

MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 2, 2006

FILE: 0540-20

TO: City Manager

FROM: Chair, Supportive Housing Site Review Task Force

RE: **RECOMMENDATION OF THE SUPPORTIVE HOUSING SITE REVIEW TASK FORCE**

REPORT PREPARED BY: JONI METHERELL

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT Council receive this Report as the Task Force's recommendation as to the best location(s) for the 30 unit supportive housing project that is to be built under a partnership between the City, Interior Health Authority, BC Housing and a housing provider under the funding delivered by the Premier's Task Force on Homelessness, Mental Illness and Addictions.

REPORT:

The Site Review Task Force, established by City Council to review viable alternative sites for a 30-unit supportive housing development, has completed its work. At its final meeting on March 29, 2006, the Task Force passed a motion to advise City Council of the scoring and ranking of the Top 6 sites that came out of the review process. I will get to the rationale for this decision and the results of the Task Force's work after first reviewing the activities of the Task Force.

The Task Force met on seven occasions since early January, 2006.

All activities of the Site Review Task Force, including meeting agendas, minutes, and opportunities for public input have been published as soon as the information was available on the City of Kelowna web site (www.kelowna.ca under "Highlights").

The Task Force chose to use a rational decision making model in undertaking this review. This model of rational decision making (known as the Kepner Tregoe model) permitted a wide range of differing opinions and priorities among the Task Force members to be considered, all the while leading us to a rational decision based on a mathematical analysis.

The process we undertook was essentially a four step process:

1. Firstly, the Task Force needed to decide on the criteria that we would use to evaluate all potential sites. Four criteria were mandatory. After extensive debate, the Task Force added a further 9 criteria. Public input was sought through a process of advertising. Submissions were received and considered by the Task Force. The 13 criteria we ultimately established are listed in Appendix 1. These criteria were approved by Council on February 27, 2006. Each Task Force member then was

asked to 'weigh' the criteria in order of relative importance to them personally. This resulted in a weighted average figure that was assigned to each criterion. That weighted average is shown in the far right column of Appendix 1.

2. The second step in the process was to apply the criteria that we had agreed on to all the potential sites for this facility. In order to do this, City Staff first had to eliminate sites that did not meet the mandatory criteria and then provide us with the information we needed for each criterion. Over 1100 hours of staff time was required. Fourteen staff members in 4 different City departments were involved. The process for eliminating sites that did not meet the criteria started with 852 sites that met the requisite mandatory zoning criteria. 156 of the 852 were eliminated as being inappropriate due to their current use, or because they were strata titled. This left 696 sites. Of those 696 sites, 608 were eliminated either because they were too small to support the facility, or were much too large to consider. This resulted in 88 sites still in the running. Of the 88 sites, 7 were gas stations that would be unable to meet the mandatory environmental criteria. 7 were City owned properties and these were set aside for further consideration. This left 74 privately owned parcels of land. Letters were sent to the owners inquiring about their interest in selling their property. As a result of this process, 9 sites were made available by members of the public. Upon review, 2 of the 9 privately owned sites were old gas station sites and could not meet the environmental requirements, one building was not structurally able to support the additional floors of the project, one was a strata property, and one was unattainable for financial reasons. The results of this were that 4 privately owned sites were available for review.

There were 45 city owned sites that met the zoning requirements (including the 7 City owned properties referred to above). Of these 45 properties, 29 were eliminated for a variety of reasons including extensive development on the site already, the site had been acquired by the City for a strategic purpose that still existed, the property had already been developed as park but had not yet been rezoned, and long term lease commitments were already in place. The result was 16 City owned parcels, representing 9 sites, were available for consideration.

In total, 13 sites (4 privately owned, 9 City owned) were available to the Task Force for further consideration.

City staff then collected all of the data we required in order to assess how well each site met the criteria that we had decided to use. This was a very time consuming process but City staff moved quickly to provide this information. By the Task Force's meeting on March 22, 2006, all of this information had been compiled and was provided to the task force.

3. At step 3 of this process, each Task Force member was provided with a package of information. For each of the 13 sites under review, we were told how that site measured up to the criteria we had set. The information we received (as shown for the top 6 sites) is included in Appendix 1. For criteria 3 we were provided with the current zoning for every parcel within 100 metres of the site under consideration. We were also told what property uses were directly adjacent to the site in question.

It's important to emphasize that this step of the process was entirely "blind." Task Force members did not know the address of the sites they were considering. The sites were identified only as Sites A through M.

At this step, each Task Force member was asked to score the sites as to how well they met the criteria we had established. A score of 1 through 10 was given to each of the criteria for each site. In order to ensure no one was able to guess the location of any of the sites, each Task Force member's package was different than the other members. And the sites were randomly "tumbled" within the Task Force member's own individual package.

This created a process that one Task Force member aptly described as "maddeningly objective." It would have been impossible for any Task Force member to determine the actual location of any of the sites they were being asked to score.

Scoring was done individually by the Task Force members between March 22 and March 27, 2006. Each member's scores were submitted to Mr. Shipclark by Monday, March 27, 2006. City staff compiled the aggregate scores for each Site. (For those interested in the math, the aggregate scores for each Site were the sum of the total scores from all Task Force members, multiplied by the weighted averages we had determined at Step 1 of this process.)

4. The final step in this process occurred on March 29, 2006. At an *in camera* meeting, the Top 6 sites, based on the aggregate scores, were unveiled to the Task Force members. Task Force members reviewed aerial maps showing the locations of the Top 6 sites. They reviewed each of the Top 6 sites and discussed any concerns they had about the inclusion of any particular site in this Report.

After extensive discussion and debate, the Task Force voted (12 in favour, 1 opposed) to present to Council the rankings of the top 6 sites in the same order in which their aggregate scores placed the sites. To this extent, it was felt that the Task Force's results speak for themselves. The majority of the Task Force felt that given the geographic proximity of all of the Top 6 sites to the highest scoring sites, Council should be aware of the location of the Top 6.

THE RESULTS:

The Top 6 ranked sites are shown outlined in red on Appendix 2 of this Report.

1. The top ranked site, previously known only as Site I to the Task Force members, is the property located at 1436 N. St Paul Street. Based on our decision making model, this site scored as the best location for the facility.
2. The second highest ranked site was Site D, the property located at 1436 S St. Paul Street. Based on our decision making model, this site scored as the second best location for the facility.
3. The third highest ranked site was Site E, the grassy parcel located adjacent to the library on Doyle Avenue. Based on our decision making model, this site scored as the third best location for the facility.
4. The fourth highest ranked site was Site L, located at 1415 Ellis Street.
5. The fifth highest ranked site was Site G, located at 1402-1414 Ellis Street

6. The sixth highest ranked site was Site J, located at 1311 St. Paul St. (corner of Cawston and St. Paul.)

Before I continue, I wish to address directly two frequent criticisms this Task Force faced during this process.

Firstly, there was criticism regarding the composition of the Task Force. Some members of the public expressed the opinion that the government partners (City, IHA, and BC Housing) ought not to have a member on the Task Force. They suggested that the presence of the government partners would jeopardize the objectivity of the Task Force in reviewing and scoring sites. I can advise Council that if the government partners scores are removed from the aggregate scores for each of the 13 sites we considered, the top 3 ranked sites remain the same. (See Appendix 3)

Secondly, we faced criticism regarding the inclusion of the criteria for proximity of the facility to certain resources identified as being important to tenants of the facility, namely Outreach Health and the Health Unit. It was suggested that the inclusion of these criteria would unreasonably skew the Task Force's work towards a downtown location. I can advise Council that if the scores related to these two proximity criteria are removed, the top 3 ranked sites still remain the same. (See Appendix 3)

In short, these two loudly voiced criticisms and concerns about the objectivity of the Task Force have turned out to be completely unfounded.

During our meeting on March 29, 2006, and now that we could actually see where the properties in question were located, the Task Force members discussed at length whether we should re-order or eliminate any of the Top 6 sites based on subjective criteria or a "sober second look."

Some of the reasons put forward by Task Force members for reordering the Top 6 were:

- concerns regarding the appropriateness of Site E, (460 Doyle Avenue) in terms of proximity to the library, and proximity to the cultural corridor and other "tourist" oriented facilities were weighed against the value of having more traffic near the facility and its proximity to the Doyle Avenue police station;
- concerns about the sizes of sites L (1415 Ellis Street) and G (1402-1414 Ellis Street) as these sites are actually larger than needed for the facility, and the relative attractiveness of redevelopment of these sites given the two street frontage;
- concerns about the high number of single family dwellings in the vicinity of Site J (1311 St. Paul) vs. extensive higher density development occurring in the area around the site and the fact that this property is outside of the "red zone"; and
- whether it made sense to bring both Sites I and D (the 1436 S and N properties) to Council as the Top 2 sites, when there was so little to distinguish them (We were then advised by the City representative on the Task Force that the only reason the 1436 S location was originally chosen over the N location was related to the preservation of trees on N site).

In the end, we determined that no Task Force member felt strongly enough about any of these concerns either to re-order the Top 6, or to prevent them from advising Council of all of the Top 6 sites, in the same order in which they scored.

In conclusion, the Task Force's work is complete, and in our view the results speak for themselves. Using an objective and blind decision making process:

- the top scoring site is 1436 N St. Paul St.,
- the second highest scoring site is 1436 S St. Paul St., and;
- the third highest scoring site is located at 460 Doyle Avenue.
- the task force has identified 3 other suitable locations for this project, albeit each of these sites scored lower than the Top 3. However, given their close geographic proximity to the Top 3 sites, the Task Force felt it was important for Council to know where they were located.

The Task Force would like to extend its thanks to David Shipclark, Carla Stephens, and the many other City staff who spent the hours necessary to give us thorough and timely information so that we could complete our work. I would like to thank all of the Task Force members for their time and assistance. They volunteered many hours (many more than originally anticipated I suspect) to do a job while under constant public scrutiny and while a public relations campaign was waged around them. Although this was at times distracting, the Task Force worked hard to stay focused on the job you have asked them to do. In light of the ongoing public debate regarding this project, we recognize the difficult decision that City Council now has to make.

Joni Metherell, Chair
Supportive Housing Site Review Task Force

JM/sh