

San Luis Obispo Countywide 10 Year Plan to End Homelessness

We envision a future in which the housing and comprehensive services necessary to remain housed are available for all, affording everyone maximum self-sufficiency, and the opportunity to be productive and participating members of our community

## HOMELESS SERVICES OVERSIGHT COUNCIL (HSOC) Homeless Services Coordinating Committee (HSCC) Agenda

January 11 2021, 10 a.m.

Members and the public may participate by Zoom video call: <a href="https://zoom.us/j/91355707714?pwd=SX|2a1RUNVVMR00yU2gzQS94L0cvUT09">https://zoom.us/j/91355707714?pwd=SX|2a1RUNVVMR00yU2gzQS94L0cvUT09</a>

Or dial in: +1 669 900 9128 Meeting ID: 913 5570 7714 Passcode: 591134

- 1. Call to Order and Introductions
- 2. Public Comment
- 3. Consent: Approval of Minutes
- 4. Action/Information/Discussion
  - 4.1 Discussion Item: COVID-19 Updates
  - 4.2 Discussion Item: Coordinated Entry
  - 4.3 Discussion Item: Federal and State Grant Updates
    - 4.3.1 Discussion Item: Homeless Housing, Assistance & Prevention Program (HHAP) Round 2 Priorities
  - 4.4 Discussion Item: Safe Parking and Alternatives to Encampments
    - 4.4.1 Discussion Item: Alternatives to Encampments Working Group Recommendations
  - 4.5 Discussion Item: 2021 Sheltered Point in Time Count January 25<sup>th</sup>
  - 4.6 Discussion Item: 2019 and 2020 Longitudinal Systems Analysis (LSA) Responses to Comparisons with 2018 LSA data
- 5. Future Discussion/Report Items

- 6. Next Meeting Date: March 8, 2021
- 7. Adjournment

# HOMELESS SERVICES OVERSIGHT COUNCIL Homeless Services Coordinating Committee November 16, 2020 10-11:30pm Meeting held by Zoom call

**STAFF & GUESTS** 

Angela Smith

**MEMBERS ABSENT** 

John Klevins

**MEMBERS PRESENT** 

Brandy Graham

75	7 11 20 10 21 11 11 11	
	Cara Vereschagin	
	Elaine Archer	
	Elaine Mansoor	
	Esther Salzman	
	George Solis	
	Jan Maitzen	
	Janna Nichols	
	Laurel Weir	
	Leon Shordon	
	Russ Francis	
	Steve Martin	
		CONCLUSIONS/ACTIONS
Devin called the meeting to order at 10am and introductions		
were made.		
Devin reported that COVID ca	ses have been rapidly increasing in	
San Luis Obispo county, and t	the county will be moving back into	
the more restrictive purple tier.		
		Nicole made a motion to
		approve the minutes,
		seconded by Brandy. The
		motion passed with none
		opposed and no
	were made.  Devin reported that COVID ca San Luis Obispo county, and to	Cara Vereschagin Elaine Archer Elaine Mansoor Esther Salzman George Solis Jan Maitzen Janna Nichols Laurel Weir Leon Shordon Russ Francis Steve Martin  Devin called the meeting to order at 10am and introductions were made.  Devin reported that COVID cases have been rapidly increasing in San Luis Obispo county, and the county will be moving back into

		abstentions.
4. Action/Information/Discussion		
4.1. Discussion Item: COVID-19 Updates	Laurel reported that the increase in COVID cases in the County is believed to be caused partly by returning Cal Poly students and partly by people gathering indoors without masks. One issue with the coming winter is the rise in demand for Public Health to do COVID testing. In the spring and summer, Public Health has been able to send nurses out to shelters during the day, but warming centers are generally only open during evenings and overnight, so people who develop symptoms in shelters will have to isolate overnight. There are also concerns that Public Health will not have the capacity to deal with the rise in cases.	
	Janna reported that 5CHC (5Cities Homeless Coalition) has shut down their offices after an employee has tested positive for COVID. All employees are being retested and are now working remotely. Calls for support have continued to increase, and are now around double what they were in the middle of the year. 5CHC expects this to increase further with the end of the eviction moratorium in February. 5CHC's warming center is likely to be at the South County Regional Center.	
	Grace reported that 40 Prado is open, and the restrictions introduced in March are still in place – a lower capacity of 70-80 beds which are physically distanced. Four clients tested positive for COVID in September, but there have been no positive cases since then. They are not taking clients from out of county, as this would put them over capacity. Grace, Janna and Brandy from CAPSLO's (Community Action Partnership of San Luis Obispo) Veterans Support Program all reported an increase in people	

from out of the area wanting to access services, but noted this is typical in the holiday season. Grace also reported that 40 Prado are seeing more psychiatric/mental health referrals. Elaine Mansoor reported that the Salvation Army are talking clients through processes by phone, rather than taking the risk of in person meetings. Jan reported that one of TFS's (Transitional Food & Shelter) four units is set aside for people who are vulnerable to complications from COVID. This unit has been leased from October 1, and currently houses three households of four people. No clients or case managers have tested positive, though somebody close to the program manger has tested positive, so the program manager is now working remotely while awaiting test results. Brandy reported that the Supportive Services for Veteran Families (SSVF) program has seen a significant increase in households seeking assistance. 4.2. Discussion Item: Laurel reported that HUD (Department of Housing & Urban Development) has asked CoCs (Continuums of Care) to consider **Coordinated Entry** their Coordinated Entry processes, and to consider adopting a parallel track that would prioritize those at high risk of COVID for Permanent Housing options. The County is working with Technical Assistance providers HomeBase to look at how this should be done. George reported that the first Coordinated Entry working group met the previous week. This group consists of Coordinated Entry partners, service providers, healthcare providers and HomeBase. HomeBase's suggestion is to create a temporary

	Coordinated Entry prioritization process, with a separate COVID priority list. The COVID priority list would be based on CDC (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention) guidelines for those who are most vulnerable. HomeBase recommends that 20% of all placements should come from the main priority list, and 80% from the COVID priority list.	
4.3. Discussion Item: Federal and State Grant Updates	Laurel reported that the County will soon be releasing new RFPs (Request for Proposals) for ESG-CV-2 (Emergency Solutions Grant – Coronavirus Round 2) funding. Approximately \$11 million will be available under two programs, one administered by DSS (Department of Social Services), and one administered by Planning (Department of Planning & Building). The DSS program funds cannot be used for homelessness prevention, while the Planning program funds can be.  DSS has already submitted an application to the State, and will be seeking approval from the Board of Supervisors in early February to award the funding to successful applicants. The timing of when funds will be released depends on how long it takes the State to get the standard agreements to the County. The State has released the NOFA (Notice of Funding Availability) for the second round of HHAP (Homeless Housing, Assistance and Prevention program) funding. The application for the County to submit will be available by November 30, and the deadline will be 60 days after the application is published. This application will require more work than is typical. The County will be seeking the full HSOC's input on priorities. Separately to this, DSS will be releasing the RFP for HHAP Round 1 before the end of the year.  Grace asked about the already awarded ESG (Emergency Solutions Grant) and CDBG (Community Development Block	

	Grant) funding will be made available, as a number of agencies are unable to begin work on some projects before this funding is released. Laurel and George clarified that the County is still waiting on the State to send through the standard agreements. Laurel will reach out to HCD (California Department of Housing and Community Development) to follow up.	Laurel to follow up with HCD
	Laurel reported that HUD is going to require the 2021 PIT (Point in Time) Count to go ahead. The survey will not be required; CoCs will be allowed to use a count sampling methodology instead. The County will follow up with the contractor and the Finance & Data Committee about how to move forward.	
4.4. Discussion Item: Racial Equity	Laurel shared that the ESG-CV-2 funding will have a racial equity component. In particular, HCD are asking applicants to encourage applications from groups that serve unrepresented groups and communities that have a disproportionate share of people affected by COVID. In SLO County, the Latinx community has been disproportionately affected. Applicants will be asked to do quarterly reports to the State on racial equity. HUD has also been encouraging communities to carry out a racial equity analysis. A recommendation will be brought to the November HSOC meeting to move CESH (California Emergency Solutions and Housing) funding from upgrading the HMIS (Homeless Management Information System) to hiring an outside contractor to carry out a racial equity analysis. This analysis will include concrete steps for how agencies can serve underrepresented populations.	
4.5. Discussion Item: Safe Parking and Alternatives to	Grace reported that CAPSLO continues to provide ten spaces through their safe parking program. They are looking at winding this down as there is no indication that funding from the County	

Encampments	or the State will be extended. They are talking to SLO City about the possibility of establishing other locations.  Janna reported that 5CHC are referring people to a faith based	
	group providing four spaces through a safe parking program at a church in South County. This program is only open to women and children. The program is monitored by camera. The faith group is looking at expanding to other locations in the 5 Cities area.	
	Nicole reported that the Alternatives to Encampment Working Group have come up with a list of recommendations that will be submitted to the next full Encampment Committee meeting.  Nicole to send the document to Russ to distribute to the	Russ to distribute
	Services Coordinating Committee.	document to committee
5. Future Discussion/Report Items	Presentation from Doctors Without Walls – Nicole to arrange this with Russ	
6. Next Meeting Date: January		
11, 2021		
7. Adjournment	Devin adjourned the meeting at 11:30am.	

#### **Alternatives to Encampments Recommendations**

In recognition of the urgency for offering alternatives to unsanctioned encampments, especially during the pandemic, these recommendations offer a range of options for meeting the needs of persons who are now homeless in our county by offering a broad continuum of housing types that will provide them with security, stability, and sanitation. These alternatives will relieve the environmental degradation being caused by unsanctioned encampments and will improve the health and safety of both people living in the camps and those who reside in the neighboring areas. Some people who are now living in unsanctioned encampments prefer moving to sanctioned encampments and safe parking areas while others seek to reside in a transitional or permanent village that will additionally provide them with community, as well as support services to address their challenges and to pursue opportunities.

San Luis Obispo County will expedite the implementation of these recommendations in coordination with the cities to undertake as quickly as possible the following actions:

- 1) Select appropriate sites for the various alternative housing options,
- 2) Identify sources of funding and allocate necessary funding directly,
- 3) Support efforts for community education regarding the need for these alternatives to encampments,
- 4) Direct appropriate departments to assist community organizations as fully as possible with rendering the services necessary for the operation of these alternative housing options.
- 5) Coordinate these efforts with the Homeless Services Oversight Council and other local government efforts to address unsheltered homelessness

#### 1. Priority #1: Existing Encampments:

- a. Identify existing encampments in feasible locations that can be prioritized to receive basic services to empower residents, provide safety and sanitation.
  - Trash collection services:
  - Basic hygiene—toilet, hand wash and showers;
  - Laundry services
  - Syringe services and overdose prevention
- 2. Sanctioned Encampments across the 5 SLO County supervisorial districts, e.g. North Coast, SLO City, Paso, Atascadero and South County; and the Seven Cities where needed.

- a. Purpose: create sanctioned encampments to create a location for unsheltered individuals and newly homeless individuals who decline or are not able to stay in shelter beds and other housing options.
- b. Tent camps
  - o Services and support to existing camps:
    - Behavioral and physical health treatment
    - Individual shelter-waterproof tent/tiny house/trailer/RV, etc; incremental option, from tent to tiny homes, and other small structures to be further explored.....
    - Basic hygiene—toilet, hand wash and showers;
    - Trash collection services;
    - Lockers/safe storage for personal items;
    - General community security--fenced enclosure and 24/7 monitoring
    - Access to supportive and community services; housing support, grocery stores, pharmacy, etc.
    - Medical services, esp. for medically fragile--Medical outreach pilot--e.g. Santa Barbara model, Doctors w/o walls;
    - Food
    - Potable water
    - Provision for pets
    - Paid clean-up program -
    - Laundry services- when feasible
    - Provide fire extinguisher when feasible
    - Low barriers to entry
    - Syringe services and overdose prevention
- c. <u>Provision:</u> base camp in each of 5 SLO County supervisorial districts, e.g. North Coast, SLO City, Paso, Atascadero and South County; and the Seven Cities where needed.
- d. Issues/Challenges:
  - Assist persons in places of their current choice or relocate (to camp, safe parking, etc);
  - o Level of provision: incrementalism or all in place at start
  - Location: Will persons choose to relocate to remote/less desirable yet more political feasible sites?
  - Mechanism/permitting
  - Funding for camp/services
  - Risk management: safety & crime; camp residents and local area residents
  - Goals: help residents; "clearance" for general community; environmental protections--watershed; fire protection
  - Religion and religious symbols conflict with separation with church and state issues
  - o Considering camps "temporary/pilots" or "ongoing" options
  - Management/oversight: Rules at odds with Personal choice and autonomy (guest restriction policies, case management requirements; zero tolerance for illegal substances, etc)
  - Pets: how to accommodate

- Political feasibility
- o Barriers to entry, i.e. drug/alcohol testing
- e. Examples and Resources
  - Plan from January 2020 in Berkeley to set up sanctioned encampments:

"Harrison's proposal asks the city manager to consider amenities in the new "outdoor shelter" such as "climate-controlled, windresistant durable tents with wooden pallets for support"; portable toilets and handwashing stations; shower and sanitation services; garbage pickup and needle disposal; and an agency to manage the program, which would be open 24 hours a day.

Council had previously allocated \$922,000 for the program over 18 months."

https://www.berkeleyside.com/2020/01/22/berkeley-officials-vote-in-favor-of-sanctioned-homeless-camp-pilot-program

 ABC 10 article regarding sanctioned encampments in Modesto, December 2018:

"In addition, the County will enter into a \$500,000 agreement with <u>Turning Point</u> for a six-month period to provide the following services to the homeless community:

- Coordination of safety and security
- Coordination of volunteerism and donations
- Supportive services (such as case management)
- Rehabilitative opportunities to support the transition out of homelessness"

https://www.abc10.com/article/news/local/modesto/modesto-homeless-community-to-leave-beard-brook-for-new-location/103-622123290

• The Guardian Article about 37MLK lot:

"Oakland city council member Nikki Fortunato Bas is one of the local lawmakers calling for turning vacant land into self-governed or co-governed encampments, something that would look a lot like 37MLK.

"We simply don't have enough places for people to go," she said. "We don't have enough shelter beds. We don't have enough transitional housing. In the interim, as we're building deeply affordable housing, we need to have transitional spaces."

Oakland already provides some services to some encampments that include picking up garbage, portable toilets and wash stations. But Bas believes more needs to be done, and has allocated \$600,000 to pilot a project similar to 37MLK in Oakland.

"These are spaces that people may need to stay in for two to five years, not a matter of months," she said. "And we need to be able to house them in a way that's healthy and safe and dignified."

https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2020/jan/07/the-oakland-women-who-took-over-a-vacant-lot-to-house-the-homeless

#### 3. Safe Parking Programs in appropriate regions throughout the county

- a. HSOC evaluates the various types of safe parking options and then encourages cities and the county to identify, in cooperation with SLOCOG, street, lots, or other properties where unhoused persons may safely stay in their vehicles overnight.
  - 1. Current legal areas for street parking or parking lot spaces for overnight stays, but without any facilities or services
  - Conduct identification of these spots in conjunction with law enforcement and city/county administration
  - Consider appropriate type of publicity about these spots after consultation with law enforcement and city/county administration
  - Designated safe areas to shelter in place-for overnight parking with limited services

Example: From late March to June 30, 2020 during the pandemic shut-downs of local businesses, hot showers and bathrooms were available along with overnight parking at three locations: San Luis Obispo Veteran's Hall parking lot, Los Osos Library Parking Lot and Coastal Dunes RV Park and Campground in the South County. Although there were minimal rules, there were no neighbor complaints or serious incidents reported. It was estimated by Grace McIntosh that the three sites averaged 10 to 22 patrons a day. Total Cost (excluding administration) for 16 weeks: \$85,5000.

<u>SLO County and city partner with 40 Prado on safe parking program for homeless | SLO the virus (newtimesslo.com)</u>

- 3. Safe Parking Programs with screening, facilities, and services including case management
  - Example: 40 Prado Safe Parking Program:

The 40 Prado Safe Parking programs offers individuals living in their cars or small RV's a safe place to park overnight at 40 Prado, as well as access to showers, meals, mental and physical health

services, and housing case management. There are on-site supervisors and cameras monitoring the area at all times. Interested persons are screened by the lead housing case manager. Persons must meet the following eligibility requirements:

- Must be interested in obtaining permanent housing in SLO county.
- Must be a SLO county resident and provide proof for at least the last 12 months.
- Must be willing to participate in case management services at 40 Prado (weekly meetings with case manager) and save money for housing.

Although proof of insurance/registration is not necessary immediately, after persons are are accepted into the program they must work with the case manager to obtain registration/insurance within a certain timeframe. Participants are required to sign a behavior agreement. 40 Prado is low-barrier, but all participants must be respectful of their neighbors. Pets who have proof of rabies vaccination are permitted. The program has operated from July 1, 2020 through December 31, 2020 with 17 spaces; however, effective January 1, 2021 the capacity will be reduced to 7 vehicles.

CAPSLO originally received \$16,500 for safe parking for a 1-year period. In July CAPSLO received additional funding through the end of the year to expand the program. CAPSLO reported cost of \$23,000 for the expanded program between 2/20 and 12/31/20 which was split between the county and the city of San Luis Obispo.

- b. Encourage cities and county to identify local lots, streets or other properties that can be used for safe parking program.
  - Currently only the city of SLO has enacted an ordinance.

<u>Title 17 Art. 4 Regulations for Specific Land Uses and Activities | San Luis</u> Obispo Municipal Code

The ordinance states that safe parking areas are subject to meeting specific performance standards and permit requirements "to ensure that these safe parking facilities will be compatible with surrounding uses and effective at facilitating participants' transition to permanent housing." The social service provider must submit a conditional use application containing a site plan with the location of trash and

recycling facilities, water, restroom facilities, exterior light fixtures, location and distances to residential properties, public transportation, and location of designated overnight parking spaces, as well as the hours of operation, a monitoring and oversight program, a neighborhood relations plan, and sufficient documentation to determine that the applicant is a social service provider that is qualified to operate a safe parking program. Program participants must participate in case management which includes a self-sufficiency program and submit to a criminal history background check. Preference is given to persons with proof of county residency for at least six months within the prior two years.

- Model Program: Santa Barbara Safe Parking Program
   Safe Parking Shelter and Rapid Rehousing Program | New Beginnings (sbnbcc.org)
- Additional resources appendix 1A 6A
- c. HSOC coordinates investigation of funding sources
  - SLOCOG currently has \$16,000 dedicated to SAFE Parking/Safe Streets and is looking to increase the FY20/21 Regional State Highways Account budget by \$84,000 in December 2020 for this purpose. Total \$100k.
  - Identify which homeless funding streams are allowed to be spent on safe parking costs
- d. Services and Supports for the Safe Parking Program level:
  - Level out treatment: step up treatment
  - Basic hygiene—toilet, hand wash and showers;
  - Trash collection services;
  - Lockers/safe storage for personal items;
  - General community security--fenced enclosure and 24/7 monitoring
  - Access to supportive services; housing support
  - Medical services, esp. for medically fragile--Medical outreach pilot--e.g. Santa Barbara model, Doctors w/o walls;
  - Food
  - Provision for pets
  - Paid clean-up program
  - Laundry services
  - Security
  - Potable water
  - Syringe services and overdose prevention

#### 4. Catalogue housing options and opportunities throughout San Luis Obispo County

- a. Identify illegal parking throughout San Luis Obispo County
  - o Reach out to law enforcement connections
- b. Multiple living units
  - o RV park
  - o Tiny Home on Wheels (THOW) park
  - o Tiny Home Villages and Communities
    - Tiny house villages are an efficient way to provide immediate housing not only because they are cost effective and are built relatively quickly, but also because they create communities that allow residents to get on the path to permanent housing in a supportive, village-like environment.
    - Tiny house villages have been built in less than six months at a cost between \$100,000 to \$500,000 on an area that is 6,000 square feet to several acres, depending on the number of tiny houses, amenities, and common facilities. Villages are serving 20 to 70 people on an annual budget of \$30,000 to \$500,000, depending on staffing and services. The individual houses may be wooden structures, cabins on wheels, Conestoga huts, or pallet shelters.
    - There are villages that provide transitional housing, permanent housing, and some that offer both. Tiny house transitional and permanent villages have been operating successfully across the United States because they provide safety and security to their residents, while addressing the concerns of their neighbors and surrounding communities.

#### i. The rationale for Tiny Home villages:

 a. Housing First Model – The United State Interagency on Homelessness (USICH, https://www.usich.gov/) states:

https://www.usich.gov/solutions/housing/housing-first/:

A Housing First system recognizes that people experiencing homelessness—like all people—need the safety and stability of a home in order to best address challenges and pursue opportunities.

The Housing First approach connects people back to a home as quickly as possible, while making readily available the services that people may need to be stable and secure.

#### ii. Tiny House Villages vs. Other Options:

1. Advantages and benefits of tiny home transitional villages –

<u>Providing for better outcome of successful and productive</u> reintegration into society - Tiny houses are the most efficient way to provide immediate assistance for people experiencing homelessness. They provide shelter, four solid walls and a lockable door, all of which are essential in providing for a person's sense of safety, dignity, and stability.

Compared with other options, tiny house villages have presented a quicker, more humane, and cost-effective solution. Safe, weatherproof and lockable, they have created strong communities that allow residents to reclaim their dignity and get on the path to permanent housing while in a supportive, village-like environment. In contrast, emergency shelters do not provide personal and secured space, nor do they offer any sense of community. A shelter is not a home and, as such, cannot function as transitional housing.

Cost effective - unlike developing and building a new emergency shelter—which could take many years for siting, permitting, and construction, plus millions of dollars in construction costs—creating a tiny house village can be done in less than six months at a cost somewhere between \$100,000 and \$500,000. (A large variable is the cost of connections for water, sewer and electricity.) Each village can serve 20 to 70 people on an annual budget of \$30,000 to \$500,000, depending on staffing and services. Homeless resident organizations are operating self-managed villages where residents work together to handle day-to-day operations while employing democratic decision-making, all the while reducing operating costs. For more details see here:

https://www.squareonevillages.org/opportunity-faq and: https://shelterforce.org/2019/03/15/tiny-house-villages-in-seattle-an-efficient-response-to-our-homelessness-crisis/

According to the Seattle Human Services Department: "Spaces in tiny home villages represent approximately 12.5% of all shelter beds and safe places the City supports and make up less than 3% of all homelessness response investments made by the City of Seattle."

Operate successfully in different sizes and type of locations - a tiny home village can be sited on land that is anywhere from 6,000 square feet up to several acres, depending on the number of tiny houses and common facilities to be provided. Possible locations include urban infill sites zoned for residential and mixed use, as well as larger commercial and industrial sites. While it takes careful research and help from local government to identify good sites, some nonprofit housing organizations own land that they hope to develop in the future, and these can be used on an interim basis, from two to four years, for a tiny house village. For more information, read here:

https://shelterforce.org/2017/06/27/fad-tiny-houses-save-lives-provide-dignity/

#### Different types of tiny house villages

<u>Iransitional tiny house village</u> - transition is defined as the passage from one form, state, style or place to another. The Transitional Village is not intended to be a final place of residence, but a temporary stepping-stone on which to stabilize one's life before moving on to permanent housing. This village model requires limited usage of water and electricity; can be self-managed with support from non-profits and community volunteers. For these reasons this type of transitional tiny house village may be especially suitable for our needs here in San Luis Obispo County because it can be built on a small scale, with low cost structures and low cost management.

<u>Permanent tiny house village</u> – these villages provide more permanent housing with larger structures; have water and electric connections, and contain kitchens and bathrooms.

<u>Population-specific villages</u> – While some villages are specific for Veterans, while others are built specifically for men, women, families, and youth.

#### Variety and type of structures used in the villages

<u>Tiny house for a transitional living village</u> - 60-80 square feet in size, can be built for about \$2,000 in materials. Each structure is composed of a kit of modular, pre-manufactured panels, constructed in an off-site workshop. The panels utilize standard dimensions of lumber and plywood, which reduces waste, simplifies the construction, and makes donation of materials easier.

https://www.squareonevillages.org/opportunity-faq

<u>Tiny houses for a more permanent living village</u> - 160–288 sq. ft.in size, designed as permanent dwellings on a slab foundation—complete with sleeping and living areas, kitchenette, and bathroom. Cost varies and considered as a very affordable housing.

https://www.squareonevillages.org/emerald

<u>Tiny house on wheels</u> - this model of tiny cabins on wheels, which measures 77 square feet, cost \$3,900 to construct, and are built on chassis in order to be moveable. They are considered "Specially-constructed mobile homes" by the DMV and are licensed as "CA Permanent Trailers."

https://hopesvillageofslo.com/projects

Conestoga Huts – Cost \$1200-\$1400; The Conestoga Hut Micro-Shelter is a quick shelter option for individuals. The Hut is designed as a hard-shelled, insulated tent structure that can be built with a group of a few volunteers with some construction experience. It has 60 sq. ft. of interior space, a 20 sq. ft. exterior covered porch, a window, lockable door, and insulated floor, walls and roof. <a href="https://communitysupportedshelters.org/hut-construction-manual">https://communitysupportedshelters.org/hut-construction-manual</a>

<u>Pallet Shelters</u> - cost between \$3,500 and \$7,500 depending on their size and additions. These small, white rectangular structures are covered from floor to ceiling with a fiberglass material and aluminum framing, and—depending on whether you pick the 64-or 100-square-foot model—can be set up with little to no tools in under an hour. They come with a fold-up bed, windows, a

ventilation system, and a front door that locks. Purchased from manufacturer.

https://www.fastcompany.com/90365347/pallet-shelters-let-cities-offer-quick-housing-to-the-homeless

#### **Rules of conduct**

Each tiny house village has their own rules that list acceptable behavior and expected responsibilities for residents within the village. All residents must agree, in writing, to these rules as part of their entry agreement.

An example of one such village manual and agreement from Opportunity Village in Eugene, Oregon: <a href="https://eead3e67-3a27-4098-aa25-">https://eead3e67-3a27-4098-aa25-</a>

<u>9fa572882b1f.filesusr.com/ugd/bd125b 32be9eddb4d34ea7ae64cf 4beed1ddbb.pdf</u>

#### Not a novel idea

Tiny home villages are a proven way to provide safe, effective, transitional housing. Villages in multiple locations throughout the country have been operating successfully for several years. They are a source of knowledge from which we can learn and adapt to our County's needs. Please see in this link, a list of transitional tiny home villages throughout the US:

https://www.squareonevillages.org/more-villages

Collaboration has been a great advantage for communities interested in building and managing similar tiny house villages. San Luis Obispo County can learn a great deal and benefit from those who came before us, who are committed to sharing their knowledge and expertise they have gained along the way.

#### Community concerns and outreach

Tiny home transitional and permanent villages have been successful because they provide safety and security to their residents, while answering common issues and concerns of the neighbors and surrounding communities. Rather than being an eye-sore, they are pleasantly designed, gated, safe communities, that can be a welcome addition to their neighborhood. Some

have even been shown to attract the help of residents from the surrounding community, as the housed help the unhoused to reintegrate into society.

#### **Examples of planned villages**

https://www.squareonevillages.org/toolbox-choosing-a-path



### 2. Examples and lessons from ongoing successfully operating transitional and permanent tiny homes villages:

a)Hope's Village of SLO: <a href="https://hopesvillageofslo.com/">https://hopesvillageofslo.com/</a>

For eight years this 501(c)(3) non-profit California corporation has been seeking a viable 3 to 5 acre site in San Luis Obispo County for a self-sustaining drug and alcohol free community village containing 30 tiny houses for 50 unhoused veterans and other unhoused adults. Hope's Village is currently in negotiations with the SLO County Building and Planning Department on a five acre site at Margarita Ranch in Santa Margarita. Rob Rossi has offered a 10 year lease with an option for another five years.

Their model tiny cabins on wheels, which measures 77 square feet, cost \$3,900 to construct. Villagers will share usage of a 2,500 square foot common house with a commercial kitchen, dining area, bathrooms, showers, office space, meeting rooms, and laundry facilities. Most villagers will temporarily reside on site while they get their bearings, while others may become permanent residents. The village will be managed by a council with all residents having a voice. There will be round the clock security. The villagers will participate in the building and maintenance of the community. They will pay a program fee in the amount of one-quarter of their monthly income. They will receive training in new skills such as cooking, farming, computer, and office skills. The village will develop micro-enterprises including furniture building/repair and painting which will be housed in a 2,000 square foot barn. Also planned is a one acre organic garden with produce and flowers for sale. They intend to start the village on a small scale, but in time would like to include a store to stock arocery necessities and to sell the villagers' arts & crafts. For more details see their business plan here:

https://img1.wsimg.com/blobby/go/a94aabe1-00b7-4060-95b1-65f37aa20659/downloads/Bus%20Pln%207%2030%2020.pdf?ver=1 606666876890

https://www.newtimesslo.com/sanluisobispo/it-takes-a-village/Content?oid=10335495

#### b)SquareOne Villages:

https://www.squareonevillages.org/

Since its founding in 2012, the non-profit SquareOne Villages group has developed three villages in Lane County, Oregon, and more are in the works.

Opportunity Village Eugene (OVE) is a transitional micro-housing community located in Eugene, Oregon. It opened as a pilot project on city-owned land in August of 2013, and has since served more than 100 otherwise unhoused individuals and couples. The 30 micro-homes range from 60-80 square feet in size, can be built for about \$2,000 in materials, and are supported by common cooking, gathering, restroom, and laundry facilities. The target resident population is comprised of 0-30% area median income, and residents are paying \$35/month. The village is self-managed by its residents with oversight and support provided by the non-profit, SquareOne Villages. Their start-up costs were

funded with around \$98,000 in private cash donations and small grants, plus an estimated \$114,000 of in-kind materials and labor. City-owned land is leased to the non-profit for a nominal fee of \$1/year. In 2016, the annual operating budget amounted to around \$30,000 for the year—including expenses for utilities, maintenance, bus passes for all residents and insurance.

While OVE does not have on-site services or management, which greatly reduces its operating costs, they work in partnership with existing service providers and other institutions in their community in order to connect the residents with resources.

https://www.squareonevillages.org/opportunity.

https://www.pbs.org/video/religion-and-ethics-newsweekly-tiny-houses-homeless/

Additional useful facts:

https://www.squareonevillages.org/opportunity-faq

c) Emerald Village Eugene (EVE) is a more permanent low-cost housing community developed by Square One Villages. EVE was founded through donations.

#### https://www.squareonevillages.org/emerald

This village model, built on 1.1 acre, provides a permanent, accessible and sustainable place to transition to. Each of the 22 homes at Emerald Village, are designed as permanent dwellings on a slab foundation—complete with sleeping and living areas, kitchenette, and bathroom—all in 160 - 288 square feet. The target Population of Emerald Village earn 20-50% area median income and the residents of EVE are members of a housing cooperative. They make monthly payments of between \$200 - 300 to the co-operative to cover utilities, maintenance, long-term reserves, and all other operating costs.

SquareOne retains ownership of property in trust to assure continued affordability to future members of the co-operative.

See here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0287joZKexo

d) Low Income Housing Institute - <a href="https://lihi.org/tiny-houses/">https://lihi.org/tiny-houses/</a> Tiny Houses Big Future:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oedKozxmg3w&feature=youtu.be

Located in Seattle, LIHI is primarily known for developing low-income, multi-family rental housing (they own and operate over 2,000 apartments and have over 500 units in the pipeline). In 2017 they decided to undertake tiny house transitional villages as a quick and effective way to respond to the homelessness crisis. Since then they have built eight tiny house transitional villages throughout Seattle area.

The tiny houses they build are 8' by 12', cost \$2,500 in materials, and can house single person, a couple or even a small family. A large family can live in two tiny houses side by side. These homes have electricity, heat, ventilation, insulation, windows, and, crucially, a lockable door.

https://www.kiro7.com/news/seattles-first-tiny-house-village-homeless-open-we/40000629/

An example of one such village, T.C.Spirit Village (https://lihi.org/spirit-village/), has 28 tiny houses, a community kitchen, a hygiene building with restrooms, showers, and laundry, staff and counseling offices, and a security pavilion. There is 24/7 staffing and case management on-site to help up to 32 residents obtain housing, employment, health care, education, and other services.

e) Links to other successful tiny house transitional villages:



1. Madison, WI, since 2015

https://occupymadisoninc.com/om-village-2046-e-johnson-st/



2. City of Medford, Oregon, since 2017

https://www.rogueretreat.com/housing-programs/hope-village/



3. Denver, CO, since 2017

https://belovedcommunityvillage.wordpress.com/



4. Albuquerque, NM, in progress, anticipated project completion, December 2020

https://www.bernco.gov/community-services/tiny-home-village.aspx



#### 5. Berkeley, Ca, since 2019

https://youthspiritartworks.org/programs/tiny-house-village/

- c. Single unit added to single lot:
  - o THOW/RV-caretakers in commercial, industrial parking/yard areas
  - o THOW/RV-in church yards, parking areas
  - o THOW/RV-in residential backyards
- d. Housing:
  - Congregate shelter
    - Dormitory type housing="no wrong door"
  - o Homeshare mentor program housing
  - Accessory Dwelling Unit
  - o Junior Accessory Dwelling Unit
  - o Residential hotels
  - o Conventional homes--choice vouchers, 70Now, other
  - o Vacant buildings with COVID changes; commercial: office, etc.
    - Leasing a building for NCS during COVID-19 may be eligible for ESG-COVID funding
    - Concern/issue: where would the community support the use of vacant buildings?
    - Necessary to receive support from community members and city officials
    - Cost: unknown
- e. Potential housing site overview:
  - o Create a list of site categories
    - Church/Religious: St. Ben's, St. Peters, UCC LOVR, etc.
    - Older motel/hospitality properties: several listed on Loopnet.com starting at \$166k/unit
      - a. Project Home Key approved in Paso Robles at Motel 6 and other possible funding available
      - b. Non-profit facilities: 40 Prado, ECHO, 5 Cities, FCNI Atasc. Etc.
    - Warming shelters/emergency shelter:
      - a. 5 Cities Homeless Coalition

- b. ECHO: Paso and Atascadero
- c. CAPSLO

#### 5. Increase shelter space in South County

- a. Location: The main concern regarding a shelter in South County is that the community has not supported any location for us to operate a shelter, or even a larger campus to provide services with transitional housing opportunities. The county once approved a grant for an acquisition of the abandoned Hillside Church for 5CHC and People's Self Help Housing (PSHH) to operate a campus and start construction of affordable housing, but the local community was very against it. This led to litigation, a lengthy escrow, and 5CHC eventually having to stop trying to operate this program. Many also immediately jumped to this being the same thing as being a shelter, which they clearly opposed.
  - One article regarding protests around the church legally being acquired and converted by 5CHC and PSHH: <a href="https://www.ksby.com/news/local-news/2019/05/12/grover-beach-residents-congregation-protest-plans-to-turn-church-into-homeless-shelter">https://www.ksby.com/news/local-news/2019/05/12/grover-beach-residents-congregation-protest-plans-to-turn-church-into-homeless-shelter</a>
  - One article from Cal Coast Times describing how many of the community have a vested interest against the church being converted to a shelter or campus: <a href="https://calcoasttimes.com/2019/09/08/nonprofit-continues-in-escrow-for-grover-beach-church/">https://calcoasttimes.com/2019/09/08/nonprofit-continues-in-escrow-for-grover-beach-church/</a>
  - Opinion piece where a community member voices his disapproval for a shelter in Grover Beach and says he didn't like have a warming shelter there either: <a href="https://www.sanluisobispo.com/opinion/letters-to-the-editor/article227014519.html">https://www.sanluisobispo.com/opinion/letters-to-the-editor/article227014519.html</a>
  - One article on KSBY that says people are concern just to have affordable housing in their area and that the idea of a shelter at the Hillside Church was controversial: <a href="https://www.ksby.com/news/local-news/5cities-homeless-coalition-scraps-plans-for-homeless-services-at-hillside-church">https://www.ksby.com/news/local-news/5cities-homeless-coalition-scraps-plans-for-homeless-services-at-hillside-church</a>
- b. Costs: Estimated \$2 million for acquisition. Please refer to CAPSLO for estimates of operation of an emergency shelter.

#### Attachments – please see

https://www.dropbox.com/sh/4n7lil5d4o98ntq/AAC2XBCAb8RuR 50-HkAHWVGa?dl=0