

## SAN JOSE Council Policy Prioritization: Early Consideration Response Form

<u> </u>			Housing					Rules Dat	е	9/28/2	9/28/22 Item C.1				
			Jacky Mo	orales-Ferrand	Counc	cil Member Sp	p Jones,	Foley, Ji	menez, M	1ahan					
		Actions F	Related to RV's	_											
,,		_					<del>_</del>			-					
		_					_								
Staff Re	commendati	on													
☑ GRI	EN Adopt l	based on tr	adeoffs	YELLOW Refer	g 🗆 RED	Recomme	nd Counc	il not	t 🗵 NEEDS CLARIFICATION OR						
	outline	d on next բ	page					adopt nominated idea			MORE TIME TO EVALUATE				
Staff Ev	aluation														
Is this a	ligned with Ci	ty Roadma		Is this already unde	•		Is this tim	e critical or a	n emerge	,			intial resources,		
				Department work p						staffing, budget, or strategic support?					
Yes				Yes ✓ No			Yes	<b>√</b> No			Yes	No			
	n to Determii				-lf +l 2										
Project	a. Low Com		•	ng the project in eac	on of the 3	s criteri	ons below a	na then sumr	ning the	score.					
	b. Medium (						Total S	Score = 14							
	c. High Com														
				Low Complexity				Medium Complexity				High Complexity			
	Estimated Duration		6 – 9 n	6 – 9 months			months			= 2   More	More than 18 months $\mathbf{\nabla} = 3$				
u	Organizational			Can Easily be Absorbed □= 1			ed Work (Fu	ıture)		= 2   Wor	Work Not Currently Proposed				
teric	Complexity			into Existing Work Plan  Have staff with required □= 1			staff with ro	auirad skillsa	+/ [4]	l- 2 Don	Do not have staff with required $\Box = 3$				
Cri	(Internal)			skillset/knowledge			Have staff with required skillset/				skillset/requires significant				
Scoring Criterion	(		Skiiisek	James y Mile Wiedge			and a moderate research				research				
Sco			Less th	Less than or equal 2 $\square = 1$			- 4 staff required □= 2				More than 5 staff required				
			_	staff required											
	(External)			1 Additional □= 1 Department			2 Other Departments Involved $\square = 2$				3 or more Departments Involved $\checkmark = 3$				
			Τ' .	□ смо –								1			
DEPT. equire	☐ Airport	☐ Audito	™ CMO	Communications	➤ OED/CA		☐ ESD	☐ Fire	□ HR	□ IT	× PRNS	☐ Police	☐ Retirement		
DEPT. Required	☐ Attorney	☐ Clerk	x CMO		☐ Community		☐ Finance	■ Housing	☐ IPA	☐ Library	□ РВСЕ	× PW	□ DOT		
			Budge	et	Energ	gy							<u> </u>		
	. /s/ An	nel Rins			9/28	8/2022									
CMO App	oroval: /s/ An				Date	,, <u> </u>									

Analysis
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.
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?
Recommendation 1 [GREEN] - The Administration will explore the cost and strategy regarding recommendation # 1 over the next three to four weeks and will report back to the Rules Committee. As required by the U.S. Dept of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), a comprehensive Point in Time (PIT) count of community members experiencing homelessness is completed by the Housing Department, in partnership with Santa Clara County, at least every two years, typically in January. The Housing department completed a PIT count in January of 2022 through a contracted company which included RV counts. To reduce duplication and strategically utilize information that is currently available, staff is requesting additional time to confirm which information collected in the PIT count aligns with the data request in recommendation #1.
If the information available does not sufficiently meet this request, the Housing Department will explore opportunities and costs associated with leveraging the next PIT countwhich is scheduled for January of 2023to collect the desired information. Staff will provide Council with scoping options related to this request; costs and staff resources needed are dependent on the ability to leverage existing efforts and the ability to collect the level of detail requested. The January PIT count will be completed by a contractor and will require the exploration of available funds to complete the work with the added requirements.  [Continued Below]
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).
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.).

Analysis (Continued)
Recommendations 2 - 5 [NEED MORE TIME TO EVALUATE]- As recommendations 2-5 are dependent on completion of #1, staff requests more time to understand what options are available to completing #1, and how the results of that analysis can be embedded in existing work vs what resources would be needed to meet the requested direction.



## SAN JOSE Council Policy Prioritization: Early Consideration Response Form

<u> </u>			Housing					Rules Dat	9-28-22	9-28-22 Item C.1						
			Jacky Mo	rales-Ferrand	Counc	Council Member Sponsorship C										
Policy/Ordinance Subject A		Actions Re	elated to RVs in	_		· -										
			of San Jos	se												
		_					_									
Staff Re	commendati	on														
☑ GRE	EN Adopt I	based on tr	adeoffs [	YELLOW Refe	g 🗆 RED	Recommer	nd Counci	I not	t							
	•	d on next p						adopt nom	ea	MORE TIME TO EVALUATE						
Staff Ev	aluation															
Is this a	ligned with Ci	ty Roadma		? Is this already underway in a				Is this time critical or an emergency?								
			Department work plan?					st	staffing, budget, or strategic support?							
Yes				✓ Yes N	0		Yes	<b>√</b> No			Yes	<b>√</b> No				
	n to Determi			<u> </u>												
Project				g the project in ea	ach of the s	3 criteri	ons below a	nd then sumr	ning the s	score.						
<ul><li>a. Low Complexity is a sum of 6 or less.</li><li>b. Medium Complexity is a sum of 7 – 9.</li></ul>							Total S	core = 8								
	c. High Com						Totals	0								
			Low Complexity				Mediu	ım Complexit	У		High Complexity					
	Estimated Duration		6 – 9 m	6 – 9 months		1 9 - 18 months				= 2 More	More than 18 months			□= 3		
_	Organizational		Can Eas	sily be Absorbed	<b>Z</b> =1	Plann	ied Work (Fu	ed Work (Future)			2 Work Not Currently Proposed □= 3					
erio	Complexity		into Existing Work Plan													
Srife	// · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Have staff with required		□=1			quired skillse		·						
Scoring Criterion	(Internal)		skillset/knowledge			requi	res moderat	e research			skillset/requires significant research					
cori			Less than or equal 2			3 - 4 9	staff require	taff required 🗸 =						□= 3		
S				staff required			5 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 -									
	(External)		1 Additional			2 Oth	er Departm	r Departments Involved		= 2 3 or n	3 or more Departments Involved □= 3					
		T	Departr	ment	<u> </u>						T	T .	Т			
DEPT. Required	☐ Airport	☐ Auditor	ĭ CMO	☐ CMO – Communication	ns OED/	′CA	□ ESD	□ Fire	□ HR	□ IT	<b>≭</b> PRNS	☐ Police	☐ Retir	rement		
DE	☐ Attorney	□ Clerk	☐ CMO – Budge		☐ Community Energy		☐ Finance	☐ Housing	□ IPA	☐ Library	□ РВСЕ	□ PW	× DOT			
CMO App	oroval: /s/ An	gel Rios			Date	3/22										

Analysis
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.
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?
Recommendation 1(a) - [GREEN] - Staff is planning to return to council late in November 2022 to discuss best practices related to designating RV locations within the City and the associated costs. This is in response to previous council direction from May 3, 2022 (see memo from Vice Mayor Chappie Jones and Councilmember Matt Mahan titled City Roadmap - Encampment Management Strategy, dated April 29, 2022).
Recommendation 1(b) - [GREEN] - Staff is currently conducting a small pilot program that is exploring both buy-back and limited repairs for vehicles and RVs valued under \$500 and is developing a process for RVs valued over \$500. Upon completion of the pilot, staff will communicate the pilot outcomes via an information memorandum; this will include costs for scaling if there were positive outcomes.
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).
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.).