Report Type: Action Items  
Meeting Date: 10/7/2013

Summary Title: Recommendation for one-time additional services in support of Palo Alto’s homeless

Title: Recommendation for One-Time Additional Allocation in the Amount of $250,000 Over Two Years for Support of Intensive Case Management in Connection with Housing Subsidies to be Provided by the County of Santa Clara for Palo Alto's Homeless

From: City Manager

Lead Department: Community Services

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Council approve a one-time City allocation of $250,000 to be disbursed over two years for support of its homeless outreach and placement plan and that the Fiscal Year 2014 allocation in the amount of $125,000 is authorized to be paid from the City Council Contingency due to the urgency of providing this service. The homeless outreach and placement plan will be comprised of intensive case management in connection with housing subsidies for the homeless to be provided by the County of Santa Clara (County). Further, the City Council directs staff to bring forward a Budget Amendment Ordinance in November to increase the City Council Contingency in the amount of $125,000 with a corresponding decrease of the General Fund Budget Stabilization Reserve and include funding of the Fiscal Year 2015 allocation in the amount of $125,000 in the FY 2015 Proposed Budget.

Executive Summary

Homelessness is a national concern and Palo Alto is not immune. Recent Santa Clara County Homeless Census figures put the local number of homeless individuals at 157 people residing in the city. During recent discussions on the overnight camping issue at the Cubberley Community Center, the Council proposed a one-time expenditure not to exceed $250,000 to augment homeless service programs in the Palo Alto community.
A newly formed Palo Alto Homeless Services Task Force (HSTF), convened by the Community Working Group, Inc., met to carefully review and forward an approach for the best use of the proposed $250,000 funding. The Homeless Services Task Force will continue to meet to create a long-term plan to inform the community on the complexities of the homeless landscape and strategies for addressing issues associated with these problems.

The recommendation forwarded for Council’s consideration combines a commitment by the County to provide housing subsidies with a City “match” to support the intensive case management services needed to house at least twenty homeless individuals.

**Background**

On August 13, 2013, the Policy and Services Committee discussed approaches to address homelessness issues City-wide (with special consideration of resolving problems at the Cubberley Community Center.) At that time, the Committee separately considered Ordinance # 5209 which amended the Palo Alto Municipal Code to add section 9.61.020 which established Community Facilities hours at Cubberley, Lucie Stern and Mitchell Park Community Centers, among other city facilities (see Attachment A-Staff Report #3977.) The ordinance was forwarded to the City Council for a first reading on August 19, 2013, (PASSED: 7-1 Berman absent, Holman no) and placed on the consent calendar for a second reading September 9, 2013 (PASSED 6-1 Berman and Kniss absent, Holman no.)

During the discussion on August 13, the Policy and Services Committee heard from many members of the public and concerned case workers and had a lengthy discussion on the issues at the Cubberley Community Center. The Committee heard testimony from neighborhood residents, individuals residing at Cubberley, service providers, homeless advocates and other interested individuals. The issue of homelessness is a complicated and regional issue that Palo Alto cannot solve or effectively manage on its own. However, the Committee agreed that immediate action was needed in several areas, one of which was the ordinance mentioned above. To address the concerns faced by the homeless, Council Member Klein made a motion to recommend to Council an investment in the creation of a multi-agency homeless outreach program to address the issues at Cubberley Community Center. The motion was approved as follows:

**MOTION:** Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Council Member Price to Recommend to the full Council:
1) That staff develop a program at a one-time cost not to exceed $150,000 to deal with homeless issues brought forward by staff,

2) Direct staff to have the details of the program ready for full Council consideration as soon as it is complete, or as soon thereafter for consideration and approval by Council,

3) Recommendation Number 2, page 7, “Funding match with Santa Clara County for housing subsidies” for an amount not to exceed $100,000 over a two-year period.

The recommendations above were made after staff reported that the Cubberley Community Center was being used as an unsanctioned place of residence for many unhoused individuals (see Attachment B – Excerpt from 8/19/13 Policy & Services meeting.)

At present, there is an average of eight individuals residing unsheltered on the campus and an additional 25 residing in vehicles in the Cubberley parking lot. The unsheltered number has decreased from an average of 20 since staff initially brought the issue to the Policy and Services Committee in August, perhaps due to the nightly patrols by the Palo Alto Police Department which have taken place since August 1st.

In regards to background information on homelessness in Palo Alto, according to data from the 2013 Santa Clara County Homeless Census and Survey, the county-wide homeless “Point in Time” count is 7,631. The number of homeless in Palo Alto is 157, which is down from 334 in 2005. According to local social service providers, a portion of that decline can be attributed to the creation of 88 single residency occupancy (SRO) units at the Opportunity Center, 132 SRO units created by Palo Alto Housing Corporation (approximately 35% went to homeless individuals), the efforts of the Downtown Street Team, who have housed over 100 Palo Alto homeless since their inception, and other limited available openings in housing programs that diligent case managers from local social service providers have sought out for their clients. However at the same time, Palo Alto lost 120 SRO units with the closing of the Craig Hotel and Palo Alto Hotel.

**Discussion**

In the staff report dated August 13, 2013, two proposals were forwarded for consideration for positively impacting homelessness in Palo Alto: (1) the HOT Team approach and (2) a funding match with Santa Clara County for long-term housing subsidies.
The Committee’s proposals commenced a multi-agency dialogue on homelessness, and thereafter the Community Working Group, Inc. convened a Homeless Services Task Force (Task Force) in order to work collaboratively on issues of homelessness in Palo Alto.

Task Force Collaboration
The newly-formed Task Force requested that they be given the opportunity to carefully review and forward an approach for the best use of the proposed $250,000 funding. The members of the Task Force included the Community Working Group, InnVision Shelter Network, Downtown Streets Team, Peninsula Health Care Connections, Momentum for Mental Health, Project We Hope, Palo Alto Housing Corporation and Santa Clara County among others. After careful review and discussion, the Task Force carefully analyzed how best to utilize a one-time contribution towards a problem that is very complex and requires a long-term plan and ongoing investment. The Task Force felt strongly that there is a need to work together to create a long-term plan to inform the community on the complexities of the homeless landscape and the need for ongoing funding to positively affect homelessness locally. While the Task Force looks forward to being in a dialogue with the Council on a longer-term plan, they appreciate the Council’s willingness to consider some immediate short-term support for housing people and that the approach of combining housing subsidies from the County with case management funded by the City is the most responsible and impactful course of action for this onetime support (see Attachment C – HSTF response to Council.)

The most salient point of discussion was that access to permanent housing is the most important ingredient to solving homelessness. While temporary shelters and other interventions are can be helpful, they ultimately do not solve the issue for the long-term. While investing one-time funds of up to $250,000 will by no means solve homelessness in Palo Alto, it could be leveraged with the County support to house 20 individuals. The Task Force and staff agree that this type of investing in long-term housing solutions will have the most significant and long-term impacts on homelessness in Palo Alto.

Therefore, with guidance from the Task Force, staff recommends the City collaborate with the County in an effort to provide permanent housing solutions for at least twenty homeless individuals utilizing housing subsidies provided by the County with funding for intensive case management provided by the City at a cost of $125,000 a year with a two-year commitment.

**
County-City Partnership

The approach works as follows: The funds will be allocated from the County’s AB190 Grant. The County funds will be used to assist individuals who: 1) have had contact with the criminal justice system; 2) have a high chance of recidivism per the Corrections Assessment and Interventions System (CAIS); 3) significantly impact county, state or local resources; and, 4) are homeless or at-risk of homelessness. This is due to the initial funding source of the County’s housing funds, which can be used in a variety of ways including as tenant-based or project-based rental assistance. County subsidies can go towards permanent supportive housing and/or long-term transitional housing. Permanent supportive housing means that the individual receives an ongoing rental subsidy to be able to remain in their housing unit and will be helped by an intensive case manager to obtain the services needed to remain stably housed. These will be prioritized for individuals who face significant barriers to achieving economic self-sufficiency. Staff anticipates that permanent supportive housing will be targeted to individuals who meet the Department of Housing and Urban Development’s (HUD) definition of chronic homelessness.

Long-term transitional housing is most often for a two-year period. These subsidies are targeted at individuals who need assistance in getting “off the street” and, it is hoped that with the benefit of a housing subsidy and the assistance of an intensive case manager (ICM), will be able to reach the point of stability to be able to transfer to a non-subsidized unit in the future, therefore “releasing” the transitional subsidy to be used by someone else. The County has budgeted $518,400 for the housing subsidies and the administration of the subsidies over 24 months.

Key to the success of these efforts is the work of the intensive case manager. Utilizing a “Housing First” approach, an ICM oversees the total provision of services to address the needs of the client to function at his or her best level in the community, often arranging for appropriate services and support. The ICM coordinates or provides mental health, social work, educational, health care, vocational, housing, transportation, advocacy, respite care, and recreational services, as needed. The ICM ensures that the changing needs of the client are met. The proposed $125,000 per year investment (for two years) by the City as part of the proposed recommendation would be utilized as follows:

- Case manager salary plus benefits and payroll taxes, Administration and Management,
- Supplies and travel expenses,
- Flex fund for the 20 clients. The flex fund is used for items such as a bus pass, rental application fees, storage fees, cell phones to stay connected with the client, interim housing options, security deposits, and move-in assistance.

Some of the specific duties of the intensive case manager include:
- Locate and assess each new client
- Arrange for a housing voucher
• Prepare client for housing (addressing both internal and external factors)
• Step one - Find a landlord that will rent to the client despite possible extenuating circumstances such as previous evictions, criminal record and how well they present. With a limited subsidy in a competitive rental market this is a very challenging.
• Step two is either a) stabilizing client in housing so that they can hold onto housing permanently (overcoming barriers to successful housing such as addiction, paying rent, adhering to a budget, etc.) or b) getting them to the point that they can take over their rent by the end of the subsidy (transitional housing.)
• Barriers that are faced by the clients include: substance abuse, mental health, disabilities, hygiene, past evictions, criminal history, lack of additional income, transportation, connectivity (sometimes it’s hard for case managers to even track down their clients without a cell phone). Misconceptions by landlords of the population or subsidy programs

To the extent that this program serves chronically homeless individuals, the County would require that the City utilize a case management agency that is part of (or agrees to become a part of) the Care Coordination Project (CCP) of the Housing 1000 Campaign (Housing 1000), which is coordinated by ‘Destination: Home.’ Destination: Home is a public-private partnership galvanizing the community to end chronic homelessness in Santa Clara County. The Housing 1000 Campaign is a county-wide campaign to house 1,000 chronically homeless men and women in Santa Clara County by the end of 2013. This is a local chapter of 100,000 Homes, a national campaign to house 100,000 over the next two years.

A community-wide project, the CCP was developed to ensure the effectiveness of services for this population by coordinating and monitoring intensive case management services, as well as providing professional development and improvement opportunities for participating case managers and agencies. The CCP also establishes data collection and performance standards for all participating agencies. Participating in the CCP also benefits the City because it would allow the City to access security deposits, move-in assistance, flexible housing funds, and potentially other housing resources for chronically homeless clients.

In Palo Alto, three local agencies are part of the Care Coordination Project; InnVision Shelter Network, Downtown Streets Team, and Momentum for Mental Health. The City has the ability to release a Request for Proposal (RFP) to select an agency to provide intensive case management as part of this collaboration with the County as well as provide direct oversight of the contract. However, after careful consideration, staff is recommending that the City instead enter into an agreement with the County’s Mental Health Department (MHD) and have them release the RFP and provide oversight of the intensive case management agency as they have the staffing and the direct expertise in homeless services to do so. The City would still retain the ability to create and oversee the referral process of those receiving the subsidies. Both the City and the County would oversee the project. In addition, by allowing the County’s MHD to contract for the intensive case management services, the program may be able to leverage Medi-Cal funding.
Selecting a provider will only be one part of the program. The selected provider, other service providers, the Task Force, the City and County Departments will have to work to:

1. Agree upon a referral and client selection process;
2. Identify interim housing options for willing clients;
3. For program clients, establish access to medical care, mental health services, dental care, and substance abuse services;
4. Identify specific workforce programs for all clients, especially those using the transitional program; and,
5. Identify and gain direct access to housing units, preferably in Palo Alto.

The agency selected to provide intensive case management as part of this Palo Alto effort will required to attend weekly County-wide meetings of the Care Coordination Project and keep very specific metrics on client progress that will be shared with staff and can be included in a progress report to Council after one year.

**Resource Impact**

Staff recommends an allocation of $250,000 to be disbursed over two years in equal parts for support of intensive case management in connection with housing subsidies for the homeless to be provided by the County of Santa Clara (County) using the City Council Contingency for FY 2014 and potentially using Stanford University Medical Center funds for FY 2015. Due to the urgent nature to fund the homeless housing subsidy, staff recommends allocating the funds from the City Council Contingency for FY 2014 and returning to the City Council in November with a Budget Amendment Ordinance to increase the City Council Contingency in the amount of $125,000 with an offsetting decrease of the General Fund Budget Stabilization Reserve.

It is important to note that a provision in the SUMC Development Agreement states that funding from this source requires an advisory recommendation from two representatives from both SUMC and the City, which the City Council may consider in its final decision. However, such a committee has not been formed yet.

**Policy Impact**

Development of strategies to address the needs of homeless individuals would be consistent with Policy C-20 of the Community Services Element of the Comprehensive Plan: “Support and promote services addressing the needs of the unhoused community.

**Attachments:**
• : Attachment A - Staff Report 3977 (PDF)
• : Attachment B - Excerpt from 8-19-13 P & S mtg (DOC)
• : Attachment C - HSTF Comments to Council 10 7 (DOCX)
Summary Title: Approaches to Homeless Programs and Ordinance on Community Center Hours

Title: Consideration of Approaches to Positively Impact Homelessness and Ordinance Regarding Establishment of Community Center Hours, including Cubberley, Stern and Mitchell Community Centers

From: City Manager

Lead Department: Community Services

Recommendation

Staff recommends that:

1. The Committee review alternative approaches for a possible multi-agency and service provider partnership that could have a positive impact on homelessness in Palo Alto.

2. The Policy and Services Committee recommend to Council an ordinance (Attachment A) that establishes hours of public access to the Cubberley Community Center and other City of Palo Alto Community Facilities as sunrise to 10:30 pm daily. Exceptions are allowed for duly authorized city employees or persons participating in city-sponsored activities, or other activities for which the City has provided written permission to utilize the grounds beyond the closing time. The ordinance also allows for the closure of specific facilities during portions of the day or the year as specified by the City Manager or his or her designee.

Executive Summary

Absent any restriction on hours of access, the Cubberley Community Center is being used by a growing number of individuals as a place of residence rather than a community center. As a multi-purpose public community center, with many preschool and afterschool programs on campus, the Cubberley Community Center has neither the appropriate facilities nor staffing to function in this capacity. Housing is neither the intended purpose nor appropriate use for the Cubberley Community Center. As Cubberley is currently open overnight, staff is concerned for
the safety and security of the Cubberley patrons, tenants, staff and the individuals residing on campus.

Staff has been meeting with social service providers and others on means to address the issue of homelessness and use of community facilities and is recommending transitional funding and service enhancements to increase homeless outreach effectiveness and access to better services and alternatives.

Additionally, staff recommendations have been developed to ensure that the core function of the community center and other City facilities, i.e., provision of a space for community events and programming is preserved by regulating hours of use (see Draft Ordinance).

Background
Since 1996, Palo Alto Municipal Code 22.04.320 has restricted access to City parks to between the hours of sunrise and 10:30 pm. There has not been a similar restriction on access to community centers, museums, theatres or City library grounds.

There have been five to 10 individuals camping on the Cubberley Community Center campus for a number of years, mostly in their vehicles. In the last two years, the number of over-night inhabitants has increased significantly at this location. Counts vary by night, but there is currently an average of 20 individuals residing unsheltered on campus and an additional 10-20 vehicle dwellers who reside in the Cubberley parking lot. Many of the vehicles leave during the day, but at least eight campers remain on campus at all times. Staff attributes the increase of individuals residing on campus to many factors, including the closure of the Clara Mateo Shelter in Menlo Park, construction closures at the Mitchell Park Community Center, Art Center, and El Camino Park.

Longer-term approaches to meeting the needs of neighbors and Cubberley patrons, as well as, individuals who are residing at Cubberley, include a proposed new municipal code ordinance defining the hours of designated public facilities and purposeful and specific outreach to the individuals residing at Cubberley and other City community centers, libraries and museums.

Overview of Issues at Cubberley
Many of the individuals residing at Cubberley observe the facility rules and their behavior causes no problems to others or staff. However, the actions of some others pose serious concerns. The key concerns are summarized below:
Day time:

1. Shower usage
   - Facilities are unmonitored, which is not consistent with best practices for a shower program.
   - Verbal disputes and physical altercations in the shower room.
   - Some Cubberley dwellers refuse to leave the shower facility by 8 am.
2. Storage of personal belonging on campus and in locker rooms.
3. Health and safety
   - Bathing and cooking in bathrooms.

Night time:

1. Safety concerns as reported by:
   - Staff
     - Aggressive actions directed at staff by some individuals including verbal abuse and threats to person safety.
   - Tenants
   - Visitors/program participants
2. Health
   - Urination/defecation in the open.
   - Dumping of vehicle sewage in bathroom sinks.
   - Cleaning of food items in bathroom sinks.
   - Bathing/shaving in bathroom sinks.
3. Drinking and drug use
4. Fights between individuals
5. Overnight sleeping on campus (in vehicles and unsheltered).
6. Trespassing into class rooms for purpose of overnight shelter.

Cubberley Facility Showers

Many of the vehicle dwellers and individuals leave the campus during the day, but come back at night, usually after 8 pm. There are no specific programs for individuals residing on the Cubberley campus. However, the women’s and men’s locker rooms are open to the public for showering Monday to Friday, from 6:00 am to 8:00 am and are currently only used by the individuals residing at Cubberley during this period.
Over a decade ago, the gymnasium showers were opened for participants in Foothill College Athletic programs starting at 7 am. In 2004, some individuals asked the Cubberley Facility and Human Services Manager if the showers could be opened at 6:00 am to accommodate their work schedules. Although not participants in a Foothill College athletic program, the staff approved the request. At the time there were no other free public showers available in the community. The original public shower times were 6:00 am to 10:00 am. However, after receiving numerous complaints from facility tenants such as Cardiac Therapy Foundation, and Foothill College staff and students regarding the behavior of some of the individuals using the showers, Cubberley staff reduced the hours to 6:00 am to 8:00 am in 2011. The use of the showers is neither a formal City of Palo Alto program nor an official policy, and staff has set a closure date for public use of August 31, 2013. This closure does not require an action by the Council.

Cubberley Safety Issues

Increasingly, concerns and complaints from the public, program participants and tenants about these behaviors of the individuals residing at Cubberley have been reported to staff at the Cubberley Community Center office. Other more specific complaints have centered on individuals or groups of individuals intoxicated, vehicles that remain in the same location for extended periods of time, lawn chairs that are set up next to RV’s, loud music coming from the parking lot on weekends, syringe needles found around campus, and encounters with half-dressed people going to the showers in the morning. The individuals residing at Cubberley also have reported concerns for their personal safety and health and sanitation violations they have witnessed by other individuals on campus, both in the hallways and in the showers.

The Cubberley Community Center custodial staff often report issues related to the individuals residing at Cubberley. For the night time custodial staff, the concerns raise exponentially. Only two custodians are on duty until 12:00 am. Their duties include cleaning and locking up the classrooms and bathrooms. They have witnessed numerous fights between individuals residing on campus, incidents of public drunkenness, cooking and cleaning of utensils and laundry in the bathrooms. At times, the janitors hesitate to approach an individual regarding their behavior due to personal safety concerns. Some individuals residing on campus also have approached staff to ask them to intervene with inter-personal disputes. Staff has called the Police Department when they become aware that criminal incidents have occurred. Over the past year, the Police Department has made a few arrests for battery and outstanding warrants on the Cubberley campus. However, for a majority of the calls for service, the Police do not make arrests. Most frequently, by the time the police arrive the parties have already left the scene or refuse to press charges against one another. Because either the Police did not witness the incident or because of a lack of victim cooperation, the Police was unable to take further action in regard to these incidents.
For a three-month period in spring 2013, Community Services felt the need to provide a security guard on campus at night to ensure staff safety after a threat was made to staff by an individual residing on campus. The Police Department filed a criminal complaint in regard to this incident and subsequently was able to obtain a protective order for the involved staff member.

*Claim Against the City for Injury Sustained in the Showers*

On June 10, 2013, the City received a claim for approximately $51,000 in damages filed by an individual as a result of a physical injury (fractured index finger) sustained by another individual residing at Cubberley while using the shower facility at Cubberley.

*Assault Incident on June 19, 2013*

On June 19, 2013, the PAPD arrested a man for assaulting another man on the Cubberley Campus with a deadly weapon. Witnesses informed the Police Department that both men resided at Cubberley and the assault was precipitated by a dispute over national origin.

**DISCUSSION**

During 2013, staff has been working to find approaches to address the issues at Cubberley Community Center. Meetings have been conducted with Community Services Department, Police Department and City Manager’s Office staff to gather information and analyze workable solutions. Staff also solicited feedback about their experiences with the individuals residing at Cubberley from all Cubberley residents and had more extended conversations with long term and larger key campus tenants. These conversations shed light on the scope of the issues.

Staff has also discussed the issues at Cubberley on several occasions with the key homeless services partners in Palo Alto including Downtown Streets Team, Inn Vision Shelter Network and Momentum for Mental Health, as well as, with the Community Working Group. Homeless services partners have provided regular outreach and/or support on the Cubberley campus and other City facilities and have been part of a larger conversation on possible approaches to addressing camping at City facilities and associated problems. In regards to the showers at Cubberley, social service providers have said the best practices for a homeless shower program are those that are staffed and monitored, which is not the case at Cubberley.

Many of the individuals residing at Cubberley are known to the social service providers and have been homeless for many years. Since many homeless individuals have mental health and/or substance abuse challenges, assisting them is not a matter of making a single contact. Service providers work to establish trust between provider and individual.
**Potential Approach - Response Plan**

While the Committee may consider a number of approaches, a proposed response plan was developed with the input and support of our key homeless social service partners to address immediate and long-term issues of homelessness in the community and individuals residing at Cubberley, as described below.

**Phase 1 – Immediate**

At present, under the leadership of the Downtown Street Team, the following actions have occurred or are on-going.

1. Assessment of individuals residing on campus
2. Monitoring of men’s and women’s showers:
   a. Informing shower users of pending shower closure.
   b. Providing Case Manager Outreach to individuals using showers.
   c. Providing incentives (including VTA bus tokens) to encourage individuals to start using showers at Opportunity Services Center.

**Phase 2 – Longer Term**

**Enhance Social Services**

Staff recommends developing a plan to enhance services for un-housed and under-housed individuals through one of the approaches listed below.

In all conversations with our homeless service partners on the most effective way to address the issue at City facilities, the need for a more comprehensive, community-wide approach was emphasized. The following longer term approaches were recommended by the homeless service providers and submitted for review by the Policy & Services Committee.

1. **Creation of a Palo Alto Homeless Outreach Team (HOT)**. A HOT team would serve to engage, case manage, transport and ultimately secure housing as available for the most challenging to serve homeless individuals with mental health and substance abuse challenges (individuals who have been residing on the street for extended period of time and are resistant to services, etc.). The approach would be tailored for each individual. Comprised of staff members of local homeless service providers (with a key agency identified), public stakeholders and other community partners, the team would focus first on individuals at the Cubberley site, and then expand their geographic scope to homeless residents of Palo Alto.
One of our key local homeless service providers, Inn Vision Shelter Network, has successfully implemented HOT programming in East Palo Alto, San Mateo and Redwood City. They have recently received awards to expand HOT programming to Half Moon Bay, Pacifica and South San Francisco. The approximate cost for a HOT team is $150,000 for one year. Funding of this program would need to be transitioned to other Santa Clara County or privately-financed programs after one year.

2. Funding match with Santa Clara County for housing subsidies. Staff has been in conversation with the Director of Homeless Systems for the County of Santa Clara on possible county funding of combination of transitional and long term rent subsidies for ten homeless individuals who primarily have had contact with the criminal justice system and have a high chance of recidivism and who significantly impact county, state or local resources. However, this would require a two-year, $50,000 annual local commitment to fund a case manager. Santa Clara County would match the City’s contribution each year at the same amount, $50,000. Management of such project would fall to the local homeless service provider who is the designated lead agency as selected by the County.

Ordinance
Staff also recommends the Policy and Services Committee recommend to Council an ordinance (Attachment A) that defines reasonable hours of public access to community facilities to be sunrise to 10:30 pm daily.

Additional Information-Demographics:
In regard to background information on homelessness in Palo Alto, according to the recently released data from the 2013 Santa Clara County Homeless Census and Survey, the number of homeless in Palo Alto is 157. For comparison, counts for our neighboring cities are; Mountain View – 137, Los Altos – 4, and Sunnyvale – 425 (count taken at time when winter shelter was open at the Sunnyvale Armory.) The county wide count is 7,631 (see Attachment B for summary of key census findings).

In its comprehensive 2011 Human Services Needs Assessment, the Human Relations Commission surveyed and held focus groups with homeless individuals and providers in Palo Alto (see Attachment C), and found that gaps in services to the homeless center around the need for more case managers to work one to one with individuals and available placements affordable housing.
Timeline

If the ordinance is recommended by the Policy and Services Committee, the ordinance would be presented for a first reading to the City Council in October 2013. The ordinance would go into effect thirty days after the passage of the second reading of the ordinance.

Resource Impact

Enforcement of the proposed ordinance would be accomplished with existing Police staff resources. No additional staffing is proposed at this time.

The resource impact for the development of social service outreach programs is dependent on the approach recommended by the Policy & Services Committee and approved by the Council. The approximate cost for a HOT Team is $150,000 per year. The funding match with Santa Clara County for housing subsidies would require a two year, $50,000 per year commitment on behalf of the City.

Policy Implications

Adoption of an ordinance regulating the hours and proper use of community facilities would be consistent with Policy C-9 of the Community Services Element of the Comprehensive Plan: “Deliver City services in a manner that creates and reinforces positive relationships among City employees, residents, businesses, and other Stakeholders,” as well as Policies C-22 (community facilities to have flexible functions to ensure adaptability to the changing needs of the community) and C-23 (expand the space available in the community for art exhibits, classes and other cultural activities).

Development of strategies to address the needs of homeless individuals would be consistent with Policy C-20 of the Community Services Element of the Comprehensive Plan: “Support and promote services addressing the needs of the unhoused community.”

Attachments:

- Attachment A - 0160023 Ordinance Closing Community Centers v5 FG (DOCX)
- Attachment B - '13 Homeless Census SCC Summarypage (PDF)
- Attachment C - Excerpt from Human Services Needs Assessment conducted by the Human Relations Commission in 2011 (DOCX)
- Attachment D - HSRAP-CDBG Support for Homless Related Services August (XLS)
ORDINANCE NO. _____

Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Amending Chapter 9.06 (Public Peace, Morals, and Safety) to add Section 9.06.020 – Overnight Use of Community Facilities Prohibited

The Council of the City of Palo Alto does ORDAIN as follows:

SECTION 1. Findings and Declarations. The City Council finds and declares as follows:

(a) The City Council hereby updates Title 9 of the Palo Alto Municipal Code to provide for overnight closure of public libraries, community centers, theaters, interpretive buildings, and Art Center is essential to maintain and promote the public health, safety and welfare, to provide for the continued effective management of public property, and to provide for the continued enjoyment and accessibility of public property by all Palo Alto residents and the public at large; and

(b) The overnight use of public libraries, community centers, theaters, interpretive buildings, and Art Center causes the City to incur increased costs for policing, maintenance, sanitation, garbage removal, animal control, and other problems which may arise; and

(c) The overnight use of public libraries, community centers, theaters, interpretive buildings, and Art Center hinders public access to the services provided at those facilities; and

(d) Public libraries, community centers, theaters, interpretive buildings, and Art Center are not intended for overnight use, during hours when the grounds are unstaffed and unmonitored, which creates a risk to the health, safety, and welfare of those persons on the grounds, as well as the public at large.

SECTION 2. Section 9.61.020 (Community Facilities Closed Midnight to Sunrise) of Chapter 9.61 (Regulation of Community Facilities) of Title 9 (Public Peace, Morals, Safety) of the Palo Alto Municipal Code is hereby added to read as follows:

“9.61.020 Use of Community Facilities Prohibited from Midnight to Sunrise

No person shall use, remain in or enter any Community Facilities between 10:30 pm and sunrise, other than a duly authorized city employee or persons participating in city-sponsored activities or other activities for which the city has provided written
permission to utilize the grounds beyond the closing time, provided however that the additional closure of specific facilities during portions of the day or the year may be specified by the City Manager or his or her designee.

For the purposes of this chapter, “Community Facilities” means all buildings and premises of City of Palo Alto Libraries, the Cubberley Community Center, Lucie Stern Community Center, Children’s Theatre, Community Theatre, Junior Museum & Zoo, Mitchell Park Community Center and Field House, Art Center, Peers Park Field House, Lucy Evans Baylands Nature Interpretive Center, Pearson Arastradero Preserve Gateway Center and Foothills Park Interpretive Center, but not any land dedicated for park use.”

SECTION 3. This ordinance shall be effective on the thirty-first day after the date of its adoption.
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PASSED:

AYES:

NOES:
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ATTEST:

____________________________
City Clerk

Mayor

____________________________
City Attorney

City Manager

____________________________
Director of

Director of Administrative Services
Every two years in January, communities across the country conduct comprehensive counts of their homeless population to gain a better understanding of the individuals who are currently experiencing homelessness, and to apply for federal funding for homeless programs.

The 2013 Santa Clara County Point-in-Time Count was a community-wide effort conducted on January 29th and 30th, 2013. In the weeks following the street count, a survey was administered to 856 unsheltered and sheltered homeless individuals, in order to profile their experience and characteristics.

**Sheltered Includes:**
- Emergency Shelter: 12%
- Transitional Housing: 13%
- Safe Haven: <1%

**Unsheltered Includes:**
- On the street: 31%
- Abandoned buildings: 9%
- Cars/vans/RVs: 16%
- Encampment Areas: 19%

**Gender**
- Men: 67%
- Women: 33%
- Transgender: 2%

**Ethnicity (Top 4 Responses)**
- Hispanic: 31%
- White: 28%
- Black: 22%
- Multi-ethnic: 8%

**First Time Homelessness**
- Yes (46%)
- No (54%)

52% of those experiencing homelessness for the first time had been homeless for one year or more.

**Duration of Homelessness**
- 30 days or less: 13%
- 1-11 months: 41%
- 1 year or more: 47%

**Age**
- 25+: 77%
- 18-24: 14%
- Under 18: 9%

**Obstacles to Securing Permanent Housing**
- No job/income: 54%
- No money for moving costs: 30%
- Bad Credit: 22%
- No housing availability: 18%

**YES!**

93% of survey respondents said YES when asked if they would want affordable permanent housing were it available.

**Homeless Census Nine-Year Trend**
- 2004: 7,646
- 2007: 7,202
- 2009: 7,086
- 2011: 7,067
- 2013: 7,631

74% Unsheltered, 26% Sheltered
What is a disabling condition?
A disabling condition is defined here as a physical disability, mental illness, chronic depression, alcohol or drug abuse, chronic health problems, HIV/AIDS, Post-traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), or a developmental disability.

64% of survey respondents reported a disabling condition.

WHAT MIGHT HAVE PREVENTED RESPONDENTS’ HOMELESSNESS (TOP 4 RESPONSES)

- Employment Assistance: 42%
- Mental Health Services: 34%
- Rent/Mortgage Assistance: 24%
- Alcohol/Drug Counseling: 21%

INCARCERATION

28% spent at least 1 or more nights in jail or prison in the past 12 months.

DISABLING CONDITIONS

- Mental illness* (53%)
- Substance abuse (17%)
- Chronic physical illness (12%)
- Physical disability (14%)
- Developmental disability (4%)

Note: Multiple response question, numbers will not total to 100%.

WHAT MIGHT HAVE PREVENTED RESPONDENTS’ HOMELESSNESS (TOP 4 RESPONSES)

- Employment Assistance: 42%
- Mental Health Services: 34%
- Rent/Mortgage Assistance: 24%
- Alcohol/Drug Counseling: 21%

EMERGENCY ROOM USE in the past 12 months

- Never: 49%
- 1-3 times: 35%
- 4+ times: 16%

SERVICES & ASSISTANCE

Government services received (Top 3 Responses)

- CalFresh, WIC or food stamps: 61%
- General Assistance: 38%
- SSDI: 15%

Reasons for NOT receiving government services (Top 3 Responses)

- Don’t need government assistance: 35%
- Don’t think you are eligible: 23%
- Income Gap: 19%

Income Gap

- Respondent’s Income: $250/mo
- Self-Sufficiency Standard: $2,900/mo

PANHANDLING

$5.90 per day is the average income for those survey respondents who reported panhandling.


For more detail or to view the comprehensive report, please visit www.appliedsurveyresearch.org.

Summary

These data provide a snapshot of those experiencing homelessness in Santa Clara County on January 29th and 30th. It provides a basic estimation of the number and characteristics of those experiencing homelessness on any given night in order to inform future service planning and provisioning efforts.
Excerpt from Human Services Needs Assessment conducted by the Human Relations Commission in 2011.

Homelessness (including permanent and temporary housing and the assistance needed to get into and remain in housing)

**Definition:** Estimates vary of the number of homeless in Palo Alto from 200 – 400. Homelessness takes a number of forms, of which these three predominate:

1) Situational or transitional: This is when someone is forced into homelessness because of uncontrollable circumstances such as losing a job and loss of the main breadwinner (father, husband, wife), etc. Also in this category are those with an urgent need for temporary shelter because of domestic abuse.

2) Episodic or cyclical: This is when a person repeatedly falls in and out of homelessness, as often happens with drug addicts and with people experiencing mental health issues. A person might live with episodes of severe depression and fall back in homelessness when these occur.

3) Chronic: This is when an individual is on the street for a long period of time and has very few or no resources at his or her disposal to modify their situation. Often, these people will suffer from mental health issues. They won’t have the ability to modify their situation without the support of others.

**Needs:** Of the basic needs, emergency and permanent housing for low-income residents is in the shortest supply. What is available for permanent housing in Palo Alto (rental and for purchase) has come from the Palo Alto Housing Corporation, Community Working Group, Opportunity Center, CDBG- and other publically-assisted low-income housing, and Section 8 vouchers through the Santa Clara County Housing Authority. The Opportunity Center also provides emergency shelter through the Hotel de Zink program with a 15-bed rotating-shelter for men, hosted by Palo Alto area faith communities. This year there was also a Hotel de Zink for women, run by a Stanford student group called Night Outreach. It operated under the auspices of the Opportunity Center. Students raised the money, but there is uncertainty about whether they can come up with the money to do so again. It closed at the end of April.

There are no other homeless shelters in North County; the Clara-Mateo Shelter at the VA in Menlo Park closed last year. The closest resource is the National Guard Armory in Sunnyvale that provides 125 beds, but is only open from November – March. Most other homeless shelters are in San Jose and have waiting lists. One key area where HSRAP enters the picture is through the services that help qualify individuals for such housing. That involves primarily mental and physical health care, employment, treatment and control of substance abuse, and other supports unique to individuals.

Right next to housing itself is the interpersonal support to get homeless individuals into it and to provide the encouragement, assistance, and, as necessary, interventions to keep them in it. This is where case management or a comparable framework is crucial. Case management combines expertise, trust, and commitment to deal with issues such as landlord disputes, bouts of joblessness, regression regarding substance abuse, and the like—and to provide encouragement, to pave paths to increasing independence, and to move someone out of dependence so that another can be helped. A prime Palo Alto example of a program that amplifies case management is the Downtown Streets
Team (DST) where a job, housing, and personal support can lead to increasing independence. Through its collaboration with Manpower, Inc., the DST links individuals with potentially permanent jobs and the coaching and guidance to capitalize on the employment opportunity.

Because Palo Alto is generally seen as a generous community, where temporary assistance, panhandling, and respectful police enforcement attenuate the pressure on the homeless to take initiative toward independence, our community is perceived on balance, as friendly to those who are un-housed. This does not mean it is problem-free, or that homeless individuals don’t need assistance to move toward self-sufficiency. But it does explain why, compared to neighboring towns, Palo Alto appears to have greater numbers than they of homeless and panhandlers. Downtown merchants have longstanding concerns about this, and the Police Department has assigned a special patrol to insure safety and cleanliness in the University Avenue area and associated parks and parking lots.

**Providers:** Four agencies have programs in Palo Alto serving the homeless. All are HSRAP grantees. The InnVision-Opportunity Center’s services include assistance for singles and families in need, providing for basic needs, case management, food, showers, laundry, computer lab, health care, lockers, and children’s activities, and oversees the “breaking bread” program (which is a free hot meal program at local churches), a food closet at a local church, permanent housing for singles and families, and temporary rotating shelter program. Downtown Street Team (DST) members work in a variety of capacities in exchange for vouchers for food and other necessities. DST also provides participants with case management, transportation assistance, temporary and permanent housing as available and job search skills to work toward greater skills and independence. Momentum for Mental Health, a county-wide agency, provides a variety of mental health services. HSRAP funding supports a 12-hour homeless outreach specialist who is employed by Momentum. Peninsula Health Care Connections provides free medical, psychiatric and intensive case management for the homeless and those at risk of being homeless.

**Interrelations:** The agencies in Palo Alto listed above work very closely together. The City’s Office of Human Services facilitates a bi-monthly meeting of North County homeless services providers called the Off the Streets Team, where the discussion usually centers on the needs of clients. The Police Department facilitates a monthly meeting called North County Alternative Services, comprised of personnel from the Police Department, Office of Human Services, District Attorney’s office, Veteran’s Administration, and County Mental Health service providers, among others. This group works on a restorative justice model to work with the homeless who are in frequent contact with the criminal justice system to connect them with housing and services.

**Gaps:** All of the agencies working with the homeless are dealing with the basic needs of a very vulnerable segment of our population. A key finding of this report is the importance of meeting basic needs first and is highlighted by Philip Dah, Executive Director of the Opportunity Center who said “Basic needs are, indeed, food, clothing, and shelter. Those needs need to be met before a person can pay attention to medications, physical and mental health, looking for work, etc., and before a case worker can get any traction on other problems.” Beyond basic needs, homelessness requires special, usually one-on-one, relationships with case workers or similarly dedicated professionals to move from homelessness to independence and housing. Finally, the housing needs to be there as do services that enable the formerly homeless to maintain this new level of independence.
## FY 2014 Funding for Homeless Service Programs

### (HSRAP/CDBG)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agencies providing homeless services</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
<th>2008-09 Funding Amount</th>
<th>2009-10 Funding Amount</th>
<th>2010-11 Funding Amount</th>
<th>2011-12 Funding Amount</th>
<th>2012-13 Funding Amount</th>
<th>2013-14 Funding Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HSRAP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Technology Alliance</td>
<td>Support for program operating expenses to provide technical tools to partnering agencies addressing chronic homelessness; provides a phone number for homeless and at-risk individuals to improve their access to employment, housing, and other social services.</td>
<td>$12,700</td>
<td>$12,065</td>
<td>$12,065</td>
<td>$5,432</td>
<td>$5,432</td>
<td>$5,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Streets Team</td>
<td>Staff salaries and program expenses to provide a work-first model geared toward the homeless and at-risk individuals in the community through training, weekly success team meetings.</td>
<td>$37,700</td>
<td>$35,815</td>
<td>$35,815</td>
<td>$33,666</td>
<td>$33,666</td>
<td>$36,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InnVision Shelter Network</td>
<td>Staff salaries to operate Opportunity Services Center's nutrition program including daily meal and grocery programs.</td>
<td>$8,920</td>
<td>$8,920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Momentum for Mental Health</td>
<td>Staff salary for Homeless Outreach Specialist who conducts direct street outreach to locations in Palo Alto and provides in person training to public and private entities in Palo Alto on homelessness.</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$25,650</td>
<td>$25,650</td>
<td>$24,111</td>
<td>$24,111</td>
<td>$25,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula HealthCare Connection Inc</td>
<td>Staff salary for outreach case worker who will seek out homeless individuals who are suffering from various untreated mental and medical conditions; work to secure housing and monitor the client's progress and keep them connected to the various medical, psychiatric and counseling services.</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$26,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$77,400</td>
<td>$73,530</td>
<td>$73,530</td>
<td>$97,129</td>
<td>$97,129</td>
<td>$106,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FY 2014 Funding for Homeless Service Programs (HSRAP/CDBG)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>Staff salaries for case workers to handle intake for drop in clients at the Opportunity Services Center.</th>
<th>$ 31,160</th>
<th>$ 34,211</th>
<th>$ 50,000</th>
<th>$ 37,175</th>
<th>$ 48,852</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>InnVision the Way Home</td>
<td>Staff salaries for emergency shelter</td>
<td>$ 36,361</td>
<td>$ 33,068</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto Housing Corp</td>
<td>Staff salaries for SRO Resident Support</td>
<td>$ 31,160</td>
<td>$ 34,211</td>
<td>$ 26,000</td>
<td>$ 20,375</td>
<td>$ 32,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Steets Inc.</td>
<td>Staff salaries and operational expenses (supplies) for workforce development program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 280,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 98,681</td>
<td>$ 101,490</td>
<td>$ 76,000</td>
<td>$ 57,550</td>
<td>$ 361,618</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CDBG funding recommendation for 2013-14 is pending final City Council approval in August.
Agenda Items

1. Consideration of Approaches to Positively Impact Homelessness and Ordinance Regarding Establishment of Community Center Hours, including Cubberley, Stern and Mitchell Community Centers.

Rob De Geus, Assistant Director of Community Services reported Cubberley Community Center (Cubberley) was a de facto homeless shelter with approximately 20 people residing on the campus and 18-20 vehicle dwellers using the parking lot nightly. Fighting, bathing, cooking in bathrooms, storage of belongings across the campus, verbal abuse of City Staff, use of alcohol and illegal drugs, and trespassing in classrooms occurred daily.

Minka Van Der Zwaag, Community Services Program Manager indicated a point-in-time count found 7,600 homeless people in Santa Clara County and 157 homeless people in Palo Alto. Requests for homeless services totaled 28,000. A shortfall of affordable rental housing and an increase in poverty were primarily responsible for the rise in homelessness. Staff worked with the Police Department, the City Manager’s Office, and service providers to analyze potential workable solutions. Since July 31, 2013, Staff and counselors from the Downtown Streets Team monitored showers at Cubberley and attempted to connect individuals with services. Staff decided to close the showers at Cubberley effective August 31, 2013.

Chris Richardson, Downtown Streets Team mentioned that the purpose of the needs assessment and outreach was to inform the Council about the nature of the problem and possible solutions. The average number of people using the Cubberley showers was 20.75. Approximately 13 vehicles utilized the parking lot at Cubberley nightly, and an average of 11 people camped on the Cubberley campus without a vehicle. Respondents to the assessment lived in Palo Alto for an average of 12 years. Respondents primarily utilized programs for food and meals, medical care, and lockers for storage. Of the 16 respondents, nine utilized showers at the Opportunity Center, and seven
did not; 11 were interested in transitional or emergency shelter; and 14 wanted to work with a case manager on permanent subsidized housing.

Greg Penzinger, Downtown Streets Team Project Manager provided shower alternatives to the Cubberley homeless population. Many did not know where they would go for showers once the program ceased on August 31, 2013.

Ms. Van Der Zwaag believed the most effective method to address the homeless issue at City facilities was a comprehensive, community-wide approach. Staff requested the Policy and Services Committee (Committee) to review alternatives for multi-agency partnerships. One recommendation was funding the Homeless Outreach Team (HOT).

Mila Zelkha, InnVision Shelter Network noted a HOT Team was one of many tools that could be used. The proposal was meant to start a multi-agency dialog regarding homelessness. The community working group offered to convene a homeless services task force.

Ms. Van Der Zwaag explained that a HOT Team was a cross-functional group of service providers working together to move homeless people into housing and to provide people with stability. A HOT Team managed, engaged, transported and secured housing for homeless residents. The team first focused on individuals at Cubberley, then expanded to other homeless areas in Palo Alto. The cost for a HOT Team program was approximately $150,000 annually. Staff's second recommendation was to have housing subsidies be provided by the County of Santa Clara (County). The County had possible funding for a combination of transitional and long-term rent subsidies for ten homeless individuals who primarily had contact with the criminal justice system. The suggested funding was divided between City and County: County provided funding for rental subsidies and the City provided funding for a case manager for two years. The project was managed by a local homeless service provider selected by the County. Experts indicated incentives worked best when combined with an element of enforcement. Staff, therefore supported a Committee recommendation to the Council of an Ordinance to define reasonable hours of public access to community facilities. The proposed Ordinance did not affect any prescheduled use of City facilities.

Greg Betts, Director of Community Services wanted to consider the best operation of Cubberley for the safety of Staff, visitors and program users when attempting to determine solutions to the homeless issue.
Chair Kniss was interested in taking a human services approach to the issue. She acknowledged residents' concerns about Cubberley, but wanted to work toward a solution that provided enforcement and oversight.

Ron Watson, Police Captain reported an increase in activity at Cubberley. He noted that it was a small number of the homeless population that was creating a problem. The previous evening, police officers arrested a female carrying a large number of baggies containing methamphetamines. Two weeks prior, police officers struggled with and arrested an intoxicated, belligerent individual at Cubberley. Enforcement and services were needed at Cubberley.

Chair Kniss noted that police officers utilized overtime to monitor Cubberley.

Council Member Klein inquired about the cost of overtime to monitor Cubberley.

Mr. Watson stated monitoring six hours a night cost the City approximately $14,000 per month, $170,000 per year.

Council Member Holman inquired about the length of time between funding a program for the homeless and seeing the positive results.

Dr. Brian Greenberg, InnVision Shelter Network explained HOT would ask police officers to identify homeless people with the most complaints and emergency room contacts. Moving the most difficult homeless people into housing created a different quality of life for the entire community. The implementation period of HOT was approximately 30-60 days. The HOT list was limited to 30-40 names; they needed to move one-fourth of those on the list to housing in the first year and one-half each subsequent year.

Council Member Holman felt one of the difficulties of any program was the immediate impact on the people. She inquired about the relationship between InnVision and healthcare providers in terms of services and funding.

Mr. Greenberg worked with police officers to detain people that were chronically inebriated and try to offer them services. InnVision encouraged transition from the streets to a shelter, which included services and placement into housing. InnVision worked with police officers, medical professionals, and community-based organizations in a village approach. InnVision worked with homeless people to make better decisions and to move out of poverty.
Council Member Holman asked about InnVision's relationship with medical service providers.

Mr. Greenberg believed substance abuse recovery services were a critical component to sustaining housing. InnVision used Hotel de Zink as a transition to housing. InnVision attempted to engage homeless people for behavioral healthcare services prior to housing them.

Council Member Holman inquired whether the National Guard Armory in Sunnyvale could be utilized for housing outside of the November to March timeframe.

Ky Le, Director of Homeless Systems for the County believed the National Guard Armory could be utilized as interim housing from November to March if the individuals had a place to go after their interim stay at the shelter.

Council Member Holman asked if the National Guard Armory could be used as a shelter beyond the November to March timeframe.

Mr. Le reported the County did not budget for that service but could discuss the option with the Cities of Sunnyvale and Palo Alto. Generally, the County did not expand emergency shelter services, but attempted to provide direct access to permanent or long-term housing.

Council Member Holman inquired about InnVision's proposal to form a HOT Team.

Ray Bacchetti, Homeless Services Task Force indicated many areas of expertise were needed for the homeless issue. HOT Teams, along with other actions were being considered for a comprehensive program.

Council Member Holman wanted to see an organizational chart to identify services, responsibilities, and funding.

Mr. Bacchetti stated an organizational chart existed in part but needed to be compiled into one group.

Council Member Price felt this conversation was a beginning to many partnerships. She inquired whether a HOT Team approach could provide resources in Palo Alto.

Mr. Greenberg related that HOT Teams were operating in Redwood City, San Mateo, and East Palo Alto, although they were not the answer to the entire homeless problem; many providers were still needed to work with homeless people. Moving the most difficult homeless situations into housing was going to provide the greatest impact to the community.
Ms. Zelkha listed three consistent questions regarding homelessness in Palo Alto were whether Palo Alto was a magnet for homeless people, did Palo Alto residents do their fair share, and what happened to a homeless person who was turned away from services. She assembled a multidisciplinary team to consider the three questions when conducting an audit of existing services for the homeless situation in the mid-Peninsula region. In working with the unhoused, the task force considered approaches that were specific to Palo Alto.

Council Member Price inquired about how to measure outcomes and/or success with the HOT Team approach and whether partner organizations already had existing strategic plans.

Ms. Zelkha did not know who the partner organizations were or what they offered. She mentioned that the task force would gather resources, expertise, and knowledge.

Mr. Greenberg explained that the HOT Team list never reached zero because police departments added new names to the list as others were removed. He encouraged the Committee to contact the chief of police in San Mateo and Redwood City regarding their experiences with the HOT Program.

Council Member Klein asked where the homeless population would go if the proposed Ordinance closing community centers passed.

Ms. Zelkha replied saying that was the reason multiple agencies, including the County were needed for a solution. The task force included the Community Working Group and Palo Alto Housing Corporation, two housing service providers; the homeless were displaced as of August 31, 2013.

Council Member Klein believed the number of homeless people at Cubberley increased within the past year. He asked if there was another area where the homeless population would move to if Cubberley closed.

Ms. Zelkha did not know but said one possibility was expanding the Hotel de Zink program. She added that it was not possible for a service provider to create housing.

Mr. Greenberg indicated that many graduates of the shelters frequently worked in the service sector on one side of the Bay and lived on the other side. Those workers were not able to afford to live in Palo Alto or San Francisco.

Mr. Watson reported the highest count of homeless people that were non-vehicle dwellers, living at Cubberley on a single night in the past two weeks.
was around 30. The number of people varied from four to 15 people. He noted that the police presence seemed to discourage the homeless population at Cubberley.

Council Member Klein inquired about the number of vehicle dwellers at Cubberley.

Mr. Watson indicated it varied from 9 to 20 over the past few weeks.

Chair Kniss opened the meeting up to public comment.

Edie Groner depended on Cubberley Community Center for education and recreation. The proposed Ordinance did not prevent Cubberley from being used as a shelter during the day.

Alice Smith thanked Staff for an interesting and detailed report. She thought a task force should be implemented to find a working solution to homelessness and she requested that the Committee not adopt the proposed Ordinance until the City had a working solution.

Karen Sundback supported adoption of the proposed Ordinance, but did not support the homeless program at Cubberley. The program did not have a schedule for removing homeless people from Cubberley. She did not think a community center should be a homeless shelter.

Palo Alto Free Press believed the homeless problem at Cubberley could have been prevented by the Human Relations Commission (HRC). They thought the Public Defender should be involved in the HOT Team, rather than the District Attorney.

Ray Bacchetti, Homeless Services Task Force expressed interest in working with City Staff to develop an implementation strategy to leverage City funds. He added that the expertise of many agencies could help with the homeless challenge.

Diane Jones offered her time and experiences as a homeless person to find a long-term solution to the problem. She added that most service providers catered to drug abusers.

Litsie Indergand, a supporter of The Opportunity Center endeavored to find a positive solution for the homeless.

Katie Fantin, Vineyard Christian Fellowship of the Peninsula reported several of the homeless people at Cubberley were open to other housing options.
She was concerned about closing Cubberley without having alternatives in place for the homeless people.

Andrew Voltmer encouraged the City to preserve Cubberley as a community center and not a homeless shelter.

Judith Schwartz felt the ideas presented were good; however, the deadline for closing Cubberley was only two weeks away. She wanted the community to find an alternative location for a temporary shelter and suggested the transition time be extended.

Lynn Huidekoper inquired whether the Committee had completed a formal needs assessment at Cubberley.

Chair Kniss was unaware of an assessment being performed at Cubberley; she requested Staff to contact Ms. Huidekoper with information.

Ms. Huidekoper believed the bulk of vehicle dwellers were middle class citizens with jobs. The shower facilities at The Opportunity Center were not sufficient for the number of homeless people needing the facilities. She thought closing Cubberley should be delayed until an alternative site could be found.

Gertrude Reagan asked the Committee to delay implementation of the proposed Ordinance to allow a transition period.

Greg Rodgers noted the Vehicle Habitation Ordinance would not be enforced until the end of 2013; however, the Committee was considering a proposal that would implement the Vehicle Habitation Ordinance. He asked where the vehicle dwellers would go if the proposed Ordinance was adopted.

Aram James reported violation of the proposed Ordinance would be a misdemeanor punishable by up to six months in jail. He suggested the second reading of the Vehicle Habitation Ordinance be removed from the Consent Calendar at the August 19, 2013 Council meeting. The task force did not include representatives of the homeless population.

William Conlon wanted to ensure homeless people were not forced out of Palo Alto. He thought the City should give the community time to identify resources and possible solutions.

Lois Salo stated the homeless were humans and deserved to have a decent life.
Cybele supported formation of the task force. She suggested vehicle dwellers utilize the Veterans Administration parking lot, that a transition period be implemented, and that the second reading of the Vehicle Habitation Ordinance be removed from the Consent Calendar.

Penny Ellson supported the proposed Ordinance and requested additional restrictions be implemented at Cubberley. The homeless problem at Cubberley began two years ago and the homelessness situation required a regional solution.

Carolyn Doberuiv indicated Cubberley was important as a community center. A transitional shelter was a potential solution.

Elizabeth Alexis felt Cubberley should be closed to the homeless. Many parking programs for vehicle dwellers did not provide amenities.

Raj Achutha Narayan believed Cubberley was a magnet for homeless people. Homeless people left their belongings under the soccer stands and moved in once the games ended in the evening.

Mary Anne Deierlein expressed concern about homeless people occupying Cubberley during the daytime. He did not think Cubberley should serve as a de facto homeless shelter.

Chuck Jagoda stated the homeless population at Cubberley had pride.

Edie Keating inquired whether closing Cubberley at night would impede the work of the HOT Team. She requested the Committee consider a multi-city parking program for vehicle dwellers.

Nick Selby supported a multi-agency partnership and dialog. He thought that if Cubberley closed at night, homeless people would disperse to other areas.

Mary Shaw did not feel safe walking at Cubberley. She wanted the proposed Ordinance to be adopted and wanted an alternative location to be found for the vehicle dwellers.

Michael Hollingshead reported that Stanford Hospital wanted to be a collaborative partner in the homeless issue and added that the Palo Alto Homeless Coalition included the Public Defender's Office.
Pastor Paul Bains founded Project “We Hope,” which built a shelter in East Palo Alto. He announced that homeless people in Palo Alto were invited to the shelter and to use the showers.

Chair Kniss asked the location of the shelter.

Mr. Bains specified the address was 1858 Bay Road, East Palo Alto. The shelter fed and housed 50 people nightly; the Opportunity Center and Downtown Streets Team referred some people to We Hope.

Paul Mitchell was a vehicle dweller at Cubberley and said the Opportunity Center did not have enough showers. He suggested Cubberley not be closed to vehicle dwellers because of this fact.

Barbara Goodwin felt it was unfair for the “difficult” homeless people to receive the majority of attention and services proposed by the HOT Team and requested the Committee consider postponing the ban on vehicle habitation.

Stephanie Munoz felt the City should provide monitors for the homeless population at Cubberley and register all homeless people using Cubberley.

Mr. Betts clarified that The Opportunity Center had five operational showers.

Mr. De Geus reported The Opportunity Center had shower programs, drop-in centers for individuals and families, lockers for storage, healthcare, and case management.

Chair Kniss added that The Opportunity Center offered mental health services.

Mr. De Geus noted the closing of Cubberley in two weeks related to the showers only.

Pam Antil, Assistant City Manager declared City Staff was not qualified to operate a shelter and said the proposed Ordinance should include the plazas around City Hall; therefore, Staff requested the Committee add those areas to the language of the proposed Ordinance.

Council Member Klein inquired whether Staff supported implementation of the HOT Program now or after review of a task force recommendation.
Mr. De Geus reported the HOT Program was the first program discussed. Partner agencies met and discussed other programs and requested time to draft a recommendation.

Council Member Klein requested Staff's recommendation.

Mr. De Geus indicated Staff's recommendation was to implement a HOT Team Program, with some flexibility within the program.

Council Member Klein suggested the recommendation to the Council should be to spend $150,000 on a program to be determined by Staff, subject to approval by the Council.

Mr. De Geus agreed with Council Member Klein.

Ms. Antil added that Staff would provide more details regarding a program when the recommendation was presented to the Council.

Council Member Holman inquired about the cost to increase the police presence at Cubberley from 6:00 P.M. to 6:00 A.M. for 30 days.

Mr. Watson reported the cost would be $28,000 per month. The Police Department was short of personnel and had difficulty filling normal overtime. With other overtime requests, officers were possibly not available for overtime at Cubberley.

**MOTION:** Council Member Holman moved, seconded by Council Member XXXX to recommend the City Council: 1) refer matter to the Human Relations Commission, charge Human Relations Commission and relevant City Staff to identify a structured proposal within 30 days with potential funding sources and a request for funding to address homeless issues discussed this evening with additional critical related matters. Such a structured proposal would include relevant organizations, related programs and responsibilities, relevant funding and a means to measure success. Proposal will not be the final word on this subject but intended to get the City on solid near-term footing for solutions; 2) provide $75,000 to expand the Hotel de Zink program, continue Downtown Street Teams work, and look at expanding Sunnyvale Armory opening earlier; and 3) direct Staff to turn off Wi-Fi at library closing time until opening time the following day; turn off electricity to external outlets at closing time; provide alternative access to showers for people; lock dumpster in non-work hours; increase patrols at Cubberley; tow unregistered vehicles; and discard unattended belongings.

**MOTION FAILED DUE TO THE LACK OF SECOND**
MOTION: Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Council Member Price to recommend to the full Council: 1) that Staff develop a program at a one-time cost not to exceed $150,000 to deal with homeless issues discussed tonight; 2) that Staff provide the details of the program as soon as complete, or as soon as possible thereafter, for consideration and approval by the Council; 3) approval of Recommendation Number 2, page 7 of the Staff Report, “funding match with Santa Clara County for housing subsidies;” and 4) approve an Ordinance (Attachment A) that establishes hours of public access to the Cubberley Community Center and other City of Palo Alto Community Facilities as sunrise to 10:30 P.M. daily.

Council Member Klein believed homeless people had the same rights as other citizens; however, no one had the right to turn Cubberley Community Center into a homeless shelter. Limited data indicated the increased number of homeless people at Cubberley did not come from Palo Alto. The City alone was not able to solve the problem of homelessness. Delaying City action did not help the adjacent neighbors or increase the likelihood of a solution being identified in a short time. The Cubberley needs assessment referred to lease negotiations with the Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD). Agencies other than the City had the primary obligation to fund programs for homelessness. He did not expect City funding to continue annually. If the Committee approved the Motion, then the Council needed to receive the recommendation in late August or early September 2013.

Ms. Antil reported a first reading of the Ordinance was on August 19, 2013; however, a program and any details of a program were not going to be drafted that quickly.

Council Member Klein noted an Ordinance would become effective 30 days after a second reading and approval.

Mr. Betts inquired whether the $150,000 amount would be a one-time expense.

Council Member Klein answered yes.

Chair Kniss requested Council Member Klein comment on the shower closure at Cubberley.

Council Member Klein agreed with Staff that Cubberley shower facilities would close as of August 31, 2013.

Mr. Betts understood the showers would close as of August 31, 2013.
Council Member Klein explained that many suggestions from the adjacent neighbors would become effective with passage of the proposed Ordinance.

Council Member Price viewed the homeless problem as a public health, safety, and welfare issue for the individuals and facility users. Determining new ways to leverage funding was critical. The Motion provided opportunities to develop sophisticated strategies. Public resources for homelessness were insufficient.

**INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER** request that Staff bring forward to Policy and Services Committee a discussion of the utilization of the Community Health and Safety component of the Development Agreement with Stanford University Medical Center, including a discussion of health services to individuals most at risk including members of the homeless community.

Council Member Price inquired whether Stanford University was merely interested in participating or proposed participating in a homeless program.

Nadia Richardson, Downtown Streets Team was negotiating a contract with all hospitals in the County with respect to homeless people.

Council Member Price assumed homeless people would be included in the program discussions.

Ms. Zelkha met with members of the unhoused community to share ideas. The task force wanted to hold an interagency discussion.

Ms. Richardson reported the County had slots reserved for homeless men and women to share their experiences.

Chair Kniss noted the County continued to work on the homeless problem. One of the Council’s responsibilities was to protect the community. The Motion was a balancing act between the neighbors and the homeless population. Mr. Bains invited homeless people to shelter and shower at We Hope. Other solutions were presented. The Opportunity Center was a regional agency.

Council Member Holman did not support the Motion because Staff, rather than the HRC were to develop a program. Of the $150,000 provided in the Motion, $100,000 was to be used to match County funds to provide housing for ten people.
Ms. Van Der Zwaag reiterated that funding for the HOT Team was $150,000, and the County proposal for housing was $50,000 for two years.

Council Member Holman inquired whether the $150,000 stated in the Motion would fund both the HOT Program and the County program.

Ms. Van Der Zwaag stated one year of funding for the HOT Team was $150,000, and $50,000 per year, with a two-year request for funding was needed for the County to commit to provide the subsidy.

Council Member Holman did not feel the Motion clearly stated the funding aspect.

Council Member Klein indicated the first and second parts of the Motion covered the HOT Program and the County subsidy program.

Council Member Holman clarified that the funding commitment was $250,000. The proposed Ordinance did not solve some issues raised by neighbors.

Chair Kniss inquired whether the first reading of the Ordinance would be placed on the Council Agenda for August 19, 2013. The next scheduled Council meeting after August 19, 2013 was September 9, 2013. She requested Staff to consider placing the second reading on a Special Meeting Agenda, in case one was scheduled before the end of August.

Ms. Antil was able to present the Ordinance for a first reading on August 19, 2013. A draft program was to be presented to the Council at a later time.

Molly Stump, City Attorney noted 11 days were required between the first and second readings of an Ordinance; therefore, a second reading occurred at a Special Meeting on August 30, 2013, or in the first week of September, or at the Regular Meeting scheduled for September 9, 2013.

**MOTION PASSED:** 3-1 Holman no
September 20, 2013

Dear Mayor Scharff and Council Members:

The Homeless Services Task Force was formed in recognition of the unmet needs of the homeless in Palo Alto and the closing of Cubberley facilities, as well as the impending vehicle ban. These actions created a short term crisis- one that has stimulated us to form this coalition in order to focus on solutions to Palo Alto’s unique homeless and affordable housing issues.

The Homeless Task Force is comprised of representatives from The Palo Alto Human Relations Commission, The Community Working Group, InnVision Shelter Network, Momentum for Mental Health, Project WeHOPE, Peninsula HealthCare Connection, the Palo Alto Housing Corporation, and the Downtown Streets Team.

We recently asked for 30-60 days to develop a plan to address homelessness. The Task Force feels that we have come up with a short-term solution that will leverage the Council’s pledge of $250,000, County funds, and our expertise to move 20 people, or about 15% of our homeless population off the streets of Palo Alto permanently.

Our recommendation to Council is to direct staff to begin an RFP process for a local agency to provide case management services to 20 individuals for two years in which collaborative efforts will be encouraged. This Case Manager will administer subsidies, work with staff to enroll preferred individuals, perform housing search within the subsidy limit and unit specifications, target landlords and more. Most importantly, they will work on successful housing retention strategies so that clients remain in housing permanently.
Should you agree to this course of action, the County has agreed to supply 20 subsidies to that agency to administer on behalf of, and in coordination with, the City of Palo Alto. We predict that the County will spend around $600,000 on these subsidies in the first two years with an ongoing commitment of up to $300,000 a year.

The task force is united in its belief that this is a good start, but only “the tip of the iceberg.” We plan to continue to develop a long-term plan for the rest of the homeless and low-income individuals of our community, focusing on building affordable housing, specifically in Palo Alto.

We look forward to a public/private partnership to make Palo Alto a leader in ending homelessness not only in our city, but in conjunction with the County’s efforts as well.

Sincerely and hopefully,

The Homeless Services Task Force