

**Responses to the Tracy Homelessness Advisory Committee (THAC)  
from May 18, 2023**

**Please note that the responses below include clarity to responses provided during the THAC meeting held on May 18, 2023, as well as responses to the unanswered questions.**

- 3.A The Tracy Homelessness Advisory Committee receive an informational report regarding the implementation of the City Council Strategic Plan to End and Prevent Homelessness and the most recent Emergency Interim Shelter activities.

**Vice Chair Bedolla**

1. What options do shelter residents have when transitioning out of the shelter?

**Response:** The available options depend on a case-by-case basis individual client case (depending on their circumstances). This is an area where case management works with the client to assess the individual's needs and to develop a transition plan. This plan could range from family reunification, transitional living, housing voucher, substance use/mental health treatment facility or shared housing.

2. What are our plans right now for permanent supportive housing for shelter residents? (Motel/Hotel conversations)

**Response:** Through the State's Project HomeKey, a local government agency may be eligible for funds to purchase and rehabilitate an existing building including hotels, motels, vacant apartment buildings, and other properties to convert them into permanent long-term housing for people experiencing or at-risk of being homeless. Additionally, a partnership is required with a non-profit or for-profit corporation.

3. Any sources of funds committee staff should be concerned about? (Referring to page 12 of budget).

**Response:** The City continues to work with San Joaquin County for funding the gap of approximately \$4 Million for the shelter construction of the sprung structure and site improvements (known as Phase 2). During the week of May 15, the City Manager was informed that the County withdrew their funding support until further discussions could take place. In addition, the City has a grant of \$1.2 Million from Health Plan of San Joaquin (HPSJ) that is contingent upon the addition of 38 beds at the shelter site. These beds were expected to come from Phase 4 through the custom containers; however, the custom containers from CC915 are unusable in their current state. An extension was offered to the City to have the beds in place by 10/31/2023. The City is discussing alternatives with the Committee.

4. Are the HPSJ funds used/allotted for custom containers only? Current CC915? Future containers, part of the 1.2 Million or other purposes?

**Response:** Funds have been used to pay for one year of the lease for the modulares, fuel costs, beds, and fences. HPSJ funds are also tied to the 38 beds that need to be in service by October 31, 2023.

5. What is the documentation process when interacting with shelter clients? How are improvements and deficiencies of providers documented?

**Response:** All client information is entered into Homeless Management Information System (HMIS), which is conducted upon entry into the shelter. City staff meets with City Operators weekly to discuss potential concerns/findings resulting in a required action.

6. Can we use existing contracts to focus or use their expertise to get projects like the containers running? Contract a Project Manager?

**Response:** The City evaluated using a Project Manager in December 2022 and received a quote for services to manage the larger construction project of Phase 2. However, due to funding shortfalls already present, the project did not move forward and was rebid to reduce costs. The available funding may not be sufficient to hire a Project Manager. Also, current vendors and consultants can be contacted to provide additional support, but to contract would mean additional money that has not been allocated.

### **Chair Davis**

1. Are their still bids out to work on the containers?

**Response:** The City currently has the following three active construction bid packages (not yet awarded):

- Equipment & Installation of permanent power to the North side (future improvement area).
  - Bid Opened: May 17, 2023.
- Equipment & Installation of permanent power to the South side (to the 5 current active modulars and 8 containers).
  - Bid Opened: May 25, 2023.
- Sewer Lift Station & Holding Tank.
  - Bid Opened: May 25, 2023.

Bids for the infrastructure needed for the containers have been received from the two contractors who are under contract with the City to complete the needed water, fire systems conduits, sprinkler system connections, and electrical work.

2. Clarity needed on agenda items due to one item indicates the approval of the new containers and the other item indicates bids are still being conducted

**Response:** A sole source vendor has been contacted to make sure containers can be completed by deadline but pending approval of request to purchase new containers.

3. What about the existing containers?

**Response:** There are three pathways: Pathway 1-Legal route due to unit conditions once received (lengthy process), Pathways 2-Rehab current units which is an exorbitant cost and Pathway 3 is to purchase new units.

4. What steps were taken prior to ghosted behavior?

**Response:** Communication with CC915 dba Custom Containers 915 is intermittent.

5. Why was 90% paid when containers are uninhabitable?

**Response:** Per the Purchase Agreement for Goods with CC915 executed on October 19, 2022, under Resolution No. 2022-121, under Section 3. Purchase Price. City shall pay Vendor according to the payment schedule outline in Exhibit A, as follows:

Payment Schedule below, pursuant to agreement stipulations:

- 50% due upon execution of agreement (\$328,000)
- 40% due upon off-load (\$32,800 per container – total: \$262,400)
- 10% due upon final inspection of all containers (\$65,600)

6. Any legal action would require time, how much does it cost to rehab units through a different provider?

**Response:** Based on the Critical Path Analysis the estimated cost to rehab the existing units is approximately \$900,000.

7. How many vendors have been spoken to in regard to rehabbing current containers?

**Response:** One (1) General Contractor, informally due to time constraints, to provide their opinion of probable costs.

8. What are the options with the current containers and options need to be given of what can be done to recoup lost funds?

**Response:** Based on the Critical Path Analysis, the options for current custom containers are to rehab them, legal pathway, and/or dispose of them. City Attorney's Office (CAO) has shared the potential to recover costs may prove difficult. Proposed options to repurpose the eight (8) custom containers include to utilize the material from one of the units to reconfigure the remaining seven (7) custom containers, to use them as storage units for the sports complex, or disposal may include relocating the custom containers for storage.

9. How was CC915 vetted?

**Response:** CC915 was selected through *Modular Building Institute*, along with other potential vendors. This is a platform for reputable vendors in the **modular** business space. Several vendors were called and two other contracts with other vendors were drafted. The City pursued Pallet for portable units, QuickHaven for Tiny Homes, and CC915 for containers. The City identified CC915 based on meeting timeline and pricing availability. In addition, CC915 were able to meet the requirements by the City during the process, including the City's warranty clause pursuant to City's template for a Purchase Agreement for Goods. The other two vendors were only able to provide 25 units at a similar price where CC915 was able to produce 39.

10. Why was an out of state vendor used versus a local vendor and/or a vendor within California?

**Response:** CC915 was selected through *Modular Building Institute*, along with other potential vendors. This is a platform for reputable vendors in the **modular** business space. Several vendors were called and two other contracts with other vendors were drafted. The City pursued Pallet for portable units, QuickHaven for Tiny Homes, and CC915 for containers. The City identified CC915 based on meeting timeline and pricing availability. In addition, CC915 were able to meet the requirements by the City during the process, including the City's warranty clause pursuant to City's template for a Purchase Agreement

for Goods. The other two vendors were only able to provide 25 units at a similar price where CC915 was able to produce 39.

11. At the time the containers from CC915 were purchased did they meet CA code or Texas code?

**Response:** Upon the delivery of the custom containers, the custom containers did not meet California building code.

12. Who recommended CC915?

**Response:** CC915 was selected through *Modular Building Institute*, along with other potential vendors. This is a platform for reputable vendors in the **modular** business space. Several vendors were called and two other contracts with other vendors were drafted. The City pursued Pallet for portable units, QuickHaven for Tiny Homes, and CC915 for containers. The City identified CC915 based on meeting timeline and pricing availability. In addition, CC915 were able to meet the requirements by the City during the process, including the City's warranty clause pursuant to City's template for a Purchase Agreement for Goods. The other two vendors were only able to provide 25 units at a similar price where CC915 was able to produce 39.

All vetted information was submitted to the City Manager's Office (CMO) and a decision was made based on the vetting process stated above. In addition, research was provided by several city departments and staff. All the decisions that were made during this time were under the order of an emergency shelter crisis and the urgency to provide beds as soon as possible.

13. Who wrote the contract?

**Response:** The complete contract was drafted by the City Attorney's Office and forwarded to the Homeless Services Manager for review. Contracts are then vetted through proper channels (CAO and CMO). Project Manager was out on medical leave during this process and unable to review scope of work and/or specifications under exhibits.

14. Who signed off on the contract?

**Response:** The contract was signed off by a Deputy City Attorney in the City Attorney's Office and by the City Manager.

15. Who signed off on the payment to CC915

**Response:** The Payment Schedule was part of the Purchase Agreement for Goods. Processed invoices were signed off by the City Manager when the agreement was approved.

16. Were any container projects that CC915 had completed in California?

**Response:** Yes, modulars completed in Chico and Bay Area.

17. Were these containers new?

**Response:** Yes.

18. When these containers arrived, who was there to receive the containers and make sure they were what was ordered and dates of when this happened?

**Response:** The Construction Manager was on-site on December 22, 2022, during the first delivery of the 2 custom containers and on December 29, 2022, when the second delivery of 6 custom containers.

19. Who received them? Who from the City was there on 12/22 and 12/29 to receive the containers?

**Response:** Construction Manager, Mr. Ward was there on both days to receive containers. Mr. Ward indicated that CC915 specified that there were still some installations needed and pending improvements that were transit related and that the CC915 contractor would return to do the minor repairs. CC915 was on site on the 29th and 30th to turn over to inspectors. Punch list was sent out January 4, 2023, follow-up conducted without response – the previous statement is inaccurate. CC915 hired Best Electric to address punch list and work commenced on electrical issues starting Thursday, February 2, 2023. From that point on, there were several iterations of concerns expressed by our onsite inspectors. On March 21, 2023, the completion timeline was extended based on the additional concerns shared by our inspectors. This subsequently brought about an inspection process by the City. CC915 / Best Electric did not adhere to the process and CC915 became unresponsive on April 17, 2023.

20. Do you have anything that the committee can show and share with counsel reflecting that you reached out to several container companies and prices they quoted you? Was anyone \$600,000 or less or just CC915?

**Response:** Both previously mentioned vendors (Pallet and Quickheaven) that the City was considering were in the same price range, however, only equipped for 25 units. CC915 was providing 39 units.

21. What does it mean that CC915 offered the best? Best price? Was this decision solely based on price?

**Response:** Between price and timeline, most vendors could not meet timeline.

22. How big of a difference between other containers timelines?

**Response:** Staff will provide this information with the requested options as alternatives.

23. Asked for transparency when legal pursuit is started against CC915 and provide the date notice is given.

**Response:** Staff is working with the City Attorney's Office and will update as issues progress.

24. Documentation on how vendor was vetted, google reviews, yelp reviews, any clients you reached out to for feedback on work provided by vendor (locally or in Texas)?

**Response:** CC915 was vetted through Modular Building Institute. No google nor yelp reviews were found during the forensic process.

- 3.B The Tracy Homelessness Advisory Committee receive an informational report regarding the City's shelter operators' approved services and a financial summary of the implementation of the City Council Strategic Plan to End and Prevent Homelessness.

### **Vice Chair Bedolla**

1. What is the typical range of administrative cost for these entities (providers) as a percentage of invoices? (10+TCCC, 14+CityNet)

**Response:** Usually between 10-15%.

### **Chair Davis**

1. Provider contracts end on 10/31. What is the thought process on renewal or no renewal on the current providers?

**Response:** The City will follow the formal procurement process for Request for Proposals.

2. Timeline of current or new provider consideration to bring to committee/council?

**Response:** Will come back in June with recommendations.

3. Is public being updated on email requests if taking longer than usual?

**Response:** Redaction on emails, 8 outgoing and working on information Executive Assistants are aware of being able to give out partials that have already been redacted. In addition, all staff members have relinquished devices to provide any public requested information.

4. What is the total monthly cost being given out to both providers?

**Response:** Provider costs provided during PowerPoint presentation from Nov-Feb.

5. Explain variances between months?

**Response:** Variances are due to rapid start-up costs and numbers will go down as rapid startup has ended and staffing is now local.

6. Staff to address duplication of services. Are we addressing that both providers are now providing similar services? Do we really need two organizations providing the same or similar services?

**Response:** File audits have been conducted on both providers to verify that HMIS data is being updated and services to clients being provided is based on their manual. Results from audit are currently in the City Attorney's que for review and forms from the City of Tracy to implement with team.

**Response:** Initially TCCC was providing those services at intake and both TCCC, Familiar Faces and City Net have implemented case conferencing to discuss gaps in services.

7. Will a copy of the results from the audit be provided to the committee and public?

**Response:** Explained that audit was more of a file review and not an audit perse and the file review conducted will help in developing the criteria for the upcoming RFP for providers. Results of file review will be shared shortly.

- 3.C The Tracy Homelessness Advisory Committee recommend that the City Council adopt a resolution approving the bylaws for the Committee.

**No questions on this item.**

- 3.D The Tracy Homelessness Advisory Committee recommend that the City Council adopt a resolution ratifying, pursuant to Tracy Municipal Code Section 2.20.180(B)(1), various procurement contracts for goods and general services agreements executed by the City Manager to implement Emergency Interim Housing solutions for the unsheltered.

**Vice Chair Bedolla**

1. The purchase of fire alarms and fire sprinklers are for CC915 or new containers?

**Response:** Regardless of container company used fire alarms and sprinkler system would need to be installed for existing or new containers.

2. Is 3D at all related to 3H? Or this authority tied to any other declaration?

**Response:** This item is only related to item 3H, to rescind the resolution # 2022-121, installed on custom containers. The rescinding of this resolution will not impact anything moving forward.

**Chair Davis**

1. Can they defer their vote until they hear 3.E?

**Response:** City Attorney indicated that this okay, to hear 3.E first, before making a decision on 3.D.

- 3.E The Tracy Homelessness Advisory Committee recommend that the City Council adopt a resolution approving a procurement agreement with Linked Equipment, LLC for the purchase of eight pre-manufactured custom container structures in an amount not to exceed \$716,320 to be the installed as part of the site improvements at the Temporary Emergency Housing Project, CIP 71112, at 370 W. Arbor Avenue.

**Vice Chair Bedolla**

1. Price and timing aside, Why did we decide to go with a non-CA code set of containers?

**Response:** This company had already provided showers and restrooms. I am unsure why we went with a vendor that was not based in California and will ask project manager.

If this question is in reference is regarding Linked Equipment, their units are CA code compliant and inspected and certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).

2. What would it look like if we did all three options, getting the congregate shelter built, getting the new containers, and restoring and/or repurposing existing containers for a different use (storage)? Is there anything that can be done to not cut them off as a loss (existing containers)?

**Response:** Phase 2 and 3 would be around \$2.1 Million. What can we do with current containers? If existing containers did not have to meet code, \$2.1 Million could cover cost for phases 2 and 3 and repurposing containers.

**Response:** Recommended Linked Equipment's, when first developing phase 2 looking for vendors who could provide customized bathroom, shower, laundry, and mechanical rooms, contacted a number of vendors in CA and nearby states. Most vendors contacted were not able to customize containers to the criteria that the City was looking for, for example. Restroom containers that were not ADA compliant and most would not go through the process to get the HCD certification, company in Arizona has experience with HCD process and everything that they build is custom to clients' needs and that is how they decided to go with Linked Equipment's and HCD certs need to go to the State to be approved and that is why they went with Linked for bathrooms, showers, laundry, and mechanical units designed for the original project.

3. What creative ideas can staff come up with regarding repurposing existing containers?

**Response:** With some repairs and modifications to the existing containers, custom container units could be repurposed for on-site sports equipment or other park site storage, or pet kennels, or other types of utility rooms at locations where power is available.

4. Why did it take 4 months to now come to this decision?

**Response:** Also, why did it take 4-months to complete repairs / punch list? Initially CC915 gave the completion date of March 30. City inserted a new inspection date and completion date was extended to April 30. Last day CC915 was on site was April 17, 2023. Two meetings via TEAMS and conference call were held and became quite apparent that CC915 would not complete the work.

The City has been actively engaged with the CC915 to make the required correction since early January 2023.

5. Has staff thought about more modular units? Is this an option in place of the containers?

**Response:** No current discussion of modular units.

6. Phase 3 Modulars-Is this an option?

**Response:** This can be an option; this came through a recommendation that due to COVID these modular dorm units were ready to go. It takes time to find and build these types of modulars and these modulars came from St. Mary's University. Most modulars are office and not sleeping. Also, Tiny Homes (pallet homes) was an option, however, concerns with contract and that they could not satisfy the time frame they were looking for and that is why they pivoted to containers. Tiny Homes can be an option, but we need to work with the time frame that we have. Current focus is on the new containers, and we need to make a significant decision with that, but ALL options should be on the table, but the time frame is the issue.

7. If the committee does not move forward with the new containers, then what is the option?

**Response:** It would then have to go back to the bid process and would delay the process.

8. Have we contacted modular company recently if they have and/or can build more dorm modulars?



**Response:** During the time the modulares were leased the vendor indicated that at the moment they did not have any other dorm modulares. The modular vendor was contacted again this week and indicated that lead time to get new dorm units similar to the ones on site would take 6 to 8 months.

**Chair Davis**

1. Who would be responsible for removing the old containers?

**Response:** Staff will evaluate as part of the reuse of the containers.

2. Cost to remove containers?

**Response:** There are locations throughout the city where they can be stored but have not really discussed options of repurposing the containers. When the vendor abandoned the units, the critical analysis was created.

3. Is HPSJ willing to go a different route in regard to getting the 38 beds by 10/31 and not be containers?

**Response:** The funds from HPSJ are tied to the 38 beds and they need to be in service by October 31.

4. Any flexibility for those 38 beds to be part of the congregate structure instead of the containers?

**Response:** Funding is tied into the department of healthcare service. Providing funding for community organizations to increase respite, recoup beds and shelter beds. This funding is tied to HPSJ report to the regional state funds they have received. HPSJ is aware of the state of the containers, however, the bed capacity date is non-negotiable. Also, the sprung structure needs to go to bids and would not meet HPSJ 10/31 deadline.

5. How many rooms does each container hold?

**Response:** Seven (7) of the units have five (5) individual rooms, one unit has four (4) individual ADA compliant rooms.

6. What other real alternatives do we have besides the containers to meet the time constraint? Tuff Sheds, tiny homes, Volumetric here in town?

**Response:** Discussion with volumetrics was held, but the timeline was the issue.

On May 18, 2023, the THAC Committee re-directed staff to provide additional options besides Linked Equipment as a potential alternative vendor to complete Phase 3. Staff engaged with Volumetrics Senior Sustainability Manager and held a virtual meeting on May 23, 2023, to discuss options.

7. Are we looking at all options?

- Tiny Homes
- Modulares
- Containers
- Safe Parking
- Safe Camping

**Response:** On May 18, 2023, the THAC Committee re-directed staff to provide additional options besides Linked Equipment as potential alternative vendors to complete Phase 3. Staff has conducted additional research on the above five (5) alternatives and are presented under Staff Report 3. D.

8. Who is in charge of this current project? Is there a project manager?

**Response:** The creation of the “Interim Shelter and Transition Plan” was brought about at City Council’s request to develop a plan to address the existing shortfall of beds necessary to remove the encampments from the El Pescadero Park to relieve the families and residents impacted by the makeshift dwellings and unsanitary activities there at the park which impacted their quality of life. This request was a direct result of the rejection of the primary project to erect the Sprung Structure at the Arbor Road location.

Project Management of all CIP projects have historically originated in and been managed by the Engineering Division, of the Development Services Department. The initiation of the project to acquire the eight (8) modular units as part of the solution to removing the encampments from El Pescadero Park brought about a shift in responsibility. During the timeframe the modular units were identified in October 2022, the Director of Development Services resigned. As did the City’s Engineer. The project manager originally responsible for site development in preparation for the Sprung Structure was out on personal leave.

In this void, the City Manager assigned the Assistant City Manager the responsibility of identifying and obtaining suitable accommodations to fill the remaining thirty-eight (38) beds needed to clear El Pescadero Park. The Assistant City Manager enlisted the assistance of the Homeless Shelter Manager to identify a reputable service to identify and select a vendor who could provide the number of beds required within the timeframe necessary to meet the grant requirements. The contract was drafted, reviewed by the City Attorney’s office, and signed by a Jr. Attorney out of the City Attorney’s office and the City Manager.

Two (2) units were delivered on December 22, 2022, and the remaining six (6) units were delivered on December 29, 2022, in the midst of a severe atmospheric weather event. Upon inspection January 4, 2023, by City Inspectors, it was clear the units were not constructed in accordance with California Code. The City Inspectors developed a list of items needing to be addressed and delivered them to the Assistant City Manager.

The Assistant City Manager accompanied by the Director of the Operations and Utilities Department met with the president and logistics manager of Custom Container 915 to share the list of discrepancies and to develop a solution to address them expeditiously. From January 2023 through April 12, 2023, and after numerous exchanges between the Assistant City Manager, Director of Operations and Utilities and Customer Containers 915, the subcontractor hired by Customer Containers stopped work with no notice. Up to this point, Custom Containers 915 gave every impression of their intention to correct the deficiencies.

Upon realizing Custom Containers 915 abandonment from the project, the Assistant City Manager immediately sought counsel from the City Attorney’s office. On May 15, 2023, Custom Containers 915 contacted the Assistant City Manager and Director Jackson to share they had a list of items which had been corrected. Director Jackson forwarded this list to the City Inspectors for verification. The inspectors reported ten (10) of the twenty (20) items listed on their list had been addressed. The remaining ten (10) could not be verified as they did not have access to the storage unit on site with the units.

## 9. Timeline?

**Response:** Please find below Timeline of Events related to Purchase Agreement of Goods with CC915, if dates/events are missing, please add to the draft timeline below.

- Executed Purchase Agreement of Goods October 19, 2022
- Purchase Order October 24, 2022
- 1st Payment Approved on October 25, 2022
- Containers Delivered on December 22 and 29, 2022
- Punch list provided to CC915 January 4, 2023
- 2nd Payment Approved on January 5, 2023
- On March 21, 2023, City conveyed to CC915 condition of open containers with standing water at various locations because of rainy weather
- Revised Work Schedule from Best Electric (CC915 Contractor) received on March 24, 2023, reflecting a completion date of April 29, 2023
- CC915 last on site the week before April 17, 2023

## 10. Who vetted CC915?

**Response:** CC915 was selected through *Modular Building Institute*, a platform for reputable vendors in the **modular** business space. Several vendors were called and two other contracts with other vendors were drafted. The City pursued Pallet for portable units, QuickHaven for Tiny Homes, and CC915 for containers. The City identified CC915 based on meeting timeline and pricing availability. In addition, CC915 were able to meet the requirements by the City during the process, including the City's warranty clause pursuant to City's template for a Purchase Agreement for Goods.

## 11. Who received these containers?

**Response:** Construction Manager, Mr. Ward was there on both days to receive containers. Mr. Ward indicated that CC915 specified that there were still some installations needed and pending improvements that were transit related and that the CC915 contractor would return to do the minor repairs. CC915 was on site on the 29th and 30th to turn over to inspectors. Punch list was sent out January 4, 2023, follow-up conducted without response – the previous statement is inaccurate. CC915 hired Best Electric to address punch list and work commenced on electrical issues starting Thursday, February 2, 2023. From that point on, there were several iterations of concerns expressed by our onsite inspectors. On March 21, 2023, the completion timeline was extended based on the additional concerns shared by our inspectors. This subsequently brought about an inspection process by the City. CC915 / Best Electric did not adhere to the process and CC915 became unresponsive on April 17, 2023.

## 12. When were they received?

**Response:** Construction Manager, Mr. Ward was there on both days to receive containers. Mr. Ward indicated that CC915 specified that there were still some installations needed and pending improvements that were transit related and that the CC915 contractor would return to do the minor repairs. CC915 was on site on the 29th and 30th to turn over to inspectors. Punch list was sent out January 4, 2023, follow-up conducted without response – the previous statement is inaccurate. CC915 hired Best Electric to address punch list and work commenced on electrical

issues starting Thursday, February 2, 2023. From that point on, there were several iterations of concerns expressed by our onsite inspectors. On March 21, 2023, the completion timeline was extended based on the additional concerns shared by our inspectors. This subsequently brought about an inspection process by the City. CC915 / Best Electric did not adhere to the process and CC915 became unresponsive on April 17, 2023.

13. Who authorized the 90% of payment without having a viable product?

**Response:** Per the Purchase Agreement for Goods with CC915 executed on October 19, 2022, under Resolution No. 2022-121, under Section 3. Purchase Price. City shall pay Vendor according to the payment schedule outline in Exhibit A, as follows:

Payment Schedule below, pursuant to agreement stipulations

- o Payment 1: Processed by Homeless Services Manager and approved by City Manager on October 25, 2022.
- o Payment 2: Processed by Homeless Services Manager and approved by Assistant City Manager on January 5, 2023.

14. Would like to know when the company has been served and when they have been reported to Texas board of licensing and registration?

**Response:** Staff is working with City Attorney's Office on responding to vendor.

15. Financing about money being spent, requesting forensic audit of the temporary emergency shelter, what is spent and all the numbers and who got paid what and when?

**Response:** Please refer to the detailed budget breakdown below provided by the Finance department reflecting up to date expenses for the Homeless Services Division and the CIP-TEHF as of June 1, 2023.

Homeless Services Division  
Expenses paid to date as of 6/01/2023

| Description                      | 2021              | 2022              | 2023                | Grand Total         |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Alarm Monitoring                 |                   |                   | \$ 1,758            | \$ 1,758            |
| Bunkbeds for Homeless Shelter    |                   |                   | \$ 66,099           | \$ 66,099           |
| Custom Containers - Interim Site |                   |                   | \$ 646,556          | \$ 646,556          |
| Fire & Burglar Alarm Install     |                   |                   | \$ 100,325          | \$ 100,325          |
| Generator/Fuel - Interim         |                   |                   | \$ 655,689          | \$ 655,689          |
| Interim Site                     |                   |                   | \$ 511,826          | \$ 511,826          |
| Modulars - Interim Site          |                   |                   | \$ 153,503          | \$ 153,503          |
| Monthly-El Pescadero Ptty        |                   |                   | \$ 13,260           | \$ 13,260           |
| Operating Supplies               | \$ 427            | \$ 1,733          | \$ 118,195          | \$ 120,356          |
| Personnel                        |                   | \$ 14,796         | \$ 222,552          | \$ 237,347          |
| Shelter Service Providers        |                   |                   | \$ 1,146,907        | \$ 1,146,907        |
| Shelter Site - Water             |                   |                   | \$ 27,707           | \$ 27,707           |
| Warming Center                   | \$ 152,666        | \$ 105,946        | \$ 41,109           | \$ 299,721          |
| <b>Grand Total</b>               | <b>\$ 153,093</b> | <b>\$ 122,475</b> | <b>\$ 3,705,486</b> | <b>\$ 3,981,054</b> |

Total Expensed to date :

|                                   |                     |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|
| Homeless Division Budget          | \$ 3,981,054        |
| Temporary Emergency Shelter (CIP) | <u>\$ 5,005,378</u> |
|                                   | <u>\$ 8,986,432</u> |

CIP - 71112 Temporary Emergency Housing

| Vendor                                  | PO#     | Amount          | Expenses        | Notes |
|---|---------|-----------------|-----------------|-------|
| United Fence Services Inc               | 2101538 | \$ 4,200.00     | \$ 4,200.00     |       |
| The KPA Group                           | 2102079 | \$ 37,730.00    | \$ 37,730.00    |       |
| David W Enke, L.S.                      | 2102295 | \$ 2,000.00     | \$ 2,000.00     |       |
| Stockton Environmental Inc              | 2102369 | \$ 500.00       | \$ 500.00       |       |
| The KPA Group                           | 2102401 | \$ 981,435.00   | \$ 981,435.00   |       |
| Pace Supply Corporation                 | 2102419 | \$ 8,275.40     | \$ 8,614.04     |       |
| David W Enke, L.S.                      | 2200766 | \$ 3,000.00     | \$ 3,000.00     |       |
| Kimley Horn                             | 2200875 | \$ 73,700.00    | \$ 73,700.00    |       |
| David W Enke, L.S.                      | 2200909 | \$ 2,400.00     | \$ 2,400.00     |       |
| Wood Rodgers                            | 2201288 | \$ 10,940.00    | \$ 7,110.00     |       |
| California Surveying                    | 2201432 | \$ 100.00       | \$ 99.59        |       |
| SWRCB                                   | 2201473 | \$ 756.00       | \$ 756.00       |       |
| Tracy Press                             | 2201560 | \$ 720.00       | \$ 720.00       |       |
| Tracy Press                             | 2201562 | \$ 396.00       | \$ 396.00       |       |
| Tracy Press                             | 2201912 | \$ 103.50       | \$ 103.50       |       |
| Tracy Press                             | 2201938 | \$ 103.50       | \$ 103.50       |       |
| Tracy Press                             | 2201981 | \$ 468.00       | \$ 468.00       |       |
| Tracy Press                             | 2201982 | \$ 468.00       | \$ 468.00       |       |
| Pacific Gas & Electric Co               | 2202412 | \$ 71,441.88    | \$ 71,441.88    |       |
| Gradetech, Inc                          | 2202437 | \$ 1,072,523.17 | \$ 972,523.16   |       |
| ABC Imaging of Washington Inc           | 2202448 | \$ 810.47       | \$ -            |       |
| Gradetech, Inc                          | 2202457 | \$ 2,378,480.00 | \$ 2,213,132.98 |       |
| Federal Express Corporation             | 2202625 | \$ 40.48        | \$ 40.48        |       |
| Terracon Consultants Inc                | 2202836 | \$ 628.00       | \$ 628.00       |       |
| Studio Blue Reporgraphics Inc           | 2202847 | \$ 467.46       | \$ 467.46       |       |
| Terracon Consultants Inc                | 2300713 | \$ 2,622.00     | \$ 2,622.00     |       |
| Terracon Consultants Inc                | 2300714 | \$ 1,463.00     | \$ 1,463.00     |       |
| Terracon Consultants Inc                | 2301102 | \$ 1,068.00     | \$ 1,068.00     |       |
| David W Enke, L.S.                      | 2301241 | \$ 4,620.00     | \$ 4,620.00     |       |
| Linked Equipment                        | 2301494 | \$ 551,887.44   | \$ 365,829.39   |       |
| GateHouse Media California Holdings Inc | 2301509 | \$ 534.20       | \$ 534.20       |       |
| The KPA Group                           | 2301659 | \$ 220,045.00   | \$ 16,120.00    |       |
| Tracy Press                             | 2301761 | \$ 936.00       | \$ 936.00       |       |
| Advertising                             |         |                 | \$ 3,504.39     |       |
| David W Enke, L.S.                      |         |                 | \$ 10,220.00    |       |
| Staff Charges                           |         |                 | \$ 176,195.00   |       |
| Construction Materials                  |         |                 | \$ 1,018.99     |       |
| Design Support                          |         |                 | \$ 7,556.54     |       |
| Permits                                 |         |                 | \$ 31,653.18    |       |
|   |         |                 | \$ -            |       |

\$ 5,005,378.28

|                           |     | BUDGET        | EXPENSES     | BALANCE      |
|---------------------------|-----|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| ARPA                      | 252 | \$ 4,500,000  | \$ 265,336   | \$ 4,234,664 |
| San Joaquin County (ARPA) | 301 | \$ 3,661,113  | \$ 3,120,783 | \$ 540,330   |
| HHAP                      | 261 | \$ 329,240    | \$ 329,240   | \$ -         |
| HHAP R2                   | 261 | \$ 414,042    | \$ 414,042   | \$ -         |
| CDBG (3 Grants)           | 268 | \$ 836,294    | \$ 836,294   | \$ -         |
| Housing Asset Funds       | 282 | \$ 690,000    | \$ 39,683    | \$ 650,317   |
| Current Budget            |     | \$ 10,430,689 | \$ 5,005,378 | \$ 5,425,311 |
|                           |     |               | \$ -         |              |
| Harder - Federal          |     | \$ 3,000,000  |              | \$ 3,000,000 |
| CDBG FY23/24              |     | \$ 349,167    |              | \$ 349,167   |
|                           |     | \$ 13,779,856 | \$ 5,005,378 | \$ 8,774,478 |