

**DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE**

2020 W. El Camino Avenue, Suite 670, 95833
P.O. Box 952054
Sacramento, CA 94252-2054
(916) 263-2771
www.hcd.ca.gov



California COVID-19 Rent Relief Program¹ Monthly Report to Joint Legislative Budget Committee – April 2022

Highlights and Milestones

During April 2022, the California COVID-19 Rent Relief program disbursed more than \$430.7 million to over 46,500 households, achieving the highest single month of production since inception. By month's end, the state-administered program had cumulatively provided approximately \$2.98 billion in rent and utility assistance aiding more than 284,100 households.

In addition to the direct assistance provided by the state-administered program, locally administered programs have used state block grant funds to help more than 83,400 households by providing more than \$644.4 million in emergency assistance. Collectively, the local programs have expended roughly 74 percent of the nearly \$875 million in ERA1² and ERA2³ block grants the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) has disbursed to jurisdictions operating local programs (i.e., Option B).

March 31, 2022 marked the end of the state eviction protection period established by Chapter 27, Statutes of 2021 (AB 832). Based on the statute, tenants who had submitted complete applications for rental assistance were granted specified protections from eviction for non-payment of rent through March 31. The passage of AB 2179 (Chapter 13, Statutes of 2022) on March 31, 2022 further extended modified state eviction protections to June 30, 2022, encompassing households that submitted a complete application with the state or local rental assistance program on or before March 31, 2022. Eviction protections now extend to June 30, 2022 (for eligible applications received by March 31, 2022) for rents due between April 1, 2020 and March 31, 2022.

The state-administered program is moving quickly to process all valid applications received by the March 31 submission deadline. Due to the time-sensitive demand and pace of payments to eligible households, the state program leveraged the use of short-term General Fund cashflow loans, as authorized by SB 115 (Chapter 2, Statutes of 2022) to continue to deploy emergency assistance. HCD has submitted requests for additional ERA1 funding to the United States Department of the Treasury (Treasury) at every opportunity through the end of April.⁴ To date, Treasury has announced two tranches of approximately \$211 million in

¹ This project is being supported, in whole or in part, by federal award numbers ERA0003 and ERAE0060 awarded to the California Department of Housing and Community Development by the U.S. Department of the Treasury.

² "ERA1" refers to Emergency Rental Assistance awards provided by Treasury pursuant to section 501 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021.

³ "ERA2" refers to Emergency Rental Assistance awards issued by Treasury pursuant to section 3201 of the American Rescue Plan Act.

⁴ U.S. Treasury, "Reallocation Guidance," *Emergency Rental Assistance Program* (Oct. 4 and Oct. 25, 2021), <https://home.treasury.gov/policy-issues/coronavirus/assistance-for-state-local-and-tribal-governments/emergency-rental-assistance-program> (as of Oct. 31, 2021).

California COVID-19 Rent Relief State Rental Assistance Program

Monthly Report to Joint Legislative Budget Committee – April 30, 2022

reallocated ERA1 funds for the state-administered program with subsequent funding decisions pending. HCD will continue to request additional federal funds from Treasury to assist California households, inclusive of remaining ERA1 and ERA2 reallocations in the coming months.

A number of local jurisdictions have also submitted reallocation requests to Treasury. At the time of this report, 11 localities had received additional federal funds through the first two rounds of ERA1 reallocations, totaling approximately \$40.6 million in added federal funding.

Key Achievements

In April, the state-administered program achieved record levels of weekly production in terms of the number of households served, amount of assistance paid, and volume of applications processed. For example, during the week of April 18-24, the state program approved 13,395 applications totaling more than \$129.4 million in assistance payments. The team achieved even higher production as it was heading into May, continually pushing to increase processing rates even further.

To date, of the approximately \$2.98 billion in assistance payments from the state-administered program, 85.3 percent of funds were paid to benefit households at or below 50 percent of the area median income. The locally administered Option B jurisdictions reported expenditures over \$644.4 million in state block grant funds to assist more than 83,400 households. Approximately 88.5 percent of state block grant funds disbursed by local programs aided households at or below 50 percent of the area median income. The programs are shown with their respective performance beginning on page 10.

Cashflow Loans

SB 115 provides authority for the Department of Finance to authorize the use of General Fund resources to provide short-term cashflow loans to both the state-administered program and to eligible local jurisdictions administering their own emergency rental assistance programs (Option B jurisdictions) pursuant to Chapter 17 (commencing with Section 50897) of Division 31 of Part 2 of the Health and Safety Code. The Cashflow Loan program is premised on the need for the state and local programs to have sufficient resources to continue to assist pending, eligible applications in anticipation of additional federal resources being made available. The state-administered program started utilizing the Cashflow Loan funds in March. As of April 30, the state program had expended approximately \$700.4 million for rent and utility assistance payments.

Throughout April, HCD worked with interested Option B jurisdictions to review their demonstrated needs for Cashflow Loan funds and prepare required documentation. Standard Agreements will be prepared for the jurisdictions that gained approval from their governing bodies to accept loaned funds; however, as of the end of April, no jurisdiction had received a Cashflow Loan.

Fund Recapture and Reallocation

Treasury announced in January 2022 it had reallocated approximately \$209 million of ERA1 grants to state and local jurisdictions across the country as required by federal law.⁵ In March 2022, Treasury provided a second round of more than \$484 million in reallocated ERA1 funding to jurisdictions across the nation demonstrating high demand. From the two rounds combined, the state-administered program gained nearly \$186.8 million in added federal funds, as well as approximately \$24.2 million in funding that four localities voluntarily reallocated to the state from their original federal grants. Treasury allocated more than \$40.6 million directly to 11 California jurisdictions running local programs. Although Treasury directed approximately 27 percent of the total funds available for reallocation to California's state ERA program, the total amount reallocated to-date is less than the \$1.9 billion California requested from Treasury to meet the projected needs of eligible applicants. Treasury provided new guidance in March 2022 indicating that it intends to make a third reallocation of available ERA1 funds and is planning for adjustments to future disbursements of unused ERA2 grant funds.

Within its statutory authority for administering the state's allocation of ERA1 and ERA2 funds, HCD is required to recapture and reallocate state block grant funds from jurisdictions that fail to meet state and federal deadlines for the prescribed minimum obligation ratios of their allocations. Per AB 832, Option B jurisdictions that received state block grants must contractually obligate at least 50 percent of their total ERA2 state block grant allocation by January 31, 2022. Jurisdictions that did not obligate at least 50 percent of their ERA2 block grant by January 31 are required to repay to HCD any unused amount of block grant funds allocated to them. HCD may waive the requirement to repay those funds if the jurisdiction demonstrates that it will contractually obligate and expend any unused block grant funds allocated to it within relevant timeframes specified in federal law. Federal deadlines require that direct recipients of ERA2 funds obligate 50 percent of their total allocation of federal funds no later than March 31, 2022. Accordingly, Option B jurisdictions must obligate at least 50 percent of the state block grant funds allocated to them by March 31, 2022 to avoid reallocation of unused block grant funds.

HCD has been closely evaluating the performance of jurisdictions that missed the state's obligation deadline (i.e., obligating at least 50 percent of their state block grants). HCD will continue to work with Option B jurisdictions that are subject to the statutory reallocations under state law to ensure unused state block grants are deployed to jurisdictions with unmet need and a demonstrated ability to distribute these emergency resources. Further details of the obligations and expenditures by jurisdiction are listed in the section titled "Locally Administered Programs - Option B Jurisdictions – ERA2 Funds" on page 14.

Customer Support

In light of the March 31 application submission deadline, inbound call volumes in the Call Center decreased substantially in April from levels observed in February and March. Whereas the Call Center received over 21,000 calls per day on average in March with a peak of nearly 49,000 on March 31, the average daily volume in April was roughly 13,000 calls with

⁵ Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (Pub.L. No. 116-260) Division N, Section 501 (d) *Reallocation of Unused Funds*.

California COVID-19 Rent Relief State Rental Assistance Program

Monthly Report to Joint Legislative Budget Committee – April 30, 2022

an April 1 peak just over 27,700 calls. As inbound calls trended down, the state’s program operator adjusted the Call Center’s active hours and began to realign agents to support other aspects of application processing.

The state-administered program again increased Case Management and Call Center staffing levels to address the volume of applications received. In early April, the program operator increased its Case Management and Call Center staffing levels by over 500 members compared to the headcount in March. The increase is intended to help the state-administered program increase application processing levels incrementally each week with the goal of reviewing all applications and providing assistance to every eligible applicant by the end of June.

The following schedule reflects selected April metrics:

| Incremental Monthly Metrics | as of 1/31 | 2/28 | 3/31 | 4/30 |
|--|-------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Call Center/Case Management Staff | 1,412 | 1,338 | 1,352 | 1,815 |
| Inbound Call Volume | 502,085 | 472,593 | 654,766 | 390,153 |
| Paid Applications | 21,180 | 33,940 | 38,056 | 46,557 |
| Funds Paid to Eligible Households ⁱⁱⁱ | \$197.2 | \$319.3 | \$354.0 | \$430.7 |

ⁱⁱⁱ Amounts in millions. March figures include both federal funds and General Fund.

Schedule reflects partial data, does not sum to program totals (expenditures and other metrics).

Outreach

HCD’s communication efforts in April focused on helping applicants and stakeholders understand important next steps following closure of the application portal on March 31. First, a direct text message was sent to every active applicant awaiting a program decision alerting them of the need to begin paying rent on April 1 regardless of the potential to receive assistance for rent arrears. Those text messages were sent in the language identified by the applicant as their preferred language spoken. Other social media messages, graphics, and key points were delivered through the Housing Is Key website as well as through the Local Partner Network and Option B partners to communicate the critical message of timely rent payments.

In an effort to showcase local programs and alternate resources available to individuals in need of housing support, HCD provided new information on the Housing Is Key website to help applicants find local resources within their county. The links and referrals will be updated to help local partners continue supporting individuals in need.

The communications team worked closely with program partners including the Community Local Partner Network, local, jurisdictions, as well as other partners to share consistent messaging. This included the sharing of social media content and graphics for use by partners, streamlining resources for legal aid, and providing additional information for those applicants navigating the appeals process.

Local Partner Network Community Support

The Community-Based Local Partner Network (LPN) maintains 106 confirmed partners statewide serving those areas with highest eviction risk. During the month of April, the LPN and HCD collaborated to provide additional outreach to applicants who had submitted an application and had yet to respond to a follow-up task request from a case manager. LPN appointment center staff made 4,260 calls to this population of applicants in seven languages (English, Chinese, Korean, Spanish, Tagalog, Russian, and Vietnamese). Of the 1,097 applicants reached, 656 applicants (60 percent) proceeded to complete the task; 253 (23 percent) sought the assistance of the LPN to complete the outstanding tasks; and 188 (17 percent) indicated no need to continue pursuing rental assistance.

The following metrics for April reflects sustained strength in the LPN:

- Over 16,300 appointments in April (including walk-in, same day, and scheduled) totaling 123,370 since inception. This represents a 15.5 percent increase compared to last month.
- 8,143 inbound Appointment Center calls in April totaling over 187,000 since inception. This represents a 67 percent decrease since last month. The average handle time for calls improved, with a duration of just under 7 minutes in English, and just under 8 minutes in other languages. Assistance is available in 14 languages.

Statutory Basis for Report

(1) Pursuant to Section 50897.4 of the Health and Safety Code, the Department shall submit to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, on a monthly basis for the duration of the program, a report that provides programmatic performance metrics for funds administered pursuant to this chapter. The report shall include, at minimum, the following information:

(A) Obligation of funds for assistance provided under this chapter:

- In total, over \$3.95 billion obligated to rent and utility assistance statewide.
- \$2.52 billion in federal ERA1 and ERA2 funds obligated for eligible uses related to jurisdictions in the State-Administered Program (Option A) as of 4/30/2022.
- \$700.4 million of State General Fund Cashflow Loan obligated for rent and utilities arrearage assistance related to jurisdictions in the State-Administered Program (Option A) as of 4/30/2022.
- \$988.1 million of the state allocation reserved for use by locally administered programs (Option B) as of 4/30/2022.
- \$726.3 million in State Block Grant funds reported obligated by locally administered programs (Option B) as of 4/30/2022.

(B) Expenditure of funds for assistance provided under this chapter:

- In total, over \$3.62 billion expended for rent and utility assistance statewide.
- \$2.28 billion in federal ERA1 and ERA2 funds expended on behalf of jurisdictions in the State-Administered Program (Option A) as of 4/30/2022.
- \$700.4 million of State General Fund Cashflow Loan expended for rent and utilities arrearage assistance related to jurisdictions in the State-Administered Program (Option A) as of 4/30/2022.
- \$644.4 million in State Block Grant funds reported expended by locally administered programs (Option B) as of 4/30/2022.

(C) Expenditure by eligible uses for assistance provided pursuant to this chapter:

- All expenditures were applied to eligible uses as listed in the tables provided on the following pages of this report.

(D) Reallocation of funds, if any, for assistance provided pursuant to this chapter:

- Please refer to Fund Recapture and Reallocation beginning on page 3.

(E) Geographic distribution of funds provided pursuant to Section 50897.3 of the Health and Safety Code:

- Please refer to Geographic Distribution of Funds tables beginning on page 10.

(F) For the first monthly report submitted pursuant to this section only, an overview of which jurisdictions have elected to participate in the state rental assistance programs as provided in Sections 50897.2 and 50897.3, respectively:

- This information was provided in the first monthly report, dated June 4, 2021.

California COVID-19 Rent Relief State Rental Assistance Program

Monthly Report to Joint Legislative Budget Committee – April 30, 2022

Obligations, Expenditures, and Eligible Uses of Funds

State-Administered Program - Option A Jurisdictions – ERA1 and ERA2 Federal Funds, plus State General Fund

Values reflect HCD's use of ERA1 and ERA2 federal allocations and state reservations administered by the state on behalf of the jurisdictions under Option A, including jurisdictions previously listed as Option B or Option C. Beginning in March 2022, the state-administered program also utilized resources from the State General Fund as authorized.

| | Rent | Utilities | Total |
|--|---------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Funds obligated for arrears ^{iv} | \$2,824,348,910.26 | \$24,330,337.95 | \$2,848,679,248.21 |
| Funds expended for arrears by income level | \$1,939,888,575.41 | \$14,115,929.74 | \$1,954,004,505.15 |
| <=30% AMI | \$1,205,773,569.78 | \$10,681,360.86 | \$1,216,454,930.64 |
| >30 and <=50% AMI | \$458,719,497.38 | \$1,950,634.03 | \$460,670,131.41 |
| >50 and <=80% AMI | \$275,395,508.25 | \$1,483,934.85 | \$276,879,443.10 |
| Funds obligated for prospective payments ^{iv} | \$364,925,806.83 | \$7,882,621.72 | \$372,808,428.55 |
| Funds expended for prospective payments by income level | \$323,188,253.29 | \$- | \$323,188,253.29 |
| <=30% AMI | \$190,552,594.50 | \$- | \$190,552,594.50 |
| >30 and <=50% AMI | \$79,259,787.20 | \$- | \$79,259,787.20 |
| >50 and <=80% AMI | \$53,375,871.59 | \$- | \$53,375,871.59 |

^{iv} Obligation values are not subdivided among the sources of funds that may eventually be expended (e.g., ERA1, ERA2, General Fund).

State-Administered Program - Option A Jurisdictions – State General Fund

Values reflect HCD's expenditures of the State General Fund Cashflow Loan in accordance with SB 115 on behalf of the jurisdictions under Option A.

| | Rent | Utilities | Total |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| Funds expended for arrears by income level | \$682,189,141.95 | \$6,667,426.57 | \$688,856,568.52 |
| <=30% AMI | \$398,578,702.68 | \$4,005,256.41 | \$402,583,959.09 |
| >30 and <=50% AMI | \$177,793,765.96 | \$1,573,015.79 | \$179,366,781.75 |
| >50 and <=80% AMI | \$105,816,673.31 | \$1,089,154.37 | \$106,905,827.68 |
| Funds expended for prospective payments by income level | \$11,587,727.41 | \$- | \$11,587,727.41 |
| <=30% AMI | \$6,614,948.45 | \$- | \$6,614,948.45 |
| >30 and <=50% AMI | \$2,924,390.28 | \$- | \$2,924,390.28 |
| >50 and <=80% AMI | \$2,048,388.68 | \$- | \$2,048,388.68 |

California COVID-19 Rent Relief State Rental Assistance Program

Monthly Report to Joint Legislative Budget Committee – April 30, 2022

Locally Administered Programs - Option B Jurisdictions – ERA1 Funds

The table below reflects the aggregated expenditures of the 19 Option B jurisdictions with ERA1 state block grants as of the date of this report. Individual results are listed in the table under “Locally Administered Programs - Option B Jurisdictions – ERA1 Funds” on page 13.

| | Rent | Utilities | Total |
|--|-------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Funds obligated for arrears | \$393,518,908.16 | \$29,656,112.11 | \$423,175,020.28 |
| Funds expended for arrears by income level | \$366,692,113.87 | \$22,917,918.56 | \$389,610,032.43 |
| <=30% AMI | \$254,827,285.89 | \$11,622,730.71 | \$266,450,016.60 |
| >30 and <=50% AMI | \$70,276,469.92 | \$6,455,820.93 | \$76,732,290.85 |
| >50 and <=80% AMI | \$41,588,358.05 | \$4,839,366.92 | \$46,427,724.97 |
| Funds obligated for prospective payments | \$78,741,469.36 | \$2,462,186.81 | \$81,203,656.17 |
| Funds expended for prospective payments by income level | \$77,210,427.64 | \$2,266,013.69 | \$79,476,441.33 |
| <=30% AMI | \$49,467,499.93 | \$1,034,798.58 | \$50,502,298.51 |
| >30 and <=50% AMI | \$19,004,288.45 | \$715,745.97 | \$19,720,034.42 |
| >50 and <=80% AMI | \$8,738,639.26 | \$515,469.14 | \$9,254,108.40 |

Locally Administered Programs - Option B Jurisdictions – ERA2 Funds

Of the 24 localities in Option B for ERA2, 15 were expending State Block Grant ERA2 funds as of the date of this report as listed in the table under “Locally Administered Programs - Option B Jurisdictions – ERA2 Funds” on page 14. Many of the Option B jurisdictions are utilizing their federal ERA2 funds before they begin expending their State Block Grant funds.

| | Rent | Utilities | Total |
|--|-------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Funds obligated for arrears | \$155,605,519.76 | \$13,668,403.18 | \$169,273,922.94 |
| Funds expended for arrears by income level | \$121,012,852.99 | \$9,235,540.37 | \$130,248,393.36 |
| <=30% AMI | \$80,284,499.75 | \$5,813,283.34 | \$86,097,783.09 |
| >30 and <=50% AMI | \$27,488,557.08 | \$2,122,252.37 | \$29,610,809.45 |
| >50 and <=80% AMI | \$13,239,796.16 | \$1,300,004.66 | \$14,539,800.82 |
| Funds obligated for prospective payments | \$51,574,407.78 | \$1,111,851.90 | \$52,686,259.68 |
| Funds expended for prospective payments by income level | \$44,567,254.61 | \$544,841.37 | \$45,112,095.98 |
| <=30% AMI | \$30,771,897.50 | \$290,894.11 | \$31,062,791.61 |
| >30 and <=50% AMI | \$10,004,723.12 | \$154,479.03 | \$10,159,202.15 |
| >50 and <=80% AMI | \$3,790,633.99 | \$99,468.23 | \$3,890,102.22 |

California COVID-19 Rent Relief State Rental Assistance Program

Monthly Report to Joint Legislative Budget Committee – April 30, 2022

Household Applications by Race and Ethnicity

Values reflect the cumulative volume of applications submitted to and processed by the state-administered program for Option A jurisdictions.

| Race | Applications Submitted | Households Paid | Federal Funds Expended | State General Fund Expended |
|---|-------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 6,788 | 3,697 | \$25,264,140.94 | \$10,728,371.74 |
| Asian | 29,146 | 19,920 | \$181,438,234.29 | \$40,783,153.73 |
| Black or African American | 90,398 | 55,012 | \$422,164,485.03 | \$144,502,220.33 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 4,179 | 2,639 | \$22,175,613.28 | \$6,245,374.79 |
| Other Multi-Racial | 70,332 | 44,597 | \$349,489,755.35 | \$109,172,392.41 |
| White | 169,945 | 97,772 | \$810,156,449.07 | \$235,607,808.52 |
| Not Reported | 44,845 | 26,501 | \$202,022,596.15 | \$72,181,653.23 |
| Refuse to Answer | 56,039 | 34,014 | \$264,481,484.33 | \$81,223,321.18 |
| Totals | 471,672 | 284,152 | \$2,277,192,758.44 | \$700,444,295.93 |

| Ethnicity | Applications Submitted | Households Paid | Federal Funds Expended | State General Fund Expended |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Hispanic or Latino | 148,573 | 93,539 | \$647,247,323.04 | \$218,962,574.34 |
| Non-Hispanic or Latino | 235,569 | 140,171 | \$1,199,062,819.40 | \$347,125,822.99 |
| Not Reported | 47,929 | 27,978 | \$218,237,118.30 | \$77,498,198.67 |
| Refuse to Answer | 39,601 | 22,464 | \$212,645,497.70 | \$56,857,699.93 |
| Totals | 471,672 | 284,152 | \$2,277,192,758.44 | \$700,444,295.93 |

California COVID-19 Rent Relief State Rental Assistance Program

Monthly Report to Joint Legislative Budget Committee – April 30, 2022

Geographic Distribution of Funds

State-Administered Program - Option A Jurisdictions – ERA1 and ERA2 Federal Funds, plus State General Fund

Figures reflect the state-administered program’s use of federal allocations, state reservations, and state funds pursuant to SB 115 on behalf of jurisdictions. All jurisdictions previously listed as Option B or C that transitioned to Option A in September 2021 are now included in this table.

| Jurisdiction | Obligations | | | | Expenditures | | | |
|---------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|
| | Rent Arrears | Utility Arrears | Prospective Rent | Prospective Utility | Rent Arrears | Utility Arrears | Prospective Rent | Prosp. Utility |
| Alpine County | \$58,722.00 | \$688.56 | \$- | \$- | \$58,722.00 | \$688.56 | \$- | \$- |
| Amador County | \$1,662,174.19 | \$17,987.04 | \$182,538.11 | \$4,654.24 | \$1,606,840.19 | \$17,965.14 | \$161,240.31 | \$- |
| Butte County | \$13,555,044.46 | \$319,858.43 | \$1,854,922.50 | \$77,028.30 | \$12,741,568.96 | \$312,760.11 | \$1,587,969.70 | \$- |
| Calaveras County | \$2,204,247.54 | \$37,067.11 | \$155,415.78 | \$10,555.06 | \$2,005,783.63 | \$35,951.51 | \$136,985.24 | \$- |
| Colusa County | \$692,314.85 | \$13,345.25 | \$50,517.98 | \$3,309.03 | \$668,080.79 | \$11,154.37 | \$41,638.99 | \$- |
| Contra Costa County | \$146,257,690.16 | \$2,041,245.59 | \$21,055,958.55 | \$599,872.87 | \$136,784,805.99 | \$1,815,542.42 | \$20,237,857.87 | \$- |
| Del Norte County | \$1,589,921.02 | \$15,810.54 | \$129,937.00 | \$12,897.89 | \$1,518,390.58 | \$14,925.54 | \$90,659.00 | \$- |
| El Dorado County | \$9,295,749.26 | \$69,373.02 | \$899,828.14 | \$42,810.83 | \$8,555,724.52 | \$68,450.41 | \$832,068.00 | \$- |
| Fontana City | \$12,945,936.20 | \$219,676.69 | \$1,408,326.75 | \$72,237.39 | \$11,813,013.45 | \$186,761.79 | \$1,325,625.93 | \$- |
| Glenn County | \$1,263,537.17 | \$31,335.58 | \$133,432.01 | \$17,655.64 | \$1,126,334.17 | \$21,688.12 | \$130,305.68 | \$- |
| Humboldt County | \$13,040,258.76 | \$150,264.33 | \$1,440,105.46 | \$77,460.34 | \$11,960,684.15 | \$147,389.96 | \$1,257,294.97 | \$- |
| Imperial County | \$7,397,332.35 | \$60,240.84 | \$1,091,549.88 | \$26,474.02 | \$6,670,951.40 | \$57,495.16 | \$1,019,011.80 | \$- |
| Inyo County | \$517,123.30 | \$8,858.82 | \$75,243.75 | \$4,068.70 | \$471,937.30 | \$7,480.64 | \$47,913.75 | \$- |
| Irvine City* | \$31,623,777.11 | \$154,789.53 | \$6,596,706.81 | \$51,475.07 | \$29,902,938.02 | \$144,689.23 | \$6,503,320.94 | \$- |
| Kings County | \$6,552,662.00 | \$173,278.93 | \$763,421.90 | \$50,680.26 | \$6,119,362.81 | \$171,458.97 | \$731,770.81 | \$- |
| Lake County | \$8,626,302.80 | \$86,821.32 | \$404,774.01 | \$41,100.24 | \$7,984,952.85 | \$80,160.66 | \$392,646.08 | \$- |
| Lassen County | \$933,132.04 | \$1,375.67 | \$108,307.39 | \$3,031.49 | \$896,491.01 | \$1,122.82 | \$89,813.96 | \$- |
| Los Angeles City* | \$823,076,533.46 | \$4,123,146.21 | \$77,285,710.19 | \$1,062,553.33 | \$757,473,999.41 | \$3,105,671.83 | \$77,206,324.14 | \$- |
| Los Angeles County | \$714,319,383.27 | \$7,738,706.79 | \$117,220,174.86 | \$2,077,164.95 | \$672,040,177.47 | \$7,029,670.01 | \$96,671,623.96 | \$- |
| Madera County | \$6,031,232.37 | \$151,581.91 | \$694,427.60 | \$19,566.59 | \$5,772,343.60 | \$132,714.92 | \$649,216.44 | \$- |
| Mariposa County | \$634,773.41 | \$3,025.18 | \$54,336.00 | \$786.23 | \$602,733.41 | \$2,222.02 | \$50,736.00 | \$- |

California COVID-19 Rent Relief State Rental Assistance Program

Monthly Report to Joint Legislative Budget Committee – April 30, 2022

| Jurisdiction | Obligations | | | | Expenditures | | | |
|------------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|
| | Rent Arrears | Utility Arrears | Prospective Rent | Prospective Utility | Rent Arrears | Utility Arrears | Prospective Rent | Prosp. Utility |
| Mendocino County | \$5,513,824.20 | \$65,169.40 | \$384,250.29 | \$38,042.23 | \$4,896,913.03 | \$63,600.79 | \$380,729.13 | \$- |
| Merced County | \$12,905,138.10 | \$195,743.77 | \$2,214,784.08 | \$44,764.38 | \$12,071,878.65 | \$178,795.73 | \$1,980,970.48 | \$- |
| Modesto City | \$11,077,615.49 | \$130,457.37 | \$1,420,070.58 | \$36,459.99 | \$9,989,583.01 | \$110,979.69 | \$1,359,031.69 | \$- |
| Modoc County | \$508,919.50 | \$1,021.51 | \$38,733.00 | \$- | \$479,275.50 | \$596.61 | \$35,872.00 | \$- |
| Mono County | \$414,157.07 | \$15,316.53 | \$153,552.38 | \$7,723.93 | \$399,737.07 | \$13,171.65 | \$125,321.38 | \$- |
| Napa County | \$7,473,300.65 | \$111,725.85 | \$1,129,842.59 | \$37,600.09 | \$6,950,285.18 | \$104,518.59 | \$1,081,015.68 | \$- |
| Nevada County | \$5,139,055.57 | \$61,366.79 | \$622,593.19 | \$18,140.21 | \$4,902,184.27 | \$58,463.28 | \$557,530.39 | \$- |
| Oakland City | \$46,767,352.57 | \$390,945.33 | \$4,881,823.49 | \$191,281.91 | \$44,708,249.38 | \$311,227.03 | \$4,784,596.44 | \$- |
| Orange County | \$168,087,025.12 | \$1,261,890.83 | \$27,592,029.10 | \$501,718.92 | \$157,971,797.72 | \$1,085,865.95 | \$27,061,341.05 | \$- |
| Oxnard City | \$18,143,443.93 | \$238,570.84 | \$3,416,149.70 | \$46,301.98 | \$16,010,116.53 | \$205,850.05 | \$3,296,163.80 | \$- |
| Placer County | \$15,224,373.22 | \$231,967.74 | \$2,277,070.40 | \$465,349.10 | \$14,181,716.20 | \$157,695.09 | \$2,235,713.10 | \$- |
| Plumas County | \$462,192.94 | \$493.76 | \$75,768.00 | \$4,263.74 | \$422,582.73 | \$447.87 | \$65,773.21 | \$- |
| San Benito County | \$2,473,346.50 | \$34,358.30 | \$298,913.70 | \$11,871.20 | \$2,377,744.72 | \$26,640.00 | \$262,729.99 | \$- |
| San Bernardino County | \$113,026,370.90 | \$814,405.78 | \$9,445,939.92 | \$425,236.73 | \$101,032,848.50 | \$682,090.72 | \$9,334,211.06 | \$- |
| San Francisco County | \$131,505,059.57 | \$467,096.04 | \$13,028,498.10 | \$184,382.50 | \$122,403,676.87 | \$359,363.84 | \$9,832,437.91 | \$- |
| San Joaquin County | \$18,498,277.05 | \$178,384.37 | \$2,002,709.86 | \$32,254.05 | \$16,640,139.70 | \$163,626.12 | \$1,896,907.59 | \$- |
| San Jose City | \$84,743,011.42 | \$609,335.05 | \$11,867,516.90 | \$203,869.54 | \$75,372,383.85 | \$386,950.73 | \$11,796,977.30 | \$- |
| San Luis Obispo County | \$15,109,658.26 | \$134,634.83 | \$1,794,449.53 | \$43,521.63 | \$14,682,409.83 | \$108,061.71 | \$1,644,670.67 | \$- |
| San Mateo County | \$72,710,160.26 | \$535,937.00 | \$11,420,829.36 | \$182,398.12 | \$67,939,210.11 | \$516,031.55 | \$11,311,185.47 | \$- |
| Santa Ana City | \$3,057,389.39 | \$57,389.60 | \$683,422.14 | \$27,594.28 | \$2,910,512.68 | \$30,593.97 | \$596,877.88 | \$- |
| Santa Barbara County | \$10,808,592.81 | \$101,848.37 | \$2,525,421.07 | \$32,553.42 | \$9,914,803.13 | \$100,896.94 | \$2,084,833.67 | \$- |
| Santa Clara County | \$46,593,920.07 | \$347,207.12 | \$6,767,773.18 | \$111,081.10 | \$43,026,236.52 | \$240,506.66 | \$6,763,951.00 | \$- |
| Santa Clarita City | \$25,247,667.22 | \$243,526.16 | \$3,752,904.48 | \$110,472.82 | \$23,036,590.57 | \$200,111.94 | \$3,569,608.32 | \$- |
| Santa Cruz County | \$18,651,967.53 | \$227,373.07 | \$2,577,779.21 | \$61,782.85 | \$17,893,679.20 | \$199,404.80 | \$2,341,595.17 | \$- |
| Shasta County | \$12,811,460.53 | \$166,816.86 | \$1,323,308.84 | \$61,451.89 | \$11,721,463.93 | \$136,864.60 | \$994,695.98 | \$- |
| Sierra County | \$106,429.00 | \$7,374.23 | \$9,100.00 | \$1,646.01 | \$98,360.00 | \$5,728.22 | \$6,240.00 | \$- |

California COVID-19 Rent Relief State Rental Assistance Program

Monthly Report to Joint Legislative Budget Committee – April 30, 2022

| Jurisdiction | Obligations | | | | Expenditures | | | |
|-------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| | Rent Arrears | Utility Arrears | Prospective Rent | Prospective Utility | Rent Arrears | Utility Arrears | Prospective Rent | Prosp. Utility |
| Siskiyou County | \$3,054,778.93 | \$25,725.96 | \$382,880.81 | \$24,860.33 | \$2,929,219.89 | \$22,830.43 | \$311,585.00 | \$- |
| Solano County | \$46,004,408.02 | \$277,489.03 | \$4,837,194.16 | \$118,648.48 | \$42,251,945.10 | \$260,567.70 | \$4,687,613.33 | \$- |
| Stanislaus County | \$12,693,653.46 | \$76,664.92 | \$1,092,540.67 | \$30,619.62 | \$11,976,892.63 | \$57,968.07 | \$1,092,539.60 | \$- |
| Sutter County | \$5,320,814.34 | \$120,131.81 | \$703,081.92 | \$43,461.58 | \$4,737,970.92 | \$115,746.18 | \$552,952.00 | \$- |
| Tehama County | \$3,755,135.87 | \$55,388.98 | \$363,398.49 | \$16,424.45 | \$3,527,215.48 | \$52,338.80 | \$303,602.35 | \$- |
| Trinity County | \$885,817.38 | \$739.00 | \$57,625.00 | \$1,198.65 | \$796,242.38 | \$85.00 | \$55,575.00 | \$- |
| Tulare County | \$28,655,874.43 | \$614,449.03 | \$2,670,470.55 | \$154,336.40 | \$28,002,436.64 | \$526,616.88 | \$2,365,809.55 | \$- |
| Tuolumne County | \$3,175,764.26 | \$37,877.22 | \$214,741.20 | \$25,733.01 | \$2,911,209.74 | \$28,744.07 | \$206,829.74 | \$- |
| Ventura County | \$50,402,555.39 | \$695,754.66 | \$8,397,323.89 | \$209,862.11 | \$46,514,424.39 | \$616,543.90 | \$7,965,367.24 | \$- |
| Yolo County | \$14,026,155.77 | \$297,053.26 | \$2,236,318.62 | \$76,424.23 | \$13,316,344.06 | \$230,081.90 | \$2,087,673.31 | \$- |
| Yuba County | \$7,036,395.82 | \$80,230.24 | \$659,363.76 | \$43,907.77 | \$6,303,601.54 | \$57,785.06 | \$581,429.65 | \$- |
| Subtotals | \$2,824,348,910.26 | \$24,330,337.95 | \$364,925,806.83 | \$7,882,621.72 | \$2,622,077,717.36 | \$20,783,356.31 | \$334,775,980.70 | \$- |

* Option A jurisdictions that are also included in this report as Option B prior to transition to A.

California COVID-19 Rent Relief State Rental Assistance Program

Monthly Report to Joint Legislative Budget Committee – April 30, 2022

Locally Administered Programs - Option B Jurisdictions – ERA1 Funds

Figures reflect only the locally administered programs’ use of State Block Grant funds. Each jurisdiction is accountable for reporting directly to the Treasury regarding use of its respective federal allocation.

| Jurisdiction | Obligations | | | | Expenditures | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| | Rent Arrears | Utility Arrears | Prospective Rent | Prospective Utility | Rent Arrears | Utility Arrears | Prospective Rent | Prospective Utility |
| Alameda County | \$19,122,226.71 | \$1,127,671.17 | \$8,744,338.42 | \$- | \$19,088,399.76 | \$1,125,131.95 | \$8,717,899.38 | \$- |
| Anaheim City | \$7,929,097.01 | \$213,461.66 | \$4,281,098.25 | \$- | \$7,803,338.22 | \$212,861.66 | \$4,169,416.58 | \$- |
| Bakersfield City | \$5,902,170.16 | \$1,586,708.23 | \$4,611,904.54 | \$338,596.99 | \$5,747,639.84 | \$1,545,165.12 | \$4,491,155.89 | \$329,731.86 |
| Chula Vista City | \$5,944,689.74 | \$70,933.40 | \$3,319,631.61 | \$- | \$5,944,689.74 | \$70,933.40 | \$3,319,631.61 | \$- |
| Fresno City | \$10,104,968.80 | \$6,859,357.15 | \$- | \$- | \$6,608,936.44 | \$1,089,507.61 | \$- | \$- |
| Fresno County | \$7,963,068.76 | \$918,815.63 | \$1,225,087.50 | \$102,090.63 | \$1,265,418.06 | \$251,104.82 | \$1,068,136.92 | \$23,825.79 |
| Irvine City | \$7,351,073.18 | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$7,351,073.18 | \$- | \$- | \$- |
| Kern County | \$8,880,812.64 | \$1,978,057.89 | \$5,215,912.81 | \$496,159.80 | \$8,122,457.48 | \$1,809,146.50 | \$4,770,512.76 | \$453,791.45 |
| Long Beach City | \$12,960,233.26 | \$635,835.35 | \$1,374,928.94 | \$17,804.62 | \$12,960,233.26 | \$635,835.35 | \$1,374,928.94 | \$17,804.62 |
| Los Angeles City | \$128,940,000.00 | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$114,438,506.45 | \$- | \$- | \$- |
| Marin County | \$8,235,058.39 | \$27,751.11 | \$134,839.70 | \$- | \$8,130,226.20 | \$27,751.11 | \$134,839.70 | \$- |
| Monterey County | \$8,515,908.09 | \$1,243,175.77 | \$2,970,658.78 | \$- | \$8,515,908.08 | \$1,243,175.77 | \$2,970,658.78 | \$- |
| Riverside City | \$9,275,969.91 | \$1,219,758.30 | \$255,307.79 | \$- | \$9,275,942.06 | \$1,219,758.30 | \$255,307.79 | \$- |
| Riverside County | \$45,367,433.88 | \$4,872,620.49 | \$10,273,318.64 | \$1,209,464.89 | \$44,413,147.45 | \$4,785,581.01 | \$9,603,496.91 | \$1,142,790.09 |
| Sacramento City | \$15,715,036.00 | \$676,368.00 | \$- | \$- | \$15,715,036.00 | \$676,368.00 | \$- | \$- |
| Sacramento County | \$25,873,263.00 | \$820,030.00 | \$- | \$- | \$25,873,263.00 | \$820,030.00 | \$- | \$- |
| San Diego City | \$12,740,251.54 | \$2,358,065.85 | \$31,033,393.08 | \$- | \$12,740,251.54 | \$2,358,065.85 | \$31,033,393.08 | \$- |
| San Diego County | \$47,715,633.31 | \$3,721,377.79 | \$1,776,107.70 | \$- | \$47,715,633.31 | \$3,721,377.79 | \$1,776,107.70 | \$- |
| Stockton City | \$4,982,013.79 | \$1,326,124.32 | \$3,524,941.60 | \$298,069.88 | \$4,982,013.79 | \$1,326,124.32 | \$3,524,941.60 | \$298,069.88 |
| Subtotals | \$393,518,908.16 | \$29,656,112.11 | \$78,741,469.36 | \$2,462,186.81 | \$366,692,113.86 | \$22,917,918.56 | \$77,210,427.64 | \$2,266,013.69 |

* Option A jurisdictions that are also included in this report as Option B prior to transition to A.

California COVID-19 Rent Relief State Rental Assistance Program

Monthly Report to Joint Legislative Budget Committee – April 30, 2022

Locally Administered Programs - Option B Jurisdictions – ERA2 Funds

Figures reflect only the locally administered programs’ use of State Block Grant funds. Each jurisdiction is accountable for reporting directly to the Treasury regarding use of its respective federal allocation.

| Jurisdiction | Obligations | | | | Expenditures | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| | Rent Arrears | Utility Arrears | Prospective Rent | Prospective Utility | Rent Arrears | Utility Arrears | Prospective Rent | Prospective Utility |
| Alameda County | \$12,732,881.31 | \$752,131.21 | \$4,887,433.73 | \$- | \$7,447,145.73 | \$511,034.42 | \$3,069,182.16 | \$- |
| Anaheim City | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- |
| Bakersfield City | \$4,355,597.60 | \$1,240,352.21 | \$3,766,982.35 | \$421,346.22 | \$2,937,941.16 | \$836,643.36 | \$2,540,907.93 | \$284,206.79 |
| Chula Vista City | \$5,616,993.18 | \$330,390.78 | \$2,794,699.97 | \$- | \$5,616,993.18 | \$330,390.78 | \$2,794,699.97 | \$- |
| Fremont City | \$4,485,558.75 | \$176,419.23 | \$750,071.22 | \$- | \$2,888,020.33 | \$148,572.76 | \$750,071.22 | \$- |
| Fresno City | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- |
| Fresno County | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- |
| Kern County | \$5,918,621.47 | \$1,318,277.55 | \$3,476,147.37 | \$330,665.92 | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- |
| Long Beach City | \$9,585,678.30 | \$867,096.00 | \$652,394.70 | \$29,577.00 | \$1,700,573.59 | \$86,289.49 | \$652,394.70 | \$315.82 |
| Marin County | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- |
| Monterey County | \$9,144,810.36 | \$1,046,961.54 | \$252,761.43 | \$2,649.67 | \$1,425,505.34 | \$110,055.04 | \$252,761.43 | \$2,649.67 |
| Moreno Valley City | \$3,515,561.57 | \$1,013,725.43 | \$56,866.00 | \$- | \$3,515,561.57 | \$1,013,722.87 | \$56,866.00 | \$- |
| Oakland City | \$331,175.61 | \$26,107.35 | \$37,100.77 | \$- | \$166,891.94 | \$11,759.28 | \$13,548.18 | \$- |
| Riverside City | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- |
| Riverside County | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- |
| Sacramento City | \$4,896,575.00 | \$54,084.00 | \$- | \$- | \$4,896,575.00 | \$54,084.00 | \$- | \$- |
| Sacramento County | \$227,133.00 | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$227,133.00 | \$- | \$- | \$- |
| San Bernardino City | \$4,647,991.67 | \$353,381.55 | \$204,589.62 | \$- | \$4,213,257.87 | \$315,427.29 | \$195,251.12 | \$- |
| San Diego City | \$29,998,830.99 | \$2,203,595.56 | \$25,422,484.41 | \$- | \$29,965,552.53 | \$2,201,151.06 | \$25,394,282.61 | \$- |
| San Diego County | \$50,829,872.61 | \$3,321,220.50 | \$4,353,596.46 | \$- | \$46,846,872.61 | \$2,722,920.50 | \$4,109,896.46 | \$- |
| Santa Ana City | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- |
| Santa Barbara County | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- | \$- |
| Sonoma County | \$5,250,336.27 | \$486,194.74 | \$2,127,196.37 | \$173,012.48 | \$5,098,887.58 | \$415,023.99 | \$1,945,309.45 | \$103,068.48 |
| Stockton City | \$4,067,902.07 | \$478,465.53 | \$2,792,083.38 | \$154,600.61 | \$4,065,941.56 | \$478,465.53 | \$2,792,083.38 | \$154,600.61 |
| Subtotals | \$155,605,519.76 | \$13,668,403.18 | \$51,574,407.78 | \$1,111,851.90 | \$121,012,852.99 | \$9,235,540.37 | \$44,567,254.61 | \$544,841.37 |