



## Safety off the Streets Workgroup ACTION PLAN

**Charge:** Prioritize strategies for increasing options for safety and a good night’s sleep, such that no women, children, or adults with disabilities have to sleep on the streets of Multnomah County by January 2017 (as measured in the 2017 Point in Time Count of Homelessness).

**Jurisdictional Staff:** Shannon Singleton (PHB); Marc Jolin (HFE Initiative)

**HFE Board Liaison(s):** Joe Walsh, City of Gresham; Stacy Borke, Transition Projects; Art Rios, Advocate; Jillian Detweiler, Mayor’s Office; Israel Bayer, Street Roots; Martha Strawn Morris, Gateway Center for Domestic Violence

### Workgroup Members:

Lynnae Berg, Downtown Clean & Safe & Portland Business Alliance  
Tony Bernal, Transition Projects  
Andrew Brown, Human Solutions  
Anna Cale, Salvation Army Female Emergency Shelter  
Kevin Donegan, Janus Youth  
Peter Fournier, Community Member  
Jason Kersten, Advocate  
Shasta Leming, Human Solutions

Susan Madar, Elders in Action  
Alexa Mason, Portland Rescue Mission  
Ibrahim Mubarak, Right to Survive, Right to Dream Too & Homeless Bill of Rights Coalition  
Rebecca Nickels, Portland Women’s Crisis Line (PWCL)  
Rachel Payton, Volunteers of America  
Bimal RajBhandary, Portland Housing Bureau  
Bob Robison, PWCL Volunteer  
Wendy Smith, Portland Housing Bureau

### The Action Plan’s Guiding Principles and Assumptions

The workgroup’s planning was guided by the principles in *A Home for Everyone* and apply to all the work of the HFE Coordinating Board. In addition, the group based its planning on a number of other key assumptions and commitments.

#### ***Home for Everyone Principles***

- Prioritize vulnerable populations
- Promote racial and ethnic justice
- Use data-driven assessment and accountability
- Engage and involve the community
- Strengthen system capacity and increase leveraging opportunities

#### ***Additional assumptions and commitments***

- People are sleeping doubled up in unsafe situations and/or stay in unsafe, abusive homes due to lack of safe options to leave
- The severe weather events this year highlighted our lack of safe places to sleep for people whose only option is to sleep outside
- We can’t do what we have always been doing; we need to have a menu of options; funds in silos by population is problematic
- Create strategies for people who will continue to be on the streets to engage in services and housing placement.

- Balance the needs between homeless, housed, and business
- We need to approach this plan as a both/and solution—we need both shelter and permanent housing
- Accessibility, location, expense are important considerations in implementation planning, in order to provide strategies that “meet people where they are”

### **Summary Recommendation**

The committee evaluated options to provide safety off the streets to the sub-populations called out in the charge, but recognized that the number and mix of beds that would need to be created depends upon the success of the strategies developed by the Housing subcommittee of the HFECB. Based upon the modeling done by that group, if they are successful in reducing unmet need for permanent housing by 50% by 2017, we will still need approximately an additional 800 safety off the streets options for the target populations each night beyond what is currently available in our system.

We propose six new funding strategy options to expand capacity for a safe night’s sleep. These expanded options have been evaluated based on our minimum criteria for safety off the streets and will require community support to overcome potential siting barriers. New funding is also recommended to provide service connection for the sites that are self-governed or privately funded, like Dignity Village, Right To Dream Too, and faith based shelters. These recommendations primarily take the form of mobile services and will be further explored in the attached table, either as new funding requests, reprioritization, or both.

We also propose policy changes that will increase flexibility and rely on people’s own expertise to help end their homelessness as well as that of our community providers. These policy changes are recommended at the local, state, and federal level. We ask that the Home for Everyone Coordinating Board and Executive Committee take primary responsibility for advocating for these policy changes in consultation with experts like those participating in this workgroup.

Finally, the Safety off the Streets Workgroup recommends a number of alignment strategies that will help address the inflow and outflow of homelessness. We request that the Home for Everyone Coordinating Board convene a workgroup to coordinate discharge planning between the criminal justice system and homeless service providers to decrease the number of people exiting jails back to homelessness. We recommend that topics include: increased coordination among homeless service providers, courts, police, probation/parole, and jails, and increased access to civil legal services, legal aid, expungement, and tenant advocacy to better support the ability of those exiting the criminal justice system to move forward in their lives and secure both safe affordable housing and employment.

The second alignment recommendation is to direct a workgroup or committee to suggest a number of policies that shape safety off the streets options in our community. This would include shelter rules, exclusions, length of stay policies, and pet policies. It would also include access for couples, as well as families that fall outside of the definition of family for federal funds, the use of guest beds, and increase low barrier options for safety off the streets. This should be done in conjunction with the Coordinated Entry committees. The committee considered but was not prepared to recommend a discussion of the reprioritization of who is served by our current shelter and safety off the streets capacity.

## **Background**

For purposes of this plan, “safety off the streets” means that we provide an array of options in our community that are safe for our neighbors sleeping outside. We have seven minimal elements for this definition. To qualify as “safety off the streets” an option must meet the following criteria:

1. People are legally able to sleep there
2. Access to bathrooms
3. Clean facilities
4. Heat/Warmth
5. Oversight/support by people trained to assist in creating physical safety
6. Dry/overhead shelter
7. Lighting designed to ensure adequate visibility for safety purposes

In assessing and prioritizing amongst available options that meet these criteria, we also recognize that different people will experience ‘safety’ differently, that different options present different political, legal, and operational challenges, as well as different cost structures, and that other elements – including barriers to access, privacy, proximity to services, geographic location, and transportation -- will affect whether and by whom different options are used.

## **Current System**

In the January 2013 Point in Time Count, 1,895 people were sleeping in unsafe situations on the streets in our community. Our community values include that no one be forced to sleep outside due to lack of options for safety off the street; therefore, we recommend that the HFE Executive Committee seek solutions for the entire population of unsheltered people (1,895 in 2013 Street Count). As directed by the HFE Executive Committee, this action plan provides options to provide safety off the streets for women, children, and adults with disabilities (1,518 in 2013 Street Count), leaving the problem of homelessness unsolved for 377 “able bodied men”.

Currently, our system offers 491 facility based safety of the streets options per day, year round, including faith-based shelter providers. In winter months, we add 197 facility based options in our system (the family shelter is no turn away and expands past the listed capacity of 80 throughout much of the winter months). This system is not well designed to serve couples and they are primarily being served at sites like Dignity Village and Right to Dream Too, serving an estimated 120 individuals per night. Our current system is at capacity and the ability of people to exit existing options is hindered by a number of factors. Without significant resources (units, rent assistance, and services), we will not be able to meet this charge. Based upon the modeling done by the Housing Workgroup, we estimate that we will need approximately 800 additional safety off the streets options by 2017.

In the attached Exhibit 1, our cost analysis is based on the current costs of facility based low barrier shelter. We encourage further exploration of the ability of our faith community partners to provide additional low barrier shelter at their lower costs, provided it is connected to mobile services as we are proposing for other sites that are not currently service connected. There is also opportunity to expand the ability of the faith community to provide options for safety off the streets for rest areas. Exhibit 2 is an example of an ordinance from Seattle to enable the faith community to host rest areas and provides guidance that we can use in our community to expand the system capacity to provide safety off the streets.

## **Challenges and Potential Adverse Impacts**

There is an urgent need to ensure that everyone experiencing homelessness in our community has a safe place to sleep at night. Whenever possible, that should be a permanent housing option. Where that is not possible, we have an obligation to offer a temporary solution to meet emergent needs. To date, one of the risks of expanding safety off the street options has been that the financial, staff, and political resources for this were pulled from the same pool used to help people end their homelessness, thus putting the two needs in competition with each other. As the relationship between the work of this committee and the Housing Workgroup make clear, to meet the charge we must be prepared to expand investment in both so that expanding safety off the street options does not adversely impact the resources focused on permanent housing placement.

Historic challenges siting shelter and other safety off the streets options suggest that creating new site-based options will take a substantial amount of time, political will, financial resources, making the objectives of the charge difficult. That said, our current system is at capacity and there will continue to be inflow into street homelessness. The ability of people to exit existing safe options remains hindered by a number of factors, chief among them the lack of suitable permanent housing options. Other than expanding site-based options, our system is left only with the option of hotel-vouchers, which the committee did not prioritize because in many cases that is a more costly and less effective safety off the streets intervention. We must make the effort to expand site-based safety off the streets options for families with children, women, and people with disabilities. Among the critical policy recommendations included in Exhibit 1 are changes to code and processes that will facilitate the more rapid creation of site-based options.

## **Data Sources and Assumptions**

The use of Street Count data presents a challenge in developing an array of options for safety off the streets, as people residing at sites like Dignity Village and Right To Dream Too are counted as unsheltered for the purposes of the Street Count. As we are recommending service connection to and potential expansion of sites like these, analysis should be done at the 2017 Point in Time Count in order to allow Home for Everyone Coordinating Board to evaluate success of this plan based on our definition of safety off the streets listed above. We acknowledge that Street Counts are, by their nature, undercounts, and that the need for safety off the streets exceeds that which we can document.

The expanded options, listed in Exhibit 1, are scalable to meet the entire gap in emergency, safety options in our community. As this action plan is inherently linked to that of the Housing Workgroup, the HFE Executive Committee should scale up the proposed expanded options based on the unmet need after evaluating both action plans.

## **Summary of Capacity and Gaps Analysis**

Unaccompanied youth: Based on the 2013 point in time count, 14 unaccompanied youth were sleeping on the street. The Homeless Youth Oversight Committee members report an average of two people being turned away from shelter each night. Analysis has revealed that a bottleneck exists in the youth system due to the lack of stable housing options for youth to transition out of shelter. By investing new dollars in the housing end of the continuum, the HYOC believes they can free up capacity in the 42 bed shelter system to serve all youth who seek that service.

Families with Children: Based on the point in time count, 122 people in families with children are actually sleeping outside on a given night. This is the subpopulation with the smallest gap and the committee believes that by expanding family winter shelter to a year around no-turn away shelter, we can achieve the objectives of the charge, provided that investments in permanent housing placement for homeless families continue.

Women: Based on the 2013 street count, 541 women were unsheltered, 482 unaccompanied women and 59 women in heterosexual couples. For single women, the current system capacity is 100 facility based shelter beds. We have no facility-based couples shelter. Approximately half of the 60 person capacity at Dignity Village is utilized by women, including many in couples, and R2D2 offers safety off the streets to approximately 30 women each night, again many in couples. Without the work of the veterans plan and the permanent housing group, we will need 481 additional safety off the streets beds for women without children each night by January 2017. Based on the veterans and housing groups achieving their charges, we estimate the gap for women without children to be reduced to approximately 225 beds by 2017. It is difficult to know the relative need for couples vs. single women options due to our current data collection processes. We recommend options for increasing outflow for couples as well as data collection methods that will give us a better sense of the full need. We know that some couples split up to sleep in facility based single gender shelters and that other couples sleep at locations like Right to Dream Too.

Adults with disabilities: The most recent street count suggests that 1,245 adults with disabilities are sleeping outdoors on a given night. Of these, 337 are women, and our recommendations for women address this gap. Among the 881 men there are 130 veterans whose needs should be met through implementation of the Veterans Plan. If we assume that half the men served by Dignity Village and R2D2 each night are disabled (about 30 total), absent the successful implementation of the Housing Group's strategies, the gap will be 680 safe options for men with disabilities. If the Housing Group charge is met, we estimate there will still be approximately 400 disabled men in need of safety off the streets options in 2017.

We will review 2015 Point-in-Time numbers and recalibrate assumptions based on the more current data at that point.

**Recommendations** We support two recommendations from existing workgroups for the youth and family systems. Specifically, we support the Homeless Youth Oversight Committee recommendation that the system be funded at the permanent housing end of their continuum, provided it achieves no turn away at the youth shelters. They have completed extensive analysis of needs, gaps, and costs. It was a unanimous decision to not increase youth shelter beds at this time. Funding request for these permanent housing units will come through the HFE Housing Workgroup. We also support the Homeless Family System of Care recommendation to expand the family winter shelter to year round. This expanded capacity is designed to meet the full need of unsheltered families throughout the year.

Based on the above analysis, review of current resources and practices, exploration of alternative models and emerging practices, and input from multiple stakeholders working to provide options for a safe night's sleep in our community, we put forward the recommended funding and policy changes and the attached table [See Exhibit 1].

## Next Steps

The Safety off the Streets workgroup discussed some items to be considered for implementation of this action plan:

1. Data:
  - a. Develop data sharing policies and procedures that provide service coordination while ensuring peoples' civil rights are protected.
  - b. Develop methods that allow system-level data analysis to provide de-duplicated information.
  - c. Develop policies and practices to evaluate interventions from both a quantitative and qualitative perspective.
  - d. Publish data in an easily accessible location(s) in order to increase accountability and transparency.
2. Work with jurisdictional partners and stakeholders to develop coordinated entry system that allows ease of connection with other systems as needed, including, domestic violence, homeless youth continuum, homeless family system of care, as well as mainstream systems like SNAP and TANF.
3. Develop community standards for:
  - a. support services and ensure opportunities for them to be accessed across the system and support roll-out of common assessment and placement strategies
  - b. Training to support physical safety at sites. We encourage further development in implementation planning with ongoing evaluation and adjustments based on best and emerging practices. Suggested training includes: Non-violent Crisis Intervention; Mental Health First Aid; trauma informed care; assertive engagement; first aid and how to access health care.
4. Development and implementation of peer services: street ambassadors; peer recovery model; mentors (they should also be vetting services)
5. Safety on the streets options should be explored for people who are not accessing existing options. Camp sweeps and the impact these have on people and their ability to work a housing plan should be assessed and solutions found that support people in ending their homelessness.

Safety off the Streets Exhibit 1: Action Plan Table

NEW FUNDING REQUESTS							
Action	Populations Served	Proposed Outcomes	Impact on Communities of Color	Operating Cost Estimates/Funding Strategies	Potential Adverse Impacts	Responsible Parties	Timeline to Implement
(1) Expansion of existing winter shelter programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Women</li> <li>People with disabilities</li> </ul>	115 beds: Expand women’s winter shelter to year round adding 115 beds	<p>For families, the impact will be positive due to the disproportionate number of people of color represented amongst families experiencing homelessness.</p> <p>Currently, facility based shelters serve approximately 38% (women’s) and 35% (men’s) people from communities of color. Being overrepresented by 16% in the 2013 PIT, we encourage programs to continue to ensure that programs are welcoming to POC</p>	<p>\$755,550 - \$1,259,250 per year; currently investing \$272,000; therefore new funds = \$483,550 - \$987,250. PLUS one-time costs of building siting, supplies (beds, etc.), and any renovations needed. These capital costs are unknown and not included.</p> <p>\$16,323 in waived land use fees (cost schedule for 7/1/14 – 6/30/15) for each site</p>	<p>For all site-based options:</p> <p>Location is important to mitigate impacts of transportation needs, etc. It may require new service alignment.</p> <p>Neighborhood resistance based on assumed impacts.</p> <p>Siting is an issue for all of the models proposed.</p>	HFECB Providers	Approximately 103 days for land use review; potential building identified
	Families with minor children	100 beds: Expand Family Winter Shelter to year round adding 100 beds	<p>overrepresented by 16% in the 2013 PIT, we encourage programs to continue to ensure that programs are welcoming to POC</p> <p>Consider siting in East County/Gresham to create more geographic diversity</p>	<p>\$250,000 new funding; \$600,000 total for on-going year round operations</p> <p>Local funding would be needed as HUD no longer funds Safe Haven. Programs; VA model = \$730,000 (\$100 per diem cost &amp; 85% occupancy)</p>			Siting schedule unknown
(2) Open new facility- based emergency shelters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Men with disabilities</li> <li>Women</li> <li>Couples</li> </ul>	Per 100 beds	<p>overrepresented by 16% in the 2013 PIT, we encourage programs to continue to ensure that programs are welcoming to POC</p> <p>Consider siting in East County/Gresham to create more geographic diversity</p>	<p>\$657,000 - \$1,095,000 per year PLUS one-time costs of building acquisition, siting, supplies (beds, etc.), and any renovations needed. These capital costs are unknown and not included.</p> <p>Local funding would be needed as HUD no longer funds Safe Haven. Programs; VA model = \$730,000 (\$100 per diem cost &amp; 85% occupancy)</p>	<p>Neighborhood resistance based on assumed impacts.</p> <p>Siting is an issue for all of the models proposed.</p>	HFECB Providers	Identifying, securing, siting, land use approvals, and renovating new facility will determine timeline.
	Adults with diagnoses of severe and persistent mental illnesses and co-occurring addictions	Per 25 beds	<p>overrepresented by 16% in the 2013 PIT, we encourage programs to continue to ensure that programs are welcoming to POC</p> <p>Consider siting in East County/Gresham to create more geographic diversity</p>	<p>Local funding would be needed as HUD no longer funds Safe Haven. Programs; VA model = \$730,000 (\$100 per diem cost &amp; 85% occupancy)</p>			

Safety off the Streets Exhibit 1: Action Plan Table

NEW FUNDING REQUESTS							
Action	Populations Served	Proposed Outcomes	Impact on Communities of Color	Operating Cost Estimates/Funding Strategies	Potential Adverse Impacts	Responsible Parties	Timeline to Implement
(3) Rest areas / Tent Cities  Transitional Campgrounds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Couples</li> <li>Adults with disabilities</li> <li>Women</li> </ul>	Per 100 people served per night	We encourage mindfulness in siting as location is important so as to not take people of color out of their communities in order to access safety options. Currently serving 36% people of color.	Est. \$66,000 per year (Share/Wheel model) to operate.  \$20,000 in operating costs and \$25,000 (.5FTE) for Dignity Village model	See above		Highly dependent on political will and acquiring a variance to site. Example of Seattle Ordinance attached as Exhibit 2.
		Per 60 people served per night		One time site acquisition, improvement, land use, etc. costs not included.			
(4) Expand mobile services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Veterans</li> <li>Adults with disabilities</li> <li>Women</li> </ul> <p>Including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>people sleeping on streets</li> <li>in camps</li> <li>rest areas/tent cities</li> <li>transitional tiny homes</li> <li>faith based shelter</li> <li>day space providers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>VA outreach worker</li> <li>mobile mental health and addictions counselor serve 100 people</li> </ul>	<p>With 38% of the unsheltered population identifying as people of color in the 2013 PIT, the group recommends adding culturally specific capacity to outreach teams to increase the positive impact for POC</p> <p>Look at non-traditional sites like schools, ER's, healthcare providers, DMV, etc.</p> <p>Explore co-location of providers</p> <p>Be sure to include geographic diversity and connect with</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$0; reallocated staff time to conduct this activity (SSVF, VA outreach, and/or HUD-VASH case managers)</li> <li>\$150,000 (2.0FTE)</li> <li>\$200,000 per year (2.0FTE)</li> </ul>	None	HFECB Providers	
		Social Workers in libraries (1.0FTE)		\$65,000 in Library dollars to support staff			
		Collaborative Interdisciplinary		\$750,000 in long-term rent, support services			None

Safety off the Streets Exhibit 1: Action Plan Table

NEW FUNDING REQUESTS							
Action	Populations Served	Proposed Outcomes	Impact on Communities of Color	Operating Cost Estimates/Funding Strategies	Potential Adverse Impacts	Responsible Parties	Timeline to Implement
		Team for people with high barriers to housing. This should include data sharing and “staffing” of people across agencies (like Service Coordination Team model). 50 HH placed & retained with access to specialty FTE requested above as needed.	efforts in Gresham/East County	\$195,000 for (3.0FTE)			
(5) Safety off the Streets Diversion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Women</li> <li>• People with disabilities</li> <li>• Families</li> </ul>	Shelters will develop and implement diversion strategies to support people in safe situations from entering the homeless service system and sitting on shelter waitlists. Flexible client assistance dollars will be attached to diversion programs. 100 people per year will be diverted from shelter waitlists	Unknown as no formal diversion program is currently operating in our system.	\$500,000 per year for flexible client assistance	None	HFECB	

Safety off the Streets Exhibit 1: Action Plan Table

Summary of Total New Funding Options	Number Served	Range of Ongoing Investments
Expand Existing Site-Based Options	115 year-around beds for single women  100 year-around beds for families	\$483,000 - \$987,250 Ongoing operating  \$250,000 Ongoing operating
New Site-Based Option: Shelter	225 women + 400 disabled men	\$4 – \$6.5 million ongoing operating + undetermined capital and siting costs
New Site-Based Option: Tent Cities/Rest Areas	225 women + 400 disabled men	\$500,000 ongoing operating + undetermined capital and siting costs
New Site-Based Option: Safe Haven	25 severely disabled men & women	\$730,000 ongoing operating + undetermined capital and siting costs.
New Inflow/Outflow Resource: Rent Assistance	150 (incl. 50 severely disabled)	\$1.25 million
New Inflow/Outflow Staffing: Mobile Housing & Support Services	8 FTE	\$610,000

RESOURCE REALLOCATION

See above regarding VA outreach in mobile services section

POLICY CHANGES

Action	Proposed Outcomes	Impact on Communities of Color	Operating Cost Estimates/Funding Strategies	Potential Adverse Impacts	Responsible Parties	Timeline to Implement
(6) Secure local waiver for transition in place/progressive engagement allowances with HUD field office	A transition in place clause with proof of eminent homelessness for HUD funded RRH and PSH dollars / progressive engagement.	Positive; less inflow to homelessness for all populations	N/A		HFE CB and EC	
(7) Broaden the definition of family in the use of local dollars to include households of	This would allow providers to house people with their existing support system. It will not only impact	positive	N/A			

Safety off the Streets Exhibit 1: Action Plan Table

POLICY CHANGES						
Action	Proposed Outcomes	Impact on Communities of Color	Operating Cost Estimates/Funding Strategies	Potential Adverse Impacts	Responsible Parties	Timeline to Implement
siblings, adult children (particularly those with disabilities in being supported by parents or siblings)	placement, but also retention.					
(8) Relocation housing placement	All locally funded programs will utilize their flexible client assistance to support people moving out of state to permanent housing and supports, when this is their housing plan.		N/A			
(9) Examine and propose changes to HUD Section 8 policy that keep families from reunifying.	Felonies preventing partners/children from residing with their partner/parent; Restrictions on moving family members into the unit (children, parents with adult children, partners).		N/A			
(10) Streamline siting and decrease land use code barriers	In order to meet the charge and site expanded options, barriers to land use code must be overcome.		N/A			
(11) Allow flexible rental situations to support opportunistic housing placements	Non-profits will re-examine requirements for lease holding in providing rent assistance. When appropriate, they will support people in safe doubled up situations by working with the household to pay rent for the individual who we be otherwise homeless.		N/A	Monitoring challenge		

# Safety off the Streets Exhibit 2: Example of Ordinance for Transitional Campgrounds

1/13/2015

Seattle Combined Legislation Search



## City of Seattle Combined Legislative Records Search

Information retrieved on January 13, 2015 5:44 PM

---

**Council Bill Number: 117288**

**Ordinance Number: 123729**

---

AN ORDINANCE relating to land use and zoning; amending Sections 23.43.040, 23.50.012, and 23.84A.038 of the Seattle Municipal Code; and adding new Sections 23.42.054, 23.44.053, 23.45.595, and 23.47A.036; to permit transitional encampments for homeless individuals as a use accessory to religious facilities in all zones.

**Status:** Passed as amended

**Date passed by Full Council:** October 3, 2011

**Vote:** 9-0

**Date of Mayor's signature:** October 13, 2011

(about the signature date)

**Date introduced/referred to committee:** September 12, 2011

**Committee:** Housing, Human Services, Health, and Culture

**Sponsor:** LICATA

**Committee Recommendation:** Pass

**Date of Committee Recommendation:** September 28, 2011

**Committee Vote:** 3 (Licata, Clark, Rasmussen) - 0

**Index Terms:** RELIGIOUS-INSTITUTIONS, HOMELESS, LAND-USE-REGULATIONS, ZONING, PUBLIC-REGULATIONS, CAMPS

**Fiscal Note:** [Fiscal Note to Resolution 117288](#)

**Electronic Copy:** [PDF scan of Ordinance No. 123729](#)

---

### Text

AN ORDINANCE relating to land use and zoning; amending Sections 23.43.040, 23.50.012, and 23.84A.038 of the Seattle Municipal Code; and adding new Sections 23.42.054, 23.44.053, 23.45.595, and 23.47A.036; to permit transitional encampments for homeless individuals as a use accessory to religious facilities in all zones.

WHEREAS, there is a well-documented history of homelessness in Seattle and a demonstrated need for additional facilities to address the issue; and

WHEREAS, faith-based communities have proven effective in providing shelter and support for homeless persons, including providing space on their property for transitional encampments that do not include permanent structures; and

WHEREAS, faith-based communities have made support of homeless persons an integral part of their religious mission, and their transitional encampment activity is incidental to their religious facilities; and

WHEREAS, transitional encampments may currently be allowed as a temporary use, in any zone, without specific health and safety standards in the Seattle Land Use Code; and

WHEREAS, this ordinance does not change the current code provision that allows entities, including secular entities, to continue to host transitional encampments after obtaining a temporary use permit according to existing procedures in the Seattle Land Use Code; and

WHEREAS, RCW 35.21.915, permits cities regulating homeless encampments on property owned or controlled by a religious organization to impose conditions necessary to protect the health and safety of the public; and

WHEREAS, adding specific transitional encampment health and safety standards to the Code, including limits to numbers of occupants and provisions for cooking and utilities, provides clear guidance to religious facilities and protects the health and safety of the public; and

WHEREAS, agreements between religious facilities and transitional encampment operators may address encampment rules that extend beyond zoning standards, including prohibiting alcohol, drugs, weapons and sex offenders; or establishing rules for children in encampments; NOW THEREFORE,

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF SEATTLE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. A new Section 23.42.054 of the Seattle Municipal Code is adopted to read as follows:

23.42.054 Transitional Encampments Accessory to Religious Facilities or to Other Principal Uses Located on Property Owned or Controlled by a Religious Organization

A. Transitional encampment accessory use. A transitional encampment is allowed as an accessory use on a site in any zone, if the established principal use of the site is as a religious facility or the principal use is on property owned or controlled by a religious organization, subject to the provisions of subsection 23.42.054.B. A religious facility site includes property developed with legally- established parking that is accessory to the religious facility. Parking accessory to a religious facility or located on property owned or controlled by a religious organization that is displaced by the encampment does not need to be replaced.

B. The encampment operator or applicant shall comply with the following provisions:

1. Allow no more than 100 persons to occupy the encampment site as residents of the encampment.
2. Comply with the following fire safety and health standards:
  - a. Properly space, hang, and maintain fire extinguishers within the encampment as required by the Fire Department;
  - b. Provide and maintain a 100-person first-aid kit;
  - c. Establish and maintain free of all obstructions access aisles as required by the Fire Department.
  - d. Install appropriate power protection devices at any location where power is provided;
  - e. Designate a smoking area;
  - f. Keep the site free of litter and garbage;
  - g. Observe all health-related requirements made by the Public Health Department of Seattle & King County; and
  - h. Post and distribute to encampment residents, copies of health or safety information provided by the City of Seattle, King County or any other public agency.
  - i. Prohibit any open flames except an outdoor heat source approved by the Fire Department.
3. Provide toilets, running water, and garbage collection according to the following standards:
  - a. Provide and maintain chemical toilets as recommended by the portable toilet service provider or provide access to toilets in an indoor location;
  - b. Provide running water in an indoor location or alternatively, continuously maintain outdoor running water and discharge the water to a location approved by the City; and
  - c. Remove garbage frequently enough to prevent overflow.
4. Cooking facilities, if they are provided, may be located in either an indoor location or outdoors according to the following standards:
  - a. Provide a sink with running water in an indoor location or alternatively, continuously maintain outdoor running water and discharge the water to a location approved by the City;
  - b. Provide a nonabsorbent and easily-cleanable food preparation counter;
  - c. Provide a means to keep perishable food cold; and
  - d. Provide all products necessary to maintain the cooking facilities in a clean condition.
5. Allow officials of the Public Health Department of Seattle & King County, the Seattle Fire Department, and Seattle Department of Planning and Development to inspect areas of the encampment that are located outdoors and plainly visible without prior notice to determine compliance with these standards.

C. A site inspection of the encampment by a Department inspector is required prior to commencing encampment operations.

D. Parking is not required for a transitional encampment allowed under this Section 23.42.054.

Section 2. Section 23.43.040 of the Seattle Municipal Code, which section was last amended by Ordinance 123378, is amended as follows:

23.43.040 Accessory uses and structures(~~(; exceptions to development standards for solar collectors and solariums.~~)

\* \* \*

F. Transitional encampments accessory use. Transitional encampments accessory to religious facilities or to principal uses located on property owned or controlled by a religious organization are regulated by Section 23.42.054.

Section 3. A new Section 23.44.053 of the Seattle Municipal Code is adopted to read as follows:

23.44.053 Transitional encampments accessory use

Transitional encampments accessory to religious facilities or to principal uses located on property owned or controlled by a religious organization are regulated by Section 23.42.054, Transitional Encampments Accessory to Religious Facilities.

Section 4. A new Section 23.45.595 of the Seattle Municipal Code is adopted to read as follows:

23.45.595 Transitional encampments accessory use

Transitional encampments accessory to religious facilities or to principal uses located on property owned or controlled by a religious organization are regulated by Section 23.42.054, Transitional Encampments Accessory to Religious Facilities.

Section 5. A new Section 23.47A.036 of the Seattle Municipal Code is adopted to read as follows:

23.47A.036 Transitional encampments accessory use

Transitional encampments accessory to religious facilities or to principal uses located on property owned or controlled by a religious organization are regulated by Section 23.42.054, Transitional Encampments Accessory to Religious Facilities.

Section 6. Section 23.50.012 of the Seattle Municipal Code, which section was last amended by Ordinance 123378, is amended as follows:

23.50.012 Permitted and Prohibited Uses

\* \* \*

Table A for 23.50.012					
Uses in Industrial Zones					
PERMITTED AND PROHIBITED USES BY ZONE					
USES	IB	IC	IG1 and IG2 (general)	IG1 in the Duwamish M/I Center	IG2 in the Duwamish M/I Center
* * *					
<b>E. INSTITUTIONS</b>					
E.1. Adult care centers	X	X	X	X	X
E.2. Child care centers	P	P	P	P	P
E.3. Colleges	EB	EB	EB	X(6)	X(6)
E.4. Community centers and Family support centers	EB	EB	EB	P	P
E.5. Community clubs	EB	EB	EB	X	P

E.6. Hospitals	EB	EB	CU(7)	P	P
E.7. Institutes for advanced study	P	P	P	X	X
E.8. Libraries	X	X	X	X	X
E.9. Major institutions subject to the provisions of Chapter 23.69	EB	EB	EB	EB	EB
E.10. Museums	EB	EB(9)	EB	X(8)	X(8)
E.11. Private clubs	EB	EB	EB	X	X
E.12. Religious facilities	P(15)	P(15)	P(15)	P(15)	P(15)
E.13. Schools, elementary or secondary	EB	EB	EB	X	X
E.14. Vocational or fine arts schools	P	P	P	P	P

\* \* \*

(15) Transitional encampments accessory to religious facilities or to principal uses located on property owned or controlled by a religious organization are regulated by Section 23.42.054.

Section 7. Section 23.84A.038 of the Seattle Municipal Code, which section was last amended by Ordinance 123495, is amended as follows:

23.84A.038 "T"

\* \* \*

"Transitional Encampment" means a use having tents or a similar shelter that provides temporary quarters for sleeping and shelter. The use may have common food preparation, shower, or other commonly-used facilities that are separate from the sleeping shelters.

\* \* \*

Section 8. The provisions of this ordinance are declared to be separate and severable. The invalidity of any particular provision shall not affect the validity of any other provision.

Section 9. This ordinance shall take effect and be in force 30 days from and after its approval by the Mayor, but if not approved and returned by the Mayor within ten days after presentation, it shall take effect as provided by Seattle Municipal Code Section 1.04.020.

Passed by the City Council the \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2011, and signed by me in open session in authentication of its passage this

\_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2011.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 President \_\_\_\_\_ of the City Council

Approved by me this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2011.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Michael McGinn, Mayor

Filed by me this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2011.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Monica Martinez Simmons, City Clerk

(Seal)

Bill Mills DPD Transitional Encampment ORD October 3, 2011 Version #12