To: Honorable Mayor and City Council

From: Mark D. Watkins, City Manager
       Jeffrey Lambert, Community Development Director

Subject: Community Homelessness Workshop Follow-Up; Next Steps

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the City Council:

a. Receive Homelessness Workshop summary report, Ken Lee Consulting (KLC) report (Attachment A) on the April 18, 2016 City Council Community Homelessness Workshop;

b. Receive a City and Ventura County staff presentation related to potential next steps for a community driven process to address opportunities, barriers and gaps in the “system of care”;

c. Based on the results of the Homelessness Workshop, adopt a homeless services and housing policy statement as follows: (1) take actions to implement the Housing Element programs and housing production goals, (2) acknowledge service gap and the need for the development of local public and private funding for temporary bridge housing of all types (with focus on shelter beds and transitional living units), (3) commit to the Continuum of Care Pathways to Home coordinated entry program (Attachment B), and (4) confirm the City’s commitment to the previously adopted Safe and Clean Public Places Initiative (Attachment C);

d. Direct staff to return to City Council with an ordinance amendment to allow sheltering and services in a new zone or overlay – Mixed Planned Development Sheltering (MPDS); MPDS (see Attachment D - Proposed Zoning Map Amendment) to include minimum operational conditions for the purposes of framing the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) review and approval process, with a targeted timeline to return to City Council by March 2017;
e. Direct staff to develop a limited subsidized CUP program also to be returned for City Council approval by March 2017;

f. Direct staff to work closely with a coalition lead by the Continuum of Care Board and staff, to also include County agency staff, the business community, faith-based organizations and local advocacy groups toward an Action Plan to implement the City's policy statement as outlined in recommendation C above, and

g. Direct staff to begin the planning process for a “one last year” winter warming shelter program in partnership with the City of Oxnard and the County of Ventura – in recognition that it is not likely that a permanent shelter will be available by December 2016.

COUNCIL PRIORITIES

This process supports the City Council’s goal of:

- Safe and Clean Public Places

PREVIOUS COUNCIL ACTION

On Friday, July 1, 2016, the City Council Homelessness Subcommittee received a presentation previewing the contents of this report.

On April 18, 2016, the City Council directed staff to return with an analysis of changing City zoning laws to accommodate wrap around services with homeless housing and shelters, and inform the City Council of the process, costs, and resources available for subsidizing or granting permit fees to non-profit providers and affordable housing developers. In addition, the City Council directed staff to provide the City Council with an analysis and synopsis of potential strategies, community homelessness viewpoints, and recommendations.

On January 30, 2016, in its annual goal setting retreat, the City Council identified and adopted the following subject areas for staff to focus on as part of the City Council Priority of a Safe and Clean Ventura.

**Safe and Clean**

Focus on homeless veterans

Maximize County, State and Federal services to homeless
Maintain and expand Ambassador Program

Focus on nuisance behaviors

Address debris issues

Explore revisions to zoning standards to align homeless shelters and services

On January 7, 2016, the City Council Homelessness Subcommittee considered staff’s recommendation for a homelessness workshop and provided direction on the format and preparation of this workshop. The subcommittee took action to commit to engaging the Ventura community in a workshop to address potential solutions and challenges facing the homeless and disenfranchised, and those individuals and organizations that are interested in assisting those in need in the City of Ventura.

SUMMARY

City Council Direction (April 18, 2016):

• Staff to return to the City Council with an analysis of changing City zoning laws to accommodate wrap around services with homeless housing and shelters;

• Inform the City Council of the process, costs and resources available for subsidizing or granting permit fees to non-profit providers and affordable housing developers; and

• Provide the City Council with an analysis and synopsis of potential strategies, the community homelessness viewpoints and recommendations.

Zoning

Senate Bill 2 was adopted several years ago and required all cities in California to identify minimum zoning designations that would allow emergency shelters by-right (without the requirement of a discretionary use permit). The City adopted its “SB2 Ordinance” to designate the M1 and M2 zones for this purpose and included minimum performance standards. To date, no request has been pursued. Staff has analyzed the zones immediately adjacent to the M1 and M2 zones, as represented by green shading on the attached map, and determined that the general location and physical character of the structures, unimproved properties, and infrastructure in certain MPD designated areas are similar to the M1 and M2 SB2 by-right zones – in addition to being immediately adjacent to those properties. Based on these similarities, it is recommended that two zone changes be pursued: (1) amend the M1/M2 zones to not only allow shelters by-right, but also allow homeless services in conjunction with shelters with the approval of a conditional use permit, and (2) create a MPD overlay or
sub-zone category to allow both sheltering and services with the approval of a conditional use permit.

It will be important that operational standards be included that ensure a well-managed program/service will be provided within the designated zones (Attachment E - Emergency Shelter Regulations – Existing). Staff will evaluate these standards and consider updated physical and operational standards as part of the pending zoning changes.

**Homeless Resource and Service Gaps**

In the Homelessness Workshop summary report by consultant KLC, the consultant refers to how the lack of a local "North Star" – a coordinated leadership between and among the stakeholder groups - emerged as a major theme coming from the conversations, exercises and data collected at the workshop. Because of that lack of coordination, there were underlying issues of lack of trust and lack of understanding of what the common leadership framework should be around the homelessness issue.

Staff contends that the primary outcomes identified at the workshop are a logical and rational approach to this complicated issue. On the bottom of page 4 of its report, KLC writes, “KLC would strongly urge the City not to myopically focus and commit all of the city’s political capital and staff resources on solely the immediate questions in front of the City Council (e.g., Zoning Code Amendment, CUP filing/processing fees), but simultaneously carry forward the energy and momentum from the workshop to partner with key agencies and organizations who want to work together to address the larger question and need for a holistic, systematic framework to address homelessness and providing a continuum of housing and supportive services.” This lack of coordination is being addressed by the implementation of a Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) which is referred to in the Pathways to Home Program.

To that end, staff recommends that the City Council direct staff to fully support and participate in the implementation of the components of the “Pathways to Home” coordinated entry program adopted by the Ventura County Continuum of Care Board, as developed utilizing proven national best practices by the Continuum of Care staff. This support may include prioritizing available City funds such as CDBG to those agencies that actively participate and comply with the principles of this Pathways program. The “Pathways” program is being developed toward the goal of being a partnership between and among the many public and private social service agencies, faith-based organizations, business groups, community advocates, and public safety agencies that interface with each other and with the homeless and disenfranchised individuals on a daily basis. However, “Pathways” will only work if each of those entities, including the City of Ventura, is committed to addressing, funding and pursuing the components that are most appropriate for any individual entity to take the lead on. For the City of Ventura, one of those components is a barrier related to zoning and CUP subsidies; however, another of those components is related to a commitment to facilitate the
creation of very low income, low income, moderate income, and above moderate income housing units as identified in the City Council adopted and State Department of Housing and Community Development adopted/approved City of Ventura Housing Element.

The County's responsibility and funding is focused on service delivery and the coordinated entry system is a "game changer" in assuring all agencies, organizations and entities serving the homeless are operating with the same basic rules of engagement, or they will be ineligible for public funding sources – and they will not have access to clients' information.

Other partners will have other responsibilities to the collaborative in the process, however the workshop participants continually cited the lack of affordable housing units as the single largest barrier to addressing the needs of homeless individuals. For example, the faith-based and business communities and also the advocacy groups will be asked to align their service programs with the "Pathways" approach and will be asked to support financially, spiritually, and otherwise the development of additional affordable housing resources, including shelter beds and transitional housing units.

DISCUSSION

Staff is recommending that the City Council direct the Community Development Department and City Attorney's office to develop the appropriate zoning map and text changes to: (1) allow services with a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) in conjunction with sheltering in the M1 and M2 zones where sheltering is currently permitted by right, and (2) develop the appropriate zoning map and text changes to allow sheltering and services to be co-located within a portion of the MPD zone as depicted on the attached map. It is anticipated that staff will develop these zoning changes, initiate public engagement with key stakeholders, conduct the appropriate CEQA review and analysis, and present these changes to the Planning Commission for its recommendation to the City Council by March 2017. Based on this schedule, this process will not permit the establishment of a shelter with services by December 2016. Therefore, staff will be pursuing the development of a 2016/17 winter warming shelter program with all stakeholders similar to the efforts in 2015/16.

As referenced on page 2 of the Homelessness Workshop summary report, "(T)here is a heavy expectation by some community stakeholders for leadership and action by the city. This is not uncommon in a community since the most visible and accessible elected leaders in any city are the locally elected City Councilmembers. It is also not uncommon....to give the public the misguided impression that cities single-handedly possess the tools and resources needed to end homelessness. But, as stakeholders and advocacy groups who have actively been involved in homelessness are well aware, homelessness is a communitywide issue requiring the collective leadership, skills, knowledge, and resources of the entire community (e.g., all those in attendance at the workshop), rather than one or two agencies on their own."
On page 3 continuing on to page 4 of the Homelessness Workshop summary report, it states, "... a gateway center approach has been effective in communities where a mix of crisis/emergency, transitional, and possibly even permanent supportive housing is provided...combined with a range of support to services also provided onsite under that same roof." While staff doesn't necessarily disagree with a centralized gateway center approach, that may be difficult in Ventura due to a variety of factors related to neighborhood concerns, building inventories, and over concentration of services in one location. That said, there is a need for a healthy mix of bridge housing (crisis/emergency shelters), transitional housing, and permanent supportive and permanent affordable housing within our community. Case managers and housing navigators (from Project Understanding, the Salvation Army, Turning Point Foundation, County agencies, etc.) have continued to run into barriers related to finding all of those housing types. In fact, the Housing Authority of the City of San Buenaventura when presenting to the City Council noted that there are approximately 80 housing vouchers (Section 8 and/or Veterans' Vouchers – known as VASH vouchers) with no units to rent.

The COC receives funding from third-party entities to be distributed to agencies that provide services toward ending homelessness throughout Ventura County. The County Behavioral Health and Human Services agencies are required to apply for those dollars in the exact same way as private nonprofits such as the Turning Point Foundation, the Salvation Army, and the Society of St. Vincent DePaul, just to name a few.

In the workshop report on page 2, it is important to note that the misguided impression that cities single-handedly possess the tools and resources needed to end homelessness is often a result of a misunderstanding of this three-sided relationship between cities, County departments, and the Continuum of Care.

Each of those three entities has a role, and each is reliant upon the other for their role to be successful. Cities must follow through on the commitments they have made through their Housing Elements. County departments must follow through on their commitments related to providing services to people who are housed and not housed. The Continuum of Care must efficiently and expeditiously distribute the nearly $2 million annually it receives to agencies that provide services within the complicated systems of ending homelessness. In addition, faith-based organizations, the business community, activists and advocates must fully understand how the system works together, and put their time, energy, and resources toward best practices related to ending homelessness.

Safe and Clean Public Places Initiative

In November 2011 the City Council adopted the Safe and Clean Public Places Initiative (Attachment C). This program has been a success in coordinating efforts across City departments, enhancing partnerships with community resources, and collaborating with the County, social service agencies, and others. A cross-department team of City staff meet regularly to monitor the implementation of this initiative and report outcomes from debris pick up to homeless services provided.
Public Engagement

More than 250 community members attended the April 18, 2016 Community Workshop. Ken Lee Consulting (KLC) facilitated a fast-moving evening with a broad spectrum of individuals and individual viewpoints for the purpose of having an open and candid dialogue about the successes, challenges and barriers associated with homelessness and vagrancy.

As a reminder, in preparation for the workshop, KLC held a series of pre-workshop interviews with a variety of stakeholder interest groups who are actively involved in homelessness programs, activities, or issues in the community, including representatives from the City, County, nonprofit service providers, faith-based organizations, business community, and other social service agencies and organizations. In total, 35 stakeholders were interviewed individually or in groups to assist KLC in designing the format and content of the workshop. The interviews were valuable and instructive to KLC in understanding who key stakeholders in the community are, what their roles and concerns are, what efforts have been successful in the past, and what topics are most critical for the workshop.

Since the workshop, staff has been engaged in dialogue with the Chamber of Commerce, faith-based organizations, and the Chair of the Ventura Social Services Task Force; however, most significantly, staff has met with County Department Heads and staff to the Continuum of Care regarding the "Pathways to Housing" coordinated entry program.

As a normal procedure, when embarking on zoning changes, staff will be engaging key stakeholders as specific language is developed and the zone changes are processed through the Planning Commission and the City Council.

Prepared by Peter Brown, Safe and Clean/Code Enforcement Manager
For

Jeffrey Lambert, AICP
Community Development Director

FORWARDED TO THE CITY COUNCIL

City Manager's Office
ATTACHMENTS

A  KLC Workshop Report
B  COC Pathways to Home Power Point
C  Safe and Clean Public Places Initiative
D  Proposed Expansion of Emergency Shelters (with Services) Map
E  Emergency Shelter Regulations (Existing)
ATTACHMENT A

KLC WORKSHOP REPORT
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DATE:       May 11, 2016

TO:         Mark Watkins, City Manager
            Jeff Lambert, Community Development Director
            Peter Brown, Community Services Manager
            CITY OF VENTURA

FROM:       Ken Lee, Principal
            KEN LEE CONSULTING, LLC

SUBJECT:    Summary Notes and Recommendations – April 18, 2016 Workshop on Community Homelessness

Attached please find summary notes from the April 18, 2016 Workshop on Community Homelessness ("Workshop") prepared by Ken Lee Consulting, LLC ("KLC"). This transmittal memo provides:

• A recap of the pre-workshop stakeholder interviews;
• Observations from the Workshop; and
• Recommendations for next steps to move forward with strategies for addressing homelessness in Ventura.

Pre-workshop Stakeholder Interviews

KLC interviewed 35 stakeholders actively involved in ending homelessness in Ventura, including representatives from the City, County, Housing Authority, business community, faith community, nonprofit service providers, and other advocacy groups (e.g., VSSTF). The interviews were highly interactive with open-ended dialogue designed to provide KLC a healthy understanding of the social, emotional, and political issues involving homelessness in Ventura. Key themes drawn from the interviews were relied upon for the design of the Workshop. In many ways, much of the "heavy-lifting" of the Workshop began during those interviews in advance of the Workshop. Several core themes from the interviews are described below.

Leadership, Action, and Trust

If there is one thing Ventura is not in short supply of, it is a passion and commitment to helping the homeless, and a strong desire to create a safe and clean environment for residents to enjoy and businesses to thrive in. Workshop Exercise #1 involved a 10-year look-back on the community's achievements, milestones, and successes in addressing homelessness in Ventura. In all, workshop participants generated 432 Post-It stickies recording one or more accomplishments and successes in addressing homelessness in the past 10 years. The 10-year timeline on the wall filled with 432 stickies was a stunning visual reminder and recognition of the resources that everyone in the room had contributed and continues to contribute to tackle homelessness.
More importantly, the second part of that exercise was acknowledgment that, looking forward to the next 10 years, stakeholders need a common “North Star” to collectively look to and work toward as a collective body committed to addressing homelessness. In the absence of a “North Star,” each stakeholder works within their own silo, expending resources in isolation or with only one or two other organizations, rather than leveraging resources in a system-wide approach to achieve greater results through greater economies of scale and scope. This “sil-o-ing” has also led to a strong competition for resources among service providers as public dollars to fund programs, services, and housing projects have dwindled, become more restrictive, or become re-prioritized.

It was very apparent during the interviews that, in the absence of a common North Star, each of the stakeholder organizations, including City representatives, possessed some frustration with the current system, or lack thereof, for dealing with homelessness. Some are waiting for the City or County to set the North Star, while others don’t know where the leadership should or can come from. Some want to see action by the City (e.g., Zoning Code Amendment, CUP streamlining) while others see a more endemic issue of broken trust among the various agencies and stakeholders. Later Workshop exercises were designed to address these underlying issues of leadership, action, and trust by creating a common framework for discussion and modeling collaborative dialogue around an extremely complex and daunting challenge.

There is a heavy expectation by some community stakeholders for leadership and action by the City. This is not uncommon in communities since the most visible and accessible elected leaders in any city are the locally elected city council members. It is also not uncommon since the ability of a city to “police” the homeless and establish rules and regulations through land use planning and code enforcement can easily give the public the misguided impression that cities single-handedly possess the tools and resources needed to end homelessness. But, as stakeholders and advocacy groups who have actively been involved in homelessness are well-aware, homelessness is a community-wide issue requiring the collective leadership, skills, knowledge, and resources of the entire community (e.g., all those in attendance at the Workshop), rather than one or two agencies on their own.

This is not to say that the City does not have a critical role in taking actions to facilitate and/or remove barriers to addressing homelessness, including land use policies and plans that support a continuum of housing and supportive services in the community and/or region. The City can also play a critical role in providing and/or developing leadership in the community with the goal of strengthening organizations and creating a culture of collaboration, coordination, and cooperation. When asked about examples of successful past efforts, Homeless 2 Home was most frequently discussed, particularly during the era when the Executive Directors of Salvation Army, Turning Point, and Project Understanding (Rob Orth, Clyde Reynolds, Jim Duran) jointly and collaboratively led the program with support from the other agencies, business community, faith community, and service organizations. This was a good example of community leadership birthed outside of, but with support from, City Hall, and a good model of a cooperative and integrated approach that other stakeholders can rally around. Fostering leadership, repairing trust, and inspiring action through collaborative partnerships is necessary to move forward together as a community around homelessness.

**Competition for Resources**

As federal, state, and local dollars for addressing homelessness tighten or are re-prioritized, the competition for resources among service providers naturally heightens. Some nonprofit service providers expressed concern that the introduction of new nonprofits or other service organizations into
the community would take funding away from them and threaten their ability to sustain operations or exist altogether. To a degree, resource competition can be healthy when it promotes accountability and performance, but it quickly becomes unproductive and unhealthy when it erodes inter-organizational trust or creates a culture of competition that discourages the sharing and leveraging of information and resources toward a common goal.

Need for a Holistic, Systematic Framework
In concert with the need for a common North Star, there is a strong and urgent need for a more holistic and systematic framework for addressing homelessness which each of the agencies, service providers, and volunteer organizations/individuals can take an active part in with clear roles, responsibilities, and resource commitments. Homeless 2 Home provides a micro-scale model for how that framework can be achieved through collaborative case management. However, other key agencies and organizations are not always involved, and a more comprehensive, community-wide system for coordinated entry/centralized intake is lacking.

Continuum of Care is currently developing a comprehensive, countywide coordinated entry system, “Pathways to Home,” which creates a centralized database system (e.g., HMIS, VI-SPDAT) that promotes consistency in assessing client needs and connecting those clients with housing and supportive services. How such a system is rolled out to the various agencies, service providers, and volunteer organizations/individuals will be critical. KLC recommends that the City take an active part in the development of the system and its roll-out in Ventura. Aside from actions the City Council may take on its land use policies and/or processing fees for crisis/transitional housing projects, KLC believes that implementation of Pathways to Home in the City of Ventura is one of the highest priority actions for all stakeholder organizations. It provides a natural platform for the various organizations to come together and agree on consistent definitions, systems, processes, and roles, and can sour the creation of a new multi-agency governance structure for decision makers on funding/resource prioritization, and the creation of a new collaborative platform for agencies, service providers, and volunteer organizations to work together within a holistic, systematic framework.

Workshop Exercise #3 was designed to model a coordinated entry system where a “first responder” works with a client to complete a needs assessment (e.g., VI-SPDAT), enters that client into a system, then works with a larger group of agencies, service providers, and volunteer organizations to collaboratively work together to meet the specific needs of that client, not only for initial entry into the system, but through the successive steps of a broader continuum of housing and supportive services necessary to develop and sustain that client’s independence as a self-sustaining member of the Ventura community.

Continuum of Housing + Supportive Services
There is no silver bullet for ending homelessness, and that is particularly true in the context of housing and supportive services. There isn’t one form of housing that can solve homelessness, whether it’s a shelter or a gateway center. There also isn’t one type of supportive service that can solve homelessness, whether it’s mental health services, counseling, or health care. It’s all of the above.

KLC agrees that a gateway center approach has been effective in communities where a mix of crisis/emergency, transitional, and possibly even permanent supportive housing is provided all under one roof, combined with a range of supportive services also provided onsite under that same roof. In addition to such a center, however, a broader spectrum of supportive and independent housing is
needed to move and guide individuals toward self-sustainability, including anything from “safe sleep” areas to motels to SROs to supportive housing to income-restricted affordable housing to market rate housing. During the interview process, KLC had an impromptu opportunity to meet and dialogue with the City’s Police Homeless Task Force. There was a clear need expressed from the first responders for some form of a landing place where they can send folks to get connected with the right types of housing and services to address their specific needs. It is important to note that, even if a brick and mortar solution existed, that facility is only as good as the coordinated entry system and collaborative framework the first responder organizations and individuals can work through to place homeless families and individuals in that facility or another, depending on their needs. You need both: (1) a place to guide people to; and (2) a system for guiding them there, or to another place, based on a needs assessment.

Workshop Exercise #3 was designed to emphasize the need for a broader continuum of housing and supportive services, highlight the complex challenges of providing a comprehensive continuum in any single community, identify where the gaps in the continuum exist in Ventura today, and identify strategies for addressing the barriers and resource needs that are creating those gaps. Several of the small groups struggled through the exercise, which was somewhat intentional to simulate the difficulty of addressing these complex challenges in a group setting with limited resources and expertise.

**Observations from the Workshop**

The following discussion candidly summarizes KLC’s observations from the Workshop.

**Key Partners for Moving Forward**

Homelessness is an emotionally charged issue that is important to all of us for one reason or another. We all define it differently but can all come together around it because we all have something to offer as individuals or organizations that can be leveraged through a larger coordinated system to address homelessness. (See summary notes from Exercise #2.) However, because it is such an emotionally charged issue, particularly in a room filled with more than 250 vested stakeholders, it is challenging to filter all of the emotions to get to true actionable outcomes that participants can take direct ownership of.

Much of the emotion that evening, and the months leading up to it, was directed at the City Council and a call to action to address impediments in the Zoning Code and City fee schedule preventing uses that combine day-time supportive services with nighttime emergency housing on the same site. In fact, many participants had a difficult time focusing on the Workshop content and dialogue because their attention was focused on those land use issues. It is critical, however, to recognize that, in addition to the vocal majority, there were other key partners present in the room that evening who are ready to work together on bigger picture issues.

KLC would strongly urge the City not to myopically focus and commit all of the City’s political capital and staff resources on solely the immediate questions in front of the Council (e.g., Zoning Code Amendment, CUP filing/processing fees), but simultaneously carry forward the energy and momentum from the Workshop to partner with key agencies and organizations who want to work together to address the larger question and need for a holistic, systematic framework to addressing homelessness and providing a continuum of housing and supportive services. When that leadership takes root and makes progress
in achieving goals early on, the rest of the community will be able to come along and leverage their grassroots support and resources toward a common goal through an integrated platform.

Neutral, Independent, Third Party Facilitator/Expert

Given the near-term goal of the County Continuum of Care ("CoC") to create an integrated and comprehensive system for coordinated entry and services, CoC is the most logical initial partner the City could collaborate with on next steps from the Workshop. However, KLC believes that all parties would also benefit from the introduction of a new neutral and independent third party group who possesses expertise in homelessness and facilitating community-wide collaborative groups, and has experience implementing integrated, system approaches for coordinated entry, data management, and resource allocation. A third party facilitator/expert could be jointly funded by the City and County, and could even include other cities such as Oxnard.

Recommendations for Next Steps

As follow up and follow through on the Workshop, KLC recommends that, in addition to the Council direction received at the Workshop:

• City staff meet with CoC staff within the next 15 days to collaborate on an integrated coordinated entry/centralized intake system, and discuss shared leadership opportunities for moving forward, including a collaborative approach to regionally providing a continuum of housing and supportive services to the homeless. Discuss strategies for developing leadership, repairing trust, and inspiring action through collaborative partnerships.

• City and CoC staffs jointly schedule a meeting within the next 30 days with other key County agencies/departments (Human Services Agency, Health Care Agency, Behavioral Health Department), and the Ventura Housing Authority to debrief on the Workshop, review the summary notes, and discuss shared leadership opportunities for moving forward, including joint implementation of an integrated coordinated entry/centralized intake system (Pathways to Home) and a collaborative approach to regionally providing a continuum of housing and supportive services to the homeless. Discuss strategies for developing leadership, repairing trust, and inspiring action through collaborative partnerships.

• City, CoC, and County staffs meet with nonprofit service providers within the next 45 days, including Salvation Army, Turning Point, and Project Understanding, to debrief on the Workshop and share identified strategies for developing leadership, repairing trust, and inspiring action through collaborative partnerships. Roll out a work plan to collaboratively implement Pathways to Home in coordination with the service providers, including a training program for the new coordinated entry system.

• City and service provider staffs meet with other stakeholder groups (e.g., business community, VSSTF, faith community) to share identified developing leadership, repairing trust, and inspiring action through collaborative partnerships. Roll out a work plan to implement Pathways to Home, including a training program for the new coordinated entry system.
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Pathways to Home
Coordinated Entry System
Ventura County Continuum of Care

What is Pathways to Home?

The Pathways to Home Program is the Ventura County Continuum of Care’s (VC CoC) Coordinated Entry System (CES) Program. A Coordinated Entry System is a system that allows individuals and families to access services needed to move them away or out of a state of homelessness. A CES Program is a client focused approach to minimizing the complexity and challenges associated with accessing multiple programs to avoid or exit homelessness.

Pathways to Home is built on a strategic agreement by all homeless services, housing providers and stakeholders to coordinate services to those clients most in need in the most expedient fashion.
So Why Implement Pathways to Home?

The McKinney Vento Act as amended by HEARTH provides a blueprint for communities as to how different homeless system components can come together at the local level resulting in changes that will result in better outcomes for clients facing a housing crisis.

System level outcomes require system level reporting

Coordinated Entry helps with minimizing the time that people experience a housing crisis

Coordinated Entry helps with moving clients in and out of the homeless system as quickly as possible allowing them to achieve housing stability

Coordinated Entry lets each project contribute to the common effort to decrease homelessness and shorten the length of stay for each client’s housing crisis

HUD’s formal Definition from the CoC Program Interim Rule:

Centralized or coordinated entry system is defined to mean a centralized or coordinated process designed to coordinate program participant intake, entry, and provision of referrals.

A centralized or coordinated system covers the geographic area, is easily accessed by individuals and families seeking housing or services, is well advertised and includes a comprehensive and standardized assessment

HUD’s Guiding Principles for Coordinated Entry:

Re-orient service provision to create a client focused environment

Identifies strategies which are best for each household based on the data and knowledge of the full array of services available

Links the household to the most appropriate intervention that will assist the household in to resolve the housing crisis
Who will be IMPACTED?

• Clients
• Service Providers
• Community

Key Decisions

• Click on any key decision to jump to that section.

01 What model of Access will we select?
02 What model of Data Sharing will we select? This is complete, we chose to share all the data with the exception of Client Notes.
03 Will we use Progressive Assessment?
04 Will we use a scale for Priority Ranking clients for referral and/or wait-lists?
05 How will we manage Wait-Lists?
In designing a Coordinated Entry system it is helpful to consider the basic design of the process. HUD suggests that the primary function of a coordinated entry system is to make rapid, effective, and consistent client-to-housing and service matches – regardless of a client’s location within a CoC’s geographic area – by standardizing the access and entry process and by coordinating referrals across the CoC…

...so how can this be accomplished?

It requires Homeless Systems Change.

In the current homeless system, the client has the responsibility to find services and housing projects. Sometimes this is done by making multiple calls, or by visiting multiple locations to seek assistance.

With Coordinated entry in place, the client accesses the homeless system through carefully designed protocols.

In the current homeless system, projects operate with autonomy and make decisions on which clients to accept for project enrollment.

With Coordinated entry, each client is placed into projects for which they are eligible.
It requires Homeless Systems Change.

Current Homeless System
- Should we accept this family into our project?
- Project centric
- Unique forms and assessments at each project
- Project specific decision-making
- Ad hoc referrals between projects

Coordinated entry System
- What assistance is best for this household?
- Client centric
- Standard forms and assessments for every client at each entry point
- Community agreement on how to triage each client based on their needs
- Coordinated referral + similar needs = similar placement

Questions to consider...
- How can we make the system easier for the client to navigate?
- What strategies will be used for each household type? Will the access look different for adult individuals than for households with children or households with only children?
- What do we need to know about the services and projects that each agency has to offer to clients? How will we compile all of the information in a comprehensive listing of what each project has to offer?
Core Operational Components of Coordinated Entry

- Standardized Access
- Standardized Assessment
- Coordinated Referral / Assignment

Standardize Access

The Access point is the coordinated entry point into the CoC System of Care. HUD requires that it cover the geographic region of the CoC, be easily accessible by individuals and families seeking homeless or prevention assistance and be well advertised. There are several different models for access and the best fit for each community will depend on a number of factors.
Standardized Access Models

SINGLE POINT OF ACCESS
This model utilizes a single physical access point. The access site typically conducts assessment and assists with some services like accessing mainstream benefits.
Staff can be permanently assigned to the location or may be staff from local service providers who work to share duties.

MULTI SITE CENTRALIZED ACCESS
This model utilizes multiple physical access points based on geography. The access site typically conducts assessment and may offer the services of a co-located provider.
This type of model may have sites that are targeted to one or several subpopulations.
Staff can be permanently assigned to the location or may be shared staff of the co-located provider.

ASSESSMENT HOTLINES
This model utilizes a single call-in number for clients in need of housing or services. The access site may do some assessment and provide information about accessing mainstream resources.
Staff are typically employees of the local 211 or designated hotline agency.

NO WRONG DOOR
This model involves combining several of the other models.

HYBRID
This model utilizes a single physical access point. The access site typically conducts assessment and assists with some services like accessing mainstream benefits.
Staff can be permanently assigned to the location or may be staff from local service providers who work to share duties.

Key Decision
What model of Access will we select?

Standardized Access Considerations
Where are the current entry points? How will this change? Leverage what is already working in the system. Is our 211 active in the CoC? Is there already a youth drop-in center where households with only children access the homeless system?
Will we have special access points for special populations like Domestic Violence victims or Veterans?
Will we have mobile staff who can be dispatched for clients that are unable or unwilling to utilize traditional access points? How will we handle data entry for clients served by outreach or mobile staff?
Will prevention projects be a part of the system? How will you incorporate them?
What is the projected demand for service? What is the technical capacity of staff to manage the access services?
More Standardized Access Considerations

Consider our plan for non-participating providers. How will we address this? We can always proceed without them and hope to convince them to join at a later time once the process is underway.

Advertising must have an intentional design. How will we address programs that are not actively involved in the CoC? How will clients know how to access the system. How will pastors and other community members know where to send people?

How will you document the level of demand for Homelessness assistance at the access point? It is important to get an unduplicated count of the people seeking assistance and keep in mind that not all clients will end up with an intervention.

Standardize Assessment

HUD requires that this stage of the process include documentation of the needs of individuals and families seeking housing or services; and use of a comprehensive and standardized assessment tool. The purpose of the assessment is to aid in linking clients/households to the most appropriate intervention and then make a referral to that intervention.

Creating the assessment tool is a big part of the design process. This is how each community tailors the process to its specific needs.
Standardized Assessment Considerations

The purpose of the assessment is to link clients/households to the most appropriate intervention and then make a referral to that intervention.

When possible attempt to divert the client from the Homeless System using either diversion or homelessness prevention to avoid the necessity for shelter as it is less disruptive for the client.

What should be documented?
- Client history
- Housing barriers
- Client Needs
- Difference between the client needs and the available resources
- Amount of service needed to resolve housing crisis
- Prescribed intervention
- Draft of the client’s housing plan

Information gathered during the assessment process should be used to guide decision making in determining the appropriate intervention (Assignment/Referral). The intervention selected should be based on the needs of the client and not simply on which projects have openings at the given time.

Progressive Assessment

Progressive assessment involves asking only the information that is needed to make the referral at hand. It involves capturing different sets of information about a client during different stages of the process to locate housing and services.

**WHY SHOULD WE USE PROGRESSIVE ASSESSMENT?**

In an Emergency Shelter the staff often report that 30-40% of single adults come to shelter for a week or less and need no further intervention and do not appear in the system again. In this example, an in-depth assessment isn’t necessary nor is it a good use of resources.
Progressive Assessment
Considerations

Crisis/Triage Assessment
Does the client have an immediate safety need? If yes, what is the protocol? If no, what is the next step?
Sample questions: Do you have a place to stay tonight? Are you in immediate danger?

Housing Barriers Assessment
What are the barriers the client faces in obtaining permanent housing?
Identify the barriers and figure out next steps.
Sample Questions: What are your current financial resources and debts? Do you have any pending legal issues that might pose an issue in securing a lease?

In-depth Assessment
This assessment contains questions that address the client’s ability to maintain housing stability. This could include questions about employment, personal issues and parenting.
Sample Questions: What employment skills or training do you have? Do you have any health limitations?

Standardize Assignment Referral
HUD requires that there is a referral provided for housing and/or services for individuals and families experiencing a housing crisis.
Standardized Assignment / Referral Considerations

- Which programs provide which services? Are there providers who are not using HMIS? How will we handle referrals to these providers?
- Place-holder providers can be created and labeled for either the non-HMIS providers or to keep track of clients that are diverted from the system.
- The referral should be made based on the needs of the client and the disposition of the referral should be tracked.
- Tracking the disposition of the referral is optional but it will allow for better evaluative reporting in the future.
- What will you do for special referrals like HOPWA and Domestic Violence Providers?
- Consider privacy when making these referrals visible to all providers.
- Consider conducting a “warm hand off” for referrals for Domestic Violence programs where the client is introduced to the staff of the refer-to provider in real time either in person or via phone.

Standardized Assignment / Referral Considerations

- HUD recommends that we make a referral, track the length of time it takes to accept the referral, and document reasons the referral was not accepted.
- Explore the client’s eligibility for programs and make an appropriate referral. Eligibility should be based on the rules as set forth in the CoC standards – this can be a complicated process but will be very useful in terms of being able to make good referrals.
- Documenting each program’s eligibility requirements may lead to programs relaxing their requirements as part of the discussion.
- What happens when a referral is incompatible? What is the next step that the program/client should take?
- Demand will likely be greater than availability – how do we deal with the wait-list?
Priority Ranking or Wait-Lists?

HUD has indicated that referrals should not be done on a first come, first served basis. The expectation is that clients are prioritized for service when limited resources are available.

The first step is to determine which scale will be used for Priority Ranking, if applicable.

Examples: Vulnerability Index, VI-SPDAT, SSOM, SPDAT, or community created tools.

How Will We Manage Wait-Lists?

HUD recognizes that implementation of Coordinated Entry does not increase resource availability. Wait-lists should use some sort of priority protocol. What will our community do to help with prioritizing clients on the wait-list?

Will the wait list be CoC-wide or provider specific?
Reporting

We should be able to easily run reports to help gauge the effectiveness of our Coordinated Assessment System.

- How many referrals are made and how many are accepted/denied?
- How many referrals are outstanding?
- Is the system growing as a result of implementation of Coordinated Assessment?
- What about average length of stay, is it increasing or decreasing over time?
- How quickly are services being delivered?
- How quickly is data updated in the HMIS?
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SAFE AND CLEAN PUBLIC PLACES INITIATIVE
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To: RICK COLE, CITY MANAGER
From: JEFFREY LAMBERT, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR
Subject: SAFE AND CLEAN PUBLIC PLACES INITIATIVE

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff is recommending that Council:

a. receive a report introducing a Safe and Clean Public Places Initiative;
b. designate the Safe and Clean Public Places Initiative as a City Council high priority to be added to the City’s Goals and Controls projects;
c. direct staff to proceed with implementation of the components of the Initiative subject to identifying funding or shifting city priorities; and
d. direct staff to develop performance measures to be introduced in the next quarterly performance measures report in January 2012.

PREVIOUS COUNCIL ACTION

On July 25, 2011 Council considered staff recommendations regarding the 10-Year Strategy to End Homelessness. As part of that consideration Council directed staff “...to develop a strategy for dealing with vagrancy...”.

SUMMARY

The Safe and Clean Public Places Initiative is designed to ensure safe and clean public spaces for the entire community to enjoy. To achieve that goal, city government can focus internal resources and strengthen community partnerships through:

a. Redirecting limited law enforcement resources to better enforce existing laws and policies to abate illegal and anti-social behaviors in public spaces.
b. Redirecting limited maintenance resources to better maintain clean public spaces.
c. Partnering with community resources to better activate and animate public spaces to encourage enjoyment by the entire community.
d. Strengthening collaboration with the County, social service agencies and faith-based organizations to support both "place-based" social services and supplement those services by assertive street outreach teams to reach service resistant clients, and

e. Seeking to reinforce (and in some cases re-orient) social services and philanthropic giving toward the philosophy of a "hand up" rather than a "hand out."

The implications of this approach are that we focus on behaviors (public spaces should not be havens for drug dealing, public inebriation, aggressive panhandling and harassment), conditions (public bathrooms should not be filthy and dangerous), and uses (urban public parks should not become campsites) and the factors in our community that serve to influence behaviors, conditions and uses.

DISCUSSION

Public spaces must be safe, clean and secure for use by the entire community, and yet places like Plaza Park, the Promenade, the South Seaward Area, Mission Park and Mission Plaza have become places where many residents and visitors feel unsafe and unwelcome. While most people would agree with that statement the reality is that many otherwise reasonable people disagree about what to do about it. An objective of the Safe and Clean Public Places is to further define the specifics and stakeholders associated with meeting this very clear goal.

Service providers agree that many chronically homeless and chronic inebriants and drug users on the streets of Ventura are aware of the services available at physical locations (such as the County Clinics, The Homeless One Stop Program, Project Understanding, Turning Point's Our Place Shelter, Operation Embrace at the Harbor Community Church, etc.), however they do not choose to avail themselves of those services. An important component to the Safe and Clean Public Places Initiative suggests that stakeholders work in partnership to address that service gap toward providing assistance to the service resistant.

The implication of a "hand-out" in any scenario is that there is not reciprocity – there is not a mutual exchange. Absent a mutual exchange – "I will give you this service assistance if you agree to change that behavior" or "I will donate this money if you agree that it will contribute to ending an individual's homelessness" – staff asserts that the otherwise well intentioned service and/or philanthropic community actually contributes to an enabling environment that is neither good for the individual or the community. Already, through the Ventura Social Services Task Force, most agencies have adopted this model. Making it universal and effective is the next collaborative challenge, along with gaining public understanding and support.
The pursuit of a successful Safe and Clean Public Places Initiative relies on further developing the collaborative and cooperative trust-based partnerships that the City has established while working in the social arena. Clearly this initiative is aimed at a community partnership to achieve its goal; for example, social service providers, various functions within the County of Ventura, are all key stakeholders in safe and clean public places. These community partners will also have a role in shaping the strategy as we move forward; discussions with these partners are underway and will be reported on in the coming months.

The City has already begun to advance ideas and develop components that are designed to contribute to, and ensure, Safe and Clean Public Places in Ventura. Those include:

**Shopping Cart Ordinance Addition to the City Municipal Code**  
In the meeting of November 21, 2011 the City Council will be presented with components of a draft ordinance to curb the theft, unauthorized use and abandonment of shopping carts that results in blighted neighborhoods and public places.

**Anti-Panhandling Campaign**  
In partnership with the Downtown Ventura Organization (DVO), Downtown Ventura Partnership (DVP), the Chamber of Commerce, and endorsed by the Salvation Army and Project Understanding, city staff are rolling out the initial phases of a reprised and revamped Anti-Panhandling Campaign modeled after the successful campaign of 2009. Components include, but are not limited to, posters, business cards, public service announcements, community and business education programs, and targeted editorial placements. The goal is to encourage and endorse charitable giving that focuses on the support of a “hand-up” concept and away from a “hand-out” activity.

**Debris and Data Collection Team**  
A hybrid of internal and external resources, the Debris and Data Collection Team is designed to remove the debris most commonly associated with illegal camping, or the illegal storage of abandoned personal belongings, in community public spaces. Internal stakeholders of this component include the Parks Division of the Parks, Recreation and Community Partnerships Department, and the Streets Division of the Public Works Department.

**The Activation of Public Places**  
“Activating” and “animating” our Downtown parks with activities and events sponsored by local business and community organizations to make our public spaces more welcoming and safe — because anti-social behaviors thrive in areas where there are fewer people to observe and report them.

**Reallocation of Police Resources**  
Recognizing the significant increase in illegal vagrant behavior, and its impact on quality of life issues for Ventura’s residents, PD reallocated two Traffic Safety motor officer
positions to team up with the Downtown Parking District Corporal for the purpose of participating in a collaborative approach to reduce unwanted vagrant behaviors.

Unfortunately, due to ongoing line of duty injuries and unanticipated vacancies, the reassignment of these two Motor officer positions to the Vagrant Collaborative team is not expected to occur within the next four months.

The Ventura Police Department is very aware of the impact of officer reductions on service to the community. In response, the Department applied for two Federal grants that would have specifically aided in the City's response to unwanted vagrant behavior. Unfortunately, we were unsuccessful in being awarded either the Federal COPS grant officers or the Bureau of Justice Assistance grant positions that we requested. We will continue to apply for grants where possible.

The Police Department will also work collaboratively with the City Attorney's Office concerning the effectiveness of the current policies, procedures and practices of the City's AP&P (AP&P 8.3) governing the Police Department's use of administrative and criminal citations as well as the Chronic Offender Program.

**CITIZEN ADVISORY GROUP REVIEW**

There is not a formal citizen advisory group for an initiative associated with the goal of providing Safe and Clean Public Places for all residents. That being said staff has engaged three groups on the issue – the Ventura Social Services Task Force (VSSTF), the Downtown Ventura Partnership (DVP) and the Chamber of Commerce (CofC).

Staff outlined potential program components to DVP staff and select Board Members Tuesday morning November 1, to staff and select CofC Board Members later that same day, and to the Ventura Social Services Task Force on Wednesday, November 2.

While staff did not request formal support for the program, it was clear that the DVP and CofC thought that the Initiative was well thought out. Because the number one priority of the DVP work plan for 2011 was to deal with the ‘vagrancy issue’ in downtown they were specifically and enthusiastically in support.

The VSSTF membership was very concerned that any actions associated with the Safe and Clean Initiative be confined to dealing with illegal behaviors, and that the status of being homeless was not criminalized.

It is important to note that the Salvation Army (Captains Bill and Tolani Finley) and Project Understanding (Executive Director Rob Orth) – both influential VSSTF members – are in full support of the Safe and Clean Public Places Initiative.
PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS / PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

City staff have been engaging in formal and informal interfaces with community members regarding the safeness and cleanliness decline in public areas for many years. The reality is that the steady and marked decline of municipal proactive and reactive resources associated with the reduction of the general fund priorities were shifted away from this basic goal – and the business and resident community has begun to reach a tipping point regarding their comfort level with our prominent public places.

Upon being directed by Council, staff public communication and engagement activities will feature regular and consistent communications with key community stakeholders toward shared ownership of the initiative throughout our community. Workshops and cross-training opportunities will be provided to city staff and community partners to coordinate and improve the maintenance of safe and clean public places, and a media campaign with educational materials will be developed to inform the community about how we can work together to mobilize municipal and partner resources to create a safer and cleaner environment in our community.

FISCAL IMPACTS

For the purpose of funding the approaches suggested in this Administrative Report the Fiscal impacts (beyond the reallocation and redeployment of existing resources) are approximated to be:
- $6,000 - $8,000 per month for the Debris and Data Collection Team, including some enforcement activities associated with the shopping cart ordinance;
- $150,000 approximate annual loss of traffic fine revenue as the result of the reallocation of two traffic safety officers;
- Potential (not yet specifically identified) loss of revenue or added costs associated with activating public places; and
- Other fiscal impact analysis can be developed based on Council direction.

ALTERNATIVES

As the Council is aware, we are stretching our resources to not only maintain routine city services, but an ambitious list of fifty "goals and controls" projects already on this year's workplan.

While safe and clean public places are a high community priority, there are many other high community priorities that compete with it for time, attention and resources. So the alternatives presented are not so much whether to address this problem, but options for different ways of doing so.

As an alternative to a city/community partnership outlined in this report, the Council could choose to tilt more toward a city-focused -- or a community-based effort.
**City-focused:** Acknowledging the urgency of this challenge, a more direct and accountable option would be to redirect significant additional City resources to achieving safe and clean public places. The Downtown Foot Patrol was very effective in maintaining safety and the application of staff or contract maintenance resources has long been effective in maintaining clean spaces. If City Council wants to redirect resources to this as a new, high priority, hard decisions will need to be made about what is not going to be done so we continue City Council's policy of "living within our means."

**Community-based:** Recognizing limited City resources, the Council could direct staff to put greater emphasis on enlisting volunteer, business, church and County agency responsibility for abating the conditions that give rise to and flow from anti-social behaviors in our public places. The City could put the onus on other stakeholders to "step up to the plate" for the conditions which are not traditionally city responsibilities.

Prepared by Peter Brown, Community Services Manager
For

Jeffrey Lambert, AICP
Community Development Director

FORWARDED TO THE CITY COUNCIL

Office of the City Manager
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PROPOSED EXPANSION OF EMERGENCY SHELTERS (WITH SERVICES) MAP
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Proposed Expansion of Emergency Shelters (with Services) - City of Ventura (Detailed)

Emergency Housing Zoning

- Existing SB2 Sheltering by Right
- Proposed Services with CUP
- Proposed Sheltering and Services with CUP

NOTE: Emergency Shelters, 15 clients maximum in R-3, P-O, C-1, C-1A, C-2, CPD, MXD, H, M-1, M-2, T4-T6; 55 clients maximum where facility is within ¼ mile of existing bus transit route or rail station in P-O, C-1, C-1A, C-2, CPD, MXD, H, M-1, M-2, T4-T6

Date: March, 2016

This map is a product of the City of San Buenaventura, California. Although reasonable efforts have been made to ensure the accuracy of this map, the City of San Buenaventura cannot guarantee its accuracy.
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EMERGENCY SHELTER REGULATIONS (EXISTING)
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Sec. 24.110.675. - Emergency shelter.

Housing with minimal supportive services for homeless persons that limits the occupancy to six months or less by a homeless person and does not deny any individual or household shelter because of an inability to pay. This use type does not include residential care or group care.

(Ord. No. 2011-010, § 2, 8-1-11)

Chapter 24.437 - Emergency Shelter Regulations

Sec. 24.437.010. - Chapter description.

Chapter 24.437 establishes emergency shelter regulations in order to provide for the potential placement of an emergency shelter to meet the city’s unmet housing need for homeless individuals, disperse shelters throughout the city and in areas close to transit and services; and encourage the creation of emergency homeless shelters as needed.

Sec. 24.437.020. - Applicability.

All operators of emergency shelters are required to apply to the city’s community development department for the sole purpose of confirming that the emergency shelter standards set forth in section 24.437.030 are satisfied.

Sec. 24.437.030. - Shelter standards.

Emergency shelters shall comply with the criteria listed below, in addition to all applicable local and state health and safety codes such as, but not limited to, the California Building Code, California Fire Code, California Health and Safety Code, as well as any applicable zoning standards for the development and use of the property on which the emergency shelter is located.

A. Number of clients. The maximum number of clients permitted in an emergency shelter shall not exceed the following limits:

1. **Fifteen clients** in an underlying R-3, Professional (P-O), Commercial (C-1, C-1A, C-2, CPD, MXD), Hospital (H), Industrial (M-1 and M-2), or T4-T6 zone.

2. **Fifty-five clients** where the shelter facility is located **within ¾ mile of an existing bus transit route or rail station** with an underlying Professional (P-O), Commercial (C-1, C-1A, C-2, CPD, MXD), Hospital (H), Industrial (M-1 and M-2), or T4-T6 zone.

B. Vehicle parking. Off-street vehicle parking shall be provided as follows:

1. Shelter facilities within ¼ mile of an existing bus route or rail station shall provide one space per employee (based on highest ratio of staffing on site) and 1/8 space per adult client.

2. Shelter facilities beyond ¼ mile of an existing bus route or rail station shall provide one space per employee (based on highest ratio of staffing on site) and ¼ space per adult client.

3. Shelter facilities that provide ongoing client transportation shall be allowed to count each client passenger seat as 1/8 parking space.

C. Bicycle parking. Bicycle racks that allow for the secure storage of bicycles shall be provided. Bicycle racks shall accommodate at least one bicycle storage space for every five adult client beds. All bicycle racks are required to be on-site and located in a secure area that is not visible from the public right-of-way.

D. Intake areas. If the intake area occurs on-site, an enclosed or screened waiting area, such as provided in a courtyard building configuration, shall be provided between the intake area and the public right-of-way. There shall be no queuing within the public right-of-way or within any parking lot.

E. Provisions for on-site management.
1. [On-site management.] On-site management shall be provided 24 hours a day seven days a week and accompanied by support staff. Clients of the shelter shall not provide on-site management.

2. On-site personnel. A designated area for on-site personnel shall be located near the main entry to the facility for the purpose of controlling admittance into the facility and providing security.

3. Client restrictions. The emergency shelter manager shall not take any person as a client of the shelter if the manager knows the prospective client has outstanding warrants for his or her arrest. The emergency shelter manager shall also confirm that the client has no outstanding parole violations.

4. Personal storage. A private storage area or closet shall be provided with each on-site bed. At no time shall any client of an emergency shelter be allowed to keep on-site any alcoholic beverages or store any type of illegal substances, drugs, and/or firearms of any kind. The manager of the emergency shelter shall conduct routine inspections of each on-site client's personal space to verify compliance with this chapter.

5. Shower and toilet facilities. Toilets, sinks, and showers shall be provided on-site. The emergency shelter manager shall be responsible for ensuring that all restroom and shower facilities comply with the city's building code requirements.

6. [Separate housing for families with children.] Families with children shall be housed separately from other clients and be provided separate restrooms.

7. Food service areas. The emergency shelter manager shall be responsible for ensuring that any food service or on-site meal preparation areas comply with all applicable requirements of the county health department.

8. Outdoor storage. Emergency shelters shall screen all outdoor storage areas from all public rights-of-way and on-site parking lots. The emergency shelter manager shall ensure that all outside storage areas be maintained in a neat, clean, and orderly manner at all times.

F. Spacing. An emergency shelter shall not be located within 300 feet of another parcel or lot with an emergency shelter.

G. Length of stay. No client shall be permitted to remain at an emergency shelter for longer than six months in any 12-month period.

H. Hours of operation. Each emergency shelter shall establish and maintain set hours of operation for client intake and discharge. These hours shall be clearly displayed at the entrance to the shelter at all times. In the event an emergency shelter client is socially disruptive, a threat to the safety of others or in violation of the emergency shelter facility rules during non-business hours of operation, the emergency shelter manager may proceed with discharging that client immediately.

I. Exterior lighting. Lighting shall be provided in all parking and exterior waiting areas and along the periphery of the building without lighting adjoining properties.

J. Security. The emergency shelter manager shall submit an on-site security plan to the community development department and the police department. The emergency shelter operator shall be responsible for ensuring that the approved security plan is implemented at the emergency shelter at all times.

K. [Grandfathering.] Existing emergency shelters that were established by a conditional use permit with adopted conditions of approval for its operation shall continue to operate under those adopted conditions of approval and be supplemented by the provisions of this ordinance. Should any conflict(s) arise with any operational requirement, the operational requirement(s) in the adopted conditions of approval shall prevail.

(Ord. No. 2011-010, § 26, 8-1-11)