



Jesse Arreguín
City Councilmember, District 4

ACTION CALENDAR
February 9, 2016

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
From: Councilmember Jesse Arreguín
Subject: Homeless Task Force Recommendations: Expand Homeless Outreach and Mobile Crisis

RECOMMENDATION

Direct the City Manager to analyze the following Tier One Recommendations from the Berkeley Homeless Task Force and return to Council in time for the FY 16-17 Mid-Biennial Budget Process with recommendations and information on financial and staff implications: 1) **Expand city Homeless Outreach Team staff**; 2) **Expand the city's Mobile Crisis Team to provide 24/7 coverage**.

BACKGROUND

The Berkeley Homeless Task Force is a community-driven process which has involved hundreds of stakeholders who met and developed solutions to address homelessness. At the June 23, 2015 Council Worksession, the Task Force presented its recommendations for increased housing and homeless services. The recommendations were split into two tiers based on the critical need for services and the amount of time for the City to implement them. Tier One recommendations were those the Task Force felt required immediate action to address important needs of the homeless population. Tier Two recommendations (which mainly focused on increased housing) require more time and resources to implement.

In the last six months since the Task Force presented its Tier One recommendations, many of the ideas have since been addressed by the City Council. In November, the Council directed staff to fund more restrooms and secure storage space for homeless residents. The plan to implement more storage and restrooms is being developed by City staff. In addition, City staff has opened temporary warming centers to provide shelter for the homeless from the cold weather and rain. Council should discuss whether and how to extend these warming shelters for the next winter season.

The following recommendations have not yet been discussed or addressed by the City Council.

Expand the city's Homeless Outreach Team (HOT) from the current staffing level of **one FTE** from the Mental Health Division. Allocate additional General Fund revenues and explore other funding (Federal, State, County, grants) to increase FTE on the

Homeless Outreach Team, either in the form of additional full-time staff, or hourly staff. Also explore partnerships with UC Berkeley School of Social Welfare or Psychology Department to establish internships for coursework for interns to work alongside permanent HOT staff. Consider specialized HOT teams for Telegraph Avenue and Downtown and provide additional outreach to the Transition Age Youth (TAY) population. The HOT team should not just focus on mental health outreach, but rather broad homeless outreach, including referrals to housing and services. (Information the City's HOT and on outreach in other cities can be found on pages 10 and 18-19 of this report: http://www.cityofberkeley.info/Clerk/City_Council/2013/04Apr/Documents/2013-04-02_Worksession_Item_01_Compassionate_Sidewalks.aspx)

While the City does contract with non-profits such as Berkeley Food and Housing Project and YEAH to provide outreach to homeless persons, one of the challenges is coordination with city departments to provide necessary interventions. Having additional City Homeless Outreach staff can help support the non-profit providers in providing direct outreach to the homeless and connecting them to the HCRC and other necessary services.

Expand Mobile Crisis Team

Dedicate additional General Fund revenues, or additional County or Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) resources to expand staffing for the city's Mobile Crisis Unit, **to potentially provide 24/7 coverage.**

The FY 2016/2017 budget allocated an additional 1.5 FTE for the Mobile Crisis team which expanded coverage during peak hours, but there are not the necessary resources to provide 24/7 coverage which is something both Berkeley Police and the community has requested. There is a growing need for additional emergency mental health services, and expanding the Mobile Crisis Unit is necessary to helping people on our streets get the care they need. It will also help address concerns raised by business owners regarding problematic behavior in commercial areas.

(A recent *Berkeleyside* article stated that mental health calls make up the largest number of calls for Police services. Limited numbers of Mobile Crisis staff put an increased burden on Police to interact, de-escalate and direct individuals suffering from a mental health crisis into appropriate treatment¹.)

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Staff time

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

No adverse effects to the environment.

CONTACT PERSON

Jesse Arreguin, Councilmember, District 4 510-981-7140

¹ <http://www.berkeleyside.com/2015/04/16/mental-health-calls-are-1-drain-on-berkeley-police-resources/>



Kriss Worthington

Councilmember, City of Berkeley, District 7
2180 Milvia Street, 5th Floor, Berkeley, CA 94704
PHONE 510-981-7170 FAX 510-981-7177
kworthington@ci.berkeley.ca.us

RECEIVED AT
COUNCIL MEETING OF

DEC 15 2015

OFFICE OF THE
CITY OF BERKELEY

AMENDMENT #42

ACTION CALENDAR

December 15, 2015

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
From: Councilmember Kriss Worthington
Subject: Refer to the City Manager to Consider the Preparation of a Resolution
Declaring a Homeless Shelter Crisis in Berkeley and Potential
Implementation Strategies

RECOMMENDATION:

Refer to the City Manager to consider the preparation of a resolution declaring a homeless shelter crisis in Berkeley and potential implementation strategies after examining similar policies in San Francisco, San Jose, Los Angeles, Sacramento, Portland, and the state of Hawaii, including but not limited to considering suspending planning, zoning, and other permit requirements.

BACKGROUND:

This amendment seeks to build upon the Homeless Task Force Tier One recommendations, and add potential policy suggestions that could address the underlying problems and increase opportunities to potentially access additional funding streams, while also acknowledging a focus on the urgency of creating short and long term housing for homeless residents. These new tactics and strategies to address this important issue have surfaced recently.

Multiple major cities that lack sufficient shelter beds for their homeless populations have recently declared states of emergency. These cities include San Francisco, San Jose, Los Angeles, Sacramento and Portland, as well as the State of Hawaii.

Berkeley has a homelessness crisis. The number of homeless persons in the City of Berkeley continues to increase and is likely to increase given the substantial upward pressure on residential rents. The shelter crisis affects Berkeley's citizens disproportionately with more African American, Latino, and elderly individuals experiencing homelessness.

The long term and recent decreases in Federal and State funding for housing programs have resulted in an erosion of shelter options for the most vulnerable populations including the elderly, youth, victims of domestic violence, sexually exploited minors, and persons suffering from mental illness, HIV/AIDS, substance abuse, and disabilities. The current number of homeless individuals in Berkeley far outpace the number of existing shelter beds, transitional housing, or permanent supportive housing units available.

Unauthorized homelessness encampments are increasing across parts of Berkeley within the public right of way, thus exposing homeless individuals to traffic hazards, crime, risk of death and injury, exposure to weather, lack of adequate sanitation and debris services, and other conditions that are detrimental to their health and safety.

Analysis and evidence have demonstrated that providing decent, safe, and stable housing combined with crucial support services are two primary components of successful transition from homelessness to a safer and healthier way of living.

This shelter crisis is not unique to Berkeley, but is evident throughout the Bay Area, California and the United States, causing other municipalities such as Los Angeles, Portland, Oregon and Seattle, Washington to also take more immediate actions to address these conditions.

Given the extent of the shelter crisis, the City Council of the City of Berkeley must find that more immediate and expeditious efforts are necessary to develop additional shelter solutions that are safe and meet basic habitability standards and that flexibility and broad based approaches are essential to increase capacity.

California Government Code Section 8698, et seq., allows the governing body of a city to declare a shelter crisis when a significant number of persons are without the ability to obtain shelter, resulting in a threat to their health and safety. In addition, California Government Code Section 8698.1 provides that, upon a declaration of a shelter crisis, the provisions of any state or local regulatory statute, regulation or Resolution prescribing standards of housing, health, or safety, as applied to public facilities, shall be suspended to the extent that strict compliance would in any way prevent, hinder, or delay the mitigation of the effects of the shelter crisis. Lastly, California Government Code Section 8698.2 provides that, upon a declaration of a shelter crisis, a city may allow persons unable to obtain housing to occupy designated public facilities (including facilities leased by the city) during the duration of the crisis.

There are many immediate strategies that Berkeley can act on to help alleviate our shelter crisis and homeless problem. Below is a list of strategies adopted by and considered by other jurisdictions:

Portland Oregon's Strategies:

- Waive zoning codes
- Convert city-owned buildings into shelters
- Work with Governor Brown to waive portions of state building codes so that more buildings can be converted into shelters
- Build permanent housing for people served by a soon-to-be-built psychiatric emergency center in Portland

Los Angeles's Strategies

- Invest at least \$100 million annually in City funding to help house tens of thousands of homeless individuals

- short-term strategy to secure an additional \$13 million in emergency funding to expand homeless services and housing
 - the bulk of that funding, \$10 million, will be allocated to veterans and non-chronically homeless people in the form of housing subsidies — to rapidly re-house individuals who need short-term assistance to get off the street and on with their lives
- Call for shelters to remain open 24 hours a day during the rainy season, and for winter shelter availability to expand by two months.
- Keeping at-risk individuals and families from becoming homeless through new investments in affordable housing — and enforcing the \$15/hour minimum wage increase signed into law by Mayor Garcetti last June.
- Securing housing for homeless Angelenos, by scaling up the Coordinated Entry System (CES) — including a substantial increase in permanent supportive housing, housing subsidies, and supportive services.
- Implementing further strategies to better balance the health and safety of the streets with the rights and needs of those forced to live on them — including the development of regional access centers that provide free personal property storage, access to clean restrooms, shower facilities, and laundry machines, and connect homeless individuals with shelter services and permanent housing.

San Jose's Strategies

- Add four emergency shelters to shield the homeless during the expected El Niño storms this winter the four emergency shelters combined will house up to 100 people a night for 30 nights from Dec. 15 to March 31.
- San Jose will allocate \$430,000 to HomeFirst, a nonprofit selected to run the shelters and provide supportive services.
- Ease regulations to allow churches to shelter the homeless for up to 35 days.

San Francisco's Strategies

- Add 1,100 temporary shelter beds

State of Hawaii's Strategies

- speed up construction of a temporary homeless shelter
- extend existing contracts for homeless services
- increase funding for housing first programs that aim to move people into a home and then address any other issues they may have

Sacramento's Strategies

- Sacramento County, the city of Sacramento and Sutter Health are providing a combined \$2.4 million to the county's primary homeless services coordinator for temporary housing and job training programs.

- Sacramento Steps Forward will use the money for "rapid re-housing" units for roughly 350 homeless individuals
- the program provides short-term rental assistance – for typically between three and nine months – and is geared toward helping homeless individuals whose vulnerability is considered low or medium.

Seattle's Strategies

- the city will make a one-time allocation of \$50 million in additional funds to combat homelessness, coming from the sale of surplus city property
 - money will pay for about 100 shelter beds, plus prevention and outreach, including a van to traverse the city offering help
- Propose \$2 million in additional funds
 - That money would pay for at least 50 shelter beds in Seattle, provide 20 housing vouchers for people exiting drug court, increase incentives for landlords to rent apartments to homeless veterans and fund other programs.

For more information please see the following -

Government Links:

http://sanjose.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php?view_id=&event_id=1476&meta_id=544993
<http://governor.hawaii.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/10.16-EMERGENCY-PROC-HOMELESSNESS-.pdf>

Media Links:

Los Angeles

<http://www.lamayor.org/homelessness-strategy-first-steps>

Portland

<http://www.kgw.com/story/news/politics/2015/09/23/mayor-announces-state-emergency-housing-homeless/72685832/>

Seattle

<http://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/politics/mayor-county-exec-declare-state-of-emergency-over-homelessness/>

San Jose

http://www.mercurynews.com/bay-area-news/ci_29226954/san-jose-council-approves-emergency-shelters-homeless

State of Hawaii

<http://thinkprogress.org/economy/2015/10/19/3713619/hawaii-homeless-emergency/>

San Francisco

<http://www.sfexaminer.com/sf-plans-to-add-1100-homeless-shelter-beds-during-el-nino-storms/>

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY:

No adverse effects to the environment.

ATTACHMENT:

1. DRAFT Resolution Declaring Homeless Shelter Crisis in Berkeley (based on similar Oakland resolution)

DRAFT Resolution

Declaring a Homeless Shelter Crisis in Berkeley

December 15, 2015

WHEREAS, the number of homeless persons in the City of Berkeley continues to increase, with the latest 2015 point-in-time count of over 2,100, and this number is likely to increase given the substantial upward pressure on residential rents; and

WHEREAS, this shelter crisis affects Berkeley's citizens disproportionately with more African American, Latino and elderly individuals experiencing homelessness; and

WHEREAS, the long term and recent decreases in Federal and State funding for housing programs have resulted in an erosion of shelter options for the most vulnerable populations including the elderly, youth, victims of domestic violence, sexually exploited minors and persons suffering from mental illness, HIV/AIDS, substance abuse and disabilities; and

WHEREAS, the current number of homeless individuals in Berkeley far outpaces the number of existing shelter beds, transitional housing or permanent supportive housing units available; and

WHEREAS, unauthorized homelessness encampments are increasing across parts of Berkeley within the public right of way, thus exposing homeless individuals to traffic hazards, crime, risk of death and injury, exposure to weather, lack of adequate sanitation and debris services, and other conditions that are detrimental to their health and safety; and

WHEREAS, analysis and evidence have demonstrated that providing decent, safe and stable housing combined with crucial support services are two primary components of successful transition from homelessness to a safer and healthier way of living; and

WHEREAS, this shelter crisis is not unique to Berkeley, but is evident throughout the Bay Area, California and the United States, causing other municipalities such as Los Angeles, Portland, Oregon and Seattle, Washington to also take more immediate actions to address these conditions; and

WHEREAS, given the extent of the shelter crisis, the City Council of the City of Berkeley finds that more immediate and expeditious efforts are necessary to develop additional shelter solutions that are safe and meet basic habitability standards and that flexibility and broad based approaches are essential to increase capacity; and

WHEREAS, California Government Code Section 8698, et seq., allows the governing body of a city to declare a shelter crisis when a significant number of persons are without the ability to obtain shelter, resulting in a threat to their health and safety; and

WHEREAS, California Government Code Section 8698.1 provides that, upon a declaration of a shelter crisis, the provisions of any state or local regulatory statute, regulation or Resolution prescribing standards of housing, health, or safety, as applied to public facilities, shall be suspended to the extent that strict compliance would in any way prevent, hinder, or delay the mitigation of the effects of the shelter crisis; and

WHEREAS, California Government Code Section 8698.2 provides that, upon a declaration of a shelter crisis, a city may allow persons unable to obtain housing to occupy designated public facilities (including facilities leased by the city) during the duration of the crisis.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BERKELEY:

1. Finds and determines the foregoing recitals to be true and correct and hereby makes them a part of this Resolution; and
 2. This Resolution shall remain in place for a period of one year from the date of passage; and
 3. Finds that a significant number of persons in Berkeley are without the ability to obtain shelter, and that this situation has resulted in a threat to the health and safety of these persons, for the reasons set forth above. The Council therefore hereby declares a shelter crisis in the City of Berkeley under the authority set forth in Government Code Section 8698, et seq.; and
 4. Authorizes the City Administrator or her designee to allow persons unable to obtain housing to occupy designated City facilities or facilities leased by the City as shelters during the period of this crisis; and
 5. Authorizes for the term of this Resolution, no planning, zoning, building, or other permit requirements for the interim establishment of shelters for the homeless at facilities owned, operated, leased or maintained by the City shall be required to the extent that strict compliance would in any way prevent, hinder, or delay the mitigation of the effects of the shelter crisis. At the City Administrator's discretion and with approval by the City Council, interim municipal health and safety provisions and land use controls may be applied to facilities ensuring minimal public health and safety standards. These interim standards shall only apply to additional public facilities open to the homeless; and
 6. Authorizes homeless housing projects that apply the authority provided for under this resolution shall be reviewed and approved by the City Council prior to implementation, and shall include detailed plans for the project and the standards and requirements being applied to the facility and its operation; and
 7. Finds that if this Resolution is inconsistent with any other provisions of the Berkeley Municipal Code, this Resolution shall apply. This Resolution suspends contrary regulations in the Berkeley Municipal Code or requirements of the General Plan or implementing regulations; and
 8. Recognizes that this Resolution is enacted pursuant to the City of Berkeley's general police powers, and Article XI of the California Constitution, as well as the other provisions of state and local law otherwise cited herein; and
 9. Severability. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause or phrase of this Resolution is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional by decision of any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of the Chapter. The City Council hereby declares that it would have passed this Resolution and each section, subsection, clause or phrase thereof irrespective of the fact that one or more other sections, subsections, clauses or phrases may be declared invalid or unconstitutional.
-



Jesse Arreguín
City Councilmember, District 4

ACTION CALENDAR

February 9, 2016

(Continued from January 12, 2016)

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

From: Councilmember Jesse Arreguín

Subject: City Manager Referral: Implementation of Tier One Recommendations from the Homeless Task Force

RECOMMENDATION

Refer to the City Manager to develop a plan to implement the Tier One Recommendations of the Homeless Task Force, which involve expanding the city's Homeless Outreach Team and Mobile Crisis Team, increasing funding for the Crisis Intervention Training (CIT), increasing the number of public restrooms, and providing additional storage spaces and warming centers for the homeless population.

BACKGROUND

At the June 23, 2015 worksession, the Homeless Task Force provided a presentation on its findings and recommendations. The Task Force, consisting of a diverse coalition of stakeholders, had deliberated and compiled its recommendations after regularly meeting for two years. The recommendations were split into two tiers based on the critical nature of the topic and ability of the City to take action in implementing it. The following were categorized as Tier One Recommendations:

Expand City Homeless Outreach Team

The current HOT staffing level is at one FTE, which is too low to adequately handle the workload needed. Funds from the General Fund or others sources (federal, state, county, grants) will be needed to increase the FTE. Other recommendations include partnering with UC Berkeley School of Social Welfare or Psychology Department, and to consider specialized HOT for Downtown, Telegraph, and Transitional Age Youth (TAY).

Expand Mobile Crisis Team

The current Mobile Crisis Team operates limited hours (11:30am-10pm), meaning that if someone suffers a mental crisis in the morning or late at night, their options for assistance are limited. 35% of police calls to BPD are for people having a mental health crisis. General funds or resources from the Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) can be used to expand the FTE (currently at 0.5) and hours of operation for the Mobile Crisis Team.

Increase Crisis Intervention Training Funds

There are currently only a limited number of classes for CIT, which prevents BPD from increasing the number of CIT trained officers on patrol. Allocating more resources to expand the number of classes can improve police interactions with those in crisis. Another proposal includes having CIT trained officers dress in plainclothes rather than in uniform.

Public Restrooms

A major concern among both Berkeley residents and visitors alike is the lack of public restrooms along commercial corridors, and that those that already exist are open for limited hours. Several ideas include looking into self-cleaning restrooms such as the Portland Loo, create incentives for business owners to open their restrooms to the public, integrate public restrooms in new city government buildings, have developers of high-rises include public restrooms as a significant community benefit, and have Bart reopen its restrooms for public use.

Storage Space for Homeless

There have been multiple incidents in recent years where a homeless person's belongings have been confiscated by the City. Carrying all their belongings everywhere they go can be a detriment to finding services and assistance. Cities such as Vancouver and San Diego have successful storage programs which allow individuals to store their items without fear of losing them.

Warming Centers

Several homeless people have died on the streets during the winter season. Establishing additional warming centers, especially in the Downtown and Telegraph areas, would enable those living on the streets to find refuge during stormy weather. These places could be located at non-profits or faith-based communities, or public buildings. Funding can be provided through resiliency initiatives such as the Rockefeller Foundation grant.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Staff time

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

No adverse effects to the environment.

CONTACT PERSON

Jesse Arreguin, Councilmember, District 4 510-981-7140

Attachments:

1: Homeless Task Force Report

Berkeley Homeless Task Force
DRAFT Report to Berkeley Mayor and City Council

June 23, 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction.....	3
Demographics of Berkeley’s Homeless Population.....	4
Current Homeless Programs and Funding.....	6
Affects of Criminalization of the Homelessness.....	10
Task Force Process.....	11
Goals and Priorities.....	12
Priority Recommendations Approved by Task Force.....	13
Additional Recommendations for City Council	16
Possible Funding Sources.....	18
FY 2016-2017 Budget Recommendations.....	18
Next Steps.....	19
Acknowledgements.....	20

Introduction

In November 2012, Berkeley voters considered an ordinance which would have banned sitting on sidewalks in commercial districts throughout the City. That proposal, Measure S, was put on the ballot by a majority of the City Council in response to long-standing concerns of the Telegraph and Downtown Business Improvement Districts about behavior and encampments on public sidewalks and spaces. There was a strong desire for the City to take immediate action to address problematic behavior in public spaces and to discourage individuals from sitting on sidewalks, which they believed obstructed pedestrian traffic and made commercial districts unwelcoming. The focus of the discussion around Measure S was not what the needs of the homeless street population are and whether additional resources are needed, but rather putting in place rules to address encampments and associated issues.

Measure S failed at the November 2012 ballot. However, the issues raised during the campaign could not be ignored, and the important citywide conversation started around Measure S needed to be continued. In that spirit, in December 2012, Councilmember Jesse Arreguín proposed the Compassionate Sidewalks Plan which would have directed the City Manager to convene a working group of representatives of City staff, the Homeless, Housing Advisory, Human Welfare & Community Action, and Police Review Commissions, the Police Department, and other stakeholders, including but not limited to business owners, homeless persons, service providers, students, and academic experts to develop a Compassionate Sidewalks Plan over a series of workshops.

Any proposal addressing homelessness requires an understanding of the demographics of the homeless population, the causes of homelessness, existing laws, a survey of existing resources and services, and an evaluation of best practices, among other things, if it is to be effective and successful.

The working group would have focused on, but not limited to, the following topics:

- 1) The demographics and causes of homelessness
- 2) A survey of existing homeless services
- 3) An assessment of potential funding needs and sources
- 4) Existing laws and enforcement
- 5) Best Practices

Ultimately, the City Council voted to schedule a workshop on April 2, 2013 on homeless programs and to defer the discussion of creating a Task Force to that time. On April 2, 2013, City of Berkeley Health, Housing and Community Services staff provided a comprehensive report on the existing homeless population, existing housing and social services, funding for homeless programs, existing quality of life laws, and best practices employed in other communities. A copy of the report can be found here:

http://www.cityofberkeley.info/Clerk/City_Council/2013/04Apr/Documents/2013-04-02_Worksession_Item_01_Compassionate_Sidewalks.aspx. This report served as a foundation for the Task Force's discussions. Ultimately, Councilmember Arreguín proposed that he independently convene a community task force on homelessness, to allow for an open and inclusive process.

As this report illustrates, Berkeley spends roughly \$3 million dollars on homeless services, yet there are still large numbers of visible homeless on Telegraph Avenue, in the Downtown area and throughout our commercial districts. Our community has a good safety net of services that meet the basic needs of the homeless, but one critical area where we are lacking is providing short-term and permanent housing to get the homeless off our streets. The Obama administration and government agencies throughout the country

are shifting their focus away from emergency services and towards Housing First. In addition, Berkeley's diverse homeless population has a number of distinct needs which must be addressed through appropriate outreach and services. While our population is largely older, male and chronically homeless, there are growing numbers of Transition Age Youth and even families who are becoming homeless and finding their way into shelters and on our streets.

The purpose of the Berkeley Homeless Task Force is to facilitate a community conversation bringing together service providers, homeless persons, students, business owners, and the broader community to identify challenges towards addressing homelessness and to develop a plan for improved services, housing opportunities and other programs to serve Berkeley's homeless population. The goal of the task force is to bring stakeholders together to discuss common goals and to develop a community vision towards addressing homelessness.

Demographics of Berkeley's Homeless Population

In January 2015, Everyone Home organized a homeless count in Alameda County, including a specific count in Berkeley. However, this information is not expected to be released until the fall. The most recent data currently available for the County is from 2013 and 2009 for Berkeley. The 2009 count identified 824 homeless in Berkeley.

680 of those were literally homeless, meaning they have no permanent housing. This includes living on the streets, shelters, and transitional housing programs. Of the 680, 526 were adults without dependents, and 125 people in families.

276 of the 680 literally homeless were defined as chronically homeless. This is defined as adults unaccompanied by children who have at least one disability and have been homeless for over a year or four times in the last year. While this is a significant decrease from the 529 people reported chronically homeless in Berkeley in 2003, it represents 27% of the County's chronically homeless population.

144 people are hidden homeless. This applies to those who are living temporarily with a friend or relative, in a motel, or facing eviction in the next seven days. This is ten-fold increase compared to 2003. Hidden homeless make up 17% of Berkeley's homeless population, compared to 41% of the County's population.

Berkeley has a considerably higher proportion of homeless with disabilities compared to the County. 41% of Berkeley's literally homeless classified themselves as having a mental illness, compared to 30% of the County. 40% of Berkeley's literally homeless are chronic substance abusers, and the County is at 36%. Half of Berkeley's chronically homeless have both a mental illness and an alcohol or drug dependence.

20% of Berkeley's homeless population is veterans, which is similar to the County's at 17%. 46% of Berkeley's homeless veterans served in the Vietnam War.

Below is a chart that breaks down the race/ethnicity, gender, and age of Berkeley's and the County's homeless population in the 2009 survey compared to demographic info provided in the 2010 US Census.

**People using Homeless Services in 2009 in Berkeley and Alameda County Compared to
Berkeley's Population in the 2010 US Census**

	Berkeley		Alameda County
	Service Users	Entire Population	Service Users
Race			
African American	59%	10%	53%
White	24%	60%	33%
Two or More Races	8%	6%	8%
Unknown	7%		2%
Asian	1%	19%	4%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1%	<1%	2%
American Indian/Alaska Native	<1%	<1%	6%
Hispanic/Latino	4%	11%	15%
Gender			
Male	56%	49%	55%
Female	44%	51%	45%
Age			
13-17	<1%	3%	<1%
18-25	5%	29%	4%
26-40	21%	21%	19%
41-60	63%	22%	62%
60+	12%	16%	15%
Average Age	48	31	49

Current Homeless Programs and Housing

The FY 2014 budget allocated \$2,833,996 towards homeless agencies. This is a 2% reduction from the FY 2013 budget and a nearly 9% reduction from the FY 2011 budget. Below is a list of organizations that provide homeless services and the City's financial contribution to those programs.

One of the first services a person seeks when becoming homeless is an emergency shelter. The City funds agencies which provide 118 year round beds and 121 seasonal beds. Some of these beds are reserved for those who are referred by the Alameda County Social Services Agency's Community Housing and Shelter Services (CHASS) or the Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services Agency (BHCS). The rest are open to the general homeless population in Berkeley.

Emergency Shelters	Address	Beds	FY 2014 Funds
Berkeley Food and Housing Project (BFHP) Men's Overnight Shelter	1931 Center St	10 CHASS beds and 26 public beds	\$180,986
BFHP Women's Shelter	2140 Dwight Way	24 single beds and 8 family beds	\$116,469
Building Opportunities for Self Sufficiency (BOSS) Harrison House Singles/Recovery Center	711 Harrison St	17 CHASS beds, 10 BHCS beds, and 23 public beds	\$110,277
Dorothy Day Berkeley Emergency Storm Center	2345 Channing Way	50 beds during severe weather	\$16,206
City of Oakland Winter Shelter Program	Oakland Army Base	50 seasonal beds	\$61,000
Youth Engagement, Advocacy, Housing (YEAH!) Youth Emergency Assistance Hostel	1744 University Ave	21 seasonal beds	\$109,115
BFHP PCEI Centralized Shelter Reservation Hotline (not a shelter, program supports shelter access)	N/A	N/A	\$34,103

Transitional housing is often the next step from an emergency shelter. There are currently 157 beds available in transitional housing, with some programs getting City funding and others receiving no City funding.

Transitional Housing	Address	Beds	FY 2014 City Funds
Berkeley Food and Housing Project (BFHP) Independent House	2140 Dwight Way	11	\$0
BFHP Men's Overnight Shelter (Veterans Program)	1931 Center St	12	Funding included in Emergency Shelter Funds
BFHP Women's Transitional House	2140 Dwight Way	14	\$0
Building Opportunities for Self Sufficiency (BOSS) Harrison House Family Shelter	711 Harrison St	26	\$27,706
BOSS McKinley Family Transitional House	2111 McKinley St	24	\$0
BOSS Sankofa Transitional Housing	711 Harrison St	30	\$26,253
Fred Finch Youth Center Turning Point (18-25 year olds)	3404 King St	18	\$86,655
Resources for Community Development (RCD) Ashby House	1621 Ashby Ave	10	\$0
Women's Daytime Drop In Center Bridget Transitional House	2218 Acton St	12	\$23,838

There are six programs that provide support services for permanent housing. Four of these are specific sites; the other two programs provide rental subsidies to tenants who are renting in private apartments. Once a person is in permanent housing, they are no longer considered homeless.

Services in Permanent Supportive Housing	Address	People Served in FY 2012	FY 2014 City Funds
Berkeley Food and Housing Project Russell Street Residence Board and Care Facility	1741-43 Russell St	20	\$13,045
Bonita House Supported	2931 MLK Jr. Way, 1910-12	9	\$18,151

Independent Living	Hearst Ave		
Lifelong Medical Care (LMC) COACH Shelter Plus Care Social Worker	Tenant based	12	\$58,322
LMC Supportive Housing Program at UA Homes	1040 and 1330 University Ave	81	\$52,250
LMC PCEI Square One Supportive Housing	Tenant based	16	\$95,330
Toolworks, Inc. Supportive Housing	1040 and 1330 University Ave	81	\$47,665

In addition to the emergency shelter, transitional and permanent housing described above, the City supports a variety of services that are not connected to housing. These include meal programs; drop in centers, substance abuse treatment, legal, employment and homelessness prevention and rapid re-housing.

The City funds two meal programs that specifically target people who are homeless.

Meal Programs	Address	Meals Provided	FY 2014 City Funds
Berkeley Food and Housing Project Quarter Meal	2362 Bancroft Way	Dinner M-F, 145/day	\$45,786
Dorothy Day Trinity Church Breakfast	2362 Bancroft Way	Breakfast M-Sat, 168/day	\$41,223

There are five drop in centers that the City provides funding to. Drop in centers provide a multitude of services. First, they provide basic services such as restrooms, mail delivery, and medical services. Second, they provide housing management and related housing services. Third, they provide case management and retention services and provide social support.

Drop In Centers	Address	People Served in FY 2012	FY 2014 City Funds
------------------------	----------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------

Alameda County Network of Mental Health Clients - Berkeley Drop In Center	3234 Adeline St	711	\$89,817
Berkeley Food and Housing Project - Multi-Service Center (MSC)	2362 Bancroft Way	226	\$197,294
Building Opportunities for Self Sufficiency (BOSS) Multi Agency Service Center (MASC)	1931 Center St	195	\$187,163
United for Health Youth Suitcase Clinic - Monday Night Clinic	2300 Bancroft Way	168	\$9,828
Women's Daytime Drop In Center Homeless Case Management and Health Care Services	2218 Acton St	1,193 (755 adults and 438 children)	\$115,793

There are four substance abuse programs, two of which provide on-site housing and the other providing general services. While these programs are available for all people, there is a significant proportion of the homeless population (40%) that is substance abusers.

Substance Use Treatment Program	Address	People Served in FY 2012	FY 2014 City Funds
Bonita House Inc.	1410 Bonita St	15 bed capacity	\$0
Lifelong Medical Care Acupuncture Detox Clinic	2001 Dwight Way	271	\$64,656
New Bridge Foundation	1820 Scenic Ave	Residential program (6-9 months) 15	\$50,000
Options Recovery Services Day Treatment Program	1931 Center St	895	\$191,839

There are several legal services that receive funding from the City. These services help homeless people become eligible for entitlements and addressing legal issues which can often be a barrier to housing.

Legal Services	Address	People Served in FY 2012	Type of Service	FY 2014 City Funds
-----------------------	----------------	---------------------------------	------------------------	---------------------------

Alameda County Homeless Action Center	3126 Shattuck Ave	SSI (138) PCEI (49)	SSI advocacy and PCEI services	\$126,349
Family Violence Law Center Domestic Violence and Homelessness Prevention Project	470 27th St, Oakland	228	Crisis intervention, advocacy, case management, financial assistance, legal representation	\$87,030

The City also funds several employment programs. These programs are used by both the homeless and those that are housed.

Employment Programs	Address	People Served in FY 2012	Type of Service	FY 2014 City Funds
Rubicon Workforce Services	1918 Bonita Ave	80	Job readiness, pre-employment workshops, vocational assessment, planning and counseling, transitional employment, job placement, business services, job retention and career advancement services	\$35,266
Rubicon Work Maturity Training Program	1918 Bonita Ave	20	Landscape service, on-job training, counseling preparation workshops, placement assistance	\$55,292

Affects of Criminalization of the Homelessness

In February 2015, the Policy Advocacy Clinic, a division of the UC Berkeley School of Law, published a report¹ detailing the effectiveness of anti-homeless laws. The study looked at 58 cities in California that

¹ California's New Vagrancy Laws – Report on anti-homeless laws by Berkeley Law:
http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2558944

combined have at least 500 anti-homeless laws. All these cities have restrictions on daytime activities such as sitting resting in public spaces, and all but one have restrictions on nighttime activities such as sleeping and lodging in public spaces.

Vagrancy laws, in which people were cited and jailed for selectively, enforced policies that often targeted people without homes, were struck down by the US Supreme Court in *Papachristou v. City of Jacksonville* in 1972. The ruling stated that vagrancy laws “encourage[d] arbitrary and erratic arrests and convictions,” “ma[de] criminal activities which by modern standards [we]re normally innocent,” and placed “unfettered discretion [...] in the hands of the Jacksonville police”.

In response to the rise of homelessness that started in the 1980s, a new wave of anti-homeless laws was enacted starting in the 1990s. The report found that 59% of anti-homeless laws in the 58 cities studied were enacted since 1990. The Great Recession worsened homelessness and more extreme anti-homeless laws followed. This equates to a collective total of 11 new laws a year under current trends. Californian cities have more anti-homeless laws than cities in other states, including being twice as likely to ban sleeping or lodging in vehicles.

Additionally, these laws appear to be targeted by status, and not behavior. The report goes on to say that there has been a 77% increase in arrests for vagrancy since 2000, even though during the same period arrests for behavioral problems such as public intoxication and disorderly conduct have decreased by 16% and 48% respectively.

The report concludes that there are several critical issues regarding the enactment of anti-homeless laws. First, it is harmful to the homeless as it perpetuates poverty by restricting access to the social safety net, affordable housing, and employment opportunities. Second, these laws raise many ethical, constitutional, and legal issues regarding the rights of homeless people. Finally, the cost of enforcing these laws is expensive, causing a lack of resources that could be used for policies that would be effective and humane in reducing homelessness.

It is clear that providing services, rather than resulting to criminalization, is both cost effective and ethical. While ultimately it should be up to the State to implement statewide homeless solutions, it is up to Berkeley to provide adequate services now. Failure to do so will only further drain resources and funding without dealing with the root causes of homelessness, causing an endless spiral of homelessness and wasteful spending.

Task Force Process

The Berkeley Homeless Task Force held its first meeting on August 15, 2013, with over 70 people in attendance. The meeting provided an overview of homelessness on a federal, county and local level and what policies and programs exist to address homelessness, as a foundation for future Task Force discussions. The Task Force heard presentations from Kristin Lee of the City of Berkeley Health, Housing and Community Services Department and Elaine DeColigny from Alameda County Everyone Home on existing Berkeley and County homeless services and Coordinated Access, and Katherine Gale from the U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness on federal homeless policy. Pattie Wall, Executive Director of the Homeless Action Center presented the results of a survey of homeless clients about service needs, which indicated that housing was the main priority and unfulfilled need of homeless people. In addition, youth from Youth Spirit Artworks provided testimonials about their experiences being

homeless. The meeting also started identifying questions and issues the Task Force would begin focusing on.

Before the first meeting, over 100 diverse stakeholders were contacted asking them to join the Task Force and to complete a survey to identify priorities for the Task Force. Out of that survey, several key issues emerged: Housing, Existing service needs and expanding services, Homeless Youth and Mental Health. Attendees of the August 15th meeting were asked to identify which subcommittees they wish to serve on. The second meeting of the Task Force was held in October 2013 and consisted of subcommittee meetings based on the priorities identified in the initial survey. Each subcommittee identified ideas/projects to work on.

Following the October 2013 meeting, the Homeless Youth Subcommittee met and not only visited Telegraph Avenue to talk to Transition Age Youth (TAY) congregating on the street, but they also visited service sites to get a sense of how is Berkeley doing in serving the homeless TAY population. Based on these site visits, the Youth Subcommittee worked on improvements to the Willard Shower Program and supporting the Suitcase Clinic's request for city funding. The Housing Subcommittee also met regularly to work on the Berkeley Way development, identifying vacant houses and buildings for homeless housing, additional resources for the Housing Trust Fund, and Housing First.

In 2014, the Task Force moved towards a direction of hosting work sessions on specific issues around homelessness and using that as a spring board for discussion and recommendations. In February and April 2014, the Task Force focused on Housing First models and how Berkeley can fully move towards a Housing First approach. In September 2014, the Task Force reflected on its work to date and identified a process going forward to develop recommendations to the City Council.

Some of the accomplishments the Task Force acknowledged at that time included:

- Successfully advocating for the Berkeley Way project (Bridge Housing and BFHP now selected for an RFQ, 1 year horizon on resolving the parking replacement issue).
- Working on developing a Housing First policy.
- Research and collaborative learning about Transitionally Aged Youth (TAY), tent villages, hostels, rainy day respite possibilities, residential co-ops, alternative funding sources for housing, how to network and streamline systems, and creating an available properties/housing inventory for Berkeley.
- There's been marked progress on improving the Willard Showers.
- We have a great contact for residential co-ops: Rick Lewis, ED, Bay Area Community Land Trust. We've realized the need to draw more residents, merchants, service providers, churches, and the campus into our conversation.
- We have the beginnings of a strong recommendation to Council.

From October 2014 to March 2015 the Task Force held focused workshops on important homeless issues: Mental Health services; the needs of the LGBT Youth Homeless population; Criminalization of the Homeless; Youth Homelessness.

From March to May 2015, the Task Force reviewed all of the issues each subcommittee identified, as well as ideas raised during each meeting and developed a comprehensive list of recommendations, which were refined and approved by consensus by the Task Force.

Goals and Priorities

Over the past three decades, Berkeley has seen a continued growth in homelessness. While Berkeley's targeted efforts to address chronic homelessness resulted in a 48% decrease in the 2009 Berkeley specific homeless count, the number of hidden homeless increased. While the results of the 2015 Berkeley specific count have not been released, rising housing costs and cost of living most likely has not resulted in a substantial decrease in chronic homelessness. Berkeley per capita has one of the largest chronic homeless populations in the entire county. While our community has provided great leadership funding an array of services and supporting regional efforts to address homelessness, there is clearly still more to do. **The Task Force's fundamental goal is ending homelessness in our city.** We have the ability to leverage resources and the vision and dedication of our citizens to solve this crisis and to serve as a model for other cities.

Homeless is fundamentally a regional crisis, and our city's efforts should focus on working with other communities in the Bay Area to develop regional strategies to address homelessness. Increased enforcement and rising housing costs result in a shifting of the homeless population from city to city. Countywide the Everyone Home program has led broader efforts to target federal dollars to promote rapid re-housing and address chronic homelessness, in support of the "Opening Doors" plan goal of ending chronic homelessness. But what happens in San Francisco and Contra Costa County also has an effect on the regional migration of homelessness. **To that end the Task Force supports increased efforts to pursue regional coordination to address homelessness.** A decade ago Berkeley led an ABAG level committee of elected officials from throughout the region to discuss regional solutions to homelessness.

However the City of Berkeley must also address the specific needs of our homeless population. The main need stated by homeless clients and agreed by nearly everyone throughout the Task Force process is **HOUSING**. Berkeley has a great safety net of services addressing the daily needs of the homeless, and providing emergency support, but in order to truly end homelessness we must provide permanent housing, and resources to prevent homelessness.

Our region and our community are facing a housing crisis. As regional pressures result in rising housing costs, Berkeley must significantly increase its supply of low-income housing, with particular emphasis on housing for extremely low income populations (30% AMI and less). Critical in success of this effort is increasing resources for affordable housing. The Task Force strongly supports any efforts to significantly expand the Housing Trust Fund as well as requirements to create mixed income housing. In addition we support efforts to preserve existing affordable housing from conversion or demolition.

As Berkeley is moving towards a coordinated access model with the implementation of the Housing Crisis Resolution Center (HCRC), we must increase our stock of transitional and permanent supportive housing. Berkeley has far few beds to house our existing homeless population. As the federal government and states and cities are moving towards a Housing First approach, **the Task Force believes that the top priority for the City should be to adopt a Housing First goal, and work towards expanding the supply of housing and housing subsidies available to rapidly house homeless people, stabilize them, provide supportive services to help them escape the cycle of homelessness.** We also believe that Berkeley should invest in new services to address identified service gaps, such as the needs of specific homeless populations (ex. Transition Age Youth).

TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

In April and May of 2015, the Berkeley Homeless Task Force met to review, revise and adopt by consensus the following recommendations to the Berkeley City Council. These recommendations reflect close to three years of meetings (August 2013-May 2015) during which the Task Force held workshop discussions on a number of topics: existing homeless services, best practices other communities have used to address homelessness, and the needs of specific homeless populations in Berkeley (such as the McKinney Vento and Transition Age Youth populations). These recommendations reflect the input of several hundred Berkeley residents who have participated throughout this process including: homeless clients, service providers, city commissioners, business owners/representatives; UC Berkeley professors, students, clergy, youth, and homeless advocates.

These stakeholders brought their expertise and ideas to the table and many good ideas came forward in the Task Force's discussions. In order to organize the many ideas, these recommendations have been divided into several sections to focus Council attention on short-term and long-term priorities, as well as additional ideas for Council and the City Manager consideration. **Tier 1 recommendations** are those the Task Force has identified as critical and which can be implemented immediately if the City were to dedicate funding and staffing to expand or establish these new services. **Tier 2 recommendations** are new concepts which require additional study and involve longer term implementation.

Recommendations Approved by Consensus by Task Force

Tier 1 Recommendations – for Immediate Implementation

Expand City Homeless Outreach Team

Expand the city's Homeless Outreach Team (HOT) from the current staffing level of **one FTE** from the Mental Health Division. Allocate additional General Fund revenues and explore other funding (Federal, State, County, grants) to increase FTE on the Homeless Outreach Team, either in the form of additional full-time staff, or hourly staff. Also explore partnerships with UC Berkeley School of Social Welfare or Psychology Department to establish internships for coursework for interns to work alongside permanent HOT staff. Consider specialized HOT teams for Telegraph Avenue and Downtown and provide additional outreach to the Transition Age Youth (TAY) population. The HOT team should not just focus on mental health outreach, but rather broad homeless outreach, including referrals to housing and services. (Information the City's HOT and on outreach in other cities can be found on pages 10 and 18-19 of this report: http://www.cityofberkeley.info/Clerk/City_Council/2013/04Apr/Documents/2013-04-02_Worksession_Item_01_Compassionate_Sidewalks.aspx)

Expand Mobile Crisis Team

Dedicate additional General Fund revenues, or additional County or Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) resources to expand staffing for the city's Mobile Crisis Unit, **beyond the .5 FTE proposed in the FY 2016-2017 budget**, to increase hours and days of coverage. (A recent *Berkeleyside* article stated that mental health calls make up the largest number of calls for Police services. Limited numbers of Mobile Crisis staff put an increased burden on Police to interact, de-escalate and direct individuals suffering from a mental health crisis into appropriate treatment².)

² <http://www.berkeleyside.com/2015/04/16/mental-health-calls-are-1-drain-on-berkeley-police-resources/>

Fund Increased CIT Training

Allocate additional resources to expand the number of Crisis Intervention Training (CIT) classes to increase the number of CIT-trained officers on patrol. Explore requiring CIT trained patrol officers to dress in plainclothes rather than in uniform. (CIT Coordinator Jeff Shannon recently told the Mental Health Commission that the limited number of classes has prevented the Police Department from increasing the number of CIT trained officers on patrol)

Public Restrooms

Establish a plan to expand the number of public restrooms available in Berkeley's commercial districts and public spaces. Study approaches other cities have employed, including self-cleaning restrooms, attended restrooms, and the Portland Loo³ (www.portlandloo.com) being used in Portland and soon Emeryville⁴. Consider establishing incentives to business owners to allow public access to restrooms. Establish a policy of integrating in new city government buildings public restrooms and allocate necessary funding to construct additional public restrooms in parks and in commercial districts. Expand the hours of current public restrooms in Berkeley.

Request that BART re-opens its restrooms in its Berkeley stations, and urge UC Berkeley to make their restrooms on-campus available for use by the general public. Request that the Downtown Berkeley Association provide a dedicated public restroom or funding for additional public restrooms Downtown.

In addition, consider the inclusion of public restrooms in new high-rise Downtown developments as a "significant community benefit" or funding for constructing public restrooms in the Downtown area. Explore requiring as part of a vacancy tax, or through agreements with owners of vacant commercial spaces, to allow public use of restrooms in vacant spaces.

Storage Space for Homeless

Establish additional secure storage space, including refrigerated lockers, in existing service sites or in public facilities, for homeless people to store their belongings. (Information on previous City locker program: <http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/citycouncil/2004citycouncil/packet/032304/2004-03-23%20Item%2009.pdf>)

Warming Centers

Establish additional Warming/ Rain-Day Respite Centers during the winter months, in addition to the storm shelters funded by the City, to provide spaces for people to get off the streets and into a safe and comfortable environment, with particular emphasis on the Telegraph and Downtown areas. Warming Centers are an enclosed physical space so that people can get out of the rain and other natural elements. Explore working with service providers, including Night on the Streets Catholic Worker, to establish Warming Centers at existing service sites, and partnering with the faith-based community to provide space for Warming Centers at churches. Look into integrating Warming Centers in either the Telegraph-

³ <http://www.citylab.com/design/2012/01/why-portlands-public-toilets-succeeded-where-others-failed/1020/>

⁴ <https://emeryville.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=2252371&GUID=D09E7F37-E23C-4F60-8175-4D33E597813F>

Channing Parking Garage or the new Center Street Garage, the entrance of the Veterans Memorial Building (1931 Center St.) or in other public facilities, such as senior centers and public libraries. Explore tying Warming Centers to the city's Resiliency initiatives, funded through the Rockefeller Foundation grant.

Tier 2 Recommendations – Require Further Study/Longer Term Implementation

Rehabilitation/Renting Vacant Homes/Multi-Family Buildings for Homeless Housing

Develop an inventory of vacant single-family homes and multi-family properties or properties at risk of conversion to market-rate housing, and engage in discussions with property owners regarding non-profit developers acquiring those properties, as well as single room occupancy hotels, to be rehabilitated for transitional and permanent supportive housing for the homeless. Explore the city leasing existing multi-family properties to provide housing for the homeless.

Short-Term Shelter/Navigation Center

Explore establishing a short-term shelter such as the Navigation Center which recently opened in San Francisco, which would provide short-term housing for individuals who have had difficulty accessing or staying in shelters because of possessions, pets or prior negative experiences. A Navigation Center would provide short-term housing (a week or more) for people to stabilize, rest, and engage in intensive case management to connect people to housing and services. A Navigation Center would allow groups of individuals to remain living together as a community, rather than be separated by limited access to shelter beds. Explore whether HUD funding is available to help establish a Navigation Center in Berkeley.

Alternative Housing Options

Explore alternative housing options that are more affordable to provide short-term or long-term housing to get people off the street such as: tiny houses, micro units, Accessory Dwelling Units, boats or sleeping in vehicles. Explore converting commercial or industrial property into housing for the homeless. Look at amending City laws prohibiting individuals from sleeping in vehicles overnight, and eliminate penalties for sleeping in vehicles. In addition, explore designating public spaces where homeless people can camp overnight.

Additional Recommendations for Council Consideration

- a. Direct the City Manager and Chief of Police to provide expanded Police training on interacting with homeless persons and how to direct individuals to housing and services, including coordination with service providers. Limit the activities of Block by Block Ambassadors to beautification and cleaning, rather than direct interaction and outreach to the street population. Instead DBA should provide funding to the City to expand the city Homeless Outreach Team and Mobile Crisis Unit. If Block by Block Ambassadors are to continue to interact and conduct outreach with the street population, then they must engage in expanded training on crisis intervention, de-escalation, and how to interact with the homeless and connect them to services. (One such training could be the recently established Mental Health First Aid course)

- b. Increase funding for the city's emergency rental assistance program, to increase the number of Berkeley residents served and to prevent eviction and homelessness.
- c. Expand direct, case specific outreach services to homeless TAY youth, either through expanding the HOT team or through contracting with a non-profit organization.
- d. Increase funding to employ more case workers to maximize federal housing dollars coming to Berkeley and to expand the number of Shelter Plus Care eligible individuals.
- e. Amend the city's Housing Trust Fund Guidelines to add among the existing established priorities funding for permanent supportive housing and housing for Transition Age Youth. In addition, when establishing priorities for each Housing Trust Fund Request for Proposals, the city should also give preference to projects that provide transitional or permanent supportive housing for the chronic homeless, with particular emphasis on the Transition Age Youth population.
- f. Increase General Fund allocations to existing homeless service providers to reverse years of funding cuts.
- g. Establish a policy of ensuring 24-hour access to shelters and increasing access to services that offer alternatives to living on streets and in other public spaces. Ensure better access to services through outreach, program design and through available resources to address the basic needs of homeless persons, and to transition individuals from living on streets and in public spaces. **Affirm the right of everyone, homeless or not, to have access and use sidewalks and public spaces.**
- h. Create an independent complaint and review system for the Block by Block Ambassador Program. The City should require as part of its contract with the Downtown Berkeley Association that they establish a formal complaint process including a standardized form for complaints, and that all complaints be forwarded to the city's contract monitor who will review and ensure resolution of the complaint.
- i. Establish a city staff position in Health, Housing and Community Services Department of a homeless services ombudsperson, to take and review complaints from homeless clients related to their denial of services and placement in shelter/housing. In addition, the ombudsman would represent the person making the complaint to the social service agency that is the subject of the complaint.
- j. Work with the Berkeley merchants to expand acceptance by Berkeley restaurants of EBT cards.

Task Force Recommendations/Statements on Criminalization of the Homeless

- a. The Task Force is opposed to any further criminalization of the homeless, including the proposals put forward by Councilmember Maio at the March 17, 2015 City Council meeting. The Task Force recognizes that criminalization does not end homelessness. In fact criminalization impedes

efforts at ending homelessness including in the employment, qualifying for housing and benefits eligibility areas.

- b. The City should establish a tracking system for infractions being levied against homeless people, including smoking and other quality-of-life violations. Currently, BPD is collecting data on all pedestrian and vehicle stops. Information regarding police stops and citations of the homeless and people sleeping and occupying public sidewalks and spaces should be collected and submitted in an annual report to the PRC, Homeless Commission and City Council.
- c. Until we have the resources to house and serve the needs of our homeless it is critical that we stop the continued harassment and criminalization of street homeless people. No new laws or ordinances should be introduced and the laws which currently exist should be reviewed carefully, including those which cite or arrest people for behaviors related to their living situation. We want all people in Berkeley to have a right to use public sidewalks and spaces.
- d. Criminalization is counterproductive and pushes homeless people to different parts of our city or to different communities, and does not solve the problem of homelessness. We should not shuffle homeless people throughout the region, but rather work to provide adequate housing and supportive services to end the cycle of homelessness.
- e. Create opportunities to increase communication between merchants and the homeless, including providing Mental Health First Aid training, and specific training on how to interact and refer homeless people to services.

Possible Funding Sources for Recommendations:

- a. Establish a vacancy tax on vacant ground floor commercial space (requires voter approval)
- b. Adopt an increase in the business license tax on rental property with funds dedicated to the Housing Trust Fund and homeless services. (requires voter approval)
- c. Allocate as part of the biennial budget process revenue from Downtown tax assessments towards homeless services.
- d. Expand the hours of enforcement for parking meters in the Downtown and Telegraph areas to 8 pm on Monday through Saturday, with a portion of that revenue dedicated to homeless services.
- e. Include in the requirement for “significant community benefits” from Downtown projects above 75 feet, that developers provide funding for affordable housing for the homeless and extremely low-income populations, as well as public restrooms.

FY 2016-2017 Budget Recommendations

The Homeless Task Force has reviewed the City Manager’s proposed allocations to community agencies for FY 2016-2017. We are concerned about proposed cuts, as well as the lack of funding at all, for a number of programs that provide important services to our homeless population. We strongly urge the City Council to identify funding to restore these cuts. These services either provide an important safety net currently for the homeless, or are new programs that would address identified gaps in services (such as the needs of the TAY population).

The Task Force appreciates the Council's budget referral of extending the YEAH Shelter beyond the winter months and urges the Council to identify funding to establish a year round shelter/drop-in center for the TAY homeless population. **However, we feel that first and foremost we should restore the cuts to existing homeless services, which are identified below.**

As we are transitioning out of the recession and more revenue becomes available to the city, we should not only invest those resources in physical infrastructure but in human infrastructure, and maintain and possibly expand the important continuum of services Berkeley provides to the homeless. The Berkeley City Council has historically been a leader in funding homeless services, and maintaining the safety net even in difficult economic times. During an improved economic climate we should not be reducing critical homeless services.

Existing services:

Berkeley Drop-In Center Case Management - \$35,000
Dorothy Day Trinity Church Breakfast Program - \$8,894
Youth Spirit Artworks:
Vocational Arts Training - \$33,777
BUSD Homeless Student Program - \$50,000

New programs which should be funded:

Youth Spirit Artworks/YEAH Housing Subsidies proposal - \$125,000
Youth Spirit Artworks TAY Youth Drop In Center/Daytime Job Training Program – \$50,000
Suitcase Clinic – \$15,000
Extending YEAH Shelter beyond winter months - \$300,000 (estimated)

Next Steps

The Homeless Task Force strongly urges the Berkeley City Council to: **Direct the City Manager to develop a plan detailing the costs and feasibility of implementing the Tier 1 Task Force Recommendations. The review should involve the Homeless Commission and a report should return to Council no later than six months. In addition, city staff should explore the possible funding sources recommended (page 17) as well as any available County, state and federal sources to implement the Task Force's recommendations. The City Manager, Homeless Commission and Housing Advisory Commission should also begin to explore the feasibility of implementing the Tier 2 Recommendations.**

Some of the recommendations put forward by the Task Force can be adopted in the Fiscal Year 2016-2017 Biennial Budget, if additional funds are identified. The Task Force urges the Council to fully fund the existing homeless services slated to be cut and new programs identified on page 18.

The Task Force will continue to meet to study additional issues (needs of homeless seniors, LGBT homeless youth) and to monitor the implementation of the Task Force's recommendations. We offer our expertise and commitment to the City in evaluating and implementing these proposals.

Acknowledgements

The Homeless Task Force wishes to acknowledge and thank its co-conveners, Genevieve Wilson and David Stegman, for their leadership and work in guiding the Task Force process.

In addition we would like to thank the office of Berkeley City Councilmember Jesse Arreguin, most specifically Anthony Sanchez, Stefan Elgstrand, Audrey Gutierrez (former) and Rian Johnson (former) for all their work in organizing Task Force meetings and providing ongoing support to the Task Force.

The Task Force wishes to thank Kristin Lee from the City of Berkeley Health, Housing and Community Services; Elaine DeColigny from Alameda County Everyone Home; and Katherine Gale from the U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness for participating in Task Force meetings and in providing important information on homeless policy and services on a federal, county and local level.

We wish to thank the Subcommittee Chairs:

Homeless Youth: Steve Martinot, Elliot Halpern, David Stegman

Housing: Genevieve Wilson and Igor Tregub

Most importantly we wish to thank the many dedicated people who have participated throughout the Task Force process and who have made important contributions towards identifying real needs for our homeless population and developing innovative ideas to help address homelessness in Berkeley.