November 1, 2018

The Honorable Charles Margines
Presiding Judge
Orange County Superior Court
700 Civic Center Drive West
Santa Ana, CA 92701

Dear Judge Margines:

The City of Irvine is in receipt of an October 18, 2018 letter from the Grand Jury Foreperson regarding the City's response to the 2017-18 Orange County Grand Jury Report entitled "Where There's a Will, There's a Way: Housing Orange County's Chronically Homeless." In the letter, Ms. Sale requests that the City provide a definitive timeline for responses to recommendations that indicate a need for further analysis.

In its response to the Grand Jury Report, the City indicated that, for Recommendation Nos. 1, 2, 7, 8, and 9, further analysis is required. That further analysis, and the timing for the completion of that analysis is contingent on the availability of meaningful proposals, plans, and information for the City to evaluate. For example, a complete response to Recommendation No. 1 requires a clear proposal as to what would constitute "proportionality" in the allocation of sites to cities. Such a proposal on proportionality does not presently exist.

Response to Recommendation No. 2 specifically notes the City stands willing and ready to consider a proposal for an allocation of responsibility for permanent supportive housing, upon receipt. Plainly, the ability to conduct that evaluation is contingent on receipt of such a proposal.

Response to Recommendation No. 7 indicates the City's willingness to consider participation in a decision making body, such as a Joint Powers Authority, empowered to identify sites. The City's response also notes that receipt of such a proposal is necessary for the City to complete an evaluation (and further notes some of the City's initial concerns regarding the preservation of local authority).

Response to Recommendation No. 8 states the City stands ready to consider a comprehensive regional housing business plan (to be developed by the decision making
body contemplated in Recommendation No. 7). At this time, neither the decision making body nor the comprehensive plan exist.

Recommendation No. 9 states the decision making body contemplated in Recommendation No. 7 should propose a plan for securing local supplemental sources of funding for permanent supportive housing and associated services. Here again, neither the decision making body nor the funding plan exist.

In summary, the City's ability to complete an evaluation of each of the recommendations is hampered by the information available to it. For each of those recommendations, the City will continue to analyze the available information within six months of the date of publication of the Grand Jury Report, as required by Penal Code section 933.05(b).

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Donald P. Wagner
Mayor

cc: Orange County Grand Jury
Irvine City Council