

Encampment Cleanup Operational Approach Alternative A.1.

Limit the number of cleanups each year to the KPI target of 52, which may be funded through Fund 26 reserves:

Pros	Cons
Meets KPI of 52 cleanups	Does not meet community demand (average is 400 cleanups)
Sufficient funds exist in Fund 26 reserves, or alternatively through the net income from Fund 12 rental properties for FYs 19-28	Limited water quality benefits and potential damage to facilities
This approach has the least impact to Fund 12 because depending on the funding source the Board approves, it utilizes between zero to approximately 23-26 percent of the net rental income from rental properties that could otherwise be used for watershed activities.	High re-encampment rate resulting in trash and pollutants in water
	Impact to aesthetics of creeks in neighborhoods and parks

Encampment Cleanup Operational Approach Alternative A.2.

Limit the number of cleanups each fiscal year based upon the funding available, which may include 52 cleanups funded through Fund 26 reserves and funding from the Board's prior commitment to utilize 90 percent of the net rental income from properties purchased through Fund 12 rental properties.

Pros	Cons
Exceeds KPI by providing between approximately 200 - 280 cleanups	Does not meet community demand (average is 400 cleanups)
FY 19 budget would be adjusted downward to approximately \$750,000 to reflect the available funding from Fund 12 rental properties and may be supplemented with \$175,000 in Fund 26 reserves to fund 52 cleanups. For FYs 20-28, sufficient funds exist either through: utilizing Fund 26 reserves to fund 52 cleanups, with the remainder of the cleanups to be funded through the net income from Fund 12 rental properties; or solely utilizing the net income from Fund 12 rental properties.	Each FY the funds available through the net rental income from Fund 12 may vary depending on rent, maintenance cost, and the demolition schedule of residences along the Upper Guadalupe River. Additionally, this approach utilizes net income from Fund 12 rental properties that could otherwise be used for watershed activities
	Limited water quality benefits and potential damage to facilities
	High re-encampment rate resulting in trash and pollutants in water
	Impact to aesthetics of creeks in neighborhoods and parks
	Limits partnership opportunities with other agencies

Encampment Cleanup Operational Approach Alternative A.3.

Supplement FY 19 budget to increase funds to cover the anticipated community demand and moving forward, budget for anticipated community demand through Fund 12 for FYs 20-28, which may include 52 cleanups funded through Fund 26 reserves.

Pros	Cons
Exceeds KPI by attempting to meet community demand (average is 400 cleanups)	Demand for cleanups continues to increase
Based upon projected surplus reserves for Fund 12, there is sufficient Fund 12 reserves to fund the project through FY 28; and sufficient funds exist in Fund 26 reserves to fund 52 cleanups each FY	Without factoring in inflation, FY costs are anticipated to go as high as \$1.5 million (offset of costs through partnerships and mitigation credit not guaranteed)
Maintaining level of service aims to deter re-encampments and reduce trash and pollutants in the water	This approach utilizes surplus reserves from Fund 12 that could otherwise be used for watershed activities
Improves aesthetics of creeks in neighborhoods and parks	
Maintains existing and seeks additional partnership opportunities with other agencies	

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK