



3-5 Year Strategic Plan

This document includes Narrative Responses to specific questions that grantees of the Community Development Block Grant, HOME Investment Partnership, Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS and Emergency Shelter Grants Programs must respond to in order to be compliant with the Consolidated Planning Regulations.

GENERAL

Executive Summary

The Executive Summary is optional, but encouraged. If you choose to complete it, please provide a brief overview that includes major initiatives and highlights that are proposed throughout the 3-5 year strategic planning period.

3-5 Year Strategic Plan Executive Summary:

Needs identified and addressed in this Strategic Plan come back most often to having a place to live.

Trends shown in the following plan reflect gains and losses in the low-income communities of Kitsap County and the City of Bremerton and while area housing affordability indexes run ahead of the national average; the general trend is down for area housing affordability.

The Five Year Consolidated Plan, required of the Department of Housing and Urban Development for each City, County, or State receiving federal formula grant funds, addresses circumstances and projected needs of the low-income community. The Plan's statistical foundation is generally the 2000 U.S. Census.

For the first time this year, HUD encourages communities to employ a series of linked electronic files to specify goals and track progress through the five-year period. This document is the narrative foundation for the electronic material. It is common to City and County, while a number of specific tables will detail one jurisdiction or the other.

The 2006-2010 Consolidated Plan for Kitsap County and the City of Bremerton brings a new level of collaboration to the jurisdictions and focuses on the many opportunities and liabilities that affect both.

Strategic Plan

Due every three, four, or five years (length of period is at the grantee's discretion) no less than 45 days prior to the start of the grantee's program year start date. HUD does not accept plans between August 15 and November 15.

Mission:

Kitsap County: In a spirit of cooperation, the Kitsap County Block Grant Program works with low income housing, and supportive services for individuals and families to provide safe & healthy housing and self-reliant living. We support agencies, non-profits, governments and individuals to identify, address and fund long term solutions and projects that reduce homelessness, advance the availability of truly affordable housing, and increase the social and economic vitality of neighborhoods and individual.

City of Bremerton: We work with all members of the community to make Bremerton a place of social, economic, and physical health by providing collaborative planning processes and responsive development services to achieve our community's desired future.

General Questions

1. Describe the geographic areas of the jurisdiction (including areas of low income families and/or racial/minority concentration) in which assistance will be directed.
2. Describe the basis for allocating investments geographically within the jurisdiction (or within the EMSA for HOPWA) (91.215(a)(1)) and the basis for assigning the priority (including the relative priority, where required) given to each category of priority needs (91.215(a)(2)).
3. Identify any obstacles to meeting underserved needs (91.215(a)(3)).

3-5 Year Strategic Plan General Questions response:

1. Kitsap County, located across the Puget Sound from Seattle, Washington, is a peninsula with miles of shoreline, quiet waterways and many forested areas. Its central City, once the heart of the area, is Bremerton, Washington. Following a pattern common in America, gradual population and economic growth beyond the original city center has led to prosperity in suburban and rural county areas while leaving the City with older infrastructure, marginal housing and services attractive to those who can afford no more. During the past five years, fresh perspectives and increasing costs in land and housing in other parts of Puget Sound have led to revitalization efforts in the City of Bremerton. Those efforts lead to living in the downtown area by the affluent from Seattle and other areas, a return of goods and services to the downtown area, increased homeownership and new economic reasons to locate in the city. The Kitsap Peninsula offers by location in the Puget Sound more affordable living costs, again attracting those of marginal means hoping to enjoy the economy of the greater area.

2. Bremerton CDBG allocations will be based on requests from service providers in yearly funding rounds while HOME funds will be allocated as opportunities warrant. Priorities are assigned by Citizen Committee or elected City Council. Exceptions are the standing CDBG-funded loan program providing rehabilitation assistance to homeowners and the HOME-funded down payment assistance to new purchasers.

Kitsap County CDBG will have an annual application cycle for CDBG/HOME funds except for the ten percent set-aside in CDBG project funds for economic development where applications will be considered as received and funding permits.

A Citizen Advisory Board will review eligible applications and make funding recommendations to the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council based on the priorities established in this plan.

3. In Bremerton, rapid population growth and a large military population detract from sustained efforts to meet underserved community needs. The growing population, often more affluent than long-term residents, tends to out-shout or out-purchase those who may have less but have survived or endured in their circumstances longer.

The concentration of Navy facilities brings mixed stability to the area. Jobs and retail are nourished by the presence of the fleet while core community efforts and sustained changes lack long-term interest and leadership in the face of a constantly-changing home port population.

Kitsap County, unlike Bremerton, is comprised of an extensive rural geography and three cities, Poulsbo, Port Orchard and Bainbridge Island along with a County government and Native American tribes. They independently make planning regulations and they are at different phases of adapting to the soaring housing costs. Over time service providers have settled in Bremerton to be within reasonable transportation to clients. Transportation to services has become very difficult, time consuming and costly for other County residents. There are two "Catch Twenty Two's" to this historical siting of services and rental housing:

1. Low income homeless and very low income persons gravitate to Bremerton, creating an imbalance in how and where to provide housing and services for the County's poor.
2. The balance of renters and homeowners has been disproportionate, causing Bremerton to have a 59% renter population compared to the County's 40% (more consistent with the National Average.) which does not provide enough economic stability for Bremerton.

This inequitable distribution throughout the County of rental housing and public support services has become a priority for the County and its cities as well as Bremerton. This dispersal (over time) of the low income populations and rental housing throughout the County is a fundamental tenet of Bremerton and the County's efforts to encourage mixed use and income development for the future stability of residents and neighborhoods.

Managing the Process (91.200 (b))

1. Lead Agency. Identify the lead agency or entity for overseeing the development of the plan and the major public and private agencies responsible for administering programs covered by the consolidated plan.
2. Identify the significant aspects of the process by which the plan was developed, and the agencies, groups, organizations, and others who participated in the process.
3. Describe the jurisdiction's consultations with housing, social service agencies, and other entities, including those focusing on services to children, elderly persons, persons with disabilities, persons with HIV/AIDS and their families, and homeless

persons.

*Note: HOPWA grantees must consult broadly to develop a metropolitan-wide strategy and other jurisdictions must assist in the preparation of the HOPWA submission.

3-5 Year Strategic Plan Managing the Process response:

1. Kitsap County will be the lead agency for HOME funds and its own CDBG entitlement while the City of Bremerton will be the lead agency for its separate CDBG entitlement. Working in partnership with the County and City are parallel housing authorities.

The Bremerton Housing Authority owns and maintains the largest rental tract in the County (disintegrating Naval housing from World War II), and provides oversight for the Section 8 Voucher program in Kitsap County. Most of the income for maintaining its local projects and preparing for a total redevelopment of Westpark come from serving as a Contract Administrator for the states of Washington, Utah, Nebraska and Hawaii.

The Kitsap County Consolidated Housing Authority is a Municipal Corporation founded in 1982 to provide a continuum of affordable housing opportunities for low income residents of Kitsap County. KCCHA administers programs that result in affordable and market-rate housing in Kitsap County outside the City of Bremerton. KCCHA owns 1,161 rental housing units, including 136 public housing units. The Single Family Housing program includes a Mutual Self-Help Housing Program, Down Payment Assistance Program, Housing Rehabilitation Program for low income homeowners and a Homeownership Counseling Program that provides budgeting skills, credit repair, predatory lending and foreclosure prevention counseling. The Multi-Family program develops new units of affordable housing, preserves existing affordable housing and provides support to non-profit agencies, for profit agencies and governments to develop, preserve and arrange financing for some of their projects.

The Housing Authority's Community Services Program provides education and recreation opportunities for youth, seniors and families. These programs are based on progressive models; each program builds skills to prepare for the next. For example, the Summer Adventures program for youth focuses on reading skills and how to work with and be supportive of others. Homework Club provides tutoring help, develops mentors, helps kids learn to study, and develop time management, organization and responsibility skills.

KCCHA is the Community Renewal Agency for the City of Bremerton. In this role, KCCHA developed the Norm Dicks Government Center, a 106,000 square foot regional government center located in downtown Bremerton. This was completed in October of 2004. KCCHA is currently constructing the Harborside Condominiums, a 78-unit waterfront market rate condominium project that will increase the tax rolls for the City of Bremerton.

Other CHDO organizations building, buying and developing housing in Kitsap County include Low Income Housing Institute, Seattle (LIHI), Housing Resources Board (HRB) Bainbridge Island, Habitat for Humanity of Kitsap County & Kitsap Community Resources, providing mainly transitional housing tied to services.

2. John Epler & Associates, working on contract, brought together the statistical basis for this Consolidated Plan. As an area leader in processes that serve the needs of the homeless and low-income housing communities, Epler facilitated the priority needs and strategies discussions with area providers and spoke to many of the area experts. The Continuum of Care took a central role in developing their own plan, most of which is provided within the content of this Consolidated Plan to ensure a strict alignment with the strategies and expectations contained in this five year plan. A 10 year homeless plan will be released by the end of 2005 as well. That process runs parallel to this planning effort, but is guided by the state of Washington's coordinated planning.

3. The following agencies and organizations were contacted and participated in the planning process to assure the Consolidated Plan is comprehensive, and addresses statutory purposes including reducing the number of households in poverty. These agencies deal with many different populations, however, the required consultations include the following: persons living with HIV/AIDS, children, CGP - Housing Authorities participating in Comprehensive Grant Program, persons with disabilities, elderly, government agencies, homeless persons, children identified as lead poisoned and organizations reducing the number of people in poverty.

Agape Unlimited
American Red Cross
Area Agency on Aging, Div. Aging & Long Term Care
B.I. Recovery Center
B.I. Senior Community Center
Bainbridge Youth Services
Bremerton Food Line
Bremerton Housing Authority
Kitsap Co. Health Dist - AIDS
Bremerton-Kitsap County Health District
Catholic Community Service/Long Term Care
Central Kitsap Food Bank
Bremerton Services Association
City of Bainbridge Island
City of Bremerton
City of Port Orchard
City of Poulsbo
Communitas
Washington Deptment of Veterans Affairs
Washington Division of Aging & Long Term Care
Washington Division of Vocational Rehab
Domestic Violence Task Force
Washington Department of Social and Human Services - Community Resources
Employment Placement Service
Family Service Center
Bremerton Foodline
Frances Haddon Morgan Center
Givens Community & Senior Center
Goodwill Industries
Green Mountain Adult Day Health
Green Mountain Rehab Medicine
Group Health Behavioral Health and Mental Health
Harrison Memorial Hospital

Helpline House
Holly Ridge Family Resource Center
Hospice of Kitsap County
Housing Resources Board
Kitsap County Board of Commissioners
Kitsap County Community Development Block Grant Office
Kitsap County Consolidated Housing Authority
Kitsap County Developmental Disabilities
Kitsap County Employment & Training
Kitsap Applied Technologies Community Health Center
Kitsap Community Resources
Kitsap County Habitat for Humanity
Kitsap County Housing Coalition
Kitsap County Job Training Center
Kitsap Mental Health Services
Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council
Kitsap Sexual Assault Center
Kitsap Tenant Support Services
Kitsap Transit ACCESS
Literacy Council of Kitsap County
Lutheran Social Services
Messenger House Care Center
Ministerial Association
North K. Fishline
Olympic ESD Youth Recovery Program
Paratransit Services
Peninsula Services Day Treatment
Port Gamble S'Klallam Senior Center
Salvation Army
Senior FOCUS
Sound Works Job Center
South Kitsap Helpline
The Suquamish Tribe
Visually Impaired Persons
Volunteer Chore Service
WA State Employment Security Department
Washington PAVE
West Sound Treatment Center
YMCA - Childcare
YWCA- ALIVE Shelter for Battered Women

The agencies listed above deal with many different populations under many missions, but make a common effort to communicate, in particular through the Continuum of Care Coalition. These and other agency and service programs associated with low income and homeless client care are described in the institutional structure by category of service.

Citizen Participation (91.200 (b))

1. Provide a summary of the citizen participation process.

2. Provide a summary of citizen comments or views on the plan.
3. Provide a summary of efforts made to broaden public participation in the development of the consolidated plan, including outreach to minorities and non-English speaking persons, as well as persons with disabilities.
4. Provide a written explanation of comments not accepted and the reasons why these comments were not accepted.

*Please note that Citizen Comments and Responses may be included as additional files within the CPMP Tool.

3-5 Year Strategic Plan Citizen Participation response:

The Citizen Participation Plan (CPP) described below is the evolution and actualization of broad base and targeted planning. The CPP recognizes the input of resident stakeholders as key to any improvements in the life and livelihood of residents and the quality and stability of neighborhoods. The purpose of the participation plan is to provide Bremerton and Kitsap County citizens genuine involvement in identifying issues and supporting program priorities.

The Plan is designed to provide citizens access to become part of the planning process. To reach sub-populations who are often marginalized when it is time to rank the most important issues, providers of services were asked to engage a client, in an informal way, in their thoughts about what important things are missing in their lives that they believe can help them be more independent. Answers will be brought back to Continuum of Care so service providers may reflect on new questions and perspectives. This can be of particular importance with culturally sensitive issues. An interview and survey were provided to the Westpark public housing tenants' board for their priority issues of concern.

Continuum of Care Coalition was involved in HUD's Consolidated planning in advance of other nonprofit and housing organizations. The McKinney grant process completed by Continuum of Care applicants every May requires similar forms and criteria and follows the same priority needs identified for the Consolidated Plan. The Homeless portion of the Consolidated Plan is the lynch pin of the Coalition's planning process and priorities and both plans will be completed before January. In addition, this year, the Coalition has been working on a Ten Year Homeless Plan, required by HUD and under the leadership of Washington State.

THE PARTICIPATION PROCESS

The Citizen Participation Plan was crafted by the administering agencies and Continuum of Care Consortium. The Plan has been modified to reach additional agencies, in particular agencies working with persons with disabilities and agencies supervising and affected by the unprepared discharge of ex-prisoners, and individuals leaving mental and physical health institutions and youth "aging out" of foster care. In addition some modification with an eye toward obtaining broader public input and encouraging more direct input from low-income public housing tenants.

Development of the Draft Plan was a fourfold process:

First - a consultant familiar with the County through the State McKinney application process, and very familiar with the Department of Housing and Urban Development regulations and local statistical data. John Epler provided a solid draft of the data and analysis as required by HUD Consolidated Plan instructions.

Second - the Continuum of Care group worked on the Ten Year Homeless Plan for the state. Many of the discussions about evidence, issues and funding challenges led to questions about how to acquire and preserve the quality of housing and support services that lead to independence. In addition to the Consolidated Plan, the Coalition has been working on the Continuum of Care Plan and the Ten Year Homeless Plan. Keeping all the plans and strategies in sync will help agencies and funds not stretch too thin.

Third - the Sept 9 Public Hearing discussions and notes and attendees. Some of the new participants. Some of the new issues – prison, econ dev, vouchers etc.

Fourth - review through email and interviews with experts – HIV, Special Needs, discharge.

The concerns of Continuum of Care Coalition awaits the decision regarding the merger of the two PHAs. It is not clear if this can benefit the community monetarily. The enormous change is expected to take a great amount of time, and require \$300 million dollars to execute. Led by the Bremerton City Council and the Board of Kitsap County Consolidated Housing Authority the decision about what kind of Public Housing Authority can best lead the development, relocation and funding adjustments.

The community will be redeveloping Westpark, a large pre-WWII public housing project over the next ten years and many critical concerns about geographical dispersion will need many services to work together.

Citizens and agency representatives were notified of the publication of the Draft Consolidated Plan by public notice in newspapers. The draft report was posted on the County and City websites and interested parties were notified by email about where to find the draft plan and how they could provide feedback or comment on the Draft Plan.

Institutional Structure (91.215 (i))

1. Explain the institutional structure through which the jurisdiction will carry out its consolidated plan, including private industry, non-profit organizations, and public institutions.
2. Assess the strengths and gaps in the delivery system.
3. Assess the strengths and gaps in the delivery system for public housing, including a description of the organizational relationship between the jurisdiction and the public housing agency, including the appointing authority for the commissioners or board of housing agency, relationship regarding hiring, contracting and procurement; provision of services funded by the jurisdiction; review by the

jurisdiction of proposed capital improvements as well as proposed development, demolition or disposition of public housing developments.

3-5 Year Strategic Plan Institutional Structure response:

Kitsap County has a great deal of the capacity already in place to carry out its Consolidated Plan. Public jurisdictions, non-profit organizations and private interests all collaborate to provide housing and community development opportunities throughout the county.

Community Collaboration

Local collaborative community development planning is coordinated through the countywide Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council. Planning staffs from each jurisdiction also meet to decrease duplication of effort and provide networking. Additionally, the jurisdictions have specifically addressed affordable housing development through a variety of programs. Countywide tax-exempt revenue bonds and HOME financed single/multi-family housing development and CDBG funded housing rehabilitation programs are operated by the Kitsap County Consolidated Housing Authority, to which the cities of Bainbridge Island, Port Orchard and Poulsbo belong. The City of Bremerton operates CDBG/HOME funded housing rehabilitation and home ownership programs within its jurisdiction. Many formal and informal networks support the community's assessment, priority setting and collaborative efforts.

Housing Authorities

Both the Bremerton Housing Authority and Kitsap County Consolidated Housing Authority own, operate and develop public housing. Bremerton Housing Authority administers 1,342 Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers used throughout the County. The Housing Needs Assessment and Affordability Plan were completed in 1993 under the direction of Kitsap County Consolidated Housing Authority to show both met and unmet housing needs. Due to be revised soon, it provides a comprehensive picture of housing trends, costs and conditions, an analysis of current housing affordability and a projection of housing needs to 2000 and 2010 in unincorporated Kitsap County and the Cities of Bainbridge Island, Port Orchard and Poulsbo. It reviews land use and regulatory constraints and opportunities, as well as offering a range of options and strategies to encourage affordable housing. The Kitsap County Real Estate Trends Report, which is published twice a year, provides an additional, updated, description of housing, economic development and real estate trends in Kitsap County.

There are at least nine private non-profit organizations within Kitsap County actively providing housing or housing related services to very-low income, low-income, homeless, and/or special needs populations. One of these, the Bainbridge Island Housing Resources Board, is organized as a housing developer for very-low and low-income populations on Bainbridge Island. HRB has developed ten units of transitional housing for families and 19 units of permanent affordable housing using HOME funds. The City of Bremerton has a down payment financial assistance and a rehabilitation program providing home ownership opportunities to very-low and low income households in the City.

Supportive Services

Additionally a wide range of supportive services is provided by non-profit organizations. They include (but are not limited to):

Rental assistance for households threatened with eviction; and housing and financial counseling services are available through Bainbridge Island Helpline House, Kitsap Community Resources, Bremerton Housing Authority and Kitsap County Consolidated Housing Authority, Benedict House, (Bremerton) and Northwest Justice Project and their legal referral and information hotline CLEAR;

Mental health and medical services: Kitsap Mental Health Services, Kitsap County Health District, the Learning Disabilities Association of Kitsap Peninsula Community Health, Communitas, and Applied Technologies (developmental disabilities), Kitsap County HIV/AIDS Foundation; Peninsula Regional Support Network; National Alliance for the Mentally Ill, (local NAMI affiliate);

Services for at-risk teens and families by Bainbridge Youth Services, YWCA Teen Parent Program, Family Outreach; YMCA Night Program, B.I. Teen Center, Stand-Up for Kids, work with and feed homeless teens and Boys & Girls Club of Bainbridge Island.

Seniors and the elderly receive information and referrals through the Senior Information and Assistance program of the Kitsap County Division of Aging and Long Term Care; personal and respite care is a growing need as people choose to stay at home to avoid the high cost of nursing home care; Communitas, Catholic Community Services, and Kitsap Tenant Support Services are three of the local care providers and they are augmented by the Senior Nutrition Program known as "Chuckwagon" that provides hot dishes and frozen meals to senior meal sites and at home;

Five food banks and several church and civic organizations provide supplementary food and referrals to services along with holiday baskets, diapers, nutrition supplements for babies, the sick and seniors. They work with many volunteers and some provide job training for clients;

Kitsap Mental Health Services is an organization contracted by the local County Consortium to provide mental health and behavioral health care and services for youth, adults and older adults. KMHS has developed and manages a continuum of community-based housing which includes inpatient and outpatient residential units for people with chronic mental illnesses. An independent living specialist provides support for those clients residing in out-patient community housing, both owned by the agency and privately owned. In addition, KMHS works with Harrison Hospital's mental illness crisis program;

Kitsap Community Resources provides weatherization and energy conservation services to very-low income households countywide, ensuring many low-income households can remain in their heated homes at a reduced cost; KCR provides case management for homeless families moving from crisis to stability and permanent housing; KCR provides Headstart and childcare, job training/referral and operates transitional rental units for families who require supportive services while they get on their feet;

The YWCA ALIVE shelter has beds for women and their children who are fleeing domestic violence along with services and case management for these and other low-income populations;

St. Vincent de Paul Society operates a shelter for single women;

AGAPE owns and operates a transitional housing facility for chemically dependent women in recovery and their children, and maintains a separate shelter for chemically dependent men. Other private and non-profit outpatient organizations also support some of this substance abuse population. For example, a partnership between West Sound Treatment Center and Oxford House worked with KCR to turn an underused teen parent house into housing for substance abusers in recovery. In

addition, the County Drug Court has helped willing participants succeed with treatment programs in exchange for a reduced or deferred sentence.

Catholic Community Services operates the H.O.S.T. Program, and in the near future will open a permanent Men's Shelter called Benedict House. This program provides transitional shelter with supportive services for chronic and low-income homeless men.

Kitsap County Affordable Housing Task Force is sponsored by the Kitsap Housing Coalition, a partnership made up of lenders, real estate professionals, businesses, government, agencies, non-profits, homebuilders, and the community at large to develop, educate and advocate affordable homeownership in the County of Kitsap and neighboring communities. The Affordable Housing Task Force is formed to determine what more can be done to provide increased affordable housing in Kitsap County.

Indicators of Gaps in Services

Unfortunately, despite the wide range of programs available, the services offered throughout the County are often insufficient in comparison to the need. Gaps in the housing and supportive services system in Kitsap County can be seen in large part as a function of low paying jobs and historically fluctuating vacancy rates combined with accelerating housing costs and an often growing population. Very-low, low-income and even moderate-income people are being priced out of the housing market. At the same time, they and special needs populations are competing for the same supply of affordable housing, which grows in cost as the demand increases. Following are some of the results of the competition for affordable housing and support services:

Cost burdens in excess of 30% and even 50% of income are typical in the very-low and low-income rental populations in Kitsap County.

As with renters, a very high number of low-income homeowner households have a housing cost burden in excess of 30% of their income.

A survey completed in September 2005 by Dupre + Scott Apartment Advisors, Inc. of Seattle, Washington found a slight increase in the apartment vacancy rate to 5% from the prior survey completed in March 2005 of 4.5%. Vacancy rates in Kitsap County fluctuate rapidly, and are strongly influenced by the arrival and departure of ships and their crew at the Bremerton shipyard. This cycle is expected to continue.

The level of cost burden on low-income homeowners, combined with the large number of older houses throughout the County, creates a situation of deferred maintenance and increasingly deteriorating housing conditions. This deferred maintenance is exacerbated by the high mobility of the service population.

The median home price in Kitsap County in the third quarter of 2005 was \$262,000, 18.6 % above a year before. The September 2005 real estate report (Source: Northwest Multiple Listing Service) indicates a range of average sales prices throughout the county varying from \$157,000 in West Bremerton to \$223,750 in East Bremerton, \$312,250 in Silverdale to the very high of \$569,000 on Bainbridge Island. The Kitsap County median home prices have nearly doubled since the fourth quarter of 1998, when the Kitsap County median home price was \$140,000.

As of July 1, 2005, there were 2,649 applicants on the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher waiting list covering both Bremerton Housing Authority and Kitsap County Consolidated Housing Authority. Fifty-eight percent of these applicants were families with children, 42% were families with disabilities and only 1% were elderly. The KCHA Public Housing waiting list had 980 applicants; 80% of those are families with children, 11% were families with disabilities and 11% were elderly. BHA reported

that 91% of the applicants on their public housing and Section 8 waiting list had incomes below 30% of Kitsap County median income.

Indicators of housing market and inventory conditions:

Approximately 68% of renters with incomes between 31 and 50% of the median family income (\$24,050 for a family of four) pay more than 30% of their income for housing.

Based on data from the Naval Housing Office collected in March 1999 there is 8.24% renter vacancy rate for single family and duplex housing in Kitsap County.

Conditions in the rental and owner housing markets contribute to an increase in families and individuals at risk of becoming homeless. In addition, other agencies also provide intake, assessment and case management services to low and no income individuals in Kitsap County. Due to a lack of funds to fully meet requests, most agencies must prioritize, by greatest need, the persons they assist. There is a need for more emphasis on prevention activities to assist those who are at risk of becoming homeless, and this will require additional funding.

Supportive Services

In general, supportive services provided to populations with special needs in Kitsap County are of a high quality. However, overall federal and state funding for most services has decreased or remained relatively stable during the past five years while numbers of homeless individuals and families, and people with special needs have increased throughout the County. New welfare law changes have increased the number of working poor, and the closing of two Puget Sound Veterans facilities has also added individuals to the needy rolls. The high cost of permanent housing challenges the working poor, and all special needs and homeless populations.

Homeless Shelters

Once an individual or family is forced out of their home there are few emergency resources for their support. Kitsap Community Resources, the Salvation Army and St. Vincent de Paul provide rental/mortgage assistance payments when funds are available. Kitsap County has only 12 family shelter units, fewer than 30 beds for single people, and 17 beds for women and children who are victims of domestic violence. None of these shelters is located in a rural location. Stays are generally limited to a single stay in a twelve-month period. Stays can be for up to 90 days (increased by the State of Washington in response to a need for longer stabilization time needed). In addition to these shelter facilities, there are thirty units of transitional housing in Kitsap County: 4 units in Bremerton, 10 units in Bainbridge Island, 4 units in Silverdale and 8 units in Port Orchard and 6 scattered sites. There are plans to develop an additional 4-6 units in Central and North Kitsap.

INDIAN TRIBES

Two Indian Reservations are located in northeastern Kitsap County: the Suquamish Tribe and the Port Gamble-S'Klallam Tribe. These two entities maintain themselves as separate assessment, development and funding grantees in relationship to Federal HUD investment dollars. Each Tribal organization provides services, housing and community and economic development needs according to their own priorities and were not participants in this Consolidated Plan.

Suquamish Tribe

The Port Madison Indian Reservation is one of two Indian Reservations located in northeastern Kitsap County, Washington, on Puget Sound. It is home to a Treaty Tribe, the federally recognized Suquamish Tribe, a sovereign nation.

The original inhabitants of the Reservation were primarily of the Suquamish Tribe and a few from other tribes represented in the Point Elliott Treaty. The Tribe's 1996 membership rolls lists over 780 members. Regardless of land ownership patterns on the Port Madison Indian Reservation, all land within the exterior boundaries is part of the Reservation, and subject to Tribal jurisdiction. The Reservation consists of over 7,486 acres that contain tribal trust lands, individually and collectively owned trust lands, historic allotments held in trust.

The Suquamish Tribe has its own land use and comprehensive plan. Additionally, the Tribe was active in collaborating with Kitsap County and the residents and land owners in Suquamish to fashion a community-based growth management plan entitled Suquamish Community Plan. The plan was approved by the Kitsap County Planning Commission with recommendations to the Kitsap County Board of Commissioners to preserve and protect the integrity of the community-based plan.

Port Gamble-S'Klallam Tribe History & Members

The Port Gamble S'Klallam Reservation consists of 1,341 acres located in the northern end of the Kitsap Peninsula in Washington State. The Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe has been a Self-Governance Tribe since 1994. There are 935 enrolled Tribal members and the current Reservation population is approximately 650.

Tribal Health Facilities and Programs

All Tribal services are located on the Port Gamble S'Klallam Reservation. The Tribe's Health Center houses a medical and dental clinic as well as various health and human service programs including emergency medical services, community health services, mental health services and maternal child health. Youth counseling and prevention programs are partially housed in a Youth Center. The Tribe's Recovery Center is located about a half mile away. A part time medical director oversees the Tribe's Health and Human Services Department. The Tribe is managing the Dental Services Program for all Native Americans in Kitsap County. According to the Portland Area Indian Health Service, the user population for 1997 was 855.

Housing:

Housing on the Reservation is provided by the Port Gamble S'Klallam Housing Authority, by the Ravenwood Mobile Home Park, or by individuals themselves. Reservation housing is all located within two miles from the Tribe's Health Center. The Housing Authority owns and manages 39 single family rental units ranging in size from two to four bedrooms. Ten of these units are for Tribal elders; four are handicap accessible. The Tribe also has 29 homes for families through mutual help programs and six single person homes. The homes managed by the Housing Authority are 100% occupied by Tribal members or families of Tribal members. The Housing Authority also manages homebuyer housing and is currently building additional homes for Tribal members to purchase. Need for additional housing is great, with 40-55 families on a waiting list.

The Ravenwood Mobile Home Park is owned and managed by the Tribe as an enterprise. Fifty-five mobile homes are located in this park at the edge of the Reservation. Residency is not restricted to Tribal members. Other homes on the Reservation were either built by their owners or built with HUD grants and purchased by Tribal members. Of these, 20 are in standard condition, 49 are in substandard condition and 23 need to be replaced or condemned.

Sources: Websites

Suquamish <http://www.suquamish.nsn.us/>

Port Gamble S'Klallam <http://www.hccc.cog.wa.us/> (Hood Canal Coordinating Council)

Monitoring (91.230)

1. Describe the standards and procedures the jurisdiction will use to monitor its housing and community development projects and ensure long-term compliance with program requirements and comprehensive planning requirements.

3-5 Year Strategic Plan Monitoring response:

Monitoring eligibility, performance, compliance, regulations and accomplishments as well as tracking financial data are primary responsibilities of the lead agencies, Kitsap County Block Grant Division for the HOME Consortium and County CDBG activities and the City of Bremerton for its CDBG entitlement. Kitsap County and the City of Bremerton will administer the Consolidated Plan. The Consortium has established clear policies and procedures governing the application and allocation process that have successfully been used and revised where necessary.

Each sub-recipient must sign a contract with the County or the City of Bremerton, which outlines roles and obligations of the County/City and sub-recipient and lays out the framework for the monitoring requirements. All contracts contain timelines and scope of work to promote timeliness of expenditures and compliance with specific goals and requirements. The project manager is responsible for clearly conveying the requirements described in the agreement to the sub-recipients.

Throughout the year, sub-recipients are responsible for submitting Quarterly Performance Reports, quarterly demographics, bi-annual budget reconciliation forms, and each voucher is accompanied by a summary of appropriate back-up or copies of original receipts and checks. Questions of capacity and expertise are reviewed through this process, and supported where necessary by technical assistance, resource referral, or guidance. Information collected throughout the year is used to provide direction for on-site monitoring at least once a year. Quarterly reports and reimbursements are used to determine funding eligibility and timeliness of expenditures.

In addition to monitoring specific projects under contractual agreements, the County and City provide resource material, information, instruction, guidance and referrals to organizations in need of support.

During the program year, each sub-recipient will undergo a full, on site audit of project and program records related to grant performance and fiscal accountability by the Kitsap County Block Grant Division project managers, or the City of Bremerton Block Grant project managers. The purpose of the review is to assess performance against the agreement, and to verify all federal, state and local regulations are satisfied. Where required, monitoring for affordability is also performed on site. Housing Quality Standards (HQS) inspections are performed once a year by qualified inspectors and are reviewed or completed by Block Grant project managers. Each on-site monitoring follows specific procedures and a written checklist

that is maintained in the files. Letters of findings with a specific timeline for completing tasks are written to each contract sub recipient. Sub recipients are monitored in a timely manner for compliance with these written requests, and given assistance or guidance where necessary.

Priority Needs Analysis and Strategies (91.215 (a))

1. Describe the basis for assigning the priority given to each category of priority needs.
2. Identify any obstacles to meeting underserved needs.

3-5 Year Strategic Plan Priority Needs Analysis and Strategies response:

1. Priorities were generally assigned by acclamation by those present for sessions called to develop the Consolidated Plan. The more voices, the higher the rating of a given need. Specific goals of this plan are shown in detail in subsequent sections. Issues of homelessness were refined in earlier efforts to create a 10-year plan to end homelessness.

Obstacles to underservice are implied in the following demographic accounts delineating population growth, age, income, employment and so on. Administratively, understaffing and staff turnover prevent sustained responses to services. Rapid population growth has the effect of eclipsing today's needs by tomorrow's problems and in effect, forcing those in line for services to take one step back as services go to more needy recent arrivals.

POPULATION

Population Growth

Washington is growing much more rapidly than the country as a whole. Kitsap County grew by 22% between 1990 and 2000 – a similar rate to the state as a whole between 1990 and 2000. The county ranked 17th in the state in growth during the period. Port Orchard grew by 54% while Poulsbo grew by 41%. The city of Winslow annexed Bainbridge Island in 1991 and was renamed “Bainbridge Island” in 1992, so no comparison between census years can be made for this new city.

While Bremerton continued to be the most populous municipality in the county at 38,142 in 2000, the city's population had actually decreased slightly, by 2% from 1990.

By 2004, Poulsbo (+2.7%), Bainbridge Island (+1.9%) and Port Orchard (+1.9%) all posted gains in population (Kitsap County Trends, 2005). Bremerton's population dropped by 3.1%.

Table 1 - Population 1990 and 2000

Location	1990	2000	Change
Bremerton	38,142	37,259	-2%
Bainbridge Island	N/A	20,308	N/A
Port Orchard	4,984	7,693	54%
Poulsbo	4,848	6,813	41%
Kitsap County	189,731	231,969	22%
Washington	4,866,692	5,894,121	21%

Source: US Census.

By 2004, Poulsbo (+2.7%), Bainbridge Island (+1.9%) and Port Orchard (+1.9%) all posted gains in population (Kitsap Trends, 2005) yet Bremerton's population dropped by 3.1%. While Bremerton's downward population trend was altered by a slight growth each year between 2000 and 2003, estimates in both 2004 and 2005 show additional losses. As of April, 2005, the estimated Bremerton population was 34,580 (OFM, 2005). This is an estimated 7% decrease in population from the 2000 census. This trend toward population loss is expected to slow in the latter part of 2005 as recently constructed condominiums on the Bremerton waterfront begin to fill. As of April 2005 Bremerton ranked 27th among cities in the state.

As of April, 2005, the estimated Kitsap County population was 240,400 (OFM, 2005). By 2020 the population of the county is expected to grow to approximately 307,100 (OFM intermediate projections, 2002).

Figure 1 (attached) shows the 2000 census tracts and block groups in Kitsap County and the City of Bremerton. Figures are included in the electronic file: Strategic Plan Additional Files. This will serve as a reference for the information presented and discussed in subsequent sections of this report.

Age

By the 2000 census, the median age of the population in the United States was 35.3 years, a significant jump of two plus years from the previous census. This increase is due in large part to the aging of baby boomers (those born between 1946 and 1964). The "boomers" are pushing up the percent of the population between the ages of 45 and 64 years. At the same time, however, the population 65 and older increased at a slower rate than the general population because of the relatively lower birth rates in the late 1920s and early 1930s.

Table 2 - Age of Population 2000

Age	Bremerton	Bainbridge	Port Orchard	Poulsbo	Kitsap	State	US
0 to 17	24%	N/A	25%	24%	28%	26%	26%
18 to 44	50%	N/A	44%	39%	44%	44%	40%
45 to 64	12%	N/A	16%	17%	17%	23%	22%
65 plus	14%	N/A	16%	20%	11%	12%	12%
Median age	30.9	43.0	31.2	39.3	35.8	35.3	35.3

Source: US Census

The median age of the population in Kitsap County (median age 35.8) is just slightly older than the state and the nation (both 35.3). The "baby boomers" have probably contributed to the rise in the percent of Kitsap County's population between 45 and 64 years: this age group rose from 17% of the total in 1990 to 24% in 2000. Persons 65 and older remained at 11% during the period.

Overall, Kitsap County age composition was similar to that of the state. However, each of the cities varied from the average of the county. Bremerton's and Port Orchard's population ages 18 to 44 (46%) was much higher than Bainbridge Island's, with just 27%. Poulsbo had a much higher number of seniors, where 20% of its population was 65 or older. This inevitably impacted the median age for the city, which was 39.3 compared with the county's 35.8. Bainbridge Island overall had a much higher median age of 43.

Between 1990 and 2000, the number of persons 85 years and older living in Kitsap County increased by 62%, compared to the overall population growth of 22%. By law this population is eligible to live in legally "age-restricted" communities, which, while meeting the housing and service demands for one segment of the population, can reduce housing choices for others.

The population in Bremerton is considerably younger than the county as a whole, with a median age of 30.9 in 2000. The preponderance of young adults is likely influenced by the presence of the military base. The percentage of Bremerton residents in the "boomer" age group is roughly half that of the state, while the number of persons over 65 is somewhat higher than the county and state percentages.

Race and Ethnicity

For the first time, the 2000 census allowed designation of two or more races. Designation of ethnicity (Hispanic) remained unchanged between 1990 and 2000, but the flexibility in choice of race may have influenced peoples' designation of Hispanic origins in the census. Because of changes in the US census, a comparison of the population composition in 2000 with that in 1990 cannot be completely accurate. Over time these changes will provide a more accurate picture of diversity in all communities. In the meantime, the changes make it difficult to assess recent trends in race and ethnicity with certainty.

Kitsap County is overall less diverse than Washington State or the United States. However, Bremerton was highly diverse compared to the other cities in the county. Like the country as a whole, 25% of Bremerton's population was non-white in 2000.

In the U.S. as a whole, there was a 56% increase in the Hispanic population between census years. While Hispanics made up just 4% of the population in Kitsap County (compared to 8% in the state), 7% of the population in Bremerton identified themselves as Hispanic. The Hispanic population nearly doubled in Port Orchard and Poulsbo between census years.

Table 3 - Population by Race and Ethnicity 2000

Race	Bremerton	Kitsap Co	State	US
White	75%	84%	82%	75%

Black/African American	8%	3%	3%	12%
American Indian/Ak Native	2%	2%	2%	1%
Asian/Pacific Islander	6%	5%	6%	4%
Other race alone	3%	1%	4%	6%
Two or more races	7%	5%	4%	2%
Ethnicity				
Hispanic (of any race)	7%	4%	8%	13%
Race				
White	93%	82%	88%	
Black/African American	0%	4%	1%	
American Indian/Ak Native	1%	2%	1%	
Asian/Pacific Islander	2%	5%	3%	
Other race alone	1%	1%	2%	
Two or more races	3%	6%	5%	
Ethnicity				
Hispanic (of any race)	2%	5%	5%	

Source: US Census

Figure 2 (attached) shows the percent of non-Hispanic white population by block group, which is a relatively unambiguous way to consider the areas of the city with concentrations of racial or ethnic minority populations. For purposes of this Consolidated Plan, areas of minority concentration are defined as census tracts where 25% or more of the population is racial or ethnic minority. By that definition, block groups INSERT have a disproportionate share of minority population.

Languages Spoken and Linguistic Isolation

The 2000 census found that 11% of the United States population was born outside the country (not US citizens at birth). Just under 5% of people in the United States were recent immigrants (had arrived between 1990 and March of 2000). In Washington, 10% of the population was born outside the United States in 2000, compared to 6% in Kitsap County. Two percent of the population in Kitsap County (3,598 persons) were recent immigrants (entry from 1990 to 2000), compared to 5% in both the state and nation.

Recent immigrants represented 3% of the population in Bremerton in 2000 (1,210 persons); 7% of the people in Bremerton were born outside the United States (2,681 persons).

Immigrants in general face significant disadvantages when entering the country. Among these are weak to no English language skills, adjusting to a different role of government and the difficulties of adapting to a new culture, lifestyle, food, climate, customs – all of which can be daunting. Furthermore, recent immigrants often find their job skills incompatible with the local job market.

Whether new to the country or longer-term residents, people with limited English-language skills face barriers in accessing services and understanding important life transactions. This includes such things as comprehension of legal rights, how to qualify for and buy a home, communicating with health-care professionals, and more

routine day-to-day activities. Linguistic isolation can be a critical barrier in emergencies.

Eight percent of the population in Kitsap County over 5 years of age spoke a language other than English in the home, and about one-third of them spoke English "less than well," which implies some degree of difficulty. The predominant language category reported was "Asian and Pacific Island languages" (46%), with 30% speaking Spanish, and 22% speaking "other Indo-European languages."

Eleven percent of the population in Bremerton over 5 years of age spoke a language other than English in the home, and 37 percent of the population 5 years of age and older said they spoke English "less than well." The predominant language category reported in Bremerton was "Asian and Pacific Island languages" (46%), with 30% speaking Spanish, and 19% speaking "other Indo-European languages."

The census identifies "linguistic isolation" as a case when no person in the household (14 years old and over) speaks only English, or speaks a non-English language and speaks English "very well." In other words, all persons in the household 14 plus years old have at least some difficulty with English. In 2000, 2,106 people (or 1% of the population of Kitsap County) were considered linguistically isolated. In Bremerton, the county's most diverse city, 709 people (or 2% of the population 5 years of age or older) were considered linguistically isolated.

Households and Household Composition

The total number of households in Kitsap County increased by 25% between 1990 and 2000, compared to a 22% increase in the total population during the same period. Poulsbo's total household number grew by 39% and Port Orchard's by 46%, between 1990 and 2000.

Family households comprised 71% of the total Kitsap County households in 2000, which was a slight decline since 1990. Overall, the Kitsap County types of households fluctuated little between the 1990 and 2000 census years. Fifty-six percent of Poulsbo's households were family households, compared to 61% in Port Orchard. There was an increase in the percent of non-family households in the county between 1990 and 2000, reflected in the higher percent of small non-family households in 2000 compared to 1990. Consistent with a relatively constant percentage of retiring population in Kitsap County between census years, elderly single households rose by only 8% between census years, comprising 8% of total households (the same as the state as a whole). Average household size decreased just slightly from 2.65 to 2.60 in Kitsap County in 2000.

In Bremerton the total number of households increased by 3% between 1990 and 2000, compared to a 2% decrease in the total population during the same period. Fifty-six percent of the total Bremerton households in 2000 were families. In comparison, the number of households in Kitsap County increased by 25% between 1990 and 2000. Non-family households made up 44% of the total households in Bremerton in 2000, largely single individuals. This affects the average household size in Bremerton, which was 2.30 in 2000.

The average household size is generally declining in the United States for several reasons, including the trend toward smaller families in general, childless couples,

single-parent households, and an increase in the number of "empty-nesters" as the baby boomers age. The average household size in the United States in 2000 was 2.59 persons per household.

Table 4A - Kitsap Households, 1990 and 2000

Type of Households	1990		2000		1990-2000
	Number	%	Number	%	% Change
Non-family households	19,167	28%	25,072	29%	31%
Single	15,327	22%	19,537	23%	27%
Elderly single	5,546	8%	6,896	8%	24%
Small (2-4 people)	3,752	5%	5,418	6%	44%
Large (5+ people)	88	0%	117	0%	33%
Family household	50,100	72%	61,344	71%	22%
Small (2-4 people)	42,901	62%	52,850	61%	23%
Large (5+ people)	7,199	10%	8,494	10%	18%
Total households	69,267	100%	86,416	100%	25%
Average household size	2.65	--	2.60	--	-2%

Table 4B - Bremerton Households, 1990 and 2000

Type of Households	1990		2000		1990-2000
	Number	%	Number	%	% Change
Non-family households	5,933	40%	6,627	44%	12%
Single	4,799	33%	5,343	35%	11%
Elderly single	1,801	12%	1,798	12%	<1%
Small (2-4 people)	1,113	8%	1,257	8%	13%
Large (5+ people)	21	<1%	27	<1%	29%
Family household	8,785	60%	8,469	56%	-4%
Small (2-4 people)	7,616	52%	7,281	48%	-4%
Large (5+ people)	1,169	8%	1,182	8%	1%
Total households	14,718	100%	15,096	100%	3%
Average household size	2.34	--	2.30	--	-2%

Source: US Census

Group Quarters

Three percent of Kitsap County's population in 2000 lived in group quarters – more than the state (with 2%). The Kitsap County group quarters population is split between institutionalized (47%) and non-institutionalized (53%) quarters. Nursing homes comprised 19% of all Kitsap group quarters in 2000. In the county, the nursing home population declined by 10% between 1990 and 2000.

Seven percent of Bremerton's population (2,004 persons) in 2000 lived in group quarters, the highest percentage of group quarter population in the county. Most (77%) of the population housed in group quarters were living in military quarters. Bremerton housed nearly three-quarters of the military quarters population in Kitsap County in 2000. Another 348 people were living in nursing homes, a population decline of 36% since 1990.

ECONOMY AND EMPLOYMENT

Employment Trends

There were 105,000 people in the Kitsap County workforce in 2004. The largest employment sectors fell into the following areas:

Employment in Kitsap County	Total Employment
Non-Farm	80,700
Service Providing Employers	74,100
Private Sector	53,400
Public Sector	27,200
Federal/Department of Defense	14,900

Source: Kitsap County Trends, 2005.

The top ten employers in Kitsap County were dominated by the public sector and, in particular, by the military. Only two of the ten largest employers were private sector firms (Harrison Hospital and Johnson Controls).

Table 5 - Top Employers in Kitsap County, 2004

Employers	Employees
Naval Base Kitsap	15,815
Puget Sound Naval Shipyard	8,125
Central Kitsap School District	1,674
Harrison Hospital	1,574
Naval Undersea Warfare Center	1,368
South Kitsap School District	1,211
Kitsap County Government	1,190
North Kitsap School District	956
Naval Hospital Bremerton	885
Johnson Controls World Services, Inc.	870

Source: Kitsap County Trends, 2005.

Statewide, jobs grew by 2.1% between April 2004 and April 2005, lagging behind the national rate of 2.5%. Kitsap County employment however, expanded by 2.68% during that period (Employment Security Department). During the first three quarters of 2004, a total of 6,300 jobs were created in the county, with 98% of the growth in the private sector (Kitsap County Trends, 2005).

Unemployment

Unemployment in Washington State has mirrored that in the nation since 1990, although the unemployment rate tends to be a little higher in Washington because of a reliance on resource-based industries (Washington Trends, OFM). In periods of economic downturn, the gap between Washington State and the nation widens. In 2002, for example, the unemployment rate in Washington was 7.3% compared to 5.8% in the nation. According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, the 2003

unemployment rate in Washington had risen to 7.5% and that in the nation as a whole rose to 6.0%.

Unemployment in Kitsap County tends to be lower than the state, though higher than the nation as a whole. In 2004, the County's unemployment rate was 5.9, compared with 6.2 in the state. However, it was still higher than the nation's unemployment rate of 5.5 (Kitsap County Trends, 2005).

Table 6 - Biennial Unemployment Rates, 1990 – 2004*

Year	Bremerton MSA**	Washington	US
1990	4.0	4.9	5.6
1992	5.8	7.6	7.5
1994	6.2	6.4	6.1
1996	5.8	6.5	5.4
1998	4.5	4.8	4.5
2000	5.1	5.2	4.0
2002	6.5	7.3	5.8
2004	5.9	6.2	5.5

*Not seasonally adjusted.

**Includes all of Kitsap County.

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics

Figure 3 (attached) shows a more detailed comparison of unemployment rates since 1990.

Education and Workforce Development

Twenty percent of the population in the United States (aged 25 years and older) did not have a high school diploma or the equivalent in 2000. Washington was better educated in comparison – 13% of the population 25 and older did not have a diploma. Kitsap County residents in general were more educated than Washington State. In Bainbridge Island, 61% of the population 25 and older had a bachelor's degree or better compared to 14% in Bremerton and Port Orchard.

Table 7 - Highest Education Levels 2000 (Population Aged 25 Years and Older)

Highest Level	Bremerton	Kitsap	State	US
No high school*	14%	9%	13%	20%
High school*	31%	25%	25%	29%
Some college	32%	31%	26%	21%
Associate degree	9%	9%	8%	6%
Bachelor's degree	10%	17%	18%	16%
Master's degree plus	4%	8%	9%	9%

Highest Level	Bainbridge	Port Orchard	Poulsbo
No high school*	3%	17%	13%
High school*	9%	32%	24%
Some college	23%	29%	26%
Associate degree	5%	8%	7%
Bachelor's degree	35%	10%	19%

Master's degree plus 26% 4% 10%

*High school diploma or equivalency.
Source: US Census

Figure 4 (attached) compares highest education levels for 2000.

Education level is an important predictor of unemployment. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, education levels are proportional to both unemployment rate and median weekly earnings. While the unemployment rate in the U.S. for a high school dropout was 7.3% in 2001, it was 4.2% with a high school diploma, 2.5% with a bachelor's degree, 2.1% with a master's degree, and 1.1% with a doctoral degree. Furthermore, for all college degrees from associates to doctoral, earnings exceed the median wage. In 1996, those without a high school diploma or equivalency earned 60% less than those with some college, and 120% less than those with a bachelor's degree.

Table 8 - Median Weekly Earnings, 1996, by Level of Educational Attainment

Highest Education Level Attained	Earnings
High school drop-out	\$317
High school graduate	\$443
Some college	\$504
Associates degree	\$556
Bachelor's degree	\$697
Master's degree	\$874
Doctoral degree	\$1,088

*Based on those 25 or more years of age who are working full time.
Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Household Income

The measures of median household and median family income in Kitsap County were similar to the state median in 1999. As with educational attainment, however, there was a considerable difference in earnings within the county. The median income of Bainbridge Island households was 50% higher than average households throughout the county. By contrast, the median income of households in Bremerton was 34% lower than the county.

Table 9 – Household and Family Income 1999

Income Measure	Bremerton	Kitsap	State
Median household	\$30,950	\$46,840	\$45,776
Per capita	\$16,724	\$22,317	\$22,973
Median family	\$36,358	\$53,878	\$53,760
Median earnings, male*	\$28,320	\$39,889	\$40,687
Median earnings, female*	\$23,523	\$28,586	\$30,021

Income Measure	Bainbridge	Port Orchard	Poulsbo
Median household	\$70,110	\$34,020	\$38,875
Per capita	\$37,482	\$16,382	\$20,649

Median family	\$83,415	\$41,946	\$51,353
Median earnings, male*	\$65,853	\$33,610	\$40,482
Median earnings, female*	\$42,051	\$25,739	\$27,899

*Working full-time, year around.
 Source: US Census.

Census studies show the median household income in Washington actually dropped 8% (in real dollars) between overlapping years 1998-1999 and 1999-2000. The loss of more than 30,000 jobs at Boeing between 1997-2000 helped fuel this decline. The decline in median income occurred at the same time that the Census Bureau found no significant change in the percent of people living in poverty. This suggests that there is a growing inequality between the highest and lowest income brackets. Because the percent of people in poverty is unchanged, the drop in median income is likely due to lowered compensation for middle income families. Many people in the lowest income bracket (bottom fifth or quintile) lost 9.4% of their income between 1989 and 1999, while the top two quintiles made substantial gains. The loss in real wages required people to work multiple jobs. In Washington, 15% of workers from low-income families work two or more jobs (Northwest Policy Center, University of Washington, 2001).

Figure 5 (attached) compares household income ranges.

In Washington, 25% of households earned less than \$25,000 annually in 1999. In Bainbridge Island, however, just 14% of households earned under \$25,000 annually, while almost half (47%) earned \$75,000 or more.

Forty percent of Bremerton households earned less than \$25,000 in 1999, and over half of those earned under \$15,000. Just 10% of the Bremerton population was in the top income bracket, earning \$75,000 or more.

Table 10 – Median Household Income Range 1999

Income Measure	Bremerton	Kitsap	State
Under \$15,000	23%	11%	13%
\$15,000 to \$24,999	17%	11%	12%
\$25,000 to \$34,999	17%	13%	13%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	19%	18%	17%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	15%	22%	21%
\$75,000 or more	10%	24%	24%

Income Measure	Bainbridge	Port Orchard	Poulsbo
Under \$15,000	7%	20%	13%
\$15,000 to \$24,999	7%	16%	20%
\$25,000 to \$34,999	9%	16%	12%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	12%	20%	17%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	18%	16%	21%
\$75,000 or more	47%	11%	18%

Source: US Census

By 2004, the median household income in Kitsap County was \$48,762, ranking seventh among counties in the state. In spite of this ranking, the county remained

below the state median household income \$51,762, largely due to the impact of King County’s higher incomes on state statistics (Kitsap County Trends, 2005).

Population in Poverty

From 2002 to 2003, Washington State was in the top ten list of states with the greatest increase in poverty, with nearly a 1% increase in poverty in one year alone. In 1999, 11% of the total population in Washington lived in poverty, while in Kitsap County, 9% of the population lived in poverty. This rate varied by community within Kitsap County.

Bremerton had the highest rate of poverty in the county, at 19%.

Table 11 – Percent of Population Living in Poverty 1999

Population Group	Bremerton	Kitsap	State
Individuals	19%	9%	11%
18 or older	17%	8%	10%
65 or older	11%	6%	8%
Families	16%	6%	7%
with children <18	23%	9%	11%
with children <5	25%	12%	15%
Females alone			
with children <18	44%	30%	31%
with children <5	50%	42%	46%

Population Group	Bainbridge	Port Orchard	Poulsbo
Individuals	4%	13%	9%
18 or older	5%	11%	8%
65 or older	3%	9%	6%
Families	3%	11%	8%
with children <18	4%	17%	14%
with children <5	4%	14%	25%
Females alone			
with children <18	14%	47%	43%
with children <5	31%	45%	65%

Source: US Census

Women alone with young children under the age of five are the most likely segment of the population to live in poverty. Almost two-thirds of women alone with children under the age of five in Poulsbo were living in poverty in 1999, considerably higher than Kitsap County as a whole (42% were living in poverty). Half of women alone with children under five in Bremerton were living in poverty.

Figure 6 (attached) shows percent of population in poverty by census block group.

Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhoods

There were 23 census block groups in Kitsap County - outside of Bremerton - where the majority of households are primarily low and moderate income. There were no

large areas of concentration of low and moderate income residents. However, the areas with the greater concentrations tended to be located in the Port Orchard/Parkwood area, immediately west and south of the City of Bremerton, in the Silverdale area, and spots near the City of Paulsbo and north Bainbridge Island. Areas of “concentration of low-income households” are defined as those block groups with 61% or more low and moderate income households. There were 12 such block groups in the county, located generally in the areas described above.

Other Indicators of Need

Students Eligible for Free and Reduced-Cost Lunches

According to the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), 29% of students enrolled in 18 elementary schools in Kitsap County were eligible for free or reduced-cost lunches during the 2003-2004 school year. Highest among these were Armin Jahr and Crownhill Elementary Schools in Bremerton, with 57% and 59% eligibility respectively. Twenty-nine percent of middle school students were also eligible for free and reduced-cost lunches. Again, the highest eligibility rates were in Bremerton.

Lead-based Paint (91.215 (g))

1. Estimate the number of housing units that contain lead-based paint hazards, as defined in section 1004 of the Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992, and are occupied by extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income families.
2. Outline actions proposed or being taken to evaluate and reduce lead-based paint hazards and describe how lead based paint hazards will be integrated into housing policies and programs.

3-5 Year Strategic Plan Lead-based Paint response:

The Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992 seeks to identify and mitigate sources of lead in the home. A high level of lead in the blood is particularly toxic to children aged six and younger. Lead can damage the central nervous system, cause mental retardation, convulsions and sometimes death. Even low levels of lead can result in lowered intelligence, reading and learning disabilities, decreased attention span, hyperactivity and aggressive behavior.

Children who live in homes with lead-based paint can become exposed by inadvertently swallowing lead contained in household dust. This is particularly a problem when houses are remodeled using practices such as scraping or sanding of old paint. Lead-based paint is not the only culprit. Lead has also been identified in many other sources, including some vinyl blinds, pottery, lead in water pipes, lead in dust brought into the home from work sites, some hobbies (like lead solder in stained glass work), and some herbal remedies.

The Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) recommends that children ages 1 and 2 should be screened for lead poisoning. The CDC also recommends that children 3 to 6 years of age should be tested for lead if they have not been tested

before and receive services from public assistance programs; if they live in or regularly visit a building built before 1950; if they live in or visit a home built before 1978 that is being remodeled; or if they have a brother, sister, or playmate who has had lead poisoning. Unfortunately, the Washington Department of Health estimates that only 4% of Washington children ever receive a blood lead test.

In the 4-year period from 2000 through 2003, 33,025 children under the age of 6 were tested in the state of Washington and 425 had confirmed elevated blood-lead levels. CDC provides funding for testing for children who are not eligible for Medicaid or who do not have private insurance. Most of the testing is performed by private physicians and clinics, at the request of parents. The Washington Department of Human Services maintains a web site with instructions for lead testing, an indication of hazards, lists of resources and links to other sites.

The State of Washington Lead Poisoning Prevention Program compiles data on testing statewide and results of those tests. Testing data are not tracked by location unless the children are Medicaid-eligible. Results that are confirmed positive for elevated blood-lead levels are tracked by location. The information is reported to the county health department for follow-up.

The age of the housing unit is a leading indicator of the presence of lead-hazard, along with building maintenance. Lead was banned from residential paint in 1978. The 1999 national survey found that 67% of housing built before 1940 had significant LBP hazards. This declined to 51% of houses built between 1940 and 1959, 10% of houses built between 1960 and 1977 and just 1% after that. Based on those estimates, approximately 5,875 homes pose potential lead-based paint hazards in Bremerton. However, the Clickner study also noted that there were regional differences in the probability of a hazard; the risk was more prevalent on the east coast (43%) than on the west coast (19%) (Clickner, R. et al. "National Survey of Lead and Allergens in Housing, Final Report, Volume 1: Analysis of Lead Hazards." Report to Office of Lead Hazard Control, US Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2001).

Table 12A - Potential Lead-Based Paint (LBP) Hazards, Kitsap County, 2000

Date Built	Total	Potential Hazards	
	Units	%	Number
Before 1940	8,709	67%	5,835
1940 to 1959	13,112	51%	6,687
1960 to 1979	28,203	10%	2,820
1980 to 2000	42,620	1%	426
Total	92,644	17%	15,769

Source: US Census; Clickner, et al.

Table 12B - Potential Lead-Based Paint (LBP) Hazards, Bremerton, 2000

Date Built	Total	Potential Hazards	
	Units	%	Number
Before 1940	3,556	67%	2,383
1940 to 1959	5,976	51%	3,048
1960 to 1979	4,152	10%	415

1980 to 2000	2,947	1%	29
Total	16,631	36%	5,875

Source: US Census; Clickner, et. al.

The older age of Bremerton’s housing stock, with an associated increased cost for maintenance, has an impact on the conditions of housing, as detailed below, particularly in common deference of maintenance as homes approach obsolescence in today’s market for homeowners.

As the Bremerton’s ownership base is about 40% of the total number of units and low-income and moderate-income households represent upwards of 40% of the population, there are perhaps 2,400 individual households at risk while in the County, (15,342 dwellings divided by the % of low-mod income households)

The City has partnered with the direct-service organization Kitsap Community Services to purchase lead-testing equipment. Testing is done in association with each new project undertaken in the City and County. Abatement plans by trained, insured contractors are part of every project.

HOUSING

Housing Needs (91.205)

*Please also refer to the Housing Needs Table in the Needs.xls workbook

1. Describe the estimated housing needs projected for the next five year period for the following categories of persons: extremely low-income, low-income, moderate-income, and middle-income families, renters and owners, elderly persons, persons with disabilities, including persons with HIV/AIDS and their families, single persons, large families, public housing residents, families on the public housing and section 8 tenant-based waiting list, and discuss specific housing problems, including: cost-burden, severe cost-burden, substandard housing, and overcrowding (especially large families).
2. To the extent that any racial or ethnic group has a disproportionately greater need for any income category in comparison to the needs of that category as a whole, the jurisdiction must complete an assessment of that specific need. For this purpose, disproportionately greater need exists when the percentage of persons in a category of need who are members of a particular racial or ethnic group is at least ten percentage points higher than the percentage of persons in the category as a whole.

3-5 Year Strategic Plan Housing Needs response:

NEED FOR HOUSING ASSISTANCE

Renter Households with Problems

Forty percent of all renter households in Kitsap County had housing problems in 2000, most because of the burden of cost in excess of 30% of household income. Households with the lowest incomes had the greatest burden – over 70% of households with incomes at or below 30% of area median income were paying in excess of 30% of their income for rent and 56% had housing costs that equaled more than half of their income. The most severely burdened were large households.

Table 13A – Kitsap County Renter Households and Percent with Housing Problems, 2000

Type of Household/ HH Income Level	Elderly (1-2)	Small (2-4)	Large (5+)	All Others	Total Renters
0% to 30% MFI	967	2,050	369	1,999	5,385
% with problems	57.6%	76.8%	86.4%	75.0%	73.4%
Cost burden >30%	56.0%	72.7%	77.2%	74.3%	70.6%
Cost burden >50%	39.3%	58.5%	63.7%	60.0%	56.0%
31% to 50% MFI	974	2,154	515	1,315	4,958
% with problems	69.2%	70.5%	70.9%	81.7%	73.3%

Cost burden >30%	67.2%	68.4%	54.4%	79.1%	69.6%
Cost burden >50%	33.4%	16.9%	9.7%	20.5%	20.4%
51% to 80% MFI	771	3,050	915	2,255	6,991
% with problems	53.3%	35.7%	38.8%	38.6%	39.0%
Cost burden >30%	51.0%	27.7%	23.5%	36.4%	32.5%
Cost burden >50%	25.7%	0.5%	1.6%	1.3%	3.7%
>80% MFI	894	5,239	855	3,815	10,803
% with problems	24.5%	8.2%	22.8%	5.5%	9.7%
Cost burden >30%	24.5%	2.5%	4.1%	3.8%	4.9%
Cost burden >50%	11.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	1.1%
Total renters	3,606	12,493	2,654	9,384	28,137
% with problems	51.6%	36.9%	46.5%	38.9%	40.4%
Cost burden >30%	50.2%	31.5%	30.7%	37.2%	35.7%
Cost burden >50%	27.8%	12.6%	11.3%	16.1%	15.6%

Notes: MFI is median family income. Housing problems include cost greater than 30% of income and/or overcrowding and/or without complete kitchen or plumbing facilities. Cost includes rent and utilities. Totals may vary slightly from census data. Source: HUD 2000 CHAS data.

Forty-seven percent of all renter households in Bremerton had housing problems in 2000, most because of the burden of costs in excess of 30% of household income. Households with the lowest incomes had the greatest burden – over 75% of households with incomes at or below 30% of area median income were paying in excess of 30% of their income for rent and 53% had housing costs that equaled more than half of their income. Like in the county as a whole, the most severely burdened were large households.

Table 13B – Bremerton Renter Households and Percent with Housing Problems, 2000

Type of Household/ HH Income Level	Elderly (1-2)	Small (2-4)	Large (5+)	All Others	Total Renters
0% to 30% MFI	411	864	142	1,024	2,441
% with problems	62.3%	76.3%	86.6%	78.0%	75.3%
Cost burden >30%	61.3%	69.3%	66.2%	77.6%	71.3%
Cost burden >50%	46.0%	50.9%	56.3%	58.1%	53.4%
31% to 50% MFI	392	775	190	610	1,967
% with problems	70.7%	66.5%	71.1%	75.4%	70.5%
Cost burden >30%	67.1%	61.9%	36.8%	71.3%	63.4%
Cost burden >50%	38.0%	14.8%	0.0%	9.0%	16.2%
51% to 80% MFI	263	880	183	679	2,005
% with problems	51.0%	33.5%	23.5%	24.2%	31.7%
Cost burden >30%	47.9%	21.0%	10.4%	21.9%	23.9%
Cost burden >50%	35.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	4.8%
>80% MFI	279	1,034	174	1,014	2,501
% with problems	30.1%	11.5%	34.5%	4.3%	12.3%
Cost burden >30%	30.1%	2.4%	0.0%	3.0%	5.6%

Cost burden >50%	8.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%
Total renters	1,345	3,553	689	3,327	8,914
% with problems	55.8%	44.7%	52.4%	44.1%	46.7%
Cost burden >30%	53.9%	36.3%	26.6%	42.4%	40.5%
Cost burden >50%	33.8%	15.6%	11.6%	19.7%	19.6%

Notes: MFI is median family income. Housing problems include cost greater than 30% of income and/or overcrowding and/or without complete kitchen or plumbing facilities. Cost includes rent and utilities. Totals may vary slightly from census data. Source: HUD 2000 CHAS data.

The following racial/ethnic renter households resided in Kitsap County in 2000:

- 1,239 Black non-Hispanic renters
- 1,339 Hispanic renters
- 494 Native American renters
- 925 Asian renters
- 220 Pacific Islander renters

Racial/Ethnic households tend to have disproportionate housing problems compared to non-minority households. In the county, three renter household types had disproportionate problems (more than 10 percentage point difference from all renters):

- Hispanic renters with incomes between 30% and 50% of AMI
- Asian non-Hispanic renters with incomes above 80% of AMI
- Pacific Islander non-Hispanic renters with incomes above 80% of AMI

The following racial/ethnic minority renter households resided in Bremerton in 2000:

- 650 Black non-Hispanic renters
- 443 Hispanic renters
- 213 Native American renters
- 389 Asian renters
- 54 Pacific Islander renters

Information on which households have disproportionate needs should be carefully considered before drawing conclusions with regard to Bremerton households, as the number of households in some categories is quite small.

Eight types of renter households had disproportionate problems (more than 10 percentage points different than all renters):

- Black non-Hispanic renters with incomes 30% or less of AMI
- Black non-Hispanic renters with incomes between 50% and 80% of AMI
- Hispanic renters with incomes between 30% and 50% of AMI
- Hispanic renters with incomes above 80% of AMI
- Native American non-Hispanic renters with incomes 30% or less of AMI
- Asian non-Hispanic renters with incomes 30% or less of AMI
- Asian non-Hispanic renters with incomes between 30% and 50% of AMI
- Pacific Islander non-Hispanic renters with incomes between 50% and 80% of

AMI

SOURCE: HUD 2000 CHAS data

Owner Households with Problems

Owner households in Kitsap County likewise experience problems with housing, due to cost burden, overcrowding, and/or lack of complete kitchen and plumbing facilities. Over 27% of all owner households experienced problems in 1999, most frequently because of costs in excess of 30% of household income. Three-quarters of owner households at the lowest income level experienced housing problems. Costs considered in preparing the table below included mortgage payment, taxes, insurance and utilities. Even households without mortgage payments may be burdened by housing costs. Meeting rising utility costs, taxes and insurance can be a challenge, especially for those on fixed incomes, such as the elderly. Repairs and maintenance costs increase the burden.

Table 14A – Kitsap County Owner Households and Percent with Housing Problems, 2000

Type of Household/ HH Income Level	Elderly (1-2)	Small (2-4)	Large (5+)	All Others	Total Owners
0% to 30% MFI	1,133	675	162	544	2,514
% with problems	68.7%	83.0%	82.1%	77.9%	75.4%
Cost burden >30%	68.7%	80.7%	72.8%	76.1%	73.8%
Cost burden >50%	48.0%	67.4%	64.2%	68.8%	58.8%
31% to 50% MFI	1,829	1,098	304	689	3,920
% with problems	46.5%	75.4%	91.8%	69.5%	62.1%
Cost burden >30%	46.5%	73.6%	87.2%	66.6%	60.8%
Cost burden >50%	22.7%	52.3%	46.1%	45.7%	36.8%
51% to 80% MFI	3,080	3,332	1,128	1,278	8,818
% with problems	25.8%	65.6%	70.3%	64.0%	52.1%
Cost burden >30%	25.8%	64.6%	59.3%	62.9%	50.1%
Cost burden >50%	58.8%	20.9%	11.9%	20.3%	15.4%
>80% MFI	7,606	26,030	4,224	5,104	42,964
% with problems	11.6%	15.9%	22.2%	22.5%	16.5%
Cost burden >30%	11.1%	14.7%	13.9%	21.7%	14.8%
Cost burden >50%	1.8%	1.4%	0.4%	1.7%	1.4%
Total owners	13,648	31,135	5,818	7,615	58,216
% with problems	24.2%	24.7%	36.9%	37.7%	27.5%
Cost burden >30%	24.0%	23.5%	28.2%	36.6%	25.8%
Cost burden >50%	10.0%	6.8%	6.8%	13.6%	8.4%

Notes: MFI is median family income. Housing problems include cost greater than 30% of income and/or overcrowding and/or without complete kitchen or plumbing

facilities. Cost includes mortgage payment, taxes, insurance and utilities. Totals may vary slightly from census data.

Source: HUD 2000 CHAS tables.

Almost 25% of all Bremerton owner households experienced problems in 1999, again, most frequently because of costs in excess of 30% of household income. Two-thirds of owner households at the lowest income level experienced housing problems.

Table 14B – Bremerton Owner Households and Percent with Housing Problems, 2000

Type of Household/ HH Income Level	Elderly (1-2)	Small (2-4)	Large (5+)	All Others	Total Owners
0% to 30% MFI	177	68	29	79	353
% with problems	70.1%	64.7%	86.2%	62.0%	68.6%
Cost burden >30%	70.1%	50.0%	86.2%	62.0%	65.7%
Cost burden >50%	50.3%	35.3%	86.2%	62.0%	53.0%
31% to 50% MFI	258	155	44	123	580
% with problems	32.2%	83.9%	100.0%	55.3%	56.0%
Cost burden >30%	32.2%	77.4%	100.0%	55.3%	54.3%
Cost burden >50%	9.3%	51.6%	43.2%	15.4%	24.5%
51% to 80% MFI	504	355	128	229	1,216
% with problems	28.6%	47.9%	53.1%	58.5%	42.4%
Cost burden >30%	28.6%	47.9%	33.6%	56.8%	40.0%
Cost burden >50%	9.9%	12.7%	3.1%	8.7%	9.8%
>80% MFI	989	1,874	280	793	3,936
% with problems	2.4%	11.4%	19.6%	15.5%	10.6%
Cost burden >30%	2.4%	10.9%	14.3%	15.0%	9.8%
Cost burden >50%	0.4%	0.2%	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%
Total owners	1,928	2,452	481	1,224	6,085
% with problems	19.5%	22.8%	39.9%	30.6%	24.6%
Cost burden >30%	19.5%	21.5%	31.6%	29.9%	23.4%
Cost burden >50%	8.7%	6.2%	10.0%	7.5%	7.6%

Notes: MFI is median family income. Housing problems include cost greater than 30% of income and/or overcrowding and/or without complete kitchen or plumbing facilities. Cost includes mortgage payment, taxes, insurance and utilities. Totals may vary slightly from census data.

Source: HUD 2000 CHAS tables.

The following racial/ethnic homeowner households resided in Kitsap County in 2000:

- 1,937 Black, non-Hispanic owner-occupants
- 1,205 Hispanic owner-occupants
- 589 Native American owner-occupants
- 1,875 Asian owner-occupants
- 194 Pacific Islander owner-occupants

Several categories of racial/ethnic households had disproportionate housing problems (more than 10 percentage point difference from all owners) in Kitsap County:

- Black non-Hispanic owner-occupants with incomes between 30% and 50% of AMI
- Black non-Hispanic owner-occupants with incomes between 50% and 80% of AMI
- Hispanic owner-occupants with incomes between 30% and 50% of AMI
- Hispanic owner-occupants with incomes between 50% and 80% of AMI
- Asian non-Hispanic owner-occupants with incomes between 50% and 80% of AMI

The following racial/ethnic minority owner households resided in Bremerton in 2000:

- 146 Black non-Hispanic owner-occupants
- 108 Hispanic owner-occupants
- 239 Native American owner-occupants
- 641 Asian owner-occupants
- 58 Pacific Islander owner-occupants

Owner households with disproportionate problems (more than 10 percentage points of difference):

- Black non-Hispanic owner-occupants with incomes between 50% and 80% of AMI
- Hispanic owner-occupants with incomes between 30% and 50% of AMI
- Hispanic owner-occupants with incomes above 80% of AMI
- Asian non-Hispanic owner-occupants with incomes between 30% and 50% of AMI
- Asian non-Hispanic owner-occupants with incomes between 50% and 80% of AMI

Overcrowding

A unit is considered overcrowded when there are more people than rooms. Crowding is not as much a problem in Kitsap County as it is in the nation and the state. In Washington, 5% of households live in overcrowded conditions (1.01 or more persons per room). This is true of just 3% of households in Kitsap County. However, in Bremerton, 6% of households live in overcrowded conditions.

Table 15 - Overcrowded Conditions, 2000

Condition	Bremerton		Kitsap		WA	US
	Number	%	Number	%	%	%
1.00 or less	14,234	94%	83,378	97%	95%	94%
1.01 – 1.50	473	3%	1,970	2%	3%	3%
More than 1.50	378	3%	1,068	1%	2%	3%

Source: US Census.

Persons with Disabilities

Persons with disabilities often have needs for special accommodations in housing, ranging from modest accommodations to more substantial modifications and assistance. The 2000 census identified 34,152 persons with disabilities in Kitsap County, including 7,041 persons with disabilities in Bremerton.

Table 16A - Persons with Disabilities, Kitsap County, 2000

Age	Male	Female	Total
16-20	945	775	1,720
21-64	11,577	10,835	22,412
65-74	1,873	1,944	3,817
75+	2,574	3,629	6,203
Total	16,969	17,183	34,152

Source: US Census.

Table 16B - Persons with Disabilities, Bremerton, 2000

Age	Male	Female	Total
16-20	233	118	351
21-64	2,013	2,449	4,462
65-74	354	438	792
75+	463	973	1,436
Total	3,063	3,978	7,041

Source: US Census.

Among people at the lowest levels of household income are persons with disabilities who have only federal SSI income for support. In 2002, "people with disabilities were priced out of every housing market area in the United States." (O'Hara. A. et al. Priced Out in 2002.) In 2004, the most recent year that that housing costs for the disabled were studied, the SSI program provided just \$564 per month. The fair-market rate for a one-bedroom unit in the Bremerton Primary Metropolitan Statistical Area was \$553. This is 98% of the monthly SSI benefit (Out of Reach, 2004).

Housing Wait Lists

The Kitsap County Consolidated Housing Authority (KCCHA) and the Bremerton Housing Authority (BHA) maintain wait lists for public housing and for Section 8 housing. The wait list for public housing maintained by the KCCHA is currently open. Most of those waiting for units are families with children (80%).

Table 16 - Wait List for Public Housing (KCCHA)

Persons on Wait List	Number
Total on wait list	980

Families with children	80%
Elderly families	9%
Families with disabilities	11%

Number bedrooms needed	
1 bedroom	47%
2 bedrooms	39%
3 bedrooms	11%
4 or more bedrooms	3%

Source: KCCHA Streamlined Five-Year PHA Plan for FY beginning 7/1/05.

There were 2,649 persons on the wait list for Section 8 Tenant-Based Assistance, covering both the Kitsap County Consolidated Housing Authority and the Bremerton Housing Authority. That wait list was also open.

Table 17A - Kitsap County Wait List for Section 8 Tenant-Based Assistance (KCCHA and BHA)

Persons on Wait List	Number
Total on wait list	2,649
Families with children	58%
Elderly families	1%
Families with disabilities	42%

Source: KCCHA Streamlined Five-Year PHA Plan for FY beginning 7/1/05.

The Bremerton Housing Authority (BHA) maintains a wait list for public housing and for Section 8 housing. The wait list is currently open. Most of those waiting for units are families with children (50%). The vast majority (91%) of those on the wait list were extremely low income households (at or below 30% of area median income).

Table 17B - Bremerton Wait List for Public Housing and Section 8 (BHA)

Persons on Wait List	Number
Total on wait list	2,884
Families with children	50%
Elderly families	<1%
Families with disabilities	37%

Number bedrooms needed	
1 bedroom	54%
2 bedrooms	23%
3 bedrooms	22%
4 or more bedrooms	1%

Source: BHA Streamlined Five-Year PHA Plan for FY beginning 10/1/05.

Priority Housing Needs (91.215 (b))

1. Identify the priority housing needs in accordance with the categories specified in

the Housing Needs Table (formerly Table 2A). These categories correspond with special tabulations of U.S. census data provided by HUD for the preparation of the Consolidated Plan.

2. Provide an analysis of how the characteristics of the housing market and the severity of housing problems and needs of each category of residents provided the basis for determining the relative priority of each priority housing need category.

Note: Family and income types may be grouped in the case of closely related categories of residents where the analysis would apply to more than one family or income type.

3. Describe the basis for assigning the priority given to each category of priority needs.
4. Identify any obstacles to meeting underserved needs.

3-5 Year Strategic Plan Priority Housing Needs response:

HOUSING GOALS:

To ensure access to affordable, decent, safe and appropriate transitional and permanent housing for all individuals and families, the Kitsap County community will increase the number of units available by:

*Special Needs Populations covered in special needs priority

Specific Objective H-1

Increase the stock of affordable units throughout County and City through preservation, rehabilitation and construction.

Number H-1.1 Kitsap County: Increase rental units for at least 40 extremely low, 50 low and 30 moderate-income households by Fall, 2010.

Number H-1.2 Kitsap County: Provide funding support for at least 50 self help housing units by Fall, 2010.

Number H-1.3 Kitsap County: Support homeownership through financial assistance for 75 low/moderate income families/individuals by Fall, 2010.

Number H-1.4 Bremerton: Support homeownership through financial assistance for 100 low/moderate income families/individuals by Fall, 2010.

Number H-1.5 Bremerton: Increase the stock of affordable units with a primary goal of expanding home ownership.

Number H-1.6 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Support the redevelopment of Westpark.

Specific Objective H-2

Increase the number of new homeowners among low/moderate income individuals and families through fair housing efforts, education and housing counseling.

Number H-2.1 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Promote housing education efforts through: individual housing counseling, consumer education, fair housing advocacy, one annual housing fair; six homeownership classes per year, public access television media promotions, and remain active in Housing Coalition activities. (Network of Public Housing Authorities, block grant programs, realtors, mortgage, loan and banking members, non-profits and government agencies.)

Number H-2.2 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Coordinate and promote an affordable housing forum by June 30 2007, in collaboration with planners, builders, landowners and developers and public officials to introduce the public and professionals to affordable and self-help construction techniques and possibilities

Specific Objective H-3

Improve and retain existing housing stock through preservation, rehabilitation, weatherization, accessibility and planning efforts.

Number H-3.1 Kitsap County: Preserve existing affordable housing units threatened with the loss of expiring federal contracts or in sound but deteriorating condition. Preserve as affordable low and moderate income housing at least 75% of expiring contracts.

Number H-3.2 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Provide funding for rehabilitation and weatherization of homeowner or rental units - at least 200 by September 1, 2010.

Number H-3.3 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Support rehabilitation projects that make homeowner dwelling units accessible for special needs family members.

Number H-3.4 Kitsap County: Take a lead in local planning efforts that support affordable housing retention and accessibility issues.

Number H-3.5 Bremerton: Take a lead in local planning efforts that support affordable homeownership and accessibility issues.

Number H-3.6 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Explore the potential for a housing quality program to assist landlords to improve housing.

Number H-3.7 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Maintain and increase where necessary, current levels of emergency, transitional and permanent housing with adequate supportive services.

Specific Objective H-4

Maintain education and training that builds community awareness of lead-based paint hazards and incorporate new studies and regulations into any planning for mitigation.

Number H-4.1 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Maintain awareness in the housing

industry of the dangers and resolutions for lead based paint and other health hazards.

Specific Objective H-5

Improve the safety and livability of neighborhoods through revitalization and/or demolition of inappropriate or dilapidated structures.

Number H-5.1 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Identify dilapidated neighborhoods and assess for revitalization or demolition.

Specific Objective H-6

Promote equal treatment of all who seek homeownership by removing impediments to fair housing.

Number H-6.1 Kitsap County/Bremerton: The Impediments to Fair Housing analysis completed in 2005 for the consortium will be reviewed and communicated for appropriate changes.

Housing Market Analysis (91.210)

*Please also refer to the Housing Market Analysis Table in the Needs.xls workbook

1. Based on information available to the jurisdiction, describe the significant characteristics of the housing market in terms of supply, demand, condition, and the cost of housing; the housing stock available to serve persons with disabilities; and to serve persons with HIV/AIDS and their families.
2. Describe the number and targeting (income level and type of household served) of units currently assisted by local, state, or federally funded programs, and an assessment of whether any such units are expected to be lost from the assisted housing inventory for any reason, (i.e. expiration of Section 8 contracts).
3. Indicate how the characteristics of the housing market will influence the use of funds made available for rental assistance, production of new units, rehabilitation of old units, or acquisition of existing units. Please note, the goal of affordable housing is not met by beds in nursing homes.

3-5 Year Strategic Plan Housing Market Analysis responses:

HOUSING TRENDS

Types of Housing and Number of Units

The number of housing units in Kitsap County grew by 25% in the ten-year period between 1990 and 2000 – from 74,038 units in 1990 to 92,644 units in 2000. Most of the housing in both 1990 and 2000 was single-family, detached units. In fact, the bulk of the increase in housing (70%) in that 10-year period was in single-family detached units.

Table 18A – Kitsap County Housing Units, 1990 and 2000

Type of Unit	1990		2000		Change
	Number	%	Number	%	
Single family	51,170	69%	64,878	70%	27%
Detached	48,346	65%	61,403	66%	27%
Attached	2,824	4%	3,475	4%	23%
Multifamily	13,959	19%	18,415	20%	32%
2-4 units	5,168	7%	6,173	7%	19%
5-19 units	5,709	8%	7,368	8%	29%
20 units	3,082	4%	4,874	5%	58%
Mobile homes	8,008	11%	8,923	10%	11%
Other	901	1%	428	<1%	-52%
Total	74,038	100%	92,644	100%	25%

*These units include boats, RVs, vans and other more temporary housing types.

Totals may not add due to rounding.

Source: US Census

The number of housing units in Bremerton grew by 6% between 1990 and 2000, a modest increase compared to Kitsap County. The majority of housing in Bremerton in both 1990 and 2000 was also single family. However, both the number and percent of single family houses in Bremerton declined between 1990 and 2000. New construction was mostly in the form of multifamily units.

Table 18B – Bremerton Housing Units, 1990 and 2000

Type of Unit	1990		2000		Change
	Number	%	Number	%	
Single family	9,190	59%	9,007	54%	-2%
Detached	7,700	49%	7,917	48%	3%
Attached	1,490	9%	1,090	7%	-27%
Multifamily	6,124	39%	7,289	44%	19%
2-4 units	2,692	17%	3,085	19%	15%
5-19 units	2,078	13%	2,124	13%	2%
20 units	1,354	9%	2,080	13%	54%
Mobile homes	216	1%	286	2%	32%
Other	163	1%	49	0%	-70%
Total	15,693	100%	16,631	100%	6%

*These units include boats, RVs, vans and other more temporary housing types.

Totals may not add due to rounding.

Source: US Census

Compared to the State of Washington, Kitsap County has a slightly greater share of single family homes – 70% in the county compared to 65% in the state. While this difference is not particularly remarkable, Bremerton did have a substantially greater share of multifamily housing than the state and county.

Table 19 - Housing Type by Location, 2000

Type of Unit	Bremerton	Kitsap	State
Single family	54%	70%	65%
MF (2 to 19 units)	31%	15%	16%

MF (20+ units)	13%	5%	9%
Mobile homes/other	2%	10%	9%

Source: US Census.

Following a national trend in part fueled by relatively low interest rates, the number of single-family building permits issued in Kitsap County hit a seven year high in 2003, when 1,359 permits were issued. Single-family permits garnered 80.8% of all permits issued, up from 66.6% in 1997. The number of mobile home permits continued to drop for the seventh year and represented only 14.7% of the total permits. This is one-half the 1997 mobile home permit share of 28.8%. Rental housing proposals continued to lag as only 75 multi-family units were issued permits in 2003, representing a 4.5% share (Kitsap County Trends, 2005).

Recent residential sales have offered opportunities for new homebuyers to invest in the area. Single-family sales in the county have steadily increased over the ten-year period ending in 2003 to 4,525 sales per year. Only six percent of 2003 county sales involved newly constructed housing. Condominium sales, while a relatively small part of the total sales in the county, continued to increase over the period, more than doubling pre-1998 sales. Sixteen percent of 2003 county sales occurred in Bremerton.

Age and Condition of Housing Units

Most of the housing in Kitsap County is in unincorporated areas (66% of housing units) and much of it was built after 1980. There were 61,284 housing units in unincorporated Kitsap County as of the 2000 census, which was two-thirds of all housing in the county.

Table 20 – Age of Housing Units, 2000

Year Built	Bremerton	Bainbridge	Port Orchard	Poulsbo	Kitsap
1980 to 2000*	18%	46%	41%	61%	46%
1960 to 1979	25%	31%	26%	25%	30%
1940 to 1959	36%	10%	20%	6%	14%
Before 1940	21%	13%	13%	8%	9%
Total	16,631	8,517	3,208	3,004	92,644

Source: US Census

In comparison to other communities in Kitsap County and in the county as a whole, a larger share of the housing in Bremerton was built prior to 1980 – 57% was built before 1960. A stock of older housing can indicate the need for rehabilitation efforts, such as those now underway in Bremerton.

Housing Tenure

in Kitsap County as a whole there were more owner-occupied than renter-occupied units – 67% of the units in 2000 were owner-occupied.

Table 21A – Kitsap County Housing Tenure, 1990 - 2000

Year	Renter-Occupied		Owner-Occupied		Total
	Number	%	Number	%	
1990	24,737	36%	44,530	64%	69,267
2000	28,137	33%	58,279	67%	86,416

Table 21B – Bremerton Housing Tenure, 1970 - 2000

Year	Renter-Occupied		Owner-Occupied		Total
	Number	%	Number	%	
1970	5,639	48%	6,055	52%	11,694
1980	7,985	57%	6,082	43%	14,067
1990	8,967	61%	5,751	39%	14,718
2000	8,841	59%	6,255	41%	15,096

Source: HUD SOCDs Census Data, 2000.

In contrast to the rest of the county, roughly 60% of housing in Bremerton is renter-occupied. A trend toward increased renter occupancy was reversed between 1990 and 2000 as owner-occupied housing increased and renter occupied housing fell slightly. Owner-occupancy varies with household type, however. While less than half of the housing is owner-occupied, that tenure is highest for family households. Owner-occupancy is lowest for non-family households and single individuals.

Table 21A - Tenure by Household Type, Kitsap County 2000

Type Household	Owned	Rented
All households	67%	33%
Family households	74%	26%
Non-family households	52%	48%
Single individuals	53%	47%
Elderly (65+) singles	64%	36%
Average household size	2.68	2.44

Source: US Census.

Table 22B - Tenure by Household Type, Bremerton, 2000

Type Household	Owned	Rented
All households	41%	59%
Family households	48%	52%
Non-family households	33%	67%
Single individuals	34%	66%
Elderly (65+) singles	47%	53%
Average household size	2.34	2.27

Source: US Census

Housing Costs

Housing costs in Kitsap County in 2000 were somewhat lower than costs in the state as a whole. However, within the cities in Kitsap County, costs varied substantially. The median value of an owner-occupied unit in Bainbridge Island was twice that of the state and the county as a whole and more than three times values in Bremerton. The variance in median gross rent was not as extreme. Rents were highest in Bainbridge Island, compared to other communities in the county, as well as the state.

The median value of an owner-occupied unit in Bremerton was 32% lower than in Kitsap County. The median gross rent in Bremerton at the time of the 2000 census was a little lower (17%) than the county average.

Table 23A - Housing Costs, 2000

Type of Cost*	Bremerton	Kitsap	State
Value owner-occupied	\$103,500	\$152,100	\$168,300
Monthly owner costs			
With mortgage	\$953	\$1,228	\$1,268
Without mortgage	\$304	\$353	\$338
Gross rent	\$554	\$667	\$663
Type of Cost*	Bainbridge	Port Orchard	Poulsbo
Value owner-occupied	\$335,000	\$120,100	\$164,200
Monthly owner costs			
With mortgage	\$1,805	\$961	\$1,327
Without mortgage	\$528	\$290	\$391
Gross rent	\$883	\$676	\$613

*All costs are median values.
Source: US Census.

According to data compiled by the Multiple Listing Service, average sales prices for homes in Kitsap County rose 16% between 1998 and 2002, and the average number of days on the market declined, typical of a tight housing market. Kitsap County average 2002 sales prices stood at \$203,134, but when Bainbridge Island prices are removed, the prices lowered to \$175,554 - very low for the Puget Sound basin. The average length of time on the market from April 2004 to April 2005 was 68 days. Bainbridge Island prices rose by 24% during this period and the average price in North Kitsap rose by 28%. The smallest increase was in South Kitsap, where the average sales price rose by only 12% between 1998 and 2002.

Median sales prices continued to rise countywide in 2005 and stood at \$234,945 in February 2005, up 24% over the previous twelve months. These prices however, remained lower than all but Pierce County in the four county central Puget Sound housing market. A limited supply of residential listings, hovering at less than 600 new listings per month between April 2004 and April 2005, coupled with high demand and favorable interest rates are the primary reasons for the price push in the county (MLS 2005).

Table 24 – MSL Average Prices (New and Used Homes)

Area	1998	2000	2002
South Kitsap	\$147,924	\$149,594	\$166,353
West/Central	\$159,393	\$168,894	\$188,754
W. Bremerton	\$97,066	\$108,358	\$120,920
E. Bremerton	\$117,846	\$124,236	\$143,652
East/Central	\$132,374	\$140,272	\$160,555
North Kitsap	\$171,771	\$190,273	\$220,237
Bainbridge Island	\$339,973	\$416,975	\$423,115
County average	\$175,155	\$186,214	\$203,134
Less Bainbridge	\$146,791	\$154,285	\$175,554

Source: Multiple Listing Service data presented in Kitsap County Trends Report Fall 2004/Winter 2005.

Between 1998 and 2002, the average housing sales price in West Bremerton rose by 25% and the average in East Bremerton rose by 22%. In spite of these increases, housing in Bremerton remained more affordable than elsewhere in the county. In 2002 the average sales price in Bremerton was 64% of the countywide average. In 2003, new home prices in Bremerton (\$221,694) averaged less than the county average (\$264,249). When new homes in Bainbridge Island are removed from the county statistics, the county wide average drops to \$232,293.

Average apartment rents have risen steadily each year in Kitsap County, from \$587 in 1997 to \$735 in September 2004. Vacancy rates declined from a high of 9.7% in 1997 to a low of 2.7% in 2002. That trend reversed as rates increased to 7.1% in 2004. Even though the vacancy rates increased, rent prices continued to climb. In Bremerton rents (\$711) remained slightly less than countywide rates.

Table 25 – Apartment Rents (Monthly) and Vacancy Rates Kitsap County

Year/Location	Rent	Vacancy
Countywide, September 2004	\$735	7.1%
Bremerton, March 2004	\$711	6.5%
Port Orchard, March 2004	\$667	3.9%
Poulsbo, March 2004	\$789	5.1%
Silverdale, March 2004	\$784	5.9%

Source: Dupre + Scott Apartment Advisors data presented in Kitsap County Trends Report Fall 2004/Winter 2005.

Housing Affordability

For homebuyers, an indication of affordability can be illustrated by using the "First-time Buyer Index". This index is based on the cost of moderately priced homes (85% of median), a 10% down payment, a 30-year private mortgage with insurance and adjusting for 70% of the median household income to account for the fact that most higher income households already are homeowners (Kitsap County Trends, 2005). The index measures the income of a typical home-buyer as a percentage of what is

required to purchase a home. A positive sign is that between 2003 and 2004 the first-time buyer affordability index for Kitsap County was consistently better than the state average. In the first 6 months of 2004, the Kitsap County index stood at 81.5 compared to the state average of 71.5.

However, the availability of affordable housing for purchase is another key factor impacting potential home-buyers. In mid-year 2004, there was a severe shortage of housing available at \$250,000 or less in Kitsap County. Only a 1.9 month's supply of homes at the \$160,000-\$250,000 range was available and only a 1.2 month's supply was available at \$80,000 or less. Clearly, moderate income persons have much less to choose from in buying homes. These inventories are well below the statewide levels (2.3 months and 3.5 months respectively) and are only higher than King County and Clark County among the top 9 most populous counties in the state.

The following table compares fair market rents, which include the cost of utilities, with the income required to afford those rents. Housing is "affordable" when it costs no more than 30% of household income. In order to afford rent and utilities for a 2-bedroom unit at a fair market rent of \$764, a household would need an annual income of \$30,560. That equates to an hourly wage of \$14.69. If one wage earner in the household earned the state minimum wage (\$7.16 an hour), that person would have to work 82 hours a week to afford the two-bedroom unit. Many households pay more than this, with Port Orchard followed by Bremerton having the two highest percentages of renter households paying more than the affordable standard.

Table 26 – Housing Costs and Income, Bremerton PMSA*

Housing/Income Factor	Bedrooms				
	Zero	One	Two	Three	Four
Fair Market Rent (FMR)*	\$553	\$620	\$764	\$1,093	\$1,233
Annual income to afford	\$22,120	\$24,800	\$30,560	\$43,720	\$47,760
Hourly wage to afford	\$10.63	\$11.92	\$14.69	\$21.02	\$22.96
Hrs/week at minimum wage*	59	67	82	117	128

*PMSA includes all of Kitsap County. Fair market rents (FMR) established by HUD 2004. Minimum wage was \$7.16 in Washington.
 Source: National Low Income Housing Coalition (2004). Out of Reach 2004: America's Housing Wage Climbs.

In general, housing costs are well beyond the affordability of low-income households. Extremely low income households (those earning up to \$19,830 in 2005) would only be able to afford \$496 per month for housing and utilities. This does not afford the fair market rent of even a studio apartment. An SSI recipient (receiving \$564 monthly) can afford rent of no more than \$169.

Table 27 - Low-Income Ranges and Affordable Monthly Housing Costs, Bremerton PMSA, 2005

Definition	Percent of AMI*	Income Limit	Housing
Extremely low income	to 30% of AMI	\$19,830	\$496
Very low income	to 50% of AMI	\$33,050	\$826
Other low income	to 80% of AMI	\$52,880	\$1,058

*AMI is area median income established by HUD. HUD estimated the AMI for Kitsap County at \$66,100 in 2005.

Source: HUD, FY 2005 income limits, February 2005.

Being able to “make ends meet” is more than a challenge for low-income families, as demonstrated in the following table. The table shows that a household at the high end of poverty would have inadequate funds at the end of the year after modest spending for necessities, even with government assistance for food. This table does not allow for emergencies, saving for education, clothes and other items that are also essential.

Table 28 - Budgeting for Poverty in the United States, 2004

Item	Source	Amount
Annual Income	US Census, Current Population Survey, Annual Social and Economic Supplement, 2004	\$18,810
Rent	DOL, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Consumer Expenditures Survey, February 2004	-5,274 = \$13,536
Utilities	DOL, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Consumer Expenditures Survey, February 2004	-2,350 = \$11,186
Transportation	DOL, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Consumer Expenditures Survey, February 2004	-4,852 = \$6,334
Food	DOL, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Consumer Expenditures Survey, February 2004 (assuming food stamps for the majority)	-4,815 = \$1,519
Health Care	DOL, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Consumer Expenditures Survey, February 2004 (assumes health insurance through employer)	-793 = \$726
Child Care	US Dept. of Agriculture, Center for Nutrition Policy and Promotion, Expenditures on Children by Families, April 2004 (assumes subsidy of ¾ of real cost)	-2,030 = \$-1,304

Source: Catholic Campaign for Human Development, Poverty USA, 2004.

Another factor to consider in planning for affordable housing in a community is housing availability at the appropriate income level. For even if there is a supply of modestly priced, adequate housing in a community, without safeguards (such as allocation based on income), the most affordable housing may not be available to those with the greatest need.

The cost of housing is a factor in anyone’s budget, not just those with limited income. The table below shows the “mismatch” in supply of affordable housing and the income of occupants (derived from the 2000 census). For example, while there were 3,520 units in Bremerton priced at an affordable rental rate for people with

incomes between 31% and 50% of AMI, only 51% were occupied by households within that income range.

Table 29 - Affordability Mismatch, Bremerton 2000

Housing Units by Affordability	Rentals	Owned*
Rent/price affordable at <30% AMI		
Units in price range	1,915	N/A
Occupants at <30% AMI	54%	N/A
Vacant units for rent/sale	110	N/A
Rent/price affordable at 31%-50% AMI		
Units in price range	3,520	1,096
Occupants at <=50% AMI	51%	27%
Vacant units for rent/sale	495	95
Rent/price affordable at 51%-80% AMI		
Units in price range	2,990	3,363
Occupants at <=80% AMI	60%	34%
Vacant units for rent/sale	115	170

*Includes units for sale.

Source: HUD 2000 CHAS data.

The needs of the more than 34,000 persons living in the county who are disabled place additional requirements on the housing market for accessible housing. More than 7,000 of these disabled persons live in the City of Bremerton.

In addition, 164 persons in Kitsap County live with HIV/AIDS.

Specific Housing Objectives (91.215 (b))

1. Describe the priorities and specific objectives the jurisdiction hopes to achieve over a specified time period.
2. Describe how Federal, State, and local public and private sector resources that are reasonably expected to be available will be used to address identified needs for the period covered by the strategic plan.

3-5 Year Strategic Plan Specific Housing Objectives response:

Kitsap County: The County will continue to utilize CDBG/HOME funds in ways that balance the affordable housing needs for both low-income and special needs individuals/families with rental and homeownership opportunities throughout the County. CDBG/HOME funding will be used, wherever possible, in ways that increase and maximize other funding sources to projects. USDA Rural Development, Washington State Housing Trust Fund dollars, Low-Income Housing Tax Credits, SHOP funds, Kitsap County SHB 2060 funds, private grants and foundations are but a few of the funding sources from whom our low-income housing partners will seek funding with CDBG/HOME commitments in hand. Self-help homeownership as well as down payment assistance for existing housing stock will be supported.

CDBG funds will also be used to preserve and make housing affordable for existing low-income and special needs individuals/families through housing rehab and weatherization.

Bremerton: Major redevelopment of the Westpark Housing Area is a primary city objective during the next five years. In a plan already agreed to by the County, residents of Westpark will be able to locate to newer dwellings as mixed-market and mixed-use development goes forward.

An additional City goal over the five-year period is to support increasing homeownership, changing the present balance of owners (40%) to renters (60%) to a balance that more nearly approaches the national and area average of 67% ownership.

Finally, the City recognizes the need for quality, affordable housing and plans to take building and tax initiatives that facilitate affordable development.

Needs of Public Housing (91.210 (b))

In cooperation with the public housing agency or agencies located within its boundaries, describe the needs of public housing, including the number of public housing units in the jurisdiction, the physical condition of such units, the restoration and revitalization needs of public housing projects within the jurisdiction, and other factors, including the number of families on public housing and tenant-based waiting lists and results from the Section 504 needs assessment of public housing projects located within its boundaries (i.e. assessment of needs of tenants and applicants on waiting list for accessible units as required by 24 CFR 8.25). The public housing agency and jurisdiction can use the optional Priority Public Housing Needs Table (formerly Table 4) of the Consolidated Plan to identify priority public housing needs to assist in this process.

3-5 Year Strategic Plan Needs of Public Housing response:

NEEDS OF PUBLIC HOUSING

There were 2,649 persons on the wait list for Section 8 Tenant-Based Assistance, covering both the Kitsap County Consolidated Housing Authority and the Bremerton Housing Authority.

Type/Name of Housing	Location	Units	Population	Program
Public Housing				
Golden Tides I	Silverdale	15	Elderly	Public Housing
Nollwood	Bremerton	48	Families	Public Housing
Fairview	Bremerton	33	Families	Public Housing
Coventry Park	Bremerton	15	Families	Public Housing
Austurbruin	Poulsbo	10	Families	Public Housing
Scattered sites	County	15	Families	Public Housing
Total Public Housing		136		

Special Needs Housing			
Chico Duplex	Silverdale	6*	Developmentally Disabled
Liberty Bay Associates	Bremerton	8	Mental illness
Liberty Bay Associates	Port Orchard	8	Mental illness
Rotary Duplex	Silverdale	2	Transitional
Rotary Duplex	Poulsbo	2	Transitional
Lippert	Port Orchard	8	Transitional
Total Special Needs Housing		34	

Other Subsidized Housing			
Fjord Manor	Poulsbo	38	Seniors
Rhododendron Apts.	Bainbridge I.	50	Families
Windsong Apts.	Poulsbo	36	Families
Orchard Bluff	Poulsbo	88	Seniors
550 Madison Ave.	Bainbridge I.	13	Mixed
Fjord Vista II	Poulsbo	16	Families
Viewmont East	Port Orchard	77	Families
Heritage	Port Orchard	57	Families
Golden Tides II	Silverdale	45	Seniors
Golden Tides III	Silverdale	18	Seniors
Madrona Manor	Port Orchard	40	Seniors
Port Orchard Vista	Port Orchard	42	Seniors
Total Other Subsidized Housing		520	

Work Force Housing			
Tree Tops I & II	Silverdale	270	Families
Kingston Ridge	Kingston	43	Families
Port Orchard Valley	Port Orchard	72	Families
Park Place Apts.	Central Kitsap	86	Families
Total Work Force Housing		471	

KCCHA Rental Units Owned 1,161

KCCHA Section 8 Housing			
Housing Choice Vouchers Scattered		374	Mixed Section 8
Total Section 8 Housing		374	

*Special needs housing – KCCHA assists non-profit programs to provide housing with specialized services for homeless persons, people with a chronic mentally illness, families in transition, frail elderly, victims of domestic violence and other special needs groups.

Source: KCCHA, June 2005.

Additional KCCHA Programs and Services

In 2004, KCCHA started the 502 Direct Housing Program to facilitate the purchase of pre-existing homes to low- and very low-income families by providing applicant referral and loan packaging services to local realtors. The housing authority is the Community Renewal Agent for the City of Bremerton and has conducted a major renewal in Bremerton.

KCCHA has been offering the USDA's Mutual Self-Help (MSH) Program in Kitsap County and surrounding counties since 1973. Over that period, KCCHA has helped

over 1,000 families achieve their dream of homeownership. KCCHA is finishing the development of 6 affordable homes at the Fort Ward Parade Ground in the City of Bainbridge Island and is developing 90 additional Mutual Self Help homes at Vetter Place in Poulsbo.

KCCHA has several development projects in progress. These include The Poplars, Finch Place Apartments, Nordic Place I and North Almira. The Poplars is the conversion of 50 motel units into 9 studio, 20 1-bedroom and 1 2-bedroom unit that will provide affordable housing for extremely low income seniors aged 62 and older.

Finch Place Apartments is the preservation of an existing USDA RD Section 515 project on Bainbridge Island. This project provides 29 units of affordable housing for seniors.

Nordic Place I is the new construction of a 96-unit mixed income family development consisting of 1, 2 and 3 bedroom apartments. This project is located in the Poulsbo Market Place master planned development (previously known as Olhava), and is adjacent to the Poulsbo Olympic College campus. Retail stores currently under construction include Walmart and Home Depot. Future development plans include other retail stores, offices, restaurants and a transportation center.

North Almira is the new construction of a 90-unit mixed income family development consisting of 1, 2 and 3 bedroom apartments. This project is located in East Bremerton, behind Fred Meyer.

KCCHA further assists households to improve housing and achieve independence, including home ownership in several ways:

- Family Self Sufficiency
- First time home buyers classes
- Down payment assistance
- Rehabilitation and Modernization program
- Homeownership counseling, which includes budgeting, credit repair, predatory lending workshops and foreclosure prevention counseling

Resident advisory committees are active at several KCCHA complexes and resident of KCCHA housing is a member of Board of Commissioners.

Bremerton Housing Authority

The Bremerton Housing Authority operates 603 units of public housing in two housing developments. In addition, the housing authority operates 968 Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers on a scattered site basis throughout the city of Bremerton and Kitsap County.

Type/Name of Housing	Location	Units	Population	Program/Funding
Westpark	W Brem	582	Families	Public Housing
Tara Heights	E Brem	21	Families	Public Housing
The Firs	W Brem	60	Seniors	Project Based S8
HSG Choice Vouchers		968	Families	Section 8
Supportive HSG Program	Brem	40	Disabled	Section 8
Tamarack	E Brem	83	Seniors	Project Based S8

Redevelopment of Westpark

The Bremerton Housing Authority is approaching the fifth year of a \$300 million housing redevelopment project of its largest public housing site, Westpark. The existing Westpark Housing Development, consisting of 582 units, is the remnant of a larger World War II-era housing project that was built as temporary housing for shipyard workers. The Bremerton Housing Authority's vision is to create an attractive new community with distinctive architecture, plazas, and pedestrian-oriented streets. The Strategic Master Plan - the redevelopment plan for Westpark - was created through a community-involvement process that included Westpark residents, residents of the wider Bremerton community, local officials, and community and business leaders.

The Strategic Master Plan calls for a new vibrant mixed-use urban community to include 1,000 public housing, low- and market-rate rental units and family-owned homes, shops, restaurants, offices, a community center, sports fields, playgrounds and a preserved environment of trees and open spaces. Also included is a new seventy-two unit assisted living facility, with a twelve-unit section for people with Alzheimer's Disease.

Once the redevelopment is completed, Westpark residents will be able to walk from home to a store, a park, or even a workplace. Housing will be two to four stories high, oriented to the street, and will include multifamily buildings, duplexes, townhouses, and small-lot detached homes.

Additional Bremerton Housing Authority Programs and Services

Affordable Housing Preservation: Preserving housing that may be sold to market; and focusing on providing housing to the senior, elderly, and special needs population.

Project Based Assistance (PBA): Provide project based assistance to the community; support family relocation of the Westpark Redevelopment project; support elderly, senior and special needs population development projects.

Resident Initiatives Programs: Home ownership, family self-sufficiency (FSS), business entrepreneurship programs to low-income families.

Resident Involvement: One resident is a member of the Board of Commissioners of the Housing Authority. In addition, a three-member Resident Advisory Committee provides advice to the Board.

Public Housing Strategy (91.210)

1. Describe the public housing agency's strategy to serve the needs of extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income families residing in the jurisdiction served by the public housing agency (including families on the public housing and section 8 tenant-based waiting list), the public housing agency's strategy for addressing the revitalization and restoration needs of public housing projects within the jurisdiction and improving the management and operation of such public housing, and the public housing agency's strategy for improving the living environment of extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate families residing in public housing.

2. Describe the manner in which the plan of the jurisdiction will help address the needs of public housing and activities it will undertake to encourage public housing residents to become more involved in management and participate in homeownership. (NAHA Sec. 105 (b)(11) and (91.215 (k))
3. If the public housing agency is designated as "troubled" by HUD or otherwise is performing poorly, the jurisdiction shall describe the manner in which it will provide financial or other assistance in improving its operations to remove such designation. (NAHA Sec. 105 (g))

3-5 Year Strategic Plan Public Housing Strategy response:

PUBLIC HOUSING STRATEGY

KCCHA has established the following goals:

- o Preserve and expand the supply of good quality housing
- o Make existing housing more affordable and more readily available
- o Promote racial and economic diversity in residential neighborhoods
- o Help households build wealth
- o Strengthen families
- o Link housing with essential supportive services
- o Promote balanced metropolitan growth.

Bremerton Housing Authority has established the following goals:

- o Expand existing assisted housing
- o Improve the quality of assisted housing
- o Increase assisted housing choices
- o Provide an improved living environment
- o Promote self-sufficiency and asset development of assisted households and partner with social services agencies to improve recipient's employability
- o Ensure equal opportunity and affirmatively further fair housing

Additionally, the Bremerton Housing Authority has established the following strategies:

1. The Housing Authority of Bremerton will continue its vision of being a progressive agency to achieve its goals of providing subsidized housing, affordable housing, economic growth, and a community resource to the City of Bremerton and its partners;
2. Redevelop the Westpark Housing Development to include the demolition of 582 1940 era dwelling units to prepare for the construction of a new vibrant mixed-use urban community to include: 1,000 housing units consisting of public housing, low- and market-rate rental units and family-owned homes with the construction of shops, restaurants, offices, and a preserved environment of trees and open spaces. Also included is a new 72-unit assisted living facility, including a 12-unit section for people suffering from Alzheimer's Disease;
3. Maintain its position with the U.S Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) as a High Performing agency in managing the Housing Choice Voucher and Public Housing Programs;

4. Respond to federal funding reductions to the Housing Choice Voucher Program by implementing policy and procedural cost control measures created with community partnership;
5. Continue to assess operation methods and implement operation efficiencies designed to control cost and provide better service to the community.
6. Continue to encourage self-sufficiency of participant families and assist in the expansion of opportunities which address the needs of families in the areas of educational, socioeconomic, recreational employability, basic life skills and other supportive services;
7. Expand the level of family, owner and community support in accomplishing BHA's mission;
8. Promote fair housing and provide an opportunity for eligible families of all ethnic and racial backgrounds to experience freedom of housing choice;
9. Promote market-driven housing programs that will assist eligible families in successfully obtaining affordable subsidized housing, by increasing the supply of housing choices for such families, as identified by local need.

Barriers to Affordable Housing (91.210 (e) and 91.215 (f))

1. Explain whether the cost of housing or the incentives to develop, maintain, or improve affordable housing are affected by public policies, particularly those of the local jurisdiction. Such policies include tax policy affecting land and other property, land use controls, zoning ordinances, building codes, fees and charges, growth limits, and policies that affect the return on residential investment.
2. Describe the strategy to remove or ameliorate negative effects of public policies that serve as barriers to affordable housing, except that, if a State requires a unit of general local government to submit a regulatory barrier assessment that is substantially equivalent to the information required under this part, as determined by HUD, the unit of general local government may submit that assessment to HUD and it shall be considered to have complied with this requirement.

3-5 Year Strategic Plan Barriers to Affordable Housing response:

Kitsap County: 1. The primary factor negatively affecting the provision of affordable housing in Kitsap County is the sharp inflation in housing prices throughout the United States, including Washington State and Kitsap County. Escalating housing prices throughout the market put increasing pressure on the lower end supply of affordable housing. What was affordable to a working family earning the median household income is no longer affordable today – those families reach farther down the housing spectrum to meet their needs, leaving fewer units available for those below the median income.

Within Kitsap, the supply of affordable housing has been affected by a number of other specific factors, including:

In a 2005 survey of affordable housing professionals (lenders, counselors, sellers/brokers, and other real estate professionals) conducted as part of the Kitsap County Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing, lack of availability of building sites (and resulting higher land cost) was cited most often as impeding affordable housing. This was related to the land use controls and growth limits required by the WA State Growth Management Act. This state statute requires local governments to set Urban Growth Area boundaries, outside of which development is restricted to (approximately) one unit per 5-10 acres. The intent of the statute is to prevent urban sprawl that cannot be served economically with urban services (sewer, transit, road network, et al). and to preserve agricultural, forest, mineral, and other resource lands. One effect is that land prices both inside and outside the UGA's may have escalated somewhat more steeply than national average land prices.

Local government has identified the lack of infrastructure -- especially sewer -- to potential building sites as a significant factor in higher housing cost.

The WA State Department of Ecology has recently issued storm water management requirements (based on the federal Clean Water Act) that inhibit urban infill.

That same 2005 survey identified lending and zoning practices and attitudes related to manufactured housing (one source of affordable housing) as a factor.

Input from the Planning Directors for Kitsap County, Cities, and Tribes revealed more subtle structural impediments in the building codes that do not encourage innovation and affordable urban-scale density. An example is the need for design standards that would make manufactured housing more desirable additions to urban neighborhoods.

Real estate professionals have noticed that changes in the federal capital gains tax structure have encouraged more people to purchase second homes, creating further pressure on the supply of affordable housing in Kitsap County.

Federal support to affordable housing in the form of Section 8 rental subsidies have decreased over the past several years.

2. The primary local strategy to address these pressures on the supply of affordable housing (see above) is to develop a set of incentives to development within Urban Growth Areas. There are many agencies and organizations whose perspectives, experience, and influence must be included in this effort: County and Cities, Kitsap Housing Coalition, Kitsap Homebuilders and Realtors Associations, the Kitsap Consolidated Housing Authority and the Bremerton Housing Authority, the many agencies providing housing support services to low income families, to name a few.

Ensuring that all voices are included in identifying and implementing incentives will be undertaken by the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council (KRCC: County, Cities, Tribes, and Port of Bremerton). The Council's regularly-convened Planning Directors Forum will utilize several channels during 2006, including:

Cross-cutting member participation in the numerous forums addressing the issue of affordable housing in Kitsap County.

Member participation in workshops and forums addressing specific aspects of identified impediments, including infrastructure and low impact development.

Specially-convened stakeholder workshops during 2006.

The starting point for the list of possible incentives will be the Desktop Reference of Reasonable Measures collaboratively developed by the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council's Planning Directors during 2005. The Reasonable Measures are a set of forty six (46) zoning, planning, infrastructure financing, and other strategies that have been compiled for use in the Urban Growth Areas to increase density and thus affordable housing.

Kitsap County's Comprehensive Plan outlines several steps to reduce barriers to affordable housing. Among them are:

- o Develop ordinances that allow or encourage a minimum percentage of low- and moderate-income units in housing developments
- o Allow provisions for reduction of minimum lot sizes
- o Permit and encourage development of residential accessory units per local regulations
- o Reduce development proposal processing time
- o Identify incentives for affordable housing (e.g. lower utility hookup fees and rates, impact fee reductions and priority for zoning reviews)

Bremerton: The City detailed in a 2004 Comprehensive plan <http://www.ci.bremerton.wa.us/display.php?id=436>, its approach to revitalizing itself. Implicit in the plan are the relationships of regulations, economics, and public process in moving affordability from where it is to where it might be.

The following language from the City's Comprehensive Plan details some of the issues:

"...the Housing Element must also address an important state-wide and regional challenge – the provision of affordable housing. Statewide and regional priorities are established in the Growth Management Act itself.... The Growth Management Act housing goal describes a fundamental requirement for Housing Elements. The GMA housing goal states: Encourage the availability of affordable housing to all economic segments of the population of this state, promote a variety of residential densities and housing types, and encourage preservation of existing housing stock.

Discussion: Affordable housing in Bremerton is abundant, but it primarily serves low and moderate income populations. The City must work towards diversifying its affordable housing choices for a healthier combination of economic segments of the population. A variety of housing densities and types, developed with a community orientation and cohesiveness will assist with this Growth Management charge. In addition to the call in the GMA for affordable housing strategies within Comprehensive Plans, jurisdictions within Kitsap County have also agreed to cooperatively address the issue of fair and equitable distribution of affordable units."

HOMELESS

Homeless Needs (91.205 (b) and 91.215 (c))

*Please also refer to the Homeless Needs Table in the Needs.xls workbook

Homeless Needs— The jurisdiction must provide a concise summary of the nature and extent of homelessness in the jurisdiction, (including rural homelessness where applicable), addressing separately the need for facilities and services for homeless persons and homeless families with children, both sheltered and unsheltered, and homeless subpopulations, in accordance with Table 1A. The summary must include the characteristics and needs of low-income individuals and children, (especially extremely low-income) who are currently housed but are at imminent risk of either residing in shelters or becoming unsheltered. In addition, to the extent information is available, the plan must include a description of the nature and extent of homelessness by racial and ethnic group. A quantitative analysis is not required. If a jurisdiction provides estimates of the at-risk population(s), it should also include a description of the operational definition of the at-risk group and the methodology used to generate the estimates.

3-5 Year Strategic Plan Homeless Needs response:

HOMELESS NEEDS

Homeless providers in the county have assessed the needs of homeless by conducting homeless surveys and meeting to review resources and needs. The Kitsap Continuum of Care Coalition coordinates activities to meet homeless needs and prevent homelessness throughout the area. The Coalition includes more than 60 members and 28 organizations that meet on a monthly basis to plan and coordinate activities assisting the homeless.

In January 2005, the community conducted a count of the homeless in the county. While the count covered most areas of the county, it is not considered by homeless community providers to be an inclusive survey of homeless needs. Nevertheless, it provides basic information on the characteristics of homelessness in the county. A total of 1,132 unduplicated homeless persons were found in 880 households. 365 children were included in the count. Four hundred were sheltered in shelters, transitional facilities or permanent supportive housing at the point in time of the survey. Single males outnumbered single females by almost 2 to 1.

Many of the sheltered had disabilities. Over one-half (216) of the sheltered reported a mental health problem. Others reported substance abuse and HIV/AIDS as problems they were facing. Sixty-six sheltered single individuals were chronically homeless; another 110 chronic homeless persons were found on the streets. There were 134 victims of domestic violence, 72 Veterans and 26 unaccompanied youth sheltered.

Many of the community's low-income persons are at-risk of becoming homeless, often literally a paycheck away from falling into homelessness. And while economic problems and eviction are often the final event leading to homelessness, persons with mental illness and/or substance abuse are particularly vulnerable. They are often unable to maintain a job (or if they do, it is at very low pay), have difficulty with medicines (or self-medicate) and require multiple services to sustain self-

sufficiency. Others at-risk are members of dysfunctional families who are often victims of domestic violence, runaway or abandoned youth and large families (86% of very low income families with five or more members were found in the CHAS data to have “housing problems” making them at-risk of losing their housing). The combination of rising housing costs, limited income and insufficient subsidized housing are major factors leading to homelessness.

The most common causes of homelessness self-identified by homeless persons interviewed in the 2005 count were:

- o Drug or alcohol use (202 responses)
- o Unable to pay rent/mortgage (132)
- o Lost job (124)
- o Family break-up (109)
- o Evicted for non-payment or other reasons (104)
- o Mental illness (89)
- o Temporary living situation ended (73)
- o Domestic violence (69)
- o Medical problems (69)

Homelessness is a countywide issue in Kitsap County. The homeless in Bremerton are served by housing and social services provided on a countywide basis. Therefore, solutions for homeless persons in Bremerton are integrally tied to this countywide planning.

Priority Homeless Needs

1. Using the results of the Continuum of Care planning process, identify the jurisdiction's homeless and homeless prevention priorities specified in Table 1A, the Homeless and Special Needs Populations Chart. The description of the jurisdiction's choice of priority needs and allocation priorities must be based on reliable data meeting HUD standards and should reflect the required consultation with homeless assistance providers, homeless persons, and other concerned citizens regarding the needs of homeless families with children and individuals. The jurisdiction must provide an analysis of how the needs of each category of residents provided the basis for determining the relative priority of each priority homeless need category. A separate brief narrative should be directed to addressing gaps in services and housing for the sheltered and unsheltered chronic homeless.
2. A community should give a high priority to chronically homeless persons, where the jurisdiction identifies sheltered and unsheltered chronic homeless persons in its Homeless Needs Table - Homeless Populations and Subpopulations.

3-5 Year Strategic Plan Priority Homeless Needs response:

To establish the priority needs, the Kitsap County Continuum of Care Coalition analyzed the needs of homeless in the county using the homeless count, intake data and anecdotal information from providers in the community. The count itself used the standards of the HUD McKinney Program, HUD homeless definitions and the standards of the Balance of Washington State Continuum Homeless Management

Information Systems. The Coalition has identified a need to develop 45 shelter beds for homeless families and 150 shelter beds for homeless individuals (see Table 1A). There is a significant unmet need for transitional housing for families totaling 158 beds and 76 beds for homeless singles. The needs for permanent supportive housing for the homeless disabled include 55 family beds and 41 singles beds, some of which would serve chronically homeless persons.

The general Continuum of Care priorities are established by the Coalition were:

Housing Projects

- o Rental Assistance
- o Transitional Housing
- o Affordable Permanent Housing
- o Emergency Shelter

Services Activities

- o Rental Assistance for Prevention
- o Case Management
- o Outreach and Collaboration
- o Education, Life Skills and Living Wage Jobs
- o Fair Market Housing

A meeting of homeless providers and governmental agencies held in September 2005 identified the following priority needs:

1. Employment, including living wage jobs (\$14.+/hr), entry level jobs with a path to living wage jobs and training/jobs skills development
2. Day Center to provide the basic needs for persons on the streets of living in their vehicles
3. Subsidized Single Room Occupancy (with bathrooms) for homeless persons and very low income persons
4. Affordable Housing for households at less than 30% AMI
5. Family Emergency Shelter beds
6. Subsidies to make rental housing affordable
7. Assistance to doubled-up persons at risk
8. Subsidized Child Care
9. Health and mental health care services including medications
10. Improved coordination of mainstream resources and the removal of unnecessary barriers in regulations
11. Supportive services for at-risk and homeless populations
12. Eviction Prevention Services including counseling and rental assistance
13. Assistance with reinstatement of credit for poor credit history or poor rent payment history
14. Transportation
15. Housing for Sex Offenders
16. Transitional Housing with supportive services
17. Maintenance of existing housing stock
18. A Range of Strength-based Case Management Services
19. Clean and Sober Living facilities
20. Permanent supportive housing for homeless and at-risk populations

HOMELESSNESS GOALS:

To ensure that decent, accessible, affordable, and suitable housing is available in the County and its cities, and support services meet the needs of individuals and families who are homeless or at risk of homelessness, the Kitsap County community will:

Specific Objective: N-1

Provide a sufficient variety and quantity of decent and safe, emergency, transitional and affordable permanent housing.

Number N-1.1 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Maintain, and increase where necessary, current levels of emergency, transitional, and permanent housing with adequate supportive services.

Number N-1.2 Increase the availability of housing options, including affordable housing and disabled housing (where necessary) through accessibility and rehabilitation funding. (see H-3)

Number N-1.3 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Expand resources for homeless programs. Maintain, and increase where necessary, the level of funding for housing programs and services identified and enforced by the Continuum of Care annually, through advocacy and grant writing.

Number N-1.4 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Support education efforts to preserve decent, safe, low-income housing.

Specific Objective: N-2

Provide adequate support through coordinated systems of: resources, outreach, assessment, case management, provider collaboration, homelessness prevention, rental assistance and advocacy.

Number N-2.1 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Support the efforts of the Continuum of Care Coalition to take the lead in identifying gaps in services and priority needs, maintaining data on homeless persons, coordinating services and developing collaborative funding proposals for homeless populations.

Number N-2.2 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Support the use of case management practices and provider collaboration to ensure a coordinated system of services for special needs and low-income populations where appropriate.

Number N- 2.3 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Use a portion of available resources to subsidize necessary support services for those who are homeless or at risk of homelessness and promote leveraging of additional funding.

Number N- 2.4 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Implement new data collection technology (HMIS) throughout the homeless system.

Specific Objective N-3

Provide critical supportive services to support housing options for the homeless.

Number N- 3.1 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Expand services during non-shelter hours.

Number N- 3.2 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Investigate models for possible development of Day Center to provide services to the homeless by Fall, 2007.

Number N- 3.3 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Expand child care services and subsidies for the homeless and those at-risk as needed.

Number N- 3.4 Expand counseling services to the homeless and improve linkages between substance abuse providers and activities and mental health providers and activities.

Number N- 3.5 Analyze needs of youth, develop a resources plan and implement a plan to meet needs of homeless and at-risk youth including those "aging out" of foster care.

Number N- 3.6 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Encourage independent living by supporting living skills training, respite care, child care, training, counseling and job referrals.

Number N- 3.7 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Develop and improve inter-agency communication to assist those released from institutions or programs in seeking housing and services.

Homeless Inventory (91.210 (c))

The jurisdiction shall provide a concise summary of the existing facilities and services (including a brief inventory) that assist homeless persons and families with children and subpopulations identified in Table 1A. These include outreach and assessment, emergency shelters and services, transitional housing, permanent supportive housing, access to permanent housing, and activities to prevent low-income individuals and families with children (especially extremely low-income) from becoming homeless. The jurisdiction can use the optional Continuum of Care Housing Activity Chart and Service Activity Chart to meet this requirement.

3-5 Year Strategic Plan Homeless Inventory response:

HOMELESS INVENTORY

To meet the needs of the homeless, area providers have developed a variety of services and housing aimed at moving the homeless back to self-sufficiency as quickly and effectively as possible. The Housing Activity Chart and the Service Activity Chart located in the Appendix are briefly summarized below:

Housing Facilities

A total of 71 permanent shelter beds and 14 seasonal beds are available to meet the short-term needs of homeless families and individuals. Sixty-one family beds serve approximately 16 families, while 10 beds are available for single female individuals. Another 14-bed facility for single men is currently under development. Homeless

planners have identified an unmet need of 195 shelter beds, predominately to serve single males.

Four providers maintain 109 transitional housing beds: 41 for individuals and 68 for families. Under development are 2 more facilities providing 36 additional beds, leaving an unmet need of 234 beds in the community.

Six housing providers have available 166 permanent supportive housing beds for homeless persons with disabilities; all but 27 beds are for single disabled persons only. Planners estimate that an additional 96 beds are needed to meet the current need.

Supportive Services

Ten different service providers assist those at-risk of homelessness with short-term rental assistance. Several others provide homeless prevention services such as utility assistance, food and clothing, rental counseling and personal services to families and individuals.

A few agencies provide outreach, assessment and referral to persons living on the streets. The Continuum of Care planning group utilizes the homeless count as a method of reaching out to many of the homeless.

Kitsap Community Resources is a primary provider of services in the community and is supported by several agencies providing specialized assistance to the homeless such as mental health counseling, child care, employment assistance, drug and alcohol treatment, case management, life skills training, HIV/AIDS treatment, drug/alcohol treatment and counseling, and transportation.

(See attached "Service Activity Chart" from 2005 McKinney Application for further detail.)

Homeless Strategic Plan (91.215 (c))

1. Homelessness— Describe the jurisdiction's strategy for developing a system to address homelessness and the priority needs of homeless persons and families (including the subpopulations identified in the needs section). The jurisdiction's strategy must consider the housing and supportive services needed in each stage of the process which includes preventing homelessness, outreach/assessment, emergency shelters and services, transitional housing, and helping homeless persons (especially any persons that are chronically homeless) make the transition to permanent housing and independent living. The jurisdiction must also describe its strategy for helping extremely low- and low-income individuals and families who are at imminent risk of becoming homeless.
2. Chronic homelessness—Describe the jurisdiction's strategy for eliminating chronic homelessness by 2012. This should include the strategy for helping homeless persons make the transition to permanent housing and independent living. This

strategy should, to the maximum extent feasible, be coordinated with the strategy presented Exhibit 1 of the Continuum of Care (CoC) application and any other strategy or plan to eliminate chronic homelessness. Also describe, in a narrative, relationships and efforts to coordinate the Conplan, CoC, and any other strategy or plan to address chronic homelessness.

3. Homelessness Prevention—Describe the jurisdiction’s strategy to help prevent homelessness for individuals and families with children who are at imminent risk of becoming homeless.
4. Institutional Structure—Briefly describe the institutional structure, including private industry, non-profit organizations, and public institutions, through which the jurisdiction will carry out its homelessness strategy.
5. Discharge Coordination Policy—Every jurisdiction receiving McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG), Supportive Housing, Shelter Plus Care, or Section 8 SRO Program funds must develop and implement a Discharge Coordination Policy, to the maximum extent practicable. Such a policy should include “policies and protocols for the discharge of persons from publicly funded institutions or systems of care (such as health care facilities, foster care or other youth facilities, or correction programs and institutions) in order to prevent such discharge from immediately resulting in homelessness for such persons.” The jurisdiction should describe its planned activities to implement a cohesive, community-wide Discharge Coordination Policy, and how the community will move toward such a policy.

3-5 Year Homeless Strategic Plan response:

DISCHARGE

Youth - Develop collaborative programs to meet the job training needs of emancipating foster youth and programs that help them obtain information regarding education, training, and job search services.

Prisoners:

Prisoner release to parole is mandated by law & requires inmates being released to return to their last county of legal residence. The public’s perception is that the parole agency then becomes exclusively responsible for the inmate/parolee population. Their role, however, is much less involved. The problems of any person with no income, housing, treatment, health care and sometime no family or community ties soon become everyone’s problems.

Recidivism studies show that planning and preparing with the local service and treatment provider agencies prior to release can speed up integration into services and security and this involvement with the community’s can promote better adjustment for released inmates. An important key to reducing problems for both the ex-prisoners and community is to provide individual discharge planning prior to parole.

Discharge planning is only as good as prison’s ability to work closely with other public agencies and non-profit support services. The inmate population does not have the ability to schedule appointments with social service agencies or jobs or training prior to their release. Consequently, once they parole, it can take months before stability can be secured for a mentally ill or physically challenged parolee.

Without housing subsidies, low-income women attempting recovery may be forced to compromise safety for themselves and their children, risk sobriety, threaten family reunification goals, and/or leave program-established support systems by finding shelter in less desirable locations. Leaving support systems that validate drug-free lifestyles will jeopardize recovery goals because many clients may return to drug use in order to cope with this stressful situation.

Advocate for comprehensive, standardized pre-release planning and necessary services for every releasee, and secure funding for housing and services identified in the planning process.

Convene stakeholder taskforce to review housing qualification and placement policies to determine if they contribute to the homelessness of institutional releases.

Improve coordination of services and movement of clients into permanent housing, especially those receiving treatment for substance abuse and mental health treatment.

Emergency Shelter Grants (ESG)

(States only) Describe the process for awarding grants to State recipients, and a description of how the allocation will be made available to units of local government.

3-5 Year Strategic Plan ESG response:

ESG funding is not a part of this consortium.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Community Development (91.215 (e))

*Please also refer to the Community Development Table in the Needs.xls workbook

1. Identify the jurisdiction's priority non-housing community development needs eligible for assistance by CDBG eligibility category specified in the Community Development Needs Table (formerly Table 2B), – i.e., public facilities, public improvements, public services and economic development.
2. Describe the basis for assigning the priority given to each category of priority needs.
3. Identify any obstacles to meeting underserved needs.
4. Identify specific long-term and short-term community development objectives (including economic development activities that create jobs), developed in accordance with the statutory goals described in section 24 CFR 91.1 and the primary objective of the CDBG program to provide decent housing and a suitable living environment and expand economic opportunities, principally for low- and moderate-income persons.

NOTE: Each specific objective developed to address a priority need, must be identified by number and contain proposed accomplishments, the time period (i.e., one, two, three, or more years), and annual program year numeric goals the jurisdiction hopes to achieve in quantitative terms, or in other measurable terms as identified and defined by the jurisdiction.

3-5 Year Strategic Plan Community Development response:

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GOALS:

To ensure the safe, livability of neighborhoods, the preservation of important facilities, public access to facilities and services, and planning activities that primarily benefit low-income persons, Kitsap County will:

Specific Objective C-1

Support a continuum of social and health services for low/moderate income persons.

Number C-1.1 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Support effective ongoing continuum of social and health services and use existing planning, housing and service networks (i.e. Continuum of Care Coalition, Planners & Funders Group, etc.) to evaluate and develop collaborative responses to priority needs.

Number C-1.2 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Support efforts to address social and health issues identified in community plans.

Specific Objective C-2

Provide suitable access to all public buildings in the cities and County by removing architectural barriers.

Number C-2.1 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Provide supportive funding to increase ADA access to city, county and other government business and for service/housing providers of low-income clients and special needs populations.

Specific Objective C-3

Support planning projects that assess or identify services and housing to support low income individuals, families, neighborhoods and special needs.

Number C-3.1 Kitsap County: Support planning projects that address community needs.

Number C-3.2 Bremerton: Support planning efforts identified in community-wide plans which address C-3 Objective.

Specific Objective C-4

Support local efforts toward solving public facility needs, especially those identified in community wide planning efforts.

Number C-4.1 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Encourage efforts to combine, coordinate and integrate CDBG funds with other available private and public resources

whenever possible to provide support to low income neighborhoods and to leverage additional funds.

Number C-4.2 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Consider community centers, senior centers, youth centers, daycare centers, shelters and drug/alcohol rehabilitation and/or detoxification centers as possible responses to public health and service needs for low income residents.

Specific Objective C-5

Meet urgent Community Development needs, which pose a serious and immediate risk to public health or safety.

Number C-5.1 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Keep apprised of disaster relief needs and public health emergencies. Evaluate Community Development needs (through the grant decision process) for imminent health and safety risks.

Antipoverty Strategy (91.215 (h))

1. Describe the jurisdiction's goals, programs, and policies for reducing the number of poverty level families (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget and revised annually). In consultation with other appropriate public and private agencies, (i.e. TANF agency) state how the jurisdiction's goals, programs, and policies for producing and preserving affordable housing set forth in the housing component of the consolidated plan will be coordinated with other programs and services for which the jurisdiction is responsible.
2. Identify the extent to which this strategy will reduce (or assist in reducing) the number of poverty level families, taking into consideration factors over which the jurisdiction has control.

3-5 Year Strategic Plan Antipoverty Strategy response:

The County and City see poverty, simply enough, as lack of income. Given that narrow definition, the jurisdictions continue to encourage economic development that creates living wage jobs in the area. Just as a Continuum of Care describes the partnerships and transitions for the homeless population, so an Economic Continuum describes area efforts to bring individuals through financial levels to meet their individual goals. Here follows the goals and objectives:

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT GOALS:

To ensure: the safe livability of neighborhoods, the preservation of important facilities, public access to facilities and services, and planning activities, that primarily benefit low-income persons, Kitsap County will:

Specific Objective E-1

Support creation and retention of sustainable livable wage jobs, and essential job preparation skills.

Number E-1.1 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Advocate for livable wage jobs (paying more than \$14.69 based on 2004 wages), and encourage services that support job preparation for low-income workers (i.e. childcare, training).

Number E-1.2 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Support efforts to promote self-sufficiency through a care continuum of social services that sustain clients through low-wage entry-level jobs and into livable wage jobs. (i.e. childcare).

Specific Objective E-2

Assist low-income individuals who wish to establish, expand or stabilize a small business by providing loans and supportive technical assistance and training.

Number E-2.1 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Maintain an economic development program that provides gap financing for reliable business start-up enterprises identified by lenders.

Number E-2.2 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Encourage community efforts to provide technical assistance to support new and growing small businesses.

Number E-2.3 Kitsap County: Provide 10% of program CDBG funds received for Economic Development through 2010.

Specific Objective E-3

Revisit existing economic development plans and policies and modify them as necessary to develop and maintain infrastructures that encourage livable-wage jobs.

Number E-3.1 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Identify and maintain relationships with economic development committees and sub-committees committed to developing infrastructures that encourage living wage jobs.

Number E-3.2 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Use 2000 Census to update financial/wage information.

Specific Objective E-4

Encourage and foster new businesses offering living wage jobs in the County.

Number E-4.1 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Convene a meeting of economic development and employment assistance agencies to network and exchange information on common issues.

Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) Coordination (91.315 (k))

1. (States only) Describe the strategy to coordinate the Low-income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) with the development of housing that is affordable to low- and moderate-income families.

3-5 Year Strategic Plan LIHTC Coordination response:

Not applicable

NON-HOMELESS SPECIAL NEEDS

Specific Special Needs Objectives (91.215)

1. Describe the priorities and specific objectives the jurisdiction hopes to achieve over a specified time period.
2. Describe how Federal, State, and local public and private sector resources that are reasonably expected to be available will be used to address identified needs for the period covered by the strategic plan.

3-5 Year Non-homeless Special Needs Analysis response:

There are relatively greater needs in terms of the number of persons who are elderly, frail elderly, and seriously mentally ill and disabled than other special needs populations. The City's housing rehabilitation program includes provisions for making housing handicapped accessible for persons with physical disabilities. Further, the service providers funded by the City's CDBG Program, notably Bremerton Foodline (Food Bank) and Bremerton Services Association (Meals-on-wheels) meet basic needs of clients and are also in a position to refer for additional services available in the community.

Obstacles that may be faced in meeting the needs of underserved special needs populations include the limited amount of state and federal funds available for these populations.

*Special Needs Populations include the following categories: elderly, frail elderly, persons with disabilities (mental, physical, developmental), persons living with HIV/AIDS, persons fleeing domestic violence, persons with alcohol or other drug addiction and people affected by more than one identification.

SPECIAL NEEDS GOALS:

To ensure that suitable, effective assistance is available for vulnerable persons in *Special Populations who are in need of housing, support or care services, the Kitsap County and Bremerton community will:

Specific Objective S-1

Maintain, improve, and increase effective services and suitable housing.

Number S-1.1 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Maintain current support service level and increase where necessary through December 2010, and substantiate service priorities with best available demographic data.

Number S-1.2 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Develop housing opportunities for people with special needs that provide services within the home through ADA rehabilitation

for at least five permanent residences a year - 25 by Fall, 2010. Explore the potential for sharing the cost of expanding housing for special needs populations throughout the county.

Number S-1.3 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Provide funding support for special needs housing.

Number S-1.4 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Develop transitional housing targeted for persons/families fleeing domestic violence.

Number S-1.5 Kitsap County: Increase the supply of permanent housing with supportive services available for chronically mentally ill persons.

Number S-1.6 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Investigate the possibility of developing a pre-treatment house for persons waiting for space in drug alcohol treatment centers.

Specific Objective S-2

Ensure effective service delivery and housing availability through supportive ordinances and regulations.

Number S-2.1 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Collaborate with governmental planning departments to monitor changes in ordinances and regulations that reduce or hinder effective service delivery or housing availability for low-moderate income residents.

Number S-2.2 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Collaborate with planning departments to prepare a Housing Affordability Forum by Summer, 2006.

Number S-2.3 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Expand the number of interlocal/interagency agreements to exchange data and information.

Specific Objective S-3

Support efforts to develop an entry system for special population clients that ensure links with appropriate diagnosis, placement, support and treatment.

Number S-3.1 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Support the efforts of existing networks and coalitions to develop and establish an assessment/entry system that connects clients with all available resources and avoids duplication of services.

Number S-3.2 Survey Agencies - By September 1, 2006

Number S-3.3 Develop Assessment - By September 1, 2008

Number S-3.4 Test Assessment - By September 1, 2009

Number S-3.5 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Incorporate principles of the New Freedom Initiative by contacting and planning with the disabled community to assure their awareness and contribution to the projects and programs funded by CDBG.

Specific Objective S-4

Increase and maintain the availability of effective, timely life skills training and work

preparation to promote self sufficiency.

Number S-4.1 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Support agency and public housing efforts to promote self-sufficiency.

Number S-4.2 Kitsap County/Bremerton: Support organizations offering training (including home living) and work skills preparation that address special needs populations endeavors to live independently (with or without assistance).

Non-homeless Special Needs (91.205 (d) and 91.210 (d)) Analysis (including HOPWA)

*Please also refer to the Non-homeless Special Needs Table in the Needs.xls workbook.

1. Estimate, to the extent practicable, the number of persons in various subpopulations that are not homeless but may require housing or supportive services, including the elderly, frail elderly, persons with disabilities (mental, physical, developmental, persons with HIV/AIDS and their families), persons with alcohol or other drug addiction, and any other categories the jurisdiction may specify and describe their supportive housing needs. The jurisdiction can use the Non-Homeless Special Needs Table (formerly Table 1B) of their Consolidated Plan to help identify these needs.

*Note: HOPWA recipients must identify the size and characteristics of the population with HIV/AIDS and their families that will be served in the metropolitan area.

2. Identify the priority housing and supportive service needs of persons who are not homeless but require supportive housing, i.e., elderly, frail elderly, persons with disabilities (mental, physical, developmental, persons with HIV/AIDS and their families), persons with alcohol or other drug addiction by using the Non-homeless Special Needs Table.
3. Describe the basis for assigning the priority given to each category of priority needs.
4. Identify any obstacles to meeting underserved needs.
5. To the extent information is available, describe the facilities and services that assist persons who are not homeless but require supportive housing, and programs for ensuring that persons returning from mental and physical health institutions receive appropriate supportive housing.
6. If the jurisdiction plans to use HOME or other tenant based rental assistance to assist one or more of these subpopulations, it must justify the need for such assistance in the plan.

3-5 Year Non-homeless Special Needs Analysis response:
NON-HOMELESS SPECIAL NEEDS AND ANALYSIS (INCLUDING HOPWA)

An indication of the number of persons with special needs is the number of persons receiving state social services. The State Department of Social and Health Services

reports that 19.6% of the county population uses state services, the fifth lowest percentage in the state and considerably below the state rate of 24.7%. A total of 18% of the county population are classified as disabled, approximating the state rate (DSHS 2003). Bremerton and Port Orchard were the two communities with the highest proportion of persons with disabilities in Kitsap County, both with 26% of their population classified as disabled in the 2000 US census. Many of these fell into special needs categories:

- o Eleven percent of the county population was over 65 years of age in 2000, representing more than 24,553 persons. 43% of the counties residents over 65 years of age were disabled in 2004 (Kitsap County Health District 2004). Many among those who are over 85 years old are in frail condition. In Kitsap County 3,081 persons were over age 85 in 2000, 816 living in Bremerton.

- o The State DSHS reports 4,302 persons in the county suffering from mental illness among their active workload in 2003. Of these, 1,613 lived in Bremerton.

- o A total of 1,624 persons in the county with alcohol or drug problems were assisted by the state in 2003. Deaths from alcohol or drugs reached 186 persons. The percentage of adults in the county needing treatment in 2003 reached 10.9%, while the rate among youth 18-24 totaled over 22%.

- o In 2003, the state reported 2,495 cases of child abuse and neglect, down for the third year in a row.

Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS (HOPWA)

*Please also refer to the HOPWA Table in the Needs.xls workbook.

1. The Plan includes a description of the activities to be undertaken with its HOPWA Program funds to address priority unmet housing needs for the eligible population. Activities will assist persons who are not homeless but require supportive housing, such as efforts to prevent low-income individuals and families from becoming homeless and may address the housing needs of persons who are homeless in order to help homeless persons make the transition to permanent housing and independent living. The plan would identify any obstacles to meeting underserved needs and summarize the priorities and specific objectives, describing how funds made available will be used to address identified needs.
2. The Plan must establish annual HOPWA output goals for the planned number of households to be assisted during the year in: (1) short-term rent, mortgage and utility payments to avoid homelessness; (2) rental assistance programs; and (3) in housing facilities, such as community residences and SRO dwellings, where funds are used to develop and/or operate these facilities. The plan can also describe the special features or needs being addressed, such as support for persons who are homeless or chronically homeless. These outputs are to be used in connection with an assessment of client outcomes for achieving housing stability, reduced risks of homelessness and improved access to care.
3. For housing facility projects being developed, a target date for the completion of each development activity must be included and information on the continued use of these units for the eligible population based on their stewardship

requirements (e.g. within the ten-year use periods for projects involving acquisition, new construction or substantial rehabilitation).

4. The Plan includes an explanation of how the funds will be allocated including a description of the geographic area in which assistance will be directed and the rationale for these geographic allocations and priorities. Include the name of each project sponsor, the zip code for the primary area(s) of planned activities, amounts committed to that sponsor, and whether the sponsor is a faith-based and/or grassroots organization.
5. The Plan describes the role of the lead jurisdiction in the eligible metropolitan statistical area (EMSA), involving (a) consultation to develop a metropolitan-wide strategy for addressing the needs of persons with HIV/AIDS and their families living throughout the EMSA with the other jurisdictions within the EMSA; (b) the standards and procedures to be used to monitor HOPWA Program activities in order to ensure compliance by project sponsors of the requirements of the program.
6. The Plan includes the certifications relevant to the HOPWA Program.

3-5 Year Strategic Plan HOPWA response:

HOPWA
HIV/AIDS Treatment and Services –

The purpose of the HIV/AIDS Program at Kitsap County Health District is to assure comprehensive, high-quality HIV/AIDS services in Kitsap County with a focus on prevention and care.

AIDS Housing of Washington used \$957,389 in HOPWA funds to renovate the Lyon Building, in downtown Seattle. It provides 64 efficiency apartments for homeless, single adults who are disabled with AIDS, chronic mental illness and/or chemical abuse. The project provides intensive on-site support that is designed to stabilize the city's hardest-to-house population. It currently spends \$227,000 to support on-going operations.

This type project is clearly beyond the need or capacity of Kitsap County to provide, but shifting funding rules make this population, of necessity, a less stable community.

HIV Case management is provided through the local Kitsap County Health District. Treatment and services are coordinated with housing services The Shelter Plus Care program may be a future funding source, but there is currently no supported housing specifically for this population. The only housing funds available have been Section 8 vouchers that remain with the client. Severe reductions in available vouchers is due to Federal reduction in issued vouchers, and the increased use of project based vouchers that remain with the building to support the costs of construction and maintenance. Funding distribution regulations have not provided a consistent funding stream that follows clients. Allocated funds stay with the district that has enrolled the client, and in recent years this has made it difficult to fund HIV/AIDS patients who have moved to Kitsap County to escape the impossibly high cost of living in surrounding communities, but leave their subsidies behind.

In addition to health and poverty issues, housing has become difficult to arrange even with a subsidy. Most patients have depleted all of their finances long before they apply for public housing. The entire rental community, including public housing, now regularly perform credit checks on every applicant. The requirements, while somewhat flexible, have guidelines that can eliminate even the conscientious (but poverty stricken) person from the waiting list.

HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PEOPLE WITH AIDS (HOPWA)

The current caseload of 164 adults in the county with HIV and AIDS is not large compared to other disabled persons, yet their individual needs are significant. (Washington State Department of Health, 2005).

Specific HOPWA Objectives

1. Describe how Federal, State, and local public and private sector resources that are reasonably expected to be available will be used to address identified needs for the period covered by the strategic plan.

3-5 Year Specific HOPWA Objectives response:

Consortium partners will engage the Kitsap County Health District, and the OutKitsap organization to monitor needs and develop goals for care of HIV/AIDS patients.

OTHER NARRATIVE

Include any Strategic Plan information that was not covered by a narrative in any other section.