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1. Call to Order and Introductions
Mariam called the meeting to order at 1pm.

2. Public Comment
None.

3. Consent: Approval of Minutes
Janna made a motion to approve the minutes, seconded by Susan. The motion passed with none opposed and no abstentions.

4. Action/Information/Discussion

4.1. Discussion Item: 2021 Point in Time (PIT) Count
George reported that HUD (Department of Housing & Urban Development) has released guidance on their requirements for the 2021 PIT (Point in Time) Count. CoCs (Continuums of Care) are required to carry out the sheltered count and HIC (Housing Inventory Count) as normal, but HUD is offering flexibility on the
unsheltered count. CoCs can seek exceptions to do only a head count, a short survey, or to not do the count at all. This guidance was brought to the Finance & Data Committee in early December. The Finance & Data Committee recommended that County staff seek an exception to conducting the unsheltered count, due to concerns with volunteer and staff safety and capacity. The Encampment Committee concurred with this recommendation. All other CoCs in Southern California are requesting this exception. HUD has received around one hundred exception requests from CoCs nationwide, which represents around a quarter of all CoCs. HUD has not provided a formal answer on whether or not there will be a financial impact on CoCs that do not carry out the unsheltered count, but representatives have said they do not want to penalize CoCs.

In the exception request, County staff will need to state what other action the CoC will be taking to understand the needs of homeless people in their community. County staff will take this discussion to the Finance & Data Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.1.1. Action Item: Vote to Request an Exception from HUD (Department of Housing &amp; Urban Development)</th>
<th>Janna made a motion to request an exception from HUD to carrying out the 2021 PIT Count, seconded by Devin. The motion passed with all in favor, none opposed and no abstentions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2. Discussion Item: Grant Updates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.1. Discussion Item: Homeless Emergency Aid Program (HEAP) Update</td>
<td>Laurel shared that the County is in the process of finalizing the North County HEAP (Homeless Emergency Aid Program) contract. HASLO (Housing Authority of San Luis Obispo) has now acquired the Motel 6 in Paso Robles. ECHO (El Camino Homeless Organization) has begun operating their shelter there on a limited basis, and will be expanding into February. HASLO are moving forward with preparing the permanent housing side. There are 63 units in total. Some rooms will be for people who are currently homeless, and some for those at risk of homelessness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2. Discussion Item: Homeless Housing, Assistance and Prevention (HHAP) Program Update and Discussion of Round 2 Application Process</td>
<td>Laurel reported that the County is working on an application for the second round of HHAP (Homeless Housing, Assistance and Prevention Program) funding, due on January 23. The State requires a detailed analysis of the community's needs, including input from people with lived experience of homelessness, and expects funding to be prioritized to meet these needs. The full HSOC will vote on priorities for HHAP Round 2 funding at its January 20 meeting. Laurel clarified that the RFP (Request for Proposals) for Round 1 of HHAP funding will be released early next year. HSOC and the Board of Supervisors have already agreed on priorities for this. Like HEAP (Homeless Emergency Aid Program), HHAP Round 1 will have funding set aside for youth projects, so there will be a special youth focus in the RFP. The Committee discussed the barriers to moving people into housing, such as lack of Section 8 vouchers, lack of places for the vouchers to be used, and lack of housing for people with Social Security as their sole source of income.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Executive Committee agreed to hold a Special meeting in the second week of January to consider priorities to take to the full HSOC. The Committee agreed to invite representatives of the Supportive Housing Consortium and John DiNunzio from SLOCOG (San Luis Obispo Council of Governments) to feed into this meeting.

<p>| 4.2.3. Discussion Item: California Emergency Solutions and Homelessness Grant (CESH) Update | No update. | Russ to send out Doodle poll with options for the date of the Special meeting |
| 4.2.4. Discussion Item: California Emergency Solutions Grant (CA ESG) Update | George reported that the County has received the executed agreement for Round 1 of the ESG-CV (Emergency Solutions Grant – Coronavirus) program, and is now in the process of drawing up subrecipient agreements. No update on the annual ESG program or Round 2 of the ESG-CV program. |
| 4.2.5. Discussion Item: Continuum of Care (CoC) Grant Update | No update. |
| 4.3. Discussion Item: COVID-19 Update |  |
| 4.3.1. Discussion Item: COVID-19 Grant | Laurel reported that the County is in the process of getting contracts sent out to subrecipients for the COVID-19 Emergency Homelessness Funding program. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>updates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.3.1.1. Discussion Item: Racial Equity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 2 of the Emergency Solutions Grant – Coronavirus (ESG-CV) program requires a focus on racial equity. Questions on this were included in the local application. The State has identified particular census tracts where people are disproportionately affected by COVID, including minority communities and people with very low income. Public Health are working on this as part of their COVID response. Applicants to the ESG-CV program will receive extra points if they will be serving people from these tracts. This could be achieved by partnering with organizations working with these tracts, but applicants must be more specific than simply stating they will serve the whole county which includes these tracts. HUD's data analysis tool Stella has recently been updated to include racial equity metrics. Stella can currently be used for reporting on data but will have modelling capabilities eventually. What Stella can tell us about racial equity in the county will be brought to the Finance &amp; Data Committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **4.3.2. Discussion Item: Situational update** |
| Laurel reported that the County is seeing a significant increase in people testing positive for COVID, which increases the risk for people experiencing homelessness. |
| Janna reported that one staff member at 5CHC (5Cities Homeless Coalition) has tested positive for COVID. 5CHC are taking extra precautions with their warming center. |
| Grace reported that 40 Prado has seen an outbreak, and the situation is still unfolding. In total, 9 clients and one staff member have tested positive, but there are more results |
### 4.4. Discussion Item: Planning for Vaccinations

Laurel reported that the County has received its first batch of Pfizer vaccines, and will receive its first batch of Moderna vaccines later in the month. People in hospitals and frontline medical staff will be prioritized. The County will be planning to distribute vaccines to vulnerable people including homeless people, and will be reaching out to homeless services agencies about concerns they may have.

### 4.5. Discussion Item: Warming Centers

Laurel reported that the Atascadero shelter has been opened (as a winter emergency shelter rather than a warming center). The center will be open every night through winter. The shelter is at Atascadero Community Church, and ECHO (El Camino Homeless Organization) can provide transportation for people physically unable to walk. Intake is done at the ECHO dinner program.

Janna reported that 5CHC is ready to open at the South County Regional Center, and has adopted the same protocols as CAPSLO (Community Action Partnership of San Luis Obispo) – the shelter will open if the temperature drops to 38 degrees or if there is a 50% chance of rain. 5CHC are still working out transportation and are talking to the County and the City of Arroyo Grande about having isolation trailers at the back of the shelter.

Laurel reported that the Los Osos Cares shelter is also ready to
open, and has only been open one night so far.

| 4.6. Discussion Item: Committee Reports | Janna shared that George had reported on what the Finance & Data Committee discussed above. There were no other Committee reports. |
| 5. Future Discussion/Report Items | • Priorities for HHAP funding (to be discussed at the Special Executive Committee meeting in January) |
| 6. Next Regular Meeting Date: February 17, 2021 | A Special Executive Committee meeting will be held in January. |
| 7. Adjournment | Mariam adjourned the meeting at 2:40pm. |
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. **Provision:** 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:**
   o 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
   o Location: Will persons choose to relocate to remote/less desirable yet more political feasible sites?
   o Mechanism/permitting
   o Funding for camp/services
   o Risk management: safety & crime; camp residents and local area residents
   o Goals: help residents; “clearance” for general community; environmental protections–watershed; fire protection
   o Religion and religious symbols conflict with separation with church and state issues
   o Considering camps “temporary/pilots” or “ongoing” options
   o Management/oversight: Rules at odds with Personal choice and autonomy (guest restriction policies, case management requirements; zero tolerance for illegal substances, etc)
   o Pets: how to accommodate
o 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, wind-resistant 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.”

- ABC 10 article regarding sanctioned encampments in Modesto, December 2018:
  “In addition, the County will enter into a $500,000 agreement with Turning Point 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”

- 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."


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: $85,500.

SLO County and city partner with 40 Prado on safe parking program for homeless | SLO the virus [newtimesslo.com]

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 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.

Title 17 Art. 4 Regulations for Specific Land Uses and Activities | San Luis 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 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 –

Providing for better outcome of successful and productive reintegation 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:

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

Transitional tiny house village - 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.

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

Population-specific villages – 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
Tiny house for a transitional living village - 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

Tiny houses for a more permanent living village - 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

Tiny house on wheels - 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.

https://communitysupportedshelters.org/hut-construction-manual

Pallet Shelters - 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.


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: https://eead3e67-3a27-4098-aa25-9fa572882b1f.filesusr.com/ugd/bd125b_32be9eddb4d34ea7ae64cf4beed1dabb.pdf

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: https://hopesvillageofslo.com/

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 grocery 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%2020%2007%2020%20.pdf?ver=160666987690

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.


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 co-operative. 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 - https://lihi.org/tiny-houses/
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.


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

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
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:
   o Congregate shelter
      • Dormitory type housing="no wrong door"
   o Homeshare mentor program housing
   o 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
      • 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: https://www.ksby.com/news/local-news/2019/05/12/grover-beach-residents-congregation-protest-plans-to-turn-church-into-homeless-shelter

   - 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: https://calcoasttimes.com/2019/09/08/nonprofit-continues-in-escrow-for-grover-beach-church/

   - 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: https://www.sanluisobispo.com/opinion/letters-to-the-editor/article227014519.html

   - 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: https://www.ksby.com/news/local-news/5cities-homeless-coalition-scrap-plan-for-homeless-services-at-hillside-church

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/4n7ll5d4o98ntg/AAC2XBCAb8RuR_50-HkAHWVGa?dl=0