

Council Policy Prioritization: Early Consideration Response Form

Department City Manager's Office Rules Date 8/3/22 Item C.1
 Department Rep. Name/Ext. Omar Passons Council Member Sponsorship Councilmember Cohen
 Policy/Ordinance Subject Quick Build Interim Housing Considerations

Staff Recommendation														
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GREEN Adopt based on tradeoffs outlined on next page				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YELLOW Refer to Priority Setting or to Budget Process				<input type="checkbox"/> RED Recommend Council not adopt nominated idea				<input type="checkbox"/> NEEDS CLARIFICATION OR MORE TIME TO EVALUATE		
Staff Evaluation														
Is this aligned with City Roadmap?				Is this already underway in a Department work plan?				Is this time critical or an emergency?				Will this require substantial resources, staffing, budget, or strategic support?		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
Criterion to Determine Scale of Project Complexity														
Project complexity is determined by scoring the project in each of the 3 criteria below and then summing the score.														
a. Low Complexity is a sum of 6 or less. b. Medium Complexity is a sum of 7 – 9. Total Score = 13 c. High Complexity is a sum of 10 or greater.														
Scoring Criterion			Low Complexity				Medium Complexity				High Complexity			
	Estimated Duration		6 – 9 months <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = 1				9 - 18 months <input type="checkbox"/> = 2				More than 18 months <input type="checkbox"/> = 3			
	Organizational Complexity (Internal)		Can Easily be Absorbed into Existing Work Plan <input type="checkbox"/> = 1				Planned Work (Future) <input type="checkbox"/> = 2				Work Not Currently Proposed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = 3			
			Have staff with required skillset/knowledge <input type="checkbox"/> = 1				Have staff with required skillset/ requires moderate research <input type="checkbox"/> = 2				Do not have staff with required skillset/requires significant research <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = 3			
			Less than or equal 2 staff required <input type="checkbox"/> = 1				3 - 4 staff required <input type="checkbox"/> = 2				More than 5 staff required <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = 3			
(External)		1 Additional Department <input type="checkbox"/> = 1				2 Other Departments Involved <input type="checkbox"/> = 2				3 or more Departments Involved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = 3				
DEPT. Required	<input type="checkbox"/> Airport	<input type="checkbox"/> Auditor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CMO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CMO – Communications	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OED/CA	<input type="checkbox"/> ESD	<input type="checkbox"/> Fire	<input type="checkbox"/> HR	<input type="checkbox"/> IT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PRNS	<input type="checkbox"/> Police	<input type="checkbox"/> Retirement		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Attorney	<input type="checkbox"/> Clerk	<input type="checkbox"/> CMO – Budget	<input type="checkbox"/> CMO –	<input type="checkbox"/> Community Energy	<input type="checkbox"/> Finance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Housing	<input type="checkbox"/> IPA	<input type="checkbox"/> Library	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PBCE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PW	<input type="checkbox"/> DOT		

CMO Approval: /s/ Lee Wilcox Date 8/2/2022

Analysis
<p>Explain the rationale for staff recommendation, including any mitigating factors that need to be considered (recent legislative action, significant work plan changes, etc.). Please address the following as well.</p>
<p>GREEN LIGHT: The Administration can implement this Nominated Idea under its current work plan. Item should be sent to Council to add to Department work plan. (1) How will the Idea be approached? (2) If adopted, what is its impact and/or tradeoff to the City Roadmap or to a Department work plan, including strategic support? (3) What is the minimum viable scope to move the Idea forward and reduce its complexity?</p>
<p>Recommendation #1 aligns with existing work that is already well under way, including five community outreach and engagement sessions so far, the establishment of a webpage for dedicated community input on alternative sites, and a dedicated email with over 100 messages responded to thus far. Further webinars and in person sessions have been planned and existing webinars have been recorded and placed on the webpage for the public to review.</p>
<p>YELLOW LIGHT: The Administration recommends Council send this Nominated Idea to the Priority Setting Process due to (describe cost implications, workload impacts, or other factors).</p>
<p>The Administration responded to previous City Council and Rules Committee direction on Emergency Interim Housing (EIH) by bringing forth a comprehensive proposal on June 21, 2022. On that date, the City Council approved much of staff recommendation, and added additional work requirements. Recommendations #2a through 2c, #3 and #4 either require further clarity or create substantial additional burdens on staff resources due to additional work requirements. Additional information is below in the Analysis Section.</p>
<p>RED LIGHT: The Administration recommends Council not adopt this Nominated Idea due to (describe reason implementation would be difficult if not impossible – conflict with other laws, etc.).</p>

Analysis (Continued)

This memo includes recommendations that align with another memo before the Rules Committee, substantial recommendations that either require clarification or substantial additional resources to complete, and a recommendation that is different from Council direction on June 21, 2022.

Recommendation #2a seeks to evaluate the legitimacy of placing EIH on a park site, but assumes a question still at issue. The Administration is reviewing the historical record together with the Charter and other relevant materials to determine whether, as the memo states, the location is a park.

Recommendation #2b requires that all design work be paused while several additional steps are taken, which is not necessary to complete the evaluation sought. Further, the definition of "thorough" community conversation requires clarity to avoid disagreement about what standard would meet that definition. In addition, the requirement of responding to all community feedback establishes a barrier that may be resource intensive where, as has been the case already, dozens of individual form letters may be submitted with multiple follow up communications that can overwhelm staff's ability to complete the evaluation work being sought.

As to Recommendation #2c, the definition of "completely vetted" needs clarity to ensure agreement in advance on the standard to be met and the further requirement that staff's evaluation be corroborated by the community shifts the burden of using expertise, research and sound judgment from professionals trained to consider the various factors at issue to non-City employees. To the extent "corroborated" is meant here only to indicate that the evaluation must be shared with the community, this may be a workable option.

Recommendation #3 seeks to add an additional body of work to explore privately owned sites and consider public private partnerships for the siting of Emergency Interim Housing Communities. While there may be merit in considering all available and prudent options, this is an expansion of prior City Council direction that will require further staff resources to engage private property owners and assess the cost and feasibility of such options. This expansion is likely to have budget implications and given the scope of the need it would not contradict moving forward with the existing Council direction. This requirement was yellow lighted due to unknown budget and staffing implications at this time.

Finally, Recommendation #4 seeks to eliminate a deadline established by the City Council/Rules Committee to ensure that these emergency housing communities get built in a timely way given the substantial number of unhoused people who are unsheltered in the City. The impact of this recommendation would be to further delay enhancing quality of life for unhoused people and creating healthy neighborhoods for all residents by decreasing burdens related to unmanaged encampment locations.

Recommendations 2 through 4 have been recommended yellow because many of the recommendations contained add substantial, unplanned resource allocations, require clarity to be completed or create potential conflicts with existing City Council direction that must be resolved by the full Council. If the Rules and Open Government Committee desires to consider these recommendations they should move forward to the full Council.