



**City Council Response to  
Grand Jury Report titled  
“Homeless in San Diego.”**

Rules Committee  
September 22, 2010



# Grand Jury Report

- Filed on May 17, 2010
- Examines problem of homelessness, social and economic costs, and potential solutions
- 24 Findings and 12 Recommendations
- Mayor and Council required to respond to all Findings and 10 Recommendations



# City Council Response

- For each finding:
  - Agree
  - Disagree wholly or partially
- For each recommendation:
  - Has been implemented
  - Has not yet been implemented, but will be
  - Requires further analysis
  - Will not be implemented



# City Council Response

- IBA received copy of Mayor's draft responses
- For each item, Council may:
  - Join the Mayor's response
  - Modify the Mayor's response
  - Respond independently of the Mayor
- IBA has prepared recommended responses on behalf of the Council



# City Council Response

Findings:	1-12, 14-18, 20-23	<b><i>Join the Mayor's Response</i></b>
Recommendations:	10-27, 10-28, 10-30 10-33, 10-34, 10-35	
Finding:	13	<b><i>Modify Mayor's Response</i></b>
Recommendations:	10-24, 10-26, 10-29 10-31	
Findings:	19, 24	<b><i>Respond Independently of the Mayor</i></b>



## Finding #13

- *“The current winter shelters, because they are seasonal, do not adequately support the chronic homeless living in San Diego”*
- **Mayor’s Draft Response:** Partially Agree.
  - Winter shelters not designed to solely support chronic homeless
  - Shelters build upon the 3073 year-round beds to provide further options to those most in need in inclement weather.
- **IBA Recommendation:** Modify response to “Agree. However...”



## Finding #19

- *“An outbreak of illness caused by unsanitary conditions in the downtown and East Village areas could result in liability to the City.”*
- Sought advice from the City Attorney’s office
- **IBA Recommendation: Disagree.** The basis for liability is unclear, and the City is not aware of any legal theory or statute which would provide a basis for liability in the manner described.



## Finding #24

- *“NGDC [Neil Good Day Center] showers are limited to disabled persons only by Father Joe’s Village.”*
- **Mayor’s Draft Response: Agree.**
  - The City’s operating agreement with St. Vincent de Paul intended for the showers to be available to all users and did not limit shower usage to disabled persons only.





## Finding #24

- **IBA Recommendation: Partially Disagree.**
- Current operator, Alpha Project, offers showers to all homeless individuals who want them
- Previous operator, St. Vincent de Paul, limited NGDC showers to disabled homeless, and directed able-bodied individuals to showers at Father Joe's Villages
- However, City's operating agreement with St. Vincent de Paul intended showers to be available for all users.



## Recommendation 10-24

- ***“Form a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) and enlist the support of leaders in other cities in the County to develop a regional approach to manage and fund programs to moderate chronic homelessness.”***
- **Mayor’s Draft Response:** The recommendation requires further analysis by the County
  - County best equipped to implement recommendation
  - Have processes for working with other cities in region
  - While City recognizes need for regional approach, would defer to County as to whether JPA is necessary
  - Currently, regional effort is underway through the Ending Homelessness Leadership Team



# Recommendation 10-24

- **IBA Recommendation:** The recommendation requires further analysis ~~by the County.~~
  - Strike the following: “While the City recognizes the need for a regional approach to managing and funding homeless services, ~~the City would defer to the County to determine whether a JPA is necessary to accomplish this goal.~~”
  - And add instead: “...such an approach requires strong cooperation and commitments from all agencies in the region, and it may be more appropriate for an agency with regional jurisdiction to take the lead on a regional effort such as a JPA.”



## Recommendation 10-26

- ***“Organize a consortium of the leaders in the San Diego region to meet no less frequently than monthly to determine the direction on reducing homelessness in the San Diego region. This consortium shall work in concert with the regional authority that is formed based on Recommendation 10-24 and 10-25.”***
- **Mayor’s Draft Response:** The recommendation requires further analysis by the County
  - Per response to Recommendation 10-24, City defers to County to determine most appropriate course of action for the region.



## Recommendation 10-26

- **IBA Recommendation:** The recommendation requires further analysis ~~by the County~~.
  - Strike the following: “Per response to Recommendation 10-24, ~~the City defers to the County to determine the most appropriate course of action for the region.~~”
  - And add instead: “...such a regional approach requires strong cooperation and commitments from all agencies in the region, and it may be more appropriate for an agency with regional jurisdiction to take the lead on such an effort.”



## Recommendation 10-29

- *“Finalize the plan, funding, and establishment of the year-round homeless intake facility.”*
- **Mayor’s Draft Response:** The recommendation has not yet been implemented; however, next phase will be implemented by SDHC in Fall 2010
  - Notes the transfer of homeless services management and oversight to SDHC in June 2010
  - Describes action taken at the July 14 LU&H Committee to approve staff recommendations regarding the homeless service and housing center



# Recommendation 10-29

- **IBA Recommendation:** Add language describing the Committee's 4-0 vote to:
  - Direct City Attorney to come to closed session with a report on draft settlement regarding restrictions on issuing illegal lodging citations;
  - Forward list of additional downtown sites presented by Cushman & Wakefield to SDHC and CCDC for review.



## Recommendation 10-31

- ***“Consider the establishment of additional temporary shelters in other parts of the City to accommodate the balance of homeless persons in those areas.”***
- **Mayor’s Draft Response:** The recommendation has been implemented
  - Last year, Council considered sites throughout the City in each Council district
  - However, Council chose to select a downtown location to operate the winter shelter program.





# Recommendation 10-31

- **IBA Recommendation:** The recommendation requires further analysis.
- Add the following language:
  - At present time, there is no funding to establish additional temporary shelters in other parts of city;
  - Merits of additional temporary shelters will be evaluated in contrast to current approach of moving toward permanent supportive housing based on the Housing First/Housing Plus model.



# Conclusion