



City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item-No Attachments (PDF)

File #: 14-0733, Version: 1

REPORT TO COUNCIL

SUBJECT

Discussion and Possible City Council action on a Temporary Cold Weather Shelter for the 2014 Winter and Options for Council Consideration

BACKGROUND

On July 15, 2014, Council directed staff to place a public hearing item on its August 12, 2014 meeting agenda for discussion of options related to development of a temporary cold weather shelter in Sunnyvale, following Council review of Information-Only Report to Council #14-0675 (**Attachment 1**) provided in that meeting's packet. Staff provided that report in response to Council direction at the Council Budget Workshop on May 22, following Vice Mayor Davis' request that Council consider allowing his task force, formed to find a replacement site for a new winter shelter facility, to use the Sunnyvale Indoor Sports Center (gym) to provide temporary, emergency shelter during the coming winter only.

The concept of a City-sponsored emergency shelter to replace the recently demolished Sunnyvale Armory building, formerly leased by the County for four months each winter for its Cold Weather Shelter Program (CWSP) was previously considered by Council as part of the 2013 study issues workshop held in January 2013. Study Issue CDD 13-14: "City options for funding a homeless shelter and/or other solutions to homelessness" was sponsored by then-Council Members Meyering and Davis (currently Vice Mayor). Council dropped this study issue at that workshop, consistent with the staff recommendation.

Since that time, Council has not directed staff to pursue development of a replacement cold weather shelter, although Vice Mayor Davis has noted several times during subsequent Council meetings that he had embarked on a personal effort to develop a new cold weather shelter in or near Sunnyvale, using private-sector funds that he intended to raise for acquisition of a site or facility for a shelter. As we are aware, he formed a community task force last year to assist with that effort. Staff has not participated in that effort, except that the Housing Division was directed to send a staff member to attend each task force meeting as an observer, in order to keep the City informed on the task force's progress.

Separately, the County has taken some action toward establishing a cold weather shelter and has provided reports to its Board, while working with North County cities to "identify a replacement facility and funding options for providing cold weather shelter services in Northern Santa Clara County." That direction did not include an appropriation for a new shelter facility, and the County adopted budget for FY 2014-15 did not include any funds for a new facility. County staff recently conducted the search for a replacement facility pursuant to the Board's direction and reached out to city staff from Sunnyvale, Mountain View and Palo Alto, and to several non-profit agencies. The City of Sunnyvale has responded to the County's inquiries and provided support as County staff has

evaluated potential sites. To date, as we understand, no concrete decisions have been made on the part of the County Board nor has a preferred site been selected. The County Board will be considering this topic at its August 26 Board meeting and, following this August 12 City Council public hearing, the City Manager will communicate the outcome of the Council's discussion and/or action to inform any related actions that the Board may want to consider on August 26.

History of CWSP and Transition to "Housing First" Model

For nearly twenty years, the CWSP was operated by Emergency Housing Consortium (EHC), a non-profit agency that recently changed its name to HomeFirst Santa Clara County (to reflect its new focus on permanent housing rather than shelters), at three locations: the Sunnyvale and Gilroy National Guard armories and at facility in San Jose. The CWSP was funded primarily by the County of Santa Clara during this entire time.

In 2005, the *Santa Clara County Task Force To End Chronic Homelessness In 10 Years*, comprised of County and City of San Jose elected officials, county staff, and various stakeholders, adopted a plan entitled "Keys to Housing: A 10-Year Plan to End Chronic Homelessness in Santa Clara County." That plan was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on May 3, 2005 (**Attachment 2**, Item 16).

According to a County press release announcing the plan's publication (**Attachment 3**):

"The Task Force is recommending a number of changes in the way homeless problem is addressed in Santa Clara County. Its goal is to completely eliminate homelessness over a period of time. **The most significant change recommended is to gradually phase out emergency shelters and identify permanent housing with supportive services**" [emphasis added].

Among a long list of recommendations in the 10-Year Plan was the following statement on page 21:

"Emergency shelters primarily serving chronically unhoused people should be converted as feasible to service-enriched interim housing; no additional emergency shelters for chronically unhoused people should be created."

During the May 3, 2005 hearing, then-Director of the County's Office of Affordable (OAH) Housing Marjorie Matthews highlighted "the central phrase of the plan, expressing the importance of shifting from homeless shelters to a 'housing first model'." Following the public hearing, the Supervisors voted unanimously to accept the 10-Year Plan and to direct OAH to work with the County-wide Collaborative on Homelessness to develop "specific implementation and funding recommendations" based on the 10-Year Plan.

Federal Policy Shift

The County's shift away from emergency shelters and toward other programs serving homeless people, and that of most other metropolitan areas in the nation, was driven in large part by a major shift in federal policy and funding priorities that began in the late nineties and grew stronger over the past fifteen years, known as the shift to "Housing First." This shift has been led primarily by the U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness (USICH) and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), in response to Congressional directives dating back to the late nineties to prove that federal spending on homelessness was effective, given that a significant amount of federal dollars had been provided for shelters and transitional housing for many years, yet the number of

homeless people nationwide increased during that time.

Researchers, advocates, and federal agencies interested in homelessness conducted numerous studies of the efficacy of shelters and related homeless programs, and of federal funding policies related to homelessness that influenced this policy shift. **Attachment 4** provides links to various articles on the development of the Housing First model and the federal policy shift. In May 2009, President Obama signed the HEARTH Act, which essentially adopted the Housing First approach as the new federal policy response to homelessness. The HEARTH Act renamed the former Emergency Shelter Grants program to the Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG) program, and revised its spending guidelines to shift the focus from emergency shelter programs to homelessness prevention activities, short- and medium-term rental assistance, and rapidly re-housing. In a 2012 interview with The Christian Science Monitor, HUD spokesman Brian Sullivan noted:

"There has been a complete paradigm shift in this country away from using emergency, big congregate shelters just to get people off of the street," says Brian Sullivan, spokesman for the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). This system is merely a band-aid with a big revolving door, and modeling our entire system of care on this wasn't having any meaningful impact in reducing homelessness, especially among the chronically homeless."¹

Local Impact of the HEARTH Act

In 2009, local homeless-serving agencies and advocates began development of a new two-year strategy for reducing homelessness within Santa Clara County based on the Housing First approach. That plan was formed by a group of homeless advocates and public and private agencies known as Destination: Home (D:H). In June of 2011, the County Board of Supervisors adopted its fiscal year 2011-12 Budget for the Mental Health Department, which administers the CWSP, based on the D:H Two Year plan. The County's adopted FY 2011-12 Budget document noted on page 495 that:

"Congruent with the commitment to the D:H Two Year Plan, the working group of Emergency Housing Consortium Lifebuilders, Destination: Home and the County are proposing a three-year proposal to close the CWSP.... There is ample evidence that supporting homelessness through shelters costs the County more in the long run than moving chronic clients to permanent housing. In 2014, the plan is to discontinue both armory shelters."

The County's 2005 and 2009 plans, which ultimately led to the County's 2011 decision to terminate funding for the Sunnyvale and Gilroy CWSP operations by 2014, reflect the impact of the HEARTH Act and revised federal and state funding priorities, particularly in relation to funding for nightly emergency shelters. In addition, many local agencies providing shelter and housing, from the Housing Authority to shelter providers, hospitals, and public health agencies, have had to make many changes to their programs and facilities due to the funding implications of the HEARTH Act.

Those involved with the D:H 2009 plan understood that, after twenty years of operations and community involvement, the impact of the closure would be felt by a small segment of shelter clients who returned year after year, and there would likely be some opposition to the closure by users, volunteers and advocates. In order to minimize these impacts, local agencies, including housing staff of local cities and the County, have been planning for several years to increase and/or develop alternative programs to offset the impact to the extent possible. Some of those plans have already been implemented, and some programs are still in the planning stages, pending local agency

approval and appropriations.

In recognition of the ineffectiveness and high costs of emergency shelters, and in keeping with the state and national policy to provide permanent supportive housing for homeless individuals, in 2013 the Sunnyvale City Council approved two new permanent supportive housing projects to provide affordable housing for very low income and homeless persons and families at the former Armory site. The first project is Parkside Studios, which will have 59 studios, for which the City and the County provided development financing to Charities Housing, the developer. This project is currently under construction and will be completed in 2015. The second project is the Armory Family Apartments, for which the City and the County provided development financing to MidPen Housing, the developer, for a 58-unit project with apartments ranging in size from one- to three-bedroom units. The total City financing for both projects exceeded \$10 million from the City's affordable housing funds, and the County provided \$4 million to the projects in federal and state funds for homeless and affordable housing. When complete, the two projects will provide 117 units of permanent supportive housing in Sunnyvale, with 47 of the units reserved for formerly homeless families and individuals.

Additional analysis concerning planning and impacts of temporary shelter option is explained in the Discussion section below.

EXISTING POLICY

General Plan, Housing Element, Goal E, Policy E.6

Participate in the County Collaborative on Affordable Housing and Homeless Issues [the CoC] to provide a continuum of care of services and facilities for the homeless. Facilitate and sponsor the provision of housing for homeless people if the Onizuka base conversion plan is approved by the federal agencies. Support local service providers that offer facilities and support services to homeless individuals and families, and persons at risk of homelessness.

2010-2015 HUD Consolidated Plan, Goal B: Alleviation of Homelessness

Help people who are currently homeless or at imminent risk of homelessness to obtain housing, employment or other sources of income, and adequate support services/ networks to achieve stability.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

No action requiring environmental review is contemplated at this time. Prior to taking any action that could reasonably be anticipated to have impacts on the environment, environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) would be required. If the use of City-controlled federal funds is contemplated, federal environmental review would also be required. If the County were to take any action with such a potential impact on any of its properties where it would serve as the permitting agency, the County would be responsible for all required environmental reviews.

DISCUSSION

RTC 14-0675 provided a brief overview of some of the issues that should be considered regarding possible conversion of the City gym to a shelter for one or more winter seasons, such as: loss of approximately \$170,000 per season in rents that would otherwise be paid to the general fund by current contractors for use of the gym for sports activities; likely opposition from current users of the gym facility; anticipated safety concerns of nearby residents and patrons of the Community Center and Senior Center, likely increased need for cleaning and maintenance of the buildings, grounds, and

parking surfaces due to increased use by prospective and actual shelter users; and the need for public outreach, environmental review, and funding appropriations prior to making a formal decision regarding use of the facility.

Next Steps

If Council wishes to lead or participate in the development of a new cold weather shelter, there are a number of concrete decisions it must make in the very near term to ensure that staff has time to either continue its work with the County or begin to implement the required actions to establish a temporary cold weather shelter, under an extremely accelerated time line of about three and a half months. Staff has prepared a decision tree diagram (**Attachment 5**) to illustrate several potential paths forward. Several key decision points shown on that diagram, and related analysis are discussed below.

Decision 1: Continue to Support the County Effort, or City to Initiate New Service of a Temporary Cold Weather Emergency Shelter?

The City Council has the option to continue to support the County in its efforts to establish a north County Cold Weather Shelter and continue to work at the County's pace for deliberation on this subject. If the Council is concerned about the potential to not have a Cold Weather Shelter this season, the City Council could consider initiating its own service and directing staff to take accelerated action to secure a site, engage the community, and begin preparations. This, of course, would require that the City Council is supportive of implementing a new City service and makes the required resources available to support it.

As background, the CWSP Sunnyvale Armory facility provided 125 beds for a four-month period each winter. Clients had to line up each afternoon, and only the first 125 clients in line were accepted into the shelter for the night. Many prospective clients who were not among the 125 accepted into the shelter each night slept in the adjacent park and neighborhood, hoping to try again the next night. County data from 2013 indicates that well over 7,600 people in the County are homeless on any given night (**Attachment 6**), of whom only 9 percent are in North County (Sunnyvale, Mountain View and Palo Alto). A 125-bed facility would provide nightly shelter to only 1.6 percent of the total nightly homeless population in the County, at significant expense to the City (see **Attachment 7** for cost estimates), and without providing any additional assistance to help the clients obtain actual housing or supportive services.

The ineffectiveness and high costs of emergency shelters are the major reasons staff to date has not recommended replacing the CWSP facility, but instead recommended assisting the development of 117 units of permanent supportive housing currently under construction at the former Armory site with over \$10 million in City housing funds. In addition, Council approved increased funding for the WorkFirst Sunnyvale and Tenant-Based Rental Assistance programs, the City's primary programs for homeless residents, in 2014-15. Total funding for these two programs in the current fiscal year alone is nearly \$550,000.

If the City decides to initiate a new emergency shelter service and takes the lead in providing this service, it will bear all responsibility and liability for funding, permitting, operating and regulating the facility/program, and staff anticipates that the County may cease providing this service in the future in North County, and the City would have to absorb a new service that it had not planned for during

its budget deliberations: thus, requiring budget modifications to put in place the required level of resources.

Development of a new emergency shelter would cost millions of dollars. The costs to operate a shelter for one four-month season at the City's gym are estimated to be well over half a million, as shown in **Attachment 7**. This includes an estimated \$75,000 in start-up costs and \$645,000 in operating costs, such as: additional contract or regular staff to handle community outreach, operations, public safety, and maintenance needs, as well as the loss of nearly \$200,000 in rental revenues from the gym and other activity fees at the campus, currently included in the projected revenues in the FY 2014-15 budget. Not included in the cost estimates are any additional legal expenses or damage claims that could arise from litigation or claims against the City in response to the change in use and/or operation of the shelter.

County Executive Jeff Smith and City Manager Deanna Santana discussed the County's position on a financial contribution to the City of Sunnyvale should the City Council determine that the most expeditious method to secure this service would be to have the City provide it at the gym. While the County continues to look for sites, the County Executive did state that if the City wishes to pursue the gym on its own that it would be willing to make a considerable "fair share" contribution to assist the City with providing these services. City Manager Santana explained the proposed costs and County Executive Smith suggested that he'd be willing to take to the County Board a request for up to \$400,000, which would be entirely subject to the Board's approval. Prior correspondence from the County reflected an interest in appropriating funds for a temporary cold weather shelter, managed by the County, in an amount of approximately \$200,000. Given that the final decisions on the part of the Board or Council are unknown, both agreed to discuss an exact amount contingent on the City Council's final action (the City Service Delivery Option) and determine if an appropriation is needed by the County Board on August 26.

If the County takes the lead in funding a replacement shelter and/or alternative programs, which will be discussed at the County's August 26th hearing, the City can contribute any amount of funding it chooses to those County initiatives, without incurring primary responsibility for funding and all associated issues. Allowing the County to continue to take the lead in addressing homelessness is consistent with federal, regional and local plans and budgets on this issue, and essentially retains the status quo that has been in place for the last twenty years of CWSP operation. The City of Sunnyvale has a well-established commitment to supporting the County with this service and can continue to support the County as it has in the past, or the Council can decide to provide a higher level of support in the following categories:

- A. Funding Appropriation
- B. Dedication of City Property/Facilities and/or Acquisition of Site
- C. Commitment of Staff Time
- D. Procurement of Additional Staff (Contract or Temporary)
- E. Deferral of Other High Priority Projects as needed

Decision 2: Determining City Resources and Appropriate Process

If the City chooses to take the lead in providing a new emergency shelter service for North County, staff will require some direction in order to proceed with development of plans for the new

facility/program. Separately, the Council should consider the potential costs and liabilities associated with such an action and additional staff work may be required to ensure minimum risk to the City.

Several key City resource parameters to be determined, as noted on the Decision Tree Diagram, are:

- A. Funding Appropriation
- B. Dedication of City Property/Facilities and/or Acquisition of Site
- C. Commitment of Staff Time
- D. Procurement of Additional Staff (Contract or Temporary)
- E. Deferral of Other High Priority Projects as needed

Additional factors to be determined by Council include the desired process (study issue, budget issue, new capital project, etc.) it would like to use in considering shelter options for the long term.

If Council wishes to make the City's gym available for this winter season only, an accelerated work plan must be established to allow for all of the required tasks to be completed within the next three and a half months, including: budget modifications; public noticing and community outreach; environmental review; termination of contracts with existing users; negotiations of legal agreements/leases with the County and other parties that may be involved; procurement of additional city staff and/or contractors to implement the program; procurement of supplies, such as additional temporary floor coverings for the wood floor to protect it during daily food service operations; and retrofits to the facility, such as installation of 220 volt outlets required for food service, as noted by HomeFirst during their tour of the facility.

The CWSP program has traditionally opened on the Monday after Thanksgiving each year. This year that will be December 1. The CWSP typically closes on the last day of March, but the lease term has historically run through April 15 to allow the operator to make any needed repairs to the facility after the program vacates, and/or to stay open for additional nights if any extreme cold weather events occur in early April.

Decision 3: Select Preferred Alternative

If Council provides staff with sufficiently detailed direction pursuant to the first two decision points, staff would study the alternatives and return to Council with a range of alternatives and a recommendation. At that point Council could select a preferred alternative, which is Decision Point 3. Staff has mentioned some of the conceivable options in **Attachments 7 and 8**, which are also discussed briefly below, but until Council has provided more detailed direction regarding the level of resources Council is willing to contribute to this effort, and a more clearly stated, outcomes-oriented goal for the effort, staff cannot fully evaluate the range of possible alternatives.

Options Identified to Date

As noted in a County letter to the City dated June 26, 2014 (included in **Attachment 1**) the County currently owns a vacant property at Fair Oaks and E. California Avenue. The County could locate a cold weather shelter facility on this property without any discretionary permit or further authorization from the City. That property is nearly two acres in size, is currently vacant, and is located in a sizeable neighborhood of single family homes just south of Central Expressway. While authorization from the City would not be required, staff would advise the County to engage the residents of the

adjacent neighborhood in a public outreach process if it wishes to explore this location for a shelter. County staff is considering installing modular units or other temporary structures on this site or possibly elsewhere as one potential temporary shelter option. The County has also inquired with City staff several times about using the City's property on the former Onizuka Air Force Station, which is 4.6 acres in size, and is vacant except for a satellite dish and a small building. Staff has indicated that Council has not yet made any decisions regarding future use of that property, but various private parties have shown interest in developing it. Council may wish to provide direction regarding this site as part of Decision 2 noted above.

In addition to the options noted above, another alternative site is the homeless services center located at 297 Commercial Street in San Jose, called the Georgia Travis Center (GTC), which is currently underutilized and has adequate space available to accommodate a seasonal cold weather shelter with up to 125 beds. The only apparent reason this facility is currently not being used for emergency shelter is due to a lack of operating funds. The Center's operator, InnVision Shelter Network, recently responded to the County's request for new shelter proposals with a proposal to set up a winter shelter comparable to the former CWSP Sunnyvale facility, using the underutilized space at the GTC. Although it is located in San Jose, not Sunnyvale, this is likely a more convenient location for most prospective clients, since 91 percent of the County's homeless population resides in San Jose or in central and south County locations, as shown in **Attachment 6**. In addition, many of the agencies providing supportive and health care services to these clients are also located in San Jose, not far from the Georgia Travis Center, including several homeless services provided at the Center itself.

As an alternative to a shelter, Council could provide funding for other programs that address homelessness, consistent with the HEARTH Act, the County's 10-Year Plan, the Housing First approach, the City's HUD Consolidated Plan and Action Plan, and Housing Element. Staff has provided a list of programs (**Attachment 8**) which are currently being implemented or investigated by the County Mental Health Department, in partnership with various agencies, including the City of Sunnyvale, and the costs associated with each. Council could appropriate full or partial funding for one or more of these programs, which could be contingent on matching funds being committed by the County and/or other local jurisdictions, in lieu of developing a new shelter at the City's gym or in another Sunnyvale location.

Some of these alternatives include the Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA) and Inclement Weather Programs. As mentioned above, the City currently operates a TBRA program in partnership with the County and several non-profits, using its federal HOME grants. The program has already housed fifteen formerly homeless or at-risk households in the first year of operation, by providing rental subsidies and case management for up to two years per household. Funding included in the City's FY 2014-15 budget expanded the program's capacity to up to 22 households. Additional funds could be appropriated to augment the current TBRA contract with the County to enable more homeless clients to move into rental housing and receive supportive services to help them regain self-sufficiency.

Supportive services such as the CDBG-funded WorkFirst Sunnyvale program work in tandem with TBRA to enable homeless residents to obtain regular paid employment and regain self-sufficiency, so that they are able to retain their rental housing after the end of the TBRA assistance. The operators of that program have also indicated that demand for the program exceeds funding available, so

additional funds could be put to use quickly for that purpose, in proportion to any increase in TBRA funding.

The potential “Inclement Weather Program” would take advantage of existing facilities that could be opened up on nights when freezing temperatures are predicted, to provide shelter from extreme cold only on such nights. Facilities could include public or private facilities, such as church buildings or public community center rooms. The program would include participation of the county-wide Emergency Response network, which includes public safety officials that typically respond to weather emergencies, and would rely on non-profit outreach teams to go into encampments and other areas to assist homeless people to locate and transit to the shelter locations.

Funding for this type of alternative, which would ideally be contributed by most of the local governments in the County on some sort of pro-rata basis, would pay for staff time and supplies of the outreach teams and potentially costs associated with use of the spaces, such as increased insurance costs and facility staff time. Council could authorize use of the gym or another City facility for the inclement weather program at significantly lesser cost and impact to other users than a full four-month winter shelter program would have, since the program would likely only be triggered for less than ten nights per winter, based on recent weather data.

FISCAL IMPACT

Fiscal impact will depend on which path Council chooses to take, following the Decision Tree outlined above. The staff recommendation would have no fiscal impact. The estimated costs for the City to develop a new emergency shelter program at the City’s gym or at an alternate location (**Attachment 7**) range from \$75,000 to nearly \$15 million in capital costs, depending on site acquisition/retrofit/construction costs, if any; and from nearly \$400,000 to \$650,000 in operating costs for each four-month season of operations, depending on location. Due to its high cost, acquisition of an alternate site would require that a financing option be considered, such as issuing bonds or obtaining other loans or grants. Given the additional time and effort required for this option, it is unlikely that it is feasible to complete in time for the upcoming cold weather season, or even the following season.

Locating a shelter at the City’s Community Center for one season would require a \$720,000 appropriation from the City’s Budget Stabilization Fund. This amount includes the cost to establish a shelter and operate it for one year as well as \$200,000 in projected revenues that would be lost from planned Community Center rental and user fees. The General Fund could absorb this as a one-time cost, however if the service were to become permanent, given current budget assumptions, it would put the General Fund out of balance in the second ten years of the plan. Therefore providing an ongoing service would potentially constrain the ability to meet other community demands going forward.

Should Council choose to appropriate funds to one or more of the homeless-serving programs listed in **Attachment 8**, start-up costs would range from \$5,000 to \$54,000 and ongoing costs would range from \$47,000 to \$500,000. As with the City-owned and operated option, providing this service for one year could be absorbed by the General Fund, however making a permanent appropriation, depending on the option chosen, could significantly affect the long term financial health of the fund. All of the City’s available CDBG and HOME funds, which could potentially be used for some of the programs described in Attachment 8, have already been fully appropriated and granted to a variety of agencies for projects currently underway, many of which are the homeless-serving programs and projects noted above, so those funds are not available for new projects at this time. Future CDBG and HOME grant amounts will not be announced until May of 2015, at

which time their potential use for new homeless programs could be considered.

Public Outreach Efforts

Before developing a proposal for a cold weather shelter that would involve a significant change in use of a City facility, particularly one funded with park and recreation funds and user fees, or a proposal to develop a new shelter elsewhere, applicable City policies and state laws require the City to conduct adequate public outreach prior to making any commitment of funds and/or property. In order to initiate a public outreach process, the project/program goal, location or range of possible locations and other related project information should be defined. Public outreach meetings typically present the following types of basic information about a new project or program:

- Project goal;
- Target clientele;
- Project budget and source(s) of funding;
- Project location or possible locations;
- Parties involved in the project and their roles;
- Significant laws or regulations applicable to the project;
- Anticipated level of environmental review;
- Project timeline (for development/completion as well as operating time frame);
- Anticipated impacts to other stakeholders/residents

If Council decides to initiate a temporary cold weather shelter program, staff will need Council to clarify its intentions regarding the first five items listed above before staff can begin an effective public outreach process. Public outreach must be strategic and must be structured so as to avoid causing unnecessary fear or tension between residents' valid concerns and a much-needed service. Anything less will make what is already a difficult project more difficult, and with inadequate time.

PUBLIC CONTACT

Public contact was made by posting the Council agenda on the City's official-notice bulletin board outside City Hall, at the Sunnyvale Senior Center, Community Center and Department of Public Safety; and by making the agenda and report available at the Sunnyvale Public Library, the Office of the City Clerk and on the City's website. Staff has shared this report with County staff.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Provide direction to staff regarding each decision point listed above.
2. Appropriate general funds for one or more additional homeless-serving programs listed in **Attachment 8**, at Council's discretion, and direct staff to return with the appropriate Budget Modification action(s).
3. Provide other direction to staff.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Alternative 1: Provide direction to staff regarding each decision point listed above.

Staff recommends that Council vote on two separate motions to provide direction to staff regarding the first two decision points listed above, so that staff and the public clearly understand the direction Council wishes to take, and to provide parameters regarding resource allocation for any new shelter

development.

As an alternative, if, rather than developing its own shelter, Council wishes to provide funding for possible shelter programs initiated by local providers, and/or programs other than shelters that address homelessness, consistent with the HEARTH Act, the County's 10-Year Plan, and the Housing First approach, Alternative 2 could include a funding or partial funding commitment for one or more of these programs, which could be contingent on matching funds being committed by the County and/or other local jurisdictions, in lieu of development of a new shelter facility.

Prepared by: Suzanne Isé, Housing Officer

Reviewed by: Hanson Hom, Director, Community Development Department

Reviewed by: Robert A. Walker, Assistant City Manager

Approved by: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS

1. Report to Council 14-0675
2. 2005 County Press Release
3. Minutes of May 3, 2005 Board of Supervisors Meeting
4. Resources and Literature on Housing First
5. Decision Tree Diagram
6. Homeless Population by Location
7. Estimated Costs to Operate Shelter
8. List of Programs to Alleviate Homelessness

ENDNOTES

1. Quoted from article "How to curb chronic homelessness? First, a home!" by Andrew Mach, Contributor, *The Christian Science Monitor*, January 25, 2012