



MEMORANDUM

To: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Through: Disability and Aging Services Commission

From: Kelly Dearman, Executive Director, Department of Disability and Aging Services (DAS)
Michael Zaugg, Director, DAS Office of Community Partnerships

Date: July 1, 2026

Subject: Community Living Fund Six-Month Report (July-December 2025)

The San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 10.100-12, created the Community Living Fund (CLF) to support aging in place and community placement alternatives to potential institutionalization. This report fulfills the Administrative Code requirement that the Department of Disability and Aging Services (DAS) report to the Board of Supervisors every six months detailing the services provided and costs associated with the duties and services with this Fund.

Contents

Overview	3
Systemic Updates	5
Referral Trends.....	5
Service Trends.....	6
Other Programmatic Highlights.....	9
Service Costs.....	10
CalAIM Revenue Received	10
Additional Charts and Tables.....	11

OVERVIEW

The Community Living Fund is a local revenue stream that supports the Community Living Fund Program (CLFP), administered by Institute on Aging. This program aims to reduce unnecessary institutionalization, with a focus on two populations: (1) nursing facility residents transitioning to the community, and (2) individuals living in the community who are at risk of being institutionalized.


CLFP consists of four major service components:

1. Traditional CLFP services
2. Public Guardian (PG) Housing Fund services
3. DAS Enhanced Care Management (ECM) services through CaAIM
4. DAS Community Supports (CS) services through CaAIM

The Fund also supports Scattered Site Housing and Rental Subsidy Administration (SSHRSA), a separate program administered by Brilliant Corners in partnership with CLFP. This program provides housing opportunities and rental subsidies to eligible individuals, supporting their ability to live independently in the community.

The service components supported by the Community Living Fund are illustrated in the diagram and described in more detail below.

Figure 1. Service Components Supported by the Community Living Fund



Traditional CLFP Services

Traditional CLFP clients receive individualized support in the forms of Intensive Case Management (ICM) and/or Purchase of Services (POS) to increase their stability in the community. Through proactive outreach and care coordination, clients are better able to navigate complex systems, access needed resources, and address barriers that previously limited their ability to manage their daily needs while aging in place.

Public Guardian Housing Fund Services

CLFP also provides housing funds for Public Guardian clients who meet traditional CLFP eligibility criteria. These individuals are under probate conservatorship due to their inability to provide for their own basic needs as a result of cognitive impairment — often caused by dementia or traumatic brain injury — or other significant disabilities. With the support of the PG Housing Fund, these individuals receive subsidies that help them remain stably housed in the community.

DAS Enhanced Care Management (ECM) Services

To expand CLFP services, DAS launched its first contract with San Francisco Health Plan (SFHP) to provide ECM services in July 2023 as part of CalAIM initiative. DAS subcontracts with IOA to deliver these services through CLFP for SFHP members. Similar to traditional CLFP services, ECM clients receive intensive care coordination, outreach, and advocacy to help them navigate complex systems, connect to essential resources, and address barriers that limit stability.

DAS Community Supports Services

In July 2024, DAS entered into a second contract with SFHP to deliver Community Supports services through CalAIM (like ECM, administered through a subcontract with IOA), which includes two types of services:

1. Community Transition Services (CTS) to Private Residences

CTS services help clients move safely and successfully from institutional settings back into the community by providing essential supports such as housing navigation, transition assistance, basic household goods, and coordination of post-discharge needs.

2. Nursing Facility Transition/Diversion (NFT/D) to Assisted Living Facilities

NFT/D services help clients move from skilled nursing facilities into assisted living facilities when appropriate and safe. The services include transition planning, placement support, and ongoing subsidies for the assisted living wraparound services.

SFHP reimburses DAS for providing ECM and Community Supports services, and the revenue received will be used to offset the County General Fund expenditures. To the extent that some ECM and Community Supports clients may have service needs that are not reimbursable under CalAIM, DAS covers those costs using CLF dollars.

Scattered Site Housing and Rental Subsidy Administration (SSHRSA)

CLFP partners with the SSHRSA program to help eligible clients secure housing placements and subsidies that support safe transitions from skilled nursing facilities into stable community living. Both programs are part of the Community Options and Resource Engagement (CORE) group, a multidisciplinary team composed of City agencies and community-based organizations. Led by Laguna Honda Hospital, the CORE team meets bi-weekly to review potential discharge cases and coordinate safe transition plans to community living.

SYSTEMIC UPDATES

During the July-December 2025 period, the CLFP team and relevant stakeholders continued to review and streamline the program’s procedures, data management system, referral and intake process, as well as community education and outreach strategies, to ensure effective service delivery across multiple service components.

As of July 2025, the program was still using two data systems: (1) CASECare to document traditional CLFP services and (2) PACECare Online to document ECM and Community Supports services. In August, the two systems were consolidated into a single platform. All historical CASECare data has been migrated to PACECare, which now serves as the central repository for both traditional CLFP and CalAIM service data and documentation. This consolidation process introduced some challenges, resulting in disruptions to service documentation and reporting, some of which are still being addressed.

REFERRAL TRENDS

There are two referral pathways for CLFP services:

- 1. Community referrals:** Community members can submit referrals for CLFP by contacting the DAS Benefits and Resource Hub. Intake staff at DAS Hub conduct an initial screening and determine the referred individual’s eligibility.

They then refer eligible individuals on to IOA to complete the enrollment process and begin services.

- SFHP referrals:** SFHP transmits a monthly file with batch referrals for CalAIM services to DAS database. DAS Intake staff at DAS Hub conduct initial outreach for up to four (4) weeks before forwarding them to IOA for further outreach and service engagement. The maximum total outreach timeframe is eight (8) weeks.

Notably, most of these referrals originate from health care providers without the client’s awareness. As a result, when DAS and IOA staff conduct outreach, many individuals decline services or cannot be reached — they are deemed “ineligible” once the eight-week timeframe expires. A small portion of SFHP referrals are “warm handoffs,” in which the individual is aware of the referral and the referrer’s contact information is provided. These referrals tend to result in more successful engagement.

Key referral trends in CLFP during this 6-month period are outlined in the table below. The volume of referrals to CLFP overall represents a decrease compared to recent periods since the launch of CalAIM-funded services, but it is still higher than the broader trend over the history of the program. Referrals to the SSHRSA program remained steady; they always originate exclusively from CLFP’s enrolled clients.

Table 1. Key Referral Trends for CLF Programs, Jul-Dec 2025

Key Referral Trends	Number	Percent
Total Referrals to CLFP	228	100%
For Traditional CLFP	44	19%
For DAS Enhanced Care Management	184	81%
CLFP Referrals from Laguna Honda Hospital	1	0%
Total Referrals to SSHRSA (from CLFP)	4	100%

SERVICE TRENDS

Overall, CLF-funded programs (CLFP and SSHRSA) served 372 unique clients during the July-December 2025 period. Some of these clients had multiple enrollments across programs and service components. This service level remained high compared with historical trends.

Service Deliverables

As the following table illustrates, CLFP and SSHRSA met mid-year benchmarks for service delivery and are on track to meet performance targets for the full fiscal year. Because this reporting period reflects only the first half of fiscal year 2025–26, full-year actuals will be provided in the subsequent 6-month report.

Table 2. Performance on Key Service Objectives for CLF Programs

Service Objective	Jul-Dec 2025 Target	Jul-Dec 2025 Actual	FY 2025-26 Target	FY 2025-26 Actual
CLFP Unduplicated Clients	188	299	375	On track
Traditional CLFP	n/a ¹	85	n/a	
PG Housing Fund	3	5	6	On track
DAS Enhanced Care Management	n/a	214	n/a	
DAS Community Supports	15	26	30	On track
CLFP New Enrollments	88	90	175	On track
Traditional CLFP	13	15	25	On track
DAS Enhanced Care Management	75	75	150	On track
SSHRSA Unduplicated Clients	55	81	110	On track

CLFP Client Demographics

Trends in CLFP client demographics in this six-month period diverge in many instances from the program’s historical trends, due in large part to the large volume and different demographic compositions of ECM enrollees new to the CLFP since July 2023. Details are provided in the following categories. Data gaps have been identified in race and ethnicity, language, and sexual orientation. Efforts to resolve reporting issues related to the database transition and to strengthen overall data collection are ongoing.

- **Age**

Nearly three-quarters (73%) of clients enrolled in CLFP in this period were older adults aged 60 and up, broadly consistent with historical trends.

¹ “n/a” indicates that no contractual targets exist for the breakdown Traditional CLFP and ECM client counts; these figures are provided for informational purposes only.

- **Race and Ethnicity**

Trends in the ethnic profile of enrolled clients remain only somewhat consistent with recent historical periods — in part due to high rates of missing or unknown ethnicity data (39% of clients), which is on the decline from its 68% peak a year ago. In this six-month period, of clients with a known ethnicity, those identifying as Asian/Pacific Islander made up the largest group (39%). White and African American individuals each accounted for 20% of clients with a known ethnicity, and Latinos made up another 14%.

- **Language**

As with client ethnicity data, though to a lesser degree, longitudinal analysis of trends in client primary language is complicated by high rates of missing or unknown data (25%) in this period. Of those clients with a known primary language, English speakers made up the largest group (56%), consistent with both recent and historical trends. Notably, Cantonese speakers made up the next largest group (32%) with a known language, consistent with the last period, but substantially higher than other recent periods and trends across the program’s history overall. The proportion of Spanish speakers enrolled in CLFP in this period (6%) was broadly consistent with recent periods, but lower than historical levels.

- **Gender**

Males represented just over half (53%) of clients this period, broadly consistent with historical trends. Although some clients identified as transgender or gender non-conforming, the volume of these enrollments was not high enough to be reflected in the percentage breakdown of enrollments by gender.

- **Sexual Orientation**

Unlike in periods prior to July 2023, a significant portion of CLFP enrollments in this period were missing sexual orientation data (28%), due to persistent challenges in tracking SOGI data related to ECM referral workflows and development of the new PCO database system. For those clients not missing sexual orientation information, the vast majority identified as straight/heterosexual (89%). Persons identifying as a sexual minority, including gay/lesbian/same gender-loving, bisexual, and other identities, accounted for the remaining 11% of referrals with a known sexual orientation.

- **Zip Code**

The most frequent zip codes for enrolled clients in this period were largely consistent with historical program trends. For example, 94103 (South of Market)

accounted for the greatest proportion (18%) of clients. Other zip codes that made up a significant share of clients included: 94115 (Western Addition) at 11%, 94102 (Hayes Valley/Tenderloin) at 9%; 94110 (Inner Mission/Bernal Heights) at 8%; and 94124 (Bayview/Hunters Point) at 6%. The proportion of clients with other or unknown zip codes (22%) remained consistent with historical levels.

- **Former Laguna Honda Hospital Patients**

Enrolled CLFP clients originally referred by Laguna Honda Hospital represented approximately 1% of all clients. This is a notably lower rate of former Laguna Honda Hospital residents stepped down to CLFP than in recent periods, and a significantly lower one than over the entire program history. Between 2010 and 2016, approximately 46% of the active CLFP caseload on average came from the facility. This decreasing pattern is due mainly to the significantly increased volume of ECM referrals from SFHP.

OTHER PROGRAMMATIC HIGHLIGHTS

Transitions to Scattered-Site Housing

CLFP continued to collaborate with the SSHRSA program to assist clients with housing navigation and discharge planning from skilled nursing facilities. During this reporting period, four (4) clients successfully transitioned into scattered-site housing units with support from the programs.

Nursing Facility Transition/Diversion to Assisted Living Facilities

During this reporting period, a total of 23 individuals received services related to assisted living, seven (7) of whom were newly placed in facilities. Of these 23 clients, 15 were receiving ongoing monthly subsidies for the wraparound services at their respective facilities.

Community Outreach

CLFP staff continue strategic community outreach to promote the full range of CLFP services and increase warm referrals for Enhanced Care Management services. During this reporting period, the program engaged with the SF LGBT Center, Mission Neighborhood Center, and Catholic Charities. Staff also delivered presentations to the IHSS Social Worker team and the Public Guardian Housing team.

SERVICE COSTS

Expenditure figures for July–December 2025 are presented in the following table. During this period, CLFP’s expenditures reached an all-time high, driven particularly by the increasing CalAIM-funded assisted living facility services. Beginning in July 2025, additional budget was provided to cover the services upfront prior to reimbursement through CalAIM funds. SSHRSA’s expenditures exceeded both the five-year and all-time averages. Despite the rise in expenditures, both programs operated within their contractual budgets.

Table 3. CLF Expenditures by Program, Jul-Dec 2025

CLF Program	Expenditure	Percent
Total Expenditures	\$4,750,709	100%
CLFP	\$2,840,939	60%
SSHRSA	\$1,740,685	37%
DAS internal (salaries & fringe)	\$169,085	4%

Total monthly costs per client for CLF-funded programs averaged \$2,128 per month in this six-month period, an increase over the last six-month period, though still slightly lower than other recent periods. Excluding costs for home care and rental subsidies, the average monthly purchase of service costs for CLFP participants who received any purchased services was \$332 per month in this reporting period, nearly double the same value reported in the last six-month period and considerably higher than other recent periods.

Table 4. Average Monthly Cost Per Client for CLF Programs, Jul-Dec 2025

Select Costs for CLF Programs	Average Monthly Cost Per Client
All costs for CLF-funded programs	\$2,128
All POS costs for CLFP purchase clients	\$3,976
POS costs for CLFP purchase clients, excluding home care and assisted living subsidies	\$332

CALAIM REVENUE RECEIVED

The revenue figures received through CalAIM funds for services rendered during July–December 2025 are shown in the following table. The funds received were used to offset the County General Fund.



Table 5. Revenue Received through CalAIM, Jul-Dec 2025

Service	Revenue	Percent
Overall CalAIM-funded services	\$846,153	100%
DAS Enhanced Care Management	\$476,350	56%
DAS Community Supports	\$369,803	44%




ADDITIONAL CHARTS AND TABLES

Additional data charts and tables are provided on the following pages.



Community Living Fund Six-Month Report



Community Living Fund Six-Month Report




Community Living Fund Six-Month Report




Community Living Fund Six-Month Report

Expenditures at CLF Increase in Recent Periods Driven by Increased Spending on Assisted Living; High Home Care and Assisted Living Costs Continue to Drive Spending Overall






Average Monthly Purchase of Service (POS) Cost Per Client for CLF Clients with Any Purchases:

Average cost per client remains largely steady with an uptick in the most recent period; Home Care and Assisted Living costs continue to rise while spending in other areas remains low




Note: Purchases in this chart represent those made across CLFP services provided by the Institute on Aging

Community Living Fund Six-Month Report



Community Living Fund Six-Month Report



Community Living Fund Six-Month Report

Enrollment and Referral Trends

Active Caseload	Jun-23		Dec-23		Jun-24		Dec-24		Jun-25		Dec-25	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
All Active Cases*	245		279		308		355		416		372	
Change from Prior 6 Months	(44)	-15.2%	34	13.9%	63	22.6%	47	15.3%	61	17.2%	(44)	-10.6%
Change from Previous Year	(38)	-13.4%	(10)	-3.5%	19	7.8%	76	27.2%	108	35.1%	17	4.8%
Change from 2 Years	(36)	-12.8%	(3)	-1.1%	26	9.2%	66	22.8%	171	69.8%	93	33.3%
Program Enrollment												
CLF at Institute on Aging**	153	62%	194	70%	226	73%	274	77%	341	82%	299	80%
with any service purchases	73	48%	72	37%	59	26%	82	30%	120	35%	109	36%
with no purchases	80	52%	122	63%	167	74%	192	70%	221	65%	190	64%
Scattered Site Housing (Brilliant Corners)	100	41%	99	35%	92	30%	91	26%	84	20%	81	22%
Program to Date												
All CLF Enrollment*	4,446		4,517		4,585		4,674		4,798		4,882	
CLF at Institute on Aging Enrollment	2,290	52%	2,355	52%	2,424	53%	2,515	54%	2,638	55%	2,723	56%
with any service purchases	1,654	72%	1,671	71%	1,675	69%	1,719	68%	1,842	70%	1,877	69%
Average monthly \$/client (all clients, all \$)	\$ 3,047		\$ 2,413		\$ 2,378		\$ 1,934		\$ 1,765		\$ 2,128	
Average monthly purchase of service \$/client for CLF IOA purchase clients	\$ 3,692		\$ 3,665		\$ 4,126		\$ 3,780		\$ 3,566		\$ 3,976	
Average monthly purchase of service \$/client for CLF IOA purchase clients, excluding home care, housing subsidies	\$ 127		\$ 111		\$ 128		\$ 150		\$ 184		\$ 332	

*Includes clients enrolled with Institute on Aging, Brilliant Corners (beginning Dec-2017), Homecoming (through June-2015), and Emergency Meals (through Dec-2015).

**CLF at IOA enrollments include clients enrolled in CLF Intensive Case Management (ICM) and Purchase of Service only services (beginning Jul-2007), CalAIM Enhanced Care Management (ECM) (beginning Apr-2023), and CalAIM Community Supports (CS) (beginning Jul-2024).

Community Living Fund Six-Month Report

Referrals	Jun-23		Dec-23		Jun-24		Dec-24		Jun-25		Dec-25	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
New Referrals***	93		362		306		312		378		228	
Change from previous six months	25	37%	269	289%	(56)	-15%	6	2%	66	21%	(150)	-40%
Change from previous year	(16)	-15%	294	432%	213	229%	(50)	-14%	72	24%	(84)	-27%
Status After Initial Screening												
Eligible:	50	54%	92	25%	71	23%	120	38%	134	35%	59	26%
<i>Approved to Receive Service</i>	25	50%	82	89%	54	76%	91	76%	113	84%	52	88%
<i>Wait List</i>	24	48%	2	2%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	-	0%
<i>Pending Final Review</i>	1	2%	8	9%	16	23%	29	24%	21	16%	7	12%
Ineligible	11	12%	268	74%	216	71%	183	59%	228	60%	161	71%
Withdraw Application	32	34%	2	1%	13	4%	9	3%	14	4%	8	4%
Pending Initial Determination	0	0%	0	0%	6	2%	0	0%	2	1%	-	0%
Program to Date												
Total Referrals	5,654		6,016		6,322		6,634		7,012		7,240	
Eligible Referrals	4,040	71%	4,132	69%	4,203	66%	4,323	65%	4,457	64%	4,516	62%
Ineligible Referrals	721	13%	989	16%	1,205	19%	1,388	21%	1,616	23%	1,777	25%

*** New Referrals include ICM, ECM, and CS referrals received by the DAS Intake and Screening Unit for CLF services at IOA in the six-month period.

Community Living Fund Six-Month Report

Referral Demographics

Age (in years)	Dec-20	Jun-21	Dec-21	Jun-22	Dec-22	Jun-23	Dec-23	Jun-24	Dec-24	Jun-25	Dec-25
18-59	22%	34%	25%	37%	29%	24%	9%	31%	31%	35%	34%
60-64	13%	15%	10%	11%	22%	16%	36%	25%	20%	20%	16%
65-74	36%	25%	40%	24%	28%	35%	43%	26%	29%	22%	21%
75-84	16%	15%	16%	19%	16%	16%	10%	12%	12%	16%	19%
85+	14%	12%	9%	7%	4%	9%	2%	6%	7%	7%	10%
Unknown	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Ethnicity	Dec-20	Jun-21	Dec-21	Jun-22	Dec-22	Jun-23	Dec-23	Jun-24	Dec-24	Jun-25	Dec-25
White	40%	35%	35%	36%	41%	38%	23%	31%	22%	29%	26%
African American	24%	26%	21%	22%	28%	30%	36%	21%	21%	26%	23%
Latino	20%	18%	11%	18%	16%	15%	9%	10%	15%	9%	13%
Chinese	5%	6%	9%	6%	3%	2%	4%	6%	8%	10%	10%
Filipino	2%	1%	5%	5%	1%	1%	2%	1%	4%	1%	1%
Other API	2%	4%	5%	8%	7%	10%	3%	5%	8%	3%	3%
Other	4%	9%	4%	2%	3%	1%	13%	6%	4%	5%	6%
Unknown	2%	0%	10%	3%	0%	3%	9%	20%	17%	17%	18%

Language	Dec-20	Jun-21	Dec-21	Jun-22	Dec-22	Jun-23	Dec-23	Jun-24	Dec-24	Jun-25	Dec-25
English	76%	79%	80%	72%	75%	81%	91%	72%	70%	78%	72%
Spanish	14%	12%	6%	14%	10%	9%	4%	8%	10%	4%	7%
Cantonese	2%	1%	5%	5%	6%	1%	1%	5%	7%	8%	9%
Mandarin	1%	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%
Russian	2%	0%	0%	1%	3%	0%	1%	6%	6%	3%	6%
Tagalog	2%	0%	6%	4%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%
Vietnamese	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	3%	2%	1%	0%
Other	3%	6%	3%	3%	4%	8%	2%	5%	4%	2%	4%

Percentages may not sum to 100% due to rounding

Community Living Fund Six-Month Report

Gender	Dec-20	Jun-21	Dec-21	Jun-22	Dec-22	Jun-23	Dec-23	Jun-24	Dec-24	Jun-25	Dec-25
Male	58%	71%	46%	55%	74%	54%	59%	51%	53%	53%	52%
Female	42%	28%	54%	42%	25%	45%	41%	48%	46%	47%	48%
Transgender MtF	1%	1%	0%	2%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Transgender FtM	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
All Other (Genderqueer, Not listed)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%
Incomplete/Missing data	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Sexual Orientation	Dec-20	Jun-21	Dec-21	Jun-22	Dec-22	Jun-23	Dec-23	Jun-24	Dec-24	Jun-25	Dec-25
Heterosexual	69%	72%	68%	67%	60%	71%	10%	7%	17%	19%	14%
Gay/Lesbian/Same Gender-Loving	5%	9%	4%	8%	12%	5%	0%	2%	0%	1%	2%
Bisexual	0%	0%	1%	3%	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%
All Other (Questioning/Unsure, Not Listed)	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	0%
Declined to State	6%	7%	5%	6%	6%	3%	0%	2%	2%	4%	1%
Incomplete/Missing data/Not asked	20%	12%	23%	16%	22%	18%	88%	87%	81%	74%	81%
Zipcode	Dec-20	Jun-21	Dec-21	Jun-22	Dec-22	Jun-23	Dec-23	Jun-24	Dec-24	Jun-25	Dec-25
94102 Hayes Valley/Tenderloin	9%	21%	1%	16%	16%	12%	20%	12%	11%	7%	10%
94103 South of Market	9%	7%	24%	11%	15%	8%	22%	21%	12%	22%	24%
94109 Polk/Russian Hill/Nob Hill	12%	12%	10%	12%	9%	4%	10%	9%	7%	7%	4%
94110 Inner Mission/Bernal Heights	6%	4%	6%	4%	6%	2%	6%	4%	10%	7%	7%
94112 Outer Mission/Excelsior/Ingleside	6%	6%	9%	8%	1%	2%	2%	5%	7%	5%	7%
94115 Western Addition	6%	1%	5%	3%	4%	5%	6%	10%	9%	5%	8%
94116 Parkside/Forest Hill	8%	12%	6%	6%	22%	5%	4%	3%	4%	2%	2%
94117 Haight/Western Addition/Fillmore	0%	4%	5%	3%	0%	2%	1%	1%	2%	3%	2%
94118 Inner Richmond/Presidio/Laurel	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	2%	3%	2%
94122 Sunset	1%	3%	3%	5%	1%	1%	2%	2%	3%	3%	5%
94124 Bayview/Hunters Point	7%	4%	6%	6%	3%	9%	10%	6%	9%	8%	8%
94133 North Beach Telegraph Hill	1%	3%	1%	0%	3%	0%	1%	3%	3%	5%	3%
94134 Visitacion Valley	6%	3%	3%	6%	4%	2%	3%	6%	6%	4%	1%
Unknown/Other	28%	17%	20%	21%	13%	47%	11%	18%	15%	17%	17%
Referral Source = Laguna Honda Hospital/TCM	14%	21%	20%	13%	26%	8%	6%	3%	2%	1%	0%

Percentages may not sum to 100% due to rounding

Community Living Fund Six-Month Report

Services Needed at Intake (Self-Reported)**	Dec-20	Jun-21	Dec-21	Jun-22	Dec-22	Jun-23	Dec-23	Jun-24	Dec-24	Jun-25	Dec-25
Case Management	85%	54%	62%	68%	82%	69%	57%	53%	65%	57%	47%
In-Home Support	77%	47%	57%	68%	62%	69%	45%	60%	53%	53%	43%
Housing-related services	59%	41%	47%	44%	62%	37%	43%	34%	33%	46%	39%
Money Management	50%	30%	32%	37%	34%	29%	24%	21%	8%	29%	20%
Assistive Devices	54%	28%	42%	45%	31%	46%	37%	34%	40%	42%	41%
Mental health/Substance Abuse Services	49%	24%	32%	34%	54%	37%	45%	21%	23%	25%	18%
Day Programs	31%	11%	23%	29%	44%	29%	33%	23%	13%	32%	23%
Food	28%	28%	34%	43%	47%	42%	39%	23%	28%	36%	37%
Caregiver Support	31%	24%	20%	28%	22%	30%	37%	23%	13%	26%	23%
Home repairs/Modifications	43%	19%	30%	40%	28%	29%	24%	38%	13%	32%	34%
Other Services	39%	19%	17%	31%	24%	28%	39%	23%	15%	26%	27%

**Based on ICM referrals only

Community Living Fund Six-Month Report

Expenditures and Budget

Expenditures	Dec-24	Jun-25	Dec-25	Project to Date
IOA Contract				
Purchase of Service *	\$ 887,667	\$ 1,010,509	\$ 967,839	\$ 29,634,855
CBAS Appeals (incl. indirect) and repayment				\$ 359,176
GRACE Project				\$ 96,315
Case Management	\$ 787,918	\$ 860,168	\$ 864,126	\$ 25,158,352
Capital & Equipment	\$ 21,450	\$ 46,410		\$ 353,430
Operations	\$ 279,142	\$ 361,195	\$ 314,458	\$ 8,562,991
Indirect	\$ 158,693	\$ 180,252	\$ 187,526	\$ 4,663,735
Housing and Disability Advocacy Program (HSH Work Order)				\$ 295,888
CCT Reimbursement				\$ (1,603,959)
SF Health Plan Reimbursement for CBAS				\$ (976,840)
CBAS Assessments for SF Health Plan				\$ 676,042
NFT Admin Fees			\$ 13,338	\$ 13,338
NFT Service Fees			\$ 493,652	\$ 493,652
Historical Expenditures within IOA Contract****				\$ 483,568
Subtotal	\$ 2,134,870	\$ 2,458,534	\$ 2,840,939	\$ 67,755,052
DPH Work Orders				\$ -
Health at Home				\$ 1,055,945
RTZ – DCIP				\$ 1,600,797
DAS Internal (Salaries & Fringe)	\$ 335,722	\$ 336,425	\$ 169,085	\$ 8,397,089
Homecoming Services Network & Research (SFSC)				\$ 274,575
MSO Consultant (Meals on Wheels)				\$ 199,711
Case Management Training Institute (FSA)				\$ 679,906
IHSS Share of Cost				\$ 93,454
Scattered Site Housing (Brilliant Corners)	\$ 1,649,753	\$ 1,610,839	\$ 1,740,685	\$ 28,632,418
Shanti / PAWS (Pets are Wonderful Support)				\$ 477,500
Historical Expenditures within CLF Program****				\$ 1,447,669
Grand Total	\$ 4,120,345	\$ 4,405,798	\$ 4,750,709	\$ 111,719,415
				Project to Date
		FY2425	FY26	
Total CLF Fund Budget***	\$	9,508,316	\$ 4,750,709	\$ 120,064,711
% DAS Internal of Total CLF Fund**		7%	4%	7%
* This figure does not match the figure in Section 4 of this report because this figure reflects the date of invoice to HSA, while the other reflects the date of service to the client.				
** According to the CLF's establishing ordinance, "In no event shall the cost of department staffing associated with the duties and services associated with this fund exceed 15% [...] of the total amount of the fund." When the most recent six-month period falls in July-December, total funds available are pro-rated to reflect half of the total annual fund.				
*** FY14/15 Budget includes \$200K of one-time addback funding for Management Services Organizations project that will be spent outside of CLF, which will not be included in the cost per client.				
**** Historical Expenditures from December 2014 and previously.				

Community Living Fund Six-Month Report

Purchased Items and Services																
CLF @ IOA Purchased Services	Dec-22		Jun-23		Dec-23		Jun-24		Dec-24		Jun-25		Dec-25		Project-to-Date	
	\$	Clients	\$	Clients	\$	Clients	\$	Clients	\$	Clients	\$	Clients	\$	Clients	\$	UDC
Grand Total	\$1,255,059	83	\$1,168,480	74	\$1,094,153	73	\$1,059,695	65	\$1,017,031	82	\$1,420,119	120	\$1,597,720	109	\$31,992,882	1,877
Home Care	\$631,376	32	\$620,109	27	\$528,572	25	\$502,668	24	\$479,261	30	\$554,906	35	\$439,879	44	\$13,030,986	480
Assisted Living (RCFE/B&C)	\$517,291	23	\$474,036	19	\$495,105	21	\$486,902	15	\$463,805	17	\$769,880	34	\$1,000,469	33	\$13,673,870	155
Scattered Site Housing															\$209,344	4
Rental Assistance (General)	\$41,394	9	\$34,019	8	\$36,493	8	\$36,176	7	\$32,538	7	\$22,155	6	\$24,349	4	\$1,654,638	451
Non-Medical Home Equipment	\$25,994	24	\$9,679	14	\$13,869	18	\$10,492	13	\$15,338	23	\$44,380	41	\$30,760	35	\$888,313	1,049
Housing-Related	\$6,809	9	\$13,788	6	\$12,887	2	\$14,558	5	\$21,429	8	\$7,659	11	\$95,314	15	\$1,122,988	402
Assistive Devices	\$24,501	11	\$6,013	10	\$3,866	10	\$5,799	11	\$2,672	14	\$10,973	24	\$3,292	10	\$664,445	758
Adult Day Programs															\$110,377	20
Communication/Translation	\$4,717	17	\$6,296	14	\$3,140	11	\$1,980	8	\$938	6	\$1,202	9	\$31	1	\$194,787	461
Respite															\$48,687	10
Health Care	\$2,540	2	30	1			\$290	1					\$550	1	\$95,836	106
Other Special Needs			\$2,369	2							6197	2			\$54,646	121
Counseling															\$126,176	204
Professional Care Assistance			1760	1											\$22,178	18
Habilitation															\$22,788	10
Transportation	\$342	4	\$381	4	\$220	2	\$830	7	\$703	7	\$2,223	25	\$2,895	30	\$44,838	301
Legal Assistance											160	1			\$10,681	32
Others	\$96	1							\$348	3	\$359	3	\$103	2	\$17,216	65

Note: Historical figures may change slightly from report to report. "Other" services have historically included purchases such as employment, recreation, education, food, social reassurance, caregiver training, clothing, furniture, and other one-time purchases. In June 2016, the Medical Services category was incorporated into Health Care. In December 2016, the Scattered Site Housing category was added to track spending of the FY 15/16 CLF growth (prior to this time, CLF funded a very limited number of ongoing SSH patches). Note: CLF must contract year-round with a non-profit housing agency to reserve these units and ensure options are available when clients discharge from SNFs. Therefore, the total purchase amount listed may not be an accurate reflection of average cost per client served.

Client counts reflect unique clients with any transaction of that type.

Community Living Fund Six-Month Report

Enrolled Client Demographics

Age (in years)	Dec-20	Jun-21	Dec-21	Jun-22	Dec-22	Jun-23	Dec-23	Jun-24	Dec-24	Jun-25	Dec-25
18-59	30%	26%	26%	20%	24%	24%	18%	22%	29%	29%	26%
60-64	15%	15%	15%	15%	14%	15%	19%	19%	19%	15%	12%
65-74	28%	30%	35%	35%	34%	29%	36%	37%	29%	31%	31%
75-84	15%	19%	17%	20%	18%	20%	17%	16%	16%	18%	22%
85+	13%	10%	12%	11%	10%	12%	10%	6%	8%	6%	8%
Ethnicity	Dec-20	Jun-21	Dec-21	Jun-22	Dec-22	Jun-23	Dec-23	Jun-24	Dec-24	Jun-25	Dec-25
White	37%	37%	35%	32%	31%	37%	30%	25%	11%	12%	12%
African American	27%	25%	26%	25%	22%	23%	30%	30%	7%	11%	12%
Latino	13%	18%	18%	14%	13%	12%	12%	11%	8%	8%	8%
Chinese	10%	6%	5%	5%	3%	6%	4%	3%	2%	2%	3%
Filipino	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other API	3%	4%	5%	6%	5%	5%	6%	5%	3%	23%	21%
Other	3%	1%	1%	0%	0%	4%	4%	1%	1%	1%	4%
Unknown	5%	9%	11%	18%	24%	12%	13%	26%	68%	43%	39%
Language	Dec-20	Jun-21	Dec-21	Jun-22	Dec-22	Jun-23	Dec-23	Jun-24	Dec-24	Jun-25	Dec-25
English	78%	77%	76%	80%	82%	78%	78%	72%	38%	62%	42%
Spanish	11%	13%	14%	10%	10%	8%	7%	5%	4%	6%	4%
Cantonese	6%	4%	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%	1%	1%	25%	24%
Mandarin	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%
Russian	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%
Tagalog	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Vietnamese	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other	3%	5%	4%	4%	3%	9%	6%	4%	9%	3%	3%
Unknown	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	16%	51%	1%	25%

Community Living Fund Six-Month Report

Gender	Dec-20	Jun-21	Dec-21	Jun-22	Dec-22	Jun-23	Dec-23	Jun-24	Dec-24	Jun-25	Dec-25
Male	54%	55%	58%	55%	56%	54%	42%	29%	53%	53%	53%
Female	46%	43%	41%	43%	41%	42%	32%	23%	41%	46%	47%
Transgender MtF	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Transgender FtM	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
All Other (Genderqueer, Not listed)	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%
Incomplete/Missing data	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%	3%	25%	48%	5%	0%	1%
Sexual Orientation	Dec-20	Jun-21	Dec-21	Jun-22	Dec-22	Jun-23	Dec-23	Jun-24	Dec-24	Jun-25	Dec-25
Heterosexual	83%	80%	81%	81%	82%	78%	58%	41%	50%	63%	63%
Gay/Lesbian/Same Gender-Loving	9%	11%	10%	9%	10%	10%	7%	5%	7%	5%	5%
Bisexual	2%	3%	2%	2%	2%	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%	1%
All Other (Questioning/Unsure, Not Listed)	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Declined to State	4%	3%	3%	3%	3%	5%	5%	3%	4%	0%	0%
Incomplete/Missing data/Not asked	1%	3%	3%	5%	3%	5%	27%	48%	38%	26%	28%
Zip Code	Dec-20	Jun-21	Dec-21	Jun-22	Dec-22	Jun-23	Dec-23	Jun-24	Dec-24	Jun-25	Dec-25
94102 Hayes Valley/Tenderloin	17%	18%	16%	18%	17%	16%	16%	17%	13%	4%	9%
94103 South of Market	6%	6%	7%	10%	8%	8%	7%	13%	14%	4%	18%
94109 Polk/Russian Hill/Nob Hill	10%	10%	8%	9%	12%	9%	10%	7%	5%	2%	5%
94110 Inner Mission/Bernal Heights	6%	5%	4%	4%	3%	3%	5%	6%	7%	1%	8%
94112 Outer Mission/Excelsior/Ingleside	6%	6%	5%	3%	3%	3%	2%	1%	3%	1%	5%
94115 Western Addition	6%	10%	11%	9%	9%	12%	14%	14%	15%	6%	11%
94116 Parkside/Forest Hill	4%	4%	4%	2%	4%	5%	4%	4%	3%	1%	3%
94117 Haight/Western Addition/Fillmore	5%	4%	3%	2%	2%	2%	4%	3%	4%	2%	3%
94118 Inner Richmond/Presidio/Laurel	4%	5%	5%	4%	5%	4%	2%	1%	1%	1%	3%
94122 Sunset	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	5%	4%	5%	3%	2%	3%
94124 Bayview/Hunters Point	4%	5%	7%	7%	4%	5%	5%	7%	7%	1%	6%
94133 North Beach Telegraph Hill	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	2%	0%	2%
94134 Visitacion Valley	2%	4%	5%	7%	6%	7%	6%	4%	4%	1%	3%
Unknown/Other	26%	22%	23%	26%	22%	23%	24%	16%	18%	73%	22%
Referral Source = Laguna Honda Hospital/TCM	25%	28%	25%	21%	22%	27%	18%	11%	9%	7%	1%