Council Policy Prioritization: Early Consideration Response Form

Department	Housing Department
Department Rep. Name/Ext.	Jacky Morales-Ferrand
Policy/Ord. Subject	Emergency Interim Housing

Rules Date **9-22-21**   Item **G.3**

Council Member Sponsorship **CM Mahan**

Staff Recommendation

[✓] GREEN — The Administration can implement this Nominated Idea under its current workplan

[ ] ALREADY UNDERWAY   [ ] MINIMAL WORK LESS THAN 40 HOURS   [ ] REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

[ ] YELLOW — The Administration recommends Council send this Nominated Idea to the Priority Setting Process (See Complexity Level Below)

[ ] RED — The Administration recommends Council not adopt this Nominated Idea

[ ] NEEDS CLARIFICATION OR MORE TIME TO EVALUATE

Criterion to Determine Scale of Project Complexity

Project complexity is determined by scoring the project in each of the 3 criterions 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

c. High Complexity is a sum of 10 or greater.

Total Score = **10**

		Low Complexity		Medium Complexity		High Complexity	
Scoring Criterion	**Estimated Duration**	6 - 9 months	[ ] =1	9 - 18 months	[ ] =2	More than 18 months	[ ] =3
	Organizational Complexity	Can Easily be Absorbed into Existing Workplan	[ ] =1	Planned Work (Future)	[ ] =2	Work Not Currently Proposed	[✓] =3
	(Internal)	Have staff with required skillset/ knowledge	[ ] =1	Have staff with required skillset/requires moderate research	[✓] =2	Do not have staff with required skillset/ requires significant research	[ ] =3
		Less than or equal 2 Staff required	[ ] =1	3 - 4 Staff required	[✓] =2	More than 5 Staff required	[ ] =3
	(External)	1 Additional Departments	[ ] =1	2 Other Department Involved	[ ] =2	3 or more Depts Involved	[✓] =3

DEPT. Required

[ ] Airport   [✓] Housing   [✓] CMO   [ ] OED   [ ] PRNS   [ ] PD   [✓] PBCE

[✓] CA   [ ] ES   [ ] DOT   [ ] LIB.   [✓] PW   [ ] FD   [ ] EM

Explain the rationale for Staff recommendation, including any mitigating factors that need to be considered (recent legislative action, significant workplan changes, etc). Please address the following as well.

GREEN LIGHT: The Administration can implement this Nominated Idea under its current workplan. Item should be sent to Council to add to Department workplan. Explain how the Idea will be approached.

Items 1a-1c. As part of the emergency response, the City of San Jose EOC stood up an Emergency Interim Housing/Shelter Branch that delivered (3) similar projects to what is being considered in this proposal. The Branch was formed primarily with re-deployed City staff to explore, on an urgent and priority basis, potential sites by evaluating them for feasibility, viability, and fit. The long list of potential sites that have been reviewed several times primarily consist of remnant parcels owned by various public agencies and private entities. The vast majority of sites had fatal flaws or serious shortcomings to be viable sites for quick-build and cost-effective EIH solutions. Staff presented to Council an evaluation of the most viable sites in April 21, 2020.

A small City team can review the existing list again to determine if any of the initial significant challenges can be mitigated. Many of the sites that would be considered under this recommendation are ones that are already on the list of potential sites, with many having flaws and reasons why they have not made previous viability lists. Staff can return to Council with a list of potentially feasible sites, although identifying a site in every Council District without an EIH/BHC is not likely. A feasibility analysis would including determining suitable size, configurability, access to utilities, cost to deliver, among other factors. This initial analysis does not include determining viability of a site, which would require considerably more staff effort, including engineering and pre-development work, as well as work with Council offices to understand community fit.

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].

For questions, please contact Gloria Schmanek, City Manager's Office at (408) 535-8104.

A viability analysis as such would have severe impacts on existing workplans and City Roadmap priorities if additional resources weren't added (e.g. small part-time staff team) to coordinate work with existing staff that manages real estate, interim housing, and capital projects.

Importantly, beyond the construction costs for EIH sites, these locations also require ongoing operation costs that can range from $2 million up to nearly $4 million depending on a number of factors, including the population size and their needs. The City's five existing sites cost just over $14.6 million to operate annually. The City does not have a funding source to pay for these sites on an ongoing basis.

Related to the items requested under 1a-1c, the Housing Department is bringing to the City Council a proposal for Homekey application sites. This item is expected to go to Council in October. There are two additional rounds for Homekey where future EIH sites may be considered.

Item 2. The Administration has an existing protocol that allows for "local preference" of unhoused residents near emergency and interim housing sites, when the City is paying for the site operating costs. However, if the City leverages funding from other sources, for example HUD or certain state funding, it would not be able to prioritize local unhoused residents.

Item 3. The Administration can make a request of the Santa Clara County Executive to provide an analysis of County owned lands that may be suitable for quick-build, cost effective housing.