



Agenda | Coalition Meeting

Date: Wednesday, September 4, 2025
Time: 10:30-noon (90 minutes)
Location: Town of Truckee, Council Chambers

Participants/Invites

- TTHAC Members
- General Public

Meeting Objectives

1. Coalition Charter Approval
2. Decision on Winter Solution Models

DRAFT AGENDA (10:30-noon)

<i>Agenda Topic</i>	<i>Discussion:</i>
Welcome	
Agenda Review, Updates from Meeting #1, Coalition Role Call	○ Community Voice, Homeless Advocate: Cindy Basso (remote) ○ Nevada County: Hardy Bullock, Phebe Bell, Ryan Gruver, Jazmin Breau ○ North Tahoe Truckee Homeless Services / AMI Housing: Cathie Foley ○ Placer County: Aliso Schwender ○ Sierra Community House: Paul Bancroft ○ Tahoe Forest Hospital Health Systems: Ted Owens, Alyce Wong ○ Tahoe Truckee Community Foundation: Absent ○ Town of Truckee: Jen Calloway, Danny Renfrow, Jan Zabriskie ○ Truckee Chamber: Jessica Penman ○ Truckee Library: Absent

<i>TTHAC announcements</i>	○ United for Action/COAD: Anne Rarick Website will be coming soon with meeting schedules and materials Meetings will alternate evenings and daytime
General Public Comment	Comments included community member introductions, one comment included support of the navigation center concept
Coalition Charter, review, discuss, approve	DRAFT Coalition charter: • Clean copy will be ready to sign at the October meeting • Help the external community understand the purpose and function • Also want the internal team to understand the purposes • Includes the high-level summary of the goals in the action plan • Because we are moving into implementation, we need to have formal voting so things can be taken back to respective governing bodies • Pg 4 - added member roles in homeless services ○ Ideally an MOU will be added when we get to specific projects ○ Seana will be reaching out to each member agency and ask what they think their specific role is in this effort There will be gaps in the needs that need to be filled, and TTHAC should be the group to collectively decide how it gets filled

Winter Solution Model Presentation + Discussion + Decision <i>Two Model options on the table for winter solutions, walk through two options, clarifying questions, Coalition decision on which model makes the most sense to move forward</i>	Navigation Center - Pilot Project Update: • Feasibility work has been underway since the last meeting in August • Decisions for today: ○ Timing: ▪ Smaller but ready this winter or larger, more permanent solution but not this winter ○ Model Options: ▪ Model A: Navigation Center (no drop in shelter) ▪ Model B: Navigation with drop in shelter ○ Location Model A: Smaller Model (no drop-in shelter): we need funds in hand now in order to contract for services - will require local funding commitments from the agencies • 4-6 interim beds ○ When someone comes in, wrap around services are available to them ▪ Avg time per stay? Varies by person / Phebe thinks avg is 6 months ○ Can we move someone to west county or KB to allow for capacity to open up? Is this reasonable and acceptable? ▪ Ryan - we try and keep ppl within their community and not break their connections ▪ Some treatment services however only exist in west county ▪ People coming in for day services can also be connected to beds in other locations • Service model: 365 days a year plus day services for 10-15 ppl at a time during specific hours • Operations / staffing - smaller staffing requirements due to model of overnight beds • Site requirements - sleeping quarters, showers, kitchen and day space • Benefits: ○ Feasible to open this winter ○ Some funding already in place ○ Operator in place ▪ AMI is willing to operate and provided a budget ○ Fewer ER visits ○ Reduced law enforcement interventions
--	---

	○ Saves lives ○ Smaller space need ○ Could include an option for post hospital recovery beds ○ Aligns with town inclusion policy • Challenges: ○ Does not provide for drop in shelter ○ Less people will be served ○ Doesn't match with the aspirations of the TTHAC plan ○ Reduces flexibility for people in crisis Model B: Model with drop-in shelter • Capacity: 8 drop in shelter beds (overnight beds for the winter months where option A does not include this) and 4 longer-term beds ○ This can be an incompatible population ○ We would need security for the overnight stays as you don't know who is coming through the door • Service model - includes drop in shelter beds for winter season - then will shift to scaled down pilot with interim housing afterwards. There is potential for limited day center hours during both / Model B would revert to Model A after March 2026 • Operations / staffing: security plus extended staffing hours through 3/31/26 (24 hours needed) - this leads to a higher budget need to stand this up • \$604k budget vs \$510k for Model A ○ Delta all due to the additional staffing needs for the overnight stays, budgets are speculative and will be determined by site and service provider • Benefits: ○ Includes winter drop in beds ○ Could include an option for post hospital recovery beds ○ Results in fewer ER visits ○ Reduced law enforcement ○ Preserves human lives ○ Protects public health ○ Aligns with Town inclusion policy ○ Smaller space needed per capita ○ More people can be served • Challenges: ○ Drop in shelters do not lower homelessness
--	--

	○ Drop in beds reduce the space available for interim housing beds ○ Conflict between the 2 populations? ○ No funding in place - State funding is more focused on moving folks into housing (not shelter beds) ○ No operator interest ▪ No response to an RFP last year, but the operator was charged with a weather triggered shelter only, finding the location and operating it for less than \$110k ○ Higher staffing costs ○ Different zoning requirements ○ Low probability of opening winter 2025/26 ○ Space could be a challenge ▪ Lower the number of shelter beds to make it work in a smaller space? Is there an alternative way to support the people in the winter months? If so, Jan believes council more likely to support Option A and meet the people who need drop in during winter with an alternative support method Other services to be provided (regardless of model we pursue): ● Expanded supported housing ● Motel vouchers - there are big challenges finding hotels willing to do this ● Connection to shelters within the county of residence ● Access to treatment beds ● Help those just "passing through" with gas and bus vouchers ● Weather emergency sheltering (under blizzard conditions) ● NOTE: all of these are challenged by availability Location Areas: ● Do we support expanding our criteria beyond the Gateway area for a navigation center? ● General scope of the search has been along Donner Pass Road - from Villager to the Shell at the west side of town ○ With the lens of community concern about any locations near schools and daycares ○ Residential areas are not explicitly excluded but awareness around resident concerns
--	---

	○ Town has zoned this as mixed use / emergency shelter would require a use permit, but residential is permissible ▪ Hardy notes that the County can use its superpowers to allow for this use, but will not pull this lever unless the coalition is unified in this • Some options considered: ○ Vets Hall: ▪ Was turned down by TDRPD Board last year but still pursuing this option ▪ Vets Hall was given to TDRPD for "community use" ○ Empty land near US Bank on Donner Pass ▪ Lacks utilities - no water and sewer ▪ Big lift to make it ready for occupancy by winter - could be a longer-term option ○ Mountain Home Furnishings ▪ Very expensive to purchase ○ Old Urgent Care space ▪ Space is no longer available ○ Some spaces near town hall and the airport - proved to be not viable • New work group will focus on digging deeper into all site options and completing due diligence Paul: • Pushes back a little on the no operator interest for the Model B option ○ Hardy - went back to Travis with VOA who was the only one who expressed any interest- asked if there is any way VOA can support this? ▪ He noted he needs to install a year-round model / he can't support the episodic stays ▪ Is it worth going back to VOA and present the pilot project with the notion that it could extend into years 2 -3 or more? Hardy thinks he may be supportive of this • Also, would like to know more about this notion of "incompatibility" between the populations? ○ Cathy - people who are working towards stability need a private space where they aren't distracted by the folks coming and going
--	---

	Ted: costs don't show the all-in costs of each of the models - ER will take on more costs if there are no ST beds - Not just medical care, but also for situation management and security - Hospital would really favor option B - at least make the effort to find a solution with drop-in beds so the hospital doesn't bear the additional expense of unsheltered people in their ER during the winter - Jazmin notes that Model B costs are really an academic estimate - true costs will be dictated by the provider - Cathy notes that Model A has a proven track record of the costs to operate whereas Model B can vary - VOA quote for Model B was \$1.2M Alice: How do people get selected for the drop-in bed's vs the interim beds? - Phebe - for an interim housing bed, they will use the coordinated entry system - Use the data they have collected to identify those who are most vulnerable and place them there - Will also consider behaviors and personalities to try and find persons who can cohabitate - There is a strong understanding by Nev County team on who is in the community and what their needs are Most providers don't want to support a weather triggered warming shelter as it is not stable and it doesn't support moving out of homelessness Risk vs Reward of the 2 options: - Model A could be achieved by January? - Model A could also be pursued and may allow a transition into Model B - Model B may not be achieved by Jan, Feb, even March, but this model provides so much more than Model A once it is up and running
Public Comment on Model Discussions	- Feels like moving away from old warming shelter model as an option is not meeting what the community wants - Likes Model B, but not model A because it won't meet the need for those who need a place in the winter months - Brody - is AMI out of scope to operate Model B? - What does the blizzard provision look like?

	○ Required for any county to do so in a declared emergency / Nev County expanded this to include blizzards • Mike L: thought to not offer interim housing and just focus on those with urgent needs – Short term beds plus drop-in services? • Dave: trailer with utilities included? Wants to cheer for Model B ○ Went to some local motels and Wagon Train - asked about their willingness to take on ppl during cold weather ▪ Got a mixed bag of answers, but got the sense that if there was accountability for the guests, it may work • Phebe - responding to why aren't we just doing a shelter: ○ It is the hardest model to stand up ○ Most funding doesn't support this model ▪ Most of the funding available is for more permanent solutions ○ Finding an operator is very hard ○ Very expensive on a cost/person basis ○ Notes that we do have a notable amount of private wealth in this community which hopefully we can tap for support over future years to augment these solutions • AMI Housing focuses on permanent supportive housing. Cathie Foley and Jessica Penman spent many hours last year meeting hotel owners to discuss creating a program with hotels, now owners were willing to commit to a program. Ted looked at options for empty lot: • Trailers can't accommodate snow load • They lack facilities • Old 1966 building is an option but currently restricted from putting ppl in this building by the state - will need to demolish the building
Coalition Member Votes	Which option are we pursuing? One vote per member (I can live with it, I am neutral, I am not comfortable with where we are going) 1. Timing: this winter or longer term? a. Nev County/Hardy - this winter b. Community Advocate/Cindy - this winter - but does not preclude ability to pursue Model B c. TFHD/Ted/Alyce - this winter d. United for Action/COAD/Anne - this winter e. Town of Truckee - winter (as long as goal of broader plan is not lost)

	f. AMIH/Cathy - winter but push towards longer term g. Chamber/Jessica - winter h. Placer/Alison - winter i. Sierra Community House/Paul - winter j. All in favor for prioritizing winter - all yes 2. Model Options: Now that we decided to focus on winter, which model do you want? a. Can we live with Model A if it is the only thing we can get done by the winter? i. Chamber - yes ii. Nevada Co - yes / let's get going on model A, but not give up on elevating shelter services too / doesn't see them as mutually exclusive iii. Town/Jan - has concerns as the "if" begs the question could model B get done? iv. Town/Jen - if Model A is the only thing we can get this winter, then let's pursue A / finding money and operator for B could take more time than we have before winter v. TFHD/Alice - has concerns that A doesn't help those who will need a drop-in shelter this winter - feels there is a disconnect between the timing focus and the needs we are trying to meet vi. Consensus vote on the model: Motion: Goal of winter - prioritize A (*): • Sierra Community House - yes • TFHD- yes • Unified for Action/COAD yes • Town yes • AMI yes • Nev County yes * to the motion above - knowing that there is an openness if an operator, site, and funding present itself, we move towards B / includes keeping an eye out for a drop in shelter pending the receipt of an operator and funding 3. Location: Gateway is the area the community is comfortable with / do we expand beyond this? a. It's more about the commercial corridor
--	---

	b. Chamber open to other areas if appropriate public outreach is conducted / Sierra Community House agrees c. Vets Hall - is this considered a neighborhood? Cindy wants this on the table d. Working group will bring back sites based on agreed upon parameters e. Motion - bring back sites for public review / expand beyond gateway corridor for other sites which could be appropriate? i. All yes except the Town 1. Jen - wants sites any sites to be brought back to the coalition that are outside of mixed-use zone f. Coalition supports identifying sites within mixed use zone, but is open to other sites pending review by the coalition and public? i. All yes
Close and Next Steps	Navigation Center Pilot Workgroup will be established and report back to the ICT and the larger TTHAC group. October TTHAC meeting scheduled October 8th 5:30 at Town Hall