

## STAFF REPORT

**DATE:** February 17, 2026

**TO:** City Council

**FROM:** Dana Bailey, Social Services and Housing Director  
Stan Gryczko, Public Works Director

**SUBJECT:** Analysis: Potential Alternative Locations Davis Daytime Respite Center

---

### **Recommendation**

1. Receive a follow up report to the November 18, 2025 presentation, including:
  - a. An analysis of potential alternative locations to site a respite center including but not limited to the Civic Center gym;
  - b. Costs estimates to make locations respite ready and plan to address relationship with surrounding neighborhood.
2. Direct staff to adopt one (or some combination) of the following options regarding respite operations:
  - a. Close and discontinue operations at 530 L Street site;
  - b. Close and discontinue operations at 530 L Street site; provide appointment-based case navigation services through existing outreach and strengthen partnerships with existing respite providers through a dedicated referral and transportation system;
  - c. Continue operations at 530 L Street in its current capacity as a navigation center;
  - d. Continue operations providing basic-need only (showers, laundry, place to rest) at 530 L Street site;
  - e. Continue operations providing basic needs only (showers, laundry, place to rest) at a TBD site;
  - f. Select an independent contractor to oversee operations at TBD site.
3. Prioritize an operational decision before committing to capital site investments.
4. Maintain continuity of operations in its current capacity at the current site through June 30, 2026.
5. Continue to monitor alternative location opportunities.

### **Council Goal(s)**

This review touches on the following City Council goals to:

- Achieving Greater Fiscal Resilience

- Improving Social Services for Vulnerable Populations
- Maintaining High Quality Infrastructure and Services

### **Commission Input**

The Social Services Commission has been involved in broad discussions around homelessness. Last year, a subcommittee of the commission embarked on a project to review the current landscape of homelessness navigation services, including services provided at the respite center. A summary of this engagement is included in the subcommittee report, which is provided to Council for reference [here](#).

### **Fiscal Analysis**

The City's current General Fund budget directly related to homelessness services is \$1,268,153. The City's annual operating costs for the Respite Center are \$501,616. Analysis related to the recommended options are provided in Table 1 in the Location Cost Analysis section of this report.

If City Council provides different or additional direction on specific operations within this report, future actions could have additional fiscal impacts.

### **Background**

*Council Direction:* Staff brought forward an update to City Council on the Homelessness System of Care in Davis on November 18, 2025 (found [here](#)). Included in the staff report and presentation were a program update on operations at the Davis Daytime Respite Center and a request for Council direction on continued Respite Center operations at the existing location.

The City Council passed the following motion at the November 18 meeting:

D. Neville moved, seconded by B. Vaitla, as follows;

1. Direct staff to conduct further analysis of potential alternative locations to site a respite center including but not limited to the Civic Center gym;
2. Return to Council in February with costs estimates to make locations respite ready and plan to address relationship with surrounding neighborhood;

B. Vaitla proposed the following friendly amendments:

- a. Conduct continuing community engagement with the Davis Manor Neighborhood
- b. Return to Council with a draft agreement that specifies expectations, information on neighborhood impacts and potential options and resources to mitigate impacts.
- c. Continue utilizing two temporary part time employee positions to operate the Respite Center as sited with provision of basic respite services;
- d. Site existing homeless outreach team employees at the Respite Center;
- e. Anticipate additional discussion regarding full-time employee positions and Respite budget to occur in March 2026 during citywide budget discussions.

*Neighborhood Engagement:* The Respite Center Council Subcommittee (Neville and Partida) has engaged with representatives of the Davis Manor Neighborhood to better understand and acknowledge community concerns related to homelessness and the operation of the Respite Center. Following a series of discussions, the subcommittee convened a community meeting on March 2, 2025, at the DaVinci School site to provide an opportunity for neighborhood members to share feedback. Community members raised a range of concerns, including perceived increases in neighborhood impacts, the desire for clearer communication regarding Respite Center operations, and other quality-of-life issues.

Following the Council presentation on November 18, 2025, the subcommittee met with neighbors who live near the respite center to discuss the motion acted on by Council at its prior meeting and to hear neighbors' suggestions. The subcommittee is prepared to provide an oral report summarizing this engagement and to acknowledge receipt of and appreciation for the recommendations offered by the neighborhood related to the location analysis and decision-making framework. Staff is awaiting direction from Council regarding the siting and operational expectations for delivering respite services before further developing agreements with neighbors.

### **Location SWOT analysis**

To fulfill City Council direction, staff conducted a comparative SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats) analysis of multiple potential locations for a Davis Daytime Respite Center. The locations evaluated include the existing site at 530 L Street, the city-owned Civic Center Gym at 23 Russell Boulevard, 512 Fifth Street, 809 11<sup>th</sup> Street duplexes, and other conceptual alternatives. This analysis is provided to assist Council in determining a formal set of siting criteria.

Across all locations, key strengths identified are the City's ability to leverage site control at the properties, proximity to transit and services, and the opportunity to pursue state and federal funding for navigation center-style facilities. The existing 530 L Street site and 512 5<sup>th</sup> Street sites are well known to clientele and have functioned as established access points for coordinated entry and services, while Civic Center Gym and 809 11<sup>th</sup> Street present opportunities for purpose-built or residential facilities with varying community impacts.

All locations also present significant weaknesses and trade-offs. The majority of the sites suffer from aging infrastructure, un-budgeted demolition and remediation costs, and ongoing neighborhood compatibility concerns. The Civic Center Gym has substantial deferred maintenance, high estimated rehabilitation costs, limited parking, and competing civic uses to address recreational needs.

Opportunities across sites include leveraging secured HUD funding for infrastructure repairs, aligning future investments with long-term City facility planning, and re-imagining respite services as part of a broader navigation or housing continuum. Conversely, threats consistently identified include persistent neighborhood opposition,

unknown environmental or seismic conditions, potential impacts to other City services, political risk, and the possibility that significant capital investment could be made at sites that are ultimately temporary.

Staff also looked at possible locations that are not owned or controlled by the City. The owners of the Hi-Wheel Flats Hotel are considering selling the property and have been exploring options for the site. The owners are keeping City staff informed as discussions continue, as the property may be suitable for a potential Project Homekey site, a State program that funds the acquisition and rehabilitation of properties for conversion to permanent supportive housing for individuals experiencing or at risk of homelessness. Staff is also monitoring the County’s budget process and may bring forward possible County-owned sites to discuss with the County as options for alternative programs. These non-city options could reduce impacts on nearby neighborhoods. However, because the City does not control these sites and key details—such as whether a sale will occur—are uncertain, these options would likely take longer to materialize.

Taken together, the location SWOT analysis highlights that no single site is without material constraints. Any location decision will require balancing cost, timeline, neighborhood compatibility, service effectiveness, and long-term City priorities.

**Location Costs Analysis**

For the sites identified, staff developed planning-level estimates of costs for site clearance, including demolition and remediation where applicable, installation of modular facilities and/or modification of existing facilities for respite services, and connection to utilities including electrical, water and wastewater services. These estimates are summarized below for each location. More detail, including the breakdown of these set-up costs is included in (Table 1). A range is provided for each location to account for some unknown costs based on the ages and conditions of the sites, or in the case of the modulars, rental or purchase. It should be noted that these costs do not include ongoing maintenance or operations, nor costs associated with any site improvements that could trigger ADA, CEQA, stormwater, or building code requirements beyond what is listed.

**Table 1**

<b>Location</b>	<b>Estimated Planning Level Cost for Set Up</b>
530 L Street	\$275,000 (rented modular) \$425,000 (purchased modular)
Civic Center Gym	\$2,750,000
512 5 <sup>th</sup> Street	\$300,000 (rented modular) \$450,000 (purchased modular)
1101 H Street/809 11th Street	\$148,500

## **Operations SWOT analysis**

In tandem with the site location analysis, staff evaluated a range of operational models for the Respite Center using a SWOT framework, including options to discontinue operations, shift to appointment-based case management, maintain operations with no change, maintain basic-needs-only services, relocate services, or contract operations to an independent provider (Attachment 2). This analysis is provided to assist Council to make a determination and, in consideration of the City's fiscal constraints, adopt the City's homeless respite service model.

Strengths identified across the various options include opportunities for immediate cost containment, reduced administrative burden on City staff, mitigation of neighborhood concerns, and the ability to realign services with experienced providers or regional systems. Options that retain some level of service preserve essential homelessness response functions, maintain a second CES/HMIS access point, and allow continued engagement with highly vulnerable individuals.

Weaknesses common to many options include the loss of low-barrier walk-in access, reduced service capacity, diminished housing and case management outcomes, continued General Fund exposure, and uncertainty related to future funding sources. Options that significantly scale back or eliminate services raise concerns about the loss of a critical entry point for approximately 400 annual walk-ins and the downstream impacts on public safety, social services systems, and visible unsheltered homelessness.

Opportunities identified include the potential to redesign Davis's homelessness response system to include case management, strengthen partnerships with the identified regional service provider Fourth & Hope, better align operations with grant-funded outcomes, and explore alternative uses of non-city-owned sites. Some options may allow for enhanced specialized services or improved consistency of outcomes reporting.

Threats associated with operational changes include increased unsheltered homelessness, strain on remaining shelter capacity, negative community and media response, political risk, and higher long-term public costs if preventative and stabilization services are reduced. The analysis underscores that operational decisions are closely linked to site decisions and funding availability, and that trade-offs between fiscal control, service effectiveness, and community impact are unavoidable.

Since the dissolution of Downtown Streets Team (the prior operator), the Respite Center has maintained uninterrupted operations through the continued employment of two former DST staff who now serve as City-managed temporary staff. This approach has preserved essential services without the cost premium associated with the terminated contract or re-procurement of contracted services. In addition to providing core respite services—such as meals, mail access, and daytime rest—these staff deliver targeted case navigation that connects participants to health and behavioral health providers, public safety agencies, employment resources, treatment programs,

and emergency shelter. This relationship-based model improves coordination across existing systems, reduces duplication of effort, and supports earlier, more appropriate referrals, resulting in more efficient use of limited public resources.

To manage fiscal risk and minimize service disruptions, staff is evaluating contingency measures should the current site close. One option under consideration is preserving navigation services as a by-appointment function within the City's broader homelessness response system. This approach would allow the City to retain high-value, low-cost service coordination capacity while avoiding the higher costs associated with continued operation of the facility or re-establishing contracted services. Maintaining navigation capacity would also reinforce existing outreach, engagement, compliance, and enforcement efforts, ensuring that prior investments in these programs continue to deliver returns.

This strategy is particularly important in light of anticipated reductions in County-funded case management. By maintaining a modest City-level navigation function, the City can mitigate downstream impacts—such as increased emergency service utilization or enforcement costs—while ensuring individuals remain connected to critical services.

Staff has confirmed that case navigation is an eligible expense under the City's Permanent Local Housing Allocation (PHLA) grant, and case management activities supporting exits from homelessness are allowable under Activity 6. As a result, the two current temporary positions may be grant-funded as Limited Term positions through June 30, 2028, preserving continuity of care while significantly reducing General Fund exposure and improving long-term cost predictability.

To further reduce the risk of service gaps across City and County systems, staff is exploring a coordinated transportation option to the region's 24/7 emergency shelter operated by Fourth & Hope. Transportation remains a significant barrier for individuals experiencing homelessness and often limits access to available respite, stabilization, and shelter resources.

Facilitated access to the Fourth & Hope East Beamer campus in Woodland would directly address this barrier by connecting individuals to a comprehensive continuum of services, including emergency shelter (up to 100 beds), meals, hygiene services, acceptance of pets, case management, transitional housing, and substance use treatment. As the largest emergency shelter provider in Yolo County, Fourth & Hope offers integrated services designed to support stabilization and pathways out of homelessness.

The proposed program would bridge an identified service gap by enabling individuals to access regional resources that are otherwise difficult to reach due to transportation constraints, while providing return transportation to the City. This approach would enhance safety, dignity, continuity of care, and overall system coordination, and would expand the City's ability to leverage regional investments to improve outcomes for individuals experiencing homelessness.

## **Recommendations**

Based on the comparative analysis of potential locations and operational models for the Davis Daytime Respite Center, staff offers the following recommendations for City Council consideration:

1. *Direct staff to adopt one of the following operational options regarding respite operations:*

- a. Close and discontinue operations at 530 L Street site;
- b. Close and discontinue operations at 530 L Street site; provide appointment-based case navigation through existing outreach and strengthen partnerships with existing respite providers through a dedicated referral and transportation program;
- c. Continue operations at 530 L Street in its current capacity as a navigation center;
- d. Continue operations at 530 L Street site providing basic-need only (showers, laundry, place to rest);
- e. Continue operations providing basic needs only (showers, laundry, place to rest) at a TBD site;
- f. Select an independent contractor to oversee operations at TBD site.

2. *Prioritize an operational decision before committing to capital site investments.*

The location SWOT analysis demonstrates that all evaluated sites present material constraints, including aging infrastructure, neighborhood compatibility concerns, uncertain timelines, or the likelihood that sites would function as interim solutions. Staff recommends deferring significant capital investment in any site until Council has identified a preferred operational model, to avoid incurring substantial costs for facilities that may not align with long-term service delivery goals.

3. *Maintain continuity of operations in its current capacity at the current site through June 30, 2026.*

To avoid service gaps and unintended downstream impacts, staff recommends maintaining current service levels at the existing site while a transition plan is implemented. Respite Center operations are currently funded through savings realized from the dissolution of the Downtown Streets Team contract. The transition to City administration has substantially reduced monthly operating costs, allowing for the use of DST contract savings to support operations through June 30, 2026.

4. *Continue to monitor alternative location opportunities.*

Staff recommends continuing to monitor potential alternative sites including opportunities that may arise through the County's budget process, commercial lease options or private property transactions. While such options may offer long-term benefits, they remain outside the City's direct control and are not suitable for near-term implementation. Any future consideration should be brought forward with clear timelines, cost estimates, and defined roles.

Taken together, these recommendations reflect staff's assessment that aligning operational structure with fiscal capacity and service outcomes will be more impactful in the near term than pursuing new or significantly modified facilities. The recommended approach provides flexibility, cost containment, and enhanced service effectiveness while preserving the City's ability to adapt to future funding and siting opportunities.

**Attachments:**

Attachment 1: Location SWOT Analysis

Attachment 2: Operations SWOT Analysis



**Strengths:**

- Site control
- Sizeable flexible programming square footage (outdoor)
- Space available to accommodate modulars to match current square footage used
- Access to infrastructure in place (utilities including water, showers, laundry)
- Centrally located to transit access, health services
- Neighborhood concerns already documented and mitigation strategies already in place
- Stable location (5+ years) known to clientele
- Regional access point for coordinated entry
- Centralized navigation point for services (mobile medicine, probation, non-governmental organization programs)
- Calls for public safety significantly reduced year over year since 2020
- Walking distance to other services, including Paul’s Place (existing service provider)

**Opportunities:**

- HUD funding secured for infrastructure rehabilitation
- State and federal funding available for construction / rehabilitation of navigation centers
- Clearing out current buildings allows for future permanent structures
- Demolishing the existing buildings and replacing them with modulars would allow for purpose-built spaces (rest area, offices etc.)
- Flexibility to expand programming to serve broader low-income community

**Weaknesses:**

- Significant concerns regarding proximity to residential neighborhood and retail
- Significant deterioration of existing infrastructure – buildings at end of useful life
- Limited area to provide landscaping and other enhancements to make the entrance more welcoming and consistent with Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles
- Limited exclusive use parking
- Potential impacts of evenings/weekend use unknown
- Nuisance activities in adjacent neighborhood/parks and after hours/weekends conflated with Respite Center
- Costs of demolition of existing buildings, new fencing, upsizing water/wastewater utility lines
- Cost of rental of new modular buildings
- Would likely be a bridge solution (site under consideration for other uses in the future)
- The site layout restricts opportunities to redesign entry/exit points for improved safety

**Threats:**

- Community impacts and neighborhood compatibility
- Operational strain on public safety and City services
- Infrastructure limitations and capital demands
- Temporary shutdowns or relocations may be required during demolition or utility work

**Estimated Costs for Site Operations – Set up only**

Task	Estimated Planning-Level Cost
Demolition of existing buildings	\$75,000-\$100,000
Extending fencing to L Street frontage	\$25,000
Rental of modular buildings to replace square footage	\$50,000/annually (Roughly \$200,000 to purchase)
Upsizing electrical, water and wastewater utility lines for site operations	\$75,000-\$100,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$225,000 - \$275,000 (rented modular)</b> <b>\$375,000 - \$425,000 (purchased modular)</b>



**Weaknesses:**

- Significant existing condition issues with the building requiring remediation, repair
- Existing infrastructure requires upgrade to accommodate Respite operations
- Rehab and/or demolition to accommodate other buildings could be limited by historical designation of building exterior
- Cost of improvements that would be necessary to design and construct custom and purpose-built rooms/offices, etc.
- Very limited parking available with competing uses

Potential impacts of evenings/weekend use unknown

**Strengths:**

- Site control
- Existing and available vacant building
- Sizeable flexible programming square footage (indoor)
- Centrally located to transit access, health services, county benefits office
- Accessible to service providers (mobile medicine, probation, NGO programs)

**Threats:**

- Existing challenges with adjacent pool & locker room use with current pool users
- Inadequate capacity of existing trash enclosure
- Potential increased public nuisance calls for service to downtown/Central Park
- Eliminates option for administrative office space issues at City Hall and keep core City operations at the same campus
- Loss of recreational capacity for indoor gym programming space
- Future single-family housing site across the street in planning phase
- Unknown impacts to City Hall service delivery
- Construction would need to factor in cost of ADA and structural upgrades to building
- Unclear how site security and access management would work

**Opportunities:**

- State and federal funding available for construction / rehabilitation of navigation centers
- Improvements will be necessary no matter what the use of the building will be, getting a start on those makes later work easier
- New construction would allow for custom- and purpose-built spaces (rest area, offices, etc.)

**Estimated Costs for Site Operations – Set up only**

Task	Estimated Planning-Level Cost
“Clean-out” costs to remove equipment, misc. materials	See below.
Remediation of mold, repair of drywall, flooring, ceiling tiles, flooring and other issues from roof leaks and truss repairs	\$200,000 for both clean out and remediation.
Installation of HVAC	\$800,000 (could vary depending on building use, estimate construction cost only)
Interior improvements for offices, resting spaces	Last estimate for offices/conference rooms for just the front section was \$1.6M in July 2024
ADA site improvements	Unknown
Upsizing electrical, water and wastewater utility lines for site operations	\$100,000-\$150,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$2,700,000 - \$2,750,000</b>



<p><b>Weaknesses:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant deterioration of existing infrastructure (sewer line, electrical, etc.)</li> <li>• Need to update utility connections for use of site (water, sewer)</li> <li>• Existing house and modulars at end of useful life</li> <li>• Likelihood of remediation for asbestos or other concerns due to age of building</li> <li>• Cost to demolish building</li> <li>• Cost to rent modular/s to match existing Respite interior building space, cost to install security fencing along frontage perimeter</li> <li>• Location will be temporary as Fire Station improvements are planned for future</li> <li>• Waste services will need to be thought out carefully for ease of collection (no existing location for size of dumpsters needed)</li> <li>• Would be a bridge solution (site within footprint of plans for remodeled Fire Station)</li> </ul>
---

<p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site control</li> <li>• Known to clientele - location had been used for social services for multiple decades</li> <li>• Moderate flexible square footage (outdoor)</li> <li>• Ample exclusive use parking</li> <li>• Proximity to safety services (Fire Dept.)</li> <li>• Centrally located to transit access, health services, county benefits office</li> </ul>
---

<p><b>Opportunities:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) funding secured for infrastructure rehabilitation</li> <li>• State and federal funding available for construction / rehabilitation of navigation centers</li> <li>• Clearance of site allows for future Fire Station improvements</li> <li>• Demolishing existing buildings and replacing with modulars would allow for purpose-built spaces (rest area, offices etc.)</li> </ul>
---

<p><b>Threats:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased foot traffic and service activity may affect emergency response circulation</li> <li>• Potential increased public nuisance calls for service to downtown/Central Park</li> <li>• Potential increased service calls from adjacent neighbors</li> </ul>
---

**Estimated Costs for Site Operations – Set up only**

Task	Estimated Planning-Level Cost
Demolition of existing buildings	Between \$75,000-\$100,000
Backfill and compaction of basement subspace	\$50,000
Installing security fencing for safety and site access control	\$25,000
Rental of modular buildings to replace square footage	\$50,000/annually (Roughly \$200,000 to purchase)
Upsizing electrical, water and wastewater utility lines for site operations	\$50,000-\$75,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$250,000 - \$300,000 (rented modular) \$400,000 - \$450,000 (purchased modular)</b>



<p><b>Weaknesses:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant remodeling required (currently a duplex, may not be adaptable to high-volume service)</li> <li>• Limited outdoor space may be restrictive for some services</li> <li>• Essential health functions would be a duplicate to services provided at Paul's Place</li> <li>• Cost of improvements needed for accessibility, replacing electrical panels and replacement of porch and supports</li> <li>• Cost of fencing for site security and access control</li> <li>• Operational costs for service expansion could be significant (security, commercial laundry, etc.)</li> </ul>
--

<p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site control</li> <li>• Known to clientele (Paul's Place next door)</li> <li>• Ample square footage (indoor)</li> <li>• Centrally located to transit access, health services, county benefits office</li> </ul>
---

<p><b>Opportunities:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HUD funding available for infrastructure rehabilitation provided qualifying services provided at location</li> <li>• Could serve as longer-term option for operations than other sites</li> <li>• Proximity to existing service provider allows for streamlined service delivery; opportunity to expand or compliment services versus duplicate</li> </ul>
--

<p><b>Threats:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Neighborhood opposition</li> <li>• Age and condition of property, could be elements within the structure unknown at this time</li> <li>• Site could no longer be used for housing families at risk of homelessness or homeless</li> </ul>
---

**Estimated Costs for Site Operations – Set up only**

Task	Estimated Planning-Level Cost
Remodel of interior and necessary repairs of property for operations	\$10,000- \$50,000 depending on level of needs.
Replacement of electrical panels	\$8,500
Installing security fencing for safety and site access control	\$10,000-\$15,000 depending on materials.
Upsizing electrical, water and wastewater utility lines for site operations	\$50,000-\$75,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$78,500 - \$148,500</b>

**Location: OTHER (to consider if interest)**

- Old Wastewater Treatment Plant site off Pole Line Road. Costs would be similar to 512 5<sup>th</sup>/530 L without demolition, but would require connection to utilities (none on site) and transportation improvements. Would also include fencing, parking lot investment. Environmental review may be more complex due to industrial use (pollutant testing and mitigation/cleanup). Location is under consideration for future site of City Corporation Yard, so use could be temporary.
- Rental facility. Could look to rent a commercial site in the City. Would require rent, but not incurring “sunk” costs of investing in sites that may be temporary. Lease terms may limit ability to install modularity, fencing, or security features. Could provide the fastest occupancy timeline if a suitable site exists

**OPTION A: Close and discontinue operations at 530 L Street site**

<p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Immediate costs operations and staffing savings.</li> <li>• Mitigates Davis Manor Neighborhood concerns.</li> <li>• Reduces City administrative burden.</li> <li>• Centralizes homeless services to legacy provider (Paul’s Place).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Weaknesses:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of second CES/HMIS access point in Davis.</li> <li>• Loss of low-barrier entry point for more than 420 annual walk-ins.</li> <li>• Loss of address for participant mail receipt</li> <li>• Removes case management, housing navigation and employment support.</li> <li>• Loss of site staff to immediately respond to activity around site.</li> <li>• Increase in nuisance, criminal and mental health calls for service at closed site and in surrounding area.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Opportunities:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential to redirect resources to existing regional/local shelters or providers.</li> <li>• Potential to redirect Respite staff to decentralized service model.</li> <li>• Opportunity to re-imagine Davis homelessness response system.</li> <li>• Opportunity to re-imagine site use (housing, community center, etc.).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Threats:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in visibly unsheltered homelessness.</li> <li>• Overwhelmed capacity at Paul’s Place.</li> <li>• Higher downstream public costs and greater strain on public systems</li> <li>• Negative community and media response.</li> <li>• Lack of progressively positive outcomes may reduce advocacy/service org/faith-based community’s support.</li> </ul>

**OPTION B: Close and discontinue operations at 530 L Street site; provide appointment-based case management through existing outreach.**

<p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eliminates fiscal impact to City general fund (positions grant funded through 2028)</li> <li>• Enhances ability to house individuals and address barriers to stability.</li> <li>• Addresses services gaps in Davis with County reduction in local services</li> <li>• Enhances capacity provided by Homeless Outreach (engagement direct to service) and COPS (compliance and enforcement).</li> <li>• Maintains consistency with clients and focused appointment-based case management</li> <li>• Ensures consistency in communication</li> <li>• Reduces capacity pressures at Paul’s Place</li> <li>• Aligns with regional, state and federal grant outcomes</li> </ul>	<p><b>Weaknesses:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of low-barrier entry point for more than 420 annual walk-ins.</li> <li>• Loss of address for participant mail receipt</li> <li>• New staffing category for city</li> <li>• Housing access / availability remains weak</li> <li>• TBD appointment site undetermined</li> </ul>
<p><b>Opportunities:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhance partnerships with mobile teams for scheduled service provision (mobile med, probation, ECM providers etc.)</li> <li>• Enhance partnerships with support groups for scheduled meetings (AA, NAMI, Narcotics Anonymous, etc.)</li> <li>• Enhance workforce development opportunities (identified priority for federal, state grants)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Threats:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uncertainty of funding source after 2028</li> <li>• Service options continue to become more restrictive or eliminated</li> </ul>

**OPTION C: Continue operations at 530 L Street site in its current capacity as a navigation site.**

<p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Service continuity of low-barrier entry point for unhoused population.</li> <li>• Continuity of second CES/HMIS access point in Davis.</li> <li>• Continuity of address for participant mail receipt</li> <li>• Ongoing case management, housing navigation and employment support.</li> <li>• Onsite staff to immediately respond to activity around site.</li> <li>• Accessible to transportation and centrally located.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Weaknesses:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential for ongoing nuisance, criminal and mental health calls for service at site and in surrounding area.</li> <li>• Ongoing City administrative burden.</li> <li>• Infrastructure at end of useful life.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Opportunities:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunity to re-imagine Davis homelessness response system.</li> <li>• Opportunity to re-imagine site use (housing, community center, etc.).</li> <li>• Opportunity to reimagine physical space use</li> </ul>	<p><b>Threats:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proximity businesses serving alcohol.</li> <li>• Does not mitigate Davis Manor Neighborhood concerns.</li> <li>• Higher downstream public costs and greater strain on public systems</li> <li>• Negative community and media response.</li> <li>• Lack of progressively positive outcomes may reduce advocacy/service org/faith-based community’s support.</li> </ul>

**OPTION D: Continue operations providing basic-needs only at 530 L Street site**

<p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lower staff costs (attendants only).</li> <li>• Maintains basic essential public health functions (temp controlled space, showers, laundry, place to rest).</li> <li>• Lower costs could allow for expanded hours/days.</li> <li>• Could provide overflow capacity for Paul’s Place.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Weaknesses:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continued ongoing general fund impact.</li> <li>• Reduces ability to leverage outcomes for state/federal grants</li> <li>• Site requires infrastructure improvements for optimal functionality.</li> <li>• Lack of site stability impact’s ability to seek outside financial resources/address infrastructure needs.</li> <li>• Lack of service stability could lead to existing and potential participant disengagement/destabilization.</li> <li>• Loss of second CES/HMIS access point in Davis.</li> <li>• Lack of site stability may lead to turnover of experienced and trusted onsite staff.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Opportunities:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revision of scope to align with outside funding opportunities.</li> <li>• Increased reliance on partnerships with mobile teams for scheduled service provision (mobile med, probation, county case managers, etc.)</li> <li>• Increased reliance on partnerships with support groups for scheduled meetings (AA, NAMI, Narcotics Anonymous, etc.)</li> <li>• Could provide expanded volunteer options for advocacy/faith-based community.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Threats:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continued neighborhood opposition.</li> <li>• Risks of perception as “drop-in hangout” without pathway to stability.</li> <li>• Negative community and media response.</li> <li>• Higher calls for public safety response in surrounding area.</li> <li>• Reduces ability to house individuals or address barriers to stability.</li> </ul>

**OPTION E: Continue operations providing basic needs only at a TBD site**

<p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain services capacity of second CES/HMIS access point in Davis.</li> <li>• Mitigates Davis Manor Neighborhood concerns.</li> <li>• Maintains essential public health functions (temp controlled space, showers, laundry, place to rest).</li> <li>• Maintains partnerships with mobile teams for service provision (mobile med, probation, ECM providers, etc.)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Weaknesses:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continued ongoing general fund impact.</li> <li>• Revision of scope does not align with outside funding opportunities.</li> <li>• Removes case management, housing navigation and employment support.</li> <li>• Diversion of homeless outreach staff eliminates Davis-wide encampment/community response.</li> <li>• Reduction in positive outcomes related to self-sufficiency.</li> <li>• Site still requires infrastructure improvements to function properly.</li> <li>• Lack of progressively positive outcomes will impact ability to seek outside financial resources.</li> <li>• May lead to disengagement/destabilization of existing and potential participants.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Opportunities:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could provide increased volunteer options for advocacy/faith-based community.</li> <li>• Revision of services to meet needs of adjacent low-income neighborhood (employment center, benefits connection).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Threats:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continued neighborhood opposition to site.</li> <li>• Perception of instability could lead to negative community and media response.</li> <li>• Reduces ability to house individuals or address barriers to stability.</li> </ul>

**OPTION F: Select an independent contractor to oversee operations at TBD site**

<p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transfers operations to experienced professional provider.</li> <li>• Enhanced Care Management (ECM) operator would offer service and operational support.</li> <li>• Experienced provider may have access to outside financial resources to address operational and infrastructure needs.</li> <li>• Could increase measurable outcomes related to housing, case management, employment and other barrier reductions as direct service provider.</li> <li>• Improves quality and consistency of services beyond City capacity.</li> <li>• Reduces administrative burden on City staff.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Weaknesses:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contracted costs could be higher and still require ongoing general fund support.</li> <li>• Site will require infrastructure improvements for optimal functionality.</li> <li>• Learning curve requires strong administrative oversight and contract management of enhanced services.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
<p><b>Opportunities:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revision of scope to align with outside funding opportunities.</li> <li>• Greater ability to integrate specialized services (behavioral health, medical, housing navigation).</li> <li>• Could allow for expanded hours/days.</li> <li>• Partnerships with mobile teams for scheduled service provision (mobile med, probation, county case managers, etc.)</li> <li>• Partnerships with support groups for scheduled meetings (AA, NAMI, Narcotics Anonymous, etc.)</li> <li>• Could provide volunteer option for advocacy/faith-based community.</li> <li>• Provision of reliably communicated positive outcomes and engagement of neighbors.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Threats:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continued neighborhood opposition.</li> <li>• Political concerns regarding outsourcing.</li> <li>• Additional entity competing for dwindling fiscal resources</li> <li>• Funding climate could impact operator performance (changes to service provision, changes to target pops served).</li> </ul>

NOTES: