

**CITY OF SUNNYVALE**  
**City Council Study Session**  
**Summary**

**Study Session on**  
**April 3, 2012**

**Review of Council Policy 5.1.3: Human Services**

The City Council met in study session in the West Conference Room at City Hall, 456 W. Olive Avenue in Sunnyvale, California, on April 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2012 at 6:30 p.m., with Vice-Mayor David Whittum presiding.

**City Councilmembers Present:**

Mayor Anthony Spitaleri  
Vice Mayor David Whittum  
Chris Moylan  
Jim Griffith  
Patrick Meyering  
Tara Martin-Milius  
Jim Davis

**City Councilmembers Absent:**

None

**City Staff Present:**

Gary Luebbers, City Manager  
David Kahn, City Attorney  
Robert Walker, Assistant City Manager  
Hanson Hom, Director of Community Development  
Suzanne Isé, Housing Officer

**Visitors/Guests Present:**

Marie Bernard, Sunnyvale Community Services

**Call to Order:** 6:30 p.m.

**Study Session Summary:**

Director Hom introduced Housing Officer Isé, who gave a brief slide presentation on the subject, including a brief background, the issues of concern identified by Council and staff during several public hearings on human services funding last year, and some possible changes to the process.

Council asked questions and commented on the subject:

- Council should follow the adopted funding policies/criteria throughout the process, not change criteria at the end of the process. The process seemed to work well last time. Is it really broken?
- The system is broken.
- Cost per client or per unit of service is a very important evaluation criterion. Staff must provide accurate data regarding these costs.
- Cost per client is not really the best way to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of these programs. A more important factor is how much cost-savings the proposed program would generate for the City, by preventing the need for more critical and expensive city services (public safety interventions, hospitalizations, incarceration, etc.).
- Council should provide direction to the Housing and Human Services Commission (HHSC) early in the process regarding the amount of the General Fund supplement Council is willing to allocate.
- We need to look both ways at cost effectiveness: both cost per unit or client, and value to society of the service.
- Staff should provide data on cost savings created by each program.
- The aging population is going to impact all levels of government by increasing the need for human services. This will be the number one issue impacting cities in the coming years.
- City role is to have a bigger perspective, including acknowledging the law enforcement savings created by many of these programs.
- Council is not as familiar with the proposed programs as are others involved earlier in the evaluation process, so they should give serious consideration to the evaluations of those who have spent time reviewing the programs in detail.

Members of the public offered the following comments:

- Other funding agencies, such as the United Way, the County, and Silicon Valley Community Foundation, are also looking at ways to better evaluate and rank funding proposals. Many of these funding agencies are dividing available funds into pre-determined portions before soliciting proposals, such as a fixed amount for safety net services, and another amount for one or more specialized social services. City should look at what they are doing and may find some good techniques for making difficult funding decisions.

**Adjournment:** 6:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Suzanne Isé  
Housing Officer