

**Other Issues and Concerns:**

- There are no outstanding HUD Monitoring findings.
- There are no outstanding Single Audit findings related to HUD CPD programs

### Single Audit Issues

In addition to the typical areas reviewed during the annual single audit, the following are program areas for audit consideration:

- **Sub recipient Activity/Commercial Contracts** - Examine the recipient's system for monitoring subrecipients and commercial contracts.
- **Activities/Objectives** - Identify eligible activities funded with CDBG funds; test expenditure and related records; for selected activities, review documentation showing how national objectives are met.
- **Twenty percent Planning and Administration Cap** - Ascertain the total amount of grant and program income. Review the financial records to determine the amount expended for planning and administration.
- **Environmental Review** - Select a sample of projects on which expenditures have been made and determine whether environmental reviews have been performed in conformance with 24 CFR Part 58.34-35.

**Acquisition and Relocation.** Select a sample of completed projects involving acquisition of real property, particularly existing homeowner and rental property. Determine that property owners and/or tenants were provided with proper notices and compensation under the Uniform Relocation and Real Property Acquisition (URA) Act and Section 104(d).



**Program Year Review Summary Table  
Program Year 2015; Year One of Five Years (2015-2019)**

**City of Chula Vista**

**Overall Goal: Decent Housing**

Goal Outcome Indicator	5 Year Goal / Unit of Measure	5 Year Cumulative Accomplishments	5 Year Goal Assessment	PY2015 Annual Goal	PY2015 Annual Accomplishments	PY2015 Annual Goal Assessment
Direct Financial Assistance to Homebuyers	20 Households Assisted	0	0%	0*	0	0%
Homeowner Housing Added	0 Household Units*	1	100%	0*	1	100%
Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated	55 Household Housing Units	2	3.63%	0*	2	200%
Housing for Homeless Added	0 Household Units*	2	200%	0*	2	200%
Rental Units Constructed	250 Household Housing Units	0	6.52%	84	0	0%
Rental Units Rehabilitated	4 Household Housing Units	3	75%	0*	3	75%
Goal met, exceeded, or on target; grantee is a good performer in the program area						
Goal not met; extenuating circumstances satisfactorily explained; grantee performance is satisfactory						
Strategic goals and objective not provided and/or not met; data and/or performance in the program area needs to improve						

*\*The city did not list an annual or 5-year goal for this goal outcome indicator, therefore goal assessments may appear greater than actual accomplishments.*

**Additional HUD Comments regarding the City's Performance towards Decent Housing Goals**

The city has shown progress in meeting its 5-year goals in this program area. In the coming years the city should strive to make progress in meeting its other 5-years goals in the areas of direct financial assistance to homebuyers, and rental units constructed. If the city was not able to meet its Annual Action Plan or Consolidated Plan goals in any category, it should provide a narrative describing any extenuating circumstances in its CAPER narrative.

**Overall Goal: Suitable Living Environment**

Goal Outcome Indicator	5 Year Goal / Unit of Measure	5 Year Cumulative Accomplishments	5 Year Goal Assessment	PY2015 Annual Goal	PY2015 Annual Accomplishments	PY2015 Annual Goal Assessment
Homeless Person Overnight Shelter	0 Persons Assisted*	38	3,800%	0*	38	3,800%
Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	30,000 Persons Assisted	0	0%	1,500	0	0%
Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	0 Households Assisted*	0	0%	1	0	0%
Public Service Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	8,500 Persons Assisted	5,557	65.38%	8,500	5,557	65.38%
Goal met, exceeded, or on target; grantee is a good performer in the program area						
Goal not met; extenuating circumstances satisfactorily explained; grantee performance is satisfactory						
Strategic goals and objective not provided and/or not met; data and/or performance in the program area needs to improve						
<i>*The city did not list an annual or 5-year goal for this goal outcome indicator, therefore goal assessments may appear greater than actual accomplishments.</i>						

**Additional HUD Comments regarding the City's Performance towards Suitable Living Environment Goals**

The city has made excellent progress in meeting (and in some cases exceeding) its 5-year goals in this program area. Although the city has not yet achieved its 5-year goals in the areas of public facility or infrastructure activities (both low/moderate income housing benefit and non-low/moderate income housing benefit) in the coming years, the city should strive to make progress in and address these areas. If the city was not able to meet its Action Plan or Consolidated Plan goals in any category, it must provide a narrative describing any extenuating circumstances in its CAPER narrative.



**Overall Goal: Economic Opportunities**

Goal Outcome Indicator	5 Year Goal / Unit of Measure	5 Year Cumulative Accomplishments	5 Year Goal Assessment	PY2015 Annual Goal	PY2015 Annual Accomplishments	PY2015 Annual Goal Assessment
N/A						
Goal met, exceeded, or on target; grantee is a good performer in the program area						Good
Goal not met; extenuating circumstances satisfactorily explained; grantee performance is satisfactory						Satisfactory
Strategic goals and objective not provided and/or not met; data and/or performance in the program area needs to improve						Needs Improvement

**Additional HUD Comments regarding the City's Performance towards Economic Opportunity Goals**

The city did not list economic opportunities as an overall goal in its 5-year plan.

**Grant Amounts for FY 2015**

<b>CDBG</b>	\$1,769,214
<b>Current Year Program Income (CYPI)</b>	\$90,916.19
<b>Prior Year Program Income (PYPI)</b>	\$102,986
<b>HOME</b>	\$571,833
<b>ESG</b>	\$153,270
<b>HOPWA</b>	N/A

**Program Requirements - Maximum and Minimum Program Thresholds**

	<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>Actual / Allowable Percentage</b>
<b>CDBG</b>		
Planning & Administration	\$305,317	16.41% (20 percent maximum of CDBG Total + CYPI)
Public Services	\$242,961	12.98% (15 percent maximum of CDBG Total + PYPI)
Primary Objective (overall benefit)	\$348,544.19	88.37% (70 percent minimum of CDBG Total/year)
Timeliness	0.88	1.5 by May 2, 2016 [(Amount in line-of-credit + Program income) ÷ Latest grant allocation]
<b>ESG</b>		
Street Outreach		40.04% (60 percent maximum of Street Outreach and Emergency Shelter activities)
Emergency Shelter	\$62,777	
Administration (ESG only)	\$11,495.25	7.5% (7.5 percent maximum of ESG Total)
As applicable, activity caps and all program thresholds are in compliance with program rules.		
The original CAPER submission contained calculations in error in one or more of the above areas. The Agency has submitted additional information documenting compliance in all areas.		
The following activity caps and or program thresholds are not in compliance with program rules. The grantee must take the steps outlined below to correct the deficiency.		
The Grantee's current balance of funds is over the recommended program year standard for this point in the program year. We would encourage the Agency to take all relevant action to be in compliance with the 1.5 program year standard when the regulatory test is taken 60 days before the close of the program year on May 1, 2017. Failure to meet the standard will result in administrative sanctions which are the first step towards monetary penalties. The rate of expenditure on eligible activities must increase if the grantee wishes to avoid administrative sanctions.		
The grantee was previously identified as an untimely grantee and is currently under an expenditure plan. Expenditure rates continue to be low and we continue to be concerned that the grantee is at risk of losing CDBG funds in excess of the 1.5 program year standard.		
		<b>X</b>



**Program Requirements - Narratives, Forms, or Reports**

	Yes	No
Evidence of compliance with MBE/WBE requirements	Yes	
Documentation of match (HOME only)	Yes	
Affirmative Marketing Plan (HOME only)	Yes	
Information regarding on-site inspections (HOME only)	Yes	

**Commitment, CHDO Reservation, & Disbursement Timeframes in the HOME Program:**

Data run on 5/31/2016 indicates that the appropriate annual HOME allocation has met/did not meet the following:

	Yes	No
2012 Commitment [last 24 months from calendar date of review]	Yes	
2009 Disbursement [last 5 years from calendar date of review]	Yes	
2012 CHDO Commitment [last 24 months from calendar date of review]	Yes	
2012 CHDO Disbursement timeframe [last 5 years from calendar date of review]	Yes	

**Comments for any column marked "No":**

N/A

**Expenditure Timeframe in the ESG Program:**

N/A

**Comments for any column marked "No":**

N/A

**Other Issues Identified:**

- There are no outstanding HUD Monitoring findings.

### Single Audit Issues

In addition to the typical areas reviewed during the annual single audit, the following are program areas for audit consideration:

- **Sub recipient Activity/Commercial Contracts** - Examine the recipient's system for monitoring subrecipients and commercial contracts.
- **Activities/Objectives** - Identify eligible activities funded with CDBG funds; test expenditure and related records; for selected activities, review documentation showing how national objectives are met.
- **Twenty percent Planning and Administration Cap** - Ascertain the total amount of grant and program income. Review the financial records to determine the amount expended for planning and administration.
- **Environmental Review** - Select a sample of projects on which expenditures have been made and determine whether environmental reviews have been performed in conformance with 24 CFR Part 58.34-35.

**Acquisition and Relocation.** Select a sample of completed projects involving acquisition of real property, particularly existing homeowner and rental property. Determine that property owners and/or tenants were provided with proper notices and compensation under the Uniform Relocation and Real Property Acquisition (URA) Act and Section 104(d).



**SNAPSHOT of HOME Program Performance--As of 9/30/17**  
**Local Participating Jurisdictions with Rental Production Activities**



Participating Jurisdiction (PJ):  State:  PJ Since (FY):

PJ's Total HOME Allocation Received:  PJ's Size Grouping\*:  Nat'l Ranking (Percentile):\*

Category	PJ	State Average	State Rank	Nat'l Average	Nat'l Ranking (Percentile):*	
					Group	C
<b>Program Progress:</b>						
% of Funds Committed	<input type="text" value="96.48"/> %	<input type="text" value="95.81"/> %	<input type="text" value="38"/> PJs in State: <input type="text" value="94"/>	<input type="text" value="96.04"/> %	<input type="text" value="49"/>	<input type="text" value="49"/>
% of Funds Disbursed	<input type="text" value="94.71"/> %	<input type="text" value="93.17"/> %	<input type="text" value="31"/>	<input type="text" value="93.27"/> %	<input type="text" value="62"/>	<input type="text" value="64"/>
Leveraging Ratio for Rental Activities	<input type="text" value="11.24"/>	<input type="text" value="6.14"/>	<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text" value="5.7"/>	<input type="text" value="100"/>	<input type="text" value="100"/>
% of Completed Rental Disbursements to All Rental Commitments***	<input type="text" value="100.00"/> %	<input type="text" value="95.39"/> %	<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text" value="96.10"/> %	<input type="text" value="100"/>	<input type="text" value="100"/>
% of Completed CHDO Disbursements to All CHDO Reservations***	<input type="text" value="100.00"/> %	<input type="text" value="92.80"/> %	<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text" value="90.74"/> %	<input type="text" value="100"/>	<input type="text" value="100"/>

**Low-Income Benefit:**

% of 0-50% AMI Renters to All Renters	<input type="text" value="95.43"/> %	<input type="text" value="83.76"/> %	<input type="text" value="13"/>	<input type="text" value="82.81"/> %	<input type="text" value="85"/>	<input type="text" value="87"/>
% of 0-30% AMI Renters to All Renters***	<input type="text" value="24.57"/> %	<input type="text" value="42.18"/> %	<input type="text" value="73"/>	<input type="text" value="46.92"/> %	<input type="text" value="17"/>	<input type="text" value="15"/>

**Lease-Up:**

% of Occupied Rental Units to All Completed Rental Units***	<input type="text" value="100.00"/> %	<input type="text" value="97.87"/> %	<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text" value="97.90"/> %	<input type="text" value="100"/>	<input type="text" value="100"/>
---	---------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

**Overall Ranking:**

In State:	<input type="text" value="32"/> / <input type="text" value="94"/>	Nationally:	<input type="text" value="62"/>	<input type="text" value="61"/>
-----------	---	-------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------

**HOME Cost Per Unit and Number of Completed Units:**

Rental Unit	<input type="text" value="\$76,030"/>	<input type="text" value="\$48,627"/>	<input type="text" value="175"/> Units	<input type="text" value="\$35,297"/>	<input type="text" value="175"/> Units	<input type="text" value="49.70"/> %
Homebuyer Unit	<input type="text" value="\$35,598"/>	<input type="text" value="\$24,842"/>	<input type="text" value="56"/> Units	<input type="text" value="\$17,519"/>	<input type="text" value="56"/> Units	<input type="text" value="15.90"/> %
Homeowner-Rehab Unit	<input type="text" value="\$8,387"/>	<input type="text" value="\$27,945"/>	<input type="text" value="73"/> Units	<input type="text" value="\$21,724"/>	<input type="text" value="73"/> Units	<input type="text" value="20.70"/> %
TBRA Unit	<input type="text" value="\$15,753"/>	<input type="text" value="\$3,032"/>	<input type="text" value="48"/> Units	<input type="text" value="\$3,532"/>	<input type="text" value="48"/> Units	<input type="text" value="13.60"/> %

\* - A = PJ's Annual Allocation is greater than or equal to \$3.5 million (16 PJs)

B = PJ's Annual Allocation is less than \$3.5 million and greater than or equal to \$1 million (119 PJs)

C = PJ's Annual Allocation is less than \$1 million (444 PJs)

\*\* - E.g., a percentile rank of 70 means that the performance exceeds that of 70% of PJs.

\*\*\* - This category is double-weighted in compiling both the State Overall Ranking and the National Overall Ranking of each PJ.

Source: Data entered by HOME Participating Jurisdictions into HUD's Integrated Disbursement and Information System (IDIS)

## Program and Beneficiary Characteristics for Completed Units

Participating Jurisdiction (PJ): Chula Vista CA

**Total Development Costs:**  
(average reported cost per unit in HOME-assisted projects)

PJ:	\$246,413	Homebuyer	\$270,538	Homeowner	\$8,387
State*:	\$180,916		\$128,035		\$30,215
National:**	\$129,510		\$86,304		\$25,865

CHDO Operating Expenses:  
(% of allocation)

PJ:	1.1 %
National Avg:	1.1 %

R.S. Means Cost Index: 1.03

	Rental		Homebuyer		Homeowner		Rental		Homebuyer		Homeowner		TBRA	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>RACE:</b>														
White:	20.6	10.7	65.8	28.6	0.0	0.0	35.4	28.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	35.7	0.0	35.7
Black/African American:	5.7	3.6	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	24.0	0.0	84.9	0.0	0.0	14.3	84.9	14.3
Asian:	1.1	8.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	26.3	8.9	1.4	0.0	0.0	28.6	1.4	28.6
American Indian/Alaska Native:	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.4	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	21.4	0.0	21.4
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander:	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.9	12.5	13.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.7	0.0
American Indian/Alaska Native and White:	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0								
Asian and White:	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0								
Black/African American and White:	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0								
American Indian/Alaska Native and Black:	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0								
Other Multi Racial:	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0								
Asian/Pacific Islander:	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0								

**ETHNICITY:**

Hispanic	66.9	76.8	31.5	71.4
----------	------	------	------	------

**HOUSEHOLD SIZE:**

1 Person:	34.3	12.5	37.0	21.4
2 Persons:	24.0	26.8	45.2	7.1
3 Persons:	18.3	21.4	8.2	14.3
4 Persons:	17.1	26.8	8.2	42.9
5 Persons:	4.0	8.9	0.0	14.3
6 Persons:	1.7	3.6	1.4	0.0
7 Persons:	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
8 or more Persons:	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

**SUPPLEMENTAL RENTAL ASSISTANCE:**

Section 8:	11.4	0.0
HOME TBRA:	0.0	0.0
Other:	23.4	0.0
No Assistance:	65.1	0.0

# of Section 504 Compliant Units: 107

\* The State average includes all local and the State PJs within that state

\*\* The National average includes all local and State PJs, and Insular Areas

# Section 8 vouchers can be used for First-Time Homebuyer Downpayment Assistance.





**HOME PROGRAM**  
**SNAPSHOT WORKSHEET - RED FLAG INDICATORS**  
 Local Participating Jurisdictions with Rental Production Activities

Participating Jurisdiction (PJ): Chula Vista State: CA Group Rank: 62  
 (Percentile)

State Rank: 32 / 94 PJs Overall Rank: 61  
 (Percentile)

Summary: 0 / Of the 5 Indicators are Red Flags

FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	THRESHOLD*	PJ RESULTS	RED FLAG
4	% OF COMPLETED RENTAL DISBURSEMENTS TO ALL RENTAL COMMITMENTS	< 95.23%	100	
5	% OF COMPLETED CHDO DISBURSEMENTS TO ALL CHDO RESERVATIONS	< 84.43%	100	
6	% OF RENTERS BELOW 50% OF AREA MEDIAN INCOME	< 70%**	95.43	
8	% OF OCCUPIED RENTAL UNITS TO ALL RENTAL UNITS	< 96.64%	100	
"ALLOCATION-YEARS" NOT DISBURSED***		> 3.390	1.67	

\* This Threshold indicates approximately the lowest 20% of the PJs

\*\* This percentage may indicate a problem with meeting the 90% of rental units and TBRA provided to households at 60% AMI requirement

\*\*\* Total of undisbursed HOME and ADDI funds through FY 2013 HOME and ADDI allocation amount. This is not a SNAPSHOT indicator, but a good indicator of program progress.

