

## Council Consent Items

- 28. Relinquishment of Council Office Budget Funds from General Funds and Grant of Such Funds to the 2025 Asian Cultural Festival**  
**From: Councilmember Tregub (Author), Mayor Ishii (Co-Sponsor), Councilmember Kesarwani (Co-Sponsor), Councilmember Lunaparra (Co-Sponsor)**  
**Recommendation:** Adopt a Resolution authorizing the expenditure of up to \$500 per Mayor/Councilmember from their D13 Discretionary Accounts, including \$500 from the Mayor, and contributions of \$250 each from Councilmembers Tregub, Kesarwani, and Lunaparra. Other Councilmembers are invited to contribute to support of the 2025 Asian Cultural Festival in an amount of up to \$500. Funds will be transferred to the City's general fund and provided to the designated fiscal sponsor of the festival to ensure its successful production and community engagement. The relinquishment of funds from the respective discretionary Council Office Budgets of such members of the Berkeley City Council who wish to contribute will support this impactful event, promoting cultural exchange, unity, and celebration of Berkeley's rich Asian American communities.  
**Financial Implications:** See report  
Contact: Igor Tregub, Councilmember, District 4, (510) 981-7140
- 29. Alternative Housing Options for People Experiencing Homelessness** *(Reviewed by the Health, Life Enrichment, Equity & Community Committee)*  
**From: Councilmember O'Keefe (Author), Mayor Ishii (Co-Sponsors), Councilmember Blackaby (Co-Sponsors), Councilmember Lunaparra (Co-Sponsor)**  
**Recommendation:** Refer to the City Manager a request for staff to identify a list of potential locations of City-owned and private properties (to be leased or acquired) – for the purpose of establishing 24/7 staffed shelter sites, including but not limited to indoor/outdoor camping areas, safe RV and car park zones, and/or congregate or non-congregate shelters for people experiencing homelessness based on the model used at Grayson Street and other models deemed successful by the City Manager. Further, direct the City Manager to provide a report to the City Council that includes: (1) Ongoing efforts to address homelessness and the mental health crisis within Berkeley's jurisdiction, including the work of non-governmental organizations the City is relying upon and, where possible, the cost thereof. (2) A gap analysis between resources required by the City to fully address homelessness and its current financial position. (3) A feasibility and cost analysis of Berkeley's ability to support additional shelter or services sites, including staffing and operational constraints. (4) A geographic equity assessment of where homeless services, shelters, and encampments have historically been and currently are located in Berkeley. (5) Opportunities to partner with Alameda County and other public agencies to utilize County, other governing jurisdictions, or state-owned land for temporary shelter and services outside of Berkeley's most heavily impacted neighborhoods  
Moreover, direct the City Manager to identify additional funding opportunities available through 2024 Measure W and affirm the City Council's position that local jurisdictions such as Berkeley, that are heavily impacted by the housing and mental health crisis, should be considered for an equitable share and speedy receipt of 2024

## Council Consent Items

Proposition 1 funding from Alameda County.

Direct the City Manager to affirm that the City Council's position is that, to the greatest extent possible, Measure W and other locally sourced funds should be used to support Berkeley-specific homelessness service needs.

Support the City Manager in collaborating with Alameda County and other neighboring jurisdictions to identify potential sites outside of Berkeley city limits that may be suitable and more cost-effective than sites within Berkeley.

Furthermore, affirm support for the following principles: 1. County resource investment in homelessness across the region should align proportionally with where homelessness is most prevalent and ensure support achieves racially equitable outcomes; 2. The use of Measure W and other funding for homelessness guided by Home Together 2030 Plan should be a local decision, with cities deciding how to divvy up investment between prevention, interim, and permanent housing; 3. Local priority for referrals into interim and permanent solutions – including everything from safe parking to shelter to permanent supportive housing and Homekey projects – should be commensurate with the level of funding provided; 4. Sustaining nonprofit capacity: (a) The homelessness response system relies heavily on nonprofit partners, many of whom face challenges in retaining staff due to funding constraints, salary limitations, and administrative burdens. (b) Measure W funding presents an opportunity to support not just direct services but also nonprofit infrastructure, helping organizations improve long-term sustainability. (c) Considerations include ensuring competitive wages, investing in staff retention strategies, and providing operational support. (d) Bonus funding consideration could be given to organizations that prioritize workforce sustainability through: (i) Competitive salaries and benefits for frontline staff; (ii) Efforts to retain high-performing, low-turnover teams; (iii) Investments in administrative capacity that enhance service quality and long-term viability

*Policy Committee Recommendation:*

*Send item to Council with a qualified positive recommendation which include the following proposed amendments:*

*Refer to the City Manager a request for staff to identify a list of potential locations of City properties and private properties (to be leased or acquired) – for the purpose of establishing 24/7 staffed shelter sites, including but not limited to indoor/outdoor camping areas, safe RV and car park zones, and/or congregate or non-congregate shelters for people experiencing homelessness based on the model used at Grayson Street and other models deemed by the City Manager to be successful.*

*Further, direct the City Manager to provide a report to the City Council of ongoing efforts to address the homelessness and mental health crisis within Berkeley's jurisdiction, including efforts by non-governmental organizations the city is relying upon, where possible, including the costs thereof, and a gap analysis between the resources required by the City to fully address homelessness and its current financial position.*

*As part of this report, direct the City Manager:*

- 1) Conduct a feasibility and cost analysis of Berkeley's ability to support additional shelter or service sites, including staffing and operational constraints*
- 2) Include a geographic equity assessment of where homeless services, shelters,*

# Council Consent Items

and encampments have historically and currently been located in Berkeley;  
3) Identify opportunities to partner with Alameda County and other public agencies to utilize County, other governing jurisdictions – or state-owned land for temporary shelter and services outside of Berkeley’s most heavily impacted neighborhoods  
Direct the City Manager to identify any additional funding opportunities available through 2024 Measure W and affirm the City Council’s position that local jurisdictions such as Berkeley that are heavily impacted by the housing and mental health crisis should be considered for an equitable share and speedy receipt of 2024 Proposition 1 funding from Alameda County. Further, direct the City Manager to affirm that the City Council’s position is that, to the extent possible, Measure W and any other locally sourced funds should be used to support Berkeley-specific homelessness services needs.

Support the City Manager in collaborating with Alameda County and other neighboring jurisdictions to identify potential sites outside of Berkeley city limits that may be suitable and more cost-effective than additional sites within Berkeley.

Further, affirm support for the following principles:

1. County resource investment in homelessness across the region should be commensurate with where homelessness occurs and targeted for racially equitable outcomes
2. Measure W and other funding for homelessness guided by Home Together 2030: Should be a Local City decision on the split between prevention, interim, and permanent housing
3. Local (City level) priority for referrals into interim and permanent solutions (including everything from safe parking to shelter to permanent supportive housing/HomeKey projects), commensurate with local funding.
4. Sustaining Nonprofit Capacity
  - The homelessness response system relies heavily on nonprofit partners, many of whom face challenges in retaining staff due to funding constraints, salary limitations, and administrative burdens.
  - Measure W funding presents an opportunity to support not just direct services but also nonprofit infrastructure, helping organizations improve long-term sustainability.
  - Considerations include ensuring competitive wages, investing in staff retention strategies, and providing operational support.
  - Bonus funding consideration could be given to organizations that prioritize workforce sustainability through:
    - Competitive salaries and benefits for frontline staff.
    - Efforts to retain high-performing, low-turnover teams.
    - Investments in administrative capacity that enhance service quality and long-term viability.

**Financial Implications:** See report  
Contact: Shoshana O’Keefe, Councilmember, District 5, (510) 981-7100