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Introduction

Celebrating its thirtieth anniversary, Community Housing Partnership (CHP) has a proud history of improving the lives of chronically homeless individuals, families and seniors in San Francisco, providing residents with the security of stable housing and supportive services that restore residents’ hope for their futures. The organization’s contributions to the sector are distinguished by its model for providing
a depth of supportive services that enable its residents to improve the quality of their lives and move toward greater self-sufficiency, dignity and contribution in their communities.

Community Housing Partnership has long been a leader in the Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) arena in San Francisco, with a mission of helping individuals, families and seniors experiencing homelessness secure stable housing and become self-sufficient. This is done by developing and managing high quality supportive housing and providing services to individuals, seniors and families experiencing homelessness to help them rebuild their lives and break the cycle of homelessness. CHP’s work is guided by the unyielding belief that - given adequate and tailored support - all people possess the capacity to achieve a high degree of self-sufficiency.

CHP has been guided by a five-year Strategic Plan that ran its course in 2020. Strategic Planning for the next three years began in June 2020, facilitated by Venture Leadership Consulting (VLC). In September, the decision was made to re-envision the strategic planning process in order to focus more deeply on articulating core elements of CHP’s work in three areas: its Impact Model, real estate development and social enterprise. Task Forces were developed with the purpose of engaging a wider range of staff, external stakeholders and content experts to drill down on essential questions with the goal of delivering well-informed recommendations for future directions. The goal of this process was to create a Bridge Plan to guide Community Housing Partnership through the next year to eighteen months, allowing the organization to be planful while remaining nimble in a tumultuous and uncertain landscape caused by the COVID-19 pandemic.

The Landscape

Homelessness is cited as one of the most significant problems confronting San Francisco, and the City and County have historically invested significantly. Nationally, Permanent Supportive Housing is a proven and accepted strategy to address chronic homelessness, and San Francisco leads in investments with the most PSH per capita of any community in the country. However, continued investments and funding directions are uncertain in this unprecedented moment in time due to the confluence of three events:

- An ongoing public health emergency caused by the coronavirus
- A national uprising over the disproportionate impacts of systemic racial and economic inequities on communities of color
- The pandemic's consequences on our economy and on people in poverty

Increases in Homelessness

The longer-term economic consequences of the pandemic are unknown, but will certainly alter the San Francisco employment and housing landscape. A recent Columbia University study predicts a 40% to 45% increase in homelessness in the United States in 2020 above 2019 homeless rates (an increase of 250,000 people nationwide).\(^1\) San Francisco, which reportedly has seen a 285% increase in homeless

\(^1\) More found [here](#).
tents and structures, has been hit especially hard given the dearth of affordable housing in the City. The situation has been exacerbated by people in need, or experiencing homelessness, coming to what is perceived to be a service-rich environment in San Francisco with the hope of finding the housing and support they need. Any disinvestments in nonprofits that deliver critical services and programs in the homeless sector, such as CHP, will only further exert extreme pressures to respond to an ever-growing crisis.

**San Francisco City and County Funding**

Calls for assistance have increased by at least 30% for most homeless service providers and at some organizations by as much as 200% since March 2020 when the pandemic forced San Francisco residents to shelter-in-place. Despite the uncertainty of the current economy, five significant propositions were passed in the November 2020 election that hold promise for increased funding for the homeless population in San Francisco. CHP has the opportunity to be a leading and collaborative voice in determining how these funds are allocated, positioning itself as a recipient of these new sources of revenue. Barring pandemic delays, it is expected that funding allocations for each of these propositions will be determined in the next year.

- **Prop A:** Will provide the largest new revenue stream for CHP, generating $207 million for construction and rehab, some of this directed for Permanent Supportive Housing. Funding for building rehab is an especially unique and much needed resource.
- **Prop F:** Gross tax receipts will fund contracts from the City and County of San Francisco and forestall any pandemic-related cuts that might have happened due to decreased City and County revenue. Funding will allow compensation rates to remain intact.
- **Prop I/K:** Real estate transfer tax that designates 10,000 new affordable housing units, a portion going to Permanent Supportive Housing. Directions here are very uncertain, but likely PSH will be a part of blended housing approaches.
- **Prop L:** A tax designation on overpaid CEOs, some of which will be directed to fund increased mental health services through Mental Health SF. It is unclear whether funds might be directed to support CHP’s mental health services directly, or whether residents might benefit from increased mental health services outside CHP.

**Real Estate Development Opportunities**

The Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) is the primary source of funding for affordable and Permanent Supportive Housing and services in San Francisco. In the fall of 2020 MOHCD released their Requests for Proposals (RFPs) focused on continued funding for PSH. CHP is partnering with the Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation (TNDC) to submit a joint proposal to develop and manage a Permanent Supportive Housing property. Prior to the release of the

---

2 More found [here](#).
RFPs it was unclear if the City would continue with significant investments in PSH. As such, CHP was grappling with the decision of no longer being an exclusive provider of Permanent Supportive Housing. If CHP were to develop and service blended housing it would mean a shift in their target population. Specifically, it would require serving low- to moderate-income residents as opposed to CHP’s historic focus on solely serving individuals, seniors and families experiencing homelessness. Such a move would have financial and staffing implications for the organization, and CHP will look to make a decision on this front in the coming months. In the near term, this decision was made for CHP with the release of the RFPs, which allowed 100% PSH developments to continue.

A bright spot on the funding horizon has been the legal resolution of the 2018 Prop C ballot measure. Prop C designates funding for homeless services and housing and will more than double San Francisco funding to address homelessness. An Oversight Committee was established to determine priorities with $492 million available for the first year of funding, with subsequent years predicted at approximately $300 million. Funding has already been released to address immediate homeless needs. Future funding will be available to support behavioral health services and it is anticipated that funding will be available for the development of new PSH properties or acquisitions.

Influencing the direction of funding in all of these areas creates a strong case for CHP to continue developing strong partnerships, joining coalitions and sharpening its policy and advocacy agenda to combat an uncertain funding environment, caused by COVID-19, which is anticipated to endure into 2022.

**The Bridge Plan**

*Strategic Exploration*

During the course of strategic planning, the Steering Committee identified three areas that required deeper inquiry to clarify future direction. In September 2020 the strategic planning process was re-envisioned to conduct a deeper and more intentional evaluation in these key areas, enabling greater precision in determining strategic direction and clarifying operational imperatives for a subsequent Strategic Plan. Three Task Forces were created to address the following:

1) **What are the core elements of CHP’s Impact Model?**
Throughout the planning process members of the Committee returned several times to the idea of codifying the key programmatic, talent, data and operational elements of the Impact Model with the goal of codifying services across their sites, as well as replicating services to other organizations and even other geographies.

2) **Does the CHP real estate development model need to evolve?**
The current CHP real estate development model focuses on 100% PSH; however, it is quite possible that the trend in San Francisco City and County, even with the recent release of the RFPs cited earlier, is to move away from these types of development projects and prioritize a blended model of both
permanent and affordable housing units. There is a need to explore additional housing and service models that potentially could be viable sources of revenue, and help further the Community Housing Partnership mission. Specifically, there may be a strong alignment between CHP’s interest in expanding the Impact Model and creating a real estate development approach that works with alternative funding.

3) Should CHP expand its employment training work?
CHP has explored myriad approaches to social enterprise over its history in order to provide a viable path for residents into employment. Currently, there are two vehicles for doing this:

- **Community Volunteer Team (CVT):** Focuses on CHP residents and provides volunteer opportunities with stipends for people to engage or re-engage in work-like activities, serving as a low-risk potentially high-reward approach to make work a part of residents’ ongoing lives.

- **Solutions SF:** Operates as a social enterprise, which provides initial training and then regular paid employment in the desk clerk occupation, with numerous paying customers throughout the Bay Area. Solutions SF (SSF) potentially has a financially, self-sustaining business model with fees from customers covering salaries for desk clerks, and all the operating costs for the business covered by the fees customers pay to place workers at CHP partners’ front desks.

Ideally, workforce readiness for residents will be accomplished through CVT, and will be part of the larger Impact Model. SSF will then pivot, delivering a robust training program that prioritizes CHP staff while simultaneously creating a revenue stream for the organization.

**Task Force Recommendations**

Task Forces were created to address the three main areas of inquiry, and provide recommendations to be implemented and tested over several months with the goal of defining key priorities that would be the foundation of a new Strategic Plan. Task Forces were comprised of staff, key external stakeholders and content experts to help shape and refine CHP’s future direction. Each Task Force was charged with asking and answering key questions, presenting a synopsis of their work and findings, and making recommendations.

**CHP Impact Model**

The journey towards impact begins as an individual or family enters CHP housing, where they initially are provided the opportunity to acclimate to their home after living on the streets or in a shelter. At the end of this six to nine month period, it is expected that residents have adjusted to their apartment and the larger building community, and they are assessed for readiness for a caseload; on the whole, about one quarter of residents will be assigned to a caseload. With the support of case management, residents look to build self-sufficiency in three areas: 1) housing, 2) income and 3) resourcefulness. This Resident Success Pathway is made possible by the effective coordination of the model’s Core Support Functions of Resident Services, Property and Facilities Management, and Data and Data Systems. (Please see Figure 1 for more detail on the Replicable Impact Model for PSH).
Near Term Strategies
The foundational elements that are core to the Impact Model, or the minimum viable product (MVP), have been articulated along with a high level outline of how CHP can think about implementing, refining and scaling the model. Specifically, more work is necessary in building out the full cost of the model (inclusive of current and future staffing needs) to adequately run the Impact Model at all CHP sites. Equally, preparing for deployment of the Impact Model across the CHP sites, developing a timeline for allocating resources to support full codification, and aligning board, staff and residents are important first steps.

Intermediate Term Strategies
Allocating resources to hire more staff, improving and refining data systems and ensuring a strong data experience across the organization is critical. If CHP has designs to scale the Impact Model to other organizations and/or geographies, widespread adoption of the model is paramount along with ease of sharing information, developing strong data utilization and feedback loops, as well as memorializing learnings from implementation that support refinement to sharpen the core tenets of the Impact Model. To best accomplish this work CHP may determine the need for new organizational structures, or the utilization of new and/or enhanced technology to support implementation and codification.

Long Term Strategies
As the Impact Model is refined during implementation this in turn will inform the way the model can be packaged, or “right-sized” for other providers as a basis for influencing the service delivery model in permanent supportive and affordable housing, improving fund development, and sharpening advocacy efforts. (Please see Figure 2 for more detail on Phases of Implementation).

Real Estate Development
Near Term Strategies
The work of the Task Force was sharpened by the release of RFPs for Permanent Supportive Housing from MOHCD. In the near-term, CHP will continue to develop real estate and focus on 100% PSH. Specifically, CHP will respond to one joint venture project with the Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation (TNDC) to develop and operate a 140-unit building. The Task Force determined that being the service provider and managing building operations are key elements to any collaboration, and will guide them when developing future partnerships. CHP will also pursue a solo project for real estate development on Treasure Island. In order to stay in real estate development CHP must pursue both joint venture and solo real estate development projects. Specifically, with joint ventures CHP does 75% of the work and receives 50% of the revenue, whereas solo developments allow for 100% revenue capture.

3 This will ultimately not be the decision of CHP, but what MOHCD allows.
Taking on new development projects will require creating a longer and continuous pipeline for real estate development, and building organizational capacity to respond to growth. To be financially sustainable, CHP must avoid gaps in real estate development, which creates a cycle of uneven and unpredictable revenue. Respective departments must be aligned with a multi-year planning cycle that will support new real estate development.

Intermediate Strategies
CHP will continue to evaluate the feasibility of real estate expansion beyond 100% PSH, in alignment with the CHP mission and organizational capacity. If expansion beyond 100% PSH is affirmed, CHP will need to build out staffing in finance, development and real estate, as well as clarify partners’ capacity for mixed-use projects.

Long Term Strategies
Achieving the capacity and stability to manage real estate development is of paramount importance for CHP. The organization must be planful and strategic in building out the department, integrating new operations and aligning resources. Once longer-term real estate development targets have been set, an analysis of the entire real estate portfolio will need to be done to ensure that CHP has the requisite organizational capacity to manage both existing properties and new properties that come online. This will involve all departments within the organization, scaling staff and conducting cost modeling on three-, five- and ten-year time horizons. (Please see Figure 3 for more detail on the Real Estate Development timeline)

Employment Training
At the onset, Solutions SF (SSF) was perceived as a possible distraction to the overall mission of CHP, diverting critical resources from the core work of the organization. The Task Force determined that the lack of clear operations within SSF was part of a larger issue that CHP was experiencing with inefficient and unclear operations across all its departments. Once this was determined, the Task Force was able to clarify that Solutions SF was indeed core to the mission of CHP, and can be an important multifaceted asset to: 1) address talent pipeline issues for CHP, 2) help those who are experiencing homelessness reach self-sufficiency, and 3) act as a revenue generator for the organization.4

Near Term Strategies
The Task Force put forth the idea of a CHP First Model to guide the future work of SSF, prioritizing CHP staff that are able to benefit from the services offered at Solutions. In order for this approach to work the CHP First Model must be clarified through understanding what type of employment opportunities CHP wants to focus on as well as determining a timeline for better integrating SSF with other departments in CHP. Ideally, the pipeline would be for entry-level Housing Operations and Resident Services positions, whose staff would then be cultivated to enter into a formal professional development training. A discovery process should be prioritized with Housing Operations and Resident Services to define employment needs, and how staff at CHP could be trained to fill these requirements.

4 Ideally, cost savings will also be created by eliminating inefficiencies in current hiring practices, as well as reducing turnover and training costs.
Staff also need to be asked about their interests to see if these align with the employment opportunities that CHP can offer.

**Intermediate Strategies**
Unraveling the operations of Solutions SF from the operations of CHP as a whole is necessary to understand where there are efficiencies and opportunities for improvement within the everyday functioning of SSF. In doing this, CHP will also gain clarity on where it has operational breakdowns within departments and across the organization, which in turn will help SSF better align with program services, human resources, finance, housing operations, and fund development.

**Long Term Strategies**
As Solutions SF moves into the CHP First Model, creating a talent pipeline for CHP, another goal is to provide workforce development training and job placement for individuals who are not part of the CHP community but are experiencing homelessness. Revenue generation is not the bottom-line motivator, but must be seen as a compelling way in which to diversify the organization’s revenue and create greater financial stability. SSF is an important asset for addressing the needs of current and formerly homeless populations, helping to mitigate the homeless issue at a larger scale than what CHP can do solely through its own asset portfolio and service delivery. Similar to the work that has been done on the Impact Model, over time Solutions SF must combine its various core elements more effectively. By clarifying its core offerings and codifying cross-departmental efforts SSF can better serve CHP staff, residents, and the larger community of individuals experiencing homelessness, while also ensuring integration within CHP.
FIGURE 1

Supporting resident success the Community Housing Partnership way:

**REPLICABLE IMPACT MODEL FOR P.S.H.**

**RESIDENT SUCCESS PATHWAY:**
- Residents move in.

**ACCLIMATE:**
- Can move to an adjust to living in a new location and in the site community.
- May participate in site activities but are not assigned to a case manager.

**BEGIN ACCESSING SITE-BASED SERVICES:**
- Voluntary services: 45% of residents will engage in case management.

**THEN BUILD SELF-SUFFICIENCY IN 3 AREAS:**
- Housing
- Income
- Resourcefulness

**CORE SUPPORT FUNCTIONS:**

**PROPERTY + FACILITIES MANAGEMENT**
- Janitorial
- Building/maintenance repairs + rehabilitation
- Rent collection
- Lease violations
- Coordination Tool
- Annual certifications
- Occupancy + compliance

**RESIDENT SERVICES**
- Resident orientation after move-in
- Resident outreach and engagement
- Mini-group work
- Case mgmt, driven by Action Plans
- Clinical case management
- Coordination Tool
- Community Volunteer Team

**SUPPORT SERVICES**
- Data feedback loops to support staff, internal stakeholders
- Collect/share resident feedback
- Administer public contracts
- Design + maintain core data collection tools

**WHAT YOU CAN EXPECT:**
- 98% of residents retain their home year over year.
- On average, residents have lived with Community Housing Partnership for nearly 7 years.

**RESIDENTS PAY RENT + ADHERE TO LEASES**
- X% of residents retain pay rent on time on average.
- X% of residents have lease violations on average.

**RESIDENTS BUILD SELF-SUFFICIENCY**
- 64% of residents who engage in case management have increased self-sufficiency in at least one area.
- X% of units are identified as a hot spot, meaning they are jeopardizing their housing, in some way.

**IMPACT MODEL COST BASIS:**

**PROPERTY + FACILITIES MANAGEMENT**
- Janitor (Full)
- Desk Clerk (Full)
- Site Manager (Full)
- Maintenance Tool (Full)
- Property Supervisor (Full)

**RESIDENT SERVICES**
- Case Manager (Full)
- Counselor (Full)
- Clinical Case Mgmt (Full)
- Community Volunteer Team (Full)
- Housing Navigator (Full)
- Health Advocate (Full)
- Support Services Manager (Full)

**DATA + DATA SYSTEMS**
- Data Analyst/Database Admin.
- Compliance Manager
Supporting resident success the Community Housing Partnership Way:

**MODEL PHASES AND VARIATIONS**

**PHASE 1: IMPLEMENT**
- Plan for deployment
- Generate buy-in: staff, residents, board, stakeholders
- Allocate resources and staffing
- Ready training program(s) and schedules
- Don't train, implement, start

**PHASE 2: REFINE**
- Use data feedback loops to sharpen implementation
- Fine-tune staffing, measurement, feedback loops
- Involve all key stakeholders in assessing and improving process: staff, residents, board
- Plan for what's next

**PHASE 3: SCALE**
- Grow staffing
- Grow capacity/sophistication
- Increase # of units/residents
- Add more program offerings: Public Policy, Advocacy, Community Organizing
- Grow/diversify funding

**VARIATIONS: SUPPORT SERVICES**
- TAY: Employment-Edu.Specialist (1:50)
- Seniors: ...
- Families: Youth Coordinator
- Chronically Homeless: Nurse (1:XX)
- Psychiatrist (1:XX)
- Bilingual: ??

**VARIATIONS: HOUSING SERVICES**
- TAY: ...
- Seniors: ..................
- Families: ..................
- Chronically Homeless: ..................
- Bilingual: ........................

**VARIATIONS: DATA FUNCTIONS**
- Research: Data team publishes stand-alone research projects
- Learning: Data team internally educated through infographics, trainings, brown bag sessions
- Intra-departmental links: Data team embeds with programmatic dept.
The Work Ahead

Creating Task Forces to answer questions regarding the Impact Model, approach to real estate development, and the role of Solutions SF was necessary to help CHP clarify areas of focus for the next year. Work streams will be prioritized in each of the three areas, and come with several considerations that were not immediately addressed in the Task Forces. Along with cost modeling, CHP should focus on building out a more robust development department that targets unrestricted revenue from foundations, individuals and corporations that can support CHP’s operations, current services, and future codification and replication efforts. A policy agenda should also be articulated with the goal of securing and maintaining categorical funding that creates a reliable revenue stream to support the implementation and scaling of the Impact Model, ongoing operations, the integration of Solutions SF, and the policy work itself.

An Implementation Guide that captures the high level work streams and intended goal state once the work is accomplished has been developed to accompany this Bridge Plan. The Guide includes timelines, staff ownership and key indicators to help CHP monitor its work and progress. Figures 4 and 5 provide an overview of the Guide.
FIGURE 5

Timeline Overview

IMPACT MODEL
- Deploy Impact Model across all CHP sites
- Staffing cost model
- Fine tune staffing, measurement, data feedback loops
- Capture learning, refine model, package for replication

REAL ESTATE DEVELOPMENT
- Employ joint-venture strategy + pursue site RED project
- Develop RED revenue cycle with budget forecasting
- Evaluate expansion beyond 100% FSH
- Build out staffing for real estate pipeline projects
- Build internal capacity to match real estate strategy

SOLUTIONS SF: TRAINING + EMPLOYMENT
- Discovery with residents, Housing Operations and R&D
- Define CHP First Model core components
- Integrate and solidify SSF operations with CHP depots
- Develop a talent pipeline from SSF to CHP
- SSF consistent revenue generator for CHP

FINANCE
- Create bubble chart to plot program impact by restricted revenue
- Develop cost structures by resident over a banded time horizon and center on key proxies for financial sustainability
- Develop RED revenue cycle with budget forecasting

FUND DEVELOPMENT
- Hire a Chief Development Officer
- Test development strategy to increase private revenue

POLICY + ADVOCACY
- Create stakeholder map that identifies key partners, current status of relationship
- Create track for action on pending local, state, and national legislation
- Policy agenda developed

JANUARY-JUNE 2021  JULY-DECEMBER 2021  JANUARY-JUNE 2022
Appendix

Task Force Pre-Work

Impact Model

The Impact Model could articulate these essential components:

- **Housing Operations**: The elements that create a safe and supported housing environment for residents
- **Resident Services**: The components of case management that provide behavioral and mental health services that enable growing resident self-sufficiency
  - What changes or adaptations are needed to place the CVT program in Resident Services?
- **Employment Development**: The essential components and ways that CHP provides pathways to work and workforce development through Community Volunteer Team and Solutions SF
- **Public Policy and Advocacy**: How CHP engages residents and builds coalitions to advance a commitment, and resources available to address the needs of the homeless and formerly homeless
- **Talent Development**: Professional development for CHP staff and management practices that ensure staff retention and quality services
- **Learning and Evaluation**: The necessary evaluation tools and processes that ensure an ongoing and accurate understanding of impact and enable continuous learning and improvement throughout an organization

As CHP determines the essential components of its Impact Model, clarity should follow with regards to what the Minimum Viable Product (MVP) should be to best support impactful, efficient and financially sustainable replication of the Impact Model.

Key Questions:

a. **Defining the Impact Model**
   - What does the fully codified Program Model look like?
   - What existing best practices/evidence should be considered when codifying the Program Model?
   - What are necessary complements to the Program Model (e.g., business model, talent development framework, data utilization and performance management) that make up the Impact Model?

b. **Determining Market Viability**
   - What is the MVP for replicating the Impact Model?
   - Who are the potential customers of the CHP Impact Model?

c. **Exploring Variation/Expansion**
   - What is the desired approach to scale? (e.g., expansion, technical assistance)
   - What does implementation of the MVP to other organizations or geographies look like?
Key Activities:

a. Data + Research Supporting Impact Model Definition
   - Research and summarize best practices/interventions for supporting formerly homeless residents to achieve self-sufficiency
   - Research and summarize the answer for "what would have to be true for CHP to adopt a lean start-up (MVP) model approach(es)?"
   - Research other organizations that have developed a replicable model

b. Cost Structure Research
   - Determine the fully loaded cost of the program model (including staffing, training, data utilization, supervision allocations, etc.)
   - Determine possible revenue streams to support the codification and delivery of the program model internally
   - Determine cost structure for potential replication to other organizations

Real Estate Development

Key Questions:
   - How vital are developer fees for the financial sustainability of CHP?
     - What would CHP look like ten years from now if it no longer developed or acquired buildings?
   - Should CHP test developing a blended building to ascertain feasibility of being effective in this arena?
     - If so, how can CHP effectively compete with developers who are already established in the blended housing arena?
     - What have been the upsides, challenges, and concerns for CHP partners who have created new housing that is not 100% PSH?
   - What are the pros and cons of developing new properties through acquisition?
   - Are there unique opportunities that have presented themselves in the COVID environment that should be evaluated for CHP (i.e. Project Homekey)?
   - What would need to be true for CHP to be able to absorb one-time opportunities?
     - What criteria should CHP evaluate to ensure appropriate diligence to make decisions on new opportunities?

Key Activities:
   - Explore cost/revenue projections of 80/20 mixed use buildings, 90/10 mixed use, acquisitions, and remaining in 100% PSH
   - Research and determine the viability of real estate developer projects in San Francisco City and County
   - Determine the possibility of partnering with developers who are familiar with developing blended buildings and developers who are familiar with acquisitions
   - Determine criteria for evaluating potential risks and rewards that create guidance on whether CHP should engage in new opportunities.
There is internal alignment throughout CHP around a longer-term horizon for real estate development

Staff capacity will be built to support longer-term real estate pipeline

Workforce Development and Training

Key Questions:

CVT

What are the risks and rewards around the impact of CVT?

SOLUTIONS SF

Are there ways to make Solutions SF more aligned with the goals of CHP residents?

What is the feasibility of expanding Solutions SF to provide training and employment in other PSH industry jobs, beyond desk clerks?

Would CHP residents be interested in participating?

Are there others in the PSH industry that would be interested in an enhanced Solutions SF training program to move their people up within their organizations?

What are the risks and rewards around the impact of Solutions SF?

How could Solutions SF “spin off“ to a partner who is already effective at social enterprise?

Key Activities:

Review logic models and/or outcomes for CVT expansion

Review logic models and/or outcomes for Solutions SF expansion

Determine viability of spinning off Solutions SF (i.e. who are potential partners in this work)

Determine the key Go/No Go milestones that would need to be monitored (and when) if CHP were to prioritize social enterprise as a key organizational strategy

Financial Viability

Key Questions:

What is the role of Real Estate Development in CHP’s financial model?

What do sub-programmatic business models look like?

Which of these models have the highest sustainability? Most potential?

Key Activities:

Develop cost structures by resident over a banded time horizon and center on key proxies for financial sustainability (general government run rate or specific block/entitlement funding, etc.)

Match/layer revenue strategies to cover expenses; identify gap of private philanthropy

Create model strawman to decrease private or real estate funding to increase government run rate percentage

Create a “bubble chart“ to plot the program impact by restricted revenue

Policy

Key Questions:
● What role does CHP want to play in advocacy?
  ○ How do partnerships and coalitions support this vision?
● What are dedicated funding streams at the City and County, State, and Federal levels to support the model (proxy is percent run rate)?
● What are the barriers that need to be removed for our residents to achieve self-sufficiency?
● Which regulations get in the way of our sustainability of impact?
● How should CHP weigh-in on current legislation/advocacy initiatives?

**Key Activities:**
● Create stakeholder map that identifies key partners, current status of relationship, and CHP owner of relationship at City and County levels that would assist in advancement of the CHP policy agenda
● Create policy agenda and tasks that remove barriers for clients and draw increased resources to the work/model
● Create rubric for action on pending local, state, and national legislation (i.e. list criteria that justifies a letter of support, sponsored legislation)
● Identify current coalitions that align to policy agenda
● Develop/join coalitions of aligned partners to help amplify CHP voice and push policy agenda