



F O C U S
strategies

MARICOPA REGIONAL CONTINUUM OF CARE

**EFFECTIVE SITING STRATEGIES FOR HOUSING AND SERVICES
PROGRAMS FOR PEOPLE EXPERIENCING HOMELESSNESS**

Prepared for Maricopa Association of Governments by Focus Strategies

04 • 05 • 2021



Focus Strategies helps communities reduce homelessness by leveraging the power of analytics and an equity-informed systems approach to deliver effective crisis response strategies and expand housing solutions. With an expert team of multi-disciplinary professionals, we help communities ask the right questions, develop strategic responses, and implement powerful solutions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
I. BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF THE REPORT	3
II. METHODOLOGY	3
III. EFFECTIVE HOMELESSNESS RESPONSE STRATEGIES	4
IV. THE VALUE, CHALLENGES, AND OBJECTIVES OF SITING STRATEGIES	5
A. The Value of Developing Siting Strategies	5
B. Common Siting Challenges	6
C. Siting Strategy Objectives	7
V. SITE SELECTION CRITERIA	8
VI. SUCCESSFUL SITING STRATEGIES	10
A. Building Community Engagement and Support	11
B. Individual Project- or Provider-Level Strategies	13
C. City-Level Strategies	15
D. Regional Strategies	18
E. State-Level Strategies	20
VII. CONCLUSION	20
Appendix A: Key Informants	21
Appendix B: Documents and Resources	22

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Developing communitywide solutions to reduce homelessness requires operating a range of services, programs, and housing interventions for people who are unhoused. Identifying and securing sites in which to locate these activities is a critical condition for success and one of the greatest challenges for communities seeking to implement an effective response to homelessness.

The Maricopa Regional Continuum of Care (MRCoC) engaged Focus Strategies to conduct research to identify successful strategies for siting of interim housing, permanent housing, and services for people experiencing homelessness. The goal of this work is for MRCoC to provide policy- and decision-makers in the region with information on effective planning and implementation strategies that can be adopted locally. To conduct this research, Focus Strategies conducted a review of literature and key informant interviews with representatives of homelessness response systems in peer communities.

The research summarized in this report shows there are a range of approaches that can be successful, and the strategies adopted should be customized to the local context. Types of strategies summarized in this report include efforts that can be undertaken at various levels and by different types of stakeholders - project- or provider-level; city-based; regional or statewide. They also include multiple types of “levers” such as informal agreements and negotiations, incentives, funding requirements, zoning or other legislative action, and other means of expanding the availability of sites where programs and projects serving people experiencing homelessness may be located.

The primary learnings presented in the report include:

- Articulating the community’s goals and objectives in relation to siting is a critical precondition for developing successful strategies for siting.
- The single greatest obstacle to securing sites tends to be neighborhood or community opposition and the most effective solution is to secure support of community leaders and key stakeholders to navigate and overcome local resistance.

- Understanding and leveraging the roles and strengths of different types of partners (developers, community groups, elected officials, Continuum of Care, or local government staff) is crucial to successfully securing sites.
- Developing clear and objective criteria for site selection is an important tool for identifying sites and communicating with community stakeholders.

Specific siting strategies that have proven effective include:

- Strategic use of master leasing, or master leasing and then purchasing sites;
- Public land utilization for homelessness response system purposes, a strategy that can be expanded through land banking;
- Changes to zoning, such as through the establishment of shelter overlay zones or adoption of inclusionary zoning, that can remove barriers to development;
- Providing incentives in the form of public benefits for communities that agree to site homelessness programs;
- Creating ongoing shelter and housing “pipeline” processes;
- Establishing regional benchmarks or requirements to advance a broader geographic distribution of programs serving people experiencing homelessness; and
- State-level legislative action to create requirements that localities plan for sufficient emergency shelter and permanent affordable housing.

Securing sites for programs that serve people who are experiencing homelessness is often challenging: adopting multi-faceted, proven strategies at multiple levels of community leadership can help overcome barriers. Advancing siting strategies to increase the inventory of accessible services and housing resources to meet local and regional needs is critical for creating homelessness response systems that are effective and equitable. Mobilizing community support and political leadership around locally tailored strategies to advance identified objectives is the key to success of these efforts.

I. BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The Maricopa Regional Continuum of Care (MRCoC) engaged Focus Strategies to conduct research related to strategies for successful siting of interim housing, permanent housing, and services for people experiencing homelessness. The MRCoC intends to use this research to provide policy- and decision-makers in the region with information on effective planning and implementation strategies that can be adopted locally. The MRCoC is particularly interested in data- and practice-informed research on effective siting strategies, as well as insight from peer communities on the successes and challenges of approaches they have implemented.

The scope of the research includes practices at multiple levels: regional and statewide policies, city-based policies and strategies, and individual provider- or project-level strategies. Research focused on the types of data collected and used to inform the siting of projects; benchmark strategies; strategies for promoting support through community and policy-maker communications and engagement; and innovative approaches to advancing the inventory of project sites.

II. METHODOLOGY

Focus Strategies gathered and reviewed information from a variety of sources to develop the strategies and examples included in this report. This included key informant interviews with peer communities; research on communities with recent success in siting interim housing, permanent housing, or services; communications strategies for advancing siting and project approvals; reviews of reports on land use strategies and impacts of program siting on existing neighborhoods; and engagement with national leaders on trends in siting strategy challenges and successes. A summary of these sources is provided below.

Key Informant Interviews

The most important source of information was interviews with key informants knowledgeable about strategies that have been developed at a state, regional, county or city level. Focus Strategies conducted key informant interviews with individuals in the following peer communities: Houston, Texas; Riverside County, California; Salt Lake City, Utah; King County, Washington, and Santa Clara County, California. In addition, Focus Strategies interviewed multiple local stakeholders including representatives from Central Arizona Shelter Services (CASS), the City of Phoenix, and the City of Glendale. Appendix A includes the full list of key informant interviews.

Research and Community Practice Examples

Focus Strategies researched and reviewed a range of materials for this report including state legislation, city ordinances, regional action plans and reports related to siting, cost analysis research on impacts of permanent supportive housing, regional community engagement samples, and provider and project level communication and planning materials. Appendix B includes a list of reports, documents, and resources reviewed to inform this report.

National Trends

Additionally, Focus Strategies engaged with national leaders in the homelessness policy field to identify trends and examples of successful strategies for siting of interim housing, permanent housing, and services for people experiencing homelessness. While some of these examples come from communities that differ from the MRCoC region and would not necessarily qualify as “peer” communities, information has been included in this report where relevant and appropriate to highlight.

Throughout the report’s development, Focus Strategies presented key findings to Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG)¹, the MRCoC lead agency, with a focus on narrowing the prioritization of strategies highlighted in the report to meet local needs.

III. EFFECTIVE HOMELESSNESS RESPONSE STRATEGIES

Guiding MRCoC’s desire to identify strategies for successful siting of interim housing, permanent housing, and services is the intent to maximize the homelessness response system’s impact in reducing homelessness across the region. The siting strategies in this report highlight opportunities to enhance multiple components of an effective homelessness response system:

- High performing homelessness response system interventions,
- Permanent housing strategies and resources,
- Equity-informed and data-driven planning and evaluation, and
- Strong and aligned leadership.

High Performing Homelessness Response System Interventions

Effective homelessness response systems typically operate an array of services designed to meet the needs of people experiencing homelessness including mobile outreach, drop-in services, interim housing, rapid rehousing, and permanent supportive housing. Programs should be accessible to people most in need of services: this includes factors such as geographic location, service need responsiveness, and cultural competency. The effectiveness of these interventions is measured by how quickly they help people to secure housing and not return to homelessness.

Permanent Housing Strategies and Resources

A system to effectively end homelessness treats a loss of housing as an emergency to be

¹ The Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) is a Council of Governments that represents 27 cities and towns, three Native nations, Maricopa County, and portions of Pinal County. Members include representatives from the incorporated cities and towns in Maricopa County as well as the City of Maricopa, Town of Florence, Maricopa County, Pinal County, Gila River Indian Community, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, and the Arizona Department of Transportation.

responded to quickly and effectively with a permanent housing solution, targeting resources to this end. The system must maximize the use of existing housing inventory to meet the needs of people experiencing homelessness (e.g., recruiting landlords to accept short- and long-term rent subsidies, developing shared housing strategies), while at the same time strategically expanding housing supply. This includes efforts to expand the supply of rental housing that is affordable to people at the lowest income levels through new construction and rehabilitation.

Equity-Informed and Data-Driven Planning and Evaluation

A homelessness crisis response system must have the infrastructure to support ongoing understanding of trends in homelessness in the community and assessment of performance at both the project and overall system levels. Strong equity-informed data analysis capacity is also needed so that leadership and key stakeholders can understand and use data to inform the types and locations of new services and housing resources that are needed and to measure the impact of investments.

Strong and Aligned Leadership

A unified CoC governance structure that brings together the community leadership and key system funders, both public and private, within a single entity or coordinated set of entities to guide system-level planning and decision-making is critical to advance improvement in the three components described above. By adopting a single shared set of strategies and policies, including policies governing how funds are invested, communities focus their attention on the services and interim and permanent housing strategies that will yield the greatest results. This also promotes cross-jurisdictional efforts to coordinate with, align to, and leverage the strategies and programs of other jurisdictions.

IV. THE VALUE, CHALLENGES, AND OBJECTIVES OF SITING STRATEGIES

As noted above, developing an effective regional response to homelessness generally requires the creation of a coordinated set of interventions that include interim housing, permanent housing solutions, and services. This section provides an overview of the reasons why a community might consider developing proactive strategies for siting these types of programs, the challenges associated with doing so, and objectives that should inform siting strategies.

A. The Value of Developing Siting Strategies

There are many benefits for cities, counties, and regions to develop strategies for the siting of services, interim housing, and permanent housing solutions for people experiencing homelessness:

- To end homelessness, communities need a range of different programs, including temporary and permanent housing. In most communities, the current inventory of

temporary and permanent housing. In most communities, the current inventory of available housing is inadequate in comparison to both the number of people experiencing homelessness and in very low- and extremely low-income households. Identifying and acquiring sites is a critical precondition to the development of expanded interim and permanent housing inventory.

- People experiencing homelessness face many barriers to accessing available programs, including the location of interim and permanent housing programs. For example, because of zoning ordinances, interim housing programs are often in zones with less access to public transportation, jobs, schools, grocery stores, and other resources. In addition, when availability of sites is the sole or primary determinant of site locations, programs may end up clustered in one city or one part of the community. In addition to disadvantaging people who need or want housing services in parts of the community where services aren't concentrated, this often leads to disproportionate investments in homelessness response across a region. Creating regional, countywide, or citywide strategies for program and project siting helps to build homelessness response systems that are low barrier and easily accessible for people experiencing homelessness.
- Homelessness is a complex regional problem in most places: thus, it is key that jurisdictions expand regional ownership for solution-focused investments and programs. By locating programs in multiple neighborhoods within a city or county, the region distributes the staffing and funding capacity needed in any one jurisdiction to plan for and implement housing programs. In addition, multiple neighborhoods or jurisdictions share in the ongoing costs and investments to operate services, interim housing, and permanent housing programs. Further, this strategy acknowledges jurisdictions carry a shared responsibility to promote housing stability and avoid conditions that exacerbate homelessness across the region.

B. Common Siting Challenges

While there are substantial benefits to developing and implementing strategies for siting projects dedicated to homelessness response, efforts to do so generally face significant challenges.

- Perhaps the most pervasive of challenges to expanding services, interim housing, and permanent housing inventory for people experiencing homelessness is community opposition that manifests in "not in my backyard" sentiments.
- Some stakeholders perceive that offering programs to people experiencing homelessness will "attract" more people to the area to seek services. In most communities, this perception is not supported by data. For example, Point-in-Time survey data assesses the length of time people experiencing homelessness have been living in a given county prior to becoming homeless: this data most often reflects that most people

were residing in the same city or county before losing their housing.²

- In addition, some stakeholders fear that the development of interim, affordable, or supportive housing projects will have negative community impacts such as increases in crime or debris and decreases in property values. The reality is more complex as each of these community determinants is impacted by multiple variables. Research shows that many affordable and supportive housing projects have positive, mixed, or neutral impact on property value and/or neighborhood crime.³ For example, a study that examined impacts of low-income housing developments on nearby property values over a 10-year span found the addition of affordable housing has no significant effect on nearby home values. In San Jose, one of the cities included in the study, homes within 2,000 feet of the new affordable housing developments increased at the same property value rate as homes that were further away.⁴
- Regulatory barriers such as zoning ordinances for interim housing and extensive permitting and approval processes can present challenges for new projects.
- Lastly, the acquisition or development of housing is costly. Obtaining sufficient capital investments for new sites can be a barrier, particularly in smaller or less resourced communities.

C. Siting Strategy Objectives

In adopting a strategy or set of approaches for siting, communities should identify their goals and objectives. This will help to identify the strategies that are best suited to maximize impact in achieving the community's specific goals. Communities typically find it necessary to adopt multiple paths to achieve their identified goals; for example, a community may aim to adopt strategies that will both help to increase housing inventory and promote racial equity in housing access. Examples of siting strategy objectives are listed below:

- To understand the inventory needed for both interim housing and permanent housing at different levels of income in the community to effectively reduce homelessness.

² Community examples based on Point-in-Time (PIT) Count data include: In Santa Clara County (2019), 81% of people experiencing homelessness resided in the County prior to losing their housing. In Houston (2017), over 75% of people resided in the city prior to experiencing homelessness. In San Francisco (2019), California, 70% of people experiencing homelessness were housed somewhere in the city when they lost housing.

³ Agnew, S. Discussion Paper: The Impact of Affordable Housing on Communities and Households. Minnesota Housing Finance Agency, Research and Evaluation Unit. This research analysis identified multiple variables influencing the impact of new programs including their size and design, existing neighborhood characteristics, and property management quality and financing.

⁴ Young, C. 2016. There Doesn't Go the Neighborhood: Low-Income Housing Has No Impact on Nearby Home Values. Trulia Research. <https://www.trulia.com/research/low-income-housing/>.

- To use data to inform the strategic planning of the number and location of units to be acquired, developed, or rehabilitated.
- To expand community support for the development of interim, affordable, and supportive housing developments.
- To promote equity in multiple ways including serving people in all parts of the region who may need services, promoting accessibility to areas of high opportunity including community amenities and living wage employment.
- To maximize community benefits while also enticing developers to propose projects within the community and thereby increase the available stock of affordable and supportive housing.

V. SITE SELECTION CRITERIA

Developing and adopting objective site criteria can assist communities in identifying shared priorities for the location of new housing and services projects that are informed by data, in alignment with adopted strategies to increase equity, advance regional ownership of homelessness response, and maintain high quality standards for siting of services and housing for people experiencing homelessness. Adopted criteria should inform factors such as preferred neighborhoods or areas in which projects can operate, proximity to or access between the project and other community services, and amenities of the project site or facility itself. Criteria may vary depending on how the sites are being acquired: strategies that involve master leasing or acquisition of existing buildings, for example, will need to include criteria relating to the features and condition of the structures that would not be applicable in acquiring vacant land for development.

Successful interim and permanent housing programs include services to assist participants with obtaining and retaining stable housing as well as maintaining immediate safety. Most often, these housing- and safety-focused services are provided on-site and integrated within the housing program. Additional services for behavioral health, substance use recovery, peer support, employment, or education may be offered on-site or at an off-site location. It is not essential these services are co-located though it is beneficial to participants if frequently needed services are accessible (e.g., proximate in location and/or easily reachable via public transportation).

The table below outlines factors often used to inform decisions around the siting of services, interim housing, and permanent housing solutions. Each criterion includes specific considerations that funders, policy makers, and/or programs may use when determining if a site is an appropriate or strong fit for a proposed project. Most of the criteria apply to the siting of interim housing, permanent supportive or affordable housing, and services for people experiencing homelessness. The descriptions note where considerations are applicable to only one or two project types.

Criteria	Considerations
<p>I. Site Location</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">  The site location advances regional goals to increase service availability and accessibility in multiple areas of the community. <p>The site is proximate* to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">  Public transportation and the nearby public transit stops are accessible (e.g., distance, slope, etc.) for people of all abilities.  Full-scale grocery stores or supermarkets (for interim and permanent housing projects).  Employment opportunities (for interim and permanent housing projects).  Applicable public and social services (e.g., senior centers for programs targeting older adults, schools for programs targeting families, etc.), as well as public parks, community centers, recreation, and socialization opportunities (for permanent housing projects). <p>*Distance parameters may be locally determined by funders and/or policy makers. Program sites should maximize access to amenities, with particular attention to the location of nearby public transit stops to increase the ability of participants to meet health and wellness needs.</p>
<p>II. Complexity of Site Acquisition</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">  The location of the site is currently zoned for the proposed project type (e.g., interim housing, supportive housing).  The property is publicly owned or leased by the jurisdiction that plans to operate or contract for the project.  The property is privately-owned, and the lease/sale terms are reasonable and consistent with comparable projects.

Criteria	Considerations
<p>III. Cost Effectiveness</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">  The cost to lease or acquire the site is reasonable as compared to similar sites.  The cost to prepare the site for operation, whether through development or rehabilitation, have been factored into the project budget and determined to be reasonable compared to alternate site options for the same or similar service delivery.  If site will be leased, the length of site availability in comparison to project costs is reasonable compared to alternate site options for the same or similar service delivery.
<p>IV. Building Habitability and Design</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">  The existing or planned facility complies with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards for accessibility. This includes access to building entrances/exits, service delivery spaces, sleeping and dining areas (for interim and permanent housing), and restrooms/showers.  The existing or planning facility proposes adequate service space for the program model and size.  For interim and permanent housing projects, the project interior design incorporates an adequate number and flexible design of individual and communal spaces such as common areas, bathrooms, showers, kitchens, etc.  For interim and permanent housing projects, the project outdoor site design incorporates a variety of recreational and gathering spaces, including covered areas for use during rain, snow, or other inclement weather.

V. Community Stakeholder Support

- ✓ People with lived experience of homelessness have been engaged around and support the site location/facility.
- ✓ Elected officials in which the site is located have indicated confirmed or likely support for the project.
- ✓ Influential supporters of the site have been identified who can help garner political and community backing of the project.

COMMUNITY SITING CRITERIA USAGE EXAMPLES

In Columbus, Ohio, the Community Shelter Board (CSB) is the Continuum of Care lead agency and coordinates the community's overall response to homelessness. The CSB has developed Community Acceptance Requirements for all organizations in the community that are seeking funding through CSB. Each organization must submit a Community Acceptance Plan detailing the community's support for the project as well as how the project location meets a set of criteria that include an assessment of the surrounding neighborhood.

The City of San Jose is in the process of developing a housing policy for equitable siting of housing projects through consideration of factors such as proximity to high-performing schools and areas of high opportunity.

VI. SUCCESSFUL SITING STRATEGIES

This section provides a summary and examples of key strategies for successful siting of homelessness response projects from MRCoC peer communities. This begins with an overview of key strategies for building community engagement and support, which is a foundational necessity for successful execution of program siting strategies. Following this,

the section is ordered by strategies that can be adopted at the following levels of planning and implementation: individual projects or providers; cities; counties or regions; and states.

A. Building Community Engagement and Support

As one of the key informants stated during the interview process: “siting is always political.” The single greatest obstacle to securing sites tends to be neighborhood or community opposition and the most effective solution is to secure support of community leaders and key stakeholders to navigate and overcome local resistance. Included below are key strategies communities can adopt to build and leverage community support for project siting efforts.

Engage community leadership. Peer community stakeholders shared that engaging “heavy hitters” (i.e., community members with positional or relational influence) to help lead or engage in efforts to garner community backing for the project can improve the success of neighborhood support efforts and increase political will among elected officials, particularly when there are difficult siting decisions to make. Examples of potential community members to engage to advance political will include business leaders, faith community leaders, philanthropists, leaders of educational or health system institutions, and other strong voices in the community.

Develop and utilize strong marketing and communications strategies. Communities apply several tools to inform stakeholders about project site opportunities, including the use of data, “heart stories” of impact, and visuals. Different strategies are employed based on the audience, communication goals, and stage of the project. Implementors of successful siting communication strategies offer the following guidance:

- Use data and storytelling to dispel myths about the program type, people who will be served by the program, or other narratives that are present in the community that may impact the success of the siting effort. Data points such as the neutral impact of housing projects on property values can be effective with some stakeholders, while others will be moved by stories about the ways housing and services impact people’s lives and the community. It can also be beneficial to provide information about the program model, including the presence of onsite staff to support program participants and staff availability to respond to community concerns.
- Strategically select and use visuals to align with communications strategies. For example, sharing pictures of newly constructed or well-managed permanent supportive or affordable housing can increase support for a project by countering negative perceptions of what a project may look like. Additionally, maps of current service locations overlaid by service need can provide a visual, non-technical demonstration of why a site should be supported in a particular region.

Actively engage nearby neighbors, business owners, and other members of the community. Stakeholders interviewed shared multiple examples of the benefits of pro-actively engaging

with nearby community members. Engagements were found to be most productive when not focused on whether community members support a site but instead on what would be needed to work together or reconcile concerns about moving the project forward. Specific strategies used include sending informational notices to residents about proposed projects, meeting individually with businesses and neighbors most likely to experience impacts or have concerns, setting up regular neighborhood input and problem-solving meetings, and taking key community leaders on tours of existing well-managed projects and programs.

Develop strategic partnerships. The process to identify potential sites, review and compare sites, implement communications strategies, garner community and political support, and approve sites is a multi-faceted and sometimes very long process. Research on successful siting strategies and conversations with peer communities illuminate the value of engaging

COMMUNITY SITING CRITERIA USAGE EXAMPLES

In Maricopa County, Central Arizona Shelter Services (CASS) affirms the importance of developing relationships with city departments, elected officials, service providers, and community members to garner support for existing and new program sites. As part of this strategy, CASS uses strategies like monthly meetings for neighborhood members to engage in dialogue around questions or concerns about program impact.

In the Riverside County, California, the Lift to Rise collective impact initiative adopted proactive approaches to neighborhood engagement for its new housing developments. This included meeting with business leaders in the development's vicinity, sending mailers to residents in the neighborhoods where developments were proposed, and hosting virtual town halls to answer resident and stakeholder questions.

In Houston, the Mayor launched a high-profile initiative to develop 2,500 units of permanent supportive housing. Key to the success of this initiative was securing the support of city leaders, including corporate CEOs, the Chamber of Commerce, the Archbishop of Galveston-Houston, and leaders of other faith communities. This group was engaged throughout the initiative and helped to marshal political support for elected officials when they had to make difficult decisions.

In Salt Lake County, an initiative to create regionally distributed emergency shelters has resulted in the creation of three new Resource Centers. As part of the conditional use permit for each center, the operators are required to organize and facilitate a neighborhood advisory council for each site.

multiple partners in siting efforts and understanding and utilizing the strengths of each partner to maximize impact. For example: developers and/or providers often have experience in robust community engagement; supportive community or neighborhood groups can engage other community members to build backing for the project; elected officials can help facilitate conversation and bring people together; and city, county, or CoC staff can provide data, background, and narratives that can help drive the process. In these efforts, it is important to have regular, clear communication between partners.

B. Individual Project- or Provider-Level Strategies

In addition to the community engagement strategies applicable to all efforts, there are multiple strategies that can be adopted at the individual project- or provider- level to increase the availability of services and interim and permanent housing for people experiencing homelessness. These strategies range from low-impact models that maximize utilization of the available housing inventory in a community to high-impact models that focus on purchasing or designating facilities for long-term or permanent utilization by people experiencing homelessness. Included below are key strategies providers or project partners can adopt to utilize and expand site availability.

Maximize use of existing housing and site availability. Expanding the number of people who can be served through interim housing or supportive services or who can be housed through permanent housing solutions such as short- or long-term rental assistance does not always require acquisition of new facilities. It is beneficial to review existing program service sites to identify if there is currently unused space that could be repurposed for the community's housing or services goals. Additionally, scattered site models that focus on providing short- or long-term rental assistance and services in housing through the private rental market allows communities to increase their available inventory for housing people experiencing homelessness without requiring new built units or acquisitions. Successful scattered site models are typically supported by robust property owner engagement programs that provide education, incentives, and ongoing services to property owner partners.

Identify opportunities for strategic or opportunistic site acquisition. Stakeholders interviewed shared multiple strategies for identifying and securing sites. One strategy is to identify housing units, such as those in an apartment complex, which can be master leased by a city, county, or provider, and then - if the situation of the owner or lessor makes it seem like a viable option - offer to acquire the property and transition it permanently into housing for program participants. An additional opportunistic approach to acquisition or site leasing is to continuously monitor existing housing or services program sites and, if a program is closing, transition it to a new provider or program rather than lose the inventory.



EXAMPLES OF SUCCESSFUL PROVIDER OR PROJECT LEVEL EFFORTS

MAXIMUM UTILIZATION OF EXISTING HOUSING AND SITE AVAILABILITY

The Los Angeles County Flexible Housing Subsidy Pool is a public/private partnership that offers rent subsidies, landlord engagement and incentives, tenant/landlord matching strategies, and services for participants. The project's coordinating agency, Brilliant Corners, secures housing options varying from individual apartments to entire buildings that can then be leased to people experiencing homelessness. Tenants in the program receive ongoing case management services from a network of service providers across the county. San Diego and San Francisco have launched similar flexible housing subsidy pool efforts.

STRATEGIC OR OPPORTUNISTIC ACQUISITION

The City of Houston has partnered with the City's largest permanent supportive housing developer, New Hope Housing, to build many of the targeted 2,500 units in the Mayor's permanent supportive housing initiative. Rather than undertaking a high-profile site selection process, the City has worked with New Hope to opportunistically secure sites and locations as they become available. The City has also leveraged New Hope's extensive expertise in doing the community-level engagement processes that are needed to navigate permitting and other processes. One example of how they engage the community is to include retail space on the ground floor of their properties and to engage the community in a process of deciding how they might want that space used.

The Norton and Ramsey Social Justice Empowerment Center operated by CASS in Glendale, Arizona, offers an array of supportive services that include housing navigation, eviction and homelessness prevention, employment services through Glendale Works (a partnership of the City of Glendale and Phoenix Rescue Mission), and access to hygiene facilities. CASS secured the building when a private property owner donated the facility to the nonprofit service provider. As the site was in a zoning area permissible for its daytime service operations, the property transfer was able to take place without a rezoning process.

C. City-Level Strategies

Cities have a significant role in the siting of interim and permanent housing and services projects. In addition to the community engagement strategies applicable to all efforts, cities can utilize zoning ordinances and strategic public land use and adopt benchmarks and incentives to further the community's housing and services siting goals. Descriptions of these strategies are provided below.

Utilize zoning ordinances and strategic public land use. There are several ways in which zoning ordinances can be developed or modified to advance a community's interim and supportive housing needs, some of which include the strategic utilization of publicly owned or leased sites. Examples adopted in peer communities include:

- **Density Bonus Programs:** Density Bonus Programs allow housing developers to build more units on a property than would otherwise be permitted so long as a minimum percentage of the additional units are reserved for low- or moderate-income households.
- **Mandatory or Voluntary Inclusionary Zoning:** Jurisdictions or areas within a jurisdiction that have inclusionary zoning in place require affordable units be included in new residential developments. The percentage of affordable units required varies significantly across projects and communities. Inclusionary zoning ordinances typically include an in-lieu fee stipulation that developers must pay a fee if they do not build the required number of affordable units in new developments as set by inclusionary zoning. The public sector then uses these fees, often referred to as in-lieu fees, to create affordable housing.
- **Emergency Shelter Overlay Zone:** Emergency shelter overlay zones are areas within a city that have been identified and designated as eligible for establishment for emergency shelter by right. If projects align with the criteria and standards outlined in the zoning ordinance, the shelter may be established without the need for a conditional use permit.
- **Public Lands and Land Banking:** Utilization of property owned or leased by a city for projects can help bypass some of the acquisition and siting processes for new programs. With land banking strategies, cities acquire sites before a specified use has been identified and "bank" it to be used as future opportunities, such as interim or permanent housing projects, arise.

Develop and adopt city benchmarks and incentives for expanding housing and/or services.

Many communities have found that setting citywide goals for the number of units to be developed or programs to be sited in the jurisdiction helps to align policy, funding, and other stakeholder efforts towards a common outcome. Additionally, in recognition that people experience homelessness across communities and to promote shared ownership in advancing housing stability for all residents in the city, more communities have or are developing fair share or geographic site diversity targets with incentives for achieving set benchmarks. This can include providing incentives in the form of public benefits, such as

increased sanitation services, for communities that approve siting of new or expanded homelessness response programs. Stakeholders interviewed shared about additional ways to use incentives in procurement processes to encourage increased housing for people experiencing homelessness: one example of this is the inclusion of incentives for dedicated Permanent Supportive Housing units within affordable housing developments.

EXAMPLES OF SUCCESSFUL CITY LEVEL EFFORTS

BENCHMARKS AND INCENTIVES

The City of Los Angeles adopted an incentive strategy called A Bridge Home to encourage the development of temporary housing programs in each of its council districts. To support the initiative, the City took advantage of State legislation that enables cities to construct bridge housing on any land it owns or leases. The effort requires that, to receive increased sanitation funding for an area, city districts must identify a location or building adjacent to a high-density population of unsheltered individuals and create bridge housing. The bridge housing is intended to be in operation for 3 years while more long-term solutions are developed.

The City of Houston has adopted multiple benchmark and incentive strategies to advance housing and program siting. The City adopted an equitable distribution policy that prioritizes new affordable housing in council districts that have lower-than-average supplies of existing housing stock. This policy distributes new projects, so any given district has no greater than two new affordable housing developments each year. Additionally, the City has partnered with the County to issue some joint RFPs for affordable housing, and they have included a \$40,000 per unit incentive for developers to make some of the units permanent supportive housing targeted to people experiencing chronic homelessness. Further, Houston is currently in the process of developing a permanent Navigation Center (this will be in addition to four temporary centers that have been created as part of COVID-19 response). The City identified land in a lower-income neighborhood with an adjacent undeveloped open space. As part of the strategy to secure support for the center, the City is working with the neighborhood to redevelop the adjacent site into a park through an informal community benefits agreement that provides incentives for acceptance in the form of new neighborhood amenities.

ADDITIONAL CITY LEVEL EXAMPLES

ZONING ORDINANCES AND STRATEGIC PUBLIC LAND USE

The City of Seattle has identified specific areas in which incentive zoning for affordable housing is applied. The ordinance is focused on mid-rise and high-rise zones in several neighborhoods, particularly in and near downtown. Residential developers seeking to expand density beyond set criteria must either dedicate a percentage of the additional floor area to households with incomes up to 80% of the Area Median Income or must pay an in-lieu fee to support affordable worker housing.

In 2016, the City of New York replaced its voluntary inclusionary housing policy with a mandatory inclusionary housing program. The new policy requires developers seeking to expand floor area in up-zoned areas to provide 25 to 30 percent of units as affordable, across a range of income levels. Allowances apply in set circumstances for developers to create affordable housing off-site or to pay in lieu fees.

The City of Sacramento recently voted to approve a plan that will do away with single family zoning, opening the entire City for developments of up to four units. This will significantly increase opportunities to site rental housing development, including small affordable and permanent supportive housing projects. Other communities in California are exploring similar measures, including Oakland and Berkeley.

The City of Detroit designed a land trust that creates affordable housing by utilizing previously vacant public land.

The City of San Jose has been able to advance multiple programs, including prefabricated unit interim housing and tiny home communities, by siting the projects on property owned or leased by the City. This has been made possible through State legislation that streamlines the approval process on publicly owned property.

The City of Berkeley has adopted an unofficial land banking strategy in which the City acquires available property when opportunities arise for future use for homelessness and/or affordable housing projects. As needs emerge and funding for programs becomes available, the City can draw upon its existing portfolio of sites to match to resources, needs and neighborhood considerations.

D. Regional Strategies

In addition to efforts that can be pursued at individual project or city levels, there are also regional strategies communities can adopt to advance siting success for services and housing for people experiencing homelessness. Included below are highlights of strategies that regional leaders such as counties, continuums of care, or collective impact groups can adopt to utilize and expand site availability.

Utilize zoning ordinances. As with cities, counties can develop or modify zoning ordinances to help facilitate the success of efforts to site interim housing, permanent housing, and services for people experiencing homelessness. Counties can adopt the same strategies outlined in the section above (Section C. City-Level Strategies) for unincorporated areas of the jurisdiction.

Develop and adopt incentives for cities and/or unincorporated areas to expand housing and/or services inventory. As with cities, counties can utilize incentives to encourage the approval of new or expanding interim housing, permanent housing solutions, and services for people experiencing homelessness. Counties highlighted in the report found incentives to be a particularly impactful strategy for advancing shared geographic ownership of homelessness response program siting. Successful incentive strategies shared by peer communities include public benefits (e.g., increased sanitation services) and dedicated access to homelessness response program services for the jurisdiction's residents. In the latter strategy, cities that site interim housing or other services can access reserved beds for their residents even if other beds in the program are filled through a countywide process.

Build cross-jurisdictional or regional partnerships with shared goals. An additional way that counties, continuums of care, and collective impact groups can advance siting efforts is through efforts that bring together elected officials, policy makers, and governance entities to develop and adopt shared priorities and goals. There are multiple ways and levels to which communities can move towards this. For example, communities can share data on current and pending supportive and affordable housing developments with ongoing communications around the project pipeline to keep stakeholders informed and maximize resource utilization and impact. Communities can develop shared benchmarks for regional development of new interim and permanent housing solutions to promote broad geographic ownership in and participation towards the goal. Additionally, communities can develop a collective impact model to more intensively strategize and coordinate regional siting goals.

EXAMPLES OF SUCCESSFUL REGIONAL EFFORTS

ZONING ORDINANCES

In alignment with a California State requirement, Riverside County developed an Emergency Shelter Overlay Zone. The Emergency Shelter Overlay Zone was established to permit emergency shelter uses in areas that have a realistic potential for development or reuse opportunities for emergency shelters. The ordinance may be applied to any zone except for certain areas designated as conservation, agricultural, mixed use, railway, livestock, or water course.

INCENTIVES

Salt Lake City undertook a process to reduce the concentration of shelter beds in the downtown area by developing three new regionally distributed emergency shelters. To help build buy in from the communities where the new Resource Centers would be located, the State appropriated funds for a City Mitigation Fund which paid for significant local investments that were desired by the community. In South Salt Lake City, for example, the mitigation funds helped pay for additional police officers, a new ambulance, a city staff person to be a liaison to the new shelter, and other services.

King County, Washington is exploring ways to encourage cities in the region to welcome the siting of shelter or housing for people experiencing homelessness by offering the city access to beds that are dedicated for people who are unsheltered within their city, rather than having all beds filled through the regional Coordinated Entry system. The goal is that this strategy can help cities meet their local need for shelter beds and overcome concerns that people will move from Seattle into surrounding cities if programs are sited there.

REGIONAL PARTNERSHIPS AND SHARED BENCHMARKS

The Coachella Valley's Lift to Rise is a collective action partnership that formed to address poverty and inequality in the Coachella Valley in Riverside County. The partnership is a cross-sector collaboration that brings private, public, and non-profit partners together in collaborative action networks (CANs), including a Housing Stability CAN. The partnership includes banking institutions, building and development corporations, city and county departments, school districts, housing service providers, community organizing groups, and residents. Members adopt shared values and work together towards the adopted vision and goals of the partnership. The Coachella Valley Lift to Rise's Housing Stability CAN is engaged in a Connect Capital Initiative to create a pipeline of affordable housing projects. The capital absorption framework used by the CAN includes a systems-level analysis of housing needs in the community, pursuit of funding for projects, and ongoing communication and partnership towards advancing the development of pipeline projects.

E. State Level Strategies

State legislation and advocacy can also aid local and regional efforts to site interim housing, permanent housing, and services for people experiencing homelessness. Most importantly, states can use legislative action to provide cities and counties with authority, leverage, and/or requirements to implement siting expansion efforts. Multiple stakeholders interviewed referenced the ways in which state legislation allowed for or pushed community efforts to develop new programs, particularly for both interim housing and affordable housing for people experiencing homelessness. Informed by local and regional needs, states also advocate to advance federal policy.

EXAMPLES OF SUCCESSFUL STATE LEVEL EFFORTS

LEGISLATIVE ACTION

California's Senate Bill 2 requires communities to make adequate housing provision for all economic segments by requiring that, among other efforts, communities identify adequate sites for rental housing, emergency shelter, and supportive housing. California also enacted a State Density Bonus Law in 1976 that requires cities to offer density bonuses in exchange for affordable housing. For example, in alignment with this legislation, the City of San Diego utilizes a 20 percent density bonus for rental developments, with the possibility to increase the bonus to a maximum of 35 percent (for each 1 percent increase above the required percentage of affordable units, the density bonus is increased by 1-2.5 percentage points). To qualify, 5 to 10 percent of the units must be set-aside as affordable to low or very low-income households for a period of 30 years for rental developments.

VII. CONCLUSION

State legislation and advocacy can also aid local and regional efforts to site interim housing, permanent housing, and services for people experiencing homelessness. Most importantly, states can use legislative action to provide cities and counties with authority, leverage, and/or requirements to implement siting expansion efforts. Multiple stakeholders interviewed referenced the ways in which state legislation allowed for or pushed community efforts to develop new programs, particularly for both interim housing and affordable housing for people experiencing homelessness. Informed by local and regional needs, states also advocate to advance federal policy.

APPENDIX A: KEY INFORMANTS

Name	Title	Affiliation	Community	Interview Date
Greg Rodriguez	Government Relations and Public Policy Advisor	County of Riverside, Office of Fourth District Supervisor V. Manual Perez	Riverside, California	February 11, 2021
Helene Schneider	Regional Coordinator	U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness	-	January 28, 2021
Jussane Goodman	Director of Community Engagement	Phoenix Rescue Mission	Maricopa County, Arizona	March 24, 2021
Lisa Glow	Chief Executive Officer	Central Arizona Shelter Services (CASS)	Phoenix, Arizona	March 12, 2021
Marc Eichenbaum	Special Assistant to the Mayor for Homeless Initiatives	City of Houston, Office of Mayor Sylvester Turner	Houston, Texas	February 10, 2021
Mark Ellerbrook	Director, Department of Community and Human Services	King County, WA	Seattle/King County, Washington	March 2, 2021
Mary Glennon	Director of Programs	Central Arizona Shelter Services (CASS)	Phoenix, Arizona	March 12, 2021
Matthew Hess	Community Revitalization Administrator	City of Glendale	Glendale, Arizona	March 24, 2021
Michelle Flynn	Executive Director	The Road Home	Salt Lake City, Utah	February 18, 2021
Ragan Henninger	Deputy Director	City of San Jose, Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo	Santa Clara County, California	February 12, 2021
Tamyra Spendley	Deputy Director	City of Phoenix, Human Services	Phoenix, Arizona	March 12, 2021

APPENDIX B: DOCUMENTS AND RESOURCES

I. RESEARCH

- Agnew, S. Discussion Paper: The Impact of Affordable Housing on Communities and Households. Minnesota Housing Finance Agency, Research and Evaluation Unit. <http://www.mhponline.org/files/AffordableHousingImpact-CommunitiesandHouseholds.pdf>
- Can Cities Use State Law to Overcome Housing Resistance? 2021. SPUR Webinar. https://www.spur.org/events/2021-02-12/can-cities-use-state-law-overcome-housing-resistance?mc_cid=d8996b509e&mc_eid=ddfa008137
- Lessons in Land Use Reform: Best Practices for Successful Upzoning. 2019. Turner Center for Housing Innovation. https://turnercenter.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/Lessons_in_Land_Use_Reform.pdf
- Residential Redevelopment of Commercially Zoned Land in California. 2020. Turner Center for Housing Innovation. <https://turnercenter.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/Residential-Redevelopment-of-Commercially-Zoned-Land-in-California-December-2020.pdf>
- Young, C. 2016. There Doesn't Go the Neighborhood: Low-Income Housing Has No Impact on Nearby Home Values. Trulia Research. <https://www.trulia.com/research/low-income-housing/>

II. POLICIES AND ORDINANCES

A. State Level Legislation

- Streamlined approval process for eligible infill projects in jurisdictions that have not met regional housing need targets. California SB 35: Planning and zoning: affordable housing: streamlined approval process. 2017-2018. https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180SB35.
- California SB 2: Building jobs and homes act. 2017-2018. https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180SB2.
- Inclusionary Zoning Requirements. California AB 1505: Land use: zoning regulations. 2017-2018. https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB1505.

III. REGIONAL OR CITY STRATEGIES

A. Reports

- Coachella Valley Homeless Engagement and Action Response Team: A Collaborative and Regional Approach to Homelessness in Coachella Valley. January 2020. <https://www.dhcd.org/media/1136/CVHEART%20Report%208.18.2020.pdf>

- Lift to Rise: 2020-2022 Action Plan. Coachella Valley.
https://static1.squarespace.com/static/597e35319f74567ca8488f81/t/5e692b01863a733fda724710/1583950602832/Lift-to-Rise_ActionPlan_Report-v8.pdf
- Ending Homelessness: The State of the Supportive Housing System in Santa Clara County. 2018. www.supportivehousingscc.org/report

B. Sample Programs and Materials

- Immediate Housing Model Presentation. National Alliance to End Homelessness 2021 Conference Session: Moving Towards Better Outcomes for Homelessness' Biggest Subpopulation.
- The Housing Ready Community's Toolkit: Action Guide. County of Santa Clara.
<http://www.scctoolkit.org>
- Rebuild Duluth Program Guidelines. 2019. The City of Duluth, Minnesota, and Duluth Economic Development Authority.
- United Way of Greater Los Angeles: Everyone In Campaign. <https://everyoneinla.org/>